JAN 7 - 1944

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89—PART 5

JUNE 15, 1943, TO JULY 6, 1943
(PAGES 5839 TO 7312)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, whose love has never let us go and beyond whose brooding care we cannot drift, in the glory and vigor of a new morning as we set our faces once more toward tasks and toils we lift our careworn hearts to Thee. We bow in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving to make known our requests unto Thee. We fain would quiet our souls in Thy presence and rest ourselves in the confidence of Thy sustaining strength, that the peace of God which passeth all understanding may guard our hearts and thoughts.

Through countless channels Thou dost seek our lives, at many a door Thou dost stand and knock, if we would but heed the gentle accents of Thy call. We wait now for the still small voice which can change our fear to faith and our cowardice to courage. Harken to the prayers of our hearts when in highest moments we forget ourselves and think of Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1616) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Memorial 16

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, petitioning the Congress to defeat any bill that has been introduced, which has for its purpose the depriving of the right by any State to require the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting and to desist from the passing of any law that encroaches on State rights and urging the passage or repeal of laws necessary to restore to the States their powers and rights to which they are entitled under a democratic form of government

"Whereas there have been many encroachments by the Federal Government, its departments, bureaus, and agencies on the rights of States; and

"Where because of this continuing depriving of the States of their proper rights and powers under a democratic form of government; and

"Whereas, if this tendency of the present National administration is not stopped it will result in a collapse of our democratic form of government and the destruction of the democratic principle on which this Nation was founded; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress a bill which has for its purpose the taking away from the States their right to collect poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in any national election: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That we do memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to defeat the bill now pending in Congress that will deprive the States of their right to require the payment of poll taxes by their citizens as a prerequisite to voting; and that we do further insist that the Congress of the United States pass no other or further laws, the operation of which would deprive the States of any of their constitutional, inherent, or other rights or powers to which they are entitled under a democratic form of government; and that we do further insist that the Congress of the United States pass such laws or repeal such laws necessary to return to the States those powers and rights to which the States of the Union are entitled.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this memorial, under the Great Seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and that copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida

in both House and Senate of the United States Congress.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the State senate and the house of representatives and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor June 10, 1943."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by the president and secretary of the Ministerial Alliance of the Baxter Springs (Kans.) community praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ROLL-BACK PROGRAM—TELEGRAM FROM JOHN W. LIVINGSTON, DIRECTOR, UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, REGION NO. 5

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference a telegram in the nature of a petition from John W. Livingston, director, U. A. W., C. I. O. region No. 5, appealing to the Congress to support roll-back prices. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 7, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of 60,000 United Auto Workers members, their families, and general public within this region, strongly urge you appear before Senate Agricultural Committee to support rolling back prices. Also imperative you take strong positive position when matter considered by Congress. Certainly President Roosevelt's program to roll back prices must not be scuttled by reactionary congressional forces, and, as public servant, you are charged with responsibility of supporting such program to aid in effective prosecution of the Nation's war effort.

JOHN W. LIVINGSTON,
Director, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Region No. 5.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1113. A bill to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 315);

S. 1132. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 316);

S. 1170. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the naval mine depot reservation at Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 317); and

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 318).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 1076. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. CLARK of Idaho):

S. 1230. A bill for the relief of Ramon Galo Ydarraga and Pedro Ygalde; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1231. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 7, 1942, so as to provide adequate protection for persons in military or naval service as to the filing of State and local income-tax returns, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1232 (by request). A bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1616) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

POST-WAR REEMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS (S. DOC. NO. 65)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in the New York Times of April 25 there appeared a newspaper article entitled "Draft in Reverse After War Urged." The article was prompted by a post-war plan to provide employment for veterans prepared by Mr. Carl A. Gray, of the State of Connecticut. This article excited my interest and I later had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Gray. It is a rather lengthy document, but the subject is of such tremendous importance, and will mean so much to our country after the war, that I thought the plan should be printed for the benefit of those who are making a special study of post-war plans, and those agencies of government which are to some extent charged with the responsibility of post-war employment planning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that what is known as the Gray plan, and certain other associated material, be printed as a Senate document.

I have not had the time to study this proposal, but I do know of Mr. Gray's work on and success with the so-called Connecticut plan, and I feel that his view on this tremendously important subject should be made available to those officially interested in post-war employment planning.

I may add that I have discussed the matter of printing the material as a Senate document with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVILIAN WAR MOBILIZATION TEAM OF BYRNES AND BARUCH

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the former colleagues of ex-Senator James F. Byrnes, who also served as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, are not only pleased but are delighted by his appointment as War Mobilization Director. His experience, his statesmanship, his sound judgment, and his pleasing personality, which have been universally recognized, will be further evidenced by his assistance in the management of the war.

Justice Byrnes' choice of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch as special adviser to him is also very pleasing and heartening. Mr. Baruch's successful management of the War Industries Board in the last war is a testimonial of his great ability. That we can have these two able, broad-minded, experienced statesmen at the helm assisting our great President is most reassuring. We are confident that the war plans and strategy, from the standpoint of civilian activities, are in capable hands.

Mr. President, I desire to quote several excerpts from commendatory articles in Pennsylvania and other newspapers:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of June 11, 1943]

MR. BARUCH'S JOB

Bernard M. Baruch's abilities and experience have already been recognized by the President in the muddled rubber situation. Director of War Mobilization Byrnes could not have a better man at his elbow than the chairman of the War Industries Board of the last war.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of June 10, 1943]

BARUCH DRAFTED

James F. Byrnes, Director of the newly created post of War Mobilization Director, has availed himself of the assistance of an able and experienced wartime administrator in "drafting" Bernard Baruch in an advisory capacity. Baruch, Presidential consultant and head of the Industries Board in the First World War, will be assigned studies on Government policies and programs, Byrnes said.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 11, 1943]

If Bernard M. Baruch isn't to be a War Administrator in his own right, his official designation as adviser and aide to James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, is the next best thing.

Mr. Baruch, as almost everybody knows, has an impressive stock of native sagacity and acquired knowledge. As chairman of the War Industries Board in World War No. 1, he worked out solutions to many problems similar to those now complicating our war effort, and without much in the way of precedents to guide him.

Ever since the First World War, Mr. Baruch has been a vigorous opponent of war profiteering. He has favored stripping the civilian economy to increase war output. He has urged a determined fight on inflation through rigid freezing of price and wage levels.

The country needs his continued counsel.

Speaking editorially, the New York Times of June 11, 1943, had this to say of the appointment of Mr. Baruch:

This appointment assures Mr. Byrnes of experienced, shrewd, and courageous counsel.

I especially wish to call attention to an article in the June 11, 1943, issue of the Washington Post, which is owned and edited by Mr. Eugene Meyer, who

was here during the last war as one of the very capable assistants of Mr. Baruch.

James F. Byrnes has made a good start in his new job as Deputy President in charge of the home front. Most important of all are the indications that he really intends to exercise his broad powers as Director of War Mobilization. Apparently he does not intend to be merely a coordinator or peacemaker between war agencies working at cross-purposes. He has already taken over the role of chief policy initiator on the home front. If he clings to that task with the tenacity of which he is capable, our great military offensive now in the offing can be matched by stepped-up production of war industry and real teamwork in Washington.

By no means the least promising move of the Office of War Mobilization to date is the appointment of Bernard M. Baruch to be an unsalaried special adviser to Director Byrnes. Mr. Baruch has been one of the country's most distinguished elder statesmen ever since he served as Chairman of the War Industries Board during the First World War.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of June 10, 1943]

WE CAN USE HIM

War Mobilization Director Byrnes made two statements yesterday. One, that he has no ambitions to be Vice President and will not seek the nomination.

The other revealed that Bernard M. Baruch is to serve the Office of War Mobilization in an advisory capacity, without pay or title. This is good news. Mr. Baruch was the head of the War Industries Board in the last war. He has no political axes to grind. He has no personal ambitions. He wants to help, but the only conspicuous task to which he has been assigned was the clearing up of the rubber mess. His committee made an outstanding report upon which Administrator Jeffers has acted with splended results.

Justice Byrnes and Mr. Baruch are warm friends. It is to the former's credit that he has enlisted Mr. Baruch for the duration. The man whose office has been a park bench across the street from the White House may supply something we've needed badly.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 11, 1943]

The new War Mobilization Director should profit by the advice and assistance of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who has been brought into the Office of War Mobilization as a sort of unofficial counselor. Mr. Baruch has frequently been consulted in the past by the President and by other leading figures in charge of the civilian economy. But except for his work as a member of the committee to investigate the rubber situation, he has had no formal connection with Government agencies.

Now that he has been officially recognized as an adviser by Mr. Byrnes, his great talents and his thorough familiarity with the problems the war agencies are facing should count for a great deal more than in the past. Mr. Baruch's active cooperation may be expected to strengthen Mr. Byrnes' hand in the difficult tasks into which he is now throwing himself.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 10, 1943]

PACING MR. BARUCH

The announcement by James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, that he intends to make use of the talents of Bernard M. Baruch brings into the foreground one of the most interesting personalities in this wartime Capital.

Mr. Baruch has not been inactive. But with the exception of his investigation of the rubber shortage, his efforts have been attended by little or no publicity. His function has been that of a behind-the-scenes adviser and trouble shooter—a handy man to have around and one with a "passion for anonymity" at least equal to that which the President has decreed for his White House secretariat. But now, with the announcement by Mr. Byrnes, the man who headed the War Industries Board in the World War emerges publicly as one of the influential figures in the shaping of the domestic war program.

I think, Mr. President, that these excerpts are representative of the views of a cross section of the Nation.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. James A. Farley at the Flag Day exercises at Cambridge, Mass., June 12, 1943, under the auspices of Cambridge Lodge, No. 839, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOMBING GERMANY OUT OF THE WAR—ARTICLE BY FRANCIS V. DRAKE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Francis V. Drake, entitled "Why Don't We Really Try to Bomb Germany Out of the War?" published in the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FIGHTING CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY DR. WILL P. KENNEDY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "America's Fighting Congress," written by Dr. Will P. Kennedy and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of the officers and directors of the recently organized Congressional War Parents Association, and also a list of the Members of both branches of Congress and their sons and daughters serving in the armed forces of the Nation, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR WAR AIMS?—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are Our War Aims?" published in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, June 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2397, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think a brief explanation might be well at this time. This is the appropriation bill for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year commencing the 1st day of July 1943.

The amount of the bill as passed by the House was $189,629,400. The amount of increase by the Senate committee is $36,476,358. I think I should pause in the statement of the figures at that point in order to make an explanation.

This increase by the Senate committee is largely in one item under the Department of Commerce. The committee increased the appropriation for the Department of Commerce because of a supplemental estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, with a letter from the President asking for an item for the training of enlisted reservists on inactive status.

The Senate will remember that along about August 1942 the Army called on the Civil Aeronautics Authority to broadcast over the country an invitation for young men to vounteer to take training as pilots, to become enlisted reservists on inactive status. Twenty-five thousand young men responded to that call between August and the first of this year.

When the 25,000 or thereabouts had enlisted, the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Army found that they did not have equipment sufficient to train the number of men who had volunteered for the service. Hence a high percentage of these 25,000 men largely stood about waiting for the training which was to be given to them.

It will be recalled that about 2 months ago we made an appropriation to pay these men while they were awaiting training. The same group we have to deal with again in the pending bill.

To be very frank with my colleagues, the group has been a difficult one to deal with fairly and justly, because neither the Army nor the Civil Aeronautics Authority had the equipment with which to train them, and after they had been marshaled into an inactive status as reservists the Army found that it did not want the total number. It also found that a high percentage of the men could not qualify for pilot training. It took the Senate committee nearly 3 weeks finally to work out and have the Army approve for this group a status in which they would be trained and into which they would fall.

The Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate for the training of this group of approximately $27,600,000. The Civil Aeronautics Authority, in whose hands there had been placed the responsibility of training the group, repeatedly stated that that was not a sufficient amount to train the men. They presented an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget considered the estimate, which was in an amount of $40,000,000. The Bureau

of the Budget sent to the committee an estimate for only $27,000,000, using round figures.

The Army came before the committee of the Senate and stated that it wanted to set up a different program for this reservist group, and that is the program which has now been approved by the Army, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In other words, we had to wind up this particular group. We did not want them going on year after year, or interminably. We wanted the group and the program at sometime definitely wound up, so that it would no longer be a group in existence, and a group of enlisted reservists on inactive status, which was a very unhappy condition for the men who occupied that position, and a very unhappy condition for those who had to take care of the appropriation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. How long will this training be carried on? What length of time is required to train a man?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Civil Aeronautics Authority, into whose hands we placed the training of these men, estimate that it takes about 10 months to put the men through the three or four courses which the Army requires.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I notice on page 3 of the report that the number of trainees will not exceed 8,648.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was about to explain that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In connection with that, I should appreciate it if the Senator would explain why the training of 8,648 trainees in 10 months would cost $33,000,000, which would mean over $4,000 per trainee.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is estimated by those in authority who have to do with these training programs that it requires approximately $10,000 to put a trainee through the courses required by the Army in this category. There are about three courses definitely assigned into which and through which these men must pass in order to be of service to the Army, and for the training of these men, the contract price for their training, their subsistence, housing, and everything connected with the training, is about $10,000 per trainee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That means that it costs $1,000 a month per man to train them.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the way it would seem to figure out, although that is not a correct way of stating it.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. I notice on page 2 of the report an item of $1,842,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall come to that item in a moment. If the Senator will kindly permit me to conclude my explanation of the other item, I shall be glad to explain the item to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WALLGREN. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. To conclude with the item in the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, which covers the group of trainees in question: The Army has established the program, and it will require about 8,600 men to be taken into training in order that the Army may receive about 7,000 fully trained men out of the group. Percentage experiences have been applied to those figures, and the Army estimates that in order finally to receive 7,200 trained men it must place 8,600 men in training at the beginning. It was first proposed that when the men were fully trained they would be taken over by the Army in a sort of civil capacity, as liaison flyers, cross-country flyers, ferry-service flyers, and so forth. But now the Army has set up a new program. The first day of July the men in this group will all be called into active service, and between the 1st of July and the 1st of September they will be screened out until there remain only 8,600 men to undertake the training. This training has been going on all the time since last August, and is continuing at the present time.

When the Army established a new program and presented it to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the committee then was confronted with another problem, namely how much money to appropriate for the proper carrying out of the Army's new program. We called before us representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and told them to present to us their estimates of what it would cost to train these men through the category of training which the Army required, and they submitted to the committee the amount which the committee has set up in this item, namely, $33,940,358. The Bureau of the Budget under a former program had estimated that the work could be done for $27,800,000. Nevertheless, when the Army set up a new program it was necessary to go forward with it at once, because the Army desired to call these men into active service on the 1st day of July; hence we have to take immediate steps to make a proper appropriation.

Let me say further that the committee has instructed the Senator from Nevada, who is handling the bill on the floor, to obtain from the Bureau of the Budget the results of a further study, before the conference committee meets, so the conferees may deal with the subject in its final analysis. So the committee will recommend when we come to consideration of this item in the bill, that the amount of $33,940,358 be appropriated, with the understanding—and I have already taken it up with the Bureau of the Budget—that before we go into conference the amount will be broken down and itemized so the conferees will know the proper amount to put into the bill to carry forward the Army program.

Mr. President, I have made an extended explanation of the item because it is the largest item in the bill that comes in by way of an amendment to the bill over and above the amount contained in the bill as it come from the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I interpose a very brief statement, perhaps in the form of a question? I shall try to make it in that form anyway.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the situation, the language which now appears as the committee amendment in the bill is the result of long deliberation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I understand conferences were held between members of the committee and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and officers of the Army, and that from those conferences there was worked out both this language and the amount which is proposed to be appropriated. I think I am justified in saying that the minority members of the subcommittee and of the committee were in complete concurrence with the conclusions, arrived at by the majority of the committee. I think in particular I am justified in saying that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], out of his experience in the armed forces of the United States, and out of the close study which he has been giving to appropriation bills, contributed substantially to working out the committee agreement, and that in the form in which the amendment now appears before the Senate it has the complete approval of the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and indeed the other minority members of the subcommittee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say, Mr. President, that what the Senator from Maine has stated is exactly the fact. The language in the appropriation bill which was recommended to be placed in it by the subcommittee was carefully worked out with this point, among others, in mind: It was the desire on the part of the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the chairman of the subcommittee, that an end be brought to the existence of this group within a reasonable time, and that time has now been fixed. No more men are going into the group. Enlistment in the group has been terminated. The group will be cut down until it shall be composed of about 8,600 men, who are to go into training, and of that number 7,200 will go into the Army. A direction in writing was given by the Army to the Civil Aeronautics Authority that it turn over to the Army during the course of this training 600 men a month. The Civil Aeronautics Authority have been keeping up the program to date.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not familiar with the hearings or the testimony adduced before the committee. I have the greatest confidence in the committee, and naturally in the committee's conclusions.

Also I have no objection as to the number of men to be trained. The more men who are trained under this program the better the result. But I am astonished at the cost of $1,000 per month per man for such training.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to advise the Senator from West Virginia that that amount includes the acquisition of equipment, of aircraft, subsistence, housing, the training to be done by regular contractors who contract to train these men. All those items are included in the figure of $1,000 a month, if that be the figure. Approximately $10,000 will be required for the training of one man.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that in fact and in purpose this is a liquidating proceeding. It is designed to bring to an end the program as it has been heretofore carried on and shift the future training to the officers and facilities of the Army.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to augment that statement by saying that since this program was set up by the Army in August of last year the Army has completely revolutionized the training, and has now set up what is known as the War Training Service, in which trainees are trained in colleges and universities throughout the country. Some two-hundred-odd colleges are training men for the Service.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] for a question.

Mr. WALLGREN. I notice on page 2 of the report an item of $1,842,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities. I am curious to know whether any of this money is being spent in Canada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have queried the Civil Aeronautics Authority on that subject because some days ago the same question came to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having this bill in hand. I queried Mr. Donaldson and others in the Civil Aeronautics Authority about the duty and obligation of constructing landing areas. I was told positively no. The language of the bill limits the construction of the landing areas and facilities to American territory.

Mr. WALLGREN. Then as to all the installations which are along the present ferry-command route through Canada and into Alaska, all those in Canada must have been built by the Army; because they have their facilities and landing fields and communications facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. In Alaska?

Mr. WALLGREN. Along the entire route going from Great Falls to Edmonton and to White Horse, and then to Fairbanks and on to Nome.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator asked me whether the money is to be spent in Canada.

Mr. WALLGREN. Yes; is any of the money to be spent in Canada, and has the Department of Commerce spent any money in Canada for the installation of landing facilities, landing strips, radio beacons, or any other facilities?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that as to landing strips and landing fields, no American money has been spent in Canada.

Mr. WALLGREN. American money has been spent in Canada; but I asked specifically as to this appropriation for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is none that I can see.

Mr. WALLGREN. Because today we are building landing fields and communications facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. In Canada?

Mr. WALLGREN. In Canada.

Mr. McCARRAN. The only answer I can give to the Senator is that all the appropriated money in the bill, except as to one item, is for construction of facilities of various kinds in Alaska.

Mr. WALLGREN. None of it for construction of facilities in Canada?

Mr. McCARRAN. None was so stated to the committee.

Mr. WALLGREN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the order has been entered that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered. I ask that the order be now complied with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Office of the Secretary of State", on page 3, line 20, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$310,000" and insert "$410,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 8, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$248,000" and insert "$288,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

Collecting and editing official papers of Territories of the United States: For the expenses of collecting, editing, copying, and arranging for publication the official papers of the Territories of the United States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and contingent and traveling expenses, as provided by the act approved February 28, 1929, as amended by the act approved June 28, 1937 (5 U. S. C. 168–168b), $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Intercourse", on page 9, line 21, after "(22 U. S. C. 12)", to strike out "$210,000" and insert "$230,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Immigration and Naturalization Service", on page 45, line 11, after the word "Convention" and the colon, to strike out *"Provided further,* That the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to alien enemy detainees receiving from the United States compensation in the form of subsistence, cash advances, or other allowances in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General for work performed in internment camps; but this proviso shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation laws of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary", on page 52, line 8, after the word "field", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$115,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census", on page 57, line 7, after the word "otherwise" and the semicolon, to insert "purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of two motor-propelled station wagons."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", on page 58, line 18, after the word "automobiles", strike out "$2,413,000" and insert "$4,255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 5, to insert:

Civilian pilot training: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1937, as amended (49 U. S. C. 751, 752), and as further amended, but limited to the training of sufficient persons, presently enrolled in the civilian pilot training program, to produce 7,200 instructor course graduates for the Army, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when authorized by the Administrator; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; purchase, cleaning, and repair of special aviation wearing apparel and parachutes; traveling expenses; not to exceed $100,000 for the purchase of aircraft for administrative purposes; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft and passenger-carrying automobiles; pay at a rate of $50 per month to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein, while undergoing training and during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses) pursuant to the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, travel and subsistence of trainees, $33,940,358: *Provided,* That not to exceed $441,000 of this amount may be transferred to the appropriation "Enforcement of safety regulations, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," for expenditure in connection with payment of salaries and travel of personnel engaged in supervision and promotion of the safety features of the civilian pilot training program, and not to exceed $258,662 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available after September 1, 1943, to pay

any member of the Enlisted Reserve on inactive status.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 62, to insert:

Development of landing areas: The consolidated appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, shall remain available until June 30, 1944, without warrant action: *Provided*, That not to exceed $158,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the development of landing-areas program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at this point I think an explanation to the Senate would not be out of place.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. While I was discussing another measure with the distinguished Senator from Washington, the clerk, seemingly with considerable haste—although I am not complaining about that—proceeded to read sundry of the committee amendments. Let me inquire at what point he stopped a moment ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. He stopped with the amendment on page 62, lines 1 to 9. We can return to the previous amendments if the Senator desires to have that done.

Mr. McNARY. No; I am not asking to have that done. Mr. President, I inquire to what subject does the amendment on page 62 relate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the development of landing areas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to make an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I should be glad to have the Senator do so; that is what I wanted.

Mr. McCARRAN. For the fiscal year 1943, the Congress appropriated $199,000,000 for the construction of landing areas within the United States or possessions of the United States. During the year all the $199,000,000 has been allocated, but only approximately $100,000,000 has been expended, leaving a balance yet unexpended, but allocated, of approximately $99,000,000. No appropriation of new money is carried in this item. There is only the reappropriation of $99,000,000, the appropriation of which will lapse and expire if we do not reappropriate the money for the program already laid out, and for which the money has already been allocated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the item, it is simply a carry-over of money which heretofore has been appropriated, but which by present law must be spent during the current fiscal year. The item is simply a projection of the $99,000,000 into the future; and the money is to be spent in its entirety for projects which have Army approval.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct—Army or Navy approval.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; Army or Navy approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 62, lines 1 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board", on page 63, line 17, after "snowshoes, and skis)", to strike out "$1,150,000" and insert "$1,214,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey", on page 66, line 19, after the name "Maryland", to strike out the comma and "not exceeding $2,700 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 69, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,260,000" and insert "$1,310,000"; in line 16, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$1,309,000" and insert "$1,359,000", and in line 19, after the word "appropriated", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation in this paragraph shall be used for inquiries or investigations relating to dairy products, or for promotional activities inquiries or investigations in connection with oleomargarine, 'filled milk', 'filled' cheese and other pretended substitutes for dairy products."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hope the Vice President will recall his statement of the adoption of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. I do not know that I shall oppose the amendment, but the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has always favored legislation of this character, and similar legislation is carried in a number of appropriation bills. I observe that he is absent at the moment, undoubtedly due to official matters.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to what item does the Senator refer, let me inquire.

Mr. McNARY. To the item on page 69, providing for deletion of the language on lines 19 to 25.

Mr. McCARRAN. That language was inserted on the floor of the House. Representatives of the Department came before the Senate subcommittee and requested that the item be stricken because in its present form it would prohibit any inquiries or investigations relative to dairy products or for the promotion of inquiries relative to "filled" cheese, so-called, or "filled milk," and the like.

The objection made on the floor of the House was that certain publications which had been issued by the Department were initiated and put forward when the W. P. A. was in existence; that W. P. A. labor was used for the preparation of the studies; that that activity had terminated, and no more publications were going to be issued, but that if the language remained in the bill it would prohibit the prosecution of studies along scientific lines.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the explanation is very satisfactory.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I mention the matter only because of the absence of my colleague who sits at the desk behind me. I wanted to make inquiry concerning the item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 69, lines 19 to 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 70, to insert:

Field office service: For salaries (not to exceed $250,000) and all other expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including foreign and domestic newspapers (not exceeding $300), periodicals and books of reference, $295,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is that item a new one?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that the item is not new. It was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget, but was stricken out by the House. It has been carried in appropriation bills for years. There are thirty-odd offices located at various places throughout the country. They belong to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. They act as offices to advise those who now are interested in the prosecution of the war as to where certain commodities may be obtained and as to what commodities may be essential for a given area. They act as a guide for that domestic commerce activity, which is now under the State Department. This is the Commerce Department's actual contact with various sections of the United States. It does not include the Foreign Service.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Recently the Committee on Commerce of the Senate reported favorably a bill which has for its purpose obtaining information in behalf of little business. I wonder if this service is rendered to that group of businessmen, who are now suffering from the impact of war activities.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was testified by Mr. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who came before the committee, that these offices are most important because of their contact with small business throughout the country, and that to put them out of business would be disastrous.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the record show that this is simply the continuation of a service which has been in existence for some 30 years?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. There are 31 or 32 offices throughout the country. Let me say that the House held the item up to make a study, and after the study was made I received word from the House committee which encouraged the inclusion of this item in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 70.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the committee, and am not very well informed concerning the bill. On page 71, lines 20 to 25, there is an item as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing the weekly issue of patents, designs, trade-marks, exclusive of illustrations; and for printing, engraving illustrations, and binding the Official Gazette, including weekly and annual indices, $740,000; for miscellaneous printing and binding, $60,000; in all, $800,000.

One issue would cost $15,000. Is there any testimony regarding that item?

Mr. McCARRAN. None at all, because it was not a matter in controversy. No department asked for a review of it. Hence, our committee did not touch on the subject, and I have no information; but the House hearings would give the Senator the information, which I am sorry I do not have.

Mr. LANGER. Does not $15,000 seem like a tremendous price to pay for one issue of the Official Gazette?

Mr. McCARRAN. We find what we consider tremendous prices in connection with every item in appropriation bills; but I think if the Senator looks into the question carefully, he will undoubtedly find that the House made a careful study of the subject, so much so that the departments did not question it, and the figure has been fixed accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards", on page 74, after line 23, to insert:

Construction of wind tunnel: For the construction of a building and wind tunnel and the purchase of necessary equipment therefor to facilitate the testing of designs of aircraft bombs and projectiles, $110,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. Why did not the committee include in the bill an appropriation for the completion of the 28 airports which have been constructed by municipalities and other Government subdivisions in conjunction with the Federal Government? I understand there is a list of 28 of them. Some of them are 90 percent complete. They are located in California, Colorado, Kentucky, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Carolina, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Nebraska.

I am particularly interested in two airports, one at Beatrice, Nebr., and one at Fremont, Nebr. I received word over the telephone day before yesterday from Beatrice. I am informed by Hon. KARL STEFAN, Representative in Congress from the Third District of Nebraska, that he has received a communication from Fremont to the effect that both those airports are 90 percent complete. I am asking why there is not an appropriation in this bill to complete them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if those airports were authorized by the War or Navy Departments, they are going forward, and the money for them is in the bill. If they were not authorized by the War or Navy Department, they would not come under this bill, and would not be constructed at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that the 28 airports to which I have referred are not provided for in this appropriation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would not say that, because I am not familiar with those airports. Let me make an explanation, which I think will answer the question.

There is in this bill a reappropriation of $99,000,000, which is a part of an appropriation of $199,000,000 which Congress made last year for the fiscal year ending June 30. One hundred million dollars has been expended in the construction of landing areas. There is still $99,000,000 in that appropriation, all of which has been allocated for the construction of landing areas, which are either now in the course of construction, or which are to be constructed within the next year. We propose to reappropriate $99,000,000 of the $199,000,000 which we appropriated last year. If we did not carry that sum by way of reappropriation in this bill, it would lapse at the end of the fiscal year. So, if the landing areas at Beatrice, Nebr., or wherever they may be in Nebraska, are in the program, if they have been approved by the Army or the Navy—and it was necessary to obtain the approval of the Army or the Navy before they could go forward—money is appropriated in this bill for their completion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am reliably informed that the 28 airports are not within the reappropriation of $99,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer that question. If they are not, then they are not authorized by the Army or Navy. No landing area can go forward now without the approval of the Army or the Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask what is to become of those properties, some of which are 90 percent complete?

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the work going on?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I personally know about the situation at Beatrice, Nebr. I have seen the airport. Some of the best land available was devoted to that purpose. Bonds were sold, and the credit of the community was pledged, with the understanding that the airport would be completed. I am reliably informed that neither the Beatrice nor the Fremont plant is included in the reappropriation of $99,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true. If it is, then they do not come under this bill at all. It may be that they come under the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in a different program, but I doubt it, because under the rules and regulations of the War Production Board the Civil Aeronautics Authority cannot go forward with the completion of a landing area without the approval of the Army or Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator now states that he is not sure that any of the 28 fields to which I have referred, in various States, come within the reappropriation of $99,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not, because I have not seen the approved list of landing fields. Let me say further to the Senator by way of explanation that about May of 1942, when the Army set up the program for landing fields in the United States, the program was brought before the Appropriations Committee. The Army then submitted a revised program; but I am advised by the Civil Aeronautics Authority and by others that even the revised program has been revised, and rerevised. Many of the fields which were approved, and were on the list first presented to the Appropriations Committee, have not gone forward because others have been selected by the Army or the Navy in their places.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask a further question. I understand the Senator to say that $99,000,000 is now reappropriated under this bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If the fields to which I have referred come under the bill, the Senator feels that the money for them will be reappropriated?

Mr. McCARRAN. In my judgment they must be under some program which the Army or the Navy approves. I think they probably come under the reappropriation of $99,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. And if they are not under it, it is because the Army or the Navy has not approved the airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry that I cannot answer that question.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to respond to an inquiry from the Senator from Maine?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to ask a question, but the Senator has already answered it.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE WEST

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have just come from an informal meeting of Senators and Representatives from ration district No. 2. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and I took the initiative in inviting Senators to hold the meeting. A group in the other House had already organized last week and had elected Representative CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio as chairman, and Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM of Iowa as secretary. There was a goodly attendance at the meeting of both Senators and Representatives.

Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, appeared, among others, and gave one of his usually frank

and illuminating statements concerning the entire situation so far as gasoline and petroleum production and transportation were concerned. I think it is fair to say that the Administrator gave clear indication that he is not at all in sympathy with the idea that persons in district No. 2 should be rationed simply on the theory that misery loves company, or should have company provided for it if it does not get it under its own power. He also assured the group that before any further restrictions were imposed upon the use of gasoline in district No. 2, or any portion of it, he would confer with this group and give it due notice of any such action.

Mr. R. F. Dow, of the Office of Defense Transportation, also made a statement concerning the transportation situation, and Mr. Paul M. O'Leary of the O. P. A., in charge of rationing, appeared and made a statement.

I believe much was accomplished, and I think the people of district II should feel reassured that there is at least no immediate prospect of a further curtailment in the use of gasoline in that area.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by Mr. Ickes. The first sentence reads as follows:

I have been advised that your committee desires to explore the petroleum supply situation in the Middle West, primarily to ascertain the facts as to the adequacy of the supply of motor gasoline for civilians.

I ask that the entire statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been advised that your committee desires to explore the petroleum supply situation in the Middle West, primarily to ascertain the facts as to the adequacy of the supply of motor gasoline for civilians. In the background there is, of course, the specter of the further curtailment of civilian use of gasoline. You wish to drag that ghost out by the heels. If, in fact, civilian motorists in any part of the country must reduce their use of gasoline more than has been required under the current rationing program established by the office of the Rubber Director as a rubber conservation measure, or if civilian motorists must continue to be rationed even after rubber is again available—you want to know why.

Last week I met with a committee of eastern Congressmen who were concerned primarily with the gasoline shortage in this area. The eastern shortage, as they know, is governed by a shortage of transportation. Regardless of the fundamental question as to whether we will have enough gasoline to supply an unrationed use by civilian motorists on a Nation-wide basis, the fact is that there are current supplies of gasoline in other areas which are more ample than those available on the east coast. The present disparity in the treatment of civilian motorists in the various geographical areas is due to physical limitations on our ability to equalize supplies in all areas of the country.

Sometime at or about the end of this year the total volume of petroleum products moving into the east coast—our District No. 1—will approximate the same volume as was moved in before the war stripped the east coast of its tanker fleet. In effect, the stream of petroleum flowing eastward, which diminished to about two-thirds its normal size at the depths of winter, will rise again to its normal level although we had to cut a brand new channel for it.

As our eastern friends well know, the resumption of a normal flow of the petroleum stream eastward does not mean that there may not continue to be a severe drought of petroleum on the Atlantic coast nevertheless. The amount of petroleum products available to civilians in the East depends, from now on out, on the needs of the armed services of the United States and its allies in the European and African theaters of war. It is from the east coast that substantial amounts of these supplies must be drawn and the more petroleum drawn from the eastern bank for the winning of the war, the less can be used at home.

I mention the international situation and the east-coast situation as a mere preliminary to a discussion of the somewhat different problem which I know is your particular concern. Further, I am presenting this prepared statement as a further preliminary to submitting myself and my staff to any specific inquiries which you may wish to make. However, the problem of petroleum supply, now and in the future, is so complex that I believe that any specific questions on the supply situation in the interior of the country can best be made after I have given you the main framework of the situation as we see it in the Petroleum Administration for War.

In order to provide an adequate supply of petroleum products to our people, we must sustain six basic features of the national economy. We must have enough crude oil each day, not in the ground, but on top of the ground, in tanks or gathering lines. We must have means to transport that crude oil to our refineries. We must have refining capacity to convert that crude into products, such as gasoline and fuel oil. We must have means to convey the products to the points of use and to distribute them. We must have men and women to man these facilities. We must have sufficient financial incentives in all phases of the industry to keep the wheels in motion.

When and if difficulty is experienced in maintaining any one of these six essential features, and the supply reaching the population is thereby reduced below the point at which there is plenty for all, we must have a really effective method of distributing the available supply in a manner that best serves the public interest. No method of reducing consumption can be effective unless the people understand it and understand the reasons for it. Opposition to any restrictions which may be imposed will be based on disbelief of the necessity of restriction, not because of any selfish interest in the relative allocations made of the available supplies. Military needs come first. Farm needs come next, lest we suffer from a shortage of food. The needs of war industries and really essential civilian industries (both as to fuel oil and as to worker's transportation) share second place with farm needs. In a choice as to whether our people are to be warm in winter or have the unrestricted use of their automobiles, there is not apt to be any disagreement. Similarly, there should be no disagreement on the point that since coal can be substituted for oil for heating purposes and cannot be used "as is" in the tank of an automobile, it is to the national interest that heating and power facilities should be converted whenever possible from the use of oil to coal or hydroelectric power, if the effect of failing to do so will be to contribute to a petroleum shortage.

Every barrel of crude oil sent through our refineries results in the production of some gasoline and some fuel oil or something equivalent to fuel oil, such as coke or asphalt. Even if there were no demand for a fuel having a petroleum base, we would have to make some just the same, in order to produce lighter products such as gasoline. Contrariwise, if there were a tremendous need for fuel oil and no reason at all for producing gasoline, we should still have to produce some gasoline in order to make fuel oil.

I mention this to remind you that the problem of adjusting the yields of various products produced in our refineries is one with which we must cope daily. Actually, of course, the war program demands tremendous quantities of both gasoline and fuel oil. Fuel oil for the Navy, for the merchant fleets, and for industry. Gasoline for planes, tanks, trucks, jeeps, and essential civilian transport.

We must cope with a certain inflexibility as to the location of our refineries. Half of the critically needed petroleum war products such as aviation gasoline, butadiene for rubber, and toluene for TNT, must be produced on the Gulf coast for the simple reason that there is where the available crude oil and refining equipment is located. War products can be only a part of the total production, and, to keep up war-product production, we must supply crude to these refineries and haul away all of the products made. The same thing is obviously true of refineries producing war products in other localities. Crude oil must be supplied to the east-coast refineries making aviation gasoline, even though diversion of the available transportation into the movement of gasoline or fuel oil to the east coast from other areas might provide greater immediate comfort to civilians. Refineries in the Midwest which make these same critical war products must have the first call on available crude oil, even if the effect would be to shut down other refineries and create local surpluses of civilian motor gasoline at some points and local shortages at other points.

I have sought your indulgence for these general observations because I can comment on the particular features of the supply situation as we see it only within the somewhat inflexible framework of the pertinent facts which I have outlined.

Now, to address myself squarely to the questions which I know interest you; that is, questions concerning the supply of petroleum in areas other than our Eastern States.

Is there going to be a shortage of petroleum products? The answer is: There is already a shortage of gasoline in some local areas.

Are the refineries running at full capacity? The answer is "no." The reasons for the failure of refineries to run at full capacity vary in the several sections of the country.

In our district 2, which encompasses the Middle West, there is a distinct and grievous shortage of crude oil at the refinery centers where it is needed. While these refineries have always drawn and are continuing to draw a part of their supplies of crude oil from points outside the district, such as Texas and Wyoming, crude-oil production within the district, particularly in the States of Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, is on the decline. Even if there were a wealth of crude oil available in districts 3 and 4, which there is not, this crude oil would not relieve the shortage in district 2 until it is conveyed to the refineries. The greatest potential new supply of crude oil for district 2 refineries lies underground in west Texas. The west Texas fields already available can produce more crude oil than can be moved out with present transportation facilities. A pipe line now authorized for construction from west Texas to district 2 can help relieve the shortage, but not until next year.

It has already been necessary for us to allocate the use of crude oil in district II. Except for those refineries which must run more crude oil than the average refinery, in order to produce a maximum quantity of critically

needed petroleum war products, refineries in district II have been instructed to operate on less crude than they consumed in 1941. Because of a dearth of gasoline in some agricultural areas we authorized operations in June at a rate greater than had been set in some areas for May, but more crude oil is currently being used than is being brought into the district. Crude inventories are dropping at a time even before all of the aviation gasoline- and toluene-producing refineries now under construction in that area have been completed. We not only need gasoline, fuel oil, and war products now, but we shall need gasoline, fuel oil, and more war products next year. Refineries in district II are living in part on accumulated crude inventories, and I fear we shall have to return to the lower rate of operation which we established for May.

I hope that these comments on the district II situation may serve to answer the question which I know you might otherwise ask me as to why we do not authorize 100 percent operation of district II refineries rather than risk the need of imposing increased restrictions in the Middle West.

Now as to district III—the Gulf coast district which includes the largest of the oil States—the State of Texas. The fact is that gasoline supplies are tight right now in some spots in that area. I must remind you the critically needed war products—aviation gasoline, butadiene, and toluene—all come from that part of the barrel of crude oil which otherwise goes into gasoline and kerosene. It is true enough that our refineries can make still greater yields of gasoline by heavier cracking operations, but when they do that they merely tend to shorten the supply of heating oils and fuel oils.

But, to answer more directly as to district III, the fact is that refining operations in that area must operate in tune with the transportation available to carry out the products. The amount of transportation varies from time to time, depending on the tanker situation, but rather than risk an actual shutdown of refineries producing critical war products (which, as I have told you, are necessarily byproducts of the main operations), it has been necessary for us to regulate the amount of crude oil run in these refineries. We must do this in such a manner that the transportation available will serve two purposes, first, to maintain maximum production of critical war products, and, second, to allocate fairly the remaining transportation between the other refiners.

Up until this time, if the diversion of the tanker fleet had not dislocated transportation and hence refining operations, most, if not all, of the district III refineries, could have run at top speed and could have alleviated the supply situation in other parts of the country. I am not at all sure that that would be true next year even if we had an unlimited ability to transport crude oil or petroleum products to any point in the United States. The war program calls for us to refine more crude oil in each succeeding quarter of this year and next year, ultimately at least 10 percent more crude oil than we have ever run in our refineries. The refineries can do it if we have the crude to run and the transportation facilities to move crude and products. While we have not yet quite hit the maximum daily production of crude oil of which we are capable, my staff tells me that we have almost achieved that point and that the high point which we can achieve is short of the goal that has been set for us. I do not want to dilute these remarks on the current supply situation with a discussion of crude reserves, the need of a price increase to stimulate discovery, production, and secondary recovery, the manpower situation, or the absolute necessity of supplies of steel for new wells in order to sustain our present rate of crude production. I merely mention these things to illustrate the point that even our district III refineries have a potential crude supply problem.

In our district IV, the Rocky Mountain States, crude production rather than transportation sets the pace for refining operations and hence for available supply of products. In district V, the Pacific Coast States, crude production is up to the maximum efficient rate and refineries are operating on a wide-open basis to the extent that crude is available. The gasoline supply situation there is satisfactory at the moment but the enormous demands of the Pacific war must be satisfied mainly from this area. Until Hirohito is vanquished the Pacific coast must face the specter of a crude shortage and a product shortage.

I have taken a good deal of your time in outlining the whole situation as I see it. I have no axes to grind and no secret schemes to invoke rationing to satisfy some quaint philosophy of demanding public sacrifices on the altar of war.

Last winter it was necessary to ration fuel oil in certain Midwestern States in order to alleviate a desperate situation in the East. Next winter the supply of fuel oil on the east coast will be determined within the limits of available transportation, by how much petroleum must be moved overseas. So far as we can foretell at the moment rationing of fuel oil will have to proceed in the same States, for the same reason, and at about the same rate as before—unless the East is actually to freeze instead of being uncomfortable.

At the present time civilian motorists in the East have necessarily been placed on a rigorously lean diet of motor gasoline—far less than their more fortunate brethren in the other States. To the extent that the eastern distress can be alleviated by moving gasoline from districts II and III it is obvious that the burden can and should be shared.

However, in considering the necessity of rationing the civilian use of gasoline and fuel oil in areas other than district I it is necessary to appraise the cumulative effect of many other factors. I have mentioned some of these factors but, to repeat, they are:

Shortage of crude in some refining areas;

Shortage of transportation for crude and products;

Necessity of producing fuel oil, even at the expense of gasoline;

Necessity of producing aviation gasoline and other war products, largely at the expense of gasoline; and

Necessity of supplying military needs, farm needs, and essential civilian transport needs before supplying motor gasoline for relatively nonessential use.

All of these factors rolled together spell a shortage of petroleum products in many areas of this country.

Now I shall turn to the "$64 question": What do we do about it?

We have a rationing system in effect all over the country now. The Office of Price Administration administers it. It was invoked at the request of Mr. Jeffers as a measure of rubber conservation. While it is unpopular and has been widely abused and evaded it has reduced the nonessential use of motor gasoline somewhat. However, I suspect that a wholesome fear on the part of some prudent motorists, that tires worn out could not be replaced, has had more to do with reduced consumption than the coupon system.

Unless the people understand and believe the need for reducing gasoline consumption, the coupon system appears to be very ineffective. Here in the East when the value of the A coupon was theoretically reduced the first result we could observe was the issuance of still more B coupons and C coupons and so far as I can determine the nonessential use of gasoline was actually increased rather than reduced. It took a pleasure-driving ban with teeth in it, plus the unpleasant shock of finding service stations out of gas, to convince the public of the reality of the shortage.

It is my hope that we may profit by that experience. It is extremely desirable that the nonessential use of motor gasoline be reduced in all parts of the country, and while I deplore the abuses of the present type of rationing to conserve rubber, I am frank to state my opinion that a sudden abolition of the present rationing system would result in "No gas" signs from time to time in various areas.

However, I have in mind another matter which is considerably more important to the Nation's welfare than a sporadic outcropping of "No gas" signs in metropolitan areas. We have already learned that the farmer is the first to suffer when gasoline supplies are short. When there was a surplus of gasoline, it flowed easily and regularly to the farmer. When a shortage in gasoline develops, the farmer has difficulty in getting it. This is partly because he is at the very end of an involved distributing system, partly because of a growing shortage of manpower for delivery, and partly because the city sale is the easiest to make. Whatever else we do or don't do, we must keep the food supplier on a mechanized basis.

My office has stepped into the rationing system in the East to order the oil companies to give preference to farm requirements, the same as military requirements. If the present relative shortage of gasoline in some of the farming areas in the interior continues, we shall have to step in there, also.

These comments are as definite a statement as I can fairly make at the moment on the subject of rationing gasoline to save gasoline. At the present time, excepting only the Atlantic seaboard, the object of gasoline rationing is to conserve rubber. Rubber was and is a national problem. Crude-oil supply is also a national problem. Gasoline supply, for reasons which I have indicated, is not one problem but a series of problems, depending on geography.

Until the crude oil supply problem has had further treatment from many angles, it would be premature (even if justifiable) to say that gasoline needs to be rationed to save crude oil for other purposes or other years. It may be so. I don't know yet. However, regardless of the Nation-wide supply situation surrounding crude oil, we cannot produce extra gasoline at the expense of critically needed war products or needed fuel oil and we must be prepared to adjust gasoline consumption to our refining, transportation, and supply resources.

The questions which I have been discussing can be resolved only by weighing all of the factors in one of our greatest industrial operations. We have the figures and we have the talent, both in our office and in industry. These matters are not casual with us. They receive fresh consideration every day, every week. Policies must follow facts. When the facts show clearly that a policy change is indicated we shall move, but we have no policy change to announce this morning. When we do I shall gladly let you know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I attended the informal meeting this morning, and I wish to compliment the Senator from Wisconsin for initiating the movement.

One fact was brought out which was of particular interest to me, and I am sure it will be of interest to other Members of the Senate. It was brought out that any shortage of gasoline on the eastern coast at the present time is due

in the main to transportation difficulties. That situation was brought about by the tremendous loss of tankers at the outset of the war.

I merely wish to recall that when the tankers were being sunk a group of aviators, particularly in the Midwest, who were too old for combat service, organized themselves and presented through me to this body a program of utilizing sportsmen's planes and sportsmen flyers who were willing to donate their services in the formation of an air umbrella over the eastern coast to protect the tankers. The Committee on Commerce of this body approved that program. It was held up by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate merely because the Secretary of War thought there might be some information which he did not want disclosed. The program had also been submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, who turned it down. But many months later the aviators to whom I have referred were organized in part and developed the Civilian Air Patrol, which did yeoman service, as testified by Mr. Landis before our committee. Many months later General Arnold said that the one outstanding defect was that we had not had air protection over the tankers.

So, Mr. President, if we have gasoline rationing in Illinois and through the Middle West it will be partly because we were not permitted to go forward in that investigation to show how to utilize the men who were willing to come from the Midwest to protect the east coast and form an air umbrella over the tankers.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of legislation, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 6, after the word "assistants", it is proposed to insert the following: "at such rates of compensation as may be authorized and approved by the Attorney General."

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to offer a word of explanation relative to the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment undoubtedly collides with the rule of the Senate in regard to legislation on an appropriation bill. Has the Senator given appropriate notice of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Notice has been published for 1 day.

Mr. McNARY. Has the amendment been favorably reported by the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was reported unanimously, and I was authorized by the committee to offer the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; I shall be glad to hear the Senator make a brief statement concerning the justification for the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment is in the nature of legislation. The rule has been complied with, and notice of a motion to suspend the rule has been published. I have been authorized by the Appropriations Committe to offer the amendment. The amendment is offered at the request of the Department of Justice.

All assistant United States district attorneys are now under the classified civil-service rules. Assistant United States district attorneys throughout the country have been and are now selected largely from the younger men of the bar. As we know, the younger men of the bar have been called into the military service of the United States. Those who remain are finding work of the bar sufficiently remunerative so that they do not care to accept the initial salary of assistant United States district attorneys, which, as I recall, is approximately $2,300 a year. I do not quote the figure authoritatively, but I believe that is about what it is. So the Department of Justice has had a great deal of difficulty in filling vacancies in the positions of assistant United States district attorneys in the various States of the Union.

The proposed amendment would permit the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to pay assistant United States district attorneys in accordance with the judgment of the Department of Justice, and in accordance with the volume of work which might be handled by the respective offices. In the unanimous view of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate the proposed change would be meritorious, and I present it with the sanction of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it may be that I do not understand the able Senator's statement. At the present time, and for years past, the Federal statute has contained a list of salaries for assistants in the offices of United States district attorneys. I do not get the point. Is the salary to be left to the discretion of the United States district attorneys in the various States?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it would not be within the discretion of the United States district attorneys in the various States. The assistant United States district attorneys are now under civil service.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Their entrance salaries and their advanced salaries are fixed by civil service. The entrance salary is too small to induce the younger men of the bar to take the office. So the Department of Justice is having difficulty in filling the offices of assistant United States district attorneys. The Department requests that it be permitted to fix the salaries of such assistant United States district attorneys in accordance with the judgment of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McNARY. As I stated a while ago, the law fixing the compensation of these deputies is old. Why now is it proposed to change the scheduled salary and leave it to the discretion of the United States district attorney or the Attorney General to fix the salaries?

Mr. McCARRAN. Because the Department has been unable to obtain men to take the place in the several States of assistant United States district attorneys who have left the service.

Mr. McNARY. Why was not a matter of this kind referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. It is purely a legislative matter. Here it is proposed to add another legislative amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no question about its being a legislative amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I appeal to the wisdom and fairness of the able Senator. I could not support a proposal of this kind. I do not know why it is not possible to get young lawyers today for the same compensation for which the Department has been able heretofore to obtain them. I know as one who started from the lowly rounds of the legal profession that a young lawyer felt himself favored if he got a position of this kind to start on during the weary and poor days of probation.

Mr. McCARRAN. That group are now in the armed services of the country.

Mr. McNARY. There are many of them who are not.

Mr. McCARRAN. There may be many of them who are not, but it does not seem possible for the Department to get them for the salaries presently provided.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask what is the lowest compensation paid to an assistant attorney?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it is $2,300.

Mr. McNARY. I know some very good lawyers who have obtained high position in the public service who were happy, indeed, to get one-half of $2,300. I may refer to an incident which I now recall as graphically as if it occurred yesterday. Years ago when President Coolidge was Vice President, while we were breakfasting one morning at the Willard Hotel, he said to me that he was very happy, indeed, when he made $2,000 a year as a practicing lawyer.

Mr. McCARRAN. But he was not paying 58 cents a pound for steak in those days.

Mr. McNARY. Probably not, but he had had many years of successful practice back of him, whereas young novitiates, just out of college, would receive in these positions $2,300 a year. I think they should be satisfied with that. It is practically $200 a month. Then they are permitted a 10-percent increase, or $230 a year, which, added to $2,300, brings the salary to over $200 a month.

I do not want them underpaid, but it does not seem to me to be advisable on an appropriation bill to tack an amendment which is wholly legislative in character and which relates to a matter which ought to be considered from all its angles. I appeal to the able Senator this is not the proper place for an amendment of this kind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to correct for the RECORD a statement I made. I read from a statement made before the committee by Mr. S. A. Andretta, assistant administrative assistant, Department of Justice:

In the case of assistants, very frequently we have had some go out of office who were getting $3,500, $3,600, or $3,700, because of length of service. The new man is appointed for the duration and 6 months thereafter. He hasn't enough time in the office to come under the automatic promotion bill, so he is stuck at $2,600—

I said $2,300. That was an error—

in the smaller districts, or $3,200, the entrance salaries of the respective grades. Usually we pay him $3,200 at the start but now very frequently you can't get a man except by paying him at least $3,600. Very often we have to pay him $3,800 to get him the entrance salary of the next higher grade.

In other words, they are unable to fill these offices, due to conditions I have stated to the Senator, and it is the desire of the Department of Justice to fill the offices of assistant United States district attorneys in the respective States and districts.

Mr. McNARY. Why has not the able Attorney General come before the proper committees of the House and the Senate and made known the necessity of a change in the law fixing the salaries of these young assistants who are needed in the Department of Justice?

Mr. McCARRAN. I can only explain that conjecturally, that is, say that time was a matter that had to enter into consideration, that this was an appropriation bill dealing with the salaries of United States district attorneys and their assistants. While formerly the amendment would not have been legislation because the salaries of assistant attorneys were fixed in the legislative bill, since they have been put under the civil service, it does fall in the category of being legislation.

Mr. McNARY. Certainly. May I ask who appeared before the Appropriations Committee in behalf of this matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. Thomas D. Quinn, administrative assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. McNARY. One individual?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think there were a number with him.

Mr. McNARY. Did he appear before the House committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think so.

Mr. McNARY. The provision was not in the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. McNARY. It is an afterthought of one person, one assistant in the Attorney General's Office, who appears before the committee and asked for this legislation on an appropriation bill. Is there no limitation in this amendment as to the salary which may be fixed for the deputies?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, sir.

Mr. McNARY. The Attorney General, then, can prescribe any sum of money he sees fit?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Under this language he could. That can be done anyway, however; that is, it could have been done before the assistants were placed under civil service; their salary was usually fixed according to the volume of work in a particular office.

Mr. McNARY. But now that is not so?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it is not so, because this group has been placed under the civil service. In my judgment, if the Senator wants my individual judgment, if it amounts to anything, this group never should have gone under the civil service, and neither should the deputy United States marshals have gone under the civil service. A marshal should be permitted to pick his men, because a marshal is responsible under his bond and in every other way for those who act under him. In my opinion, assistant United States district attorneys never should have been put under the civil service.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the Senator's argument that the United States marshals should fix the compensation of their deputies?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; that never was done.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator said a moment ago he thought it should be.

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. McNARY. I do not think the Attorney General should fix the salaries of these men without some limitation being placed by the Congress. The absence of a limitation makes it doubly offensive in my opinion. He can, under this appropriation, select any man he may choose and fix any salary that may appeal to his generosity. I think that is offensive legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have to trust somebody, and we face a condition not a theory. We have a shortage of men for these respective offices at a time when the volume of work of the district attorneys throughout the country is greater than it ever has been in our history.

Mr. McNARY. That is what the gentleman mentioned and the Senator may think, but I, myself, think I have some knowledge on that subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. McNARY. In the State of Oregon many lawyers have appealed to me to write letters commending them for positions in the Attorney General's office and district attorneys' offices. I have not heard of any effort being made to induce young lawyers to leave these jobs or decline them. There are plenty of men who would be glad to take them, and I think it is perfectly absurd to state that there is such a scarcity that the Attorney General should be given carte blanche authority to fix any salary that occurs to him as being proper. There is nothing in the amendment that would not permit an assistant attorney in Oregon to receive one salary and an assistant attorney in Nevada to receive a different salary. There is neither a minimum nor a maximum, a floor nor a ceiling. It is left to the wild discretion of someone to fix these salaries at any figure, in any of the 48 States.

I hope the Senator, for whom I have great admiration, and who I know has a sense of propriety, will not insist on the amendment, but will let the matter go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am directed by my committee to insist on the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I understand, but in former years, when the country was well governed, I served in the capacity of chairman of a committee, and often had committee bills in charge in the Senate. When I found that in my judgment the committee was in error, I assumed the responsibility of vetoing its action.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think the committee is in error. I favor this amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Then the Senator is not escaping under an alibi?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, nor trying to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada stated in all good faith that this amendment was the result of unanimous action by the Committee on Appropriations. I would not challenge the accuracy of that statement, but I wish to add that if I was present when the action was taken, I remained silent, or voted for the amendment, with a complete failure to appreciate its significance, for I am one of those definitely hostile to the Committee on Appropriations reporting to this body legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I remember, as other Senators now present remember, the days when there were several appropriating committees in this body and in the other House. The military appropriations bill was reported from the legislative committee having jurisdiction over military affairs. Likewise the naval appropriation bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs. There was also a post office appropriation bill, and there were other appropriation bills coming before this body from legislative committees which had a background of knowledge of the circumstances to which the appropriations related.

All those committees were stripped of their appropriating power, and that power was lodged in a single Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I have great doubt as to whether it was a wise course. It seemed to be wise at the time, but as it has worked out, I have doubt about it.

What now distresses me is the growing tendency of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I happen to be a member, to reach out now into the legislative authority of the several committees of the Senate. The Senate has taken from the legislative committees what was originally their appropriating jurisdiction, and now we are asked repeatedly to reach in and further strip the legislative committees of authority.

So far as I myself am concerned, I do not intend knowingly, and with appreciation of what I am doing, to support any provision coming from the Committee on Appropriations which proposes to attach to an appropriation bill matter which is clearly legislative in its character.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I rise merely for the purpose of complimenting the Senator from Nevada in adhering to the old, obsolete practice, under the general theory of the rules of the Senate, of coming into the Senate and making a motion to suspend the rules if he desires to put legislation on an appropriation bill, submitting it to the requirement of a two-thirds vote, rather than resorting to the practice followed here last week of bringing in a legislative proposal equally obnoxious to the rules of the Senate, and suspending the rules by a majority vote, rather than by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the motion of the Senator from Nevada to suspend the rules——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that such a motion has not as yet been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understood from the Senator from Nevada that he had made that motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not made the motion, but I shall make the motion. I did not think it was necessary to make the motion. No point of order has been raised as yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order has as yet been raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall proceed to discuss the question of the proposal of the Senator, very briefly.

It seems to me that, under the general theory and practice of the rules of the Senate, there is no parliamentary objection of any sort to legislation on an appropriation bill if it receives the sanction of two-thirds of the Members of this body, which I understand to be the procedure contemplated by the Senator from Nevada.

It seems to me also, it is only fair to say, that the rule against legislation in an appropriation bill was, in effect, repealed by the action of the Senate last week—with the support of the Senator from Oregon, incidentally—in voting to sustain the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting legislation on an appropriation bill. I intend to vote for the amendment now under discussion, because it comes frankly under the theory of the rules of the Senate. I intend to supply one of the two-thirds, if two-thirds can be supplied, because I think the amendment is meritorious.

I have experienced in actual practice the situation described by the Senator from Nevada. I have seen young, capable lawyers, of some experience, assistant district attorneys, men who were able to carry on with the additional and many new duties which have been imposed upon the United States attorneys' offices by war conditions, leave their offices and go into the service. In such cases it would be necessary either to take most immature young men, without experience, or get some older lawyers who were capable of doing the same sort of work that had been carried on by the men who went into the service. In other words, to carry the additional burden of duty it was necessary to get older men, with more experience, to replace the men who had gone into the service.

It has been found that in these times, when lawyers are scarce, owing to war conditions, it has been difficult to get men in the United States district attorneys' offices, at the minimum entrance salary established by law, with the experience necessary to enable them to carry on the work of the men who have gone into the service.

Mr. President, this is an emergency. I understand that the proposed legislation is intended as an emergency measure, merely to enable the district attorneys' offices to carry the burden of work thrown on them. I think the amendment is meritorious, and that since it is brought in, or is intended to be brought in, under the sanction of a motion to suspend the rules, if it becomes necessary, it is entitled to the support of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I understand, already we have voted extra pay for all Federal employees, 15 percent for the particular employees now under discussion.

We have heard much about "holding the line." When the farmers want a little advance, we have to "hold that line." When the coal miners come in for a little increase, the line has to be held. When any other Federal employee comes in for an increase, the cry is "hold that line." That is what we told the postal employees, that is what we have told everyone asking for an increase.

It so happens that there are a great many Members of Congress who are attorneys, that is their own fraternity, and here their own fraternity comes in and asks an increase, and immediately the Senators rally around their fraternal brothers and try to secure the increase for them. They forget all about "holding the line," but they go right ahead trying to get an extra increase over and above that granted all other Federal employees.

Personally, I think this is an outrage. If we are to "hold the line," let us "hold the line." If we are to "hold the line" against the farmers, and the miners, and the engineers, and everyone else in the Federal service, let us "hold the line" against these attorneys.

I know that I am fairly besieged from my own State with applications from young men anxious to have the opportunity of serving as assistant district attorneys. I have reason to believe that my State is not an exception, that the experience is the same in all other States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, does the amendment apply only to attorneys in the lowest grade?

Mr. McCARRAN. It applies to all assistant United States district attorneys.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not true that under the present law they are classified in different classes at different salaries?

Mr. McCARRAN. They enter with a salary of $2,600.

Mr. WALSH. Would the amendment permit the Department to change the salaries of all assistant attorneys?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment would suspend the salary legislation, and would permit them to be appointed with a salary to be fixed in the judgment of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose there was an attorney in the $2,500 salary classification. Could the Department pick out a man and give him any salary they saw fit, and put him in that classification?

Mr. McCARRAN. They could fill the place.

Mr. WALSH. At any salary they saw fit?

Mr. McCARRAN. At any salary they saw fit.

Mr. WALSH. So it is not merely dealing with the lowest bracket, but it is giving the Department carte blanche authority to get an increased salary for a man in any one of these classified salaried positions?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. While I am on my feet, and with the Senator's permission, I wish to say a word of approval of what the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has said. What I shall say does not relate to the pending matter. In the past, amendments have actually been attached to appropriation bills providing for increasing the rank of naval officers, when the naval authorities did not know anything about it. Such things have been done in the last minute, when very few Senators were on the floor, and measures have been passed containing such amendments. I do not mean to make any such suggestion in reference to the particular matter under consideration, but I wish to emphasize that occasionally in the Committee on Naval Affairs we have been embarrassed by finding legislation placed in appropriation bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the amendment as drawn is limited in its application to the next fiscal year, or will it provide permanent legislation?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is for the ensuing fiscal year only. It can only be that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee, on page 37, line 6.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if no other Senator will raise the point of order, I raise the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order on the ground that the amendment is in violation of paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move to suspend the rule under the notice given by me on June 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada to suspend the rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barbour	Buck
Andrews	Bilbo	Burton
Bailey	Bone	Bushfield
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Bankhead	Brooks	Capper

Caraway	La Follette	Robertson
Chandler	Langer	Russell
Chavez	Lucas	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Smith
Danaher	McKellar	Stewart
Davis	McNary	Taft
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
George	Millikin	Tydings
Gerry	Moore	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murdock	Van Nuys
Green	Murray	Wallgren
Guffey	Nye	Walsh
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Hawkes	Overton	White
Hayden	Radcliffe	Willis
Hill	Reed	Wilson
Holman	Revercomb	
Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada to suspend the rule so as to permit consideration of the amendment submitted by him.

Mr. McCARRAN. This matter has been presented to the Senate by authority and direction of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The item is strictly and squarely a legislative one. I am entirely in accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Maine. I think the rule should be lived up to; but we have not lived up to it; and if there were a legislative item on any bill which would be justified, in my judgment this item would be justified. In other words, these offices, highly important ones, cannot be filled because the salary is not sufficient to induce lawyers to take the places. I think I have a fairly good sense of condition; I am inclined to believe that if the matter were put to a vote of the Senate, it would be impossible to obtain the votes of two-thirds of the Senators present to suspend the rule. Therefore, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, having raised the issue, I appreciate the fine attitude of the distinguished Senator. It is my view that if a bill on the subject, legislative in character, comes before the appropriate committee, I certainly shall make no objection to its early consideration, even though I might not be in favor of its passage unless some effort were made in the bill to limit the right of the Attorney General to fix the salaries.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for myself and the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That, after 30 days following the approval of this act and notwithstanding any other provision of law or executive or administrative act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce directly or indirectly in any respect (whether by criminal or civil proceedings in any court or by administrative proceedings or executive acts in any agency or by any officer of the Government of the United States or in any manner whatever concerning) any maximum price, priority, rationing, allocation, distribution, limitation, or similar rules, regulations, directives, or orders relating to goods, supplies, or products for civilian consumption as against any processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer thereof in the usual course or custom of trade, where the facts offered in defense in any such proceeding or before any such court, agency, or officer demonstrate that any such rules, regulations, or orders do not (1) afford, as compared with the prevailing cost of agricultural or other materials or products (including livestock) such persons must buy for processing or resale, the generally fair and necessary operating margins consistent with the third proviso of section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942 (Public, No. 729, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), or (2) make due, adequate, and affirmative provision for the allocation or distribution of such available supplies, goods, or products through the usual and established channels of trade (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, or retailers) in the proportion so distributed during the calendar year 1941 as contemplated by section 2 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public, No. 421, 77th Cong., 2d sess.); or (3) as to such rules, regulations, or orders issued or amended after 30 days following the approval of regulations, or orders issued or amended without full consultation orally or in writing with a standing advisory committee composed of representatives and alternates chosen by, and assigned to such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representative of each branch of such industry as required by section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942: *Provided further*, That, in order to prevent evasions of the foregoing, no part of any other appropriation nor any other public funds, personnel, services, or property whatever shall be so used and any court, agency, or officer acting contrary to the foregoing in any case shall be without jurisdiction or authority in such case and any judgments, decrees, orders, rules, regulations, or rulings or other judicial or administrative acts or process issued by any such court, agency, or officer in any such case shall be null and void."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana is legislative in nature; and, under the rule, notice in writing must be given 1 day in advance of intention to move to suspend the rule so as to permit the consideration of a legislative item. Mr. President, I invoke the rule; therefore, I object to consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I realize that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, it is designed to remedy a very serious situation, and is of such importance that it seems to me the rule should be suspended in order to enable the amendment to be agreed to at this time. The Senate Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises and the similar committee in the House have been holding hearings and have been receiving complaints from all over the country as a result of the situation which is sought to be remedied by the amendment. I have before me lists of concerns all over the country that are about to close their doors because of the failure of the Office of Price Administration to allow a fair margin of profit in the conduct of their businesses.

Unless the amendment be agreed to and added to the bill, concerns all over the country will continue to close their doors. They are doing so now, as I have said. In this morning's issue of the Washington Post, I noticed a dispatch from Seattle, Wash., dealing with the situation. It reads as follows:

FOUR MEAT PACKERS DECIDE TO QUIT OVER PRICE RULINGS

SEATTLE, June 14.—Four Washington packing companies said today that they had suspended slaughtering. Their officials declared the action resulted from confusion over prices, subsidies, and roll-backs.

The Gibson Packing Co., at Yakima; Schaake Packing Co., at Ellensberg, and the Acme and James Henry Packing companies, at Seattle, all reported they would stop slaughtering.

President Morris Gordon, of the Acme Packing & Provision Co., said, "We'll wait a day or two and then liquidate. We just can't operate this way."

In view of the seriousness of the situation I felt impelled to offer this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the 1 day's notice required by rule XL to be given with respect to the suspension of the rule may be waived so as to permit me to make a motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the rule of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate it is the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge to invoke the rule when an amendment, which is clearly legislative in nature, is offered without sanction of the committee.

Let me say in that regard, with all due respect to my friend from Montana, that there is merit in his amendment; but it is strictly legislative in nature. It has no place in an appropriation bill. Under the rule of the Appropriations Committee I am in duty bound to invoke the rule against legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the correctness of the statement made by the Senator from Nevada, but it seems to me that the country is in a very serious situation as a result of these conditions.

Mr. McCARRAN. There can be no question about that. The Senator and his committee should be commended for their zeal and study in this matter. The substance of the proposed amendment is exceedingly meritorious. The country wants legislation of that kind and should have it; but it is legislation, and we are now dealing exclusively with an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much in sympathy with the general aims of the Senator from Montana. I should like to suggest to him that a precedent was set last week in the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, which he might well follow in order to obtain a vote on this question. A proposal came from the Appropriations Committee which was frankly and undeniably legislation. By inducing the Chair at that time to submit the question to the Senate, instead of passing on the point of order that it was legislation, a vote was obtained on the point of order as to legislation, and most Senators voted their predelictions on the merits of the case, rather than on the parliamentary situation. It is within the power of the Senator from Montana now, either by inducing the Chair to submit the question to the Senate on the point of order, in which case, under the precedent set, most Senators who are in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Montana would vote to overrule the point of order; or, if the Chair should be unwilling to "pass the buck" and submit the question to the Senate, and should sustain the point of order, the Senator from Montana could well take an appeal from that decision, in which case most Senators, according to the ordinary practice, would vote, not on the merits of the parliamentary question submitted, but on the merits of the amendment of the Senator from Montana. I suggest to the Senator that if he really wishes to obtain a vote, that is the way to do it.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Chair has already ruled on the objection raised by the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask that the question be submitted to the Senate for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That stage has been passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can change one word in the amendment and reoffer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Chair is sustained.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the bill is put to a vote, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada to explain one point. I did not desire to offer an amendment when the question was before the Senate. I should like to ask the Senator to explain the situation, because his explanation may have some influence in conference. I should like an explanation with regard to the provision for field service offices for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, no estimate was made for that item.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that the House eliminated the appropriation for the field service offices.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. The House made a study of the subject, and advised the Senate committee of its study. We found in our own investigation that some 30 offices throughout the United States were rendering unusually worthy service to business of all kinds, especially at this time, when small business is looking for advice and counsel from the Government. Moreover, these offices in the several sections of the United States act as a guide for the foreign service, which is under the Department of State, assisting the foreign service in determining what flow of commodities should go into a particular section and what flow of commodities may go out of a particular section for foreign commerce.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House had eliminated the appropriation and the Senate committee had restored a portion of the appropriation, I did not deem it desirable to oppose the reduction from the amount which was appropriated for this agency last year, I do desire to say that I think it is extremely unfortunate that the amount should have been reduced to the extent to which it was reduced, even in the Senate committee's proposal.

I believe that it is easily demonstrable that this is one of the most valuable services now being rendered by any subdivision of any department of the Government. I know that that is true in my own community. I know that this is the only agency to which small business, or even large business, engaged to any degree whatever in the import or export trade, can go to get instructions, and constructions of the various regulations now governing export and import trade, including regulations issued by the Export-Import Bank and the various restrictions imposed by the State Department. I have never seen any greater unanimity among businessmen who come in contact with any governmental agency—at least in my community—than in their enthusiastic support of this agency. I believe that this is the most effective expenditure being made by the Department of Commerce at the present time. I wish the appropriation might have been restored to the amount which was carried in the appropriation act last year. I believe that there will be a deprivation in service by reason of this reduction. The House eliminated the item entirely, and the Senate committee has restored a large portion of the appropriation to preserve the activity of this agency, which I think will become one of the most vitally necessary and valuable agencies in all the governmental departments at the conclusion of this war, when we will be trying to reestablish import and export trade.

In view of the fact that the committee has at least continued the life of that service, I believe that the committee is to be very greatly complimented. I wish to urge the Senator from Nevada, who in all probability will be the head of the Senate conferees, to insist upon the amendment to the full extent to which the Senate has gone.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I very heartily agree with the views expressed by the Senator from Missouri. In that connection, I wish to make the additional observation that I am a member of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee of the Senate which had under consideration the Mead bill, which is sponsored by the Secretary of Commerce, to aid small business. In executing the functions provided for by that bill, it is expected that a good many of those engaged in foreign and domestic commerce under the provisions of the bill will be utilized to aid the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that. As the Senator knows as a member of the Commerce Committee, my views and his as to the Mead bill are almost entirely in consonance. I am glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana express that view. It seems to me that a service of this sort, the cost of which has been so relatively unimportant, but which has maintained contact with our foreign trade during these perilous times, is certain to be so necessary at the conclusion of the war that it ought not to have been amputated, as it was by the House.

I thank the Senator from Nevada very much. I merely want to renew my urging upon him that in conference upon

this bill he insist on the maintenance of this very essential service.

Mr. McCARRAN. I assure the Senator from Missouri of my hearty accord with what he has said. Let me say that I am advised that the service can be continued with fairly good results with the amount which the committee has appropriated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to propound another question in connection with the one which I asked the Senator a few moments ago concerning civilian pilots. Are there any Negro pilots? Is any discrimination being exercised against Negro pilots?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no discrimination.

Mr. LANGER. There is no discrimination of any kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is legislation to the effect that there shall be no discrimination, and I take it that the law is being complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill H. R. 2397 was passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event of a recess of the Senate following today's session, the Senate Committee on Appropriations be authorized to report appropriation bills during the recess. I have particularly in mind the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EFFECT OF ROLL-BACK PRICES ON CATTLE MARKET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, amendment 15 to order 169 as issued by the Office of Price Administration was put into effect yesterday in the terminal meat markets of this country. As a result, there was a complete break-down of prices, and not only yesterday but today there is a demoralized market in all the terminal markets of this country. This order is to roll back prices. I believe that all Members of the Senate are in favor of doing our level best to control inflation. But when the order went into effect yesterday it affected all segments of the meat industry, and as a result the prices in the market yesterday of live animals decreased a dollar per hundred. Just before I came to the Senate Chamber this morning I received a long-distance phone call from Earl Kelloway, secretary of the Omaha Livestock Exchange, in which he said that the market is still demoralized, and the reduction is about 50 cents per hundred on today's market.

What is the difficulty? It is my understanding that the Office of Price Administration put this order into effect at the suggestion and advice of the Department of Agriculture, but they depended on the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide the forms, blanks, and machinery to make certain that the subsidy which was to be paid would be paid to the packers. When the market opened yesterday no such provision had been made. As a result, the packers went out into the open market, and, without a guaranty of the subsidy being paid, they simply proceeded to buy cattle at a dollar a hundred cheaper than the day before.

Yesterday in the five central markets there were a hundred thousand head of steers purchased. The producers and the cattle feeders had to sell them at a reduction of a dollar per hundred, and when we take into consideration that a steer weighs on an average of six or seven or eight hundred pounds—I think it would be nearly a thousand pounds—it would mean that those men lost $6 to $10 a head. On a hundred thousand head, the loss would be somewhere between $500,000 and $1,000,000. This condition will continue until the machinery is definitely determined and clarified so that the packers can go out into the open market and pay the price they should pay for these cattle, depending on the subsidy being paid to them.

The manner of instituting this program is a mistake, a horrible blunder, and one of the emergencies with which we are faced today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I hope it is merely a blunder. It looks to me like a deliberate underhanded attempt to force the Congress to vote for subsidies.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. It is not a blunder. It is a part of a deliberate program which will wreck meat production in this country. I wish to say that I can confirm what the Senator from Nebraska has said. I telephoned to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics this morning and was informed that, based upon their best judgment of the effect of these orders which had been made, the price of cattle will drop 50 cents a hundred pounds today in the primary markets of the country.

I wish to follow the Senator from Nebraska to emphasize the statements which he has made, and after he has concluded I shall ask for the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have received many telegrams and letters, not only from cattle producers, but from hog producers, sheep producers, and processors all over the country protesting against this situation. I had intended when I first came into the Chamber to put them into the RECORD, but they are so voluminous and come from all parts of the agricultural sections of the country, that I will content myself with merely making a statement concerning them. The material which has come to my office in the last week is so voluminous that the printing of it would not be justified. There is evidently a deliberate and continuous attack on the producer of agricultural products.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am convinced that this roll-back should never have been put into effect until a complete program had been worked out so that the processor could have known what his roll-back would be, what money he would receive, and how it would be handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I wish to tell Senators just what this means to one feeder. I have a telegram which comes from a small town in my State, and I wish to take the time of the Senator, if I may, to read it.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for the purpose of reading the telegram.

Mr. GURNEY. The telegram shows how ruinous this plan can be to the individual stock feeder. The telegram reads as follows:

> The present roll-back of meat prices are serious to meat production. Labor and feed prices are high and being asked to produce all they could lots of feeders will be seriously hurt. These feeders may not retaliate very strong. I have fed approximately 12,000 sheep and 200 head of cattle and large number of hogs this season. The last end of these operations have hurt seriously in a financial way. Estimate loss of $12,000 since roll-back.

That is from only one farmer, but it shows how the situation has affected him because the plan was put into effect before complete study had been made and a complete procedure worked out so that the consumer would not be hit. However, in the way it has been handled, the processor has no alternative. He has got to take it off of the cost of his live animal because he does not know whether he will get the money from the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to point out that this roll-back goes back through different stages, and particularly affects the producer on the farm. Last fall the farmers were assured that the price of hogs would not at any time go beyond $13.50. They were assured of that. A

farmer might have brood sows producing litters of pigs. He has to take care of the hogs he has produced and bred, and now comes the proposition for a roll-back on the farmer. The chances are that if this condition is not remedied it will result in demoralization for the original producer. That is the man who has his capital invested in the farm and must produce the raw material, and he is the foundation of all food production.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his additional remarks, and I wish to say, in response to his statement, that the market is already demoralized; I emphasize that fact, and that is why I am speaking today. Last night I received telephone call after telephone call from cattle feeders in my State. As I have previously stated, I received a long distance call at 11 o'clock today from Earl Kelloway, a man in whom I have the utmost confidence. The cattle feeders are complaining that somewhere along the line someone failed to exercise sufficient forethought, did not make proper provision for the institution of the program, and utterly failed to realize the impact of these orders upon the meat-producing industry. Whether one believes in subsidy or not—and I shall refer to that later for a few moments—provision was not made whereby the packer could knowingly go into the market and pay the producer a price for his cattle, because the packer was not being assured or given any proper guaranty of the payment of a subsidy. As the senior Senator from South Dakota just remarked, "he lacks assurance." The packer had to go out in the market yesterday and buy his cattle a dollar a hundred cheaper because he did not have a certain guaranty that he would get the subsidy. Not even the blanks or the forms were prepared or published to enable him to apply for the subsidy.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. And he has had no guaranty up to this minute, either.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; he has no guaranty now; and until the packer is given a guaranty, until this situation is rectified, he will continue to buy cattle for a dollar a hundred less.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska how the producer is going to know that he will recover that difference in price even if Jesse Jones and the R. F. C. are willing to continue to violate the law and furnish the money? How does the producer know he is going to get the money?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the very timely question of the Senator from Kansas, which I intend to cover in my remarks, I may say that the producer does not know; that is the unfortunate part about it.

Mr. REED. What effect will it have on the production of meat?

Mr. WHERRY. It will not only have the effect of complete stoppage of replacement cattle going into the feed yards, but the producers will not ship the cattle into the open market until this condition is rectified.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If a producer had feed cattle yesterday, and did not ship them to the market, and the price is arbitrarily cut on him over night, what chance has he ever got to get his money back, no matter how much Jesse Jones may continue to violate the law?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, and I think my remarks will cover it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator know any authority of law that the O. P. A. has to issue such an order as that?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to answer the question of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. There is no authority of law, but let me refer to the Price Control Act which the Congress passed last October and suggest to the Senator from Missouri that the law provided that no maximum price should be fixed below the highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

The highest price received for beef cattle between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, as given to me this morning, if you please—for I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I knew this question was coming up—was on August 13, when the average price of all cattle was $16.32 a hundred pounds. There is no authority anywhere for any agency or agent of the Government to fix, directly or indirectly, a price below that price of August 13 last year. Yet that is done now, yesterday, and today in plain violation of the direct mandate of the Congress. When the Senator from Nebraska concludes I desire to follow through, but I am glad to contribute this statement as we go along.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the junior Senator from Kansas for his helpful information. In further response to the question asked by the senior Senator from Missouri, I should like to call his attention to a hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, which was recently conducted and has not yet been printed. During the hearings a question was asked directly of Jesse Jones. I shall read three or four lines from the testimony.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked this question of Jesse Jones of the R. F. C.:

> Mr. Jones, for the record, where do you find your authority?

He was referring to the paying of these subsidies—

> Secretary JONES. Section 2 (e) in the Price Control Act.
>
> Senator MCNARY. The original act or the act as amended?
>
> Secretary JONES. As amended, I suppose—2 (e).

The testimony goes on down through the record.

In further answer to the senior Senator from Missouri the provision of the act, which as far as Congress was concerned, was designed to expand agricultural acreage and to bring about greater food production, is interpreted by Jesse Jones to apply to what? To the production of beef. I am of the opinion that that is not the interpretation placed on the act by Congress. Anyone who has carefully studied the provision must admit that it never contemplated the subsidy program which has now been initiated by the Office of Price Administration, but under the provisions of that act they are going to spend $450,000,000 and, when that is gone, Mr. Jones says they will come back to Congress and ask for additional appropriations to continue the subsidy.

Mr. President, in addition to the information given by the senior Senator from South Dakota, in which he stated that one man would lose $12,000 until this machinery is set up, let me say that the present condition is going to play havoc with the cattle production in this country. It is not only a question of the loss of $600,000. I know, because as one who feeds cattle I can state what the facts are. What does it mean when the cattle are finished, are ready for market, and cannot be held any longer, and the owner is forced to put his cattle on the market? It means that today he will have to sell for a dollar a hundred less if the market continues its trend, and a dollar and a half less tomorrow, and, before it is over, it will probably be $2 a hundred. So it will mean not only $600,000 a day for 30 days, if it takes that long to correct the situation, but it will mean between twenty and twenty-five million dollars' loss on cattle feeders that are actually ready for the market. I say, Mr. President, it is an outrage, and this situation must be corrected, or the cattle producers cannot survive.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is speaking of the loss in the case of cattle. Has he the figures with respect to the loss in the case of hogs?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is going to bring those statistics to the attention of the Senate; so I think I will leave those figures to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. SMITH. I notice from the market reports that the prices have gone down from 15 cents to about 13 cents.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the Senator from South Carolina is correct. In fact, they went down to less than $14 a hundred yesterday on the Omaha market and have now reached a point as low as $13.75. Cattle and hogs which have been sold for the past 8 weeks have sold at less than they sold for prior to that time, and prices are now at a level lower than the prices from January 1 to September 1, 1942.

They are at a lower price because of this order, and because of the low price figure being below levels I think this

order is illegal. It has brought the prices down lower than the prices that were established as the level, and those prices were established for any time they sold between January 1 and September 1, 1942. That is the result of this order, this order which has been ill-timed, this order for which no provision has been made in the machinery of Government, this order which should have been taken care of by the Commodity Credit Corporation, who now blame the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture blames the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It has produced an effect which not only has cut present shipments, but what will be the effect on those who deal in replacement cattle? I had the privilege recently of going into the feed lots of many of my farmer constituents and I wanted to know how they felt about the subsidy. I wish to say now that cattle feeders do not want a subsidy. They merely want the profit motive established. They would like to be able to feed their cattle on a profit basis. That is how they want to operate. They feel they have a right to feed cattle so they can make a profit, maintain their farms, and pay the necessary expenses.

But whether one agrees with the subsidy or not, that is not the problem for the Senate today. The difficulty is that the packers have not been guaranteed this subsidy. The packers are going out in the market, and within 24 hours from this morning—that is, yesterday—they cut the price a dollar a hundred, because they are not assured that they will ever get the money during this interim period. And they must be correct.

Mr. President, I am going to ask the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate to consider this matter. I think it should be brought to their attention, and I know they have the interest of the producers at heart. I think the Committee on Agriculture should wait on the Office of Price Administration or the office of Jesse Jones this very afternoon and see to it that this matter is ironed out, so the packers could go out in the market tomorrow morning and pay the accustomed price or the market price for these cattle, hogs, or sheep. Unless that is so, it will mean that thousands and thousands of the cattle feeders of this country will not only suffer immediate profit loss on the cattle which have to be sold, but it will have a tremendous influence on the cattle feeders who cannot be expected to put back replacement cattle which they must feed if we are to get the production in this country.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to warn the Senator from Nebraska, we must "hold the line!"

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, we all wish to hold the line. I think that is a very timely suggestion. But let me tell the Senator something. There are ways and ways of holding the line. We have held the line on wages, that is true. We want to hold the line on prices, that is true. But we can fix price ceilings, and if they are all right, I am for them, but when we regulate the producer out of existence, what good does a price ceiling do, and what good does rationing do?

Mr. President, there must be an increase in the production of beef. Last week the Army got approximately 30 percent of its needs, and the week before 20 percent. In 45 years of experience of our firm in feeding cattle, this is the first year it does not know what to do. This uncertainty about subsidies, this uncertainty over the demoralized market, is what has caused the cattle feeder to hesitate. Thus he is hesitant about putting cattle back into the feed lots.

I make this prediction this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, and I do so from actual facts, that unless this situation is corrected inside of the next 6 months, this country will be facing a second Pearl Harbor, and the crisis will be over food. While there is time, while we can rectify this matter, we should take it upon ourselves to see that it is corrected.

As to the matter of subsidies, whether it is right or wrong, I should like to say that I believe there is no justification for this order under present legislation. I think that if the officials want to put up subsidies, the administration should come right up the aisle and say to the gentlemen of the Senate, "Now, listen. We want subsidies. We must have them. We want authority and an appropriation." But instead of doing that, they are coming through the back door, they are coming in and taking money of the R. F. C., which was not appropriated for the purpose of paying subsidies; they are going to the packers, deferring payments to them, and they say they will pay them in 30 days or 60 days. They have a fund of $450,000,000, and when that is gone, they will have to ask for an appropriation. Then they will come right up the aisle and say, "Gentlemen, we have obligated ourselves for millions and millions of dollars, and we want an appropriation."

If they want a subsidy, the time to decide is now, and if they want a subsidy and want an appropriation, let us accordingly legislate now. Let us not do it as a back-door proposition, and then have to make good on the promise of the Office of Price Administration when the time comes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is there any way on earth by which a producer of cattle, when the cattle are finished, today or tomorrow, to know, under the present situation, whether to send his cattle into the market, run the risk of not getting the subsidy that is being orated about in the newspapers, or hold his cattle and lose the money? The cattle producer is bound to lose money either way under any such system as the present.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has hit the nail on the head. Those who put cattle in the feed lot for the first time do not know what to do. There never was such a situation. In Chicago good white-faced, finished steers sold for less than what they cost when they were put in the feed lot. There must be some margin of profit, and here we are face to face with a situation in which cattle feeders are not putting cattle back into the feed lots because it jeopardizes their credit; it jeopardizes their farms; it jeopardizes their homes.

My heart goes out to these people. Believe me, they are the gamest bunch of men I have ever met, year in and year out. They will take their losses when they have to, but they keep on feeding; they take pride in it; they take pride in finishing the cattle.

We ask them to go out and produce food and they do it. Many a man has put cattle on the feed lot when there was barely a profit in order to help the war effort. But now they come here because of a mistake—that is what I am told—the packers were told the prices were to be rolled back, and the department says it will roll them back, yet the packer is presented with no assured or timely guaranty. No packer is going to pay the regular price because the packer must protect himself and will, if he must, buy those cattle a dollar a hundred under cost.

Such a situation should never exist, and I should like to say that it behooves us in the Senate to take the responsibility on our shoulders to see that this situation is corrected. Then, if we want to subsidize, that is a different proposition. If we want that, let us have it out, here and now.

So far as I am concerned, before the Senate ever adjourns, I should like to settle this question of subsidies once and for all. If we are to pay them, let us pay them, let us get the appropriations and do it the right way. Let us not come in through the back door and permit commitments for which we will have to appropriate afterward, regardless of how we feel about it.

Therefore, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Kansas and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, men who have been leaders here for years, here is a situation which is acute, here is a situation which needs attention, here is a situation which is going to stop the production of meat. We need meat for the boys, we need it for our allies under our lease-lend program, and we need it for the civilians of our country. Unless the replacement cattle are put back we will not get it, and when the meat supply goes down, the standard of living in this country will drop to a lower level and that will cause havoc. There will be a serious and acute shortage of meat in this country if the situation is not corrected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to concur in everything the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has said. We are facing an extremely acute meat situation in this country, which is bound to grow more acute as more bad faith is exhibited on the part of men with whom we have been having to deal recently, and now.

I had a part in the passage of the price control legislation of last year, and at that time and afterward we challenged

any authority of the administration to fix prices. Let me read the provision of the legislation which deals with this particular matter:

Below the highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

Yet in the case of the production of meat—and I shall deal with hogs first—this Administration has deliberately dealt in bad faith with the hog feeders of the West. Where the lowest price for hogs under the law was $15.30, which was paid on August 13, we specifically forbade any price to be forced below that. Yet yesterday the Administration had forced hogs down to $14.15 on the market.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, having heard the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and some of the comments of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], I thought if I could get any additional facts on the matter and give them to the Senate and to the country I should do so. So I have just consulted on the telephone Mr. Charles M. Elkinton, who is the price executive of the Food Division of the O. P. A. From what Mr. Elkinton tells me there can be no excuse for the packers reducing prices paid to the producers. Mr. Elkinton tells me that on June 5 the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. issued a joint release advising the packers, and the country also for that matter, that these reductions could become effective on June 14, but assuring the packers that under the law which the Congress has passed, the R. F. C. has the power and the money to make compensatory payments for the reductions; that so far as the packers were concerned, they would receive the compensatory payments on th 1st of July, and that therefore there should have been and should be no reduction in the prices paid to the producers by the packers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may answer the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama suggests, as I understand, that we have now passed completely into the field of government by press release. A press release is issued saying we will pay a subsidy on the 1st of July, and thereupon, I suppose, every packer has some kind of a right of action. But he certainly has not. Not only that, but the power to pay subsidies under the Food Control Act is exceedingly doubtful. I do not think it exists at all under the circumstances, and any packer who consults his lawyer would be told by his lawyer that there is very serious doubt whether the Government can pay 1 cent in these subsidies which, according to press release, are supposed to be paid on the 1st of July.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with the Senator's fine, legalistic, weaving mind I am not surprised that he takes that position. But we are at war. We are in a great emergency. I think in such a situation when the Government, through its lawfully constituted agencies, acts, so far as the law has given the agencies power to act—and they have power to meet any obligations they impose upon themselves—when these agencies issue certain statements, I think the packers are justified in acting on the basis of what Jesse Jones, of the R. F. C., and the O. P. A. have said to them. Of course, the Government might have entered into some kind of contract with all the packers in the United States. I do not know whether that could be done. But it seems to me that in order to be effective in a great emergency some action had to be taken. The procedure followed might not have been the wisest or the best; but from what Mr. Elkinton tells me—and he, the head of this Division, is my authority—steps seem to have been taken in an attempt to prevent this reduction in the price paid to the producers.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that the action he has just suggested is clearly illegal, unlawful, without any basis of law, or in sound public policy, or in any other way, even in common sense. No authority in law exists for the doing of what the Senator from Alabama suggests.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further I will say that I have not examined the law——

Mr. REED. The Senator helped to pass it.

Mr. HILL. And if I had examined it I do not know that my opinion would prevail with the Senator from Kansas, but I will say that I asked Mr. Elkinton that particular question. I asked, "Is there any question about your authority, or the authority of R. F. C., to do this very thing?" His answer was, "There is no question about it." He cited to me section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act of 1942.

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I had no part in framing this legislation, and I have never given it any particular study, but that is the story Mr. Elkinton gave me. I thought the Senate and the country ought to have it. At least, they think they have the authority.

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I shall yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I was not present when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] discussed the question of rollbacks and subsidies. Before the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty of the Senate this matter has been under discussion, study, and investigation for 3 weeks. We have listened to the testimony of Professor Galbraith and Professor Elkinton. They have assured us that there was no reason why producers' prices should go down by reason of the roll-back.

The difficulty, Mr. President, with college professors is that they deal in theories instead of facts. Prices have gone down in spite of their theories, and in spite of their assurances. The price of cattle in the Middle West has gone down 50 cents a hundred. The price of milk and butter has gone down five cents. All other prices go down in accordance with the roll-back. When some college professors assure us that they do not see why or how prices will go down they are simply talking about a dream world. What they say does not correspond with the facts.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I shall in a moment.

Mr. HILL. I wanted to make a brief comment with respect to what the Senator from South Dakota has just said.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wish to say a word in regard to section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, to which the Senator from Alabama referred.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, have I the floor, or do I not have the floor?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. In regard to section 2 (e) to which the distinguished Senator from Alabama referred a moment ago, and which he was told over the telephone governed this situation, I wonder if the Senator has read that section of the law? I am sure he has, because he helped pass it. Under the provisions of that law, the only purpose for which subsidies can be paid, Mr. President, is to increase production. We have the testimony of Mr. Jones, we have the testimony of Chester Davis, we have the testimony of the head of the Marketing Association, all of them telling us, unfortunately in direct contradiction to what the professors tell us, that prices have gone down.

I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that my dear friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has announced the most remarkable doctrine that has been heard in many a year on this floor, to wit, that a press release from Jesse Jones and Prentiss Brown, both of them good men, both of them old friends of many Senators on this floor, not only has the effect of a statutory enactment, which is a remarkable enough proposition in itself, but, according to the Senator from Alabama, also has the effect of supplying bank collateral.

Mr. President, where do the packers get the money to advance when prices are cut under the promise of additional subsidy? Where can the packers get the money? Can they take this press release issued by Jesse Jones and Prentiss Brown to their banks and obtain the money with which to advance these sub-

sidies, which Congress in its stupidity may finally say that Jesse Jones and Prentiss Brown are entitled to pay out of the Public Treasury? How is this thing to be financed?

I hold no brief for the packers, Heaven knows, but what can the packers do when they get an order to cut prices? Do they have the right to say, "Very well, we will pay the producer the additional subsidy some time?" Is the producer required to rely on some furtive promise made in a press release written undoubtedly by some public relations counsel? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] asks who Mr. Elkinton is. If the Senator from Kansas will pardon me a moment further, it seems to me from the amount of sense contained in the order he has issued, that he must be the same fellow who went to Fort Worth a few months ago and discussed with a number of cattle producers a price to be fixed on steers. Toward the conclusion of the discussion—I do not know that he is the same man, but his general approach to the subject and his general intelligence must indicate that he is the same man—he said, "You understand these prices have to apply to female steers as well as to male steers." [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. HILL. I should like the Senator to yield to me now.

Mr. REED. I do not yield now, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas refuses to yield further.

Mr. REED. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a deeper affection than the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to warn the people of the country that to continue to follow this policy will further jeopardize the meat supply of the country. In recent months I have received from cattle feeders in Kansas, which is one of the important cattle-feeding States, letter after letter, stating that if these policies are continued, with the confusion existing which prohibits them from carrying on and from financing their feeding operations, they are going to quit just as soon as they dispose of their present stocks.

Mr. President, there is nothing more important to the people of the United States than a continued, dependable supply of food, including meat. That is what is being jeopardized by the policies we are discusisng today.

Mr. President, I say to you that the policy Mr. Jones is following, and to which the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Missouri have referred, in my opinion is illegal, unlawful, and without any foundation in any act passed by this body. It has produced a condition of uncertainty in the cattle-feeding areas, which has reached such a point that numerous cattle feeders of Kansas are writing me that the uncertainties of the future are so great that when they dispose of the cattle they now have on hand or are getting ready for market, they are going to stop. Why not? How does any cattle producer know he is going to get this roll-back, even if it is legal and lawful, which in my opinion it is not. Not only is this administration introducing an element of unlawfulness, in my opinion, into the whole meat situation, but it is introducing an element of uncertainty which is causing those who must depend upon law interpretation in order to make their plans to retire from business on their present scale of operations just so soon as they can legally and lawfully do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They must retire unless they choose to rely on the legal opinion of some fellow by the name of Elkinton, of whom they never before heard, who probably is not a lawyer, and whose opinion is very much at variance with that of most of the men who are opposed to this law.

Mr. REED. If they do not retire now, they will be in bankruptcy court within the next several months or the next year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator whether the same thing is not happening today to those who are canning food? They have asked for an increase in the prices to be paid for labor; and they have discovered that they are told—also by press release—that if they will go ahead and obtain from the War Labor Board the right to pay labor a certain amount in excess of what they are now paying, the Office of Price Administration will decide later, and the Credit Corporation will decide later, whether the increase will be repaid to them by way of a subsidy. Is not the same thing happening in the food-canning industry that is happening in the meat industry? The people who are told they will obtain these prices do not know whether they will obtain them by subsidy or not.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the plan of operations is quite similar, perhaps parallel. It is unsound and unreasonable and, I think, an unlawful procedure. When attempt is made to do a thing in an unlawful way, it leaves those who are interested in a state of uncertainty. The longer such policies are followed, the greater will be the uncertainty and the greater will be the threat to the food supply of the people of the country.

I come from a great food-producing region; we are on the edge of the hog-feeding region and in the heart of the cattle-feeding region. Every feeder of livestock today is uncertain about his future. He has seen this administration uncertain; he has seen it take paths which, in my opinion, have no authority in law, until he does not know where he is. He is going to get out while the getting is good.

I warn the people of the country that a continuation of this devious way of dealing with essential producers of food, particularly the producers of meat, can do only one thing to the necessary meat supply of the country. This continued manipulation, this continued exercise of bad faith, this continued attempt to "whip the devil around the stump" by means for which no authority can be found in any statute the Congress has passed, can result only in disaster to the people of the country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Before I surrender the floor, I would yield to my good friend, the Senator from Alabama, if I had not already gone so far down the road that he would not be interested.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. I rise to speak in my own time, Mr. President.

I think it can be said that, at best, this situation is a difficult one. The problem is a difficult one. Mistakes may have been made. I do not now know enough about the meat program or enough about what has taken place or what has been done to be certain concerning the details; but I strongly deny that there has been any effort or action on the part of anyone deliberately to do any harm to the meat producers of the country.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I believe I have some information which may be helpful in the situation.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, Mr. President, I am tremendously interested in the prices which livestock producers are to receive. If there is any excuse for a subsidy, it is the desire to lower the retail cost to consumers. Of course, that was the reason for advocating subsidies in the first place; and the roll-back to the consumer was supposed to be about the equivalent of 10 percent upon the retail price, which would be a roll-back on the basis of which it was estimated the processor would be paid approximately one and one-tenth cents a pound on beef, approximately one and one-third cents a pound on hogs, and approximately ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent on mutton. That was the plan; and under a directive issued by Mr. Jones, of the R. F. C., that plan was supposed to have been offered to the processors.

I talked to Mr. Jones not more than 15 minutes ago—probably not quite that long ago—and asked him what program had been laid out. I told him what we were up against; I told him, over the telephone, that the market on beef cattle had gone down a dollar in the last 2 days. I told him it was absolutely necessary to give some assurance to the processor that the subsidy would be coming to him and that he—the processor—would have some legal reason to believe, some absolute guaranty, that the subsidy was coming from the R. F. C.

Mr. Jones advised me that he was alive to the situation, that he was operating under a directive from the assistant president——

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator mean the Director of Economic Stabilization?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; I forgot the name for the moment—from Mr. Vinson, through the Commodity Credit Corporation—and that he would endeavor to

get absolute guaranties out to the processors today or, at the latest, tomorrow.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the Senator will corroborate what I have said. After his conversation with Mr. Jones it was very evident that there was no one, either in Mr. Jones' office or in the Office of Price Administration, who was deliberately trying to do anything to harm any producer of cattle. It is easy, of course, to rise on the floor of the Senate and carp and criticize, and it is easy to question the good faith and motives of another.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was not present when I made my address.

Mr. HILL. I heard a part of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that I hold him in the same affection as does my good friend from Kansas. However, the packers have not received the forms. I checked with the Department yesterday. I called the Department on the telephone, and was told that the other Department was to send out the forms. There has been a great deal of confusion, and the packers do not know what affidavits or applications they must sign to enable them to receive a subsidy. That was admitted by the Department.

Mr. HILL. That may be true.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as being malicious is concerned, I said that the program had not been started properly, and that it had a demoralizing effect on the market, which cannot now be rectified by sending out forms, because a great deal of uncertainty has been created in the minds of cattle feeders. That is the point.

Mr. HILL. From what I heard of the address of the Senator from Nebraska, I did not gather that he questions the good faith of anyone; but I did construe the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] to mean that he questioned the good faith of those who had attempted to put the roll-back program into operation.

The Senator from Kansas has now returned to the Chamber. Let me say that I hope my affection for him is reciprocated. If I have put the wrong interpretation on the Senator's remarks, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, age cannot wither, nor custom stale, the infinite variety of the Senator from Alabama, who still retains a prominent place in my affections.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. That is very gratifying to me; but still it does not change my construction of his remarks.

Mr. President, when I examined the act of January 30, 1942, which is entitled "An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes," I found on page 4, subsection (e) of section 2, this provision:

> Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bids, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store and use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof, or otherwise supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is most important that there should be a complete understanding of certain plain facts with respect to this situation.

SUBSIDY PROGRAM NEEDS CLARIFICATION

The law which the Senator from Alabama has just read, is, of course, well understood by all Members of the Senate, particularly by members of the Banking and Currency Committee who were in the Senate when the bill was under consideration.

The authority to pay subsidies was granted in that law, but no appropriation was made. Nor was any formula laid down by which such subsidies should be paid.

The purpose of subsidies, as stated in the law, however, was to encourage production. It was recognized that when retail prices were held down the producer would probably not be able to obtain the cost of production without the payment by the Government of additional sums in one form or another. The plan recently announced by the O. P. A. and the Office of Economic Stabilization does not involve a payment to producers, except incidentally. It was designed to be a payment of subsidies.

Shortly after the original price control law was enacted—perhaps some months afterward—there came a recommendation from the Commodity Credit Corporation and from the R. F. C. to the Banking and Currency Committee, while former Senator Prentiss Brown, now the Administrator of O. P. A., was a member of that committee. A bill was favorably reported by the Banking and Currency Committee making funds available to the R. F. C. and to the Commodity Credit Corporation, by which the subsidies were to be paid, but that bill was sent back to the committee on a motion to recommit because it still contained no standards to control the discretion of the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation in the payment of subsidies. Under the terms of that bill as it was reported to the Senate it would have been possible for Mr. Jones, as the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to subsidize a bootblack in the Willard Hotel. So the Senate returned the bill to the committee with instructions—implied instructions, at least—that it should be revised.

Nothing was done; and nothing has been done at this session of the Senate. We are faced with the tremendous question of how retail prices are to be controlled on the one hand, and production maintained upon the other. A few days ago—about the 1st or 2d of June—after having had many conferences with the Price Administration over the question of subsidies, and having read in the newspapers that a new subsidy program was to be announced with respect to livestock, particularly with respect to beef, I telephoned to former Senator Prentiss Brown. The producers of beef were fearful that if the prices at retail were reduced by 10 percent, as was announced, it would be impossible to prevent a reduction of the price to the producer, that is to say, a reduction of the price of cattle on the hoof. It was feared that that might result in the necessity for placing a ceiling upon live animals. In other words, it was feared that production would be penalized instead of being stimulated.

Producers of beef were not concerned about securing an increase in price. They were concerned only with maintaining a price that would enable them to stay in business and continue to produce livestock. They were interested only in preventing a reduction of prices, since their costs have risen. They knew that if a ceiling on live animals were to be announced, it would be impossible of enforcement, for reasons which are known to everyone who has any acquaintance with the livestock business. It is impossible to grade live animals.

The O. P. A. was convinced that such was the fact. When I talked with Mr. Brown he said to me that one of the purposes of the O. P. A. in adopting the new program would be to avoid putting ceilings on the prices of live animals, and to prevent a roll-back upon the producer.

What has happened? The reduction of retail prices has been announced, and nothing has been done about the subsidy to the packer beyond the announcement of the program. The purpose, of course, was to effect a cut of 2 cents a pound on the carcass, and to pay the packer a subsidy of 2 cents a pound, so that the packer would have the same amount of money with which to go into the market to buy livestock.

The cut in retail prices has been made, but the subsidy to the packer is not yet effective. So the inevitable operation of economic law brings about the very thing which the Office of Price Administration sought to avoid, namely, a reduction in the price to be obtained by the producer for his livestock. Thus it appears that under the Price Control Act, which authorized subsidies to increase production, we are having a subsidy program that may actually decrease production. We are subsidizing consumption and endangering production.

The inevitable result of the reduction of livestock prices will be to drive producers out of business, to reduce the supply for the Army, for the Navy, and for civilians.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. HILL. I sharply disagree with the Senator when he says nothing has been done to protect the producer. Senators may question the legality of it, but I shall state what was done, as I understand the action taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator has misquoted me.

Mr. HILL. If I have, I wish to understand the Senator correctly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say that nothing had been done to protect the producer. On the contrary, I said that Mr. Brown stated to me specifically that one of the objects of the program which was to be put into effect was to protect the producer. I said that the program is not operating to bring about that result.

Mr. HILL. Certainly, and that is exactly what Mr. Brown and Mr. Jones have sought to do—protect the producer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they have made only one phase of the program effective. There is an announcement with respect to the reduction in the retail price, but the subsidies to the processor are not yet paid.

Mr. HILL. I shall state my understanding of it. Acting under subsection (e) of section 2 of the act of January 30, 1942, which subsection I have just read to the Senate, and also acting under the power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, giving to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authority to pay subsidies, as I understand, when the President of the United States has declared a commodity to be a strategic or critical material—acting under those two sections, the R. F. C. Act and O. P. A. Act, Jesse Jones and the O. P. A. at least took the steps they thought were necessary to let the packers know that on the 1st of July at the end of this month they would receive back whatever subsidy was necessary so that they would not have to reduce the prices paid to the producer.

Now, the situation is that the program which they had prepared may not have worked. It may be that the packers—and I am not here to lay any particular blame upon them—for some reason or other have questioned the authority which Jesse Jones and the O. P. A. thought they had by reason of these acts. The information which I have received directly from the O. P. A. is that Jesse Jones and the O. P. A. acted under these two acts, the act of January 30, 1940, and the R. F. C. Act, to protect the producers of meat in this country against any reduction in their prices due to this roll-back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment.

The Senator from Missouri said that I had announced a new doctrine, that by what I suppose is a release some official in the executive branch could pass a law to take money out of the Treasury. Of course, everyone knows that would be absurd. The only body in the world which can pass a statute which would take money out of the Treasury or confer any authority for so doing, other than that given under the Constitution, is the Congress of the United States. The only body in the world that can take money out of the Treasury is the Congress of the United States. But it is not unusual to have laws or statutes become operative by some kind of a public proclamation. There is nothing new, unusual, or unprecedented in that. As I may recall, when the President of the United States calls Congress into session he does not sit down and write every Member a letter. There is some kind of a public announcement, proclamation, or something of that nature, which is published by the press, and that information convenes the Congress. So there is nothing unusual about a public announcement or proclamation which gives notice of and puts a statute into operation.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may suggest to the Senator that the difficulty here is not at all with respect to the intention of the O. P. A. or the intention of the R. F. C. There can be no question about the fact that both Mr. Brown, as head of the O. P. A., and Jesse Jones as head of the R. F. C., with their staffs have all intended to protect the producer. The difficulty is that in the very fact of the application of the policy it is not operating that way because retail reduction is immediately effective whereas the subsidy is not immediately effective. Even as the Senator from Alabama has stated it, it is dependent on some payments still to be obtained from the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. Now, with all the criticism——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I still have the floor, in spite of the criticism of my friend.

Of course, if I am to reimburse the Senator for some loss he suffers on a payment he makes, I cannot reimburse him until he has already made the payment, or sustained the loss. I do not know what it is. The O. P. A. in Washington today could not tell the amount of business a packer in Chicago will do between this 15th day of June and the 1st day of July of this year. It could not make these payments until the packer had done the business and had sustained the loss. Then the packer comes in and the R. F. C., acting for the O. P. A., meets the loss. The loss cannot be anticipated. No business could operate in that way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is impossible, of course, to enter into a debate with me until the Senator fully understands my statement.

Mr. HILL. I understand that what the Senator is saying is that whatever the good intentions or good purposes have been of Mr. Jones, of the R. F. C., and Mr. Brown, of the O. P. A., the program which they devised and which they attempted to put into operation did not work. Is that not the Senator's position?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to state the situation further.

Mr. HILL. One reason I have for saying what I have stated is that at least one Senator has stood on this floor and questioned the good faith, the purposes, and the motives of the men who put this program into effect. I am sure the Senator shares no such feeling as that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not. I know they have proper motives. The problem is how the motives are to be made effective.

From the moment that the intention to adopt a subsidy program to processors was announced the producers of the country expressed the fear that it would inevitably result in a roll-back of prices upon the producer and thus penalize the production of the meat that is so sorely needed. That has transpired. Now, why should they entertain that fear? They entertain it because there has been no agreement between Congress and the Executive with respect to the whole subsidy program. It is being announced by directive, by Executive order, instead of by an understanding between the Executive and the legislative branches of the Congress.

The Senator's colleague, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has been laboring for months in that committee to bring about a stable policy with respect to the payment of subsidies. I say to the Senator that the cure of the great problem with which we are now confronted, the remedy to be applied, is the immediate development of an understanding between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government as to policy. If laws are to be made merely by Executive order and by directive instead of by the understanding of the elected representatives of the people, such problems as those which confront us now cannot be avoided, and of course that ends in destroying the ability of the producer to produce.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, everything the Senator says may have justification, but I come back to the proposition that Jesse Jones and the R. F. C. and the O. P. A. acted under authority of the law, under the act of June 30, 1942, and the R. F. C. Act, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may have already discussed this particular phase of the law, but the law reads:

> Or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

Certainly there is nothing in that to authorize subsidies to others than producers.

Mr. HILL. Yes, there is; the Senator has not read it all.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to read further.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only purpose for which a subsidy can be given is to bring about maximum production.

Mr. HILL. That is right. I read, in addition to what the Senator from Montana has read:

> Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year—

Of course, if the Administrator shoved prices down he would have good reason to know that he would not get maximum production.

Mr. WHEELER. The point I am making is that the subsidy in question is not being given for the purpose of increasing production, which, after all, is what the law provides.

Mr. HILL. The plan was that the packer was to pay the money to the producers. Then the R. F. C. was to reimburse the packer. The Government would simply be using the packer as the machinery to insure that the producer drew the subsidy and got his full price.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not what the law says, and anybody who puts that construction upon it certainly is putting a construction never intended by the Congress of the United States. I remember distinctly when the law was before the Senate. The only excuse for a subsidy and the only argument made for a subsidy was that in the case of certain crops it was desired to pay a subsidy because there was a shortage of such crops and there was a new crop coming on. When you begin to pay a subsidy to the manufacturer rather than to the producer, you can go all the way down the line and pay a subsidy to every manufacturer in the United States, and say of course you are just using him as an instrument to pay it back to the producer of the raw material. You can give a subsidy to the manufacturer of boots and shoes and say he will give it back to the tanner, and finally the tanner will give it back to the producer of hides, but you cannot possibly put that forced construction upon the law, and when Jesse Jones or any other official in the Department is doing that he is doing something absolutely contrary to the intention of Congress and the plain language of the law itself.

Mr. HILL. That may be the Senator's opinion, and he is a very distinguished lawyer, but I do not agree with him in this particular case.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, but I desire to conclude, as the calendar is soon to be called.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Alabama read from section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, because it is upon that section that the executive authorities base their right to pay subsidies on butter and meat. For 3 weeks I sat in the subcommittee with the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from South Dakota listening to numberless witnesses, many of them from executive departments, and during all the time we were taking the testimony, to the best of my recollection, not a single witness or a single officer of any executive department even pretended that this subsidy was being offered for the purpose of expanding production; they admitted it was for the purpose of reducing prices, and not for the purpose of expanding production.

Mr. HILL. The Senator realizes that this whole thing is predicated on the idea of holding down prices, and when prices are held down, if care is not taken production is reduced. That is all the provision was put in the law for, the whole thing is predicated on holding down prices.

Mr. AIKEN. As I remember, a number of the witnesses who appeared before the committee from the executive departments made no such interpretation as that. It was simply that they were determined to push down prices. It was pointed out to them that they would be pushing down prices to the original consumer, and then, when they were cornered, they fell back on the statement that they had an Executive directive to do it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is one thing I wanted to call attention to, and that was that Mr. Jones himself was very doubtful about his power to subsidize, for when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee on the bill referred to by the Senator from Wyoming he said, "I may or may not have the power to subsidize, but I do not propose to do it without congressional authority," and so he asked for the authority. The Banking and Currency Committee reported the bill. The Senate referred it back to the committee not so much on any technical difficulty, but, obviously, because the large majority of the Senate disapproved of subsidies. Mr. Jones was so notified. Yet in spite of that, because the President ordered him to do so, he has not departed from the policy he adopted at that time.

There has been much discussion about the protection of the producers. I am concerned about the producers, but I am more concerned about the effect on the consuming public of the United States. It seems to me that this is the greatest example of incompetence we have seen in the O. P. A., although there have been many of them. I read from the New York Herald Tribune of this morning:

> The worst meat shortage in its history struck New York yesterday in the wake of the Government's roll-back of meat prices at the packer level. Unlike the shortage caused by heavy buying before rationing began on March 29, no relief was in sight.
>
> In Chicago, the Nation's largest livestock market, the major packers "struck" against the high cattle prices of recent weeks and offered $1 to $1.50 a hundred pounds less than they have been paying for most grades. Despite the Nation-wide meat shortage, 2,000 head were unbought at the end of the day. Farmers are considered likely to retaliate by holding back further shipments, thus intensifying the shortage. Similar conditions were reported in other Midwestern markets.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Despite the Government's vague pledge to provide subsidy payments to repay the meat industry for its added losses the packers apparently decided they could not continue to absorb the present squeeze and take on the risk of new losses in the face of congressional disapproval of the subsidy program.

In other words, it is not enough to say that there is authority so long as we admit there is a serious doubt about the ability to subsidize, and no competent administration would ever have undertaken a subsidy policy without further congressional approval.

> Wholesale markets here—
>
> That is, in New York—
>
> were bare and retailer supplies were confined to that held back from the meat-hungry week-end trade. Local slaughter was reported almost at a standstill.

From the other end of the Nation we find—

> SEATTLE, June 14.—Four Washington packing companies said today that they had suspended slaughtering. Their officials declared the action resulted from confusion over prices, subsidies, and roll-backs.
>
> The Gibson Packing Co., at Yakima; Schaake Packing Co., of Ellensburg; and the Acme and James Packing Cos. at Seattle all reported they would stop slaughtering.
>
> Morris Gordon, president of the Acme Packing & Provision Co., said, "We'll wait a day or two and then liquidate. We just can't operate this way."

It seems to me the condition which has been produced is that the American people no longer have any meat, and if this kind of administration of food continues, we shall face in this country next year the biggest famine we ever saw. Far from being the world's granary, to distribute relief to all the suffering peoples of Europe, we are not going to have enough food to feed our own population.

In my opinion, what we require is a complete reorganization of the entire method of administering prices in this country. From the time the act was passed—and it is a reasonable act, prescribing a reasonable policy—the Food Administration has wholly failed to comply with any of the provisions of the act it did not like, and has proceeded with policies which are absolutely contrary to the basic and underlying theory of the act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator's voice has been raised on this issue time and again. Other Senators desire to speak, and we want to get to the calendar. This is a twice-told story, so I shall not stop to comment on it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the discussion a moment ago with respect to the roll-back upon meats and other matters the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] discussed the canning situation, and asked if the canners were not in the same position in which the small packers found themselves, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] seemed to agree, although he admitted he did not know much about the canning situation.

A week ago last Saturday a group of canners from the Midwest interviewed me with respect to certain labor costs which they sought to have included in connection with their canning work, in order that they might at least make a fair profit in their operations during the coming season. They advised me that the increase in price as a result of a decision of the War Labor Board had made it absolutely impossible for them to operate without a loss unless they received some help from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I had not met the majority of these canners until they came into my office. I presume most of them were of the opposite political faith. But

they had been to see a good many Members of Congress, some from Illinois and some from other States, and the only thing they received in the way of help, they told me, from those Members of Congress was just one constant stream of condemnation of this administration throughout the entire interviews. That was the aid and the help they received.

As I previously stated, I never had seen most of these men before they came into my office but after listening to their case I realized they needed help. I immediately called Justice Byrnes in connection with the canning situation because I knew he had handled that matter before he was promoted to his present position. I also called Chester Davis. After talking with these two men they suggested that I talk to Judge Vinson, which I did. I made an appointment for these men to see Mr. Vinson to discuss this economic problem, because after listening to them I thought they had a meritorious case which deserved immediate attention and consideration by men who had the power and authority to give them assistance.

They met with Judge Vinson in his office at 4 o'clock Saturday afternoon and spent an hour discussing this entire matter with him. Yesterday I received a letter from the Milford Canning Co., of Milford, Ill. I shall not read it all, but just a part of it:

JUNE 12, 1943.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The news published in newspapers this morning and conveyed by commentators over the radio that Mr. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, has authorized a subsidy to cover any additional labor costs which were approved by the War Labor Board was indeed sweet music to the ears of the entire canning industry.

I shall not read the remainder of the letter because it has some personal reference to me; however, I may say, it is a pleasing one. Anyway here is an individual who is at the head of a large canning industry in my State, one of the individuals who was with the group here seeking relief, and he is happy to know that Judge Vinson, Mr. Byrnes' successor, listened to their pleas, and was convinced of the justice and the merit of the cause these men presented.

I only place this into the RECORD at this particular time because the junior Senator from Michigan said the canning people were getting no relief. Here is one at least who tells me that the entire canning industry is pleased and happy in the fact that they are going to obtain these subsidies. It is not a question of giving these subsidies over night, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said a moment ago. That cannot be done. But certainly these men are willing to wait until such time as Mr. Vinson and his group can ascertain what amount is necessary in the way of paying subsidies, and that will be done. These men are relying upon the good faith of these officials and they have a right to. Uncle Sam will make good his pledge.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to say a word at this time, but I had a visitation from canners of the Pacific coast where the canning industry is very large and important. I too advised them to confer with Judge Vinson after I had conferred with Mr. Justice Byrnes. The information I have, and it is accurate, is not that a subsidy is being granted, but only that Judge Vinson had said that the canners could increase the pay of the wage earners 10 cents an hour, but in doing so they would run the risk of future consideration of the problem, namely, whether it would be a subsidy or an elevation of the ceiling price. That is the true interpretation of the order. The cannery man probably could not be certain whether this was a final adjudication, nor could the Senator from Illinois realize the import of the order. I am thankful for the attitude of Judge Vinson, but it is one of those things which lies in the future, subject to determination after the matter is given further consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wanted to point out that the statement made in the letter written to the Senator from Illinois is that Judge Vinson will approve what is approved by the War Labor Board, and it is represented to me that, although the War Labor Board has authorized some increase, it was not sufficient to permit the canners to get the labor which they need in the competitive situation with which they find themselves placed at this time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have received information of a similar nature from the canners of Illinois; that in the early stages of the canning program they could not get the help they needed because they could not bid successfully for the labor. That is still their problem, and they are undecided as to their future course. The situation presents a direct hindrance to the production of food, and to the canning of food which is now available in this country. It is likely to result in a break-down of our whole war effort. If the food we have actually grown cannot be canned, and we fall short with respect to food production, then all the talk about what is going to be done will not save the situation. The canners need action, and they must have knowledge that the food which is actually produced can be canned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say one more word in connection with the matter, in view of what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has said. All I know is what is contained in the letter. I shall reread a paragraph from the letter written to me by the Milford Canning Co., of Milford, Ill., as follows:

The news published in newspapers this morning, and conveyed by commentators over the radio that Mr. Vinson, director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, has authorized a subsidy to cover any additional labor costs—

Whatever those additional labor costs are, of course, I do not know. It was represented to me by the canners that there would probably be an 8-cent increase per hour in the cost per man who will work in these canning factories, and that 8 cents was the main thing that was troubling them. If the War Labor Board approves an 8-cent increase in the hourly pay Judge Vinson is ready, as I understand the letter, to O. K. that 8 cents with a subsidy.

That is about all there is to the proposition. I do not know what was represented to other individuals with respect to shortage of labor. Of course, there is a shortage of labor everywhere. But these canners have been paying the workers in my section of the country about the same kind of wage paid to a man who is working on the farm. That has been the history of the situation and everyone knows it. Now, all they are asking for, according to this letter, is the additional increase of 8 cents per hour, and they made no claim to me that they would not be able to produce what was necessary to produce if they could get this increase, and thereby save themselves from operating at a loss.

Let me read the following paragraph from the letter:

If the War Labor Board in Washington approves the regional office recommendations we can then proceed with our packing plants happily and work with unstinted measure toward putting up another record crop.

Does that, Mr. President, sound as though there exists any real labor shortage?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I tried to show the true interpretation of the letter a moment ago, having some familiarity with the subject matter over and above what the cannery man has. The cannery man does not understand the proposition. Judge Vinson's order was that the canner can increase the wage 10 cents an hour provided he assumes the risk which may follow later, if the officials of Government come to some determination whether it should be a subsidy or whether there should be an elevation of the price level. So it is up to the cannery man to determine upon his own judgment and own risk whether he wants to pay the 10 cents an hour increase or not.

There is no assurance to him that he can get it either. That is a thing for him to determine in accordance with his best judgment.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not familiar, I will say to the Senator——

Mr. McNARY. I am not criticizing the author of the letter. I think perhaps he was not accurately informed through the press with respect to the decision made by Judge Vinson. I am not criticizing the writer of the letter, but I am stating the true interpretation of the order.

Mr. LUCAS. I assumed that in view of the fact the canning industry was represented by such able men as were in my office that this gentleman knew what he was talking about and that they had faith and confidence in the integrity of the order. Therefore I took advantage of the letter to discuss the subject here on the floor in view of the remarks made by the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the letter to which reference has been made might well be placed in the RECORD. The letter is dated June 12, 1943, and is addressed by Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization,

to Dr. George W. Taylor, Vice Chairman, National War Labor Board, Washington, D. C. The pertinent part of the letter is as follows:

The National War Labor Board and its designated agents are consequently authorized in ruling on applications for approval of wage increases submitted by employers in the canning industry, whose products are seasonal and perishable in nature, to approve such wage increases of not more than 10 cents per hour, if they are otherwise proper and to authorize such increases to be placed into effect immediately by those employers who are willing to rely for price relief on the results of the study now being made of price increases in the canning industry generally.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 12, 1943.

DR. GEORGE W. TAYLOR,
Vice Chairman,
National War Labor Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. TAYLOR: After studying the contents of your letter of June 7 relating to the canning industry, I have concluded that the suggestion made by you has much merit and will meet the needs of the situation in conformity with the necessities of the wage and price stabilization program.

The National War Labor Board and its designated agents are consequently authorized in ruling on applications for approval of wage increases submitted by employers in the canning industry, whose products are seasonal and perishable in nature, to approve such wage increases of not more than 10 cents per hour, if they are otherwise proper and to authorize such increases to be placed into effect immediately by those employers who are willing to rely for price relief on the results of the study now being made of price increases in the canning industry generally.

Of course, those employers who, in filing applications for approval of wage increases, do not indicate the need for price relief may, in accordance with existing procedures, be authorized to place an approved wage increase into effect immediately.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to inject a few words into the debate which has taken place on the meat-subsidy program.

I have just returned from Wyoming, where I attended the convention of the Wyoming Stockgrowers Association, an association of cattle growers representing practically every cattle raiser in the State of Wyoming. The suggestion has been made on the floor of the Senate that the subsidy was for the purpose of encouraging the producers. That is not so. There are approximately 4,000,000 more cattle in the United States today than there have ever been before. According to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, by the first of the year there will be 81,000,000 head of cattle, which will be about 7,000,000 more than there ever before have been in this country.

Mr. President, the trouble is not with the producer. There is no more loyal citizen, no one more anxious to help in the war effort; and he is doing his share by producing the livestock. He is satisfied with the prices he is receiving. That fact is evidenced by a telegram which was sent from the convention to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, stating that the stock growers—

feel they should express fears and conviction that the suggested subsidy program would have a disastrous effect on the industry and the supply of meat so essential for our armed forces, lend-lease, and our civilian population.

The stock growers of the Nation earnestly desire to do everything in their power to provide the needed supplies of meat. Under the present conditions they do not seek nor desire higher prices for themselves.

They earnestly urge the immediate putting into effect of the meat management program recently adopted by the livestock and meat industry. That, if necessary, a further meeting of the sponsors of that program be called at once in order to iron out any unsolved details.

Mr. President, that telegram was sent to Mr. Byrnes.

I feel that the trouble today is not with the producers, but with the method of distribution, the mismanagement and mishandling, and the use of executive directives and press-release instructions by this administration.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

IMMOBILIZED AUTOMOBILE TIRES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, Mr. Sidney W. Hooper, writing in the Fargo Forum of recent date, says:

Farmers in the Fargo Office of Price Administration district have been issued about 4,000 certificates for the purchase of grade 3 tires by tire-ration boards after proving their need in connection with food production for war purposes.

They haven't been able to buy the tires because dealers have no stock and have unfilled orders running back weeks and months.

Meanwhile, approximately 50,000 tires are in a Fargo warehouse at 1434 First Avenue N. They are spare tires turned in by North Dakota motorists last fall on the demand of the Government for all tires over five for each car.

Very naturally, Mr. President, the people who direly need tires are experiencing not only displeasure but a large degree of suspicion by reason of the facts which I have read.

Two questions arise in the minds of most people: First, might this be just a game of ring-around-the-rosy to stretch out the duration of certain jobs; or, second, is it a deliberate plan to keep these tires out of circulation and out of competition with the regular supply?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article under the heading "Muddleheadedness or worse" be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUDDLEHEADEDNESS OR WORSE—SOME 50,000 TIRES STORED IN FARGO WAREHOUSE BUT FARMERS' CERTIFICATES HAVE TO BE UNFILLED

(By Sidney W. Hooper)

Farmers in the Fargo Office of Price Administration district have been issued about 4,000 certificates for the purchase of grade 3 tires by tire ration boards after proving their need in connection with food production for war purposes.

They haven't been able to buy the tires because dealers have no stock and have unfilled orders running back weeks and months.

Meanwhile, approximately 50,000 tires are in a Fargo warehouse at 1434 First Avenue North. They are spare tires turned in by North Dakota motorists last fall on the demand of the Government for all tires over five for each car. They are the property of the Federal Defense Supplies Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, set up to handle distribution of the tires through regular car tire trade channels.

Through muddleheadedness or worse, the store has been lying idle in the Fargo warehouse while farmers have been clamoring for the identical tires.

And in the last few days, the situation has taken a turn for the worse. The tires actually are being shipped out of North Dakota, are being loaded onto trucks headed for Minneapolis. A similar, though somewhat smaller stock, is held by the Federal Defense Supplies Corporation in a Minot warehouse.

The above facts came to light after the Fargo Forum had spent several days investigating heated complaints from farmers, some of whom were hampered in seeding operations because they could not obtain tires for their cars—could not drive into town to bring back laborers, machine parts, and so forth, necessary for operations which must be carried out immediately.

A check with retail and wholesale tire dealers in Fargo confirmed the story—that they had been unable to get stocks, that countless inquiries had failed to produce any results in distribution of the idle Fargo tire pile or any reasonable explanation of the ridiculous situation.

TAKES COGNIZANCE

Governor John Moses took cognizance of the situation today in a message to Rubber Director William M. Jeffers.

"I am informed the Defense Supplies Corporation has over 50,000 grade 3 tires in storage in North Dakota now," the chief executive declared, "and I urge immediate steps be taken to release sufficient tires to dealers to fill all outstanding certificates. Farming operations are seriously hampered and the situation is critical."

W. W. Leigh, supervisor of tires and tubes, informed the Governor his request had been referred to the Defense Supplies Corporation "with the urgest request that they release tires from North Dakota warehouses as quickly as possible."

"We had brought this matter to their attention previously," he said.

"Last week I made arrangements for manufacturers where possible from their own stocks to move grade 3 tires into North Dakota and other important farming areas."

To put the finger on just who is to blame or what motive lies behind the strange action—or lack of action—of the Defense Supplies Corporation is something that can't be done on the basis of a few days of investigation.

That corporation certainly must shoulder the major blame since it was set up to effect distribution of the tires and they are not being distributed—at least recently in any quantity.

Tire dealers, Government employees, and other individuals contacted by the Fargo

Forum were reluctant to be quoted in person. But the pictures reproduced herewith speak for themselves. Hehe in Fargo are thousand of tires, of the exact kind needed by North Dakota farmers, turned in to the Government in the first place by North Dakota residents and they are not being distributed.

No representative of the Defense Supplies Corporation was available locally for checking.

PICTURE IS THIS

The picture as the Fargo Forum got it from various and rather reliable sources in round figures, was this:

Originally 113,000 tires were accumulated. They were graded and 63,000 were determined to be junk and shipped to rubber reclaiming plants.

Of the remainder, 25,000 were and are immediately usable.

During March and April, 1,500 were shipped from the Fargo warehouse to North Dakota dealers.

The other 25,000 could be used through recapping or through making sectional repairs.

Current orders are for the liquidation of the stock in the Fargo warehouse within 30 days, and that apparently means more than 20,000 usable tires are being shipped out of North Dakota.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I shall be calling the matter to the attention of the Truman committee, with some hope of having the facts ascertained.

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESS—CRITICISM OF OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the issue of the Washington Evening Star for Monday, June 14. One of the leading articles appearing in that issue is entitled "Washington News Inadequately Covered, Elmer Davis Says."

Mr. President, who is Elmer Davis? You know who he is, he is head of the alphabetical agency, O. W. I. I desire to say a word in reference to his statement. I rise today to speak in defense of our American press. The men and women who report the activities of Congress, who write the news of our Nation, of wartime Washington, and of the war in general, are to be commended, not criticized, for their outstanding effort and their masterful accomplishment of a difficult task.

I present herewith, not for insertion in the RECORD, but for inspection by Senators, an Associated Press news article crediting Elmer Davis with asserting that the "Washington news is inadequately covered * * * less adequately covered than any other news in the world."

Mr. Davis objects that the representatives of the press have not covered the news. Perhaps his real objection is that they have uncovered some news about Washington which does not look too well outside of Washington.

Mr. President, such reports of similar statements made by Mr. Davis have reached me on previous occasions, but I have taken them lightly. However, I cannot and shall not stand idly by while our American press is openly scored by Elmer Davis, a man who has sought to create the first United States Government propaganda bureau of a kind used in the dictator countries.

Nowhere can be found a more loyal group of American citizens than the men and women who today report the news of this Nation for the great wire services and the many newspapers, both large and small.

Elmer Davis, as Director of the Office of War Information, now seeks to silence the Nation's press, so as to cover sins of maladministration on the part of the New Deal in many phases of the war effort.

The O. W. I. and other governmental agencies remind me of the cuttlefish which drowns itself in its own ink.

The Washington force of correspondents is known and respected wherever a free press exists in the world today. It is admired for its ability and for its nonpartisan covering of the news.

By his unwarranted attack upon the press, by his attack upon these newspaper man and women, Elmer Davis has incapacitated himself, in my judgment, to further hold the office to which he was appointed by President Roosevelt.

After repeated bungling, after being compelled to admit that certain material issued by his Office has been improper politically, Mr. Davis now has found recourse in seeking to smear Washington correspondents and the press in general. He seeks to make this country believe that unbiased news reports from Washington of faulty administration on the home front, of O. P. A., of foodstuffs, of rationing, are so much bunk.

Well, Mr. President, I know it is not bunk. So do you. We all know it is the truth—the truth reported by talented and able men and women.

Mr. Davis finds his own answer in the repeated juggling and shifting of bureaucrats from one alphabetical hodgepodge to another each time public opinion catches up with the failure of the previous agency.

What Mr. Davis would offer in the place of what he terms an "inadequate press" he does not make clear.

If the free press as it exists in America is surrendered, everything our men and women are fighting for is surrendered. If the free press is surrendered, the people will become dependent upon the growing collection of misfits, political hirelings, and radical journalists assembled in the O. W. I.

The Washington correspondents are doing a good job. They know how to write unbiased news stories without being told what to do by some governmental agency such as the O. W. I.

The O. W. I. itself has prevented industry from telling the full story of production, just as it has prevented the truth from being told in Washington in many instances when the people had the right to know the truth.

Mr. President, for the good of the country I believe the O. W. I., its policies, and its personnel should be thoroughly investigated. A thorough investigation would give Mr. Davis an opportunity to explain in detail wherein the news services are inadequate or have fallen down, as he stated in his Boston speech.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 259, where we left off at the previous call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are about to call the calendar, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

PREVENTION OF EXCESSIVE FEES IN CONNECTION WITH WAR CONTRACTS

The bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts was announced as first in order.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, when the first measure on the calendar, House bill 1900, was called, it was passed over. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] objected to consideration of the bill, and spoke to me briefly concerning it after he had entered his objection. Apparently at the moment he is not available. I think the Senator would be well advised to let the bill be passed over temporarily.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement in regard to the bill, so that it may appear in the RECORD, even though the bill is passed over.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection to the Senator making a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

(Mr. GURNEY entered the Chamber.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill is recommended by the Treasury Department, the Navy Department, the War Department, and the Maritime Commission. It has passed the House. It meets with the approval of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It does not deal with the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of renegotiating contracts. It has nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of the system of renegotiating contracts.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I asked that the bill go over.

Mr. WALSH. I so understood; and I asked permission to proceed for 5 minutes in explanation of the bill for the record. Then if the Senator wishes to have the bill go over, it may go over and I shall call it up as a special order of business at a later date.

Mr. GURNEY. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on April 20, 1943, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 1900. This bill is somewhat similar in principle to the proposal made by the Senate committee last year. It does not prohibit the payment of a contingent fee or commission. It is designed to give the departments authority to control the excessive fees and profits being received by manufacturers' representatives or commission agents, by defining their contracts or arrangements with their principals as "subcontracts" under the statute dealing with the renegotiation of war contracts, which will permit the renegotiation downward of their profits—providing their gross annual income referable to the procurement of Government contracts, or subcontracts thereunder, exceeds $25,000. In order to encompass them all, these agents are defined in two ways: First, those agents who receive commissions or fees contingent upon the procurement of, or amount of, the Government contracts, or subcontracts thereunder; and, second, those agents any part of whose services consist of the solicitation or procurement of Government contracts or subcontracts thereunder. This latter category would include those representatives who are on a salary or some other form of fixed compensation.

Compensation arrangements between business enterprises and their bona fide officers, partners, or full-time employees, who may represent the enterprises directly in soliciting or procuring Government business, are specifically excepted. It is felt that the compensation of these persons can be sufficiently controlled in the direct renegotiations of the business enterprises themselves, when the allowability of salaries, bonuses, commissions, and other forms of compensation is considered.

The existing remedy of proceeding under the contract covenant against contractors who have employed contingent-fee agents in violation of their covenant is preserved, as well as the right to eliminate excessive selling fees in the original negotiation of the contract price, both of which methods presently are being used by the departments.

The proposed amendments to section 403 of Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, are made effective as of April 28, 1942, the effective date of the original Renegotiation Act and the amendments thereto, since all substantive provisions of the Renegotiation Act remain unchanged, the only modifications being definitive in character.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Evidence presented to the House Naval Affairs Committee demonstrated that excessive profits or fees were being realized by numerous manufacturers' agents or "war brokers" in connection with the procurement of Government contracts. Fees and commissions, based upon a percentage of Government business obtained, were modest in pre-war years, but skyrocketed in 1941 and 1942 when our rearmament program was in full swing. It appears also that the amounts being paid agents in commissions and fees in respect to subcontracts were at least as great as the amounts being paid in connection with prime contracts.

The services of these agents were not entirely without value. Generally speaking, they were useful in bringing Government and business together, and sometimes they have assisted in adapting peacetime enterprises to war production. There is nothing in the bill which would prevent small manufacturers from availing themselves of the services of representatives of this character. It is recognized that many of them cannot afford to have a direct representative in Washington, and there is an advantage in being able to share the expense with other manufacturers. However, the commissions and fees of these agents were frequently disproportionate to the value of their services, measured by any reasonable standard, and it is at the excessive amount of their compensation, both from individual companies and in the aggregate, that this bill is directed.

EXISTING REMEDIES ARE INADEQUATE

The War and Navy Departments have been acutely aware of the huge selling costs being borne by the Government, and have employed every means presently at their disposal to recapture excessive fees and commissions paid in the past and to forestall additional payments in the future. They have relied principally upon a strict interpretation of the warranty clause and have sought to prevent the inclusion of contingent fees in the cost of future contracts.

The warranty clause, which is included in all Government contracts, provides as follows:

ART. 11. Covenant against contingent fees: The contractor warrants that he has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

The exception in the warranty of "bona fide established commercial or selling agents maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business" has given rise to considerable uncertainty. For administrative purposes, the Navy Department has adopted certain tests which, strictly applied, would except from the warranty only those agents who, first, have had a certain continuity of service, going back well before the war; second, have represented their principals in selling to commercial customers as well as to the Government; and, third, have been employed because of their familiarity with the products sold, not because of their knowledge of Government procedure or acquaintance with Government officials. It can be appreciated that a determination as to who can qualify within this exception presents many difficult questions of law and fact, and is necessarily a slow process. Moreover, even when agents are clearly bona fide under the warranty clause, nevertheless there is created an unjustifiable drain upon the Public Treasury when their fees become grossly disproportionate to the services which they render.

Even conceding that the warranty clause affords some protection to the Department under its prime contracts, no control over contingent fees can be exercised in the procurement of subcontracts. The Government is not a party to these subcontracts; neither do they contain a warranty clause. The procurement of subcontracts, however, is a necessary adjunct to Government procurement and any selling expenses paid in connection therewith must ultimately be paid by the Government.

There has been an increasing effort to eliminate excessive fees at the time contracts are originally negotiated with the departments. This approach is not a complete solution, however, since such action can only be taken in connection with prime contracts, and subcontracts cannot be reached. Frequently the agent is unwilling to relinquish his contractual rights to the commissions. Insistence upon an adjustment at the time of original negotiation might unreasonably delay procurement. Also, contracting officers are not always aware, for various reasons, of the existence of excessive fees.

At one time a bill was introduced in the House, and was rejected by the Committee on Naval Affairs because it would impose obligations upon legitimate, bona fide agents. However, all appreciated that there was an evil which ought to be reached. The representatives of various bureaus testified that the way to reach it was to require that the agent who negotiated for an excessive fee with any contractor to obtain a contract from the Government be made a subcontractor and his fee subjected to renegotiation. That is all there is to this bill. If a person collects $200,000 for a $10,000,000 contract, the bill would make him a subcontractor, and the renegotiators would decide how much of the money he had honestly earned, how much was bonus,

how much was excessive, and how much was fraudulent. That is all there is to the bill. It would not change the policy or principle of renegotiating. It represents a serious and honest endeavor to reach lobbyists who are making enormous sums of money. If I had the time I would read a list of them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the bill apply to negotiators of subcontracts as well as of primary contracts?

Mr. WALSH. Under prime contracts, these people can usually be reached. The bill would apply to subcontractors who cannot now be reached. If the renegotiators should decide, as they have in some cases, that the fees were excessive, and should hold back payment by the Government, the situation which the bill seeks to correct might be remedied. That would be in the interest of the contractors, and the contractors favor it. The contractor who might make a contract with an agent could sue the agent if the renegotiators should decide that the fee was excessive and reduce the allowance. The contractor could sue the agent to recover the excess payment, which would otherwise represent a real loss to the contractor.

So far as I know, not a single person is opposed to the bill once he understands it. Of course, there is a great difference of opinion regarding the principle of renegotiation, as to whether or not the act ought to be repealed. I admit that, and I have not closed my mind to their views. But if the law is on the statute books and is now applied to everybody, it certainly ought to be applied to agents who have scandalously received excessive sums of money for using their influence, without labor or effort, in obtaining contracts involving huge fees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to make sure that the bill covers all negotiators of contracts for fees, so that it applies to everyone.

Mr. WALSH. It applies to everyone. To repeat, it would be in the interest of the contractor. The negotiators could say, "You paid that agent $150,000, and you owe him honestly only $25,000." By the way, the bill applies only to fees of more than $25,000. The negotiators could say, "You must give that money back. We will not make such an allowance." The contractor could then sue the agent and recover $125,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand that a commission broker could obtain 10 fees of $25,000 each on different contracts without being subject to renegotiation?

Mr. WALSH. If he received a large number of fees from different contractors they would all be considered together. The negotiators would ask, "How much did you spend? How many times did you visit the navy yard in Washington? Was it once or 300 times? What were your fees before for other work? How is it you received $500,000 this year, when never before in your life did you earn more than $5,000?"

Regardless of the principle of renegotiating, in my opinion the proposal is very meritorious. If the Senator from South Dakota still thinks he should object, I shall have to move later to take up the bill. I thought perhaps my explanation would be sufficient. The bill applies only to persons who have made tremendous sums of money by using their influence, personally and politically, to obtain contracts from our Government.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, my purpose in opposing the passage of this bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar is, first, that I am concerned as to whether renegotiation is the way to reach these representatives. I am not convinced that renegotiation has been effective in the case of a large number of primary contracts which have been let by the armed services and the Maritime Commission. I am sure that a bill which covers all types of contracts is sufficiently important to warrant its being gone into thoroughly. Additional information is being received which I hope will make it possible for me to offer an amendment which I think may improve the bill. Therefore, I urge my objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the bill is passed over I wish to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks tables appearing in the committee report on pages 4 and 5 setting forth the names of 40 or more persons or companies, showing the fees they received in 1939, 1940, and 1941.

I wish to emphasize again that the bill does not deal with the principle of renegotiation, whether it is a wise policy or not. It recognizes the fact that there is such a law, and seeks to renegotiate the contracts of representatives or agents who are receiving extortionate and unconscionable fees. That is all the bill does.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amounts of retainer fees, reimbursements of expenses, salaries, and commissions paid to and due certain manufacturers' agents, 1939–42 [1]

	1939	1940	1941	1942 [2]	
				Received	Due [3]
Associated Manufacturers, Inc			$17,529.89	$47,797.19	$75,073.21
Baker, W. Lester	$27,957.71	$81,015.39	184,471.76	[4] 261,947.00	([5])
Belzer, Dana	14,215.00	15,083.00	13,954.00	24,607.00	([5])
Booher, Howard	27,688.84	30,200.00	24,750.00	38,175.00	([5])
Bradley Co., The	49,221.83	69,881.94	100,688.36	72,765.33	18,575.00
Brady, John B	17,035.59	16,616.18	67,308.66	104,808.59	10,944.24
Brew, Altiery & Wesely, Inc			7,634.61	[4] 49,332.35	[4] 64,841.48
Bolton, Luther Mathew	2,175.00	17,194.19	68,784.83	[4] 123,604.55	[4] 16,000.00
Brown, Charles E., Jr	10,354.00	14,022.00	22,170.00	17,936.00	([5])
Brown, Lewis H		2,000.00	20,613.52	20,426.96	([5])
Commercial Engineering Co	13,653.51	19,443.36	33,478.61	42,319.33	141,200.00
Cunneen, F. J	18,380.00	40,970.00	64,082.00	47,373.00	([5])
Davenport, B. A	2,100.00	2,600.00	10,500.00	22,500.00	([5])
DeFord, Allen V., Co	21,655.13	45,928.63	28,937.92	26,057.46	([5])
Dunn & Jones			84,718.32	98,016.01	([5])
Eaton, Samuel W		7,221.15	21,788.34	28,081.33	([5])
Ettenger, E. Lloyd	6,675.45	10,359.20	13,810.42	21,676.84	24,792.42
Ferguson, Moir C	3,300.00	4,600.00	6,400.00	12,875.00	([5])
Flood, R. J			20,600.00	24,597.70	([5])
Frankel, G. S			26,000.00	35,000.00	([5])
Gibson, S. Douglas	6,809.00	21,400.44	83,958.73	138,796.01	34,744.22
Goodloe, E. S	3,072.66	9,072.73	20,542.52	49,764.43	40,863.89
Gose, John H	633.98	3,672.15	25,121.41	12,000.00	([5])
Graham, William S	23,525.21	19,538.50	18,958.08	18,267.29	4,922.94
Grant, Harry L	16,900.00	32,412.98	60,358.37	51,037.31	([5])
Gray, George A	6,570.48	16,600.00	36,946.52	60,656.30	44,440.96
Hanes, Earlton	2,749.43	5,438.24	18,290.15	19,289.65	35,085.46
Headden, C. W	15,055.00	19,333.00	57,281.00	67,728.00	([5])
Jondreau, Russell	7,339.70	15,684.00	22,260.00	29,000.00	5,000.00
Joralemon, L. D	42,573.53	63,496.01	103,312.72	64,088.06	([5])
Leyde, Glen H			9,000.00	30,250.00	46,511.30
Lindquist, Gustaf and Raymond	60,861.55	39,114.32	24,104.92	21,208.88	([5])
Luther and Wood	4,330.71	6,257.76	38,440.26	40,937.99	44,425.39
Lynn, George H	325.00	272.93	16,778.67	32,992.05	([5])
MacIntosh and Sheridan	38,935.04	39,532.77	124,186.38	123,352.92	47,933.27
Mashbir, Sydney F., Inc	12,499.69	19,316.85	40,737.98	19,401.48	15,440.47
McDorman, L. K	12,349.00	12,133.00	13,047.00	24,637.00	([5])
Meaney, Joseph A	6,520.70	7,689.00	14,725.60	12,849.54	([5])
Meeks, S. J	13,469.00	14,608.00	28,452.00	39,755.00	56,799.00
Melency, George L	13,721.23	15,627.53	23,509.03	34,877.63	80,650.90
Milburn & Brady, Inc		34,550.00	52,176.00	48,000.00	4,400.00
Mullin, Leo F	15,062.42	33,427.63	33,773.32	36,311.01	9,375.00
Nichols, J. R	8,161.60	8,624.90	35,660.00	23,500.00	35,034.31
Orr, John J. [6]				16,571.39	35,627.32
Pack, M. R			17,150.00	27,460.00	9,141.98
Powell, Benjamin A	12,597.35	13,849.08	35,350.49	[4] 89,343.96	[4] 78,466.63
Randall, Henry D	4,056.22	5,758.20	30,652.34	14,645.48	18,160.75
Richtmeyer, A. L			10,986.37	20,393.49	2,610.19
Rubel, Charles, & Co	68,901.75	102,493.84	203,529.61	287,553.26	([5])
Stock, Edward L	8,837.12	11,198.30	21,449.65	27,199.64	([5])
Shirley, Olcott & Nichols [6]	67,072.78	165,944.96	609,899.43	[4] 1,104,844.09	([5])
Scrimgeour, William, & Sons [6]		214,053.20	613,799.69	[4] 516,049.11	([5])
Stone, Alexander H. (Stone & Stone Co.) [6]				[4] 125,371.29	([5])
Sweeney and Bishop	10,833.56	31,559.38	48,372.61	49,660.65	([5])
Taylor, R. E		750.00	5,925.91	25,325.83	141,591.68

See footnotes at end of table.

Amounts of retainer fees, reimbursements of expenses, salaries, and commissions paid to and due certain manufacturers' agents, 1939–42—Continued

	1939	1940	1941	1942	
				Received	Due
Thumm, C. A.	$53,039.33	$46,888.36	$212,754.11	[4] $144,232.47	[4] $188,836.30
Ward, Horace [6]			103,296.85	[4] 179,315.88	284,499.73
Washington Engineering Co.	60,644.61	74,944.24	310,177.05	253,193.76	[5]
Weiler, Edward W.	1,361.54	2,711.42	15,268.86	38,753.42	66,219.23
Whitehead, Edward	2,929.39	5,555.15	22,128.40	58,438.95	[5]
Total	816,150.64	1,490,733.91	4,000,583.24	5,095,949.86	1,682,207.27

[1] In some cases, amounts include payments on commercial business.
[2] As of approximately August 1942 (see footnote 4).
[3] Represents amounts due and to become due.
[4] As of Dec. 31, 1942.
[5] Not determinable.
[6] Agents who previously appeared before committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The Clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MEMPHIS, TENN.

The bill (H. R. 1702) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALCASIEU RIVER BRIDGE, LAKE CHARLES, LA.

The bill (H. R. 1731) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE, HUDSON, WIS.

The bill (H. R. 2077) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Saint Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAFEGUARDS TO RADIO COMMUNICATIONS OF SHIPS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 1063) to extend the effective date of the Act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, since Senate bill 1063 was placed on the calendar, House bill 2612, covering the same subject, has been passed, and has come over to the Senate and now appears as calendar No. 302. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill as amended by the Commerce Committee, and be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "following", it is proposed to strike out "present war and for 6 months thereafter" and insert "until July 1, 1945"; and in line 3, after the words "time as", to strike out "the President by proclamation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1063 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over for the purpose of enabling me to make certain inquiries. I have spoken to the author of the bill about it. I am unable to make any definite announcement as to whether or not I shall be able to withdraw my objection by the time of the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REEMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

The bill (H. R. 131) to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] a question. Is the provision for bringing suit against private firms the same as that in the Selective Service Act?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. It is not a remedy in addition to that given to selectees in the selective service?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have not the language of the existing law before me, and I would not attempt to give a definite answer to the Senator from Ohio. This bill makes specific provision by which those who are denied the opportunity to get their positions back after the war are permitted, under certain conditions, to bring suit. This bill provides machinery to carry out that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. I remember the provision in the Selective Service Act. As I understand, this bill would extend that provision to members of the merchant marine. I was not certain that the Selective Service Act had as definite a provision for bringing suit for damages against a private concern which might fail to comply with the provisions of the law. Does the Senator think it is the same provision?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I believe so, but I would rather not be entirely definite in my answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 131) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADVANCES TO STATES FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 136 and ask that it be read. Following the reading of the joint resolution, I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, (1) grants to States for old-age assistance, (2) grants to States for aid to dependent children, (3) grants to States for aid to the blind, and (4) grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for each of such purposes under the authority of this joint resolution shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection unless it should lead to debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not lead to debate if I can prevent it.

Mr. McNARY. If it should lead to debate I shall enter an objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. This money is needed in advance, and the legislation providing for it is late. I hope the joint resolution will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS TO AIR CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1106) to prohibit the allowance of credit in the computation of lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, for active service hereafter performed during the present wars and for 6 months thereafter, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia state his reasons for asking that the bill go over? Does he have some strong reasons for opposing its passage?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that I have some strong reasons for opposing its passage. I know what the bill provides, and I think it should be taken up and discussed at a later time. I do not think it should come up during the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that is perfectly agreeable, but there is this to say about it: At the present time there is a discrimination between temporary officers entering the Air Corps and officers who entered the service as Reserve officers prior to June 8, 1942.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand, but Reserve officers who came in prior to June 1942 came in under a law which Congress enacted; they are serving under that law, and, under it, they are entitled to $500 additional pay for each year they serve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but this bill is not retroactive. It merely stops the situation where it now is. The officers would not receive additional pay, but they would receive payment up until the time the bill is enacted. There is a very gross injustice involved as between two classes of officers performing exactly the same kind of duties, but one is called a Reserve officer, while the other is called a temporary officer, and if one officer is entitled to the pay the other should be entitled to it.

The objective, of course, from the beginning was to provide an incentive to get the men into the Air Corps prior to the date when war was declared.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know that I altogether understand the bill, but it occurred to me that it was breaking faith with these officers. Suppose a man entered the service, say, in 1939; he entered under existing law, and he was simply brought into active service in 1940 or 1941. He was taking his chances; he went in as a peacetime soldier, but he went into a dangerous arm of the service, and he was willing to do so. I myself do not feel it is altogether just to deprive him of the additional pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, to be equitable in the matter, we ought to extend the same privilege to the temporary officers.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so, Mr. President. When war came they were subject to be called into service and they preferred to go into that line of service. To take a simple case, when a man went into the service in 1938, during a whole year's training he had a bare subsistence level and then he went into the Navy with the understanding that he might accumulate for 7 years $500 a year if he remained in active service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So long as he remained on active service; yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, but he could accumulate only $500 a year for 7 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was a bonus.

Mr. GEORGE. It was a bonus; that is what it was; but it was what induced him to go into the service. Say he went into the service in '38; he finished in '39; then the Government called him into active service, and he has since been there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; he might have been called into active service had he not taken advantage of this training, but he is serving alongside another officer, and is performing exactly the same duty but getting no bonus at all.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, but he was brought in, let us say, under the Selective Service; he was subject to military duty, and he was called in. He merely preferred to go into this branch. It seems to me that we ought not to strike down this provision, which was made for the benefit of the Reserve officers or men entering the Reserve officers' class, while they are, it may be, now fighting on actual battle fronts.

I know there is some economy in it, and there is a seeming injustice to the man who was subject to the draft, placed in the Army, and who is engaged in the same line of work. He simply went into this branch of the service; he was anxious to get into it. It strikes me we ought to live up to the contractual obligation we wrote into the statute. I should like to have the bill go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

RELIEF OF PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will reserve the objection, I should like to make a statement regarding the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Personally, Mr. President, I have no interest in the matter. I am acting now in behalf of a Senator who is absent from the Chamber and who asked me to request that the joint resolution go over. So I now ask that it go over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McNARY. I said I had no personal interest in the joint resolution, but a Senator who is absent asked me to object until the next call of the calendar. I shall be very glad, however, to have the Senator make a statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I knew who the other Senator was, I think I could explain the matter to him and he would agree to have the joint resolution acted on today.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest that the Senator wait until we conclude the call of the calendar. I may be able to get in touch with the other Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. CHAVEZ subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when Calendar No. 273, House Joint Resolution 128, was called, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked that it be passed over at the suggestion of a Senator who was absent. Since that time the Senator from Oregon has notified me that he has contacted the Senator in question.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to the consideration of Calendar No. 273, House Joint Resolution 128.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, with regard to the request of the able Senator from New Mexico, I feel better advised, and I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 338) to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 332) to revise the Alaska game law was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let that bill also go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS AGAINST GOLD AND SILVER MINE OPERATORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "holds", to insert "as a mortgagor or"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "property", to strike out "because he is unable to obtain the necessary supplies and equipment, or"; in line 6, after the name "United States", to strike out "or in any State court"; in line 7, after the words "to be", to strike out "relieved of his obligations" and insert "protected from forfeiture, penalty, and damages"; in line 8, after the word "contract", to insert "or mortgage", and in line 9, after the word "property", to insert a comma and "in the following manner", so as to make the section read:

That any person who is or has been engaged in mining gold or silver from any mining property which he holds as a mortgagor or under a contract (1) providing for his purchase of such property, or giving him an option to purchase such property and (2) requiring the performance of certain work on such property, or periodic or installment payments with respect thereto, or both, and who is unable to mine gold or silver from such property because of the operation of any statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States or any agency thereof, may institute a proceeding in the appropriate district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction to be protected from forfeiture, penalty, and damages under the contract or mortgage under which he holds such property, in the following manner.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 11, before the word "such", to strike out "the ability of"; in the same line, after the word "person", to insert "has been prevented by any of such causes"; in line 12, before the word "the", to strike out "to perform" and insert "from performing"; in the same line, after the word "or", to strike out "make" and insert "making"; in line 13, after the word "contract", to strike out "has been substantially impaired by reason of the fact that he is unable to mine gold or silver from such property" and insert "or mortgage"; in line 18, after the word "made", to strike out the semicolon and the word "and" and insert "during the operation of such statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States or any agency thereof"; after line 20, to insert "(b) stay any action based on breach of performance or payment for any such cause"; in line 23, before the word "make", to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "other", to insert "orders and"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "suspension", to insert "or stay", and in the same line, before the word "extend", to insert "or, (b)", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. The court may, in its discretion, if it finds that such person has been prevented by any of such causes from performing the work or making the payments required under such contract or mortgage—

(a) Make an order suspending, in whole or in part, the requirement that such work be performed or such payments be made during the operation of such statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States or any agency thereof;

(b) Stay any action based on breach of performance or payment for any such cause;

(c) Make such other orders and disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties: *Provided, however,* That in no case shall such suspension or stay under (a) or (b) extend for more than 1 year after the termination of the present war.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 7, after the word "contract", to insert "or mortgage"; in line 8, before the word "and", to insert "or staying such action", and in the same line, after the word "make", to insert "from time to time", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Whenever a proceeding is instituted in accordance with section 1 of this act the court may, upon cause shown, make a temporary order suspending the requirements for performing work and making payments under the contract or mortgage pending final disposition of such proceeding, or staying such action, and may make from time to time such additional and supplementary orders as may be necessary for proper disposition of the case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the word "in" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "reliance upon any provision of this act, or" and insert "conformity with"; in line 16, after the word "any" to strike out "such", and in the same line, after the word "provision", to insert "of this act", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. No person shall be held liable in any proceeding in any court for any damages, penalty, or forfeiture on account of any act done or omitted to be done in good faith in accordance with or in conformity with any order or judgment of a court made pursuant to any provision of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

On page 4, line 1, I move to amend by striking out the words "gold or silver."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. On line 1, page 2, I move to strike out the words "gold or silver."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall also move to amend the title by striking out the words "gold and silver."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to make an objection to the consideration of this bill and to state briefly the reason why. We have had before the Small Business Committee case after case of people who have been put out of business by the war—for instance, as to automobile dealers, the question arises whether they should be relieved of obligations perhaps to rent certain premises. There are so many circumstances involved that if we begin to redistribute the burden of the effect of the war on all kinds of businessmen there is no place we can stop. I certainly see no reason why men operating gold and silver mines should be treated any differently than many other men who have been put out of business by conditions and regulations incident to the war. Therefore I object to the consideration of the bill, at least, for the present. I think it ought to be discussed on a proper basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that the bill does not stand in the same category, and with my amendments—if I may have the attention of the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. I am watching the bill and listening to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. With the amendments I just had adopted, striking out the words "gold and silver," the bill extends the same privilege to all classes of mining.

Let me say to the Senator that while I have no desire to affect his objection—and my explanation probably will not do so—the condition is brought about, not by reason of the war alone, but by reason of the regulation of the War Production Board shutting down certain mines, and the obligations pertaining to these mines still continue, putting the lessee in one instance or another in the embarrassing position of being compelled to perform under a contract, but not being able to perform under a regulation of the War Production Board.

Mr. TAFT. Industry after industry in the State of Ohio has been put out of business by the War Production Board; in many cases it may be the lessees of plants; but if we attempt to redistribute the burden, caused by the cessation of work brought about by the War Production Board, between the owner of the plant, the lessee of the plant, the mortgagor of the plant, and so on, it is almost impossible for us to do any better than the courts do.

I came to the conclusion, after going into the matter, for instance, of those engaged in the automobile business put out of business, that the best we could do was merely to leave the matter to the courts to decide, on the basis of equity, the extent to which obligations entered into should be relieved of performance by the action of the Government.

I have no interest one way or the other in the question of gold and silver mines, I know nothing about it, but I do not see how we can go into the problem of attempting to relieve businessmen who have been shut down, in effect, by the action of the War Production Board.

I think the question should be more widely discussed, and I object for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1120) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men, approved July 28, 1942," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 883) providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DR. J. W. GOIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 824) for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,005", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. J. W. Goin, of Albany, Oreg., the sum of $3,005, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for loss of and damage to certain livestock as the result of eating borax which had been placed by employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, as a weed deterrent, around transmission-line poles on property owned by the said Dr. J. W. Goin on or about June 24, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. G. CORNELL CO.

The bill (S. 694) for the relief of W. G. Cornell Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the W. G. Cornell Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of $840.65, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the amount of the manufacturer's excise tax included in the cost of certain gas ranges purchased by the said company for installation in the Highland Defense Dwellings project of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, a refund of such excise tax having been denied on the ground that such stoves were not sold directly to the United States by the manufacturer thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BURTON S. RADFORD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1087) for the relief of Burton S. Radford, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to add a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the payment of compensation to aliens, to pay Burton S. Radford, formerly an employee of the Corporation, in accordance with the terms of his employment, for services rendered by him during the period from October 16, 1942, to October 28, 1942, inclusive, such payment to be made from any funds available to the Corporation for payment of administrative expenses; and that Burton S. Radford shall not be required by the disbursing officer of the Corporation to refund any moneys heretofore paid to him for services rendered to the Corporation which, under the provisions of section 3 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, approved June 27, 1942, he otherwise might be required to refund: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. AND MRS. RICHARD STEVER

The bill (H. R. 1278) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELINE ARBUCKLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 626) for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,080.45" and insert "$2,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angeline Arbuckle, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 53, in St. Louis County, Minn., on July 23, 1937: *Provided*, That the acceptance of such sum shall be in full and final settlement of any and all judgments against Walter Mitchell, driver of the Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZA WARD

The bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHNNY NEWTON STRICKLAND

The bill (S. 653) for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Johnny Newton Strickland, of Southern Pines, N. C., the sum to $1,500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and hospital and medical expenses incurred by him, as the result of a collision which occurred when his automobile was struck by a United States Army truck on October 22, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1088) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN INDIANA AND KENTUCKY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas, by decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Indiana against Kentucky, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in 163 United States Reports, the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky between certain terminal points therein described was fixed and established; and

Whereas neither of said terminal points reached the low-water mark of the right side of the Ohio River, forming the remainder of the boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth; and

Whereas owing to the fact recited in the preceding literary paragraph hereof a dispute has arisen as to the boundary line connecting said terminal points with said low-water mark; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of Indiana and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky appointed commissioners to study said question for the purpose of ascertaining the true and legal boundary line thus in dispute; and

Whereas said commissioners agreed upon the true and legal boundary line; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Indiana passed an act known and designated as Enrolled Act No. 19, House, bearing the signatures of Hobart Creighton, speaker of the house of representatives; Charles M. Dawson, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana, under date of January 29, 1943; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky passed a like act known and designated as house bill No. 375, bearing the signatures of Stanley S. Dickson, speaker of the house of representatives; Rodes K. Myers, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Keen Johnson, Governor of Kentucky, under date of March 9, 1942; and

Whereas the said acts provided in substance that upon the approval and consent of the Congress of the United States the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall be as follows:

Commencing at a point on the line between sections 15 and 14, township 7 south, range 10 west, and sixty-seven and twenty-five one-hundredths chains south of the northeast corner of section 15, the same being the beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line as fixed by the Supreme Court of the United States in Indiana against Kentucky, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in 163 United States Reports; thence south no degrees fifty-three minutes fifteen seconds west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence upstream at low-water mark on the right side of said river. Also beginning at the same beginning point, to wit: The beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky as fixed by the Supreme Court in the case above recited and following that line to the end of so much of said boundary line as was fixed by said decree; thence due west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence downstream with said low-water mark on the right side of said river; and

Whereas the said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky constitute an agreement between said State and said Commonwealth establishing a boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary, and said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky are hereby approved.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SIMPLIFICATION OF COLLECTION PROCEDURE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 321) to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals in parenthesis, strike out "and from all other provisions of law requiring the deposit of contracts or other instruments, or copies thereof, in the General Accounting Office, whenever the amount actually becoming due to the Government under the lease, permit, license, contract, agreement, or other instrument involved does not exceed $300 in any one fiscal year", and to insert "when the lease or other instruments do not require payment to the Government in excess of $300 in any one fiscal year", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That leases, permits, licenses, contracts, agreements, and other instruments providing for payments to the United States on account of the use of lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or on account of the sale of products of such lands or waters, or on account of other transactions incident to the administration of such lands or waters, including contributions by cooperators, but excluding sales of used equipment, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3743 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (title 41, U. S. C., sec. 20), when the lease or other instruments do not require payment to the Government in excess of $300 in any one fiscal year: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe from time to time regulations requiring that originals or copies of any class or group of documents within the foregoing exemption, in the circumstances and upon the conditions designated by him in such regulations, shall be deposited in the General Accounting Office for audit purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 37) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "land", to insert "or interests in land," and on page 2, line 11, after the words "preserve it", to insert "in a suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift or purchase, the site of the birthplace of George Washington Carver, distinguished Negro scientist, located near Diamond, Mo., together with such additional land or interests in land and any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. In the event the Secretary is unable to acquire such property, or any part thereof, at a reasonable price, he is authorized and directed to condemn such property, or any part thereof, in the manner provided by law.

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall constitute the George Washington Carver National Monument and shall be a public national memorial to George Washington Carver. The director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall maintain and preserve it in a suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) Maintain, either in an existing structure acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose, a museum for relics and records pertaining to George Washington Carver, and for other articles of national and patriotic interest, and to accept on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum; and

(2) Construct roads and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest within the boundaries of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to acquire, in his discretion, certain lands located in the State of Arizona known as the Montezuma Well property, containing approximately 180 acres and situated within section 36, township 15 north, range 5 east, and section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian. Such lands, when acquired, shall become a detached unit of Montezuma Castle National Monument.

(b) Effective on the date of the acquisition of such property, the south half of the northwest quarter of section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, containing 80 acres of land owned by the United States, shall also become a part of such national monument.

SEC. 2. All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national monument shall be applicable with respect to the lands described in the first section of this act upon the addition of such lands to such national monument. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SALE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALBANY, N. Y.

The bill (S. 982) to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y., may be paid into the general funds of such city was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third read-

ing, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y.", approved June 16, 1936, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any unexpended proceeds may be paid by such committee to the city of Albany, N. Y., for deposit in the general funds of such city."

TRAINING OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL MILITARY FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1157) to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 4, after the word "expenses", to insert "of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 61. (a) No State or Territory or Puerto Rico or the Canal Zone shall maintain troops in time of peace other than as authorized in accordance with the organization prescribed under this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting the rights of the States and Territories and Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone in the use of the National Guard within their respective borders in time of peace: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall prevent the organization and maintenance of State or Territorial police or constabulary.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe for the organization, standards of training, instruction, and discipline, the organization by and maintenance within any State or Territory or Puerto Rico or the Canal Zone of such military forces other than a National Guard as may be provided by the laws of such State or Territory is hereby authorized while any part of the National Guard of the State or Territory or Puerto Rico or the Canal Zone concerned is in active Federal service: *Provided*, That under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe for the organization, standards of training, instruction, and discipline, the organization by and maintenance within the Virgin Islands of the United States of such military forces as may be provided by the laws of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized: *Provided further*, That such forces shall not be called, ordered, or in any manner drafted, as such, into the military services of the United States; however, no person shall, by reason of his membership in any such unit, be exempted from military service under any Federal law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to use appropriations for the Military Establishment for any expenses of the United States incident to the training of the military forces authorized by this subsection except for pay, subsistence, medical care and treatment, and transportation of members of such military forces between their homes and the places of performance of such training: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War, in his discretion and under regulations determined by him, is authorized to issue, from time to time, for the use of such military units, to any State or Territory or Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or the Canal Zone, upon requisition of the Governor thereof, such arms, ammunition, clothing, and equipment as he deems necessary. The provisions of this subsection shall terminate upon the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the present war, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may designate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE SUITS IN CASES OF FRAUD AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know a little more about the bill, because of the pendency of actions of the character sought to be affected by the bill. I note the presence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I should like to have an explanation. One or two other Senators have raised some objection and some question about the bill.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, this bill is an amendment to an act passed in 1863, growing out of the Civil War. The old act provided for informers in what are known as informer suits. When any person or corporation filed an alleged fraudulent claim against the United States Government, and some individual learned of the facts in the case, such individual, on behalf of himself and the Government, had a right to bring suit for damages and forfeiture. The forfeiture was fixed in the sum of $2,000, and the damages were unlimited.

This was necessary according to the records during the Civil War, when the facilities of the Department of Justice were much more limited than they are today. There was no F. B. I. or similar organization, and it was necessary, in order to enable the Government to obtain information concerning war frauds, at least it was thought necessary, to offer rewards such as those contained in the old statute.

The amendments offered to this particular section of the act cover pending suits and new suits. By the amendment proposed it is not intended to eliminate suits brought by informers, but to limit them. For instance, if an individual claims to have original knowledge of a fraudulent claim, under the amendment if he reveals that original knowledge to the Attorney General and notifies the Attorney General to bring suit, and the Attorney General within 6 months does not bring suit, then the individual may proceed as under the old statute.

The only difference in the remedy is that under the old statute the informer received half the recovery. Under the amendment he will receive such compensation as the court may deem to be fair and reasonable, provided it does not exceed 10 percent of the recovery.

Mr. President, that states the material change as to new suits. As to suits pending—and I may say there are now pending 28 such suits, which I shall very briefly describe in a moment, in the pending cases the court, if the amendment shall be agreed to, will suspend operations, and notify the Attorney General of the pendency of such suits. In case the Attorney General moves to dismiss the suits within the 30 days, they shall be dismissed, but the informer may revive an action at his own cost after such dismissal.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I notice there is a date at which certain activities come to repose, the date being June 15, 1942. I wonder what that provision attempts to achieve.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I will explain to the Senator from Washington the purpose of the inclusion of that date. There are 28 suits pending. All the suits except 6, as I remember, have been filed within the last 2 or 3 months. The Department of Justice considered that suits filed prior to June of 1942 were honest informer suits, and not suits filed by racketeers, such as 75 percent of these complaints deal with, which I shall review in a minute. That is the reason for inclusion of the date.

There are in the State of New York one suit for $702,000, another for $40,000,000, another for $2,000,000, another for $6,000,000, another for $2,000,000, one for $500,000, one for $4,000,000, one for $15,000, one for $200,000, one for $702,000, and another for $702,000.

I will tell the Senate how these suits originate. The Government indicts a certain corporation or individual. As soon as the arrest is made and the indictment is made public, attorneys of a certain type, mostly confined to New York City, immediately change the caption from a criminal indictment to a civil action, copying word for word the wording of the indictment, and demanding half a million dollars, or, in one instance, $40,000,000, and they are entitled to one-half of the amount recovered in case recovery is made.

The committee spent many days investigating this circumstance, and I wish to assure Members of the Senate that in this day of rackets these informer suits represent the world form of racketeering today existing in the United States of America.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not only is what the Senator says true, but racketeers take advantage of the situation to take depositions of certain witnesses on whom the Government may rely for conviction, in order that they may bolster up their own case, and as a matter of fact, destroy the Government's chance for conviction.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In fact, it has been suggested—I do not think the committee has any definite proof—that in some instances, the corporation or individual sued was a party to the bringing of the suit as a sort of exploration of the evidence in the possession of the Department of Justice in the criminal case.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. It would be a very valuable method by which a defendant in a criminal case could ascertain the evidence the Government expected to produce in the criminal case. A fishing expedition, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] suggests.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that under the measure as it is now presented, with the amendment which the Senator has explained, every legitimate informer's suit may be brought and prosecuted?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Exactly. The only difference will be that instead of receiving one-half of the recovery, the court may decree a fair and reasonable compensation not to exceed 10 percent of the recovery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] has expired.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me add one more sentence. The sum total of demands in the suits now pending is $69,000,000 and these racketeers are working toward a potential pot of $35,000,000.

Mr. BONE. With the grace of the Senate, may I inquire of the able Senator from Indiana if the Attorney General's office desires this legislation? I have tried to contact a member of the staff, and I merely want to be assured that they want the legislation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I will say to the Senator from Washington that there is not a bill on the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary in which the department is more interested and insistent on immediate action than this bill;

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to ask that the bill go over.

FINES IMPOSED IN THE ANACONDA WIRE AND CABLE CO. FRAUD CASE

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate am I permitted now to discuss generally another matter outside the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, in connection with war frauds, I call attention to an editorial published in PM, a New York publication, signed by Powers Moulton, who is obviously the editor, in which he refers to the recent activities of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. They present about as somber and unhappy a picture as I have ever seen presented during wartime. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICES FROM THE GRAVE

Officials of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., an industrial wrecking crew that sold defective communications wire to the Government, endangered the lives of American and Russian troops who got it.

Attorney General Biddle is amply justified in his anger over the suspension of prison sentences for these men by Federal Judge Slick at Fort Wayne.

The fines set were the lightest possible slap on the wrist that could be given to such "monkey business as usual" artists. Painless penalties like these amount to no more than a license to put our soldiers in jeopardy—for profit.

Apparently nothing more can be done about the guilty men. So we'll confine our editorial comment to this picture. It shows some American boys who didn't make a cent of profit out of dying in Africa. The Anaconda swindle, if it hadn't been caught in time, might have made more mounds like these.—POWERS MOULTON.

Mr. BONE. I also ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement attributed to Mr. Biddle, our Attorney General; the statement appearing in PM also, and being headed "Biddle assails light fines in fraud case."

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIDDLE ASSAILS LIGHT FINES IN FRAUD CASE—ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYS ANACONDA DEFENDANTS DESERVED MAXIMUM PENALTY

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Attorney General Francis Biddle has issued an unusual statement commenting in restrained but obviously angry terms on the sentences imposed in the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. fraud case.

He issued his statement following the news from Fort Wayne, Ind., that Federal Judge Thomas W. Slick had suspended prison sentences and levied a total of only $31,100 in fines on the company and indicted officials in this $5,000,000 wartime fraud case.

The fines were imposed after the company and its officials pleaded nolo contendere, the equivalent of a plea of guilty in New York State and most other jurisdictions. Biddle's statement protested that "considering the seriousness of the offense, the Government believed that only imposition of maximum sentences would serve the ends of justice. The Government made it clear that that was its recommendation in this case."

MORAL GUILT DENIED

Counsel for the company admitted "technical guilt but denied "moral guilt" in entering the plea. Biddle said the Government was prepared to prove not only the supplying of defective wire and cable to the armed services of the United States of America and its Allies, but use of deliberate devices to fool inspectors.

According to Biddle, Thor S. Johnson, general manager of all Anaconda mills, told mill foremen that "any employee who is not able to get wire past these jerk inspectors ought not to be working in any plant." Johnson was fined $10,000 and a 2-year jail sentence was suspended.

INSPECTION LABELS SHIFTED

One of the counts to which the company pleaded only "technical guilt" was that 90 percent of the wire manufactured in its Marion, Ind., plant was defective. Another, Biddle pointed out, was that the Russian Government complained to the United States Army Signal Corps that 50 percent of field telephone wire manufactured for Lend-Lease delivery to the Soviet Union "was found to be defective in one or more of five respects."

The company was fined $10,000, and Frank E. Hart, manager of its Marion, Ind., mill, was also fined $10,000. He was given a suspended sentence of 18 months in jail.

Biddle's statement said the Government was prepared to prove that inspection labels were taken from approved wire and cable and affixed to defective untested material; that a secret electrical device was rigged up to deceive Government inspectors as to the electrical resistance capacity of wire; and that "these and similar practices of defendants have continued at the Marion plant for 10 years or more."

ANOTHER PLANT INDICTED

Chalmer C. Bishop, chief company inspector at the Marion mill, was fined $500 and given a suspended prison sentence of a year and a day. The former superintendent of the mill, Don R. Carpenter, was fined $500, and Frank Kunkle, the company's former assistant chief inspector, was fined $100.

Biddle's statement also disclosed that the company pleaded nolo contendere to seven counts of the indictment charging presentation of false claims to the United States Army Signal Corps. A $5,000,000 damage suit for recovery is pending in the Federal district court in New York, but the terms of the plea entered by the company are such that they cannot be used as evidence of guilt in this collateral proceeding.

The Justice Department, however, still has an opportunity to prove its charges in a parallel case against the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., involving its plant at Pawtucket, R. I.

This indictment, returned by a Federal grand jury at Providence a month after the Fort Wayne case became public, makes similar charges that the company installed special equipment to circumvent Government tests, resulting in sale of defective wire and cable which might have cost the lives of fighting troops.

The Pawtucket indictment charges that the conspiracy to circumvent Government tests continued from November 1940 to September 1942, a period during which more than $1,000,000 worth of military wire was sold to the British and United States Armies.

Besides the company, five individuals are named in the Pawtucket charges, including Jacob Eagleson, plant manager, and William H. Morley, assistant general manager of all Anaconda mills.

Both indictments resulted from investigations by the War Frauds Unit of the Justice Department, of which Tom C. Clark is Chief.

Mr. BONE. The editorial in question refers to this operation as "monkey business as usual." Mr. President, that is indeed a light indictment of an offense which smells to high heaven, which reeks with corruption, which is a savage assault on all the common decencies of life. The Germans who came here to accomplish sabotage failed in their mission. How grotesque that our own noble business enterprisers succeeded as saboteurs when the German wrecking crew, landed surreptitiously on our beaches at night, failed to make the grade. They met their ends at the hands of the executioner.

Suppose those German saboteurs had succeeded in getting into this wire and cable plant or plants, and there did exactly what was done by so-called Americans. Our press would have played it up as an example of the diabolical ingenuity of German gestapo agents. Anyone who can ruin the usefulness of a communication cable designed for use on a battlefield in the hour of travail, and still make it appear to be a good cable, is an artist who would warm Hitler's heart.

Here is something that challenges all the finer concepts of American decency. To let the matter rest on the present record is to invite open contempt for some of our loudest pretensions of loyalty to the war effort. When some of our own people do a work of sabotage which would invite death for imported gestapo agents, or death for our own soldiers, if done in a war zone, and get away with

it by paying a small fine, it is time to ascertain if conscience is dead in America. All that now remains to complete the cycle of infamy is to have the defendants charge the fines to business expenses, and be allowed the item as a legitimate expense by the Treasury Department in figuring their income tax.

Mr. President, at a later time I intend to lay before the Senate considerable of the record of this very startling case, because it constitutes an outstanding example of turpitude, of an open assault upon our war effort by Americans who were punished only by a fine for the doing of things which would inevitably bring about the death at the hands of a firing squad of the son of any Member of the Senate if he had committed such an offense in either North Africa or in southwest Asiatic waters. This case proves how lightly some folks regard sabotage.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA POTATO CROP

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, perhaps it may be a little late to speak on the floor of the Senate regarding the mismanagement in the handling of the South Carolina potato crop. For the past month, day after day, and hour after hour, I have used what influence I have to try and show to the departments in Washington just what would happen if they themselves did not communicate with the people at the crossroads and with the people in the rural sections of South Carolina. In the afternoon edition of a Washington newspaper there appears a statement headed "O. D. T. rules cause rot of 300,000 pounds of spuds."

Whether that be the exact amount, Mr. President, I do not know; neither do I know how much of the potato crop was destroyed by what, in my opinion, is Washington red tape and carelessness; but I do know that for the past 3 weeks the farmers of South Carolina have advised me that because of the excessive hot weather potatoes which were to be shipped north would be received rotten.

Last winter the Government asked the farmers of South Carolina and of the other States to increase their acreage. They did so, in the war effort.

The financial losses to the farmers are one thing; but the loss to the people of the country is another. Everyone has been wanting potatoes. Everyone knows the value of potatoes. It is obvious to me that when the Government agencies which had the responsibility for taking action knew the conditions which existed, they should have acted, and should have done so promptly. On many occasions when I called, I was told by the Department of Agriculture or by the Office of Price Administration or by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the O. D. T., or some other agency or department that the potatoes were arriving in good shape. Of course, those potatoes had been shipped during the heat wave. The Interstate Commerce Commission told me no ice was available, but, of course, it was if they had busied themselves. Finally the ice was obtained, but not until after most of the potatoes had been shipped and rotted.

So I rise on the floor of the Senate to express one hope only, which is that when the other vegetable crops and the other perishable crops of South Carolina and the great United States move to market this summer and this fall, the present experience will be a lesson, and we shall have immediate action taken, and the food which is so badly needed by our population will be preserved by means of proper handling, and the incomes of our farmers will not be entirely dissipated.

Mr. President, I place the blame on no individual. I do not know the exact amount that has been lost. But I do know that from New England to South Carolina there are carloads of rotten potatoes, and I do know that if everyone in Washington had worked together, if each fellow had not been so jealous, perhaps, of his own prerogatives, but had done as any business firm would have done, certainly the loss would have been very small, and, in my opinion, could have been eliminated. I hope we shall have no more of such bungling this year. Let us hope for America's sake the lesson is learned.

PRIVATE SUITS IN CASES OF FRAUD AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, have we disposed of Calendar No. 297, House bill 1203?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair understood the Senator from Oregon to ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it is with regard to Calendar No. 297, House bill 1203, that I wish to say a word, and request that it be passed over, with the statement that I wish to express my entire agreement with the principle of the bill. I recall very well that last year before the Committee on the Judiciary similar action, but in an even broader form than the action proposed to be taken by House bill 1203, was proposed to be taken. I should like to have an opportunity to discuss some amendments with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, with a view to expanding the present provisions of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the bil' be passed over, with a view to having it taken up in the Senate at an early date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES IN LIEU OF QUARTERS OR RATIONS IN KIND TO ENLISTED MEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 674) authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That no enlisted man who would have been entitled to receive an allowance in lieu of quarters or rations in kind for any period commencing on or after September 8, 1939, under section 11 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 630), or section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law No. 607, 77th Cong.), if an order authorizing the payment thereof had been issued prior to or within the period during which quarters or rations in kind were not furnished, shall be denied such allowance because such order was not so issued.

SEC. 2. Claims which may be validated by the provisions of this act may be settled by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or such officers as they may designate, from current applicable appropriations, in cases where the claimant, at time of settlement, is serving in the same enlistment or under the same term of service in which the claim accrued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The bill (S. 1158) to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, but only for the purpose of asking a question, let me ask the Senator from North Carolina whether the bill is not identical with the following bill on the calendar?

Mr. BAILEY. It is.

Mr. President, Calendar No. 299, Senate bill 1158, is identical with the bill which follows it on the calendar, House bill 2750. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2750 be substituted for Senate bill 1158, and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2750) to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether I am correct in understanding that the bill would simply extend the authority of the Commission to modify or waive existing statutory provisions, but for a definite time only.

Mr. BAILEY. The bill would amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act with a view to extending the time within which compliance with the regular requirements in time of peace may be required.

Mr. WHITE. The bill proposes the extension for only a definite time; does it not?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2750) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1158 will be indefinitely postponed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, interestingly enough, examination of House Joint Resolution 108 discloses that on May 17, the House called upon the Congress to designate May 15 as a day of commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration of the

United States Post Office Department Air Mail Service. That is not all, Mr. President; it is not merely that 2 days after the event they asked that we celebrate the day of May 15. Particularly, though, they called upon us to prepare a suitable "plague" to be presented to the Postmaster General to mark the occasion. [Laughter.] In line 7, on page 1, the joint resolution definitely says that we should present to the Postmaster General a suitable "plague." [Laughter.] I do not know whether a scorpion rampant on a field of cactus would be considered such a "plague." It might be that advancing the date of the Democratic National Convention to the first Tuesday of May in 1944 would prove sufficient. [Laughter.] But whatever a suitable "plague" would be for the Postmaster General, it may be that the junior Senator from North Dakota, were he here, would readily join in subscribing to it. [Laughter.]

Seriously, Mr. President, there cannot be any point on this day in June in calling upon the American people to celebrate an event which occurred a month ago, when even then it was 25 years late. Probably the joint resolution should go over; and I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

PREVENTION OF DESECRATION AND MUTILATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 369) to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "nature" and the semicolon, to strike out "or (3) shall manufacture, sell, expose for sale or to public view or give away or have in possession for sale or to be given away or for any purpose, any article of merchandise or substance being an article or thing for carrying or transporting merchandise, upon which shall have been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed a representation of any such flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign, to advertise, call attention to, decorate, mark, or distinguish the article or substance on which so placed;" in line 11, after the word "or", to strike out "(4)", and insert "(3)"; in line 12, after the word "defile", to strike out "or defy"; in line 19, after the word "ensign", to strike out "or any picture or representation of either thereof,"; and in line 24, after the word "America", to strike out "or a picture or a representation of either", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, (1) in any manner, for exhibition or display, shall place or cause to be placed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, drawing, or any advertisement of any nature upon any flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign of the United States of America; or (2) shall expose or cause to be exposed to public view any such flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign upon which shall have been printed, painted, or otherwise placed, or to which shall be attached, appended, affixed, or annexed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, or drawing, or any advertisement of any nature; or (3) shall publicly mutilate, deface, defile, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court. The words "flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign", as used herein, shall include any flag, standard, colors, shield, ensign, or of any part or parts of either, made of any substance or represented on any substance, of any size, evidently purporting to be either of said flag, standard, colors, shield, or ensign of the United States of America upon which shall be shown the colors, the stars and the stripes, in any number of either thereof, or of any part or parts of either, by which the average person seeing the same without deliberation may believe the same to represent the flag, colors, standard, shield, or ensign of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts of Congress in conflict with the provisions of this act be and the same are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to deprive any State, or political subdivision thereof, of its civil or criminal jurisdiction.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the bill is similar to the bill which passed the Senate in the last Congress. At that time objections were raised in the House. The bill is now amended so as to eliminate the objections.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1046) to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXPENSES OF INTER-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR POLITICAL DEFENSE, AND APPROPRIATION THEREFOR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense and authorizing an appropriation therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense is?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 307, House Joint Resolution 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withdraw the objection which I made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense and authorizing an appropriation therefor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES PARCEL POST BUILDING COMPANY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 159) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States Parcel Post Building Co. the sum of $4,827.06, in full for settlement of its claim against the United States for rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935, for quarters in the Parcel Post Station Building, Cleveland, Ohio, formerly occupied by the Post Office Department as a parcel-post station under lease dated October 9, 1928: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 159, Calendar 308, which has just been passed, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Claims, inasmuch as the nature of the bill was changed by the amendments. I think the report would be helpful in explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 301) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 159) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States Parcel Post Building Co. the sum of $4,827.06, in full settlement of its claim against the United States for rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935, for quarters in "The Parcel Post Station Building", Cleveland, Ohio, formerly occupied by the Post Office Department as a parcel-post station under lease dated October 9, 1928: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title to read: "A bill for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $4,827.06 in full settlement of the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, against the United States for rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Post Office Department leased from the claimant a building in Cleveland, Ohio, at a rental of $78,072.50 per year. When the new Federal Building was erected at Cleveland the postal activities occupying the building were removed to the new building. This occurred in October 1934. The rental payments as specified in the lease were made to and including June 30, 1935. The date of the expiration of the lease was July 23, 1935. However, since the building was leased to a new tenant effective August 1, 1935, and was at least partially used by the new tenant after July 5, 1935, the Post Office Department recognizes no liability after July 5. No rent was paid by the new tenant until August 1, 1935. Under the conditions your committee believes the Government owes the rent to July 23, 1935, and recommend the allowance of the sum of $4,827.06 in full settlement of the claim.

Attached hereto is report of the Postmaster General and copy of the statement of facts presented by claimant to the Post Office Department when the original claim was filed, along with other pertinent evidence.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee of
Committee on Claims,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TUNNELL: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 27, 1943, relating to S. 159, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

The claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Co. is for $4,827.06 as rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935, for quarters in the Parcel Post Station Building, at Cleveland, Ohio.

The premises in question were occupied for postal purposes under a lease to July 23, 1935, at an annual rental of $78,072.50, including equipment, heat, and water. When the new Federal building was erected at Cleveland the postal activities occupying the Parcel Post Station Building were removed thereto. This removal occurred in October 1934, and rental payments as specified in the lease were made to and including June 30, 1935.

Rental payments from July 1 to July 23, 1935 (the expiration date of the lease), were not made because of occupancy by a new tenant effective July 5, 1935, which occupancy was construed as a legal extinguishment of liability for the period of such occupancy.

This Department recognizes its liability for rent only for the period from July 1 to July 4, 1935, but the lessor has been unwilling to accept rental for that period claiming that the circumstances of the occupancy by the new tenant on July 5, 1935, were such as not to relieve the Department of liability for rent until July 23, 1935.

The bill contemplates vesting jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to adjudicate the matter notwithstanding the existence of any statute of limitations.

It has been ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget that this proposed legislation is not in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

THE UNITED STATES PARCEL POST BUILDING CO. *v.* THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—STATEMENT OF FACTS

The United States Parcel Post Building, situated at 201-209 St. Clair Avenue NW., Cleveland, Ohio, was built according to Government specifications for the express purpose of renting it to the United States Government for a parcel-post building. Prior to the erection of the building two noncancelable leases had been entered into with the United States Government.

The first lease included the basement, first floor, and part of the second floor, and ran from July 24, 1924, to and including July 23, 1943, at a rental of $42,952.50 per year. The second lease included a part of the second floor and the entire third floor, and ran from October 1, 1924, to July 23, 1943, at a rental of $35,120 per year for the entire period of the lease with the exception of the first year, which called for a larger sum. Both leases contained provisions that the premises would be returned in as good a condition as received, ordinary wear and tear excepted.

By virtue of these two leases, which did not have the usual Government cancelation clauses, land trust certificates, and first-mortgage leasehold bonds were sold to the public in the amount of $1,000,000. The United States Parcel Post Building, known among investors as a special purpose building, was the apparent security for the land trust certificates and leasehold bonds, but the actual security, as represented to the public, consisted of the two Government leases enumerated above.

In January 1928 there was a fire on the upper floors of the building. While the principal damage was to the space not rented by the Government, there was some damage to Government property, principally from water. In the meantime, by the authority of the 1926 act, volume 44, Statutes at Large, page 633, known as the Public Buildings Act, Cleveland was selected as one of the cities to secure a new post-office building. The Government, therefore, not so much because of the fire or water damage, which was very promptly made whole by the lessor, but more because of its desire to relieve itself of the burdens of expensive leases after the erection of the new post-office building, promptly notified the United States Parcel Post Building Co. that it chose to cancel the leases by virtue of the fire clauses contained therein.

After much negotiation, a third lease was then entered into on substantially the same terms, except that the expiration date was July 23, 1935, instead of July 23, 1943. This shorter lease cost the investors of the securities of the United States Parcel Post Building Co. between $400,000 and $500,000, due to the fact that it was impossible to obtain any substantial tenant for this property, specially built for a special Government purpose, and in the end, was the primary cause of the United States Parcel Post Building Co. reorganizing under section 77-B of the United States Bankruptcy Act.

A new post-office building for Cleveland was completed in 1934, and during the month of October 1934 the Government removed its property to its new quarters, but continued paying rent for the old quarters under terms of its lease. On October 31, 1934, Mr. S. W. Purdum, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, notified the United States Parcel Post Building Co. that the Government no longer desired to be responsible for protecting the property, and trusted that the lessors would protect it "without expense to the Government." A copy of this letter is attached to this statement, and for purposes of identification marked "Exhibit A."

After the removal of the Government from the building in October 1934, other tenants complained that their property was not sufficiently protected. This fact, the attitude of the Government desiring to be released of the responsibility of protecting the property, as evidenced by Mr. Purdum's letter, and the further fact that when the Government left the premises there was much debris to be cleared and damage to the building and equipment to be repaired, prompted Mr. Culp, president of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., to permit new tenants, Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Schoenig, to enter upon a part of the Government's premises a few days before the expiration of its lease. This statement of Mr. Culp is disputed by the Government, who maintains that Mr. Culp gave Mr. and Mrs. Schoenig permission to park cars in approximately one-third of the space under lease to the Government, as additional compensation for clearing the premises and making necessary repairs.

The following facts concerning the Schoenig lease, however, are not disputed:

1. The lease was entered into between the United States Parcel Post Building Co. and Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Schoenig, early in July 1935, but took effect as of August 1, 1935.

2. It called for payment of $500 per month, and expired on October 30, 1935, a period of 3 months, with the provision, however, that it might continue indefinitely on a month-to-month basis.

3. The lease covered the first floor and basement only, and did not in any way affect the second and third floors that had been leased to the Government.

4. The Schoenigs entered the premises on July 4, 1935, and during the month of July cleared the premises and made them fit for occupancy.

5. On July 8, 1935, the new tenants first parked cars in the premises, that being the date of the all-star baseball game.

Shortly after the all-star baseball game, July 8, 1935, Mr. Hart, post-office inspector for the Cleveland district, heard that cars had been parked in a portion of the premises under lease to the Government and, with another representative of the Government, went directly to the premises and told Mr. Schoenig that he had no right to park cars during the period of the Government's lease. Mr. Schoenig responded that Mr. Culp had given him that right for clearing the premises and making them fit for occupancy, but he also said that if this was not satisfactory to the Government, he would immediately withdraw from the premises. Mr. Hart did not ask him to leave, but stated that he would get in touch with Mr. Culp. See affidavit of Frank J. Schoenig attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B."

Because of their failure to hear further from the Government the Schoenigs continued to prepare the first floor and basement of the building for occupancy by August 1, 1935. They also parked some cars in these premises from July 9, 1935, until the beginning of their lease.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing facts, the following claims against the Government (not including the moral claim of investors amounting to approximately $1,500,000) naturally arises: (1) Damage to equipment; (2) cost of placing premises in the same condition as when rented, ordinary wear and tear excepted; (3) rent of premises from July 1, 1935, to and including July 23, 1935.

The Government's damage to the equipment has been determined and paid.

The cost of placing the premises in good condition may be canceled by reason of the fact that this work was done by the new tenants, Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Schoenig, without expense to the United States Parcel Post Building Co.

This leaves the rent claim only for determination and settlement.

THE CLAIM

The sole claim for consideration at this time is the amount of rent called for under the lease from July 1, 1935, to and including July 23, 1935, $4,827.06.

EXHIBIT A

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FOURTH ASSISTANT
POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 31, 1934.

Mr. JACOB KULP,
President, United States Parcel Post Building Co., Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge your communication of October 29, 1934, relative to the vacation of the quarters formerly occupied by the parcel post station at Cleveland, Ohio.

Our records indicate that all postal activities were actually moved from this building on October 22, 1934. The postmaster advises that the lessors were duly notified. The lease in question does not contain the customary cancelation clauses and expires July 23, 1935. The lease includes heat and obligates the lessors to keep the premises, equipment, etc., in satisfactory condition. Of course, little or no heat will be required in the space formerly occupied by the parcel post station and the wear and tear on the building and equipment will be eliminated. In the circumstances the Department will, of course, expect the lessors to properly protect the property without expense to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

S. W. PURDUM,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

EXHIBIT B

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF OHIO:
County of Cuyahoga, ss:

Frank J. Shoenig, being first duly sworn, depcses and states that on July 5, 1935, he and his wife, Anna M. Schoenig, entered into a lease with the United States Parcel Post Building Co. for the first floor of the United States Parcel Post Building, located at 201-9 St. Clair Avenue NW., Cleveland, Ohio.

Affiant states that said lease was to run from August 1, 1935, to October 30, 1935, calling for payments of $500 per month, and contained a provision that it should remain in full force and effect on a month-to-month basis until the lessor had given the lessees a 60-day written notice of its intention to cancel the lease.

Affiant further states that on July 4, 1935, he entered upon said premises to clear out the debris, remove partitions, screens, cages, and special equipment built into the premises by the United States Post Office Department, and that the placing of the property in a tenable condition required his services and those of his employees for the greater portion of July 1935. Affiant states that on July 8, 1935, he parked a few cars in the cleared portion of the space—this being the day of all-star American League baseball game—and it being his opinion that as compensation for clearing the premises, he would have the right to take care of transient business such as this, and acquaint the public with the fact that on and after August 1, 1935, the building would be available as a parking garage.

Affiant further states that on July 8, 1935, after parking a very few cars, Inspector Hart, of the Cleveland branch of the United States Post Office Department, entered upon the premises and informed him that he had no right to occupy the property because the lease of the United States Post Office Department had not expired. Affiant states that upon receipt of this information from Mr. Hart, he immediately offered to vacate the premises until said lease expired, but that Mr. Hart and another gentleman accompanying him stated they would take up the matter with the president of the United States Parcel Post Building Co. rather than request him to vacate.

Affiant further states that he was thereafter never requested to vacate the premises by Mr. Hart, although at all times he stood ready and willing to do so.

Further affiant saith not.

——— ———.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this —— day of June A. D. 1940.

——— ———, *Notary Public.*

EDWARD GILLAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 254) for the relief of Edward Gillam, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out $16,845.60" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Gillam, of Hermiston, Oreg., the sum of $5,500 in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding as a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of the Umatilla ordnance depot highway and United States Highway No. 207 near Hermiston, Oreg., on January 5, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIMO GIORDANENGO AND ANGIE GIORDANENGO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 462) for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$1,681.31" and insert "$1,471.31", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $1,471.31, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damages to, and for loss of rentals from, their apartment building in San Pedro, Calif., which resulted from heavy gunfire on May 16, 1942, by Coast Artillery units located at Fort MacArthur, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The bill (S. 346) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds available for payments of adjusted-service credits and the installments due to dependents of deceased veterans, as provided in the act of May 19, 1924, as amended, the sum of $385.80, to Harriet B. Rickards, of Seattle, Wash., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the proceeds of seven checks drawn during the fiscal years 1937 and 1938 to the order of Mary Ellen Butler, the deceased mother of the said Harriet B. Rickards, such checks having been for value received, properly endorsed by the said Mary Ellen Butler and her right to the proceeds thereof transferred to the said Harriet B. Rickards prior to the death of the said Mary Ellen Butler on August 28, 1939, though not presented for payment prior to such date: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

VERNA MAE ROSSELL AND WINIFRED ROSSELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1038) for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,420.50"; in line 7, after the name "Rossell" to insert "Mooney"; and in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out "Mount Holly, N. J." and insert "Fort Monroe, Va."; and in line 8, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$555", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay,

out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Verna Mae Rossell, of Mount Holly, N. J., the sum of $3,420.50, and to Winifred Rossell Mooney, of Fort Monroe, Va., the sum of $575, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and for reimbursement for medical and hospital expenses incurred by them when the automobile in which they were riding as passengers was struck by a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 39 near Fort Dix, N. J., on January 18, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney."

PETER CUCCIO AND VIOLET CUCCIO

The bill (H. R. 575) for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HENRY MILLER, JR.

The bill (S. 1090) for the relief of John Henry Miller, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Henry Miller, Jr., of Staunton, Va., the sum of $135, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for accumulated 'eave which was due him at the time of his resignation as deputy clerk for the United States Court for the Western District of Virginia, but which he failed to receive prior to the acceptance of such resignation by reason of a misunderstanding of his superiors: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO BRING SUIT ON CLAIMS OF UTE INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 1947) to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933

The bill (H. R. 2427) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Let the bill go over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill was reported by my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not a member of that committee, but I know that my colleague and other Senators are anxious to have the bill passed. I have read the report on the bill. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia has any very strong feeling in the matter. The hour is growing late.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I notice that the report incorporates a letter from the Department of Agriculture, which concludes with these words:

To summarize, Commissioner loans are now needed, not to meet such an emergency as existed when they were originally authorized in 1933, but (1) to assist tenants and former farm owners to finance the purchase of family type farms on a long-time amortized basis; (2) to supplement loans made by the Federal land banks and enable these banks to obtain a fair share of the farm-mortgage business; and (3) to assist farmers to repair or reconstruct farm buildings and other permanent improvements destroyed or damaged by floods or other causes.

In that connection I may say that I find that during 1942 loans closed by the Federal land banks amounted to only 7 percent of the total volume of farm mortgages executed during that year, and Commissioner loans represented only 3.7 percent of this total, as against 25 percent by commercial banks, 20.3 percent by insurance companies, and 44 percent by individual and miscellaneous lenders.

The record seems to show that Commissioner loans are not competing in the field of private bankers and private mortgage companies, but that there is need for an extension of the time for Commissioner loans.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2427) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 630) to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective July 1, 1943, so much of the second sentence of section 107 (c) of the Judicial Code, as amended, as precedes the proviso, is amended to read as follows: "Terms of the district court for the Nashville division of said district shall be held at Nashville on the fourth Monday in January and the fourth Monday in September; for the Columbia division at Columbia on the first Monday in May and the second Monday in November; and for the northeastern division at Cookeville on the second Monday in June and the first Monday in December."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to calendar 151, House bill 205, on page 4 of the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I object until we finish the call of the calendar under the unanimous-consent agreement. We can revert to that bill a little later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

The bill (S. 357) to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the bill go over.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I should like to offer a brief explanation of the bill. It was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments. As I understand, it was amended because of an objection which was made by the House to a previous bill reported by the same committee and approved by the Senate a year ago.

As I understand the record, this bill was acted upon favorably at two separate sessions by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is hoped that if it should go to the House as now amended, it would meet with no objection in that body.

As I understand, the objection in the House was to the description of the medal. According to the first draft of the bill, the medal was to be a congressional medal, and objection was made to that description of the medal; so the Judiciary Committee suggested that an appropriate medal be presented to the chief officer of the F. B. I. in recognition of the work of his agency and the cooperation secured by his agency from other similar agencies throughout the United States. So actually the medal would honor the chief officer of the F. B. I., the F. B. I., and the cooperating agencies throughout the United States. I ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee if that is not correct.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, that is entirely correct.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I may say also that the marvelous record of the F. B. I. in preventing sabotage from the very beginning of this emergency warrants congressional recognition.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I wonder if the Senator used the term "perfect record."

Mr. MEAD. No; I did not say "perfect record."

Mr. BONE. I wished to inquire how the F. B. I. overlooked the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. and other plants engaged in that business.

Mr. MEAD. I am sure the F. B. I. will read the RECORD, and probably take note of it.

Mr. President, every boy in America is playing or planning an F. B. I. career, thus indicating the great popularity of this agency. The Chief of the F. B. I. is the hero of the American boy because of the splendid work which he and his agency have so far accomplished in this war, in meeting saboteurs before they landed on our shores, and putting them

in the penitentiary before they injured our people or damaged our plants.

Mr. President, I believe we would be making no mistake by passing this bill, which has been unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee for the second time. A similar bill received the approval of the Senate at a previous session.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CHANGE OF TERMS OF THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (S. 906) to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The State of Connecticut shall constitute one judicial district to be known as the "district of Connecticut." Terms of the district court shall be held in New Haven on the second Tuesday in February and the third Tuesday in September; and at Hartford on the second Tuesday in May and the first Tuesday in December."

INVESTIGATION OF SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The resolution (S. Res. 155) authorizing an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BONE. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], I ask that the resolution go over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the able leader of the majority refer to Calendar No. 321?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I was about to request on behalf of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that it go over, but the request has already been made.

Mr. HILL. I made such a request in the name of the Senator from Montana, who is Chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which committee reported the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF INSECTICIDE ACT OF 1910—RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 242, Senate bill 897, a bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910, be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations under the War Manpower Commission, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Norman Collison, of Bridgeville, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of James H. Latchum; and

Harry C. Westover, of Santa Ana, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, in place of Nat Rogan, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, June 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Arthur L. Schoenthal, from the District of Columbia, to be assistant to the regional director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office.

Henry L. Badoux, from the State of Tennessee, to be assistant regional chief of manpower utilization, at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Paul F. Murphy, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the New Castle area office.

William B. McCarter, from the State of California, to be senior occupational analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

William O. Weyforth, from the State of Maryland, to be senior labor economist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Maryland State office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Gerald F. Bogan to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 7, 1943.

Thomas C. Kinkaid to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 7, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Jack V. Stockburger, Winslow.

KANSAS

Glenn Harold Diggs, Lorraine.

NORTH CAROLINA

Shepperd Strudwick, Hillsboro.
Horace C. Johnson, Wrightsville Beach.

PENNSYLVANIA

G. Wilda Schang, Broughton.
Melvin C. Bender, Friedens.
John A. Frazier, Liberty.
Oliver S. Rosenberger, Penllyn.
James F. Gibbons, Pittston.

WISCONSIN

Elmer G. Zellmer, Fair Water.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in these days of solicitude, sustain us with the promise, "Blessed is the man that endureth trial"; without conflict there can be no reality of virtue. To him that overcometh is given the merit in the school of character. O Master, we pray that Thy spirit may inspire us to make our sacrifice real, intense, entering with sympathy into the woes and wants of men. "If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him."

We pray that patience, more potent than passion, may do its perfect work. O Shepherd of the fold, matchless in wealth and in consolation, lead us all by the way. We praise Thee for the great lessons in Christian truth; to be deprived of them is to rob the open sky of the morning star. Grant that our souls may be steeped in their wondrous teaching, whose words are for the healing of the nations. So fill the higher ranges of our being that we may with tranquillity accept our place and adjust ourselves to the call of our demanding obligations. Higher than morality, higher than phi-

lanthropy, comes the truth that Thou wilt hold fast the imperiled heart and keep it in every swelling gale. Open our eyes, that we may look beyond our disproportionate sacrifice and enable us to realize the multitudes who dare the most tremendous suffering that they may win the blessings of their ideals. Great God, forgive the absurdity of our complaints and may we reckon ourselves as debtors to a world overborne with grief and death. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 575. An act to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the War Labor Disputes Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New Orleans Item, written by Herman Deutsch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Idaho Granger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by Miss Betsy Heagy, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., which won the prize in the essay contest of the district American Legion. The article is entitled "For This We Fight."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ONE CENTRAL FOOD CONTROL AGENCY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that many House and Senate Members are now advocating the setting up of one central food control agency; and that the White House is now recognizing the fact that the food situation is serious.

This is largely the result of the efforts of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

On May 18, 1943, under the direction of that committee, I introduced a bill now generally referred to as the Jenkins food control bill, which would place all food activities under one man in the Department of Agriculture. Our committee is perfectly willing that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, attach his name to that bill if that will hasten its passage. This bill should be passed immediately. A Presidential directive will not do the job.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the legislative business of the day, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Sabotage by Rumor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ZOOT SUITERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from an article that appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday last under the heading, "Zoot Suiters—A New Youth Movement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ENCYCLOPEDIC TAX SERVICE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the ways of the New Deal are indeed devious. They rant against special privileges continuously but none of them have ever been known to overlook an opportunity to feather their own nests.

Just a few days ago the mails were filled with circulars soliciting subscriptions from banks at $50 a year to an Encyclopedic Tax Service, located somewhere in Chicago, published by Randolph Paul, the general counsel for the Treasury, and Jacob Mertens, Jr.

The impropriety of this enterprise is obvious, not only from the standpoint of implied pressure upon the banks to subscribe, but from the thought of a high Treasury official engaging in such an enterprise. Special privileges for New Dealers and no liberties for the American people.

JAPANESE LABOR

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 of this year, a constituent who operates a large truck farm in my district requested that the War Relocation Authority send him Japanese labor in order that he might increase his production, in the face of our great war needs. He offered to pay $50 per month, provide furniture, housing, heat, electric light, milk and vegetables, hot and cold water, shower bath, and free transportation to the trading center.

The regional supervisor in Cleveland, Ohio, replied to this request, as follows:

In order to increase the possibilities of obtaining this labor we are wondering if you would be willing to reconsider your wage offer.

The constituent thereupon increased the offer to $60 a month including all the things enumerated in his previous communication; however, to date he has received no help.

I note in this morning's Washington Post that Dillon S. Myer, National Director of the War Relocation Authority, states that he employs 25 Japanese-Americans in the Washington branch of his agency, and makes the following comments:

They have rendered excellent service. They are simply American youngsters doing a good job.

And further said:

Some of the Japanese are employed, at pay ranging up to $19 a month maximum, in addition to subsistence.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the people who are vested with public authority begin regulating themselves by the same rules they impose upon our worthy citizens who are doing constructive work.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of June 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FLAG LAW

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am dropping in the hopper today a bill to revise section 7 of the act of June 22, 1942, Public, 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public, 829, Seventy-seventh Congress, pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

Section 7 of Public Law 623, as amended on December 22, 1942, changed the position of the hand when pledging allegiance to the flag from the original position of extending the right hand, palm upward, toward the flag as the words "to the flag" are reached in the pledge of allegiance, and holding this position to the end when the hand drops to the side, to that of standing with the right hand over the heart all during the time the pledge of allegiance to the flag is being given. I wish to advise the Members of the House that the reason for the form of extending the hand to the flag when pledging allegiance grew out of the fact that in many instances in the public schools children were found to be pledging allegiance to a red flag pinned to their shirts or in a pocket directly over their hearts, and when the pledge of allegiance was given they were in fact pledging allegiance to this red flag instead of the flag of the United States of America. When it was made a law that everyone should extend his right hand, palm upward, toward the flag in pledging allegiance, there could be no mistake to which flag they were pledging allegiance.

If this is to be one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, it seems to me we should do everything possible to eliminate any question of doubt as to what flag everyone is pledging allegiance. I sincerely hope, for the sake of unity, that my bill, which will restore the original form of extending the hand toward the flag during this very impressive ceremony, will receive favorable consideration at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a discourse delivered by the Very Reverend James H. Griffiths at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington on May 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 5, and further insist on our disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that there is a definite program agreed upon by the majority of the House conferees and the majority of the Senate conferees whereby the House will yield to wiping out all restrictions upon the President's emergency fund and whereby the House would yield to the striking out of the amendment placed on the bill on the motion by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] prohibiting payment of funds to Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., and Dr. Robert Morss Lovett. I cannot agree to that situation and therefore I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the vital bills now before the House. It must be passed before the 30th. It carries $132,000,000 overtime pay, affecting 271 different appropriations and practically every agency and department of the Government except the War and Navy Departments. Already many of those agencies are out of money and their pay rolls are being met by advances from the President's fund in order to avoid the embarrassments pending enactment of the bill. The President's fund will not long serve to relieve this situation and a pay-roll crisis is not far off unless this bill becomes a law.

There are only two amendments upon which we are still in disagreement. One is the limitation on the President's fund and the other relates to denial of salaries of the three charged with subversive activities. I am convinced that the Senate will yield on this last amendment. I have no assurance on that, but am basing my opinion on the logic of the situation. Far from having any agreement to yield on the subversive amendment, I will say that before we would take such a step we would bring the bill back to the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to emphasize what the gentleman is saying about the Kerr amendment. Certainly it could not be possible that there would be any thought on the part of the House conferees of yielding on that amendment which was adopted after so much deliberation and by such an overwhelming vote. As one of the conferees, and supplementing what the gentleman from Missouri says, I certainly can assure the House that there will be no yielding on that. But I do think we are getting near the deadline and that we ought to try to go to conference and fix up something if we can.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is this situation: This bill passed the House on the 18th day of May. The Senate has voted to strike out the House amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] without holding any hearings whatever.

If the Senate was holding hearings on that subject they would come to us with clean hands. I think they should begin hearings immediately and in the meantime we should let the bill lay on the Speaker's table.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Suppose we could show the gentlemen of the Senate the true light and they are willing to yield immediately without having hearings; they might be satisfied with that, based on the findings of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Senate cannot yield unless we can go to conference with them; they would have no opportunity to yield.

Mr. TABER. They can ask for the papers and yield on the record. That is the feeling that I have at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York if he were given assurance that the conferees on this side of the aisle would cooperate with him in the retention of this provision would he then be willing for the bill to go to conference?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. With the assurance given us by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that there is to be no backing down on the part of the House conferees on the amendment eliminating these three alleged subversive individuals from the pay roll, I hope the gentleman from New York will agree to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, with that understanding.

I will say now that I do not care how much is involved in this bill, there is enough involved that the Senate conferees should have investigated the charges against these men that have been found correct by the Dies committee, by the Kerr committee, and by the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the committee will assure us that the conferees will stand firm on that amendment, I would have no objection to the bill going to conference and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will withdraw his objection with that understanding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I might add that in the meantime every agency of the Government, with the exception of the Army and Navy, will be without funds on the 30th of June.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I am just as much in favor of getting every subversive individual off the Federal pay roll as he is, and I recognize his sincerity, but I believe that with the assurance given us by the chairman of the com-

mittee, we should agree to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that at this time I must object. If I see from the evidence a different attitude I would be glad to go along.

Mr. RANKIN. That is, a different attitude on the part of the Senate?

Mr. TABER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Private Calendar will be called.

ALMOS W. GLASGOW

The Clerk called the first bill, S. 555, for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CINDA J. SHORT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 717, for the relief of Cinda J. Short.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not othewise appropriated, to Mrs. Cinda J. Short, of Wise County, Va., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for the deaths of her sons, Kermit Short and Victor Short, who were killed, on June 9, 1939, as the result of being struck by a bolt of lightning which was carried to the house of Monroe Short, a local fire warden, deceased husband of the said Cinda J. Short, by unconnected telephone wires installed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps, such wires not having been grounded, payment of such claim to the said Monroe Short having been authorized by Private Law No. 502, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 13, 1942, but not having been made prior to the death of the said Monroe Short: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES FRANCIS FESSENDEN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 671, for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Charles Francis Fessenden, of Waverly, Pa., who allegedly was injured and became permanently disabled while engaged in the performance of his duty in October 1916 as an employee at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., and as a result of such duty, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LT. M. V. DAVEN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 684, for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That M. V. Daven, first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to $474.16 heretofore paid to him as compensation for services rendered by him during the summers of 1932, 1933, 1934, and 1936 as chief baker for the Texas National Guard, at Camp Hulen, Palacios, Tex.; and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of Taylor Nichols and Lawrence E. McGee, formerly United States property and disbursing officers for the State of Texas, for so much of such sum as has been suspended against the accounts of each of said former officers.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said M. V. Daven the sum of $161.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the sum which he paid to H. J. Weiler, United States property and disbursing officer for the State of Texas, to compensate said H. J. Weiler for a suspension in his accounts entered by the Comptroller General because of his having paid the said M. V. Daven the sum of $161.50 for services rendered as chief baker for the Texas National Guard, at Camp Hulen, Palacios, Tex., during the summer of 1937.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETTA HOUSER FREEMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 839, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman, of Dobson, N. C., for the death of her husband, L. W. Freeman, who was killed January 29, 1938, near Dobson, N. C., when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck operated by one Paul J. Flynn: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed a total sum of $5,000.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

C. Y. WEBB

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 376, for the relief of C. Y. Webb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

H. B. NELSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1335, to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.), may, at any time within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act, appeal as of right to the Supreme Court of the United States from the judgments of the Court of Claims of the United States in the suits Nos. 43574A and 43574B, respectively, heretofore instituted in the Court of Claims by said H. B. Nelson, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Supreme Court to consider and determine on such appeal all questions of law and fact upon the merits, and render judgment against the United States for the amount of any and all losses and/or damages suffered by said H. B. Nelson in justice and equity and without regard to technical bars, because of extra work and/or differences in conditions from those contemplated or misrepresentations or concealments of conditions or breaches of warranty, or arising otherwise howsoever prior to or during or subsequent to the performance of Government contracts numbered NOY-2203 and 2248, dated June 19, 1934, and September 12, 1934: *Provided*, That said cases shall be determined separately upon the evidence and transcripts of the records heretofore agreed upon by the parties, approved and certified on November 27, 1940, by the clerk of the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any judgments rendered in favor of the claimant shall be paid in the same manner as other judgments of said Court of Claims are paid.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2454, for the relief of William C. Reese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JULIA PETERSON MILLS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2415, for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ROBERT N. BICKERT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1602, for the relief of Robert N. Bickert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert N. Bickert the sum of $65.54, in full settlement of all claims against the United States to reimburse him for the expense borne by him incident to his transfer as an employee of the Soil Conservation Service from Hebron, Nebr., to Stanton, Nebr., on September 20, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$65.54" and insert "$60.38."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 215, for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 165 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which he may have sustained or suffered, as such owner, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BESSIE PIKE AND MRS. ESTELLE ROSENFELD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1518, for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bessie Pike, of Rockaway Beach, N. Y., the sum of $500, and to Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld, of Belle Harbor, Long Island, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck at Rockaway Beach, N. Y., on December 20, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$274."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,500."

At the end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY AND ESTATE OF LOUISA COWLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 925, for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1889, for the relief of Andrew Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Andrew Williams, of DeRidder, La., the sum of $8,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when he was shot by Clifford Davis, a soldier on military police duty in DeRidder, La., on September 23, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB WOLOZIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1222, for the relief of Jacob Wolozin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jacob Wolozin, New York City, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Jacob Wolozin, resulting from his being struck by a Work Projects Administration station wagon in New York City, N. Y., on June 26, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PENNSYLVANIA COAL & COKE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1375, for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation.

Messrs. MOTT, McGREGOR, MADDEN, and PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOE KOOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 563, for the relief of Joe Koor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $930.41 to Joe Koor to reimburse him for the purchase price of shoes bought from the Government at salvage sale held November 28, 1938, at the West Virginia district, Civilian Conservation Corps, Charleston, W. Va., and for expenses incurred by the claimant in connection with the transaction.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the language "and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $930.41."

Page 1, line 6, after the words "to Joe Koor", insert comma and add "of Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $930.41, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement."

At the end of the bill strike out period and add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DELORES LEWIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1313, for the relief of Delores Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Delores Lewis, 1525 Edmondson Avenue, Baltimore, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government for injuries sustained when the motor vehicle in which she was riding was struck by a motor vehicle owned by the National Training School for Boys, an institution under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, at the intersection of Carey and Mosher Streets, Baltimore, Md., on February 2, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "injuries" and insert in lieu thereof "personal injuries, medical and other expenses, and property damage."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER HANNEVIG

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2528, to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christopher Hannevig, through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes.

Messrs. PRIEST and MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HEIRS OF JOHN J. SHIELDS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 134, for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs of John J. Shields, formerly of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $537, the amount of the funeral expenses incurred for the burial of said John J. Shields; and the payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such heirs against the United States arising out of the death of said John J. Shields as a result of a collision on October 19, 1940, near Fort Dix, N. J., of the automobile in which the said John J. Shields was riding and an Army station wagon: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MARY FRANCIS HUTSON

The clerk called the next bill, S. 807, for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Francis Hutson, of La Junta, Colo., the sum of $2,245.90 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred, by her as a result of her having been hit by a bullet from a revolver fired during an altercation between two soldiers which occurred in La Junta, Colo., on December 13, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be demed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

COL. E. H. TARBUTTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 255, for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. E. H. Tarbutton, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, $3,287.67, or so much of such sum as shall have been collected from him prior to the passage of this act, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as a result of the loss of public funds due to financial irregularities and frauds against the Government in the handling of public funds by a civilian employee of the Quartermaster Corps at Fort Jay, N. Y., during the period from March 17, 1927, to May 6, 1928, while Colonel Tarbutton was on duty as post quartermaster at Fort Jay and Governors Island, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "by", insert the language "Charles G. Beiler."

Page 2, line 4, after the words "New York" insert a comma and add the language "and that neither Col. E. H. Tarbutton nor any other person, except the estate of the deceased civilian employee, shall hereafter be held accountable or responsible for the loss of the funds so embezzled or misappropriated."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. E. MARTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 304, for the relief of J. E. Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. E. Martin,

Crestview, Fla., the sum of $250.04. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. E. Martin against the United States for losses incurred on account of personal injuries sustained by his wife and minor child and damage to his automobile when such automobile was in collision on October 3, 1941, in Crestview, Fla., with an Army reconnaissance car.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$250.04", strike out period and insert comma, and strike out words "The payment of such sum shall be."

At end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be demed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARRELL-ARGAST ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 560, for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Farrell-Argast Electric Co., Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $402.68, as additional payment for three transformers delivered to the War Department under a bid which through error resulted in the Government receiving three transformers at the price of one transformer: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL W. BUSBEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1344, for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul W. Busbey, Wheeling, W. Va., the sum of $3,768.13; to Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Wheeling, W. Va., the sum of $1,500; to Paula Busbey, Wheeling, W. Va., the sum of $7,500; and to Mrs. Louisa Busbey, Wheeling, W. Va., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by such persons on July 30, 1941, in a collision on United States Highway No. 17, Ways Station, Ga., between a United States Army truck and the automobile in which such persons were riding.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out figures "$3,768.13" and insert in lieu thereof figures "$2,298.13."

Page 1, line 8, strike out figures "$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof figures "$5,000."

Page 1, line 9, after the figures "$1,000" strike out period and insert comma and strike out the words "The payment of such sums shall be."

At end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY J. LEIBERSCHAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1907, for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object, under the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Under the rules of the House, cannot a Member reserve the right to object to get information on a bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not on bills on the Private Calendar. There is a special rule providing that there may be no reservation of objection to the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

W. M. HURLEY AND JOE WHITSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2299, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson, of North Little Rock, Ark., or the claims of either of them, against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of the breaking of a dike constructed by the United States Government on the Arkansas River near property belonging to such persons: *Provided*, That any suit brought hereunder shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. The liability of the United States in any suit brought under this act shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability for negligence as in like cases between private individuals.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. P. HARRIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2360, for the relief of J. P. Harris.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BESSIE MYERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2544, for the relief of Bessie Myers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Bessie Myers the sum of $150, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained on January 9, 1939, as the result of negligence on the part of employees on paving project 65-14-7893 of the Works Progress Administration, on Ruthven Street, Roxbury, Mass.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENZIE GRAHAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 550, for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was

recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request after objection is made.

CAPT. LELAND M. MOWER AND LT. PERCY K. MORRISON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1155, for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay jointly, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Leland M. Mower, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, and First Lt. Percy K. Morrison, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of $447.18, or so much of such sum as shall have been collected from either of them prior to the passage of this act in full settlement of their joint claim against the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "resulting from their being held accountable for the embezzlement by Pvt. Alonzo D. Durden, an unbonded enlisted man assigned to the Finance Office, Savannah Air Base, Savannah, Ga., of certain moneys belonging to the United States, on March 8, 1941, and that neither Capt. Leland M. Mower, First Lt. Percy K. Morrison, nor any other person, except the said Pvt. Alonzo D. Durden, shall hereafter be held accountable or responsible for the loss of the funds so embezzled: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THULA B. WELLBORN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1310, for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $636 to Thula B. Wellborn, of Garland, Kans., in full settlement and satisfaction of her claim against the United States by reason of damages sustained by her as a result of being required by the Civil Service Commission of the United States and the Post Office Department of the United States to resign as a school teacher in Miller County, Ark., in order to be eligible to accept appointment as postmaster at Garland, Ark., and the failure to appoint her to the latter position after such resignation and her place as a school teacher having been filled by another after such resignation and it being too late for her to negotiate a contract for a teaching position elsewhere, and the aforesaid being the amount of salary that would have been earned by claimant as a school teacher under the contract of employment from which she was required to resign as above set forth: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, either directly or indirectly, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the money hereby appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof for or on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$636" and insert "$419.50."

Line 6, strike out "Kansas" and insert "Arkansas."

Line 7, strike out "and satisfaction of her claim" and insert "of all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALD ESTELL PROCTOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1379, for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerald Estell Proctor the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of any claim against the United States for personal injuries caused him, by the negligent explosion of a charge of dynamite by employees of the Work Projects Administration, on road project No. 5882-70, in Livingston County, Ky., on October 17, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "Proctor", insert "of Princeton, Ky."

Line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

Line 7, strike out "any claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. E. McCOY & SON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1872, for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. E. McCoy & Son, Kingsland, Ark., the sum of $131.03. Such sum represents the aggregate amount payable to the said J. E. McCoy & Son as endorser of seven United States Treasury checks which, during the month of November 1939, were mailed by the said J. E. McCoy & Son to the Bank of Rison, Rison, Ark., for deposit, but which were stolen from the mails, and cashed by the thief by means of erasing the endorsement and falsely representing himself as payee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out ". Such sum represents" and insert ", in full settlement of all claims against the United States, by reason of such sum representing."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL J. D. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2545, for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Samuel J. D. Marshall, former captain, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, disbursing officer of the Army at Camp Stewart, Va., and Mitchel Field, Long Island, N. Y., with $49,112.18, this sum being an alleged shortage in the accounts of the said Samuel J. D. Marshall and a balance due the United States while acting as disbursing officer at Camp Stewart, and Mitchel Field, N. Y., due to the lack of evidence to support certain disbursements.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 8, strike out "$49,112.18" and insert "$49,612.18."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER C. BLAKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 282) for the relief of Walter C. Blake.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter C. Blake, of Springfield, Mass., the sum of $1,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained by the said Walter C. Blake from the loss of an eye caused by an injury received in April 1919 while he was an employee of the United States Armory at Springfield, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDDIE SANDERS AND EDD HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 520) for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Freddie Sanders, widow of Jim Sanders, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all her claims against the Government of the United States on account of the death of her husband, who died on November 9, 1940, as a result of injuries sustained on November 2, 1940, when the wagon which he was driving was struck by a truck operated by an employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority on Highway No. 64, about 2 miles west of Hornsby, in Hardeman County, Tenn., and the sum of $500 to Edd Harris, in full satisfaction of all injuries sustained by him while riding as a passenger in such wagon at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services render in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

This bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A. C. BLOUNT AND OSCAR WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 625) for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. C. Blount, of Pensacola, Fla., and Oscar Williams, of Muscogee, Fla., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of a dwelling house located in Baldwin County, Alabama, which was destroyed by fire on December 21, 1942, when an electric power line which was severed by a United States Navy, airplane fell on such dwelling house and set it afire: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOSEPH F. BOLGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 695) for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph F. Bolger, lieutenant, United States Navy, the sum of $143.75, such sum representing a per diem allowance for subsistence while he was performing temporary additional duty at Norfolk, Va., during October and November 1932, which was allowed him by the official orders designating him for such duty but was subsequently disallowed by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS H. PINK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 776) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States.

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HOWARD MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 305) for the relief of Howard Morgan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard Morgan, Pensacola, Fla., the sum of $250. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Howard Morgan against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by his minor son, Morgan, who was injured on May 26, 1942, when he was struck near his home by a wire fence pushed against him by a United States Navy ambulance which drove through the fence without warning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$250", strike out period and insert comma, then strike out the words "The payment of such sum shall be."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "of the said Howard Morgan."

Page 1, line 9, after the language "his minor son," and just before the word "Morgan", insert the name "Tom."

At end of bill strike out period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAFAEL TORRES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2152) for the relief of Rafael Torres.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rafael Torres, of Ysleta, Tex., the sum of $677.05, in satisfaction of his claim against the United States Government for damage sustained when a truck he was driving while hauling rock for the United States Boundary Commission was thrown into the Rio Grande by cave-in of the levee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "in", strike out the words "satisfaction of his claim" and insert in lieu thereof the words "full settlement of all claims."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "levee", strike out period, insert comma and add "on June 12, 1942" and then add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"HUGH L. SCOTT"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2439) for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property loss in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection a similar Senate bill S. 954, will be substituted for the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the aggregate sum of $462.25, to reimburse certain enlisted men of the Navy for the loss of their personal property, as herein next provided, to wit: The sum of $268.50 to reimburse Donald Robert Leighton, water tender, first class, United States Navy, and the sum of $193.74 to reimburse Libero Quiero, machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property on board the *Hugh L. Scott* lost by them, respectively, as a result of the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott* on or about November 18, 1942, in the north African action: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The bill (H. R. 2439) was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION TO SPECIAL COUNSEL, UNITED STATES AGAINST STANDARD OIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2508) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Company of California.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2575, for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection a similar Senate bill, S. 1025, will be substituted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. L. M. Edwards, Finance Department, $2.90; Lt. Col. H. G. Foster, Finance Department (now retired), $150.97; Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), $46.98; Lt. Col. K. S. Olson, Finance Department, $67.03; Col. F. Richards, Finance Department, $85.63; Lt. Col. H. B. Turner, Finance Department, $37.95; Col. E. W. Wilson, Finance Department, $7; Lt. Col. G. S. Woolworth, Judge Advocate General's Department, $9.64; Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, $35.60; and Col. L. H. Sims, Finance Department, $123.11; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in the computations of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former members of the Army of the United States, civilian employees, and commercial firms or individuals from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Hendrik Dolleman, the amount of $67; to Sgt. Anthony J. L. Morency, the amount of $24; to First Sgt. Charles W. Sharbonneau, the amount of $88.25; and to Staff Sgt. Clarence E. Steele, the amount of $74.01; such amounts representing the value of personal effects lost by them when in the course of the evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's Antarctic bases it became necessary in March 1941 to resort to an emergency abandonment of East Base, in Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pvt. (1st cl.) Rex E. Dally the amount of $6.57, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds for the transportation of Government property.

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. W. T. Delihant, Finance Department, the sum of $27, public funds for which he is accountable, which were lost by his agent officer, Capt. John J. Abbott, Medical Administrative Corps, when the car in which he was carrying the said funds skidded from the road and upset in a stream: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Capt. John J. Abbott.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt Col. W. E. Harris, Corps of Engineers, the sum of $19.25, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum represents the difference between per diem of $5 erroneously paid to Master Sgt. Frank Zinn and the monetary allowance of $2.25 per day to which he was entitled for a period of travel on duty under orders: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Master Sgt. Frank Zinn.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. C. B. Lindner, Finance Department, the sum of $3,974.50; and in the accounts of Maj. F. J. Stagliano, Finance Department, the sum of $1,487, public funds for which they are accountable and which were paid by them on fraudulent vouchers prepared by their deputy.

SEC. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. T. G. McCulloch, Finance Department, the sum of $14.09, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing the unrecovered balance of payments totaling $64.34 made to civilian employees for periods of absence on annual leave, to which leave said employees were not entitled by reason of having been engaged for work in connection with Work Projects Administration projects: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be charged to Maj. Robert E. Cron, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), the sum of $182.81, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers prepared by a former employee of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 9. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. H. L. Oldenburg, Finance Department, the sum of $55.17, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen from the locker of his agent officer, Second Lt. B. C. Haltom, Coast Artillery, by a person or persons unknown: *Provided*, That the said Second Lt. B. C. Haltom shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

SEC. 10 That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, the sum of $32.40, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing commutation of furlough rations which was paid to an enlisted man and to which he was not entitled by reason of not having returned to his duty station when his furlough was terminated by sickness and subsequent discharge without such return: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to Maj. Charles L. Driscoll, Medical Administrative Corps.

SEC. 11. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. R. L. Scott, Finance Department, the sum of $264.82, public funds for which he is accountable and which were lost while being carried for pay-roll purposes from one building to another in the custody of his agent officer, Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson, Air Corps: *Provided*, That the said Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

SEC. 12. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. Lee R. Watrous, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of $1,268, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers.

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Advertiser Co., Montgomery, Ala., $8; to the Light Publishing Co., San Antonio, Tex., $5.72; to the Houston Press Co., Houston, Tex., $8.40; to the Houston Printing Corporation, Houston, Tex., $11.38; to Carter Glass & Sons, Lynchburg, Va., $12.32; and to the Evening Star Publishing Co., Inc., Radford, Va., $8.79, which amounts are due to the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstandng. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2575, was laid on the table.

W. COOKE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 170, for the relief of W. Cooke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. Cooke, of Shawnee, Okla., the sum of $5,810, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for liquidated damages assessed for delay in the completion of contract No. I-1-ind-6541 for the construction of a gymnasium at the Sequoyah Indian Orphan Training School near Tahlequah, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RACHEL ACERRA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 241, for the relief of Rachel Acerra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rachel Acerra, of West Long Branch, N. J., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when the car which she was driving was struck by a United States Army truck in Oakhurst, N. J., on May 28, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILIP KLEINMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 252, for the relief of Philip Kleinman.

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES FAVORS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 373, for the relief of Charles Favors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Favors, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages sustained and funeral expenses incurred by him as the result of the death of his son, Richard Eugene Favors, a minor, who died from injuries sustained in an accident involving a United States Army truck in which he was riding in Phoenix, Ariz., on February 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JAMES B. LEWS ET AL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 410, for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to James B. Lewis, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $200, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, as a result of the collision of the automobile in which he was riding, with a Civilian Conservation Corps ambulance on United States Highway No. 17 at a point about 10 miles west of New Bern, N. C., on May 31, 1940; (2) to Jarvis T. Mills, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, and personal property destroyed, in such accident at such time; and (3) to Richard D. Peters, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him in such accident at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

INEZ SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 510, for the relief of Inez Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Inez Smith, postmaster at Bluff City, Tenn., the sum of $235.76 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid by her to the United States on account of official funds and stamp stock stolen from the Bluff City post office on August 25, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

THE NASHVILLE, CHATTANOOGA & ST. LOUIS RAILWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 516, for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,954.38 to the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Tennessee and having its principal place of business in Nashville in said State, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damage to property sustained by the said Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway caused by fire resulting from the spilling of gasoline on the floor of a baggage car while in use as a kitchen car by troops of the Ninety-seventh Field Artillery Battalion, while said car was contained in a train being transported by the said railway on its tracks for the movement of the said Ninety-seventh Field Artillery Battalion en route to San Francisco, port of embarkation, March 8, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE ANTHONY ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 628, for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Lawrence Anthony, of Collis, Minn., the sum of $609, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his automobile which he was operating was struck by a United States Army truck at a point on Highway No. 18, 2 miles west of Corona, Calif., on December 14, 1941;

(2) to R. E. Murphy, of Collis, Minn., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a passenger in such automobile at such time and the sum of $577.43 in full satisfaction for all funeral expenses of his wife, Ella Murphy; (3) to Mary E. Armstrong, of Riverside, Calif., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a passenger in such automobile at such time and the sum of $562 in full satisfaction of all medical expenses incurred; and (4) to R. E. Murphy, of Collis, Minn., as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy, the sum of $4,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of the estate of Ella Murphy against the United States for compensation for the death of said Ella Murphy, who died as a result of injuries sustained by her while riding as a passenger in such automobile at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. WALTER H. KINDON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 743, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter H. Kindon, of Wadley, Ga., the sum of $135, and to Mrs. Walter H. Kindon, of Wadley, Ga., the sum of $185, in full satisfaction of their respective claims for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them and medical expenses incurred by them as the result of an accident which occurred when their automobile was struck by a United States Army motorcycle near Louisville, Ga., on August 9, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLA DALE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 765, for the relief of Viola Dale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Viola Dale, of Superior, Ariz., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by her as a result of a collision of the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger and a Forest Service truck which occurred on the Klamath River Road, Siskiyou County, Calif., on March 19, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. J. TOOLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 636, for the relief of C. J. Toole.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. J. Toole, Macon, Ga., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum represents reimbursement to the said C. J. Toole of the amount paid by him to the United States as surety on a bond for the appearance on April 22, 1942, of Emmett Eugene Dean to answer criminal charges in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Macon Division. The said Emmett Eugene Dean failed to appear on such date, but was apprehended shortly thereafter, at considerable expense to the said C. J. Toole, and convicted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$1,000", strike out the period and insert a comma, and then strike out the words "The payment of such sum represents reimbursement to the said C. J. Toole" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Division", strike out the period and insert a comma, and then strike out the words "The said Emmett Eugene Dean failed to appear on such date but was" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the said Emmett Eugene Dean having failed to appear on such date but being."

At end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. FRANK MEADOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1334, for the relief of J. Frank Meador.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of $3,500 to J. Frank Meador, of Atlanta, Ga., for personal injuries received as the result of being struck by a bicycle being operated by a special-delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on June 20, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact or collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. RUCKMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1498, for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles W. Ruckman, the sum of $3,195.45, representing the total annuity payments received by him under the Civil Service Retirement Act, in good faith, while serving as postmaster at the Concho, Okla., post office, and which he was required to refund.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert "the civil service retirement and disability fund," and on page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,195.45" and insert "$3,150.42, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, said sum."

And at the end of the bill, strike out the period and add the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED HUNTER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1635, for the relief of Fred Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to

Fred Hunter, rural route No. 4, Greencastle, Ind., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the injuries sustained by the said Fred Hunter when the team and the wagon he was driving was struck, on May 18, 1940, on the United States Highway No. 40, about 6 miles west of the town of Mount Meridian, Ind., by a truck owned and operated by an employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert "$4,000."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "on account of the injuries sustained by the said Fred Hunter" and insert "for personal injuries sustained by him."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WYMER BOWLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1780, for the relief of Wymer Bowlin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Wymer Bowlin, who is alleged to have sustained injuries by becoming overheated in the line of his duties on July 10, 1940, while employed by the Work Projects Administration in feeding a rock crusher at a quarry at Highcliff, Campbell County, Tenn., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Wymer Bowlin may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2 line 5, after the word "amended", insert "and supplemented by the act of February 15, 1934."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK LEE LITTLEFIELD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1835, for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frederick Lee Littlefield, of Hyannis, Mass., the sum of $8,000 and disbursement amounting to $53.30, in full satisfaction of his claim for damages against the Government of the United States on account of personal injuries of a permanent nature suffered by him on May 5, 1941, when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a truck belonging to the War Department and operated by a private of said Department on Route No. 130 near the intersection of Quaker Meeting House Road in the town of Sandwich, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,000 and disbursement amounting to $53.30, in full satisfaction of his claim for damages against the Government of the United States on account of personal injuries of a permanent nature suffered," and insert the following: "$5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LUCKENBACH STEAMSHIP CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1890, for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOHN RHODEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2088, for the relief of John Rhoden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of John Rhoden, Brushart, Ky., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from an injury sustained on January 12, 1940, while employed by the Work Projects Administration, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, and under other provisions of law relating to disability or death compensations and benefits for employees of the Work Projects Administration, as if he had filed notice of injury and claim for compensation for disability within the time prescribed by such sections 17 and 20, but only if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "17" and insert "15."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Increase", insert "alleged to have been."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "than", insert the word "sixty."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURTON S. RADFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2556, for the relief of Burton S. Radford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the payment of compensation to aliens, to pay Burton S. Radford, formerly an employee of the Corporation, in accordance with the terms of his employment, for services rendered by him during the period from October 16, 1942, to October 28, 1942, inclusive, such payment to be made from any funds available to the Corporation for payment of administrative expenses; and that Burton S. Radford shall not be required by the disbursing officer of the Corporation to refund any moneys heretofore paid to him for services rendered to the Corporation which, under the provisions of section 3 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, approved June 27, 1942, he otherwise might be required to refund: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figure "28" and insert the figure "29".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOSES TENNENBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2456, for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

THADDEUS C. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 414, for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas Thaddeus C. Knight, formerly a captain, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, was convicted on April 28, 1926, by a general court martial for the violation of the ninety-third and ninety-sixth articles of war and sentenced to be discharged from the military service and to serve 5 years in prison. The said Thaddeus C. Knight was discharged from the Army in accordance with the findings of the court martial and served 2 years of the sentence imposed upon him, at which time he was paroled. Since the carrying into execution of the findings of the court martial it has been determined that the testimony upon which the said Thaddeus C. Knight was convicted was perjured and untrue and that the conviction of the said Thaddeus C. Knight by general court martial was without foundation in law or in fact: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the said Thaddeus C. Knight, a captain in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the same longevity and rank on both the relative and promotion list as the said Thaddeus C. Knight would have attained had he not been separated from the service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 438, for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Mr. McGREGOR, and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

ANNA M. KOHLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1434, for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitteed to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PAUL SZELIGA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2134, for the relief of Paul Szeliga.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Mr. McGREGOR, and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

ANTHONY J. LEIBERSCHAL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 158, H. R. 1907, for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal. I am authorized to say that the gentleman from Mississippi desires to withdraw his objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anthony J. Leiberschal, Everett, Wash., the sum of $3,315.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Anthony J. Leiberschal against the United States for losses sustained as the result of a United States Army airplane crashing on February 17, 1942, into a chicken house owned by the said Anthony J. Leiberschal and located approximately 6 miles east of Paine Field, near Silver Lake, Wash.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", strike out "$3,315.22. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,775.43."

At end of bill strike out the period, insert a colon, and add *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today following the other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 257) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House a sum not to exceed $250, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee under authority of House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress, and approved by the Committee on Accounts in order to pay outstanding debts incurred by the Special Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 258.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the committee of investigation authorized by House Resolution 38, not exceeding $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the Department of the Interior in reference to the development of the war food program in reclamation areas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, and 26.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
PAT McCARRAN,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 2: Increases the appropriation for "Foreign funds control" from $3,100,000 to $3,800,000. The House recedes with an amendment making the amount to be appropriated $3,450,000.

Amendment No. 18: Increases the appropriation for the Bureau of Accounts, Post Office Department, from $133,640 to $300,000. The House recedes.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 1: Deletes a provision, included in the bill by the House, prohibiting the expenditure of any appropriation in the bill for carrying out the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts.

Amendment No. 17: Authorizes the employment of a temporary expert by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or civil-service laws.

Amendment No. 26: Provides for a study by the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General of the use of the mails by agencies in the executive branch of the Government, the report on such study to be filed within 60 days of the passage of the act, in lieu of the provision included by the House prohibiting the use of any funds in the bill for carrying penalty mail.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this report is the unanimous report of the conferees, signed by all members of the conference committee. I move the adoption of the report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 19, strike out lines 19 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1 and concur in the same with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by the Senate amendment amended to read as follows:

"'No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the silver purchase acts—namely, the acts of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1934—or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said silver purchase acts except with respect to silver purchased or procured or transfers of any interest in silver bullion effected on or before June 30, 1943.'"

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard it said that the rules governing this Chamber are such that a majority of the House of Representatives can always find a way to do what it wants to do. That saying is about to be exemplified once more in connection with the proposition now before us.

In no uncertain terms a majority of the House has twice made known that it does not want any of the taxpayers' money spent during the fiscal year 1944 for the enforcement of the silver purchase acts. It gave its first decision to this effect when it adopted the Celler amendment. It gave its second decision to this effect when, on a former occasion, I moved to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which struck out the Celler proviso. So the House under majority rule is indubitably on record in favor of denying any appropriation to enforce the silver purchase acts during the next fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman recalls that when that amendment was first voted on we were unable to get a record vote in the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. We had a record vote later.

To a majority of your subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Department appropriations this nullification of acts of Congress by the starvation method seemed to be very poor business. It seemed to us that the sounder practice would be to bring in a bill through the regular legislative committee to repeal the silver purchase acts outright. The appropriation bill before us is applicable only to the next fiscal year. As that year draws to a close, the issue as to whether funds shall be provided to enforce the silver purchase acts will come up again and that issue will have to be faced again and again, year after year, unless or until the silver purchase acts are repealed.

But the fact remains that the House has spoken twice on this matter and your subcommittee is a servant of the House. In deference to the majority opinion, I have presented this motion to recede and concur with an amendment which has been read at the Clerk's desk.

The effect of the adoption of this motion would be to reaffirm the position of the House in respect to the Celler amendment and to add to the Celler amendment the following language:

Except with respect to silver purchased or procured or transfers of any interest in silver bullion effected on or before June 30, 1943.

This additional language was proposed by the Treasury Department, and it is intended to prevent the nullification of the silver purchase acts from having a retroactive effect. The Treasury Department has no interest in a continuation of the purchase of silver under the silver purchase acts, but it was tremendously disturbed lest the abrupt nullification proposed in the Celler amendment might cause great confusion and embarrassment in Treasury operations.

I invited the Treasury Department to submit language which in its opinion would obviate this anticipated interference with its administrative operations, and I received the following letter from Daniel W. Bell, the Under Secretary of the Treasury:

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: You have requested advice as to possible changes in the language of the Celler amendment to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations bill which would eliminate the administrative difficulties expected to result from its enactment. The amendment now reads as follows:

"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used, directly or indirectly, during the fiscal year 1944, for the purchase or procurement of silver, under the provisions of the silver purchase acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said silver purchase acts."

In previous letters to you, I have pointed out that the amendment would not repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, or section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, but would merely leave the Department without an appropriation with which to carry out the provisions of such acts, and that this would create a confusing situation. While we believe that it would be desirable to have a clearer expression of the intention of the Congress, if the amendment is finally adopted the Department will be required to interpret it as a mandate that the acquisition of silver under the silver purchase acts be suspended during the fiscal year 1944.

On the other hand, it seems clear to me that the amendment was not intended to have retroactive effect, and, accordingly, the operations of the Department with respect to, or arising in connection with, silver acquired prior to June 30, 1943, should not be deemed to fall within the scope of the amendment. However, in order that there will be no doubt as to the propriety of this construction of the amendment, it is suggested that the following language be added at the end of the proposed amendment: "except with respect to silver purchased or procured or transfers of any interest in silver bullion effected on or before June 30, 1943."

If you deem it appropriate, I should appreciate it if you would have this letter inserted in the RECORD, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the Department's views on this subject.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

When your managers go back to conference with this proposal we will face a real battle, as Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, leader of the silver bloc in the upper body, has served notice that snow will be flying before the Senate yields to the nullification of the Silver Purchase Acts. That is a situation which we shall have to face when we come to it.

From the standpoint of the House I think the motion I have made is as good a solution as can be worked out. By adopting the motion to recede and concur which I have offered, the House will carry out its will as heretofore twice expressed and will do so without embarrassment to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with interest what the distinguished

chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], has stated. I agree with him it would be far better to attempt to wipe the Silver Purchase Acts clean off the books and to do that by a frontal attack rather than by a flank attack, which is what we did when we adopted the amendment I offered which precluded the use of any moneys appropriated for the Treasury Department for the administration of the so-called Silver Purchase Acts. I agree that it is more appropriate to consider a specific bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Acts or some similar measure rather than indirectly attack those acts by sort of "riders" to an appropriation bill.

The distinguished Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell, makes the suggestion that the prohibition involved in my amendment should not apply to the silver that has already been purchased and which is to the extent of roughly 3,000,000,000 ounces. That silver is rotting and tarnishing at West Point, where it is stored, but rather, says Bell, my amendment should apply only to future purchases of silver, that is, silver purchased after June 30, 1943. The amendment of the committee—as suggested by Mr. Bell—to the so-called Celler amendment would make my amendment apply only to future and not to past purchases of silver by the Treasury.

Let us see the effect of that. Frankly, it would greatly weaken my amendment. It would apply to a trickle of silver and would not get at the meat of the situation at all. But a half a loaf may be better than no loaf at all. Let us see what Mr. Bell said with reference to future purchases of silver. He testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency as follows:

> During the month of December 1942, the Treasury did not acquire any foreign silver under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and it acquired only an inconsequential amount of newly mined domestic silver pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939. Consequently, the acquisition of more "free silver" seems unlikely and cannot safely be considered in making plans for the use of Government-owned silver in the war effort.

In other words, he admits that practically no silver will be purchased after July 1 of this year. Therefore, if you add his amendment to my amendment you practically vitiate the very purposes of my amendment, because this vast amount of silver has already been purchased and the moneys appropriated under the Treasury Department appropriation bill could thus still be used for its administration. We did not want the moneys to be used in any respect for the administration of those Silver Purchase Acts. We took that means of putting a broomstick, as it were, between the legs of the silver bloc to make them realize it is time to change its attitude on silver. It was time to get "mad" about silver.

I went down to the Riggs National Bank this morning and asked a teller to give me four silver dollars. I have them in my hand. I gave them four one-dollar bills. The paying teller said to me, "Why, this is astounding. You are the first man in my experience that has come to this window and asked for silver dollars. Everybody wants to get rid of his silver dollars and does not want to take silver dollars." Judging by the sheer weight of these four heavy silver disks, their bulkiness, I can well see the reason for the dislike. Truly, I ask you to reflect, when did you last have or see a silver dollar?

It is very significant that there is contained in every silver dollar a large amount of copper and other very strategic metals. I have here a chart which is very interesting. There is the United States silver dollar. There is only 35 cents worth of silver in that silver dollar. The rest of it is copper and other strategic metals. Thus the silver dollar contains only 35 cents' worth of silver, even at the world market price. Thus to call this coin I hold before you a silver dollar is a misnomer.

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman ought to stick to the facts.

Mr. CELLER. I am going to stick to the facts. There is no need of getting personal or hot about it, I say to my good friend from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows there is 10 percent of copper in every silver dollar and every gold dollar.

Mr. CELLER. In this dollar I hold before you there is 10 percent of copper. The Board of Economic Warfare goes all over the world in its endeavor to get this very precious metal, copper, for the war effort, this metal used in tanks, airplanes, antiaircraft guns, searchlights, and what have you. Yet, there is a vast stock pile of copper in these dollars. Let us get at it. Put it to work. Put it on the "front line."

I asked, furthermore, how many silver dollars of this character there are in existence and was told that there are 468,000,000 of these minted silver dollars held by the Treasury. I asked further how many are in circulation and used, and got this astounding information. Only 70,000,000 of these 468,000,000 silver dollars are actually in circulation and used throughout the country. What is the conclusion? The difference, or 398,000,000 of these minted dollars are useless—lying idle—people just will not use them. Three hundred and ninety-eight million of these silver dollars are useless "cartwheels." Nothing is done with them. They are in the vault wasting away. The people do not want to use them as circulating media. Ten percent of these 398,000,000 silver pieces is composed of this very valuable copper. Thus there is rotting in conjunction with the silver and other metals contained in these unused 398,000,000 silver dollars a vast stock pile of copper, which we cannot touch because of the so-called silver bloc. Why should not that copper be released and applied for war industrial uses? We could substitute that copper for use in cartridges. Do we want the cartridges to kill the Huns and Nazis and save our boys from being killed or do we wish to continue feeding silver mine owners with subsidies? Shall we become sensible about silver and use "free" silver in the war, or shall we consider silver still a sacrosanct metal—thus untouchable. If the latter, then Goebbels in the Reich might well say, "Keep the silver subsidy on your books. That helps the Axis." I call it all legalized silver robbery.

Eight hundred and fifty million ounces of silver circulate in these coins; 1,170,000,000 ounces are pledged to paper currency. The remaining amount of silver—namely, 1,338,000,000 ounces—represents a tribute paid to the silver bloc. How much is that in dollars and cents? Multiply for yourselves 71 cents—price paid to silver miners as a subsidy—by 1,338,000,000, and you get the vast amount of tribute paid to the silver mine owners, for which the Government does not get a blessed thing in return.

It is no wonder, therefore, that I call it legalized robbery. We are trying to hold down inflation, we are doing our damnedest to do that; we have set up all kinds of agencies to hold down prices and put ceilings on practically everything, but when it comes to silver, we have a sort of Mad Hatter arithmetic, and the lid is off. Let me present a chart with reference to the effect of the silver purchase on inflation and see how its stimulates the vicious spiral of inflation. Under the inflationary Silver Purchase Acts the United States silver miner sells to the Treasury up to 45 cents worth of silver for how much? Under the Silver Purchase Act he sells it to the Treasury for 71 cents an ounce, and he makes a minimum profit of 57 percent. Then what does the Government do? The Treasury takes plain silver it purchased at 71 cents and issues it to the public at $1.29 an ounce, and the Government makes the second profit of 82 percent. Thus we have the profit of 82 percent superimposed upon a profit of 57 percent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. First there is a profit of 57 percent to the miner, and then a profit of 82 percent to the Government, which puts it out to the public at $1.29. If that is not inflation gone berserk I will eat my hat, all because of the silly Silver Purchase Acts. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Who makes the profit when the Government issues the money?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said the Government issues the silver and who makes the profit when the Government puts out the money?

Mr. CELLER. The Treasury has no right to such profit. Some of the silver—a very little—is used in the war effort, and those who purchase silver from the Government must pay $1.29 to the Government for that which is mined, sometimes at a cost of only 30 to 35 cents per ounce. Then when the War or Navy Departments buy the goods containing silver for the war, the Government pays the profit back to the contractor plus his

profit on the profit. See what suckers we are for foreigners. This chart gives you an idea of what we do with reference to the purchase of silver. It shows the sources of purchase. Foreigners have gained most. This chart represents—by the smaller black square—the amount of silver the Government purchased from Americans, namely 501,000,000 ounces, newly mined, and this other larger black square represents the silver we purchased from foreigners—2,158,000,000 ounces. We benefited, since the advent of the Silver Purchase Act through March 3, 1943, foreign sellers of silver more than four times as much as we benefited domestic sellers. If that is not playing a sucker game to the entire world outside of America, again I will eat my hat.

Mr. WHITE. And when the gentleman is talking about buying silver, what about paying $35 an ounce for gold to South Africa?

Mr. CELLER. I cannot say that is, offhand, wrong. If it is, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. WHITE. Then the gentleman admits that that is wrong?

Mr. CELLER. Maybe yes, maybe no. But we have $23,000,000,000 worth of gold stored at Fort Knox, which is more than ample to base all the currency, paper money, and circulation media that are issued. We do not need any second foundation by way of silver.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. If you have $23,000,000,000 worth of gold, and have a national debt of $300,000,000,000, what is the ratio between that actual debt and the gold backing?

Mr. CELLER. I am not worried about the credit of America. We are the richest country in the world, and we are the finest people in the world occupying it. If we are not good for the credit then our whole structure will topple over, and that would topple over regardless of gold or silver. Our real credit is based in a great measure upon our worthwhileness, our talents, inventiveness, our industry, our general character, our aptitudes, our personal worth, all combined.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is not objecting to the compromise of the Celler amendment to the extent that the money may be used to carry on what has happened up to 1943? The gentleman is not objecting to that?

Mr. CELLER. I say to the gentleman that I am not objecting to that amendment to my amendment, but I want to point out in general to the membership of the House the seriousness of the situation. I want to indicate that I am not an obstructionist. I shall not object to the amendment to my amendment. I do not want to hold up the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill, but I want to impress upon the membership of the House the need for having hearings at least on the bills which I have offered to cure the silver malady from which we suffer. Unhappily, my bills, H. R. 822 and H. R. 823, are gathering the dust of centuries in the Ways and Means Committee. Help me on that score. Get me some action in the Ways and Means Committee. I am helping the Treasury Department and your Committee on Appropriations by not insisting upon my amendment in toto. Now you give me some help with reference to the Ways and Means Committee. Get action on my bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the introduction of the Ludlow amendment will be the means of releasing an amount of silver which otherwise might be put into commercial and war purposes.

Mr. CELLER. As to that there is an interesting story. The silver bloc in the other Chamber says that they are not going to pass favorably on the so-called Green bill unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] withdraws his amendment. In the first place, I would not have the power to withdraw my amendment. The House has acted upon it. I do not believe it is to the credit of the other Chamber to try to bludgeon us, to coerce us, force us. It should not say, We will not give you the Green bill unless CELLER withdraws his amendment. Such a threat must fall upon deaf ears. I do hope the members of the committee of conference on this side of the Capitol will make known to the silver bloc in the other Chamber, in no uncertain terms, that we are not going to stand any longer for that type of shenanigans. Let us see what is happening with reference to silver in the war effort. No silver can be used practically except for what is called nonconsumptive uses. You cannot use the silver, you cannot melt the silver, you cannot change the character or the texture of it, you cannot use it as an alloy, you cannot use it as the War Production Board says it ought to be used, as a substitute for chrome, steel, and tin and other precious metals. They will not let us touch the silver—it is a sacred cow.

I herewith submit a letter from the War Production Board addressed to me under date of October 5, 1942, showing the uses to which silver can be put in the war effort. Storing silver and locking it up is like locking up and storing ammunition, tanks, and airplanes in a warehouse.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am pleased to acknowledge your letter of the 29th instant in which you inquire as to the use of silver in war industry as a substitute for tin, copper, and antimony and other strategic metals. I trust the following will serve to orient you somewhat in respect to your inquiry.

1. SILVER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR TIN

Silver is now replacing tin in solder. It is estimated that some 50 long tons of silver will be used in silver-lead solders in the year 1942, that 200 long tons will be used in 1943, and that possibly 275 long tons will be used in the years following 1943. An all-out substitution of silver for tin in all solders would, it is estimated, involve some 875 tons annually. Present indications are, however, that this all-out substitution would be unnecessary.

Silver is also used in engine bearings and saves tin in cases where tin is used in the bearing alloy. In the year 1941 steel-backed bearings faced with silver used in air cooled radial aircraft engines consumed some 108 tons of silver, while estimates for the year 1942 indicate that some 500 tons of silver would be so used.

2. SILVER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR COPPER

The principal substitution of silver for copper is for bus bars. This is a nonconsumptive use and there has been authorized under lend-lease agreement with the Treasury Department use of upward of 40,000 tons of silver for bus bars in magnesium and aluminum plants, as well as some 6,000 additional tons for similar use under control of military authorities. The element of time is a factor in determining just how soon all of this silver will find its way into the channels indicated.

In the electrical field silver and silver alloys also replace copper and other metals for such uses as circuit interruption devices, commutator segments, contact switches, wiring in fractional horsepower motors, etc. These and similar uses consumed 157 tons of silver in 1941. Eventually, should the war continue, it is estimated that as much as 700 tons may be so used annually.

Silver, in a sense, replaces copper in brazing alloys. Copper-zinc alloys containing silver are now needed in which the silver content varies from 5 to 80 percent. Statistical data as to the extent of this use is not as yet available, although it is known to be of considerable magnitude.

3. SILVER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR NICKEL

Perhaps the most important substitute to date is in the recently authorized 5-cent coins which will require some 30,000,000 ounces of silver. Other substitutions involve linings and plated surfaces, such as silver-plated steel, where corrosive resistant properties are essential.

4. SILVER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ANTIMONY

Antimony is currently in ample supply. However, in cases of shortage, silver could be substituted for it in storage battery plates.

5. SILVER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ALUMINUM

Silver could be used in lieu of sheet or foil aluminum because of its malleability, corrosive resistance, and high reflectivity.

A questionnaire has recently been sent out by the Miscellaneous Minerals Branch of the War Production Board to various industries concerned with the use of silver. Replies to these are just now being received. When the information submitted has been correlated we will be in a position to evaluate current trends with much greater accuracy than is now possible.

Sincerely yours,

C. K. LEITH,
Technical Consultant.

P. S.—The information contained in this letter was furnished me by Mr. J. S. Macgregor of the Miscellaneous Minerals Branch.

C. K. L.

Mr. Speaker, the Government does not permit the hoarding of war metals like tin or steel. Yet the Government is the worst offender when it comes to silver. I want to put silver in uniform and make silver fight. It is a slacker metal, and it ought to be put on the battlefield.

Only about 700,000 ounces of silver are used as bus bars in the war effort. A bus bar is used to conduct electricity. These silver bus bars replace copper bus bars and to that extent properly release cop-

per. But what of the other vast silver reserves buried by law up at West Point? This buried silver amounts to 2,135,000,000 ounces. Thus the silver bloc says, "The war can wait." While industry clamors for metals, "monetary" silver, now an industrial precious metal, is buried.

Secretary Morgenthau said he would like to see all silver-purchase laws repealed. Senator CARTER GLASS favors immediate repeal. Under the present statute the Treasury must continue to buy silver, both foreign and domestic, until our silver reserve equals 25 percent of our total monetary metal—gold and silver. Considering the fact that we have $23,000,000,000 worth of gold stored at Fort Knox, it will take years and years before the Treasury can purchase silver to enable that silver to equal 25 percent of our total monetary metal.

There is plenty of silver in the Treasury for American arts and industry, for the war effort, and for the setting up of an appropriate basis for the issuance of silver certificates and the so-called silver cart wheels.

I roughly suggest the following remedies: The free or unpledged silver—1,350,300,000 ounces—should be used for the war and industrial purposes under control of the War Production Board. Secondly, all pledged silver or bullion, namely, 1,167,000,500 ounces, less 63,000,000 ounces used in standard silver dollars now in circulation might well be used or lend-leased as so-called bus bars to replace copper bus bars.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when this conference report was before the House on May 6 last, I was delighted to have the chairman move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which, at that time, meant throwing the Celler amendment out of the bill. In my judgment it should be thrown out of the bill. However, the motion then to recede and concur was defeated. Now we have before us today a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. I do not like the motion today, for it virtually incorporates the Celler amendment as originally proposed. Therefore, I shall vote "no" on this motion today.

We are dealing here with more than one important matter involving silver. Not only is the question of the maximum use of silver in our war effort involved, but our attitude toward silver in our monetary system is also involved. Twice already this session, as on February 5 and May 6, this year, have I tried to express myself with regard to silver, and prior to this session I have expressed myself many times in other sessions on some phase of the silver question. Accordingly I will use only a little time today.

I have done my best to show the close relationship between the mining of silver and many other baser metals, such as copper, lead, and zinc. That physical relationship brings about a close price relationship, all of which has been brought out in debate here in the House. Anything which slows up or stops the production of silver also slows up and stops the production of those strategic and critical minerals associated with silver in Mother Earth. Silver is itself a critical and necessary war mineral, as well as being a precious metal. It has indeed more than one function to perform. It is performing more than one function in our total war effort, both in our financial system and for war purposes, both in a consumptive and nonconsumptive way.

What powerful influence has spread abroad all this misinformation about silver during the past months? Magazine articles of very wide distribution had declared that silver was selfishly being held out of war usefulness at the very time when, to my personal knowledge, some of the best friends of silver in Congress had made due arrangements with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and other high Government officials for using thousands of tons of free silver directly serving the war purpose in a nonconsumptive way. These same Members stood ready to make adequate provision for silver's consumptive use as needed in the prosecution of the war. To my mind there is a sinister motive back of this campaign of misinformation, and it has been carried on in the face of facts, which facts have not had the publicity given them as has had this misinformation.

There seems to be a determined effort in Congress and outside to strip silver of its dignity and place in our monetary system by relegating it to a very minor place in subsidiary coin. Of course, those individuals or institutions profiting by taking over the sovereign function of furnishing this Nation with money do not want our Nation to use the people's money. There is one school of economists and one class of businessmen who contend that the only kind of money which America should have is a kind which is based on an interest-bearing debt, so that those who furnish it may be the recipients of the toll charged the public for the issuance of such money. This is a class of people who act on the theory that a national debt is a national blessing in that it keeps the American people busy paying interest. Perhaps it was one of this school who said, "Fleas are good for a dog because they take his mind off his worries."

Yes; this motion to recede and concur has the sanction of the Treasury Department, and it would save the Department from some embarrassment which would be occasioned by the original Celler amendment, but this amendment offered us today is just as unfriendly to silver and strikes a blow at silver in the same way that the original amendment did. Although it is offered in the name of patriotic effort to put silver into the war, such a move is unnecessary in that respect and the amendment would be exceedingly harmful in other respects. Therefore, I trust that the motion will be voted down.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, if the Celler amendment prevails, it will simply be a triumph of misleading and false propaganda over the real facts in connection with the Government silver-purchase program. Only a few moments ago the Sergeant at Arms in cashing a check in payment for my services here presented me with a one-dollar silver certificate; here it is, a piece of money that is perfectly good in all parts of the United States and the rest of the world because we are paying our troops in Africa with the so-called gold-seal silver certificates.

This certificate reads:

> This certifies that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States of America one dollar in silver payable to the bearer on demand.

That is the only redeemable money you can get your hands on today.

The gentleman from New York certainly does not know his silver facts or he would not have made such a foolish statement as he has presented to the House. There is now outstanding silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars, according to the Treasury statement for June 9, $1,920,549,506—money that is circulating interest free; money that is circulating at a profit to the people of this country; money that did not cost the taxpayers one cent. These are the facts—facts that should be known to every Member of this House.

I am told by the Secretary of the Treasury, in answer to a question in the hearings, that the silver behind this one-dollar silver certificate only cost the Government 50 cents. The Government is making a clean profit of 50 cents on every one of these $2,000,000,000 of silver certificates and silver dollars that have been put out.

The gentleman from New York says that the silver is rotting and useless. Where did he get his facts? Silver is held as security for paper money in circulation, just as it has been from the time this Government was established—just as gold has—for the redemption of our paper currency. Two billion dollars of that silver is held for redemption and backing for the currency of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. On this matter of credit the gentleman from New York said he had faith in the credit of the United States, but is it not true that as long as we have got this silver in the vaults we have hard money behind these paper bills which we are putting out?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from New York says that silver is rotting. If he had read the footnote on the bottom of the Treasury statement he would have found that there are 699,000,000, over half a billion, ounces of silver now held by the Defense Plant Corporation that is being supplied to Government war industries as fast as it is needed. I think the gentleman knew that.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield briefly.

Mr. CELLER. That is only used as bus bars. It cannot be melted.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman says it cannot be melted. How do you make a silver ingot into a bus bar without melting it?

Mr. CELLER. In other words, you have to restore to the Treasury in the same form, size, shape, and quantity at which it was loaned to the various defense plant corporations.

Mr. WHITE. I hold in my hand a silver dollar, an old, worn silver dollar, minted in 1879. What has that old, worn silver dollar saved the American people? Let me tell you. I have this from the Federal Reserve bank itself. I asked them on the telephone what would be the interest on a bank note that was issued in 1879. The letter is dated February 1, 1942, from which I read: "The present value of a dollar computed at 6 percent from 1879 would be $39.29"—$39.29 that old, humble, worn silver dollar has saved the American people, in circulating from hand to hand, in transacting business without interest. If that had been a Federal Reserve note, loaned by the Federal Reserve bank, and borrowed out again when the loan was paid—and that is the only way these notes can flow in circulation—it would have cost its user more than its weight in gold. Get that fact when you go to vote on this proposition.

Mr. COMPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. COMPTON. Can you tell us how much interest has been lost on the silver that is now at West Point and has not been used?

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman it is used. Every silver certificate is backed by a silver dollar stored at West Point. If any financial disturbance shakes this country your money is good.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. You say the money is backed by the silver at West Point, but currency of any kind is worth only what you can get for it. If that silver were to be sold, how much would it be worth—35 cents an ounce?

Mr. WHITE. If the restraints were taken off of silver it would go to its monetary value of $1.29 per ounce. With all the restraint the British Government is putting on silver to keep it from rising, it is worth 91 cents per ounce in India. They come here and ask us for $3,000,000,000 of silver to be coined by them into money. We would be a bunch of chumps—talk about suckers! We would be suckers if we gave them that silver on a lend-lease proposition. Let England go into the market and buy her silver just as we do.

Let me read this act that the gentleman complains of:

> Each United States coinage mint shall receive for coinage into standard silver dollars any silver which such mint, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, is satisfied has been mined subsequently to July 1, 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Now, listen to what the real words of this law are that the gentleman is complaining of, the law they are trying to strike down.

> The Director of such mint, with the consent of the owner, shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 45 percent as seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received, that is 55 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars and the same, or any equal number of other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver.

Now who gets the subsidy? The miner or the Government? You do not have a subsidy in that case. Forty-five percent of the product of the miner who goes into the ground and performs the labor and bears all the expense—the fellow who mines the silver gets 55 percent, and Uncle Sam then takes 45 percent and mints silver dollars that flow into the channels of trade to carry on the business of this country.

But opposed to this we have a proposal of usury, a scheme under which every dollar in circulation must be drawn from a bank, whether it is for the purchase of goods or commodities, someone must pay interest on it; you cannot escape paying your share of this interest, whether it is in spending money for meals or goods, because you have to pay the merchants' cost of doing business, and it is added into the price you are paying for the article you buy.

That is a beautiful scheme, but it is a scheme that we are going to come up against some of these days when inflation or repudiation hits us, when the old silver dollar will look as big as a cart wheel to the people of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. To make the record clear I want to state that the Treasury Department gave me a statement of its unpledged silver for certificates, showing 1,160,000,000 ounces as the free silver, unpledged, at West Point, and 1,350,000,000 ounces for the silver not in use.

Mr. WHITE. The statement is an error, because here is the Treasury statement showing that 699,000,000 ounces plus of the silver is in uniform, so to speak, in use by the Defense Plant Corporation to help fight this war—silver that did not cost the taxpayers a penny. That is shown in the daily statement of the United States Treasury.

And in the way of seigniorage of silver used for money the Government has made $819,700,000 of profit. That is shown by the table in monthly bulletins of the Treasury issued by the Treasury Department if anyone will take the time to sit down in his office and read it. This bulletin for May that comes to us directly from the Treasury Department shows that the Government has made $819,700,000 in the way of profit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The silver which the Treasury has on hand in these vaults which the gentleman from New York refers to, that is not covered by outstanding silver notes, could be covered by silver notes if they thought it were necessary?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is right. But the point I am referring to is the fact that the Treasury has made $819,700,000 in profit in the way of seigniorage.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What I want to know is, Do they have the power to issue the notes if they wanted to do so?

Mr. WHITE. I could read the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act to the gentleman showing that the Secretary has the power, but because of some gentleman's agreement with the banks the Department will not do that; it prefers to permit the banks to collect interest for the use of money.

Much of this silver is now being used in the defense of this country by the Defense Plant Corporation. There is nothing to equal the benefits we have received from the silver-purchase program in the history of any country. The operation of the Silver Purchase Act provides the peoples of the United States with $200,000,000 interest-free money and the silver which the Treasury does not use as money, but which is going into use in fighting this war, at no cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What I want to get clear is this: The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said this silver was idle. I understand that such of it as was idle could be covered at any time by silver certificates just as the quantity which has been covered was done?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from North Carolina is entirely correct.

Mr. Speaker, usury is woven into every line of this Celler amendment to strike down silver and the use of silver as money.

The payment of interest by the people who use money is the issue behind this organized fight by the Republicans supported by a few Democrats to do away with interest-free money and cut off the profit the American people are making in using silver from their own mines for money.

What a pitiful spectacle the grand old Republican Party presents today in fighting for this usury thing, in contrast to the Republicans of Lincoln's day when our Nation was facing another great war emergency and Lincoln struck down the usury schemes of his times and financed the winning of the Civil War with interest-free Government money.

What will the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the Republican keyman of the Appropriations Conference Committee, do by putting through the silver amendment?

He will break down a program that has put over $2,000,000,000 of interest-free silver money to circulating in the channels of trade and business in this country and at the same time he will strike down a monetary program that has made a profit to our Government of over $819,000,000 in the form of silver seigniorage, profits that are represented by 1,350,000,000 ounces of silver that is a godsend to our war industries in this time of need for strategic metals, metal that is rolling from the Treasury to the defense plants in a constant stream as fast as these plants can use it. Silver metal that has been acquired with no cost to our taxpayers.

Surely the Republicans must know these facts. A Treasury statement comes to each Member of Congress daily and the silver seigniorage tables are printed every month in the Treasury Bulletin. Our Government needs money now, as never before. The American people need to have their interest load lightened now, as never before. How will this Republican organization that has waged this 15-week-long fight to strike down the use of interest-free money and the only monetary plan on which the Government is making a profit—how will the Republican membership of this Congress justify the fight they are making on interest-free money in this hour of our Nation's need to the people who have given them the sacred trust of representation in this Congress?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, however important to the maintenance of peace in the world as the monetary role of silver may be, the immediate importance of silver in winning the war is its direct effect upon the production of the base and other metals.

The average easterner seems to visualize a mine as consisting of shelves containing separate supplies of copper, silver, lead, gold, zinc, or what have you.

The price of silver contained in the complex ores containing copper, lead, and zinc is what in most cases makes possible or impossible the production of the other badly needed metals—the difference between loss and bare profit. For instance, the great mines in the Tintic, Utah, district could not produce lead and zinc if the domestic price of silver were lowered.

Current prices paid for silver, copper, lead, and zinc are far below World War No. 1 prices, underground mining costs are more than 60 percent higher than during the last conflict.

Domestically produced silver during World War No. 1 was $1 per ounce as against 71.11 cents now.

Silver production in the United States will be 48,000,000 ounces short of requirements for the current year, according to Richard J. Lund, Director of the Miscellaneous Division of the War Production Board.

The United States produces 25 percent of the world's production of silver; Canada 9 percent; Mexico 30 percent; total, United States, Canada, and Mexico, 64 percent; total, North America, 66 percent; total, Western Hemisphere, 77 percent; total, British Empire, including Canada, 18 percent; total, British Empire, excluding Canada, 9 percent.

Very obviously, an enhancement in the price of silver will especially benefit the United States and its immediate neighbors as well as other countries in the Western Hemisphere with whom it hopes to have a large and growing trade. The United States interest in gold as a metal is far less than its interest in silver. With the British Empire, the opposite is the case.

The function of price making of silver for the world for a century or two has been discharged by what is known as the London Fixing Board, a group comprising four brokers licensed under Crown grant in London as representatives of the silver-using nations and the great silver buyers and sellers over the world.

How unfair this price-fixing method is when you consider that the British Empire, including Canada, produces only 18 percent of the world's silver.

Mr. Speaker, after this war is over the United States is expecting a great development in China. The Chinese and the inhabitants of India have always been silver-using nations. Long centuries of experience—in China recently repeated—have taught their people the uncertainties of paper money. More than ever will they demand hard money—gold and silver, and especially silver, which best suits the purpose of the great majority of their people. If the United States wishes for the development of those nations and many others in Asia and Africa it should use its utmost efforts to restore silver to a monetary status.

During World War No. 1, Lloyd George said that the war would be won with silver bullets. The utility of the white metal is, and must be, recognized by our own Government. It may be idle to speculate on future demands. We do know, however, that immediate demands exist for more silver than can be produced.

It is claimed that the purchase by the Government of domestic silver constitutes an outrageous expense on the Government and an outrageous subsidy to the silver producers. Every time the Government buys such silver it pays the producer $71.11 per 100 ounces in silver certificates, practically at the cost of running the printing presses, and minting the bullion, if and when called on to redeem the paper. In other words, 55 ounces out of each 100 ounces are coined into silver dollars, and the remainder, or 45 ounces, are held by the Government as a free gift from the miner.

I do not think anyone who will read section 4 of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act will contend that the Government is out 1 penny in buying domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce, or will deny that the Government profits by the transaction to the extent of 45 percent of the silver purchased.

As the silver in a silver dollar is figured at $1.29 an ounce, the Government makes a profit of 45 cents on every dollar it coins, or 58 cents on each ounce of silver that goes into the coinage of a silver dollar.

The Wall Street Journal of May 20 reports that the war boosted 1942 usage of silver for all purposes in the United States to 193,933,000 ounces, that this is a gain of more than 43 percent over that consumed in 1941, and more than three times that consumed in 1940, and that about 50 percent of that consumed in 1942 was for direct and indirect military purposes. This does not include the silver leased for use as bus bars, and so forth.

I have some of these silver dollars here; so have other Members. On every one of these dollars that the Government mints it makes 45 cents. The purchase of silver does not cost the Government or the people of this country one cent; it is not a subsidy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I rise for the purpose of asking the Members to vote down this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York prohibits the use of any funds in this appropriation for the purchase by the Treasury of domestic as well as foreign silver during the fiscal year 1944?

Mr. LUDLOW. It prohibits the use of any funds to carry into effect either one of the Silver Purchase Acts. These acts are definitive and explain themselves. I do not know whether the amendments specifically prohibit all purchase of silver, but the effect of the motion is to prohibit the use of any funds to carry these acts into effect.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will yield, I may state that it is very definitely stated in the Celler amendment and this amendment to the Celler amendment that there will be no money used for the purchase of silver by the Government from any category after June 30, 1943.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the amendment which the gentleman from Indiana offers provides that no part of the money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts—namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman from Ohio had been listening he would have heard me read the provisions of the act of 1939 right today on the floor.

I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to have somebody else answer this question.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is the question?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wish to be sure about what this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] really does, whether it prohibits the purchase of domestic silver as well as the purchase of foreign silver or the use of this money for the purchase of silver in any of these categories?

Mr. LUDLOW. It is not my amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio; it is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York who probably can explain it better than I; but my understanding is that it prohibits the purchase of all silver.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It prohibits the purchase of all silver according to the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am pursuing this inquiry merely because I want to be certain. So the only change made by the gentleman's amendment to the Celler-Wolcott amendment is that it removes the restriction that would not allow the use of these funds for administering the silver already on hand; is that correct?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the motion I offered embraced in toto the Celler amendment in the exact language of the Celler amendment and adds to it language prepared by the Treasury Department to prevent embarrassment in its administrative operations. The effect of the language of the Treasury Department is that the Celler amendment shall not have a restrictive effect on operations that have already taken place.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That satisfies my interest in the matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment protects the idea that the House had in mind when it adopted the original amendment that is under consideration now and permits the Treasury to do those things that it otherwise might do with the silver that is already in the Treasury. It permits no purchase of silver by the Treasury. The amendment, in my opinion, is satisfactory.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I think we have talked enough about this.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has not led the fight against silver and silver legislation consistently all the way through?

Mr. TABER. I do not know that I have led the fight. I would not want to hand myself all the bouquets in the world. That would look kind of presumptuous on my part. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further and yield the floor.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE), there were—ayes 66, noes 19.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum is not present before the gentleman's point of order.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 58, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—259

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Martin, Mass.
Allen, La.	Gathings	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Gearhart	Miller, Conn.
	Gilchrist	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Miller, Pa.
Andresen, August H.	Gorski	Mills
	Gossett	Monkiewicz
Angell	Graham	Monroney
Arends	Grant, Ala.	Morrison, La.
Arnold	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Auchincloss	Gregory	Mruk
Bates, Mass.	Griffiths	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Bender,	Gwynne	Newsome
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Norrell
Bennett, Mo.	Hale	Norton
Bishop	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.
Blackney		O'Hara
Bland	Halleck	O'Konski
Bloom	Hancock	O'Neal
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Patton
Boren	Harris, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.
Boykin	Harris, Va.	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	Philbin
Brehm	Hartley	Pittenger
Brooks	Hays	Ploeser
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Poulson
Bryson	Hess	Powers
Buffett	Hinshaw	Pracht
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Priest
Burch, Va.	Hoch	Rabaut
Burchill, N. Y.	Hoeven	Ramey
Burgin	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Busbey	Hope	Randolph
Camp	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Jeffrey	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Carlson, Kans.	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Carter	Jensen	Rivers
Celler	Johnson, Anton J.	Robertson
Church		Rodgers, Pa.
Clark	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rogers, Mass.
Clason		Rohrbough
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Rowe
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Luther A.	Sasscer
Compton		Satterfield
Cooley	Johnson, Ward	Sauthoff
Cooper	Jones	Scanlon
Cravens	Jonkman	Schiffler
Creal	Judd	Schuetz
Crosser	Kean	Sheppard
Cullen	Kee	Sikes
Cunningham	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
D'Alesandro	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Davis	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Kinzer	Smith, Va.
Day	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	Kleberg	Snyder
Dewey	Klein	Sparkman
Dickstein	Kunkel	Spence
Dilweg	LaFollette	Springer
Dingell	Lambertson	Stanley
Dirksen	Landis	Stefan
Disney	Lane	Stevenson
Ditter	Lanham	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Larcade	Sundstrom
Doughton	Lesinski	Taber
Drewry	Lewis, Ohio	Talbot
Durham	Ludlow	Talle
Eaton	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	McCord	Thomas, Tex.
Ellison, Md.	McCormack	Tibbott
Engel	McGregor	Towe
Feighan	McKenzie	Troutman
Fellows	McLean	Vincent, Ky.
Fenton	McMillan	Vorys, Ohio
Fish	McMurray	Walter
Fisher	Maas	Waid
Fitzpatrick	Madden	Wasielewski
Flannagan	Mahon	Weiss
Fogarty	Maloney	Wene
Fulbright	Manasco	West
Fulmer	Martin, Iowa	Wheat
Whittington	Wolcott	Wright
Wigglesworth	Wolfenden, Pa.	Zimmerman
Willey	Wolverton, N. J.	
Wilson	Worley	

NAYS—58

Abernethy	Hull	Rankin
Anderson, N. Mex.	Izac	Richards
	Jackson	Rockwell
Barrett	Johnson, J Leroy	Rogers, Calif.
Beckworth		Rolph
Burdick	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Case	Kerr	Sadowski
Coffee	Lea	Steagall
Colmer	Lemke	Stewart
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stockman
Elliott	Mansfield, Mont.	Sullivan
Fernandez		Tarver
Folger	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Ford	Marcantonio	Vursell
Granger	Morrison, N. C.	Welch
Hare	Murdock	White
Harless, Ariz.	Norman	Whitten
Hill	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Holifield	O'Connor	Winstead
Holmes, Wash.	Outland	
Horan	Patman	

NOT VOTING—114

Andrews	Gavin	Nichols
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Leary
Barden	Gifford	O'Toole
Barry	Gillie	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Gordon	Phillips
Bonner	Gore	Plumley
Bradley, Mich.	Green	Price
Buckley	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rizley
Butler		Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Heffernan	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Russell
Capozzoli	Hendricks	Sabath
Carson, Ohio	Hoffman	Schwabe
Chapman	Jarman	Scott
Chenoweth	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shafer
Chiperfield		Sheridan
Cochran	Kearney	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Slaughter
Costello	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Cox	King	Starnes, Ala.
Crawford	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Culkin	LeCompte	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	LeFevre	Taylor
Dies	Luce	Tolan
Domengeaux	McCowen	Treadway
Douglas	McGehee	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McGranery	Vinson, Ga.
Ellsworth	McWilliams	Voorhis, Calif.
Elmer	Mason	Wadsworth
Elston, Ohio	May	Weaver
Fay	Merritt	Weichel, Ohio
Forand	Merrow	Whelchel, Ga.
Furlong	Miller, Mo.	Winter
Gallagher	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Gamble	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.
Gavagan	Myers	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. May with Mr. Short.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. McWilliams.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Miller of Missouri.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Schwabe.

Mr. Green with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. King with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr Elmer.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Carson of Ohio.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. La Fevre.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Le Compte.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Weaver with Van Zandt.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Culkin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: On page 34, line 7, after "accounts," insert the following: "Including the employment a temporary expert by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the postal service."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "including the employment of not to exceed three temporary experts by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedure of the Postal Service."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this amendment I may say that it has the endorsement of all of the members of the committee of conference. The amendatory language simply gives the Postmaster General the authority to employ three temporary experts of his choosing instead of one temporary expert, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the civil-service and classification laws. As I understand, this has the approval of all the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the gentleman's amendment refers to amendment No. 17?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. On what page does that appear?

Mr. LUDLOW. On page 34 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: On page 52, line 11, strike out the following:

"SEC. 204. No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of government."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 204. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to conduct jointly a study of the use of the mails free of postage by the departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government, and shall report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the passage of this act such actions as may be considered in the best interests of the Government toward reduction in the volume and cost of handling such penalty mail."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to a division of the question and insist on my preferential motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from New York is entitled to have the question divided if he so desires.

Mr. LUDLOW. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I have always understood that a motion to recede and concur by the Member in charge of the bill is a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. It is a preferential motion, but it may be divided.

Mr. LUDLOW. If I insist that it is a preferential motion, what is the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The ruling of the Chair is that it is a preferential motion, but it is divisible. If any Member desires a division of the question, he has a right under the rules of the House to demand it.

Mr. O'NEAL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEAL. May I inquire if a Member is entitled, merely on his own request, to have a division of the question even on a preferential motion, which includes two parts?

The SPEAKER. He is.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am a little uncertain about the parliamentary status. If we agree to recede, then the motion would come on concurring?

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement?

Mr. LUDLOW. Speaking for a majority of our subcommittee, we have no objection to receding.

The SPEAKER. Then the question is on the motion to recede.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LUDLOW. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the status? I move to concur.

The SPEAKER. That motion is pending now. The gentleman from Indiana moved to recede and concur. The gentleman from New York demanded a division of the question, and the Chair put the question to recede, which was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman from Indiana retains the floor.

Mr. LUDLOW. Then this is just for information?

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; this is a preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves to concur with an amendment as follows: Insert in lieu of the Senate amendment No. 26 the following:

"SEC. 204. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to conduct jointly a study of the use of the mails free of postage by the departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government, and shall report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the passage of this act such actions as may be considered in the best interests of the Government toward reduction in the volume and cost of handling such penalty mails: *Provided further*, That after January 1, 1944, no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, and delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph under discussion. It goes beyond the matters considered in the paragraph.

Mr. LUDLOW. I supplement that with the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, also that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. But the Senate amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, or the matter would not be here. The only difference that the Chair can see is that there is a further proviso—a difference in the date.

Mr. O'NEAL. Which is beyond the scope of the paragraph and, therefore, is not germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to the language in the House bill that no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government. The Chair thinks the language is practically identical except that it has been limited to 6 months instead of a year.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have not had an opportunity to read the amendment, but as I understood it, it provides that after January 1, 1944, no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting or handling, transporting or delivering free the mail of any officer of any department or administrative agency of the Government. The Senate amendment has only to do with a study of penalty mail, unless the Senate amendment includes the matter stricken

from the House bill. The Keefe amendment deals with the use of the money after January 1, 1944, and this seems to go beyond the scope of paragraph 204, the amendment of the Senate, in that among other matters there is a wide degree of prohibition as to all agencies of the Government. That is beyond what is contained in the Senate amendment, unless the Senate amendment includes the previously stricken matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that this appropriation runs until June 30, 1944.

Mr. O'NEAL. Only for those things in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The limitation of January 1, 1944, it appears to the Chair, is just 6 months shorter time than the original provision if applied, and the only difference between the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment 204 and the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is simply the date. Otherwise the Chair would think that the language is identical.

Mr. O'NEAL. My understanding is that the language went into a great many other duties than the studies outlined in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has great respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Kentucky upon this and all other matters, but he cannot agree with the point that the gentleman makes. The only difference that the Chair can see between the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and what was in the House bill and is now in the bill as it comes from the Senate is fixing the dates January 1, 1944, and June 30, 1944. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption that there is now 1 hour's time for discussion of this subject and that the time is under the control of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Indiana made the original motion.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. To clarify the parliamentary situation, on which motion will the vote come first? I made a motion to recede and concur. The gentleman from Wisconsin made a motion which the Chair held preferential.

The SPEAKER. The vote would come first on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin. If that is voted down, then the vote would come on the remainder of the motion made by the gentleman from Indiana that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable time consumed in the discussion of the matter. Is that taken out of the time?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is the much-controverted issue over penalty mail. The issue, in essence, is not changed any, as I conceive it, by the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin. His preferential motion simply defers until January 1, 1944, the time when all appropriation provisions for penalty mail shall be cut off, unless meantime some substitute shall have been adopted. I think it is a bad proposal. There is no positive assurance that a satisfactory solution of this most difficult question can be worked out before January 1, 1944. If it is not worked out before that time, under the gentleman's proposal the departments of Government, including the Army and the Navy, will all find themselves up against the gun on that day. There will be no provision, as I understand it, although I did not have the privilege of reading the text of the gentleman's amendment, for the carrying on of penalty mail after January 1, 1944, unless some substitute has been agreed upon in the meantime. I do not believe that alleviates the situation very much as far as the Army and the Navy and all of the other activities having to do with the conduct of the war are concerned. They will not know and no one can possibly know until January 1, 1944, what sort of a situation we will be in on that date. I do not think it is wise, candidly, to fix a time limit beyond which no money can be used for the carrying on of penalty mail when we do not have the faintest conception as to whether or not a solution can be had before that time.

Now let us review briefly the history of this proposal for the abolishment of penalty mail. The House adopted an amendment which appears on page 54 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which provides, "no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of Government."

That was a flat inhibition against the use of any of the money carried in this bill for the purpose of transporting mail under the penalty provision.

The Senate struck out that amendment and adopted the following:

SEC. 204. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to conduct jointly a study of the use of the mails free of postage by the departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government, and shall report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the passage of this act, such actions as may be considered in the best interests of the Government toward a reduction of the volume and cost of handling such penalty mail.

I am authorized by the Postmaster General to tell the House that he will make every effort to devise a substitute plan for handling departmental mail within 30 days instead of 60 days, if this language is adopted. The Postmaster General opposes the abolishment at this time of the penalty provision and promises to cooperate immediately with the Director of the Budget in making every effort to work out a plan which may be a satisfactory substitute for the penalty provisions.

The main objection to the abolishment of penalty mail without something having been done to fill that gap comes from the Navy Department, the War Department, the War Production Board, and other war agencies. I have before me communications from those departments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the letters I have received from the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Under Secretary of War with reference to penalty mail.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: A report has been received that action is being proposed in Congress to change the existing law concerning the penalty-mail privilege of executive departments of the Government.

A review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated February 3, 1943, column 2, page 543, refers to remarks of Congressman KEEFE, of Wisconsin, who proposes to offer an amendment to appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, of the Treasury and Post Office Departments, limiting and restricting the penalty-mail privilege of the executive departments of the Government.

Due to the short notice which the Navy Department has had regarding this proposed amendment, it has been impossible to efficiently review the past records and letters on this subject. It is desired, however, to offer immediate objections of the Navy Department to the proposed amendment.

To place in effect such a far-reaching change as that proposed would seriously handicap the present organization of the Navy Department and definitely impede the war effort. It is believed that the solution to the abuse of the penalty-mail privilege lies in correct internal administration of various executive departments rather than a change in the law.

Among the many objections against changing the existing law are the following:

(a) Considerable additional space would be required by the Navy Department, and space at present is at a premium.

(b) No financial gain to the Government would result, and the same effect as far as the Post Office Department funds are concerned could be obtained by transferring funds from the various executive departments to the Post Office Department account.

(c) A considerable increase in civil-service and Navy personnel would be required to care for the additional handling of stamping, weighing, and stamps themselves.

(d) There is a serious shortage of post-office equipment. At present we are unable to properly equip our outlying stations. To increase the demands on an already overburdened system of supplies would cause a break-down in our outlying postal supply system. As these supplies are made out of critical war materials, it is doubtful if they could be obtained.

(e) The physical handling of mail would be considerably slowed down by the necessity for weighing and stamping every letter. Mail delays at present are the source of many complaints from Members of Congress, Government agencies, and private citizens. This would be further aggravated by the lack of availability of automatic stamping machines and accounting instruments.

(f) The expense of additional personnel and equipment required to comply with the proposed change would be in excess of the benefit to be derived therefrom.

In view of the above objectionable features, as well as past records in this matter, it is considered that a change in the existing penalty-mail privilege would be highly undesirable, particularly at the present time.

The Navy Department has not, for lack of time, been advised as to the relationship of this report to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

MEMORANDUM RE PROHIBITION OF PENALTY MAIL

[From Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War)

Amendment No. 26 to H. R. 1648, with respect to which the conferees are in disagreement, is a Senate amendment to section 204, providing for a study by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General of the use of the mails, free of postage, by agencies in the executive branch of the Government. This amendment was substituted for section 204, as passed by the House, which prohibited the use of any funds appropriated by the bill for handling penalty mail.

Prohibition of penalty mail will result in no net revenue to the Government. The Post Office Department will receive additional revenue from Government mail, but that revenue will come from departmental appropriations. More Government dollars will change hands, but the dollars will all be Government dollars.

As a matter of fact, prohibition of penalty mail will result in substantial additional net expense to the Government, growing out of increases of personnel required to prepare postage-paid mail for mailing. This expense would be in addition to the cost of scales, permit machines, and the like even if these items were obtainable.

The prohibition of penalty mail, further, is not a cure for any excess volume of Government mail. If it is desired to reduce the volume of departmental mail, this can best be accomplished by administrative action within the departments or by specific legislation further limiting the character of penalty mail. At the present time, under Public, No. 65, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, mail matter, not relating to official Government business, may, with certain exceptions, be forwarded free of postage only if a request in advance has been made therefor by outside third parties. Public, No. 65, subject to the exceptions therein enumerated, thus effectively limits penalty mail to strictly official business and to mail matter specifically requested by the public. If it is believed that free mail matter, which is not strictly official, should be further restricted, this can be accomplished by narrowing the present exceptions provided for in Public, No. 65. Reduction of the volume of penalty mail should be accomplished directly and not indirectly by requiring postage to be paid by the departments on strictly official mail. The indirect approach will not assure any reduction in the volume of Government mail and will accomplish no economies, but will merely increase administrative operating costs.

War Department mail must, in wartime, be forwarded to destination at the earliest practicable moment. This means that the mail must get to post offices as quickly as possible after it has been written. Under the proposed prohibition of penalty mail, each individual piece of mail would be required to be weighed and stamped. A great deal of additional space would be needed for mailing departments. All postage would have to be properly accounted for. A large volume of War Department mail arrives at various departmental mailing rooms around 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and it has been estimated that there would be from 2 to 4 hours' delay involved in the weighing and stamping thereof, even with an adequate number of employees. Additional delays would ensue because of necessity to collect postage at destination with respect to such part of the mail as is not adequately stamped.

The volume of mail dispatched by the War Department is huge, and necessarily so with establishments all over the United States and in many different parts of the world. The War Department Post Office in Washington, during the month of March 1943 sent over 4,500,000 pieces of mail to the Washington Post Office. This included only mail from the Pentagon Building, Munitions Building, Temporary Building M and two other small Washington War Department offices.

The Washington headquarters of the Army Air Forces dispatches around 435,000 pieces of mail monthly, and, in addition, 81,000 pieces of secret or confidential bulletins, orders, training information and the like, and about 60 tons of similar material which is not confidential.

From Washington alone the Office of Chief of Transportation sends out approximately 110,000 pieces of mail per month, the Signal Corps 125,000, the Surgeon General 300,000, and the Office of the Chief of Engineers 125,000.

The Quartermaster General's Department sends out 211,000 pieces of mail monthly from Washington, 277,000 from Philadelphia, and 59,000 from Chicago. It has 20 depots in addition to those in Philadelphia and Chicago, as well as various remount headquarters, ports of embarkation, training schools, and other field installations.

The Finance Department sends out about 1,250,000 pieces of mail per month from 6 offices.

The Adjutant General's Office dispatches over 3,000,000 allotment checks per month, exclusive of the other mail dispatched by that office.

The Ordnance Department sends out close to 900,000 pieces of mail per month from its various offices.

There are over 1,500 War Department establishments, posts, camps, stations, and offices which use the penalty privilege, exclusive of those outside continental United States.

The above figures cover only the War Department. To this volume must be added the mail of the other departments and agencies.

If postage is required to be paid on War Department mail, it would be impossible at this time to manually stamp each piece without the addition of a very large number of employees. For example, the Ordnance Department estimates that manual stamping would require 10,000 man-hours per year, or an expenditure for employees alone of $15,000, at $1.50 per man-hour; these figures are based upon cost figures furnished by a professional stamping company. The Corps of Engineers estimates that it would require from 150 to 200 additional employees if mail was required to be manually stamped. All stamps would have to be distributed and accounted for.

If the War Department is required to pay postage, then, in order that it may transact its business with dispatch, mail would have to be handled in permit or stamping machines. Even if machines were used, the Finance Department, with 6 offices, estimates that it would require 29 additional employees, costing $52,700 per year, and expenditures of $4,200 for mailing machines, and $770 for scales. In many instances, if machines were used, envelope sizes would have to be changed. Further, the Post Office Department would grant permits to use machines only to the larger War Department establishments (those having sufficient mail volume to qualify for permits) and hence the smaller establishments would be compelled to manually stamp mail.

Machines, however, are not available except to the extent of inventories on hand. Representatives of the War Production Board advise that inventories are now practically exhausted. Under the War Production Board's steel order issued in May 1942, production of mailing machines, stamp affixing machines, envelope mailing machines, and other forms of envelope handling machines was stopped. This stop-production order was continued in effect under War Production Board Order L-54-c, as amended, and is still effective. The manufacture of these machines has always been a specialty production and there has never been any great volume, due to the fact that only very large non-Federal Government purchasers use the machines. The Chief of the Office Machinery Section of the War Production Board expresses doubt whether, if orders were placed for the machines, which would be required if the penalty mail privilege is taken away, any appreciable number of machines could be produced for many months to come. He estimates that it would take from 1½ to 2 years, and possibly longer, before the manufacturers of this type of machinery could reorganize and reconvert and turn out sufficient machines to handle Government mail. Even if the machines could be produced, a great volume of critical materials and machine tool capacity would be required in their manufacture, as well as the use of many skilled laborers who could be much better utilized in the war effort. Even if available, the machines could only be acquired at a large expense.

Congress has, in effect, recognized the impracticability of requiring War Department mail to be stamped. By the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, the War and Navy Departments were relieved from the duty even of submitting to the Postmaster General quarterly reports relating to mail matter transmitted free of postage. This was done in order to avoid putting upon the two departments the great burden which would result from compiling reports at a time when we were preparing for war. It is clear that the burden which would be placed upon the War Department, if it were required to stamp mail now that we are actually at war, would be many, many times that involved in merely reporting volume of mail.

The prohibition against penalty mail would bring no compensating advantages. The net revenue to the Government would be nil, as the War Department would only pay to the Post Office Department money which it, in turn, received from the Treasury Department by way of appropriations. The Annual Report of the Postmaster General, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, showed (p. 69) that it cost the Post Office Department $16,002,591.39 to handle all penalty mail for all departments and agencies (exclusive of congressional franked mail) and that total Post Office expenses for that fiscal year were $734,720,847.06. Thus penalty mail cost the Post Office slightly over 2 percent of its total expenses. In his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, the Postmaster General does not show the cost of delivering penalty mail, so that the 1941 report is the last report which may be relied upon. The Post Office Department could, of course, show a profit on penalty mail if it were stamped, but no profit (in fact a loss) would result to the Government and a very great hardship would be put upon the departments.

MARCH 30, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BURCH: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of H. R. 2001, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill requiring departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government to pay postage on official mail matter, and for other purposes.

The act approved May 6, 1939 (53 Stat. 683), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 989), required that the head of each executive department submit to the Postmaster General quarterly reports relating to mail matter which had been transmitted free of postage. The above requirements were suspended insofar as the War and Navy Departments were concerned by section 301 of the act approved September 9, 1940. It was necessary to request the suspension of the requirements cited above because it was found impractical to comply with the requirements that all mail be weighed. The volume of mail at the time the suspension was authorized, September 9, 1940, was relatively small in comparison with the volume of mail dispatched by the War Department today.

To place in effect such a change as that proposed would seriously handicap the present organization of the War Department and seriously interfere with the war effort. The change would involve: 1. A diversion of manpower, greatly in excess of that required for the submission of the suspended quarterly reports, to care for the additional handling, stamping, weighing, and accounting for mail matter all over the world. 2. The procurement of a great number of stamping and accounting machines which, if available at all, would require the use of critical materials. 3. The requirement of considerable additional space. 4. The slowing up of the dispatch of important mail. For example, at the present time between 1,750,000 and 2,000,000 allotment checks are mailed each month by the Office of Dependency Benefits to soldiers' dependents. It is expected that this number will materially increase as the strength of the Army and the movement of troops overseas are stepped up. If actual postage were substituted for penalty postage, it would be necessary to add personnel and to revamp the present procedures established for processing these checks to soldiers' dependents. This is just one of the many functions of the Department which would be adversely affected. Many more examples could be cited.

The distribution of forms, orders, circulars, bulletins, etc., by the War Department is a matter which relates exclusively to the business of the Government and so far as this Department is concerned, it is not the practice of any of the elements of the Army to use the penalty mail privilege for matters other than those relating exclusively to official business.

The object of the proposed measure appears to be intended as a curb on the volume of mail and it is believed that any curb that might be necessary could better be accomplished by the internal administration of the various executive departments rather than by a change in the law. It is the firm conviction of this Department that the expense of additional personnel and equipment which would be required to comply with the proposed change would greatly offset any benefit or economy that would be derived therefrom.

For the reasons stated in the foregoing, the War Department strongly recommends that this bill be not favorably considered.

However, in the event that this proposed legislation should be enacted, it is urgently recommended that the Congress exempt the War and Navy Departments therefrom, at least for the duration of the war.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the bill, H. R. 2001, should not be considered in accord, at the present time, with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter sent by the Secretary of War to the Chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], in which the Secretary of War calls attention to the possibility that the abolition of penalty mail might prove a very serious handicap in the payment of allotment checks, and we all know what the wives and mothers of our veterans would think of that. There are already many complaints—all of us receive scores of them—from mothers and wives who do not get their allotment checks on time. Shall we subject them to further inexcusable delays?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The Post Office and Post Roads Committee has this matter under consideration now. A bill was introduced some time ago, some 2 or 3 months ago. We are asking the different departments, bureaus, and commissions in Washington and elsewhere using penalty mail, to give us letters just as you have letters from them, giving their reaction to this bill.

I do not see how it is possible for the departments to function under an amendment of the kind under consideration now. There are many things, without going into detail, that must be done before they can function, even if something is done by which they can justify their expenditures.

At this point I want to say I think something should be done by which they justify their expenditures for postage, and the Post Office and Post Roads Committee intends to take up the Senate amendment and give the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget 60 days in which to investigate this matter and make a report to the committee. It is the intention of the committee to take this matter up at once, and as speedily as possible try to bring something definite before the House that will be workable and that will do something with reference to the expenditure of these large amounts.

Mr. LUDLOW. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his very excellent contribution to this discussion. He has told you that his committee has already sent inquiries to all of the Government agencies to get their views on this question. He and his committee are seeking the right solution of this matter which should be approached in accordance with our regular established procedure—that is to say, through the committee that legislates on post-office matters, and not through the appropriations committee.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. May I add that there are over 60 departments, commissions, and bureaus that have to be dealt with, some of them having special laws under which they operate, special penalty laws, and they could not possibly handle their mail otherwise.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman from Virginia calls attention to the fact that there are over 60 departments and bureaus now making use of penalty mail. It is a very intricate and very important problem, and for his committee he has sent communications to the various agencies to get their views on the subject.

Now is not the best thing to do, to adopt this amendment for a study of the proposal and meanwhile give the chairman and the legislative committee on postal affairs an opportunity to work out a sane and sensible solution of this matter? I personally think that penalty mail should be drastically curtailed, and I will gladly cooperate with Mr. Burch's committee in securing the enactment of a sound and well-considered law on the subject.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman from Indiana intend to yield any of this time to the minority?

Mr. LUDLOW. I certainly do.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the gentleman will have consumed 35 minutes of the hour when he gets through with the 10 minutes additional he has just yielded himself. I wonder how much time he will yield to us.

Mr. LUDLOW. I believe I have consumed 20 minutes so far. I felt I would probably use less time of the House by yielding myself this additional 10 minutes now to present a full explanation than to have to yield to questions later.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself but 5 additional minutes instead of the 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The procurement of a great number of stamping and accounting machines, if available at all, would require the use of critical materials. Then here is something from Secretary Stimson's letter that I want to call especially to the attention of the Members:

> The slowing up of the dispatch of important mail: For example, at the present time between 1,750,000 and 2,000,000 allotment checks are mailed each month by the Office of Dependency Benefits to soldiers' dependents. It is expected this number will materially increase as the strength of the Army and the movement of troops overseas is stepped up. If actual postage is substituted for penalty postage it would be necessary to add personnel and to revamp the present procedure to establish further processing of these checks for soldiers' dependents. This is just one of many functions of the Department that would be adversely affected. Many more examples could be cited.

The conversion from penalty mail to some other system is an important operation and it cannot be done quite so speedily as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] told the House on the last occasion when this matter was be-

fore the House. I yield to no one in my admiration of the gentleman from New York; he is one of the most useful Members in this Chamber, diligent always in the performance of his duties, zealous to see that the Public Treasury is protected, but when it comes to the delicate and intricate operations of the Postal Establishment I feel free to say without any disparagement to my friend from New York or to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that I would rather trust the experts of the Postal Department to work out this problem. They have said they will try to do it in 30 days if you will give them an opportunity. I hope the House will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin and vote up the motion I propose to offer when given the opportunity, a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the attention of the Members of the House, because this is an important matter. The House on two separate occasions has passed upon this question by a record vote and I direct your attention to the fact that the bill now under consideration, containing the amendment which I offered restricting the use of penalty mail, passed in the House on the 9th day of February 1943; it was passed in the Senate on March 25, 1943. The Post Office Department and the Post Office Committee and every agency of the Government has had notice since the 9th day of February of the action of the House writing this provision into this bill. They have done absolutely nothing up to date to meet an issue which even the Post Office Department admits is a menace to the agency.

The Senate in order to soft pedal the situation wrote in an amendment in which they asked that the Bureau of the Budget and the Post Office Department be given 60 days' time in which to make a study of this problem and to report back to the Congress, the idea being that in this 60-day period of time the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget could work out a program to deal with this admittedly bad proposition and report suitable progress on legislation to the Congress. As I have indicated, that amendment passed in the Senate last March, and I ask the gentleman from Indiana, who is so solicitous for the Post Office Department and for this amendment of the Senate: What have they done? When we appeared in conference on this matter it was stated to the conferees that all they needed was 30 days, if we would give the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget 30 days they would be ready to report back to the Congress. Is not that correct? I ask the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think probably the Postmaster General has been waiting to see what solution Congress was going to make of the matter. They have not been given the "go" sign yet.

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps they have not been given the "go" sign, but they certainly knew the attitude of the House as reflected by the two separate votes on this question, roll call votes; and they knew that the proposition was up in the Senate because the Postmaster General submitted that amendment to the Senate himself and they have done nothing. I have offered a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The amendment which I have offered to the Senate amendment simply reinstates the original amendment which the House had passed upon on two separate occasions, but we provide in that amendment that it shall not be effective until January 1, 1944.

I am willing to give them not 30 days, not 60 days, but 6 months to study this proposition. They say they can bring a report back in 30 days; the Senate amendment said 60 days; I say: "We will give you until January 1, 1944 to make your study and report back to the Congress your proposals to deal with this admittedly rotten situation in the matter of penalty mail." Assume this bill passes with the pending amendment included. The Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget will then have 60 days in which to study the problem and report their findings and suggestions to the Congress. We will be in session in September, October, November, and December, and the Congress can speedily deal with any suggestion made. Let me tell the Members of the Congress what will happen if you do not adopt this amendment. There just will not be anything done, that is all, not a thing. All there will be in this bill will be the proposal that the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget make a study and report back to the Congress in 60 days. They have not done anything since the 9th of last February and there is not a thing in this bill that indicates that they will do anything if you pass it with the Senate amendment included. However, if you serve notice on the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget that the Congress insist that they act and act promptly or else this amendment will become effective on January 1, 1944, that is going to be a powerful club over their heads that will guarantee some action.

This matter has been discussed at great length on the floor. Not a Member has dared to come in the well of this House and justify the abuse of the use of penalty mail that we all know exists. The only thing that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has had to say was to contend that if this amendment becomes effective on January 1, 1944, it is going to interfere with the Army and Navy and some of the departments of the Government because, he says, they will have to buy stamping machines and they will have to hire a lot of people to lick stamps and put them on the letters, count them, and weigh them. I never heard such a ridiculous argument in my life, and I do not care whether the argument comes from the gentleman from Indiana or from the Under Secretary of War. One would think that these people had never heard of a postal permit. Every penalty mail envelope that these people send out has printed on it in the upper right hand corner "Penalty for Private Use $300." You have seen that. I ask the gentleman from Indiana why the Post Office Department cannot enter into an agreement with every agency of the Government giving to them a postal permit whereby they can print the postal permit number on all of their mail just as well as that penalty provision? There would not have to be a single stamp licked, there would not have to be a single stamp affixed to that type of mail.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman knows that if the penalty provision is done away and you put it on a postage basis, every individual piece of mail will have to be weighed or else we would not have any account of it.

Mr. KEEFE. There is no question about that.

Mr. LUDLOW. Many letters would be a shade over the first ounce or half-ounce. You would have to have a monumental force to do that.

Mr. KEEFE. No; you would not have to have a monumental force to do that any more than you would have to have a monumental force in your office to weigh the mail that goes out of your office. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that one of the things that this Congress ought to do is to insist that these departments pay some attention to the weight of the mail they are sending out. You will not have so much of this mail burdening the Postal Service as you have at the present time if we do that.

All I ask you to do is just postpone the effectiveness of this amendment that the House has passed twice, not 30 days as the conference committee thought was always necessary, not 60 days as the Senate amendment provides, but until January 1, 1944. Let Mr. BURCH's committee make a report. We will be in session. Let the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget come down here with a report telling us how they intend to handle this proposition. If you are sincere, and if these committees intend to do anything with the proposition, you ought to accept this amendment without question. All that the amendment will do will simply insure activity on the part of the Post Office Department to deal with this problem.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am sure the gentleman has the greatest confidence in our colleague from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, as all have. Is it not well to let this matter go over, permit the committee, which has done all the

spade work, to continue its investigation, report a bill and we pass it?

Mr. KEEFE. I am perfectly willing to let Mr. BURCH's committee handle it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, or 10 minutes if he so desires.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked me a question and I would like to answer it. I am perfectly willing that the committee of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] have ample opportunity to deal with this problem. I may say, however, they have had since February, when this amendment was adopted, and the only thing I have heard is that the distinguished chairman of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee has sent out letters to 60 departments of the Government asking for their opinion and suggestion since last February. I am willing to give the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Post Office Department, and the Bureau of the Budget until next January 1. You get busy between now and January 1 and bring us a program. You have a time limit set upon you and it is to insure that something will be done. Unless you do put a time limit upon it I say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that I prophesy there will not be a single thing done and the whole matter will be forgotten and we will have to do this again on the next appropriation bill. It seems to me that in view of the twice expressed attitude of the House on this question dealing with a problem which is conceded even by the Postmaster General himself to be an atrocious situation, $72,000,000 worth of postage lost to the Post Office Department through the use of penalty mail, a ridiculous use of the mail, if you please, that the gentleman should accept my amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. It is true that if postage had been paid at the usual rate the amount would be $72,000,000, but, as a matter of fact, the cost of handling that mail has been $20,000,000 a year instead of $72,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the gentleman on that at all, even though the figures of the Post Office seem to so indicate. The Post Office Department claims that it has allocated to the handling of penalty mail a cost of $20,000,000, and that is all you can get out of the Postmaster General's statement. I do not know whether it is true or not, and I do not think he knows whether it is true or not. The fact is he has no idea of the cost and he has come here to the Congress and asked for the employment of three cost experts, a matter that we just passed on, in order that he might know something about his costs—I say his arbitrary allocation of $20,000,000 as the cost of handling penalty mail is just a pure and simple guess on his part.

Mr. LUDLOW. I have the citation before me.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very familiar with that.

Mr. LUDLOW. On page 101 of the Senate hearings he said that the postage would bring in a revenue of $70,000,000 but, he says: "However, the actual cost to us is only $20,000,000 for handling that mail."

Mr. KEEFE. I understand he made that statement, but I reiterate in reply to the gentleman what I have just said. The gentleman has given no substantial reason or argument why this amendment should not be adopted. He has made a speech against the prohibition of the use of penalty mail. I want the departments of government to have a right to use penalty mail. No one has ever argued that we should deny them that right, but I do not want them to have the unrestricted right to use the mail by the trainload and carload in sending out propaganda and literature throughout this country and the Congress of the United States have nothing to say about the amount of that mail that shall go out to the four corners of this country and the four corners of the world, if you please.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman believe there is some substance to the argument of the Navy Department and the War Department that the war effort would be very much impeded and disrupted and that allotment checks would be held up out of order and delayed?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not believe there is a bit of substance in it, and I will tell the gentleman why. I think it is just a lot of bunk that has been shot into this proposition to try to oppose this amendment. The amount of mail that is sent by air mail by the War Department, and the Navy Department, and the other departments of Government, is reaching terrific proportions. Every department of the Government that uses air mail must come to the Committee on Appropriations and get an appropriation to purchase air-mail stamps. They are doing it today. They must have people to count those letters, and lick those stamps, and put them on the air-mail letters. I have not heard the gentleman say anything about that. No one has ever contended that that has caused any very serious inconvenience to the war effort, yet they are compelled to do that with every piece of air mail that is carried by the Post Office Department today.

I repeat, there is not a man in this Chamber that has not used a permit, perhaps, during a campaign, and sent out thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature on a permit. I did not have to have a single clerk in my office licking any stamps. You would not even have to weigh the great bulk of the mail. The man who puts the letter in the envelope knows that it is carried under the permit for the regular 3-cent rate of postage. There will have to be a few people, perhaps, to weigh some mail. The little, puny expense to which the gentleman refers as being mentioned in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of War would prove to be infinitesimal as compared with the savings to the Post Office that would be effected if these people were compelled to pay regular rates of postage on their mail.

Do you suppose the Congress of the United States will deny to the Navy Department or the War Department the amount of postage necessary to carry the mail, or deny that to any other department of the Government? When the O. P. A. sends out two or three carloads of stuff going through the penalty mail, I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States be in a position to make some inquiry as to the necessity for sending out that type of mail.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Post Office is losing on the average $80,000,000 a year on second- and third-class mail which is used to propagandize other institutions in this country, and this is a deprivation of the people of this country, yet the Post Office has paid no attention to the protest I made, and I cannot get anywhere.

Mr. KEEFE. I will tell the gentleman right now that he is not going to get anywhere with this proposition unless this amendment is carried as a club over the head of the Post Office Department, so we can say to these gentlemen "You have until January 1, 1944, to do something about this. Mr. Walker, you claim that you can sit down with the Bureau of the Budget—and you have told this to the Senate committee—and work out a program that will solve this problem. You say you can do it in 30 days. That is what you told the conferees. You told the Senate committee you could do it in 60 days. That is the amendment in this bill. We are giving you until January 1, 1944, to do it, but we insist that if you do not do it something is going to happen."

That is all my amendment does. It seems to me, in view of the strongly expressed attitude of the House on this subject, that the amendment ought to have been accepted by the committee itself. I do not believe the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, who is present this afternoon, can find any serious objection to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House will reiterate its twice-expressed position on this subject by adopting the pending amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the evil the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] seeks to correct is one that was first called to our attention by the Postmaster General himself. It is not something that has been gone into for the purpose of playing politics; it is something that was brought up by the Postmaster General himself. He recognizes the terrific evil there is in spending $78,000,000 for penalty mail when it absolutely is not necessary, and when most of the material they send out

ought not to be sent out in anything like the volume in which it is being sent out. This amendment seeks to correct that situation.

This will be the procedure. Each one of these agencies will come before the Congress with an estimate asking for the money to pay their postage. This will give us a control over the amount they will use for this purpose. They will then get a permit, and they can go ahead and operate without the slightest trouble or the slightest difficulty. The weighing of mail will take place only on the heavier packages. The putting on of stamps will be required only in the few instances where the package takes above the 3-cent rate.

A permit can be printed upon all of the envelopes covering the 3-cent rate, and there will be absolutely no great amount of work. It will not interfere in the slightest degree with any of the operations of the Army or the Navy. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, the cost will be only a very few thousands; it will not amount to much of anything.

The idea of coming in here with a lot of letters from these people, showing that they are utterly confused and have not grasped the situation and do not understand it, is perfectly ridiculous. Let us adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, cut out the $78,000,000 expense, and put the people in these departments under control. This is one time when there is absolutely no excuse for not going along with this amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this subject. I shall endeavor to clarify it so that the House can vote intelligently on the matter. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] offers an amendment which states, in part:

> You shall go ahead and make a study of the problem.

And so forth. His amendment concurs in the Senate amendment which directs that a study shall be made of the entire subject, and then he adds the further statement that irrespective of what the study might disclose, whether it approves or disapproves, whether it be correct or incorrect, at the same time they shall do what he says—abolish penalty mail as of January 1, 1944. It is just like the lawyer who said, "Go ahead, gentlemen, and argue your case, but you will find the decision of the judge under the pad on his desk."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, just let me proceed for a while, and I shall be glad to have the gentleman make another speech when I have concluded. The amendment is simply that they shall do what the gentleman says, irrespective of what the study accomplishes, as prescribed by the Senate amendment. Certainly that is hardly a rational, hardly a reasonable, proposition, to tell them what they shall do before they even have completed the study.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I decline to yield to the gentleman. I shall be glad to do so later. The gentleman has had a long time on his side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. What the gentleman proposes, which is urged so vehemently here, has been tried. The Government used to do that and the Government found that it is better, more efficient to do it by penalty mail, rather than by stamp. It was tried over many years and changed in order to do what we are doing now. The gentleman discussed the question of economy. He failed to show one bit of economy in the proposition, and in my honest opinion it will cost more to do it the way the gentleman says, than the way it is done at the present time. The Post Office Department handles the mail at a cost of $23,000,000. The Government departments would have to buy stamps amounting to $72,000,000. The Post Office Department would receive a revenue of $72,000,000, but the bureaus would have to get appropriations for the $72,000,000 worth of stamps. Where is the economy? Perhaps to the Post Office Department, but the bureaus would have to buy the stamps, and I fail to see the logic of the gentleman from Wisconsin in stating that it is an economy simply because the bureaus must buy the stamps, and the revenue must go to the Post Office Department, rather than to do it the way it is done now. Today the War Department, the Navy Department, the Collector of Internal Revenue send out vast quantities of mail, and think what a force it would take to stamp or label each piece of it. It is impractical to try to do that job by hand and by putting a stamp on every letter or even an imprint. Think of the volume of a billion and a half pieces of mail every year! The Internal Revenue Bureau sends out 50,000,000 blanks. We do not know what a job we are putting on the public officials in having this thing done. We do know that careful consideration should be given to this matter. We know it is of sufficient importance from a practical standpoint to say, "Let us have a real study made of it." We have a Post Office Committee. Give those gentlemen time enough to go into this matter and see what is right and what is wrong. There may be some merit in what the gentleman says, but certainly our Post Office Committee would make a fair, impartial study, and bring to us a recommendation and do it in a legislative way, rather than simply because someone gets up and by an impassioned speech on the floor suddenly springs an idea as though it were new, when it has been tried and found in the past to have failed. Certainly it would be enough at this time to follow some of the leaders who are disturbed by this proposal. Secretary of War Stimson, carrying a right important load, doing a big job, sincerely interested in doing his job as effectively as possible, said in his letter of March 30 to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], as follows:

> To place in effect such a change as that proposed would seriously handicap the present organization of the War Department and seriously interfere with the war effort.

That is a long letter, and he urges us not to do it. The War Department does not want to have it done that way.

On the question of economy Mr. Patterson said:

> As a matter of fact, prohibition of penalty mail will result in substantial additional net expense to the Government, growing out of increase of personnel required to prepare postage-paid mail for mailing. This expense would be in addition to the cost of scales, permit machines, and the like even if those items were obtainable.

Mail is of different weight and of different character and these gentlemen of the War and the Navy Departments and of the War Production Board and most of the 60 agencies affected, many of them doing war work, would find themselves seriously delayed in their war effort. To continue further with what Mr. Patterson says:

> The volume of mail dispatched by the War Department is huge, and necessarily so with establishments all over the United States and in many different parts of the world. The War Department post office in Washington, during the month of March 1943 sent over 4,500,000 pieces of mail to the Washington post office. This included only mail from the Pentagon Building, Munitions Building, Temporary Building M and two other small Washington War Department offices.

I would like to read much more of this if I had the time; I will read a paragraph of Secretary Forrestal's letter:

> To place in effect such a far-reaching change as proposed would seriously handicap the present organization of the Navy Department, and definitely impede the war effort. It is believed that the solution to the abuse of the penalty-mail privilege lies in correct internal administration of various executive departments rather than a change in the law.

The Appropriations Committee can ask every department how much mail they send and give them an amount of money sufficient to take care of any of that part of the mail we think should be sent out. We can thereby exercise some control of the volume.

This is a hit-and-miss effort to make people reduce their mail, a desirable goal, no doubt. Let me say I get very little mail from the departments of the type that we had a year ago. You will find that your mail coming from the departments is at the minimum. The Army says it does not want this. The Navy does not want it. The War Production Board does not want it. None of them want it. Why should we in an appropriation bill direct that this should be done, irrespective of how much harm it may do? Would it not be more intelligent to defeat the amendment, let a study be made as to what we are going to do or what we are not going to do and let the legislative committee hold hearings and let everyone be heard so that the War Department, the Navy Department, and every other department will not be crippled? It is not wise. It is a poor way to do business. I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were ayes 101 and noes 60.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 159, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—179

Allen, Ill.	Griffiths	Mruk
Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Gwynne	O'Hara
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	O'Konski
Andrews	Hale	Phillips
Angell	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Arends	Halleck	Ploeser
Arnold	Hancock	Plumley
Auchincloss	Harness, Ind.	Poulson
Baldwin, Md.	Hart	Powers
Barrett	Hartley	Pracht
Bates, Mass.	Heidinger	Ramey
Beall	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Bishop	Hoeven	Robsion, Ky.
Blackney	Holmes, Mass.	Rockwell
Bolton	Holmes, Wash.	Rodgers, Pa.
Brehm	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rohrbough
Buffett	Howell	Rolph
Burdick	Hull	Rowe
Busbey	Jeffrey	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jenkins	Schiffler
Carlson, Kans.	Jennings	Schwabe
Carter	Jensen	Shafer
Case	Johnson Anton J.	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calvin D.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Johnson, J. Leroy	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Johnson, Luther A.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Smith, Wis.
Compton	Jones	Springer
Cunningham	Jonkman	Stanley
Curley	Judd	Stefan
Curtis	Kean	Stevenson
Day	Keefe	Stewart
Dewey	Kerr	Stockman
Dirksen	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Ditter	Kunkel	Sundstrom
Dondero	LaFollette	Taber
Dworshak	Lambertson	Talbot
Eaton	Landis	Talle
Elliott	Lemke	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Lewis, Ohio	Troutman
Ellison, Md.	McCowen	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	McGregor	Vursell
Elmer	McLean	Wadsworth
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Welch
Engel	Martin, Iowa	Wheat
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Merrow	Willey
Fish	Michener	Wilson
Gale	Miller, Conn.	Winter
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Gilchrist	Miller, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillette	Morrison, La.	Wolverton, N. J.
Graham	Mott	Woodruff, Mich.
Grant, Ind.		

NAYS—159

Abernethy	Boren	Burchill, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Bradley, Pa.	Burgin
Anderson, N. Mex.	Brooks	Camp
Beckworth	Brown, Ga.	Cannon, Mo.
Bland	Bryson	Celler
Bloom	Bulwinkle	Clark
	Burch, Va.	Coffee
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Priest
Cooley	Kee	Rabaut
Cooper	Kennedy	Ramspeck
Cox	Kilday	Randolph
Cravens	Kirwan	Rankin
Creal	Kleberg	Richards
Crosser	Klein	Rivers
Cullen	Lane	Robertson
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Rogers, Calif.
Davis	Larcade	Rowan
Dawson	Lea	Sadowski
Delaney	Lesinski	Sasscer
Dickstein	Ludlow	Satterfield
Dilweg	Lynch	Scanlon
Dingell	McCord	Schuetz
Disney	McCormack	Sheppard
Doughton	McGranery	Sikes
Drewry	McKenzie	Smith, Va.
Durham	McMillan	Snyder
Feighan	McMurray	Sparkman
Fernandez	Madden	Spence
Fisher	Magnuson	Starnes, Ala.
Fitzpatrick	Mahon	Steagall
Flannagan	Maloney	Sullivan
Fogarty	Manasco	Sumners, Tex.
Folger	Mansfield, Mont.	Tarver
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomas, Tex.
Fulbright	Marcantonio	Thomason
Fulmer	Mills	Vincent, Ky.
Gathings	Monroney	Walter
Gorski	Morrison, N. C.	Ward
Gossett	Murdock	Wasielewski
Granger	Murray, Tenn.	Weiss
Grant, Ala.	Newsome	Wene
Gregory	Norrell	West
Hare	Norton	Whelchel, Ga.
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Ill.	White
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Harris, Va.	O'Connor	Whittington
Hays	O'Neal	Wickersham
Hébert	Outland	Winstead
Hobbs	Patman	Woodrum, Va.
Hoch	Patton	Worley
Holifield	Peterson, Fla.	Wright
Izac	Peterson, Ga.	Zimmerman
Jackson	Philbin	
Johnson, Luther A.	Poage	

NOT VOTING—93

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Miller, Mo.
Barden	Gerlach	Monkiewicz
Barry	Gibson	Mundt
Bates, Ky.	Gifford	Murphy
Bell	Gillie	Myers
Bonner	Goodwin	Nichols
Boykin	Gordon	Norman
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Green	O'Leary
Butler	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Byrne	Heffernan	Pace
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Hoffman	Price
Carson, Ohio	Jarman	Rizley
Chapman	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Chenoweth	Kearney	Russell
Cochran	Kefauver	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Scott
Costello	Keogh	Sheridan
Courtney	Kilburn	Slaughter
Crawford	King	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	Knutson	Somers, N. Y.
Dies	LeCompte	Stearns, N. H.
Domengeaux	LeFevre	Taylor
Douglas	Luce	Tolan
Eberharter	McGehee	Treadway
Fay	McWilliams	Van Zandt
Forand	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Furlong	May	Voorhis, Calif.
Gallagher	Merritt	Weaver
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Welchel, Ohio
Gavagan		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Monkiewicz for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Carson of Ohio for, with Mr. Gavagan against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. Welchel of Ohio for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. McWilliams for, with Mr. McGehee against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Costello against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Pace against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Smith of West Virginia against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Le Fevre for, with Mr. Russell against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

General pairs:

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. May with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Norman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the independent offices appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file their report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2935), making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Labor Department, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 259) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript containing an analysis of the Revenue Act of 1943, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED containing an analysis of the Revenue Act of 1943 entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill," be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935), making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for the remainder of the day and we will try to arrive at some conclusion as to the length of time for general debate.

Mr. ENGEL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have about 5 hours all told.

Mr. HARE. I am asking the gentleman if we will not be able to decide on a definite time for general debate?

Mr. ENGEL. Let us continue general debate for today and see how far we get. Then we can decide tomorrow. It will require an hour tomorrow to adopt the rule.

Mr. HARE. I think the House would like to have some definite understanding as to how long general debate will continue.

Mr. ENGEL. Then I ask for 5 hours' general debate, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would the gentleman be willing to hold a night session?

Mr. ENGEL. No; I would not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have three appropriation bills which must be completed by Saturday night.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I think you could get through with the three appropriation bills much quicker if you start in the morning at 11 o'clock and run until 6 o'clock, than if you try to have night sessions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If we take 3 hours' debate tonight and meet at 11 in the morning we can begin reading the bill at 1 o'clock, and that would still give 5 hours of general debate.

Mr. ENGEL. You would not get the 5 hours that way. The rule has to be taken up tomorrow. If somebody makes a point of order that there is no quorum present, that will take another half an hour. I think we should have general debate this afternoon and then decide tomorrow what we will do.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills before the House. It involves the National Labor Relations Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Labor Department, the Social Security—over a billion dollars. Some of the most controversial items that come before the House are in this bill, and I do not think we should crowd the time. We should have 5 hours of debate on this bill, which covers more than a billion dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the hours allowed for debate is not the question. I would be glad to fix 10 hours for debate if the gentleman desires it. The question is one of making sufficient progress to complete these three bills this week. I see no reason why we cannot have a night session. We have not had a night session during the entire session of Congress.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to work until 6 o'clock, but I think the Members of the House, many of them, have other things to attend to; they have their own work to do in their offices.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is willing to remain until 6 o'clock I will agree to 5 hours of general debate and then begin reading the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that while we are anxious to cooperate and to see that the House gets a vacation, we are going to insist that the public business be given due deliberation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as I have said we are perfectly willing to have any amount of debate, but I see no reason why we could not have a night session.

Mr. ENGEL. Most of the Members have their time taken up in the evening in order to get their work done.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina wish to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate continue for 5 hours and then we begin reading the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time to be equally divided?

Mr. HARE. The time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2935, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1944, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee reporting this bill I consider myself fortunate in having on the committee the same personnel who reported a similar bill last year; namely, Judge Tarver, of Georgia; Mr. Thomas, of Texas; Mr. Engel, of Michigan; and Mr. Keefe, of Wisconsin; Mr. Harrington, of Iowa, a former member, having volunteered and entered the armed forces prior to reporting the bill. In addition, we have two new members, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], both of whom have been very active and cooperative on the committee and rendered highly valued services in the preparation of this bill.

I am personally grateful to each and every member for the interest manifested and the cooperation demonstrated in our efforts to properly interpret and analyze the justifications submitted, and I want to emphasize the fact that they have seemingly been conscious of their individual responsibilities and have not shifted them to the chairman of the committee. They have been of great service to me personally and it is a great pleasure to be able to give full and complete credit for the manner and efficiency in their efforts to secure a proper solution of each problem. Too, I desire to express not only my personal estimate, but the recognition of other members of the committee of the very capable, valuable, and efficient services rendered by the clerk of the committee, Mr. George Harvey, because he has been diligent, painstaking, and extremely helpful in analyzing the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Of course, an appropriation bill is not written by the chairman, it generally represents the combined and cooperative judgment of the entire membership of the subcommittee. Although the items contained herein represent the best judgment of a majority of the members there are probably a number of items which do not have the full endorsement of each member but, under a long-established practice, the chairman of the committee reporting the bill is supposed to defend and justify each item even though he may find himself personally in disagreement with some of them. I know there are some items carried in the bill to which I do not fully subscribe, but in view of the prevailing custom I shall not attempt to shirk my responsibility and will endeavor to explain the various items and present the justifications and the conclusions reached to the best of my ability. I feel that if you will read the hearings consisting of upwards of 1,500 pages of printed matter you will be convinced that the committee has endeavored to obtain all the facts and used their best judgment in arriving at a proper determination of all matters before it for consideration.

A reduction in some of the items may seem rather drastic, or it may appear that further economies could have been effected by a reduction in other items, but your committee is convinced that no irreparable loss to the public good will follow the reductions made and that there will be little opportunity for useless expenditures of funds by failure of the committee to make further reduction. We may have made some mistakes in our conclusion and I shall not attempt to justify them further than to say if there are any they can be attributed to our failure to secure full and complete information.

Your committee has been fully conscious of the necessity in this emergency to reduce appropriations in what is often referred to as nondefense activities and it has not been unmindful of the many demands occasioned by the necessity of a defense program, but whatever these latter demands may be they do not relieve the committee of the necessity of making thorough inquiry into all justifications of appropriations for defense purposes. We have acted upon the theory that a dollar wasted or misspent in a defense activity is just as burdensome to the taxpayer as a dollar wasted or misspent on a nondefense activity.

Mr. Chairman, I shall first attempt to give an over-all picture of the contents of the bill and then present more detailed information relating to the various items if time permits.

The bill, as presented this year, includes appropriations for the War Manpower Commission, as well as the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Administration, and a number of smaller independent organizations, whose functions are related to the larger agencies mentioned. The total amount of the Budget estimates is $1,204,031,110, as compared with appropriations for 1943 of $1,200,656,023. The committee has approved $1,086,562,499. This is a reduction of $117,468,611 below the estimates and $114,093,524 below the 1943 appropriation. Each item in the bill has received very careful consideration, and the committee has made every reduction which it felt could be made without impairing an important activity of the Government. Many of the services supported by appropriations in this bill, while normal operating agencies of the Government, are, nevertheless, charged with heavy wartime burdens and they must be implemented with sufficient funds to discharge these responsibilities adequately and timely. Others which have no additional burdens imposed by the war have found their normal operations greatly increased because of increased industrial activity and business generally. The increased tempo of business, even though it be brought about entirely by the war effort, is reflected in the operations of the Government, and such services as the Social Security Board find themselves carrying a much heavier burden than in the pre-war period.

I shall not attempt to cover the bill item by item, but expect merely to discuss the more important phases of it and call attention to the report for detailed information as to the individual items.

The Department of Labor, a very important cog in the wheels of the Government, has numerous wartime programs to administer. The committee has endeavored to supply the Department with all funds necessary to carry on these activities. The question of absenteeism in industry was discussed before the committee by representatives of various agencies and by practically all bureaus of the Department of Labor. Inquiry develops the fact that nearly every agency in Washington which has anything whatever to do with production of war materials and equipment is devoting some attention to the question of solving the problem of absenteeism. The Department of Labor submitted a supplemental estimate in the amount of $1,142,000 to establish a working-conditions service in the Division of Labor Standards for the purpose of attacking the problem of absenteeism. The Secretary of Labor appeared personally before the committee to urge the approval of this item. However, for 2 years the committee has closely questioned the operations of the Division of Labor Standards and has not been greatly impressed with its accomplishments. The Division has been working in the same field and along the same lines that was proposed to expend the new appropriation. The committee had before it only the record of the Division of Labor Standards on which to base its judgment as to whether or not the expenditure of $1,142,000 additional funds would make a showing in reducing absenteeism and came to the conclusion that the expenditure would not accomplish the purpose for which it was sought.

Substantial reductions were made in the appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division, and the details are set forth in the report. The Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, which are administered by this Division, have now been in effect for several years, and the employees covered by the statutes, as well as their employers, have become familiar with their rights and responsibilities. It was necessary in the beginning to provide a staff of inspectors large enough to make periodic inspections of plants and industries covered by the laws, to enforce compliance therewith, and to carry on an additional program to inform employers and employees as to the effects of the statutes. The educational period is over. Persons affected by the statutes are, or should be, familiar with them. The amount of money provided in the bill will furnish all the inspectors required to investigate complaints of violation and to carry on a certain amount of spot-check work to ascertain the degree of compliance which may be expected. There is no reason why this Division should not, within the space of a few years, be able to confine its activities to investigation of complaints.

Last year the Congress voted to liquidate the Civilian Conservation Corps and stipulated that the liquidation should be concluded by June 30, 1943. A splendid record has been made by Mr. McEntee in liquidating the corps, and he deserves a great deal of credit for the efficient and expeditious manner in which this large activity has been disbanded. At the close of March the corps had disposed of property totaling more than $120,000,000, most of which was turned over to other Government agencies. The remainder was of such character as to be of no service in the war effort and was made available to local communities and other interests where it might serve some useful purpose. There are a number of knotty problems remaining to be untangled. Mr. McEntee has left the service, but recommended to the committee that one of his assistants, with a small office force, be retained for 1 additional year to complete the processes of liquidation.

However, it is found that before complete liquidation, provision should be made for the hospitalization and care of about 20 disabled C. C. C. enrollees, and it will be necessary to make provision for payment of accumulated leave to those employees who will not be able to obtain leave prior to June 30, 1943. Therefore the committee has inserted language into the bill that would transfer the care of these enrollees to the Employees' Compensation Commission and has provided for the reappropriation of $20,000 from the unexpended balance to dispose of matters pending at the close of this fiscal year, with the provision that complete liquidation shall be effected on or before June 30, 1944.

The normal activities of the Office of Education are provided for in the usual amount. Two of the defense-training items have been reduced below the 1943 appropriation. For training of factory workers in the vocational schools the committee recommends $90,000,000, which is a reduction of $14,000,000 below the amount available in 1943, and $10,000,000 below the Budget estimate. As peak production is reached, lesser numbers of new workers will be required and there is every reason to believe that the need for additional training will be less acute before the close of 1944. The appropriation for short courses of college grade for chemists, engineers, physicists, and the like, is reduced $5,000,000 below the Budget estimate and below the 1943 appropriation. Most of the new war industries are now in production and it is only reasonable to expect that we will have trained enough technical personnel to staff all of them before the end of the fiscal year. The appropriation of $25,000,000 should make available all training which will be necessary this year. Too little attention has been given, however, to the training of rural workers and the committee has increased the amount for this purpose $1,000,000 above the Budget. The $12,500,000 appropriated is still $2,500,000 below the 1943 appropriation. The language of the appropriating paragraph has also been redrafted to accomplish two purposes. In the first place, it was found desirable to authorize the training of persons in rural areas for all types of work involved in the food-production program, and the authority has been broadened for that purpose. In the second place, the committee felt that the program should be under the complete control of the vocational

education system, and has amended the language to provide this safeguard.

The Public Health Service is provided with total appropriations of $56,173,630, an increase of $258,426 above 1943 appropriations, and a reduction of $47,530 below the estimate. This service, to a large degree, is a wartime agency. It is training nurses, furnishing medical service to the members of the Coast Guard and merchant marine, rendering assistance to areas in which Army camps and defense industries are located in local health and sanitation problems, aiding in the control of venereal disease, policing ports of entry to prevent the entrance of new diseases which might become epidemic, and carrying on a number of other very important activities. The general health of the country is remarkably good, and it is a singular thing that there has been no widespread epidemic since the outbreak of the war. This fact is largely attributable to the efforts of the Public Health Service, and particularly to the personal devotion to duty of Dr. Parran, the Surgeon General, than whom no more conscientious public official has entered our committee room.

The question of control of typhus fever came before the committee and it was noted that the Bureau of the Budget had reduced the item below 1943. The committee was apprehensive lest this reduction might reduce the efficiency of the control of typhus fever, and Dr. Parran was requested to carefully restudy the matter and advise us as to what amount should be appropriated. He had carte blanche; the committee would take no chance for a few dollars on permitting the spread of typhus fever, but Dr. Parran was conscientious enough to inform the committee, after reviewing the matter, that he could further reduce his estimate by $10,000. Mr. Speaker, the Public Health Service is keeping plague and typhus fever under control in this vast country with the sum of $300,000. They go their way without fanfare, doing their job quietly, expeditiously, and effectively, and on a reasonably small amount of money. In these days of appropriations running into monumental figures, it is highly refreshing to find a service in the Government which moves so quietly to do so great a work with such a small fund. After the submission of the Budget estimates to the committee the Congress enacted the Bolton bill—H. R. 2664—to provide a large Federal training program for nurses. The Committee recalled Dr. Parran and discussed this question with him, with view to including a provision in the bill for the purposes of this act. However, the committee has determined to wait until plans have been completed and more accurate estimates can be submitted before making a recommendation to the House.

The appropriations for grants to States for old-age pensions and aid to dependent children, have been reduced a total of $16,000,000 below the Budget estimates, and $17,000,000 below current year appropriations. However, $20,000,000 of the 1943 appropriation will remain unexpended and the best estimates now available indicate that the amount provided in the bill will meet all requirements. In the event there are not enough funds available within the appropriation, it will be necessary to make deficiency appropriations, however, as the law is so written as to make the payment of the Federal portion of these gratuities mandatory when matched by the States.

The appropriation for grants to States for Unemployment Compensation Administration, $30,000,000 is $9,000,000 below 1943 levels and $7,328,000 below the Budget estimate. The committee has been much surprised to learn that in some few localities claims for unemployment compensation are at remarkably high levels. This can only mean that there is a failure to properly utilize available manpower in the war effort. These problems are being met and will undoubtedly reduce the number of compensation claims and make possible the absorption of the reduction proposed.

Community War Services is the new name for the Office of Defense Health and Welfare, which has been in operation for the past 2 years. It is carrying on some very worth-while programs and it is the judgment of the committee that some of its activities are just as worthless as others are worth while. There is no intention of reducing the appropriation below the amount required to carry on necessary activities but rather substantial reductions below the Budget estimate, the details of which are explained in the report, will not interfere with those functions which are useful and which are contributing to the war effort.

The War Manpower Commission was the subject of long and careful consideration. It is a new organization which has not had a great deal of experience and for which it was difficult to estimate requirements. The Commission has a large field organization with 12 regional offices and 125 area offices, and proposed to establish 66 additional area offices in addition to increasing the staff in the regional offices. The confusion as to lines of authority and the responsibility in functions of various offices and officials was never cleared up to the satisfaction of the committee, even after long interrogation and it is probably safe to say that the same confusion exists in the minds of the officials themselves. The committee eliminated money for the additional area offices and provided a sufficient amount for the regional offices to complete staff requirements. Permit me to express the hope that the Commission will make every effort to clear the atmosphere and so organize its business as to expedite the very important functions for which it is responsible. The Manpower Commission is charged with over-all supervision of the agencies which are training workers for defense industry. These training programs are very important, but more than likely the need for them will be greatly reduced before the end of the fiscal year. The committee has inserted a provision which will prohibit the operation of any of these funds for a period longer than 60 days after the cessation of hostilities. The committee expects any agencies administering one of these training programs to close it down just as rapidly as production requirements will permit. Some small amount of training will, of course, have to be carried on as long as the war continues, as there will always have to be replacements made, but we are undoubtedly approaching the peak of employment where it will no longer be necessary to train new people to take new jobs, and it will then be necessary to train only those who are needed to replace persons leaving employment through death or military service, or otherwise.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

I shall briefly discuss some of the items carried in this bill beginning with the Department of Labor and shall follow as nearly as possible the order in which they appear in the committee report.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

It will be observed that the amount carried in the bill, $352,000, is a reduction of $34,000 under the Budget estimate for 1944 and represents a reduction of $34,000 under comparable appropriations of $386,125 for 1943. In view of reductions in other items for the Department of Labor, which will to some extent lessen the necessity for supervisory functions in the Office of the Secretary, this reduction should not interfere with the necessary work to be performed.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The amount carried in the Bureau for the Office of the Solicitor for 1943 was $841,532, the estimate for 1944 by the Bureau of the Budget being $841,000 and the amount recommended in this bill is $715,000, or a decrease of $126,532 as compared with the appropriation for 1943 and $126,000 less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1944. From the table of work-load statistics appearing on page 35 of the hearings a marked decrease in volume of work handled by this Office will be observed. In the fiscal year 1941 there were 1,690 civil cases for injunction instituted; in the fiscal year 1942, 1,193 such cases were instituted and the first 6 months of 1943, 320 cases, or at the rate of 640 per year, were instituted. Other cases of work were naturally reduced and the trend, generally, is downward. The reduction, therefore, should not interfere with the handling of necessary work.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

Travel expenses for the Department have been decreased from $1,256,250 carried in the appropriation for 1943 to $1,092,000 for 1944, a reduction of $164,250 below the appropriation for last year and a decrease of $140,000 for 1944.

PRINTING AND BINDING

The bill provides $263,500 for printing and binding, a reduction of $32,300 below the appropriation for 1943 and a decrease of $20,500 below the Budget estimate for 1944. This reduction is commensurate with reductions in other items of the bill. It should be stated, however, that while the amount allowed for printing in the Children's Bureau is $8,000 less than was proposed in the Budget and $10,400 less than the amount appropriated for 1943, the bill, in absorbing the

reduction, will not reduce the number printed for distribution of the publications entitled "Infant Care" and "Prenatal Care." These are very useful publications and the maximum number should be made available.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

The regular annual item of $1,100,000 is approved in the full amount of the estimate of the original bureau estimate of $862,000 for National Defense activities of this Bureau is also approved in full. A supplemental estimate for national defense activities in the amount of $363,000 is reduced to $300,000. This estimate included $55,000 for a survey of the cost of living in the territories and the feeling of the committee was the survey should not be conducted unless the cost thereof can be absorbed in appropirations for other activities.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU, MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE, NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under the first Deficiency Appropriation Act for 1943 the amount of $1,200,000 was approved for maternity care of wives and infants of men in the armed forces. The Budget Bureau submitted an estimate for 1944 in the amount of $4,800,000 for this purpose. The committee has approved $4,000,000 a decrease in the Budget estimate of $800,000. The estimate was calculated to provide prenatal care of mothers and hospital care at time of birth of children of those men in the armed forces in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades, including other grades in extreme emergencies. There is no means of determining accurately the amount that will be required for this purpose. However, there is no reason to suppose that it will be necessary to provide assistance in all cases and the committee in making the reduction is doing so in the belief that the amount appropriated will provide all necessary care. The language of the appropriation as submitted would restrict such assistance to the wives and infants of enlisted men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, but the evidence submitted to the committee indicates there are certain hardship cases in the first, second, and third pay grades, which are just as appealing as those in the lower grades and has, therefore, stricken from the paragraph the provision which would prevent aid to the first three pay grades. It is a feeling of the committee that in expending the appropriation first consideration should be given to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, but it feels that where circumstances require, the Department should render assistance to wives of men in the first three pay grades.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The amount carried in the bill, $200,000, is a reduction of $53,000 below the Budget estimate and $51,660 below the appropriation for 1943. In view of the fact that this statute has been in force for a period of 4 years and the pioneer work has been completed it is no longer necessary to carry on any additional work in connection with the act and the committee feels that the amount allowed should be sufficient to provide all services necessary to proper enforcement.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

In 1941, the Committee on Appropriations suggested in its report that the Division of Public Contracts, charged with the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Wage and Hour Division, charged with the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, be consolidated under the title, "Wage and Hour Division," the idea being to eliminate overhead expenses as much as possible. The consolidation has been effected and the 1944 estimates were submitted on that basis. The salaries for the Wage and Hour Division are reduced from $4,711,000, the appropriation for 1943, to $3,750,000, or a decrease of $961,600, and eliminated altogether the estimate for $141,000 for national defense in this division.

MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE, REGULAR

There is no change in the appropriation for grants-in-aid to States for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare as compared with 1943, or in the estimates for 1944, the appropriation for maternal and child health being $5,820,000, crippled children $3,870,000, and child welfare $1,510,000. However, the appropriation for salaries and expense in administering the maternal and child welfare program is reduced from $375,795 for 1943 to $350,000 for 1944, a decrease of $25,795.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The total amount appropriated for the Children's Bureau in 1943 was $13,358,765, the estimate for 1944 was $16,955,000, and the amount carried in the bill is $16,074,000, which represents an increase of $2,715,235 over the appropriation for 1943, but a decrease of $881,000 in Budget estimates. It is noted that the increase is confined exclusively to emergency maternal and infant care for wives and children of men in the armed forces.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The appropriation for the enforcement and operation of the Food and Drug Administration of $2,200,000 is $123,580 below the Budget estimate as well as the appropriation for 1943. Inasmuch as the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease Administration all have inspectors inspecting foods, and as they represent a large proportion of the total food consumption of the country, the committee felt that the remaining inspection services necessary can be carried on with the reduced amount of money provided in the bill. The amount of $40,000 providing for seafood inspectors corresponds with the Budget estimate and the amount provided in the appropriation for 1943.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The amount carried in the bill for salaries in the United States Office of Education, $294,400, is a reduction of $29,600 below the Budget estimate and $5,600 under the appropriation for 1943. The $2,480,000 carried in the bill for further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical art corresponds with Budget estimates and represents the same amount appropriated in 1943. The total of the general appropriation for the Office of Education is $2,807,200, or a reduction of $31,600 as compared with the Budget estimates and a decrease of $5,105,630 compared with the appropriation for 1943. The main item eliminates by $5,000,000 loans to students under the National Youth program of last year.

We indicated in our analysis of the appropriation last year that one of the most important problems confronting the Federal Security Agency was that of training additional workers necessary in the war effort. The Executive order creating the War Manpower Commission transferred training activities of the Department of Labor and the War Production Board to the Federal Security Agency and thereby placed under the control of one administrator the several programs operating in this field. Since that time the program of training war workers has been transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the War Manpower Commission.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The amount appropriated for the Public Health Service in 1943 was $55,915,254. The estimate for 1944 was $56,221,200 and the amount provided in this bill for 1944 is $56,173,680, or an increase of $258,426 over the appropriation for 1943 and a decrease of $47,520 below the Budget estimate for 1944. Increases will be noted in the items for interstate quarantine services, prevention of epidemics, emergency health and sanitation activities in the national defense, foreign quarantine service, National Institute of Health, and pay allowances for commissioned personnel, salaries of the office of the Surgeon General, miscellaneous and contingent expenses.

The Public Health Service in wartime becomes almost entirely a war activity. The hospitals which it maintains provide the necessary care for employees of the Coast Guard and merchant marine. These organizations are greatly expanded by wartime necessity and the responsibilities of the Public Health Service are commensurately greater. In addition, the Service administers a program known as Emergency Health and Sanitation Activities, through which it assists local communities to meet the health and sanitation problems resulting from large overnight increases in population on account of wartime industrial plants or Army encampments. As a part of this same service the Service is cooperating with the Army and Navy and other agencies in the control and eradication of mosquitoes and other insect pests which might well spread diseases among the armed forces and the population generally.

The venereal disease program has been affected by the war and the Public Health Service has found it necessary to undertake work in areas adjacent to Army camps in order to prevent the spread of venereal disease among the troops. Prostitution on account of the spread of venereal diseases and the availability of alcoholic beverages in areas near to troop concentrations are probably two of the greatest threats to our war effort. Certainly, they constitute a great menace to the health and welfare of the armed forces. Many of these young men are a

great distance from their homes for the first time and it is the responsibility of the Government to provide safeguards for their well-being. It is a responsibility to the Nation to put a healthy, physically equipped army in the field and there is a responsibility to each boy to provide adequate measures of protection for his health.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The testimony before our committee will show that approximately 63,200,000 men and women will be engaged in the war effort—military and civilian—in July 1943, the estimate being that about 64,400,000 will be so engaged by July 1944.

It is estimated that in July 1943, the armed forces will stand at approximately 9,200,000, the officially announced strength for December 31, 1943, being placed at 10,900,000, necessitating the induction of approximately 1,700,000 between July and the end of the calendar year. Testimony shows that the pool from which men suitable for military service is to be drawn is becoming smaller day by day. At the same time the demand for additional workers in war-production industries and agriculture is daily becoming more pronounced. It will be seen, therefore, that proper and efficient functioning of the War Manpower Commission as well as the Bureau of the Selective Service, will become increasingly more difficult from month to month.

It is estimated that the employment in our munitions industries must increase by 1,300,000 workers from July 1943 to July 1944. At the same time aircraft manufacturing will require an estimated 300,000 additional workers in the fiscal year 1944, and if our shipbuilding goal is to be reached at least 150,000 more employees must be found. The estimated number of employees for the manufacture of guns, tanks, explosives, firearms, and other equipment must increase by 350,000 within the fiscal year 1944. According to best estimates 12,000,000 workers will be required to meet the needs of agriculture during the coming year.

It will be the outstanding function of the War Manpower Commission to assist in meeting these demands, and in view of the depleted condition of the labor market the problem has become more difficult from day to day. It is generally known that practically every person with training and experience in industry is now employed and that workers going into industry hereafter will necessarily have to be carefully selected and screened for training before we can expect them to make anywhere near the maximum contribution to the war-production program. We all realize it is an enormous problem and according to estimates submitted to your committee a very ambitious program has been planned by the Commission. To some of us the plans as indicated by the estimates for appropriations are overly ambitious, but in the absence of information to the contrary the committee has been rather generous in accepting the justifications submitted in support of the estimates. It will be noted from the committee report that $181,830,000 are requested for the Commission, and the committee has approved $151,257,300, or $30,977,700 less than the Budget estimate.

APPRENTICE TRAINING SERVICE

In view of the defense-training program already referred to in the Office of Education, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $465,500 for regular apprentice-training service which represents a decrease of $116,500 below the Budget estimates and $61,390 below the appropriation for 1943. The bill carries a further appropriation of $550,000 for apprentice-training service in national defense, which represents a reduction of $283,000 of the Budget estimate for 1944 and $86,000 below the amount carried in the appropriation for 1943.

TRAINING FOR INCREASED WAR PRODUCTION

Nearly $200,000,000 are carried in this bill for the Federal Security Agency and the War Manpower Commission to be used in training persons for work and more efficient work in war production. Then there is an appropriation of approximately $2,000,000 for the Conciliation Service in the Labor Department to try and see to it that they do work. That is, one agency is training men and women for work and another agency is assuming the responsibility of seeing that they stay on the job and do the work.

It has occurred to some of us that if both types of training are essential it would appear that one agency could do both jobs. In other words, it seems to some of us that those agencies that are actually training men and women how to operate a machine for war production and necessity for speeding such production they should be able to emphasize that it is just as essential to stay on the job and do the work as it is to know how to do it.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

I shall not attempt to express the impress received by other members of the committee listening to and analyzing the justifications for these appropriations but I have a distinct feeling that in the process of training persons for work many instructors appear to be more interested in emphasizing what the worker can do to promote his or her personal interest instead of emphasizing the necessity for increased efficiency in actual production, and as a basis for this conclusion I submit a few quotations offered in the support of justifications for such training. In outlining the various objectives in the training program we note the following:

> Section 4, describing contributing services such as recruiting, instructor training, and the promotion of favorable labor relations in training situations which supplement and facilitate war training.

Teaching "the promotion of favorable labor relations" may not be training for increased production.

Another objective is "assistance in the solution of labor relation problems arising from training programs."

Rendering "assistance in the solution of labor relation problems" may not be training for increased equipment in war production.

Another objective as shown by the recommendations of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship November 4, 1942, is summarized as follows:

> Youths of 16 and 17 years of age need the training and discipline which comes with learning a trade. Under present conditions the Nation cannot afford to allow this generation of young men to spend all of its time in schools or in dead-end jobs or idleness, waiting for its time to enter the military forces. We need now the goods they can produce. We need the skills they can acquire. We will need those skills if they are called to military service, but most of all we will need the sound citizens they will be upon restoration of peace.

No one will question the value of good and sound citizenship following the restoration of peace, but we would like to observe that it is just as essential in time of war as in peacetime, and we would like to observe further that this appropriation is made primarily to train men and women for increased efficiency in war production and not to give courses in civics, regardless of how important such a cause may be.

Another recommendation by the committee is as follows:

> Joint apprenticeship committees and apprentice supervisors should be encouraged to maintain close contact with apprentices who enter the military services. Every reasonable effort should be made to have these apprentices assigned to military jobs where their skills can be utilized most effectively and where further training can be obtained. Generally, if an apprentice is well advanced with his training at the time he enters the armed forces, it does not seem wise to expect that he should return to an apprenticeship status upon the conclusion of the war.

In providing for preemployment training, supplementary training, or training in industry, Congress never contemplated that these trainees should be followed into the armed forces, should they be called, and see to it that they be given military jobs, for further training with the idea they would be more efficient artisans following the restoration of peace.

Another objective is described as follows:

> The Apprentice and Training Service field men assist in a consulting capacity employees and employers and other training agencies to solve problems arising from training programs in the field of labor relations such as problems of seniority, hours, wages, and the classification of workers.

There is no doubt but what these are matters of importance both to employers and employees, but I do not think it is a function of government to undertake to advise or determine standards for them in the first place, and in the second place I can see the possibility of creating uncertainty and confusion to the extent of decreasing instead of increasing production output. I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion from these observations that instead of emphasizing the importance of learning how to do the job and the necessity of doing it more efficiently, too much emphasis is placed on what labor called other related matters.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. In the report of the hearings, on page 555, there are three or four pages dealing with this Committee on Physical Fitness. Are you in accord with the expenditure of $80,000 for this line of chatter that you got from this gentleman named Mr. Kelly, which we are spending for conversations; it is all conversations.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Has the gentleman read this comment of Mr. Kelly?

Mr. HARE. I heard every word that he said both on the record and off the record, and I can answer the gentleman's question in the affirmative, because I think that if his program can be effected, and I am not certain whether it can, I will admit that, but if the program outlined by Mr. Kelly, who is contributing his services to the country free of charge, will decrease the number of men in this country who are physically unfit for service, he will be entitled to a monument to his life for his service to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. It was Thomas Jefferson, I think, who once said in effect that if he were compelled to live either in a country without organized government or without free newspapers, he would unhesitatingly choose to live in the country without organized government.

In other words, Jefferson realized, as most of us do, that a free and independent press, newspapers that are unshackled, untrammeled, and unfettered, are absolutely indispensable to the creation and preservation of our civil, political, and religious liberties.

I was shocked to read in the daily papers where Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, on yesterday, Flag Day, in Boston, addressed a radical group of American newspapermen, if they have a radical group, the American Newspaper Guild, in which he rather flayed the newspapermen and women of this country generally and of Washington correspondents in particular.

It is rather difficult to understand why Mr. Davis would go out of his way to attempt to smear those men and women of the press who have already won their spurs and proved their ability for thoroughness and accuracy, and for the most part certainly, of honest reporting here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Davis, in his political defense of the bureaucrats in Washington, whom he attempts to defend generally from attacks made by some Members of Congress and the press, gives as an excuse that most of these bureaucrats would be paid much more in private industry than they are now receiving in Government service. Well, it might be that some of them are. I think that is true of many of the major executives of successful industries who have sacrificed their individual and private business to come to Washington and devote their time and energy to the successful prosecution of the war. However, I challenge Mr. Davis, or anyone else under him, to give the public the names of the men and women on the pay roll of the Office of War Information with the corresponding pay they received before flopping to his service. This challenge applies not only to the domestic division of the O. W. I., which is now competing with the free press, the radio, and motion pictures here on the home front, but also to the overseas division that is under the guiding hand of President Roosevelt's personal political servant and ghost writer, Mr. Robert Sherwood.

Time after time in recent months, Mr. Chairman, Congress and the inquiring press of the country which Mr. Davis seems to dislike so much have revealed and exposed many of the overlapping and duplicating agencies and much of the waste and extravagance, not to mention downright graft, in certain departments. Mr. Davis seems to dislike the fact that Congress and the inquiring press have discovered in recent months much propaganda emanating from the Office of War Information that went far beyond the field of war information.

Some of this propaganda has been aimed at further New Deal economic objectives and social gains of a small coterie or group who, I think, are more interested in perpetuating themselves in power and carrying out their idealistic theories than they are in actually winning the war. There was much of this propaganda, under the forced admission of Mr. Davis himself, that was very improper from a political point of view because it was aimed at the reelection of President Roosevelt for a fourth term and even would serve to satisfy the ambitions of one of the United States Senators to nominate Mr. Roosevelt as president of the United Nations following the close of the war. The United States are no longer big and important enough for the Roosevelts to rule. The whole wide world is their domain. The O. W. I. must not be converted into a political bureau for the promotion of a fourth term. The people are growing tired of paying the campaign bills of professional politicians. Let each candidate pay his own expenses. Government is still the servant and not the master of the people.

It has become increasingly apparent on the part of this Mr. Davis who no doubt is a fine man—he is a clever and a very able man—and it has become increasingly clear I think that this Hoosier and every Hoosier is either a poet or a politician—most of them are both—whatever ideas he may have had about his job when he became Director of the Office of War Information, he now conceives his real title to be that of American Propaganda Minister. There is no room in this country for such a minister, we do not want to set up any Herr Goebbels in this Nation and it is time for Mr. Davis to return to his office as chairman of the radical New York American Labor Party from which Mr. Roosevelt brought him to Washington. Too many of their kind already are here. We want no more.

Mr. Davis' answers to these exposés of many of the pamphlets and memoranda that have been sent out from the Office of War Information, much of which has had nothing to do with the war itself—his answers to these exposés and to the frank discussion by the press of certain bureaus' failures in Washington are simply to attack the press and to assert that our newspapermen are falling down on the job and are refusing to print the news adequately.

We are going to be called upon in the next day or two to vote appropriations for this one particular bureau, and it will be interesting for the Members of this body to bear in mind that under the War Information Bureau of President Wilson in the last war headed by George Creel, one of the greatest psychologists we have ever had in this country, only 4½ millions of dollars were spent. Last year the Office of War Information under Elmer Davis spent in excess of $38,000,000 and now they are going to ask us to give them within the next day or two $10,000,000 in addition to that, or an amount in excess of $47,000,000 for operating expenses for the next year. Why in the name of common sense we have to have such a vast army of men and women on the public pay roll in time of war to dish out propaganda is more than I can understand. We all know that the vast majority of the American press are intelligent and patriotic men and women who are as anxious to win this war as anyone in the O. W. I. or even in the Congress itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure my friend recognizes that the war of propaganda engaged in by Nazi Germany was very effective until recent months. I am sure my friend further recognizes that propaganda is part of the over-all war and it has been particularly accentuated in recent years. Without discussing whether this act or that act is right or wrong, because none of us are perfect, do I understand my friend to take the position that propaganda on our part has no place at all in this war?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. In just a minute. The distinguished and able majority leader has asked me a very decent and a very pertinent question.

Mr. McCORMACK. And not an embarrassing question.

Mr. SHORT. No; not at all. A certain amount of war information and even propaganda is absolutely necessary, and I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman that it has a part in the over-all picture. Certainly Nazi propaganda before our entrance into this war, just like the propaganda of other nations, some of our own allies, was very potent indeed not only in this country but throughout the republics of South America, and we did have to spend much money and time in combating that propaganda; but now that we are in the war and the lines have been drawn I cannot see any excuse for the Office of War Information to ask us for $10,000,000 more than they spent last year, asking us for $47,000,000 at a time when the American taxpayers are shouldering a back-breaking debt, as we all know.

Where are we going to get the money? We are almost taxed to death now.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. Gladly.

Mr. HARE. Referring to the $10,000,000, they are not trying to put it onto the bill we are now considering.

Mr. SHORT. No; it does not enter into the consideration of the present bill. It is not here because I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina never would have consented to such an increase. It will be taken up after the disposition of this measure, so I have been informed by certain members of the powerful Committee on Appropriations. I am merely forewarning the Members of what is to come.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DITTER. I followed very closely the gentleman's observation with reference to O. W. I. and I must express surprise that the majority leader attempted to place a construction on the observations of the gentleman from Missouri that might in any way reflect unfavorably on propaganda so far as the war effort was concerned. As I understood the statement of the gentleman from Missouri it could not be considered critical of the war effort or of anything which could be construed as war propaganda but rather it attacked the criticism of the press and particularly the Washingtonian press by Mr. Davis which I believe all of us felt was unfortunate and lamentable.

Mr. SHORT. And I might say to the gentleman that that is the only reason I am speaking about the matter, because I believe the Washington correspondents, much as I may disagree with them at times, have bent over backward most of the time to go along with the administration. When they could have written articles attacking the administration and criticizing it for things it did, they did not do it simply because they wanted unity and wanted to get on with the prosecution of the war. This is also the reason many of the Members of Congress, regardless of party, have maintained a repressed silence because we were willing to forego criticism for the common weal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has recognized the thought that with every right we possess there is a corresponding duty on our part to always conduct ourselves in a manner so as to preserve the rights which we possess under our Constitution. I think the gentleman recognizes that.

Mr. SHORT. One should never practice license merely because of the liberty he has.

Mr. McCORMACK. Most people think only of rights but they ignore the fact that there is a corresponding duty of exercising those rights so that they will always be preserved.

Mr. SHORT. I have often thought that to be true, particularly when I was being attacked.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Am I to construe the observation of the distinguished majority leader to mean that he feels that the press, the correspondents of Washington, do not recognize the serious obligations and responsibilities that are theirs when they attempt to exercise their rights? I can hardly believe that any such construction should be placed on his language.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts did not mean any such thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman from Missouri always, as I have noticed even when I disagree with him, is possessed of a sound analytical mind. The gentleman from Missouri, if he thought for a moment that I had any such thought in my mind, would very quickly join issue showing that the gentleman interpreted my state of mind correctly.

I take this opportunity of publicly expressing the admiration that I have always had for my distinguished friend from Missouri in his clear analytical interpretation of other persons' minds, even when I personally disagree with his own interpretation.

Mr. SHORT. I am deeply appreciative of the gentleman's compliment. Our admiration is mutual.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to throw out this suggestion to you for your own meditation, cogitation, and consideration. Take it for what it is worth. Before further funds are allocated to O. W. I. by the Congress there should be a full and complete investigation to determine to what extent the O. W. I. is going beyond its functions of war information, to what extent the press, the radio, and the motion pictures are being intimidated or coerced by Government press agents, and to what extent Mr. Davis is attempting to centralize in his own hands the control of the news dissemination of the country. We should not and must not adopt Hitler's methods here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning reported out a concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 25—that is, in my opinion, very important and very historic. The resolution is very short, but it is all-embracing, and it is as comprehensive as if it were a resolution containing several pages.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I congratulate the members of that committee on their vision, their foresight, their judgment, and their action. To me it constitutes a historic action, and I am very proud to be a Member of this body when a committee of this particular session acts in such a statesmanlike manner.

It is my hope that this resolution will be called up as soon as possible. I have already suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that a rule be requested. I hope a rule will be reported out in the very near future, and if it is reported out this week, it is my intention to call this vastly important, historic resolution up for the consideration of the House the early part of next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will not undertake to add anything to the able presentation made by the chairman of the subcommittee on the subject matters contained in this bill and of the action of the subcommittee with regard thereto. However, in view of the action which was taken by the full committee in the elimination of the proposed appropriation for the National Youth Administration, I do want to discuss briefly at this time this subject matter because from inquiries received from many of our colleagues I know that they are interested in what the further procedure may be in an effort to have the Congress at least accord consideration to the needs of this organization for funds for its continuance.

You are doubtless already advised through the medium of the public press that the subcommittee by a vote of 5 to 2 provided an appropriation for the National Youth Administration for the next fiscal year, but reduced, however, the Budget estimate by more than $15,000,000. You are doubtless also advised that the full committee with 10 members absent by a vote of 17 to 16, which I regret to state was almost purely a party vote, eliminated the appropriation for the National Youth Administration from the pending bill.

We will not be able to offer under the rule under which bill will be considered in the House an amendment to restore the funds which were thus taken from the National Youth Administration. The National Youth Administration has never been authorized by law, therefore an amendment of that character would be ruled out of order by the presiding officer. I am making this statement in order that those who are interested in the National Youth Administration and in the continuation of its work may understand that its friends have not abandoned the continuance of that work merely by reason of their failure to offer

an amendment to restore this appropriation in the Committee of the Whole. It is the hope of the friends of the National Youth Administration and of the work it has so efficiently carried on that the Senate in its consideration of this bill will make provision for the restoration of the N. Y. A. appropriation so that this House may thereafter have the opportunity to at least voice its will with regard to this very important subject matter.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I understand there is some talk of a rule being reported out, to be taken up after general debate, waiving all points of order on the bill under consideration.

Mr. TARVER. The rule has already been reported and will be taken up tomorrow, but the rule merely waives points of order against legislative provisions in the bill, and the appropriations for the National Youth Administration, except $3,000,000 for its liquidation, are not in the bill. Therefore, the rule does not waive points of order against an amendment proposing provisions for the National Youth Administration's continuance.

I think the Members of the House should examine carefully the hearings, the very voluminous hearings, which were held by the subcommittee with regard to the National Youth Administration. They are 110 pages in length, running from page 297 of part 3 of the hearings to page 407.

This has been a very much talked-about subject matter for a long time. The so-called Byrd committee, which apparently does not represent sentiment in the Senate because a few days ago the Senate by a vote of 55 to 23 refused to follow the Byrd committee with regard to the proposed abolition of the Farm Security Administration, has been clamoring for the elimination of the National Youth Administration, yet despite the publicity which has been given to the opposition to the National Youth Administration not a single witness in all of the weeks of our hearings came before our committee to deliver any evidence adverse to the accomplishments of the National Youth Administration or to indicate any reason for the discontinuance of its work. This, of course, ought to be considered a significant circumstance.

It is true that in the meeting of the full committee a statement was made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] which reflected severely upon a portion of the work of the National Youth Administration in his home city in New York. If the statements made by him are correct, I join with him in condemning the conditions which he states existed there, or exist there now, but the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, did not give the subcommittee the advice which he undertook to give the full committee upon the hearing of the bill in the full committee, did not attend any session or request the privilege of attending to give us the benefit of the information which he claims to have, and I doubt whether he makes on this floor the same statements that he made to us in the full Committee on Appropriations.

For the benefit of the RECORD, I want to ask him now, although he is not present on the floor, that on tomorrow, if he feels that the statements made with regard to interracial relations of students at the N. Y. A. project in his home city in New York are correct, he get on the floor and, for the RECORD and for the people of the country, make those same statements. If he had advised our subcommittee of the alleged existence of any such conditions as he detailed in his statement before the full committee, the subcommittee would have promptly taken action to have investigated the existence or nonexistence of those conditions and to have taken such action as lay within its power for the correction of any abuses.

I certainly do not yield to the gentleman from New York or to anyone else in my desire to protect the young people of any section of the country against such conditions as he described as existing in his home town.

This item is a part of our national program of training for war industry. It is a part of the work carried on under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Training of the War Manpower Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. This Bureau has the function of coordinating our various training activities, which now fall into six different categories, so as to prevent duplication of effort and to prevent the work in one field from infringing upon work that is being done in another field. They have found and have planned that this National Youth Administration should be an important part of this training-for-industry program.

We had to entrust to some administrative officials the duty of trying to carry on this training-for-industry program in an efficient way so as to provide as nearly as we could the workers for the war industries for this country that must be trained if we are to win this war. They have decided that the work of the National Youth Administration is necessary to that end. As far as I am concerned, if I knew nothing else about the National Youth Administration except that, I would be willing to follow the judgment of the men who have been placed in charge of this training program and would be unwilling to substitute my individual judgment for theirs in a matter of this importance.

During the present fiscal year the National Youth Administration prior to March 1, 1943, trained, according to its Administrator, 303,000 young men and women for important work in war industries. It is true that there is no evidence that all of these young people have entered war industries, but there is evidence that a large proportion of them, aggregating at least 50 percent in number, have entered into war production.

I may say here that while there are some who try to unfavorably compare the work of the national defense training in vocational education against the work of the National Youth Administration, the vocational education people have not been able to show the committee that an equal percentage of their trainees have entered into production in the war program.

I say that as a friend of the vocational education program. I have fought for it and I intend to continue to fight for it. I believe the appropriations we are carrying in this bill and have carried during prior years for vocational education are amply justified, but there is no conflict between the work of the vocational education training schools and the work of the National Youth Administration.

This idea that there is some effort on the part of the National Youth Administration to start an educational program and to have Federal supervision of education is, in my judgment, entirely without foundation. We have carried in this bill for prior fiscal years and for the present fiscal year a provision which would prevent the carrying on of any educational program under the National Youth Administration. While the Budget recommends its being excluded from the bill for the next fiscal year, the committee wrote it back into the bill. I will read it to you:

PAR. 22. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. And so we have taken the precaution to see to it that there shall not be an intrusion on the part of the National Youth Administration into the educational field. There may be this possible exception, what may be regarded by some as an exception, to this rule. We have made provision heretofore for a college-aid program, and we also made provision this year for a student-aid program in schools below the college level. The Budget made no recommendation for the continuance of that program for the next fiscal year, but our committee for the next fiscal year put in the bill an appropriation for $3,000,000 and a reappropriation for $1,000,000, making $4,000,000 more, for the continuance of the college-aid program. That program, as all know, is one under which students at colleges, who are unable to pay their way, are permitted to work part time and receive for their work small compensation, to aid them in the payment of their collegiate expenses. It seemed to us a necessary program, to continue at this time, especially in the education of teachers, and particularly of young women who desire to be teachers.

There is going to be and is now in fact and will be increasing in severity, a need for school teachers, and we felt that the provision of this money to aid these students who would work in return for the money they receive from the Government is a worthy thing, and furthermore, we recommended this in the report as in substitution for a far more liberal program of $50,000,000, which will be brought before you before a long while. An estimate is pending before the Budget, under which it is proposed to pay students, not for work in connection with their going to college, but to pay them for going to college, to pay them so much per hour for the time actually engaged in studying in college. Our committee felt that that is a program which ought not to be entered on, and that the N. Y. A. student aid program, where students give something in return for aid received is preferable, and we indicated in the report that we recommended this $4,000,000 expenditure in lieu of this greater expenditure of $50,000,000, which it is understood we will be asked to make later on.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to that $50,000,000, where it is proposed to pay students to go to school, would they be permitted to organize into a union, and strike for higher wages?

Mr. TARVER. Of course, as I indicated to the gentleman, I am not in favor of the $50,000,000 program, and I do not know how much the authorities who advocate it would encourage anything in that connection. I feel sure that they would not be in favor of that sort of a program. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], who indicated that she wished to question me.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, and have enjoyed them. The thought in my mind is this: Does the gentleman not think that the National Youth Administration is much more necessary even when we have completed and won the war than it is at the present time?

Mr. TARVER. I believe that the National Youth Administration ought to be continued after the war, and that there ought to be legislation for its operation. I believe that after the war, with so many young people coming back from the armed services, who in many instances will have been unable to obtain work, the need for this training and opportunity program, if I may be justified in calling it such, will be much more intense than it was before the war began, although perhaps not greater than it is at the present time.

I shall not undertake further to enter into a discussion of the work of the National Youth Administration except in a few details, because it not only is not before us but it cannot be before us during the consideration of this bill in committee of the whole, but I simply wanted to make reference to these facts with the hope that the membership of the House will study the hearings regarding this subject matter, and that the Senate may include in the bill when it reaches that body an adequate provision for the continuance of the N. Y. A., and that Members may then have an opportunity to express their will concerning the matter.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the N. E. A., the National Educational Association, did not appear before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. TARVER. As I suggested to the gentleman awhile ago, it is not my recollection that any witness who appeared before our subcommittee opposed the granting of this appropriation to the National Youth Administration. I also indicated my opinion that a great many people who are interested in not carrying on an educational program in the N. Y. A., have a misconception of just what is proposed in this appropriation. This is a war-training program. These young people manufacture needed articles for the Army and the Navy of the United States, running up into million of dollars worth, and in the manufacturing they receive training. They are not being educated in the usual sense of that term.

For the information of the House I desire to add the following concise statement of some of the accomplishments of N. Y. A. as of the present fiscal year:

A WAR PRODUCTION TRAINING PROGRAM

From July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, the National Youth Administration gave war production training to 303,000 previously unemployed boys and girls. It is conservatively estimated that over 400,000 will have been given training in the 12-month period of fiscal year 1943.

Over a thousand youth a day leave the program and a thousand other youth, mostly without any work experience, take their places. Of those who leave, between 650 and 700 a day enter employment, the majority of them in war industries. While it is not practical to follow through on every youth who leaves the program, there is ample reason for assuming that many of the remainder likewise find employment in essential industry. Some enter the armed services, greatly advantaged by their training in mechanics.

The National Youth Administration war production training program utilizes approximately 39,000 work stations (a machine or equivalent training facility for one person per shift) concentrated in 640 shops located in 510 communities and in every State of the Nation. How closely these work stations are related to war production is apparent from the following list, which gives the number of work stations for each type of training activity carried on by the National Youth Administration:

Machine	9,739
Sheet metal	5,666
Welding	6,858
Patternmaking and foundry	1,005
Forge	208
Radio and electrical	3,543
Auto mechanics	1,105
Aircraft and aircraft engine mechanics	1,079
Joinery	207
Aircraft woodwork	748
General woodwork	1,400
Industrial sewing	2,570
Mechanical drafting	638
Other shop activities	40
Clerical	2,162
Other activities	258

In 225 of the above 510 communities, and in 11 additional places, residence centers for the housing of youth are provided. This makes it possible to bring in youth from sparsely settled areas where it would be impractical to set up training facilities and to give them training which enables them to make the maximum contribution to the war effort of which they are capable. These residence centers have a second important function, for they are the basis of the youth transfer system whereby the demands of one area for semiskilled labor may be met by transferring youth having the specific skills needed from an area that has a relative surplus. By the end of this month over 31,000 National Youth Administration trained youth will have been transferred to critical labor shortage areas. Shipyards alone have been provided with 14,000 National Youth Administration trained youth.

The average cost per month, for each youth, including subsistence of those in residence centers, the wages paid to youth and all training and administrative cost is $66.91. The average cost for each different trainee for the entire period of time spent in training is $108.44.

Actual production work of material, principally for the armed forces, is the basis of National Youth Administrative training. The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and other agencies provide the materials; National Youth Administration processes them at no charge. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are thus saved the Government, and the youth profit by the best kind of training it is possible to give. In many cases parts that must be had by the Navy shore establishments or Army arsenals without a moment's delay in order to break a production bottleneck can be and are sped through National Youth Administration shops, the saving of time in such cases being far more important than the savings in cost. Some idea of the extent of this production may be had by citing the number of parts or articles made for a few Government establishments in the past 10 months:

Portsmouth Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	1,214,318
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	406,047
Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.	102,731
United States Naval Coast Guard, New England	20,884
United States Submarine Base, Connecticut	1,384
United States Maritime Commission, various shipyards	13,795
Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.	1,282,747
Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.	8,129

One-half of all National Youth Administration trainees are females. Youth of draft age now represent approximately one-third of the males. Many in this group, while acceptable to industry, are not up to the physical standards of the armed services.

In the past year National Youth Administration moved 10,500, or more than 25 percent of its work stations to new locations, as the urgency of training needs developed in various parts of the country. It has proved to be the only training agency that is capable of rapidly moving and setting up its facilities to meet immediate needs.

STUDENT WORK PROGRAM

By keeping 40,000 youth in college National Youth Administration has this year assured the training of 3,106 additional engineers, 2,084 chemists, 410 physicists, 1,129 mathematicians, 277 pharmacists, 68 metallurgists, 1,613 doctors, 270 dentists, 1,033 biologists and bacteriological specialists, 361 nurses, 2,624 dieticians and home economists, 1,256 agricultural specialists, 6,276 teachers, 1,233 physical education directors, 5,073 business

and commerce technicians, 2,593 social scientists, and 9,952 other technical personnel, all of whom would have been unable to continue their college education without National Youth Administration assistance.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, next to the actual conduct of the war itself, the most critical situation confronting the American people today is that relating to food. It might even be more accurate to say that the food crisis is the most important situation confronting us for the reason that we appear to be making reasonable progress in our military operations while the food situation grows more critical and desperate all the time. I do not at this time propose to discuss food generally, I want to confine myself to one product—corn. I am discussing corn for two reasons. First, because of the acute situation which now exists in the distribution and marketing of that commodity, and, second, because corn furnishes a typical illustration of the failure to approach the food situation realistically.

Corn is primarily a livestock feed. Normally, only a small proportion of the crop is used for human food or for industrial purposes. During the past 2 years the amount of corn used for nonfeed purposes has increased considerably. This is due to additional industrial demands for cornstarch in war production, increased use of corn sirup as sugar substitutes, and expansion of the use of corn for alcohol. At the present time, however, very little corn is being used in alcohol production and it is likely that from now on the amount so used will be negligible.

The latest figures released by the Department of Agriculture estimate that 285,000,000 bushels of corn will be used for industrial purposes or food during the crop year 1942–43 and that 2,932,000,000 bushels will be used for livestock feed. Both of these figures, of course, are considerably higher than normal. The estimated supply of corn for the crop year 1942-43 is 3,667,000,000 bushels, thus leaving an estimated carry-over of 450,000,000 bushels which, in normal times, would be ample.

The estimated stocks on the farms on April 1 was 1,395,000,000 bushels, which is 460,000 000 bushels above normal and over 100,000,000 bushels more than stocks a year ago.

Notwithstanding these large supplies, there is an acute shortage of corn for livestock feed, human food, and industrial purposes in every part of the country with the exception of the commercial corn area in the upper Mississippi Valley. Members of Congress from all parts of the country are receiving urgent wires and letters demanding that something be done at once to relieve this critical situation. Industrial corn users are rapidly exhausting their stocks and are unable to procure new supplies. The seriousness of the situation is indicated by letters and telegrams coming in from all parts of the country. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith a number of these wires which are typical of all of those being received:

Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised critical emergency exists forcing drastic cut in corn sugars, sirups, malt extract due to corn-hog price ratio. Also yeast supply threatened because of shortage corn byproducts required. That farmers are feeding corn instead of selling due to ceiling on corn and none on hogs, supply failure expected after present inventories exhausted within 2 weeks. Due to unnecessary sugar restrictions corn products as sweetening agents in bread must be had. Yeast absolutely necessary to continue to make bread products. Bread supply is threatened unless relief obtained.

THE JORDAN BAKING CO.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 14, 1943.*
Representative CLIFFORD HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Due to the many Office of Price Administration rulings, part of which are MPR 305 and amendments MPR 401 FDO 52 No. 346, the dry-corn milling industry is in desperate situation due to ceilings and lack of supply of corn. The industry had a meeting in Chicago Tuesday, last week, appealed to Office of Price Administration for relief. Unless something is accomplished quick the dry-corn milling industry will be shut down, shutting off the supply of both human food and animal feeds.

FORBES BROS. CENTRAL MILLS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *June 11, 1943.*

Sources of supply notify us that corn sugar, corn sirup, and cornstarch will be cut 40 percent for 2 weeks, then possibly cease due to lack of corn caused by feeders f livestock using corn at $1.40 per bushel for feed, with processors' ceiling fixed at $1.07. Lack of corn byproducts will drastically curtail bakery production, with consequent curtailment in consumption in wheat products, fruits, and other farm products. Unrationed bakery products will not be available to the consumer, with resulting additional strain on rationing. With sugar rationed, this would remove our last line of defense against curtailment in production, with the consequent loss of use in wheat and other farm products, and the case of this company would create a serious shortage of sugar or the only substitute now available.

GRIDLEY BAKING CO.,
CHARLES V. GRIDLEY.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 11, 1943.*

Serious situation affecting all corn products due to disparity in value of corn for hog feed and for refining purposes. We urge you to take action regarding same, as this will seriously affect our business.

SHAGHALIAN'S, INC.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 11, 1943.*

We are large users of corn sirup and have been advised by our suppliers the Penick & Ford Co., that a shut-down is inevitable unless corn is made available. You undoubtedly know of this problem. Will you try for immediate action.

CHARLES M. MILLER CO.

DORCHESTER, MASS., *June 11, 1943.*

Unless something is done quickly hundreds of plants producing food confections will be shut down and products used by Army-Navy personnel, millions defense workers as between-meal pick-up will be stopped and their personnel thrown out of work; shipments interrupted. The problem is that corn millers cannot buy corn at dollar seven when farmer can sell it in hogs at dollar forty, and corn sirup a vitally essential food material is being stopped. Prompt action by the Office of Price Administration and Agriculture is positively imperative.

C. H. GAGER.

The above wires relate to the shortage of corn for industrial users. The same desperate situation applies with reference to livestock and poultry producers and the following wires go into that phase of the matter—

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COMPTON. Has the gentleman had communications from the textile industry and paperboard industry?

Mr. HOPE. I do not happen to have any from those industries, but I understand they are in a very critical condition.

Mr. COMPTON. They are in a very critical condition.

Mr. HOPE. I am very glad to have the gentleman's confirmation of that fact.

I will not read a wire covering the situation as far as poultry and livestock feed are concerned. I have a telegram here from Wichita, Kans., which is not very far from the Corn Belt:

WICHITA, KANS., *June 5, 1943.*
Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Washington, D. C.:

Unable to buy any corn since last Saturday due to Office of Price Administration amendment effective May 31. Have orders this week for 25 cars corn from feeders and feed dealers. Feed conditions are growing more serious daily as many have no corn. Ceiling should be lifted as livestock must be fed.

ROTH GRAIN CO.

PORTLAND, MAINE, *June 4, 1943.*

Unless corn and wheat sales are made available by Commodity Credit Corporation immediately the feeders in Maine will be entirely without feed within 1 week. S g-gest your utmost endeavors to release same at once.

NEW ENGLAND GRAIN CO.,
Portland, Bridgton, Brunswick, Belfast, Dexter, Dover, Foxcroft, Ellsworth, Rumford, Waterville, and Wilton.

Mr. Chairman, it is well recognized that a large proportion of our dairy, livestock, and poultry production is outside of the corn-producing area. Unless steps can be taken at once to make corn or other grain available to these outside areas the production of such vital food products as milk, butter, eggs, poultry, and meat will be seriously curtailed.

The situation is equally as serious as far as the industrial users of corn are concerned. It may not be generally known, but corn products such as the various types of starches, sugars, and sirups enter into many phases of our war effort. Corn products are used in the manufacture of aluminum ore, steel and aluminum castings, in textiles for our armed forces, in paper and paper products, including containers used by our armed forces, in explosives and chemicals, and in the manufacture of adhesives and drugs and pharmaceutical products, including synthetic vitamins. At least 300,000,000 pounds of starch will be

needed for lend-lease purposes this year. Many corn products are important ingredients in essential foods. The use of corn sugar and sirup is particularly important now when our sugar supply is depleted. It is estimated this year that our domestic sugar production will be approximately 35 percent less than normal and shipping difficulties, of course, make it impossible for us to bring adequate and needed supplies from the Tropics. Food products in which corn sirups, sugars, and starches are important ingredients are baking powder, bakery products, jams, jellies, and preserves, dairy products such as ice cream and condensed milk, confectioneries, canned fruits, and many others, had I but the time to mention them.

As indicated by the telegrams quoted above and by other information which is available to everyone, the use of corn for industrial products cannot continue much longer unless supplies are made available. Reserves are now used up and corn shipments have dwindled down to practically nothing. This decline began about the 1st of May and has grown progressively worse.

Why is it that users of corn and livestock and poultry producers outside of the Corn Belt are unable to purchase corn at this time. Why is there no corn on the market when the supply for this year is the largest ever known? The answer is primarily one of price. The O. P. A. has placed a ceiling on corn at $1.07 per bushel, Chicago basis. That means a farm price of somewhere between 90 cents and $1 in the Corn Belt, depending upon location. Farmers will not sell corn for that price because they can get 35 or 40 cents a bushel more by selling it as pork.

Today we have a ceiling price of $1.07 on corn and we have a floor price of $13.75 on hogs. That floor price has been assured the producers of hogs by the Secretary of Agriculture, until September 1944. If that relationship continues there is every indication that a large part of the corn in this country will be consumed by hogs and there will be not only a shortage for industrial purposes and for human food, but a shortage for other types of livestock as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is making a very interesting and informative address, as he always does. I am sure that members appreciate his statement. It is very vital to the welfare of the country at this particular time. The gentleman might be interested to know that a very important representative of the Department of Agriculture took lunch today with the Oklahoma delegation. We were asking him about the so-called shortage of livestock. He assured our delegation that there is no shortage of livestock in this country, but that it is a shortage of feed. For instance, he told us that in Oklahoma there are 771,000 more head of cattle this year than the average for the past 8 years; that there are 400,000 more hogs in my own State than the average of the past 8 years, and that there are more than 300,000 more sheep in my State than the average for the past 8 years. So there is no shortage in my State, or in any State, as far as the Department of Agriculture knows, but there is a real shortage of feed facing the country. We must have ways and means of feeding those cattle, hogs, and sheep if we are to feed our own forces, our Allied forces, and ourselves.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, which is very apropos and indicates the true situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to inquire if the Department of Agriculture that the gentleman from Oklahoma was referring to is the same Department of Agriculture that 7 or 8 months or a year ago said there would be no shortage of food?

Mr. HOPE. Of course, the gentleman knows the answer to that.

Mr. CURTIS. Apparently their experts or their books or something are not infallible down there.

Mr. HOPE. There have been a number of changes of opinion, I think, since those statements were made.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman stated that as long as the price remained at $1.07 the farmers would feed their corn to the hogs. What would the price have to be in order to make it pay the farmer to release some of his corn?

Mr. HOPE. That is a very difficult question to answer. I would not undertake to answer it. Of course, if there were no ceilings on corn, the price of corn would undoubtedly increase and it would go up to a point where there would be a balance between corn prices and hog prices.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman really think that this thing can be solved in that way? In other words, can we wait for this price to increase and test it out? For instance, a day or two ago a man came to my office representing some big chemical organization. He told me that they were unable to get any corn and that the normal requirements of their organization were 300,000 bushels a day; that they ground up 300,000 bushels a day, and that corn found its way into other industry. Even though we do work out a compromise between the hog and ourselves, we are still going to have this insatiable maw of industry that we cannot satisfy. Is that not right?

Mr. HOPE. Well, of course, the situation is this, that there is at this time a sufficient amount of corn in the country to take care of our present needs. There may not be in 6 months or a year from now, but at the present time if this corn were coming on the market there would be a sufficient amount of corn for all needed purposes. But the price situation which exists at this time, by which it is so much more profitable to feed the corn to hogs than it is to use it for any other purpose, has resulted in taking all of the corn off of the market. And it is impossible to procure corn on the market at this time.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to say to the gentleman that I talked to an official of the O. P. A. yesterday along this very line and he informed me that the corn was not being sold because of the price charged, that farmers had been advised by different agricultural colleges and different universities not to sell their corn because they had no assurance of what the oncoming crop would be. That is the information I had from the official in the O. P. A., that the corn would not be released even if the price went to $2 per bushel. He placed the blame on the farmers for not releasing the corn, and that would be in accord with many of the communications that we have had to the same purpose.

Mr. HOPE. I would expect the gentleman to get such an answer from the O. P. A.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do you not think the situation is aggravated by the fact that pretty nearly all, at least a large percentage of the commercial corn, has to come from Illinois and Iowa, those two States; the two States that have made such a wonderful development in pork production during the last 2 years, so that it is aggravated much more in those two States probably than the other States? And the fact that in 1943 evidently there is going to be twice as much pork produced as in 1936, and the situation existing in those two States, which are the chief sources of this corn, is because they have taken upon themselves to follow another request of the Government to increase their production of pork?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I think that is true; that is, we have got the incentive for heavy pork production in the heavy corn-producing areas, and as the situation stands now, the corn is still being fed to hogs in that area and it cannot be procured in other parts of the country.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I believe the gentleman gave us the requirements at least for the coming year. Does the gentleman have any figures showing the exports of corn and corn products for the past few months?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think that I have them handy. I merely mentioned starch, the lend-lease requirements of starch. I do not happen to have the record showing corn exports. Of course, we have not been exporting much corn in the last few months.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made a very constructive and interesting statement on this corn shortage situation and I think all of us have been recipients of many letters and telegrams of the character read by the distinguished gentleman who now occupies the floor.

The gentleman has indicated that it would be his opinion that the disparity in the relationship between the price of pork and the O. P. A. fixed price on commercial corn for commercial purposes is out of line, and that disparity, because the farmers refuse to run their corn into the regular channels of trade, means the millers and the processors of corn products are being compelled to close up all over this country, threatened with many and serious effects.

I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of that situation and the seriousness of this problem and the imminence of the problem a question. For instance, a large milling concern situated in Milwaukee, advises me that it will have to close by the end of this week; certain brewing interests in my State have indicated they will have to close up; bakeries have wired me they will be compelled to close or seriously curtail their business.

The thing that I would like to know, and the question I have asked time and time again on the floor of the House is, What is the remedy? There is a picture which has been clearly depicted to the Members of the House. We all know what the situation is. What is the remedy? What is the answer that will enable you and will enable the Members of this House to advise their constituents as to what is to be done to alleviate the situation?

Is the gentleman of the opinion that the only relief that can be effected is to secure a change in the attitude of the O. P. A. by which it will either take off the ceiling on corn or increase the price ceiling, or what is the gentleman's opinion as to the remedy to prevent these concerns closing up in the next 20 days? That is what I am interested in.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I have been trying to find an answer for the past weeks and I confess I have been unable to do so.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has very well stated the real problem. The answer to that question is what we are all wanting, and I propose, in just a few moments, to suggest what I think should be the first step taken toward meeting the situation.

Before I go into that, however, I want to cover just one or two phases of another matter, because we are getting a good many wires and letters urging that we ask the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell or to put on the market its supply of corn. The situation there is that the Commodity Credit Corporation does not have any corn. They may have a few million bushels scattered around over the country in steel bins under the control of the triple A committees, but there is no worth while quantity of corn available in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; so that solution is out.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a fact, is it not, that in order to stimulate the flow of corn into the orderly channels of market the Government loans on that corn were called. What was it, the first of May? Or was it in June?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; the first of July.

Mr. KEEFE. They are calling them right now, are they not?

Mr. HOPE. They are called now for the first of July on the corn of the 1941 crop or earlier.

Mr. KEEFE. It was expected that by calling those loans that would stimulate the flow into the market of corn that is out on the farm, in the elevators, in the corn cribs; is not that true?

Mr. HOPE. That was one of their hopes.

Mr. KEEFE. Has it had any effect, appreciable effect?

Mr. HOPE. It has not up to date produced any corn on the market. There are only 45,000,000 bushels of 1941 or earlier corn under loan with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Loans on the 1942 crop have not been called, I understand, but that may be done later. But I do not believe it will bring any corn on the market, because farmers can pay off the loans and take the corn or, of course, they can sell it if they want to sell it for more than the loan, but the probability is they will hold the corn and use it. I do not expect that very much of it anyway will come on the market. It is certain that they will not let the Commodity Credit Corporation take the corn over because it is worth more than the amount of the loans.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman at this point that the bill we have under consideration is entitled, in part, "The Federal Security Bill." At least the bill deals with the Federal Security Agency, social security. I think of no more pressing problem that could be discussed under that general head than has been discussed by the gentleman from Kansas, even though the gentleman's discussion is not directly related to the bill under consideration.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We should commence to get the new corn crop within 90 days, should we not?

Mr. HOPE. We shall get very little before the 1st of October.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It comes along at different dates in different sections.

Mr. HOPE. About then, yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It is now thought that we have enough corn to supply all demands if we could get it to the market, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. For the time being, yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And with a new crop in front of us they are feeding the old corn to the hogs. The hogs cannot possibly eat all the corn we have in the next 90 days, can they?

Mr. HOPE. No.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is just one source to which some of the corn is going. The real trouble is, is it not, that the farmers will not sell it; but their whole outlet prospect for disposing of it is not through the hogs, is it?

Mr. HOPE. Not entirely, but at the present time that is the most profitable way of disposing of it. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the great increase in our production of hogs. The estimated number of hogs this year, that is the 1942 pig crop I am talking about now, is 125,000,000 head. That compares with the pig crop of 1942 of 105,000,000 and an average pig crop of less than 69,000,000 head for the 5 years from 1935 to 1939; and, of course, there is an increase in all other kinds of livestock. The gentleman understands that there is going to be a very grave question within the next year whether we shall have enough feed to feed all of the livestock that may be in existence at that time. One thing which should be mentioned is that hog producers are feeding their hogs to heavier weights, they are feeding them longer so that each hog is consuming more corn now than it would normally.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I do not wish to bother the gentleman by anything like argument; I want to get a little information if I can, and I am sure he can give it to me.

Mr. HOPE. I do not want to imply, of course, that the hogs are eating all the corn or that they will eat all the corn in the next 90 days, but as long as hog production keeps increasing at the present rate and as long as the differential between corn prices and hog prices continues as it is, a constantly increasing volume of corn is going to go to hog production.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Yes, unless the increase in the corn crop keeps pace with the increase in the hogs.

Mr. HOPE. Then, again, the corn prospects for this year are very poor. Floods, wet weather, and the backward season in the Corn Belt have resulted in the corn crop being planted from 1 to 4 weeks late; some is not planted yet. At the present time prospects for the corn crop are very poor; that is, we cannot have anything like a good corn year and what we do have will depend entirely upon weather conditions. They will have to be very favorable in order to have anything like a normal crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is it not a fact that in addition to the difficulties the gentleman has presented we are having to feed more corn to hogs to fatten them than we normally would because of inability to get the accompanying high protein feeds that are usually fed to hogs and thereby save corn?

Mr. HOPE. That enters into it, but I would not want to say to what extent.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It is a contributing cause.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It is a contributing cause that is so with dairy feeds, poultry feeds, and all other feeds where we use corn and other carbohydrate grains. On account of the shortage of protein feeds we have increased the carbohydrates and decreased the other.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Along that line of what the gentleman has just said, I may say that for many years I have been trying to induce the A. A. A. organization down here and Congress to permit the dairy farmers to produce corn to fill the silos. I have been defeated every time in my effort to get through such an amendment. Had that been permitted last year we would have 500,000,000 bushels more corn to sell to the people this year than we have.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How in the world did they keep them from doing it? They did not pay them to do it. They could do it if they wanted it. I did it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman did it because he is an individualist and an independent and he wanted to run his own business.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And I did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many farmers said, "We have to go along with the farm program and raise 8 acres of corn instead of 20 acres because we will be considered slackers; we will not get loans and we will not get the other assistance."

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. They were not prohibited from doing it, from putting it in the silo, except they would not pay them for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They were denied benefits under the triple A and many of them did not want to be considered in the slacker class.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to conclude by answering the very pertinent question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin. That is, What can we do about this situation? The thing I am going to suggest as the first step that ought to be taken is to coordinate the Government agencies which deal with food, put them all under a food administrator who would have authority to handle this entire food problem. At the present time I do not know how many agencies there are dealing with food, but there are probably 20 of them. Unless we can have an Executive order or legislation to put all phases of production, processing, distribution, rationing, procurement, requisitioning, and allocation, and the establishment of priorities, storage, transportation, and exportation and importation, under a food administrator, we are not going to solve this food problem. As long as we have the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Food Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and other agencies, including, of course, the Army and Navy and the other procurement agencies dealing with this subject of food and working in opposition to each other, we are not going to solve the corn situation or the food situation in any way.

There are pending before this Congress bills to do that very thing. The first bill is the one introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], and referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], has introduced a somewhat similar bill, now pending before the Committee on Agriculture. Unless we can enact legislation or unless the President by Executive order, and he has the authority will consolidate these agencies dealing with food, I see no possibility of meeting the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. With regard to the question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin as to what we can do about it, does the gentleman from Kansas know if the O. P. A. or the other agencies has considered the usual technique of compulsion that is employed. The House passed last week a bill compelling men to give their time in a war industry even at a less wage than they could get elsewhere. Is there under consideration, so far as the gentleman knows, plans to compel the farmer to sell at $1.07 rather than to withhold that corn from the market which he has to sell, in this case not his labor, but goods? If the situation becomes desperate enough, does that become one of the possibilities, regardless of whether he gets more money or not, because it is necessary for the war effort?

Mr. HOPE. I have not heard that discussed. It may be considered, I do not know.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Are there any restrictive measures or regulations now with respect to the production of any food crops? In other words, are farmers who produce corn or beets or rye or barley or wheat limited to any particular acreage under a penalty that if they exceed a certain quota they will be penalized?

Mr. HOPE. There is no limit upon the production of any food crop now except winter wheat and that will be taken off next year. However, if the farmers want to get their benefit payments under the agricultural program they must plant in addition to these crops a certain acreage of war crops.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Did the gentleman say that most of the stock on hand is in the hands of the farmers?

Mr. HOPE. The stock of corn?

Mr. GRANGER. Of corn.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I think most of it is. The stocks on the farm, as I understand it now, were 1,395,000,000 bushels on April 1, the last date for which figures are available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to an analysis of the corn situation by our distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. We see this food and food products problem affect one product after another. If some head is not appointed that has control of these agricultural products for domestic farm use as well as for domestic commercial use and foreign commitments we can expect to see wheat and other farm products also become in an equally embarrassing position.

The sooner the food program is converted fully from a control program to a production program the more assured the consumers will be of an adequate food supply.

DOES THE RIGHT HAND KNOW WHAT THE LEFT HAND IS DOING?

The following item from the Sunday Washington Post should be of interest to every citizen of our country:

PROBLEM OF GRAIN FROM CANADA

Food Boss Chester Davis has spent days looking for a good transportation man to solve that problem of bringing in wheat from Canada.

Commodity Credit Corporation has bought 7,500,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, but not a bushel has moved. Meantime, dairy and poultry farmers in the Northeast are running low on feed grains.

Great Lakes steamers got moving a month late on account of the late thaw. They are loaded down with ore for the steel mills, have no space for grain. Rail movement is the only alternative.

Grain stocks in the United States have been the heaviest in history, but so is consumption of grain.

If and when invasion comes, the civilians on the invasion front, whether in France, the Low Countries, or the Balkans, will have to be fed from the American bread basket. Quickest way to get food to starving people is in the form of grain.

Now, while you are digesting this, I wish to call your attention to the following table from the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Sales of wheat and flour for export under the wheat-flour export programs during fiscal years 1938–39 through April 29, 1943 [1]

	Flour export program		Wheat export program	
	Sales (barrels)	Indicated payments [2]	Sales (bushels)	Indicated payments [2]
Fiscal year—				
1938–39	$5,164,630.54	$5,214,967.88	69,801,561	$20,709,561
1939–40	3,487,304.87	4,312,621.77	18,564,680	3,423,355
1940–41	3,902,703.12	3,809,440.40	3,865,249	573,376
1941–42	2,492,434.08	3,183,341.44	7,806,726	1,027,481
1942–43 [3]	1,782,776.51	3,499,519.44	6,657,587	1,730,439
Total	16,929,849.12	20,019,890.93	106,695,803	27,464,212

[1] Subject to adjustment.
[2] All payments have been made from funds provided under sec. 32, Public Law 320, 74th Cong.
[3] As of Apr. 29, 1943.

Source: Grain Division, Commodity Credit Corporation, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Two important facts are revealed by this clipping and table. First, we paid an export subsidy of nearly $2 per barrel on 1,782,776 barrels of flour and an average export subsidy of 25 to 30 cents per bushel in order to dispose of 6,657,587 bushels of wheat during 1942–43. I shall not, at this time, dwell on the fact that a total of over $47,000,000 was spent on these export subsidies from 1938 to 1943, nor that we paid export subsidies on wheat products in 1936 when we were on an import basis for this crop. This did not make sense in peacetime and we should not tolerate such "goings on" in wartime.

I will, however, call your attention to the fact that, in 1942 and 1943, after we had become engaged in a world war, our planners subsidized more wheat in order to get rid of it than the planners are now importing to replace what they subsidized to get rid of.

The time has come when someone should do some planning for the planners. How much longer must we contend with this inefficiency and lack of common sense in the approach to our food problems?

It could also be pointed out that the export subsidies were larger in percentage for the wheat exported, in many cases, then were the subsidies for the domestic consumer when the 225,000,000 bushels of wheat were released for feeding purposes during 1942 and 1943.

In fairness it should be stated that this wheat export subsidy program was discontinued last month—at least temporarily. There is no reason to subsidize exports up to 30 cents per bushel and then be buying outside wheat that cannot be distributed and pay more for the imported wheat than what is obtained for the subsidized wheat exported.

The left hand surely does not know what the right hand is doing, and sometimes I wonder whether the left hand really cares as much as it should what the right hand is doing, or what it should be doing. Let us get the food production, distribution, and consumption needs in the hands of one agency. No high officials in the present price control program comes with any practical background of food production. We can have a food shortage even in the United States.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to the debate that occurred in the Senate recently involving matters before the Senate in connection with the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, in 1938 the House of Representatives by House Resolution No. 282 authorized the creation of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARTIN DIES, was made chairman. Since the creation of the Dies committee the sum of $495,000 has been appropriated to carry on its investigations and this committee has held extensive investigations throughout the United States. In the process of these hearings it was discovered that many employees of the Government were members of or actively associated with certain organizations which were not in sympathy with our form of government.

The Dies committee made reports to the House from time to time concerning these employees. In 1941 the Department of Justice was given an appropriation of $100,000 and in 1942 the sum of $200,000 to investigate, through the F. B. I., Government employees alleged to be engaged in subversive activities and hostile to our form of government. Pending these investigations the departmental committee was created by the President for the purpose of investigating certain Government employees. Many of the employees involved were also investigated by the Civil Service Commission and by the various departments where they were employed. All of the above evidence was made available to the Kerr committee.

On June 10, 1943, the Senate voted that Senate amendment No. 60, relating to the action of the House in providing that no part of the appropriation should be used to pay the salaries of Drs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, be sent back to conference.

There seemed to be much confusion in the Senate as to what had transpired in the House and before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and particularly as to the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Senator MCKELLAR requested from the Kerr committee the transcripts of evidence in the above hearings a few days before this matter was taken up in the Senate and the evidence was promptly furnished to him. It was not contemplated that this evidence would be printed at least until all hearings were completed. A number of the Senators seemed not to have a clear understanding of what had transpired or what the procedure had been in reference to these hearings, as for instance:

First. Senator LUCAS, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5604, said:

> Apparently these men are being discharged from appointed positions because of what was developed before the Kerr committee, the Senate being denied the opportunity to peruse that evidence. To discharge the men under such circumstances is tantamount to convicting them as being Communists without a hearing or trial.

Second. Senator OVERTON, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5604, stated:

> There was not a scintilla of evidence in the House hearings taken by the subcommittee in charge of this bill with reference to any one of the three men.

Third. Senator CLARK of Missouri, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5605, stated:

> It is a fact, is it not, that these men have been condemned so far as the action of one body is concerned without any hearing whatever, except in star-chamber proceedings, the records of which are not available to the membership even of the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or to the ordinary mine-run Members of the Senate or House? In other words, we do not know on what basis the so-called Kerr committee arrived at its conclusions that these men were disqualified to hold office.

Fourth. Senator BONE, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5605, stated:

> Mr. President, it seems to me that this sort of procedure should be challenging to every lawyer in this body, and there are some very able lawyers in the Senate and men who have served on the bench. I think every one of them must shrink at the contemplation of a proceeding which amounts to a bill of attainder in the absence of any formal hearing or the production of any proof which would be convincing and persuasive.

Fifth. Senator MEAD, on the same page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is quoted as stating:

> I do not believe the Senate should take action in a high-handed affair such as this presents itself to be.

Sixth. Senator BYRD, on page 5604 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, states:

> What I want to know is, Is there any evidence which has been brought to the attention of the committee which is conclusive * * * that any of these men are members of communistic organizations?

It is very evident that there was a general misunderstanding among the Senators as to the proceedings upon which the House passed the amendment in relation to Drs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett.

Taking up the statements or quotations from the Senators in the numerical order:

First, Senator LUCAS. The Senate has never been denied the opportunity "to peruse the evidence." The transcripts

have been available at all times to any and all of the Members of the Congress and in a number of instances Members of Congress have called for these transcripts and have examined them. All the transcripts were turned over to Senator McKellar by the clerk of the special subcommittee. The exhibits in these cases are voluminous and are and have been available to all Members of Congress, but to deliver them from one office to another would require trucks or wheelbarrows to transport them.

In answer to the suggestion that these men were convicted without a hearing or trial, it is stated that they were heard. In the case of Dr. Lovett there were 103 exhibits and 84 pages of testimony. In the case of Dr. Watson there were many exhibits and 246 pages of testimony. In the case of Dr. Dodd there were a number of exhibits and 78 pages of testimony. In addition to this testimony taken before the Kerr committee there were several hundred pages of testimony taken before the Dies committee and each of these men were examined by representatives of the F. B. I. and by representatives of other committees and departments, all of which evidence is now and has been at all times available to the Members of Congress or to other interested parties.

Second, Senator Overton. The statement of Senator Overton that "there was not a scintilla of evidence in the House hearings taken by the subcommittee in charge of this bill with reference to any one of the three men," shows that the Senator was not informed at all upon what had transpired in connection with these hearings, and reference is here made to my answer to the statement made by Senator Lucas, to wit: "That there were hundreds of pages of testimony taken and that the transcripts are now and have always been available."

Third, Senator Clark of Miss uri. The statement of Senator Clark of Missouri that these men have been condemned without any hearing whatever except in star-chamber proceedings the records of which are not available to the membership of the House, is utterly without foundation and shows that the Senator was not informed as to what had transpired and did not take the trouble to inquire about the hearings. Here I refer the Senator to the rules of procedure of the Kerr committee, as set forth in the Appendix of the Congressional Record at page A2763, in extension of remarks of Hon. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, as follows:

1. Unless or until otherwise ordered, all hearings before this committee shall be held in executive session.

2. It is the understanding of this committee that it is acting under a mandate of the Congress of the United States to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes have been subversive to the Government of the United States, and to report to the House of Representatives the conclusions of the committee with respect to each case in the light of factual evidence obtained, and that it is not the province of this committee to pass upon any legal or constitutional questions that may be raised, such responsibility being the proper office of the House of Representatives after this committee has made report of its findings and conclusions.

3. The committee will proceed to collect and review all of the reports of the several committees and the reports of investigations made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation together with such transcripts of evidence as may be available from the several investigating committees, and prepare a digest or memorandum of each individual case for the aid of the committee and for use at such time as the person charged shall appear for examination.

4. After all such evidence has been assembled, reviewed, and a digest made, an invitation by letter to the accused shall be mailed suggesting a time and place at which such accused person will be privileged to appear in person before the committee and make such statement or explanation under oath as such person may desire and to answer such questions as may be propounded. The invitation shall either advise the accused of the specific charges and allegations made or shall set forth that if the accused is unacquainted with the charges and allegations a copy will be furnished upon request in person or by telephone.

5. The proceedings before this committee will be summary.

6. All reports of the several committees and the investigations made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with such transcripts of evidence as are made available from the several investigating committees, and all letters, resolutions, and other data bearing upon each individual case will be treated as a part of the evidence and record in each particular case.

7. The following definition of "subversive activity" is adopted by the committee for the purposes of the examinations to be conducted, namely:

"Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all. Such activity may be open and direct as by effort to overthrow, or subtle and indirect as by sabotage."

8. After the committee has made its findings and conclusions, a report thereof at convenient intervals will be made to the Committee on Appropriations for such other and further action as it may deem proper.

9. Upon the completion of the hearings before this committee the transcripts of all evidence taken will be delivered to the clerk of the Appropriations Committee to be, in turn, delivered over by him to the file clerk of the House of Representatives.

10. If this committee shall deem it necessary and advisable to require the attendance of witnesses other than the accused person or the production of books or papers or documents by subpena or otherwise, or if the accused person shall fail to appear in response to the invitation issued by the committee and it shall be deemed necessary and advisable to subpena the accused person, then and in such event another or other rules of procedure may be adopted.

Fourth, Senator Bone. The answer to the statements of Senator Clark of Missouri would seem to be a complete answer to the statements of Senator Bone, charging that there was no formal hearing or the production of any proof which would be convincing and persuasive. No one has charged that there was anything high-handed or secretive about the proceedings of this committee except Secretary Ickes in his statement mailed to the Members of Congress. The accused persons in every instance stated that they had had a fair hearing and had been given every opportunity and the only opportunity to present their views and explanations of the charges. The statements made by Secretary Ickes were careless and in some instances without any foundation whatsoever, and such a careless attack upon a committee of Congress by a member of the Cabinet is to be deplored.

Fifth, Senator Meade. The statement of the Senator that "I do not believe the Senate should take action in a high-handed affair such as this presents itself to be" shows that the Senator was either not informed or was misled and misinformed by the statements of Secretary Ickes.

Sixth, Senator Byrd. The Senator from Virginia very properly inquired if there was any evidence brought to the attention of the committee that any of these men are members of communistic organizations, and the reply was in the negative. The Senator from Virginia is here advised that an examination of the records will disclose that these men were members of and associated with organizations which were not only communistic but which advocated the overthrow of this Government, and as an example of one of such organizations I refer to the membership of Dr. Watson in an organization which he sponsored and helped to organize, known as New America, and he spoke for it all over the country. New America in its official pamphlet advocated the following:

1. Agitation and struggle for revolutionary change.

2. Eliminate private ownership.

3. Under the heading "Methods" New America was to prepare to resort to force and violence.

4. New America will direct the forces of hate and destruction that remove obstacles in order to build.

5. Under the heading "Coercion" New America prepares the masses to use sufficient coercive strength at the proper time.

6. Under the heading "Other organizations" New America will cooperate in genuine united-front movements designed to weaken capitalistic society. New America offers and strives to maintain an attitude of friendliness to other revolutionary groups that have the same general objectives.

In a mimeograph issued by New America entitled "Suggestions in Propaganda Technique" it was explained that there was a good way and a bad way to present the purposes and program to the American people and contains elaborate precaution as to the use of the right words, and ends up by giving recommended examples as follows:

EXAMPLE OF SUBSTITUTION

ORIGINAL

The only chance the worker has is to seize power through a revolutionary movement, destroy capitalism, set up a Socialist state.

SUBSTITUTED

The only chance that the wage earners have is to get the political and economic

authority through a party recognizing the need for social change, completely change the economic system, and set up an intelligently planned society.

Do not use: "Seize power," "revolutionary potentiality," "fight for," "revolution."

Substitute: "Get the authority," "social consciousness," "work for," "basic social change."

Anyone who will examine these suggestions and propaganda technique will find it easy to understand and interpret the words and writings of Dr. Watson and others.

Dr. Watson conducted two trips to Europe under the auspices of the Open Road, a travel group approved by the Communists. He led a similar group to Mexico when Mexico was on the verge of going Communist. His magazine articles and speeches contain phrases and statements that can only be construed as advocating overthrow of this Government when interpreted with his examples of substitution.

It was stated by Secretary Ickes that these accused persons had been denied the right of counsel, and this statement has been quoted by Members of the Senate and of the House. It is here stated that this is not true and that the statement of Secretary Ickes is without foundation. No person appearing before this committee has asked for counsel and no person has been subpenaed to appear before this committee. The question of the right of counsel has never been raised. These parties have appeared in response to a letter inviting them to appear if they desired to do so and make such explanations or statements as they cared to make in connection with the allegations and charges.

I submit that the rules of procedure adopted by this committee are in keeping with the procedure before other congressional committees, and I challenge the statement by any person or persons that these parties have not been given a fair hearing with every opportunity to make any explanation or defense to any and every charge against them. In every case the person invited to appear before the committee was advised of the charges which had been made on the floor of the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman DIES—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 1, 1943.

Many persons may agree with Senator BYRD of Virginia that if these parties are members of subversive organizations and that the department heads refuse to dismiss them the only way left to bring about their dismissal is through this method adopted by the House of Representatives, and that while one may not approve this method it is justified as the only course left to bring about a necessary purge.

A great deal of the confusion seems to have arisen in the minds of the Senators through the reading of the statement of Secretary Ickes, which has been broadcast throughout the Nation. The Secretary was once a lawyer and, we may admit, an able lawyer, but a lawyer may be able and yet unfair. The Secretary of the Interior concludes his Nation-wide broadcast with a statement that the Kerr subcommittee had based its action as to Dr. Robert Morss Lovett upon two statements, one by a woman under Federal indictment for sedition and the other by a Fascist sympathizer, and finally says:

These are the people used by the Kerr subcommittee to brand as disloyal a patriotic American citizen.

This statement is unfair and untrue. Dr. Lovett was admittedly a member of more than 100 organizations and a number of them were admittedly Communist dominated, as will appear by the F. B. I. reports, and Dr. Lovett admitted the Communist affiliation in a number of these organizations. The Secretary further overlooks the fact that a Senate committee of the Legislature of the State of Illinois in 1935, after an exhaustive investigation into the subversive activities within the University of Chicago, made a finding upon Dr. Lovett, who had been a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago for nearly 40 years, as follows:

Fair consideration of all evidence received by the committee compels the conclusion that Prof. Robert Morss Lovett has pursued an unpatriotic course of conduct for a period of 8 or 10 years. From the testimony and exhibits considered by the committee he is not loyal to the spirit or letter of the Constitution of Illinois or the United States.

The Secretary complains that Dr. Lovett did not have an opportunity to develop a great variety of facts and circumstances which demonstrated his loyalty and patriotism, and that the transcript of hearing was not shown to Dr. Lovett or to the Department of the Interior or even to the House of Representatives. This statement is without any foundation in fact. Dr. Lovett was given every opportunity to develop any facts which he desired. It is true that the transcript of evidence was not shown to Dr. Lovett or to the Secretary, but it was and has been available at all times to any interested parties and neither Dr. Lovett nor the Secretary has asked to see it.

The Secretary further states:

Yet the Kerr subcommittee not only denied the right of counsel but conducted its interrogation in a secret session, the transcript of which is still not available.

This statement is not true. Dr. Lovett made no request or suggestion that he have counsel and, therefore, there could be no denial of the right of counsel, and the transcript has always been available. In this connection it is stated that the Kerr committee has examined the records and heard evidence involving three employees of the Department of the Interior, namely, Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Mr. Arthur Edward Goldschmidt, and Mr. Jack Bradley Fahy. In the cases of Goldschmidt and Fahy the committee completely exonerated both men, and in the memo exonerating these two men the committee set out that there was no evidence tending to show any subversive activity and that on the contrary both men were rendering to the Government loyal and patriotic service of a high degree and that they were both men of high character and integrity. The disposition of these last two mentioned cases were not mentioned in the broadcast of Secretary of Interior Ickes and very little has been said about them in the press.

If the Senate desires to make intelligent disposition of the amendment now pending it is hoped that the Members of the Senate will examine the transcript and record in these cases and not act upon the circulars distributed by the interested parties and by the Secretary of the Interior, who is a member of the Cabinet and who ought not to issue such statements until he has thoroughly and carefully examined the facts.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I was almost fascinated by the calm and intelligent manner in which the distinguished gentleman from Kansas discussed the difficulty, and I was distressed that no greater relief could be suggested by so intelligent and well-informed a gentleman than what he suggested, simply that we shift officers again at the head of this agency.

I am quite satisfied that the executive and administrative officers trying to administer this program are doing it just about as well as anybody else could do it, but it is so big, so broad in its scope, that it would be utterly impossible for any human agency or agencies to do satisfactorily what during this war we are having to try to do. There is no partisanship in it. Our executive officers are just as able as we are. I think if the leaders of the executive branch of the Government were compared with this House, which I am coming to love, or with the other branch of Congress, they would be found our peers. I think they are doing the best they can do, but some things just cannot be done.

One thing this bureaucratic crowd did yesterday the gentleman did not mention, but I think it will be a very great help to us. I am sure he would have said so if I could have had a chance to ask him the question about it. That is, the President approved the sale of millions of bushels of saved-up wheat, which serves very largely the same feed purposes that corn does. So in our husbandry and in our effort to meet these difficulties, this horrible conglomeration of inefficient administrative officers has some direct and most helpful relief ready in the ever-normal granary of Mr. WALLACE, who has been kicked about so much that nobody hardly mentions him now. Millions of bushels will meet this very same difficulty.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. That is very true, and the sale of wheat will, of course, temporarily relieve this critical feed situation, but nevertheless we cannot dip very much further into our wheat supply without running into the same critical situation there we are in as far as corn is concerned.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We have more wheat than we ever had at any period of the world's history, with

the crop being harvested right now in some sections.

Mr. HOPE. That is very true, yet the winter wheat crop this year is something like 25 percent below that of last year and the prospects for the spring wheat crop are about the same. We have never in 1 year raised as much as 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country, whereas our consumption of feed grain is almost 4,000,000,000 bushels a year or perhaps in excess of that. So we cannot count upon wheat as a source of feed supply to any great extent. In addition, we are going to have to retain some wheat supply to carry out our obligation, which we have already assumed, of feeding the war-torn countries as soon as we can get the food to them.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is to be considered, it is true, but last year the prophecy was bad about the crop and it exceeded any year but one in the history of this country, and we grew more grain last year than ever before. We had all we wanted; we supplied our allies; and for the first time in the history of America, according to the best statistics available, we had 7 percent more grain left over than we needed.

There is no shortage of any of these things. We are uneasy that there will be a shortage. There is no shortage of livestock; there is no shortage of protein feeds; there is no shortage of any of these things; but the demand is greater, and the demand related to the supply gives difficulty and makes us very uneasy.

The whole of it is that the crop is just in front of us. Our expectations are not as rosy as I wish they were, but certainly it should postpone for quite a while anything like a pinching difficulty. Oats are being gathered now. Wheat and barley are only 2 weeks from harvest.

Another thing as to these foods we are worried about, such as corn: The difficulty is that our farmer friends in the Corn Belt have the corn. They know we need it. They can use a little of it, not much, in the way the very well-informed gentleman from Kansas points out, to feed the hogs. But as to the crop just in front of us, shrewd as these farmers are, if they do not look out, they are going to be caught with an abundant corn supply and a lowered price. I think they are going to see that in the next few days and do some better about putting corn on the market.

This country is not in any danger except for a little pinch for a little while. That can be remedied by the people who want to buy the corn getting permission to pay more for it, which permission I have no doubt they will be accorded very soon by any administrator, if nothing else can be done. But the foods about which we are in danger of serious difficulty are those foods of which we need so much more and that our farmers cannot afford to grow because it will not pay them except when they have incentive payments and when they are promised to be held free from loss by so doing. Every pound of protein we can get will save more corn than we can save any other way and save more wheat than we can save any other way.

What this Congress ought to do is try to provide in some way now robustly to help raise the protein feeds, which we will not raise, and have not in the past raised unless we give the farmer some security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

THE FARMERS OF THE NATION STAND BETWEEN OUR PEOPLE AND FAMINE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now being considered makes appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. It appropriates for grants to States for the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve services for promoting the health of mothers and children the sum of $5,820,000; and to enable each State to extend and improve services for crippled children the sum of $3,870,000; and for the care of homeless and neglected children, or children in danger of becoming delinquent, the sum of $1,510,000; for the rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry the sum of $3,500,000; for vocational education the sum of $14,200,000; and for training defense workers in schools throughout the Nation the sum of $90,000,000. The bill makes an appropriation for old-age assistance of $325,000,000, and for aid to dependent children of $65,000,000; for aid to the blind, $9,000,000.

These are wise provisions. The appropriation for old-age assistance, if matched by the States—and for the most part it will be—will afford the sum of approximately $650,000,000 for the aid of our old people who otherwise would suffer for the necessities of life. This appropriation will go far to prevent old age and want—that ill-matched pair—from being the companions of thousands of worthy men and women who, through no fault of their own, are no longer able to earn a living.

The appropriations made for dependent children, for the blind, for maternal and child welfare, for crippled children, for the rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry, for the vocational training of our young people in the schools throughout the country, and for the public-health service merit the support of each and every Member of this House.

The children who, as a result of these appropriations, will receive care and training in the formative years of their lives are not only the wards of the Nation. They constitute a living part of our most priceless assets. Our children are the seed corn of the Nation. We can ill afford to lose any of them. Their loss would be irreparable.

Much has been said in the course of this debate on the subject of food. Through the bungling of this administration the people of this Nation, for the first time in their history, have been brought face to face with an alarming food shortage and an ever-increasing rise in the cost of living. Many well-informed persons are making the startling prediction that before this year is over famine will stalk the land. The causes for this dreadful situation are not far to seek. For more than a year past, the President has been repeatedly urged to appoint an experienced, capable food administrator, with full power to encourage the production of foods, their processing, canning, preparation for human consumption, storing, distribution, and with power, through cooperation with producers and processors, to keep their prices in due bounds. He has turned a deaf ear to all of these proposals. Instead of adopting the course followed by Woodrow Wilson in the First World War, he has set up agency after agency, clothing all with limited and doubtful powers, and all of which are now working at cross purposes with one another.

The farms of the country have been stripped of manpower through the unwise administration of the Selective Service Act and through the inability of the farmer to compete with the high wages paid in industry. The farmers have been unable to purchase needed farm machinery. The manufacture and sale of fertilizers has been curtailed. In addition to this, we have had the most unfavorable weather for the growing of crops that has been experienced for many years. This is a matter over which neither a Government nor individuals have any control. But the uncertainty of weather conditions is a factor that must always be taken into consideration in the growing of crops and in the production of foods. The War Production Board, through the restrictions it has placed upon the manufacture and allocation of farm machinery and apparatus and supplies and equipment for canning, and the restrictions and unprecedented labeling requirements which the O. P. A. has forced upon the canners of food, the meat packers of the country, and all others engaged in the processing and preparation of foods for human consumption, are contributing causes to the situation that now confronts us, for which the administration is altogether responsible.

The unprecedented floods in the Mississippi Valley, the drought in the far West, the incessant rains in the great vegetable growing areas of the country, both in the Central and Northern States, have prevented the planting and cultivation of vegetables for canning and the planting of corn and oats. Throughout the great food producing States of the Middle West thousands of acres have not yet been planted in crops. This same condition exists in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York. The agricultural experts of the University of Tennessee have made surveys that disclose that the crops in the State of Tennessee this year will probably be 25 or 30 percent less than last year.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Thousands of those boys taken to the armed services were raising money crops, were they not, like tobacco and cotton,

those crops that we are not going to suffer so much from?

Mr. JENNINGS. Some of these boys were, but the great majority of them were raising wheat, corn, potatoes, livestock, vegetables, and helping to produce dairy products.

I have letters from scores of farm owners in my district, old men from 70 to 80 years of age, who own farms ranging from 150 to 300 acres. They state to me that their farms will not be cultivated this year for the reason that the last boy or the last grandson they had on the place who knew how to farm had been drafted and put into the armed service of the country. There is not now, and there has not been, disposition on the part of the farmers or the farm boys of this country to avoid service in the armed forces of the Nation. But certain it is, we cannot successfully wage war, feed our own soldiers, those of our allies, and provide for our own people here at home, without an adequate supply of bread and meat, vegetables and dairy products. The truth is that we may overlook the fact we are undertaking to fight a 500,000,000 population war with 132,000,000 people.

The gentleman from North Carolina had something to say about the growing of tobacco and intimated that its growth should be done away with.

In Tennessee and in other States this is the chief money crop of the farmers. In my district there are more small tobacco growers, that is, men with an allotment of only one-half an acre to an acre or an acre and a half, than in any other district in the United States. The tobacco which these farmers and their families grow does not interfere with their production of food crops. On the contrary, it is an aid to them in the production of foods. It affords them a certain cash income which they otherwise would not have, and it comes in at a time when their taxes are due and around Christmas when, of all times, they need money. Its growth also enables the farmer to keep help on the farm which he otherwise could not have.

For the first time in the history of this country we face a famine. We are facing it at a time when we are producing less than we have ever produced before, and at a time when we need more food for our armed forces than we ever needed before, and at a time when we are proposing to feed our Allies and the peoples of the occupied countries that we propose to liberate. We are promising three square meals a day to the people of all the world while we are being placed on smaller and smaller rations here at home.

The ever-decreasing supply of foods in this country and the ever-increasing cost of foods has been brought about by the meddling and inefficiency of the administration. It has placed in authority men with power to determine the food policies of the administration who are wholly incompetent—intellectuals who think they are supermen and who are disciples of the Frankfurter philosophy of government and life. There is no centralization of authority. There is a division of authority—15 or 20 governmental agencies with no coordination and which are at war with each other through their total lack of understanding of the tremendous and complex problem which they themselves are increasing and multiplying, rather than solving. The restrictive policies which the administration has applied to farmers is decreasing their ability to produce food when there should be an increase in its production. A farmer who produces more food or plants more acres than he is permitted to grow or plant under his soil-conservation contract will lose his benefit payments and his commodity loan. Thus a farmer will suffer a penalty if he exceeds his quotas in the production of foodstuffs. Take the case of a farmer who owns an 80-acre farm. He is permitted to plant only 30 acres in corn. He needs to plant 50 acres of corn. But he can plant 50 acres in corn only if he produces 90 percent of war crops, such as flax, soybeans, peanuts, potatoes, and so forth. Most of the farmers of this country are small farmers, and what I have just said about the growth of corn applies equally to the growth of wheat. There are about 700,000,000 bushels of corn in the country at this time. In October of this year it is estimated that there will be a carryover of 450,000,000 bushels.

For the past 10 years the production of pigs in this country has averaged 70,000,000 annually. Secretary Wickard last year urged the farmers to produce 125,000,000 pigs this year and promised them $14 per hundred for their hogs. The hog raisers have produced 125,000,000 pigs, and there is not enough corn and wheat in the country to feed them, and this shortage of hog feed was brought about by the restrictions placed upon the growers of wheat and corn by the Government.

There are 76,000,000 head of cattle in the country. This includes both beef and milk cattle. There is a shortage of dairy feed and a shortage of poultry feed due to the fact that the farmers who now find themselves with 125,000,000 pigs on their hands must keep the wheat and corn to finish their hogs for market and, therefore, are unable to sell it to the owners of dairy herds and poultry flocks throughout the country.

These facts, together with crop failures throughout the country, will inevitably lower our standard of living. The long-haired professors and disciples of Frankfurter in Washington now glibly say to the country that we will have to abandon the finishing of our beef cattle, lambs, hogs, and poultry for human food and teach our people to eat hog, cattle, dairy, and poultry feed, instead of meats. They say that in that way we will have plenty of food and will not have to go to the trouble of growing animals and poultry and doing all the labor incident to the production of dairy products. Hereafter, according to them, when you think you want roast turkey or fried chicken, you will get yourself a tin bill and make a meal off poultry feed, and when you hunger for a pork chop, roast lamb or a beef steak, you, like the prodigal son, may fill your "belly with the husks that the swine did eat."

This perilous condition does not frighten those in Washington who have brought it about. It brings to their hands a situation that is exactly to their liking. Those who would remake America, in order to obtain their objectives, must have, first, chaos, and, second, a total regimentation of production and distribution of food and all of the necessities of life. They have planned it that way.

The administration has gotten the American people into this hole, and the President is blandly saying "Give me $2,000,000,000 and I will fix it so you can buy butter, meat, bread, and vegetables on a roll-back basis."

Now, let's see what this means. The proposed reduction in prices as a result of the so-called roll-back, financed by a subsidy, will amount to this: It will result in the saving to each individual in the country of $3 per year on meat, 60 cents per year on butter, and 30 cents a year on coffee. The Government does not have $2,000,000,000. It cannot obtain $2,000,000,000 by taxation. It has already scraped the bottom of the tax barrel. Uncle Sam is broke, so far as ready money is concerned. To get this $2,000,000,000 the Government must print and sell bonds. So that the individual who has saved $3.90 per year by virtue of the roll-back in the prices of his meat, butter, and coffee will ultimately be called upon to pay, in principal and interest, $9.15. In other words, you pay for all you get in this world. You cannot get something for nothing. The $2,000,000,000 necessary for this proposed subsidy will amount to $5,000,000,000 dollars, principal and interest, when pay day comes.

The individual who receives a $3.90 reduction in his grocery bill by reason of this subsidized roll-back may think he is dancing to a new tune, but, in the end, he will pay the fiddler. In fact, he will not have to wait long before he begins to pay. The New Deal, with its left hand, will hand him $3.90 of hush money, and with its right hand will take $9 15 from him. The individual will pay the butcher, the baker, and the grocer that $3.90 less, and the Government will take from him in taxes, direct and indirect, $9.15. It is a flim-flam, a delusion, and a snare. It is a campaign fund for the fourth term, and those who are foisting it on the people are doing so in the hope that they are naive, childish, and unsophisticated enough to think they are really getting something for nothing. The truth is, the American people are just now beginning to reap the bitter fruits of the crackpot doctrine that the way to be prosperous is to go broke and that woeful want no longer follows in the wake of willful waste.

I here include an editorial from the Knoxville Journal:

[From the Knoxville Journal of May 12, 1943]

GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE IN LAND CONDEMNATION SUITS IS CONCERN OF ALL COUNTRY'S CITIZENSHIP

In Sunday's Journal there was a story in connection with land condemnation suits in the Roane-Anderson area that was of concern not only to the citizens whose lands were subjected to forced sale to the Government

but to all of us, for reasons the reader will be quick to grasp.

An attorney for some of the dispossessed landowners asserts that special attorney for the Department of Justice, Mr. J. C. McKenzie, said in the course of a recent conference that he had instructions to appeal for the Government in any instance in which the existing jury of view might make an award to a property owner in excess of what Federal acquisition agents originally offered. Mr. McKenzie is further charged with saying that he is allowed absolutely no discretion in making such appeals.

It is only fair to point out that Mr. McKenzie denies the statements attributed to him, and it is to be sincerely hoped that the difference of opinion boils down to being simply a misunderstanding between the attorneys involved.

For if this should not prove to be the case, the procedure now being employed, whereby a landowner dissatisfied with the price offered in condemnation action can carry his case before the jury of view for a reexamination of his case, is a complete farce. This is so because if all protesting landowners are to be forced to carry their cases into court on appeal, with attendant expenses for lawyers' fees and court costs, most of them will do better to take what the Government originally offered, no matter what the rights and wrongs of their cases may actually be.

Such procedure would not legally be depriving citizens of their property without due process of law but certainly this is what it would be in reality. It would be a method none of us would like to see his government guilty of, and from that standpoint this whole question is a matter of concern to every citizen, no matter whether he has land acquired under the condemnation proceedings under discussion or not.

It will be granted, of course, that it is a human failing for any of us to get sentimental values mixed up, in our appraisal of our own property, with actual values. On the other hand, it is always possible for even Federal land appraisers to make mistakes in evaluating as much property as came under their view in the purchase of 56,000 acres in the Roane-Anderson tract.

It is a matter of simple justice for the citizen to be able to carry his complaint of being offered too little before an arbiter—in this case the jury of view—empowered to give him some relief if he deserves it. Certainly every citizen should not be forced to carry his case to the Supreme Court to force his own Government to pay a fair price for his land, regardless of the facts in his case.

The public will await with interest the outcome of the large number of cases before the jury of view.

Mr. Chairman, this editorial has reference to the acquisition by the War Department of 56,000 acres of land situated in Anderson and Roane Counties, in my district. When it was announced in October 1942 that the Government proposed to acquire this vast boundary of land, I, on October 24, wired the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of War as follows:

One thousand farmers in 56,000-acre area being taken over by War Department for military purposes in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn., have been ordered to move. Their plight is desperate. They desire to acquire and operate farms. Farm lands are scarce. Delay in payment to them is threatened and will be disastrous.

I met with more than 500 of the people of this area and discussed with them the question of their loss of their homes and assured them that, in my opinion, the Government would deal fairly with them and pay them the value of their farms. They did not wish to give up their homes because they knew it would be difficult to obtain other farms on account of the rapidly advancing prices of farm lands and the fact that farmers were disinclined to sell their farms.

Without waiting to see if it could acquire these farm lands through voluntary purchase and sale the War Department filed in the United States district court at Knoxville, Tenn., a blanket condemnation suit against all the owners of lands in the area, and the owners and occupants of the lands were ordered to move. The Government sent land appraisers from distant States to place a value on these lands, and the valuation placed on them was so low that the owners, for the most part, declined to accept the amounts offered. Hundreds of these landowners appealed to me for assistance. They furnished me affidavits which disclosed the fact that the Government was offering them for their lands anywhere from 90 percent to one-third the value thereof. In addition to this, I went in person upon many of the farms that were being taken over by the Government and, in company with the county judge of Anderson County, who is a landowner and knows the value of lands, satisfied myself of the justice of the complaints of the landowners. I am familiar with the farms in this entire section. I know the value of farm lands in Anderson and Roane Counties, and I can testify to the fact that the Government is undertaking to acquire title to these lands for sums far below their real value.

I recall that in one instance the Government sought to take the farm of a blind minister of the gospel, who had lost both of his hands in an accident, for one-third of its value. In anotner instance, it is seeking to take the 333-acre river farm of the wife of an ex-soldier for the sum of $5,200, when the proof shows that this farm is worth $15,000. Mr. Stewart, who bears upon his body the scars of wounds received in battle, writes me as follows about the effort of the Government to take his wife's property for less than it is worth:

I do hope you will not feel that I am too persistent in my letters to you in re our property in the Anderson County area, but this thing is taking a turn that will seriously affect every one of us who is dissatisfied with the appraisals made in that area.

Mr. Morgan, the Government official in charge of the acquisition of these lands, states he will not accept any decision of the jury of view but expects to appeal any finding by the jury that raises the price of any of these lands.

You who know of the general financial condition of a majority of the people in this district and of the effect of a prolonged suit to get reasonable justice from the Government, and you know that we will be broke or dead before we get a final settlement.

Are we to have the vast power of the Federal Government in bitter arrayment against us getting a reasonable settlement for these properties. If Mr. Morgan's power to delay settlement by appeal to higher and still higher courts is not checked, we will never be able to get anywhere.

Judge, for the love of God and your people in this district, stop this confiscation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. STEWART.

I have repeatedly called the facts with reference to the injustice with which these property owners are being treated to the attention of Judge Robert R. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. He has sent representatives from his office who have conferred with me about the matter. They, in effect, stated that if the War Department had a valuation of these lands other than that fixed by the War Department's appraisers and that fixed by the owners and their appraisers, they felt that an amicable and speedy settlement could be made with the landowners. Such a standard has since been furnished. Some of the landowners who stood upon their rights and refused to accept the inadequate prices offered by the Government for their farms and homes have since had their farms appraised by a jury of view appointed by the judge of the United States district court at Knoxville, Tenn.

These lands were appraised for the Government, by land bank appraisers from distant States who do not know the values of farm lands in Tennessee. A thousand farm families have been evacuated from the area. Some of the landowners took the money offered them by the Government rather than to incur lawyer fees and suffer the long delays incident to a lawsuit. Others, being of the native Tennessee Anglo-Saxon stock, decided to fight for their rights. As heretofore stated, I met and talked with these people about the giving up of their homes, and they said: "We hate to give up our farms, our homes, the cities of our dead, our churches, our community life, our association with our neighbors. This is an area that is consecrated by the dust of our ancestors and we have lived here all of our lives, but our boys are giving up their lives and we will give up our homes."

I asked the Secretary of War of this great Government of ours to pay to these people the fair value of their lands. I regret to say that he has assumed the attitude of an invader. Again and again I have furnished him with affidavit after affidavit made by the owners of these lands and by disinterested parties who knew the value of the lands. All these have been by him ignored.

I want to call your attention now to the conclusions reached by the jury of view with respect to the valuation of these lands. The men who composed this jury of view were disinterested. They have had years of experience in valuing farm lands. They are men of intelligence and character. They went upon the lands and heard the testimony of unimpeachable witnesses with respect to the value of the lands, and I am now going to cite the cases that they acted upon:

The farm of T. W. Fox, of 145 acres in Anderson County, was valued by the Government appraisers at $8,500. The jury of view fixed the value of said farm at $12,250, and awarded the owner a recovery for that sum.

Four thousand dollars is too much for a farmer to lose who has put his whole life and all of his energy and all of his capital into a farm that was his home, producing foodstuffs for his family and for the people of this country.

The farm of J. B. Jones, 828 acres in Anderson County, was appraised by the Government appraisers at $25,800. It was valued by the jury of view at $37,760. Twelve thousand dollars is too much for a farmer to be filched of when he stands in the evening of his life.

The farm of C. E. Brennan, 63.4 acres, Anderson County, was valued by the Government appraisers at $2,800. The jury of view, experienced real-estate men, acting under their oaths, having seen the land as they did in each instance, having heard the testimony of witnesses, said that that farm, which the Government appraisers said was worth $2,800, was worth $4,250.

The farm of Andy Rayfield, 103.4 acres, was valued by the Government appraisers at $6,250, and by the jury of view at $7,250.

The farm of Henry Price, 176.2 acres, was valued by the Government appraisers at $7,000, and by the jury of view at $8,281.40.

The farm of J. L. Hackworth, 412.5 acres, was valued by the Government appraisers at $12,000, and by the jury of view at $14,100.

The lands of Henry Price, 38.3 acres, was valued by the Government appraisers at $920, and by the jury of view at $1,460.

The farm of Charles E. Brennan, 177.5 acres, in Anderson County, was valued by the Government appraisers at $4,600, and by the jury of view at $7,280.

The farm of C. F. Brennan, 62 acres in Roane County, was valued by the Government appraisers at $1,200, and by the jury of view at $3,100.

Now I come to the cases that have actually been tried before juries of 12 men in the United States District Court at Knoxville.

Take the farm of C. W. Peak, 293.4 acres, valued by Government appraisers at $15,000. After hearing the testimony and the charge of the court, the jury, by its verdict, put a value of $22,000 on this farm. In this instance the Government offered this citizen, and undertook to force him to accept, just $7,000 short of what his farm is worth.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if most of the land he refers to is in Anderson County.

Mr. JENNINGS. In Anderson and Roane counties.

Mr. PRIEST. The reason I asked the gentleman the question is that I talked to one of the citizens of Clinton last Saturday and he gave me some of the same information which the gentleman is giving with reference to this land.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Clinton is the county seat of Anderson County.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Is the gentleman referring to Anderson County, S. C., Anderson County, Ky., or Anderson County, Tenn.?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about Anderson County, Tenn. Take the case of Earl Stringfield. He owns a farm of 146.8 acres in Anderson County. The Government appraisers valued his farm at $3,800. A jury of 12 men, in the United States Court at Knoxville, fixed the value of his farm at $5,000.

You would think that after the Secretary of War was brought face to face with a thorough investigation, upon the sworn testimony of reputable witnesses adduced through judicial proceedings, with the real values of these lands, that he would not wage war with and would not make war upon the citizens of this country.

The Secretary of War, of course, cannot have personal knowledge of the value of these lands, but he should remember that, in acquiring title to these farms and to these homes, he has not invaded a foreign country and that he is not dealing with aliens. He is dealing with citizens of the United States. These men have made farming their lifelong vocation. They wish to continue to farm. They cannot continue to farm unless they can get the value of the lands which have been taken from them and go elsewhere and buy other farms. It is amazing that the Secretary of War, charged with waging a victorious war, would take such an attitude against loyal citizens of this country whose boys are serving on every battle front around the world, and many of whom, ere this conflict is over, will have given their lives in defense of this country.

I think it is entirely appropriate that I should bring this matter again to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the country. There is always hope that a man who has done wrong will see the error of his way and do right. The good people in this section of my State are a God-fearing, home-loving, patriotic people. I have heard them sing a song, the burden of which is to this effect, "As long as the lamp holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return." And they are yet indulging the hope that the Secretary of War will yet see fit and proper to discontinue his effort to acquire their lands for less than they are worth and to stop a litigation that is ruinous to the people involved, and that will cost the Government, in the long run, hundreds of thousands of dollars more than it could acquire these lands for on a basis of voluntary sale and purchase at their fair and reasonable value.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not these property owners have been paid?

Mr. JENNINGS. No; they cannot get their money. It has been paid to the Clerk of the District Court at Knoxville. That is, the meager sums offered the owners have been paid to the clerk of the court. The landowner may obtain 75 percent of the small amounts unjustly claimed to be the value of their lands by the Government. The Government has adopted a policy of delay and is doing all that it can to harass these people, to drive them, through coercive and oppressive methods, to accept from their Government a less amount, often as little as one-third of the value of the lands being taken.

This is a matter that should be corrected, and corrected promptly. For the Government to at once, and without further delay, go down to Tennessee and deal justly and fairly with these people and pay them the real value of their lands, would enable these farmers to go elsewhere, buy other farms on which they, with their wives and children, would at once go to work producing potatoes, corn, wheat, oats, barley, cattle, hogs, poultry, and dairy products. It is hard to understand the attitude adopted by these officials of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if the President of this country could forget politics long enough to put a man of the ability and experience of Herbert Hoover in control of the production and distribution of food, he could bring order out of chaos and avert the famine with which the people of this country are threatened.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a statement setting out the facts with reference to these trials.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FIGHTING THE WAR ON THE HOME FRONT AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in these days of victory for the armed forces overseas we need to be reminded of the victories we have yet to win on our home front. As I have said recently, we in this country are facing two major problems. One is winning the war; the other is preventing inflation on the home front.

The war's progress recently has been highly encouraging. We see results that inspire praise and confidence. Those who represent us in war strategy and on the battlefronts are doing well, but what about the big and longer war on the home front—the war against ruinous inflation?

LOSING BATTLE AT HOME

Anyone can see with half an eye that the forces of inflation are making headway. Their undermining influence is showing up in every field of production and trade. While we are winning battles across the seas because of the skill, organization, and bravery of our forces, we are in danger of losing great battles at home because of the carelessness, disorganization, or indifference of those of us here. Look at the facts.

TOO MUCH MONEY

Our pockets are bulging with money and we are engaged in a mad scramble for food, supplies, even luxuries, when we can safely and wisely do with far less. I

recognize that the temptation is powerful. It doesn't take an economist to know that. Today our total excess of usable income over cost of goods and services at 1942 prices will be somewhere between forty and forty-five billion dollars. Last year it was $27,000,000,000. This 1943 sum is almost equal to the total national income in either 1932 or 1933. Such a large amount of additional money in our pockets, after payment of higher taxes and the meeting of all household and personal expenses, calls for exercise of restraint and wisdom which we must be big enough to employ.

EXPENDITURES, THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST

On May 24, 1943, our public debt was $134,000,000,000. Last June, when the President submitted his Budget message to Congress, he said there was an unexpended balance of appropriations for the war in excess of $170,000,000,000. At that time he asked, in addition, for $109,000,000,000. These combined figures indicate a clear prospect of a total public debt at the end of the war of $300,000,000,000. When you compare this with the public debt of $27,000,000,000 at the end of World War No. 1, you can see how vast our expenditures in this war have been and will be compared with those of the last war. The expenditures in the last war exceeded the total expenditures of all our previous wars by more than 10 times. The present World War will certainly cost more than 10 times the total expenses of the last World War.

SPENDING OURSELVES INTO POVERTY

War as a national burden must be borne by all the people—certainly those on the home front as well as those in our armed forces. If those of us at home do not bear it by taxation and savings, we and our returning service men and women will bear it by savage inflation. It is quite possible for us, in spite of earned incomes this year more than 50 percent higher than in any previous year in our history, to spend ourselves into poverty. What can we say to our returning men and women if we have so wasted our substance that after the war their dollar and ours is worth less than 10 cents?

HIGH STANDARD OF LIVING NOW

Those who are fortified with the facts and, therefore, in a position to know tell us that thus far in this war we in this country have enjoyed a higher standard of living than we did at any time before this war. In spite of some obvious curtailments such as automobiles, gasoline, meat, and canned goods, our present consumption this year is greater than in even the flush year of 1939.

FIFTY CENTS OF EACH DOLLAR GOING FOR WAR

This war is costing us an enormous sum. At the current rate, we will spend about $90,000,000,000 in 1943, which means that 50 cents out of every dollar of our entire expenditures for all purposes will go for war. As war expenditures increase, it is inevitable that all of us will be compelled to lower our standard of living, since available supplies will decrease and we shall no longer have opportunity to purchase some of the foods and other supplies which will be needed for war purposes. War necessities will make it impossible for us to obtain many of the things we desire—perhaps some of the things we actually need—but if we are compelled to deprive ourselves of luxuries and some essentials, we should know that it is part of the cost of war.

FEW THINGS TO BUY WITH LARGER INCOMES

In 1941, when our total private income was $94,000,000,000, about one-fifth of private purchases went for so-called durable goods; that is, such things as autos, bathtubs, refrigerators, radios, and washing machines. Now almost none of these things can be bought. Materials which went into their construction are diverted into tanks, planes, ships, and machinery of war. As a result, our people, with larger incomes at their disposal, have fewer things they can buy.

NOT ENOUGH GOODS TO GO AROUND

If we in the United States, either because we are thoughtless or selfish, indulge in a mad scramble for the limited supply of things that can be bought, we shall still further reduce that supply and, in the process, boost the prices of the things that remain. Unless controlled by our own efforts, this pressure will grow until we shall have a vicious succession of consequences, each progressively worse. We must frankly face the facts and acknowledge that whether we deal in terms of food, clothing, fuel, or general supplies, there is not enough to go around.

EXCESS INCOME A PROBLEM

Everyone, therefore, in all fairness must do with less. At the same time, if any are financially better off because of higher incomes they must in simple common sense set aside the excess for later use. That is not only the practical safe road, it is the road of improved personal security and independence. Of course, every one of us must decide for himself what he will do with his net income. We can spend it on whatever we can buy, wherever we can buy it, and at whatever we have to pay, and in the end accumulate nothing—or we can set aside regularly for the future and be prepared for whatever may come of personal opportunity or adversity.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

Many things commonly accepted as true before the war are now clearly recognized as false. One of those is the statement, "Everybody's business is nobody's business." That we know with certainty is not true of the war. No matter how grim war is, it is our business and the business of everyone who has a stake in the future. Every living person is affected; no one wholly escapes. Our personal lives and our fortunes, whether we like it or not, are involved.

MUST KEEP INFLATION UNDER CONTROL

It is my conviction that when the farmer and shopkeeper, the miner and plumber, the wage earner and the contractor understand inflation and its vicious evolution, everyone will courageously join in a great partnership to keep it under control. It is our clear duty. Our men and women in the services are prepared to give their lives—surely we should so work together on the home front as to increase our personal and national security and to make life more worth living.

WIN BOTH WAR AND PEACE

This war can bring great tragedy. It will bring tragedy deep and harrowing to many lives, but it can also mark a great turning point in our individual and our national lives. If together in a great country a great people for the first time in history meet a great peril and by cooperation and calm intelligence meet its challenge, we shall have won a great moral as well as a great economic victory. We frequently hear it said that we can win the war and lose the peace. It, of course, is our desire to win both war and peace. Let us make sure of both by such conduct in frugality and cooperative thrift and self-control that we shall submerge the menace of inflation and achieve the enduring benefits of orderly control and use of our fabulous resources.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that more Members of the House are not present, and especially to have heard the intelligent and scholarly discussion about corn and farm production by the able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KEEFE; and the only answer, as I see it, to their query is subsidies and subsidies alone, which have stabilized the price-control system in Great Britain and Canada and should be good enough for America, unless someone in this great body can submit a better plan.

Mr. Chairman, this administration and Congress have failed in their most important task of stabilizing the cost of living. I take this opportunity to inform the American people on the real obstacle to uniform price control.

While the administration, through the Office of Price Administration, is somewhat to blame, the Congress of the United States, with its farm bloc, patronage seekers, and pressure groups, and by its failure to grant sufficient appropriations, has hindered and rendered ineffective the real function of O. P. A. The O. P. A. is the people's agency, and I urge this Congress to strengthen it, not weaken it. The primary responsibility is ours. How? Well, there is but one answer in solution—namely, food subsidies.

We cannot get away from the facts. Labor's wages have been frozen, and the War Labor Board has the power to keep them frozen. Unless this Congress and the farm bloc go along on subsidies to roll back the prices of the food that labor must buy, labor cannot be expected to go along indefinitely on frozen wages. And I do not expect labor to, especially in view of the fact that this same Congress would not freeze salaries at $25,000. This is simple mathematics that all workers can understand, and it does not make sense to them. It is as futile to

expect wages to remain frozen while food prices zoom upward as it would be to expect a cake of ice to remain frozen next to a hot stove.

Food prices have gone up steadily since President Roosevelt's famous "hold the line" order on April 8. Housewives throughout the Nation say the rise is 5 percent. Retailers admit the rise is 2 to 3 percent. Whatever the percentage, food does cost more. That is the one big reason why the miners—who are as patriotic Americans as any group—have followed the leadership of John L. Lewis. That is the one big argument John L. Lewis has on his side. Notwithstanding, in my opinion, John L. Lewis has acted arbitrarily and has failed to display the type of statesmanship required of leaders in time of national emergency.

On May 28 O. P. A. Administrator Prentiss Brown admitted that the "cost of living has gotten away from us." Since then the administration has embarked on its own subsidy program, beginning on butter, with coffee and meat subsidies under way. The legal authority for this action is questioned—yes, by Members of Congress—because Congress is out of step with public sentiment both at home and abroad.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield gladly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understood the gentleman to make the statement that the cost of living had gotten away from the administration. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not he considers that the cost of living has risen in any degree corresponding to the increase in what we term defense-plant wages during the last 2 years for instance?

Mr. WEISS. Yes; I would say it has.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman believes that the cost of living has risen more in proportion?

Mr. WEISS. It has completely gotten away from us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken, as I will prove tomorrow.

Mr. WEISS. I hope the gentleman does, because we all know and admit that the wages of miners, for instance, remained frozen because of their contract entered into a year ago. These simple facts are substantiated by Bureau of Labor Statistics which I have before me which clearly show that food prices have gotten entirely out of our control. During the past year everyday table foodstuffs have risen from 33 to 70 percent. For example, onions have risen from 3 to 7 cents; oranges from 23 and 24 cents a dozen to 45 to 53 cents; lettuce from 10 to 20 cents; celery, 10 to 15 cents to 25 to 29 cents; potatoes, 43 to 84 cents; while wages have remained frozen during the past year under the Little Steel formula.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman picks out a few little things.

Mr. WEISS. I could name dozens of items necessary to maintain an adequate standard of life for most workers of the country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman quotes prices of a few minor things. Take bread, for instance. What is the price of bread?

Mr. WEISS. I am giving the substantial things; foodstuffs on the daily table of all workers' families.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But the gentleman mentioned onions.

Mr. WEISS. The items I mentioned are necessary for maintaining a decent standard of living.

To date, Congress has failed and refused to give the President and the O. P. A. any aid in a real hold-the-line order of stabilizing the cost of living. Congress has refused funds for subsidies and has sought to tie up existing funds out of which subsidies could for a while at least, be paid. Congress fails to recognize that the Canadian Government and the British in the United Kingdom have operated price control with conspicuous success. This is universally admitted by all sections of Canadian and British opinion. At the time that Sir Walter Ilsley, Minister of Finance, made his appeal to Members of the British Parliament for the present British Price Control Act, conservative Members of Parliament ridiculed his efforts maintaining that this was regimentation; that subsidies were inflationary and would result in a collapse of the financial structure of the British Empire. Time, yes, time alone, plus the unified cooperation of a courageous people have proven these statements wrong. Wages and prices have been kept in line throughout the British Empire and have assured a strong morale among the British people in the face of adversity unparalleled in any democracy in the world.

A word to the wise by the proven price-control methods of Canada and Great Britain should be sufficient, but not so with this Seventy-eighth Congress. Ignored, too, is the elementary truth that it is as silly to try to combat inflation without control over food prices as it would be to try to dam water with a half-built dike.

The problem is a vital one of immediate concern to the entire Nation. Every housewife in America knows the answer. It requires no explanations by an economist. The dollar of the housewife today has less than the purchasing power of 50 cents a year and a half ago. If this continues unabated, a barrel of money will hardly buy a barrel of potatoes. These results bring discontentment and unrest among the American people, and will certainly not aid the morale of the Nation. This situation is not true in Canada nor in the British Empire. Why? Subsidies. Subsidies which have very effectively maintained price levels. To complete the program of preventing inflation by stabilizing prices and wages, ration food and clothing to insure fair distribution, we must syphon off surplus spending power by taxation and compulsory savings.

Resorting to subsidization as a means of keeping prices from rising is not a new expedient. Both the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C. are currently subsidizing food processors by buying certain commodities at prices above the levels at which they are later sold. The C. C. C. has agreed, for instance, to buy crops for canning at prices designed to encourage their production and to sell them to canners at prices that enable the latter to operate under the retail price ceilings. The price of coffee has been kept down by similar means as the R. F. C. buys the coffee and sells it to domestic processors for less than the cost of bringing it into this country. Yet, with danger ahead—yes, a probable collapse of our whole price-control system—Congress has no program to stabilize the cost of living. Congress refuses to learn from the practical experience of Canada and Great Britain. Congress fails to analyze correctly the elemental facts of this most vital problem that reaches into every home and affects every man, woman, and child in America. Congress and the administration are attempting by main force and awkwardness, chiefly words, to ignore the simple truths of economics.

The trouble lies in our failure to recognize that if we wish to freeze the retail prices of food and at the same time to make sure that enough food is produced we cannot rely on a general freeze of all prices. Our whole campaign is based on this false assumption—that is, that retail prices in the shops and prices paid to producers are tied together. They are not tied together and they cannot be tied together; and the program will be mere words and will remain unworkable until we all recognize that we must pay the producers one set of prices—enough to assure the production of the right commodities in the right quantities—and that we must assure the consumers another set of prices—low enough and steady enough to maintain an adequate standard of life. We must agree that there has to be one set of prices for the producers and another set for the consumers, and that the spread between the two sets of prices has to be regulated by Government subsidies and Government purchasing. If we fail to recognize this simple economic philosophy, I predict a collapse of our entire price-control system that will endanger our entire economy.

I plead with Congress to stop using the O. P. A. as a whipping post every time someone from back home complains about prices or a new ration regulation. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 119, modeled after the British Price Control Act, giving the President an adequate appropriation for subsidies so that our price-control system can work. My bill provides for the use of Government funds to insulate retail prices against the upward pressure of wholesale prices. This system has proven itself in Canada and in Great Britain. Why not in the United States? We can avoid a national catastrophe from within and help the morale of labor and all America by enacting House Joint Resolution 119 into law. Congress must act. The responsibility is that of Congress and Congress alone.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement from a publication put out by the British Information Service on price control which deals with the general movement of prices from 1939 to 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is extraneous matter the gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WEISS. I will submit my request in the House, Mr. Chairman.

The matter referred to follows:

8. GENERAL MOVEMENT OF PRICES, 1939–42, IN GREAT BRITAIN

At the outbreak of war, prices rose rapidly. During 1940, after the Prices of Goods Act, 1939, came into force, prices continued to rise, though not as rapidly as during the last months of 1939, and by April 1941, the Ministry of Labour's cost-of-living index (based upon the expenditure of working-class households prior to 1914), showed an increase of 29 percent since the outbreak of war. At that time the Chancelor of the Exchequer announced that the Government would endeavor to maintain the cost-of-living index at not more than 25 to 30 percent above the pre-war level. This policy has been effective: At the end of July 1942 the index stood at 30 percent above the pre-war level. Of this 30-percent rise, about 2.6 percent is due to increases in the taxes on sugar, tobacco, and matches, and about 3.9 percent is due to the purchase tax. The price of food has actually been reduced from 24 percent above the pre-war level in April 1941 to 16 percent above that level in July 1942.

The following table shows the movement of wholesale and retail prices since the end of August 1939:

	Wholesale prices [1]	Retail prices: Ministry of Labour cost-of-living index. Figures for end of each month. August 1939=100					
		Total index	Food	Rent	Clothing	Fuel and light	Other items
August 1939	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
January 1940	128	114	117	100	125	111	105
July 1940	142	119	119	101	140	116	122
January 1941	152	127	124	101	165	124	125
April 1941	154	129	124	101	175	124	126
July 1941	156	128	121	101	183	125	128
January 1942	159	129	118	101	194	126	131
July 1942	163	130	116	101	195	132	147

[1] Board of Trade index.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly the oil situation in Kansas and the Midwest.

There has been little so-called pleasure driving in the Midwest since the extension of gasoline rationing to that region late in 1942. The distances which the people must travel to transact necessary business, the lack of other means of transportation, and the fairly rigid mileage allowances to all who obtained supplemental rations, have reduced driving to practically the bare necessities.

Urban transportation in all except the largest cities is by bus. Few cities in most of the States have streetcar systems. In all of Texas, for example, there are four cities with streetcar systems. Only one Oklahoma town has a streetcar line—it operates from downtown to the State capitol. Two cities in Kansas rely in part on streetcars. The list could be extended to many other States. Besides this lack of a form of transportation with which the East is more adequately provided, bus service is meager in many hundreds of fair-sized towns. A great part of the Midwest has based its transportation needs wholly upon the privately owned automobile.

The need for all the mileage that is presently being allowed is indisputable to anyone familiar with this great region of the Nation. There are no idle people. They are producing food and performing the services incidental to the production of food, and there are many hundreds of plants, large and small, engaged in making war materials.

In this region, there is another problem that is so intimately related to gasoline rationing that a reduction in gasoline allowances will result, not in a greater supply to the East, but in a reduction of the over-all supply of gasoline. That is the problem of the smaller refineries which are engaged practically altogether in selling to the motoring public. They do not have equipment for the manufacture of aviation gasoline, or of other products which are being purchased for military use.

The gasoline from such plants is sold in their natural marketing territory. In addition, these plants produce fuel oil. They cannot make fuel oil without first making gasoline. They must sell the gasoline, or cease to operate. None of them have the storage facilities to withhold their surplus gasoline from the market, nor could they finance a program of storage if they had the tanks.

Further, a reduction in their rate of manufacturing would be effected only at high expense. A refinery which processes 1,000 barrels of crude oil per day will not halve its costs by running 500 barrels. On the contrary, its processing costs would be affected but little by such reduction and it would then be necessary for such a plant to realize far more for its finished products than it does when running the greater volume, if it is to continue operating at all.

These smaller plants, or independent companies, are widely scattered throughout the Midwest. The Petroleum Administrator is now putting in a program throughout this region of eliminating cross-hauls and back-hauls so as to free all tank cars possible for the service of the East. Such program would be nullified by any rationing program that would compel refineries to cease operations. A small refinery that serves its immediate trade territory, using tank trucks for distribution, if compelled to cease operations would immediately create a situation where tank cars would have to be diverted into the service of supplying that community, hauling from distant points where refineries of the major companies are located.

Illustrative of this condition, the following are figures on crude-oil-refining capacities of independent refineries in various States of the region outside district 1, or the Eastern States:

Processing capacities of independent refineries

State	Number of plants	Daily crude oil refining capacity	Percent of total crude oil refining capacity in State
Arkansas	6	44,000	100
Colorado	5	8,125	59
Idaho	2	2,500	100
Illinois	14	71,950	25
Indiana	5	14,100	5.7
Kansas	16	82,600	44
Kentucky	7	38,450	67
Louisiana	8	35,900	16
Michigan	18	64,800	69
Minnesota	2	7,500	100
Mississippi	2	7,000	100
Missouri	1	500	2
Montana	10	24,380	65
Nebraska	8	9,650	100
New Mexico	6	7,300	76
Ohio	1	9,300	4.8
Oklahoma	18	90,830	42
South Dakota	4	400	100
Tennessee	1	4,800	100
Texas	57	285,300	25
Utah	2	3,000	24
Washington	2	6,000	100
Wisconsin	1	5,000	100
Wyoming	17	13,155	21.5

Base figures from Oil and Gas Journal. Above capacities do not include cracking capacities.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 15, 1943.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Since our conference in Washington in April on crude price situation the plight of the independent producer has become even more critical. Installation of the 48-hour week is working an added hardship in increased wage scales and labor complications. My association called 2 meetings on June 11 featuring Dr. Frederick Harrison, labor counselor, Petroleum Administration for War, on manpower, and L. B. Holland of No. 2 production committee on materials, I was amazed at the lack of interest. Where there should have been 300 in attendance there were about 75. It is discouraging for the independents to realize that the replacement cost of oil they are selling at an average price of $1.17 is $1.75 to $2. Because of the uncertainties in the tax set-up they are reluctant to take unnecessary risks without any promise of a crude price increase. Recent data compiled reveals the independents have discovered 75 percent of Kansas pools to date, although the greater part of the oil is being produced by major companies. In June 6,290,607 barrels of the State allowable allocations will be produced from pools discovered by independents as against 1,182,687 barrels from pools discovered by major companies. Most of the known structures in Kansas have been tested, leaving only random drilling. The element of risk attendant to finding new oil reserves grows daily. Frankly, Mr. CARLSON, a large number of the successful independent producers are earnestly seeking a way out. Like myself they are getting awfully weary of receiving brush-offs in response to appeals for correction of a serious economic problem. I believe there is no just criticism for anyone who quits in the face of these conditions.

E. B. SHAWVER,
President, Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association.

WICHITA, KANS.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Present Kansas daily crude production is maximum amount that can be produced with due regard to conservation and maximum ultimate recovery. Transportation facilities are slightly in excess of present daily production rate. Future development of present fields and exploration of new areas will depend largely upon price, material, and manpower. The amount of crude in storage in Kansas available to Kansas refineries is only working stock. The gasoline situation, while somewhat tight, is occasioned by the refineries being ordered about a year ago to cut their gasoline yield per barrel and also to cut the amount of crude run through their plants. Many details and figures impossible to furnish in wire. Are available in recent testimony of T. A. Morgan, E. B. Shawver, and William Ainsworth before the Lee and Patman committee. Have tried to contact Shawver but out of town until morning. You will undoubtedly hear from him early tomorrow.

E. C. MORIARTY.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I shall be very glad in the main to support the bill that is before the House. I think one of the best things about it is that it offers some economy, something like a hundred million dollars. I am not so sure but what it could stand a much deeper cut than that and the country would probably be better off, but I am well satisfied if we can turn back on these bills a little more toward the reason of economy. And I think there is some hope when this House brings in bill after bill showing a clear tendency toward economy rather than greater appropriations. It should be so at this time because of the tremendous expense the Government is undergoing to win this war. I think in the last campaign there was nothing more evident than the fact that the people throughout the length and breadth of this country expressed by their sentiments and by their votes that they would like for the Congress of the United States in helping to win the war to cut out every possible expense not essential to the winning of the war; and I believe that the Members generally on both sides of the House are to be complimented for showing serious inclination to carry out that mandate of the people. It is my opinion that two things must follow, two ideas must be pretty closely observed and followed. The first is rather unpopular, but it is heavier taxation, yes; collect more taxes and help defeat inflation by this route. At the same time cut every appropriation all we can, especially all those that are not absolutely necessary to enhance the winning of the war at an earlier period.

There has been considerable talk about farm prices. There has been talk about protests coming from the people of the Nation as reflected in telegrams received by Members of Congress. I, too, have received telegrams from organizations claiming that they will have to go out of business unless they can buy more corn. We are up against a rather serious situation, but I am not sure, full of faults as it has been, as demonstrated in the past, that the O. P. A. is altogether to blame. I think that organization has been shot through with too many incompetents and inexperienced men, yet as one of the gentlemen said on the floor of the House this afternoon, there are a number of competent, patriotic men who want to do the best they can for the people of this great country and for the winning of the war. The people who are supposed to help control prices are under a mandate from the President of the United States when he coined that phrase, "Hold the line." I do not know of a more popular phrase that one could coin at a time when he hurled this across the Nation to the eager ears of the people of this country. They acclaimed it generally. Slogans have a catchy way. They get the acclaim of the people of this country or any other country, and this one rung and reverberated from one side of the country to the other. With all of the laudable ambitions that went with that slogan, and that existed in the mind of the President, I am not so sure but what it might have been unfortunate to make that statement just in that way at that time. That had more of the ring of a command.

I have been of the school of thought that the way to help successfully hold the line and win this war and to help keep the necessary civilian business of this country going is not to fix an imaginary line. I would like to give thought to the proposition that we hold the line, but let it bend at times to take care of gross inequities that in certain instances were placed upon the prices of the commodities of this country at the time the slogan was hurled at the public. I think the better way to hold the line is to handle the line so that it will give rather than break. I am afraid that there is danger of breaking this line if you attempt to hold it too rigidly.

We know that we are facing a food shortage and we know, those of us who are giving thought to the oil situation of the Nation, that we are facing an oil shortage in this Nation, both of which may develop into crises that may be desperate not only for the public welfare but for the winning of the war. We convinced the Secretary of the Interior, who has had charge largely of the governmental section of the oil business for a number of years, that it was necessary to increase the price of crude oil by something like 50 cents a barrel. He recommended a lesser increase in a fervent appeal to Price Administrator Brown, but Mr. Brown—taking the slogan of "Hold the line" from the President as a mandate—Mr. Brown, who has not had an opportunity to become conversant with the vast oil problems of this country, overruled the request of the Secretary of the Interior, which request was a reflection of the independent producers, the major producers, and all of the people of the country who had studied the oil situation. He ruled to "hold the line" and, if necessary, contribute to a Nation-wide oil shortage in this country. That is one of the incidents that I want to point out, which indicates that it might have been unfortunate that the President coined and gave that slogan to the Nation at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have had two instances presented to us this afternoon, corn and oil, both of which may develop into a shortage. Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps instead of shutting down these great plants affecting corn that it might be well for O. P. A. to take into consideration the raising of the price of corn temporarily, say 15 cents a bushel, in order to get this corn out of the granaries where the farmer has every right if he so wishes, to keep it? Does not the gentleman more or less think that is the practical and only practical solution to this problem today?

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman's point is well taken, and may I say in reply that in the feeding of hogs I thing the statistics will show that if you feed the corn to the porkers you get about $1.35 to $1.45 a bushel, whereas if you sell it on the market it brings you something less than a dollar. I would apply the remedy to the greater flow of corn into the market at the present time that I would apply in my reference to oil. I am satisfied that the O. P. A. should increase the price of corn, raise the price of corn to something like $1.25 a bushel, and do it immediately. But can he, in the face of the President's order, "hold the line"?

There has been a suggestion made that we put someone else in charge of agricultural prices and food rationing; that we make a change and put someone else in complete charge who will do no better so long as the "hold the line" order is taken as a mandate from the President.

I would favor such a change, but I would want him to have the power to handle the food situation over and above the power of the President. I say this not out of any lack of respect for our President.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just spoken so ably said that at the present time we should do everything possible to cut appropriations to the bone. I agree with him that in time of an emergency such as we are going through that is a very wise thing to do, but I also think there are times when it is verging upon foolishness to cut certain appropriations. While we are in a period of war we are also trying to save certain values here at home. One of those values, in my judgment, is the lives, standards, and the ideals of the children of this country who are the citizens of the future.

Mr. Chairman, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, H. R. 2935, provides for a reduction of more than one-fifth of the amount which the Children's Bureau

has had during the current year for child-labor administration. This cut, following a 13-percent decrease made last year, comes at a time when employment of children is mounting higher and higher, when large numbers are entering undesirable occupations and working under harmful conditions, and when violations of standards established for their protection are increasing.

The Children's Bureau appropriation for child-labor administration, by fiscal years, was cut from $279,623 in 1942 to $251,660 in 1943, and the House Committee now proposes a further cut to $200,000 for 1944—a decrease of 28 percent for the 2-year period. Estimated numbers of boys and girls 14 to 17 years of age at work in the United States at the same time rose from 1,000,000 in April 1941 to 1,500,000 in April 1942, and to 2,000,000 in April 1943, an increase of 100 percent in the 2-year period. More children at work mean a bigger job for the agency administering the standards established by Congress for the protection of children from child-labor exploitation and interference with their education.

The danger is not merely in the fact that more children are going to work but in the fact that much of this new employment is not properly guided. As a result, it means loss of needed education and unnecessary exposure to physical and moral hazards. This not only harms boys and girls now but the men and women of tomorrow. It is highly significant that in 1942 the number of children 14 and 15 years of age obtaining certificates for work increased even more rapidly than the number of 16 and 17-year-olds.

With unemployed workers not easy to find in many places, the danger of hiring children in violation of the law increases. More and more children are working illegally. Enforcing agencies must not only be more vigilant but must be equipped to meet an added burden of inspection work. In the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, even with a smaller staff resulting from reduction in appropriation, representatives of the Children's Bureau found 54 percent more establishments violating the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and 28 percent more children working illegally than in the corresponding period the year before. Of the total 2,828 children found illegally employed under the act in the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1943, 17 percent were under 14 years of age.

Increasing employment of boys and girls means not only an increase in numbers of age and employment certificates issued, but greatly increased work in seeing that these certificates are provided. These certificates are the instruments which the Fair Labor Standards Act provides for the protection of employers as well as a means of preventing child labor violations before they occur. Cooperating issuing agencies in the States report to the Children's Bureau that, in the 2-year period 1940 to 1942, the number of certificates issued rose from less than 200,000 to over 750,000. Federal age certificates, issued by the Children's Bureau for minors going into establishments subject to the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 4 States where there is no State system, rose from 3,459 in 1940, to 16,710 in 1942, an increase of about 380 percent.

Government and industry are making every effort to reduce the rising industrial accidents that are crippling manpower for war production. To keep the younger workers, who are more susceptible to accident and industrial disease, in the safer jobs, the Bureau has not limited itself to enforcement of the existing standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act, but has worked with management, labor, and safety and health experts on advisory standards for young workers. These have been developed to help employers, inexperienced in the hiring of young workers, know which jobs are suitable for young workers and which are too hazardous for them, thus safeguarding the youth and making for their more effective utilization in war production.

Recently a representative of the National Manufacturers Association requested a considerable number of the advisory standards already available for distribution to the members of the association, stating that the association felt these standards prepared by the Children's Bureau filled a widespread need on the part of employers, many of whom are using young workers under 18 for the first time. A recent letter, for example, from a representative of the aircraft industry requested copies of any standards which had been worked out that would apply to that industry, stressing the fact that the aircraft industry was grasping for all possible sources of effective labor supply and "would, indeed, welcome any assistance which the Bureau can give us."

During a period of war emergency such as we are now going through it is imperative that we maintain adequate services for our children, the American citizens of the future. The problem of child labor is closely related to the problem of juvenile delinquency, and we are now seeing a sharp increase in both of these unwholesome conditions. In my judgment it is shortsighted and dangerous to reduce the appropriation for the Children's Bureau just at the time when the work of that agency is needed most. I sincerely hope that the House will restore the budget to at least the present level.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and that he further be permitted to extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN INDIANA AND KENTUCKY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131), giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the measure explain what it does?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to take part in the settlement of a controversy that is almost 2 centuries old. This controversy has been between the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky. The controversy started before either of these States was admitted to the Union.

The old grant that was issued to Virginia extended the boundary line of Virginia to the low-water mark on the north shore of the Ohio River. The Ohio River is now the northern boundary line of Kentucky for more than 900 miles. In the vicinity of Evansville, Ind., the Ohio River many years ago changed its course and cut off several hundred acres of land and left it north of the river. Many years ago the city of Evansville, Ind., built a water and power plant on this strip of land that was cut off by the change of the river course, and some time later citizens of Kentucky built a race track on this same strip of land.

From the beginning, Kentucky attempted to collect taxes from the property owners located on this strip of land, and many of these controversies found their way into the courts. In 1896 the controversy waxed so hot it found its way into the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision of the Court is reported in 163 United States Reports. This case, like many others, did not settle the question in issue, and the quarrels and controversies continued.

In 1935 I was elected attorney general of the State of Kentucky, and this question was one of the problems that first came to me as attorney general. Indiana and Kentucky, both believing in the policy of being a good neighbor, simply came to the conclusion that this old controversy, "That is so old the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," should be settled once and for all. So the Governor of Indiana and the Governor of Kentucky sat down together and

agreed upon a settlement. In furthering their agreement they appointed commissioners to go upon the land and ascertain a true and legal boundary line. That has now been done. The Legislature of Kentucky on March 9, 1942, approved the boundary line as agreed upon by the commissioners, and the Legislature of Indiana, on January 29, 1943, approved the boundary line as agreed upon by the commissioners. The officers of both States have requested that the Congress, by this resolution, also ratify the agreement. And we are asking you today to give your approval to this agreement.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleague [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], who represents the district of Indiana that is immediately adjacent to this land in controversy. He assisted me in the preparation and introduction of the resolution. He appeared with me before the committee and made a fine statement in regard to the controversy and stated that he was delighted to have an opportunity to cooperate in the settlement of this controversy. I think it is a fine example of good feeling and sportsmanship that a question involving several million dollars can be settled forever in such a reasonable and amicable manner. When a world war is being fought over boundary lines and nations are scrambling for more territory, I think Indiana and Kentucky should be complimented on the peaceable settlement they have concluded. Of course, each of them has certain pride in its contention, and I might say each of them probably had unanswerable argument to offer for its position. Yet both of them laid these things aside and said, "O. K." Now we hope you will also give us your approval.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, the Legislature of the State of Kentucky has passed a law approving this matter and the State of Indiana by legislative action has also passed an act confirming it?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is merely to confirm the establishment of the boundary line by an act of Congress?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The gentleman from Kentucky has very ably stated what this is about. We have been trying for about 50 years to get our boundary line straightened out. I am particularly appreciative of the cooperation I have received from the gentleman from Kentucky. The matter is absolutely in agreement between the two States, and I think this joint resolution should be passed immediately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas by decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Indiana* v. *Kentucky*, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in One Hundred and Sixty-third United States Reports, the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky between certain terminal points therein described was fixed and established; and

Whereas neither of said terminal points reached the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River, forming the remainder of the boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth; and

Whereas owing to the fact recited in the preceding literary paragraph hereof a dispute has arisen as the boundary line connecting said terminal points with said low-water mark; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of Indiana and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky appointed commissioners to study said question for the purpose of ascertaining the true and legal boundary line thus in dispute; and

Whereas said commissioners agreed upon the true and legal boundary line; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Indiana passed an act known and designated as Enrolled Act No. 19, House, bearing the signatures of Hobart Creighton, speaker of the house of representatives; Charles M. Dawson, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana, under date of January 29, 1943; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky passed a like act known and designated as House bill No. 375, bearing the signatures of Stanley S. Dickson, speaker of the house of representatives; Rodes K. Myers, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Keen Johnson, Governor of Kentucky, under date of March 9, 1942; and

Whereas the said acts provided in substance that upon the approval and consent of the Congress of the United States the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall be as follows:

Commencing at a point on the line between sections 15 and 14, township 7 south, range 10 west, and sixty-seven and twenty-five one-hundredths chains south of the northeast corner of section 15, the same being the beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line as fixed by the Supreme Court of the United States in Indiana v. *Kentucky*, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in One Hundred and Sixty-third United States Reports; thence south 0° 53 minutes 15 seconds west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence upstream at low-water mark on the right side of said river. Also beginning at the same beginning point to wit: The beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky as fixed by the Supreme Court in the case above recited and following that line to the end of so much of said boundary line as was fixed by said decree; thence due west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence downstream with said low-water mark on the right side of said river; and

Whereas the said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky constitute an agreement between said State and said Commonwealth establishing a boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary, and said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky are hereby approved.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be permitted to revise and extend their own remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include therein certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each of the gentlemen who spoke on House Joint Resolution 131 be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Lt. John Holmes and also on the subject of Lt. Keene Wilson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a column by the distinguished columnist, Mark Sullivan, appearing in the Washington Post of June 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

REINSTATEMENT OF CERTAIN BILLS ON PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H. R. 2134, Calendar No. 201, called up today, be reinstated on the Private Calendar. This bill was reported last Friday, and the report was not available today. I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] on the majority side, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] on the minority side, and they have agreed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The same situation prevails with respect to H. R. 1434, Calendar No. 200, that should also be reinstated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] have permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article by George Rothwell Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter, regarding the roll-back of prices, from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SOMERS of New York, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow during the absence of the Speaker.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 575. An act to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration.

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Pepresentatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

492. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 7, 1942, so as to provide adequate protection for persons in military or naval service as to the filing of State and local income-tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

493. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Mobile Harbor, Ala., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on June 20, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

494. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a second supplemental list of contracts in excess of $150,000, pursuant to the provisions of title IV, section 401, of the act of Congress approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.). These contracts were executed during the fiscal year 1942 and were omitted from the reports previously submitted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 257. Resolution authorizing payment of $250 to settle debts of Special Committee Investigating National Defense Migration; without amendment (Rept. No. 544). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 258. Resolution providing funds for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38; without amendment (Rept. No. 545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1991. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year; with amendment (Rept. No. 546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 2614. A bill to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2912. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; without amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth; without amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution waiving all points of order against the bill (H. R. 2935) or any provisions contained therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 550). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2794. A bill to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 551). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2946. A bill to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 2947. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to provide medical care for recipients of public assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2948. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 2949. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2950 (by request). A bill to extend, to all service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof and feasible therefor, eligibility for vocational rehabilitation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 2951. A bill to provide for the presentation of certificates of honor to mothers of members of the armed forces who give their lives for their country during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2952. A bill to stimulate production of strategic and critical minerals for the present war effort and to assure an adequate supply of such minerals for any future emergency by continuance, intact, in the post-war period of all stock piles surviving the present war and by necessary augmentation thereof primarily from domestic sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2953. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work on Lytle and Cajon Creeks, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2954. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide that service in any State guard or other home-defense force shall be credited for pay purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 2955. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2956. A bill for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2957. A bill to provide for flood-control work on the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 2958. A bill to provide for the direct sale to certain former owners of real property of the United States when it is no longer needed for the national defense or war program; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2959. A bill to preserve safety in, and the economic stability of, civil aeronautics by regulating and controlling the disposal of surplus aircraft of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2960. A bill to control the development of oil lands and the production of oil and fixing the rights of the parties interested in such lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2961. A bill relating to certain proceedings in the district courts of the United States where property is requisitioned under the act of October 16, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2962. A bill to continue in effect until June 30, 1946, the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2966. A bill authorizing a lapel button to be worn by men who are honorably discharged from World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 2967. A bill to grant naturalization to all foreign seamen who can show employment on American-owned vessels and who continue such employment as long as the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint congressional committee to prepare a monograph on the history of the flag and the oath of allegiance; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to provide for expenses of joint congressional committee authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 26; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943," as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House and Senate documents rooms; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 260. Resolution authorizing a special committee to investigate purported statement made at banquet; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 262. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to investigate the plans for the improvement of the Columbia River and its tributaries for utilization of its waters for reclamation flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation relative to State rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 2963. A bill granting a pension to Annie I. Ritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 2964. A bill for the relief of Ruth Dudley Cameron and Henry V. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2965. A bill for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1570. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of various residents of New Concord, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1571. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of J. F. Edmister, of Route No. 2, Winlock, Wash., and 14 other citizens of that community and vicinity, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1572. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of various citizens of Guernsey County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1573. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petition of Esther L. Robinson and 20 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1574. Also, petition of Edith M. Cocks and 19 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1575. Also, petition of Mrs. Cleva B. Warner and 335 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1576. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of various citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1577. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, concerning hospitalization of veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

1578. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. George W. Miller and 37 other residents of Jasper County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH H. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1579. Also, petition of Rev. S. W. Scott and 50 other residents of Ozark County, Mo., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, which would protect military men from alcoholic liquor (including beer) sold in the camps and camp areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1580. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 54 other residents of Howell County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1581. Also, petition of Rev. C. E. Phillips and other residents of Ozark and Douglas Counties, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1582. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, T. D. B. S., M. A., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, Thou art merciful and gracious and Thy truth endureth from generation to generation. We pray Thee to incline our hearts to seek Thy face and own Thee as Father and Saviour. Into the secret place of every breast let Thy whisper bestow the blessing of peace.

Allow not the tyranny of events to paralyze our endeavors, but by the virtue of an inner force may all difficulties be surmounted, proclaiming afresh the freedom of the spirit; thus we shall be the instrument of Thy purpose and the mirror of Thy good pleasure. There can be no national strength except through unity and no safe and abiding council except through the recognition of the dignity of the human soul, walking patiently with our fellow men. Ever faithful and loyal to our great stewardship and to our high vocation to which we have been called, clothe us, dear Lord, with a will so unyielding, that we may never betray, through sloth or selfishness, the great cause which has been entrusted to us. Keep us free from the discontented heart and the roving imagination lest they cheat us of the marvelous opportunities of actual service for our Republic. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 254. An act for the relief of Edward Gillam;

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 346. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards;

S. 369. An act to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States;

S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee;

S. 653. An act for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland;

S. 674. An act authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men;

S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 906. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

S. 982. An act to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y., may be paid into the general funds of such city;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1087. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford;

S. 1090. An act for the relief of John Henry Miller, Jr.;

S. 1157. An act to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; and

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1762), making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,642,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, and 16.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
GERALD P. NYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

No. 2: Strikes out the provision of the Senate reappropriating unexpended balance for defense housing contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.

Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriates $125,000 for flood-control surveys, Federal Power Commission, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $76,670 of such sum shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of $115,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 7: Provides that $172,410 of the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission shall be available for enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 8: Appropriates $275,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 9, 10, and 11: Corrects statute references, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 13: Appropriates $3,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, for motor-transport regulation, Interstate Commerce Commission.

No. 15: Strikes out the provision of the House providing for liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as provided by section 4 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and inserts $11,642,200 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, including the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The reduction of $500,000 below the Senate figure has been applied to funds for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

No. 17: Continues available until June 30, 1944, the appropriation for work in connection with liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation, contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House prohibiting the use of funds by the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate or enforce rules or regulations in connection with the sale of oil and gas royalties and leases.

No. 19: Appropriates $800,000 for salaries and expenses of the Tariff Commission, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $825,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 20: Provides that appropriations for the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the purchase of legal newspapers in an amount not exceeding $200, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 21 and 22: Appropriates $70,000 for payment of claims as authorized by article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942, and corrects the total of appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 23: Eliminates that portion of the provision in the bill as passed by the House providing that salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be at the rate of $10,000 each per annum, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 24: Strikes out the provision of the House with reference to citizenship requirements in connection with Federal employment, and inserts the provision of the Senate with regard thereto. The Senate provision imposes an additional penalty in the case of any person making a false affidavit, provides for recoupment of salaries paid contrary to the provisions of the section, and provides that an affidavit shall be regarded as prima facie evidence that the requirements of the section have been complied with.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

No. 1: Relating to appropriations for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget. The House managers will recommend that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

No. 3: Relating to appropriations for salaries and expenses, National Resources Planning Board.

No. 4: Relating to the Board of Investigation and Research-Transportation. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 12: Relating to the salary of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 14: Relating to the transfer of administrative functions, National Housing Agency. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

No. 16: Relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this report is a complete agreement among the conferees. There were very few Senate amendments of any controversial nature, and on most of those we have reached some equitable settlement. There is nothing I know of in the conference report that calls for any particular explanation. There are several amendments that will have to be acted upon separately, on which I shall have a brief statement to make when we come to them. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, every conference report is a compromise, and this is no exception to the rule. If the bill passes in accordance with the present recommendations of the House conferees it will still be $6,255,706 below the Budget. I shall support the report.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 23, strike out "$1,655,000" and insert "$1,450,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,552,500."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is to split the amount that the Senate reduced the Bureau of the Budget. The House cut $180,000 off the appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget. The Senate deducted an additional $205,000. The amendment which I have sent to the desk, if adopted, will split that small amount between the two bodies.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What is this item about?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This applies to the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by inserting a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1943.

Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUM: During our conversation the other day you suggested that I furnish you with a brief history of the Bureau of the Budget appropriations for the fiscal year 1944.

The estimates of appropriations submitted for this Bureau provided sufficient funds to carry on for a full year the activities of the Bureau of the Budget, some of which are provided for only on a part-year basis during 1943, and they further provided for the

establishment of a field service for the Bureau.

Your subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee recommended these estimates to the House in the amount in which they were submitted. On the floor of the House an amendment was proposed by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to reduce the estimate for salaries and expenses by $180,000. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17, 1943, p. 1045.) The argument for the reduction was that the Bureau had been concerning itself not only with its activities relating to the submission of estimates, but with other activities such as work on the problem of manpower, work on the development of a program for the Food Administration, work on a plan for handling insurance premiums, and work in the field of rationing, subsidies, and the like.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH specifically stated "My amendment would reduce this figure by $180,000, stopping at that point in order to allow $205,000 for four offices in the field which the agency requests."

Despite your protest, the House adopted this amendment by a vote of 84 to 36. We requested the Senate committee to restore this amount. After a hearing with that committee in which I managed to make some explanation of the estimate in the midst of a discussion of many other subjects, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill out and not only failed to restore the item of $180,000 but in addition eliminated the remaining increase of $205,000, which would have provided for the establishment of four field offices in 1944.

To return to Mr. WIGGLESWORTH's point that we were concerning ourselves with activities other than those relating solely to the submission of estimates, I pointed out in the hearings before your committee that the work we perform in those fields is clearly within the scope of the Bureau's functions. It has never been my conception, and I am sure it is not yours, that the Bureau should function as a mere transmitting agency for estimates of appropriations. The Bureau's staff must know intimately and thoroughly the functions, organization, and methods of operation of the Federal agencies if we are to make intelligent recommendations as to their needs for funds. We must be prepared to assist these agencies to develop the type of organization best adapted to carry out efficiently and economically the functions of that agency. Procedures must be surveyed so that wasteful or ineffective methods will be eliminated and those that are cumbersome or unwieldy will be simplified.

As an instance of our work in connection with procedures, we were able, in cooperation with the War Department and the Veterans' Administration, to develop a plan of handling insurance premiums of military personnel which will save $3,000,000 annually and will eliminate the need for some 2,000 employees. Certainly such activities are not outside the scope of the Bureau's functions.

As the field of Government activity expanded under the pressure of organizing for total war, the size of the Bureau's staff could not remain static. It was necessary that the Bureau be prepared to cope with the new activities and organizations necessary in the effective conduct of the war. As I stated to your committee, I do not consider the staff proposed in the 1944 Budget as being necessarily adequate to do a completely effective job.

The reduction of $180,000 made on the floor of the House and agreed to by the Senate will mean a curtailment of the Bureau's activities and will reduce its effectiveness. I realize, however, that this item is not before you in conference at this time. The amount in disagreement is the $205,000 for field offices, the establishment of which I have discussed with your committee several times. I regard it as particularly unfortunate that in the face of a reduction in the staff needed to continue the existing activities of the Bureau, the Senate has eliminated the setting up of offices in the field which has already been too long delayed.

It is brought to my attention constantly that there are serious gaps between the field agencies of some departments and their Washington offices. This has caused confusion and a good many conflicts. Our staff members traveling from Washington can cope with some of the situations, but if we had staff living in the locality and in frequent contact with the various agencies they would get information in an informal way that they could not very well get otherwise. They would be able to know first hand the effectiveness with which Federal programs are operating; they could study at the local level the problems of organization, management, procedures, and coordination; they could get first-hand information on joint programs where Federal-State relationships were involved. The information they would obtain would be of the utmost value in supplementing the Washington staff in pointing out those areas which need attention. I believe that such a staff would also give the Bureau a better appreciation of many problems coming before us since they could furnish a better understanding of the viewpoints of the States and localities affected by many and varied Federal programs.

I hope that you and the other conferees will see your way clear to restore this amount so that we may establish the field offices and do a more effective job in dealing with our increasing budgetary problem.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 3: Page 4, line 23, insert:

"NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

"Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for the work of the National Resources Planning Board, to perform the functions transferred to said Board on July 1, 1939, and for all expenses necessary for the planning activities of said Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; printing and binding (not to exceed $8,000); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; not to exceed $20,000 for traveling expenses, $200,000: *Provided*, That no part of of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States.

"The appropriation herein made for the National Resources Planning Board shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, and agree to the same with an ambendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

"Salaries and expenses: For all expenses incident to the discontinuance of the work of the Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, traveling expenses, and the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of employees of the Board due them after June 30, 1943, $50,000: *Provided*, That the National Resources Planning Board is abolished effective August 31, 1943, and the functions exercised by such Board shall not be transferred to any other agency and shall not be performed after such date except as hereafter provided by law or as authorized in the ensuing proviso of this paragraph with respect to winding up the Board's affairs: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Board is authorized after August 31, 1943, and until January 1, 1944, to perform such duties and to exercise such administrative authority as may be incident to the effectuation of the discontinuance of the Board: *Provided further*, That the records and files of the Board shall be transferred to The National Archives.

"The appropriation herein made for the National Resources Planning Board shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that we made no provision in the independent offices appropriation bill for the National Resources Planning Board. The Senate inserted an amendment which provided $200,000 for carrying on the work of this Board which during this fiscal year has available for expenditure over $1,000,000. It is the thought of the House conferees that the $200,000 contained in the Senate amendment certainly would not provide sufficient funds to enable this Board or any agency to do any real post-war planning, and that the whole subject would be brought to the attention of the country and the House if we wind up this Board and start again from scratch.

Personally—and I believe I reflect the sentiments of most Members of the House—I believe there should be very serious and immediate attention given to matters respecting post-war planning, but I do not believe it should be done through the medium of this agency. Merely to give it $200,000 would leave it hanging by a thread, without enough money to do anything, and probably prevent other action being taken. It would appear, therefore, that the best thing to do is to liquidate the Board, to give them enough money to pay their accrued leave and dispose of their records, and then the Congress and the administration can act separately or jointly or in whatever manner is believed advisable with a view to setting up some appropriate post-war planning agency.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the planning program for the development of the water power of this country. I have been disappointed in the assistance or lack of assistance we have received from this Planning Board.

But I am glad to say that we now have, probably for the first time, a man at the head of the Army engineers, General Reybold, who is progressive and in sympathy with our program in this respect; and he has a splendid staff to assist in the planning for the future development of our rivers and harbors and for the development of the water power of the Nation. We also have the Federal Power Commission which is rendering a service today surpassing any we have ever received at its hands, and we have the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Power Division in the Department of the Interior that is now handling the developments on the Columbia River. With all these splendid organizations working and planning for the development of the water power of this Nation, from that standpoint, I do not think we will lose very much of anything by adopting this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] desire to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may desire.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time to go into the merits or demerits of the National Resources Planning Board. I think the sentiment of this House has crystalized overwhelmingly against the further continuance of the present Board. Much of its work, in my judgment, has been largely a duplication or correlation of the work of other agencies of the Government; much of it has been devoted to assisting States and localities with respect to problems, which in my judgment, are local problems and not Federal problems.

The Senate has provided for a maximum appropriation of $200,000. I agree with the analysis of the appropriation just made by the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. I think that the motion which he proposes should prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I would like to inquire whether or not the motion offered by the gentleman has been agreed to by the Senate conferees? In other words, if the House adopts the motion, will we have a settlement of the matter or is the Senate still insisting on the appropriation of $200,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Senate conferees, when we left them, were still insisting, but I will say to the gentleman that I am hoping that when the House takes this action that it will give the Senate some ground to work on.

Mr. TARVER. This motion is not the result of an agreement then?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

Mr. TARVER. On the part of the conferees?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; it is not.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The House will probably adopt the amendment that has been proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. In doing so, however, I think the record ought to show that there are two distinct problems which will still be left hanging in the air. The first problem has to do with the correlation of public works activity of the Government.

Personally I am not satisfied that this action is the final action that the Congress should take in this matter. There should be some definite legislative action whereby there will be a correlation of the public works activities of the Government. That does not necessarily call for a National Resources Planning Board, but in my judgment it does call for an organization that will have some man out of the Corps of Engineers, some man out of the Public Roads Administration, some man out of the Bureau of Reclamation, and some man out of each of the other agencies that deal with public works to cordinate their activities, so that there will be no duplication of public works program in some parts of the country and an absence of public works in some other parts of the country.

The second thing which I think will be left hanging in the air is the failure of the Congress to provide for a planning of public works in the post-war era that will take care of the inland and rural sections of the country. There is a provision of the bill which relates to Public Roads Administration in which provision is made for the planning of highways that will bypass the large cities or will develop networks of highways around the large cities, but there is no adequate provision, in my judgment, for the programming of roads throughout the country as such and throughout the rural sections of the country. My prediction is that unless the Congress takes some cognizance of this situation, when we come to the post-war era on public works we will find that the money will be spent in the communities and in those large cities which have developed post-war planning programs, and unless some action is taken there will not be the adequate program of public roads throughout the general reaches of the country.

In conclusion I merely wish to say that those two fields are being abandoned by the action that is being taken unless something else is taken up to fill those obligations, and I believe that probably the other members of the subcommittee will agree with me that something should be done in that direction and that the real intent of this amendment is to force the situation into the open and to place the full problem before the Congress, recognizing that perhaps the National Resources Planning Board is not the answer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Briefly; I promised to yield to the gentleman from Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I just wanted to make a statement because of the remark made by the gentleman from South Dakota, that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], chairman of the Committee on Roads, about 2 weeks ago introduced a resolution which was referred to the Committee on Rules to authorize the Committee on Roads to subdivide itself for several purposes among which was the planning of post-war highways, both urban as well as rural. We do not ask for money at the present time. If that resolution were adopted I think we could give the gentleman reasonable assurance that a construction post-war program of highways, both rural and urban, would be presented to the Congress within a reasonable time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the House adopts the amendment now on the desk, which I presume will be the case, it will mean the end of the National Resources Planning Board as an agency, and it will mean the end of its functions. That action, of course, precipitates responsibility on this House. When this action was first taken by the House some months ago, the President promptly remarked that if planning was to be done by Congress, well and good, but they ought to get busy. The Senate did get busy by setting up a 10-man committee under the chairmanship of Senator GEORGE. I think it is necessary now for the House to take similar action. There are some 8 or 9 resolutions pending before the Committee on Rules dealing with this subject, and the Committee on Rules should get busy without delay.

We had the same kind of delay after the last World War. The armistice came as something of a shock. At that time there were pending in the Senate resolutions by Senator Overman and Senator Weeks, and in the House there were pending resolutions for planning by Representative Madden, of Illinois, and Representative London, of New York, and others. No action was ever taken. It is necessary to take action if we are going to develop some perspective plan that will eliminate duplication and develop a maximum of efficiency. This war is going to end. Our peak labor force will be about 63,000,000 men with various concentrations. Where there is preponderance of aircraft and shipbuilding, I am informed by the figures from the Bureau of Statistics that in 4 States of the Union the equivalent of 45 percent of the entire population is now engaged in war work. What will happen when this thing finally terminates and there comes a tremendous mobility and migration of labor? Congress must be ready, and so there is a responsibility to adopt one of these resolutions and set up a post-war

planning committee that can deal almost exclusively with this whole problem; otherwise there will be the usual charges of boondoggling and superboondoggling, and that is one thing we must avoid if we are going to be true to the taxpayers of the country.

Action taken now on this amendment, which will expunge the National Resources Planning Board and its functions, makes it doubtly imperative that the House should take action.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is speaking of planning for a road program. The greatest thing we can do for the American farmer is to extend our rural electrification program to reach the rest of them.

We have the facilities for planning that development now. I just want to emphasize the fact that when this war is over or when strategic materials are made available, we propose to extend this program to reach every farmhouse in America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the last war from November 11 to January 1 we demobilized about 500,000 troops. In that same 7-week period we canceled $6,000,000,000 in war contracts, and about that same situation can develop when this war is over. So there will be a rising curve of unemployment unless the thing is programmed.

I respectfully suggest to the Rules Committee of the House that they get busy on one of the many resolutions now pending for the creation of a committee similar to that already created by the Senate.

Congress is the steward of the public purse. A post-war program to achieve full employment can be translated into actuality only by the expenditure of money. The funds for this purpose must be taxed from the American people or borrowed from the American people through action taken by the Congress. Therefore, we have a double responsibility to the taxpayers of the country and to those who have been lifted out of our civilian economy and placed in uniform to make this preparation well in advance of the day when the problem reposes on the national doorstep.

The late Alexander Woollcott wrote a very entertaining play about The Man Who Came to Dinner. Our problem will be the ten or eleven million who one day will come to dinner. It will include those who will be demobilized as well as that great host of men and women now working in defense plants. By dinner is meant that they will return to familiar scenes to find jobs, establish families, and acquire homes. They will want to resume where they left off to go forth into the world-wide struggle for freedom. Let it not be said that, while they who have been enduring hardships and facing every hazard on the far-flung battle lines of the world, we have been derelict in giving sustained attention to the problem of full employment when they return.

I recognize that the first responsibility evolves upon industry to so plan within the framework of free enterprise to absorb as much of the unemployment which will be occasioned when demobilization begins as is possible. This, of course, will mean a program which permits the accumulation of necessary reserves by industry with which to expand their civilian production and to meet the unemployment problem. Government must step in and do that part of the job which cannot be handled by private industry.

It is rather astonishing that the present drift in dealing with this matter of post-war preparation is so singularly similar to that which prevailed in the First World War period. At that time there was no real unity of purpose in making plans for the period after the war. In fact there is evidence that discussion of such matters was discouraged. This was true notwithstanding the fact that the problem which would be provoked by the cancelation of war contracts and the demobilization of defense workers was well recognized in the editorial comment of that period. Neither the President nor the Congress took any specific action so that when the Armistice came, no plans to absorb returning soldiers and demobilized defense workers had been prepared. Any proposals in this field of activity were soon lost in the cleavages which developed between the legislative and executive branch in the emphasis on retrenchment which immediately followed the First World War and in the rosy optimism which prevailed after the war terminated. I express the hope that we will not be derelict in our duty and that the Rules Committee will give early consideration to this all-important question of reporting a rule for the creation of a committee which could mobilize expert assistance and give immediate attention to a program that will meet the demand of full employment in the post-war period.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the National Resources Planning Board is finally abolished. However, the people should not be led to believe that this move means the end of the political and bureaucratic planning to make our country over into a collectivist state.

After all the Resources Planning Board was only a front to practically all the Federal agencies. These will not discontinue their activities just because the Planning Board is abolished.

It seems political planning and ordering of the lives of our people from the cradle to the grave is taking on the aspects of becoming a veritable national madness. All the Federal agencies are engaged in it. Practically all the States and most of the counties, together with municipalities of any size are at it more or less.

It is to me disconcerting to see the Congress now taking up what appears to me to be the same line of planning as the bureaucracy is engaged in.

There is nothing wrong with Congress undertaking a program of planning but it should be to reduce the bureaucracy to its proper size and shear it of its excessive powers. It should also plan to take back to itself some of the powers it handed over to the Chief Executive. Furthermore, it should plan to bring our Nation back to constitutional government, sound money, and finances.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, more than 3 years ago I introduced a resolution to have this job of planning to meet the problems of the post-war period centered in the Congress. I still believe that that is where it should be centered. We ought to take action about this matter at once, but before we have taken action it seems to me it is ill-advised to destroy the work of the National Resources Planning Board. In that respect I differ from the recommendation of the committee. In my opinion, we are going to be subject to criticism if we cut them off and destroy them until such time as we have another agency established that is really doing this job and the men who are now fighting this war are expecting of us two things more than anything else. First, that there shall be jobs for them when they come home and second, a lasting peace shall be established. For these reasons I have advocated a congressional committee or commission to do this task for a long, long time. But until we have done that I do not agree that the National Resources Planning Board should be destroyed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 8, line 8, insert:

"BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

"Board of Investigation and Research: For all necessary expenses to enable the Board of Investigation and Research to perform the duties authorized under part 1 of title III of the Transportation Act of 1940, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers; not to exceed $12,000 for travel, including attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the problem of the Board; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks and books of reference; rents in the District of Columbia; and payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; and including not to exceed $20,000 for printing and binding; and not to exceed $10,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to Section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil service or classification laws, to remain available until September 18, 1944, $350,000, which amount shall be added to and merged with the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1943, of the appropriations under this head in the Third

Supplemental National Defense Appropria- Act, 1942, and the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for economy and fitness studies."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 22 of said amendment, strike out the sum "$350,000" and insert "$275,000", and strike out the proviso beginning in line 27, down to the period at the end of line 28, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the foregoing total amount shall be so used as to complete the studies, investigations, and reports authorized and required by Part I, Title III, of the Transportation Act of 1940."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 32, line 24, after the figures insert: "*Provided*, That the salary of the Assistant Comptroller General shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum effective on the date of enactment of this Act, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, strike out the figure "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: On page 43, line 3, insert: ": *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units or the Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency such additional sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator or in a constituent unit of any of the administrative functions of the National Housing Agency; but no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 14 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of said amendment insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That a report of such transfers and the savings effected thereby shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Budget."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 16: Page 47, line 6, insert: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any order or regulation issued by the Office of Price Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is authorized to dispose of any real property to which such Corporation has title upon such terms and conditions as the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner determines will expedite the orderly liquidation of such real property: *Provided further*, That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall prepare a plan for its liquidation by July 1, 1945, and shall submit a report of such plan to the Congress, setting forth the terms of liquidation and such other information as may be necessary to inform the Congress of the disposition of the property of such Corporation while in the process of liquidation: *Provided further*, That the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, on behalf of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, shall transmit to the Congress semiannually during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a progress report with respect to liquidation, showing all dispositions of the property of such Corporation by States during the period of liquidation, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds during each quarterly period of the fiscal year 1944."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 10 of said amendment, strike out the words "by July 1, 1945" and insert in lieu thereof "at the earliest practicable date", and in the same line, after the word "shall", insert ", by February 1, 1944."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House on February 15, the House, by a majority of some 64 votes, had adopted an amendment which I suggested to expedite the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The amendment in effect reduced the available funds by about $3,500,000 and so earmarked the funds for expenditure over a period of time as to hasten this liquidation. Contrary to the impression, however, that went out over the country, it did not contemplate this liquidation in the fiscal year 1944.

I would have gone a little bit further than the language that is now proposed, but I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. It means that a plan for liquidation will have to be presented to the Congress on or before the 1st of February 1944, and that liquidation shall be brought about at the earliest practicable date. I recognize the difficulty of tying the thing down to a definite date, largely because you cannot always tell what the condition may be, but one thing did interest me a great deal. When an estimate of losses was made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and presented to the Senate and the Byrd committee, I went over and spent an hour with the Senate subcommittee and testified and sought to analyze these loss figures. My estimate was about like that of the Byrd committee. That committee finally decided that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimate of loss was $120,000,000 too high, because they had included items which, practically speaking, should have been precluded in that kind of an estimate because they would have been losses anyway.

What we present to you now is the requirement for the submission of a plan for liquidation on or before February 1, 1944, and for complete liquidation of this Corporation at the earliest practicable date. I propose to go along with this amendment, notwithstanding the action the House took on the 17th of February.

One other observation: As I look at these estimates and conjectures that are often submitted to us by governmental agencies, I am frank to say that governmental accounting as practiced by some of these administrators is certainly a mystical and a magic kind of science that encompasseth all understanding and brings bewilderment to everybody. I think if we can get it down to a basis where everybody can understand we will make a little more progress. So I will go along with the amendment that is proposed, with the hope that when the plan finally comes the liquidation will be expedited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the conference was any consideration given to the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the Federal home loan banks? It seems to me that all the expense of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation can be eliminated by transferring the liquidation functions of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation immediately to the Federal home loan banks, which at the present time have very little or nothing to do and would welcome the opportunity to liquidate these assets.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my friend from Michigan that we could not include that language on the House side because it would be legislative in character and contain an affirmative recommendation. On the other hand, the Senate did not include it, and consequently it did not come before the committee of conference.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We did provide for the immediate and orderly liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which would have compelled the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, possibly, to turn its assets and the liquidation of its assets over to the Federal home loan banks to administer. Although we could not have legislated to do that, of course, we could by cutting off the appropriations for the administration of the liquidation force them into a situation where they would have had to utilize these banks

which have little or nothing to do now, without any additional cost to the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me make one other observation as I conclude, and that is this. The Byrd Committee recommended that this could be liquidated by June 30, 1945, and that is quite in accord with the finding I made in an independent way.

I recommend to Members of this House who are genuinely concerned with the liquidation of the Home Owners Loan Corporation that they read the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. That report carefully sets forth the losses estimated by Commissioner Fahey in case the Corporation was liquidated in 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, or 1948 and then proceeds to analyze every item which constituted the loss estimates. On the basis of this analysis the committee concluded as indicated on page 8 of their report that complete liquidation should be effected by June 30, 1945. I am of the opinion that with proper diligence on the part of the Corporation that liquidation by this date can be accomplished and wish now to indicate to the membership that this matter will receive sustained attention on the part of the members of the subcommittee when the matter is next presented in connection with the Corporation on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 556), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, carrying overtime pay for practically all agencies of the Government, and send it to conference. I wonder if the gentleman from New York, after deliberation, will now be good enough to permit this bill to go to conference.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the Senate has started any hearings on those matters that are in disagreement and on which they have not had hearings. I would think that that would be a prerequisite. I would think that the way to get an agreement with the Senate would be for them to have started to take the necessary steps that would be a basis for their yielding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The only way we can determine the wishes of the Senate is to send the bill to conference, so I would suggest that the gentleman let us go to conference and we can then take up the matter with the managers on the part of the Senate and thrash it out in conference.

Mr. TABER. I think if we do not go to conference for a little while we will get quicker results. That is my opinion. That is why I objected yesterday and that is why I feel obliged to object today. Unless they have shown a disposition to go to work and lay the foundation for an agreement on some of the things that are in dispute, I think it would be good judgment for us to object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I suggest to the gentleman that we go to conference and find out what their disposition is in regard to that matter. In the meantime, there is $126,000,000 of overtime pay due Federal personnel on the 30th of the month that cannot be paid to employees in all branches of the Government, except the Army and the Navy, who are entitled to receive it on the 1st day of July, but who cannot receive it until this bill becomes a law.

Mr. TABER. The Senate is to blame for that because it has taken an arbitrary stand without having any hearings on which to base it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is little relationship between the attitude of the Senate on subversiveness and the payment of wages to the employees of the United States who are entitled to receive it on the 1st day of July. I trust the gentleman will permit the bill to go to conference.

Mr. TABER. I think I will hold off for 1 more day. Let us see if the Senate will not start hearings in the meantime.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall defer my request until tomorrow.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON TAX PAYMENT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings in the House yesterday upon agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 259) authorizing the printing of questions and answers on the tax bill be vacated and be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 557) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the printing of the manuscript Questions and Answers on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House and Senate document rooms, and ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Payment Act," be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 shall be for the use of the House document room, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are these books to be distributed to each Member?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Each Member can have his share. They will be in the document room.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then it is first come first served?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. Forty-two thousand copies will be printed and left in the document room.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is merely to change the proceeding because the Senate wanted them as well as the House?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Just how was this document prepared? Was it prepared entirely by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will let the gentleman from New York answer that.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I worked out a great many questions and answers with the experts of the committee, and that was checked by the experts of the Joint Committee on Taxation, and as far as humanly possible these questions, 92 questions and answers, I believe, are authentic.

Mr. TARVER. Then the people of the country who will get this document can rely upon it as giving authentic information which has the approval of the administrative authorities, dealing with the collection of the income tax under the 1943 current payment act?

Mr. REED of New York. That is the purpose of it, and it was prepared solely for the convenience of the Members of the House on both sides.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid or the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Germantown Courier. I am informed that this may somewhat

exceed the limitation fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to attend a convention of the Eastern Federation of Feed Dealers, in what they entitled a "Food Shortage Conference." They estimated that between 50 and 75 percent of these dealers would find their granaries and warehouses empty of wheat and corn by the end of a couple of weeks. This makes it all the more obvious that I was right in my prophecy 4 months ago when I said that we would be absolutely bereft of feed before the summer is out, and that the feed that must go to produce the food for freedom will not be forthcoming, because of the bungling and disastrous methods being inaugurated downtown by the various bureaucrats. I hope some solution may be found for this and that our Government will come to the rescue of the backbone of rural American enterprise, the feed dealer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the Texas Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a number of telegrams and communications that I have received from various educational institutions throughout the country, favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I am to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon, and include certain extracts and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two aspects, one with reference to Eddie Gilmore, and the other with reference to Commander Howard Gilmore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Huntington Advertiser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution passed by the Pittsburg County, Okla., Bar Association with regard to strikes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a proposed amendment to the bill H. R. 2869.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOLCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the commencement exercises of the North Carolina College for Negroes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULMER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter from Mr. Kuhn, president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on Flag Day and to include therein the words of a new patriotic song.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post of recent date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem entitled "A Doughboy Speaks to John L. Lewis."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an excellent editorial appearing in today's issue of the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a number of communications on the meat situation at Butte, Mont., among the copper miners, together with names and addresses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the National Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR DEPARTMENT—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1944

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Labor Department, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if I use all of the time reserved to me, but I wish to say just a few words about this resolution.

Yesterday the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] came before the Rules Committee and asked for this rule. During the discussion in the Rules Committee most of it surrounded the question of the National Youth Admin-

istration. As the House well knows, there was no appropriation made for this agency, but there is a provision in the bill which appropriates about $3,000,000 of unexpended balances to carry out the idea of dissolving this organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a member of the committee, let me say there were about 10 absentees from the Appropriations Committee yesterday morning; if those 10 had been present, this would have carried by 9 or 10 votes for the National Youth Administration appropriation; so the appropriation is not dead by any manner of means.

Mr. DELANEY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the vote was very close, but there is nothing carried in the bill, and I believe a point of order will lie against any such provision if it is presented by way of an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. DELANEY. We are all interested in a continuation of the National Youth Administration and we are hoping that something may be done in the future which will recreate that agency so it can continue its very fine work.

The National Youth Administration program is turning out 700 potential war workers daily and, of course, we all realize what a wonderful help that is to the prosecution of the war. The War Manpower Commission has estimated that an additional 4,600,000 men will be needed through June 1944. If we dissolve this organization it means it is going to create a lot of confusion and we are going to have a terrific time getting the extra men without any training unless we do appropriate money to the N. Y. A.

Mr. Speaker, there are many organizations which have indicated their strong endorsement of this program; among them is the Worthington Pump Co., the A. J. Johnson Machine Tool Co., and many hundreds of other companies.

I do hope that when this matter goes to the other body they may see fit to reinstate this item.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution reported by our Foreign Affairs Committee on post-war participation is important and will prove to be historic in my judgment. It is so brief and simple that it can hardly be misunderstood or misconstrued. I want to point out for those who have not read it and do not know its history just what it is and what it is not.

It is not just a pious generality. On the other hand, it is not a blueprint of a supergovernment. It is not a "must" measure from the Executive. On the other hand it is not an antiadministration measure. It is not a commitment. It is not a pledge. It is merely a statement of congressional preference in post-war policies. Nevertheless, it is important and historic. The Fulbright resolution was home-made by representatives of the people and by nobody else. Mr. FULBRIGHT's original draft, which he made himself, was overhauled and revamped by the committee and by no one else in a devoted and earnest attempt to secure a statement which would show the unanimous preference of our committee on post-war participation. It was not forced on the minority by the majority, or vice versa. I hope it will be considered in the same spirit by the House and the Senate.

The members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee hold divergent views as to the form and details of post-war participation by our country and each Member reserves the right to decide on the form and the details of that participation as we study and explore this vast and difficult and perplexing problem, but one thing is made clear by this resolution—we prefer post-war participation—not post-war isolation. If the House and Senate are like-minded, this resolution we have reported will be adopted.

For the present, it is important and historic because it is the first time any official part of our Government has been able to light some place on a given set of words to explain the hopes, the ideals, the preference of this country in the post-war period. For 4 years, I have urged that our foreign policy, whatever it is, should be brought down from the clouds into reality and out of the closets into the open, and that the people's representatives in Congress should attempt to state in official words our war aims and our peace aims. This is a historic and important step in this direction.

The resolution is so short and simple that it speaks for itself. It is the hope of our committee that it will be considered because of what it says, not because of what is said about it. My sole purpose in this statement is to urge that the resolution be considered on this basis. Here it is:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, if the House were given an opportunity to vote on the continuation of the N. Y. A., I am confident that an overwhelming majority would support it. The situation which prevents the exercise of the will of the majority of the House in connection with the N. Y. A. is most unfortunate.

Failure of the House Committee on Appropriations to provide for continuation of N. Y. A. will be a serious hindrance to our war effort. This agency has been providing our country's industrial war machine with 700 potential war workers with basic training in mechanical skills every day. In the fiscal year 1942 it provided preemployment training to 900,000 youth, of which 386,000 are known to have taken work in skilled and semiskilled employment in war industry.

The N. Y. A. cost per youth-month on its war training program has been only $65.86, including a nominal wage of 16 cents per hour as compared with the customary wages of 60 cents or more received by trainees in private industry.

This is no time to abolish the N. Y. A. Rather at a time when the shortage of manpower is becoming more and more acute and at a time when the N. Y. A. officials estimate that they can train another 50,000 youth each month, Congress should insist upon an appropriation sufficient to fully utilize all war-training facilities of this agency, an agency which is no longer a relief agency in any respect and which has 8 years' experience in youth training.

I ask you to bear in mind that the N. Y. A. war-training program is not only training youth but is as well producing significant quantities of war matériel. For one navy yard, the one at Portsmouth, it produced 311,000 items in 1 year's time.

I want to read to the Members of the House one letter to the head of the N. Y. A. from an industrialist, which is typical of hundreds that can be produced to indicate the importance of the N. Y. A. to our war effort:

PARACHUTE CO. OF UTAH,
Manti, Utah, August 11, 1942.

Mr. AUBREY WILLIAMS,
National Youth Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: It has come to our attention that the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim, Utah, is about to be discontinued. We feel that ths project has made a definite contribution to national defense, and the purpose of this letter is to ascertain whether there is not some way of continuing its valuable work.

The Parachute Co. of Utah, a subcontractor for Standard Parachute Corporation, of San Diego, was organized solely for, and is engaged exclusively in, the manufacture of parachutes and parachute spare parts for the United States Army and Navy. When this company came to Utah about the 1st of May the only women in southern Utah who were familiar with power sewing were those who had been trained in the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim. Each week the National Youth Administration has sent us some prospective employees with a basic knowledge of power sewing. Some of the best operators we have on our pay roll at the present time are young women who were originally trained in power sewing on the National Youth Administration sewing machines. We find that a woman who has had experience on a power machine has mastered the first step in parachute making, i. e., overcoming fear of the machine.

This company made its first shipment of parachutes to the United States Army on June 17. In the 8 weeks since that time we have shipped 1,600 parachutes, 895 harness assemblies, and 300 spare packs. This, of course, is just a small beginning. The State of Utah is presently constructing a State

armory building in Manti, to be occupied exclusively by the Parachute Co. of Utah. This building is 8 times larger than the building we are now occupying and in which we are now running 3 shifts per day, employing approximately 300 women. With the completion of the new building, our total personnel requirements will be around 800 women.

If the National Youth Administration project were discontinued, we feel that we would lose a very valuable source of personnel. We believe that the Federal Government could make no better contribution toward national defense in this community than by continuing to train young women in power sewing. The industry is here to employ them when they have completed their training with the National Youth Administration. It is the only defense industry within a radius of 100 miles and it is doing a 100-percent war job.

We respectfully seek your cooperation in maintaining the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim, Utah.

Very truly yours,

PARACHUTE CO. OF UTAH,
By M. J. BROWN.

The executive secretary of the National Education Association in a letter sent out May 27 has sought to create the impression that the N. Y. A. is "duplicating the work being done better by the public schools and at a cost that is unreasonable." This House ought to know that Mr. Givens' figure of $955 as the estimated cost per trainee per year is a gross distortion. The fact is that the cost per trainee per year estimated for 1944 is substantially less than estimated by Mr. Givens. The fact is that the estimated cost per trainee per year estimated for 1944 is $726.61, or only about $26 more per year than the actual training costs in 1942, despite the great increase in costs of supplies for the coming year.

From my own city of New York I have received numerous letters from educators and high-school principals, including the High School Principals Association of the City of New York, asking that N. Y. A. be continued.

Certainly the testimony of industrialists engaged in vital war work, of educators directly in touch with the Nation's youth, of the highly competent officials of the National Youth Administration is evidence of the high worth of the N. Y. A. and the vital need for its continuance. Certainly this evidence is of more importance than the proved distortions of Mr. Givens, concocted at his desk in Washington.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will restore this appropriation and that this House shall have the opportunity to approve its action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I beg to make a brief statement relative to the resolution unanimously voted by the Foreign Affairs Committee so ably discussed a few moments ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

I believe the Fulbright resolution to be a constructive statement, a first step toward insuring us as a nation at war a secure and lasting peace. Its very simplicity lends itself to making possible a start in unified thinking on the part of the Congress. It settles nothing, it merely clarifies a beginning. But it does say that because we are participating in the war we have the right and the obligation to participate in setting up the peace. It recognizes the fundamental fact that just as our strength and our power is necessary to victory so is our power, our vision, our influence necessary to peace.

It says very simply: We do not propose to give our sons and daughters to the grim business of world war and then fail them and their sons and daughters by refusing to take up the right we have won to participate in the building of the peace. Nor do we propose to forget that that very right gives us a responsibility we dare not set aside.

This resolution offers a very simple starting point for unified action. It sets up no blueprint, no complicated machinery. It merely expresses an intention. I believe it to be timely and I hope most earnestly that it will receive thoughtful consideration from every Member of the Congress.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I did not know until I read it in the papers that there was any such resolution coming up. I have only heard the resolution read by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I do know how a lot of people at home feel about Union Now, and I can see from that resolution, as I have heard it read, that it gives over the power to those who would want to keep peace, and that means with armies; that might mean with sovereignty, it might mean giving away rights of this Government under the Constitution.

How can you believe with a war going on that this resolution, only the consideration of it by the House of Representatives, will not incite to revolt our people who are complaining, who are already discouraged at the way things are being handled in Washington?

I plead with you, I beg you not to bring forth such a confusing and a discouraging resolution before this country at a time when every thought and energy should be concentrated on the effort before us.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that the discussion of foreign policies is not germane to the bill pending before us. The resolution read by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by both Democrats and Republicans. It is a very important and far-reaching resolution, and I have always yielded time as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules to anyone who had a very important matter to present to the House. Nothing could be more vital than that resolution. No one has more respect for the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] for her ability, for her sincerity, and for her real Americanism than I, and I think I voted with her practically every time prior to Pearl Harbor to keep us out of the war unless attacked, and I am proud of my record. I assume she is proud of hers; but this is a question of peace and not of war. We are in the war and we have to fight the war through to final victory. Someday we will have to face the question of deciding how we shall make peace; and I hope to God when we do the people will have something to say about it, that the Congress of the United States, representing the people, will have a great deal to say about it.

I am for this resolution because it commits us only to the principle of favoring a just and lasting peace. That I have been for, for 20 years, long before we ever got into the war. I would give my right arm now if we could as a result of this war achieve a just and lasting peace and unless we do the war will have been fought in vain and the lives of your sons sacrificed in vain. I would like to see the question of peace discussed at all times and I do not want any one man or any small group of men to present us with a ready-made peace committing us to anything unless it is discussed on the floor of this House and in the Congress and by the American people. This commits us to nothing, absolutely nothing whatever except the question of discussing peace and favoring a just and lasting peace; and I cannot see how anybody would be opposed to that in principle.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to suggest to the gentleman from New York that the men now in the armed services of the country should have something to say about any international arrangement that might be made after the war is over.

Mr. FISH. I agree absolutely. We cannot, of course, enter into any peace agreement until the war is over. I hope the returning veterans will have a great deal to say about it and I think they will; and when they come back their views may be entirely different.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is absolutely nothing that will be binding on us, for before any permanent agreement that might be recommended could be entered into as a result of this resolution it would have to be ratified by the Senate. This resolution is really for a free and open discussion to try to plan something for these men to consider when they come back.

Mr. FISH. And, furthermore, I want to go on record as saying that I am opposed to having anybody make any peace commitments for us without the consent of the Senate or the Congress, and particularly to make any commitments for the American people before we know

what the peace aims of Soviet Russia are and what the peace aims of the British Empire are. No one has a right to speak for us or to speak for the American people or to make any commitments whatever in relation to peace. I am sure we are all agreed, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, that nobody should attempt to commit us until we know what the peace aims of our allies are.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that I agree thoroughly that this question ought to be discussed on the floor of the House, and it is not untimely to begin the discussion now.

Mr. FISH. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Because we represent the American people and we are the body charged with the responsibility of declaring war. We can also declare peace, and should have something to say about the kind of peace we are to have.

Mr. FISH. I am for this resolution because I want the peace problems discussed openly by the people and the people's representatives. If this is the people's war it must be a people's peace.

Mr. RANKIN. When this war is over I want the boys who are doing the fighting, and not a few star-gazers who are doing the talking, to have more to say about our international relations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that this would help bring the peace problem before the boys and their families? Everyone of those who served will ask for a lasting peace.

Mr. RANKIN. I think so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I want to say amen to what the gentleman from Mississippi just said.

Mr. FISH. This is an important resolution. Several members of the Foreign Affairs Committee wanted to discuss it but could not under the established procedure so I am yielding a little time for that purpose. I may say for the benefit of the newer Members that a few years ago a Member could get the floor and talk for 10 to 15 minutes. Now under the rules a Member may ask for only one minute at the outset of the session. This resolution could not be discussed for days or weeks possibly unless under a rule in this way.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. By bringing this matter to the attention of the House and having it discussed by the Representatives of the American people, we can probably arrive at some sane solution and not inject into the debate and into the program the silly, stupid, insane proposition of making every citizen of this country a citizen of some other country or making every citizen of some other country a citizen of the United States.

Mr. FISH. And backed up by a glorified W. P. A. We do not want that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the proposition that was originally before us, a rule brought in by the Rules Committee waiving all points of order against items in the bill that have been added as legislation. That is the rule. It makes in order all items in the bill, or, if you want to put it the other way, it waives all points of order against any items in the bill. There are several matters I would like to discuss in connection with this rule.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it make in order any amendment to the bill to increase the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. FISH. Well, if the gentleman refers specifically to the National Youth Administration, it does not.

Mr. DONDERO. I do refer to that.

Mr. FISH. It does not make in order any amendment to that particular item. The item carried in the bill is $3,000,000 for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration, therefore no amendment offered from the floor to carry on that administration or to provide sums to carry it on will be considered germane if a point of order is made against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it the purpose then of the Rules Committee not to permit the House of Representatives to vote on whether or not it wants to continue the National Youth Administration?

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee never had that question before it at any time. The Committee on Appropriations put in an item for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration. That committee of the House had this item under consideration and put in a certain amount of money, namely, $3,000,000, for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration. The Rules Committee was never asked to present a rule that would make in order something that is not germane to the bill. All we were asked to do was to present a rule that would waive points of order against items that were in the bill. The Appropriations Committee itself acted in the first instance and left out everything that had anything to do with the National Youth Administration except a sum of money to liquidate it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to get this straight for the RECORD. Was any request made by the gentlemen appearing on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations to make in order any amendment that would provide for the continuance of the N. Y. A.?

Mr. FISH. No; not that I remember.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But the Rules Committee could have done it?

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee can do anything at all. It is all-powerful, subject to the will of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It failed to do it?

Mr. FISH. They were not asked to do it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They did not have to be asked.

Mr. FISH. That is the regular procedure. They can change any rule if the House agrees. The House has to pass on all rules. It is the master in the last instance. The Rules Committee is the servant of the House like all other committees.

Mr. Speaker, there is one little item in here I would like to refer to and I do it with some reluctance because it concerns a friend of mind I have known many years, Paul McNutt. There is legislation in this appropriation bill that increases his salary by $3,000, not a huge amount of money, not something we should begrudge him after spending a billion dollars in this bill, but it seems to me there is a principle involved. We are called upon to increase the salary of the Chairman of the Manpower Commission by $3,000. We should not be asked to increase his salary by even $300 or $30. If I recollect correctly, and I am not positive about my memory, it was Mr. McNutt who was largely responsible for the freezing order on salaries of some 27,000,000 American wage earners. Does it not appear a little bit inconsistent to raise the salary of a high public official $3,000 by an act of Congress when that same man issued an order freezing the salaries of 27,000,000 wage earners in the country? What are they going to think if the Congress comes along and favors a high New Deal official, no matter who he is, and increases his salary by $3,000? This rule makes that in order. I would not have voted for the rule had I known it at the time. If the question is raised in the House to strike the item out I shall certainly support it because I think it is utterly inconsistent on the part of the Congress to increase the salary of high public officials and at the same time freeze the salaries and the wages of millions of American wage earners.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. May I say in connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], with reference to a request made of the Committee on Rules for a rule waiving all points of order, that it is not the duty of the Committee on Rules to suggest legislation nor is it our duty to suggest that a committee ask that certain provisions be included in a rule.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] could have

come before the Rules Committee himself and asked for it.

Mr. DELANEY. We are a policy-making committee, not a legislative committee in the sense that we legislate or present these bills.

Mr. FISH. Any Member, of course, Democrat or Republican, could have come before us and asked for any specific rule.

Mr. DELANEY. I want to have it clear that the Committee on Rules was not asked for such a rule.

Mr. FISH. That is just exactly what I said and I am glad to have my colleague substantiate my statement.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this rule, either to defend it or otherwise, but since most of the time here has been taken up by some of our friends over on this side of the aisle discussing peace resolutions I thought it might be apropos to make a little comment on that myself.

I read in the paper the other day that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had unanimously—and I was amazed when I read that word "unanimously"—reported out a resolution approving certain terms for the peace treaty. I thought that that was a matter for the Senate. I did not know the House made peace treaties. But it was all right. I say I was amazed to observe that my friends over here, who have been more or less, well, I will not say isolationist——

Mr. FISH. Noninterventionist.

Mr. COLMER. But something bordering on isolationist——

Mr. SHAFER. It was unanimously reported, so why refer to this side of the House altogether?

Mr. COLMER. The point I am trying to make to my distinguished friend is that I was amazed that this side—Republican—had gone along with that position.

Mr. SHAFER. I am amazed, too.

Mr. COLMER. Then that makes it unanimous. I kinc of expected that over here.

This morning we have the unusual situation of some of these folks who had voted for this resolution taking the floor and in a kind of apologetic manner explaining the thing away by telling why they had done this, and so on. Their position here today reminds me of a little story about the organization of the Bengal Riflemen. The Bengal Riflemen decided to incorporate, and they incorporated, being a peace-loving group, under two heads. The first head of incorporation was, "Be it resolved that the name of this organization shall be the Bengal Riflemen." The second head of incorporation was, "Be it further resolved that in case of hostilities this organization shall immediately disband."

It seems that we are getting a little disbanding over here on the Republican side since the organization has been incorporated.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of clarifying an impression with reference to the rule. As chairman of the subcommittee I was authorized by the full Committee on Appropriations to appear before the Committee on Rules to obtain a rule that would provide a waiver of all points of order against provisions already in the bill and no more.

The question has been raised as to why we did not ask the Committee on Rules to include in that rule the right to offer a substitute provision for appropriations for the National Youth Administration. It is reasonable to assume that since the full committee eliminated the appropriation for the N. Y. A. from the bill it would not authorize its representative to ask from the Committee on Rules for a rule making the reinstatement of such an appropriation free from points of order. That is the reason no request was made for a rule providing for the reinstatement of the appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a member of the committee

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the leading labor leaders of the Nation attended a conference at the White House. There came out that evening in the newspapers headlines declaring that labor demanded a roll-back in food prices and in the general cost of living, to, I believe, the figures obtaining as of January 1, 1942.

When I glanced at that article and read of the account of the White House conference on the subject, there occurred to me the thought, just what would labor say if the farmer would also demand a roll-back in labor, in the wages that labor receives, and I could immediately hear the expostulation of the labor press against any such fool idea.

And yet, is it so foolish, Mr. Speaker? I have here a statement, a table from the May 1943 Agricultural Statistics, published by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics of the U. S. D. A., which would appear to show that perhaps labor as a whole is being treated very fairly in the economic picture of today.

The following official table from the May 1943 Agricultural Statistics, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the U. S. D. A., shows what the picture is as far as the relation of food prices to the ability of the consumer to buy it:

Economic trends affecting agriculture

Year and month	Industrial production (1935-39=100)	Income of industrial workers (1935-39=100)	Cost of living (1935-39=100)	1910-14=100					
				Wholesale prices of all commodities	Prices paid by farmers for commodities used in—			Prices paid, interest, and taxes	Farm wage rates
					Living	Production	Living and production		
1925	90	126	125	151	163	147	156	170	176
1926	96	131	126	146	162	146	155	168	179
1927	95	127	124	139	160	144	153	166	179
1928	99	126	123	141	160	148	155	168	179
1929	110	134	122	139	159	147	154	167	180
1930	91	110	119	126	150	141	146	160	167
1931	75	84	109	107	128	123	126	140	130
1932	58	58	98	95	108	109	108	122	96
1933	69	61	92	96	108	108	108	118	85
1934	75	76	96	109	122	123	122	128	95
1935	87	86	98	117	124	127	125	130	103
1936	103	100	99	118	123	125	124	128	111
1937	113	117	103	126	128	136	131	134	126
1938	89	91	101	115	122	125	123	127	125
1939	108	105	99	113	120	122	121	125	123
1940	123	119	100	115	121	124	122	126	126
1941	156	169	105	127	131	131	131	134	154
1942	181	238	116	144	154	149	152	152	201
1942—April	173	218	115	144	152	149	151	151	177
May	174	225	116	144	153	150	152	152	----------
June	176	234	116	144	154	150	152	152	183
July	178	247	117	144	154	150	152	152	202
August	183	251	118	145	155	150	153	152	----------
September	187	255	118	145	157	151	154	153	----------
October	191	259	119	146	158	151	155	154	220
November	194	273	120	146	160	151	156	155	----------
December	197	279	120	147	162	153	158	156	----------
1943—January	199	291	121	149	163	155	160	158	223
February	202	286	121	150	165	157	162	160	----------
March	203	287	122	151	167	158	163	161	----------
April	----------	----------	----------	----------	168	161	165	162	239

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this table as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we find by glancing at this table which I have obtained permission to insert in the RECORD, that considering the average of the years 1935 to 1939 as the equation 100, the income of industrial workers rose in 1940 to 119, in 1941 to 169, in 1942 to an average of 238, and the latest figures available, in March 1943, 287.

Now let us see how this same group, labor, has fared as far as the rise in the cost of living is concerned. Again taking the 1935 to 1939 average as 100, we find that average remaining at 100 for 1940 and we find that it has crawled up to 105 in 1941, 116 in 1942, until it reaches a peak in March 1943 of 122.

In other words while labor had advanced in its income from the 100 base period of 1935 to 1939 up to 287 last

month or nearly three times the average that it obtained a few short years ago, we find that the cost of living has risen only 22 percent.

I have here, Members of the House, a copy of a labor paper entitled "the Labor Beacon" which proudly terms itself the Nation's greatest labor newspaper and which is published weekly at Michigan City, Ind. I believe that most of us may safely assume that this particular newspaper, devoting itself as it has a perfect right to do, in the interest of labor, would have no cause to publish articles in its columns which it felt in any way was untruthful as far as labor's interest was concerned.

I note an article on page 2 of this particular issue of Friday, June 4, headlined "Buying power higher despite living cost." Quoting from that in part, I read as follows:

Figures obtained from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Indiana Office of Employment Service, shows that in February, 1943 the average factory worker's weekly earnings were 71.8 percent higher than at the beginning of the war in Europe in September, 1939, while during the same period his cost of living has advanced only 20.2 percent.

The bulletin further shows that factory workers' earnings in Indiana are typical of the Nation:

In February 1943—

The bulletin says—

the average wage in manufacturing in the United States was $41.12 for an average week of 44.5 hours. In Indiana this figure stood at $41.55 for an average week of 45 hours. In September 1939 average weekly earnings in Indiana were $25.47 for 38 hours. No time in the 4-year period has there been a significant variation in National and State figures and in almost every month the Indiana figure has been higher.

The cost of living in February 1943 in the United States—

The bulletin continues—

stood at 120.9 percent of the 1935–39 average. This was an increase of 20 percent over September 1939 and 9.4 percent over December 1941. Of the various items which enter into the wage earner's budget, food has shown the greatest advance in prices since 1939, an increase of 35.8 percent, followed by clothing with an increase of 25.5 percent.

This, Mr. Speaker, concludes my quoting from the Labor Beacon, published in Indiana.

Yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] was kind enough to permit me to ask him a question during his speech upholding the theory of subsidies on food.

I asked the gentleman as follows, quoting from page 5928 of the RECORD:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand the gentleman to make the statement that the cost of living has gotten out of control. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not he considers that the cost of living has risen in any degree corresponding to the increase in what we term defense plant wages during the last 2 years?

Mr. WEISS. Yes, I would say it has.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman believes that the cost of living has risen more in proportion?

Mr. WEISS. It has completely gotten away from us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken, as I will prove tomorrow.

Mr. WEISS. I hope the gentleman does.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] at this time and to others who feel the same as he does, that these figures put out by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the average factory worker's weekly earnings were 71.8 percent higher today than at the beginning of the war in September 1939, whereas the cost of his food has risen according to this same article 35.8 percent with the increase in the cost of his clothing of 25.5 percent, and the general cost of living by only 22 percent.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we see an official publication, the Agricultural Statistics in its May 1943 issue produce figures to the effect that labor today is 2.87 times better off as far as income is concerned than it was in the average of the period from 1935 to 1939 and also shows that labor's cost of living has risen only to 1.22 times that which it paid for the average of the same 5-year period from 1935 to 1939. Also, we note the article from the Labor Beacon which I have quoted and which states that the cost of living in February 1943, in the United States stood at 120.9 percent of the 1935–39 average, a figure by the way, only 9.4 percent above 1941 and in the same article we note that the average factory worker's weekly earnings were 71.8 percent higher in February 1943 than at the beginning of the war in Europe in September 1939.

That, Mr. Speaker, constitutes my answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He may perhaps demand an investigation into the caliber of the men whom we have working as statisticians in our Agricultural Department. He may question the figures as quoted from these two official sources. I simply leave it to the sound judgment of the House as to whether the statement of the gentleman yesterday in the House of Representatives is correct or not.

In conclusion upon this particular subject, might I suggest to the gentlemen who represent labor, who are labor leaders in this Nation that they investigate very carefully before they advocate the rolling back of the prices of farm commodities. Mr. Speaker, if a roll-back in the cost of food prices is justified, perhaps such an investigation might find that it is more justified to roll back defense-plant labor, which down in our hearts each and every one of us in this Chamber today, I believe, will admit has been allowed by a paternalistic administration to go hog wild and disrupt the entire economic structure of our Nation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR DEPARTMENT—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2935, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the end of the debate on Tuesday, June 15, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] had consumed 1 hour and 31 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] had consumed 1 hour and 28 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of keeping the record straight, gentlemen will recall the fact that a month or two ago the Committee on Appropriations asked the Committee on Rules for a rule waiving points of order against the agricultural appropriation bill, at which time a majority of that committee held up its hands in holy horror on being asked to permit legislation on an appropriation bill, and declined to grant any such rule. We recall the members of the Agricultural Committee expressing their unalterable opposition to waiving all points of order against legislative provisions in any appropriation bill, and yet this morning you have adopted, without a single dissenting vote, a rule waiving all points of order against proposed appropriations not authorized by law aggregating $200,000,000 in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. Therefore, it is plainly evident that the action of the Committee on Rules was not the result of any set policy, but was the result of a wish not to have the agricultural bill considered under the procedure and practice which has obtained with regard to some other appropriation bills. Their action in refusing a rule has brought about a situation in which we have 134 amendments to the agricultural appropriation bill, many of which could have been avoided had the rule been granted and the House given an opportunity to consider all the subject matters, which must be considered before that bill is enacted into law. Consistency, thou art a jewel.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, on January 21 I addressed the House of Representatives in connection with a serious work stoppage situation which existed in the San Francisco Bay area. At that time I called attention to the activities of Local No. 68 of the A. F. of L. Machinists Union, whose business agents are Harry Hook and E. F. Dillon. I made the following statement:

Remember these names, because you will hear a great deal more about these gentlemen.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we are hearing more about these gentlemen right now.

Messrs. Hook and Dillon have called the machinists off their job at the National Motor Bearing plant in Redwood City, Calif., an organization engaged in vital war work, and have again caused a very serious work stoppage in spite of the oft-repeated pledge of no strikes in war industries for the duration. An interim order has been issued by the War Labor Board, directing the machinists to return to work, but in spite of this fact, Hook and Dillon have told their men not to return, and have threatened those who do with expulsion from the union.

The background of this particular case has a familiar ring. In March of this year the business agents for local 68 notified the National Motor Bearing Co. that they had decided to reopen their then existing contract. The company agreed. The parties met in Redwood City, and the union's proposal, which called for an automatic wage increase in ratio to the increase in the cost-of-living index, was rejected as being illegal under President Roosevelt's wage freeze order of April 8, and also under the ruling of the War Labor Board.

The company also took the position that there were other clauses in the old contract which were either illegal or void under emergency executive orders or legislation. The negotiations continued until May 8, when Hook and Dillon notified the company that they would reject all proposals and that the company would have to sign the union's contract by May 15 or the men would be pulled off their jobs on May 17. The company requested further negotiations, but this was rejected. Accordingly, a wire was sent to Dr. John R. Steelman, Director of the United States Conciliation Service, requesting that a conciliator be appointed and this was done.

In spite of the fact that the conciliator was appointed, Hook and Dillon posted notices to the machinists that they were not to report for work on May 17, and consequently work was stopped. Conciliation proceedings continued for several days without success. Finally, on June 7 the Department of Labor certified the case to the War Labor Board. On June 9 the following wire from the War Labor Board was sent to Hook and Dillon:

The Tenth Regional War Labor Board today considered the case involving the dispute between your union and the National Motor Bearing Co., of Redwood City, including your wire of June 9 stating that the members of lodge No. 68 terminated their employment under instructions of the union due to unfair labor conditions. The Board unanimously found that a strike exists and directs that you immediately establish the status quo by ordering your members to resume work in their former positions with the company in order that vital war production may be resumed. Advise of compliance with this order.

THOMAS FAIR NEBLETT,
Chairman.

A wire was also sent to the machinists asking them to return to their jobs in the interest of maintaining production of materials vital to the war effort. However, Hook and Dillon did not see fit to obey the order issued by the War Labor Board and replied to the Board as follows:

In re your telegram of June 8 there is no strike in progress at National Motor Bearing Co. Members of Lodge No. 68 who terminated their employment under instructions of the union due to unfair labor conditions existing in the plant are now employed in fair union shops engaged in the production of war materials as is their right and obligation to do. National Motor Bearing Co. is unjustified in refusing to sign a contract which is identical and in force and observed by 182 fair employers of labor in the jurisdiction of Lodge No 68 and it is our position that the National Motor Bearing Co. should sign the agreement which has stabilized industry in this area and if there are any grievances thereafter to bring them before your board and this should be your directive to them at this time. Under the circumstances we regret we cannot accede to your request.

E. F. DILLON,
HARRY HOOK,
Business Agents.

Mr. Chairman, such actions can be called by no other name than outright treason. How long is this Government going to tolerate that attitude on the part of some of its misguided and so-called labor leaders? Here is another flat refusal to comply with an order of the War Labor Board.

I have discussed the situation with Harvey Brown, international president of the Machinists Union and gather from my conversation that the international organization has little or no control over these two business agents. The Government should step in and put these men where they can do no more damage to the war effort.

Prior to the work stoppage some 38 machinists were employed at the National Motor Bearing Co. I was informed this morning by the War Labor Board that between 20 and 25 of these men have returned to work, although Local 68 is still seeking methods of preventing them from doing their patriotic duty on the production front. One case is particularly worthy of comment.

I have here the sworn affidavit of one R. F. Tuttle, who was dismissed from the union because he returned to work in defiance of the union's edict. Mr. Tuttle's statement is as follows:

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of San Mateo, ss:

R. F. Tuttle, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that on the evening of May 28 at about the hour of 8:45 p. m., he held a conversation with E. F. Dillon, business agent of San Francisco Lodge No. 68, International Association of Machinists, at the office of said lodge at the Labor Temple, Sixteenth and Capp Streets, San Francisco; also present at said conversation was Harry Hook, business agent of said lodge, and five other persons comprising the trial committee of said lodge; that the names of said five persons are unknown at this time to affiant; that during said conversation the following statements, questions, and answers were made and given:

R. F. Tuttle said, "It isn't beyond me to wave the flag. The publicity that you have seen and read in the papers regarding the stoppage of production on B-25 bombers is the truth, and the stoppage of work at National Motor Bearing Co. is seriously injuring the war effort."

Mr. Dillon replied, "You would place your country before the union; is that correct?"

Mr. Tuttle said, "Yes. My country comes before the union."

Mr. Dillon replied, "That is a very poor attitude."

R. F. TUTTLE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of May 1943.

[SEAL] NELLIE B. STREIFF,
Notary Public in and for the County of San Mateo, State of California.

I wonder what the attitude of the country is toward such individuals as Mr. Dillon and Mr. Hook.

Mr. Chairman, I realize there are two sides to this question and I will not say that the company is entirely blameless, but unless we pass legislation in this House giving men who want to work the right to work in spite of their union laws and edicts, then we are not doing our duty. If we do not do our job now, when the soldiers and sailors come home after the war is over, the job will be done, and done right.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought you Republicans and the antilabor Democrats took care of that strike situation by voting for the Connally bill last week.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We did our best by voting for that bill. It is my hope the President will sign it.

Mr. FOGARTY. You know deep down in your heart that that will not stop strikes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It is going to go a long way in preventing unauthorized labor stoppages, in violation of the pledge given by labor that there would be no stoppages. This country is at war and strikes cannot be tolerated.

Mr. FOGARTY. All it will do is cause more walk-outs like the one you have mentioned.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is your attitude.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that many industrial concerns are ignoring the War Labor Board rulings, as well as the laboring men?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That may be true, but does that justify labor in doing the same thing?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It does not justify either one of them in doing it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. And in spite of their promise that there would be no work stoppages. This Congress has to take the power out of the hands of these misguided labor leaders

so that the patriotic workingman can be protected in his desire to work.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And we continue to have actions that are disastrous to the war effort, from industrial concerns, such as the Anaconda Copper Co.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Does not the gentleman agree with me that there are laws set up to deal with cases of that kind? If the laws are not properly administered I cannot help it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But you see what the judges did in that case. They slapped them on the wrist.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Well, I am not a judge. Furthermore I did not appoint them.

Now, getting back to Hook and Dillon. These two men have frequently been referred to as the Peck's Bad Boys of labor in the San Francisco Bay area. That is too charitable. They are dangerous individuals, and the Government has tolerated their nefarious activities too long. The President of the United States had to wire them last January to cease interfering with the naval ship construction program. They did in that instance, but now they are at it again.

The War Labor Board has informed us that they are going to fight this case through to a successful settlement. More power to them. It is about time we stopped giving in to these would-be dictators and extended some real measure of protection to the millions of loyal workers in the ranks of organized labor who want to get on with winning the war.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, last Sunday on a Detroit radio program Maj. James H. Clark, speaker of the Ontario Legislature, asserted that 40 to 45 percent of Canadians favor political union with the United States.

Major Clark is 55 years old, a native-born Canadian, and a lawyer who is descended from one of the families which migrated to New Brunswick at the close of the American Revolution. He explained that his opinion was based on conversations had with many Canadians in all the provinces, as well as a poll which showed that with the exception of French Canadians, who preferred their independence, 34 percent were for the empire, 37 percent for union with the United States, 18 percent for independence, and 11 percent undecided.

The question is being widely discussed and sentiment is growing—

He said—

I made it quite plain when I spoke Sunday that I was speaking for myself alone and not for the government. I am in favor of physical union with the States because it is economically absurd to drive commerce east and west along a strip across North America instead of letting it flow north and south.

We are one natural economic unit and we are now united militarily. It would be better for the people on both sides of the border if North America were one country.

A union would also cement good feeling between the United States, Canada, and Great Britain. We all speak the same language.

International boundaries are getting out of date, with the great advances which have been made in transport. A union would be a great step forward toward maintaining the peace of the world in the post-war period.

We've got to get rid of this feeling of intense nationalism and make common front with the British and Russians and Chinese to maintain peaceful relations.

My travels and contacts with other thinking Canadians have convinced me that there is a growing feeling that our standard of living would be raised and that we would have a greater measure of prosperity on both sides of the border if we'd get together.

My views are not anti-British. I have as much love and respect for the British as anyone.

A minority spokesman in Ontario has called Major Clark "mischievous" for so expressing himself and what he is convinced is a majority of Canadian citizens. Major Clark speaks forth with the frankness and courage of Winston Churchill himself. He can be assured that a majority of Americans respect him for these qualities because they are fighting all over the world to establish freedom for all and especially freedom of speech and expression in their fullest meaning.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to say something about the N. Y. A. The N. Y. A. has gone to war. Certainly it is making a great contribution to the war effort. I understand that the N. Y. A. is placing in industry from 700 to 1,000 trained persons per day. Most of these are going into war plants. I think any organization that is able to place in industry today anywhere from 700 to 1,000 young people each day, who are pretty well skilled, is making a distinct contribution to the war effort.

In my district we have considerable N. Y. A. activity. We have the shops and the State work which centers there. Last year in that one congressional district the N. Y. A. sent into industry—and nearly all of it went into war industry—1,324 people.

Here are the figures for the different parishes in the Eighth District of Louisiana, which I represent: Avoyelles, 97; Grant, 108; La Salle, 71; Natchitoches, 134; Rapides, 621; Sabine, 104; Vernon, 82; Winn, 107. That means in that congressional district alone the N. Y. A. sent into essential war industry last year 1,324 people. I understand that practically all of them went into essential war industry. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is worth while. I think the committee made a very serious mistake in eliminating the N. Y. A. program. It was stated on the House floor here today that the N. Y. A. item was defeated in the committee by just one vote. It is regrettable that several members who favored it were not present. I think it ought to be continued and continued because it is making this very great contribution to the war effort. It is unfortunate that under the parliamentary situation it cannot be placed in the bill in the House. The rule under which the bill was presented makes no provision for an amendment to put the item in the bill. When this bill gets to the Senate, I sincerely hope that the Senate will put this appropriation in the bill and that the House will sustain the action of the Senate so this important function can go on.

Mr. Chairman, I base my position squarely on the contribution which the agency is making to the war effort. Can it be said that it should be stopped in the midst of the worst war of all times when we are informed that practically all of its effort now is directed toward furthering the war effort? These men and women in the N. Y. A. are being recruited from all walks of life and they are being given the specific training to qualify them to go into the war plants of the country. The N. Y. A. has the machinery, the shops, and the trained teachers to carry on this vital training program during the war. My greatest desire is to aid the war effort in any way I can. This is a war where machines, tanks, airplanes, and other implements play a great part, and if the N. Y. A. is sending into those factories around a thousand trained people a day, as we are advised is being done, it certainly seems to me that that is worth while. In this connection, I have received a great many telegrams from people who have urged the continuance of the N. Y. A. as a war agency. Among the telegrams I have received is one from one of the largest industrialists in this country today. I refer to Mr. Andrew J. Higgins, president of the Higgins Industries, Inc., of New Orleans. He wired me and urged that this training program in the N. Y. A. be continued. I am informed that a great many men and women in his great plant in New Orleans are products of the N. Y. A. training program. Let us keep sending trained men and women into those war plants. We must not slow down production.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, five Members of this House have risen in their places today to voice their approval and hope that the N. Y. A. might be continued, and one Member even expressed it as his opinion that in spite of the fact that the Appropriations Committee had rejected the item of $59,000,000 to continue the N. Y. A., that that item was by no means dead.

I rise for the purpose of saying something on the other side, based on the record of the N. Y. A., and I am sure if the five Members who have risen in their places and spoken in favor of that item had read the report filed by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States, on the 24th day of May, undoubtedly their opinions would have been changed and they would have taken the other side of the question.

We have set up a Federal colossus in this Government. In the last decade there have been 92 new boards, bureaus, commissions, and agencies established in the Federal Government. We are becoming a government by bureaucracy. The N. Y. A. is one of those agencies. It may have served a useful purpose

when it was first established, but in my judgment, based upon this report, that purpose no longer exists. I think the Committee on Appropriations deserves the commendation not only of the Congress of the United States, but of the people of this country, in trying to save $59,000,000 by eliminating that item from this bill which, in my opinion, would be expended most unwisely.

I commend the reading of this document to every Member of the House. It is Senate Document No. 54, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. Let me give the House some information about the N. Y. A. contained in this report. On page 7, you will find that the N. Y. A. on October 28, 1942, had 11,806 employees. Out of that number, 7,035 were in the administrative field, and 4,771, or 44 percent of them, were out in the field actually doing the work. In other words, they had about one and one-half administrative personnel for every one person doing the work.

The N. Y. A., with a staff of 11,806, has 53,000 youths. In other words, they had one paid employee for every four and a half trainees. That is just one of the things I wish to call your attention to.

Here is another: They had 56,534 work stations in the United States. Seventeen thousand of those have been placed on the shelf, they have folded up because there was no need for them. That left something like 38,000 work stations. They have 38,000 stations to train 53,000 students or trainees. That means they have one station for every one and four-tenths students in training.

It is not necessary to enlarge on these figures before every Member of the House understands how ridiculous it is to ask for a continuation of the N. Y. A. with that kind of a record.

The committee investigating the N. Y. A. did not hesitate to say that no part of the $59,000,000 requested for it as a part of the Manpower War Commission's budget should be granted. The committee found that the N. Y. A., in effect, duplicated, overlapped, or performed functions very similar to six other Government bureaus, and that Mr. Aubrey Williams, Executive Director of N. Y. A., testified that industry itself is being paid in some cases as much as 2 percent on war contracts for doing practically the same work. In other words, the Government is paying industry to train youths and men for war jobs, while at the same time it is carrying on a similar program in its own organization. The N. Y. A. clearly duplicates the program of the Office of Education in its defense-training work.

It may shock some of the Members of the House to learn that the N. Y. A. has already cost the taxpayers of this Nation over $771,000,000 from 1935 to and including 1943. The report containing this information was filed by the committee of which the distinguished and able Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, was chairman.

In my own State of Michigan, with 1,330 stations in existence, they have 1,724 students, or about 1.4 to every work station in the State. I heard some recommendations read here this morning to the effect that this agency should be continued. Does Congress know, and those who have spoken in favor of this agency know, that no less an organization in this country than the National Education Association is against the continuance of N. Y. A. and have said so in writing? I now read from a report of the N. E. A.:

It is, therefore, our conviction that the entire National Youth Administration planning program with its attendant production and service projects should be transferred to the State and local educational agencies at the earliest possible date.

That is their recommendation. I have letters in my office, and I have one here from school superintendents in my district who state very frankly that they are able to do everything that the N. Y. A. is now attempting to do. Here is a letter from the superintendent of schools at Rochester, Oakland County, Mich. Listen to what this superintendent says:

Perhaps there was a time when this activity was an important part of the rehabilitation program of the Government during the depression years. It has long since, however, outlived its usefulness. It has become a highly political and developed activity for the purpose, principally, of maintaining in positions of fairly satisfactory salaries, people who should be engaged in other activities at this time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In support of what the gentleman stated I may say that I have received a number of letters and telegrams from the leading school people of my congressional district stating the very things the gentleman has mentioned and urging that this be discontinued as it was a threat to the public schools and public educational institutions of the country.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Right along that line may I read the recommendations or conclusions reached by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing discussion certain inferences may be made regarding the National Youth Administration:

1. The National Youth Administration activities duplicate those training programs of various Government bureaus as well as those of industry itself. Although it is true that the National Youth Administration has carried its present training program to places where there are no vocational training facilities of a similar nature, nevertheless this does not necessarily argue for the continuance of the National Youth Administration, for other Government training programs can be carried to these very places should the expense and the results seem justified.

2. The cost of the National Youth Administration training is much higher than necessary. This cost would be more than doubled under the present proposed program to increase the number of trainees.

3. Recent figures indicate that the enrollment in the National Youth Administration has fallen off markedly while the number of female trainees is rapidly overtaking the number of males.

4. The National Youth Administration has been forced to depend more and more on boys beneath the draft age of 18 for its male trainees.

5. The equipment of the National Youth Administration is not being utilized to an extent commensurate with satisfactory results.

6. Only 50 percent of the youth trained by the National Youth Administration utilize these skills in war industry.

7. Educational groups fear that the National Youth Administration presages centralized educational control.

That is the danger and the threat in this country today: That the Federal Government through various bureaus and agencies of Government is trying to get its hands on the public schools. I refer also to a bill introduced in the Senate to provide a subsidy of $200,000,000 annually to supplement the salaries of school teachers in the various States. If this is not an attempt to gain Federal control, what is it? I do not know of any State whose Representatives are here on the floor making any appeal that they are not able to pay their school teachers. The public school is one institution still free from Federal control; let us keep it so, and transfer to it the work N. Y. A. is doing, and save the $59,000,000. Economy is a stranger in Washington. No one uses that word any more. In the light of what has happened over the last 10 years, one is looked upon as a little queer for advocating economy in Government and saving the taxpayers money. Thomas Jefferson did not hesitate to espouse that policy and recommended "economy in public expense that labor might be lightly burdened."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the gentleman also turn over to the schools of the various States the facilities that N. Y. A. has built up?

Mr. DONDERO. If the facilities are there, and many of them are, let them be transferred to the schools; there is no reason why they should not use them as a matter of practical common sense. I shall oppose every effort to waste the people's money for the continuance of this unnecessary agency and I appeal to you, my colleagues of the House of Representatives, for support in defeating every attempt to make it a part of the bill now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman preceding me, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has discussed the National Youth Administration and pointed out objections to an appropriation proposed for it by the Budget. I do not know what amendments, if any, may be offered concerning N. Y. A. when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. I understand that the $55,000,000 item at first proposed for

N. Y. A. was dropped out of this bill by a vote of 17 to 16 in the committee before the bill was brought to us. In this case any restoration of that amount, or part of that amount, would need to be offered as an amendment from the floor, and I do not know whether such an amendment is to be offered.

Probably no Member of this House has had as much to say on the floor of this Chamber in favor of the National Youth Administration as I have had to say since January 1937. Not only have I advocated during the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses suitable appropriations for the N. Y. A., but I have worked appropriately behind the scenes for the support of this splendid program. I felt during the great depression that the N. Y. A. was one of the most fruitful, helpful, and significant of New Deal agencies to help youth and the whole country during those dark and troublous times. How fortunate we are that we now have in active young life well-trained young men and women who received their high-school and college training under the auspices of the National Youth Administration.

As a former dean of a teachers college and a former instructor in college and university work I know whereof I speak. On coming here as a Congressman I naturally wanted in my office the most efficient office help I could get. I have chosen that help from young college graduates who got their college training the hard way but the exceedingly profitable way afforded them under the N. Y. A. I know of hundreds of such students now serving efficiently because of such training, who otherwise would have been engulfed in a sea of despair without that encouragement and aid.

Of course, I am thinking of the work of the N. Y. A. during the depression years. Also, I have in mind aid given to students in high schools and colleges before a program of industrial training was set up. That is the helpful program I am praising. Now today the situation is entirely different, especially with reference to shop and industrial training. As the gentleman from Michigan has said, the regular local public-school authorities are opposed to this suggested appropriation and feel that the time has come to abolish the N. Y. A. I can confirm his statement of the sentiment of schoolmen, as I have correspondence from the Arizona Education Association, as well as the National Education Association, to that effect.

I hold in my hand a letter from Phoenix, dated June 10, opposing appropriation for N. Y. A. to be made under this bill. This letter is signed by E. D. Ring, State superintendent of public instruction; Howard M. Soule, president, Arizona Education Association; E. W. Montgomery, chairman of the Arizona Education Association legislative committee; L. A. Eastburn, president, State Association of School Administrators; R. J. Hannelly, president, State department of Classroom Teachers; and Walter Maxwell, executive secretary of Arizona Education Association. All of these men I know, and their interest in the cause of education I well know. For that reason I am constrained to oppose a continuation of the N. Y. A. on so large a scale or on the proposed new plan. I should like to see its work continued to a lesser degree in high schools and colleges to whatever extent needed and with appropriately reduced personnel.

Having been a school teacher all my life I am the firm friend of the public schools. In my thinking, that term "public schools" extends all the way up the educational ladder, from the kindergarten to the graduate college of the university. I am very proud of the long, glorious, and successful struggle which we have had in America to obtain free, nonsectarian, public education for so large an element of our citizenry. Of course, there are further steps in this progress to which I shall devote all my energies. One universal religion which Americans may be said to have is their belief and faith in and devotion to public education.

In the interest of efficiency, I want our Nation to avoid a duplication of wasteful effort in education, for we are not adequately financing our regular system. I do not want to see rival systems of education set up; certainly none should exist as rivals supported by public funds. I believe that public-school facilities under local control can carry on the industrial training necessary for the war effort. Such expresses my attitude toward any extensive appropriation for N. Y. A. which may later be offered to this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee of the House is to be congratulated on its decision to refuse further funds for the National Youth Administration. I hope the House will take the necessary steps to eliminate this organization for the duration.

Some will point out the valuable work done by the N. Y. A. programs in former years. That, however, is not the question now. The appropriations already made for the next fiscal year are literally staggering. In one bill, for example, we provided $29,000,000,000 for the Navy making the total for the Naval Establishment from 1940 through the fiscal year of 1944, approximately $95,000,000,000.

We have made huge sums available for lend-lease. The War Department bill soon to be brought in will far exceed anything heretofore seen. To say that our national debt will exceed $300,000,000,000 is to put it conservatively. That amounts to $2,375 for every man, woman, and child in America, or the equivalent of a mortgage on the home of the average family of four of $9,500.

I wish every person in America could read the speech made on this subject by the very able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] on May 27, 1943, to be found on page 5003 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The question is not whether any particular appropriation will do some good, but rather can we get along without it. Now is the time to get rid of all the nonessentials.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it proper for me to ask unanimous consent at this time to include in my remarks the letter to which I referred while speaking?

The CHAIRMAN. Not in the Committee of the Whole; that request would have to be submitted in the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to stand here and to make a statement to the effect that there seems to be a well-organized bloc in the House determined to bring about the defeat of any and all legislation recommended by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. They are always shouting that we do not go to the bottom of things but when we express the willingness to go into the whole problem of aliens in this country the same people vote against that too. In order to survey the matter a little more carefully, may I say that in 1942 the committee asked to be given the opportunity to study the whole field of immigration and naturalization, the problem caused by war conditions as it affected the aliens in this country, and so forth, so that we could establish a proper policy dealing with this very important question. House Resolution 433, introduced for that purpose, was agreed to by the Rules Committee and was reported. All we asked was the right to study the question, so as to formulate a good policy we could follow in dealing with this problem. When we got on the floor, lo and behold, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, as usual, talked the resolution to death by saying that it attempted to open the doors on immigration, and so forth. He was told that the resolution had nothing to do with permitting anyone to enter this country, but he persisted in confusing the issue. When the resolution came up for a vote, about two hundred and some-odd Members voted against it. They voted against giving the committee the right to study this question. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the House has passed at least a dozen investigation resolutions with thousands of dollars involved without a dissenting vote and without much discussion.

Why, we have so many investigating committees now that we have not even the office space to put them in. We find so many investigators around here that you need more investigators to investigate the investigators. Yet a simple resolution to give the committee the right to make an important study of an involved question of great importance to this country was voted down. A few days ago a bill came up to waive the declaration of intention for fathers and mothers of boys serving honorably in our armed forces. Now the gentleman from Mississippi is forever talking about his interest in the boys in the armed forces, but when he could have made a concrete

effort to help some of them in supporting this bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] he did not do so. As a matter of fact, the old familiar cry was raised that the country would be flooded with immigrants. Mind you, this argument on a bill which had nothing to do with immigration, which would not have permitted one single person to enter this country. The rule was talked to death without even taking up the bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] today said that we are the people, we represent the people, and we ought to decide these questions before the full body, but you did not give us a chance under that very doctrine that you are preaching before the full body. A full discussion on the bill was not made possible because the rule was voted down. You refused to vote out the rule to give the committee the opportunity to discuss the merits of this legislation. No matter how you look upon it—prejudice reigns supreme when legislation from the Immigration and Naturalization Committee is brought up.

I remember full well that the very men who opposed every piece of immigration legislation are the very men also who voted against the resolution in 1942 to give the committee the right to study this question. I have the RECORD here.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to assimilate our legally admitted aliens in this country, we are trying to cement a better understanding, but you cannot create a better feeling among people if we are going to allow old prejudices to divide our strength and to determine the action of this House. Just another little example on the attitude toward legislation from our committee.

On Monday night members of our committee filed three reports on private bills. The people in question are and have been for years in this country. It was just a question of legalizing their entry. The committee considered all bills, heard witnesses and the representative of the Justice Department, and reported the bills unanimously. The bills were on the calendar Tuesday morning. The reports were not yet printed by the Government Printing Office. The full corps of objectors, however, stood up like a church choir and all objected to three simple private bills without even looking at the reports, because there were no reports.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield? I was one of the objectors.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; the gentleman was one of the objectors. Was that not based on prejudice?

Mr. MOTT. It was not; no.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There was no report filed yet?

Mr. MOTT. I want to ask the gentleman a question. Suppose he had been one of the official objectors and three bills came in on the Private Calendar which had no departmental report, no digest from the objecting committee which goes over the bills for that purpose, nothing whatever but a bare bill that you ask the Congress of the United States to pass by unanimous consent, I ask the gentleman what he would have done had he been on that committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I were on the committee, in fairness to the Members who filed these bills, and I have no personal interest in any of the bills, I would have done this: There were three outstanding Members of this House who came before the committee and presented testimony. If I were on the objecting committee and I found there was no report filed, I would ask unanimous consent that they go over. Then you get the report and object to it, if you wish to object, on the merits of the bill. I am merely mentioning this as an illustration and I can point out hundreds of them in the last 20 or 21 years since I have been a Member of this body. I say to you there is just as much power in every individual Member to stand up here and object as is in your objectors. I say to you it is unfair, not to me, you are not hurting my feelings a bit, but when 22 Members examine these bills and bring them out with a unanimous report the objectors should give it more careful consideration. If there is no report, as the gentleman says, and I say there was no report, I agree with the gentleman; the least you could have done was to put the bills over without objecting to them.

There was an omnibus bill on the calendar yesterday morning which had nothing to do with the Private Calendar. When that bill was called, you thought it was an immigration bill and you objected to it without looking at it. That is an omnibus bill and it had to come up under a different procedure. With all due respect to the gentleman, and he is entitled to his opinion as is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I say it is unfair. If you want unity in the Congress of the United States, we had better sit down around the table and find out what is bothering some people in order to stop this division among the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the attack on the official objectors, which has just been made by the gentleman from New York, to go without challenge. The circumstances under which the three bills he has spoken of were objected to by the official objectors yesterday are, I think, pretty well known to everyone who was present at the time. Here was a case where three private bills, unaccompanied by any report either from the department or from the committee itself, were brought up for immediate consideration by the House, and the House was asked to pass them by unanimous consent. In the circumstances those bills were properly objected to.

If anything were required to demonstrate the propriety of the objection, I have only to call attention to the fact that there were three official objectors on the Republican side and three official objectors on the Democratic side, and that the objection to the consideration of those bills was unanimous on both sides. There were six objections to each of those bills because they had come in in a thoroughly improper way, and they should have been objected to. The official objectors, of which I was one, would have been derelict in their duty and unfaithful to the official responsibility which the House had placed in them had they allowed those bills to slip through the House by unanimous consent.

Those bills were not properly before the House because the House had not been furnished with the report of the committee to which the bills had been referred. That is why they were objected to by the official objectors, and that is why the objection was unanimous on the part of all six of the objectors.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

GOVERNMENT ACTION CAUSES FAMINE IN BUTTER

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] charges that there is a lack of unity in the House of Representatives. There may be a lack of unity when it comes to considering legislation presented by him, but there is no lack of unity in Congress and amongst the American people in our effort and desire to win the war. I also know there is unity amongst the rank and file of the people in this country in the effort now being made to save our American institutions and system of free enterprise. I am convinced that there is unity amongst the people in the effort of some of us to eliminate the bureaucracy which has taken control of our Government away from the constitutional representatives of the people.

I have secured this time to discuss the issue of roll-back and subsidy of food recently put into operation by the Office of Price Administration and other agencies. I was a member of the delegation that called at the White House yesterday to discuss food problems with the President and his associates. I would not discuss this matter if it were not for the fact that shortly after our conference with the President he gave a newspaper interview in which he told the representatives of the press that every proposal we had made to him with reference to the production and distribution of food was contrary to his plan. In view of the President's statement, I feel that I am at liberty to present my views on this scheme to my colleagues in the House.

The administration has announced that the roll-back in food prices and subsidy payments will apply to butter, meat, and coffee. The price of butter was rolled back 5 cents a pound on June 1. The roll-back in the price of meat will be 3 cents a pound, and I understand that the price on coffee will also be rolled back 3 cents a pound. In order to prevent a loss for the producers and distributors of butter, meat, and coffee, the administration, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, proposes to

pay a subsidy equivalent to the amount of the roll-back. Without estimating administrative expense, it is predicted that the subsidy for these commodities will run well over $450,000,000, which will be paid by the taxpayers of the country.

Before entering my discussion of the roll-back and subsidy scheme, I want to call your attention to the statement of the American Dairy Association, the voice of 5,000,000 American dairy farmers, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The headline of this article, "One hundred million pounds of butter disappear," is so startling that I feel that every Member should read the entire statement, and I am, therefore, including it at this point in my remarks.

100,000,000 POUNDS OF BUTTER DISAPPEAR

Something has happened. You've probably sensed it in your inability to get butter—even though you have the money and red stamps with which to buy it. Perhaps you'll have to go without the butter you want for the next few days.

Though the situation is temporary, we regret it has happened. We wish it could be corrected today. But meanwhile, the 5,000,000 American dairy farmers want you to know the facts concerning today's butter situation.

The Government reduced the retail price of butter 10 percent. To provide for this reduction in price and to maintain production, the Government plans to pay a subsidy of 5 cents per pound.

But no provision was made to pay a subsidy for butter in warehouses or in transit to consumers. This has resulted in the Government's acquiring more than 100,000,000 pounds of butter through emergency selling of all storage butter. One hundred million pounds have disappeared from the regular trade channels. Wholesalers and retailers are without stocks to take care of your needs. It will probably take another week to fully restore retail and wholesale butter supplies to normal.

The present butter situation is not the fault of grocers, distributors, creameries, nor dairy farmers. It's been brought about by incomplete planning of those responsible for putting into effect the roll-back on butter prices. Recognizing the seriousness of homes without butter, 5,000,000 dairy farmers want you to know that the whole industry is striving to restore stocks so that you'll have butter back on your tables as soon as possible.

This message, paid for by the dairy farmer members of the American Dairy Association, deals with an unfortunate market condition. It does not attempt to discuss whether price subsidies are a workable means for reducing the cost of living or preventing inflation.

The normal distribution of butter has been seriously upset by the manner of administrating the Government price reduction order. By making it difficult for housewives to buy butter for even a short time, confidence and faith of the American people in the rationing system is threatened. Confusion and uncertainty promote chaos, so we've frankly presented the butter situation in a constructive spirit with the hope of preventing similar mishaps in the future.

The American Dairy Association, as the voice of the dairy farmer, speaks for its dairy farmer members in the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Washington.

AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of the American Dairy Association is the gospel truth. One hundred million pounds of butter, which represents all butter in storage produced prior to June 1, 1943, has disappeared from the customary channels of trade and is now owned and controlled by your Government. This butter was sold to the Government by the creameries of the country in order to avoid a loss of 5 cents a pound, because the Government refused to pay the 5-cents-per-pound subsidy when the roll-back went into operation.

Since the Government does not intend to permit the use of any of its butter to fill civilian needs, a butter famine has overtaken us, and another 2 weeks may pass by before civilians again can purchase butter through regular channels. Butter produced after June 1 will be entitled to the 5-cents-per-pound subsidy if and when it is paid by the R. F. C.

In the latter part of May the Office of Price Administration announced a roll-back in the price of butter of 5 cents a pound. At that time the Department of Agriculture agreed to buy all of the butter produced prior to June 1 at a price of 46 cents a pound wholesale in Chicago. The roll-back of 5 cents a pound rolled the price of butter back to 41 cents, but the Government agreed to buy all stored butter produced before June 1 at 46 cents per pound because no subsidy was to be paid on it, and by the afternoon of June 5 the Government had purchased approximately 100,000,000 pounds of butter, or all of the butter that was in storage throughout the United States from every creamery and storage plant, and the butter was taken out of the regular channels of distribution and came into the possession of the United States, where it is today. The people who want to buy butter cannot get it from the regular channels of trade.

In my opinion, the roll-back and subsidy program for these commodities is a farce and a deceit upon the American people. In the case of butter, under the rationing program each individual is allowed 12 pounds of butter a year. The O. P. A. proposes to save each individual 5 cents a pound or 60 cents a year on the roll-back on butter. On meat the O. P. A. proposes to save each individual 3 cents a pound. You are allowed two pounds a week, which means a saving of 6 cents a week or a little over $3 a year. The O. P. A. proposes to roll back the price of coffee 3 cents a pound which will save you around 30 cents a year. The total saving on the roll-back on butter, meat, and coffee will be around $3.92 a year. That is what each individual will save.

It is stated by the Administration that this roll-back will cost the Government approximately $450,000,000 in subsidies to be paid to the processors so that the farmers will still get, say, 46 cents a pound on butter and will not lose any money on pork and beef. It will cost at least $50,000,000 to administer this program because the O. P. A. and R. F. C. will need a lot of auditors to check all the books, and they will need thousands of additional employees. I have estimated, and I think it is probably too low an estimate, that it will cost $50,000,000 in addition to the $450,000,000 which is paid out as subsidies. This makes a total of $500,000,000. All of this to save each individual $3.92 a year on the roll-back.

The Government does not have the money to pay the subsidy so it will have to sell bonds and raise taxes. These bonds are sold to the American people. I dare say it is a conservative estimate on my part that the bonds will not be paid off within 50 years from now. These bonds and the War Savings bonds that are sold to the people who are going to save 60 cents a year on butter will draw 2.9 percent interest. Let us just figure out how much the taxpayers will have to pay because they are saved $3.92 a year on butter, meat, and coffee.

The interest at 2.9 percent for 50 years is $725,000,000, or $225,000,000 more than the $500,000,000 subsidy, making a total of $1,225,000,000 that will have to be paid in order to pay out a subsidy of $450,000,000 during the next 12 months, to save you 60 cents a year on butter, $3 a year on meat, and 30 cents a year on coffee. So where you have saved $3.92 now, when the bonds are paid, including interest, you will have paid $9.15 to take care of the subsidy for the next year. That certainly is a fine thing, but they have not told the average consumer about the cost to reduce the grocery bill $3.92. They have mentioned nothing about the fact that he has to pay taxes, buy the bonds, and pay the interest on them in order to get a saving through the roll-back of 60 cents in the next 12 months on butter and $3 on meat.

Mr. Prentiss Brown, whom we all respect, stated that they are going to go through with this subsidy program irrespective of what action Congress takes. I am satisfied that most Members of Congress, or a large majority of them, are opposed to this roll-back and subsidy scheme.

Nevertheless, Mr. Brown says they are going to go through with it, and Mr. Murray of the C. I. O. and Mr. Green of the A. F. of L., and policy makers in the O. P. A. as well as the President have stated they want $2,000,000,000 for a general subsidy program. Well, if Congress approves the subsidy scheme the Government will have to sell those $2,000,000,000 in bonds, and when the bonds are paid off with interest the people and the taxpayers will have to pay over $5,000,000,000 in order to save themselves around $12, in the year 1943, or, in other words, they will have to pay $35 each to liquidate the bonds and pay the interest on them. This may be a good political scheme to get votes for a fourth term, but what a price for the individual to pay in the end in order to save $12 on the grocery bill for the next 12 months.

I think that is one thing that our friends in labor who are advocating this roll-back and subsidy program should know at the present time, because, after all, they or their children and grandchildren are the ones who will be called upon to pay this bill when the debt is to be paid, unless the administration contemplates repudiation of our national debt.

I tried to find out who was the author of this roll-back and subsidy scheme. I doubt very much if it was the President, because he is so busy with Mr. Churchill making plans for the prosecution of the war; but somebody sold the idea to him, and after making an extensive search I have come to the conclusion that it was a man in the administration named Benjamin Cohen. He was formerly of the team of Corcoran and Cohen, and he is one of the administration's chief advisers and planners for the new Utopia. Undoubtedly he is a follower of the Frankfurter philosophy that has become so firmly entrenched in our governmental structure, and is dictating all of the policies that govern every action of the O. P. A., in his effort to destroy our American system of government and free enterprise.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, we want the men in the armed forces to get all of the butter and meat that we can provide. We are willing to go without those necessities of life in order to see that our fighting forces are properly fed. They will never win this war without an abundance of food, and so our first obligation is to provide for our men who are fighting to keep our country free. However, while they are doing that, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to see to it that the things that our boys are fighting for are saved by us here in this country, so that they may come back to a free America when they return home. Otherwise the suffering and the sacrificing they have made will be worth nothing. I am convinced that men like Benjamin Cohen, Judge Rosenman, and other New Deal planners for the "new order" are more interested in reforms and in changing our American system than they are in securing food for the American people and for the armed forces. They are trying to change our American system while the people and we in Congress are concerned about winning the war. That is one reason why we must be on the alert and try to legislate on these things, so that we can stop them in their activities to destroy our American system.

Under the present program the Government will purchase 475,000,000 pounds of this year's supply of butter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. These 475,000,000 pounds of butter will be used to feed men in the armed forces, and for lend-lease purposes. The officials in the Department estimate our production of butter for 1943 will be 1,800,000,000 pounds, which I think is about 300,000,000 more than actual production will materialize. That will leave approximately 1,200,000,000 pounds for the American people. It may be that taking 100,000,000 pounds of butter out of the civilian trade will help the situation, because if the people will go without butter for the next 2 or 3 weeks, that will increase the supplies for lend-lease and use in other countries.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I called up the gentleman in the O. P. A. who has charge of butter, and asked him about the supplies of butter that will be available, and he said that the supply was liable to be reduced 50 percent, and then another 20 percent this year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that. The only butter that is going on the market is butter that is produced after June 1, and it takes about 3 weeks for that to get into the regular channels of distribution. All other butter produced prior to June 1 was purchased by the Government and is now in Government warehouses.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure the gentleman has had a great many complaints from people back in his district as to the effect of this roll-back theory upon the markets as to butter, and as to beef, since this theory was put into effect. That is, it has disorganized the market of the people who produced it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has not only disorganized the market, it has decreased the price that the farmer was to receive for butterfat, pork, and beef.

Mr. HINSHAW. And I think it is a well-known fact that those who are engaged in the retail distribution of butter, in order to secure themselves against no butter at all during the winter months, must purchase and store butter at the time it is being made in excess quantities, which is now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The month of June is the peak season for butter production. The Department of Agriculture expects to produce 208,000,000 pounds during the month of June this year.

Mr. HINSHAW. On the other hand, the regulations of the O. P. A. prevent the retailer or distributor of butter to have on hand more than a 6 weeks' supply, as measured by his distribution in a certain previous 6 months.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The only amount he can buy is for the number of points that he has to turn in for the butter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How does the gentleman account for the fact that butter, not bringing more than parity, was selected for a roll-back, when many other commodities, like tobacco, were bringing up to 195 percent of parity and many others around 150 and 160 percent of parity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Since the present price on butter is just a few points above parity, before the roll-back, the only reason that I can give for this cut in the price of butter is the fact that all people like it and want it on the table every day, and therefore, the O. P. A. selected butter for the first roll-back operation. I want to restate the roll-back scheme on butter, so that each of you will know how much you will save on your future purchases of butter. The roll-back is 5 cents per pound, if you are able to buy butter. Under the rationing system, you are allowed 12 pounds of butter a year. The roll-back will save you 60 cents for the next 12 months. The cost to the Government and the taxpayers to pay the subsidy on butter will be around $90,000,000, and I might say, that the 60 cents that you save will not be sufficient to purchase an admission ticket to any downtown movie house for one performance.

The officials who concocted this subsidy scheme, assert that we must put it into operation because the English use it in the British Isles. It may work out in England, but what is good for England is not always good for the United States. As a matter of fact, the situation is entirely different in England when it comes to food. The British Isles import more than 60 percent of all their food, and we have sent them hundreds of millions of dollars of food without cost under lend-lease. The British Government buys all food imports and resells them to distributors and dealers in the British Isles. The British Government also sells lend-lease food received from this country to dealers in England. They can, therefore, well afford to pay a subsidy.

I have felt it my duty to let the people of the country learn why they are not able to buy butter. The blame should not be placed upon dairy farmers or processors of butter. The responsibility for the famine in butter is on the doorstep of the administration. I do not believe in the roll-back and subsidy program. It is a fraud on the people. It will not save them any money, and, in my opinion, the program will increase the possibilities for inflation. We will have a chance next week to stop this scheme when the O. P. A. bill comes up for consideration. Let us do a job with it.

The Nation's supply of food is in a sad state. Lack of coordination and understanding on the part of many agencies in charge of food will bring us close to famine next winter, if we are to meet all of the commitments made by the administration to feed hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. We cannot undo all of the damage that has been done, but we can avoid repeating mistakes and making new mistakes. To do this, all control over food should be placed in the hands of an experienced and practical administrator.

Now, in conclusion, let me say this: Several of us in Congress, and I think the majority of us agree, that all authority over food during the present war should be centralized in the hands of one individual. We have proposed in the Committee on Agriculture, and I believe it is unanimous, that the War Food Administrator should be clothed with all authority to handle the production, rationing, pricing, purchasing, and distribution of food. The President said in his interview yesterday that he was against the proposal. That is what he told us at our conference with him. I imagine he would veto a bill if we passed it. But I think as practical men, as representatives who express the will of our people, we should pass that kind of a bill in Congress and send it to the White House and give him an opportunity to consider it. We certainly are a part of

this governmental structure and it is our business and our duty to act before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired. If there is no further debate, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation in this title for traveling expenses shall be available in an amount not to exceed $2,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Women's Bureau when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 7 of the bill under the title "Maternal and Child Welfare," it will be observed there is the following provision:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation which discriminates between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics.

In view of the fact that one of our colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, raised some question about this particular proviso and because he discussed the matter at some length with the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other members of the subcommittee, as well as with myself, I had anticipated that the gentleman would be here on the floor to offer an amendment before this paragraph was read. Evidently the gentleman did not anticipate the bill would be read quite as soon as it is now being read, but I do not want him or any of those with whom this matter has been discussed to gain the impression that the committee is not perfectly willing to make it absolutely clear as to just exactly what the subcommittee had in mind in placing this provision in the bill. I am very certain the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has exactly the same feeling about the matter as I have.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am quite sure that as the language now reads, it could be interpreted to mean that people licensed to practice obstetrics could as well engage in pediatrics and all other practices which we did not intend in the committee. The gentleman from Minnesota, who is not here, also another member of the medical profession, suggested that we add the words, on page 7, line 22, "relating to the care of obstetrical cases." If that is done, it would tie down the language to the very thing we wanted to cover, and I think that would be very desirable.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as I am personally concerned, I have taken this time so that at least the RECORD will show in the discussions on this bill the interpretation which the committee placed on this particular provision in the bill. That interpretation is that in those States where they license people to practice obstetrics there shall be no discrimination practiced by the Children's Bureau as to those people who are licensed by the States to practice obstetrics. To be perfectly candid about the situation, the evidence before our committee was to the effect that there are many communities in this country where there are no M. D.'s at all, but where there are licensed and qualified osteopaths who are rendering obstetrical service, but under the regulations of the Children's Bureau those osteopaths could not practice, within the rules and regulations of the Children's Bureau governing the practice of obstetrics. We intended to limit this matter to the practice of obstetrics and nothing else. So that there may be no question about it, and to show the good faith of the committee with those who questioned this particular provision in the bill, I have seen fit to make this explanation. I hope that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will ask unanimous consent to return to this particular paragraph in the bill and to write into it the language which we agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. To ask to insert in the bill language which we agreed upon, which will make it perfectly clear and without question what the committee intended.

May I state to you that the States in this Union, with the exception of five, do license osteopaths to practice obstetrics.

They have to take a State examination; they take the same examination in my State as do the M. D.'s, and yet they are discriminated against and cannot practice obstetrics so far as the Children's Bureau is concerned, because of an arbitrary regulation that has been written into the law by the Children's Bureau. All we want to do is to say that any man or woman who is licensed by the State to practice obstetrics under the State law shall have the right to practice without discrimination, and that is as far as the committee saw fit to go.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revert to the paragraph at the bottom of page 7, under maternal and child welfare, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to return to the last paragraph on page 7. Is there objection?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have read the amendment which is being offered by the gentleman from New Mexico and I have no objection to it. I think it does not change the meaning of the proviso. I have no objection to returning to the proviso in question for the sole purpose of considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico, but I do object to returning to it for any other purpose, such as offering of other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I meant to limit my request to that specific purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico as modified?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Page 7, line 22, after the word "regulation" insert "relating to care of obstetrical cases."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to raise some questions about some of the figures that have been given to this Committee on the cost of subsidies and on the effect of the use of subsidies for rolling back prices.

Let me quote some figures which ought to be easily understandable to every Member of this House. First, we are now spending $100,000,000,000 per year; that is the Government is spending this amount on the war effort. If the price of materials and services is raised 1 percent, this will cost the taxpayers of this country $1,000,000,000 more per year.

There is also being sold in this country annually about $75,000,000,000 worth of goods and services for domestic consumption. A rise in price of 1 percent costs the people of this country, by virtue of that 1-percent rise for these goods and services used domestically, $750,000,000. That is on a rise of 1 percent only.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The paragraph under consideration in this bill is on page 10 of the bill, entitled the "Women's Bureau."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the paragraph of this bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished, generous gentleman from Wisconsin for preventing me from answering arguments which I tried to answer by asking for time from the committee chairman and from the ranking minority Member immediately after those statements were made.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator, $146,000: *Provided*, That the salary of the Administrator shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum so long as the incumbent thereof is Chairman of the War Manpower Commission: *Provided further*, That of the sum herein appropriated the Administrator may expend not to exceed $2,500 for temporary employment of persons, by contract or otherwise, for special services determined necessary by the Administrator, without regard to section 3709 of

the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 47, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$12,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to raise the salary of the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of the hold-the-line order of April 8. How we are going to raise a salary from $12,000 to $15,000—of the Commissioner in this case—when we are trying to keep those who are working on the bench down to a 15 percent increase since the 1st of January 1941 I do not see.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is this in line with the Little Steel formula?

Mr. TABER. This is spreading the Little Steel formula quite considerably; this gets into a big spread. The hard-working Congressman has no business asking for a raise. How would it look right now if we came in and asked for a raise? How would it look if we asked for a raise in wartime? How does it look to grant a raise in a high-salaried position, a raise so out of line with that permitted to the working people? I cannot see it, frankly; I think we ought to adopt this amendment and avoid such activities.

Mr. SHAFER. I was just wondering whether the gentleman from Minnesota might have meant the big s-t-e-a-l?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was the Little Steel formula.

Mr. TABER. It is hard to understand, but I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we in the House will not set out to raise large salaries at this time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I think I can subscribe in a way to practically everything the gentleman from New York has said, but I believe this House should be advised that this provision is to the effect that this salary shall be only so long as the incumbent is Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and is also Director of the Federal Security Agency. We all know, of course, that the chairmanship of the War Manpower Commission is a position of extreme importance involving an enormous amount of administrative responsibility. The appropriation for the W. M. C. carried in this bill amounts to upward of $150,000,000. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is also Director of the Federal Security Agency. The salary of the Director of the Federal Security Agency, as I understand, is ordinarily $12,000, and the salary of the War Manpower Commissioner were he a separate and distinct individual, corresponding with other posts of equal rank, would be $15,000. If, therefore, separate men served as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and Director of the Federal Security Agency, it would cost us $27,000 a year. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, however, who has been Director of the Federal Security Agency, has undertaken to perform the functions of both the Director of the Federal Security Agency and Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and the committee felt that for the additional duties assumed by the Director of the Federal Security Agency $3,000 would be a fair compensation and a good business proposition.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman, to be perfectly accurate, could say that the majority of the subcommittee felt that this action was proper.

Mr. HARE. I said yesterday in my opening remarks on this bill that there were very few items in the bill on which all members of the subcommittee agreed fully and in detail; but I made the further statement that there was no item in the bill that was not supported by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, and I am one of those who believes that the majority should govern.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question in my mind but what the present Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is worth $75,000 a year and may get that some day; but has he threatened to quit his job unless this increase is granted?

Mr. HARE. No; I have not heard that he has, but I may say that he could resign his position as Director of the Federal Security Agency and I assume remain as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at $15,000 per annum, and then someone else would be appointed as Director of the Federal Security Agency at $12,000, which would be a Federal expenditure, totaling $27,000. Now, we are able under this provision to secure the services of the Director of the Federal Security Agency and Chairman of the Manpower Commission for $15,000. If anyone wants to take this out it is his responsibility. The committee has put it in; if you want to take out a proposed increase of $3,000 and then add in its place the sum of $12,000 it is the responsibility of the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am confident that the present occupant would never resign any position.

Mr. HARE. If the gentleman is satisfied of that and wants to take it out that is his responsibility, but it may result in our paying $27,000 for services we can get for $15,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much as I regret to differ with my friend from New York, I do believe that this is an amendment or a provision which the House can support. It is just simply this plain question: When the Government established a number of people in responsible positions, there was established a salary range, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, of $15,000 to a number of individuals. The chairman of the War Manpower Commission was slated to become that sort of position, but Paul McNutt, who was then head of the Federal Security Agency, was asked to take also that additional responsibility.

Is it fair to say that because he elected to hold two jobs and try his best to fill them both that he should be punished financially for so doing? I think there are other governmental officials who might take two jobs and do pretty good work with them.

Paul McNutt has a tremendous responsibility. We were all impressed in the subcommittee by the amount and diversity of activity that has been thrust upon that War Manpower Commission in the last year. It seemed unwise and perhaps unfair to say to a man that the only way that he can be placed on a parity with the other "czars," as they have been called, is for him to resign his Federal Security job and then assume a $15,000 salary as head of the War Manpower Commission. It seems much more sensible, certainly much easier, to give him the salary that he draws or would draw as head of the War Manpower Commission and allow him to continue with the Federal Security Agency.

I have no particular pride in what the committee has done, but I may say that it checked the salaries of every other man in a similar responsibility; it checked a number of salaries that seemed to be indicative of what we should do, and the $15,000 seemed to be the proper scale. On that basis we tried to say to him, "We will not punish you for trying to do two things." I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, we all have our own responsibility to the people of this country and also to our districts.

Why give Mr. McNutt a 25-percent increase in salary? This provision to increase Mr. McNutt's salary from $12,000 to $15,000 should not prevail. We have seen Mr. McNutt freeze the wages and salaries of 27,000,000 people, many even at $1 or less per day. We have seen the Little Steel formula put into operation whereby people receiving $1 per day obtain 15 cents per day to meet the increased cost of living and also whereby people receiving $10 per day may obtain $1.50 a day to meet the same increased cost of living. We have seen the people in the lower income brackets, like the miners, refused wage increases on account of the effect on the inflation "hold the line" policy, though we passed a law giving Government employees getting up to $12,000 a year a $628 increase in salary without one public word by the O. P. A., Mr. Byrnes, or other Federal agencies as to the effect on inflation. Now we have a bill brought in here to provide Mr. McNutt a 25-percent increase in salary. This is in excess of the 15-percent provision of the Little Steel formula for the people in the lower income brackets. Why should we keep on following the policy of legislating for the few at the expense of the many?

The only time the inflation "hold the line" theory is proposed seems to be when the people in the low-income brackets are involved, or the American farmer is in the picture.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. Would we be consistent in giving this $3,000 raise when we are presently jeopardizing the oil industry, the small oil producers, and also the canners of America?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that all I ask is to see all treated fairly. I would like to have a chance to go on record one way or the other. I think the membership of this House is entitled to the chance to express its opinion on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. There is a fundamental policy involved. The fundamental policy is whether we can expect our civilian population to hold the line if we continually break the line for individuals in the higher income brackets.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, to increase the Manpower Commissioner's salary $3,000 per year would break the "hold the line" order. He has been instrumental in freezing the wages of the workers of America, and I see no reason why we should give him any special consideration.

If we are going to break the "hold the line" order, we should first break it in the low-paid food and war industries, which are vital to the war effort.

Many wage earners in the canning industries have been frozen at 40 cents an hour. Wages in the parachute industry in my district have been frozen at some forty-odd cents per hour. Our coal miners asked for a $2 per day increase, which would be an increase of $600 per year. The small oil producers were turned down on their request for an increase of 35 cents a barrel on account of the wage-freeze order.

We must have immediate action in regard to the wage freeze on the canners and processors or we shall want for food next year.

The old people of America have not been properly taken care of at this time.

Therefore, it would hardly be consistent to hold the line on the lower paid workers of America and then give an increase of $3,000 to a $12,000-a-year bureaucrat.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather startled and surprised that the gentleman from New York has the temerity to offer an amendment of this character which would refuse a raise of $3,000 to a man of the stripe and character of Paul McNutt, who has been assuming almost superhuman tasks and has been carrying out those tasks most admirably and efficiently. I know the gentleman from New York who has offered the amendment most strenuously opposed the limitation of salaries in private industry to $25,000. He was the spearhead of the opposition to that proposal of President Roosevelt.

Mr. Mayer, of the moving-picture concern of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, earns a salary of over $800,000 a year. His tasks are nowhere near the tasks of Paul McNutt in his administration of the work of the Manpower Commission and Social Security Board. Mr. Grace, of steel fame, earns a salary of over $500,000. His work in no shape or form even approaches the tasks of Mr. McNutt. Mr. Sloan, of General Motors, likewise has a salary away up in the thousands. Yet the gentleman who seeks to whittle down this $3,000 never breathes a word against these gigantic salaries paid in private industry in this time of inflation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If I am not mistaken, did not the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota vote to give Mr. Mayer back $600,000 on his income tax for 1942?

Mr. CELLER. I am not prepared to state "yes" or "no" on that. I take the gentleman's word for it, but I presume that would be the effect of the tax bill we passed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does Mr. McNutt still receive his 2 percent from the 2-Percent Club out in Indiana?

Mr. CELLER. I am not aware of that, but I will say that the gentlemen whom I mentioned, Messrs. Grace, Mayer, and Sloan, still clip their coupons and can probably get an additional $500,000 or $800,000 besides the salaries which, in part, I am sure, they do not even work as hard to earn as does Mr. McNutt his salary.

But where we are dealing in these millions, this $3,000 is just peanuts. I am amazed that anyone on the Republican side of the aisle would even deign to make such a motion. I do indeed hope that we shall not stultify ourselves by adopting this amendment, and I say all this with the greatest respect for my colleague from my own State, Mr. TABER.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad the gentleman very distinctly said that these men in private enterprise to whom he referred earn their salaries. There is a fine distinction between earning a salary and receiving a compensation.

Mr. CELLER. That is an unjustifiable bar sinister that the gentleman places on the brow of Mr. McNutt. He earns every penny of the salary he receives now, and he would earn every penny of the increase that I am sure we are going to give him. Ultimately there will be no cutting down from $15,000 but, on the contrary, we will give him the increase of $3,000 which he richly deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee that placed this provision in the bill, I believe that when we vote on this amendment we should do so with exact and full knowledge as to just exactly what we are doing.

Paul McNutt was appointed by the President as Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. This Congress created the Federal Security Agency by law. This Congress, by legislative enactment, fixed the salary of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency at $12,000 a year. The President, a considerable period later, by Executive order, created the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I am sure the gentleman would not want to be mistaken. I have the impression that the Federal Security Agency was not a product of legislation but was a product of Executive order under the reorganization plan.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman may be correct in that. At least in that reorganization plan the salary was fixed at $12,000 a year.

Mr. HARE. I think that is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McNutt accepted that position and with it he accepted the salary of $12,000. He went to work on that job. Now they create a new agency, the War Manpower Commission, and he is appointed to head that also. If he were simply the head of the War Manpower Commission he perhaps would draw $15,000 a year, but he cannot draw two salaries. He is limited to $12,000 because that is the amount fixed that he gets as Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

What you are in effect doing is boosting the pay of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency from $12,000 to $15,000 a year, and that is all you are doing. Mr. McNutt can resign as Federal Security Administrator and draw $15,000 a year as head of the War Manpower Commission, or he can resign his arduous task as head of the War Manpower Commission, relieve himself of some of his responsibility, and continue to earn $12,000 a year as head of the Federal Security Agency.

This is just simply a question of whether or not you want to increase the salary of the Federal Security Administrator $3,000 a year. Mr. McNutt may not be there tomorrow. He may pass out of the picture the day after tomorrow. If Mr. McNutt resigns as chairman of the War Manpower Commission, under the terms of this bill, of course, the then incumbent of the office of Federal Security Administrator could not continue to draw $15,000 a year.

There are the facts. I think it is proper for the House to give consideration to this proposal. I did not support the proposal in the committee, but it is safe to

say that the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico who presented this matter to the committee did so in a very effective manner and presented some matters that have not been presented on the floor, which I think justified the majority of the committee in taking the action they did.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 64, noes 67.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. HARE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 47, line 4, after the dollar mark, strike out "146,600" and insert "143,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question? I do not believe that the $600 is properly applied to the amendment if it has been correctly reported by the Clerk. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. As the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee was read by the Clerk, it substituted for the figures in the bill at the point of the amendment, 143,600. The change made by the Taber amendment was only $3,000, and the figures should have been $143,000. The sum stated in the bill is $146,000, not $146,600. I am wondering if the Clerk did correctly report the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 47, line 4, after the dollar mark, strike out "146,600" and insert "143,600."

Mr. HARE. That is to take care of the $3,000 which has been deducted by the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to modify his amendment as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. What would that make the amendment?

Mr. TARVER. A reduction of $3,000.

Mr. TABER. The $600 is not included?

The CHAIRMAN. No, it is $143,000 even.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated by this act to the Social Security Board for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 12, after the word "Board" insert the following: "or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries: For three Board members of the National Labor Relations Board and other personal services of the Board in the District of Columbia and elsewhere necessary in performing the duties imposed by law, $1,915,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 56, line 10, strike out "$1,915,000", and insert "$1,415,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the item for salaries in the National Labor Relations Board $500,000. I have done this because the Board, instead of attending to its own business, has gone out trying to promote labor disturbances between the different labor organizations. They have been caught at it red-handed, and the situation is such that out on the west coast they have attempted to create differences between two labor unions in the Kaiser shipyard and upset an agreement which has been of long standing with one of the organizations. When an organization of the Government gets into that kind of business it is time we put a crimp in some of their activities.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. It is a situation that is absolutely unpardonable. A board that represents the Government of the United States should be absolutely impartial and fair as between one labor organization and another. It should be absolutely impartial and fair as between the employer and the employee, and when it goes out and lends itself to the promotion of disturbances between labor organizations, it is time that we told them that that activity is not needed. It is with the object of trying to circumscribe their activities so that they can only do those things which are fair and impartial as between labor organizations and as between employer and employee that I offer this amendment to reduce the amount of money that is available to them, $500,000, or a little less than 25 percent. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Suppose we grant what the gentleman from New York has said as absolutely correct, which I am not prepared to admit except for the sake of argument. I do not see where the matter that he complains of would be corrected by reducing the appropriation. We have already reduced the appropriation for this agency about $330,000 below the Budget estimate. We reduced it last year over $200,000. In other words, out of the 2 years we have reduced the appropriation for this agency upward of $500,000, and the condition of which the gentleman from New York complains continues to exist.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that the subcommittee reduced the amount $200,000.

Mr. HARE. That was last year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Two hundred and thirteen thousand dollars.

Mr. HARE. Yes; last year, and $330,000 this year. My thought is that in view of the reductions already made there should be an amendment offered for the benefit of the National Labor Relations Board, and should this amendment prevail I purpose to offer such an amendment and I hope it may carry and prove to be of some service to the Board.

The committee feels that we can relieve this Board of some of its duties and responsibilities by placing a limitation on the appropriation which would relieve the Board of the necessity of having to consider complaint cases arising on agreements between management and labor where the agreements have been in existence for 3 months or longer. In other words, where contracts have been in operation for 3 months or longer and no complaint has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board, the National Labor Relations Board would be relieved of the necessity of going in and taking jurisdiction any time within the next 9 months, or during the life of this appropriation. The committee feels that possibly in that time the necessity for interference may not be necessary. In that way we may be able to reduce the expenditures of the National Labor Relations Board to the point where it can operate efficiently and effectively and at the same time satisfactorily to management and to labor with the reduction made by the committee.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. I observe that the salary item has now been cut $213,000.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. McGRANERY. What would be the effect if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York slashing it another $500,000 is agreed to?

Mr. HARE. Well, it would not interfere with the power and responsibility and duties and efforts of the National Labor Relations Board. It would only deprive them of a sufficient amount of

services or personnel to discharge the duties and obligations efficiently, and the passage of this amendment would materially interfere with the efficiency of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were ayes 74 and noes 65.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. HARE and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 95 and noes 79.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the National Labor Relations Board to perform the duties imposed upon it by law or in pursuance of law in connection with disputes involving labor in industries under the national defense program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise properly chargeable to appropriations of the National Labor Relations Board for miscellaneous expenses and printing and binding, $600,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 57, line 5, insert "No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed."

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. HARE. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is twofold. One is, since the adoption of the previous amendment, to relieve the National Labor Relations Board of additional duties. Another is to assist the Board in the discharge of its functions and responsibilities. It simply means that the National Labor Relations Board will not be charged with the responsibility, nor will it have the authority or right to take jurisdiction of a complaint unless the contract under which the complaint is made has not been in force for as much as 3 months. Where an agreement between management and its employees has been in operation for as long as 3 months or more and no complaint has been filed by management or no formal complaint filed by the employees, National Labor Relations Board would not have jurisdiction and would be relieved of any duty or expense until the availability of these funds expires.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DITTER. In order to save time, the observation that I wanted to make was that I had an amendment at the desk which contained practically the same language, and certainly it has the same purpose as the committee amendment. I wonder whether I might add the further objective that would be served by the amendment, that it would discourage what we have been fearful of on the part of the National Labor Relations Board, the encouraging of strikes rather than discouraging strikes among labor organizations. I believe I have the support of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in the observation that I make when I say that the National Labor Relations Board's purpose under the Wagner Act was to encourage peace between men and management. Certainly not to bring them at swords' points with each other. On the Pacific Coast there have been evidences of cases where that original intent probably was not carried out. I want to commend the subcommittee for having taken over the program of saving that strike-sparing feature of the National Labor Relations Board by the amendment that has been offered.

With our boys scattered over the many fighting fronts defending our liberties, we find bureaucracy attacking those liberties on every sector of the home front. We are faced with the amazing spectacle of the National Labor Relations Board, which was created to administer labor's so-called Magna Carta, and which was held out as a means of establishing peace in industry, setting itself at this time to an entirely different purpose. Instead of conserving peace it contributes to the creation of strife and turmoil in our war plants.

From the beginning, those who have been chosen to administer the Wagner Act have conceived it, not to be their duty to guarantee a worker the right to join a union, but to force him into the political organization known as the C. I. O. From the beginning, these administrators have sought to dismember the craft union movement, which has for 60 years brought benefits to the labor interests and to the workingmen of America. Unless some step is taken to thwart their purpose, they will take advantage of the expanding conditions of our war plants to drive the A. F. of L. skilled workers into the unskilled ranks of the C. I. O.

I believe Congress passed the Wagner Act with the hope that industrial strife would be discouraged. It certainly was not intended that the Board should encourage discord. All of us are in accord that such encouragement should not be given at a time when our fighting forces are engaged on a far-flung battle front. But the National Labor Relations Board has embarked upon a legal debauch. It has moved to throw our wartime shipyards, particularly the Kaiser yards on the Pacific coast, into an orgy of turmoil.

The C. I. O. claims it has the legal right to get into these stabilized yards and agitate for the spoils. The astounding thing is that the National Labor Relations Board contends it is its duty to press the alleged right of the C. I. O. Such practices should not be continued.

The workers in the Kaiser yards are already organized. The amendment which the committee has offered and which is similar to the amendment which I have already sent to the clerk, will prevent these workers and others from being disorganized. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if any of the funds appropriated here are used by that Board to investigate cases where management and labor are undertaking to reach an amicable agreement, so that both will have a voice in the management and operation of the affairs of the company? What do the hearings disclose with reference to that?

Mr. HARE. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Whether the Board is expending public funds to investigate cases where management and labor are trying to get together in the solution of their problems?

Mr. HARE. Not unless either management or labor has filed a request with the Board to assist in that effort.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And unless that request is filed within 3 months no part of these funds will be available.

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Personally, I do not think they ought to be available when management and labor are trying to get together, when the Board interferes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1944."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee to section 804 of this bill which reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the head of the department or independent establishment to which such appropriation is made.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that section, as explained to me by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is to prevent the Bureau of the Budget from impounding funds which Congress has appropriated to certain agencies under this bill as was done during the current fiscal year.

I doubt the wisdom of that section in the bill. I am informed by the Bureau of the Budget that they have impounded and thus kept agencies of the Government from spending already this year $300,000,000. Are we going to say to the Bureau of the Budget, where the facts show an agency has more money than it should spend, that it cannot save that money because Congress has appropriated so many thousands of dollars to a

particular agency and it must spend it? This section does not prevent certain agencies from saving, but it has been my observation that there is too much of a disposition on the part of agencies to spend every dollar they can get from Congress and not to try to save the money and carry it over.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that the only way that saving on excessive travel allowance has been possible to be made on the part of these agencies is by freezing these funds by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the fact that Congress is jealous of its rights to say how much these agencies shall spend for a particular purpose, but it developed in the hearings before the Civil Service Committee where we are investigating civilian personnel, that the only power the Bureau of the Budget has for effecting economy in government is to require agencies of the Government to adopt economical procedures, and to cut out red tape and save money is by impounding a certain percentage of the funds appropriated by the Congress to those agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have personally talked to the Director of the Budget about this particular section and he is opposed to it in principle. It seems to me that the position taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is a sound one. The President has the responsibility of executing the laws we pass; the executive branch of the Government, and the President of the United States, has the responsibility of spending the money that we appropriate; certainly, he ought to have that responsibility, and I think he has the responsibility of saving money we appropriate as the conditions change which justify the saving of the money.

By this provision, so far as this appropriation is concerned, we, by legislation, take away that responsibility, and to me certainly it is unwise that section 804 should remain in the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I agree with him.

I doubt the wisdom of the Congress saying to the executive branch of the Government that it cannot save money, even though it has been appropriated by the Congress and where it is found that conditions have changed, nevertheless you cannot withhold some of the money.

I hope that the Committee may give serious consideration to this before we reach that section. I think some change certainly ought to be made in this section.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the statement that any further effort to deal with matters not pertaining to a part of the bill under consideration is subject to a point of order. I do not propose to object to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] proceeding at this time, because the matter has already been discussed, but I want to give notice that after this I shall insist on the regular order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be out of order. We have had these pro forma amendments before, and arguments are advanced for and against many of them.

I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to reply to the arguments made by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]; the matter will refer to a portion of the bill he has discussed, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with reference to section 804.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry; the gentleman is going to take all of my time.

Mr. HARE. I wanted to make it clear I was not objecting to the gentleman proceeding and have no desire to interfere with his doing so.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this provision was inserted in the bill for reasons which are clearly shown in the hearings. The statements made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who, I am not advised, has conferred with the subcommittee with respect to this matter; perhaps with some members of the subcommittee, but certainly not with me, indicate that they have not read the hearings, and I think also indicate the possibility that they are not advised as to the facts which have motivated the committee in inserting this language in the bill.

What is the reason for this provision? For the last several years the Budget has been undertaking to revise the judgment of Congress as to how much money should be expended for certain purposes. We have no objection to the exercise of discretion by the Budget where circumstances have changed and it appears that a saving can be accomplished without interfering with the objectives that Congress had in mind when making an appropriation, but instances have frequently occurred where Congress, as it occasionally does, had increased by some figure the amount which the Budget had recommended for a certain purpose and where the Budget had merely set aside that increase or substantially that increase in a reserve—frozen it, to use the common expression—so as to prevent its expenditure. Now, when Congress after the consideration of a matter decides that it will appropriate more money than the Budget estimated for a particular purpose and the Budget comes along and says: "Why, you have appropriated more money than we recommended, and therefore we will just put the excess over our recommendation in a reserve fund and it shall not be spent," you are letting the Budget revise the appropriating power of Congress, which, in my judgment, ought not to be done.

There is an instance shown in this committee report if you will take the trouble to read it; I think it is on page 3 where we refer to our report on the bill for the present fiscal year in which we made a cut in the item for printing and binding in the Federal Security Agency but we said in the report that none of this cut should be allocated to the Office of Education. The Congress approved our report and made the appropriation in accordance with the recommendation of the subcommittee; but the Budget came along after the Office of Education had made plans to expend these funds it had for printing and binding purposes, after it had sought the collaboration and cooperation of well-known educators throughout the country in the preparation of material that it intended to publish, and the Budget froze some $8,000 of the funds which we said should not be frozen or should not be taken from the allocation for printing and binding to the Office of Education, and thereby prevented the Office of Education from carrying out the work the subcommittee intended it should do, which intention of the subcommittee was approved by the Congress itself. If you want the Bureau of the Budget to revise your appropriations and exercise appellate authority over Congress as to how much money is going to be provided for the various subject matters for which we appropriate the money, then when you reach section 804 you ought to vote to strike it out, but if you think that the judgment of the Congress in appropriating money and designating it for certain purposes should be controlling at least until some conditions arise which justify a change in the amount of funds allocated for the purposes for which Congress has provided them, you ought to leave it in, perhaps with a modification which I am going to suggest, but at least you ought to leave the principle in. I am going to offer an amendment which will add to the section these words:

> Unless additional hearings have been held before and advices received from appropriate subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

That simply means, if you adopt that amendment, that the Budget would be unable to change the allocations which have been made by Congress in the passage of an appropriation bill without further hearings before appropriate congressional committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. It says to them in effect that they should not undertake to freeze money that Congress has said

should be expended for certain purposes without at least coming back to the Congress and giving reasons, the new conditions which have arisen, the new circumstances which ought to be considered which in the judgment of the Budget might justify the change desired in the amount of the appropriation made by Congress.

If this amendment which I intend to offer is adopted it will not even require that the Budget obey the advices which may be given to it; it simply requires that before they do these things, before they take money which has been appropriated by Congress and put it aside in a reserve fund and say: "This money shall not be spent," they come over and advise with the appropriate authorities of the Congress as to the reasons they think justify them. It is not going to prevent any reasonable and justified economy; it is simply going to require a little more respect for the action which the Congress takes in making provision for the executive departments of the Government, and take away from the Bureau of the Budget this self-assumed power, which I do not think it has under the law, to negative congressional appropriations by taking the sums appropriated by Congress and preventing their expenditure for the objectives which the Congress had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 7 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have previously advised the gentleman that I could not consent to that request. I object.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that there was objection to the request to return to strike out that proviso on page 7 which relates to a letting down of the bars in medicine, especially in the field of obstetrics. I am not unmindful of State legislation, but I think we should try to protect the health of the American people generally. This, of course, has been the policy of organized medicine for many years, a policy to which I subscribe. The membership of this House can certainly recall the prevalence of diphtheria, typhoid fever, cholera, smallpox, and many other illnesses that were common just a few years ago. Today, through medical research and organized medicine generally, these diseases are indeed rare. Everyone here knows of the recent revolution in medicine, and I refer to the use of sulfa drugs for pneumonia and other infections of that character. To let down the bars of medicine which are protecting the public at this particular time is very unwise, in my estimation.

The Government agencies know of these things and have governed the administration of the various departments with the cooperation of organized medicine. The results have been indeed very gratifying. The Army and Navy Medical Corps of our services recognize these things generally, and I want to quote to you from a letter written by the Surgeon General some time ago regarding his opposition to granting commissions to osteopaths:

Since the establishment of the Medical Department of the Army in Revolutionary days it has been the endeavor of those responsible for its organization and maintenance to hold to requirements of the highest current standard for membership. It has recognized only that school of medicine that has its foundation on proven scientific research and practices in the healing art that are subscribed to by the vast majority of physicians throughout the world. This standard has kept apace with the vast strides in medical and surgical progress and in the teaching of medicine. At the present time appointment in the Medical Corps is contingent upon graduation from a school of regular medicine chartered to award the degree of doctor of medicine, this to be followed by the completion of a year's internship in a hospital offering a general service and recognized as of a standard to award an approved certificate of interneship. Although commissions are issued to recent graduates of these schools, they are not allowed to go on active duty until their interneships are completed.

The Surgeon General is charged with the preservation of the physical well-being of the military forces. This responsibility cannot be discharged in the absence of fixed standards of preventive measures, diagnostic procedures, and curative therapy. These standards are found only in the school of regular medicine and are based upon scientific fact that precludes the integration of healers of schools that are founded on dogma or cult.

Osteopaths are granted licenses to practice healing in certain States, but there are many States where they are not recognized as physicians, but as practitioners of manipulative measures only. The Government would be open to serious criticism if advocates of limited or auxiliary methods of treatments were given commissions in the Medical Corps and allowed to care for the sick and wounded.

One of the prime functions of the Medical Department is in the prevention of diseases and keeping the soldier fit for duty. This demands the highest type of scientific medicine and does not depend upon particular and special therapeutic procedures which are recognized outside the field of scientific medicine.

To accede to the desire of every interested group of persons engaged in the practice of auxiliary medical service for commissions in the Medical Corps is not justified by the duties to be performed, nor by the needs of the military service.

The citizens of this country, who give their sons to the military service, have every right to expect that they will receive the highest type of medical attention when they are sick or wounded. In order to carry this out, it is imperative that only those physicians whose training has been based upon sound scientific principles, can be utilized in their care. This is particularly true in the case of battle casualties, in which the particular procedures of osteopathic practice are not considered applicable.

JAMES C. MAGEE,
Major General, United States Army,
The Surgeon General.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 13, 1942.*

The present Surgeon General of the United States Army has just notified me that he is also of the same opinion as his predecessor.

Mr. Chairman, the action taken here today will permit those people who are not recognized in regular medicine to deliver babies of the wives of our soldiers. Our military authorities refused to grant these same people the right to receive commissions in the Army to administer to the boys while they are in the service. Now they are going to permit them to go out in the general practice of medicine and to try to deliver the babies of the wives of these boys who are in the Army.

I think we are taking a step backward instead of holding to the line of what really organized medicine is trying to do.

I also have a letter from the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania protesting against this very thing. I want to quote just a paragraph or two if I have time:

A proviso in this appropriation bill in effect prohibits the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor from investigating the professional background of those who may practice obstetrics in the various States in connection with any of the programs conducted under authority of the Social Security Act through the State health agencies in the maternal and child-welfare program.

The Children's Bureau or any well-established Federal bureau, in the administration of appropriations from tax funds for definite purposes, has always had and should continue to have the authority to determine after investigation the scholastic qualifications of those who render the health and medical services provided for in the law in order to guarantee a high standard of service to our citizens.

The proviso referred to in H. R. 2935 makes it mandatory that the Children's Bureau use none of the funds to be appropriated for investigative purposes. This interferes with the administrative functions of the Children's Bureau to such an extent that it will remove all obstacles in the way of preventing unqualified and inefficiently trained individuals from participating in these health service programs. This will endanger the best health and welfare interests of the public.

The purpose of this bill (H. R. 2935) very likely originated in groups who fear such investigations and who do not desire to conform to certain high standards in their scholastic attainments. It is a clever and subtle measure to force administrative bureaus to accept unqualified individuals in the rendering of these services and if not stopped will spread to all the various health agencies of the Federal and State Governments.

This proviso should be eliminated from this bill and we sincerely believe that your appropriate action to accomplish such purpose will directly contribute to the health interests of prospective mothers and infant children in your constituency.

Very truly yours,

C. L. Palmer, Pittsburgh, chairman; Joseph A. Daly, Philadelphia; John J. Sweeney, Upper Darby; Francis J. Conahan, Bethlehem; J. Stratton Carpenter, Pottsville; Charles W. Smith, Harrisburg; Joseph S. Brown, Lewistown; Walter S. Brenholtz, Williamsport; Luther J. King, Meadville; Charles A. Rogers, Freeport; Robert J. Sagerson, Johnstown; Herman A. Fischer, Jr., Wilkes-Barre; James C. Fleming, Pittsburgh; Robert L. Anderson, Pittsburgh; Walter F. Donaldson, Pittsburgh, Committee on Public Health Legislation of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania (membership 9,500).

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

For all necessary expenses to enable the National Youth Administrator to provide for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration and the conservation and disposition of all the property of whatever type (including buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types), in use by said National Youth Administration, including the personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of the National Youth Administration operations, and such travel and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with the liquidation of the National Youth Administration from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the National Youth Administration in the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act of 1942" not exceeding $3,000,000: *Provided*, That said liquidation shall be completed as quickly as possible, but in any event not later than January 1, 1944.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: On page 64, line 22, after "of" strike out the figures "1942" and insert the figures "1943."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this is merely to correct a typographical error. The money is to be appropriated under the act of 1943 instead of 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 703. This title may be cited as the "War Manpower Commission Appropriation Act, 1944."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 7, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have objected to other requests to return to page 7. I do not see how we can agree to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey without being discriminatory. I shall be compelled to object.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 802. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 68, line 17, insert the following after the period:

"*Provided further*, That unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not germane to the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly, Mr. Chairman. This is nothing more than a simple limitation.

Mr. HARE. As I understood it, Mr. Chairman, it referred to this or any other act, thus placing limitations on other acts of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is correct. The amendment refers to other appropriations, in other bills. The Chair thinks it is very clearly subject to a point of order and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 804. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the head of the department or independent establishment to which such appropriation is made.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 68, line 22, strike out all of section 804.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the principle in my amendment was first raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in his remarks to the House a few moments ago, and replied to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. Very little can be added to what has heretofore been stated with reference to the position which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] took at that time.

It is the historic function of the President as Chief Executive of the Nation to execute our laws faithfully and to administer and supervise the expenditure of funds which the Congress of the United States has made available for the various executive agencies and bureaus of the Federal Government.

Simply because Congress appropriates a certain sum of money there is no binding obligation on that particular agency of the Government to expend all the funds which are made available. Changes in our social, economic, and political life are constantly arising. Such changes often make the expenditure of funds under an appropriation passed by the Congress months before entirely unnecessary, uneconomical, unwise, and wasteful. Heretofore the President has used the Bureau of the Budget as the central agency of the Government to impound certain funds as a reserve and to take the necessary steps to save the Government from a waste of public funds because conditions may have changed so radically and so swiftly since the Congress had made them available. To have expended the funds under the changed conditions would not be the intent of the Congress and would be entirely unwise, uneconomical, and most wasteful.

In my humble judgment the Budget has exercised good administration, wise administration, and economical administration of the functions of the President in impounding reserve funds and withholding funds the expenditure of which would be unnecessary and unwise.

Section 804 in the bill would bring about a departure from the established law and the established custom in impounding funds when their expenditure would be unnecessary and wasteful.

As a concrete example, when the W. P. A. was abolished millions of dollars were impounded by the action of the Director of the Budget, millions that might have been expended and could have been expended by the head of that agency but for the action of the Director of the Budget.

I think section 804 should be stricken from the bill. The elimination of this section would tend to save money for the taxpayers and bring about more efficient and economical administration and supervision over the expenditure of Federal funds on the part of the President. I therefore hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman heard the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. That is not the issue he raised at all. Would the gentleman comment on the point the gentleman from Georgia raised about the Bureau of the Budget withholding funds after Congress had appropriated them?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I have the assurance given by the Director of the Budget in a letter to the chairman of this committee, a copy of which was transmitted to the Majority Leader, and which I use with his permission, that it is not the will or the intent of the Director of the Budget to withhold the expenditure of public funds in an effort to thwart the will of Congress. It is his intent to withhold such funds and to impound them in a reserve solely and

simply to save an unnecessary expenditure of public funds.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That was not the testimony before the committee, which is why the section happens to be in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Has the gentleman read the committee report?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I read the committee report before I took the floor.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman then is advised that in the committee report of last year the committee expressly directed that certain funds be used for printing and binding by the Office of Education, and that it was found this year that the Bureau of the Budget had frozen those funds and refused to permit their expenditure, in direct contravention of the direction of the Congress, because the Congress approved our committee report. How, then, can the gentleman, if he has read the report and read the hearings, say that he can feel that the Bureau of the Budget is not going to contravene the action of the Congress?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In reply to the gentleman from Georgia, may I say that in this same letter from the Director of the Budget it is stated that the $75,000 was impounded as a reserve at the beginning of the year in order to see that it was economically expended, so that no deficiency would be created. The Assistant Director of the Budget, Mr. Coy, informed the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the item for printing and binding for the Office of Education was made available and was expended. This information is contained in the letter heretofore referred to.

Mr. TARVER. The hearings disclose that that is not true. The letter to which the gentleman refers has never been called to the attention of our subcommittee, has not been read in this debate until this good moment, and was evidently turned over to gentlemen not familiar with our hearings for obvious reasons.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The letter from the Bureau of the Budget to which I have referred is as follows:

JUNE 16, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the report on the labor-Federal security appropriation bill for 1944 a statement was made that the Bureau of the Budget placed a reserve against an appropriation for printing and binding for the Federal Security Agency which resulted in a reduction in the allocation for printing and binding for the Office of Education in the amount of $8,871, and that this fund was withheld from expenditure. The report further stated that the committee considered this and other similar actions by the Bureau of the Budget to be an unwarranted exercise of authority and inserted a provision, section 804, in the bill to prevent future actions of this character.

This Bureau, in carrying out its functions of apportioning funds for expenditure, set up under the appropriation for printing and binding of the Federal Security Agency a reserve of $75,000 to which reserve the Agency agreed. This action was similar to that taken in many other appropriations to provide for contingencies and emergencies and to avoid the incurring of obligations at rates which might in some instances result in deficiencies. Almost without exception the agencies concerned agreed to the establishment of those reserves as being a part of sound financial management and good budgetary practice.

In apportioning the reserve of $75,000 the Federal Security Agency itself allocated a part of the reserve to the allotment for printing and binding of the Office of Education. On April 14, 1943, $60,000 of that reserve was released to the Federal Security Agency. Subsequently that Agency reallotted $9,000 to the Office of Education, making a total available for that Office for printing and binding of $74,719—$129 more than the amount which the committee indicated as a minimum.

The fact that a reserve is established at the beginning of the year does not mean that the money is taken away from the agency. It means that its expenditure program is being planned at a rate which will permit some leeway to meet contingencies or emergencies without the necessity of supplemental appropriations. There are other occasions when conditions so radically change after the making of appropriations that sound administration would demand that excess funds be withheld from expenditure. I am sure you will agree that appropriations should not be expended simply because the money happens to be available. I assure you that reserves are never established by the Bureau of the Budget "to thwart the will of Congress."

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 69, line 2, strike out the period, substitute a comma, and insert "unless additional hearings have been held before and advices received from appropriate subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not in order at this time. A perfecting amendment is not in order to an amendment to strike out the section. It is given preference only when offered concurrently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair invites the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that a perfecting amendment is always in order and it takes precedence over an amendment to strike out, the theory being that the House be given an opportunity to perfect provisions of a bill before deciding they want to strike them out.

Mr. TABER. Must it not be offered concurrently with the motion to strike out?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it is in order to be offered whenever the author gets recognition. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of any more interest to me than it is to the membership of the House as a whole. The Bureau of the Budget has been insisting on exercising authority in the matter of freezing appropriations made by the Congress, which it does not have under any statute enacted by the Congress. It is undertaking to exercise that authority under a section of the code which has reference only to the allocation of funds to a bureau or organization for 1 year by the Bureau of the Budget so as to prevent the bureau or other organization from overexpending the amounts of money that have been appropriated to its use by the Congress. I have no information and none has been given to a committee of this House to the effect that $300,000,000 or any comparable sum has been saved by the Bureau of the Budget in the exercise of its self-assumed power. I do have information as I indicated to the House awhile ago that in some instances the Bureau of the Budget has acted directly contrary to the will of the Congress, and I can cite an instance in an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture a couple of years ago, when $3,000,000 was added by Congress to the amount made available for the Soil Conservation districts. The Bureau of the Budget had not recommended that increase and so after it was appropriated by the Congress the Bureau of the Budget froze the main portion of it into a reserve fund. Two years ago the Congress appropriated $15,000,000 for out-of-school rural vocational training. The Bureau of the Budget had estimated $10,000,000, so the Bureau froze about four and three-quarter million dollars, or some such sum, and did not permit its expenditure. I have already pointed out where during this fiscal year the Bureau has refused to allow the Office of Education to expend moneys which Congress expressly provided in the appropriation bill for Labor-Federal Security for this fiscal year should be expended by the Office of Education.

If gentlemen feel, despite these facts, that the Bureau of the Budget ought not to at least come before a congressional committee and explain why it has determined to freeze a portion of the funds appropriated by the Congress, then gentlemen ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, but if they adopt the amendment I have offered here it would mean nothing more than that after the Budget Bureau reached a decision, or at least is about to reach a decision, that part of appropriations made by Congress should be placed in a reserve, the officials of the Bureau of the Budget shall come before the Appropriations Committees of Congress and explain to these committees just why that action should be taken. They are not required under the language of my amendment to observe whatever advice the committees give to them. They are simply required before they take action to come down and explain to the proper committees of the Congress of the United States what action they wish to take and why that action should be taken. If that is unreasonable to require, if you want to turn over to that Bureau the power of appropriating or refusing to appropriate money, a power which under the Constitution is in the Congress of the United States, you ought not to adopt my amendment, and ought to vote for the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that a bureau chief may veto, in whole or in part, an appropriation by Congress while the President himself has not the power to veto individual items in an appropriation bill?

Mr. TARVER. The Bureau of the Budget has assumed a power which I do not think they have and have been exercising it on numerous occasions.

Mr. HOBBS. Does the gentleman think under any circumstances, whether before or after consultation with Congress, the Bureau of the Budget should exercise such a power?

Mr. TARVER. I do not think so, and if Congress thinks it ought to exercise such power, it ought to enact a law under which it can do it, which it has not done so far. But I am trying in part to reconcile my views to those expressed by the majority leader and the whip on the majority side, whom I do not think have had an opportunity to read the hearings. I am simply offering to require by this amendment that they come over and show us the courtesy of telling us they contemplate doing these things which they have been doing without consultation heretofore—talk with us about it, and give us an opportunity to express our views, after which they can go ahead and take such action as they think they may be legally authorized to take; or we may bring before the Congress legislation to prevent their contemplated actions.

I think the amendment I have offered should be accepted by the Committee of the Whole, and I hope it may be, and that the motion to strike out the section may be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were ayes 74 and noes 87.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 134 and noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 69, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 804. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply makes the appropriations carried in this bill retroactive to July 1, 1943, in case the bill should not become law prior to that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take down my hair and admit with considerable chagrin that I was not present in the Chamber at the time when a provision of great importance in this bill was passed over without the Members of the House, I am sure, realizing its seriousness.

I was called out earlier in the afternoon on a matter of official business. I came and asked the members of the committee in charge of the bill how soon it would be taken up under the 5-minute rule, as some of us wanted to offer an amendment to strike out the provision in question. I was told reading would start about 4 o'clock. When I came back into the Chamber at 3:15 the bill was already being read and the section in question had been passed.

Therefore, I beg the indulgence of the Committee to say a few words about the provision beginning on line 20 on page 7 of the bill which provides "that no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation, which discriminates between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics."

Two members of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], with whom I had spoken about this provision, were most courteous in having inserted a clarifying amendment which narrows the scope of the provision to regulations relating to the care of obstetrical cases. This reduces the danger of the provision, as it enables the Children's Bureau still to set up and maintain medical standards at least for the care of neglected and crippled children under this bill. But the amendment is not enough, I believe, because it prevents the Bureau from maintaining its hitherto high standards for the care of obstetrical patients.

May I say a word about the background of this?

The Social Security Act, in title XI, section 1102, reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor and the Social Security Board, respectively, shall make and publish such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this chapter, as may be necessary to the efficient administration of the functions with which each is charged under this chapter.

This gave the Children's Bureau, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, authority to prescribe standards for medical service rendered under the act. I am told that in 1935 at the beginning of this program the Department of Labor and the Children's Bureau consulted with the health officers of the various States who recommended that the Children's Bureau after consultation establish and publish proper medical standards for the care of crippled children, for the care of homeless and neglected children, and for the care of mothers in childbirth and their babies. Such standards were established and they required that no practitioner of medicine could be allowed to participate in this program unless he or she was a graduate of a class A medical school, or of two other specified schools that were not fully approved or of certain approved foreign medical schools. Certain higher standards and specialized training were required of those doctors permitted to take care of crippled children.

Surely we will all agree that the Federal agency charged with the dispensing of Federal funds is responsible for the way that these funds are used, for seeing that they provide the best care possible to the individuals for whom they are appropriated.

The argument is made that, after all, this is a matter for the States to decide; and if certain States license individuals with lesser training to practice obstetrics who are we to say who shall practice obstetrics within their jurisdiction? It is an argument with which I concur wholeheartedly except under two conditions: First, when the standards in the States are reasonably uniform. Such is not the case in this instance. The chief objection is not to those States which have laws requiring the passage of examinations in the basic sciences and require that men or women, to be permitted to practice obstetrics in the State, shall serve proper internships and demonstrate that they possess high-grade qualifications in the handling of abnormal as well as normal obstetrical cases.

The great danger we see in this provision comes from those States which have low standards, where almost any good-hearted mammy who believes that she is called of God to take care of women in childbirth is licensed to go out and do so. We feel that it is most dangerous for a provision like this to be slipped through without careful consideration or debate, and without recognizing what it does to the high standards which have been worked out very carefully by the medical profession all during these years.

The Army and the Navy have refused to grant commissions in the Medical Corps to any who were not graduates of the approved schools I have mentioned. They have been unwilling to lower the standards for the medical care of the men in the service, yet we here today have passed a provision which lowers the standards for the care of their wives when they are delivered. Do we want that provision to stand? Do we want to change in a time like this a policy which has produced such excellent results?

Objection can be raised that so many doctors are now in the service that it is not possible to get obstetrical care unless in some States men and women with lower standards of training are used. It is true that in most obstetrical

cases if the attendant merely exercises masterful inactivity and knows enough not to intervene, nature will take care of itself. But the test comes when things do not proceed normally. When to intervene, what needs to be done, how to do it. In no emergency of medicine or surgery is better judgment and more skill needed.

For example, the individual who is able to handle normal obstetrics satisfactorily meets a situation where a Caesarean section is necessary to save the woman's and the child's life. He is not qualified or licensed to do major surgery. It is natural for him to try, as long as he can, to use the method that he or she is accustomed to. He is likely not to recognize in time his own limitations. He does not like to confess his own inadequacy and call in a doctor who is adequately trained. He may delay until the woman's life cannot be saved nor the child's.

All these years we have worked to lower the infant and maternal mortality throughout the country, and with spectacular results. Here we are doing a thing which is bound to increase the mortality rate in many States.

My second objection to the argument, in this instance, that States should be allowed to decide the qualifications of those who take care of women in childbirth, under this program is that in much of this program the money is wholly Federal. Whenever Federal money is matched dollar for dollar by a State, I have less objection to the contention. A State is likely to be much more careful to what kind of practitioners it gives its own money. But much of the money we are appropriating today, particularly the $4,000,000 grant to the States for emergency maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces is not matched by the States. Surely the Department of Labor charged with responsibility for wise use of these public funds should be authorized, in fact required, to see that they are spent for only the highest grade of skilled care.

There is another consideration which I think ought to be presented with regard to this particular provision of the bill. The National Research Council has been asked by the Children's Bureau to make a study of this whole matter and that study is now in progress. The National Research Council is not a New Deal agency. It was established by the Congress, as I recall, more than a half century ago. It has the highest scientific standing. It is wholly nonpartisan and unbiased. It has been working on this very thing to prepare for our guidance a factual report regarding the relative merits of the various healing methods and arts.

It certainly would seem premature and ill-advised for Congress to pass just now a provision of this sort without having considered adequately and thoroughly what we are doing, not having at hand the report of this impartial investigating body. Therefore, I hope very much that in the Senate this provision will be removed and that in conference we will agree to the Senate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes had directed him to report the same back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, June 21, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I made yesterday and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon on the bill and include therein a letter from the Assistant Director of the Budget, Wayne Coy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 561), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment briefly on action taken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in reporting out House Concurrent Resolution 25. This resolution in substance calls for the creation of international machinery with power to write the peace and to maintain the same by means of an international police force with the United States participating.

I consider it very unfortunate that this action has been taken. I fear the effect will be to greatly injure the war effort. It cannot help but give the impression to the country that the war is so surely won that we can already take the next step, that of writing the peace. Nothing could be more dangerous than for our people to get such an impression for it can cause them to relax in their efforts to carry to a successful conclusion the winning of the war.

This Congress is not in a position to take any such definite action as this resolution contemplates. There is great danger that should this resolution be passed the politicians of the world will get control of the peace making and enforcing powers and shut out from having anything to say about these matters the men who are fighting and dying and

upon whom we must depend to win this war.

That was the great error in World War No. 1. Let us not repeat it. Let us be sure that the men who do the actual fighting have something to say about the kind of peace we shall have.

I must further remark that this is playing into the hands of the group that seeks to destroy the sovereignty of the United States and put the people under the rule of a world superstate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and that my remarks may follow those of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Sacramento Bee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

IMMIGRATION BILLS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and insert certain excerpts from newspapers, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because on Monday, the day which had been set aside for calling the Calendar of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I did not have much time to discuss the legislation that would have been made in order by the first rule presented. Time on that rule was consumed by some of my colleagues who spoke of everything but the legislation before the House. From the Republican side there were a few criticisms to the effect that we should have a better immigration policy but some of the distinguished gentlemen on the Democratic side talked of everything but the legislation and more or less told me that I was bringing up controversial legislation. Let me repeat what I have said so often before, that unless we can get harmony in the Congress of the United States we shall get nowhere. There is too much fighting over legislation that comes from certain committees, too much objection to certain racial groups. We talk about unity in the outside world, we talk about being in a great war—we all know it and we all want to win this war—but we have got to keep our forces united so that people of every race, religion, and nationality will join in this great struggle to win the war. Let me make a few observations.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization had considered a certain bill covering the case of a man now in Cuba unable to secure a visa because he offered some stamps to a clerk in the consul's office because he had admired them and who charged him with bribery and the consul therefore had to refuse a visa which would have permitted him to enter this country. He has two sons, both wearing the uniform of this country, boys who have lived in this country the last 4 years. One was drafted, the other enlisted. Probably within the next few weeks these boys will sail for foreign service. The committee was unanimous that this bill ought to be adopted and reported quickly in order to give these boys a chance to see their father before they left; and remember they had not seen him for about 5 years. The Speaker agreed to recognize me to ask for the immediate consideration of the bill. I am talking now of the bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum. You will find the proceedings on page 5829 of the RECORD of last Monday. Before I had a chance to open my mouth the gentleman from Mississippi objected. The Speaker finally induced him to withdraw his objection. You will notice by the statement I have made that this is a most deserving case if ever there was one—one designed to give these boys a little peace of mind before going abroad to fight for our cause. The gentleman from Mississippi objected. By the way, this is not my bill, it was introduced by another Member of the House. The only interest I have is to help two young soldiers to see their father before they go to the front.

Then a bill was called up under a rule. As I said a moment ago, I did not have a chance to explain the purpose of the bill. It is simply this, Mr. Speaker: There are hundreds of old people in this country who have raised families, as many as five or six children, who have not had an opportunity to take out their first papers because they were too busy trying to make a living and to educate their children. Some lived 100 to 200 miles from a court and could not possibly pay the expenses involved. Their sons and daughters are now in the armed forces of our country. All that we asked in that bill was to waive the first papers so that they could apply for naturalization. We did not ask to waive any literacy test; we did not ask to open the doors to further immigration; it was not a question of new immigrants, but these were people who have been here for years, who now have sons and daughters in the service. The performance that took place here on Monday was a classic demonstration of the feeling that exists among certain people in the House, the prejudices that rise the moment one talks about an alien.

On page 5830 of the RECORD you will see I am charged with having introduced bills on the Chinese exclusion question. Since when must I apologize to Members of Congress for the bills I introduce? Since when does anyone have to ask for permission to introduce any bill in the Congress of the United States? Just because some people disagree with the provisions in bills to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws they have started a rumor that we are going to flood this country with cheap Chinese labor. I say it is unfair and unjust to the American people to stifle any bill that has merit in committee. I introduced two bills to repeal Chinese exclusion and I am proud of it. They did not go far enough and I withdrew them, but there are other bills pending in my committee now that I think deserve the most earnest consideration of this Congress.

I have every reason to believe that these bills can be reported or that one bill can be reported to remove the stigma against China and fix a quota for the Chinese people which will help our war effort. I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that China has been a great ally to this country. China for 6 years has been struggling in a war involving horrors no other nation has endured in centuries. True, we agreed to supply her with material, with ammunition, planes, and so forth, but we cannot get these materials or planes in there as fast as we should like to.

China is at a low ebb now except for the victory she had only a few days ago. China is being divided by Japan through propaganda which tells the Chinese that they should throw in their lot with the Asiatic race, that they should come in with Japan as one unit, that the American people are just fooling China, that the American people are not going to carry out the terms of its promises because they do not like the Chinese as shown by the Chinese Exclusion Acts.

If you heard the testimony that was presented for the last month in the committee room, where we heard some of the best minds of America, from every religious organization, from every community of this country, asking repeal of the Chinese exclusion law and placing China on a quota basis, you would change your mind. The section from which I expected the most protest was the west coast, but believe me when I tell you that I have received more communications in the form of letters and petitions from the west coast asking me to bring out a bill that will remove the stigma from China and place her on an equal basis with other nations than I have from any other part of the country.

Can you imagine, Hitler could come in under a quota, Mussolini could come in under a quota, but Madame Chiang Kai-shek, or the finest type of Chinese people, cannot because we say they are ineligible to come here. How can you explain that? Some statesmen of this Congress

say, "Let us wait until after this war is over." I am definitely surprised at the stand taken by the American Legion, but then I was given to understand by many prominent members of the Legion that this question had never been brought up for consideration officially, and that many groups and people within that organization are definitely in favor of this legislation. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the matter was presented to the American Legion convention, 90 percent or more would vote for support of the bill. And that goes for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, too.

The objection that was made by the representatives of the American Legion was to the effect that we ought to wait until after the war is over before we determine whether we will let the Chinese come in or not. After the war may be too late. China may not be in the war unless we give her some sort of moral support. All she is asking now to bring up her morale and to unite her people is to give her a quota on the same basis as we gave Germany, Italy, and the other countries of the world, which in the case of China would amount to 100 or, tops, 107 persons a year. Yet I have been criticized from this end of the aisle and from that end of the aisle in statements to the effect that I am trying to open the doors to bring in a lot of Chinese coolie labor. You know and I know that this is not the fact. The bill that we are considering now would be restrictive so that only about 107 per year could come into this country, no matter where they were born, no matter where they are, and, in addition to that, they would have to comply with all the immigration requirements, moral, physical, mental and financial. I venture to say that 105 would not come in. By the way, I would like to mention at this point that the committee has received a number of telegrams and letters from important and large unions affiliated with the A. F. L. protesting against the testimony given by the A. F. L. representative and urging favorable consideration of the bills repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act.

It is just a question of policy and the policy, in the opinion of the American people as I have viewed it in the last several months, is to give courage to China in this war and to give China an equal footing and equal respect with other nations who are our friends today. As I stated a week ago, if you would give China a quota of 105 and if that quota lasted for 50 years you would have less Chinese in this country than you have Japs today. You would have much less Chinese people in this country.

I have no ax to grind with anybody. I am frank enough to stand up here and express my views whether some people like them or not. You have the same right and I would not criticize you if you introduced one bill or another, or in one form or another. That is all right; that is your privilege, but I do not believe in stifling legislation in committee. I would rather bring it out on the floor and let it be aired by the American Congress that represents the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, so far as the Immigration Committee is concerned, I may not agree with all of my colleagues on the committee, but they are outstanding men in Congress; I respect their views, as I respect any man's views, but we ought to be a little more farsighted. If China gets out of this war, we are in trouble for many years to come in fighting Japan. I do not say it will give her the greatest help possible. I do not say this is going to win the war, but surely it will do a great thing for her people who have been struggling and who are being divided by short-wave propaganda every single day in the week to the effect that we are just speaking sweet words to China but we do not intend to carry them out.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say now that I do not intend to be abused by any Member of this House because I have a different philosophy of life than he does. I do not mind Members disagreeing with me; I do not mind their voting against any proposition that I suggest, but this sniping and the cruel objections to deserving legislation that are made on the floor by some of the Members from my side of the aisle have to stop. I have not objected to any man's bill and I have not been responsible for calling a quorum. But I want to serve notice on some of my colleagues that I can exercise my privilege to do so should the necessity arise. I have listened with patience to people who may differ from me and I respect their opinion, but these continuous objections based upon no justice or no reason to label certain people in this country who are trying with all of us to win the war, are not fair to the people of this country.

I remember in 1932 and 1933 that lone-handed I pleaded for an investigation of un-American activities. Oh, my friends, you ought to have heard some of the debates.

I was called everything under the sun; it was stated that I was a rabble-rouser, that I was afraid of Nazis under the bed, that I was afraid of people following me, and all that. It took me a year and a half to convince the American people of the menace of saboteurs and others engaged in un-American activities.

That committee, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, was the chairman, did a great job. That work was taken over by the Dies committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman recalls that when the McCormack committee finished its work that committee deposited with the Library of Congress certain very confidential information and documents concerning un-American activities, especially concerning the Nazis, with the understanding and with an agreement, signed by the Librarian of Congress, that no one would ever be allowed to inspect the records without a resolution authorizing it being first passed by the Congress.

It is my understanding that a resolution has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], to authorize the Attorney General to inspect those records. Since they are so important to the un-American Activities Committee of the House and to the Kerr committee and others, does not the gentleman believe any committee of the House should be allowed to inspect these records?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not know that any such papers were deposited there, frankly speaking, until the gentleman called my attention to it several months ago. I did not deposit them there. Our former colleague, now deceased, Charles Kramer, with the clerk of our committee, made these deposits. I do not really know what is in them, but on general principles I think we ought to know what is in them.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman believe any committee of the House should have the right to inspect them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I personally have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Tomorrow morning there will be a hearing on that bill before the committee of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am going to be there.

I just want to point out that in the last 10 years I have tried my hardest to keep America safe from subversive movements and from subversive activities. But there was always the same opposition. It is not a pleasure for me to report out bills—after they have been cleared by various Government departments and been considered by the committee—and then be confronted with objectors who do not even read the reports, and who, no matter how good a report might be, would object anyway. The facts will bear me out.

I will speak for the people of my district and for all people where it will do the most good. I do not intend to criticize anybody unfairly, but this sniping, these unnecessary objections, instead of helping the committee work out its program for the benefit of all the people, just retard its work.

This was best illustrated by what I stated the earlier part of this afternoon. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did not have an opportunity to study many problems that have arisen within the last 35 years. There are a lot of things we would like to know. There are 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 aliens in this country, and we should like to find out what we are going to do with them and how to segregate the good from the bad. We have been appealing to the Committee on Rules to give us a rule, just to give us the right to study these questions. There are a lot of Japanese in this country who have no place here. I should like to know what we are going to do. I have before me now bills to disfranchise certain Japanese citizens, Japanese who were born here. We have not had the opportunity to study and understand this question.

Finally we convinced the Committee on Rules, which unanimously voted out a rule to give us the authority to study the

question, with only a few thousand dollars, and lo and behold, the gentleman from Mississippi got up here and convinced your side that I am going to open the door and let all the aliens into this country.

It had nothing to do with opening doors at all. And some of my friends on this side helped him, and you beat us by 100 votes, and yet you have voted out 12 investigating committees, and they are falling over each other. There is not enough office space in the building for them, and they are provided with hundreds of thousands of dollars, and we could not get a resolution through for $2,000 to investigate the alien problem, and to lay down a policy regarding alien enemies in this country, because of certain obnoxious objections and prejudices.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. How many aliens did the gentleman say we have in the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I should judge between four and four and a half million.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought it was closer to 6,000,000.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No, a lot of them have become citizens, and have been assimilated in our population.

Mr. STEFAN. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service are now making a double check of those aliens.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is talking now about the Smith bill.

Mr. STEFAN. In the appropriation bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, we supplied funds for the purpose of making a double check on those aliens, and I am wondering what the gentleman's bill proposes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Our committee thought that it ought to be divided into subcommittees and get first-hand information. For instance, Ellis Island is overcrowded today. We have 200 deserting seamen there.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; that is exactly what the Department of Immigration is doing now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I understand that, but the Department of Immigration became helpless. We had to pass in this House a bill to deport these alien seamen back to England.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service have funds that we provided for them, for doing the things that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You granted them funds for administrative purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, no; they are going to double check these aliens and find out where they are, where they are coming from, and we are going to interrogate them and inquire into everything they are doing. What more is to be done?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, much more.

Mr. STEFAN. What?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the Department makes a recommendation will the committee accept it? Listen to what happened only a few months ago. We passed a bill for the deportation of Chinese seamen who deserted here from the lend-lease ships—some witnesses told us that Chinese have deliberately deserted ships, and they cannot be shipped back. We had a number of witnesses before the committee and we were convinced that that was the story. We passed a bill, and it went to the Senate. The Senate passed it and then recalled it, because it was discovered that there was another side to the picture. After this action by the Senate I took the trouble myself to go to Ellis Island one day and spent all day there with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and interrogated these deserting Chinese seamen, and it gave us an entirely different picture than the one presented to the committee by some of the witnesses.

Mr. STEFAN. Right along the line of these seamen who were deserters, they are not only Chinese, but they are nationals of other countries.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am speaking of the Chinese seamen only now.

Mr. STEFAN. The Department has funds right now, and the Department is picking these people up, and eventually will send them back to the countries from which they come.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Chinese seamen want to go back to China, but under our bill we would deport them to England. I would like to have sent Mr. MASON and Mr. REES of Kansas and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana out to determine certain facts that Congress would like to know, but I could not do that unless they took the money out of their own pockets.

I could not bring anybody under a subpena for the purpose of inquiring along the question of the dual nationality. I could not do anything unless I spent money from my own pocket, as I have been doing for years, because I could not get a 5-cent piece for the study of this question.

Now we have a situation in California. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a bill before our committee now to disfranchise certain Japanese. I do not like to assume the responsibility of violating the constitutional rights of those people, yet it requires study. I would like to understand it. We have to accept the word of someone who comes in and makes a statement. We do not have any first-hand information at all. We legislate from day to day.

We have been very careful in what we have sent to this floor. The matters we have sent to this floor were based upon the unanimous opinion of the committee, based upon the report of the State Department, the Justice Department, and even the War Department. But you see we cannot compel anyone to come in aside from the department heads themselves. I would like to go beyond some of their investigations to determine certain policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include certain pertinent data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with the marine hospital at Carville, La.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include copies of two bills which I introduced, along with some correspondence I have received from the department, and an editorial and an article from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include articles from various newspapers touching the question of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, last April 15, when the matter of the F. S. A. was before the House, I took the floor at that time to denounce, as both political and short-sighted, the proposed annihilation of the Farm Security Administration.

The House was warned many times that day that the law of averages would eventually show itself—that the 6 fat food-production years would eventually be offset by some lean years. I called the attitude of the House that day penny wise and pound foolish, and when the argument was advanced against me that the farmers were now paying off their loans and gradually getting back on their feet and for that reason this project was no longer necessary, and that the program was costing a lot of money, which expenditure should be stopped, I stated, and it holds more true today than ever:

> This is a question of food and not one of money; we have got to have food; we are already facing a serious food crisis, and it will rapidly become worse.

But my warnings and the words of admonition of others did not stop the sacrificial lamb for that day from being offered up—the F. S. A. was killed. Now many are able to see the natural consequence of the action taken that day when they read the recent crop report and find out that many crops are falling off with alarming rapidity. That report flatly states that aggregate yields averaging as high as those secured last year are no longer within reach. It goes on to say that the crop outlook is the worst in the last 3 years.

I think it is high time we stop playing politics and become more realistic about

this war. Food is just as important as men and guns in this conflict. No nation can fight long on an empty stomach, either in the field or at home.

It seems unthinkable and highly paradoxical to me that we Members of Congress should destroy the one organization which has been one of the principal factors behind the tremendous boost in the 1942 crop. Nor has it been or will be any great cost to this Nation—of the loans it has made to thousands and thousands of farmers, 92 percent plus interest, have been repaid on every dollar. I am proud to say that Montana is keeping up her share of those repayments.

Since this war I have consistently voted against every bill that I thought would in any way injure or retard our war effort and by that same token I have supported all bills which I thought would help that effort. The F. S. A. is playing a vital role in enabling the farmers of this country to produce to the fullest extent possible and I want to say here today, that in my opinion, anyone who opposes the continuance of this highly important cog in our war program is voting to slow down and jeopardize our war effort just as surely as he would be if he voted to hamstring any of our commanders on any of the various fighting fronts.

Let us look now at the crop prospects in the United States as reported just the other day by the Crop Reporting Board of the Department of Agriculture.

On wheat we find that the total wheat production of 730,524,000 bushels indicated June 1, is 26 percent less than the 981,327,000-bushel crop last year. The indicated winter-wheat production of 501,702,000 bushels in about 29 percent less than last year's crop of 703,253,000 bushels.

The decline in prospects since May 1 is due largely to additional abandonment of volunteer wheat in western Kansas caused by dry weather, and to flood damage which was particularly severe in Missouri, eastern Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, and Iowa. In Oklahoma the season has been so late and damage has been so heavy that many farmers are abandoning their crops and seeking other employment.

With the exception of the Southern States where corn is in good condition, the corn crop is far from encouraging. Corn planting has been delayed materially by cool and rainy weather during May and is now so late that any further occasioned delay in planting or early frosts would be very costly.

The production of oats is nearly 14 percent below that of the 1942 crop of 1,358,730,000 bushels although the indicated 1,168,850,000 bushels is still above the last 10-year average.

Barley and rye are likewise running behind last year's crops according to all indications—the barley crop being figured at 13 percent less this year and the rye crop 41 percent below the 1942 crops.

Likewise the hay and potato crops and most of the fruit crops are expected to show a marked decline with the peach crop expected to be the smallest since 1932.

Sugar-beet acreage this year will be only 62 percent of the 1942 crop and only 69 percent of the 1939–42 average. This will mean a 30-percent reduction of our domestic sugar supply. On this crop, Montana will run a little better, having an indicated crop of 69 percent of the 1942 crop.

As regards sugar beets, I pleaded for years against what seemed to me the short-sighted policy of the Agriculture Department in limiting the acreage devoted to sugar-beet crops. Montana had thousands and thousands of acres of land situated near irrigable streams which I thought should have been allowed to have been devoted to sugar-beet planting.

This then certainly does not make for a very favorable outlook for the Nation or the hungry people of Europe and Asia who are looking toward the United States as the bread basket of the world.

Now, my colleagues, there is but one sensible, reasonable, right thing to do. That is not to kill the agency which has played such an important and vital part or role in the great increased production of crops since the time of its inception but on the contrary to sustain and pass the appropriation written into the bill by the Senate providing for the continuance of the Farm Security Administration.

My attention was just recently called to the very widespread interest among the newspapers of the country on this matter of the Farm Security Administration. Almost without exception are the praises of the F. S. A. sung. Several of those articles are interesting enough, because of the light they throw on the matter, to deserve reading. I am therefore inserting in the RECORD at this time some of those remarks:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of April 25, 1943]

IF CONGRESS WRECKS FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, AMERICA WILL EAT LESS

It is up to the Senate of the United States to rescue small farmers of America from the farm bloc.

Elimination of Farm Security Administration funds from the agricultural appropriations bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, is a direct attempt to kill this agency, which has helped more than 1,000,000 farmers grow more food just when this Nation needs more food most.

Abolition of Farm Security Administration in the midst of this war would be a serious blow to America's food program.

Critics of Farm Security Administration call it communistic because (a) it has transplanted thousands of farmers from poor land to fertile soil where they can produce more, and (b) because it granted loans principally on character rather than security.

Those critics had better read their history. The migration of farmers to new and richer land is a tradition antedating Revolutionary days. And Farm Security Administration loans not only are being repaid, they are, as we said above, helping thousands of farmers to become self-sustaining citizens.

It's capitalistic, not communistic. It gives the farmer a chance to own more property and makes him independent.

[From PM, New York, N. Y., of May 7, 1943]

ON THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Just when the Nation is exerting every effort to produce more food Congress threatens to kill the Farm Security Administration.

But it was the 463,941 little Farm Security Administration farmers last year who gave United States food production its greatest boost.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of March 29, 1943]

DOES IT MAKE SENSE?

How much did the 463,941 American farmers with actively supervised loans from the Farm Security Administration increase agricultural production in 1942? Latest figures from the United States Department of Agriculture give the percentage of the over-all Nation-wide increase in 1942, as compared with 1941, contributed by these Farm Security Administration borrowers as follows:

Milk, 36 percent of the entire national increase in 1942 over 1941; pork, 9 percent of the entire increase; eggs, 10 percent; beef, 7 percent; chickens, 10 percent; peanuts, 10 percent; soybeans, 3 percent; dry beans, 27 percent; and sugar beets, 7 percent.

Farm Security Administration is the agency which a group in Congress is trying to abolish. The foregoing figures speak for themselves. The small farmers who have Farm Security Administration loans are the ones who performed this feat. They are disadvantaged farmers, farmers with little or no capital, often without much experience, except with a single crop. Yet, under the guidance and with the modest financial aid provided by Farm Security Administration, they produced an important share of the Nation's farm products last year, and a goodly percentage of the increase in that year over the previous year.

[From the Washington News, of May 4, 1943]

BIG FARMERS OF SOUTH ANTAGONISTIC TO FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

MEMPHIS, May 4.—A contributing factor to the current unrest in the South, an unrest which some clothe with more political influence than it justifies, may be found in the intensified hostility of the plantation owner and big farmer to what the New Deal has done for the marginal farmer and sharecropper through its Farm Security Administration.

Numerically the plantation owner is in the minority, but he is noisy and is influential because of a community of interest with businessmen, large and small, in the towns which dot the agricultural sections of the South. This community of interest is even more closely knit now because the businessman also finds his one-time easy exploitation of cheap labor hampered by what the New Deal has done for labor.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1943]

"I'D RATHER BE RIGHT"—ABOLITION OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, ASSIGNMENT OF SOLDIERS TO WORK FARMS IS SHEER OBSCURANTISM

(By Samuel Grafton)

If we kill the Farm Security Administration, as the House desires to do, we may make it impossible for 500,000 farm families to continue to produce food for the war. We may throw them out of production at a time when we are talking of taking soldiers out of the Army to work on farms.

And that is what I mean when I use that hard word "obscurantism" to describe some of the murky double-talk and facing-two-way trends which mark so much of the current political debate.

This is obscurantism on the march, with swords. We are making a big thing of importing 5,000 farm workers from the Bahamas. Here are 500,000 farm families, our citizens and brothers, who have been helped by their pitiful Farm Security Administration loans to the point where they produced last

year 36 percent of the national increase in milk, and 27 percent of the national increase in dry beans, and 10 percent in eggs and chickens, though they number but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farmers.

So we demobilize them out of their farms, and we also import farm labor meanwhile, and if that is not obscurantism I would like to know what other word to paste on it.

[From the Alabama Journal, Montgomery, Ala., of April 14, 1943]

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINSTRATION UNDER FIRE

Jealous rivals, and foes of the National Democratic administration, have set out to kill the Farm Security Administration. They have succeeded in getting the House appropriations committee to make such restrictions in its funds that effective operation would be impossible.

It is a grand victory for the big farm monopolies, the corporate land owners, the Republican wreckers and the reactionary so-called Democratic enemies of everything President Roosevelt attempts to do.

* * * * *

It is a rotten deal being given an agency which has added billions to the farm wealth of the Nation, untold increase in farm production and new hope and courage to thousands of hopeless families tied to the land.

[From the Birmingham News of February 3, 1943]

COTTON, FOOD, AND FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The other day Oscar Johnston, the big cotton farmer of Scott, Miss., took occasion in his annual report as president of the National Cotton Council to make another attack on the Farm Security Administration, which so many big farmers do not seem to like that it makes us wonder if it is because the Farm Security Administration helps little farmers. At any rate, Mr. Johnston charged that the Farm Security Administration "threatens the integrity and efficiency of cotton production." And he went on to repeat various accusations he has made before against the Farm Security Administration. Among other things, he said:

"I am definitely certain that it was not the purpose of the Congress to authorize the creation of an agency which would go into a community or a county and buy a large tract of land to be farmed by it, the agency, on a share-crop basis by tenants regardless of the name by which the tenants are called."

Mr. Johnston is referring here to certain cooperative farming enterprises which have been undertaken with the help of the Farm Security Administration. Anyone as interested in the welfare of southern agriculture as Oscar Johnston is credited with being ought to know that there is need for experimenting with different kinds of agricultural organizations, practices, and methods, and it may be that cooperative farming of the kind undertaken under the sponsorship of the Farm Security Administration will be very helpful in solving some of the distressing farm problems of the South. In any case, what has been done in this field does not warrant such an attack as Mr. Johnston has made.

Whatever the merits of these enterprises may be, however, it ill becomes Oscar Johnston to talk about any kind of large-scale, cooperative farm enterprise, because he is the manager of the world's largest cotton plantation—a plantation which is owned by British interests, incidentally—and it has much in common with the Farm Security Administration cooperative farms besides the fact of large-scale operations.

The world's largest cotton plantation is cooperatively owned, even if the term is spelled corporation rather than cooperation, is worked by many small farmers, whatever they may be called, and is operated under the direction of Oscar Johnston. A Farm Security Administration cooperative farm is owned by another kind of cooperative, is worked by small farmers cooperating in the enterprise, whether they are called coowners, tenants, or what not, and is operated under the direction of the Farm Security Administration.

We do not see that the Farm Security Administration cooperative enterprise is any less desirable than Mr. Johnston's corporation-owned cotton plantation.

Mr. Johnston, however, does not seem to relish the way the Farm Security Administration is helping small farmers to acquire farms.

[From the Daily Oklahoman (Oklahoma City, Okla.), of February 9, 1943]

STRANGE PARADOX

It seems strange that when Congress looked around for something to eliminate, it should pick on the Farm Security Administration, which, despite some faults in carrying out its program, has the best framework for a constructive job of any of the numerous farm programs.

[From PM (New York, N. Y.)]

CATHOLIC LEADER FOR CONTINUATION OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Msgr. John O'Grady, of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, has gone on record in favor of continuation of the Farm Security Administration (F. S. A.) program to aid small farmers.

Appearing before a House agriculture subcommittee, he denied that the Farm Security Administration program is "communistic in any way," and added that the "Catholic Church doesn't think it communistic." He said:

"Unless the welfare of the lower third of our farm people is placed under the direction of those interested in helping them, you will see a return to agricultural feudalism in a very few years.

Mr. Speaker, others and other organizations who have expressed themselves as very definitely in favor of the continuance of this program are Railway Brotherhoods, National Council of Churches, C. I. O., A. F. of L., National Catholic Welfare Conference, Farmers' Union, and some granges.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations reduced the request of the Smaller War Plants Corporation from $18,000,000 for the next year to $12,006,000. The reason the reduction was made was because the Bureau of the Budget had arbitrarily reduced it from $18,000,000 to $12,006,000. I believe the amount should be $18,000,000. Gen. Robert Wood Johnson is doing an excellent job. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has never had a good chance. Now General Johnson is making it work. It is giving the little man the same opportunity near his home to receive the same service and the same opportunities for contracts that the big man may obtain here in Washington.

When that bill comes before the House, which I understand will be tomorrow, it is my hope that this House will raise the amount from $12,006,000 to $18,000,000, and give General Johnson a chance, and then at the end of the first year if he cannot make a good showing, reduce the amount for the next year, or if he has made a good showing, increase the amount, but let us give the Smaller War Plants Corporation a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and include therein a letter from the former Surgeon General of the United States, General Magee, and the Pennsylvania State Society of Medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular business of the House and any other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next I ask permission to address the House for 15 minutes after any other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), from June 2 to June 16, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co. of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 254. An act for the relief of Edward Gillam; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 346. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 369. An act to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 653. An act for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 674. An act authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Cornell Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 906. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 982. An act to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y., may be paid into the general funds of such city; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1087. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1090. An act for the relief of John Henry Miller, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1157. An act to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 1943, at 11 a. m.)

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 17, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

495. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

496. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $8,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 238); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

497. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

498. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

499. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, required by the provisions of section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934, section 23 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, approved August 26, 1935, section 46 (a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940, and section 216 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 25. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace; without amendment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 554. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 555. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2968. A bill making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943," as a House Document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House and Senate document rooms; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. WARD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2836. A bill to grant increase in compensation to substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. H. R. 2943. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title 11 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 264. Resolution waving all points of order against the bill H. R. 2968 or any provisions contained therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2188. A bill to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 2969. A bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2970. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 2971. A bill relating to the disposition after the termination of the present war

of farm lands acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2972. A bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 2973. A bill to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2974. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2975. A bill to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 2976. A bill to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2977. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of judge of the District Court of Alaska, to the office of United States attorney for Alaska, and to the office of United States marshal for Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 2978. A bill relating to the quarantine regulations with respect to the importation of birds of the parrot family; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 263. Resolution waiving all points of order on H. R. 2968, a bill making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 2979. A bill for the relief of the estate of Percy R. Pyne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2980. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2981. A bill for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2982. A bill for the relief of Jess Willard Dean and his dependents; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 2983. A bill for the relief of Sam Fance; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1583. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting May 26, 1943, by a substantial majority of the draft boards of Bergen County, in which is set forth the unanimous opinion of the members of the local draft boards of Bergen County, N. J., that the Congress of the United States adopt appropriate legislation to outlaw strikes for the duration of the war, and that such legislation make proper provision for its effective enforcement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1584. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., protesting against the recent order of the Office of Defense Transportation reducing transportation facilities in the city of Buffalo and the county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1585. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., at meeting sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, on June 10, 1943, in which they voted unanimously to join in resolution by subjects of Great Britain appealing for new declaration of peace aims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1586. By Mr. CARTER: Petition signed by Ida Stine, of Alameda, Calif., and 118 other parties of Alameda and other cities of Alameda County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1587. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of W. C. McGuire and 65 other signers, of Hoyt, Jackson County, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1588. Also, petition of the Assembly of God Church, with 44 signers, of Williamstown, Kans., and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1589. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Mugler and 75 other citizens of Riley County, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1590. Also, petition of Mrs. D. E. McDonald and 55 other citizens of Jefferson county, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1591. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Martha Hermason and other signers, of Wiscasset, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1592. Also, petition of Walter S. Jones and other signers, of Alna, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1593. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Resolution by the house of representatives of the sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), memorializing and urging the Congress of the United States and the Office of Price Administration that the rationing and restriction of milk and foodstuffs in connection with health-building programs as set forth in this preamble be discontinued and all reasonable effort be made to effectuate the continuance of all such programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1594. By Mr. SCHWABE: Petition of sundry citizens of Rocheport, Mo., urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale, or transportation of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent of alcohol, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, while we pray for pardoning grace, restore to us our simple faith. In this historic Chamber, associated with the labors of mind and heart, grant that we may love the blessed gifts of life and never touch the ark carelessly, nor soil the sacred vessels on the altar of the soul. We praise Thee that Thou art our encompassing tabernacle and a shelter in every stormy blast.

Heavenly Father, in these perilous times human hearts everywhere are feeling the strain of adversity, conflict with temptation, the pangs of loss and bereavement. O bring from the clouds Thy eternal promises and enable us to claim them as our very own. Bring reconciliation to all who are in the hard school of life and make their acceptance as solid as the Rock of Ages. In Christ, the apples of gold are set in the baskets of silver, shining forth in unhindered glory; invest us with great influence for good; dower us with spiritual riches and bless us with merited favor in the sight of all men, and in everything may we give thanks, revealing it with newer and richer tokens of our love and gratitude for our own dear land of the free. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks on the food

situation in Butte, Mont., and to include therein a number of communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith the proceedings of the Memorial Day exercises at Charleston, S. C., at Magnolia Cemetery on May 10, included in which is a very able address by the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 264), as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it appeared to the Rules Committee upon the consideration of this resolution, that the appropriation bill was reported to the House by unanimous action of the committee, and the committee was also unanimous, according to our information, in requesting the granting of a rule waiving points of order. Under those circumstances, I see no good to be served by consuming time in a discussion of the rule.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] such time as he may require.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to confine my remarks to the rule, and I agree with my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] that the rule was adopted unanimously and at least nobody came before the Rules Committee to oppose the waiving of all points of order against items in this large appropriation bill.

I simply want to go on record, although I voted for the rule I did so with some reluctance, to say that I am opposed as a general proposition to this procedure. There is no question that when they come before the Rules Committee and ask for a rule of this kind that it means trespassing upon the rights and prerogatives of the legislative committees of the House and the procedure, therefore, is bad from the beginning to the end. I suppose there is some excuse for asking for a rule of this kind. The Appropriations Committee wants to get through with the appropriation bills and pass them and have them adopted by the 1st of July and unless the Committee on Rules helps out by waiving all points of order, it might well be that these large appropriation bills that have to do with the war effort would not be disposed of by the 1st of July.

It also might well be that we would not be able to adjourn by the 10th of July, which is hoped for, I think, by every Member of the House, unless we on the Rules Committee cooperate to pass and adopt rules that we should not be called upon to do, because every time we do it we take away from certain committees of the House their rights and prerogatives to present legislation which is their responsibility and their duty to do. Therefore, I am making this explanation because I do not propose to make it a habit to go along at the request of the Appropriations Committee to permit them to become a legislative committee and add on legislation to appropriation bills, contrary to the rules of the House. That is exactly what we are doing and I want all Members of the House to know that they have the right to vote the rule up or down and that we are merely presenting the rule. I do not suppose there will be any opposition to it, but I wanted the facts presented to the House so the Members will know exactly what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we all regret, I am sure, that there has been such controversy with respect to the agency which the Congress set up to prevent inflation; I refer to the Office of Price Administration. I believe criticism of the Office of Price Administration is well-founded. We in the Congress should understand that any law depends for its successful operation primarily upon the administration of that law. From the very beginning the administration of O. P. A. has been in a terrible mess; it has caused confusion; it has gone so far as to break down confidence in the Government as a whole, all because bad judgment has been used in the administration of a law which was set up in response to popular demand and which had as its purpose the stabilizing of all prices.

O. P. A. started out under a man who had a reckless disregard of the economic consequences of his acts. Leon Henderson apparently had a most peculiar complex: he loved to be hated by the people, and it seemed to many of us that in all of his actions he gave more thought to his ambition to be hated by the American people than he did to doing the job we set up for him to do, to stabilize prices. I do not know whether it was the fault of Leon Henderson or not, but I do know there has been more intellectual dishonesty in the administration of the price control acts than any other act which this Congress has ever passed. The clear intent of Congress has been defied. Surely the Office of Price Administration having had their counsel sit in on the conferences knew what the intent of Congress was in respect to the stabilization of prices, and when they do the things they have done and are doing in clear defiance of congressional intent we cannot but believe that it is not the result of an accident or an unfortunate interpretation of the law but is the result of a deliberate arrogant attempt to put the Congress in a most unfavorable light in respect to inflation. The administration has all the power it needs to stabilize prices. There is no reason why we should have this controversy today and following this perhaps for weeks over whether subsidies should be paid to stabilize prices; and let me make this statement: I defy anyone in the administration or out of the administration to find any language whatsoever in the price control acts which authorizes subsidizing of consumer prices. The subsidies in the price control acts are all predicated upon the necessity for encouraging the maximum amount of production. It was in keeping with a policy which Congress had adopted a good many years ago when it set up the Commodity Credit Corporation. We stabilized prices to the producer in order to assure the people, in order to assure the armed forces an adequate supply of food and incidentally munitions of war.

The language in the act is very clear, that in order to obtain the maximum of production of all these commodities the O. P. A. was authorized to subsidize them; and let me say in this connection also that in none of the R. F. C. acts is there authority for the R. F. C. or any other agency of the Government to subsidize consumer prices. Likewise the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act in respect to subsidies were predicated upon the desire and the necessity to maintain a maximum production of essential goods to carry on this war. We gave R. F. C. the authority to subsidize for what purpose? For the purpose of guaranteeing a maximum quantity of essential and critical materials, and primarily we had in mind minerals. We on the committee told the Members of the House when the bill was being considered that they wanted this authority primarily to get copper, that copper could be produced out in the far West under a ceiling of 10 cents a pound, but copper could not be produced in the Michigan mines at less than 14 cents a pound, and R. F. C. said it wanted the authority to buy the Michigan copper at 14 cents a pound and sell it under the ceiling price of 10 cents a pound. That was sensible and it opened the copper mines of Michigan, which would have remained closed had we put a price of 10 cents on copper. That was the reason why we authorized O. P. A. to subsidize. It was, however, never the intention of any committee of Congress or any Member of Congress to subsidize the prices to the ultimate consumer.

What do we do when we subsidize prices? In the first place we embark upon an entirely new philosophy in respect to the duty of government. In times of stress, in times of want, when the purchasing power of the Nation is at

a minimum, as it has been in years gone by, there was justification for Congress subsidizing food which was necessary to keep body and soul together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In just a minute, if I may proceed.

In times like these, however, when the national income approaches $140,000,000,000, the highest in the history of the Nation, subsidies are undesirable for several reasons: The first is that it regiments agriculture; the second is that we adopt this new philosophy of feeding our people at Government expense, those who can afford to buy their food; the third is that subsidies are inflationary, and we pass on to the soldiers, the sailors, the marines, the WAVES, the WAAC's, and the SPARS, who are fighting this war, pass on to them the burden of paying for our bread, our butter, and our potatoes. It is a reprehensible thing. I wish the Members of this House who have been so solicitous of the soldiers on their return and the economic conditions of this country when they get back, would take into consideration the fact that every dollar of subsidies we pay to the American people today must come out of the pockets of the soldiers, sailors, and marines in years to come, because we have no way of raising that money except to bond the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

SUBSIDY ON COPPER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan mentioned copper. I agree with the gentleman that subsidizing the production of copper was a good thing. There are many other things that can be subsidized and be in the public interest just exactly like copper. The same soldier who has to pay for the subsidies on other things will, of course, have to pay for the subsidy on copper.

TWO MAJOR PROBLEMS

It is a question that the Congress cannot properly pass upon. We have two major problems in this country. One is winning the war, about which there is no dispute. We are united on that. We are in accord with the work of the Commander in Chief in successfully prosecuting the war. We are so well pleased with his efforts that I am afraid we are talking too much about post-war plans already, looking to the day of victory. But there is another problem that is almost as serious as the loss of a war and that is the problem of inflation, the runaway or ruinous type of inflation. It is almost as necessary that we prevent inflation here on the domestic front as it is in winning the war on the foreign battlefields.

ON BRINK OF INFLATION

As one who has in times gone by been branded by some of the members of the newspaper fraternity as probably the number one inflationist in this country, may I humbly suggest to our distinguished colleagues here upon this occasion that we are nearer runaway inflation today than we have ever been in the history of this country. We are on the verge of it. Most anything can set it off.

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

The time can come very soon when it will take a wheelbarrow load of printing press money to buy a loaf of bread right here in our country. It can happen here. How are we going to stop it? Congress cannot do it. We cannot operate so quickly. We pass a law. It takes months to change it or repeal it and sometimes to find out how bad that is.

CONGRESS MAKES AND EXECUTIVE ENFORCES

The Constitution of the United States is a great document. The Constitution says that Congress shall pass laws. It says that the President of the United States shall faithfully execute the laws. The makers of that great document felt so strongly about that point they required in the Constitution that the Chief Executive take an oath that he will faithfully execute the laws. So when we pass laws, when we make it possible for the Commander in Chief to carry on a war and when we furnish the money to carry on a war, we are doing our duty. Then the responsibility goes to him. He is elected by the people just like we are.

EIGHT MILLION COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS

In reference to the matter of inflation, we cannot pass on all these different commodities. Do you know how many commodities we have in this country? We have eight million different kinds of commodities, including grades, classes, styles, fashions and designs. Possibly some of them should be subsidized. The gentleman from Michigan admitted that in at least one case a subsidy was the right and proper thing to do. Well, possibly there are others, we do not know. We cannot legislate about all of them. If we do and make a mistake we cannot change it quickly.

Those who execute our laws can change them quickly. If they make a mistake, they can change it quickly. So I say to you in all sincerity, that in the winning of this war and in the prevention of inflation, which is our No. 2 problem, we must grant lots of power to the Executive and place the responsibility upon him to win the war and prevent inflation. In doing this No. 2 problem we have got to grant him lots of power. He will make lots of mistakes. Certainly, lots of mistakes will be made. They must be expected. He can change them without delay. It would require months for the Congress to correct similar mistakes.

The O. P. A. has made lots of mistakes. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that in one or more cases I think the law has been flagrantly violated by the O. P. A. Mr. Prentiss Brown, the present Director of O. P. A., admitted that according to his view the law had been violated, but he said, "We are going to correct it, we are going to change it," and I believe that those of you who have been watching the progress, and especially the activity of Mr. Brown in the recent past, will discover, or at least you have discovered, that some progress has been made in the changing of personnel, in the changing of regulations, in the delegation of more power to local, regional, State, and district officers, and especially a better feeling toward business and industry in general. May I suggest to you that only in the last few days Mr. Prentiss Brown ordered that before any regulation can be issued affecting a business industry that the true representatives of that industry should first be consulted. That was in the law that we passed. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was on the committee that passed that bill out. I was on the same committee, but for some reason the O. P. A. has not been very diligent or careful in that respect. However, Prentiss Brown is trying to do something about it, and I am willing to give Mr. Prentiss Brown a trial to see if we cannot get something done.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I wish the gentleman would explain why Prentiss Brown has taken almost 6 months to make up his mind on industry representation in the O. P. A. He went in the first of the year.

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot speak for Mr. Brown, but progress has been made. You cannot overnight throw an organization out which is as important as the O. P. A. Let me say this about the O. P. A. There is not a Member listening to me now or a Member of this House who would vote to repeal the price- and rent-control laws. I do not believe there is a single one who would do that. If there is, I do not believe he is sufficiently informed or he would not vote that way.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman cannot speak for the whole Congress on that proposition.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not speaking for the whole Congress. Is the gentleman opposed to price control? Would the gentleman repeal the law? He would not.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I opposed the law originally, I would repeal it now and go back to the program followed in the First World War. It would be one of the greatest things that could happen to the American people and to our war efforts at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. Your dollars would not be worth 10 cents today had it not been for price and rent control. A $10,000-a-year salary would not be worth a thousand dollars in value, and the people who are getting $30 a month pension would be getting $3 a month in true value.

Mr. RANKIN. I am more interested in the welfare of my country than I am in the purchasing power of my salary.

Mr. PATMAN. But when your salary is affected, the salary of everybody is affected. You take the pensioner who receives $30 a month, when the gentleman's salary of $10,000 is cut to 10 percent, that pensioner's $30 is cut to $3. Those who are living on retirement benefits, those who are living on fixed salaries and wages, they all go up or down in proportion to prices. The only way to hold down prices is to have price control and siphon off the excess purchasing power.

I am inserting herewith excerpts from the testimony of the Honorable Prentiss Brown before the House Committee on Appropriations May 24, 1943. It is on pages 7 and 8, part 2, of the printed hearings on this bill and is as follows:

ACHIEVEMENTS OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROWN. * * * I should like to call to the committee's attention some of the achievements of the Office of Price Administration.

I will use, as I did in a speech that Congressman WOODRUM heard me make, the commodity cash price index as found in the New York Times each day. We are affected so much by foodstuffs that we often forget that price control has very much wider fields than foodstuffs, and yet there are many foodstuffs where the Office of Price Control has maintained prices at substantially equal levels.

Taking, first, metals, according to yesterday's New York Times, the price of No. 2 iron in Philadelphia was $25.98 on May 23 a year ago, and today it is $25.98.

Steel billets in Pittsburgh were $34 a ton a year ago today. They are $34 a ton today.

Steel scrap for heavy melting in Pittsburgh was $20 a ton a year ago. It is $20 a ton today.

Aluminum, 15 cents a pound a year ago. Fifteen cents a pound today.

Copper, 12 cents a pound a year ago today. It is 12 cents a pound today.

Lead, 6½ cents a pound a year ago and 6½ cents a pound today.

Quicksilver, $199 per flask of 76 pounds, and $199 today.

Zinc in East St. Louis, 8¼ cents a pound a year ago, and 8¼ cents a pound today.

Textile cotton, 20.7 a year ago and the price is 22.02 today.

Print cloth, 0.088 cents per yard. Today it is 0.089, almost an infinitesimal rise.

Hides, 15½ cents a pound a year ago, and 15½ cents a pound today.

Gasoline, 10.6 cents, tank-wagon price, a year ago today, and 10.6 today.

Crude oil, 1.11 cents a year ago today, 1.11 cents today.

Taking some of the foodstuffs where the line has been held, and of course the illustrations that I give are those commodities where the outlets are so few in number that the control is easy, coffee, 9¾ cents per pound at wholesale a year ago today, and the same price today.

Sugar, granulated, 5.6 cents a year ago today and 5.6 today. As most of you gentlemen know, I am fairly familiar with the sugar business. The reason we are able to control sugar so well is that there are just a few outlets in the United States.

You often hear about the great success that England has experienced in the control of meat. The reason is that the great bulk of England's meat is imported, and the British have taken over the distribution of meat as a government monopoly and are able, therefore, to exercise that control because the outlets are so few in number.

Mr. TABER. How much additional subsidy has been dumped into any one of these commodities in the course of a year?

Mr. BROWN. Offhand, Mr. TABER, copper is the one commodity that stands out in my mind, and I think that is a case where there can be no real dispute.

Mr. TABER. How about sugar?

Mr. BROWN. I was going to mention that in a moment.

Copper is the one commodity where it seems to me there can be no difference of opinion about the desirability of a subsidy. There it is simply a case where they subsidized the high-cost producers in order to get the copper. Certainly, with Anaconda, Utah-Idaho, and Phelps-Dodge producing copper, perhaps with a good profit at 12 cents, it would be unfortunate to let the price of copper, where they have to get about 16 in Michigan, go up to that general level.

In sugar, the subsidy, of course, is a different thing.

EFFECTS OF PRICE-CONTROL MEASURES

Let me mention some effects of our price-control measures. The cost of World War No. 1 inflation to the Federal Government was $13,500,000,000. Total war expenditures were approximately $32,000,000,000, but $13,500,000,000 of this total was made necessary by price increases. By preventing the pattern of price increases which occurred during the corresponding period of the last war, Office of Price Administration has saved the Government $25,800,000,000 on the cost of the war by the end of 1942. By the end of 1943 these savings to the Government will amount to over $70,000,000,000, if prices are held at current levels. This is 2½ times the total cost of the World War No. 1. Some estimates of specific savings to the Government have been made. By preventing proposed price increases or by controlling previous trends in prices, annual savings to the Government on selected individual items are: Imported commodities, $361,000,000; steel mill products, $320,000,000; armor plate, $100,000,000; lumber and lumber products, $88,000,000; Diesel and gas engines, $50,000,000; new machine tools, $43,000,000; cured, frozen, and canned pork, $37,000,000; second-hand machine tools, $25,000,000.

These estimates are conservative and do not include the proposed subsidies program, which figures I can give later.

COST TO CONSUMERS IN THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST WAR

Consumers would have spent nearly $6,000,000,000 more for the goods and services consumed since September 1939, if prices had followed the prices of the last war. By the end of 1943 savings to consumers will amount to over $20,000,000,000 with prices held at current levels.

The cost of living as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics index has risen only 7.1 percent since statutory authority to control prices was provided in January 1942, and only 4.2 percent since Office of Price Administration issued the General Maximum Price Regulation in May 1942. Although the cost of living has risen approximately 23 percent since the war began in September 1939, three-fifths of this rise occurred before the passage of the Emergency Price Control Act. The effectiveness of price control in stabilizing the cost of living in this war is also evidenced by comparison with the last war.

At the height of World War No. 1 inflation, the cost of living had risen 108 percent. By the forty-second month of that war, which corresponds to February 1943 of this war, the cost of living had increased over 39 percent, as compared with an increase of only 23 percent in this war. From February 1942 to February 1943, the cost of living rose only 7 percent while during the corresponding period of the last war, the cost of living rose 20 percent, or almost three times as much. It is significant to note that the increase in the present war has been largely due to advances in the price of uncontrolled items.

I have heard it said here time and again, "Look at Canada. They have only 8 lawyers in Canada, but they have 2,700 in the entire United States on price control. They have only 100 in England. Why is it they have 2,700 in America?"

The answer is just as plain and simple as can be. The answer is that England and Canada are siphoning off the excess purchasing power in taxes and the people do not have the money to buy; they do not have the money to get into competition and scramble over these goods. Price control is a minor problem with them. But with us, instead of our siphoning off the excess purchasing power, which is absolutely necessary and our No. 2 problem in controlling inflation, and carrying out the President's wishes when he says, "Give me a tax bill that will take off $16,000,000,000 more," Congress went in the other direction and actually remitted $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 in a tax bill this year. How are we going to stop inflation unless we siphon off excess purchasing power?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. May I ask this of my distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee? After all these months of hearings, the Office of Price Administration does not mean to tell this House that, because of the failure to levy greater taxes and siphon off this money, it is necessary to have 2,700 law-school graduates?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not even saying there are 2,700. I am sure that number is greatly exaggerated. I do not even know how many there are or anything about their qualifications, but it would not surprise me if they had a real large number because Congress has not done its duty. We are to blame.

Mr. PLOESER. I do not know how many there are, either.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not trying to stop inflation. The only way to stop inflation is to take off the purchasing power first, with price control next. How are you going to force price control in this country if you do not put on plenty of taxes? You cannot do it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement to the effect that when the President recently suggested to Congress that it enact legislation to increase the revenues of the Treasury by $16,000,000,000 to obviate inflation and help pay the war debt, the Congress turned and proceeded the other way, brings to mind a similar situation in the War of 1812. It will be recalled that when President Madison and Secretary of the Treasury Gallatan recommended to the

Congress the renewal of the charter of the United States Bank for the purpose of increasing revenues to carry on the war Congress refused to follow the recommendation on the theory that it was better qualified to determine the procedure for obtaining revenues than the President or the Secretary of the Treasury. We all know what happened. The people did not respond to the plan suggested by Congress and as a consequence there were no funds for the prosecution of the war and the English Army marched into Washington with little or no opposition, took charge of the Capitol, where we are now assembled, the commanding officer mounted the Speaker's stand and upon receiving a unanimous vote from his followers that the building should be burned they proceeded to do the job, then marched to the White House and did the same thing. Now the point I wanted to make was the gentleman's observation relative to the failure of the Congress to follow the suggestions of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury is not without precedent and a precedent that should be a very valuable lesson to the wise and loyal American citizens. I think it was Poor Richard who said, "Wise men profit by the mistakes of others."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Usually we have competition in these 8,000,000 commodities we speak of, and competition fixes the prices, but now, with 135,000,000 people, and the people with more money than they have ever had in their lives, their pockets are filled with money, and they want to spend that money. They want to buy the things they have always wanted but did not have the money to buy with. They are in competition for the diminishing supply of goods, scarce goods, and necessarily the price will go up unless we have price control. When you fix the price on one thing, it involves other things. Therefore, mistakes will be made, inequalities and injustices will creep in, but the executive branch can correct them as they are discovered. Congress, if it writes them into law, cannot correct them.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman does not include the white-collar class, to which we belong, when he refers to people whose pockets are bulging with money, does he? We are being squeezed to death by this very taxation.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about $140,000,000,000 of purchasing power.

Mr. EATON. Where is it?

Mr. PATMAN. And $45,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power.

Mr. EATON. That is not among the white-collar people.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not talking about individuals.

Mr. EATON. The individuals have to pay it.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about the country; I am talking about the people; I am talking about the national situation. If we do not do something and do it at once, we are going to face ruinous inflation in this country.

SUBSIDIES

I am inserting herewith Mr. Brown's testimony on subsidies, which is in the printed hearings on this bill, pages 10 and 11:

LEGALITY OF AND NECESSITY FOR SUBSIDIES

Mr. BROWN. * * * Gentlemen, I think it is impossible to get back to the September 1942 level without substantial use of subsidies. I think that we can maintain prices substantially as they are without their use. That statement may be subject to some modification because there are bulges in price levels that cannot be controlled by anybody without subsidies, but if we want to follow the Stabilization Act of 1942 and get back to what I think we should do, a strict adherence to the law and reach the September 15, 1942, level, it is going to be necessary to subsidize.

Now, there has been congressional doubt, expressed on the floor about the powers of the Office of Price Administration in that respect. I wish to read subsection (e) of section 2, which is the meat of the price-control bill:

"Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodities in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof: *Provided*"—

And this is the section of the law that is contemplated to be used with respect to coffee—"That in the case of any commodity which have heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, such determinations shall be made by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or of any existing law, such commodity may be bought or sold, or stored or used"—

I think that there is no question about the legal authority for subsidies. The policy is definitely adopted by the Congress in that bill. I do not think that I need take time to discuss the debate in the Senate which many people say was a rejection of the idea of using subsidies. I merely will summarize it by saying if any of you gentlemen will read that debate, you will find it was not a rejection of the ideas contained in the Price Control Act—that was a year ago now, I think, almost to the day, May 24 or 25, 1942—but there was grave doubt expressed as to whether or not the proposed Reconstruction Finance Corporation authority would authorize the use of incentive payments to wage earners, and the fact that that might be done, plus a general opinion that the standards were not sufficiently laid down, was the reason for the rejection of the measure which had already passed the House in the form of a $5,000,000,000 appropriation to Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and which we then passed in the Senate in the same form and eliminated any reference to the subsidy program, but it cannot, on careful reading, I am sure, be taken as a rejection of any of the authority laid down as a matter of policy in the Price Control Act.

Also further testimony on page 33:

Situations in which subsidies are being paid

Item	Federal agency	Objective
War-risk insurance	War Shipping Administration	To maintain Jan. 1, 1942, ocean shipping rates (with some exceptions).
Sugar	Defense Supplies Corporation [1]	To equalize increased transportation costs.
Fats and oils	Commodity Credit Corporation	To reduce processors' prices by 1 cent per pound, one-half of which is absorbed by processors.
Copper, lead, and zinc	Metals Reserve Company	To pay premiums for production over quota: Copper 5 cents per pound; zinc, 2¾ cents per pound; lead, 2¾ cents per pound.
Bituminous coal	Defense Supplies Corporation	To compensate New York and New England users for increased cost of using rail instead of ocean shipping.
Oil seeds	Commodity Credit Corporation	To obtain adequate imports.
Coffee	do	To prevent squeeze of roasters and distributors.
Hennequin and sisal	Defense Supplies Corporation	To encourage importation.
Petroleum	do	To absorb increased transportation costs and additional costs of higher valued products to avoid long hauls.
Metals (copper, lead, tin, mica, etc.).	Metals Reserve Company	To cover increased shipping costs and foreign sellers' prices and encourage importation.
Copper scrap	Copper Recovery Corporation	To cover loss of about 1 cent per pound in recovery of copper.
Nicotine sulphate	Agricultural Marketing Administration.	To cover increased cost of low-grade leaf tobacco.
Alcohol:		
Grain	Commodity Credit Corporation	To cover costs of converting whisky distillers to production of industrial alcohol.
Molasses	Defense Supplies Corporation	To cover increased freight and war risk insurance.
Chilean nitrate	do	To cover increased freight and war risk insurance and increase in Chilean price.
Cheddar cheese	Commodity Credit Corporation	To give milk producers shipping to cheese factories a price comparable to that paid for butter, etc., production.
Puerto Rican food	Department o. Interior Agricultural Marketing Administration.	To compensate for increased shipping and other costs.
Canned goods	Commodity Credit Corporation	To encourage greater production of tomatoes, peas, sweet corn, and snap beans.
Jute	Defense Supplies Corporation	To encourage importation.
Flax	Commodity Credit Corporation	Do.
American hemp	do	To encourage production.
Panama abaca	Defense Supplies Corporation	To encourage importation.
Bleached sulfite wood pulp.	do	To increase production and avoid disruption of price ceilings.
Milk (11 cities)	Commodity Credit Corporation	To avoid a break-down in distribution facilities.

[1] Commodity Credit Corporation since December 1942.

Although this table was compiled by the Office of Price Administration, it is based on data obtained from other sources, primarily the Federal agencies listed in column 2.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who just preceded me, spoke about paper dollars. I want to speak about gold.

On Mr. Donald Nelson's desk at the present moment there is a request for a revision of Order L–208, which was issued in October last year. By this order the gold mines in California and throughout the United States were closed down.

My State is known as the Golden State. Gold not only means much to my State and my community but, as you know, it has contributed greatly to the wealth of this country.

I want to read a letter from the president of the Original Sixteen to One Mine, Inc., whose headquarters are located in San Francisco. The letter is dated San Francisco, October 15, 1942:

The call to arms makes it necessary for California's oldest industry (gold mining) to discontinue operations for the duration in order that those engaged therein may be used in mining metals more essential to the war effort.

It is not for us to challenge the wisdom or necessity for the order of the War Production Board in ordering the suspension of gold-mining operations, and we shall therefore, as our patriotic duty, cheerfully comply with the order immediately.

But with this temporary, and we hope, short-lived suspension of operations, it seems appropriate to call attention to a few matters worthy of consideration.

This company, under its present management, has been continuously operating in Sierra County for many years. During the last 20 years of that period the records show it has paid out more than $3,200,000 in wages at the mine. Not once has its operations ceased due to labor trouble or dissatisfaction among its employees. In good times, as in bad times, it has paid top wages. Its profits have come out of the ground itself, and its employees have always received their just share.

It has paid out over $1,150,000 to the merchants of Sierra and other counties for material and supplies which, in turn, employed labor in their fabrication and production and thus has further contributed to the general welfare of the community and State. In addition, over $1,100,000 has been spent for electric power, insurance, and other expenses, including State and county taxes but not including income taxes. In addition to the foregoing, there have been dividends paid to stockholders who supplied the capital for this enterprise.

All in all, it has been a prosperous enterprise for Sierra County, the surrounding areas, as well as for the company and its stockholders. The fundamental principles for which this war is being fought and will be won are the fundamental principles which made this enterprise possible. When men are dying in battle to secure for us and those to come, those institutions which have made this enterprise possible, what is now asked of us is trivial. The inconvenience to our faithful employees who face movement to new localities and new adjustments is, of course, recognized and to be regretted. No one is to blame. It is part of the price of victory and well worth it, and if it is deemed necessary to discontinue gold mining to help win this war, we are for it 100 percent.

To all those with whom this company has had dealings in the past, and to all those who directly or indirectly have had a part or contributed in any way to this successful enterprise, the company expresses its profound appreciation and gratitude. As solace for those whose lives are now being changed and otherwise affected by the exigencies of war, the company gives assurance that when victory and the peace are won it will resume its operations.

ORIGINAL SIXTEEN TO ONE MINE, INC.,
By H. U. MAXFIELD, *President*.

Mr. Speaker, that is typical of the patriotic spirit in the gold-mining industry of my State. I read now from a dispatch dated Santiago, Chile, June 12, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, June 13, 1943:

As a concession toward achieving this objective the Metals Reserve Company has agreed to continue purchasing for another year, at least, reasonable quantities of gold and manganese which the United States does not need. Representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare and the Metals Reserve Company explained to the Chilean Government that no gold is being mined in the United States, but that as a good-neighbor gesture Washington is willing to continue buying gold from Chilean mines to prevent the serious social and economic problems that would follow the closing down of those mines, especially in the northern Province of Coquimbo and Atacama.

I repeat that last portion—

to prevent the serious social and economic problems that would follow the closing down of those mines, especially in the northern Provinces of Coquimbo and Atacama.

Recently I was in the Mother Lode district of California. The Mother Lode is the great mining section of our State. The mines are closed down. Towns in the Mother Lode that were thriving communities not long ago are now suffering, and I trust that when Mr. Nelson reviews this request for revision of the order he will grant relief.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. If instead of subsidizing the copper mines in Michigan, they had opened up the lead mines in Arizona, Utah, and Montana, this country could have had all of the copper it needs, and we could have used these Japs they are pampering in these concentration camps, to do the mining for the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi wants to carry the impression that Japanese who have been weeding the gardens in California can go into a copper mine and mine copper. There is as much difference between the two employments as there is between a master machinist and a truck driver. I do not want to assume to speak for the miners, but I know that mining is not only an essential industry, but that it takes more brains and experience to mine copper than it surely does to do the work the Japanese have been doing in gardens in California.

Mr. ROLPH. And I want to say to the gentleman that there are no Japanese in the mining industry of California. They have been evacuated from California, and I believe the unanimous opinion of my State is that now that they are out of California, the people of California want them to stay out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Oh, I would like to continue my speech for a minute. I have been trying to get statistics as to the number that would be available for gold mines.

Mr. NORRELL. If the gentleman will permit I might say that we have 20,000 of those Japanese in my State that we want to send back to California as soon as the war is over.

Mr. ANGELL. I am interested in the discussion of the gold situation which applies in my State as it does in the gentleman's State. Is it not true that the program being followed by the administration, just outlined by the gentleman from California, is subsidizing the gold mines of South America, and closing up the gold mines of North America?

Mr. ROLPH. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. And in that connection we are also subsidizing copper in Michigan, and closing up the copper mines in the Western States.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And I would like to say as a Representative of one of the Western States, that we do not resent at all what has happened in Michigan. There is a shortage of copper, and the price paid in Michigan, 14 cents, as against 12 cents in my State, is a reasonable one, and contributes to the war effort.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. In reply to what the gentleman from Mississippi said about using Japanese in copper mines, I will say there is no chance that a Jap would get a job in the Butte mines at all. They could not stand up under conditions there; they could not cut the buck; and we do not want them.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have been gathering figures as to the number of men that would have been available, and I find the figures vary considerably between 6,000 and 12,300. The latter figure is from the Bureau of Mines. Actually the most optimistic estimate is that only 1,200 men ever got into the copper mines, and some of the men tell me that less than 500 men actually went into the copper mines.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows how a house deteriorates unless occupied. But few realize how much more rapidly a mine goes to wrack and ruin. A few weeks ago I went down the shaft of a large California mine. What I saw is tragic. Many drifts are beyond repair. One of the Nation's valuable natural resources is being dissipated. And for what? Some men went to work in the copper mines. Others did go to other war industries. But there is a sufficient number of men right now in the Mother Lode country to work the mines to the extent of keeping them in running order.

Mining people only want permission to operate to the extent of paying expenses and maintaining essential upkeep.

As I recall, the manager of one mine told me the average age of his men at

the time of shut-down was 50 years; a second mine, 48 years.

When the war is over boys returning from the front to the Mother Lode want to get their jobs back. I hope Mr. Nelson will approve a proper revision of Order L–208.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], defending the subsidies of copper production in Michigan and at the same time frowning down on all other subsidies, and especially the ones that would tend to bring the farmer up to a parity with the rest of the country. I repeat, that this copper could have been produced more economically in Arizona, Utah, and Montana.

I want to say in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that I have not changed my position on this price fixing, rationing legislation. I believe you made a mistake when you passed the legislation providing for price fixing, rationing, and regimentation.

I believe we would be far better off if we had followed the same policy we followed in the First World War. Then we would not be leaving the farmers way down at the bottom of the ladder, toiling, plowing, hoeing, and reaping in the hot sun at 15 or 20 cents an hour while you are paying men from $1 to $1.50 or $2 an hour for working in the shade, under electric fans, and then striking for higher wages.

If this condition continues, in my opinion, it is going to drive our farmers to the level of peonage, and for that reason I am not in sympathy with the economic program of some top-flight bureaucrats in the O. P. A., whose records show they have been laying plans for wiping out our economic system, the profit or incentive system which they call the capitalistic system.

There are only two motives that make human beings work. One of them is the fear of punishment and the other is the hope of reward. Fear of punishment is what drives the slave to toil under the lash of a superior or boss. The hope of profit or reward is the incentive that inspires the efforts of freemen. If you destroy the incentive system, what they call the capitalistic system, the profit system, you destroy the initiative of the American people. Instead of freemen toiling under the glorious inspiration of the hope of reward, we all become the slaves of the state, driven to our tasks by the fear of punishment.

I know that certain top-flight bureaucrats in the O. P. A. have been planning for that very thing, to destroy the profit system in America. Now let me say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that all of this is bootstrap bureaucracy. It is ridiculous. As I said the other day, it reminds me of old Lightning telling how he tried to walk and drive a swarm of bees across Arizona. You have men down here in the O. P. A. trying to regulate prices and regiment every human being in America, who know nothing about the problems involved and who are merely trying to regiment our people permanently.

They have it in their minds to carry this program on after the war. They have driven many small farmers out of business, because they have made it impossible for them to gather the fruits and berries and other things they have been producing, and can and market them as they have done in the past. They have made it impossible for many other farmers and small businessmen to operate, and in doing so they have not helped our war efforts in the least.

The gentleman from Texas need not get excited about the specter of inflation. Inflation is already here. Inflation means an increase in the circulating medium, accompanied by rising prices. Prices ordinarily are regulated by the volume of the Nation's currency, multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. In the highest peak of the World War period we had $53.21 per capita in circulation. On the 28th of February 1943, the date of the last report I have, we had $118.92 per capita in circulation, with the highest velocity of circulation we have ever known in all the history of this country.

During the World War, under the normal advance in prices, under a system that worked perfectly and under which we won the war, cotton went to 40 cents a pound; wheat went to $2.50 a bushel. Today cotton is down to 19½ cents, and wheat, I believe, is about $1.35 or $1.40 a bushel. If permitted to rise to their normal values, cotton would be about 40 cents a pound and wheat $2.50 a bushel with prices of other farm products in proportion. You may say what you please, but the backbone of this Republic is agriculture. The basis of our national prosperity, and the one on which depends our balance of trade, is our agricultural superiority. Yet under this system you are not only harassing every farmer with limitless regulations, but you are also holding down his prices to where it is impossible for him to retain the labor on his farm necessary to do the work, or earn sufficient income to enable him to carry on.

I say it is time to go back to the system that worked during the last war, so that our people may ever remain free to labor under the glorious impulse of the hope of reward and not be driven to their tasks as slaves of the State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to speak to the Members of Congress about a very distressing and desperate situation in my own district, and to present facts that affect many other farm districts throughout the country, both Democratic and Republican, particularly in the Eastern and Northeastern States.

I represent one of the largest poultry and dairy districts in the United States, perhaps the largest. Delaware County in my new district, is the largest year-around milk-producing county in America. The bungling and sheer stupidity of the O. P. A. is all but ruining the farmers in my district and driving them to the brink of disaster and economic ruin. The O. P. A. seems to have entered into a compact, an all-out alliance for hogs and pork by setting a price of $1.07 a bushel on corn, which makes it profitable for the western farmers to put the corn into the bellies of the hogs instead of selling it to the farmers in the northeastern section of our country to enable them to keep our poultry industry going and to feed our cattle in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and in other Eastern States. The situation is desperate, and what can a Member of Congress do? The only thing he can do is to protest. That is what I am doing right now—protesting in behalf of my own district, and, I believe, in behalf of a great many other poultry and dairy districts which face the same disastrous situation for lack of corn, which is abundant in the Middle West.

The granaries of the eastern grain dealers and storehouses are almost empty. They believe in another 30 days they will be empty. The poultry hatcheries are closing down in my district. The dairymen in Orange and Delaware Counties are unable to get enough corn today to feed their cattle.

We have been warned before that the American people may face a famine this winter. I have never believed that statement, but I do today. I believe if the O. P. A. does not do something immediately to afford necessary relief to our poultry raisers and milk producers that we will face a famine in this country by next winter. If they do not do something immediately to help the poultry industry by making corn available, 25 percent of the poultrymen in my district, and probably in other eastern districts, will be ruined, and that means a huge loss in food production. If corn and feed are not rushed to the East it also will mean that the dairy herds will be sold and slaughtered, with the net result that while we are trying to feed our soldiers abroad and our people at home, the O. P. A. through their bungling, bad judgment and inefficiency have brought about a situation in which the farmers of the East are being rapidly ruined. What is Congress doing about it and what can Congress do about it? I would like to see the House Committee on Agriculture demand immediate distribution of corn by the Food Administrator in the Eastern States, the responsibility rests on him and on the blundering O. P. A. policies. The situation is getting worse and worse every day until we will soon be confronted with a situation where our own farmers

will be completely ruined because corn prices are frozen under O. P. A. ceilings and we will have undernourishment and famine in our own country by fall.

The tragedy is that there is plenty of corn in the Middle West but the farmers will not sell at $1.07 a bushel, the O. P. A. ceiling, when they can make much more by feeding it to the hogs and getting $1.35 a bushel for the corn in the form of pork.

No wonder the eastern poultry and dairymen are good and mad at being deprived of necessary corn by stupid rulings made by inefficient O. P. A. bureaucrats.

Last year three and a half billion bushels of corn were produced in the United States. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to place in the RECORD, not a letter from an angry farmer, because I have hundreds of such letters as well as telegrams from my district, but from a banker who deals with farmers and who knows all of their problems. It is interesting reading and shows the seriousness of the plight of the farmers in New York State one of the largest agricultural States in the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SULLIVAN COUNTY NATIONAL BANK,
Liberty, N. Y., June 15, 1943.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The farmers of Sullivan County need at once corn in carload lots, shipped into the county to save hundreds of thousands of poultry.

1. By county agent: That 400,000 eggs now in hatcheries would best be abandoned, that the little chicks be gassed, that persons who had made deposits, forfeit the same to hatcheries and abandon that branch of the food supply of the county.

2. By one of the larger hatchery men that he was closing down as of today (15th inst.).

3. By the manager of a cooperative feed store speaking for county feed men's association, that corn was not obtainable and barley (the best substitute) that comes from Canada, could not arrive because the boats on the Great Lakes were carrying iron ore and that he was rationing his customers from a 2 weeks' supply. He also stated his concern had not taken on a new customer since January last.

Sullivan County is unusual in its chicken consuming demands. I have seen $30,000 in sight drafts with B/L attached for poultry in this bank at one time and all paid by the same dealer in 1 week.

I am sure there is corn in quantity. I cannot here go into the economics involved re inflation, but we want corn to save from bankruptcy people who, having faith in the utterances of persons in high places, have borrowed to produce food. Since 1933 we have heard over the radio and read the famous Mac Howe slogan, "There is nothing to fear but fear." I feel that our greatest fear is the loss of our food production effort through inefficiency in the Office of Price Administration's management.

Sincerely,

ISHAM YOUNG.

Mr. FISH. In conclusion, gentlemen, Members on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, I rise here to give you the Macedonian cry, the cry for immediate help, to get relief before it is too late. It does no good for me to get up and talk and protest; that would not be helping the farmer unless we can convince the Food Administrator to cut the red tape and send trainloads of corn to the Eastern States. What the farmer wants is corn; at a time when there are 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn somewhere out in the Western States, we in the East want that corn, and we need it now, and I am giving to you the Macedonian cry for help and I hope that the O. P. A. will listen to it and act at once and that the Food Administrator will make immediately available 50,000,000 bushels of corn and provide a continuous supply both for our demoralized poultrymen and equally bewildered and worried dairymen in my section of New York State. It must be self-evident to the O. P. A. wand wavers and crystal gazers that American farmers cannot continue to feed livestock and poultry with the existing inadequate supply of feed, to say nothing about increasing the production of milk, eggs, and foodstuffs that the Government is requesting for use in helping to win the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, now that we have consumed some little time in a study of the questions of subsidy, inflation, and a few other minor topics, I hope the House will not forget to adopt this rule, which is very important for the consideration of the bill before the House today. There is no opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency bill, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, and further insist upon its disagreement to amendments 60 and 61.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment? I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York stated yesterday he was willing to go along and have the bill go to conference today.

Mr. TABER. I have, as yet, heard no evidence of action on the part of the Senate that would cause me to change my mind.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

APPROPRIATION FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York and myself, and that before the Committee rises the first paragraph of the bill be read.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman means that the Committee would rise without attempting to read the bill for amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That the bill be read for amendment tomorrow when the House meets at 11.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for agencies in the Executive Office of the President, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, wars are not won on the battlefield. The success of armies on the field of battle merely registers victories already won in the test tubes of laboratories, on the assembly lines of production plants, in the mobilization of transportation facilities, in the control of critical and strategic materials, in espionage, in counterespionage, in propaganda and counterpropaganda, and in the maintenance or destruction of national morale. These are the materials with which victories are won, long before ambassadors receive their passports or the guns are wheeled into position, and it is the lack of these irreplacable factors that lose a war before it has begun.

Hitler did not win France at the breach of the Maginot line. He won France, and the war, long before hostilities opened, through intrigue and propaganda that lulled patriotism to sleep, that decreased production, that developed antipathies and antagonisms, that undermined morale and rendered France a mere shell which collapsed at

the shock of the first onslaught upon her frontiers.

These collateral activities become more important as military strategy develops. Other factors being equal, or anything like equal, these activities mean the difference between victory and defeat in any war—and especially in this war. It is for these activities that the pending bill provides.

They cover the widest range both economically and geographically. They enter every field of human endeavor and war, and will continue to win this war—tic to the Antarctic. There is no area of mind or matter untouched by at least one of the war agencies provided for in this bill.

It follows inevitably that called into being suddenly, unexpectedly; having to recruit personnel, formulate procedure, assemble the machinery of organization from the ground up; inexperienced and untutored, with no blue prints to go by, without compass or chart to guide them in these extraordinary activities, there should not have been some mistakes. It was to be expected that there should be serious mistakes. It is a matter of astonishment that there are so few errors, and that those few have been comparatively minor and inconsequential, and susceptible of correction and adjustment.

The committee has given particular attention to the discovery of defects and mismanagement, errors of judgment, and dereliction of duty—and especially failure of objective. The committee has devoted more time to the consideration of this bill than to any other bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations in my memory and experience. In the hearings on this one bill the committee sat continuously for more than 5 weeks. Every effort was made to sift the merits of the plan of operation, the degree of accomplishment and success in carrying out the purpose for which created, administration or maladministration of the functions and activities of each of these agencies, and we present to you today a report that is deeply gratifying. The record made by these agencies is gratifying to the committee; it should be gratifying to the House; I know it will be gratifying to the American people. It is a record of extraordinary success—a success far in excess of what we felt we had reason to anticipate. These agencies have, without exception, done a wonderful job. There may be some minor defects that can be criticized, miscalculations in the early days of their program, when of necessity they had to proceed largely by a process of trial and error, but one consideration is that they are getting results—extraordinary results—in the face of unexampled obstacles and handicaps.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my first statement I shall be glad to yield presently.

Mr. Chairman, America did not enter this war voluntarily; she was driven into this war by attacks which rendered it necessary for her to protect herself in self-defense. It is a war of self-preservation and in each of the activities enumerated in this bill we have entered competitive fields long after our enemies had completely exploited them. Even today in every activity in which these agencies are operating our enemies have a larger personnel engaged, working on a broader program, expending more than the United States is expending in either money or personnel and notwithstanding those handicaps, our American agencies are getting results that are winning this war, and will continue to win this war—results that insure victory.

And yet, notwithstanding this remarkable record of achievement, there appears, on every hand in every newspaper, over every radio, in speeches on the floor of this House and elsewhere criticism, continuing criticism. Now we invite criticism; but I want you to examine the charges made against these agencies, and if you do you will observe that not one of those criticisms goes to the fundamental policies or administration of the agencies, and none of these critics can successfully sustain any charge that they are failing in their purpose; that they are not accomplishing the objectives toward which they are directed; that they are not contributing to an all but incredible extent to the successful prosecution of the war, the success of American arms. Possibly we do not always get just the right man here or there; it may be that every dollar has not been spent exactly as some of us think it should have been; it may be that under the classified service some of these men are being paid a little more than they formerly received. But, granting that such instances might be found, every one of them, that would not be sufficient reason, or justification, for opposing the program of these agencies or opposing the recommendations made by this committee for their support.

Every time one of these infinitesimal points of protest and criticism is advanced let me ask you to look beyond the minutiae complained of to the one inescapable fact that every one of these agencies is rendering great and patriotic service; and, above all other considerations, they are getting results, they are achieving the purpose for which they were created, they are winning the war. It is only necessary to call your attention to the extraordinary record made by the War Production Board. We have there what amounts to a summary of the work of a typical agency, what amounts to a balance sheet of debit and credit, of cost and results secured. You will find there according to the report of Chairman Nelson that our gross national production has expanded from a total of $97,000,000,000 in the calendar year 1940 to a total of $180,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1943. No one, when that board was created, when this agency was established and its work laid out, not even the most optimistic, would have thought that such a result was possible in that space of time. It would have seemed beyond the range of possibility.

In the brief time between 1940 and 1943 the production for war purposes has risen from $2,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000—4,500 percent increase in war production, and nonwar production has dropped from $95,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000. We have reached, as he reports, the peak of American capacity; we have reached in this short time the complete utilization of American resources and American facilities. Let us touch briefly each of these agencies—they are just a little short of a score—there are a total of 17 of these agencies for which we provide an aggregate of $2,939,441,504. The Budget estimate was $3,078,933,922, and the committee recommends a direct appropriation and contractual authority which is $139,492,418 less than the total of the Budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, the Board of Economic Warfare presents one of the most interesting reports of any submitted to the committee. Of course, in the discussion of all these estimates it was inevitable that much of the testimony and much of the discussion should be off the record. We cannot notify the enemy of what action we propose to take or in what direction we propose to proceed, therefore much of the testimony was of such military and naval importance as not to permit its open discussion. That was particularly true of the work of the Board of Economic Warfare. But sufficient has been recorded to justify the recommendations of the committee, and is on the record. I trust the Members of the House will read at least the opening statements on all war agencies. I especially commend to them, if time is short, the statements by Donald M. Nelson, Milo Perkins, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Prentiss M. Brown, Elmer Davis, Admiral Land, and Dillon S. Myer. These are not selected on a basis of personal consideration or importance of activity but merely because most frequently subject to attack. The Board of Economic Warfare is engaged particularly in providing sufficient essential and critical materials required for our production program. We once took great pride in insisting that the United States was self-sufficient, that we could build a wall around the Nation and without contributions from any other country or other section of the globe, live self-sustained and independent; but we have discovered as civilization proceeds and as mechanical development becomes more complex that there are certain elements not produced in the United States which are essential to our war program.

For example, there is more than one item without which we cannot construct certain indispensable military equipment. It may take only a small amount, the amount you could hold in the hollow of your hand, for a great war machine, but, unless that small amount is available, the machine cannot be completed.

Through the efforts of the Board of Economic Warfare, we have kept our factories, plants, and our production lines supplied with these essentials. There has never been a time when any of the major production plants have had to close down on account of the lack of critical material, although we have been at times close to the dead line; and the evidence shows that continuous and uninterrupted production has been due wholly and solely to the work and success of this agency.

Although none of the committee was familiar with its record until it presented the facts which were so convincing, the operations of the agency were so successful and so gratifying that no reduction was made in the amount recommended by the Budget for its support.

I want to insert here a letter from Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Assistant Chief of Staff, United States Army, Military Intelligence Division, concerning the character and value of the service the Board of Economic Warfare is rendering the armed forces:

WAR DEPARTMENT GENERAL STAFF,
MILITARY INTELLIGENCE DIVISION G–2,
Washington, June 12, 1943.

Mr. MILO PERKINS,
Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PERKINS: I should like to invite your attention to the developments of the past year in the use of reports prepared by the Board of Economic Warfare in connection with the activities both of the Joint Intelligence Committee and the Military Information Division of the General Staff. The economic material, furnished by the Board of Economic Warfare, has been most useful in connection with estimates of Axis capabilities, both in Europe and the Far East. The services performed by the Board of Economic Warfare, particularly in regard to the oil situation, have been outstanding and far more accurate than information received from any other source. As Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have come to lean heavily upon your Bureau of Economic Warfare representatives on the committee and on its subcommittees, in determining accurate and analytical questions which are of vital importance to sound decisions bearing upon tactical and strategical plans. The reports and analyses submitted to the Joint Intelligence Committee, through your representatives, have been of outstanding value and a material contribution to the over-all picture which is essential to sound intelligence and the basis for sound planning. In addition your organization has been particularly helpful in various problems arising in the estimation of the Axis positions in regard to strategic materials, foodstuffs, industrial capacity, and potentialities of the German and Japanese war machines.

In the Government service we are too often prone to accept services as a matter of course and without any particular recognition. In view of the heavy burden which my organizations have undoubtedly placed upon yours, I desire to take this opportunity to express to you and, through you, to the personnel of your organization my very keen appreciation and heartfelt thanks for the close cooperation and the outstanding services performed by the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Very sincerely yours,
GEO. V. STRONG,
Major General, A. C. of S., G–2.

The Office of Censorship is rendering a service which compared with the excellent service rendered by a similar agency in the last World War, is complete and satisfactory in every respect. We have had less inquiry, less criticism, and less friction in the operation of censorship than in almost any other agency, in this indispensable agency in modern warfare. Their duties include censorship of international communications such as letters, parcel post, cables, radiograms, and telephone, and a heavy duty in connection with the growing volume of prisoner-of-war mail.

The Office of Price Administration, which has been subject to perhaps more criticism and in many respects justified criticism than any of these agencies, has been continually improving, continually readjusting itself to practical operation and continually bringing about satisfactory readjustments in the administration of its functions until it is today rendering an indispensable service in the conduct of the war. They have practiced a commendable economy, limiting their expenditures during the current year to $120,000,000 although they were authorized to expend $140,000,000. They refrained from expending $20,000,000 which they could have used had they so desired. Credit is due Administrator Prentiss M. Brown for that.

The Budget estimate for the Price Administration for 1944 is $177,335,000. The committee has allowed $165,000,000, which is a decrease of $12,335,000 under the Budget estimate. The O. P. A. requested an increase of 8,340 additional employees for 1944, including in that total an additional 5,189 paid clerks for local boards. The committee allowed the additional clerks for local boards and denied the remaining new personnel of 3,151. In addition, we eliminated 412 of the present personnel in the Washington force. Eight new ration programs are planned for the coming year. No additional personnel is provided for these programs except for local boards. It will be necessary for the O. P. A. to find this personnel within the present authorized strength in Washington, the regional offices, the District and State offices. We believe they can do it by continuing the reorganizations which the present Administrator has undertaken.

The difference between the 1943 appropriation, $120,000,000, and the amount in the bill, $165,000,000, is an increase of $45,000,000. It should be recalled that O. P. A. during a large part of the fiscal year 1943 has been in process of assembling its organization. It required a very much smaller amount in fiscal 1943 to pay the organization on a partial-year basis than it will in 1944 to pay a smaller organization, except local boards, on a full year's employment. In order that Members may see clearly at a glance how this difference between 1943 and 1944 is accounted for, I am inserting the following table which shows the approximate distribution of the increase of $45,000,000:

Approximate distribution of spread of $45,000,000 between appropriation of $120,000,000 in 1943 and recommended amount of $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1944

[(+) Increase (−) Decrease]

Salaries and all other expenses of local boards (estimated at $37,000,000 for 1943 and $59,500,000 for 1944)—increase due to carrying 1943 local board paid clerks for a full year in 1944 as against a partial year in 1943 and to 5,189 additional local board clerks in 1944 (increase)	+$22,500,000
Payments to banks for ration banking plan (estimated expenditure in 1943, $4,000,000, amount in bill for 1944, $17,500,000)—increase due to fact that this plan was in operation for only part of 1943 and will be in full year in 1944 and affect more commodities (increase)	+13,500,000
Amount required in fiscal year 1944 to carry personnel in Washington, 9 regional offices, 108 district offices, and 279 area rent offices, provided for 1943, less 412 eliminated by committee in Washington, on a full annual basis in 1944 as against a partial year in 1943 (increase)	+13,250,000
Printing of ration books, ration, forms, etc., account old programs and contemplated new programs (8) in 1944 (increase)	+1,000,000
Travel—due to personnel for 1943 being in a travel status in 1944 for a longer period of year than in 1943 (increase)	+750,000
Temporary employees for peak periods (reduction)	−1,250,000
Elimination of 412 personnel from Washington office, authorized for fiscal 1943 (decrease)	−1,250,000
Equipment (decrease)	−1,500,000
All other miscellaneous objects of expenditure (net reduction)	−2,000,000
Net increase	+45,000,000

The Office of Strategic Services, under General Donovan, made its report entirely off the record. It was of such a confidential nature that it was not possible to transcribe the testimony. It may be said that this Office has two purposes. The first is to collect and analyze such strategic information as may be required by the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the second is to plan and operate such special services as may be directed by the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has for its principal duty the planning, developing, and execution of the military program for psychological warfare.

One of the heaviest proportionate cuts was made in the Office of Civilian Defense, not because of an unsatisfactory showing as to administration but because the committee felt that certain of its activities are no longer necessary to the extent heretofore required and others might be safely curtailed.

The Office of Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs, under Nelson Rockefeller, is rendering a particularly valuable service in the cementing and strengthening of our relations with our sister republics in Central and South America. There in particular we came face to face with long-established and heavily entrenched competition by the Axis Powers. They have spent money there to an extent which we cannot duplicate, and they have developed long-range plans of indoctrination through schools, radios, newspapers, and transportation systems which we must combat on short notice and with restricted budgets.

The Office of Defense Transportation is one of the most important of these agencies. Regardless of how much we produce or how rapidly we turn it out, it is of no advantage so far as the war is concerned unless we get it to the front. Although we reduced the amount for this agency in the coming year by $250,000 the Office of Defense Transportation made a very satisfactory report. I wish to note especially one feature of their work that should not be overlooked, that compared with the experience of the First World War, when the Government took over the railroads and operated them, the transport facilities in this war have handled a vastly larger volume of traffic and most expeditiously, considering heavy handicaps in the way of equipment, repair parts, and manpower problems. It has made under Mr. Eastman a very satisfactory record.

The Office of Economic Stabilization has just been established. Director Vinson appeared before the committee a few days after his appointment and before he had had opportunity to organize fully his office and his program. We recommended for him the amount as provided by the Budget estimate, $100,000.

The National War Labor Board under Mr. Davis has made a particularly satisfactory record. They are adjusting labor differences and passing on wage increases and they are securing a cooperation upon the part of labor and industry that is one of the explanations of the remarkable record in production reported by Chairman Nelson of the War Production Board.

The functions of the Board now are, first, settlement of labor disputes upon compliance with the no-strike, no-lockout agreement; and, second, to carry out the national wage-stabilization policy. In the latter function the classes of cases are now confined to those (a) within the Little Steel formula, (b) involving correction of inequalities for key occupations in different labor market areas—bracket cases—and (c) to correct substandards of living.

One of the especially interesting activities, and one on which we were able to print little of the testimony, is the Office of Scientific Research and Development. We are fortunate to have engaged there some of the most eminent scientists in America. We have secured from our greatest educational and industrial institutions selected men of long records of ability, efficiency, and achievement. They are contributing to a remarkable degree through technical and scientific research to our weapons of war.

The Office of War Information, which has been subject to continuous criticism, some of it in the early days of the establishment and its early activities relating to deficiencies which have now been remedied and errors in administration which have now been adjusted, is rendering a service both at home and abroad. It is particularly effective in enemy countries, in enemy-occupied countries, in neutral countries, and in allied countries, and is contributing a service which is indispensable to the successful conduct of the war. In reviewing these criticisms of past performances and possible delinquencies which have now been ironed out, it is only necessary to look back of and beyond these minor deficiencies to the fact that they are in America and especially in Europe, both in occupied countries and in enemy countries, meeting the enemy on their own ground of propaganda and misinformation and beating them at their own game by giving the world the truth.

The Budget estimate for the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1944 is $47,342,000, in which sum is included a special fund of $10,000,000 contingent upon need in connection with military operations. The funds available for the current fiscal year total $35,847,292 and do not include any such special fund. The amount asked for 1944, therefore, exclusive of the special fund, is $37,342,000, or an increase over the figure for 1943 of $1,494,708.

The committee recommends a total of $34,472,504, which is an apparent decrease of $1,374,788 under 1943 funds and $12,869,496 under the Budget estimates. The amount allowed for 1944, however, includes $5,000,000 for a special fund for use contingent upon military operations and eliminating this from the $34,472,504, the figure becomes $29,472,504, which is $6,374,788 less than the amount for 1943.

The decrease in the Budget estimate of $12,869,496 consists of a cut of $5,000,000 in the $10,000,000 request for a fund for use contingent upon actual or projected military operations, a decrease of $4,503,590 in the amount for the Overseas Operations Branch, and a reduction of $3,365,906 in the request for the Domestic Operations Branch.

The amount requested for the Overseas Operations Branch is $27,003,590, compared with an allocation for 1943 of $25,785,821. The committee has allowed $22,500,000, which is a decrease of $4,503,590 in the Budget allocation. The sum sought for 1944 contains provision for an increase of 763 in personnel whose cost, including salaries and other attendant expenses, amounts to $2,290,000. The allowance eliminates the increase and makes a further reduction of $2,213,590. This sum must be met by curtailments in other directions.

The amount requested for the Domestic Operations Branch is $8,865,906, compared with an allocation of $8,561,199 for the current year. The committee has provided $5,500,000, which is a decrease of $3,365,906 in the amount of the Budget estimate, or approximately 37 percent. The reduction will require a drastic rearrangement of the domestic program, particularly in the fields of publications, posters, motion pictures, special services, and field operations.

We have a satisfactory report from the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, General Johnson; and I want to read just one or two sentences from it. He said:

> We are confident that we now know how to solve the problem. We are confident that it is capable of rapid solution. We are confident that given the right men in the right places we can deliver to Congress the job that we are hired to do. And we believe it is a matter of relative short time, given the right tools, to put the vast majority of the small plants of America to work in the production of weapons or essential civilian needs.

That is their job, that is their objective. He concludes by saying:

> We can keep on top of the job.

All of the evidence adduced before the committee corroborated his conclusion in that respect.

The committee recommends the amount of the Budget estimate which is $12,006,000, payable from the funds of the Corporation. This is an increase of $4,506,000 in the amount made available to the War Production Board for administration of the act in 1943. The Budget calls for increases in personnel in Washington and in the field in numbers approximating 400 more than the like numbers engaged under the organization of the War Production Board on this work in 1943. In the discussions during the hearings it developed that the amount of the Budget estimate is below what the Chairman of the Board believes is necessary to accomplish the task. The committee is not inclined to increase the Budget figure but if results are obtained and can be conclusively demonstrated the committee will later in the year consider supplementing the figure.

The War Relocation Authority has been much discussed in the newspapers in the last 2 or 3 weeks. It has had a tremendous task. There are in the United States 132,000 Japanese or persons of Japanese descent. Many of them are American citizens, born in the United States and under the Constitution entitled to every right of an American citizen. It is an unprecedented and an extraordinary departure abritrarily to take an American citizen and put him in a detention camp and treat him as an enemy alien, but the exigencies of the situation required it and the War Department proceeded early in this war to move all Japanese citizens and aliens from the west coast defense command area and relocate them in areas outside the command area. Originally 14 relocation centers were planned but finally resolved into 10 main centers and one isolation center to which the troublemakers from the 10 main centers are brought.

Recently—and this is the action which has given rise to newspaper discussion—realizing the injustice done many of these people and appreciating the importance of utilizing all available manpower, we have been, from time to time, releasing individuals and sending them out into communities where they are needed and are welcome.

The Director advised the committee that no Japanese is allowed to be relocated if there is anything in his record to indicate that it would be undesirable for him to live outside a relocation center and that the W. R. A. has extensive information concerning each evacuee.

The leave regulations in force provide that persons in the relocation centers, citizen or alien, can make application for leave, first, provided they had a place to go and could take care of themselves outside of the evacuated area; second, provided the War Relocation Authority was reasonably assured that the community they were moving into would accept them; third, provided the War Relocation Authority was reasonably assured they were not dangerous from the standpoint of the internal security of the country; and fourth, provided they would keep the War Relocation Authority informed about their movements. On the last point all aliens are required under the law to report to the United States attorney, but citizens do not have to do so.

The W. R. A. reports that it has received no complaint of disloyalty, sabotage, or espionage, on the part of any man released.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is there any program in contemplation of sending any of these Japanese out to California?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Up to this time the plan has been to release them only to communities in which they are desired. It rests entirely upon the considerations I have placed in the RECORD. Of course, California, and the Pacific Coast States, would be in a different category from other States of the Union. It is my understanding that they are released in the West Coast Defense Command area and other Army coastal defense command areas, only upon the advice and consent of the Army in each particular individual case.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman will agree that the psychological warfare conducted by the Office of War Information is highly important. The gentleman recognized that in his statement, I think.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to that I may say that General Marshall told the committee in the beginning of the war that the thing most essential to the success of an army or a nation in war is morale. When you undermine morale you destroy the greatest factor essential to a successful campaign.

Mr. CELLER. And that was exemplified notably in the North African campaign, was it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was a remarkable demonstration of the efficacy of morale—and contrariwise to the devastating effect of the destruction of morale.

Mr. CELLER. Why is it then that the committee recommended a total of $34,472,000, an apparent decrease of $1,374,000 under the 1943 funds, and a decrease of $12,869,000 under the Budget estimates for that splendid work being done by the Office of War Information? The Office of War Information asked for $10,000,000 for unforeseen contingencies that might arise in connection with the contemplated invasion of Europe, for example.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The European activities of the agency are not greatly affected by these retrenchments. The main retrenchment is the domestic program, in the field of domestic publications, posters, motion pictures, special services, field operations. It was felt by the committee after the examination of some of these publications, that they were not essential, and that they could be dispensed with without in any way prejudicing the work of the agency.

Mr. CELLER. The overseas branch?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The overseas branch.

Mr. CELLER. Was there not a reduction in the overseas branch? I believe there was. The committee has given them $5,000,000 for contingencies, and it has deducted $5,000,000 for contingencies for their over-all operations, which include overseas operations. So there has been a substantial reduction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There was a decrease in the Budget estimate of the overseas branch. We cut out new personnel costing $2,290,000 and made a cut in present funds of $2,213,590.

Mr. CELLER. Why was that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was thought that the amount could be deducted from their budget without materially affecting their work.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman assure me that that will be the case? I have great confidence in the gentleman's judgment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is, of course, a matter of opinion. Naturally, each member of the committee forms his own opinion after hearing all the evidence pro and con. We must then strike a balance and reach a conclusion to which all members of the committee may subscribe. In this case it was thought possible to make a retrenchment, without materially affecting the service.

Mr. CELLER. I am inclined to most respectfully differ with the gentleman in that regard. I believe it was grievously wrong to reduce the proposed expenditures for the overseas branch, at least.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not suppose there is an item in the bill, at least there are very few, of major importance, on which there was not a difference of opinion in the committee. Unfortunately the human mind is of such range and trend that no two of us look at a proposition exactly alike. This committee action is a unanimous report upon the part of the committee. Both the majority and the minority concurred on every item in this bill, with the single exception possibly of the Board of Economic Warfare and with that exception both the majority and the minority members concurred and agreed to support the amount recommended in the bill on the floor. In view of the divergence of opinion to which the gentleman has referred, and of which he himself is a notable example, it was necessary, in order to reach a figure on which all of us could agree to readjust our individual views. It devolved upon some of us to raise our figures, and on some to lower our figures, in order to strike a level on which we could reach concurrence.

Mr. CELLER. I know you have a difficult task before you always, but may I assume that if that contingent fund of $5,000,000 will prove inadequate, the matter can be reviewed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was one consideration.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I would like to ask the gentleman again with reference to the Japanese situation. In my State of Oregon there were a great many Japanese. My people are very much interested as to what is being done with those Japanese that are being released. How many have been released and what does this program contemplate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have provided in the hearings a complete tabulation. If the gentleman will look at pages 26 and 27 he will note the appropriation for 1943 was based upon an evacuee population of 132,000, but at no time during the current year has it exceeded 110,000. The 110,000 has been the peak of the evacuees who were in the centers. While the number has gone up to 110,000 as a maximum, it is down now to 98,623. At the end of May, 12,799 were on leave of absence, engaged in outside employment. This is the number to which I referred as being released.

Mr. ANGELL. What does the program contemplate with reference to the release of the others?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is contemplated that if they demonstrate their loyalty and the fact that they are released will in no way interfere with the military program, and they can find work and are self-sustaining, that the program will continue. The committee is very emphatic that the utmost care be exercised as to each person released and that there should be no doubt in any case.

Mr. ANGELL. I understand from what the gentleman has said that it is not contemplated that they will be returned to any State that does not desire them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they will not be returned to any community which does not desire them and which objects to receiving them. I will say, however, that we also made allowance for the fact that it might be necessary to return them to the relocation centers, and on that account, instead of reducing the estimate here, as we could have reduced it if the program is successful and is continued, we provided the Budget estimate, so that if it were necessary to maintain the present number in the centers we would have the funds with which to do it.

Mr. ANGELL. Are those who are being released going into agricultural districts?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Into the cities and the country. About half of them are going into agriculture, because they have been drawn from agricultural occupations.

Mr. ANGELL. But they are not being placed anywhere where they are not desired?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are not being placed where not desired. It is about 50–50 as between agricultural workers and others. I might say that I had occasion to note from an objective point of view, the operation of testing the sentiment of a community. A prospective employer in Missouri asked for a man and his wife. Thereupon the authorities submitted questionnaires, and when it developed that the replies to the questionnaires were adverse, they canceled the proposed release.

Mr. ANGELL. Does the record show that there have been three attacks by Japanese in the State of Oregon already, two incendiary attacks, where attempts were made to set fire to our forests?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reports were made and estimates submitted, both to this subcommittee and the subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, to provide facilities to combat forest fires, which might have incendiary origin. There seemed to be some question as to the authenticity of enemy origin, but, as I recall it, one committee made provision for fire protection so that in such event—that is, if such sabotage should develop, we would be in a position to combat it.

Mr. ANGELL. That is one reason why the people are very much concerned over the Japanese not being permitted to return to the State, by reason of the possibility that they might engage with outside Japanese, if attack is contemplated, resulting in the destruction of our forests.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Their wishes will be observed and every precaution will be taken to keep in touch with these men after they leave. Upon evidence of any overt act they will be promptly returned to the centers.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Did the testimony adduced before your committee show where Japanese had hoisted their flag over some of the encampments in Arizona?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is to be expected that where large numbers of men and women are suddenly removed from their homes, separated from their property, summarily transported to a detention camp, you would find among 100,000 individuals some recalcitrants. That has been the case in a few instances. There have been instances of insubordination and of troublemakers organizing disturbances, but every such case has been promptly disposed of, and in order to meet that situation they have established an isolation center. There are 10 of the main centers, and whenever one of the evacuees becomes unruly or gives any evidence of insubordination he is quietly removed to this isolation center where he is subject to control.

Mr. WELCH. Does the gentleman think that Japanese who continue their loyalty to the Japanese Government to the extent of hoisting their flag over a concentration camp in this country should be permitted to run at large and return to the Pacific coast?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. We are not advised of any instances in which that has happened. I hope it has not. I do not think that we have any occasion to expect all Japanese to prove loyal to the United States any more than we would expect any 100,000 Americans who might be suddenly apprehended in Japan and thrust into a concentration camp over there to be loyal to the Japanese, even though they had been there for many years.

We must face that situation. It is inevitable, but we are providing in every way possible to handle it, and where such incident occurs as the gentleman relates, the perpetrators are properly apprehended and placed under control.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I just want the record to show that while we in Arkansas were not advised by the War Department—that is, our consent was not asked that we receive the Japanese—I do understand that definite assurance has been given to the State by the War Department that after the emergency is over—during the emergency the arrangement which the gentleman has outlined of course, will prevail—but after the emergency is over, the War Department has assured us and we are expecting the War Department to carry out its contracts, that the Japanese will be taken out of the State and sent back to the homes from which they have come.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is my understanding that while there may have been no publicity of the fact, that before the camp was located in Arkansas steps were taken to ascertain whether or not it would be agreeable to the State and local authorities.

The following is a letter from the Director of the War Relocation Authority with respect to the leave regulations concerning the relocation of Japanese outside the relocation centers and a statement of the policy concerning them:

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY,
Washington, June 15, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Because misunderstanding may arise from misinformation recently appearing in the press regarding the relocation policies of this Authority and how they were developed, I am submitting to you a brief summary of their historical development.

The leave policy now in effect developed from leave policies applied to assembly centers under the jurisdiction of the War Department and to early relocation centers under the jurisdiction of this agency.

About the middle of May 1942 a demand from farmers for labor to assist in farm work throughout the irrigated area of the West resulted in a plan worked out between the War Relocation Authority and the Western Defense Command of the United States Army. Under this plan, labor was recruited from assembly centers under the jurisdiction of the War Department and from relocation centers under the jurisdiction of the War Relocation Authority, for work on farms in specified areas to the east of the evacuated military zones.

The first group of seasonal workers left the centers sometime during the latter part of May 1942—about 1,700 were recruited during the late spring and early summer. By the time harvest season arrived, approximately 9,800 evacuees from assembly centers and war relocation centers had been recruited and were harvesting sugar beets and other crops in the Western States outside of the evacuated area.

At about the same time this policy of recruiting group labor for farm work was established, a policy was developed by the War Relocation Authority and approved by the War Department permitting college students with good records to continue their college work, if they desired to do so, in institutions located outside the evacuated area.

On July 20, 1942, the first general leave procedure was issued by the War Relocation Authority. At that time leave was limited to citizens of the United States who were interested in locating outside the Western Defense Command. Leave was given only after thorough investigation by the War Relocation Authority. In developing this program we worked out with the War Department a gentlemen's agreement to the effect that leave would not be granted to anyone wishing to settle in the Eastern Defense Command and certain coastal areas without prior approval of each individual person by the War Department. This phase of the policy is still in effect; those who are given leave to resettle directly within the Eastern Defense Command are approved by a joint board consisting of representatives of the Military Intelligence, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Provost Marshal's office of the War Department, and the War Relocation Authority.

Leave regulations have always provided that evacuees may not return to the evacuated area without approval of the War Department. They have also always provided that those applying for leave to relocate within the Eastern Defense Command are cleared before leave is granted by the War Department. Only recently this function has been assumed by the Japanese-American Joint Board mentioned in the previous paragraph. This Board was established in January of this year.

On October 1, 1942, revised leave regulations and procedures were published in the

Federal Register after the policy was approved by the War Department from the standpoint of military safety to the country and by other interested agencies of the Government.

Before putting into effect the leave regulations established October 1, 1942, the policy was thoroughly discussed with Attorney General Biddle and with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The general policy was approved in writing as of September 25, 1942, in a letter signed by Attorney General Biddle, copy of which is attached.

Shortly after the publication of the general regulations in the Federal Register, the policy was discussed with the War Manpower Commission. In a letter to me dated November 27, 1942, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission endorsed the policy and offered continued cooperation in the recruitment and placement program. A copy of the letter signed by the Chairman is attached. In a letter dated May 28, 1943, Mr. Chester Davis, Administrator of the War Food Administration, urged the use of persons residing in relocation centers who are released by the War Relocation Authority to work on farms. A copy of this letter is attached.

There has been much misunderstanding concerning the services rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the relocation program. It is not and has never been the policy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to recommend anyone for leave. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has cooperated with the War Relocation Authority in providing available information from their files regarding individuals when requested. It has been the responsibility of the War Relocation Authority to secure this information and any other that might be available for its use in determining who should or should not be released from the centers.

I am attaching a copy of a statement recently issued setting forth the general relocation policy and our procedures in making such investigations.

A review of Executive Order 9102, issued March 18, 1942, will reveal that the leave policies of the War Relocation Authority are thoroughly in accord with the purposes this agency was established to accomplish.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. MYER,
Director.

POLICIES GOVERNING INDEFINITE LEAVE

In accordance with the directives in the Presidential Executive order which created the agency, the War Relocation Authority has developed procedures which are aimed at bringing about the relocation into normal communities of the largest possible number of the evacuated people consistent with the national security.

Any resident of a relocation center may apply for permission to leave the center. Permission is granted only if the following conditions are met:

a. There is nothing in the record of the person to indicate that he would be dangerous to society or to the national security.

b. He has a place to go and means of supporting himself.

c. There is evidence that his presence in the community to which he proposes to go would not cause a disturbance.

d. The evacuee agrees to keep the War Relocation Authority informed of his address at all times.

The War Relocation Authority has basic records on every evacuee 17 years of age and over who is eligible for consideration for leave. These records provide information on the evacuee's education, affiliations, foreign travel, employment, religion, and other pertinent facts, in addition to his own statement on the matter of allegiance to the United States. These records are carefully checked when the evacuee applies for a permit to leave. If there is any question about the desirability of granting the permit, the records, if any, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other intelligence agencies are secured before a determination is made.

Leave permits are not being issued to persons who have applied for repatriation or expatriation to Japan, those who have not pledged unqualified loyalty to the United States, or any others whose records indicate reason to question the advisability of their living outside the centers in normal communities during the war. Provision is made when requested for review of cases in which leave permits are denied. This is regarded as being necessary in fairness to those who, because of mistakes, misinformation, misunderstanding, or because of pressure from family or associates, may have given negative or qualified answers on questions of loyalty.

The leave procedures of the War Relocation Authority were checked with the Department of Justice and with the War Department before they were instituted.

It is the policy of the agency to consider each individual case carefully, and if there is reason to believe an evacuee would endanger national safety if released, no leave permit is granted.

The leave regulations of the War Relocation Authority apply only to persons of Japanese ancestry who were living in California, a coastal area in Oregon and Washington, and the southern third of Arizona, on a certain date in the spring of 1942. Only these persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated and subsequently provided emergency places of residence in relocation centers. Some 20,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were living in other parts of the United States in the spring of 1942 and have never been in relocation centers. Japanese aliens, like other aliens of enemy nationality, considered to be of potential danger to internal security, are apprehended by the Department of Justice and confined in internment camps which are not under the jurisdiction of the War Relocation Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri, has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

We have here before us an appropriation bill calling for $2,921,000,000. All of it is supposed to be for the war effort. Some of it is working directly against the war effort. Some of it is a refuge for the employment of all sorts of New Deal political derelicts at high salaries, and, on the other hand, once in a while you strike an agency that is trying, in spite of the handicaps of the administration, to do a decent job.

The Board of Economic Warfare is the first agency involved. The Domestic Branch calls for an increase from $7,500,000 this year, to $11,815,000 next year. In spite of the fact that lease-lend will represent 70 percent of our exports next year as against 30 percent this year, the B. E. W. Export Division in the United States comes before us with a proposal to increase their personnel by 100 and the amount of money that they shall spend by upward of a million dollars. They propose 1,092 people with an average salary of $2,500—a perfectly ridiculous set-up.

Then we have an Imports Division to regulate the imports that may come into this country, and on that they have 738 employees at an average salary of $3,500. They have a total of 850 economic analysts on their pay roll and of 66 lawyers. What there is for these people to do is beyond understanding, but the worst thing about it is the attitude that the Board takes.

Mr. Richard D. Quinan, Chief of the Coffee Section of the Procurement Branch of this Board, on February 13, 1943, stated:

> The Board of Economic Warfare feels very strongly that neither its hands nor those of Commodity Credit Corporation should be tied in any way whatsoever in the disposition of any commodities which may be accumulated in store in foreign countries. I am thinking particularly of the disposition of such accumulated stocks of commodities after hostilities cease. We may wish to sell, barter, lend-lease, or give away all or part of such stocks and disposition will probably reach into many parts of the world.

This clearly indicates that the attitude of this outfit is to regiment all of our economy, not only now but after the war, and that they are making cockeyed plans for that purpose, and that that is the reason for the enormous number of employees of that type.

There is also covered up in this unit several of the employees of O. W. I. who were dumped out a couple of months ago because they were so communistic that they could not get along with that outfit and so this organization is a haven of refuge for the derelicts.

I am advised that people who wish to know things about the trade situation are accustomed to contact the British office in London, rather than this outfit, because of the failure of this organization to function efficiently, and to have dependable information. There has been a turmoil between the B. E. W. and the R. F. C. most of the time. In the New York Times for the 16th of January this year, there is an article indicating that from 25 to 40 percent of the export licenses that they have already issued are expected to lapse because of failure to get the goods to export.

They have another set-up on a foreign cost-of-living study. Why should this be in the Import Section, or anywhere else in this Bureau? What do they have to do with this? Anything of that kind should properly come from the State Department.

Another outlandish set-up is that 16 percent of this estimate goes in one way or another for administration and detail costs such as looking after pay roll and looking after their expenditures. This is a far higher percentage than we run into in regular departmental work, and indicates a poor management of their operations. It is perfectly apparent that this organization would be much healthier if its appropriations were properly trimmed.

And I might say that the committee made no trim on that item.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was any testimony given the committee as to the way the employees of the B. E. W. spend their money abroad? I have been told by at least two responsible career men in the State Department that the Bureau of Economic Warface operating in foreign lands, to use his expression, was playing the duce with the State Department's employees; that they are spending money like drunken sailors in many parts of the world, while the State Department employees, as the gentleman well knows, is pretty carefully restricted in its expense allowance.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is correct, and the worst part of the picture is not presented. I will get to that in detail when I get to the motion that I hope to be able to make tomorrow to put the B. E. W. house in order. One of the worst items involved is the travel item. The estimate for 1944 involves, for the foreign branch, $2,789,217, as against an expenditure down to the 30th of April of $482,936, and a probable expenditure of not over $125,000 since that date, indicating an increase of five times in the amount of traveling expense.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Which suggests that it might be cheaper to buy a battleship for their cruises.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps it might, but perhaps it would be better if some of these men went to work in a defense factory for the actual production of something for the war effort instead of going around spending money. Some of those factors have made rather a disagreeable impression upon me and I have felt that we ought to make it a war agency and let them make sacrifices like the rest of the folks are making.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Did the committee get any definition of duties between the Board of Economic Warfare, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Foreign Agriculture Section of the Department of Agriculture, the United States Tariff Commission, the Office of War Information, the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Strategic Services, and the Intelligence section of the Army and the Intelligence section of the Navy? A demarcation, a definition of the duties between them with respect to the gathering of information on economic situations in other countries?

Mr. TABER. The situation is utterly confused. There is this to be said: The Board of Economic Warfare, the State Department, and the O. W. I. all have representatives in London where they go to the British communications organization and receive the releases they put out to the United Nations as to the broadcasts that have come out of the Axis Powers on the European continent; in other words, the O. W. I. and the B. E. W. and the rest of them are not content to let one unit do it; they have to have three. The whole thing has operated in a way to gum everything up; there is just no coordination; there is no sifting out of duplicating activities in any respect anywhere.

Mr. CASE. When the Tariff Commission was before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations one of the large points they attempted to make in justification of their requests was the economic information they were called upon to furnish to the war effort; then we found the same thing was being advocated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and all these other agencies. It seems to me that somewhere somebody should say that it is somebody's job and we should not make appropriations on the same picture for eight or nine different agencies.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. In a moment.

Perhaps the gentleman will remember that the War Department came before us and told us they were trying to locate targets in foreign countries by getting in touch with engineers and others who had been employed in those places; and they told us that in the strictest confidence, admonished us that we should not let it out; then there appeared in the newspapers on the 5th of April this year an article by Jack Beall, a feature writer, on information given to him by the B. E. W. telling all about the same thing that the Appropriations Committee was given in confidence.

The management of our governmental press releases is very evidently on a disjointed basis and on a basis that is not contributing to the war effort, and these people ought to be put in their place.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Right along the line of the matter discussed by the gentleman from South Dakota: When we considered the bill making appropriations for the Departments—State, Justice, and Commerce—we were assured that all the functions of B. E. W., O. W. I., and others were synchronized with the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. We were assured that nothing was done without close coordination with the ambassador or minister in the country in which the operation was taking place. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CASE. I think it rather adds to the perplexity I have, unless somebody can assure me that they do make a differentiation between the work of the different agencies.

Mr. STEFAN. We were assured that there was absolutely no duplication whatsoever.

Mr. CASE. No agency can say there is no duplication, for when it comes to sifting things down we find that in many instances several agencies are doing the same thing.

Mr. TABER. The duplication is so thick that it is absolutely impenetrable.

The Office of Price Administration has been cut from $177,000,000 to $165,000,000, but it is still $45,000,000 above last year. There is much question of course as to whether the cut is deep enough.

The original Price Control Act was passed with the deliberate purpose of wrecking the small merchant and the small businessman. The second Price Control Act was passed with the deliberate purpose of wrecking the farmer. I do not mean that this was the purpose of Congress, but I mean that this was the purpose of the gang that was then in control of O. P. A. Just as long as Mr. Leon Henderson stayed in the position of chief of the Price Administration the activities of O. P. A. were carried on with the deliberate purpose of carrying out the intention of those who were behind the act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I find on page 10 of the report a statement from Mr. Brown who does not seem to agree with the gentleman on the effectiveness of the Price Control Act because Mr. Brown states:

> By the end of 1943 these savings to the Government will amount to over $70,000,000,000 if prices are held at current levels.

What does the gentleman think of that?

Mr. TABER. That is perfectly ridiculous, of course; there is no foundation for it whatever.

With the advent of Prentiss Brown, there came a new philosophy, but Mr. Brown did not have the courage to immediately fire the lawyers who thought they were being paid by the yard for drawing regulations designed to involve the whole picture and to destroy the effectiveness of all rationing and pricing. Long-haired professors, even now, are in key positions making decisions. Our food situation is further complicated by a requirement that the rationing and pricing go through the Food Administrator as well as the Office of Price Administration. These long-haired professors will take 3 months to decide a question which should be decided in an hour. After they have admitted that they are wrong and that they should give up on something, they will insist on further study for weeks and months when they know it will produce no results.

These long-haired professors never should be permitted to make decisions. Competent businessmen of experience should be in those positions, or lawyers of long experience in connection with business law. A group of green lawyers with no practical experience have been a menace to the operations of the Price Enforcement Act. Enormous sums have been wasted, but worst of all, the Price Administration and Mr. Brown, himself, has fallen for this, and has attempted, in violation of the law, to institute a subsidy system. A subsidy system was authorized by the Price Control Act to be paid to the producers. Nothing of that kind has been established. On the other hand, it has either paid or promised to pay a subsidy to processors or retailers.

The Office of Price Administration itself has fostered and promoted the black market in meats by fixing the price at so low a level that the packers could not butcher and conduct the marketing operations without a loss. At the present time they have been required to reduce

prices and they have been told that a subsidy would be forthcoming. The result is no meat. Farmers who have been accustomed to butcher large quantities of pork and lamb and whose facilities have been ample for that purpose are no longer allowed to do it unless they carry the meat 50 to 75 miles at an enormous expense, for an inspection, and this has contributed to the fact that we have no meat.

The Office of Price Administration was not permitted, under the law, to establish a price which does not give the processor and the retailer a fair profit. They have attempted to do this and the result has been the black market.

Unless all of these long-haired professors are fired out and a new man with practical experience and training in food and in business is put in charge of the entire food-production situation, and we get rid of the foolish things that have been done, we are going to face starvation next winter. The situation is becoming hourly more serious.

As a result of the ridiculous operations, the price of corn and the price of meat animals is so out of line that the farmers are unable to obtain corn for feeding dairy cows and poultry. This is going to result in the shortage of milk and poultry and eggs and complicate and embarrass our war effort. Never in the history has there been such a collosal administrative failure as the present administration's mussing up of the food situation. The minute you begin to pay subsidies, the deluge of inflation starts. Twenty billion dollars would be a low estimate for the subsidies that would be required. If we pay a subsidy on food to keep the cost of living down, we have got to pay a subsidy upon coal to keep the cost of living down, and before we get through, there will be no bottom left in the Treasury and the confidence of our people in our Government's financial structure will be lost. These ignorant and foolish operations inspired, I believe, directly by the President, are the cause of our difficulty. Is it not about time for him to surrender these ideas; put someone in charge of the food situation with authority; and clean it up? That is the least that we can ask.

The O. W. I.—this outfit and its overseas branch—two-thirds of whom are in New York City—had a total of 2,571 employees and they are asking for 3,742—an increase of 50 percent. In its Domestic Branch on May 17 it had a total of 517, and they are asking for 1,446—a 300-percent increase. They have too many now. They are spending their time spreading false stories issued by the departments of the Government—stories that tend to create disunity and make trouble in this country and discredit the war effort.

Just the other day their main release was a story to the effect that the gasoline shortage for farmers had been taken care of and that the farmers were going to have the gasoline to plow. On that same day I received a dozen telephone calls and 30 or 40 telegrams from people in my district telling me there was no gasoline for the farmers to plow.

Our domestic newspapers are fully equipped to take care of this situation. This outfit is loaded up with derelicts—derelicts who have been taken over by the O. W. I. from other organizations and who are without the capacity to do a decent job. A moderate cut has been made by the committee. There certainly is no question but what the domestic branch should be eliminated. The publications that they have been putting out are so perfectly ridiculous and inane that they do not justify any public confidence, and it is about time that they were brought up short.

Elmer Davis is a total failure as an administrator. He has not the courage or the character to fire people who have not made good.

Now I want to speak for just a moment of the total incapacity of our Government to function intelligently.

As absolute proof of this, I want to call attention to the fact that we have war industries operating over 350 regional offices throughout the country, and that does not include the O. W. I. In the same town we have as high as 11 separate offices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman just referred to the director of the O. W. I. I wonder if the gentleman has some information in reference to his background, his experience, his qualifications and political views?

Mr. TABER. Well, he was an active member of the American Labor Party. There seems to be a dispute between him and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] as to whether he was in the radical wing or not. I do not know. He was a radio broadcaster and I think he has been author of several publications of one kind or another, but without any experience whatsoever as an administrator.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I had in mind is whether or not he had experience to qualify him as an administrator for this particular job.

Mr. TABER. No; not in the least.

At the present time we have war agencies operating over 350 regional offices throughout the country. In the same towns you will find the O. D. T. and the Petroleum Administration for War; you will find the O. P. A. and the W. P. B.; you will find the W. L. B. and the Wage and Hour Division; you will find the W. M. C. and the United States Employment Service. It is perfectly clear that there should be a consolidation and a working down of the number of these outfits. What few small cuts have been made by the Budget, by the committee, and by the Congress should be a warning to the Budget to get rid of this terrific waste of manpower. The biggest part of this waste of manpower is in the Government itself. Private industry is functioning to much better advantage; and if it were not so hampered by Government operations, it would do much better.

I am in hopes that the House will give this bill its most earnest and careful consideration and when we are through with it some more of the waste and uselessness will be out of it.

I am not going to use a lot more time now, because there will be a number of items which will require the attention of the House as the bill is read, and I intend to bring them up at that time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As I see food gradually decreasing, and realizing that it is going to decrease in the future at an accelerated pace on account of the O. P. A. ceilings, I have about reached the conclusion that O. P. A. should be totally eliminated so that Congress may pass a law putting the administration of this matter into other hands. Has the gentleman given any consideration to this? I would like to have his views on the matter in case I offer an amendment.

Mr. TABER. Let me give you a picture to show you how impossible it is to get anywhere. The O. P. A., the Food Administrator, the Office of Civilian Supply, and the War Production Board have authority under the law and conflicting Executive orders, concurrent authority, to ration and price food. An appeal may then be taken by anybody aggrieved to the Director of Economic Stabilization. I suppose an appeal might be taken to Mr. Justice Byrnes, the head of the War Management Organization, and to the President on top of that. Anyone who has a problem of that kind has to contend with all this voluminous picture. I have myself struggled for 2 or 3 months before professors and that type of people in the Food Administration and the Price Administration, and, after they had admitted that they were wrong, instead of quitting right there and getting out gracefully, I have known them to hang on for a couple of months so that they could study it some more. You know, it would be too bad if they did not study it more because they might get themselves out of a job if they did anything and made a decision.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How does the gentleman feel about eliminating them, liquidating them altogether?

Mr. TABER. They might kill the job if they did the job.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They are cutting the supply lines.

Mr. TABER. They are cutting the supply lines, yes. I do not know what the remedy is. I know we are in a terrible situation. There is no question but what we need intelligent price control and intelligent rationing. We are getting neither. We are getting a program designed to wreck our food and civilian supply situation.

I am going to give you an illustration of the kind of job they are doing along some other line than food. You remember they put out a rule that destroyed the branded lines of rayon hosiery.

What they did was this: they cut the price for the small retail merchant who carries the branded lines, but raised the price for the big chain stores with offices and stores all over the country. That is

the intelligence with which they have operated. They say they are controlling the price in that way. I wonder if anybody believes that that is price control or what the Congress had in mind when it passed that bill. It is just an attempt to muss up and destroy our methods of distribution.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In connection with the statement the gentleman just made, I wonder if the gentleman was not in error when in connection with this handling of branded lines of rayon hosiery he indicated that they raised the price to the large chains and lowered it to the small merchant. Is it not a fact that it is just the other way around?

Mr. TABER. No. They did allow a differential to the small merchant, but the branded lines, which are supposed to be better and which have for many years carried a larger price, were wiped out, and the people who had made the branded lines were obliged to put out hosiery without the brands and were obliged to lower the price they had previously received for the branded lines. While the small merchant was given a differential, it resulted in raising the price in the chain stores.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know whether or not the gentleman has touched upon this proposition, but in examining this report I note that the committee has recommended $45,000,000 additional appropriation for the Office of Price Administration. It is true that the committee report indicates a $12,335,000 cut below the Budget estimates, but the recommendation of the committee is that this agency have $45,000,000 more for the next fiscal year than it has in the current year.

May I ask the gentleman whether or not the hearings and justifications for that item involve additional funds for the O. P. A. to enable them to handle the matter of subsidies and the subsidy program, and whether or not, in view of the fact that the Congress has indicated quite definitely its opposition to this program of subsidies, the normal activities of the O. P. A. in conducting a fair, decent price-control administration could not be accomplished for even less than the amount they had last year, rather than give them an additional appropriation of $45,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I think there are a great many activities in the O. P. A. where they would do a better job if they had less money. I think the rent-control item is very much of that character. I think, however, there is one instance where it is fair they should have more money. There is a situation where the clerks in the local offices have been paid locally by the local people. I question if that is the proper thing. I am inclined to believe that it is fair that the Government should pay these clerks rather than expect them either to donate their time or be paid by the locality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I correctly understand that as part of the justification for this increase of $45,000,000 the justifications indicate the necessity for paying salaries to all of the non-paid clerical help in the local rationing offices?

Mr. TABER. Very largely.

Mr. KEEFE. Is that the justification which is given?

Mr. TABER. That is the only item that had any merit that came before us in connection with a request for an increase.

Mr. KEEFE. Was there anything in the hearings that would justify or indicate the possibility of a reduction in the number of attorneys and employees at the Washington level so as to reduce this appropriation rather than increase it?

Mr. TABER. There was, and there was a reduction made by the committee in connection with those items and with all of their overhead. They have altogether too much of that at the present time, and it must be weeded out. They should get rid of these people about whom I have talked, the professors, and get somebody who is competent to make the decisions.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not answered my question to this extent. Is there money provided in this $45,000,000 increase to take care of additional personnel that it is contemplated will be necessary to carry out this program of subsidizing food products?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe we have added any personnel that could operate along that line. I do not believe the increases come along that line. On the other hand, they have the program all set up for that purpose, and their program is very largely in violation of the law and beyond the law. They claimed when they were before us that they had authority to pay subsidies. May I read you the statute:

> Or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodities in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production.

That is the only provision with reference to the paying of a subsidy. They have currently announced the payment of 3 cents a pound or 36 cents a year, to reduce the cost of living to each workingman in the United States 36 cents a year, and that has been done by subsidy upon coffee. The wholesale price of coffee was 13 cents a pound in New York a year ago, and it is 13 cents a pound today.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I think I might make an observation that might clear up the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He asked whether or not this additional $45,000,000 might go to subsidies. I think it is quite evident that they have no idea of using this for subsidies because the President and others are talking about a subsidy program of $2,000,000,000, and naturally they would not stop to fool with $45,000,000.

I will tell you what I think this $45,000,000 is for. I think it is nothing but a political grab bag to put more people on the political pay roll for the fourth term. This is evidenced by the fact that nobody in the great State of Illinois who pays considerable taxes to run this Government can have a job on the O. P. A. in any county anywhere unless he has the absolute political endorsement of the politicians in control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point to clarify that issue?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman in connection with my question that I had no idea of suggesting that the $45,000,000 was for the purpose of paying subsidies. The question I asked was whether or not any portion of this $45,000,000 was to be used for paying the administrative expenses in the Office of Price Administration incident to the paying of subsidies.

Mr. TABER. I understood the gentleman's question that way. I think it was perfectly clear. There will be no subsidies paid out of whatever is carried in this bill. They would have authority to pay the money out for help to provide the operation of a subsidy unless Congress should in its wisdom write a limitation upon this item in the bill which would prevent that kind of an operation. For my own part, I should feel that that would be a desirable thing to do.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that included in this general total of requested appropriations of $165,000,000 there is a sum allocated for the Office of Rent Control, but I do not have available the break-down of that $165,000,000 appropriation which would indicate the amount that was requested of the committee for the purpose of enforcing rent control and how much was allowed by the committee to this division which has charge of rent control. I know many Members of the House are exceedingly interested in that particular question, and I know that I am, to know whether they are going to be able to carry on this expanded rent control in areas where it is not needed, and throwing money away.

Mr. TABER. They should not be allowed to do so, and I am going to see to it that the figures are made available to the House. I shall put into the RECORD at this point a break-down of the request, and of the items that are contained in this bill as it stands.

Mr. KEEFE. Was the amount requested by the Office of Rent Control reduced by the committee?

Mr. TABER. That is my recollection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee reduced that $700,000.

Mr. KEEFE. How much was the amount that they requested?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amount carried in the bill for salaries is $5,363,390. That is $700,000 less than the amount used this year.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I understand that the amount which has been allocated in the break-down, if the gentleman will permit me, is $700,000 for the next fiscal year less than was expended by that division in the Office of Price Control during the present current year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Prentiss Brown made that reduction himself.

Mr. KEEFE. The committee made no reduction beyond what Mr. Brown suggested?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not on that figure. Substantial reductions were made in the Budget estimates.

Mr. KEEFE. I am speaking particularly of the operation of rent control. The committee itself simply accepted the reduction that Mr. Brown himself thought possibly might be made of $700,000? Is that right?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is substantially correct. It seemed to be a reasonable reduction, a reasonable effort made to curtail the expense.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. I was interested in the discussion about rayon hosiery. In my district is the McCallum Co., which makes one of the finest grades of hosiery, and has for a number of years. Dr. Bernard F. Haley, of the Office of Price Administration, testified before the Smith congressional committee investigating this subject. He testified that he heads the Textile Clothing and Leather Price Division, including hosiery. He testified, and this is quoted in the press dispatch to which I am referring:

> I have had no business experience whatever.

It appears that he is connected with the department of economics of Stanford University in California, and has been since 1924. What I would like to know is whether the gentleman's committee takes into consideration the salaries that are being paid to the heads of large divisions down in the O. P. A., who are handling these matters, and who have had no business experience.

Mr. TABER. I certainly do for one, and I am very much dissatisfied with that situation. That is one of the causes of the utter confusion, and the utter failure of the price-administration law, and that is exactly what you could expect with the set-up that was organized and put into effect by Mr. Leon Henderson.

Mr. CLASON. This Dr. Haley went on to further state and testify that these big manufacturers were putting new items on the market, which are selling for higher prices than those specified in O. P. A.'s general maximum price order of last year. In other words, he accuses the manufacturers of avoiding ceilings. The next day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] in the committee asked him to name the manufacturers. He said that he could not name a single manufacturer and retracted his statement. It seems to me that is a situation which is very serious. I have 600 persons employed in a factory who might find themselves out of employment, because this man has been bypassing the provisions of the O. P. A. Act.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is going to find situations where every single thing they touch produces just the same result, unless there is a drastic change in their method of operation.

Mr. CLASON. Can the gentleman's committee help at all in that?

Mr. TABER. The only thing that we can do is to stifle appropriations. That is all the House can do at the moment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with the committee that there is a lot of deadwood in the O. P. A., but I also believe the committee should provide funds so that there can be an employed clerk in these local boards. I have in mind now a city of 165,000 people, with 1 office of O. P. A. The people stood in line for 2 or 3 hours to get an answer to some questions. Some of these voluntary workers are doing a fine job, and some are just feeling their authority, and in 1 case a voluntary worker told a claimant for replacement for a lost ration book that because she had had the audacity, to use the word that was used, to complain to her Congressman, that she would have to wait 60 days. I think there should be someone in every office that is an employee of the Government and responsible and I hope that $45,000,000 will enable them to do that.

Mr. TABER. I think that statement is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that most of these employees without practical experience, to use the same language, were employed by the predecessor of Mr. Brown as Price Administrator, and is it not also true that a good many of those impractical people as they are called have been weeded out during Mr. Brown's administration?

Mr. TABER. I suggest that perhaps 10 percent have been weeded out, and 90 percent have been left, and that that 90 percent has absolutely ruined to date the Office of Price Administration and the rationing program and that unless that situation is immediately and effectively corrected, we are in for terrible distress in America. He is not moving fast enough, and unless he moves a little faster there is going to be no hope of straightening the thing out. We are going to be in for disaster unless the thing improves. The trouble is he does not move fast enough. He ought to take 1 day and fire that whole bunch.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is fair to say, at least, that there has been some improvement in the situation.

Mr. TABER. Oh, it does not smell quite so bad. That is about all anybody can say about it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I could interpose to answer the query of the gentleman from Mississippi, I have been sitting on a subcommittee for the last 4 or 5 weeks which has been investigating some of the activities of O. P. A. The evidence that has been produced before that committee shows that many of the divisions are still being operated and controlled almost entirely by college professors, by theorists and men who have had not 1 minute of practical experience in the field which they are trying to control and over which they are placing price regulations and other restrictions. I want to agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in the position that he has taken, that in my opinion, from the experience I have had in this investigation, it is necessary that there be a thorough and complete housecleaning in O. P. A., and that in place of impractical men, these theorists, these college professors who openly admit that they have no knowledge whatsoever of the subject which they are endeavoring to control, we should have men of practical business experience, men who know something about industry, men who will bring to the task that they have some real, hard-headed common sense.

Mr. TABER. And the situation cries out loud for immediate action. That is what I figure on that situation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not believe there is a single individual in this Congress who can read, who could read the testimony that has been taken in our committee and not come to the conclusion that some vital changes are necessary in that organization.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this Budget estimate makes provision for the sum of $17,503,110 for payment to the banks of this country to handle the bank plan, under which these purchase authorizations are handled in the rationing coupons. Can the gentleman give us any information as to just how the banks are to be compensated under this appropriation for handling this so-called bank plan of purchase authorizations?

Mr. TABER. The understanding of that was that it was a reimbursement proposition.

Mr. KEEFE. Who determines the amount that the bank is going to get and how is it to be paid to the banks of this country?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, it has been determined as the result of some experiments that they have brought out in connection with handling these things. How well it is going to work I do not know when it gets spread out abroad. I hope they will be able to handle it. On the other hand, it is a difficult job and a messy job, and I do not know how they are going to manage. When they were before us they spoke about weighing the coupons, but how they could do it I could not see, and I understand they have abandoned that idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. May I suggest to the gentleman that I am definitely interested in this particular item because I am very familiar with the work that the

banks have done without compensation, in handling this particular program and the magnificent effort which they have put forth to accommodate people who have established these rationing bank credits in the various banks of the country, but I am interested to know if the facts disclose just how O. P. A. proposes to disburse this money to the banks which have heretofore rendered this service gratuitously, and an explanation of it.

Mr. TABER. It is supposed to be upon a reimbursement basis of what it actually cost the banks, and there is just as much profit in this for the banks as there is in the handling of the War bonds and that sort of thing, and no more.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The whole schedule of disbursement is worked out and put in the hearings.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate where I can find that report?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will get it for the gentleman. I do not have it just at the moment. It is an average of about $1,100 per bank, purely on a reimbursable basis and only to take care of the amount of additional cost that they will have incurred in employing extra clerks to take care of this work. The gentleman will find a very satisfactory statement of the whole proposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was much interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York and also the distinguished gentleman from Ohio about getting rid of those who failed to grasp the problems of price control. This question is not for the purpose of embarrassment, I assure my friend, but if this appropriation goes through and there is a general exodus of such individuals, I am sure the gentleman from New York would not holler politics and will not take the floor and attack Prentiss Brown or anyone else for carrying out the very able and constructive suggestions that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Ohio have made today.

Mr. TABER. I would trust a Democrat much quicker than I would some of these daydreamers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not certain whether the gentleman from Massachusetts was referring to me or not, but I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he had been sitting in our committee and had heard some of the testimony given by businessmen and business interests of the city of Boston, from which he hails, he would agree with me that a change in O. P. A. is badly needed, and also, incidentally, agree with them, your constituents.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman understand I was challenging his statement or did the gentleman understand that if that does take place, in the future will the gentleman then attack Prentiss Brown for terminating the services of some of these people?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope the gentleman would not disagree, because it happens that some of the leaders of your party, Cabinet members and others, have agreed with us that a vital change is needed; that the system of rationing in O. P. A. is not being conducted properly, and therefore I would hate to see the gentleman from Massachusetts disagree with the members of his own party.

Mr. McCORMACK. My question is, That if that does take place, will you then accuse Prentiss Brown of engaging in politics?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would not think so, because my experience, from what I have learned in this investigation, is that the gentlemen in O. P. A. have no politics.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just asking these questions seriously because the todays become tomorrows, and if when the time does arrive to terminate some of the services of these men that my friend from New York and the other two gentlemen are ably advocating, I hope they will not criticize the act of termination.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if they will replace these crackpot theorists in the O. P. A. and put in some old-line Democrats, I not only will not criticize, but will heartily support him.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I like to hear.

Mr. TABER. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I shall not criticize the changes, but I hope they will do the job at once, and that you will get after them and get it done, and I will judge them by the job they are doing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that there has been a reduction of something like $3,000,000 alone in the activities of the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information, a branch that has been doing a splendid job, rendering yeoman service in psychological warfare and in preparation of ultimate victory.

If you wish proof as to the value of the Overseas Branch in the Office of War Information, we have but to look at recent history to see what it did with reference to softening up the native population in Morocco, Algiers, and Tunisia in preparation for the splendid victory that was ours in north Africa.

The O. W. I. Overseas Branch is rendering similar service at the present moment in Bulgaria and other Balkan countries and in Italy in preparation for the victory which ultimately again will be ours.

Charges are flung about this Chamber and on the outside of this Chamber that the O. W. I. is a nest of adherents to and propagandists of the fourth term of our President, and that it is a nest of political activity. I think those charges are unfair, highly inequitable and place the O. W. I. in a deplorable light. I think the time has come that the House knew something of the real situation of the O. W. I. The charges of political activity are utterly false. On pages 842 to 848, inclusive, of the hearings on the bill, you will read a list of the splendid gentlemen who formulate the policy of the O. W. I. I made inquiries as to the political complexion of these men, and beyond peradventure of a doubt, I will say, although I have not as yet exhausted my research in that regard, that half the men in the policy-making positions of O. W. I. are Republicans. Certainly, therefore, if these extravagant charges are true, then the sins of politics must be laid in part at the door of Republicans.

Let me give you a few names of the men who are Republicans in the O. W. I. The first one you will note is M. S. Eisenhower, associate director, who is about to go from O. W. I. to the presidency of the Kansas State College, and if he were not a Republican he could not be appointed to the presidency of the official State college of Kansas, a thoroughgoing Republican State. He is second in command, or was second in command, and will be for sometime, with O. W. I.; a thoroughgoing Republican, who held high office in the Hoover administration and held high office in the Coolidge administration, in the Department of Agriculture; he is a Republican, but indeed an enlightened Republican.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

Then we have Joseph Barnes, deputy director of Atlantic operations, formerly head of the Moscow Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, certainly not a Democratic newspaper; assuredly a Republican paper. He is very close to Mr. Wendell Willkie, a Republican, and accompanied him upon his tour around the world and was given great credit by Mr. Willkie when writing the book called One World.

Then there is another high-ranking Republican, Mr. James A. Linen, whose family is very closely connected with the Republican national committeemen of the State of Pennsylvania; he is connected with Time, Inc., which in turn owns Time, Life, and Fortune, certainly papers or magazines that could not be put in the Democratic column. These are publications which have been avowedly and will continue to be avowedly anti-Roosevelt.

Then we have Maurice English, an Italian expert, European correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, a paper one would not very well rate as a Democratic paper, a paper one would not very well rate as pro-administration or pro-Roosevelt. Let me continue.

You have as director a Republican, Gardiner Cowles, Jr., who will remain in Office of War Information for a few months and who will, incidentally, be succeeded by another Republican whose name I will mention in a moment. What is the background of Director Gardiner Cowles, Jr.? He is a stout, stanch Republican, a very well-known Republican who is the publisher of the Des Moines Register, a Republican journal.

He is the publisher of the Minneapolis Journal, a Republican paper; he is the publisher of the magazine Look—a Republican publication; and he is soon to be replaced by another well-known Republican, Palmer Hoyt, a prominent Republican on the West coast and publisher of the Republican paper called the Portland Oregonian.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman from New York that the committee was very much impressed with Mr. Cowles who appeared before our committee personally and who had been in close touch with the operations of Office of War Information. We asked him his political persuasion and he said he had been a Republican and is now a Republican but very whole-heartedly endorsed the operations of Office of War Information under Mr. Elmer Davis.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I want to give just one more name, then I will yield. I could give dozens of names of Republicans to indicate the bipartisan complexion of Office of War Information. The new presentation of these names should vitiate all charges of political Roosevelt-Democratic activity.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield while he is on Mr. Cowles?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I merely wanted to say that he made the trip with Willkie around the world. He is frequently mentioned in Willkie's book One World and he hopes to leave shortly to work in Willkie's campaign. I am just wondering whether the controversy we got into over the domestic policies of Office of War Information was not a fight between Willkieites and regular Republicans?

Mr. CELLER. I cannot see how in the world anyone can charge that politics is being played by Office of War Information, and that charge is leveled by gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle yet we have the admission now that these gentlemen occupying these high and important key positions are Republicans.

Let me mention one more name: The deputy to the director is Nicholas Roosevelt, from my State, a very, very important Republican and an important contributor to the Republican campaign fund, former United States Minister to Hungary under a Republican administration. If time permitted I could, as I said before, give the names of scores of high-ranking Republicans who have been employed by the O. W. I.

In addition to the splendid personnel I have mentioned, there are numerous others whose political affiliations I know not of, but who are outstanding in the professions and callings and who are giving of their "all" to the O. W. I. I refer to the following:

Ferdinand Kuhn, deputy director. He was formerly chief of the London Bureau of the New York Times, and until December 1942, was assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Owen Lattimore, Deputy Director of Pacific Operations. He is an expert on Chinese affairs. He is on leave of absence from the staff of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. He has spent considerable time in China as well as in India, the Middle East, and Africa.

Edward W. Barrett, chief of the News and Features Bureau. He is associate editor of Newsweek—by no means a Democrat weekly.

Edd Johnson, chief of the New York Control Office. He is assistant managing editor of Colliers—also by no means a Democrat magazine. He was formerly with the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Robert Riskin, chief of the Bureau of Motion Pictures. He sacrificed a salary of $120,000 a year to take $8,000 a year with O. W. I. He has been affiliated with Columbia Pictures, Inc., and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios.

Percy Winner, regional chief of Latin Europe. He was chief correspondent for north Africa for the Havas News Agency. He was manager of the Rome Bureau for International News Service. He accompanied the American Expeditionary Forces in landings in North Africa.

Douglas P. Miller, regional chief of middle Europe. He was formerly commercial attaché at the American Embassy in Berlin and is author of the book You Can't Do Business With Hitler.

Reuben H. Markham, regional chief for the Balkans. He formerly was foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor—by no means a Democrat paper. He was also employed by the London Times and the London News Chronicle.

George Taylor, regional chief in the Far East. He is an expect on China. He lectured on international relations at the London University and was a professor at Yenching University, Peking.

C. D. Jackson, Deputy Director of the Overseas Branch. He was administrative vice president of Time, Inc. Time controls Life, Time, and Fortune magazines, and they are by no means even benevolently neutral to Roosevelt.

Robert Parker, special representative in charge of Balkan propaganda. He was formerly with the Associated Press.

Wallace J. Carroll, chief of the London outpost of the O. W. I. He was formerly with the United Press.

Francis M. Fisher, Chungking representative. He was formerly with the United Press.

James G. Rogers, Jr., Deputy Director. He was formerly general manager of Benton & Bowles as well as Lord & Thomas.

Donald D. Stauffer, Chief of the Radio Bureau. He was formerly vice president in charge of radio of Ruthrauth & Ryan, Inc., an advertising agency.

H. Andrew Dudly, Chief of the Office of Program Coordination. He was formerly sales manager of William Wrigley, Jr., Co.

Commander Price Gilbert, of the Bureau of Graphics and Printing. He was formerly vice president of the Coca-Cola Co., in Atlanta, Ga.

You will note that there are comparatively few professors. Judging from Republican criticism, professors are always in the doghouse. To my mind, professors are just as valuable as businessmen. It matters not where the good man comes from—college or business—the test should always be, Is he efficient, intelligent, and equitable?

I could go on with a list of good men connected with the O. W. I. Most of them are distinguished Americans, coming from all climes, of every shade of politics, race, and religion, covering various economic, governmental, and philosophical viewpoints. It is idle to take potshots at these men for no reason except politics.

The charge has been made that many of the newspapermen come from PM. A mere glance at the roster would dissipate such an idea. The charge should never have been made. It is utterly false. Any paper of any consequence throughout the land is represented on O. W. I.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it would be interesting for the gentleman to tell the House something about Elmer Davis.

Mr. CELLER. Elmer Davis is a Democrat, and I am glad he is a Democrat. He is doing a splendid job, splendid particularly since he does not draw the political line when he hires important members of his staff.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. In a moment.

Elmer Davis issued this order, which you would all do well to consider, a most persuasive order, as follows:

> Lately this office has been accused of partisan political activity. For this accusation no evidence has been adduced. However such attacks may be expected to continue and—

Consider the political astuteness of Mr. Davis—

> However, such attacks may be expected to continue until the election of 1944. It is the duty of staff members to continue so to conduct themselves that there shall never be any basis for such criticism in the judgment of fair and intelligent observers.

The criticism that has been unfortunately heaped upon Mr. Davis in this Chamber I will say advisedly has not been intelligent and has not been fair.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has discussed a few names whom he classifies as Republicans in addition to my friend Mr. Gardiner Cowles, of Minneapolis. I do not know any of the other gentlemen, but have any of them so far as the gentleman knows ever run for public office on the Republican ticket?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, yes; they may have.

Mr. O'HARA. Which ones?

Mr. CELLER. I shall be glad to continue my research and discover the names of those who have run for public office. Of course, their running for office is immaterial. I have just given a sketchy résumé of some. What I have given is only a modicum of what there is to give. I shall be pleased to put more information in the RECORD.

Mr. O'HARA. Offhand, does the gentleman know of any who has been a candidate for public office on the Republican ticket?

Mr. CELLER. I can give the gentleman that information, but I cannot give it to him one way or the other at the moment.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I must decline to yield further.

Mr. O'HARA. While the gentleman is about it can he tell us which of those classed as Democrats may have run for office on the Democratic ticket?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know of any members who are on the Democratic side who have also run for public office. I did not examine into that. But it would be worth while to check on it likewise in order to get all the possible information. Elmer Davis is willing to have focused upon his activities the searchlight of inquiry. He is unafraid. He wants us to be relentless in our inquiries, because he has nothing to hide. He is doing a good job. But we put a broomstick between his legs when we cut off something like $3,000,000 for the administration of the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information. By doing that we cut off our nose to spite our face. It is a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy. The more money we put into the Overseas Branch the more precious lives of our boys we might save, the shorter we may make the war.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to make the observation that it might be pointed out the personal sacrifices that are being made by a substantial number of men in O. W. I., including men such as Elmer Davis, who have given up substantial salaries for much smaller salaries here in Washington.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, there are scores of such men. There is Robert E. Sherwood, distinguished playwright and thrice recipient of the Pulitzer prize, who could earn over a hundred thousand dollars a year if he resigned from the O. W. I. tomorrow. His salary with O. W. I. is only $9,000 a year. There is James P. Warburg, who could earn a hundred thousand dollars a year. He gets $7,500. There is Douglas P. Miller, author of the book, You Cannot Do Business With Hitler, who could earn a vast sum of money but is willing to make the sacrifice and take the job as regional chief of the Middle Europe Division of O. W. I. I could give you any number of men who are sacrificing vast sums of money in this patriotic work of the O. W. I.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. When the gentleman continues his brilliant research on the political affiliation of the people in O. W. I., will he be kind enough to put in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House the background of socialism and his connection with the American Labor Party?

Mr. CELLER. To whom is the gentleman referring?

Mr. PLOESER. To Elmer Davis, so that the record is complete. Maybe your party will not claim him as a Democrat.

Mr. CELLER. We are happy to claim him as a Democrat. As for the American Labor Party, I am perfectly willing to operate under the aegis of and the endorsement of the American Labor Party as a Democrat. I got their endorsement as a Democrat. Many Members likewise from New York City could not be in this House unless they had secured that endorsement. Many Republicans in New York City would lick the boots of the American Labor Party to get its endorsement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I may say that a number of the officials of the O. W. I. are for Roosevelt. Some of them are against Roosevelt. They have expressed themselves as being against the President. Some of them are for the New Deal; some of them are possibly against the New Deal, but all are united in their desire to win the war so that victory may descend upon us as quickly as possible. None of them, however, underestimate the value of psychological warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the members of the very distinguished Appropriations Committee have been too niggardly in their approach to this problem. In their endeavor to be economical, they have rendered a disservice, in part, to the country for failing to uphold the hand of and give proper support to Elmer Davis in the fine work he is doing. Remember, his work will increase in importance as the war goes on. I have the highest admiration for him. As somebody said, this snow-haired gentleman may be characterized as having snow on his roof, but there is lots of fire in his furnace. I thoroughly agree with that. He is fearless; he is willing to stand up and be counted and he is willing to face his adversaries because he has the answers. He is resourceful, of sound sense and thoroughly sincere, and honest.

With reference to this niggardly approach, I want to direct your attention to an article that appeared in Life recently wherein it was indicated that the United States may be losing the war of words, due, in part, to lack of funds, and, among other things, Life said:

> Nobody in Washington knew better than Office of War Information Director Davis that he was still running a puny pushcart compared to the high-powered propaganda machine operated by the Nazis. The overseas branch of the Office of War Information is spending less than $26,000,000 a year.

Now, we cut that by $2,213,590. Dr. Goebbels spends between $250,000,000 and $500,000,000 a year in this war for men's minds.

Some months ago, the O. W. I. issued the magazine, Victory. Charges were made that it was an attempt to enfold President Roosevelt in an American flag for the purposes of a fourth term. These charges, to my mind, are ridiculous. The accusers of Elmer Davis utterly failed to realize that the enemy funnels its psychological warfare around its dictators and its heroes. We cannot retaliate unless we personalize our propaganda. To neutral and Axis people, Roosevelt is the United States, and the United States is Roosevelt. He is, therefore, our greatest propaganda asset. It would be asinine not to capitalize such an asset. When it is charged that Elmer Davis is furthering a fourth term for Roosevelt by publishing and distributing pamphlets, like the one Franklin Delano Roosevelt, showing episodes in the life of Roosevelt by pictures and cartoons, such charge is just balderdash. It must be remembered that none of these publications circulate in America; they do not circulate among our soldiers. They are for foreign consumption. Pedro in Portugal, Olaf in Sweden, Batista in Spain, Luigi in Italy, Hans in Germany, Ala in Arabia, Pierre in France just cannot vote for Roosevelt.

The current appropriations are woefully insufficient for overseas work and now they are to be cut down by $2,213,000. We are hampering still further our effort in the war of words. We need to give to our propaganda real pungency so that in turn, it can give to Axis people and those benevolently neutral to the Axis a powerful sock, mentally. Remember, in the last war, the Allied propaganda was so effective that it broke down German morale. We must repeat that performance.

Although we are the world's masters of advertising and publicity, we do not like propaganda and we do not take kindly to propaganda by the Government. But we have no choice. It is a necessary weapon of political warfare. O. W. I. is the entity to wield this weapon. But the Appropriations Committee is setting up handicaps by way of curtailing of funds.

Hundreds and hundreds of Axis magazines, newspapers, radio broadcasts flood and pour into Europe from Rome, Tokyo, and Berlin. Signal, Der Adler, Spectator, All Set for the Final Fight, Vox, Freedom, Nippon, Jap Photo-News, The Second Hunger Blockade, The Pictorial Orient, Beaute du Travail, En Allemagne—In Germany, La Famille, are but a few of the vast number of publications of poisoned propaganda flowing into Europe. In comparison our propaganda effort is a mere trickle, due to lack of funds. The Axis is far ahead of us. Why? Because it has unlimited funds. We are just as talented and just as clever as they if not more talented and cleverer. With the limited funds he has, Elmer Davis is doing a magnificent job.

For goodness' sake, do not let politics, petty politics, picayune politics hamper the efforts of the O. W. I. for lack of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as has been pointed out, carries a total, including contract authorizations, of $2,940,000,000 or roughly $139,500,000 less than the Budget estimate. It deals with 18 so-called national war agencies and carries in respect to those agencies as compared with funds for the current fiscal year an increase of $1,114,000,000 on thereabouts.

It covers a tremendous field. The committee has taken upward of 6 weeks in respect to the hearings on this bill. It is impossible to deal with each and every one of the agencies in any detail in the time available. I propose, therefore, to confine myself to certain observations in reference to several of the agencies which seem to me to most require the consideration of the committee at this time.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

First, in reference to O. P. A., the request as approved by the Budget amounted to something over $177,000,000 as compared with $120,000,000 for the current fiscal year. The request contemplated additional personnel of 8,340, the placing of 1943 personnel on a full annual basis, and $17,500,000 for the so-called ration banking plan.

The committee recommends $165,000,000, or $12,335,000 less than the Budget estimate, but some $45,000,000 over and above what this agency has had for the current year. The increase is based on allowing $17,500,000 for the ration banking plan, on allowing the local boards an increase in personnel of 5,189, on denying all other increases in personnel, on rolling back the Washington office personnel to where it was on May 31, and on what amounts to a direction to the agency to apply a cut of $1,335,000 in its discretion. Personally, I think the request might well be further and substantially reduced.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate the problems the committee has had upon this appropriation bill. May I call the attention of the gentleman and the committee to a situation which exists as to rationing offices that are established in various places in the country. Oftentimes O. P. A. will establish only one in a rural county, and some additional offices must be established by the scattered towns themselves in order to expedite and help the rationing program. I had this situation arise in the last few months, where the attempt was made to get some help to finance the small upkeep of these offices. The O. P. A. has taken the position that there are not sufficient funds available to aid the smaller suboffices. I appreciate that that may not have been called to the gentleman's attention when the committee was considering this bill, but I do feel that some consideration should be given to these suboffices in the rural sections where they are needed. The counties, or the villages, or the individual merchants of a town have had to finance these offices themselves. I wonder if the committee received any testimony on the matter while it was in session.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question specifically. The record indicates, in addition to nearly 69,000 paid personnel contemplated for the coming fiscal year about 92,000 volunteers, giving an over-all force, including volunteers, of approximately 161,350 people. It indicates also as I have already stated, an increase in paid personnel for the local offices in the field amounting to 5,189.

Mr. O'HARA. Five thousand one hundred and eighty-nine additional employees?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we could talk all day on this one agency.

As we know, the O. P. A. has been charged with the flagrant violation of that provision of the law whereby it is required to consult with responsible members of industries affected before any change is put into effect. It has been charged with flagrantly exceeding its authority under that provision of the law which states that its power shall not be used to compel changes in business practices or business methods except for the purpose of preventing circumvention or evasion. It has been charged that O. P. A. has been fostering monopoly at the expense of independent and small business. It has been charged that O. P. A. has been rationing while other departments of the Federal Government have been hoarding essential foodstuffs needed by the people.

All of us have had bitter complaints from many sources. Personally, I have received them from the dairy-cattle man, the milkman, the poultry man, the market man, the druggist, the hosiery man, the shoe man, the general retailer, the tenant, the landlord, labor, management, and others that do not occur to me at this time.

I have always believed that the underlying law under which this agency operates has been faulty. I think we are trying to regulate the price of every hairpin and every collar button in this country. I do not think it can be done. I think we should have followed Mr. Baruch's advice or concentrated on fundamental commodities with a fair percentage for the middleman and the retailer, and shot at a 90 percent job with 10 percent of the headaches.

Whether or not the law is faulty, it seems manifest that its administration has been made difficult if not impossible by the absurd division of authority which this administration has insisted upon, which we have seen in respect of fuel oil, in respect of foodstuffs, in respect of other commodities.

I join also in what has already been said in reference to the character of personnel in responsible positions in this agency at this time. If O. P. A. is going to function, the situation demands that these positions be filled by men with practical experience. Administrator Brown gave us a list of 943 important positions. Out of these 943 important positions, 478 he testified were filled by economists, with little or no business experience. No administration like O. P. A. with tremendous influence over our entire national economy can in my judgment function on any such basis. I believe Prentiss Brown can do this Nation a tremendous service, if he is permitted to do it, by an immediate overhauling and housecleaning of O. P. A. which will serve to substitute for the theorists in important positions men of practical experience and sound judgment.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

I want to say a word about O. W. I. The request in this instance was for $47,342,000, compared with $35,847,000 for the present year. The committee recommendation amounts to $34,472,000, or $12,800,000 less than the Budget estimate.

The recommendation of $34,472,000 compares with a total of $4,500,000 expended by George Creel in the operation of his agency engaged in similar, though less extensive work, during the whole of World War No. 1.

There has been very widespread and very severe criticism of the work of O. W. I., both in respect to its overseas field of operations and in respect of its domestic field of operations. Some of that criticism seems to me to be clearly justified.

It is difficult to pass judgment with accuracy on the work in the overseas field. Much of the broadcasting that is done in that field is in foreign languages. The committee has not been provided with transcripts of that broadcasting, which have been requested. We do know, however, that serious criticism has been leveled at the Hungarian desk, at the Italian desk, at the Polish desk, and at the Yugoslav desk. It has been rumored that in Army circles there has been criticism of the work done in the overseas field. It has been stated that persons in position to know have severely criticized broadcasts going to neutral or Allied nations on the ground that they included sheer communism.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the committee had not had translations of foreign broadcasts, although they had been requested?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that the gentleman from New York made a request for certain of these broadcasts and that they have not been made available by the agency.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Certainly there can be nothing of a military secret about these broadcasts. Some of us are relying upon the committee to advise us as to the

nature of them. I cannot conceive of that request being refused.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When we deal with the work in the domestic field it seems to be much easier to assess the criticism that has been leveled. Personally I feel that much of that criticism is more than justified.

I understand that the O. W. I. was set up to operate in the domestic field primarily as the coordinator of governmental information. It is perfectly evident from the testimony before the committee that the agency has gone far beyond that function, that in fact it has engaged in propaganda here at home in the domestic field through radio programs, through moving pictures, through pamphlets dealing with controversial matters having little or nothing to do with the war effort, through materials furnished to some 17,000 libraries, to colleges, and to schools, and through material furnished to O. C. D. to be used in the contemplated block system. O. W. I. has itself admitted that publications have been gotten up that were unwise and a mistake, as, for instance, Overseas Victory No. 1 and Battle Stations for All.

In my judgment there is absolutely no reason for O. W. I. to engage in propaganda work in the domestic field. Only recently it was brought out that there were no less than 35,000 paid publicity workers or propagandists on the Federal pay roll, at a cost to the taxpayers of some $27,000,000, and that no less than 3,000,000,000 pieces of Government penalty mail were handled by the Post Office in a single year. O. W. I. was supposed to curtail, not to increase this publicity. O. W. I. should deal in facts not in domestic propaganda.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. What assurance has the gentleman that if the appropriation is cut, that propaganda of the O. W. I. would be decreased? Would it not be possible for O. W. I. to make its cut in some legitimate work, and spend just as much money as ever on so-called propaganda?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would say to the gentleman that at the proper time I think we should incorporate limiting language, to be sure that the purpose of the House is carried out, if that is the purpose of the House.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. Following the gentleman's thought a moment ago when the first big broadcast on the radio on hosiery was put out by O. P. A.—I think all Members probably got the same broadcast—led off with the propaganda from the Office of War Information in which they seemed to have joined in praising this article, that would save the women of the Nation $50,000,000 on hosiery. I thought at the time that this was hardly fair to the small merchants, as they were cut out from the field. The gentleman will probably remember that propaganda coming out from the O. W. I. I thought it was out of place at the time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not happen to remember the particular broadcast to which the gentleman refers, but it is apparently in line with other broadcasting with which I am familiar.

I want to read in this general connection just two or three paragraphs from an article by Mr. David Lawrence, an able and fine Democrat, which will be found in the hearings at page 985. The article is entitled "New Dealism Colors New Office of War Information Booklet—Public Funds Used to Take Sides in Controversial Issues." It reads, in part, as follows:

NEW DEALISM COLORS NEW OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION BOOKLET—PUBLIC FUNDS USED TO TAKE SIDES ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

(By David Lawrence)

Elmer Davis is a nonpolitical person trying to do his duty in the Office of War Information, but the job is so big and the possibilities of misuse of his office are so numerous that to protect his own good name and the distribution of really important war information he ought to forbid at once the writing of all books and pamphlets on domestic questions by his staff and rely wholly on the newspapers, the radio, and the movies for dissemination of official material.

No more flagrant case of abuse of power and misuse of public funds could be found than in the amazing book of 120 pages called Battle Stations for All, of which 140,000 copies have just been distributed.

* * * * *

The book is supposed to be the story of the fight to control living costs, but while containing certain factual data, it envelops much of this in a series of chapters which are highly controversial and can hardly be justified as pieces of war information.

Thus, what difference does it make whether the Treasury did or did not get its way in the controversy about mandatory income-tax returns? What business is it of the Office of War Information whether this is or is not a loophole for avoidance of taxes? Why should Congress be criticized by inference and be made to appear as against national policy when it sidetracks the plan for incentive payments sponsored by Secretary Wickard?

He goes along at some length, and winds up with this statement:

The time has come to amend the appropriation laws so that the funds of Office of War Information cannot be used for any such purposes again. Evidently the New Dealers who write the above type of pamphlets are too slick for Mr. Davis, for he can't read all their copy and devious writings. So the safest thing from the people's standpoint is to stop it all and confine the Office of War Information to news releases such as those to which the Committee of Public Information confined itself primarily in the last war.

I agree with this conclusion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman, of course, will be fair enough to say that Mr. Davis readily said that the book the gentleman mentioned was one of the mistakes made by the Office of War Information and should not have been published.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He did as to that publication and at least one other.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I want to mention in this connection, and that is this. Whether rightly or wrongly, it has been charged, and repeatedly charged, that this particular agency has included in its ranks a great many people of extremely radical points of view. So extensive was this criticism and so much was brought to me specifically in the nature of charges, that I felt it my duty to inquire to some extent into the matter as far as the O. W. I. is concerned. Much of the inquiry was deleted from the hearings upon what seemed to be a fair showing upon the part of O. W. I., but the balance will be found in pages 1291 to 1310 of the hearings, which the Members have before them. I just want to point out in this connection that the record shows 417 aliens on the rolls of the agency, many of them presumably secured through a private agency known as the Short Wave Research, Inc., set up apparently for the purpose of helping refugees from abroad to enter America and secure employment. It also shows no less than 1,235 cases in respect to which investigations with regard to character and loyalty have not been completed.

I think an examination will indicate to any Member who reads it the degree of care or rather lack of care which this agency has been employing with reference to its personnel.

I just want to quote one excerpt from that examination, appearing at page 1292 of the hearings:

Mr. DAVIS. We feel that the test of the Communist is his behavior between August 22, 1939, when Germany and Russia signed their treaty, and June 22, 1941, when Germany attacked Russia. We feel that there were a good many people who may have been more or less sympathetic in some degree with communism before that time in the years when the Communists were the chief advocates of collective security, but if those people immediately turned against the Communists' line on August 22, 1939, and were against them during the subsequent year and 10 months when the Communists were in favor of neutrality in Europe and were against the war both in Europe and in this country, then we feel that they have established the fact that they are not members of the Communist Party and not followers of the Communist Party line.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you think that that is a safe test to rely on for those in confidential positions?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it is a safe test, because I may say that the people who were mildly pink in the earlier years before August 22, 1939, if they definitely opposed the policy of the party from then on until June 1941, I think it is pretty good proof because those people had to take a lot of hammering from their former comrades.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the test apparently accepted by Mr. Davis is not a safe one for those in confidential positions. It would appear from his statement that Mr. Davis is not in any way interested in the convictions or activities of any O. W. I. employee prior to the date specified.

If I had my way in respect to O. W. I.—based on such information as came to this committee—I would place its overseas work entirely under the jurisdiction of the Army and the Navy and perhaps in the hands of O. S. E. I would limit its domestic work here at home strictly, first, to eliminating other Government publicity agencies insofar as they can be eliminated; second, to coordinating ac-

tivities of those that remain; third, to serving through its news room as a place where representatives of the press can obtain their information from day to day.

The most dangerous threat to our form of government, in my judgment, is the threat to freedom of speech. I would eliminate all domestic propaganda through this agency, relying exclusively on the normal channels, such as the press, the radio, and moving pictures for the dissemination of information. I believe this would eliminate danger to the war effort, would increase efficiency, and insure economy.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I was especially interested in the gentleman's statement as to the large number of aliens in the employ of this particular agency and the indication that those were aliens, not of long residence in this country, but refugees who had recently arrived. Can the gentleman elaborate any upon that matter?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that it developed in the course of the hearings that this private organization, to which I have heretofore referred, furnished to O. W. I., either directly or indirectly, a large part of its personnel from countries overseas—many of them refugees. I asked Mr. Davis for a list of those furnished, the positions to which they were appointed, and the salaries which they were awarded. That list I received yesterday with a covering letter from Mr. Davis. The total number of persons on the list, I think, was somewhere between 250 and 300. So that if there are 417 aliens on the rolls all told, it would seem to follow that between 250 and 300 of them were probably furnished through this private agency to which I have referred.

Mr. MICHENER. Is there any objection, from the standpoint of military information, to the gentleman including this list of aliens who are helping in the furnishing, making, and distributing of propaganda which our people are supposed to listen to, and be guided and controlled by?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as I know, there is nothing confidential about the list. I had rather thought it would be put in the hearings. It was not put in the hearings but was furnished subsequently.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman include that list?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I shall be glad to comply with the gentleman's request.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, June 1, 1943.

The Honorable CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: During the hearing before the committee on 1944 estimates for the Office of War Information, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH requested a list of employees who had been transferred from the former Short-Wave Research, Inc., into positions in the Office of War Information. The list is attached. It will be noted that the list includes also employees whose services are used on a part-time or when-actually-employed basis. Such employees are designated in the list by the symbol "WAE."

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

Radio Program Bureau

Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Entered on duties
Adams, Paul	Program director	CAF-11	[1] $3,800	Sept. 3, 1942
Adgate, Carla	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Allen, Judith	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 2, 1943
Allison, Robert	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Amato, Mario	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Antonanzas, Mateo	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Arida, Naseeb	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Nov. 2, 1942
Arons, Lilli	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Do.
Baccanelli, Elma D	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	July 1, 1942
Bachman, Ida	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Baker, Millicent	Special events clerk	CAF-4	1,800	Aug. 19, 1942
Bam, Frederick	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Baral, Lillian	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Do.
Baumann, Edouard	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Beaucaire, Roger S	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 27, 1942
Beique, Edward W	do	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 1, 1942
Berlau, Ruth	do	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Berry, Charles B	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Berry, John	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Berry, Sidney N	Assistant program director.	CAF-7	2,600	Jan. 26, 1943
Bingham, Robert	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Pollack, Martin	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Blatt, Marianne	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Do.
Blok, Nils C	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Do.
Blumenthal, Stella	Senior program schedule clerk.	CAF-5	2,000	Do.
Boegler, Magdalene A	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Oct. 31, 1942
Boley, Joseph A	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Boorman, Eleanor F	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	July 1, 1942
Bordes, Frederick	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Borgida, Tibor	Assistant program director.	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 16, 1942
Bowman, Sidney R	Announcer	CAF-11	[3] 800	Feb. 20, 1943
Brandao, Joao S	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Dec. 30, 1942
Brandt, Martin B	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Mar. 12, 1943
Breton, Andre R	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Brock, Charles	Associate program director.	CAF-9	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
Broder, Jane	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Brown, Thomas K	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Bryner, Youl	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Buckley, Floyd	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Bunce, Alan	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 12, 1943
Butler, Frank	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Bendix, Hans J	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Bing, Julian	Associate program director.	CAF-9	3,200	Jan. 23, 1943
Bellaver, Harry	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Campbell, Willian	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 1, 1943
Caporale, Stefano	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Nov. 3, 1942
Carbajal, Frank	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Cartwright, Lowell	Announcer	CAF-10	3,500	Oct. 3, 1942
Carvalhido, Joseph	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Aug. 20, 1942
Chamiec, Wanda J	do	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 16, 1942
Charles, Lewis	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Apr. 30, 1943
Cillie, Francois	Senior script editor	CAF-12	4,600	Aug. 16, 1942
Citron, Wolfgang	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 29, 1942
Clark, Harry B	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Clay, Edwin (Dassori)	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Coen, Guido	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Corning, Tip	Announcer		[2]	Mar. 25, 1943
Costa, Riccardo F	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Crohn-Perret, Denise	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Nov. 2, 1942
Crosby, Everett	Associate program director	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 26, 1942
Cullen, Edward	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Crocetti, Mary C	Senior translator	CAF-5	$2,000	Apr. 1, 1943
Correa, Carmen	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Nov. 13, 1942
Coto, Primeitbo	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
D'Allesandro, Aldo	Program director	CAF-10	3,500	Sept 25, 1942
Dal Piaz, Guy H	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Dangelzer, Joan	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 17, 1942
D'Athayde, Alvaro	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 16, 1942
Davis, Tatiana	Translator	CAF-4	1,800	Nov. 13, 1942
De La Vega, Jose	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 23, 1942
Della Guistina, Mary	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	July 1, 1942
D'Esaguy, Augusto	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Oct. 7, 1942
Deseife, Marguerite	Junior clerk-typist	CAF-2	1,440	Jan. 23, 1943
Deutsch, Julius	Consultant		[3] 8	Apr. 19, 1943
D'Hellocourt, Jean	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 17, 1943
Diaz, Elisa	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	July 1, 1942
Dorsay, Elmer	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Williamson, Jess	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 2, 1943
Dreyfus, Adolphe	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Dufetel, Lucien	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 1, 1943
Dunlop, Helen	Assistant program director	CAF-7	2,600	Apr. 1, 1943
Echols, J. Randolph	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Corris, Allyn E	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 28, 1942
Elliott, Melvin	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 3, 1943
Embretsen, Jon E	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Errante, Anne Marie	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 1, 1942
Kasses, Zakeya Esa	do	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 12, 1942
Escuder, Joseph	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Schachman Esseze Emmanuel.	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Everett, Ethel	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Ellis, Ruth	Associate casting director	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Fagrell, Gunnar	Senior script editor	CAF-12	4,600	May 26, 1942
Falco, Emma	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Oct. 16, 1942
Fernandez, Victor	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Ferreira, Mario F	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Fischer, Marcel	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Foy, Louis	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Franc, Robert	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Frank, Carl	Consultant		[2]	Mar. 30, 1943
Fray, Jacques	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Freiderick, Jens	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Do.
Fuchs, Martin	Assistant language editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 26, 1942
Ferrer, Leonardo T	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Faris, Nabih Amin	Senior script editor	CAF-12	4,600	Sept. 25, 1942
Fiorvanti, Vincenzo	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Gebrovsky, Vsevolod	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Gerbi, Guliano	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Ginsberg, Vida	Junior program director	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 23, 1942
Giovanola, Luigi	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Godos, Salvador	Assistant language editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 7, 1942
Goldsmith, Lawrence	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 25, 1942
Goll, Yvon	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Gonzales, Jose F	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Gonzales, Enrique	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Gould, Elizabeth	Associate program director	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 16, 1942
Granata, Yole L	Junior script editor	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 10, 1942
Green, Julian	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Jan. 23, 1943
Greenberg, Dorothy	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	July 1, 1942
Greenstein, Florence	Junior administrative aide	CAF-5	2,000	Do.
Griggs, John M	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Grunt, Olav Paus	Assistant language editor	CAF-7	[2] 2,600	Mar. 4, 1943
Guerard, Albert L	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Gugliotta, Vincent	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 18, 1942
Gunzbourg, Jules	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 19, 1942
Guyot, Yvette	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 14, 1942

[1] When actually employed.
[2] Without compensation.
[3] Per day.

Radio Program Bureau—Continued

Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Entered on duties
Grobe, Albert	Announcer	CAF-11	$3,800	Sept. 1, 1942
Goorin, Samuel J	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Nov. 14, 1942
Haas, Dorothy G	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 22, 1943
Haas, Hugo	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Nov. 10, 1942
Halasz, Piroska C	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Aug. 16, 1942
Halle, Dexter D	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Harper, Loren E. B	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Harper, Frederick T	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Hart, Giovanna	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Hausenball, Rene	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Apr. 20, 1943
Heinowitz, Jeanette	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	July 1, 1942
Hendrik, John	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Hermann, Gary G	do	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Herzog, Milan	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Mar. 30, 1943
Heymann, Lotte	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Nov. 3, 1942
Hoffherr, Fred	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Hoffmeister, Adolph	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 28, 1942
Hotchner, Howard	Associate program director.	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 28, 1942
Houston, George F	Program director	CAF-10	3,500	July 1, 1943
Hudes, Tadeusz N	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Human, Cornelia	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Nov. 13, 1942
Hertz, Alexander	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 31, 1942
Jameson, House	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 26, 1942
Januskis, Vera	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Nov. 3, 1942
Jones, Russell (Johns)	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Nov. 27, 1942
Jungeblut, Rolf	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Nov. 16, 1942
Jurist, Edward	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Kac Uszer	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Mar. 10, 1943
Kahn, Amalia L	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Sept. 18, 1942
Kallin, Alexandra	Clerk-typist	CAF-4	[1] 1,800	Feb. 4, 1943
Kaiser, Erwin	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Karlstedt, Reuben	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Kayaalp, Ali	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 19, 1942
Khalidi, Ismail	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Kochnitsky, Leon	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Kouindjy, Leon	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 26, 1942
Kraber, Tony	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Kramer, Harry	do	CAF-11	3,800	Oct. 1, 1942
Katibah, Habib	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Lamport, Sara	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	July 1, 1942
Lange, Robert E	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
Lebel, Robert	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Lederman, Lilliane	Junior clerk-typist	CAF-2	1,440	Oct. 30, 1942
Leeds, David	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Leeser, Paulus	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Lert, Wolfgang	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	June 8, 1942
Levi, Mario	do	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Levi-Strauss, Claude	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Lewis, Helen	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Lewis, Joseph W., Jr	do	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Lindenberg, Paul	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Do.
Lindon, Lucien	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Lissim, Benedict	Consultant		[2]	Apr. 16, 1943
Llona, Victor	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 19, 1942
Lloyd, Norman	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Lomax, Bess	Junior research assistant	CAF-5	2,000	Dec. 16, 1942
Lopez, Robert	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Lowe, David	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Lupis, Giuseppe	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 8, 1943
Luzzato, Ermano	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 21, 1942
Lyons, Roger	Announcer	CAF-10	3,500	Aug. 16, 1942
Lurie, Walter	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Lyon, Peter C	Script editor	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Sept. 25, 1942
Loupas, Stathis	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Nov. 20, 1942
Laurent, Robert	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Leps, Bernard	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Mack, Gilbert	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Malgor, Mario M	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Malley, Elaine	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Oct. 27, 1942
Malten, William	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Yisrol Libman (Mann)	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Marais, Josef	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
March Mills (Tittler)	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 2, 1943
Marll, Konrad	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	July 1, 1942
Markiewicz, Helmut	Program director	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Marcov, Alexander	Associated script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 23, 1942
Markowski, Wladyslaw	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Aug. 16, 1942
Marx, Montague	do	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Mazel, Kaarel	do	CAF-7	2,600	Sept. 25, 1942
Mendoza, Martin	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Mar. 10, 1942
Mercie, Helene	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 3, 1943
Meyer, Hans	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Michaelis, Karin	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 24, 1943
Minciotti, Silvio	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
de Miranda, Rosa R	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Aug. 16, 1942
Misch, Gerda	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Sept. 25, 1942
Monteforte, Toledo Mario	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Mar. 9, 1943
Morenoff, Sam	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Morgan, Raymond	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Maron, Margarita R	Clerk-typist	CAF-4	1,800	Mar. 16, 1943
Mulaine, Maria	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	July 1, 1942
Marrow, Macklin	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 29, 1942
Mellner, Sylvia	Junior program director	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 10, 1942
MacLaughlin, Don	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 3, 1943
McCormick, Myron	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
McGrath, Byron	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
MacRorie, Janet	Senior script editor	CAF-12	4,600	Sept. 25, 1942
Nathan, Reuben S	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 30, 1942
Navarra, Louis	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	July 1, 1942
Neagoe, Peter	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Jan. 23, 1943
Nicoll, Oliver	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Nitzschke, Renee V	Junior script editor	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 4, 1942
Nizan, Henrietta	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Aug. 16, 1942
O'Connell, William	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] $3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
O'Neill, Charles E	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Ozenfant, Amedee	do	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 26, 1942
Paechter, Hedwig	Script clerk	CAF-4	1,800	July 1, 1942
Pahmer, Marcel	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Palmer, Philip Keith	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Parks, Paul	do	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Passante, Dominic	Associate program director.	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 26, 1942
Pertschuk, Marie	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Oct. 30, 1942
Peters, Brandon	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 2, 1943
Petroff, Boris	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Pierre, Jules	do	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Schapira, Gisella (Pieri)	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Pillois, Raymond	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Do.
Piernie, Duncan	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 5, 1943
Pitoeff, Georges	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 11, 1943
Polselver, Judith	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Nov. 13, 1942
Pollon, Michael	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Puhan, Alfred	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Pusta, Kaarel	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Pardo, Nester	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Jan. 1, 1943
Rado, Otto	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Aug. 10, 1942
Ramstein, Simone	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	July 1, 1942
Raquello, Edward	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Rava, Ettore	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 19, 1942
Ravel, Tony	Associate program director.	CAF-8	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
Ray, Nick	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Reed, John A	Junior script editor	CAF-5	2,000	Feb. 20, 1943
Reivo, William	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	May 25, 1942
Barjansky, Rehand	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 13, 1942
Revey, E. Lewis	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Riwkin, Ester	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	May 28, 1942
Riza, Said	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	July 16, 1942
Roberti, Renee	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Robinson, Allin	do	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Rose, Ernest W	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 25, 1942
Oscar Rose	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Ross, Robert	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 16, 1942
Rossi, Mario	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Nov. 2, 1942
Rothier, Leon	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
de Rougement, Denis	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Nov. 28, 1942
Rourke, John F	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Sept. 5, 1942
Roussel, Georges	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Rubinstein, Nina	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	July 1, 1942
Ruf, George	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 30, 1942
Rabasa, William P	do	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 20, 1942
Rasooli-Sa'eed, Joseph	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 22, 1942
Sacerdoti, Renzo	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 1, 1942
Salomon, Herbert J	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 3, 1942
Santon, Chester	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Sargent, Herbert C	do	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Saucier, Celestine	Senior clerk-stenographer	CAF-5	2,000	May 28, 1942
Schapiro, Eleanora	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Nov. 16, 1942
Schenke, Carolus	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	July 1, 1942
Scherer, Jacques	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug 16, 1942
Scheuer, Rose	Assistant clerk typist	CAF-3	1,620	July 1, 1942
Schlesinger, Frieda	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	Nov. 2, 1942
Segnitz, Paul	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Seitelman, Sophie	Junior clerk-typist	CAF-2	1,440	July 1, 1942
Sequerra, Jacob	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Do.
Seiffert, Peter	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 13, 1942
Sharf, Eli	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Shashahani, Riza	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 27, 1942
Shepard, Robert	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Shilton, Robert E	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
Siemsen, Hans	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	May 29, 1942
Silverman, Stanley	do	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 29, 1942
Singer, Diana	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	CAF-3	1,620	July 1, 1942
Sion, Sydney	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	Do.
Smith, Charles E	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942
Smith, Isabella	Assistant program director.	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 1, 1942
Smith, Sydney	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 10, 1942
Sonnenthal, Annamarie	Clerk-stenographer	CAF-4	1,800	July 1, 1942
Statlander, Robert	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Feb. 20, 1943
Stein, Emanuel	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Sterbini, Pio	Assistant language editor	CAF-7	2,600	Jan. 13, 1943
Stewart, Paul	Senior program director	CAF-12	4,600	Aug. 16, 1942
Stoinoff, Stoin	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Mauduit, Alexander (Strong)	Program director	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Surmagne, Jaques	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 23, 1942
Swanger, Ludmilla	do	CAF-7	2,600	July 1, 1942
Santo, Marie	Junior clerk-typist	CAF-2	1,440	Sept. 18, 1942
Scheuing, Edwin	Associate program director.	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 29, 1942
Segal, Sonya	Junior clerk-typist	CAF-2	1,440	Jan. 16, 1942
Stokvis, Paul	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 6, 1943
Tamim-Ollivand, Marie	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Terebessy, John	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 5, 1942
Tesoro, Vittorio	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 16, 1942
Thorn, Georgette	Assistant clerk-typist	CAF-3	1,620	Oct. 30, 1942
Thurman, Beverly	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Tiplady, George	do	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Tobin Joseph	do	CAF-10	3,500	Sept. 26, 1942
Tobler	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Dec. 18, 1942
Todes, Jules	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943
Torczyner, Harry	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Do.
Takal, Alfonse	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 2, 1943
Vacirca, Corrado	do	CAF-11	3,800	July 1, 1942
Van Doren, Anne	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Do.

[1] When actually employed.

Radio Program Bureau—Continued

Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Entered on duties	Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Entered on duties
Van Doren, Dorothy	Senior script editor	CAF-12	$4,600	Aug. 16, 1942	Welch, Niles	Program director	CAF-11	$3,800	Sept. 3, 9142
Van Schaik, Jan	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 29, 1942	Welch, Edgar	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 2, 1943
Vatis, Anastasios	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Jan. 13, 1943	Werich, Jan	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 30, 1942
Vergara, Edouardo	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	May 12, 1942	Wertler, Carol	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Sept. 25, 1942
Vicente, Esteban	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943	Wesley, Jay	Announcer	CAF-11	3,800	Nov. 4, 1942
Volski, Sophia	Assistant file clerk	CAF-3	1,620	Oct. 30, 1942	Winternitz, Edward	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Von Mendelsohn, Eleonora.	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943	Winternitz, Robert	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 18, 1943
Von Wasserman	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Nov. 2, 1942	Wolfson, Martin	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Aug. 16, 1942
Voskovec, George	Script editor	CAF-11	3,800	Aug. 16, 1942	Wang, Zaren	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 21, 1942
Vallin, Antonio	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943	Ward, George	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Waldrop, James	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Do.	Wiener, Francis	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Mar. 6, 1943
Wale, May (Mamorek).	Assistant casting director	CAF-7	2,600	July 2, 1942	Yenice, Humerya	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Nov. 24, 1942
Wallner, Mimi	Junior research assistant	CAF-5	2,000	Feb. 22, 1943	York, Ruth	Announcer	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Feb. 20, 1943
Weil, Georges	Assistant announcer	CAF-7	2,600	Feb. 20, 1943	Zanirato, Serafina	do	CAF-11	[1] 3,800	Do.
Weiss, Rudolf	Associate announcer	CAF-9	3,200	Oct. 1, 1942	Zatkin, Nathan	Special events promoter	CAF-11	3,800	Sept. 28, 1942
Weissman, Ingeborg	Senior clerk-stenographer	CAF-5	2,000	Aug. 1, 1942	Zeider, Mira	Senior translator	CAF-5	2,000	Oct. 20, 1942
					Zlotowski, Mira	Assistant script editor	CAF-7	2,600	Oct. 16, 1942
					Zoylner, Christian	Associate script editor	CAF-9	3,200	Aug. 16, 1942

[1] When actually employed.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is there any evidence before the committee as to the amount of investigation that was made into the political background of these alien employees, whether they were fellow travelers or members of any subversive political party?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I indicated a little earlier that I conducted some inquiry along that line, which will be found at pages 1291 to 1310 of the hearings. I think anyone who will examine these pages will at least have a very substantial query in his mind as to whether a proper degree of care has been exercised by the agency in considering the background of those who are now on its rolls.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] very rightly referred to the preparation of propaganda by those persons who are aliens. The O. W. I., of course, is divided into the Overseas Division and the Domestic Division, as far as the preparation of propaganda is concerned. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman could give the committee some idea of how many of those are in the Domestic Division. That is, in the preparation of propaganda, if we wish to call it that, for domestic readers, and how many in the Overseas Division?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry I cannot give the answer to the gentleman specifically. My impression is that the larger proportion were in the overseas branch of the work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The matter is also discussed at page 757 of the hearings. Mr. Sherwood explained the situation, as well Mr. Eisenhower, that in the Foreign Service they had to get people who are familiar with the language of the people of the land where they were and it was absolutely impossible to get American citizens who know the language, that they have exercised a very high degree of care and deliberation in picking the people who are sympathetic to the cause, that it was not possible for them to go out and get American citizens who could speak over these broadcasts; and that they have even employed some Japanese to speak over the broadcasts because there was no one else they could get.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think a certain percentage is necessary for the reasons indicated, but whatever the percentage it is vital that the agency be assured of the absolute loyalty of each and every person on the pay roll.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Has the gentleman any indication as to the general range of salaries paid to these individuals; do they compare in any way to similar salaries that are paid under civil service?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the shortest answer to the gentleman's question would be to insert, as the gentleman from Michigan has suggested, the list which Mr. Davis has furnished.

Mr. DEWEY. That will include the salaries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It will show the salaries as well as the positions.

Mr. DEWEY. I think we should have that.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I merely want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have had a number of complaints from some Polish-language newspapers and radio stations in my State about the type of remarks that have been received from the O. W. I., advising me that they are written in such poor language they could not even be used but had to be completely rewritten, and some of it did not make any sense at all.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I appeared before a committee on which the gentleman is serving to protest against the spending of Government funds for domestic propaganda. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there has been a reduction in the amount of money for domestic propaganda, or whether the committee has been able to eliminate it entirely from this bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There has been a cut in the funds requested for the Domestic Operations Branch from $8,800,000 to $5,500,000, but I think if we are to insure the elimination of propaganda to which the gentleman refers, that an amendment should be adopted with limiting language.

Mr. BROOKS. Is there any restriction on the use of that fund for domestic propaganda purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think there is no restriction in the bill at present. I think an amendment should be adopted to meet your suggestion.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I notice from a recent press report that a program is in contemplation to propagandize the political contest for the President of the United States, in foreign parts, and this article went on to state that this propaganda would not only be in the interest of the Democratic candidate but in the interest of the Republican candidate as well, whoever he might be.

Does the gentleman have any information on that subject, or was anything stated to the committee regarding it?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the article probably resulted from remarks by Mr. Sherwood, who is in charge of the Overseas Branch, to the effect that it was the intention of that Branch to treat equally and to play up equally both candidates whoever they might be in the next election.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman's views whether he thinks the Government taxes, or American taxpayers' dollars, should be expended for propaganda regardless of what political party, and spent in foreign countries.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am against any propaganda by O. W. I., except overseas, where it may be helpful in psychological warfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word in reference to the Office of Civilian Defense. The request for this agency, as you will note, was $5,746,000 as compared with $7,447,000. The amount recommended by the committee is $4,000,000.

Under the act approved January 27, 1942, the Office of Civilian Defense was directed—

To provide facilities, supplies, and services to include research and development for the adequate protection of persons and property from bombing attacks, sabotage, and other war hazards.

Every dollar essential for that purpose should, in my judgment and in the judgment of the committee, be made available to O. C. D.

It appears, however, from the testimony that O. C. D. has embarked, or is about to embark, upon various other activities which seem to have little or nothing to do with the protective functions with which it was originally entrusted. It appears that under the general heading of aiding the individual to cooperate better in the war effort, the agency plans to embark upon a program of 100,000 or more speakers, with material to be provided by the O. W. I., on a program for local discussion groups with material to be provided by the O. W. I., and on a Nation-wide program, known as the block system, a system which has been in effect in Germany for some time with a block leader in every block of the country, headed up through the various superiors into State offices, designed as a medium of transmisison of information from Washington, we will say, to the blocks and from the blocks back to Washington in reference to matters lying outside the field of protection.

Criticism has apparently already manifested itself in reference to this proposed program and the committee has been reluctant to believe that the regimentation and the expense in connection with it is necessary under present conditions. The committee has felt that the Congress would not wish in the name of air raid defense to set up a gigantic organization reaching into every local organization, every group, and every home in the country.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I did not hear quite clearly in regard to the block official. Did the gentleman say a precinct captain or a block captain?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is to be a block leader in every block and over him is to be a sector leader who will have possibly half a dozen block leaders under him: then there will be a zone leader and over the zone leader will come a chief of the block leader service and the local defense council or the State headquarters.

Mr. DEWEY. That is similar to the German scheme; is it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that if it was not invented in Germany, it has been in effect in Germany under the Hitler regime for a considerable period.

Mr. DEWEY. What is the purpose of these people—political or what?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The purpose, according to the sponsors, is to help the individual citizen cooperate better in the war effort.

Mr. DEWEY. Are they paid, or is this volunteer work?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Certain funds are involved for the preparation of the information which O. W. I. is to make available. Just what will be the over-all cost either to the Federal Government or to the States and communities I am unable to state at the moment.

Mr. DEWEY. They would not have anything to do with political matters, I presume, or political propaganda?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman's judgment in that respect is as good as mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. For the sake of the record I wish to make a statement of fact. In the city of Chicago when the civilian defense organization was set up, Mayor Kelly, who is the chief coordinator of the Chicago metropolitan area, issued orders that the Democratic precinct captains were to recommend the names of block organizers in every ward and every precinct in the city of Chicago. If this is not politics I do not know the meaning of politics. Another thing, Mayor Kelly was the metropolitan chief of O. C. D. up until a couple of weeks before the last election, at which time he resigned, but immediately upon being reelected as mayor of Chicago he resumed his duty as chief coordinator of that district.

For the sake of unity, and the future welfare of the Office of Civilian Defense I ask that all politics be removed from this agency.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the general view of the committee is summed up in an editorial appearing in the New York Times entitled "What Is Civilian Defense?" It reads as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1943]

WHAT IS "CIVILIAN DEFENSE"?

Most of us have assumed that the purpose of the Office of Civilian Defense and of the various organizations affiliated with it is to prepare for civilian protection against enemy bombing and other forms of enemy action against the home front. But some odd things seem to be happening. We have before us, for example, a Consumers Wartime Digest, published under the imprint of the Civilian Defense Volunteer Office (Consumers Service Division, Manhattan). It opens with a campaign in behalf of grade labeling. Grade labeling is a cause that has been suddenly taken up very ardently by a number of left-wing groups. Our purpose here is not to enter into the merits or defects of grade labeling but to raise a few questions. Just what have "consumers" got to do with preparations against the bombing of New York? What has grade labeling got to do with the protection of the public against bombing? What right has any group in this national wartime agency to use the Civilian Defense Volunteer Office as a means of promoting its own economic ideas?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say in the opening of his remarks that the O. C. D. was about to embark upon this program?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe the program has not been fully developed. It may have been started in places, but this is the first time it has been considered by the Congress.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to call attention to the fact that I hold in my hand more than 20 bulletins I secured from the Chicago Office of Civilian Defense, including various bulletins put out by O. W. I. As far as I can determine, a great deal of this is nothing but propaganda of a political nature for a fourth term.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the testimony of the Petroleum Administration for War for just a minute. This office requested $5,473,000, which request is recommended in full by the committee.

Let me emphasize that the agency states that all functions in respect to the fuel-oil and gasoline problem have not yet been concentrated in the hands of the Administrator, that the rationing function is still in the hands of at least three agencies, that the price function is in the hands of another agency, and that in the opinion of those testifying before the committee the present critical gasoline situation could have been avoided if the Administration had permitted centralization of all these functions and not insisted upon division of authority.

The agency points out that so far as the eastern seaboard is concerned there has been an increase from 100,000 barrels a day to about 1,250,000 barrels a day as of May 15 last; that the new 24-inch pipe line should add 180,000 barrels a day net as of August 1 next; that the new 20-inch pipe line should add another 165,000 barrels as of January 1 next; and the agency states that in the light of foreseeable military demands and on the basis of the elimination of nonessential driving it both hopes and expects to make available next winter as much fuel oil as was available last winter—that is, 25 percent less than the normal unrestricted demand.

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Mr. Chairman, I intended to say something in reference to B. E. W., but I think I will withhold what I had in mind to say until the reading of the bil' for amendment. I may simply observe, Mr. Chairman, that I concur in the con-

clusion reached by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I believe a substantial reduction in the amount recommended by the committee should be made.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Before the gentleman leaves entirely the subject of the Petroleum Administrator for War, I would like to add, it is not only a tremendous weakness in the administrative ability of the administration not to have a centralization of authority but the record between the Petroleum Administrator for War and the Office of Price Administration shows one of complete failure when it comes to cooperation. The Office of Price Administration has taken upon its shoulders the full responsibility for any oil shortage that may occur in the future because of their refusal to cooperate with the Petroleum Administrator for War and for their insistence upon vetoing his program for continued and increased exploration for discovery.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The division of authority has been inexcusable. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I close by saying a word in reference to the War Production Board. The request in this instance is $89,950,000, as compared with $80,791,000 for the current year. The amount recommended is $88,200,000, or $1,750,000 less than the Budget estimate. The W. P. B. is an agency which all of us, I am sure, hesitate to reduce insofar as appropriations are concerned, because of its immense importance in the war effort; yet it does seem as though further reduction should be possible, particularly as time goes on.

It was only a few weeks ago that Mr. Nelson himself, appearing before the deficiency subcommittee, indicated in response to a question which I asked him, that in his judgment if this agency were to be run on a business basis for profit as distinguished from a Government agency for war purposes he could probably get along with a 25-percent reduction in personnel. I hope as time goes on that the progress he has already made in reducing from about 23,000 to 19,000 may continue and that we may realize somewhere near the basis that he suggested from a business standpoint.

The committee will be interested in testimony in reference to the new office for civilian requirements and the testimony by Mr. Jeffers in reference to synthetic rubber. Mr. Nelson states that friction has been largely eliminated and that in his opinion everything from that standpoint is on a 95-percent basis as distinguished from a 75-percent basis 6 months ago. He points out that of the $246,000,000,000 appropriated for the war effort to date, $110,000,000,000 have been spent and $120,000,000,000 obligated, leaving only $16,000,000,000 unobligated as of the end of this fiscal year. He points out also the enormous increase in national production in this country from about $97,000,000,000 in 1940 to $180,000,000,000 in 1943. War production has increased from $2,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000. Nonwar production has fallen from $95,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000. Mr. Nelson indicates that we are approaching the limit both in terms of production and in terms of the proportion of production which we can devote to the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I think this record is unparalleled in the history of the world. It is the greatest possible tribute both to labor and to management throughout this great Nation of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill under consideration has in it an item for the Office of War Information.

The Members of the House will recall that the Office for Emergency Management was established by an Executive order of May 25, 1940, and there was established within the Office for Emergency Management, under Executive Order 9182, on June 13, 1942, the Office of War Information, consolidating into one agency the war information functions of the Government—both foreign and domestic. There was transferred to the Office of War Information the Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of Government Reports, the Division of Information in the Office for Emergency Management, with the exception to functions relating to the provisions of press and publication services dealing with specific activities of the constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Management. There was also transferred to the Office of War Information the Foreign Information Service, Outpost, Publication, and Pictorial Branches of the Coordinator of Information.

The Executive Order also established within the Office of War Information a committee on war-information policy to formulate basic policies and plans on war information and to advise with respect to the development of coordinated war-information programs. The policies of this committee to any casual observer became that of war interference—instead of disseminating war information. The Executive order authorized the Director to formulate and carry out through the use of the press, radio, motion picture, and other facilities, information programs designed to facilitate the development of an informed and intelligent understanding—at home and abroad—of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies, activities, and aims of the Government. By reason of the transfer under the provisions of the Executive order of June 13, 1942, the several agencies I have heretofore enumerated gave to the newly created Office of War Information the personnel nucleus to carry on the activities of this very important Government agency.

Thus, the newly appointed Director of the Office of War Information—Mr. Elmer Davis, for whom I personally have the highest regard—a man who has reached the top of his chosen profession and who has an unquestionable reputation for integrity and reliability as a newspaperman and radio commentator—found himself surrounded by a group of assistants and so-called experts who were not of his own choosing, but that of the personnel officers who were charged with the responsibility of securing efficient personnel in the several agencies which were absorbed by the Office of War Information. In his chosen fields of endeavor, Elmer Davis is undoubtedly a man of unsurpassed ability, but a good newspaperman and a good radio commentator is not necessarily a good administrator, and as an administrator, in my opinion, Elmer Davis has been a complete failure.

Mr. Elmer Davis, as Director of the Office of War Information, is responsible for the official activities of his personnel. It would be but logical to assume that a person employed as an expert—for instance, as a foreign linguist or translator—should, at least, understand the language and have a thorough knowledge of the history and traditions, as well as a political and economic background of the people of the foreign country to which they are supposed to disseminate information as to the aims of the Government with reference to the war effort.

For instance, the Chief of the Foreign Section of the Office of War Information is a 28-year-old genius—one Matt Gordon—who has spent his entire lifetime on the lower side of New York prior to accepting his very responsible position in Washington, and I have been reliably informed that this young man does not speak any foreign language—yet he has the final word on releasing or supressing all foreign news. I do not know whether or not Mr. Gordon is a Communist, but from what I have learned of his activities—both past and present—and his public utterances and private conversations, he goes the whole way for the Soviet political set-up—in fact, anyone who dares to disagree with him is classified as a Fascist. Mr. Gordon's assistants are of the same class.

They have a child wonder down there in O. W. I.—aged 23 years—George Michanowski—the Russian expert—who probably started to read and write before he cut his baby teeth.

The Foreign Language Division of the O. W. I. is under the direction of Alan Cranston. His myterious role in the Tresca affair has never been explained. The result of his costly efforts in the Office of War Information—pardon me, War Interference—is such that none of his press releases contain any mention concerning the activities of the exiled governments—even though they are our Allies and signatories to the Atlantic Charter. Insofar as Mr. Cranston is concerned these exiled governments do not exist—nor do they exist so far as Soviet Russia is concerned.

I was amazed to learn from a reliable source that in the O. W. I. short-wave broadcast beamed to Europe, the mention of the name of that great Yugoslav

patriot, General Draja Michajlowicz, was taboo, and that no reference could be made of him or of the great work he and his army are doing for the Allied cause because the O. W. I. feared that they might offend our ally, Russia, because General Michajlowicz is not in their good graces and they do not look with favor on the great work he is doing not only for his country but all of our allies.

Take for instance, the expert in charge of the Polish language broadcasts directed to Europe—he is a certain person by the name of Hudes. This man, Hudes, was born in Poland, and his birthright is the only thing he has in common with the ideals of Poland. He left Poland as a very young man, lived for 15 years in Paris, France, where he was a notorious Communist associated with the most important French Communistic writers and his writings were linked with the Communistic French newspapers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how these men got the positions they are holding in this office?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is one question I cannot answer. I do not know how they go there. They are brought in through some agency, but how they are brought in I do not know.

He lost all ties with his native country of Poland and finally even lost his Polish citizenship. He remained in France after its collapse, and as Russia was at that time still Germany's faithful ally, he associated with the most fervent Vichyites. Finally, he left France, came here, and became, after a few weeks' stay in this country, the O. W. I.'s expert for teaching the Polish people the meaning of American democracy. How this Communist who lost his Polish citizenship and is not even now an American citizen and has not been in the land of his birth for more than 18 years can tell the people of Poland about American democracy and the American war aims is beyond the comprehension of any intelligent person.

As further evidence that Hudes is not qualified to disseminate information as to American democracy and the freedoms as outlined in the United Nations Pact, I give you this startling fact: Since Pearl Harbor the Office of War Information has by short wave been beaming programs to the occupied countries of Europe disseminating pertinent war information and encouraging the nations of those countries to keep up the fight and aid and assist the United Nations in their efforts to restore their rights and liberties. It has been the uniform practice—and fittingly so—that at the end of each of these programs to play the national anthem of the particular country to which the program was directed. That practice is still in force as to programs to the occupied countries, with the exception of Poland. For the past few weeks Mr. Hudes has substituted in lieu of the Polish national anthem a Polish song.

Evidently Mr. Hudes does not like the opening stanza of the Polish National Anthem which is, "Poland is not yet lost," but prefers a song which he has substituted and which is used almost exclusively by Red Quislings of Polish descent now in Moscow and who are now endeavoring with Stalin's aid to overthrow the legitimate Polish Government in exile. I submit to the Members of the House that this communistic-tainted man without a country is not a fit person to have charge of the Polish language broadcasts directed to Europe. Such rank discrimination against one of our brave allies should certainly not come from one who is on the pay roll of the Office of War Information and whose foremost thoughts and actions should be in behalf of the efforts of the United Nations and not be communistically inspired as it is in this instance.

My personal opinion is that people in charge of disseminating American propaganda for each particular foreign country should be American born, American educated, and American indoctrinated, and belonging to that particular national group, and they should be qualified to speak fluently the language of their forebears and have a comprehensive knowledge of the traditions, history, politics, economics, and national aims of the people to which they direct the information.

There is no difficulty at all to find such persons in our great country—there are plenty of young Americans of Greek, Yugoslav, Czech, Rumanian, Hungarian, Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, and Polish descent. There are plenty of Americans of Polish descent who are highly educated and entrusted with responsible positions in our Government and in our armed forces who have a deep and lasting affection for the land of their forefathers and the principles for which the United Nations are fighting. You can find such young men in every walk of life—they are doctors, lawyers, and are in other chosen professions in civilian life—and in our armed forces you can find Americans of Polish descent from the general in the Army down to the buck private—and from high-ranking officers in the Navy to seamen.

It is indeed regrettable that those charged with the responsibility of securing trained and efficient personnel to disseminate information to our allies in foreign countries that cannot go afield and secure men of the high caliber and training that is required to efficiently maintain our close relations and cooperation so necessary to present a united front in a common cause.

Instead of securing trained American personnel with a thorough knowledge of the background of the countries of our allies, they have employed so-called experts whose whole philosophy of government and purposes are aimed at helping the strong and mighty and ignoring the weak and exiled governments which include the countries of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Norway, Belgium, Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Poland. These Office of War Information experts are endeavoring to tell the people in the occupied countries all about the greatness of Russia and the privileges and freedoms that Russia permits her people to have—that propaganda is false and misleading because there is no difference between Hitler's freedom and Stalin's freedom and their forms of government are despised by the peoples of the smaller nations—especially those who have been harshly and inhumanly treated and subjugated to the German and Russian yokes.

I would advise the O. W. I. experts to read very carefully the columns of the brilliant American writer, Mr. Raymond Clapper, who is now, and has been for the past few weeks, in Sweden. This trained and sharp-eyed observer informs us most authoritatively how deeply afraid the European nations are to fall under Stalin's yoke.

The O. W. I. should interpret to the peoples of occupied Europe the policy of the Government of the United States—the policy stated in the United Nations Pact and evidenced by these three words, "no territorial aggrandizement"—instead of interpreting the Russian policy. Being an American governmental agency, the O. W. I. should comply with the plans and strategy of the United States, and one of these plans is to secure the most efficient help of the European fighting underground for the American and British invasion armies. The German propaganda is trying to soften these underground fighters by telling them that in case of an Allied victory they will be sold to Russia. We must hearten these fighters against Goebbels' propaganda—and tell them that we will never give them to Russia. This is the duty of the O. W. I.

Personally, I am of the opinion that this Office of War Information should be dissolved and its functions transferred to the State Department, where capable and efficient career men—thoroughly trained in Foreign Service work—would be able to handle the functions in a much more satisfactory and diplomatic manner insofar as they concern war information and our relationship with foreign countries. I am also of the opinion that the State Department could do this work in a much more efficient and economical manner. As it seems to be the aim of the Government to spend money, let us use the difference between what it would actually take to do this work in an efficient manner in the State Department and what is now being spent under the bungling methods of the Office of War Information and appropriate it to the small American country press to carry on a great educational campaign as to the aims of our Government insofar as it concerns this global war.

The American press is doing an excellent job and could do an even better one if it were not for the censorship imposed by the hand-picked personnel of the Office of War Information—take, for instance, the story as to what happened to the thousands of Polish officers who were murdered in the Katyn Forest. The story was completely quashed despite the fact that this same story came from neutral

sources. Statements of representatives of the Polish Government were put under the blotter, while the Soviet declarations were given space on the first page at the direction of the Office of War Information. As for presenting the Polish standpoint, the newspapers of the United States were told by the Office of War Information to lay off the story.

The Soviet-Japanese fishing agreement, by direction of the Office of War Information, was modestly hidden behind local news—it was given in a few lines without any comment, as it might create an unfavorable reaction among the American people.

These are the methods of the O. W. I. with reference to disseminating war information.

Take the story of the cold-blooded murder of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, two Polish labor leaders, and leaders of the Jewish Social-Democratic parties. For convenience the Soviets charged them with being German spies and by a magic stroke of the pen they made these two venerable Polish citizens into Soviet citizens overnight. After the Soviets murdered Ehrlich and Alter they made a blunder—or should we say, a bureaucratic mistake? The Polish Ambassador at Moscow, a few weeks before his departure, received a bill from the Soviet Government for hotel expenses for the two murdered men amounting to 1,600 rubles—the unfortunate men did not have a chance to pay their bill after their arrest, and so the Soviet Government wanted to collect the bill from the Poles because it was stated that Ehrlich and Alter were Polish citizens while they were alive and Soviet citizens when they were executed. The O. W. I. has not given one line of this affair to the press nor have they taken the trouble to explain the true facts. Do the child wonders and so-called experts of the O. W. I. think for 1 minute that anyone in the United States—or, for that matter, in the entire world—will give credence to the dastardly Soviet lie that these two labor leaders of Jewish faith were agents of Hitler?

The leaders of the great labor organizations of this country did not believe the Soviet lie because the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined in a memorial and indignation meeting at Mecca Temple at New York City, on Tuesday, March 30, 1943, and denounced the execution by the Soviet Government of Ehrlich and Alter, Polish-Jewish labor leaders, who, according to the Soviets, were defeatists and advocates of a separate peace. The meeting was presided over by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. Mayor LaGuardia participated in the meeting; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, delivered speeches. This meeting was held under the auspices of the committee of 250 representing the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. unions, and Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, addressed the meeting by telephone from Washington.

This was the first meeting of this character in this country involving a member of the United Nations, but it is reported that all the speakers maintained that the execution by the Soviet Government of Ehrlich and Alter was a blow to the principles and purposes for which the United Nations are fighting this global war.

Mr. Green and Mr. Carey stressed the injury to the cause of the world solidarity of labor by the Russian Government. During his address, Mr. Green stated that—

Because of our dependence upon Russia's aid in this war and because of our natural reluctance to arouse division and friction among the United Nations, there is a disposition in some quarters to accept all the acts of the Soviet Government as sacred and beyond the sphere of debate. We in the American labor movement recognize no such compulsion. We, who reserve the right to criticize the leaders of our own Government when our views differ, will not relinquish that right with respect to the leaders of other governments. We do not believe it is wise or healthy to suppress freedom of thought or freedom of expression even in the midst of a war. These fundamental rights must be preserved at any cost. When we are confronted with an act which we consider unjust, we cannot stop our ears, blind our eyes, or silence our protests. In America, now and forevermore, we can and we will speak out against injustice anywhere.

In this spirit we meet here tonight to consider the case of two men who were executed by the Soviet Government last December. Their names were Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter. The news of their death has just reached us and we are immeasurably shocked by it. Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter were our friends. We knew and loved them and respected them, as did many thousands of our fellow trade-unionists in this country, in Great Britain, and in every other nation where freedom is revered.

During his remarks he told of his efforts in cooperation with British labor leaders to obtain information as to the fate of Ehrlich and Alter, and he said that—

He was confronted with an unsurmountable obstacle for although the Russian Government in the past has evidenced a lively interest in the internal affairs of other nations, it does not recognize the right of another government to intercede or seek information concerning aliens held in Russia. Since Ehrlich and Alter were not American citizens, the authorities in Russia firmly declined to give us any information about them.

Further alarmed by this development, I joined with the friends of Erhlich and Alter in this country and in Great Britain in appealing to the Russian Government for the release of the two Polish labor leaders so that they might be brought to America. These efforts continued for some time with no definite results until we received formal notification from representatives of the Russian Government only a few weeks ago that Ehrlich and Alter had been executed by that Government.

This notification gave us, for the first time, even the faintest inkling of the official charges against Ehrlich and Alter. It declared that they had been found guilty of hostile activities against the Soviet Government, including appeals to the Soviet troops to stop bloodshed and to conclude peace with Germany.

These were the charges. What facts and what evidence were produced in support of these charges we do not know. We do know this—that the lives and records and characters of Ehrlich and Alter thoroughly belie these charges.

During the course of his remarks, he referred to the fact that communistic publications in this country had dared to condemn David Dubinsky as a pro-Hitlerite because he had the courage to protest against what he considered an injustice.

Mr. Green concluded his remarks with the following statement:

We must be patient. We must wait. But when the time comes, when victory is won, we will move heaven and earth to expose the hidden facts, to clear their names, and to give them their rightful place in history as heroic martyrs in the cause of progress.

His complete speech can be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A1723–A1724.

Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, made a brilliant address and during his remarks, stated that—

The execution of Alter and Ehrlich has been a grave blow to our vision of world labor unity.

He defended the right of labor to protest against the execution of these two leaders as follows:

One can only feel a sense of tragedy about the words we are called upon to speak.

But the tragedy would be even greater if we remained silent. To us in the labor movement, this war is not merely a negative crusade against the evils of fascism. It is a struggle to affirm those principles of justice, and the dignity of individual human life, which have been symbols of the labor movement in all times in the past.

He further stated that—

While recognizing the debt all people owe to the Soviet workers for their heroic resistance against nazi-ism, there can be no true unity achieved unless the Soviet Government acknowledges its responsibility to the workers of other countries. There can be no true unity without recognition that we are equals; that American workers and Polish workers and workers everywhere have a right to choose their own leaders; that any attempt by anyone to dictate their choice can only shatter the unity we seek. There can be no real unity if only those labor leaders who have blindly worshipped the emissaries of the Communist International are welcomed by the Soviet Government at the international council tables. And when two great leaders of labor are executed, we have the right to demand the truth about the execution and to air the case in the court of international conscience.

I know that there are forces within our country and abroad which still dream of an anti-Soviet front in Europe. We in the Congress of Industrial Organizations have challenged these forces and resisted their actions. It is perhaps inevitable that the Soviet Government should still look with suspicion at the continued presence of some of these men in high places. But these men are not Americans any more than Alter and Ehrlich can be confused with the Pro-Fascist landlords of Poland. The Soviet Government can dismiss the crocodile tears spilled by the Hearst press and other traditional foes of labor over the execution of these two men. But it cannot dismiss the questions and the fears stirring in the minds of millions of workers all over the world who knew the records of Alter and Ehrlich. Their questions, their fears, must be answered if world unity is to be won.

In asking that the Soviet Government respond to these questions, I am not presenting issues of internal Russian politics. I note here for the record—whatever my private opinions—that I did not publicly discuss the Moscow trials, or other acts of the Russian Government which created widespread controversy here. But the Alter-Ehrlich case extends far beyond national boundaries. It cuts deep into the whole future of world labor. The victims were Poles, not Russians; many people looked to them as the leaders of a great democratic reconstruction in Poland; their fate carries an implied threat to the integrity of labor leaders in other countries.

He continued his remarks by stating:

I know of no men of independent thought who have been persuaded that Alter and Ehrlich were guilty. I have read and reread the explanation submitted by Ambassador Litvinoff, and each time the explanation appears less convincing. These men were leaders of labor. They were anti-Fascists. They were Socialists. They were Jews. Their lives were a record of uncompromising resistance to the intellectual and physical barbarism which reached its climax under Hitler. All that they stood for was endangered by the Nazi advance.

He concluded his remarks by stating:

We have been fully told one side of the story—the story of political rigidity and suppression—but we have been told little of the other side—of economic change and enlarged opportunity. But it would be foolish to believe that this is the sole reason for our misunderstanding. The other key fact is that the Communist Parties operating in this and other countries have proclaimed themselves the only true representative of the Russian workers. It is my considered opinion that the activities of the Communist Party in this country, with its savage vilification of all who refuse to follow the party line, with its sudden reversals of policy and its ideological twists and turns, with its totalitarian habits of mind and ways of action, remains a major barrier to true American-Russian understanding. As long as the Soviet Government lives in the delusion that the Communist Party represents American workers, it cannot conceivably appreciate the problems that divide the workers of our countries.

This is a time that requires frankness, and I have spoken in that spirit. I have spoken in the belief that we fight a war not only for survival but for the liberation of the human spirit; and that the workers of all countries must make common cause now to lay the foundation for a bright new era in human history.

Mr. Carey's entire speech is in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A1669–A1670.

Mr. David Dubinsky, chairman of the protest meeting in Mecca Temple, and president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, opened his remarks with the following statement:

Friends, fellow trade-unionists, 6 years ago, in 1937, Henryk Ehrlich spoke from this platform, in Mecca Temple, at a meeting at which I was the chairman. Ehrlich spoke about the great menace of nazi-ism and called upon us in America to help combat that menace.

Tonight we meet in Mecca Temple again. We meet to honor the memory of two fallen leaders, two of the noblest souls in the ranks of world-wide labor—Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter. * * *

Ehrlich and Alter are no strangers to us in America. They were close to our labor movement, we worked with them, we cooperated with them, and we loved them for their idealism and for their high integrity.

During his remarks he referred to the appeals that had been made for the release of Ehrlich and Alter in the following words:

They were executed in defiance of appeals for their release from president William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, president Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, Dr. Albert Einstein, and many other outstanding representatives of democratic and labor opinion here and in England, including the British labor party and Sir Stafford Cripps. Both the State Department and the British Foreign Office, as well as the Polish Government in exile have taken a deep interest in the case.

They were executed because they were democratic socialists, champions of trade-unionism, and opponents of all dictatorship, including the Communist dictatorship.

He further stated:

Nor can we, American labor men and Democrats, accept the cold-blooded alibi that the execution of Ehrlich and Alter was a matter of Soviet domestic policy and does not concern us. If the Soviet Government expects to be taken seriously as a collaborator with the democratic countries in the establishment of a new world order based upon justice, decency, and respect for human rights it should show respect for these principles in its own policies and actions at home.

He concluded his remarks as follows:

Friends and comrades, no power on earth can bring Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter back to life; how well we recognize this in this moment of great sorrow. But no power on earth, we declare, shall succeed in besmirching the nobility of their lives, their reputations, or their characters. As free American citizens, as workers, and as democrats, in registering our fiery protest against their execution, we shall assert and reassert to the end of time our unshakable belief in their innocence and their stainless idealism. Ehrlich and Alter died as martyrs. They died because even at the price of life itself they would not renounce their convictions, the principles of a free democratic world. This is our tragedy, this is our loss, this is their undying glory.

Mr. Dubinsky's entire speech is in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1705.

It is indeed a brilliant and masterful protest as to the activities of the Communists.

Mr. Thomas J. Lyons, president of the New York State Federation of Labor with a membership of 1,500,000 addressed the following message to Mr. Dubinsky:

The American people are in the midst of a great struggle for self-preservation, for the survival on this continent and everywhere in this world of the undying principles of humanity without which life is worthless.

We in America do not intend to dictate domestic policies to any of our friends or allies, but we cannot fail in our duty to protest from the depth of our hearts when we see the principles of humanity for which we are fighting trampled under foot by those with whom we are engaged in a struggle against a common enemy.

That is why I join with you in this protest against the execution by the Soviet authorities of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter. They were men with unblemished lives devoted to labor. Their memory will remain unsoiled and clean in the hearts of all lovers of liberty and humanity.

Mr. Gustav Strebel, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations for New York State, declared that the killing of the two Polish labor leaders "was not execution but political assassination, dictated by party considerations, without justice or legal reasons."

Another pillar in the labor movement of New York is James C. Quinn, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Council, who said:

Together with the overwhelming majority of labor in our country, I reject the absurd charge that these two self-sacrificing fighters for freedom and against nazi-ism and all other kinds of dictatorship were guilty of advocating among Red Army soldiers a separate peace between Russia and Nazi Germany.

Other speakers who addressed the rally included M. Mendelson, representing the Labor Union of Poland; Victor Ehrepreis of the same organization; and J. B. S. Hardman, editor of the Advance, official organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

It is indeed fortunate that here in America we have at the helm of our labor movement tried and true friends of the laboring class who are unafraid and who so ably presented the united front of the labor movement in their protest of communistic Russia's execution of two great labor leaders, Alter and Ehrlich.

So long as men of the caliber who spoke at the meeting at Mecca Temple on March 30 are entrusted with guiding the destinies of our labor organizations and holding aloft the torch of freedom, the subjugated, oppressed people of the world can be assured that they will have champions ever ready to defend and plead their cause.

The propaganda machine of the Soviet Government has been working overtime, and they have been able to secure the aid of influential persons here in the United States. They have been able to even invade the magazine field, and on March 29, 1943, there was issued a special issue of Life magazine on the Soviet Union. The data contained in this Life issue was misleading and inaccurate in many places, and the Polish Ambassador here in Washington, Mr. Ciechanowski, addressed a letter to the editor of Life magazine, where he pointed out inaccurate statements contained in the article entitled "The Soviets and the Post-War," by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, former United States Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and I inserted a complete copy of the Polish Ambassador's letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A1901–A1902.

Another recent example of glorified propaganda is the film, Mission to Moscow, produced by Warner Bros.' Pictures, Inc., and based on a book of the same name written by Joseph E. Davies. The current news informs us that the film was produced with Mr. Davies' assistance. This film has produced a stream of protest here in America and has been recently criticized in a letter signed by 52 editors, writers, and union leaders as "the first full-dress example of the kind of propaganda movie hitherto confined to the totalitarian countries." Among those who signed this protest

letter were George R. Counts, of Columbia University, State chairman of the American Labor Party; Norman Thomas, leader of the Socialist Party; Charles W. Ervin and Joseph Schlossberg, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Max Danish, editor of Justice, official organ of the International Ladies' Garment Workers. It is the considered opinion of the signers of this letter that—

> The film version of Mission to Moscow is a political event to which no thoughtful American can remain indifferent.

This film falsifies history and glorifies dictatorship and will lead millions of Americans to believe that Stalin's methods of dictatorship are nowise incompatible with genuine democracy. It places the White House and the Kremlin practically under the same roof, and the Congress of the United States is slanderously portrayed.

In a letter to the editor of the New York Times, printed in that newspaper May 9, 1943, Prof. John Dewey and Susan La Follette deal with the film in detail, and they state that the motion picture is "totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption," and charge that the picture is a departure from the text of Ambassador Davies' book as well as historical facts, and in the letter they point out that "where thousands read books—millions see motion pictures, and Americans will be deadened to all moral values."

Other distinguished Americans to protest vigorously against the film were the well-known columnists and authorities on foreign affairs—Miss Dorothy Thompson and Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick.

A recent change in the tactics of the Soviet propaganda machine was brought into being at Moscow on Saturday, May 17, when Mr. Stalin dissolved the Third Communist International. The dissolution of the Comintern does not provide a cure-all as to the activities of the Communist Party in this country, whose program has always followed the dictates of the leaders of Soviet Russia. Mr. Earl Browder, general secretary and many times Presidential candidate of the Communist Party here in the United States, has publicly announced that the dissolution of the Comintern would in no way affect the American-Communist Party, because they severed their relations with the Communist International in 1940. This severance in 1940 was nothing more than a loophole to get around the laws of the United States, which require foreign-controlled organizations to register with the State Department.

The Communist Party in the United States, from the time of its inception in 1919, has been an organization which has advocated the overthrow by force and violence of our Government—that is the very principle upon which the party is founded. Many of those Communist subscribers to those principles are entrusted with confidential positions in the Office of War Information. This dissolution of the Comintern by Stalin was nothing more than a diplomatic move to bolster the standing of the Russian Government in the eyes of the Allied Nations. Stalin is a man who thinks not only in terms of today but in the days to follow, and it appears that this move of his is based upon post-war aims—particularly with reference to the Russian boundary question. It is no secret that Russia intends to take Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and at least half of Poland as her spoils of the victory—and to get portions of Finland, Norway, Sweden, Persia, and Turkey. It is also their ambition to control practically all of the continent of Europe and provide themselves with an outlet to the Mediterranean—and as to Asia, you will find that he will demand territories that will give them a direct road to the Indian Ocean. Mr. Stalin's plans and ambitions are almost identical with those of Kaiser Wilhelm of World War days.

I recall that over a year ago, when Sir Stafford Cripps was on a special mission to Moscow for his Government, and when he returned to England, he made a statement which—in essence—was to the effect that Russia's aims and ambitions appeared to be to control whatever territory her arms had wrested by force beyond what was her legal boundaries of pre-war days, and apparently at the time of the statement, Russia's plan of expansion had the approval of the English Government. I called on Mr. Sumner Welles, our Assistant Secretary of State, with a delegation at that time, and he assured me that Mr. Cripps spoke only as an individual and not as the representative of his Government.

I was indeed delighted to get that assurance from our Assistant Secretary of State because one of the basic principles of the Government of the United States is to the effect that we have never recognized unlawful acquisition of territory and that principle of nonrecognition of territorial acquisition by force is the very basis of the United Nations pact. It is, therefore, the foremost duty of the Office of War Information to interpret this basic policy of the United States Government to the foreign nations and especially to the oppressed people of Europe and Asia. It is their duty to emphasize in each broadcast—day by day—hour by hour—that contrary to Mr. Goebbel's propaganda assertions, the Government of the United States has not sold the suppressed nations "down the river" and that we are still standing foursquare behind our commitments as set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

In my humble opinion, not even the brilliant and able newspaper correspondent and radio commentator, Elmer Davis, Director of the O. W. I., will be able to do this job in a satisfactory manner with his present communistic hand-picked personnel, and, I am therefore, for transferring the entire activities of the O. W. I. in the foreign field to our State Department, where, under the very able leadership of that great liberal American, Cordell Hull, the subversive communistic practices will not be tolerated and there will be substituted by him in lieu thereof the principles of real American democracy and it will be correctly interpreted to the world—especially our brave fighting allies.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, because of its strategic geographical location, San Francisco and San Francisco Bay have become the center of the greatest naval operating establishments in the world. The port of San Francisco has, likewise, become the greatest port of embarkation this world has ever seen, with the major portion of all supplies for our naval and military activities in the Pacific flowing through its arteries.

More than a decade before the present World War broke out in Europe, Admiral Charles F. Hughes, then Chief of Naval Operations, stated before a committee of the House of Representatives:

> San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind, it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. For its natural advantages and its location, San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, that prediction has been fulfilled, and the tremendous activities now taking place in that bay area defy adequate description. The people of San Francisco are proud of the contributions they have been able to make to the successful development of this great harbor as our primary base for naval operations, and they will continue in their support of the Navy as its further requirements develop.

The peacetime growth of commercial aviation in the years preceding the present conflict made it necessary that San Francisco seek a site for the development of adequate airport facilities. Ten years ago, in 1933, the State of California, after thorough and careful investigation of all possibilities then available, ceded the Yerba Buena shoals to the city of San Francisco to be reclaimed for the specific purpose of building a commercial airport, and for no other purpose. The city of San Francisco immediately entered into preparations for the reclamation of these tidelands to build what is now called Treasure Island. Because of its superb location, only a few minutes ride over a part of the transbay bridge from the heart of the commercial and hotel sections of San Francisco, this site had a potential value of millions of dollars before a single dollar was spent toward its reclamation.

Of far greater importance than its economic value to San Francisco and the whole of the San Francisco Bay area, is the value of this airport site to our system of national defense. The Federal Government early recognized this. With a full knowledge that the only permanent purpose to which Treasure Island would be put was the construction of a modern airport with facilities for both land-operated planes and the trans-Pacific Clippers, the Federal Government assisted in the reclamation of Treasure Island from the Yerba Buena shoals by public works appropriations in excess of $4,000,000. The site is not adaptable to

any other industrial or commercial maritime usage by reason of the fact that ship and rail facilities could not be made to meet at this point.

The absolute necessity of developing completely modern airport facilities throughout the Nation in the interest of national defense has long been a part of the Federal Government's policy. Mr. Chairman, more than $650,000,000 of Federal money has been spent on some 3,000 or more publicly or privately owned commercial aviation projects throughout the Nation. National defense is founded upon a four-square foundation of the Army, the Navy, Aviation, and the Merchant Marine. Each is interdependent upon the other for its maximum efficiency. In the short space of a single generation we have seen the air arm of national defense grow from infancy to maturity, until today its role in keeping the enemy from our shores is coequal with that of the Army and the Navy.

The first-rate strategic geographical location of San Francisco emphasized the need for this great airport. Its location geographically has made San Francisco the great port of embarkation that it is. Its wonderful land-locked harbor has made it one of the greatest naval bastions in the world, and certainly the greatest on the Pacific coast for the defense of this Nation. Located midway between the Mexican and the Canadian borders it stands out as one of nature's greatest contributions to our defense. As the time approaches for directly aggressive action against Japan its importance, both as a port of embarkation, a naval base, and an aviation center will increase.

Recognizing all of these facts, and also recognizing that our national defense transcends all other interests, the city of San Francisco entered into an agreement with the Navy Department on February 3, 1941, 10 full months before Pearl Harbor, whereby the city gave full use of Treasure Island to the Navy under the national defense program for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, at no cost whatsoever to the Federal Government.

And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, let me say that no city or community in this Nation has a greater loyalty to the Navy than the city of San Francisco and its citizens. We have always supported it in every way possible at our command. We have even appropriated city funds to assist the Navy in areas outside of the city limits of San Francisco. We have no quarrel with the Navy, but on the contrary shall always continue in that same spirit of collaboration and cooperation which has marked our attitude down through the decades. The officials of the Navy Department whose responsibility it is to provide proper facilities for our national defense are more cognizant of its needs than can we be as civilians.

As a single instance of that great interest of our people in the development of our Navy and every possible facility to incerase its protective efficiency in time of national emergency, I invite attention to Hunters Point. Over the objection of the then Secretary of the Navy, I proposed the purchase of the Hunters Point drydocks from private interests by the Navy. I carried the matter to the President of the United States, and he loaned his support to this proposal. Congress was convinced of the wisdom of this course and authorized the purchase of Hunters Point drydocks. This action, taken before the present conflict began, placed at the disposal of the Navy the largest naval repair establishment of its kind in the United States, if not in the world, which immeasurably increased its efficiency.

In that same spirit of collaboration, and in order that it may have all of the facts involved in reaching its conclusions, we shall always bring to the attention of the proper officials the requirements and position of the city of San Francisco, in dealing with these problems.

Notwithstanding the fact that the city of San Francisco had entered into this agreement to freely turn Treasure Island over to the Navy in the interest of national defense for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, the Navy Department finally came to the conclusion that it required this site in perpetuity. Again the city of San Francisco accedes to the Navy Department's requirements. But, Mr. Chairman, it came somewhat as a shock when the Navy Department entered suit on April 17, 1942, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Southern Division, filing a condemnation proceeding placing the value of this tremendously important airport site at only $44,801, when reclamation of the shoals and improvements made thereon had cost millions of dollars of both Federal and municipal moneys.

To carry through this suit on this basis not only means that the Navy Department is requiring the return of all money advanced by the Federal Government to develop Treasure Island, but it in effect is confiscation of the large sums already expended by the city of San Francisco itself. And it likewise severs the economic aviation life line of a great city and community that has and is contributing much to our national defense. This cannot be.

Our only alternative is to turn to Mills Field, which, contrary to testimony given before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House that it is only 6 miles distant, is actually 12 miles to the south of Treasure Island by air. This change in location, necessitated by Federal Government requirements, requires additional large expenditures. Not only will it be necessary to bring Mills Field to its full development, but it will be equally imperative that we build a high-speed highway from the heart of San Francisco to that airport site, where the Federal Government has already made large national defense investments on behalf of both the Navy and the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has the moral, if not the legal, obligation to lend every possible assistance to the city of San Francisco in furnishing adequate airport facilities at this new site. The continuing needs of national defense and the protection of Federal defense expenditures at Mills Field demand proper Federal assistance in this development, aside from the Government's moral responsibility to the city for requiring its better airport site at Treasure Island.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my remarks today to the appropriation made for the Office of Civilian Defense. The Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to make a substantial cut in the appropriation for this Office. My congressional district happens to be in the northwest corner of the United States, the closest point to Japan in the continental United States. Leading military strategists seem to agree that the Japs sometime soon will make an attack on the Pacific Coast, particularly the Pacific Northwest. I want to make sure that the civilians in that area and elsewhere in the United States will be adequately protected. At the present time, under the appropriations provided in this bill, we will not be provided adequate protection by the Office of Civilian Defense.

It occurs to me that it is the better course of wisdom to provide funds for sufficient and adequate personnel to make sure that the thousands, in fact millions, of volunteers who are now engaged in civilian-defense activities may continue in that work and thus save the Government millions of dollars in actual labor cost.

Mr. Chairman, in Germany and Japan civilian defense is not a voluntary organization. The total population is told by the government what to do and when to do it. The millions of volunteers in civilian defense in America came in to work of their own free will. There is still a big job to be done to recruit sufficient numbers so that the total strength of our civilian population will be pitted against the strength of the enemy populations. This is a war of civilians against civilians as well as soldiers against soldiers. Here in our country every bricklayer, every bank clerk, every grocery store manager, and every farm hand must be enlisted to fight against his counterpart in the Axis countries.

The United States Office of Civilian Defense does not exercise direct control, but its aid and advice has done much to keep the lines of national war programs clear and untangled at the level of community action. Picture the confusion that would result from 15 or 20 different Government agencies each recruiting volunteers for its own program. The O. C. D. has succeeded in providing volunteers by the millions to carry out war programs that are by their very nature national in scope. It has done this without infringement upon the rights of communities and States and without infringement upon the rights of American citizens to choose the war work they think best suited to their individual talents.

No one will question the national necessity for such programs as health and medical care, recruitment of agricultural labor, salvage, transportation,

nutrition, housing, welfare, and child care. No one will question that these programs cannot be carried out without the wholehearted support of the millions of volunteers the O. C. D. has enrolled and trained, with the cooperation of the State defense councils of the 48 States and the more than 12,000 local defense councils.

It would be short-sighted, not to say dangerous, to the Nation's interest to interrupt the successful course of action that the national Office of Civilian Defense has initiated and encouraged and which it has guided with the best advice its staff could muster. There must be a channel through which the benefits of experiences of our allies at war can be brought to the consideration of every American State and city, there to be accepted, rejected, or adapted to local needs. It is equally necessary that American communities shall have access to a channel through which they can share their experiences, so that the best and most workable practices in one community may be made known to every other. It is these channels which O. C. D. has sought to establish with a degree of success apparent to all, and it is these channels which O. C. D. seeks to improve so that volunteer effort may become increasingly efficient and productive.

The machine of civilian defense contains many essential cogs, each of which must mesh before the surge of America's patriotic efforts can find fruit in action. This mighty machine, flexible and adaptable to all States and communities, must nevertheless have some direction of a central nature, a clearinghouse, a headquarters. This headquarters operates solely on the tolerance of its related State and local components, but it must be given a chance to operate within these limits or we shall pay the inevitable price of confusion, individual and group conflicts of plans and performances, and the slackening of civilian efforts at a time when every ounce of local, State, and national energy must be directed upon the long climb toward victory.

Look, if you will, only at the money value of volunteer efforts, which leadership and guidance of the Office of Civilian Defense has already mobilized. It can be shown, on the most conservative estimate, that the money value of volunteer labor of civilian defense has already reached the astounding total of at least $900,000,000 annually. It is absurd to save one and a half millions by removing this leadership and guidance, which is daily adding to the number of volunteers and, through preparation and training, to the quality and volume of their services. The dividends this Nation has drawn from the free labor of millions of its citizens represent a true investment in democracy.

Let us continue to invest in democracy and let us retain the able services of the managers of this enterprise, without destroying, hampering, or restricting the leadership which has demonstrated its total effectiveness.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, if I did not love our friends on the left side of the central aisle so well, I should be inclined to say that their efforts today to give a political coloring to the block system of the Office of Civilian Defense would come under the head of summer humor, that is, June humor.

I think anyone who has seen and talked to Dr. Landis, the dean of the Harvard Law School, Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, would not be able by the wildest stretch of the imagination to identify him as a diabolical political conniver, schemer, and plotter. Of all the men in the United States, in my opinion, he would be the last man to condone the prostitution of the public service to politics. He is a man of unimpeachable character, a man of the highest ideals. He would be entirely out of character in the role of a political villain.

When our subcommittee had under consideration the block system, one of the very able members who sits at the west end of the table in the Appropriations Committee room undertook to run Dr. Landis into a fox hole in respect to the activities of one of these local block units. What did he find out? He found out after the most assiduous cross-examination that the diabolical political activity in which that block unit was engaged consisted in organizing for the collection of glass containers.

Here are some of the malicious political activities which are being conducted to the great detriment of the public welfare under the block system. You will find them set forth on page 359 of the hearings. First, car-sharing programs. Second, housing and vacant room surveys. Third, explanations of point rationing. Fourth, surveys of day-care needs for children of working mothers. Fifth, securing donations to the blood plasma bank.

These are the malicious, antisocial, Machiavelian political activities that are being conducted day after day under this unthinkable block system. The personnel required in the Washington headquarters of the Office of Civilian Defense for the operation of the block system consists, all told, of four lonesome individuals.

You will find on page 593 a statement by Dr. Landis to which I should like to call your attention, because it throws a floodlight on his thinking on public questions. He says:

> I have a fundamental belief in the millions of people involved in the movement.

He is speaking now particularly about the block movement.

> The thing that has been heartening to me over and over again in my contacts with the field is the resentment that the people of the United States have and will have to any attempt to try to traduce machinery that has been set up for their common good, to use that for some special purpose, whether it be political or economic, or whatever it is.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot resist my friend from Pennsylvania. Certainly I yield to him.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I join with my distinguished friend from Indiana in the avowed purpose expressed by Mr. Landis, but I am wondering whether as a result of his academic background and his rather limited association with the practical and the real things of life he is in a position to form an opinion such as he expressed and to which the gentleman has just referred. I am fearful that he is not.

Mr. LUDLOW. I shall answer the gentleman's question if he will agree to answer one for me.

Mr. DITTER. At all times.

Mr. LUDLOW. I should say that I think Dr. Landis will do everything he can within the limit of his ability to prosecute righteousness in public service, and I do not think anything in the world would deflect him from that resolution.

Mr. DITTER. I certainly concur wholeheartedly in what my distinguished friend has said, for I notice that he very carefully guarded the compliment he paid Dr. Landis by saying that he would do this subject to his ability. That circumscribes it to a certain extent.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am sure he would do that with the very best intentions in the world.

Now, will the gentleman answer my question? The gentleman sat day by day beside Dr. Landis and in his inimitable and superlative way cross-examined him. I want to ask the gentleman if Dr. Landis impressed him as being a ward heeler.

Mr. DITTER. No; I could hardly characterize Dr. Landis as a ward heeler. It seems to me that that would be eminently unfair to the professional background that Dr. Landis enjoys. My theory, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, is that Dr. Landis may be the victim of his own innocence, and his own ignorance of the realities of life. I am concerned about the practical application of his theories.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a lawyer of great ability, and a cross-examiner par excellence. In all of his cross-examination of Dr. Landis, the gentleman did not bring out any evidence to show that Dr. Landis is a victim of his own innocence.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad to humbly acknowledge the compliment the gentleman from Indiana pays me, but I must say that at least Dr. Landis was superlatively evasive at times.

Mr. LUDLOW. And may I continue with an example of Dr. Landis' philosophy? He goes on and says:

> The safeguard of the use of the block system does not lie in the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense. It lies in the millions of people who constitute that block plan, the thousands of block leaders. They are ordinary American human beings, patriotic, of every creed, of every political faith, of every color, and there is the strength and there is the bulwark against having a thing like that used for improper purposes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I should like to make my point. That, Mr. Chairman, I think is a very fine sentiment, and a very

splendid philosophy, and I think my friend from Pennsylvania will so agree, will he not?

Mr. DITTER. I agree wholeheartedly, but may I direct the attention of my distinguished friend from Indiana to the question of the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, which to me was rather pointed, on page 360, when the chairman asked the question of Dr. Landis, in referring to the word "block," whether it was spelled b-l-o-c or b-l-o-c-k. It seemed to me that the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, was concerned about what the possibilities of this scheme might be; otherwise he would not have directed an inquiry as to the spelling, whether it be b-l-o-c or b-l-o-c-k.

Mr. LUDLOW. And I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that that is a matter that he will have to settle with the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman speaks of millions of people involved in the block plan. I wonder if he appreciates quite how many of them are women who know that the block plan at its best is in Germany, and that many of our women very definitely question the advisability of putting over on them the kind of thing that is done in Germany, and they resent this block plan.

Mr. LUDLOW. That matter was discussed in the committee, and I think it was stated that this plan has been operated in Germany, but Dr. Landis said emphatically the plan was quite a different plan and his plan is not rooted to any extent or to any degree in the plan involved in Germany.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is, however, very definitely questioned by the women of this country.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill, and I shall discuss only one relatively small phase of it. The broader aspects of the pending bill have been thoroughly covered by the able chairman of our committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I shall be content if I may consume a little time in presenting some factual information about one of the most interesting of all the war agencies, the Office of Civilian Defense. In my opinion, the amount provided in the bill for this activity is the irreducible minimum that should be allowed. There is even a question in my mind as to whether in our zeal to protect the Treasury and save the expenditure of every unnecessary dollar we of the Appropriations Committee did not insert the pruning knife a little too deeply in the estimates for that activity. I am certain that in the national interests not one dollar too much has been provided in this measure for the Office of Civilian Defense.

The appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense for the current fiscal year 1943 was $7,447,075. That Office went before the Budget Bureau and asked for an appropriation of $9,023,353 to carry on its activities during the fiscal year 1944. The Budget Bureau allowed $5,949,450. Our Committee on Appropriations decided that $4,000,000 would be sufficient to enable the Office of Civilian Defense to carry on during the next fiscal year in view of the spade work that already has been done and the nonrecurrent items which will not have to be met next year. The amount allowed is $5,023,353 below the amount the Office of Civilian Defense asked the Budget, $1,949,450 below the amount the Budget allowed, and $3,447,075 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year. It is the rock-bottom amount that should be appropriated.

The organization for civilian national defense is one that cannot be lightly regarded. It is one that directly affects all of the people of the Nation, your constituents and mine, everybody. Since, fortunately, there has been no attack on our country from the outside, many of our citizens are complacently inclined to a let-down in their appreciation of the need for civilian defense, but according to all of our authorities, both military and civilian, that lackadaisical attitude is not warranted. In his testimony before our subcommittee, James M. Landis, Director of Civilian Defense, expressed the opinion that while the likelihood of an aerial attack on the southeastern part of the United States and the Gulf has diminished considerably as a result of the north African campaign, the attack from the west, on the west coast, and the attack on the northeastern coast of the United States is still a possibility, and the same degree of possibility as it was a year ago, with possibly one change: That is that the air forces of the enemy may have been considerably diminished in strength as a result of our own activity.

I was much impressed when Director Landis at the conclusion of his 2 days of testimony said solemnly:

> I think it would be a very serious mistake if anything that Congress did or anything that we did told the American people to let down their guard against the enemy. Neither you nor I nor anyone here knows if and when the enemy will strike against this country. In the light of that fog of our knowledge, which is just characteristic of the fog that surrounds the war as a whole, we cannot afford to let down on the type of protective services that we have built.

That statement, I think, reflects wisdom and sound sense.

The work of the Office of Civilian Defense is separated into two main divisions—the Protection Branch and the Civilian War Services Branch. The Protection Branch is concerned with the organization of the United States for protection against enemy attack, primarily air bombardment.

This branch enters the civilian-defense picture in the fields of maintenance of communications, air raid warning services, control systems, alarm devices, protective lighting and concealment, fire defense, gas defense, training, facility security, evacuation of population, emergency transportation, and medical services.

The Protection Branch is headed by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, grandson of President Grant, who was loaned by the Army to the Office of Civilian Defense. Incidentally, the military and civilian defense programs are tied in very closely together. An important feature of the protective service is the organization, recruitment, and training of volunteers in an organization known as the United States Citizens' Defense Corps, which today comprises some 6,000,000 people.

Much of the work of the protective section does not and should not go beyond the planning stage because there is no military reason at this time why it should go beyond that stage. There is no actual construction of shelters in the way England had to undertake a shelter program, but it would be foolhardy not to have a shelter plan to put in operation if necessity should arise. Plans must be made for speedy evacuation of target areas, even though it may never be necessary to evacuate. Such plans have been made on an elaborate scale, providing for removal of people from the possible zone of attack on the eastern seaboard as far west as Ohio, and on the west coast to safe points in the interior. The protective program provides for the manufacture of 5,000,000 gas masks with stand-by facilities to manufacture more at the rate of 2,500,000 a month. Gas masks deteriorate rapidly. Up to date 1,000,000 masks have been manufactured and delivered to areas of potential attack.

Last year Congress gave the Office of Civilian Defense $100,000,000 to provide protective equipment for localities that were most in need of that equipment. To date about half of that amount or $50,000,000 has been spent in providing equipment to 2,044 communities. One hundred and ninety-one hospital units have been organized under the protective branch, each with a staff of doctors and nurses. The doctors are given Reserve commissions in the United States Public Health Service and are ready to be on duty and take over the hospital facilities immediately whenever the need appears.

Among the hospitals and the medical profession of cities mobile medical teams have been organized, equipped, and trained. Several thousand casualty stations have been created and equipped. The preparations even go as far as to include plans for mortuary services.

A complete program for collection of blood plasma has been put in operation by the protection branch with the result that 60,000 units are now available and it is proposed to increase the supply to 130,000 units. One hundred and fifty-four hospitals are cooperating in this program. This plasma supply is being reserved entirely for civilian casualties as the Red Cross collects plasma for the armed forces. A great deal of Office of Civilian Defense blood plasma was used in connection with the Cocoanut Grove fire in Boston, and it is believed that many lives were saved by it.

The Civilian War Services Branch, the second great division of the Office of Civilian Defense, is devoted mainly to the organization of volunteers to carry out the many and varied programs and plans relating to civilian national defense that emanate from the National Government. It is in this branch that the cut in appropriations will be most severely felt. Civilian war training, Vic-

tory speakers, and victory gardens come under this branch. Tied into it are 14,000 local defense councils, representing about 80 percent of the Nation's population. That is about twice as many councils as were in existence a year ago.

The Civilian War Services Branch is the branch that reaches out and arouses the interest, enthusiasm, and cooperation of the masses in a vast variety of ways connected with the war and the national interest.

It distributes vast quantities of literature. It generates fervor in all sorts of enterprises to promote the national interests and gets all hands to cooperating in patriotic efforts. An example of the activities of one volunteer office is described on page 358 of the hearings. This is the volunteer office of Hartford, Conn., and this is its report. It reported the assignment in recent months of more than 400 volunteers for assistance to local draft boards; 322 to help with fuel and oil rationing; 109 to aid in the development of a land Army; 644 to set up point rationing; 109 to work on war boards; 113 to assist in the collection of scrap; 219 to assist the board of health hospitals, and health agencies; 144 to help in community youth work; 71 to assist in child-care work; 381 to aid 18 other community organizations, including 163 to help the United States Employment Service.

I simply give you that as an illustration of what the activity of these volunteer offices can be. This is a good example. It is estimated that there are now 11,000,000 volunteers who are contributing about $1,000,000,000 worth of labor annually in carrying out the programs that are so necessary to our civilian defense today. Of the 11,000,000 volunteers, about 3,000,000 are undergoing training in the civilian war services.

An idea of the value and extent of the cooperative assistance that is being obtained on a strictly volunteer basis may be had by reading the hearings on this bill.

The United States Chamber of Commerce estimates that more than half of its 600,000 members are active in local civilian-defense councils, having such local civilian-defense activities as car sharing, farm and industrial employment, fire and sabotage prevention, housing and industrial surveys, and fuel conservation.

A total of 1,250,000 members of the American Legion are serving as air-raid wardens. Ninety-three percent of the 1,400 Elks lodges, covering a membership of 530,000, report that they are cooperating actively with local defense councils; 970 Rotarians are heads of their local defense councils, and 6,901 serve as staff members.

Reports from the Moose organization indicate that the secretary-general has been successful in getting all lodges active in 1 or more of 15 civilian defense activities. Approximately 60,900 Kiwanians serve in the protective services, an average of 29 members per club.

In 1942 the 2,100 Kiwanis clubs devoted 84 percent of their programs to Federal wartime subjects advanced nationally by the Office of Civilian Defense.

The Division of War Services helps these and many other organizations to shape their programs and to integrate those programs with the general plan of civilian national defense.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am very glad that the gentleman has pointed out to the committee the work of the civilian defense groups—the various volunteer groups. There are literally thousands of volunteer groups in every county community in the United States, of all faiths, of all political beliefs, who are furnishing their volunteer services in the war effort, under the leadership of the Civilian Defense. Because of the drastic cut made by the committee in this appropriation, all of this volunteer work—all of this work of volunteer groups—will be suspended. It will not be possible to do any of it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am a little confused by the statement of the gentleman from Virginia. I do not see how a cut in funds can stop volunteer work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Because the volunteer work is done under the leadership and under the auspices of the Office of Civilian Defense. They have furnished small skeleton groups in towns and cities who have coordinated these things, for instance, in the rationing program and explaining the rationing to people. They furnished small groups that get together—different volunteer groups all over the country—who undertake to instruct the people in rationing and in the rationing program, and in all of the various programs. We have dealt a body blow at that volunteer work which I do not believe the country at large is going to like.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering, after so many months of training under paid workers, whether the volunteer group could step into those positions without pay?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The experience of the rationing boards is that they have to have a full-time staff of leaders in all of these groups. The volunteer groups are willing to do voluntary service, but they must have people who are experienced, who know the program and know the work, in order to furnish leadership.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. My time is very short.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia concerning the remarks he has just made, because they are a matter of great concern on the Pacific coast. On the west coast we count on our civilian defense to do a job in case of attack of some sort, whether it be merely a token raid or any other kind of a raid, and we fully anticipate such a thing on the coast at some time within the period of this war. Does the gentleman mean that if this program is reduced it will be necessary for the civilian defense on our coast to fold up?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I did not mean quite that much. I mean practically all the work of the voluntary groups would be suspended under this reduction.

Mr. HINSHAW. Practically all of our work is volunteer work except for certain paid personnel.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are two types of work done under this program. One is called the work that the volunteer groups do, such as furnishing information on these various war programs, bond buying programs, rationing programs and gasoline programs, and all of that which they have called into service under civilian defense. Then there is the other branch of work, purely local defense work, of which the gentleman speaks. We carry funds here for that, although they have been cut, but we have dangerously cut the program of the Office of Civilian Defense, and I do not think that is the way to reform it. If it is not being properly conducted we should correct it by legislation, but I think we have struck a dangerous blow at civilian defense in this country by the cuts we have made.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman divide his remarks between the activities that have to do with the bond buying program, the rationing program and the gasoline program and that part which has to do with defense against attack, and explain the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is fully set out in the hearings. Beyond saying that I do not think we have given them enough money to carry on the defense program, I do not think we have done that.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman's statement to me is important, because the House relies a great deal on the gentleman's information.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate that, but I think that is one point where I think we have cut dangerously deep.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, some of the programs that are being successfully carried into effect through this voluntary cooperative system are as follows:

First. The Victory garden campaign.

Second. Car-sharing programs.

Third. Housing and vacant-room surveys.

Fourth. Explanations of point rationing.

Fifth. Surveys of day-care needs for children of working mothers.

Sixth. Securing donations to the blood plasma bank.

Seventh. Scrap collecting.

Eighth. Tin-can processing and collection.

Ninth. Manpower programs.

These are programs that are obviously worth while and their successful execution cannot fail to contribute to the national welfare.

The Civilian War Services Branch sponsors the Victory speakers, whose

duty it is to speak to the people on all phases of national civilian defense and the war effort. In 1 State alone—Michigan—about 1,000 speeches are made a week. The speakers are local people who prepare their own speeches. The Community War Information Section of the Office of Civilian Defense issues a publication entitled "The Victory Speaker," and furnishes it and other material to the local speakers, which they may use or not, as they see fit.

These are the bare outlines of the two main fields of operation of the Office of Civilian Defense. It will be seen, I think, that while there is much variance and dissimilarity in the scope of activities that are carried on, all are important and worth while in this grave period of our national emergency.

Director Landis impressed us as a sincere and earnest man of the scholar type, consecrated to the public service in every fiber of his being. He has never allowed politics to get as much as a toehold in his organization. He is clean as a hound's tooth. If any of the expert axmen of the House should attempt to chop his appropriation further I would say "Woodman, spare that tree!" The amount carried in the bill is only 44 percent of the amount he requested of the Budget and this reduction of itself will force a drastic curtailment and reorganization of the Office of Civilian Defense.

Events may prove that some of the precautionary steps that are being taken are unnecessary, but who can tell? It is a time when caution commends to us the old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." It is dangerous to cut this appropriation more than it has been cut. Director Landis spoke wisely when he told our committee that now is no time to let down our guard against the enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill provides for an appropriation of $48,170,000 for the War Relocation Authority. However, the total amount of the appropriation requested in this measure is the huge sum of $2,921,441,504. There are certain observations which I desire to make with respect to this measure, which apply generally to the huge indebtedness which is being piled up against the generation now here, and those yet to come, which will be an obstruction throughout the coming years to the progress of the people of this country.

May I suggest at the very outset that the Congress has done everything within its power to aid in the winning of this war. It has appropriated all the funds for which it was asked by the President and those in authority. It has given its wholehearted support in every instance to aid in our victory. However, the Congress does not have any power or authority over the spending of the money when it is once appropriated. The President, who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in time of war, and his subordinates have the full control over the spending of the taxpayers' money. And in this connection may I suggest that the Congress has appropriated tremendous sums of money for our war effort; and recently it was predicted by those in power that we are rapidly approaching the day when our spending will reach the staggering sum of $100,000,000,000 in the period of 1 year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly approaching the day when our national debt will equal or exceed the unfathomable and incomprehensible sum of $300,000,000,000. This sum of money is so huge that we cannot understand it—we cannot appraise it—we cannot calculate its effect upon our people and our way of life. What are some of the implications involved in such a staggering debt in our country?

Mr. Chairman, recently I had the occasion to break down the staggering sum of $300,000,000,000 into the area and among the people of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and if and when the national debt reaches the sum hereinbefore mentioned, the portion thereof which will have to be assumed and paid by the people of my district is in the sum of $698,272,444, which is equal to, or in excess of, the total appraisement of all real estate and all personal property in that entire area. When we visualize this huge debt and come to realize that it will, with interest, far exceed the value of everything we have, when we will come to know that all of the savings of a lifetime have been frittered away, and when we will come to realize that our farm or home will have to be paid for again and again before we are the owners of it, then we will fully realize just what our incomparable situation is. The continuance of the spending of huge sums of money for nonessential and unnecessary things in time of war, and the packing of every department of Government with needless and useless employees, is sapping the very life and resources of our Government and our people, leaving us poor indeed. This spending for nonessential things must be stopped. I call upon every department of Government to cut down the cost of operation, and to release and discharge every employee that is not essential. I call upon them to make the same sacrifice our people are making throughout this Nation—to economize in every instance possible. We are involved in war, and we must win this war. We cannot win the war if the various agencies of our own Government continue to obstruct our war effort by spending the taxpayers' money for unnecessary and nonessential things.

Mr. Chairman, the various counties in the Tenth Congressional District, with the debt of $300,000,000,000 as contemplated, will have their portion of that debt to pay. If it was paid before any interest charges have attached thereto, those counties in Indiana would owe the respective amounts hereinafter set forth: Decatur County, $40,380,716; Delaware County, $170,765,714; Fayette County, $54,220,158; Hancock County, $39,413,956; Henry County, $91,593,824; Randolph County, $60,972,948; Rush County, $43,115,706; Shelby County, $59,220,934; Union County, $13,707,726; Wayne County, $134,923,662. And, Mr. Chairman, when we witness those staggering amounts of money which those counties will owe, on a basis of a debt of $300,000,000,000, it makes every American shudder. The waste and extravagance by those in charge of the spending of our taxpayers' money is responsible, in part, for this tremendous debt—and for those grievous errors our people will be compelled to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I especially wish to direct my remarks to that portion of this measure which relates to the appropriation of $48,170,000 for the War Relocation Authority. It is contemplated, we are advised, to send Japanese and other aliens into the various sections of our country to aid in the farm work, and in all kinds of work. In my section of the country the people do not want these Japanese, or other aliens, sent into their locality to secure jobs upon the farms and in the factories and mills. Many of those Japanese are still loyal to their own country; we are engaged in a war against Japan; we must not forget that Japan attacked us in the most dastardly manner, she killed our people and she destroyed our ships, and all this occurred on the very day the ambassadors of peace from Japan were in conference with the authorities of government, in Washington. That is not all. In some of the isolation centers, or concentration camps, where the Japanese have been placed, it has been discovered in one or two instances that those Japanese had obtained the flag of their country—Japan—and that they had raised the flag and were flying it over their camp; that was in this country, and that was after we were engaged in this war with Japan.

The people in my section of Indiana do not want any Japanese or Germans, who have been engaged in this war and who are now prisoners of war, to come into their localities for the purpose of working. My people do not want to work with, or near, those people who have been engaged in war against our boys or those who are still loyal to their foreign homeland. My people do not want to assume the added burden of guarding those who are classified as alien enemies. They want to go about their farms and their factories and mills with a sense of security—and they do not want to go forward with a feeling of insecurity by reason of having in their very midst people who have fought against us and who are now prisoners of war, or Japanese whose affiliations are yet attached to the homeland and their cause against our country.

Mr. Chairman, I have read with much regret that a large number of Japanese—our enemies in this war—are being cared for with fatherly care, while our own men and boys who were captured at Bataan and in the Philippines, and elsewhere, are bearing heavy burdens—they are not being sustained with the care of home and with the tenderness of father and mother. The Japanese put those to death who participated in the air raid over Japan and who were thereafter captured. We are dealing with those who

are ruthless and dangerous. As I stated before, the people in my locality in Indiana do not want that type of people about or near them. They want to remain secure in their homes and in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, as we contemplate our future—and as we scan the horizon ahead, let us stop all useless spending of money by the agencies of government, and let us force those agencies to reduce their personnel and their force. Let us begin to fight at home as our boys are fighting on every front—for victory. Let us stop the waste and the extravagance, and let us go forward and win this war.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I hold certain positive convictions that I should like to express at this time. I am prompted to do this because of the controversial features in this bill and because of a continued practice here in the House by which an attempt is made to choke off criticism of the administration.

As a basis for my right to express these convictions, I quote from a statement of Lincoln when he said:

> There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual, the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his Government and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration.

Since the declaration of war in December 1941, there has been a studied effort here in the House to attribute to those who might be critical of the administration an unpatriotic purpose and motive. I want to make the very positive declaration today that in my opinion a man's patriotism is not measured by his willingness to acquiesce in and approve the policies of the present administration. I am not prepared to accept the brand of unpatriotism simply because of my refusal to approve administration policies. I know that the administration has a propaganda machine and the most skilled publicity experts, paid for by the taxpayers, to place its position in the most favorable light before the people. I believe that I, as a Member of Congress—no, even more than that, the Congress as a whole—has a duty to perform in subjecting the administration policies and methods to the most searching and the most critical examination; to exhaust every means at its command to expose the failures and mistakes, and to bring that information home to the people. If the administration has the right to use a propaganda machine for its purposes, if the highly skilled technicians employed by the present administration but paid for by the overburdened taxpayers, continue their operations, then certainly no one can be critical of the efforts that are made by those of us who feel that the administration has made mistakes and that it continues in these mistakes.

Here and now I challenge the majority to deny to me or to any Member of the Congress the right to be critical of the administration in power. I yield to the majority here and now, as to whether or not my patriotism shall be measured by my critical appraisal of the administration's policies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman is asking me to yield to answer my challenge, I yield to the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts always approaches with great hesitancy the answering of any challenge issued by the distinguished and brilliant gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Massachusetts simply asks the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield for a suggestion.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman from Massachusetts overwhelms me.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I overwhelm the gentleman, I have attained a goal that I never thought in my mind that I could even approximate from a human angle. But I ask my distinguished friend to yield to suggest that he take out from his remarks any reference to his patriotism because no one on the majority side, and I know no one on the minority side, ever questions the patriotism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We may question his judgment and disagree with the gentleman, but, so far as the patriotism of the gentleman is concerned, I am proud publicly to state that he has always been an inspiration to all of us, and may I say that that comes from the depths of my heart and is a sincere expression of my thoughts.

Mr. DITTER. Again, Mr. Chairman, I say the distinguished majority leader overwhelms me. Certainly I would in no way question the sincerity of the distinguished majority leader. I would be lacking, indeed, were I to fail to acknowledge very humbly the splendid tribute that my distinguished friend has paid me. Probably I should have made my declaration a little less personal. Certainly I have never been charged with a lack of patriotism, and as the majority leader knows, my mouth has not been closed in my criticism of the administration.

The distinguished majority leader resorts to kindness and in that kindness completely sets at nought what had been my purpose. My purpose had been to challenge the majority. The majority leader disarms me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DITTER. My purpose had been to challenge. Now his kindness makes me submissive to his approach. I shall not change my remarks. I appreciate the suggestion my distinguished friend has made. I shall bear in mind, of course, the assurance that my distinguished friend has given me. I am glad to know that even though I am critical and even though my friend does not agree with me at all times, nevertheless the differences of opinion which exist between us will not cast any reflection upon me. Of course, I can assure the distinguished majority leader that I never entertain anything in the way of passing doubt with reference to his patriotism and the high purposes of his public service.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. My distinguished and warm friend from Pennsylvania has stated that the observation that I just made was out of the kindness of my heart. I want to state that that is a fair construction to place upon it by the gentleman, but it was not my state of mind however. Under no condition would or could I say anything unkind about my friend from Pennsylvania, but the thing that prompted me to make the statement I did was not kindness but attempted intellectual honesty.

Mr. DITTER. I certainly hope that my feeble effort at acknowledging the compliment could not have been construed in any way as suggesting that the distinguished majority leader has ever been or ever will be unkind, either to me or to those who serve with him here in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in my last observation was to convey to my friend that the motive which prompted me to make my first statement was far greater than kindness; it was a frank statement, a statement that everyone agrees with because everyone knows the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of the finest type of Americans that ever lived.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I can find no other word for the overwhelming character of the contribution made by my distinguished friend.

Under the circumstances I might be constrained from pursuing my thought further, but a deep, abiding conviction, and probably a considered sense of public duty, urges me on.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I am reminded of the words of Disraeli, when someone was critical, who said, "It is much easier to be critical than it is to be correct."

Mr. DITTER. I quite agree. It is the easier task to criticize. Were I stronger probably I would not accept the lighter task criticism. Certainly at no time, and I hope when I say this you will accept it, I certainly have at no time endeavored to indicate to the House the feeling on my part that I was always correct. I am very conscious of the human limitations that are mine. I have always striven to avoid an intolerant attitude, an assurance that I could under no circumstances be in error. God forbid that I should ever assume such a position.

My human frailties press upon me at all times. I always ask a gracious Providence to excuse my sins of omission and commission. My fear, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, my fear is that those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue never realize that they can be mistaken. They feel that they are always correct. It is because of that intolerant insistence of their infallibility that those of the minority here must bring to their attention and to the attention of the country their shortcomings, their errors, and mistakes.

Now you have given me the thread of my remarks. I said when my distinguished majority leader complimented me a moment ago that I was dissuaded

for the moment. I thank my friend from Michigan for having now put me on my course again. It has been 18 months, I believe, or thereabouts, since we entered into the war. Since then we have heard much of a comprehensive national economic policy—a policy to deal with our problems here at home. During the course of the hearings the distinguished judge who has taken over the task of stabilization, one of our former colleagues, one for whom all have a great respect, one who has rendered a very distinguished service on the bench, was asked what that policy was. I was surprised when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] asked Judge Vinson what the comprehensive national policy was as to prices, rents, wages, salaries, profits, rationing, subsidies, and all other matters, to have the brilliant jurist say that he did not know what it was. I doubt very much whether anybody else knows what the comprehensive national policy is with reference to our domestic problems. I submit that my distinguished friend from Michigan, Mr. LESINSKI, who drew an indictment just a moment ago against O. P. A. would not have drawn that indictment had there been a well-rounded, completely coordinated, and entirely comprehensive national economic policy. We would not have six, seven, eight, nine—dear knows how many—agencies, one pulling against the other, if there were a comprehensive national policy. There may be one, but apparently it is locked up. The President may have it; Harry Hopkins may have it, and there may be one or two others who have been let in on the secret, but by and large there is no—at least no announced—comprehensive national policy on the domestic front.

What have we done in the European theater of war? We have taken skilled men, men who knew what armaments were, men in the Army, men in the Navy, men who had studied strategy and we have said: "Here is the task before you." Those men have set to work and have outlined certain objectives, and they have required from us certain means for carrying out those objectives. They have very definitely in their minds the striking points: Here, there, and elsewhere on this far-flung battle front. They are skilled men with a definite plan and a positive policy, and they are pushing the war gloriously and successfully on every battle front. But there on the home front we have been much like a mariner who has a splendid ship—a better ship could not be had—but who has no rudder, no compass no chart, and, certainly, thus far with no avowed destination in mind.

I say it is high time the American people were told what the "comprehensive"—the word is intriguing. May I just stop long enough to pay my compliment to the administration for its ability to play with words? A comprehensive national economic policy! Some few years back I knew what the comprehensive national policy was; it was announced as that of the more abundant life. Now it seems to me this comprehensive national policy has become a coupon-rationed existence. Such of it as is necessary by reason of the exactions and requirements of war should not be complained of, but such part of this rationed coupon existence of ours that results from the mismanagement and the incompetency and the failure of the administration to chart a course and come to an ultimate end, that cannot be excused. Is this coupon-rationed existence a part of our national policy? Is the hit or miss, slipshod methods of price control a part of our national policy? Is the vacillation on the question of men and management a part of our national policy? Is the suppression and the coloring of news by O. W. I. a part of our national policy? What, I ask again, is our national policy?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I know that the gentleman with his kind attitude to everybody does not want to be unkind toward Judge Fred Vinson. Is it not true——

Mr. DITTER. May I make the observation and then if the gentleman wishes he may add to it: Judge Vinson had just come from the bench. I think Judge Vinson was more than kind in being willing to come before the committee after but a day or two of tenure of office and submit to the examination that he did; and I in no way wanted to reflect upon Judge Vinson with reference to this failure to have an announced policy.

Mr. LUDLOW. May I say that I think the gentleman has made a very manful statement, one that will be greatly appreciated by Judge Vinson and the people of the entire country. Judge Vinson had not yet got warm in his office when he came before us and he was not familiar with the policies and could not have been.

Mr. DITTER. In fact, he had not as yet had the opportunity of selecting his personnel.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is correct.

Mr. DITTER. He was alone.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is correct.

Mr. DITTER. And any observation of mine should not carry the suggestion of a criticism of Judge Vinson.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. My criticism was directed against those who should have formulated the policy so that Judge Vinson would have known what it was even before he came into office. If he did not know the fault was not his, but the fault lies at the door of those in the administration circles who have not had the courage to formulate a policy, those who are waiting for public opinion to provide favorable weather for their sails. I want to take issue with one thing that was said here this afternoon.

The majority must be hard put. I do not know how many of you here present today heard my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] earlier today. I am sorry I must make this observation even though public business requires him to be absent at the moment. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in an effort to get from under the stigma of O. W. I. tried to say that O. W. I. is a Republican outfit. I know my friend from New York can stretch his imagination at times. I know that he is most persuasive. When he tries to take O. W. I., with Elmer Davis as the guiding hand and Mr. Sherwood as the one in charge of O. W. I.'s foreign service, and make of it a Republican outfit, he is going far afield. I want him to produce the evidence of the assertion. I am not at all surprised that the able gentleman from New York would try to get from under the unfavorable reaction which has set in all over the country against O. W. I. If in his absence there are others on the majority side who share his opinion and who can produce the proof of the assertion at this time, I shall yield for the production of the proof.

I should like to revert to the failure of the administration to put our economic house in order on the home front. Every day's mail brings complaints about the failure.

After 18 months of American participation in the war, the administration has failed to formulate a coordinated national policy for dealing with the war's domestic problems. The President should forthwith formulate and make known to the American people such a policy. Our armed forces, as I have said before, under our military leadership, have a definite program for winning the war overseas. But the President and his New Deal advisers are still hopelessly floundering amid a welter of impractical ideas and philosophies on the home front.

It is high time that the New Deal philosophy of spending and scarcity be abandoned and that Mr. Roosevelt divorce himself long enough from his ambition for a fourth term in the White House to deal realistically and courageously with the chaotic situation confronting the Nation. Thus far the President has failed to show the courage and nonpartisanship required in the really grave emergency in which the country now actually finds itself.

The people are alarmed and dismayed by the confusion and bickering in high Government offices and by the failure to provide a national policy to direct the civilian economy and to effectively halt the inflationary rise in prices and wages.

Or, if there is any such over-all plan, it remarks a secret locked deep in the breast of the President, of Harry Hopkins, of James T. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director, until a few days ago Economic Stabilization Director, and his successor in that office, Judge Fred M. Vinson.

I make this statement that the New Deal is without a coordinated policy in respect to the protection of the civilian economy advisedly, for at the hearings held on June 5 by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on the budget of the Office of Economic Stabilization Judge Vinson admitted that he had formulated no such policy and that he was unaware of what his predecessor, Justice Byrnes, had done in this regard.

And Justice Byrnes took over his new office in the Office of War Mobilization without taking the American people into his confidence as to what, if anything, has been done in the three-quarters of a

year the Office of Economic Stabilization has been in operation.

Asked to give a picture of what has gone on in the Office since it was established, Judge Vinson could only say:

I think it would be a very formidable task to get a complete picture or a picture in detail.

The more abundant life has given way to a life of coupon-rationing of life's necessities, something to which the American people are unaccustomed and which has been largely brought about by inefficiency and mismanagement.

The only new policy which has been advanced is to roll back food prices by a $2,000,000,000 subsidy program outlined by the President and to which Judge Vinson has already committed himself without the opportunity for study of the inflationary consequences that must result, and for which all the people, whatever their station in life, will pay through the nose, not only in higher taxes but in finally increased rather than lessened living costs.

It is thus apparent that regardless of the wishes or intent of the Congress, the President is determined to enlarge upon the fallacious economic policies which have characterized the New Deal from its beginning.

I am confident, however, that the American people will have a great deal more to say about this issue. I rely upon their judgment and common sense to compel the President to at least get down to earth and to actualities and to face the situation with the courage the American people have a right to expect of the President of the United States, and which thus far has been lamentably lacking in the President's official acts.

The present situation is, furthermore, one that calls for eternal vigilance made necessary by Mr. Roosevelt's well-known habit and that of those serving under him, of exceeding their constitutional powers whenever they can get away with it.

We are faced with a situation of the gravest import. On the one hand, is the deplorable condition in which the country finds itself because of the lack of a national policy for civilian economic control. On the other, the threat that by Executive order and directive the attempt will be made to continue piecemeal, ineffective, even un-American, policies that will accentuate rather than decrease the evils of inflation and will work the most destructive changes in our business and social structure.

The American people demand a different course than this.

The American people want something other than the policy of the palace politicians; something other than the policy of improvidence; something other than the "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" policy of the high priests of the New Deal; something other than the scarcity and profligacy policies of the W. P. A. and the A. A. A.

I have already referred to the right of the Congress to be critical. I have fixed opinions on these rights. The only means which democracy has to urge speed on its leaders or to improve their methods is the whiplash of public opinion and the crack of critical appraisal. Unless we exercise the right of critical examination of executive operations, we automatically invite a situation not unlike the conditions which attend Hitler's tyranny.

Extended reference has been made to the tactics followed by the Office of War Information. I shall make a more extended observation about this agency at another time. Suffice it to say that I believe it is a matter of deep and vital concern to a free people, even in time of war, how far government should be permitted to go in molding public opinion by the circulation of news or by tinting the news with deceptive colors. A well-informed people can be a free people, but an ignorant or misinformed people cannot hope to retain their liberties.

Mr. Chairman, I shall pursue at greater length at some future time the subject of the agencies for which appropriations are made in this bill. I am convinced the activities of these agencies will continue to be misdirected efforts unless a comprehensive national economic policy is formulated and adopted, and unless the disruptive forces which have been permitted to operate in these agencies are brought to an end.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us carries an appropriation of $2,939,000,000 to serve 18 essential war agencies for the coming fiscal year. If you divide the 18 into that amount, $2,939,000,000, you will find that it is a very small amount comparatively speaking to carry on these important war agencies.

In considering this appropriation request for the Board of Economic Warfare, it is vitally important that we understand clearly the direct relationship of this agency to the total war effort. We are not interested in theory here; we want to know the facts of current operations.

We do not need to be reminded that this war will not be won on the military front alone. Our total resources must be geared in here at home, and broad activities which we call economic warfare must be carried on throughout the world. Let us take a brief look at high lights of what B. E. W. is doing in this field, so that we will be better able to judge the value of this agency's job—to see how indispensable it is.

In time of war, the United States must control its commercial exports. We cannot permit the shipment of goods needed vitally in our own war effort. We cannot afford to permit anything to leave the country which might aid the enemy, directly or indirectly. At the same time, we must protect the economy of the friendly countries who are on our side, within the safe limits of available supply.

B. E. W. is doing this job, centralizing the authority effectively. Working with the War Production Board and the Department of State, it gets the determination of what we can spare from this country, and then squares that with the most urgent war-economy needs of our allies.

Around 6,000 export-license applications have to be considered each day. These cover hundreds of commodity groups, coming from thousands of United States exporters. Each must be checked against the supply and need situation, and against the blacklist of undesirable foreign customers. It is a tremendous task—an essential task—and we simply cannot afford to hamstring the work in any way.

Turning to the problem of import of needed war materials from other countries, we again find B. E. W. doing an essential war job. We are not self-sufficient in raw materials. Literally hundreds of strategic commodities must be brought in from outside the United States. Former sources of supply lost to the enemy, particularly in the Far East, have to be offset from other areas of the world.

Without these supplies our war industries could not keep on operating at full strength. Without them, we could not meet our commitments in war production.

As a Nation, we are justly proud that no United States war factory has had to close for lack of imported strategic materials. And this has not just happened. It has been the result of efficient, centralized planning and direction by the Board of Economic Warfare.

The materials have to be located in the four corners of the earth; their procurement has to be carefully programmed and blueprinted; frequently vast development projects must be carried through before the goods can be bought at all.

All this is headed up, and headed up successfully, in B. E. W. Foreign buying operations will pass $2,000,000,000 during the year. The B. E. W. import field men have been called economic commandos, and I think the term is well taken. We cannot be shortsighted enough to limit the scope of work so obviously vital to the very prosecution of the war—work which is saving the lives of our sons on the fighting fronts.

Another side of Board of Economic Warfare activities is related very directly to the military effort; so much so in fact that much of its work must come under the limits of military secrecy. I refer to the extensive economic intelligence and analysis work which is carried out all over the world, especially for enemy countries. This work is at the very foundation of successful war strategy. It is not only used by the armed services, it is directly requested by these services.

Two letters written recently by Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Military Intelligence Division of the War Department General Staff, which are addressed to the Executive Director of B. E. W., tell better than I can the value of this economic warfare analysis service. These letters appear on page 6016.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we are always pleased when we see our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] take the floor, because we know that we are not only going to listen to an eloquent speaker, although sometimes misguided, but we are also going to listen to a most charming gentleman. I was rather intrigued in a way when I heard him admit, and I think it was a very fine admission, a very wholesome one, and an admission that others could well follow, that he has asked the Divine Providence on many occasions to forgive him for his acts of omission and commission. I may say further I am sure he also asked the Divine Providence for guidance, as I do each day.

When the gentleman referred to Judge Vinson awhile ago I did not ask him to yield but the very thought entered my mind that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania about. I was wondering then if the gentleman from Pennsylvania was going to leave his remarks without further explanation in relation to Judge Vinson and the fact that Judge Vinson had just assumed office, and, if he was, I was going to say that my good friend from Pennsylvania should ask Divine Providence for forgiveness. But due to the efforts of my good friend from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], he bailed our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania out so that he does not have to ask the Divine Providence for forgiveness in using the name of our distinguished former colleague Judge Vinson, as the basis for his argument that the present administration has no comprehensive national economic program.

However, the fact is we have produced 60,000 planes in the last year. There must have been some program for that.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Am I to understand that my friend from Massachusetts feels that a comprehensive national economic program has produced those airplanes, or does he feel that the great initiative and industry of private enterprise that was long under the whiplash of this administration has produced those planes?

Mr. McCORMACK. You cannot have a comprehensive national economic program without human beings being a part of that program. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania realizes that no program which affects human beings can be accomplished one way or the other except through human agencies. Certainly there must be a program. In that program the Congress played its part, as I have said on the floor; manager and labor played their part, but there had to be some program, some governmental policy, in order to produce 60,000 planes. At the time the President predicted the production of 60,000 planes almost everyone took issue with him and many in the Halls of Congress criticized him for making, as they said at that time, such a wild prediction. Forty-five thousand tanks, too, is something that has been produced. Somebody has done that. There must have been some programing.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I know the gentleman always wants to be fair. Would not the gentleman be willing to say that the 60,000 planes were produced in spite of the fact that there has been no comprehensive national economic policy?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks a question about something that he knows is impossible. You cannot produce 60,000 airplanes unless there is some programing, unless there is some work done, unless there is some policy which enables that to be brought about.

Mr. DITTER. Will my friend announce the policy?

Mr. McCORMACK. The whole policy is in the first instance to win the war.

Mr. DITTER. Yes, we have heard that; but I should not make a speech to the gentleman, and I shall not ask him to yield further.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are many on the gentleman's side of the aisle who in good faith, exercising their conscience, before Pearl Harbor voted against measures the passage of which were vital to the best interests of our country. Certainly there was some planning in connection with that. Without the passage of that legislation, the probabilities are that after Pearl Harbor this country would not have been able to make the recovery it did make, if as a result of what we did prior to December 7, 1941, we had not converted our peacetime economy into at least a 25 to 30 percent wartime economy.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. DITTER. I have accepted at times the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader with reference to my remarks on the floor. He has never misguided me. I am wondering whether the gentleman from Massachusetts really wants to revive an old sore. I am not speaking for myself, but I am wondering whether in the honest profession of his purposes of unity he feels the revival of the sore to which he has just made reference will mean very much as a contribution. I hope the gentleman will reconsider his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not revived anything. It is the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has done the reviving. My observation was not made in any partisan sense and was not made in any strong manner. I said that men voted as their consciences dictated. I respect their views although disagreeing with them. I just made a mild, casual observation.

Mr. DITTER. Somewhat in the nature of an effort at chastisement.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the chastising comes from my friend from Pennsylvania. What I wanted to say, without going into further detail, is simply that when we receive criticism for mistakes—by the way, our Government in the conduct of this war for all practical purposes is bipartisan, but I recognize party responsibility—we are entitled to credit for successes. I welcome and I appreciate constructive criticism. No one hears me take issue with constructive criticism. It is healthy in wartime as well as in peacetime, but always, particularly in wartime, it should be constructive more so than at other times. We can make mistakes in criticism and otherwise in peacetime and struggle along, but in wartime it is an entirely different situation. We must be very careful and temperate in our criticisms.

I think that when you criticize the Government and the administration—I will use the word "administration" in the sense of the Government, recognizing that the party in power has party responsibility—when you criticize the administration for some things, that administration is also entitled to receive credit for other things. My friend from Pennsylvania referred to the success of our boys in Africa and in the Far East. If you criticize this administration—and some of the criticism has been justified and has produced results—if you criticize the administration on the home front for this or that thing for which the administration should be criticized, certainly the administration is entitled to credit for the things that are contributing toward the winning of the war. The administration is entitled to receive credit for the successes on the military front. If you attack the Commander in Chief on the home front, certainly he is entitled to receive credit for his contributions made to the successes on the military front.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. First of all, I should like to remind the distinguished majority leader that I did give credit to the administration in the observations I made with reference to the strategy and the conduct of the war. The Army and the Navy are a part of this administration. I could not have found more words to pay my tribute to them for the splendid work the Army and Navy are doing, during the course of my humble effort. The gentleman has brought up the very thing that I think all of us on this side at times resent, that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy but he is not the Commander in Chief of the civilian forces. He is the President of the United States. At the present time he makes himself all the more vulnerable to criticism because he is a fourth-term candidate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman ask me to yield to bring politics in here?

Mr. DITTER. The subject was opened up by my distinguished friend the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is so adroit in charging others with doing the things he does himself. The gentleman is too able a legislator and too profound a student of government not to know that in wartime the position of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief for all practical purposes is first, and his activities as President from a practical angle become more or less secondary. The strength of our military leaders is due to a strong Commander in Chief. When

I use the word "military" I mean the leaders of our armed forces, all the officers and men of all of our armed branches of the service, from General Marshall and Admiral King down, brilliant men, as this war fortunately has shown them to be. We are very lucky to have great generals and great admirals, but the strength of their leadership is due to a strong Commander in Chief.

I am not talking of the commander in chief of the Democrats or the Republicans. It is absolutely vital in a democracy in times like this that we have in the White House a man of courage. He may make mistakes, yes, but we must have, above all, a man who is courageous. He is the symbol of everything that our country stands for, whether we like his party politics or not, whether we like this thing or that thing that he does. In looking at the over-all picture, the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief in wartime, is the symbol of our national strength or weakness, for that depends to a great extent upon the strength or the weakness of the man who occupies the White House. Lincoln in the War between the States incurred the criticism and opposition of his own party, but it was the strength of his character and his determination to go on that gave the leadership that preserved the Union. We need a strong man today. Fortunately we have one, not the Democrat, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, the American. We legislate and through him and through our military and naval commanders the measures of war are executed. You might have the greatest military men in the world, and yet if you have a weak President, then every effort will be interfered with. Fortunately we do not have that situation today, so that I will agree with the gentleman in the technical, academic distinction that he has drawn, but from a practical angle in wartime, the President of the United States must consider his duties as Commander in Chief as of paramount importance, and it is difficult to separate those duties on the military field from those on the domestic field. So I contend, accepting everything the gentleman said from an academic or theoretical angle, but from a practical angle, in wartime the President of the United States becomes the Commander in Chief, and those duties as Commander in Chief in wartime transcend the duties that would otherwise devolve upon him as President during peacetime.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will not at this time make any reference to the person, but I should like to reemphasize my own opinion. The occupant of the White House at the present time represents three entities. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. He is the President of the United States, and he is——

Mr. McCORMACK. The leader of his party, if you want to put it that way.

Mr. DITTER. A fourth-time candidate, according to many spokesmen of his party. I find it very difficult to separate the one from the other.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman admits that what I said is true, that he is Commander in Chief as well as President, and that the duties of Commander in Chief in wartime are of primary importance. I am very glad that he admits that when he states it is difficult to separate one from the other.

Mr. DITTER. My observation was to be this, that I would recommend to the distinguished majority leader something that I know he has already pursued at great length, and that is to reread the Federalist, and he will see where the care and the caution of the founding fathers indicate very definitely they wanted to preserve the balance between the civilian leadership and the military leadership. They wanted to avoid a recurrence of what they had suffered under as a result of the conditions and the abuses of George III. They wanted to observe a line of demarcation, and I can hardly imagine that the founding fathers at any time would have resorted to the term Commander in Chief when purely civilian purposes and objectives were being considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has said nothing with which I do not thoroughly agree. I thoroughly subscribe to everything the gentleman said. The founding fathers very wisely provided a separation of powers. The founding fathers wisely provided, and Congress has followed them, that we should not have a large standing army. Our Army today is a civilian army, made up of eight or nine million men today, but still it is a civilian army. But when we are in war the founding fathers recognized that you cannot have the ordinary conduct of government that we could have under peacetime conditions. The founding fathers knew, and the gentleman and I recognize, that when we are faced with the "law of the jungle" we have got to respond to exigency and necessity and not principle, because the first job we have is to save ourselves and win the war and preserve our country. We are justified in doing, within the rules of decency, all things that are necessary to bring about that end. So everything the gentleman says is correct, and I agree, but that is for peacetime conditions, not wartime. We have got to gear ourselves to the conditions of war. That is why in wartime the President is above all the Commander in Chief.

Now my friend has injected politics, about the fourth term, and I am sorry, because I think the most harmful thing for this country is for anybody to talk about the fourth term. I think it is wrong to bring General MacArthur's name into the political arena. I think it is embarrassing to that great military leader whose only concern now is to do his job and to help win the war. That is not tending toward unity. That is division. The injection of the fourth term is to try to create an issue that does not exist, and then knock it down. I do not say it is intended, but the results of it are division.

So, mildly speaking, I think it would be wise for us to wait until next year. There is plenty of time next year to talk about the fourth term.

Coming back to what I wanted to say, the strength of our Nation in war depends, in a sense, upon a strong leader in the White House, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. It was a Republican from 1861 to 1865, but he was an American. It is a Democrat today. We are concerned, as Americans, with preserving our country, and Franklin D. Roosevelt is our President. All I can say is I thank God that in the early days of our constitutional history that God in His wisdom gave us Washington to establish the foundation for the Nation that we have today. I thank God that in the War between the States we were given Lincoln. I thank God that today we are given Franklin D. Roosevelt. And I can say further that after you and I are dead and gone, if some future generation of Americans, our children or our children's children, are faced with a similar situation as we are today, I hope there will be in the White House a man—I do not care what his party is—I do not care what his name is, Smolenski, O'Brien, Smith, Ditter or any other name. It does not mean a thing to me; but I hope, however, that if a future generation of Americans ever undergo the same crisis we are going through today that there will be in the White House a leader of courage, because, above all, while Americans may be possessed of a determination and willingness to cooperate in every way possible, they must have in the White House a man not only of vision, but a man of courage, to lead our country to victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am rather reluctant to bring the discussion from so exalted and profound a level down to something more prosaic, but in November and December and in the early months of 1944, the men, women, and children of the United States are going to ask that rather forceful and homely question, "When do we eat?" It is a question that cannot be laughed off. You can ration people's automobiles, you can diminish the availability of tires and gasoline, you can issue a certain number of shoe coupons in the course of a calendar year, but look out when you reduce the quantity of food that is necessary for the sustenance of life and for the development of that energy that is so necessary to carry on.

The food situation today is critical. The food situation in the months to come will be infinitely more critical. I do not believe in all the years of my service in this House I have ever experienced that intangible, indefinable dread that often hangs over people. I have experienced it for weeks. It does not improve, because I think I can see ahead. It is arithmetic that bothers me. Back in ancient culture somebody said, "Arithmetic is the most important of the sciences and the mother of invention." How true it is today. I am thinking

particularly this afternoon about the question of feed and food. How prosaic it is—feed—oats, corn, wheat, the very things that are indispensable to making pork chops and sirloin steaks and lamb cutlets and all those succulent, toothsome dainties that are at once dainty and tasty, but so necessary for life and for energy.

We have a very critical feed problem and an industrial problem, as factories begin to shut down and men lose their livelihood and the amount of food for the armed forces and the civilian population diminishes, we are going to hear about it, and I assume that we are going to be blamed.

I have here a telegram that I think expresses the situation pretty well. It came this morning. It is rather interesting, and I will read it to you in its entirety:

PEKIN, ILL., *June 16, 1943.*

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Due to the ceiling price on corn our suppliers of starch and dextrose notify us that a shutdown of their plants is imminent as they are unable to obtain corn. We are having the same trouble at our Pekin, Ill., malt and syrup plant and also our Cincinnati plant in obtaining corn to operate. The ceiling price on corn is $1.07 per bushel. However, the farmer can get the equivalent of $1.40 per bushel by feeding his corn to hogs. Obviously he will not sell his corn for prccessing unless the price difference is narrowed or closed if we are to have our materials to operate processors must have the corn to operate and they cannot do so unless provided with corn through Government action. We ask you to please take immediate action to insure continual operation of the starch and dextrose plants of the United States.

STANDARD BRANDS, INCORPORATED,
PEKIN MANUFACTURING BRANCH,
R. NEWCOMB, *Manager.*

They manufacture dextrose that is being used by bakers and candy makers, and already there is imminent the danger of a great many of our wholesale bakers, which in the main bake bread rather than pastry, who may shut down. It may be necessary for those who use dextrose and glucose and other derivatives of corn, to shut down. Think of the importance of this problem as the producers of the staff of life are threatened through lack of corn for processors of necessary ingredients.

The corn industry roughly uses about 12,000,000 bushels of corn every 30 days. Do you know how much corn they received in the last 3 weeks? They received 1,500,000 bushels, and that is the reason they are ready to close. The men who are working therein are disconcerted and anxious about their jobs. That, of course, is only a portion of the story. I said a little while ago that it is the arithmetic of the situation that startles me. Here is the arithmetic. I asked the Department of Agriculture to compile these figures:

Let us consider the 1942 corn crop; roughly, 3,200,000,000 bushels. What happened to it? Here is what happened to it, and is happening:

Forty-one million bushels went to the production of hominy grits and corn flakes and kindred items.

Fifty-four million bushels went into the manufacture of alcohol and alcoholic beverages.

One hundred and thirty million bushels to the starch processors and to corn gluten, corn oil, and like derivatives.

Eleven million bushels went into breakfast foods of various kinds.

Twenty-three million bushels plus were used for farm household purposes.

Seventeen million bushels plus were used for seed.

Two hundred and seventy-seven million bushels for food and related feed uses.

Two billion nine hundred and thirty-three million bushels of corn available for feed. That looks like a lot of corn when the average is about 2,500,000,000 bushels in the ordinary year. But let me remind you the hog population of the country has increased very materially notwithstanding the effort on the part of other years to teach birth control to the hogs of the Nation. We have 20 percent more hogs today than we had before. They have figured on 120,000,000 hogs, and when you have 20 percent more hogs you need 20 percent more feed. So, in reality, this year we need over 500,000,000 bushels more for feed than we required in other years. There are in excess of 73,000,000 hogs now on farms. The number of cattle and calves now on farms is 3,000,000 greater than in 1942. This but aggravates the feed problem.

But that is only a portion of the story. I was reminded just a little while ago—and this was verified at a meeting I attended one night several weeks ago in Washington—of the situation facing the poultry people of the country. One poultry raiser, close to Washington, has produced some 200,000 young chicks and about 60,000 turkey chicks, and he has 1 week's supply of feed left; and when that is gone no more is obtainable; the immature fowls must be put on the market if they have any market value.

You heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] state in the Well of this House earlier this afternoon that the poultry producers up in his area are precisely in the same situation.

The National Poultry Association met in Washington recently with the members of the Agricultural Committee of the House and Senate and stated their case and indicated how acute was the feed situation which confronted them, with some 75,000,000 extra chicks hatched this year.

So the arithmetic of feed is the thing that is going to spell, not starvation particularly, but a species of hunger, perhaps, unless this thing is remedied before very long. In addition many jobs and livelihoods will be extinguished unless corn is forthcoming. There must be an answer for the condition that is developing acutely in the industrial branch, the processing of corn for all forms of edible and feed purposes.

Getting back to this question of 20 percent more hogs which will require 20 percent more corn. In other words, the need for an additional 500,000,000 bushels this year. But where are we going to get it? Maybe it will be made up in part by wheat, but let us look at the wheat figures for 1942 and for the ensuing year.

We will have a carry-over on the 1st of July, according to the estimate, less whatever wheat is fed, of 590,000,000 bushels. Production is estimated at 731,000,000 bushels, making a total available wheat supply in 1943 of 1,321,000,000 bushels. How does that compare with last year? It will be about 300,000,000 bushels short. Is there any hope in that direction as a competitive feed to take the place of corn?

So the arithmetic of this thing is: more livestock, more need for products that are derived from corn, an expanding per capita consumption of corn products of all kinds every year, including 1943 and the diminishing feed supply which, as it begins to tail out, will mean the farmers will haul premature stock to market, probably too light for market, and must sell at a discount and thereby decrease the amount of edible meat when we come in to November, December, and January of this next year. This problem is not a mere statistical curiosity. It is an alarming condition, which demands our best thought and attention.

I was rather interested in the statement of Fulton Lewis, in the broadcast on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, which he made at Omaha.

That rather bears out this contention that the real crux of the whole matter today is the feed situation, namely, corn and wheat.

Now, then, how are we circumstanced? The Commodity Credit Corporation owns about 10,000,000 bushels of corn and has under loan 70,000,000 bushels. This is a C. C. C. figure. There are in elevator stocks and on farms 900,000,000 bushels right now. The farmer is the greatest economist on the face of the earth. He may never have studied these rather abstract and obfuscating principles of economics that one gets in college, but he is a great practical economist, because he can reach down and take a straw, chew on it and contemplate for a while, and then take a stick and begin to make some figures in the freshly plowed earth and he does not need a very elaborate abstract education in higher algebra and the theory of least squares and the fourth dimension to know that he can make more money at $1.40 feeding his corn to animals than he can at $1.07 selling it in the market. He will know what to do with his corn.

So the corn is on the farm; it is not getting into the industrial centers, and men will be deprived of a livelihood. Why? Because the corn does not move in. And why does it not move in? Because sometime ago the O. P. A. and the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain that there would be sufficient meat in the country said they would put a floor under pork prices of $13.75 which may go up to $14 or $15 as an incentive, and so your farmer, economist that he is, is going to get 33 cents per bushel more out of every bushel of corn in the form of meat than he is in the form of cereal corn, and so it is in the bins, the storage places, and the granaries of the farmers of the country today, to be used for feed rather than for industrial processing.

The O. P. A. could remedy the situation. The Director of War Mobilization could remedy the situation if he were disposed to do so by lessening the difference between the price of corn and the price of livestock so that there would be some incentive to take that corn in to the market. The spread between livestock and corn must be narrowed to induce a flow of corn into industries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Whether they will do it or not I do not know.

What is the alternative? The alternative is to requisition corn. They are thinking about it now. I think the Congress should be advised, because I discussed it with the appropriate officials at the other end of the Avenue this morning. A proposal may be forthcoming within the next few days. Will they requisition stocks of corn in the elevators of the country? I do not know, but they are discussing that. Will they undertake to requisition corn that is in a farmer's bin on the farms of Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, or Minnesota? I do not know, but they are discussing it. Do they have authority to do so? This question was discussed rather earnestly back here a little while ago: Whether or not the sovereign government as a contribution to the victory effort can exercise those powers under the first and second War Powers Act, or whether the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States—not of the civilian population, and that is so expressly and indelibly written into the organic law of this Nation—can issue an Executive order to requisition corn, and wheat, and have it go to the industrial markets of the country.

I am submitting this matter to you this afternoon because we are going to have to reckon with it now very shortly. When the old belly begins to growl, when it begins to pinch, then look out. You see you cannot argue with folks then; no; you cannot argue with a hungry man. More than that, just think of the millions of children in the country; what a tragedy if they have to go to bed at night with insufficient food, with a lack of that nutrition that is so necessary and that should be theirs. What a tragedy after all these years of the economy of scarcity when we were paying good hard cash out of the Federal Treasury to take acreage out of cultivation and reduce production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All of us did not approve it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am speaking about myself—taking acreage out of cultivation and pursuing the philosophy of scarcity; yet today as we look down the corridor of time just a little way ahead there looms trouble because there is not enough feed to get this meat to market and to keep the industries that process corn running so that they can contribute to the supply of food for the Nation.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I remind my distinguished colleague from Illinois of the dearth of calories in roll-backs when food becomes scarce?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman knows that almost every part of the country is suffering from the things he has pointed out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. Some people suggest that we should take the ceiling off of corn. Would the gentleman suggest that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest that at least we moderate the present ceiling on corn because, after all, O. P. A. is torpedoing the Price Control Act almost every day. It is rather interesting in respect thereto that that seems to be the philosophy of today. I have Fulton Lewis' remarks made in his broadcast of June 9. I cannot verify this, but I give it for what it is worth.

He says:

> There is at least one specific case in which officials of the Office of Price Administration told a group of men in one of the most important industries of the Nation, this remark being in response to a statement by one of the lawyers for the industry, that the Office of Price Administration was not following the Price Control Act as passed by Congress. The reply to the lawyer by the Office of Price Administration officials was that in order to carry out the Office of Price Administration program, they found it necessary to deviate from the Office of Price Administration law as passed by Congress on occasion. That is just how much the Office of Price Administration has been restricted and hampered by Congress in carrying out this Price Control Act and just how much Congress is to blame for the failure of the Office of Price Administration program.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think the gentleman can find ample evidence in some of the hearings held on the meat situation before the Small Business Committee of the House to justify Mr. Fulton Lewis' statement and the witnesses were those brilliant employees, lawyers, and professors of Office of Price Administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to allude to the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio a moment ago relative to roll-backs. To me that looks like a mirage in the desert. Let us assume that butter sells for 46 cents a pound and according to those in authority it ought to sell for 41 cents. So you say to the butter processor, "You must sell the grocer butter so that he can sell it at 41 cents, then we will give you 5 cents out of the Federal Treasury." Everybody is happy. The butter maker gets the same amount of money that he would ordinarily get, the retailer gets his profit and, of course, the consumer gets his butter at 41 cents a pound. It is very simple if it were not an illusion, because the 5 cents must ultimately come out of the Treasury. And who is going to pay that 5 cents? Well, you have the evidence of it here every day. We have a $3,000,000,000 bill pending.

The national debt is scheduled to reach $210,000,000,000 on June 30, 1944. If in your own mind you can spin out some rough figure for expenditures in the fiscal year 1945 and then figure that we have inadequate taxes to meet that expenditure, our national debt will be going up to $300,000,000,000. It is then just a deferred tax, just like all expenditures are. Then what? If the consumer does not pay that nickel per pound on butter in this generation his children will. But they will pay more, for when you set up a great working establishment to make it possible to take money out of the Treasury in order to subsidize a pound of butter you have to have auditors to do it, you have to have price executives, you must have clerks and stenographers, there must be statisticians, there must be analysts, there must be all sorts of experts, there must be accountants; so that in addition to the price of 5 cents that is involved on each pound of butter there is this extra expenditure that is going to be charged back against every person in the public and that is the reason why they are asking for 63,000 people today. But we will have more to say about that tomorrow. This will be continued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman knows this, but I want to bring to his attention our plight in New England because of the shortage of cornstarch, and that applies, of course, to the southern textile mills as well as the northern mills. It will be a very serious problem in connection with the war effort to us and the southern mills also.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the corn does not get into the cornstarch industry, this starch cannot go out to the textile mills to be used for sizing for the cloth and that goes not only to the civilian requirements of the country but to the military and naval requirements as well.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All sections of the country are interested in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have there a sample of the integrated economy of this country. It is like pushing over the first soldier in the row of soldiers, then all soldiers fall down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to incorporate in the RECORD two letters from Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, and chairman of the Joint

Intelligence Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Strong is a native of Helena, Mont., and although he has spent many years away from us in the Army we still look upon him as one of our own. Montana is proud of her son who is now in charge of Army Intelligence. I feel that the letters he has written to us about the Board of Economic Warfare are well worth our study and deliberation, especially in view of the bill now before us for decision.

The two letters to which I refer follow:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 12, 1943.

Mr. MILO PERKINS,
Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PERKINS: I should like to invite your attention to the developments of the past year in the use of reports prepared by the Board of Economic Warfare in connection with the activities both of the Joint Intelligence Committee and the Military Information Division of the General Staff. The economic material, furnished by the Board of Economic Warfare, has been most useful in connection with estimates of Axis capabilities, both in Europe and the Far East. The services performed by the Board of Economic Warfare, particularly in regard to the oil situation, have been outstanding and far more accurate than information received from any other source. As chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have come to lean heavily upon your Board of Economic Warfare representatives on the committee and on its subcommittees, in determining accurate and analytical questions which are of vital importance to sound decisions bearing upon tactical and strategical plans. The reports and analyses submitted to the Joint Intelligence Committee, through your representatives, have been of outstanding value and a material contribution to the over-all picture which is essential to sound intelligence and the basis for sound planning. In addition, your organization has been particularly helpful in various problems arising in the estimation of the Axis positions in regard to strategic materials, foodstuffs, industrial capacity, and potentialities of the German and Japanese war machines.

In the Government service we are too often prone to accept services as a matter of course and without any particular recognition. In view of the heavy burden which my organizations have undoubtedly placed upon yours, I desire to take this opportunity to express to you and, through you, to the personnel of your organization my very keen appreciation and heartfelt thanks for the close cooperation and the outstanding services performed by the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Very sincerely yours,

GEO. V. STRONG,
Major General, A. C. of S., G–2.

JUNE 14, 1943.

Mr. MILO PERKINS,
Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PERKINS: In my letter of June 12 I had the pleasure of expressing to you the appreciation of this Division for the excellent and important contribution made by the Board of Economic Warfare to Military Intelligence. Permit me now to ask your consideration of another aspect of this matter. I refer to its security implications. As you are aware there is a two-way relationship between the Board of Economic Warfare and the Military Intelligence Division, inasmuch as we exchange information. Much of the data which we give you is confidential or secret and its exposure in any way might place in the hands of the enemy weapons which would be most damaging to the cause of the United Nations. May I therefore ask you to exercise at all times careful precaution that classified material received from Military Intelligence Division is properly safeguarded and used only for the prosecution of the war.

My concern in this connection is heightened by my knowledge that the Board of Economic Warfare is playing an integrated part in the conduct of the war and is actually conducting economic operations directed against the enemy and coordinated with our general strategy. It is thus quite possible that, should enemy agents by any means obtain access either to the broad or to the detailed strategic programs executed by the Board of Economic Warfare, they might well be able to diagnose our purely military plans.

While it is not my own immediate province, permit me also to suggest to you that your tactics and techniques of conducting economic warfare might well provide the enemy, if they were known to him, with means of combating your operations. I make this suggestion from the realization that your effort is integrated with the military effort in the global strategy which we are pursuing. Any defeat which you might suffer through enemy knowledge of the scope, direction, and method of your operations will be reflected eventually in the military field.

Very sincerely,

GEO. V. STRONG,
Major General, A. C. of S., G–2.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak on a matter which, next to the winning of the war itself, is today the most vital concern of the American people. This matter is inflation, which faces us like an awful apparition. In its direct and imminent effects on the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child—both during the war and after the war—the fight against inflation is of absolutely paramount importance. As Bernard Baruch has well said:

> Except for human slaughter and maiming and all the cost that goes with them, inflation is the most destructive of the consequences of war.

I may add that inflation, if we do not prevent it, may lose the war for us.

The employment of subsidies to prevent prices from rising further, and to roll some of them back, is at this moment the key step to winning this battle against inflation—a battle which has been carried on valiantly for almost 2 years now under the most adverse conditions, and with far too little help from this Congress and its predecessor. Time has come for this body to act in the capacity of responsible guardians of the people's welfare for which purpose we were chosen. I feel it is especially necessary to speak out clearly and boldly at this time, inasmuch as the American public and this House have been recently deluged with confused and erroneous statements on this subject of price-restraining subsidies. These statements have been made in this House and before its committees, in the Senate and before its committees, in the press, and on the radio.

Above all, the American people have the right to know, and this Congress should know, that a voice against these subsidies at this critical time—no matter what may be its motive—is in reality a voice for higher prices, and for further steps along the ruinous path to uncontrolled inflation. Those who, while avowing they do not want inflation, refuse to permit moderate subsidies to prevent prices from rising are in a hopelessly contradictory position. For there is no practical possibility of reducing—or even holding—the cost of living and still maintaining essential production and distribution and the American system of free enterprise, except by the judicious use of subsidies.

The loud voices against the cost-of-living subsidy program arise for one or more of the following reasons: First, sheer ignorance; second, inability to understand the workings of our economy in wartime; third, misconceptions, based mainly upon misinformation broadcast by the self-interested; fourth, reprehensible selfishness; and, finally, partisan politics.

The strongest voices we hear in this bedlam chorus are from those who really want the present hold-the-line stabilization program to collapse. They know that subsidies will cement this program and be a long step toward the permanent victory of the anti-inflation battle. If the battle is won and prices stabilized, the profits which these persons, these saboteurs of the war program, still hope to make from the miseries of war will largely vanish. That, Mr. Chairman, is why they are opposed to this sensible program.

Let me repeat, regardless of motive, those who speak against the subsidy program should be branded before the American people as advocating higher prices. If that is what they want, let them say so.

Let me take up briefly the major so-called "arguments"—and I use quotation marks advisedly—against the use of subsidies which are obscuring recognition of the merits of the case. I will explain later the positive reasons why this program is both necessary and highly advantageous.

The first red herring dragged across the trail of truth is that the payment of subsidies to permit American industry to hold or reduce prices of important cost-of-living goods would lead to monopoly. Since those who make this claim do not trouble to give any reasons why monopoly should result, it is a little difficult to deal with this objection. No doubt, most of those who mouth the word "monopoly" have not taken the trouble to find out the simple fact that these subsidies are especially designed to relieve the squeeze which might otherwise fall upon small and financially weak concerns. The case is quite opposite to that which the critics give. If we were to try to avoid inflation without using these subsidies, the threat of monopoly would indeed be serious, since, in order to effect the economies which would permit goods to be sold at low prices, it might be necessary in many cases to shut down the small marginal enterprises and consolidate their business with the larger concerns. Subsidies, on the other hand, will enable these concerns to sell at stable prices, to

keep going throughout the war and into the post-war period, when their ability to compete will be revived by normal economic conditions.

Not all those who cry "monopoly," Mr. Chairman, are simply uninformed or misinformed. There are others who do so with malice and with scheming knowledge. I would like to call the attention of the House to the full page advertisements which have been appearing recently in newspapers throughout the country—advertisements calling for the defeat of the subsidy program and the handling of the price regulation problem by the industry itself. The advertisements to which I refer, Mr. Chairman, were bought and paid for by the American Meat Institute, which this House will recognize as the trade organization of the giant packers—the Big Five—whose record of milking the American public is long and most unsavory and who would benefit enormously by further increases in the prices of the meat which Americans put upon their table. These gentlemen of the American Meat Institute are proven arch-monopolists against which the Government, small packers and dealers have been waging a just war for more than a generation. Are these the people who are to tell us that a subsidy program would lead to monopoly? Need I suggest that they, like too many others, hate O. P. A. and every type of price regulation because they prevent these gentlemen from skinning the American public and destroying their competitors.

It is downright amusing to note that many of the ignorant and dishonest critics also dust off the old shibboleth of socialization in opposing this clean-cut program aimed at preserving the solvency of private enterprise while protecting the foundations of our free American system against inflation. The claim of socialization is exactly the opposite of the truth. Our Government, in proposing to pay subsidies, is trying to preserve the system of private business by insuring reasonable margins to producers and distributors, yet without risk of inflation. Nothing leads to socialism, nazi-ism, or communism like the shattering effects of inflation. In the early days of Russian communism, Soviet leaders deliberately destroyed the value of their money by inflation. They candidly declared that by this means the value of money—the underpinning of capitalist enterprise—was to be sapped and destroyed. It is too well known to need repetition that the growth of nazi-ism was in large part attributable to the disastrous war and post-war inflation which Germany experienced. The rank profiteering, and the pauperization of the small businessman, the middle classes, and the stable working people, which that inflation caused, were the breeding grounds of the antiprivate enterprise and regimenting Nazi philosophy. If we want socialism in this country, Mr. Chairman, we can get it with a vengeance by just letting inflation get out of hand.

We hear cries that the use of subsidies runs counter to the traditions of American business and economic policy. Can anything be more ridiculous! Let us look at the record. Our great American railroad system on which we now depend so vitally was founded and suckled upon public subsidies—of land, of rights, and of money. Our fast-growing and excellent system of waterways has been steadily receiving well-deserved grants of public funds for their extension and improvement. It hardly needs pointing out that our American airways were assisted by postal and other subsidies which permitted them to keep alive during their infancy and the lean years before the war. The American merchant marine was nurtured by public funds during every period of its growth and ascendency. It is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that more was not spent on American shipping and air transport in the years between the two wars. Think of what a few hundred million a year would have done for our strength and safety.

Finally, in considering whether subsidies for public purposes are out of harmony with the American way, let us look at agriculture. Since the founding of this country it has been our firm and consistent policy to further agricultural development and improvement by public funds and by use of our public lands. The story is well known; I will not repeat it. I would like, however, to call special attention to the several billions which we spent, after 1932, to bring agriculture out of its worst collapse in history and restore it to the condition in which it can now carry on its immense wartime job. These subsidies were paid, be it noted, to raise prices, when the demands of America and the world for our agricultural products were ruinously low. Now those conditions are reversed. We need all the food we can produce, and food prices have already risen to levels which place a severe burden upon millions of low-income American families. Is it un-American now to use public funds to insure adequate prices to farmers without requiring the payment of burdensome prices by the very consumers who supported American agriculture so generously in its adversity? Is it un-American to save American agriculture, for which billions of public money have been spent, from the ruin which inflation and subsequent deflation would bring upon it? Those few medicine men who presume, unjustly, to speak for the millions of patriotic American farmers should remember what happened to agriculture after the inflation of the last war. Would these fake medicine men say that after this war agriculture will not again need assistance? That what they call meddling and interference with prices fixed competitively in the market should then be eschewed—that Congress should shut off the subsidy funds which will permit agriculture's difficult readjustment to post-war conditions? If they are really against subsidies on principle, as contrary to the American tradition, let them say so frankly. The American farmers will be very interested to hear that!

No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot pursue such a policy. Our agricultural program, which was finally created 10 years ago after so many disappointments and discouragements at the hands of unfriendly administrations, must go on. America must aid agriculture consistently—in the way in which aid is required. One of the most important ways is to avoid the holocaust of inflation. Another is to insure adequate prices during the war. Subsidies are needed to reach the former first objective—avoidance of inflation. While the second objective, fair prices for the farmer, has now been attained, we need subsidies to make sure that fair farm prices will be maintained, both during and after the war.

I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, but the fact must be recognized—that many of those who oppose the subsidy program as supposedly monopolistic, socialistic, and un-American are not really concerned about these vital matters but only with the fattening of their own pocketbooks. There are those who know that a subsidy would be paid only to those who need it. They therefore want higher prices instead, higher prices which would be paid on all output, across the board, and would therefore be much larger in amount than the subsidy. There are also those, as I have said, who desire to see the whole stabilization program defeated so that they may profiteer on an ascending spiral of prices. They want the entire burden of the war to rest upon the unfortunate consumers to the benefit of the relatively few. It is these people who, besides being selfish and unpatriotic, are the true breeders of monopoly, socialization, and un-Americanism. May this Congress and the American people recognize this in time.

Further arguments which have been made against the subsidy program are that by increasing Government borrowing it would add to the inflationary pressure, and that it places an added burden on the taxpayer. I believe that most of those who use this argument are simply misguided—that they do not understand the inflationary problem nor the part which subsidies play in its dissolution. The point they miss, Mr. Chairman, is that moderate subsidies, by preventing ruinous inflation, will save the taxpayers of this country untold misery and literally tens and even hundreds of billions in dollars. They will enormously decrease the inflationary pressure, and vastly decrease the amounts which must be borrowed and taxed. When cost-of-living prices go up seriously, the wages of labor and other prices and incomes will move up too, costs and prices will be raised in a spiral throughout the whole economy. Higher costs and prices increase the cost of tanks, guns, ships, and planes to the Government and are therefore sorely felt by the taxpayers, who will have to pay the bondholders interest on the larger Government debt. By comparison with the price rises of the last war, our present anti-inflation program has already saved the Government upward of $70,000,000,000 on the cost of the war. As the war goes on these savings—if we succeed in preventing inflation—will grow progressively.

The $100,000,000,000 which we plan to spend on the war this next fiscal year

could easily be $200,000,000,000—or $500,000,000,000, or even a trillion—if inflation gets out of hand. What would be the position of the taxpayers if that should happen? Other countries experienced such disaster in the last war. These countries, forearmed with experience, are using subsidies this time to help prevent a recurrence. They rightly view the money spent for this purpose as the best insurance bargain they could possibly make. Those thoughtless critics who cry out against spending several hundred million dollars on inflation-fighting subsidies when tens and even hundreds of billions are at stake are as foolish as a man who would refuse to pay a few dollars to insure his house against fire when a wave of arson is sweeping his community. The proposed expenditure for subsidies is plain and understandable common sense.

Special attention should perhaps be drawn to the objections which ex-President Hoover has brought against the subsidy program. Special attention is deserved in view of Mr. Hoover's economic and agricultural record. Mr. Hoover asserts that subsidies will not stop inflation but are "a delayed aggravation." Although workers and farmers are supposed to benefit, he says, both are taxpayers and will eventually have to pay higher taxes because of subsidies.

I have already shown the ignorance and confusion which lies back of his position. I would like to call to mind, however, Mr. Hoover's outstanding record in dealing with our economic, and especially our agricultural, problems and that shall suffice. However, most of the Members of this House will remember his diagnoses of our economic ills between 1928 and 1932, and the remarkable "therapeutic" results of his prescriptions. Under his treatment our American economy, and especially our agriculture, were brought to death's door. It will be recalled that the only significant thing he prescribed for agriculture was the expenditure of $500,000,000 of public funds to purchase foodstuffs to be held menacingly over the market, in a pathetic expectation that this would improve prices. Mr. Hoover's subsidy was perhaps unique in American history in having no sensible purpose and absolutely no helpful results. He now advises the American public, in view of his experience, not to use subsidy funds at a time when they are otherwise faced with a possible national catastrophe. He attempts to criticize a plan and a method he obviously never did understand, a plan designed to give the farmers what they need without causing disastrous inflation.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the opposition against this straightforward proposal to meet a crying wartime need is a tissue of absurdities—mixed, as I have noted, with insincerities—which flies in the teeth of reason and experience. It is absolutely imperative at the present time to stop inflation. Will any man deny it? Every country which has stopped it has used subsidies to do so. One of the clearest lessons of this war and of the last is that the cost of living cannot be stabilized without subsidies and that success in the whole fight against inflation depends on the stability of the cost of living. Heavy taxation, forced saving, over-all rigid price freezing, strict wage control, and comprehensive rationing have, all combined, not been able to do the job in countries that have been fighting this war much longer than we have, even when their programs, as those of certain European countries, have been backed by the most repressive regimentation and the most lavish employment of the hated Gestapo methods. No major belligerent of World War No. 2 has succeeded in maintaining reasonable stability of prices without the widespread use of subsidies. On the other hand, there is the clearest possible connection between the use of subsidies and the stability of the cost of living which has now been achieved in Great Britain and Canada. Indeed, our sister nation to the north is pointed to continually as an object lesson, almost of perfection, in holding the line on prices. "Why can't we do it if Canada does?" is the repeated question. The plain answer, known to anyone who takes the trouble to inquire, Mr. Chairman, is that Canada has used price-restraining subsidies for a year and a half, ever since her price ceiling was placed in effect, whereas the repeated appeals of our authorities for subsidy funds have fallen on deaf ears.

Are we going to be so foolish as to ignore the clear teaching of experience? Are we going to ask our stabilization authorities for results comparable to those achieved by other countries yet withhold the means? That is exactly the situation in which the Office of Price Administration, Justice Byrnes and Justice Vinson have been and are now placed. It is unfair, to put it mildly, to give them a vital job to do and then to reject their repeated pleadings for the necessary tools.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, with a brief explanation of why the subsidy program should be supported by every Member in the House. The question, "Why should subsidies be paid?" amounts basically to another, "Why must the cost of living line be held?" As I have already pointed out, the cost of living must be held to avert the catastrophe of inflation. I have also shown that subsidies are a sound and fabulously profitable investment to the taxpayer and to the country as a whole. I would like, however, to add two other points, which I fear some Members of this House may have overlooked.

We are now spending hundreds of billions of dollars on war contracts made with American businesses to produce the arms for our men behind the guns. These contracts are made in good faith and guarantee these enterprises adequate profits, and better in many cases. American agriculture is guaranteed "parity" or better. A contract was also made between the Government and workers and others who suffer severely when living costs rise, back in May 1942—a contract to stabilize the cost of living at the levels then prevailing. That contract was incorporated in the Little Steel Formula, according to which wage adjustments have been made by the War Labor Board. That contract was solemnly reaffirmed by the Congress on October 2 of last year with the bench mark for stabilization of wages and prices set at September 15. While our contracts with American industry have been kept, we have fallen down on our contract with American workers and others suffering from rising living costs. The cost of living has risen by 7 percent since September 15, 1942, and food prices by 16 percent. On the basis of this contract the no-strike agreement was founded.

This Congress has recently passed legislation to make this no-strike agreement compulsory. We will all agree that there should be no strikes in wartime. Can we at the same time dodge our responsibility under the stabilization agreement? The answer is clear; we cannot, in all fairness. Some of the opponents of the subsidy program of whom I have spoken—all except those who merely have not understood the issues—would have us pay attractive prices to industry and agriculture yet permit workers, dependents of soldiers and sailors, widows, the aged and infirm, and all other classes of our population to take the rap by paying the inflated price. When we are paying these billions to corporations are we going to refuse to pay a few hundred millions to producers for the benefit of the millions of workers and other consumers of this Nation? No, Mr. Chairman, we have to make good on our contract.

But to those to whom a contract has no meaning, and to whom justice and fairness carry no appeal, let me say this. The hard-working laboring men and women of my constituency, and of the entire country—men and women, most of them, who toil with their hands—are not going to permit their country to back down on its contract. They are not going to let prices go on increasing without demanding a new contract—one which will make adjustment for the higher prices they are being asked to pay for their food and clothing. They will make sacrifices for the war—they will go without scarce goods, pay heavy taxes, save to the utmost, work hard, play little, and fight when called upon. But they will not be mulcted by selfish and unpatriotic interests who want to get all the benefits of war production and place the sacrifices upon others. Let no one think the wage problem is settled regardless of what is done about prices. Quite the contrary. Without stabilization of all prices, and the roll-back of some, American workers are rightfully going to demand revision of the Little Steel formula and the other arrangements which are restraining wages. And these workers are going to remember who did, and who did not, support relief on the price front, when the members of this Congress stand up and are counted.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a short time the bill which we have before us, but before I go into a general discussion of it I want to say that I was very much interested earlier in the day in the re-

marks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]. I was attracted to those remarks at the very outset because he read a letter from the president of the 16-to-1 Gold Mine Co., Mr. Harry Maxfield, in whose office in San Francisco and in whose home in Oakland I have spent a little time. I want to say that the man from whom he quoted is one of the finest citizens on the west coast and one of its most distinguished characters.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I want to thank the gentleman very sincerely for the remarks he has made about our mutual friend, Mr. Maxfield, who is, as the gentleman from New Mexico has just stated, one of the most outstanding citizens of San Francisco.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what Mr. Maxfield had to say about the plight of the American gold miner. We recognize that the American gold mines are temporarily closed. I was tremendously interested when the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] read an item from the New York Herald Tribune of June 12 which pointed to the fact that in certain South American countries gold mining was going on and the Government of the United States was purchasing the gold these mines produced. I thought if that was extensive it was a deplorable practice, and that certainly the gentleman from California was entitled to complain. I think it is fine that he has called this matter to the attention of the House, because we have a right to know under what circumstances our American resources are being safeguarded or threatened.

Therefore, I am glad to report to him and to the Members of the House that gold-mining supplies are not going extensively into any country, nor is gold being brought out for export to this country in any substantial fashion except upon order of the State Department and in situations that contribute to success in a phase of our economic warfare. The State Department has frequently put the pressure on the Metals Reserve Corporation and on the Board of Economic Warfare to buy certain amounts of gold and on some occasions to ship in gold-mining machinery, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof of the wisdom of the course of the State Department is demonstrated today by the fact that 20 of the 21 American republics are wholeheartedly with us in our endeavor and the remaining 1 is not unfriendly.

Therefore, we need to remember that gold may be bought occasionally in very small quantities from three South American countries and, I think, three only, but that gold mining in South America generally is at an absolute minimum, and that our American gold miners, who have patriotically accepted what appeared to them as an unwise and unjust order, are not going to have their investments destroyed if the State Department and B. E. W. can prevent it.

I do think we should remember that the concession given to some of these South American countries has been beneficial in the extreme to the United States. We need to remember that 75 percent of our supply of quinine, sorely needed by soldiers who may be serving in tropical lands, was cut off by Japan as soon as the war started, and that the Board of Economic Warfare has had to try to find a supply to replace that. They found it in Ecuador. The cinchona bark which is brought back to us from Ecuador is now supplying the deficiency of the supply which Japan took away from us. We have permitted Ecuador to mine and sell to us a very tiny amount of gold, but I think the bargain is one that is well worth while if it supplies quinine to our boys in the Tropics, in Guadalcanal, and in north Africa, in places where tropical weather has made their occupation in defending our liberty an extremely hazardous one.

The comment in that newspaper article read today was that a small amount of gold was now to come in from Chile. We are getting in return nitrates and copper, both of which we badly need for industry and war.

I just want to suggest to this House that it is important to remember that we can fight a war economically as well as with guns, tanks, and planes. If by our economic warfare we can lessen the burden that the boys must bear, we have made a fine contribution to the war effort.

There was a good deal said here today about Abraham Lincoln. If any of us sought to buy a copy of some of Abraham Lincoln's writings we would find that the price was prohibitive today, but if we tried to pick up some volumes written by Carl Sandburg dealing with Lincoln during the war years and during the prairie years we might find that a set of those fine volumes cost $15.

I hold in my hand two volumes that cost $15. They are the two volumes that deal with the hearings under which this war agencies bill is brought to the House. One thousand sets of these have been printed. The total cost of taking the stenographic notes and transcribing them, putting them into type, printing them, and presenting them to the House, is such that the cost of these two volumes will be $15.

If I came to your office and offered you without cost a $15 set of books, I am sure you would accept the set as a very fine gift. So I say that since so much effort has gone into these two volumes and since the committee in charge of this bill has sat long hours and worked earnestly, we ought to pay a good deal of attention to what is in these hearings. We ought to read them. I think that no committee of the House has ever been more zealous in its work than the committee which brings us at this time the national war agencies appropriation bill. This applies, of course, to the men on the majority side and on the minority side, because they have faithfully stayed by the task for 5 solid weeks.

Let us go carefully through these hearings to find the justification for the appropriations which the committee has recommended. We should not vote to strike a single dollar from this important wartime bill until we have studied the justification and understand why it is in the bill. Here is one place where we cannot vote blindly in the name of economy, because the committee was thinking in terms of economy when it reduced the items in the bill to a figure which its study convinced the members was as low as it was safe to go.

I wish to put before the House a few facts, which I believe are not generally known, about the business of the Board of Economic Warfare and the way in which business is carried on at that agency. They will tend to show that this vitally important wartime agency—built up almost overnight in a period of grave national emergency—is being operated by businessmen on a businesslike basis. In my opinion, in the Board of Economic Warfare we are getting a bargain. We are getting the services of hundreds of top-flight businessmen at salaries which are only a fraction of what they earned in private industry.

First, I want to pull out a few basic figures from the elaborate and carefully prepared budget statement presented by B. E. W. On July 25, 1942, the Congress appropriated $12,000,000 for B. E. W. administrative expenses for fiscal year 1943. For fiscal year 1944 the agency's Budget statement asks for $26,150,000 for administrative expenses. On the surface this seems to be a considerable jump. A careful examination of the record, however, indicates that the increase is a relatively modest one in view of the current scale of operations.

The agency is now operating at a rate of $19,000,000 per year. Thus the increase asked for the next year is actually only $7,000,000 more than the current operations rate. An additional $10,000,000 in confidential funds for secret war purposes was requested in both years.

At the time of the previous appropriation, the agency was in the first stage of its job of developing a world-wide import program to bring in critical war materials. Our supply of many products was cut off when the Japs overran the Southwest Pacific, and new sources had to be developed in areas where these goods had never before been produced on a commercial basis. Exploratory and development missions had to be sent abroad. Involved negotiations had to be carried through and contracts signed. Yet today and for many months past, despite these initial handicaps, the strategic materials are pouring in from overseas at an ever-increasing rate.

In fact, today the B. E. W. is bringing in these goods at a rate of about a billion and a half dollars a year. During the coming fiscal year, B. E. W. expects to step up our imports to nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of critical materials, which are absolutely essential to keep our war plants running and our armies supplied. This huge task of finding, developing, and buying strategic commodities is only one of three major jobs handled by B. E. W. In addition, it is responsible for licensing all commercial exports from this country, in order to conserve our supplies of scarce commodities, and to

see that no goods leak into enemy hands. And, finally, B. E. W. carries out a detailed analysis of the enemy's economic machine, both to guide its own operations and as a service undertaken at the direct request of the Army and Navy intelligence organizations.

Now I want to call to your attention the type of men B. E. W. has enlisted to handle this work. Primarily it is a business job, and B. E. W. has gone after the best businessmen it could find. These men have had to meet pay rolls. Most of them have had outstanding careers in private business, many in the foreign trade field. They know the commodities with which they deal; they know production costs, prices, and markets. Some of them have spent years in the far-off jungles and mountains where these goods are to be found. They know transportation and shipping. They have technical experience on processing. In brief, they are putting the skill and training of a lifetime at the service of their country—in many cases, at a considerable financial sacrifice.

I have had a chance to examine a compilation of the 502 top men—the policy makers—in the B. E. W. organization who earn $5,600 or more. This information, I understand, was submitted to at least one of the members of the committee which reported out this bill. The vast majority of these men in B. E. W. were drawn from private industry—380 to be exact. The break-down of the salaries these men earned before they came to work for B. E. W. is one of the most unusual statements I have ever seen. You can get much of this from the hearings, part 2, at about page 412. Of these 380 former businessmen, 117 previously made from $5,600 to $7,500 per year in private industry; 105 made from $7,500 to $10,000; 111 made from $10,000 to $25,000; while 47 men, almost 10 percent, made over $25,000 per year. You can read their names and previous connections on page 432. That to my mind is a record of which few organizations in or out of the Government can boast. I might add that all of them have severed their previous connections entirely; B. E. W. has no dollar-a-year men.

I have heard a great deal about the inferior caliber of men who are working for the governmental war agencies. Here is at least one agency which cannot be subjected to such criticism. The import and export programs of B. E. W., as well as its economic intelligence work, are being conducted by the best brains that the country has to offer.

Before I close, I want to refer to two letters addressed to Milo Perkins of the Board of Economic Warfare by Maj. Gen. George V. Strong of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department General Staff. I think they are vital to any discussion of this agency because when we deal with it under the 5-minute rule and face questions as to the necessity for ample appropriations for its continuance, we might otherwise forget that we are in reality appropriating for a war purpose.

Earlier I have indicated that we can fight with guns, tanks, and planes, but that we can also wage war and intensive, crippling, and devastating war by economic devices. I want these two letters called to your attention because they indicate how economic bartering can contribute to military intelligence, can point out the strength or weakness of an adversary, and can therefore be only accurately described as part of the over-all war effort. This is a war agency, and when we appropriate for it, we must recognize it as such and be as careful with it as we will be with the War Department itself when the bill to give it funds is before this House later this week or in the first days of the next.

These letters from General Strong have been put into today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Finally, I like the way in which this agency goes about its business. It does not merely negotiate a contract and then sit back and wait for the goods to come in. Its people realize that we are fighting a war; and we cannot conduct business as usual. B. E. W. has its men on the ground—expediters who can drive the goods from the mines, to the seacoast, and onto the ships. These men have accomplished miracles in getting production where there was no production before. Roads and railroads have had to be built; airports leveled off; housing and sanitary facilities and trade goods have had to be supplied so that native labor could be put to work. Plantations for quinine and fibers and oil plants have sprung up from the jungles. These are the solid, substantial, business achievements of the Board of Economic Warfare, and I am proud to say they have been accomplished by able businessmen in an aggressive, businesslike manner.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, one of the great newspapers in the country is the Washington Evening Star. I began reading the Star along with other Washington newspapers during my first term in Congress and have found its news columns to be usually extremely reliable. One of the slogans of that newspaper is "If you read it in the Star, it's true."

Today there appears on the front page of the Washington Evening Star a rather lengthy article concerning a supposed shake-up of the O. P. A. by a Mr. Blair Moody, which begins with the following significant statement:

> Price Administrator Brown counterattacking hard against inflationists in Congress who are seeking to smash the price line is ready to announce the long-expected shake-up in the top flight of O. P. A.

Such a beginning is the best evidence of the purpose of this reporter to prejudice his readers against those mentioned later in his article as "inflationists" bent on smashing the price line.

After going into some detail concerning the proposed shake-up soon to take place in the O. P. A. and naming some of the top-notch men in Mr. Brown's office who it is stated are to soon be relieved of their duty, this enterprising young reporter proceeds to tell about what he calls a "cozy little luncheon party" alleged to be held at the Capitol recently attended by a number of leading Members of Congress and at least one Cabinet member.

The meeting, according to the article in question, was attended by Mr. Prentiss Brown, who was confronted by this group of Members of Congress whom this reporter was plainly endeavoring to smear as "inflationists" who are bent on smashing the price line. Imagine my surprise to find my name listed among the group of big, bad boys who inveigled Mr. Brown to a luncheon in order to threaten and browbeat him into submission on the question, Smashing the price line. The truth is I would feel highly honored to be invited to attend any meeting with such an outstanding and well-known gentleman mentioned, but the fact is I did not attend such a luncheon in the Capitol, or elsewhere, nor did I ever hear of such a meeting until I read of it today in the Washington Evening Star.

Reference is also made in the same article to political pressure that was supposed to have been made against Prentiss Brown by the Members of Congress who attended the meeting to secure the increase in the price of crude oil. That, of course, is a plain implication that political trading was indulged in or proposed. It has been several weeks since I have discussed the plight of the independent oil operator with the Price Administrator and during that discussion in his office he made it plain to me that he favored a substantial increase in the price of crude oil. Incidentally, I have every reason to believe that Mr. Brown still favors such an increase, not for the purpose of assisting any group, but in order to make certain the production of the vitally needed oil to win the war. I might add that in all of my conversations with Prentiss Brown on this or any other subject I have approached the subject matter from the standpoint of national welfare and the necessity for winning the war. At no time has there been the remotest suggestion of political trading.

The part of the petroleum industry which has campaigned so many months to get even a little recognition of the petroleum supply problem is the independent producing division. These men, who number upward of 20,000, have stated their case openly in many ways. They have appeared, first, before the emergency war agencies. Failing to obtain any relief there, they have gone before committees of the Congress—both House and Senate—some six or seven times. Producers of oil have come from every area of the United States in which petroleum is produced. The problem is not local or sectional. It is national, and it has no relationship to the candidacy of any man now in or out of office.

Members of Congress have been interested in this question because they are in position to see the whole of the problem. Those who represent districts and States in which petroleum is produced know something of the economics of oil production, just as a Member of Congress from an agricultural section or a coal region informs himself upon the

industry and commerce of his region. There are other Members of Congress, representing districts and States in which no petroleum production occurs, who see the whole question in terms of supply for their constituents, as well as for the Nation.

The plain fact is that we are running perilously low in our oil supply. The Petroleum Administrator for War recently told an informal committee of eastern Senators and Representatives that one of the greatest services a congressional committee could render to the public would be the directing of attention to the danger of a shortage of petroleum. As he phrased it, "We have been going along like a lot of careless, ignorant children."

Except for sporadic, planless, and trifling adjustments, the price of crude oil has been unchanged since price control was established. The changes made have not been sufficient to affect the national average price of oil more than a cent per barrel. The Petroleum Administrator's recommendation was for a 35-cent average raise. The longer there is delay the greater the price that will be required to get the oil-discovery forces into motion, for they are becoming idle, day by day, and men who have made oil exploration and production their life work are quitting the business.

The record is clear. It is public. The evidence is assembled for anyone to inspect.

This is no more a political matter than is the procurement of guns and clothing and food for the armed services. Oil is one of their primary weapons, also. Ever-increasing quantities of it are being required. We are not safeguarding nor making assured the needed supply—the supply for the military and the Navy, for industry that produces the war goods, for the farmers who must provide the food, and for the rest of the population who rely on petroleum for warmth and transportation.

The effort on the petroleum front is failing. Those of us who have gone to some pains to inform ourselves refuse to let this question be regarded as a political one. It is the welfare of a nation at war that is at stake.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. Am I to understand that the gentleman advocates an increase in the price of crude?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely, yes. I have been in favor of that for many months, not in order to bail anybody out, not to help one group, I have no personal interest in the oil business. I do not own a barrel of oil, I do not own any oil-producing land, but as a matter of getting oil to the forces to help carry on the war, I favor an increase in the price of crude oil.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. Am I to understand that the gentleman considers his position critical of Mr. Brown because of his refusal to go along with the Petroleum Administrator for an increase, in war, in the price of crude?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not criticizing Mr. Brown in this instance. I have criticized him on his impractical policies when he appeared before our committee, and I told him that he ought to get rid of some of these daydreamers and impractical theorists. He seems to understand the oil situation, and I repeat that he has indicated that he does favor a substantial increase in the price of crude oil.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman think it is not Mr. Brown's own wish?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am talking about an enterprising reporter who is stirring up trouble and trying to place the label of inflationists on some people.

Mr. PLOESER. Could it be Mr. Hopkins who is dictating the policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not think so. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to be deterred from what I conceive to be my plain duty by any insinuating applications on front-page headlines of the Star, even though it does say when you see it in the Star it is so.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, in her column My Day of day before yesterday, Tuesday, June 15, Mrs. Roosevelt, after paying her customary tribute to the birds, the flowers, and the bees she encounters in her constant peregrinations, put forward what is really a most interesting suggestion, namely, that all candidates for public office spend exactly the same amount on their campaigns.

Said Mrs. Roosevelt, after referring to the clause in the Connally antistrike bill placing both corporations and labor unions on the same footing in regard to political contributions:

> Of course, I think it would be a great step forward if the Government allowed all candidates to spend exactly the same amount, gave them so much time on the radio, so much newspaper advertising space, and so much cash for traveling and actually meeting people.
>
> It would really be a good thing if this expense came out of our taxes and we never had to have any funds raised by political organizations except for education work on actual policies and measures between election periods. Even where party activities such as these are concerned, I am not sure that there might not be better ways of doing it than the way in which we do it now.

These are astute thoughts, indeed, worthy of the nimble intellect and political sagacity of the great lady who advances them.

They will be warmly seconded by the President and Commander in Chief and all the big and little New Dealers in office or who hope some day to be in office if the fourth term shall become an actuality.

And why not?

Candidates of the New Deal party have little need to go into the highways and the byways to collect funds from the citizenry with which to conduct their 1944 campaigns.

Have they not at their service the $40,000,000 a year propaganda agency of the Office of War Information to do their campaigning for them?

And beside this expensive agency, paid for by the Nation's taxpayers, Republicans and New Dealers alike, are there not innumerable press agents in every branch of the Government to spread the New Deal gospel without expense to the party?

And does not the administration, through the control it exercises over the press, the radio, and the movies, dominate these forces for the expression of public opinion?

What need, then, in these circumstances, has the New Deal party and its satellites for campaign contributions given in the old-fashioned way? What has the New Deal to fear from the restrictions of the Hatch Act?

Now firmly entrenched and unscrupulous in the use of the powers it has gathered unto itself, the New Deal can thumb its nose at the gifts it formerly humbly asked labor unions to contribute, equally with those now denied to it by law from the allegedly hated corporations. Mr. Roosevelt has no reason to veto the antistrike legislation because of its provisions estopping the unions from contributing to the campaign funds of political parties.

Were Mrs. Roosevelt's suggestion to be adopted into law she could be credited with putting over a fast one, in fact one of the most adroit political coups in all history.

Of course the President, as such, would not be in the same category as his 1944 Republican opponent.

He would still be President of the United States. The speeches he might wish to make over the radio, political, or otherwise, and few of the President's speeches are wholly without political implications, would be unlimited. Nor would, or could, the press refuse to carry his utterances and his pictures could hardly be kept out of the news reel. His allowance for traveling expenses, a mere $35,000 annually, would enable him to "meet the people" without hindrance.

Yes, Mrs. Roosevelt has a great idea, "too clever by far," as Elmer Davis once said of Mrs. Roosevelt's strategy in coralling his third-term nomination.

But it is just the idea the New Deal has been waiting for and it is possible that Mrs. Roosevelt, sensing the revolt over many of her husband's policies, believes the putting of it into practice, the one means of making the fourth term an actuality.

Mr. Davis, too, having undergone one of his frequent changes of heart since 1940, and now having a vast organization and millions at his disposal in the Office of War Information, can be expected to second the motion. He has thus far shown no reluctance toward propagandizing the New Deal by every subtle means at his command and probably yearns to do a bigger job in the same direction.

Nor will the opposition balk at Mrs. Roosevelt's suggestion, providing only that it be given by the Government a sum equal to that the administration

has to boost its own cause and its own candidates.

This sum would not, however, be merely the $40,000,000 or so the Office of War Information is allotted, it would have to include countless other millions the administration takes out of the pockets of the people annually and that is spent mainly with the idea of perpetuating itself.

It is possible, of course, that Mrs. Roosevelt's plan will strike a snag when the seemingly innocent proposal finally seeps into the public consciousness for what it really is.

It will be difficult enough to counteract the political effect of the administration's vast resources without succumbing to the lure the perambulating lady so enticingly puts forth.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, on November 1 of last year the O. P. A. had 35,720 persons on their pay rolls. Among these were over 2,000 drawing salaries of $4,500 or more. Now that is a nice fat pay roll. You might even think they would be satisfied with it. That number represents an average number of 750 persons for every State in the Union. That is a lot of manpower when every day we see and realize that essential food production is falling off because we cannot keep enough people down on the farm. It is a lot of manpower when our manpower barrel is so low that we must call upon fathers to answer the call to defend their country.

But they are not satisfied with 36,000 employees. That is not enough. They must have more and more every month. I ask you gentlemen, Is there not any limit or is it like subsidies, just a little at first but a little more each month and each appropriation? Now, in their budget this O. P. A., which feels it has the right to stop and question citizens on public thoroughfares as to their destination, asks for a total of 69,170 employees. That, gentlemen, is an average of more than 1,450 for every State in the Union. That is almost twice the number on the rolls just last November. Think of it, gentlemen, twice as many persons are being taken out of production or withheld from other war services so that this organization can tell everyone what they can eat, and how they must present themselves to shoe stores. We often hear about how much money this organization saves, but how frequently do we hear about how much it costs in pay rolls, paper for releases, reduced production, and volunteer time of some of our most patriotic citizens?

This rapid growth at a time when there is such a demand for manpower is alarming in itself. However, what is far worse is the type of personnel. Here we have an organization which is trying to prescribe the daily living rules for every American, an organization which tells every business firm in the land what it may sell and what it may charge, an organization charged with keeping the domestic economy in good running order. You would think it would have at its helm practical businessmen who understand the needs of retailers and consumers alike. We look for these men, but what do we find? The top berth is reserved for a lame duck who could not hold the votes of his own constituents. Is he just window dressing for an efficient operating organization? Let us look down at the next layer, those that get $7,500 a year or more, or have equivalent positions. The hearings show 25 persons in such categories. Out of these top 25, there are 15 with chiefly academic backgrounds—15 who have had no business experience of any consequence. These college professors, we are told, come from a poorly paid profession, yet they seem to be doing all right down here. Among this group the lowest sum that could inveigle them into Government service seems to be $8,000. The graybeard who directs our Automotive Rationing Division is the ancient and honorable Prof. Charles F. Phillips, Ph. D., who has reached the venerable age of 32. The long hair who directs Miscellaneous Products Rationing is Prof. Patterson H. French, age 35, the same age that has been attained by the assistant professor who is Director of Retail Trade and Services, while the Director of the Food Price Division has reached the ripe old age of 37. We are to be spared the future services of the 34-year-old Deputy Administrator for Price, who has resigned. Gentlemen, of these long hairs, not one has attained the age of 48. I would certainly not object to practical experienced youth.

Who are the other 10 among the top 25? Are they businessmen? Well, 2 of them have had business experience. One, Mr. Maxon, has actually had experience running a business of his own. You know, the exception that proves the rule. Six of these 10 have spent most of their recent years in Government connections, although one was actually in the real-estate business before he came with the Government. He is thought well enough of to be permitted to assist the 38-year-old deputy administrator of the rent department, who never had any real-estate experience before he was thrust into his present $9,000-a-year position, where he can rule and ruin the rental properties in which the thrifty people of this Nation have invested funds for their old age or dependent widows.

In case you wonder who the other two were, they were members of the legal profession, one of whom has spent half the last decade on the Federal pay roll.

When our honorable colleague, Mr. TABER, asked the O. P. A. officials if there was anyone in charge of a unit who had "had practical experience in the line of business" he was told "your criticism at the top is probably true." The businessmen, it seems, are only suitable for the lower positions, the positions which do not pay $8,000. Surely a practical businessman cannot be worth as much as a 32-year-old longhair. So we find in the final statistics that there are 478 economists and only 465 business people, and you can probably bet that stenographers who worked for a business firm are included in with their figure for business people.

America may be wary of more than just professors. The ones who succeed in making the orders so complicated that their associates in the academic field have to be employed to explain to retailers what they mean, in addition to economic strangulation.

There are other employees on the O. P. A. pay roll who are neither longhairs, lawyers, or businessmen. They are the practical politicians. The men who know there will soon be an election to win. An election which may determine whether this country is to revert back to a representative form of Government. An election which might be the death knell for bureaucrats who live off the fats of administrative orders which often have no authority in congressional law.

These politicians are on the pay roll you can be sure. It is too fine an opportunity to miss. There are also administrators administrating O. P. A. who are not on the pay rolls. They are the powerful political machines that have built up over the years with the help of taxpayers' funds.

Just this month an O. P. A. official resigned, saying, "Political machinations designed to create a powerful patronage machine in the O. P. A. force me to tender my resignation from that organization effective immediately. I could not fulfill my duties sincerely knowing that the O. P. A. is under the thumbs of political bosses Ed Flynn, Frank Kelly, Mike Kennedy, and Senator MEAD and others.

"I was shocked when you told me yesterday that the reason for my removal as acting district director in favor of Russell was a purely political one, namely, that you were ordered by Ed Flynn, Frank Kelly, Mike Kennedy and Senator MEAD to put their suggested candidate, Frank Russell, in the job. You said if you did not do that the O. P. A. would not have the support of the New York congressional delegation when in the near future the $177,000,000 O. P. A. appropriations bill comes up for a vote."

Now that would not seem to indicate that these funds are not being sought so we can better win the war, but rather so that those in power can better win the election.

In his resignation this Mr. Russell Porter was not content with general charges. He was quite specific. He cited eight incidents within his personal knowledge where the O. P. A. personnel was being used for political purposes. In one instance he was ordered by his superior to proceed at once to Rochester, N. Y., apparently at Government expense, to interview the chairman of the Monroe County Democratic Committee who told him he was not getting enough jobs from O. P. A.

Nor is Mr. Porter's resignation the only one because of political pressure. In addition to the urge to make jobs for the faithful, there has been the urge of political expediency. This is how Mr. John K. Westberg spoke about his impending resignation from O. P. A.:

The Office of Price Administration was forced to do many things we knew were not right because somebody at the top did not

have guts enough to cross a political bridge. I have resigned and am leaving Washington July 3 because I was not permitted to do a fair, honest, and complete job, which means fixing equitable ceiling prices at every level of production and distribution.

The politics within the O. P. A. organization are even too much for that stanch New Dealer, the president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Harold R. Muskovit. Just a fortnight ago he said:

They have too many people inside the Office of Price Administration who don't know what it's all about. They haven't got their finger on the public pulse. They don't know what the common man wants or needs. They need more practical grocery clerks and fewer officeholders.

I understand that Paving Block Flynn named as chief New York O. P. A. commissioner at $6,500 the former chairman of the Bronx Democratic Committee, Harry D. Chambers.

Now, all this is not a thing to be taken lightly. The O. P. A. is a powerful organization. It can determine who can ride, who can walk, and who can eat. Greater power hath no Government organization. It seems to have the power to stop a man on the street and ask where he is going, and why. It has assumed the right to say who may have extra shoes and who may not. I am also reliably informed that they are studying the possibility of varying the food rations for various types of people. Now, some of this might be justified as a war measure if you feel that dictatorships are more efficient operators than representative governments. Nevertheless, it is a great power over human life from the cradle to the grave, from the baby buggy, milk and rubber nipple, to the gas to take you to your grave in a casket with an O. P. A. price on it.

If we are to preserve this Nation in the form which made it the greatest nation in the world we must watch that this power is not politically abused. We are on a dangerous path. We are following the ways of Germany in dictating the daily acts of our citizens. We must make every possible safeguard that political machines do not use this vast power to maintain themselves in power for perpetuity.

The administration should be ashamed of this misuse of office. If it wants unity in the Nation it must at least be honest with the people and not spend taxpayers' money to maintain political pets in offices for which they are not competent. I hope that those acadamic long hairs in the O. P. A. will at least be politically honest and remove from office all whose main purpose is party politics. It is bad enough to have a flock of theorists who do not understand what made this Nation the envy of all others and the bankers of all forces of freedom. These we can counter with common sense and experience as time goes on, but once the political dictators get into power, with unlimited Federal funds, it will be almost impossible to drive them and their propaganda ministers out. They will control the food and life blood of our Nation, and while we talk about poll taxes they may well dictate how you must vote if you want meat and potatoes.

You may well call the O. P. A. the office of professors administration, but look out, gentlemen, that it does not become the office of political administration for which there is already so much evidence. When that day comes we shall know plenty of want and fear.

I wish to make it very clear that I am thoroughly in sympathy with and in support of an attempt on the part of the Government to hold back any tendencies of runaway inflation, by using the method of price control, or price fixing. I did not vote for the first Price Control Act, and I stated my reasons to the House on that occasion. I think they were thoroughly confirmed when later the leader of this administration, the President, virtually admitted that the original Price Control Act, which was in substance dictated by his administration, was a complete failure, and requested of Congress a drastic revision in 1942. I did vote for the changes in the act.

Much has been said publicly and even on the floor of the House that the reason for some of our serious situations today in respect to food is due to the divided authority set up in the Price Control Act by this Congress. I think probably the Congress can be frank enough to admit that we now learn that was a mistake, but on the other hand the sole responsibility does not lay with the Congress. This administration has the power to bring together those two responsible agencies, namely, the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture. If their failure to cooperate has been the cause of our food problem in this Nation, as it becomes more acute every day, then as the failure continues, it becomes all the more the obligation of the President of the United States to call before him these two responsible agencies and see to it that they do cooperate. He appointed both agencies and he has the power to remove the personnel in either or both agencies. There is not any possibility, however strong the majority's imagination, of this administration shirking the responsibility and trying to pass it back to Congress or to the group they may smear as inflationists, or to the group they may term the profiteers of the Nation, or to any other imaginary group. This administration is wholly responsible for the critical food situation which has already developed, and which promises to become more and more critical as the months go on.

Now, after all that has been said here today in regard to food, I want to make some reference to meat. I followed with intense interest the very able comments of my distinguished colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], when he sought to draw the picture for this committee of the critical developments in the feed situation and how it applied to meat. The O. P. A. has the habit of blaming the war needs, lease-lend demands, and the black market for all of its troubles in the meat industry of the Nation. The O. P. A. has failed to realize or to take cognizance of the fact that there was no such thing as a black market in existence in the United States of America in meat until the establishment of their rules and price ceilings, and that they mothered and gave birth to the black market by virtue of the very incompetence and, if I may say, the idiotic rulings and type of price ceilings established; and, further than that, by virtue of their very violation of the Price Control Act. You may say, "Wherein has the O. P. A. violated the Price Control Act?" The Price Control Act sets forth this one policy as established by Congress. That is, that it was the duty of the Office of Price Administration in the fixing of prices not to disturb the normal channels of trade and distribution and to allow normal customary price mark-ups in the various fields of industry.

In the case of beef alone the O. P. A. set a price ceiling at the processor's level, which was below that which the slaughterer of livestock had to pay for live beef. The Department of Agriculture has consistently and persistently gone along with the policy of refusal to permit a price ceiling to be set upon beef at the producer's level. So there was an attempt, under the now exploded Henderson theory of price fixing, to set a ceiling at the processor's level. When they established slaughtering quotas they gave those quotas only to the slaughterers of live animals, and to the nonslaughtering processors of the Nation they gave no quotas. It was only natural that when the slaughterer of beef lost money every time he killed an animal, there would be a hold-back in the live-animal market on beef. It was only natural, then, that if the farmer wanted to sell his commodity, which was the live animal, and he could not sell it to the slaughterers who were losing money whenever they bought the animals, that the farmer himself began to slaughter this beef on the farm, or sell it to those who were willing to pay above the ceiling and who had avenues of distribution known as the black market. Reputable people found themselves in the middle of black-market operations.

This developed many months ago and the O. P. A. recognized the fact that a black market had developed, and they proclaimed to the public that the reason for shortages of beef in part was due to the fact that a black market was draining off a tremendous volume of this vital food. Now, as a matter of fact, under normal production estimates as issued for 1943 by the Department of Agriculture, the Army and Navy and lend-lease did not contemplate taking more than 28 per cent of the total production of live animals. Under a 70 per cent quota restriction for civilian use there would have been ample meat to feed this Nation. Dislocations in distribution were brought about by the simple fact that every community does not have a slaughterhouse, and thousands of communities in this Nation depend upon the so-called wholesalers of meat for the distribution of this necessary food to their community. The O. P. A. did nothing about that. By its

very policies the O. P. A. boosted the production of sausage in this country, and then this year, with the establishment of point rationing, the O. P. A. was guilty of putting almost the same point ration value upon sausage, which is made from the trimmings of meat; trimmings which cannot be sold in a butcher shop because they are not attractive cuts, as they put on the good cuts of beef. They had the packer in a price squeeze on beef, which resulted in excess trimmings going into the making of sausage. In sausage many packers found a way of making a little profit where he was suffering a loss on the fresh cuts of meat.

O. P. A. put the same point value on sausage as they did on fresh cuts, choice cuts of beef. This was called to the attention of the O. P. A. by myself in a meat hearing held before the Small Business Committee of the House. Prentiss Brown and Chester Davis were both present and the question was directed to them. Brown admitted that this was an error and there would be a change made. They made a change of one point. I appealed for a drastic reduction and I was told by Mr. Brown, and I have the letter here and I intend to put it in the RECORD—I was told by Mr. Brown in words which were virtually the same as the head of the meat branch in O. P. A. that it was not logical to put a different point value on sausage which contained the same meat value as the meat before it was made into sausage.

I have heard a great deal of talk this afternoon about a comprehensive national economic policy. There is not any comprehensive price fixing program that can be effective unless O. P. A. and this administration from the President on down through the different fanciful agencies or boards or commissions or special mobilization groups which he may set up, recognize that there is something else besides the actual vitamin content of a product that has to do with its market value. The demand for sausage is not as great as the demand for fresh meat. The O. P. A. tried to force upon the country the theory that the demand by the consuming public had nothing whatsoever to do with the point values in their rationing program. But the other day Mr. Brown contradicted his letter to me when he upped the value of different cuts and again reduced the point value of sausage. If what he told me in his letter was a fact then, what he has done now has been a gross blunder. Conversely, however, I do believe that what he has done now is much more equitable and that he should have taken such action many weeks ago. Had he acted as the meat industry wanted then he could have saved millions of tons of meat waste.

The letter referred to follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1943.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 19 in which you propose a reduction in the point values of sausage products.

If such a proposal were to be adopted, the meat which goes into the manufacture of sausage products would also have to be adjusted to lower point values because, generally speaking, the point value of sausage should not be lower than the point value of the material from which it is made. All of these point reductions would necessarily require increases in the point values on stews, roasts, steaks, and chops because the estimated total meat supply available for civilians has been balanced at present point values with the number of points issued to consumers.

For many months prior to rationing, despite decreasing fresh meat supplies, the production of sausage increased tremendously. Sausage production in federally inspected plants in March of 1943 was 188 percent of production for the same month in 1942. Consumers purchased sausage rather freely, particularly if no fresh meats were available. During this period sausage production increased to such an extent that many of the cheaper cattle and the cheaper primal cuts of the better grades of cattle were processed into sausage. Many retailers complained that they were unable to get these primal cuts as well as some variety meats for resale to the consumer. Now that rationing has resulted in an improved distribution of fresh meat, consumers are showing their preference for meat in this form. This, of course, is presenting problems of adjustment, both for the sausage manufacturer and the retailer.

Rationing experience thus far indicates that many consumers seem to be reluctant to spend the same proportion of their points for some sausage items. Reports reaching this office do indicate, however, that consumers are buying relatively the same proportions of "hot dish" sausage items such as wieners, knockwurst, Polish sausage and mettwurst.

If an attempt were made to compel greater consumption of these processed meats by manipulating point values so that the consumers could not afford to overlook these items, the amount of fresh meat items which they could buy would be considerably reduced. Thus, it would seem that a reduction in the point values on sausage would have the effect only of influencing consumers to eat meats in the form of sausage rather than as fresh meats or in the form for which they show considerable preference.

The season of the year is now at hand in which the consumption of sausage is usually greater and it is quite possible that sales will enjoy the usual seasonal increase.

You may be assured that the problems of sausage production as a part of the over-all meat supply will be given appropriate consideration in the continued administration of the rationing program.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN, *Administrator.*

APRIL 19, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS BROWN,
Director, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Present high point rationing on sausage continues to keep the sausage market in a state of paralysis. When this matter was called to your attention during the latest meat hearings before the Small Business Committee of the House, you indicated that changes would be made. This was made promptly by reducing the point ration from 7 to 6 per pound.

Survey of the industry indicates this change has been ineffective. Obviously a much more drastic point reduction is immediately necessary.

Sausage point rationing is higher at 6 points, for example, than hamburger at 5 points, while the meat content of sausage is of lower grade.

Present situation intensifies demands for fresh meats and, therefore, to that degree impairs your meat rationing and distribution program. May I hope for your immediate action.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943.

The Honorable WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will reply to your letter of April 22, transmitting copies of three letters by two trade associations and a sausage manufacturer, bearing upon the question of further reductions of point values on sausage items.

Besides the industrial and commercial angles is the element of consumer interest. There is also the problem of determining which meat cuts and products must be selected for point-value increases, when and if sausage point values are further lowered, for there is only a given quantity of meat to ration, which has been balanced with the number of points issued to consumers. Since sausage manufacture expanded under prerationing conditions of an over-all meat shortage to a higher degree and at a faster rate than before, adjustment to ration-curtailed volume was bound to be painful.

Your suggestion that the Office of Price Administration permit sausage to move on a point-free basis for 30 days, and then to have very low point values, cannot be accepted since it is not in line with our handling of the entire meat-rationing problem. We are attaching a copy of a memorandum prepared by the Food Rationing Division which sets forth the basic considerations underlying the sausage point problem.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

THE PROBLEM OF SAUSAGE POINT VALUES

So that the present problem of sausage under the meats and fats rationing program may be properly appreciated, it is necessary to review several conditions peculiar to the sausage industry in the months immediately preceding the rationing program. There are three conditions which seem to be of major importance.

1. The imposition of price ceilings on primal cuts of carcass meat created a situation in which slaughterers found it difficult to maintain previous profit positions. Because price ceilings under General Maximum Price Regulations did not seem to squeeze margins on sausage items to the same extent, slaughterers found it increasingly desirable to route as much material as possible through their sausage kitchens. This increased sausage production was reflected in several ways. An increase took place in the price of sausage materials relative to prices on other primal cuts. The narrowed gap between the price of beef rounds and tripe, for example, provided some measurement of the development in sausage production. The expansion in sausage production was also indicated by the extreme shortage in retail markets of lower-grade block cattle, as well as of the less expensive primal cuts of better-grade cattle. Many retailers complained rather bitterly that they were unable to buy plates, briskets, flanks, and other meat cuts including variety meats because packers were unwilling to sell them. Sausage processed under Federal inspection in January, February, and March of 1943 was, respectively, 148, 168, and 188 percent of comparable periods in 1942.

2. Those figures include production of these products on Government contract. Further, it must be pointed out that there was nothing dishonorable in encouraging this heavy sausage production, although the general desirability of some aspects of this large output of manufactured products may be questioned. In a period in which meat was so short in supply as to require ration-

ing, it may seem somewhat inconsistent that consumers were compelled to take an ever-increasing quantity of this smaller supply, in the form of processed or manufactured meats. Some question might also be raised about a practice of many meat companies which required retail dealers to buy stipulated quantities of sausage, if requests or orders for fresh meats were to be recognized. That the purchase of sausage was, and still is, required has been reported by many retailers.

3. The boom in sausage production stimulated some less farsighted operators to lower the quality of their products, to make a tight supply of raw materials go further and further in yield of finished products. Residents of many cities were able to obtain only negligible quantities of fresh meats during the past fall and winter. Often these consumers were required to buy meats in the form of sausage, if they wanted any meat at all; and trade reports suggest that, in too many instances, the quality of these sausage products deterioriated as time went on.

* * * * *

When rationing of meats and fats was imposed and consumers were put on an allowance of meat (which averaged about 2 pounds of meat per week per person) a sausage problem quickly developed. The sale of sausage suffered a precipitous drop. A part of this sudden decrease in sales found explanation in the fact that many consumers had purchased considerable quantities of sausage, and whatever other meats they could locate, during the few days immediately preceding the inception of rationing on March 29. Many sausage manufacturers and retailers, however, did not allow for this prerationing buying of meat products; they continued to make and buy sausage in preration quantities. The inevitable occurred, and a problem of point sales developed in the first week or 10 days of rationing.

In developing the first schedule of point values, one factor, among others considered, was that of the estimated consumer acceptance for various meats and meat products. The popularity of sausage was misjudged, resulting in point values somewhat higher than the point value of raw materials required for sausage manufacture. The error was adjusted April 11, when point-value reductions were made to place the point value of sausage in more direct relation to the point value of the materials from which sausage is commonly made. These point-value reductions, however, failed to stimulate the sale of sausage to anything like the quantity sold prior to rationing. To further assist the sale of these products, a new classification has been added so that fresh, cooked, and smoked sausage can be made and sold at consumer point values of 6, 5, 4, and 3 (depending upon the proportion of meat content) instead of 7 and 4 points.

Point values applied to primary or fresh meat products are related to each other. Point values on sausage products are closely related to the point value of the meat content of these products. It must be obvious that with scores of thousands of sausage formulas used by manufacturers, specific point values cannot match the exact point value cost of all processors. Some manufacturers will lose some points (they can get additional point capital from Office of Price Administration); other manufacturers will gain some points which will be surrendered to Office of Price Administration. As far as practicable, however, all processed meats have point values which reflect the point value of the fresh meats from which such processed meats are prepared. This merely means that consumers are given the opportunity to choose the form in which they desire to purchase meat.

Consumer resistance to most sausage items under rationing is not too difficult to explain. Many consumers, with whom this situation has been discussed by members of our staff, admit that they have purchased little or no sausage since the start of rationing. Their explanation is that the 16 points permitted, for all of the products included in the meats and fats rationing program, are too few to allow them to buy cold meats. This explanation is concurred in by trade members. Apparently consumers feel that when they are down to a per capita allowance of approximately 2 pounds of meat per week, they prefer to consume meat in the form of hot dishes. This observation is supported by the fact that wieners, Thuringer, Polish sausage, and mettwurst, all of which are commonly eaten as hot meat dishes, have sold relatively very well under rationing.

Sausage manufacturers who have discussed the problem indicate that the better quality products have sold better than the lower grade and cheaper items or lines.

The issue, then, seems to be fairly evident. Meat companies are interested in maintaining high sausage production for reasons of maximizing profits or minimizing losses. Sausage production is relatively more attractive from that standpoint. Many consumers by and large seem to consider that they have little room in their point budget for many types of sausage. Considerable pressure is being brought to bear at present—by sausage manufacturers and industries serving sausage production, such as casing manufacturers—to lower point values on sausage. If they are to be further reduced, the materials which go into these products will have to have lower point values also. Such reductions in point values will necessitate an increase in the point values on other fresh meat items. If point values on sausage are to be lowered to such an extent that consumers could not afford not to buy sausage products, it is reasonable to expect that the point values of nonsausage products might have to be increased considerably. From the standpoint of administering a rationing program it does not seem feasible to force consumers to eat meat in the form in which they seem to have indicated a pretty strong resistance.

* * * * *

Consumers are not the only parties of interest in this matter. Many retailers have cited their inability to buy various variety meats, the cheaper primal cuts, and the lower grades of block cattle; because meat companies have been using these materials in sausage production. Some dealers apparently would like to have more of these items, to sell to consumers as a form of variety of fresh meat. Pharmaceutical houses have indicated extreme difficulty in obtaining various meat items for pharmaceutical manufacture. Livers have been specifically mentioned as an item which is hard to buy. Liver happens also to be one of the more important variety meats used in sausage manufacture. It would seem, therefore, that all livers need not necessarily be put into freezers just because the sale of sausage products has fallen off.

It would seem reasonable that sausage manufacture could be expected to decrease with the decrease in the quantity of meat available for civilian consumption. If, generally, there is approximately 80 percent of meat available for civilian consumption this year, as contrasted with last year, it does not seem reasonable to manipulate point values in such a way as to maintain sausage sales at a figure considerably higher than last year. If the materials generally used for sausage do not move into retail markets, either as fresh meats or as sausage at the point values scheduled for May, it may be necessary again to lower the point values of some of these items. Such action would admit the possibility of a further reduction in sausage products made primarily from variety meats, but it would require a corresponding increase in the point values for fresh meats.

Proposals to allow distribution of sausage products ration-free or at point values which are not warranted by the point value of the ingredients of these products are not compatible with the broad objectives of distributing a commodity so short in supply as to require rationing.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 30, 1943.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PLOESER: This is in reply to your letter of April 23 in which you asked for estimates of total meat production in 1943 and other related information.

As is shown in table 1 attached, the total United States output of meat in the calendar year 1943 is currently estimated at about 23.2 billion pounds (dressed-weight basis), about one and a half billion pounds more than the 21.7 billion pounds produced in 1942. This is the estimate which this Department supplied the Office of Price Administration a few weeks ago and upon which the point values in the meat-rationing program now are based.

In view of the large increases which have taken place in the farm production of livestock during the past year, this estimate of total meat production is believed to be on the conservative side, even though the number of livestock currently being marketed through regular commercial channels is not running as high as normally would be expected. Table 2 shows that slaughter of cattle and calves in federally inspected plants during January to March was smaller than a year earlier, despite the large increase in cattle on farms and in feed lots on January 1, 1943, over the preceding year. Similarly, the increase in inspected hog slaughter has been smaller than the increase in the 1942 spring pig crop. We have no current information as to the volume of livestock slaughtered in noninspected plants, by local slaughterers, and on farms, so it is not possible to calculate total meat production month by month. However, as the estimates shown in table 1 indicate, we believe slaughter in these categories was increased considerably. It may be that we have underestimated it, and to the extent that we have, total meat production for 1943 may be larger than 23.2 billion pounds shown.

Estimates of the amount of meat that will be needed for our armed forces and for lend-lease during 1943 total about 6.1 billion pounds, 60 percent of which is for military services. All of this meat must come from plants which have Federal inspection.

Sincerely,

GROVER B. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated meat production, dressed-weight basis, from total United States slaughter, 1943, with comparisons*

[Million pounds]

Item	1936-40 average	1941	1942 [1]	1943 [2]
Beef and veal:				
Federal inspection	5,525	6,339	7,014	6,340
Other wholesale	1,370	1,499	1,609	1,205
Retail	870	982	1,022	1,601
Farm	315	303	308	589
Total	8,080	9,123	9,953	9,735
Lamb and mutton:				
Federal inspection	696	749	880	752
Other wholesale	104	104	115	88
Retail	45	45	25	50
Farm	26	25	25	32
Total	871	923	1,045	922

[1] Preliminary. [2] Tentative estimate.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated meat production, dressed-weight basis, from total United States slaughter, 1943, with comparisons*—Continued

[Million pounds]

Item	1936–40 average	1941	1942	1943
Pork (excluding lard):				
Federal inspection	5,208	6,345	7,562	8,899
Other wholesale	760	983	918	910
Retail	434	490	607	732
Farm	1,743	1,629	1,595	2,016
Total	8,145	9,447	10,682	12,557
All meat:				
Federal inspection	11,429	13,433	15,456	15,991
Other wholesale	2,234	2,586	2,642	2,203
Retail	1,349	1,517	1,654	2,383
Farm	2,084	1,957	1,928	2,637
Total	17,096	19,493	21,680	23,214

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 2.—*Livestock slaughter under Federal inspection, by months, 1942 and 1943*

Month	Cattle			Calves		
	1942	1943	1943 as percent of 1942	1942	1943	1943 as percent of 1942
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Pct.*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Pct.*
January	1,057	928	87.7	440	340	77.3
February	891	854	95.8	392	331	84.5
March	929	923	99.3	491	410	83.6
April	956	------	------	502	------	------
May	885	------	------	471	------	------
June	1,039	------	------	475	------	------
July	1,048	------	------	461	------	------
August	1,103	------	------	460	------	------
September	1,159	------	------	513	------	------
October	1,280	------	------	578	------	------
November	1,018	------	------	501	------	------
December	982	------	------	476	------	------
	Sheep and lambs			Hogs		
January	1,611	1,724	107.0	5,831	5,431	93.1
February	1,407	1,499	106.5	3,892	4,335	111.4
March	1,669	1,495	89.6	4,134	4,661	112.7
April	1,570	------	------	4,196	------	------
May	1,475	------	------	4,320	------	------
June	1,481	------	------	4,554	------	------
July	1,705	------	------	3,886	------	------
August	1,840	------	------	3,223	------	------
September	2,223	------	------	3,843	------	------
October	2,344	------	------	4,218	------	------
November	2,126	------	------	5,023	------	------
December	2,175	------	------	6,778	------	------

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

APRIL 23, 1943.

Mr. GROVER HILL,
Assistant Secretary,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HILL: Will you kindly furnish me the following information just as quickly as possible:

1. Meat production of this year compared with the meat production of last year.

2. Figures of the amount of meat being slaughtered this year and last year.

3. Percentage of total output required by the armed forces and lend-lease.

(I am only interested in the above as it pertains to livestock—hogs, sheep, and cattle.)

Thanking you in advance for your prompt reply to this request, I am

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think the gentleman's criticism is correctly made in the direction of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. PLOESER. Whom would the gentleman criticize?

Mr. RABAUT. A moment ago the gentleman made mention of the fact that the packer saw that he could take the meat and put it into sausage and get a benefit thereby, and then the gentleman said that the O. P. A. has held that meat of a certain value put into sausage was worth as much as sausage. There is logic in saying that meat of a certain quality is worth as much money when placed in sausage as when it is offered as fresh meat.

Mr. PLOESER. Regardless of the consumer demand? I said that is what Mr. Brown said.

Mr. RABAUT. Now, when it is transferred, because of the advantage that the processor had in putting it into sausage, whereby he could get more money for it, then, of course, that is his privilege to take that benefit, under the arrangement.

But I do not see how the gentleman can blame that on the Administrator of the O. P. A. An error was found and it had to be corrected.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman fails to take into account the fact that the O. P. A. forced the packers and slaughterers of the Nation to take a killing loss.

If the gentleman thinks it is healthy for American business and for the prosecution of the war, through any theory of government or any theory of economics, he may support; if he thinks it is healthy for this Nation or for the prosecution of the war, I repeat, to cause the business and industry of this Nation to suffer such losses that they must close their doors and disrupt the normal channels of trade in the production of food, then he has a great misconception of a comprehensive economic policy of this country.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Missouri cannot put words in my mouth.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman attempted to put words in my mouth. Forgive me, I had no desire to lend the gentleman my words.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman made the statement, but he cannot put the words into my mouth.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman from Michigan allow me to finish my answer?

Mr. RABAUT. Certainly.

Mr. PLOESER. Because we both cannot talk at one time.

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman attempted to put a twist on my words. If he will read the RECORD, or if he had been listening, he would have heard something different to what he is attempting to quote me as saying.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has yielded to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DITTER. I merely wanted to make the observation that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has plenty of time of his own, and I hope he will use his own time.

Mr. PLOESER. I have great respect for my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I was not attempting to put words in his mouth; and if they were not the words he used or if I misunderstood the gentleman, I certainly had no intention of misquoting him.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me give the gentleman from Michigan a sample of what has taken place. Adding to this price squeeze causing a loss to the packers, the administration is now coming along with a 10-percent roll-back program with a subsidy to be paid at the processors' level in the meat industry.

That program was announced as effective a week ago last Monday, to be effective as to prices beginning last Monday. That program was secretly put into effect without any rules by which the packers of this Nation may be guided. This is the latter part of the week. The actual price roll-back went into effect a week ago last Monday.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PLOESER. Just a moment. I am going to read to you a portion of a letter which I received today from one of the largest independent packers in my home city, St. Louis, having to do with the subsidy, and from which you will begin to see why the meat problem of this Nation has been caused not by a shortage of animals on the plains of the Nation, but by the bungling administrative policy.

Now let me read you an excerpt from this letter.

Even as of this time—

This letter was dated on the 16th—

we have not received the full rule book covering the subsidy plan. In addition to the bulls killed to supply meat, on Monday of this week we only killed 10 cows; and on Tuesday of this week 17 heifers and 3 steers. This is in contrast to our usual kill of from 150 to 230 cattle, and 30 to 50 cows daily.

I might add for the edification of the gentleman from Michigan that at the present moment the War Department is having difficulty getting sufficient meat to feed the Army; that in some stations of the Navy there is a shortage of beef today; that in the civilian use there is an extreme shortage of beef in many localities. Yet the O. P. A. still stupidly clings to errors it made 10 months ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is partially correct, and partially incorrect.

The set-back date was in three divisions; the set-back dates are the 7th, the 14th, and the 21st. It starts with the processor, then goes to the wholesaler, then to the retailer so that part of the arrangement the gentleman should not overlook. He probably knew it but failed to mention it.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. As for the arrangements that were to be issued, I understand they were to be issued by one of the subsidiaries of the R. F. C. A meeting was held, I think, yesterday, to see that it was done.

Mr. PLOESER. Was yesterday before the date the subsidy was to go into effect?

Mr. RABAUT. No; yesterday was when the R. F. C. agreed to certain things that have got to be done.

Mr. PLOESER. And yesterday is several days after the 7th and after the 14th.

Mr. RABAUT. Just a minute; I just want to say this is not the O. P. A.; this is where they are going to make the arrangements about paying back the amount of the subsidy. I agree with the gentleman that it might have caused some consternation. I do not say that the gentleman is wrong at all on that, but there is much to the program and it is a difficult program when you start rationing things.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that in his own city of Detroit, according to information I received yesterday, there is practically no live meat being butchered. If the gentleman insists on defending these destructive O. P. A. policies he will be hearing from home soon.

The point I want to emphasize is that if you are going to put a program into effect it becomes necessary to work out the details of the program before you actually put it into effect. Here we have gone about the thing backwards with the subsidy program announced, the date set, the date comes but no plans. The people who are to receive subsidies do not know how they are going to be paid, where they are going to be paid, from whom they are going to be paid, or how or if they are going to be paid.

The meat situation in the United States is a demonstration of the grossest type of mismanagement ever to be witnessed in important national governmental affairs. It is chargeable entirely to the ineptitude of the administration and to the stubbornness of the group of revolutionaries to be found in the Office of Price Administration.

The United States today has a cattle population of between seventy-five and eighty million head. The cattle population of North and Central America totals about 100,000,000 head and, with South America, the Western Hemisphere has an available cattle population of about 200,000,000. With such availability of supply, good management can supply the armed forces and provide necessary quantities for lend-lease and, at the same time, provide the 2 pounds per week per person allowed under rationing with comparative ease. But it takes good management.

The present management of food supply in this administration has so severely disrupted the normal distributive channels as to threaten production and distribution to an alarming and dangerous degree.

The new subsidy program offers nothing to eliminate the packers' killing losses or to allow the normal channels to function. It is a consumer's subsidy which does nothing to prevent either inflationary trends or to correct the black market. Instead, it adds to the consumer's surplus buying power and may have tendencies to effect maldistribution in other commodities. At the present allowable ration, each person in the United States is permitted 104 pounds of meat, cheese, and butter; about one-fifth of this amount will be butter and cheese, leaving in the neighborhood of 80 pounds of meat per person. At an estimated 3 cents per pound roll-back, the actual saving per person on their meat bill is $2.40 per year. Black market meat prices are not eliminated or rolled back. Black market meat prices are 8 to 12 cents per pound higher than ceilings. The estimated cost to the Government and, ultimately to the same people in taxes, is between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 per year, plus heavy administration costs, which are habitual and politically desirable, as we all must realize by now.

These subsidies would have to be paid monthly in order to keep the small packers in business. This, of course, means an enormous administrative expense and the $2.40 saved per year will undoubtedly result in more than $3 per person per year additional tax load. Under the present subsidy program for meat there is absolutely no production incentive, because it is not applied at the producer's level.

The O. P. A. not only gave birth to the black market through incompetent administration and ill-advised and ill-conceived regulatory measures, but has mothered the black market to such extent that today it is authoritatively estimated that between twenty-five and twenty-seven million pounds of beef are going through the black market weekly. It has been conservatively estimated that approximately 20 percent of the entire national meat supply is "black." The O. P. A. subsidy program is not designed to touch black-market operations or to in any manner alleviate the bad and unworkable regulations which brought it into being.

The O. P. A. program, as it has been practiced by its crackpot policy makers who have had the blessing and support of the administration, has not been used so much as a price-control agency but as a forerunner of the administration postwar plan of governmental management and partnership in business. Some big businesses have cowered to the mandates of the revolutionary planners, some American interests have even flirted as did the Thyssens and Krupps in Germany when the Nazis were setting up their economic feudalism. The fate of Germany who is our mortal enemy, marked for destruction by us, must not be the fate of America. Unless American business, labor, and agriculture join now and eliminate this vicious group which is working ultimate destruction of American free competitive enterprise, the post-war period may be too late. We want price control. The Congress designed the law under which the Office of Price Administration could function with great effect. That law specifically stated that the normal and able established channels of trade should not be disturbed. The O. P. A. has deliberately and persistently violated this law. This law specifically called for industry counsel in the development of the rules and regulations concerning price control. This mandate of the Congress has been intentionally and persistently violated.

Yet, this administration has the temerity to ask for an increase of $45,000,000 in their appropriation for next year. Are we to expect this addition to one hundred and twenty million or one hundred and sixty-five million will all be spent for such continued injury to the war effort?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS] as he may desire.

O. W. I.—RADIO

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in Germany and Italy and the Axis-occupied and satellite countries, when a government official goes on the air he has the air lanes to himself. Radio stations are compelled to carry his voice, "or else," and that else wouldn't make pleasant reading if permitted in print.

Here in America we have always laughed at the possibility of something of that nature occurring here, and yet I sometimes wonder.

Each Friday night, from coast to coast, many of our citizens are being deprived of listening to programs more to their liking because Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, feels it necessary to use all major radio networks to interpret the news.

Mr. Davis is apparently not quite satisfied with the ability of the numerous well-known and widely experienced commentators who command handsome stipends from broadcast chains and program sponsors. It just has to be Elmer Davis and the news again, and a threefold increase in the number of stations over the Columbia Broadcasting System since his appointment to be the New Deal's propaganda minister.

And a lot of us have found fault with the 1943 edition of Elmer Davis and the news. We detect here and there bits of subtle propaganda and perhaps a little coloring, all in the interest of the administration in power, of course. Mr. Davis will and has indignantly denied this, and Mr. Davis, Mr. Speaker, can wax indignant.

Heretofore only the President of the United States was accorded the privilege of all networks. The broadcasting chains have always felt that what the President has to say is of national interest, and should be presented as a public-service program, and rightly so.

But it is hard for me to believe that they consider Mr. Davis so far superior to their own commentators, as to freely make available to him the combined networks. The O. W. I. head, we must bear in mind, is an ex-staff Columbia commentator and presumably will return to the C. B. S. at some future date. Is it conceivable that N. B. C., Blue, and Mutual would voluntarily lend their facilities to building up his reputation?

The only other explanation is that a subtle bit of coercion was employed to bring about the desired result. And Mr. Davis will and has denied this, too. He would have us believe that he was implored by his former competitors to make the sacrifice of airing his views over their lanes in the interest of the war effort. Now, if National, Blue, and Mutual were not already making staggering contributions to that effort, we might be willing to go along with Mr. Davis' side of it, but somehow or other it just does not add up in our way of doing arithmetic.

We do know, however, that the very life of radio depends upon the whims of a bureaucratic Federal Communications Commission. We do know that Chairman Fly, of that Commission, has made a whipping boy of the radio-broadcasting industry, and we do know that the United States Supreme Court, in a recent opinion delivered by the arch-New Dealer, Justice Felix Frankfurter, sustained the F. C. C.'s effort to control every phase of the industry. With a stroke of a pen, the smart boys down at the F. C. C. can effectively destroy a radio investment of thousands, by revoking a station's license.

We have already seen that same F. C. C. step in and say to the National Broadcasting Co.: "You must dispose of one of your networks, either the Red or the Blue," and N. B. C. got rid of the Blue. At the same time the Commission regulated the business practices of the broadcasters and got by with it, in spite of the clear intention of Congress, in enacting radio legislation, to confine the Commission's authority to little other than frequency allocation.

And because of this life-or-death hold of the F. C. C. on the industry, it is logical to assume, in the interest of self-preservation, that the networks and radio stations will jump through hoops when told to do so by the New Deal bureaucrats. I do not condemn the broadcasters—I realize that they can do little else and live.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, seems to add up in my school.

And I very much suspect that when somebody, if not in the O. W. I. at least in the Federal service, coyly suggested, and may I repeat that word "suggested," because that is all that would have been necessary, the brow-beaten radio men groaned inwardly, but outwardly probably managed a sickly smile and said "Yes."

That is probably why each Friday evening the voice of the New Deal propaganda ministry comes through your loudspeaker to present what its director calls facts. We often twist our dials to another station and there he is again. Once more we try with the same results and unless we want to listen to the Davis facts, we must turn off our receiver. Maybe, after all, it is better to turn out the lights and go to sleep.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, because of the lateness of the hour, I will not take the time.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, today I introduced a bill providing for the recognition of self-determination and independence of Puerto Rico. In the light of conditions in Puerto Rico and by virtue of the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of Puerto Rico, self-determination and independence are synonymous. Because of the importance of this question, and because of the lack of attention Congress has given it, I take this time to read into the RECORD the bill I have introduced so that Members may have an opportunity of acquainting themselves with its terms.

A bill to provide for the recognition of self-determination and independence of Puerto Rico, and to provide for good neighborly relations with the proposed Government of Puerto Rico.

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico, after four centuries of common economic, cultural, social, and political experience developed into a distinct nation of people, who as a result of more than 100 years of constant struggle against Spain had attained in 1897 an irrevocable autonomous status, which permitted them essential sovereignty and self-government, including the right to enter into foreign treaties, impose tariffs and completely control Puerto Rico's internal affairs; and

Whereas in 1898 as a result of the Spanish-American War, in which Puerto Rico was not a part, the island of Puerto Rico was taken over without the consent of its people, who have since been denied the right of self-determination and forced to live under an executive government, deprived of democratic rights and powers and powerless to regulate their political, economic, and social life in accordance with their own interests and wishes; and

Whereas in the present global war of survival of the United Nations against the Axis enemy, the leadership of the United States is impaired by her failure in the case of Puerto Rico to give living content to the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of Habana, and other pronouncements of American conferences and leaders guaranteeing the rights of small nations in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas there lies before the United States the rich opportunity both during this crucial war and in the years after the war to cement the ties of mutual friendship between the more than 100,000,000 Latin-American peoples and the people of the United States by freely recognizing the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination; and

Whereas the genuine independence for Puerto Rico furnishes the surest guaranty of effective naval and military defense of the Western Hemisphere against aggression by releasing the full energies of the Puerto Rican people for the struggle for victory of the United Nations; and

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico of all political parties, acting concurrently, have petitioned the United States for immediate application of the principle of self-determination,

Be it enacted, etc., That 90 days after the enactment of this act the President of the United States shall by proclamation withdraw and surrender all rights of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, and sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the Territory and people of Puerto Rico, excepting all military and naval reservations, which shall remain in the possession and control of the United States until such time as a treaty of mutual defense shall have been entered into between the United States and the Government of Puerto Rico, but in no case for a period longer than 6 months after the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged shall have ceased; and, the President of the United States shall also, on behalf of the United States, recognize the independence of Puerto Rico as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of any government which the people thereof may constitute and the right of the Government of Puerto Rico to decide all internal questions, including those relating to American property and citizens and diplomatic relations, without interference or intervention.

SEC. 2. All problems arising between the United States and Puerto Rico out of the occupation of Puerto Rico by the United States shall be submitted for arbitration to a joint commission appointed by the Government of the United States and the Government of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 3. In proclaiming the independence of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States shall recognize the responsibility of the United States toward the disastrous state of Puerto Rican economy and the poverty of its people and to strive for friendly relations with the new Government of Puerto Rico, shall declare free entry of Puerto Rican products into the United States, and no immigration restrictions on Puerto Rican citizens shall be made. These principles are to be recognized in a treaty between the two nations, and said treaty shall be made with the best intentions of developing Puerto Rican economy and the well-being of its people, the discussion of this treaty shall begin within 90 days after the new Government of Puerto Rico expresses its desire to begin. In the interim between the proclamation of Puerto Rican independence and the signing of this treaty, the present status quo in the matter of trade relations shall be maintained.

SEC. 4. By virtue of its responsibility for the present disastrous state of Puerto Rican economy and the poverty of the people of Puerto Rico, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the United States shall be responsible to the Government of Puerto Rico for any claims of indemnity established by said Government.

SEC. 5. Upon the proclamation and recognition of the independence of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States shall give notice of such action to the governments with which the United States is in diplomatic correspondence and invite said governments to recognize the independence of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 6. At the time of the issuance of the proclamation under section 1 hereof, the President shall appoint a commission of five to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE SALARY INCREASES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Byrd committee issued a report pointing out that in 7 of the war agencies whose appropriations are included in this bill, 861 employees received pay increases of from $1,200 to $6,000 a year. The Byrd committee found in the 7 agencies, W. P. B., B. E. W., Central Administrative Services of O. E. M., the War Relocation Authority, the O. D. T., the Board of Scientific Research and Management, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs—that 568 employees received increases of more than $1,200 and less than $2,000; 234 received increases of $2,000 to $3,000; 38 received increases of $3,000 to $4,000; 14 received increases of $4,000 to $5,000; 4 received increases of $5,000 to $6,000; and 3 received increases of $6,000 or more. The W. P. B. and B. E. W. were called the "most outstanding" examples of such pay-increase practices. While the emergency agencies gave large salaries and generous increases, the "old line" department employees received little, few getting more than $3,800 a year.

Abundant evidence of B. E. W. salary increases is contained in the hearings both from the over-all picture and the standpoint of individual instances. The average annual salary of B. E. W. domestic personnel was $2,315 on July 1, 1942, and had risen to $2,586—more than 10 percent—by December 31, 1942. For 1944 the average salary will be better than $2,800 apparently. When the personnel on foreign duty are included, the average goes much higher. The average of the State Department is $2,000, for the Justice Department $2,256, and for the Department of Commerce, exclusive of R. F. C., $2,048.

Now let us look at some of the individual instances. First, we have a lady by the name of Josephine Raushenbush who happens to be the wife of one Stephen Raushenbush, who, the House will remember, we had a controversy about last year in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. Mrs. Raushenbush was getting $3,200 a year with the Department of Agriculture in 1941 when she moved over to B. E. W. at a starting salary of $3,800. Since then she has been raised to $6,500 so that she is now being paid more than twice what she received less than 2 years ago. That is pretty good going in any league.

Then we have Harold Stephan, who from 1931 to 1941 was with the Tariff Commission with a top salary of $3,200. He was taken into B. E. W. at $3,800 and is now getting $5,600.

Next we have George Alfred Tesoro, who in March 1943 was employed at American University at $2,600. B. E. W. picked him up and used him for 45 days and paid him at the rate of $5,600 a year.

Then we have Nathaniel Weyl, whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] got after last year. He was getting $3,400 with the Federal Reserve when the B. E. W. took him into the fold at $3,800 and has since raised him to $5,600. Milo Perkins says that he "is a very alive, vigorous person."

Next we have Hugh Wilkinson, who was with the Farm Security Administration until 1942 at a salary of $2,000. B. E. W. took him and now he is up to $3,800.

Many others did not get into the hearings. One Leo Auman was getting $1,800 before he came with B. E. W. at $4,600. Chester E. Davis—not the War Food Administrator—was taken from Agriculture where he was getting $5,600 and is now pulling down $8,000 with B. E. W. Elias J. Drexler and Phillip H. Dunaway were getting $3,200 each before B. E. W. picked them up at $3,800 each. Now each is getting $5,600. One James W. Hurst was getting $3,500; now he is being paid $5,600 by B. E. W.

One could go on and on in listing these individual instances of large salary increases given by B. E. W. It is no wonder that the Byrd committee registers a protest. We should also. The Government orders wage-and-salary stabilization in private employment; yet within the Government itself we have all these raises with overtime pay on top.

Spend and elect, spend and elect seems still to be the order of the day. The administration will shortly ask for an additional $16,000,000,000. Now a million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars, and the American taxpayers are going to be asked for another sixteen thousand million dollars. We are talking today about roll-back of food prices; we had better begin talking about roll-back of governmental pay rolls before we break the back of the American taxpayers. It is about time to stop up this colossal program of spending, eliminate thousands of young professional bureaucrats, economists, and smart-aleck lawyers, effect economies in pay-roll spending, or when the boys return home they will return home to a bankrupt nation. Let us cut out this spending and get down to the all-important job of winning this war.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Smaller War Plants Corporation item is reached on page 28 of the bill, I expect to offer an amendment to page 28, line 6, to strike out the words and figures "$12,600,000," which is the appropriation for the Smaller War Plants Corporation this next year and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000."

I believe that we must give the little man a chance to get a contract near his home without compelling him to come to Washington, hire a lobbyist, and pay this lobbyist a big fee to get him a contract. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is making substantial progress in this field and is doing a great deal for small business.

Gen. Robert Wood Johnson said he needs $18,000,000, so let us give it to him next year and give him an opportunity to do a real service to small business. This amendment will be offered by me, but at the request of the Committee on Small Business of the House, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read down to page 1, line 7.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Dr. Waclaw Bitner, entitled "Poland Crucified," which appears in the current issue of The Sign, the National Catholic magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests: first, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Slovak Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H. R. 2188

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs file a supplemental report on H. R. 2188.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks that I made today in the House and to insert therein certain excerpts from the printed hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address recently made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks that I made today and to include therein a letter and enclosures received from Mr. Elmer Davis, as well as various excerpts from the committee hearings and certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole two letters from Maj. Gen. George B. Strong, Chief of Army Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, may have permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the committee today and to include some letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "The Forgotten Man of Today," published in the Cumberland News of June 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection and the Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. RABAUT, KERR, HARE, O'BRIEN of Illinois, CARTER, STEFAN, and JONES.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, and 30.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 22½, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "after December 31, 1943, that would entail expenditures in liquidation thereof"; and on page 34 of the bill, in line 15, strike out "June 30, 1945" and insert "December 31, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Director of Personnel, Senior Executive Officer, not to exceed $7,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8 and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate amending the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Strikes out of the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses" the clause making $200,000 of the appropriation immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Restores to the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships", authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to substitute contractual authority for a part of the appropriation proposed by the House under "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships".

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6, relating to the appropriation "Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy": Modifies clause respecting production facilities so as to express more clearly the intent, as proposed by the Senate; restores authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to substitute contractual authority for a part of the appropriation proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Corrects the rate for commuted rations in the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Restores to the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Restores to the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks" authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, relating to "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks": Restores the authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House, and reduces from 6 to 4 percent the amount of fixed fees to be paid contractors, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Restores to the appropriation "Aviation, Navy" authorization for contract employees, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Makes a title correclating to "General expenses, Marine Corps": as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, relating to "General expenses, Marine Corps": Transfers fiscal year 1943 appropriations proposed by the House to a separate title in the bill, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Brings within the scope of the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, construction and machinery" combatant ship construction in the way of replacement tonnage, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20, relating to "Emergency construction": Extends the obligation period and the expenditure period proposed by the House by 6 months. The Senate proposed to limit the obligation period only.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 22½, relating to the Coast Guard: Provides for employing enlisted men in certain officers' quarters and messes ashore, plus a contingent number of 100, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The House proposed to leave the entire matter to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. The Senate proposal was as has been agreed to, except that the contingent number was 200.

With respect to furnishing equipment for officers' messes, provides for certain specific messes and such bachelor officers' quarters and messes as may be specifically designated by the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the Senate, instead of vesting discretion as to the entire matter in the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, and 25: Provides specifically for the position of Director of Personnel, Navy Department, without reference to compensation, instead of providing for a fixed rate of compensation, as proposed by the House, and limits the compensation of the senior executive officer to $7,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Amends section 104, relating to the employment of enlisted men at headquarters in Washington, so as to indicate disapproval of employing men qualified for combat service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Amends section 113, so as to remove the ceiling proposed by the House upon the number of civilian employees in the Navy Department, at Washington, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30: Amends section 114, so as to remove the ceiling proposed by the House upon the number of group IV (b) personnel in the field service of the Navy Department, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out phrase proposed by the Senate with respect to detailing or assigning employees to committees of the Congress.

Amendment No. 31: Clarifies the proviso attached to section 117 with respect to orders placed with other Federal agencies, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision proposed by the House with respect to recruiting civilian employees for work in industrial yards of the Navy.

Amendment No. 33: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 35: Makes a textual change in consequence of creation of an additional title in the bill.

Amendments Nos. 36 to 41, inclusive: Appropriates $173,539,000 for various objects for the fiscal year 1942 and 1943, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,900,000 for the fiscal year 1943, as proposed by the House.

DISAGREEMENTS PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 2, RULE XX

Amendment No. 8, relating to travel by enlisted personnel.

Amendment No. 34, modifying per diem rate for subsistence while traveling by officers of services embraced by act of June 16, 1942.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON.
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent also that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am for the report. The ease and expedition with which the irresistible force and the immovable object harmonized their differences in a gentleman's conference surely sets an example for those who may come after us.

I do just wish to say that in the last 2 months I have been from coast to coast and from the Canadian border to the Gulf representing my subcommittee, undertaking to learn and to report to my subcommittee the results of my findings in regard and with reference to how and where and how wisely the Navy is spending the taxpayers' money which we appropriate.

I have to report that I have been thrilled by the enthusiasm of those who are doing the job, as well as encouraged by the expedition and efficiency evidenced. I am not too easily thrilled. I commend the Navy for what it has done and is doing. I am disposed to be very pugnaciously critical.

Ships, ships, ships—planes, planes, planes, to adorn the decks. Submarines, destroyers, cruisers, and battleships—If the enemies of decent living only knew what I know and have seen, and could know what we are bound to do and are doing and shall do to wipe them completely off the map and the face of the earth, hara-kiri and suicide would be indulged in by millions of Japanese and Germans and Italians, multitudinously and tomorrow, for we are on our way.

This is the day for an accounting. We will take none of their promises. Unconditional surrender or nothing, or both. We do not propose that retributive justice shall be circumvented. We have no hate in our hearts. We do intend and we propose to see to it that never again shall it be possible for such a gang of murderous thugs to try to rape civilization.

There will be no such gang when we get through with this job, dirty as it is. We propose to clean the stables this time, at whatever the cost and no matter how great the price, for it is our debt to posterity which we propose to pay now to the hilt.

This conference report is only a drop in the bucket to swell the flood that shall inundate, destroy, and effectually bury the foes of individualism, democracy, and decency, and the rights of men and women everywhere to live their lives, under God, according to law, with liberty under it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: On page 21, line 4, after the word "stations", insert the following: "*: And provided further*, That funds appropriated under the heads of 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation', 'General expenses, Marine Corps', 'Pay and allowances, Coast Guard', in this act shall be available for the payment of money allowances, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, at 3 cents per mile to enlisted men regardless of the mode of travel who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, travel at their own expense."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: On page 57, line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 119. The funds appropriated in the appropriations acts for the fiscal year 1944 of the services mentioned in the title of the act of June 16, 1942 (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.), shall be available for, and the heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe, per diem rates of allowance, at rates not to exceed $7 per day, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, and to members of the services concerned (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted personnel, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) when traveling by air under competent orders and on duty without troops."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SHEPPARD, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

BUTTER SHORTAGE

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly nauseating to me when a group of greedy, profiteering lobbyists, who cannot get their deliberate falsehoods accepted by the editorial side of newspapers, resort to paid advertising space. I refer to the advertisement in yesterday morning's Washington Post entitled "One Hundred Million Pounds of Butter Disappeared," put out over the signature of the American Dairy Association.

Every newspaper man in Washington, and I presume elsewhere in the country, knows exactly what has happened to the butter which has so mysteriously "disappeared." Most newspapers carried official reports of its "disappearance."

The one hundred millions of pounds of butter were purchased by the War Food Administration to protect the creamery industry from suffering an inventory loss when O. P. A.'s consumer nickel-a-pound butter subsidy went into effect on June 10. The War Food Administration now are the owners of these hundred million pounds of butter. What do they plan to do with it? Every consumer in America has the right to ask this question. It is their butter. They, as taxpayers, pay for it. Is the W. F. A. going to release it today or tomorrow so that the present butter shortage to consumers will be averted? Or are they going to sit on it and play politics with their pals in the creamery business?

Those who paid for this lying advertisement know the answers full well. They also know that they are the beneficiaries of the Government's largess. But so anticonsumer, and so unpatriotic, is this lobby, that they are willing to spend some of the money the Government has given them to purchase space for the printing of their lies.

One of the members of the American Dairy Association in Wisconsin had his representatives in the field tell farmers that because of the O. P. A. subsidy they would not buy any more milk from the farmer with which to make butter, or if they did buy milk, the farmers' price would be cut. This is not merely a lie, it is just as much an act of sabotage as if it were directly ordered by Hitler.

Yesterday morning's advertisement is part of a campaign by a profiteering minority in big business to discredit the O. P. A. and to place control of consumer food prices in the hands of the War Food Administration where they know big business will get a break and the consumer will get it in the neck.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a young man serving with the United States Marine Corps in the South Pacific to his father in the city of Lynn, which I think is most interesting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ELLSWORTH, from June 17 to 24, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEISS, for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Doctor and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order the House adjourned to meet on tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Friday, June 18, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, Room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Friday, June 18, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

500. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting the First Annual Report (1942) of the National Housing Agency; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

501. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended by the acts of June 28, 1940, and December 8, 1942, and referring to his letter to the Congress dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases; a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 256 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him by the said statute together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

502. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting in accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report from the committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

503. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Erie Harbor, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on October 13, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. Supplemental report to part 2 to accompany H. R. 2188. A bill to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2520. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; with amendment (Rept. 564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1436) granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 2984. A bill to preserve Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefit rights of members of the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2985. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2986. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to provide for payment of the Government's contribution to dependents of enlisted men for any period of active service prior to the date of filing application for a family allowance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2988. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2989. A bill to provide for the recognition of self-determination and independence of Puerto Rico, and to provide for good neighborly relations with the proposed government of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2991. A bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2992. A bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2993. A bill for the relief of John W. Booth II; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2994. A bill to extend reissued Letters Patent No. 19,023; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2995. A bill granting a pension to William B. Ludlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1595. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 60 citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1596. Also, petition of Etta L. Stoll and 60 other citizens of Polk County, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1597. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1598. By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Petition of committee for a memorial and protest meeting, to permit Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1599. Also, petition of committee for a memorial and protest meeting, to prohibit the use of the mails for anti-Semitic literature; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1600. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of 13 creameries in Dubuque County, Iowa, with a total production of nearly 5,000,000 pounds of butter in 1942 and bearing the signatures of responsible officers protesting against the 10 percent roll-back in butter prices and the payment of subsidies in lieu of fair prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1601. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Maude Makeever and 105 other residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1602. Also, petition of Susan E. Platter and 18 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francos Jean Reuter, specialist in management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Lt. Flynn G. Humphreys, chaplain, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the light of every heart that sees Thee, the life of every soul that loves Thee, the strength of every mind that seeks Thee, keep us steadfast in Thy holy love that we may face life with confidence and dare to live as worthy sons of God. Thou who art the confidence of all the ends of the earth, who stilleth the roaring of the seas and the tumult of the people, harken unto our prayer. O God, be merciful unto us for our trust is in Thee, and under the shadow of Thy wing shall be our refuge until shadows are past. Remove from us all doubt and fear and fill us with a true spirit of godliness. Dedicate us day by day to Thy joyful service and own us as Thy children. Sanctify to us the meaning of this hour in which the guardians of our Nation's destiny are gathered. Bless, we pray Thee, the President of our great Nation, those in authority over us, and guide the minds and actions of those who lead us as a people.

Hear our prayer, O God, as we bring before Thy throne of grace the noble sons and daughters of our land who today are on the far-flung battlefields of the world. Keep them close to Thy heart, protect and comfort them; make us worthy of the sacrifice they are so willingly making for us and for our freedom. Our prayer is that, through Thy guidance, we may give to the world freedom from bondage, fear, and want, and a freedom to live life to the full, wherein there shall be peace on earth and good will among men. We ask in the name of Jesus Christ and our blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CHAPLAIN FLYNN G. HUMPHREYS, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate concerning the young man who delivered the invocation this morning, the Reverend Flynn G. Humphreys, minister of the Presbyterian Church. He is now Lieutenant Humphreys, a chaplain in the United States Navy. Chaplain Humphreys is a native of Memphis, Tenn., and at the time of his induction into the Navy he was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, Ala. He obtained a leave of absence from the church in order to join the Navy. He was at one time pastor of the Presbyterian Church in my home town of Winchester, Tenn.

By a singular coincidence, about a year ago when Rev. Mr. Humphreys was contemplating joining the Navy and happened to be in Washington, he delivered, at the invitation of the late Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, the prayer opening the session of the Senate.

He is now, as I have said, serving in the United States Navy as chaplain and is at present on a short leave of absence for 10 days. He was actually in the battle of Attu when that island was recently taken by the United States Army forces. I am sure Members of the Senate would be interested to hear some of the very interesting stories he has to relate concerning the taking of Attu from Japan.

Mr. President, I merely wanted to make this statement as a matter of human interest. I assume Chaplain Humphreys is the first man who has actually participated in an engagement as a member of the armed forces of the United States to deliver the invocation in the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Bone	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Byrd	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Millikin	Vandenberg
Eastland	Moore	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murdock	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murray	Wheeler
George	Nye	Wherry
Gerry	O'Daniel	White
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 17, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;* and

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 12, and 14 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 16 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbtton;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 563. An act for the relief of Joe Koor;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of C. J. Toole;

H. R. 725. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1310. An act for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn;

H. R. 1313. An act for the relief of Delores Lewis;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 1335. An act to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.);

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter;

H. R. 1790. An act for the relief of Wymer Bowlin;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Bessie Myers;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the current Tax Payment Act of 1943, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Payment Act", be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 shall be for the use of the House Document Room, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate Document Room, 1,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and with the accompanying report referred to the Committee on Patents:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION OF OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (S. Doc. No. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Mobilization of the Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $138,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE TO CONTINUE AVAILABLE UNEXPENDED BALANCE FOR OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE (S. Doc. No. 68)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate to continue available until June 30, 1944, for the Office of Civilian Defense of the Office for Emergency Management the unexpended balance except $32,500,000 of the appropriation of $100,000,000 for civilian defense contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAR DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS IN EXCESS OF $150,000

A letter from the Secretary of War stating: "Referring to my letters, dated August 29, 1942, and January 1, 1943, which informed you that a list of contracts in excess of $150,000 and a supplemental report, respectively, had been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to the provisions of title IV, section 401, of the act of Congress approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.), a second supplemental list of contracts in excess of $150,000 has been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. These contracts were executed during the fiscal year 1942 and were omitted from the reports previously submitted"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT ON SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 256 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that Agency, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy (4), Interior (2), and Agriculture (4); Federal Works Agency, and the National Housing Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — FEDERAL PERSONNEL (S. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT paid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, submitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee relating to Federal personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present to the Senate a report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures respecting the civil-service personnel of the Federal Government.

In April there were 3,008,519 civil-service employees. This compares with a total of 917,760 employees on November 11, 1918, the peak of the employment in the last World War. Today, the Federal Government has one civilian employee to two and one-half soldiers. In the last World War it had one to five soldiers. In Jefferson's day, there was 1 Federal employee to every 5,308 persons. Today there is 1 civilian employee of the Government, not including the armed forces, to every 45 of our population. If we include the employees of the county, municipal, and State governments, and exclude the armed forces, we have today 1 civilian government employee to every 25 of our population.

Utilization of the available manpower is one of the greatest responsibilities of our Government in this crisis. The Federal Government is attempting to direct the use of manpower in private employment, but has done nothing of a constructive character in utilizing in the most effective way the more than 3,000,000 civil-service employees. Of these 3,000,000 approximately 1,349,098 are engaged in what may be termed direct mechanical war-production work, such as work in arsenals, camps, navy yards, airports, and so forth. Those so engaged represent less than 45 percent of the civilian employees in the Federal Government. The balance of about 1,700,000 are engaged in work other than direct mechanical war production and many in purely clerical work.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has made a very careful investigation and

analysis of the personnel of the Federal Government as set forth in this report, and recommends as a beginning that the Budget Bureau, acting with the Civil Service Commission, and using the authority they now have, effect promptly a reduction of 300,000 in the civilian personnel. The committee is of the opinion that this is a conservative estimate of the reduction that can be effected without injury to the war effort. If the matter is energetically and determinedly taken in hand, a much greater reduction can and should be made. A reduction of 300,000 would mean an approximate saving of $750,000,000 in the annual pay roll.

The Government cannot expect full measure of sacrifice from the civilian population of the country unless it sets an example. It is time to clean house in these various bureaus here at Washington. It has already been delayed too long. Unless the Budget Bureau and the Civil Service Commission undertake this work promptly and energetically under the powers these agencies already have, then Congress should direct them to do so by the passage of a joint resolution.

A few months ago the civilian personnel of the Government was placed by Executive order on a complete 48-hour basis. Some of the employees, such as those engaged in direct mechanical work, were already on a 48-hour basis, but this order resulted in placing about 1,600,000 additional employees on a 48-hour basis, meaning that 12,800,000 work-hours were added each week. This should have resulted in a substantial reduction in the existing personnel, and, although Congress directed that such a reduction be effected by the Budget Bureau, and gave the necessary power to do so, little has so far been accomplished. The vast majority of bureaus and agencies were already greatly overstaffed when this 48-hour order became operative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the report made by the committee, eliminating the illustrations on page 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report (without illustrations) is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

(Report to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives)

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In the course of the committee's investigation information and statistical data were accumulated which were previously unavailable. In the use of this information the committee has cooperated with other congressional committees as well as Senators and Representatives and has furnished them with data which have been of invaluable aid in the conduct of their inquiries. In addition, on various occasions the committee has been informed that the material has been of great value to the Government departments and agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The committee has long been troubled by the extent of the ever-increasing Federal employment, which has now passed the three million mark. Recognizing that additions in personnel were necessary to departments and agencies directly engaged in the war effort, the committee has found that there was no justification for the tremendous expansions as carried on by many of the other executive departments and agencies. That this expansion is sufficient to give cause for alarm is evident from the following:

Executive branch employment and monthly pay roll

Date	Employment	Monthly pay roll
Nov. 11, 1918	917,760	(1)
September 1939	940,133	$141,522,23
September 1940	1,059,984	159,793,624
September 1941	1,487,925	224,149,668
January 1942	1,703,099	259,404,945
February 1942	1,805,186	262,105,949
March 1942	1,926,074	302,764,679
April 1942	1,970,969	317,207,094
May 1942	2,066,873	336,558,306
June 1942	2,206,970	353,364,409
July 1942	2,327,632	382,373,859
August 1942	2,450,759	391,502,171
September 1942	2,549,474	414,594,644
October 1942	2,687,093	445,135,852
November 9142	2,739,815	453,580,367
December 1942	2,810,871	470,334,353
January 1943	2,864,021	519,225,846
February 1943	2,944,922	531,185,480
March 1943	2,991,287	552,700,300
April 1943	3,008,519	(1)

[1] No figures available.

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES NOT IN DIRECT WAR PRODUCTION

It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of people actively engaged in the direct production of war essentials. Much depends upon the definition of war essentials. Much depends, too, on where to draw the line between those actually engaged in fashioning the war materials and those engaged in administrative, advisory, and clerical work, etc.

It may definitely be stated, however, that no more than 7 establishments of the Federal Government are engaged in direct mechanical war production—namely, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Panama Canal, Bureau of Standards, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The total employment in these 7 establishments of those engaged in war production is 1,349,098. This excludes certain personnel in these agencies performing clerical, administrative, and fiscal work.

The 519,438 employees of the War and Navy Departments who are working in clerical and administrative positions cannot be considered as in direct mechanical war production. Therefore, they have been omitted from the following table:

War Department (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	809,268
Navy Department (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	475,436
Maritime Commission (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	2,179
Tennessee Valley Authority (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	26,213
Panama Canal	30,187
Bureau of Standards	2,235
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3,580
Total	1,349,098

The above figures include all employment (except as noted) in arsenals and navy yards, camps and airports, aircraft industries and ports of embarkation.

This total represents less than 45 percent of the civilian employees in the Federal Government. These are the only employees who are chiefly engaged in actual mechanical war production. The committee may be criticized for including in these figures a large number of employees who are undoubtedly not in war production. It has included, for example, all of the consultants, analysts, attorneys, auditors, accountants, janitors, charwomen, police guards, economists, building electricians, and numerous others in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, in addition, the clerical employees of the Panama Canal, Bureau of Standards, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

It has been stated that more than 1,600,000, or approximately 60 percent of all Federal civilian employees are engaged directly in war production. However, from material furnished the committee, recapitulated in the above table, it is difficult if not impossible to understand the basis for arriving at such a disproportionate figure. It is reasonable to presume that it was based upon the inclusion of hundreds of thousands of employees within the clerical category. While the committee believes that some, but not all, of these clerical employees are essential, nevertheless it is clear that they are definitely not engaged in direct mechanical war production. Of course, the committee knows that many of the remaining Federal employees are essential to the war effort and to the maintenance of the Government. This division of employees is made to define the number of Federal civilian employees engaged in mechanical war production and those engaged in clerical, administrative, and fiscal duties. It emphasizes that this division does not attempt to establish an essential group of employees and a nonessential group. The committee finds that reductions in personnel can be made in both groups by improved efficiency and coordination without injury to the war effort. Investigations by and reports to the committee have shown that many of those clerical employees who have been included by others in their definition of those engaged in war production, are either idle, not employed in a position where their highest skills can be utilized, or are performing activities which duplicate and overlap those functions being performed by other employees in other agencies.

With 55 percent of the Federal employees not engaged in direct war production, and in view of the foregoing, it is obvious that cuts may be made in Federal personnel without hindering direct mechanical war production. Consequently, a drastic reduction can be made in the number of Federal employees without harmful effect to the war-production effort. That is to say, nonessential employees may be removed from Federal pay rolls by the Budget Bureau, which already has the power to make such reductions in over one-half of the Federal personnel pursuant to the authority contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Overtime Pay Act.[1] Such a reduction will in no way jeopardize the war effort but will increase efficiency and morale, provide additional manpower for war work, reduce the Federal pay roll, and carry out the Overtime Pay Act.[1]

Other portions of this report show that the efforts of the 55 percent of the Federal employees who are not engaged in mechanical war-production work have not been fully utilized because of the lack of a vigorously administered war transfer program, and the failure to establish an effective Federal employee manpower pool.

[1] Public Law 49, 78th Cong., approved May 7, 1943.

SURVEY OF ALARMING INCREASE IN PERSONNEL

The committee has undertaken an unprecedented investigation and study of the personnel and pay rolls of the entire Federal Government. (See appendixes I–VI.) This began on December 24, 1941, when, anticipating this rise in needless personnel and resultant wasteful expenditures, the committee recommended that "every possible retrenchment be made in the administrative costs of the civil departments and agencies." It is clear that this has not been done. Since then attention has been focused on (1) the ever-increasing rate of employment; (2) the rise in pay-roll figures (not to be confused with congressional action increasing pay rates); (3) the unwarranted increases in salaries of employees receiving $2,500 or more; (4) the irregularities attendant to many promotions; and, as an underlying cause, (5) the unsuccessful attempts of the Civil Service Commission to exercise properly many of its assigned functions. The committee feels that drastic action, as described herein, is necessary to curb this abuse of departmental power and consequent waste of Federal funds and manpower.

The following table makes clear the large increase in Federal employment:

Report of employees in the executive agencies [1]

Date	Total employees in District of Columbia	Total employees outside District of Columbia	Grand total employees	Total monthly pay roll	Total employee increase	Percent employee increase	Percent pay increase
July 1, 1939	123,505	801,755	925,260	$140,140,553			
July 1, 1941	184,236	1,185,874	1,370,110	205,780,916	444,850	48.1	46.8
July 1, 1942	283,756	1,986,722	2,270,478	353,364,409	1,345,218	145.4	152.1
Jan. 1, 1943	276,228	2,553,520	2,829,748	470,334,353	1,904,488	205.8	235.6
Apr. 1, 1943	278,336	2,730,183	3,008,519		2,083,259	225.2	

[1] The employment figures used in this report are for all agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government except the President's War Relief Control Board.

From this table may be read the tremendous drain which the Government has exerted on the Nation's manpower. From 925,000 on July 1, 1939, the total has jumped to 2,270,000 just 3 years later, an increase of 145 percent. In the following 6 months the total had further risen to the alarming height of 2,830,000, an increase of 205 percent since July 1, 1939. Latest committee figures show an increase of 225 percent to 3,008,519 in April 1943. In the last World War the ratio was 1 civilian Government employee to 5 soldiers. The ratio now is 1 civilian employee to 2½ soldiers.

From employment figures interesting comparisons may be made on a 6-month basis:

Rise in Federal civilian employment

Average rise every 6 months from July 1939 to July 1941 110,000
Average rise every 6 months from July 1941 to July 1942 450,000
Actual rise in the 6 months from July 1942 to January 1943 559,000

In other words, the employment has been increasing at a rate of nearly 50 percent semiannually. Despite the assurances of those who are responsible for the reduction of Federal personnel the committee has observed a constant month-to-month rise in the number of employees on Federal pay rolls.

Pay-roll figures, which do not include overtime pay, similarly reflect an upward trend. From a monthly pay roll of one hundred and forty millions as of July 1, 1939, the figure has risen steadily until as of January 1, 1943, the total reached $470,000,000. This indicates a 235-percent increase in pay roll as compared to a 205-percent increase in employment.

The pay increases in the higher-salary brackets in certain agencies are not isolated cases but are carried on in some instances on a large scale. Such increases reflect a pirating of employees, or trends in that direction, and a disregard for basic salary classifications and dangers of inflation.

AGENCIES DRAIN PERSONNEL MARKET

The committee made a study of the increase in personnel of certain agencies, particularly the new war agencies, a list of which follows:

Increase in personnel of certain new Federal agencies

Agency	July 1, 1942	Jan. 1, 1943	Apr. 1, 1943
Alien Property Custodian	229	1,118	1,195
Board of Economic Warfare	2,015	2,961	3,024
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	804	1,079	1,253
Lend-Lease Administration	418	493	586
National Housing Agency	13,970	16,497	18,082
Office of Censorship	9,008	12,600	12,517
Office of Civilian Defense	1,160	1,550	1,616
Office of Defense Transportation	718	3,835	3,901
Office of Price Administration	22,981	44,517	51,817
Office of Scientific Research and Development	306	556	1,198
Office of War Information	2,391	3,617	3,698
War Labor Board, National	136	807	1,637
War Manpower Commission [1]	528	2,692	3,760
War Production Board	17,067	21,628	21,886
War Relocation Authority	212	641	1,898
War Shipping Administration	432	1,707	2,107
Total	72,375	116,298	130,175

[1] Excludes Selective Service System, National Youth Administration and U. S. Employment Service.

While certain increases are to be expected in new agencies, in most instances overstaffing has taken place with resultant waste and duplication of effort. The doubling of the number of employees in the Office of Price Administration over a 9-month period, the large increases in the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, and Office of Defense Transportation are evidences of a lack of restraint in their recruiting programs.

In addition, several departments and agencies have given ample evidence of overstaffing. The Department of Commerce, with 29,000 employees has more than doubled its size since July 1939. The Civil Service Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, General Accounting Office, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation—all have failed to redirect their recruiting to reasonable levels. The committee's studies reveal that those agencies and departments concerned with the war effort could reduce their employment considerably without weakening their programs; and that those agencies and departments not directly concerned with winning the war could cut their employment to the minimum.

WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

On July 1, 1939, the War Department had 109,886 employees. This figure rose sharply to 1,257,014 by January 1, 1943, an increase of 1,147,123. In the next 2 months the total had risen to 1,285,000. Similarly, the Navy Department showed a constant increase in personnel during the period July 1, 1939, to January 1, 1943. On the former date the number of employees of the Navy Department totaled 85,400, while on the latter date the total number showed 559,590, an increase of 474,190 in this 3½-year period. Likewise, the total number of Navy employees continued to increase during the first 2 months of 1943 to more than 580,000. These figures are, of course, only for the civilian personnel of the War and Navy Departments. They do not include any men in the armed services who from time to time are assigned office work in these two Departments.

Complaints reaching the committee have indicated that a completely sound employee utilization program has not as yet become effective. In the past the committee has been reluctant to criticize these two Departments in such matters, as inadequate record keeping, lack of organization, and faulty personnel placement, but in the future, when the consolidation of certain overlapping functions is accomplished, it intends to follow closely their efforts to utilize their personnel in a more effective manner.

Committee figures show that a large percentage of the increase in Federal civilian employment from July 1, 1939, to the present time has been due to increases in the clerical personnel of the War and Navy Departments.

The employees in the clerical (clerical, administrative, and fiscal service) category [2] within the Navy Department have increased from 10,437 in September 1939, to 94,390 in January 1943, and according to the Navy Department officials a further increase to 101,937 is contemplated by June 1943. These employees are not engaged in mechanical war production, and it is not reasonable that a number as large as one-sixth of the total Navy civilian personnel is needed to keep records and perform the routine clerical, administrative, and fiscal duties. In addition, 25,510 WAVES, SPARS, and members of the United States Marine Corps Women's Reserve, and a large number of enlisted and commissioned personnel similarly are also engaged in comparable routine clerical duties for the Navy Department.

The employees in the clerical (clerical, administrative, and fiscal service) category of the War Department likewise have had spectacular increases in their numbers. In July 1942, it is estimated that approximately 300,000 employees in the War Department were performing clerical duties. By October 1942, this figure rose to 406,037, and by January 1, 1943, there were 425,048 of these employees. Therefore, it is clear that today one-third of the total employees of the War Department are performing clerical administrative and fiscal duties. As in the case of the Navy Department this does not take into consideration the 63,300 WAAC's and the large number of enlisted and commis-

[2] The Classification Act of 1923 defines clerical, administrative, and fiscal service as follows: "The clerical, administrative, and fiscal service shall include all classes of positions the duties of which are to perform clerical, administrative, or accounting work, or any other work commonly associated with office, business, or fiscal administration" (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 673, approved March 4, 1923; 42 Stat. 1491).

sioned personnel who are also engaged in duties of a clerical nature.

On January 1, 1943, 519,438 employees were found by the committee to be in a clerical (clerical, administrative, and fiscal service) category in the War and Navy Departments. This represents over one-sixth of the personnel of the entire Federal Government who are performing clerical duties in the War and Navy Departments.

UNUSUAL PAY RAISES

The committee made a study of those employees in certain agencies of the Office for Emergency Management—namely, the Central Administrative Services, the War Relocation Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Board of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and the War Production Board—to determine current Office for Emergency Management practices of advancement. The study embraced all those employees who, on November 15, 1942, were receiving over $2,500 per annum. By comparing salary raises over a 2-year period from November 15, 1940, to November 15, 1942, it was determined that all of the above agencies showed unusual and apparently unwarranted pay raises in a large number of cases by reclassification of grades and promotions.

In the 7 agencies investigated over the 2-year period, a total of 568 employees received pay raises of more than $1,200 and less than $2,000, 234 received pay raises of between $2,000 and $3,000, 38 received pay raises of between $3,000 and $4,000, 14 received pay raises of between $4,000 and $5,000, 4 received pay raises of between $5,000 and $6,000, and 3 received pay raises of $6,000 or over. It must be borne in mind that these are raises in pay and do not include the regular per annum salaries of these employees on November 15, 1940.

While all the agencies studied are open to censure for unwarranted pay raises, the War Production Board and the Board of Economic Warfare are most outstanding. Three Board of Economic Warfare employees received raises in pay of $6,000 or over in the 2-year period between November 15, 1940, and November 15, 1942. Three employees—2 from the Board of Economic Warfare and 1 from the War Production Board—received raises in the same period which brought them in the $5,000 to $5,999 pay group. Eight employees of the Board of Economic Warfare and 6 from the War Production Board received raises of at least $4,000 and not more than $4,999. Fifteen from the Board of Economic Warfare and 18 from the War Production Board received pay raises of at least $3,000 and not more than $3,999. Forty-nine from the Board of Economic Warfare and 116 from the War Production Board received raises of from $2,000 to $2,999. No fewer than 61 employees of the Board of Economic Warfare and 282 employees of the War Production Board received raises of from $1,200 to $1,999. The average annual salary increase for these Board of Economic Warfare employees is $2,491.33.

The committee has yet to determine the salary levels of these employees since November 15, 1942, and the amount of salary increase attributed to recent wholesale promotions. More current data on unusual salary increases in this and in other agencies of the Federal Government will be included in a subsequent personnel report of the committee.

The committee made many studies of this nature which are not included in this report but the above detailed analyses are equally applicable to all of the agencies studied in this respect.

SKIP-GRADE PROMOTIONS

A searching inquiry into the system of promotions was made by the committee to determine the methods used by the agencies to accelerate such wasteful and extravagant misuse of Federal funds. With respect to the responsibility for a vast number of rapid and lucrative promotions the personnel officers of the agencies blamed the Civil Service Commission. At first the Civil Service Commission refused to accept the responsibility and blamed the agencies, but a few months ago when the committee was investigating this malpractice, the Commission adopted corrective measures, the effectiveness of which has not yet been determined. However, it is clear that responsibility for these increases in salaries was due in the last analysis to the Civil Service Commission, because that agency has the statutory authority to approve or act in an advisory capacity on all promotions. The committee's investigation revealed that despite the fact that the Congress in the Classification Act of 1923 intended that grades CAF–6, CAF–8, and CAF–10 be used, the agencies seldom used these classifications and that the Civil Service Commission has sanctioned this nonuse.

It would be impossible to approximate what amount of Federal funds has been wasted and misused by way of "skip grade" promotions. In one agency Federal funds were being used in this manner at a rate of over $1,000,000 annually. The committee feels that such an inexcusable state of affairs can only be attributed to the failure of the respective agencies and the Civil Service Commission to cooperate and to administer, within proper spheres of jurisdiction, a uniformly intelligent personnel policy.

TOP-HEAVY PAY ROLLS

Actually, 28 Government agencies are today paying employees from 4 to 18 times as much as the average Government agency pays its employees. This is borne out by the following analysis.

By examining the over-all salary practices in the Government as a whole and by checking this with a further examination of the salary rates of the old line departments, one is able to establish what may be considered a normal salary rate in the higher income brackets. Thus, of the total number of classified employees who were in the Federal Government service on October 31, 1942, only 3.8 percent of these were making $3,800 per annum or more, as evidenced by the following table:

Percentage of employees, by salary brackets, in classified Government service

Salary	Number of employees	Percentage of employees
Under $1,200	43,282	3.1
$1,200 to $1,439	211,249	15.3
$1,440 to $1,619	322,853	23.4
$1,620 to $1,799	190,593	13.8
$1,800 to $1,999	122,245	8.8
$2,000 to $2,499	305,391	22.1
$2,500 to $2,999	85,902	6.2
$3,000 to $3,799	48,615	3.5
$3,800 to $4,499	25,023	1.8
Over $4,499	27,715	2.0
Total	1,382,868	100.0

From this it may seem that 25,023 employees, or 1.8 percent, are being paid from $3,800 to $4,499 while 27,715 employees, or 2 percent, are being paid $4,500 and up. Thus, only 3.8 percent of all Federal classified employees are paid $3,800 or more.

A further check as to an equitable distribution of employees reveals the following number of employees in the higher salary brackets in old line agencies. The War and Navy Departments were omitted from this group because of the unusual conditions existing today in those organizations. However, these two Departments actually have fewer highly paid classified civilian employees than do any of the others.

Table of 8 departments showing classified employees and percentage in upper income bracket (see appendix II)

Department	Number of employees	$3,800–$4,499		Over $4,500		Over $3,800	
		Number of employees	Percentage	Employees	Percentage	Employees	Percentage
Agriculture	76,624	2,125	2.8	2,635	3.4	4,760	6.2
Commerce	19,282	768	3.9	884	4.6	1,652	8.6
Interior	27,582	1,112	4.0	1,098	4.0	2,210	8.0
Justice	29,564	1,218	4.1	1,606	5.4	2,824	9.6
Labor	5,806	260	4.5	304	5.2	564	9.7
State	5,200	251	4.8	668	12.8	919	17.7
Treasury	59,344	1,436	2.4	2,428	4.1	3,864	6.5
Post Office	266,281	862	.3	296	.1	1,158	.5
Total	489,683	8,032	1.7	9,919	2.0	17,951	3.7

From these tables it is clear that 3.7 percent of the old line agency employees receive salaries of $3,800 or more, which percentage compares favorably with the 3.8 percent in the Government as a whole.

With reasonable variations allowed for highly specialized groups—such as the State Department above—one might expect this to be true of the entire Government. But even after allowing a 400-percent deviation from

the normal salary rates for possible extraordinary conditions one still finds 28 agencies spending money wastefully in even higher income brackets. A list of these agencies follows:

Agencies with 15 percent or more classified employees paid over $3,800 per annum

Agency	Number of classified employees receiving $3,800 per annum or over	Percentage of classified employees receiving $3,800 per annum or more
Office for Emergency Management: Liaison Office	5	71
National Mediation Board	19	70
Office for Emergency Management: Office of Economic Stabilization	4	66
Bureau of the Budget	215	48
Federal Trade Commission	209	35
National Resources Planning Board	102	34
Office for Emergency Management: Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	344	33
Board of Investigation and Research	50	32
Tax Court of the United States	39	21
Securities and Exchange Commission	424	30
Tariff Commission	100	28
Interstate Commerce Commission	775	28
Office for Emergency Management: Office of Alien Property Custodian	278	28
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	5	27
Federal Power Commission	180	27
National Labor Relations Board	247	27
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,031	27
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	15	26
Office for Emergency Management:		
War Production Board	5,301	26
Lend-Lease	120	25
Board of Economic Warfare	640	23
Office for Emergency Management:		
Office of Civilian Defense	262	19
Office of Scientific Research and Development	79	18
War Manpower Commission	166	18
War Relocation Authority	139	18
National Housing Agency	2,564	18
State Department	919	17
National War Labor Board	49	17

Attention is specifically directed to the War Production Board, with 5,301 employees receiving over $3,800, or 26 percent of its total employment; National Housing Agency, in which 2,564 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 18 percent of its total personnel; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in which 2,031 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 27 percent of its personnel; the Interstate Commerce Commission, in which 775 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 28 percent of its personnel; the Board of Economic Warfare, in which 640 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 23 percent of its total personnel; the Securities and Exchange Commission, in which 424 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 30 percent of its total personnel; the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, in which 344 employees receiving $3,800 or over comprise 33 percent of its total personnel.

BREAK-DOWN IN PERSONNEL RECORDING SYSTEM

Under the authority vested in the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to inquire into the personnel practices of the Federal Government, a request was made by the committee that the departments and agencies of the Government furnish statistics on a monthly basis concerning their respective employees.

The committee experienced great difficulty in obtaining from the establishments of the Federal Government a monthly personnel and pay-roll report in a reasonable length of time. On April 28, 1943, there were 4 agencies which had not yet submitted complete reports for the month of December; 8 which had submitted no reports for the month of January; 17 which had submitted no reports for the month of February; and 27 which had submitted no reports for the month of March.

It is amazing to note that, in the face of the vast numbers of employees now on the pay roll of the Federal Government, the main reason given by the agencies for their inability to submit correct reports on time was lack of sufficient personnel. Many of the agency personnel reports were incorrect as to mechanical details and even as to simple addition, facts which substantiate the committee's belief that large numbers of inefficient and untrained employees have been recruited and are still being carried on the pay rolls of the various executive establishments. One agency submitted three different reports for the same month before a correct one was achieved. Another completely overlooked reporting a field office in Chicago. Others did not make the effort to see that the quasi-independent bureaus, for which they were responsible, were informed about the report or given information as to the detail of its preparation. Failure to use a system of providing permanent records was another reason which made it difficult for the agencies to submit correct reports. Information which was current, it was said, may be procured, but past records relating to items of Federal personnel expenditures are not available.

Many agencies experienced difficulty in securing information from their numerous field offices scattered over the country because of failure or delay in submitting reports to their central offices in Washington. This was true especially of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Panama Canal, and the Division of Central Administrative Services in the Office for Emergency Management. The Department of Agriculture reported 68,210 employees to the committee as of January 1, 1943, and reported 76,875 employees to the Civil Service Commission for the same date. Thus this Department is unable to determine within more than 8,000 the actual number of employees it has on its pay roll. In discrepancies of this type the situation at the Department of Agriculture is a typical but not an isolated instance.

In a short while it became apparent that it would be almost impossible to secure this information on a current basis by reason of the fact that over a period of years a sound businesslike procedure had not been adopted by the agencies and the Civil Service Commission to secure such information readily. The Civil Service Commission from the outset was unable to furnish this information despite the fact that it is the central personnel servicing agency of the Federal Government. The situation was further complicated by the fact that departments and agencies had not followed the lines set by the Classification Act in determining categories into which employees should be placed. Thousands of field positions have not as yet been placed under the Classification Act in a uniform manner as provided by the Brookhart Act of 1930 and the Mead-Ramspeck Act of 1940.

In addition it is difficult to ascertain the categories of those employees specifically exempted from civil-service examinations by section 3, rule 2, of the Civil Service Rules and Regulations. Also, those employees paid on the basis of prevailing wage scale in a particular locality, including mechanics, tradesmen employees, laborers, and artisans, seasonal employees, temporary employees paid on a per diem basis, and scores of other special categories—none of these fall under the Classification Act unless it is so desired by the particular agency involved. Therefore, it was evident from this that the committee not only had to devise means of obtaining this information readily but also had to encourage a more uniform, practical, and efficient method of reporting. A series of conferences arranged by the committee with representatives of the various departments and agencies, including the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the War and Navy Departments, resulted in the formulation of plans which would enable the Civil Service Commission to gather pertinent personnel data in a more intelligible and uniform manner. It is too early to predict the final outcome of these conferences, but it is hoped that the Civil Service Commission will modernize its reporting system so that all information pertaining to Federal personnel may be readily available to interested authorities. Such a system would obviate the necessity of the constant harassment of Federal personnel officers by various fact-finding and statistic-gathering governmental groups.

It is clear that a uniform personnel reporting system must be based on uniform job descriptions and a uniform classification of positions and salaries. The situation regarding the classification of employees within the Federal service has aggravated this entire problem of personnel reporting. From committee personnel reports it is obvious that a uniform employee classification system has not yet been put into operation by the Civil Service Commission. Investigation has revealed that thousands of employees all through the Federal service performing identical duties have been placed in different classifications and are receiving various salaries for the same work. This not only is a reprehensible situation unfair to the Federal employees, but wastes thousands of dollars of Federal funds.

In this connection it should be pointed out that the Civil Service Commission has not fully complied with the part of the Classification Act of 1923 which reads:

"Its regulations shall provide for ascertaining and recording the duties of positions and the qualifications required of incumbents, and it shall prepare and publish an adequate statement giving (1) the duties and responsibilities involved in the classes to be established within the several grades, illustrated where necessary by examples of typical tasks, (2) the minimum qualifications required for

the satisfactory performance of such duties and tasks, and (3) the titles given to said classes (5 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 663; approved March 4, 1923; 42 Stat. 1489)."

Future investigations and reports will deal more fully with this problem as it relates to unnecessary Federal expenditures.

EMPLOYEES' PROTESTS INVESTIGATED

Supplementing the information received by the committee from the agencies were hundreds of letters and complaints received from Federal employees who believed that a greater economy and a reduction in personnel in the Federal Government would aid the war program and would abolish red tape, wasted effort, and negligence. The committee is appreciative of these expressions of interest, and it is hoped that Federal employees will continue their cooperation in this manner. In many instances these complaints were wholly justified. Investigations were conducted and several times the problem was remedied by the agency itself during the course of the investigation. One agency in particular reorganized an entire division under investigation by the committee and transferred the major portion of its personnel to the field. Three weeks after the committee began investigating the loose promotion practices in the Federal service the Civil Service Commission issued an order placing certain restrictions on promotions.

FAULTY EXECUTION OF CLASSIFICATION ACT

It has come to the attention of the committee that within the Federal Government, both in the departmental and field service, there exist inequities and waste because of the fact that employees performing the same duties are designated by different civil-service title, grade, and salary classifications. Under existing legislation, the committee believes that there is no excuse for this situation within the departmental service and seriously doubts that it should exist in the field service. By the Classification Act of 1923 and the Brookhart Act of 1930 (with certain exceptions provided for by law), departmental and field employees were brought within a classified civil service. The difference between the Civil Service Commission's jurisdiction over field and departmental classifications has arisen because of the Comptroller General's decisions stating in effect that the Commission has no authority "to review or revise adjustments in pay of positions in the field service." Therefore, as far as uniformity of positions within the field service is concerned the responsibility in the final analysis has rested on the departments and agencies. The Mead-Ramspeck Act of 1940 provides that by Executive order the entire departmental and field service shall be brought under the classified civil service (with certain exceptions provided for by law). The committee expresses the hope that the proper execution of future Executive orders on this score will operate to wipe out the inequities and waste present today.

For a long time the committee has been aware that the departments and agencies are solving the problem of inefficient personnel by the recruitment of scores of additional employees. This policy of making up in quantity what is lacking in quality is tacit admission that an effective personnel administration is absent and a dilatory and more expensive solution is being used. The committee believes that in the future attempts should be made to recruit for and employ in key positions only those who are fully qualified and are capable administrators, and those who are more concerned with winning the war than with personal aggrandizement.

OVERLAPPING PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

The committee has been apprised that there have been extensive recruiting programs carried on by many of the Federal agencies. Aside from the merits of their individual recruiting activities the committee was concerned with the fact that these overlapped and duplicated generally accepted functions of the Civil Service Commission. This duplication has wasted thousands of dollars of Federal funds. Regardless of whether this condition arose as a result of the failure of the Civil Service Commission to exercise its rightful function or as a result of the Commission's failure to plan effectively for future needs, it is clear the situation is intolerable.

The performance of functions which heretofore was considered as incumbent upon the Civil Service Commission and which has been duplicated by other departments and agencies has not been restricted to the field of recruiting alone, for an examination has shown that this duplication has extended to interviewing, examining, investigating, and placing applicants.

One department in its report stated that one of its divisions operated a "miniature civil-service commission in receiving and rating applications, and certifying eligibles * * *. In this connection 9,359 applications were received, personally examined, and rated, and 1,975 certificates of eligibles containing 4,609 names were issued from which selections were made."

LABOR UTILIZATION REQUIRES MANPOWER POOL

The committee finds that the turn-over in Federal personnel is due to (a) the absence of a uniform personnel policy, (b) the lack of a full labor-utilization program, (c) lack of planning, and (d) inefficient administrative management.

It is reasonable to presume that the recruitment of vast numbers of new employees could be eliminated if the available Government manpower pool—namely, those employees already in Government service—was used to its fullest extent. Many efforts have been made in this direction, but as yet only the surface has been scratched. The committee believes that the solution to the problem is through more concerted action and cooperation rather than through confusing, countermanding, and contradictory circular letters, orders, and regulations.

Pursuant to several Executive orders and War Manpower directive 10, the Civil Service Commission has been given complete control over the war transfer program within the Federal Government service. However, it has not been successful in initiating and executing such a program in a really effective manner.

About a year and a half ago the Commission set up a War Transfer Unit, but did very little to advertise it among the Federal workers or to give the unit proper emphasis. The committee's investigation showed that from an organizational standpoint that unit functioned well and its procedure was modernized in every way possible. However, for some reason not entirely clear, the Commission changed the procedure and instead of 6 actions being required to effect a transfer under the previous set-up, now 10 major and 35 minor actions by employees are necessary. The investigation showed also that war transfer files are not consulted before a new employee is certified to an agency.

Many Government employees were interviewed, who stated that they had never heard of the war-transfer program. A responsible official of the Civil Service Commission admitted that the Commission had not really tried to make the program as effective as it should be. He thought that "possibly the Commission would have to implement its regulations."

A few employees who had used the facilities of the Civil Service Commission's war-transfer program and had reported overstaffing and waste in their agencies, stated that retaliatory measures had been taken against them in a prejudicial and unfair manner.

Therefore, the Federal Government finds itself in the peculiar position of advocating and sponsoring a full labor-utilization program within private industry, but neglecting the same problem insofar as the Federal service is concerned.

Failure to attack this problem effectively does not rest entirely upon the Civil Service Commission, because, coincident with such a governmental program, the departments and agencies should have instituted a survey within their own organizations to determine whether all employees were working at top capacity in positions for which they were best suited, and those not necessary should have been discharged or transferred to other parts of the Federal service. Instead of adopting such a policy and solving an acute labor shortage in this manner, the departments and agencies, with a few exceptions, recruited needless numbers of employees at the expense of an American public which was soon to feel the pinch of the extravagant and wasteful expense in higher taxes.

The committee wishes to commend the efforts of those departments and agencies whose administrators attacked this problem realistically and set up a division with the power to make the necessary changes equitably and in accordance with full manpower utilization, but at the same time the committee regrets that this was not done in other departments and agencies of the Government.

With the United States faced with an acute labor shortage of competent and qualified employees it is imperative that the Government put a brake on recruiting, and adopt an efficient, well-planned, fair, and equitable labor-utilization program.

EFFECT OF OVERTIME PAY LAWS

(Public Law 821, 77th Cong., and Public Law 49, 78th Cong.)

On December 22, 1942, the temporary overtime pay resolution (Public Law 821, 77th Cong.) was approved. It provided overtime compensation for approximately 2,180,000 Federal civilian employees retroactive to December 1, 1942, and extending to April 30, 1943. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and Senator WILLIAM LANGER caused section 2 to be added to the overtime pay resolution. Section 2 provided as follows:

"SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the proper and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency. Upon the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance of such order by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall cease to be applicable to the employees of the agency affected by such order, unless and until the head thereof has certified to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such order has been complied with. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies."

This provision gave the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authority to order reductions in the personnel of the departments

and agencies subject to the overtime-pay law. One of the most important factors considered by the Director was the effect of the increased number of working hours, and it was assumed that the amount of reductions in personnel would be in direct proportion to that increase.

The Byrd-Langer amendment was continued in section 11 of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law 49, 78th Cong., approved May 7, 1943), which law extended the overtime compensation for Federal civilian employees to June 30, 1945. Section 11 of the latter act provides as follows:

"SEC. 11. The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this act, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress such information as the Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the first day of each quarter, require for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall, from time to time, but not less frequently than the thirtieth day after the beginning of each quarter, determine the number of employees so required, and any personnel of any such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released at such times as the Director shall order. Such determination shall be reported to the Congress each quarter. Sections 2 and 3 of this act shall cease to be applicable to the employees of such department or agency unless the head thereof shall certify within 30 days from the effective date so prescribed by the Director that the number of employees of this agency does not exceed the number determined by the Director to be required for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions. Any determinations and directions made by the Director under the authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, are hereby continued in effect until modified by him. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments and agencies any employees released pursuant to this section whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies, and the services of these employees are to be utilized by the departments and agencies before additional employees are recruited."

The continued increase in Federal employment gives rise to the speculation as to what effect the Byrd-Langer amendment has had on the reduction of Federal employment. The committee is at present obtaining information from the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget in the form of progress reports which will reflect the true effect of the reduction orders. In the near future, when such information is complete, the committee will report its findings to the President and to the Congress.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Any needless Federal personnel and resultant administrative expenses is a hindrance to the war effort and is also an unnecessary burden on the American taxpayer. Despite the committee's recommendation on December 24, 1941, that administrative costs be held to a minimum, the problem today is more acute than ever. (See recommendations 1 and 2.)

2. During the past 2 years too much emphasis has been placed on positive recruiting and not enough importance has been attached to a full labor utilization program. This has caused poor morale, inefficiency, unnecessary personnel, and resultant wasteful expenditures. (See recommendation 3.)

3. Functions ordinarily performed by the Civil Service Commission have been usurped by the individual departments and agencies of the Federal Government, leaving a field of doubtful authority, thereby causing a duplication and an overlapping of such functions. (See recommendation 4.)

4. Within the past 2 years the beneficial effects of a merit system have been impaired and Federal funds have been wasted through the negligent attitude of the personnel officers and operating officials of the various departments and agencies. (See recommendation 6.)

5. Unwarranted promotions of employees receiving $2,500 per annum or more have been sanctioned by the various agencies and approved by the Civil Service Commission. In this connection the policy of granting "skip grade" promotions, instituted widely by the executive agencies with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, clearly violates the Classification Act of 1923. (See recommendation 6.)

6. The institution of a uniform personnel reporting procedure based upon a uniform position classification structure satisfying legislative and executive needs for personnel information is imperative. (See recommendation 7.)

7. The problems raised by this report have been aggravated by the fact that various agencies have hampered the Civil Service Commission in its efforts to carry out a well-defined personnel policy in line with the broad authorization given the Commission under the Civil Service Act of 1883 and have not given the Commission their fullest cooperation in reporting personnel statistics. (See recommendation 7.)

8. The Civil Service Commission throughout the war period has concentrated most of its resources on recruiting. The Commission must recognize, however, that it also has the responsibility, as the central personnel agency of the Government, of exercising leadership in connection with all phases of personnel administration. The Commission has in some instances exercised this leadership. In others it has not. This failure has aggravated the problems raised by this report. (See recommendation 8.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends:

1. That a 300,000 reduction in personnel be promptly carried out by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The committee believes that much further reductions can be safely effected without interference with the war effort by a firm determination of all branches of the Government to eliminate all unnecessary personnel. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget can effect much of this reduction through an effective use and execution of the authority and power contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment in the Overtime Pay Act (sec. 11, Public Law 49, 78th Cong., approved May 7, 1943). This power applies to all employees in the classified service comprising over one-half of the total Federal civilian personnel. In the remaining half the proper officials in charge shall take the necessary steps to effect all possible reductions of personnel. It is, of course, realized that this reduction cannot be made on a uniform basis as some agencies can afford a greater reduction than others.

2. That the Civil Service Commission and the respective personnel offices of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government immediately cease all unnecessary recruiting of employees, particularly from sources outside the Government service; and that the Civil Service Commission be specifically authorized to enforce this measure.

3. That the Federal labor-utilization program be strengthened by the Civil Service Commission by forming an effective manpower pool to use fully the services of those employees already in the Federal Government.

4. That the Civil Service Commission exercise its authority to guard against activities of recruiting, interviewing, investigating, and placing of employees by the personnel offices of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

5. That steps be taken immediately in all personnel offices of the various departments and agencies pending adjustment of functions outlined in the above recommendations to improve the selection of their employees as to quality in order that the number of new employees hired may be reduced to a minimum; and that the Civil Service Commission take full responsibility for this action.

6. That a sound employee promotion system be adopted by the Federal Government; and that the Civil Service Commission take full responsibility for modernizing; effecting and policing such systems in line with the Classification Act of 1923.

7. That a uniform system of reporting personnel statistics to the Civil Service Commission with a satisfactory occupational and functional break-down be instituted immediately by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and that this method replace the antiquated system now in use; and that this new personnel report be so constituted as to satisfy the needs of the executive and legislataive groups now desiring such information; and that the Civil Service Commission be empowered and instructed to make this change immediately.

8. That the Civil Service Commission should spend more and more of its time and resources on the exercise of such functions as those outlined in this report. It should make sure, in its relations with the President, with the departments, and with the Congress, that it is constantly exercising the vigorous type of leadership which the Nation has the right to expect from its central personnel agency.

9. That the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget immediately take steps to eliminate the evils herein outlined, and use their respective authority to prevent the wasteful personnel malpractices prevalent within the Federal service, and if those ends cannot be achieved in a cooperative and effective manner, the entire personnel-servicing and business-management functions of the Federal Government should be reorganized.

10. That in order to reduce recruiting, eliminate overstaffing, and make effective the war-transfer program the Civil Service Commission, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, adopt the following procedure: (A) Under authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget, and upon information gathered by that agency from all sources, the Bureau of the Budget prepare and furnish the Civil Service Commission with information as to the existence and contemplated existence of surplus employees in every department and agency of the Government; and (B) that the Civil Service Commission by using the authority vested in it by War Manpower Directive No. 10 use the services of those employees and place them where they can be utilized before the recruitment of any single new employee.

LETTER OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 12, 1943.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of June 4, 1943, requesting an expression of my views on the tentative report on Government personnel which you furnished on May 26, but which has been subsequently revised, and which you have been directed by the committee to submit to Congress at an early date.

I am in accord with the committee's views that the tremendous expansion in Federal

personnel is a cause of serious concern, and that agencies of the Government, including new war agencies, should redouble their efforts to reduce their employment. It should be borne in mind, however, that many of the older agencies have had duties incident to the war placed upon them, and furthermore have without question done a better job in holding down their personnel requirements than some of the newer agencies by reason of their more mature experience in dealing with problems of personnel, with consequent better controls over such matters. Also, they have lost the services of many of their most valuable employees who have entered the armed forces. This situation has undoubtedly had its effect upon efficiency of operations and resulted in a tendency to require a greater number of untrained persons or inexperienced employees to carry on essential services. This has been our experience in the Treasury, and it is reasonable to assume that other agencies have had the same experience.

As Secretary of the Treasury, I am in a position to appreciate the personnel problems of the executive agencies because I meet such problems in administering the Treasury Department and, as a member of the committee, I recognize our duty to strive for the reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures. Improvement in governmental administrative management, including personnel, will be a positive step in the direction of economy, but wartime administration, especially war on the scale in which we are now engaged, accentuates our personnel problems and consequently makes improvements more difficult to accomplish. We should nevertheless correct or eliminate obvious unsatisfactory conditions wherever possible and lay long-range plans for our postwar guidance in this field.

In the relatively short time available, and on account of my preoccupation with matters involved with our financing operations, I have not been able to fully acquaint myself with or to analyze the detailed information upon which the committee's general conclusions, page 17, and its recommendations, page 18, have been based.

I do not share the general implications in the report that the Civil Service Commission has failed to exercise properly its assigned functions and is primarily responsible for many of the unfavorable personnel conditions mentioned in the report. The Civil Service Commission has been the advocate of improved personnel procedures for several years, but was unable to accomplish such improvements for the reason that it, along with other Government agencies, was handicapped by inadequate appropriations for improving personnel administration.

In the present emergency when the energies of the greater percentage of Government personnel are being taxed to the utmost in performing essential functions relating to the war effort, it is my belief that it is not an opportune time to undertake drastic and far-reaching changes in Government personnel administration. Nevertheless, I am in sympathy with the committee's objectives and with the reservations herein outlined join in the committee's report.

I will be glad if you will include these comments with the committee report.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

LETTER OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. June 14, 1943.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: If I were to sign the committee report on Federal personnel, I would be in a position of predetermining the judgments which I am required by law to make quarterly.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the enactment of pending anti-poll-tax legislation, House bill 7; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Paola, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

POST-WAR CONSTRUCTION OF THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to present and request to have printed in the RECORD, under the rule, a joint resolution passed by the legislature of Wisconsin memorializing the Congress to take steps in the war effort to bring about the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 13

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war

Whereas the tortuous and hazardous shipment of submarines from Wisconsin to the Gulf coast recently symbolized both the stupidity of the selfish interests that have opposed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and the tremendous potentialities of the Midwest as an oceangoing seaport; and

Whereas the President has indicated that such program of power and navigation development must be abandoned during the present emergency because of the critical and urgent war needs of raw materials and manpower which necessarily must be utilized in such project; and

Whereas one of the very first projects that should be undertaken upon the termination of the war is the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in order to ease the burden of readjustment from emergency conditions of the country to a peacetime economy with a full measure of opportunity to the returning soldiers for employment; and

Whereas the complete utilization and development of all inland transportation facilities will reduce shipping costs so as to permit the entire country to cooperate and to participate in the international competition for commerce in the post-war period on more than even terms; and

Whereas the exigencies of the war have imperatively illustrated that such seaway would grant the hydroelectric power necessary to an effective and expansive defensive effort and grant savings to consumers with lower rates and better living standards through a greater use of electricity; and

Whereas this waterway project will add value to the products of industry and agriculture, create new markets and business, and thereby stimulate employment and materially aid economic recovery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States, and especially the Wisconsin Senators and Members of Congress, to promulgate and initiate the adoption of such treaties or other necessary legislation for the construction of the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project upon termination of the war; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 15th instant,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, reported it on June 17, 1943, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 319) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 320).

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. KILGORE), from the Committee on Claims:

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Robert Norheim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 321); and

S. 425. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; without amendment (Rept. No. 322).

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor I report back with amendments Senate bill 637, the Federal aid and education bill. I ask that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may have the right to file minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 637. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; with amendments (Rept. No. 323).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 636. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 324); and

S. 1109. A bill to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated

for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 325).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

MEETING OF CANADA BRANCH OF THE EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION—ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO HAVE MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE ATTEND MEETING

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitation tendered by the speaker of the Senate of Canada and joint president of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada Branch, to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, during the period June 26 to July 1, 1943, at which the Dominion of Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association will be host to a delegation from the United Kingdom Parliament and probably to delegations from the legislative bodies of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $1,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] who is detained from the Senate on account of illness I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. JOHNSON of California):

S. 1233. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), California; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1234 (by request). A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1235. A bill for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1236. A bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; and

S. 1237. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1238. A bill to authorize payment to attorneys representing Creek Nation of Indians;

S. 1239. A bill to authorize payment to attorneys representing Seminole Nation of Indians; and

S. 1240. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942, Public, No. 645, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of the Canal Dredging Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1242. A bill to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1243. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 3[illegible]. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 563. An act for the relief of Joe Koor;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of C. J. Toole;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1310. An act for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn;

H. R. 1313. An act for the relief of Delores Lewis;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 1335. An act to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H B. Nelson Construction Co.);

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter;

H. R. 1790. An act for the relief of Wymer Bowlin;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Bessie Myers; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONTINUATION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 28, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the current Tax Payment Act of 1943, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Payment Act," be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 shall be for the use of the House document room, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BARKLEY at the Flag Day celebration, Hot Springs, Ark., on June 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TRUMAN at the Victory dinner at Oklahoma City, Okla., June 14, 1943, under the auspices of the Oklahoma Democratic State Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUSHFIELD

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of subsidies delivered by Senator BUSHFIELD on June 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WINGS FOR THE FUTURE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wings for the Future," written by Senator McCARRAN and published in Shipmate for June 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY BASIL MANLY CONCERNING THE FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Basil Manly, Vice Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, concerning the functions of the Federal Power Commission in relation to the supply of electricity and gas for war plants and establishments, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII TO THE WORKERS OF ITALY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the workers of Italy on June 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROLL-BACK AND SUBSIDY PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY ALBERT S. GOSS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the roll-back and subsidy problem, made by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on June 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JUAN T. TRIPPE ON INAUGURATION OF STRATOCLIPPER SERVICE TO CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at New Orleans, La., on June 12, 1943, by Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan-American World Airways, on the occasion of the inauguration of stratoclipper service between New Orleans and the Central and South American countries which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING—LETTER FROM RALPH W. PINKERTON

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, a letter addressed to him from Ralph W. Pinkerton, of Ferndale, Wash., relative to the Government purchase of newspaper advertising, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GASOLINE PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY IGOR CASSINI

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the gasoline problem, by Igor Cassini, published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YARDSTICK OF CHRISTIANITY—LETTER FROM WALLACE C. SPEERS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him under date of June 9, 1943, by Wallace C. Speers, discussing Christianity as a yardstick in national affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TIMES TEST AND OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS—PAPER BY PAUL BOYD

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper on the subject The Times Test and Our Public Schools, by Paul B. Boyd, dean of the college of arts and sciences, University of Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,642,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, and 16.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
GERALD P. NYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 1762, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 16, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$1,552,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

"Salaries and expenses: For all expenses incident to the discontinuance of the work of the Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, traveling expenses, and the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of employees of the Board due them after June 30, 1943, $50,000: *Provided*, That the National Resources Planning Board is abolished effective August 31, 1943, and the functions exercised by such Board shall not be transferred to any other agency and shall not be performed after such date except as hereafter provided by law or as authorized in the ensuing proviso of this paragraph with respect to winding up the Board's affairs: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Board is authorized after August 31, 1943, and until January 1, 1944, to perform such duties and to exercise such administrative authority as may be incident to the effectuation of the discontinuance of the Board: *Provided further*, That the records and files of the Board shall be transferred to The National Archives.

"The appropriation herein made for the National Resources Planning Board shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendments: In line 22 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$350,000" and insert "$275,000"; and in line 27 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out all after "1943:" down to and including "studies" in line 28 and insert "*Provided*, That the foregoing total amount shall be so used as to complete the studies, investigations, and reports authorized and required by part I, title III, of the Transportation Act of 1940."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$10,000" and insert "$9,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "authorization" insert ": *Provided*, That a report of such transfers and the savings effected thereby shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Budget."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendments: In line 10 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "by July 1, 1945" and insert "at the earliest practicable date"; and in line 10 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "shall" insert ", by February 1, 1944."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I intend to move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, and 16, but before a vote is had, I wish to explain to the Senate just what is being done.

Senate amendment numbered 1 increased by $205,000 the appropriation for

the Bureau of the Budget. The House concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment restoring $102,500 of the $205,000 which the House had cut out. This is an amendment in which the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is greatly interested, and he has informed me that he is agreeable to the amendment made by the House.

I am not sure but that the amendments should be separately voted on, and I ask for a vote on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. The next amendment is one about which there has been a great deal of controversy, as Senators all know. It relates to the National Resources Planning Board. The Senate adopted an amendment continuing the Board, and appropriating $200,000 for that purpose. The House had proposed to abolish the Board entirely. Yesterday the House, on motion, agreed to an appropriation of $50,000 to wind up the affairs of the Board, and I shall move to concur in the amendment of the House.

I wish to say, in explanation, that there will be $42,500 due employees of the Board for leaves of absence, and the $50,000 will not be sufficient to pay that sum and take care of the other necessary expenses, but rather than not let the bill go through at this time, I shall move to concur in the amendment of the House, and let that be the end of the matter to that extent. Whatever appropriation may be necessary to pay the employees of the Board for earned leave may be carried in a subsequent bill. I have conferred with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia of the House, and that matter will probably be brought up later.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, which means that the appropriation to wind up the National Resources Planning Board will be only $50,000.

Personally, I believe we will spend on other methods of doing the work the Board has been doing a great deal more money than if we had allowed the Board to proceed with a reasonable appropriation, but that is only my opinion, and the Senate has disagreed with me, and for that reason I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3.

Mr. McNARY. Will this completely liquidate the activities of the Board by July 1?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it will take until September 1 to carry out the liquidation, according to statements in the House.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Board have any funds after September 1, unless it receives funds transferred to it by the President?

Mr. McKELLAR. Funds cannot be transferred to the Board; they cannot receive funds from any other source. Congress has as nearly as possible abolished the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I really regret the action of the House; but under the circumstances I suppose we had better follow the judgment of the able Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think we can do anything else at this late day but agree to the amendment the House has made to the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the other four House amendments to amendments of the Senate have to do merely with ordinary routine items. Unless an explanation of them is desired, I shall not make an explanation. I move that the remaining four House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 4, 12, 14, and 16 be agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that concludes my request at this time.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, and 30.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 22½, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "after December 31, 1943, that would entail expenditures in liquidation thereof"; and on page 34 of the bill, in line 15, strike out "June 30, 1945" and insert "December 31, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Director of Personnel, Senior Executive Officer, not to exceed $7,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8 and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate amending the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RUFUS G. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As matter of information, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House bill 2713.

The message was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 17, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the conference report on the naval appropriation bill been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has; and the House has agreed to certain Senate amendments which were in disagreement. No further action on the part of the Senate is necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry. Conference reports on two appropriation bills, the Navy Department appropriation bill and the Independent Offices appropriation bill, have just been finally agreed to and will now go to the President. How long will it be before they actually reach the White House? I am not as familiar with the procedure as I ought to be. I am very anxious to have final disposition made on the measures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The probabilities are they will reach the White House by tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation of the Senate Finance Committee, it has several times pointedly come to my attention that benefits intended by Congress for servicemen, ex-servicemen, and their dependents frequently are not received by them, mostly because of the failure of the potential beneficiaries to apply for such benefits, generally by reason of

their lack of information concerning such benefits.

Legislation pertaining to those serving actively in our Nation's armed forces, or to those who have so served, and their dependents is now so voluminous as to be confusing. Although I have spent 10 years as a member of the veterans' subcommittee, and have been intensely interested in this legislation from year to year, it is very difficult for me to find these statutes without painstaking investigation. Not all of such laws are applicable to all of such persons; in fact, most of them are applicable only to certain groups, under certain conditions.

How to bring order out of this chaos so that those in each such group might be put on notice as to the rights, privileges, and benefits to which they might become eligible, without requiring them to read too much about other benefits to which they could never be entitled, has heretofore been an unsolved problem. The key to the solution of this maze of material has, I believe, just been fashioned by my good friend, Mr. Millard W. Rice, the National Service Director for the Disabled American Veterans, now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several major veteran organizations.

Mr. Rice has compiled a 31-point outline as to all such benefits divided into 5 parts, a scanning of which will speedily inform a serviceman, a veteran, or his dependent as to what governmental benefits, if any, he or she might be entitled to under the circumstances indicated.

Those who read such outline should be cautioned that it is merely an outline, and that more detailed information concerning each such point can be secured from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Veterans' Administration, or whatever governmental agency may be concerned with the application of the particular law indicated.

It is well also to be reminded that active servicemen may request the assistance of an American Red Cross representative as to any problem or claim, whereas discharged veterans, and the dependents of veterans, have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from the service officers of the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations: The Disabled American Veterans—commonly referred to as the D. A. V.—which is composed exclusively of American citizens who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving honorably in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war; the American Legion, composed of honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—commonly referred to as the V. F. W.—composed solely of America's campaign badge war, campaign and expedition veterans.

These three major veteran organizations, and others, have been recognized by Congress, and by the Veterans' Administration, as having the right, through their accredited service officers, to look through the papers in the claim folders of veteran applicants, and to advise and assist them as to the proper preparation, presentation and prosecution of their equitable claims for various benefits potentially provided for. Most applicants would be wise to take advantage of the technical knowledge and experience of such veteran organization service officers.

Mr. Rice assures me that the outline prepared by him has been carefully checked by members of his staff and by the office of the legislative counsel of the Veterans' Administration to make sure of its accuracy. I ask unanimous consent that the outline prepared by Mr. Rice be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I. BENEFITS FOR PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

1. Base pay for enlisted personnel, beginning with privates or apprentice seamen, and up through seven grades to master sergeant or chief petty officer, is from $50 to $138 per month. Base pay for commissioned personnel begins with $150 per month for second lieutenants or ensigns. All base pay of enlisted men is increased by 20 percent and of all officers by 10 percent while on sea duty or serving outside the continental United States. Active flying duty or active submarine duty increases the base pay by 50 percent, and active parachutist duty by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Certain other pay increases are provided for special skilled or dangerous types of service. Longevity pay is provided by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of active or Reserve service, up to 30 years.

2. Allowances, in varying amount, for clothing, subsistence, and quarters made to officers and, under certain conditions, to enlisted men are not subject to income tax.

3. During World War No. 2, after June 1, 1942, any enlisted man of the four lowest grades, with a wife (including a divorced wife) or a dependent child must, upon a written application therefor by himself or by or on behalf of a dependent, be charged with an allotment from his pay of $22 per month, to which is added a Government allowance of $28 per month for a wife, plus additional allowances, in varying amounts, for other dependents, and an additional allotment of $5 per month is charged against his pay, and allowances, in varying amounts, are made for his dependent parents, grandchildren, brothers, or sisters which may be terminated at his written request. In the event of death during active service the next of kin is entitled to a gratuity equal to the monthly pay of the deceased for a period of 6 months.

4. National service life insurance, obtainable without examination during first 120 days of active service, or before August 11, 1943, whichever date is later, and thereafter if found by the Veterans' Administration to be a good insurance risk (with privilege of conversion after 1 year; mandatory conversion before end of fifth policy year), in multiples of $500, from $1,000 to $10,000, for those in active service since October 8, 1940, maturable only by death of the insured, with proviso that premiums may be waived during continuous total disability, which commenced after he was insured, and before he became 60 years of age, and which has continued for 6 consecutive months.

5. Certain protection for those in active military or naval service of the United States, and to American citizens, under certain conditions, in the active service of some country allied with it during time of war, with reference to private life insurance and property rights, and personal indebtedness, when ability to meet obligations is impaired by such service, through judicial process, under Soldiers and Sailors' Relief Act. (All matters affecting real or personal property rights should be referred promptly to competent local attorneys for assistance and advice.)

6. Naturalization as an American citizen by the easy petition method as to any alien while serving in the armed forces, as well as for certain war veterans.

II. MONETARY BENEFITS TO VETERANS

1. Compensation or pension for disabilities proven to have been incurred in, or aggravated by reason of, active service in the armed forces of the United States, ranging from $6 to $285 per month, depending on the nature, degree, and permanency of disability, and the time of its incurrence, including statutory awards ranging from $18.75 to $285 per month for certain disabilities, but, if single and without dependents, not more than $15 per month while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency.

2. Retirement benefits, at three-fourths of base pay, for certain Regular officers with permanent handicapping disabilities, or after a certain period for certain types of service, or/and the attainment of certain ages; and for certain emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers with permanent disabilities of requisite degree, clearly shown to have been acquired in active service, in fact, in line of duty.

3. Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for—

(1) Civil War veterans, in the amount of $75 per month or $100 if in need of a regular attendant, and for Indian war veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $55 per month, or $72, if in need of an attendant, but only $50 while in a United States, National, or State soldiers' home, and only $15 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration if the veteran has no dependents.

(2) Veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $60 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but not more than $50 monthly while maintained in a United States, National or State, soldiers' home.

4. Pension of $40 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or, if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. (Only $6 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a governmental agency.)

5. Enlisted men of the Regular Army, or of the Philippine Scouts, who have served 20 years or more and who have become permanently incapacitated for active service, due to physical disability incurred in line of duty, may be retired at 75 percent of the average monthly pay received for 6 months prior to retirement. This retired pay may be waived for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation.

6. Enlisted men of the Regular Navy, whose service began after July 1, 1925, may, after 20 years service, be transferred to the Fleet Reserve at one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, and, after completion of 30 years of service, are transferred to the retired list with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions thereto. If their service commenced on or prior to July 1, 1925, they could

be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon completion of at least 16 years service, with one-third of base pay, and after 20 years of service or more, one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, plus all permanent additions. This pay is increased by 10 percent for all men credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty, or whose average marks in conduct for 20 or more years, shall be not less than 95 percent of the maximum. After 30 years of service they are transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions.

7. Enlisted men of the Army or Navy are, after 30 years of service, entitled to retirement with monthly pay at 75 percent of their last base pay.

8. Statutory award of $10 per month is payable to all medal of honor men, age 65 or more.

9. All monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration are exempt from taxation, or from attachment by claims of private creditors, or as to claims of any other Government agency, except as to overpayments by the Veterans' Administration.

10. Adjusted service credit up to $50, payable in cash, or, if more, an adjusted service certificate based upon adjusted service credit, for active World War No. 1 service in excess of 60 days, computed at the rate of $1 per day for domestic service and $1.25 per day for overseas service, with maximum limitations, exchangeable for United States bonds bearing interest at 3 percent, redeemable at any time.

11. Government life insurance policies, as to death or permanent total disability, in multiples of $500 up to $10,000 for insurable veterans of (1) World War No. 1 or (2) of peacetime-service men who applied therefor prior to October 8, 1940, with lien loans permissible up to 94 percent of reserve value, at interest of 5 percent per annum.

12. Incompetent and minor beneficiaries generally receive their monetary benefits, if any, through guardians, whose accountings are periodically inspected by regional attorneys of the Veterans' Administration.

III. MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospital treatment, or out-patient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, may be furnished certain persons medically determined to be in need thereof, for service-connected disabilities. Out-patient treatment may also be authorized for any non-service-connected condition which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment.

2. Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities may be furnished, when needed, for any war veteran not dishonorably discharged, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension.

3. Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

4. Clothing may be furnished at Government expense to beneficiaries receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, when necessary for protection of health or for sanitary reasons and when such beneficiaries are without means and receiving less than $10 per month for their own personal use. Toilet articles, barber service, tobacco, etc., are furnished beneficiaries receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, whose total income is less than $6 per month.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

1. Vocational rehabilitation, including placement in suitable gainful employment, furnished by the Veterans' Administration for those honorably discharged service-connected disabled veterans of World War No. 2 who are feasible therefor, and in need thereof, to overcome a service-incurred handicap.

2. Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and Regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

3. Credit for all active military or naval service for Federal civil-service retirement purposes, with minor exceptions.

4. Credit for all active war service for railroad-retirement purposes.

5. Burial allowance, up to the amount of $100, may be paid as to any war veteran, honorably discharged or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged as to any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and, under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

6. Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, recently published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans Laws."

V. MONETARY BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS

1. Death compensation or pension, under varying conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children), and dependent parents, of those deceased veterans who die as the result of service-connected disabilities.

2. Death compensation, in smaller amounts, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children) of those deceased World War No. 1 veterans, who, at time of death, had some service-connected disability of measurable degree, even though less than 1 percent.

3. Death pensions, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children) of deceased Civil War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and Indian War veterans.

NOTE.—The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is an auxiliary component of the Army, and as such is not generally covered by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps and Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, on the basis of active duty, are eligible to veterans' benefits, except pension, the latter being excluded by the acts creating these components, and employees' compensation is granted in lieu thereof. The WAAC's are also eligible for employees' compensation.

As to rights to hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the term "active military or naval service" includes active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2719, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection, but I have stated over and over again that when unanimous consent is given to the reporting of measures during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, if any Senator wishes consideration of the bill to go over he may have the privilege of asking that it go over. Personally, I have no objection to the present consideration of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there are Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time. For that reason, until they shall have concluded, I shall not at the moment press further consideration of the bill. When Senators shall have concluded their addresses I shall be very glad to explain the bill to the Senate.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the morning press reports that tremendous pressure is being exerted on the President in an effort to induce him to veto the antistrike bill which passed the Senate on the 5th of May, and subsequently passed the House and went through conference, after which action was concluded by both Houses, and the measure is now on the President's desk. The press reports that Mr. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Philip Murray, of the C. I. O.; and Mr. David B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and

Enginemen, have filed with the President a vigorous protest against the approval of the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say in this forum that the American people are expecting and hoping that the President will approve the bill. The Senate and the House of Representatives are not spokesmen for any minority; they are not spokesmen for any selfish or interested group, but they are spokesmen for all the people of the United States.

The Senate passed the bill by a vote of 55 to 22, a majority of 2½ to 1. The bill passed the House of Representatives by a very large majority. Polls, including the Gallup poll, and other evidence of public sentiment throughout the United States reveal that 80 percent of the American people desire that the bill be approved.

Mr. President, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray say that the bill is—

> The worst antilabor bill passed by Congress in the last hundred years.

It is not an antilabor bill. So far as I am aware, no antilabor bill has ever been passed by this Congress or any other Congress. We have been passing bills for labor at every session, every year, and most of the Senators who voted for the antistrike bill as it passed the Senate have voted time after time for legislation in behalf of labor unions. There is no spirit of enmity toward the great body of labor that wants to help us in our efforts to win the war. There is no opposition to the men who made no-strike agreements and are observing them, and intend to observe them in the future. But there is an intention to deal with the outlaw—the man who broke his word—the outlaw who in time of stress of world war would utilize violence and force in order to extort from his government advantages which he ought not to enjoy.

So, Mr. President, I hope the President of the United States will not be beguiled by this insistent, this arrogant, this impudent pressure upon him. These gentlemen say that the bill is not constitutional. It is constitutional, and if any portion of it is not constitutional, and the courts shall so declare, the bill provides that the failure of any clause of the bill on the ground of unconstitutionality shall not vitiate or affect the other clauses of the bill; so they will be able to stand on their own legs. The reason these gentlemen probably do not want the bill is because they think it is constitutional.

Mr. President, I have no abuse or vilification for labor. I sympathize with the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow and the toil of his hands. I know what it is to work, to engage in manual labor and toil. Through a long career of public life, my record is the record of other Senators here revealed. We have been voting for the progressive and helpful measure in behalf of labor and its unionization, and for cooperation in advancing better working conditions and living conditions and advantages in the compensation of labor. But the members of labor are not above other citizens. Because a man happens to be a member of a union he does not become elevated above other citizens. All of us have obligations. We are regulated. Each one of us is regulated as to food, as to clothing, as to fuel, and as to motive power; we are regulated in hundreds of ways. Labor is not superior to the remainder of our citizens, and it has no right to claim more than the rights and privileges to which every other citizen of this Republic is entitled.

So, Mr. President, I hope the President of the United States will listen to the people of the United States; I hope he will listen to the verdict which was written on the floor of the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and in the conference committee between the two Houses; and I trust that without undue delay, he will approve the bill and will make it the law of the land, as sanctioned by the law-making bodies, the representatives of the people of the United States, without regard to faction or class or group, but in behalf of the national welfare of all the people in prosecuting this war for survival, this war to establish the principles upon which we have always rested our democracy and our Government, and in connection with the maintenance of which we call upon every citizen of the Republic, not alone to perform positively his duty, but to refrain from sabotaging the war effort by hindering or impeding that effort through strikes, slow-downs, or any other method which would hamper or delay the efforts of all the people of the United States.

SENATOR TYDINGS AND PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at the present time the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs has been holding hearings on a bill introduced by our very able colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is chairman of that committee, regarding the independence of Puerto Rico. I hold in my hand a radio address which was delivered in Spanish by the Honorable Felix Benitez Rexach, a native of San Juan, P. R. I had his very excellent speech translated into English. In it a very high tribute is paid to our colleague, the Senator from Maryland. The speech is one of the finest orations I have read in many a day. The author of the speech is a gentleman of very high character, and has in interest not only the welfare and future of the entire United States, but particularly, and naturally, of Puerto Rico. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD as a part of my comments at this time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow Puerto Ricans, you are listening to Félix Benitez Rexach. I have just half an hour to talk to you. I am going to explain as clearly and as accurately as possible what recently happened in Washington regarding Senator TYDINGS' independence bill for Puerto Rico at the hearings of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Senator TYDINGS belongs to the Democratic Party. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, he is a nationally prominent figure. Senator TYDINGS was the author of the bill granting independence to the Philippine Islands, which, as you know, came under the United States flag as a result of the Spanish-American War.

I shall also talk to you about the independence of Puerto Rico as the only solution to our problem.

I want as many of you to hear me as possible. I am going to ask such fellow countrymen as are listening to me to go to the telephone, call up their friends, and tell them to tune in on station WIAC.

You have 2 minutes to make your calls. I shall speak again in 2 minutes.

(Music: Lamento Borincano.)

Very well, ladies and gentlemen. Puerto Rico is at this moment going through the most important and significant period in her history. After more than 400 years under Spanish control and 45 years under American rule, her right to become a sovereign and independent republic has for the first time been brought clearly and forcefully to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

And this historic moment becomes still more significant when, also for the first time, the Congress of the United States, through Senator TYDINGS, chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, says, in effect, to Puerto Rico:

"We want to make you a sovereign and independent republic like the other 21 republics of the Americas. We desire to give you your sovereignty in accordance with the democratic principles of the United States of America. We wish to see the Puerto Ricans have their own government; we wish to see them accept as freemen the responsibility of governing their own country. We want the Puerto Ricans to set up their own economic structure in harmony with their own needs. We want the Puerto Ricans to retain their language, their culture, and their customs. We wish to help them solve their economic problems. We do not by any means desire to set Puerto Rico adrift, hence the 21-year period of transition provided by the independence bill for the gradual adjustment of the economic machinery of the new republic. And as to citizenship, we grant the right to retain American citizenship to all Puerto Ricans who desire to do so."

Still more clearly, with the utmost frankness, without mincing words, Senator TYDINGS in effect told those who oppose Puerto Rican independence:

"You will either accept independence or remain as you are—a colony, a mere possession. This is the attitude of the United States Congress."

It is easy to see the basis of this determination of the Washington Government. A brief historical analysis is enough to reveal the motives for this attitude of the United States Congress.

As you know, Puerto Rico is a country of Spanish origin—the earliest stronghold of religion and culture in the New World. Men of our race left Puerto Rico to discover portions of North America that are now parts of the United States. We have given to the world great men in the fields of science, literature, and war. We have the right and the duty to be proud of our ancestry and our history.

Our forefathers waged bitter battles during the Spanish régime to obtain the independence of the island. No matter how selfish we may be, no matter how short-sighted we may insist upon being, no matter how negative our attitudes may appear—there will always be in the heart of every Puerto Rican a spark of respect and admiration for that group of patriots who struggled, lived, and died with the ideal of Puerto Rican independence in their hearts.

Finally, a change of government in Spain gave us the Autonomy Charter and complete self-government. In all fairness I should make it clear—and here history is speaking—

that we had in those days, as we have today, a mercenary group of Puerto Ricans who consistently opposed every reform that implied greater liberty for Puerto Rico. This was the same group that everywhere in the world wants to be on the right side of the government—our "Inconditionals," the "Afrancesados" of Spain, the "Tories" of the Thirteen American Colonies. Of this type of people, ladies and gentlemen, all that remains is a sad and shameful memory. But we remember our glorious patriots with pride. We venerate their memory and the cause for which they stood. We honor them with monuments in town and country, and as time goes on, their patriotic struggle takes on greater significance.

Cuba and the other republics revere with almost religious fervor the heroes of their epic fights for freedom. In Washington, the City of Monuments, the immortal figures of America's great men, done in granite and bronze, stand in parks and public squares; and even the theaters present plays that carry directly to the American public and to foreign vistors the heroic stature of the patriots who fought and bled to found the freest and most sovereign Nation in the world—the United States of America.

War broke out with Spain. Under the command of General Miles, American troops landed at Guánica and planted on Puerto Rican soil the Stars and Stripes—the symbol of justice and liberty throughout the world. General Miles, in the name of the United States Government, made to the people of Puerto Rico the promise with which you are all familiar.[1]

The people of Puerto Rico en masse welcomed the American Army with greatest joy. This attitude of our people was more than justified—first, because we were getting rid of a number of Spaniards against whom we had certain grievances due to mistakes of the past; and, second, because General Miles' pledge, which was and is clear and definitive, was made under the folds of the United States flag, which, as I said before, is the symbol of justice and liberty throughout the world. The United States won the love and affection of our people in that historic moment; but since then, as a result of violations of that promise and of the sacred principles of justice and liberty, she has gradually lost what was so easy for her to win.

A military government was instituted in place of the autonomy that we had acquired by our struggles and sacrifices in the time of Spain. Then came the Foraker Act. Later on we received our present organic act and with it a special form of American citizenship and the status of a possession.

The expansionist policy which in the past[2] intervened in and invaded the affairs of other American republics, also made us the easy prey of its commercial aims. United States marines landed in sister republics, governments were changed, and so-called financial experts were sent to "set in order" and "regulate" the finances and economy of these independent nations.

To be sure, in these countries, as in Puerto Rico, there was no lack of native cooperation.[3]

Under the shadow of the old[4] governmental power these collaborators lived a life of ease, while absentee corporations grew wealthy at the expense of the misery of exploited people.[5]

In our country the president of a foreign corporation or the lawyer of an American shipping company received greater attention and had more power in the Governor's palace[6] than the president of our own senate.

"One hundred percent Americanism" became the watchword of job seekers. No matter how great his merits might be, nobody whatever could find employment unless he subscribed to this sort of Americanism invented by the favored group of exploiters.

It became a crime to talk about Puerto Rican independence. Any voice raised in protest was a voice crying in the wilderness.

It may be said in passing that much of the blame for this unhappy past falls on our own political leaders, who, with few exceptions, submitted without protest to a regime that exploited us, starved our people, ruined our industries, destroyed our middle class, and reduced us to actual slavery under a colonial regime of the worst type.

For Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hoover the United States had fulfilled to Puerto Rico General Miles' sacred promise, and this likewise was the theory broadcast from the housetops with certain pride by many of our own politicians.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a bird's-eye view of the situation that was found in Puerto Rico by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the greatest and most humane man of our times.

But since nothing endures forever, and since truth is finally victorious, the Washington Government of today began to realize that the glorious history of the United States had become somewhat beclouded[7] by the official actions of unscrupulous men in her own Government.

The great statesmen of the North looked toward the Americas—toward all the Americas from Tierra del Fuego to Alaska. He was horrified at what his predecessors had done. In order to wipe out once and for all the blot on the history of his country, President Roosevelt conceived and is successfully carrying out his immortal good neighbor policy, which is as firm, as humane, and as sacred as the very Bill of Rights of the American people.

The present war broke out, and the United States, in defense of democracy and in defense of the weaker countries threw her resources into the combat with the firm determination to restore the liberty and independence of those countries that had been conquered by brute force.

Out of this situation arose the Atlantic Charter, which gives explicit recognition to the right of self-determination for all countries.

The combination of past experiences with the good neighbor policy and the Atlantic Charter gave new spirit to our leaders, and, in February 1943, the Legislature of Puerto Rico, midst patriotic rejoicing, passed, by unanimous vote of all the legislators of all the parties, Joint Resolution No. 1 petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States for recognition of the right of Puerto Rico to terminate her present colonial regime and establish herself as a sovereign country in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

The bill of Senator TYDINGS granting to Puerto Rico the right to independence is, without doubt, a definite answer from the Congress of the United States to the unanimous resolution of our legislature asking for termination of the colonial regime. The bill of Senator TYDINGS represents the very essence of the good neighbor policy. The bill of Senator TYDINGS is complete fulfillment, on the part of the United States, of the Atlantic Charter. The bill of Senator TYDINGS is, ladies and gentlemen, irrefutable proof to Latin America of the fact that the United States has no desire to annex countries in this hemisphere, and this bill carries out the purpose of rectifying once and for all the errors of the past.

We must open our eyes to reality. We must understand this problem from the national point of view. The United States has to solve our problem, because it is an American problem, and the problems of the Americas have always been solved by independence. The problem of Santo Domingo was solved by the independence of Santo Domingo. The problem of Haiti was solved by the independence of Haiti. The problem of Panama was solved by the independence of Panama. The problem of Nicaragua was solved by the independence of Nicaragua.

The problem of Cuba was solved by the independence of Cuba. The problem of the Philippines was solved by the independence of the Philippines. And, likewise, the problem of Puerto Rico must be solved by the independence of Puerto Rico.

There is no use in thinking for a moment of the annexation of Puerto Rico to the United States either as a Territory or as a State. This idea was clearly expressed in the hearings by the chairman of the committee, Senator TYDINGS. In the realm of international politics such a solution would nullify the good-neighbor policy and would violate the first article of the Atlantic Charter.

For reasons of culture and language, our annexation to the United States would be impossible, aside from the fact that it would create an internal conflict of alarming proportions for the United States herself.

In the economic field, annexation would mean the utter ruin of Puerto Rico. The Federal income-tax laws would automatically be applied to Puerto Rico, and the taxes would go to the United States Treasury rather than to the Treasury of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, and this is an important point, our own income-tax laws would remain in force. The customshouse duties would go to the Federal Treasury and not to the Treasury of Puerto Rico. The same thing would happen in regard to Federal internal-revenue taxes on goods produced or processed in Puerto Rico and exported to the United States. The Federal minimum-wage law and other uniform Federal laws would also be enforced in full in Puerto Rico.

The coastwise-shipping laws would remain in force, thus perpetuating the American shipping monopoly that is ruining us by raising our cost of living, and by preventing us from developing industries and from exporting our goods.

As a Territory or State of the Union, Puerto Rico would not be able to maintain a single industry. We should continue to be unable to afford to our industries tariff protection, the only means of keeping them alive.

We should continue to be tied to the economic structure of the United States, a country of large-scale production which can ruin

---

[1] Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles said: "The people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity * * * come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose * * * (to) bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in justice and humanity to all those living within its fold * * * not to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government * * * to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization."

[2] Original manuscript, before revision by radio censor: "of the United States which."

[3] Original manuscript, before revision by radio censor: "there was no lack of Arnolds and Quislings."

[4] Inserted by radio censor.

[5] Original manuscript, before revision by radio censor: "exploited the people and reduced them to the utmost misery."

[6] Deleted by radio censor.

[7] Original manuscript before revision by radio censor: "besmirched."

any of our industries by dumping and suppressing competition.

We should continue to be obliged to import everything that we consume; and our money, instead of remaining at home, would go to enrich foreigners, carrying with it both prosperity and opportunities for work to people outside our country. Our honest, industrious, and skillful workers would continue to be victims of unemployment. The few industries that we possess and that exist merely because of the present war emergency would inevitably disappear as soon as shipping and business were again established on a normal basis in the North.

Our cement factory and other industries that the Government is sponsoring at present because of the world situation, would be unable to survive the crushing competition of the large and powerful factories of the North. This, in broad outline, is the picture that I present for the consideration of sensible and thoughtful Puerto Ricans.

I have maintained all my life, and I reaffirmed in Washington, the criterion that such independence as is provided in the bill of Senator TYDINGS is the only solution to our problem, both from the point of view of the United States and from that of Puerto Rico.

I maintained that under the Republic, during the 21-year period of transition provided by the Tydings bill, we should gradually restrict our sugar in order to avoid the evils of a single-crop economy, and to free lands for the production of food crops that we now import. By producing our own food, we should avoid the emigration of millions of dollars from the country, and this money would remain in circulation here for the benefit of our people.

We should lower the cost of living and therefore the cost of production. Under independence our working people would be better fed; they would be healthy and strong, since they would not lack good, wholesome food.

Our excess population which is now a liability and which is sustained by Federal almsgiving, would become an asset of great value in the development of our industries. And our industries would exist without the fear of being wiped out, because under independence we should be able to protect them from destructive outside competition.

Under independence we should transport our products in our ships, with our own seamen and to our own profit, and in the same manner we should import what we bought elsewhere.

Under independence we could do business throughout the world without let or hindrance. Our fruits, our vegetables, and other crops, now ruined by the high freight rates of the shipping monopoly, would rise again to a state of prosperity.

By means of reciprocal commercial treaties with the European countries we could recover for our coffee—the best in the world—its lost market. And we could do the same for our tobacco, our cotton, and other products.

Under independence we should convert the tourist industry into a great source of revenue. We should be free from the coastwise shipping laws and other hindrances that have never permitted the development of this business in Puerto Rico in spite of the large investments and enormous efforts of our Government.

Under independence we should be able to make in San Juan Harbor a free zone in accordance with our needs and with our desire to become a center of distribution and to have available raw products from all over the world. I should like to pursue this idea further, but my time is limited.

The inevitable conclusion is that this whole governmental program involves a well-balanced economy together with a system of taxation that would not be burdensome.

I affirm once more—and I address myself particularly to bankers, capitalists, farmers, merchants, and manufacturers; to the conservatives, to the timid and pessimistic Puerto Ricans—I affirm that the right of a people to be free is not to be discussed in terms of dollars and cents, nor in the light of falsified statistics. Liberty is priceless. It is supreme and axiomatic. But in our particular case we must add that independence is not only a sacred ideal but is also our economic salvation.

Under independence, I most emphatically affirm—and I am willing to prove it to the incredulous, to those who doubt even the existence of a God—that the economic structure of the Republic of Puerto Rico will be so solid, so firm, and so beneficial to all, that it will allow us to have a budget of $30,000,000 without any income tax, and that the property tax will be insignificant rather than ruinous, as it is today.

It is useless to waste energy in combating the independence bill of Senator TYDINGS. It is unfitting that any good Puerto Rican should, at this moment, waste his time in advocating reforms that are not in the mind of the United States Congress nor within the policy of Washington.

In February 1943, all our legislators united as brothers, and, setting aside the pettiness of party politics, joined together in our capitol to pass unanimously the patriotic resolution asking for immediate termination of colonialism in Puerto Rico. I wish to remind my friends who favor statehood, I wish to remind our legislators, I wish to remind the leaders of all our political parties that the day has come to repeat that patriotic gesture so that all of us, on a firm, realistic basis, may determine the future of Puerto Rico without further tragic vacillations.

Read the record of the public hearings held in Washington a few days ago to discuss Senator TYDINGS' bill. A Spanish translation of this record is being published in El Imparcial. This document of the United States Congress will reveal to you the feeling of the higher circles of the Washington Government. This feeling is that without loss of time the independence of Puerto Rico should be recognized on a basis of peace, friendship, and sound economic and political relations with the people and Government of the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us ask Almighty God to illuminate the minds of our political leaders, and of our people. I thank you.

A FRUITFUL APPROACH TO A PROLONGED PEACE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has become plain as day and it is common sense to recognize that our British and Russian allies are not only dedicated to the broad purpose of crushing Naziism and Fascism, but that they have a number of very definite and very practical national aims which have been frankly revealed to the world. These great nations are not only committed to defeat of the common enemy and to cooperation for peace thereafter; one of them—Britain—frankly intends to maintain the Empire, and the other one—Russia—has clear intentions regarding eastern Europe.

We in the United States, on the other hand, are committed to speedy victory and to effective measures to preserve peace thereafter. But in the field of definite and practical aims there seems to be a vacuum. Why this vacuum exists, I cannot say; but I suggest that it is not because there is any lack of matters lying outside our borders in which we have a vital interest. I further submit that the clear statement of these aims is not only in our own interest, but is also a frank act to which our Allies and our own people are entitled, and is an essential step—nay, the most fruitful approach—toward discharging the overshadowing obligation of effective postwar collaboration.

What are some of these matters outside our borders in which we must have a definite interest?

It will, for example, come as a surprise to many Americans to be told that we are actually facing the prospect of an America materially depleted of some of its magnificent natural resources. The great demands of our own fighting forces and those of our allies have cut deeply into our reserves of vital, basic materials. We are not in the habit of regarding the United States as a "have not" nation—and now is the time to think of steps to avert such a catastrophe. These thoughts are also expressed in an article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Sunday, January 10, 1943, and written by Richard I. Stokes, its Washington correspondent, from which I desire to quote certain excerpts:

Another legend exploded since Pearl Harbor was the idea that the United States had inexhaustible natural resources. The country has been at war for only 13 months, but the fury with which its material wealth is being ransacked has already perturbed the Government's scientific agencies.

Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, predicted recently that manufacture of armament goods in the current twelvemonth will surpass that of 1942 by two-thirds. He defined 1942 as the year of the battle of facilities, which was won, and promised that 1943 would bring victory likewise in the battle of materials.

If so, the triumph may be a Pyrrhic one, because of the headlong greed with which Mars is rifling the Nation's material stocks, even of clay and sand.

On the presumption that World War No. 2 will continue several years and that depletion of this country's natural reserves will accelerate rather than decline, the following question, of portentous significance for the destiny of the American people, is now being raised:

Is the United States headed toward an economy of scarcity, which will replace its historic economy of abundance?

And, if the answer to the first question is yes, there are these further considerations: Must regimentation of materials become national policy in time of peace as well as war? Will there be a leveling down of American wage and living standards, with a proportionate leveling up of such standards in countries from which essential supplies are imported? Is a revolution in our trade and tariff systems bound to follow? Will the United States, out of its own resources, ever again be able to fight a big-time war?

On the verge of exhaustion or serious impoverishment, according to scientists in the Department of the Interior, are the domestic stores of materials having such ultra-vital combatant importance as lead, zinc, mercury, and iron, for which there are no substitutes; and copper, bauxite, and petroleum as well. Alternatives for the last three are known, but they are either at a primitive stage of development, exorbitant in cost or relatively inefficient.

In the Reader's Digest for April appears a condensation of an article from

the United States News entitled "Will War Make Us a 'Have-Not' Nation?"

We are digging deep into our natural resources to make bombs and bullets that will be shot away; to make tanks, planes and ships some of which will never return. As a result, the United States may become a "have not" Nation in many materials basic to our economy.

The vast expenditure of irreplaceable riches is leading thoughtful people in and out of the Government to ask if the United States will be left with enough basic resources to fight another big-time war. They ask if present material shortages aren't just the forerunners of permanent shortages in the future. They ask whether this country should not eventually develop resources in other areas of the world and conserve its own.

War costs astronomical amounts of all materials. Copper is a good example. A 37-millimeter antiaircraft gun shoots away a ton every 20 minutes of action. The Army Signal Corps uses 5,000 tons a month in communications equipment. Once plentiful deposits of high-grade copper ore are now reduced to a single big deposit near Butte, Mont.

The same applies to oil. Until recently, 60 percent of the supplies going to the African front were petroleum products. Government officials warn that our oil supply is not inexhaustible. In 1942, output of oil was greater than reserves discovered. This is a reversal of a trend that lasted until 1938, and comes just when oil reserves are subjected to the greatest strain in history. While new fields have been found, they average less than half the size they did before. There seems to be little question that the United States eventually will be dependent on foreign sources.

We are running out of high-grade ores in certain metals. Supplies of bauxite, best source of aluminum, may be used up within 3 years. The great Mesabi Range of iron ore in Minnesota, which supplies 80 to 85 percent of our needs, may be exhausted by 1950. Lead deposits in the tri-State area centering at Joplin, Mo., are nearing their end. Mercury deposits are expected to be exhausted for good before this war is finished. The possibility of opening new zinc mines is small. Depletion of these ores is the price paid for all-time record production of metals and minerals.

I, therefore, undertook an investigation of my own. I addressed an inquiry to Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, in which I asked him to give me the facts bearing on the exhaustion of our supply of vital minerals. Under date of March 2, 1943, Dr. Sayers wrote me as follows:

MARCH 2, 1943.

Hon. H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In your letter of February 17 you made inquiry concerning the status of domestic resources of ores of some of the common metals and of petroleum, and to what extent depletion has been accelerated by war production.

The volume of our mineral resources cannot be evaluated with precision because of the multitude of factors that affect the definition of ore, price being usually the major consideration. Under wartime conditions even that factor may be of subordinate importance, need being the governing criterion. However, a reflection of the relative reserve positions of the minerals you named is provided by the classification given in the list of material substitutions and supply issued by the Conservation Division of the War Production Board, February 1, 1943.

Iron ore and petroleum as such are not listed but numerous iron and petroleum products are in the extremely short-supply category and are completely subject to allocation. That is, currently and for the near future raw material resources are ample to meet anticipated demands although the rapid depletion of direct shipping open-cut iron ores and restrictions of wildcat oil drilling are causing some concern. The immediate problems connected therewith are primarily those of conversion and distribution. Our internal ability to meet the requirements now does not however imply that the current high rates of production can long be maintained unless discovery be kept in pace with extraction.

Lead is now among the noncritical materials and is available in sufficient volume to serve as a substitute for scarcer materials. In the early part of last year shortages were feared. Thus it may be a border-line case as far as domestic supply is concerned. Mercury remains in the critical class, with supply approximately in balance with war and essential civilian needs. Although domestic production rose approximately one-third from 1940 to a half-century peak in 1942, it is doubtful if that rate, which was just about sufficient to meet domestic needs, can be maintained for more than a year. The relatively satisfactory and fair current positions of these metals are in large measure owing to substantial volumes of imports from Canada and Mexico during the past year.

The situation with respect to the other minerals is in varying degree precarious. Aluminum, copper, and zinc are, respectively, second, third, and sixth in the most critical metals group, viz., those essential for war, but in insufficient supply for war and essential civilian demands and in many cases, including those named, insufficient for war purposes alone. We are highly dependent on overseas resources for major portions of our total supply, and since ocean transport has become increasingly difficult while demand pyramided domestic production capacity has been strained and appears about to reach its peak or a point of rapidly diminishing returns. Ore reserves in a major zinc-producing area are close to exhaustion, and reserves of bauxite that can be treated in existing plants will last but a few years at the contemplated rate of extraction; a condition so serious that this Bureau has recently proposed a greatly expanded exploration and research program. Although our copper store has a potentially longer life, its concentration in a few large ore deposits precludes further expansion of output except at the expense of production of war end products.

The exploratory programs of the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey and the Bureau's research work with those that could be carried out by industry have indeed added much to our known natural resources, but although these results are impressive they still have failed to keep step with extraction, and it is to be noted that for virtually all the minerals most of the deposits explored have been smaller in size and lower in tenor than those being exploited. Except for petroleum and iron ore there have been also marked declines in grade of ore mined, another definite marker of impoverishment. Thus our ore reserves are being depleted at a rate even greater than accelerated production might indicate because in more normal times much of what remains may be submarginal.

In the attached pages are given more detailed statements concerning each of the minerals you named. Since virtually all the data have been furnished in confidential reports to the Bureau, you will understand, I am sure, that their use is restricted.

Sincerely yours,

R. R. SAYERS.

I then became interested in discovering the minerals which the United States needed but which it did not possess within its own borders. I requested the Bureau of Mines to make a compilation listing these minerals together with principal world sources. The list includes antimony, arsenic, asbestos, bauxite, beryllium ore, chromite, graphite, industrial diamonds, lead, manganese ore, mercury, mica, natural nitrates, nickel, platinum, quartz crystals, tin, titanium ore, tungsten, vanadium, and zinc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Deficient minerals of the United States and principal world sources of supply

Mineral	Percent	Percent of world production
Antimony:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	94	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Bolivia		27
China		24
Mexico		23
Yugoslavia		9
Arsenic, white:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	94	
Principal world sources 1939:		
United States		35
Sweden		15
Mexico		12
France		11
Japan		7
Belgium		6
Asbestos (long fiber):		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	99	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
Canada		45
Rhodesia		35
Union of South Africa		15
Soviet Russia		5
Bauxite:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	55	
Principal world sources 1939:		
France		19
Surinam		12
Hungary		11
Italy		11
British Guiana		11
United States		9
Yugoslavia		7
Soviet Russia		6
Netherlands East Indies		5
Greece		4
Beryllium ore:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	83	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Argentina		35
Brazil		32
Canada		19
Chromite:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	99	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Soviet Russia		17
Turkey		16
Union of South Africa		14
South Rhodesia		12
Philippine Islands		11
Cuba		6
Greece		5
Yugoslavia		5
India		4
New Caledonia		4
Japan		3
Graphite (crucible grade):		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	100	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Madagascar		60
Ceylon		20
Germany		15
Soviet Russia		5

Deficient minerals of the United States and principal world sources of supply—Con.

Mineral	Percent	Percent of world production
Industrial diamonds:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	100	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Belgian Congo		77
Gold Coast		6
Angola		6
Sierra Leone		4
Union of South Africa		4
Brazil		2
Lead:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	3	
Principal world sources 1939:		
United States		25
Australia		16
Mexico		13
Germany and Austria		10
Canada		10
Manganese ore:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	97	
Principal world sources 1939:		
Soviet Russia		49
British India		17
Union of South Africa		8
Gold Coast		7
Brazil		5
Egypt		3
Cuba		2
French Morocco		2
Mercury:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	35	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
Italy		43
Spain		34
United States		12
Mexico		5
Soviet Russia		5
Mica (excluding scrap and ground):		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	80	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
British India		80
Brazil		2
Canada		2
Natural nitrates: [1]		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	100	
Principal world sources 1939: Chile		99
Nickel:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	99	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
Canada		85
New Caledonia		8
Platinum:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	84	
Canada		[2] 54
Soviet Russia		[2] 19
Union of South Africa		[2] 11
United States		[2] 9
Colombia		[2] 6
Quartz crystals:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	100	
Principal world source, 1939: Brazil		99
Tin:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	100	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
Malay States		29
Netherlands Indies		16
Bolivia		15
Thailand		10
China		6
Belgian Congo		6
Nigeria		5
Burma		5
Titanium ore:		
Ilmenite:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	[2] 4	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
India		74
Norway		16
United States		4
Rutile:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	29	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
United States		46
Australia		37
Brazil		10

[1] These percentages do not take into account the large synthetic nitrogen industry of the United States. After this war there will be sufficient synthetic nitrogen fixation capacity available to more than replace pre-war natural nitrate purchases. Nitrate imports would then be unnecessary except for diplomatic reasons.

[2] All platinum metals.

Deficient minerals of the United States and principal world sources of supply—Con.

Mineral	Percent	Percent of world production
Tungsten:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	60	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
China		29
Burma		23
Portugal		10
United States		10
Bolivia		8
Argentina		3
Vanadium:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	52	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
Peru		34
United States		30
Southwest Africa		17
Northern Rhodesia		13
Mexico		5
Zinc:		
United States consumption, imported pre-war	9	
Principal world sources, 1939:		
United States		28
Germany		13
Belgium		11
Canada		10
Poland		7
Australia		4
France		4
United Kingdom		3

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the tabulation shows all the foreign countries from which these articles can be obtained.

In a letter accompanying this tabulation, Dr. Sayers made the following remarks:

MARCH 15, 1943.

Hon. HENRY C. LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In response to your recent request for a list of minerals of which the United States has an inadequate supply, and information as to the principal world sources of these deficient minerals, I am pleased to submit the enclosed tabulation. The data shown are based on pre-war conditions rather than the present disturbed relationships because it is believed the former will reflect more accurately the state of affairs after the war is concluded. The 21 commodities listed include all the important minerals, substantial quantities of which were imported for domestic consumption in the immediate pre-war years.

Not included in the list are the major industrial minerals—coal, iron ore, copper, and petroleum. The United States has abundant reserves of coal. Deposits of iron ore and copper appear to be adequate to meet our peacetime requirements for several years, although a small proportion of our total iron-ore demand doubtless will continue to be imported by our seaboard blast furnaces due chiefly to lower freight rates on ocean shipping. In 1939, 4 percent of the iron ore consumed in domestic blast furnaces was foreign ore, over half of which was obtained from Chile and the remainder chiefly from Cuba and Scandinavia. The outlook for continued self-sufficiency in petroleum is less favorable. Unless current trends in prospecting and discovery are reversed, present rates of production cannot be assured for more than a few years. In recent pre-war years the United States was a net exporter of crude petroleum. In the event of a decline in domestic production it would seem logical for the United States first to reduce its export trade and then to draw on those sources that have supplied imported crudes in the past. These include Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia. Less accessible reserves exist in southwest Asia and the Netherlands Indies.

If the Bureau of Mines can be of further assistance at any time, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

R. R. SAYERS, *Director.*

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The report which the able Senator has read shows that petroleum reserves will probably last only a few years. Does the Senator know whether any specific statement has been made as to the number of years they will last? I have read in periodicals and newspapers that the probable duration of petroleum reserves in the United States, under normal usage will be from 15 to 20 years. Has the Senator any specific information concerning that subject?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that I have been in touch with the experts in Washington, and they have not given me information as to any particularly specific period, but they have given me the impression that the period is not nearly so long as 15 years.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator has any information along kindred lines I should be glad to receive it. I should like to know whether petroleum can be produced economically from coal. If it can be, we would have an almost inexhaustible supply.

Mr. LODGE. I am not in a position to comment on that suggestion. I wish I were.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand, American and British companies to a large extent own all Venezuela petroleum-producing properties. Am I correct in that regard?

Mr. LODGE. I believe so.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will further yield, as a matter of future policy, I suggest that it would be wisdom to enter into what is called a customs union with Venezuela so that we could utilize oil properties there owned by our own people and keep intact our own reserves in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to the question as to what we should do about the oil situation. I believe I have in my mind the same purpose the Senator has in his. If the Senator will permit me, as I continue my address, I think he will see what I mean.

Mr. WILEY. If I may make one further inquiry, Is the Senator acquainted with the large deposits of oil in northern Canada near Alaska?

Mr. LODGE. I have heard about them.

Mr. WILEY. We have already built a pipe line there, but I wondered if the Senator had any information as to the tremendous reservoir which exists there, and what, if any, suggestion he has to make regarding the utilization of that reservoir.

Mr. LODGE. I have been told about it, but the figures which I have been

shown I am not permitted to use in public. The knowledge as to the exact location of all the oil deposits is somewhat of a military secret; and while the authorities will allow a Member of Congress to examine the figures, they will not authorize him to use them in public.

It is undoubtedly true that we can improve our position by using low-grade ores, of which we have a large supply in the case of certain metals. We have, during our short national life, lived off the cream. We may not be able to skim off the cream much longer. We must take careful stock of our domestic resources and stand ready to develop them. Military considerations indicate that these resources should be freely available and that at the same time we should encourage importations and stock piles of scarce materials.

In the case of those metals of which we are entirely deficient, however, we have no choice but to import them.

While considering this subject of matters outside our own borders in which the welfare of the American people compels us to have a strong national interest, let us take a somewhat longer look at oil.

The importance of insuring a supply of oil adequate to maintain the domestic economy of this country is painfully apparent to every citizen today. Competent opinion is that our domestic reserves are inadequate. The world supply of oil is ample for all if efficiently developed and distributed. Present American concessions abroad are sufficient for our needs and trade, if preserved. Responsibility for this preservation could be left with the oil companies as in the past, or could be taken in some degree by the Government. History does not give us confidence that private company policy alone will adequately safeguard the national public interest, particularly with the prospect of circumstances in the future even more difficult than those which the private companies have failed to cope with in the past. How should this Government move to achieve the security of so important a factor in our national life? This responsibility is a real one, and those entrusted with it cannot dismiss it with fair promises.

The importance of oil from the standpoint of the armed forces is also vital. Responsible and forward-looking Navy officers, experienced in oil-supply problems, have been asking what assurance have we—if any—that our fleet and air force will have certain supplies for maintenance or police duty. This question extends itself to include supplies for such cargo shipping as this Government may choose to keep under its own administration following the war for implementation of its security or economic policies until a stabilized world economy makes this unnecessary. These officers bear and keenly feel a high responsibility. They know better than most the price paid for empty bunkers and do not intend to find them empty. They are waiting impatiently for our solution.

I shall not enter into the details of what the answers are to these two challenging questions. The suggestion has been made by thoughtful men that a petroleum reserve corporation should be established to provide an agency in which many related functions could be centered and through which much might be accomplished. Certain it is, however, that we must have oil, that the average citizen insists that he have oil, and that he looks to us who are public servants to see that he gets it.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. For a long time I have assembled material dealing with the probable consequences of the prodigal expenditure of our natural resources during the war. These resources are not limitless; they have very definite limitations. Wrapped up in the problem is the possibility of another great war following this war. That is the supreme tragedy of it, because with this technology of ours, 135,000,000 Americans are not going to see this vast industrial machine break down and bring about what would amount to a chaotic condition under the system which we have enthroned in this country, and which we cherish. I think that is one of the great tragedies which threaten, and I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has referred to it as he has here today, for it is a discouraging situation, and it may spell disaster for us, because it may force us into another war. If we should become a "have-not" nation a man would be a bold prophet who would assert that we would not go out and get what we need, and if some other nation has it and does not want to give it because of her technological needs we might have the ground work for a most grave issue in the future.

Mr. LODGE. I am obliged to the Senator for what he says. It is essentially a tragedy, and it is also essentially an opportunity, as I have tried to show.

In my remarks up to this point I have listed some of the mineral resources which are vital to our existence and for which we are to a greater or lesser degree dependent on the outside world.

Then, of course, there are vast vegetable resources, such as rubber, coffee, and quinine. I wish to emphasize that we are also vitally interested in the world outside our borders for other things—for services as well as goods. Think of the merchant marine which we have so suddenly built. Think of radio, telegraph, and telephone communications, a field in which we have a natural proficiency, and in which I do not think we are on an equality throughout the world. Think of aviation. After the war we shall have at least 3,000,000 young men who will be well versed in the fields of aviation, merchant marine, and communications. They will probably look to their Government to give them an opportunity to exercise these skills. These are activities which rest on international agreements if they are to exist at all. You cannot have free air transportation without international understanding. You cannot have a large merchant marine without agreements. You cannot operate either of these things without a communications system at least on an equal basis with that possessed by other countries. In these fields, therefore, other countries have things to give, things which we want to get. I hope we can get them—of course, by just, peaceful means, for under no condition can this war ever become an imperialistic one.

Then there are the broad questions of currency, international exchange, and beyond these the still broader questions of international commerce as a whole.

These are vital matters in the long view, as we well know. They will also have great immediate urgency. There is a deep conviction in men's minds today that the powers of government, now being used to win the war, can and must be used after the war to promote prosperity, while at the same time preserving and encouraging free enterprise.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I take pleasure in expressing my appreciation to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts for calling the attention of the Senate and the people of the country to the threatened shortage of critical and important materials. The people of the country are very deeply concerned about this matter, and I wish to say to the Senator that I think he is performing a real service to the people of his country.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much for his courteous and generous words.

I think we can all agree that there will be no patience with a post-war world of doles and bread lines. There must be a gradual transition from a war to a peace footing. In all this the goods and services which we must get from abroad will play a vital part—a part which cannot be postponed.

Mr. President, we pride ourselves on having the highest material living standard of any nation in the world, and we boast of it not merely in a materialistic spirit. We know that a society of free men, with free speech, free worship, free institutions, and equal opportunity cannot exist in a country which is in a state of abject poverty. If you are to have democracy you must have a certain amount of prosperity.

Therefore, both our standard of living and our spiritual freedom are based on the fact that Providence has blessed us with so many natural resources.

In this war some of us have been privileged to observe our young American fighting man. In a very true sense he represents the justification of our democratic system, for his hardihood, his quickness of thought, his self-reliance, and his courage under the most severe tests life holds are the results not only of the food and clothing which he received as a child, but of the education which he received and the spiritual climate in which he grew to manhood. All these things rise and fall together. An

America without a plentiful supply of natural resources would not be the America of democracy. It would be a bitter irony if we were to shoot away our natural resources in the name of democracy and lose democracy while we were doing it.

After the last war it was stated many times that the United States wanted nothing, and we magnanimously refused to accept any territory. If it is true that we are becoming a "have-not" Nation, it is a very open question indeed whether we should not at the end of this war seek to acquire, in a just and peaceful manner, some things which we might lack. We hear it often said—and with admiration in some quarters—that our allies know exactly what they want out of this war. Should we not be equally definite in making our wants known? Is not such frankness on all sides the best guarantor of fruitful agreement and true understanding?

What will be the result of a conference at which two parties know exactly what they need whereas the third wants everything in general and nothing in particular? As a fervent believer in the pressing need of effective international collaboration after the war, I submit that the United States owes it to the world as well as to herself to define her needs.

Mr. President, these are the questions which bring me to the last part of this speech.

In the part just ended I tried to list the goods and services which we must obtain from outside our borders if we are to maintain either our democratic life or a respectable military establishment, or our influence for peace in the family of nations.

I now submit that if these problems are solved—if we have a satisfactory set of treaties assuring us, for example, proper supplies of oil and tin and our fair share of our shipping and communications rights, that the framework of our relationship with the rest of the world would be fixed—and that it would be fixed on a sound basis, a true basis, a basis which took into account the differences between nations, a basis which saw the different needs of different peoples and sought to satisfy those needs—instead of a basis which assumed that all nations and peoples are alike when actually they are not.

Mr. President, I have very little faith in what I call the cosmic or transcendental approach to the question of American foreign relations. I cannot see why it is necessary to treat the relations between peoples of different nationalities on a highly theoretical, political, and emotional basis when the relations between peoples of the same nationality are not treated that way. True, the airplane has changed commerce and revolutionized military science; it has not, however, automatically created a universal state of brotherly love. I have some good friends, of whom I am personally fond, both in and out of the Senate who believe in the cosmic approach, and I respect their sincerity. But the more I think about it the more convinced I become that it is an approach which can only do harm to the very cause which its proponents espouse.

One method produces agreement on the part of the American people; the other method divides the American people. And have we not learned by this time that one of the first considerations in forming any foreign policy in this country is that it must be a policy on which the American people can unite?

Such a policy must be based on national interest, guided by justice. Would that we had had a clear policy of national interest to guide us in the past. I am very much afraid that we have not had such a policy for quite a little time. We have had momentary policies based on emotion, such as the Neutrality Act, the purpose of which was to keep us out of war by legislation and which circumstances then caused us to repeal. We then had a vacuum instead of a true policy based on national interest, and that was all too often—and all too naturally—filled by old hatreds and old attachments relating to countries in the Old World. I do not hesitate to say that if a policy based on national interest had been in existence in the past in the prewar period it would have been wholeheartedly supported by all Americans regardless of racial extraction. Such a policy in the future would weld Americans together—regardless of racial differences—more than any other single act of government.

In his book entitled "U. S. Foreign Policy," Walter Lippmann makes some true observations on the mentality prevailing in the administrations of two Presidents holding office before and during the First World War. He says:

> Both were idealists who habitually rejected the premises of the politics of power. Both disliked armaments. In them the idealism which prompts Americans to make large and resounding commitments was combined with the pacifism which causes Americans to shrink from the measures of force that are needed to support the commitments. Neither promoted the preparation of armaments in time of peace. Both accepted reluctantly and tardily the need to arm. Both abhorred as inherently vicious and unnecessary, and as contrary to American principles, the formation of alliances. But both favored a league of nations in which the United States assumed the obligation to enforce peace.

This eagerness to accept commitments and reluctance to arm also characterized our conduct before World War No. 2.

In a later discussion of the failure of the United States to enter the League of Nations, Mr. Lippmann says:

> The United States did not go to war because it wished to found a league of nations; it went to war in order to preserve American security. And when the war was over, the Nation would almost certainly have accepted in some form or other the scheme of the League of Nations if President Wilson had been able to demonstrate to the people that the League would perpetuate the security which the military victory had won for them. Mr. Wilson failed to make this demonstration. He failed because in leading the Nation to war he had failed to give the durable and compelling reasons for the momentous decision. The reasons he did give were legalistic and moralistic and idealistic reasons, rather than the substantial and vital reason that the security of the United States demanded that no aggressively expanding imperial power, like Germany, should be allowed to gain the mastery of the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. Lippmann here points out the dangers of what he calls a legalistic, or a moralistic, or an idealist policy, rather than a substantial and vital policy. I have used the phrases cosmic, transcendental, theoretical, and political. We both mean the same thing.

I believe we have made some progress toward a truly national policy. For instance, we are determined that never again shall we find ourselves unprepared as we were on the outbreak of this war, and that we must have a military force which is manifestly ready to function at any moment. We believe that if we had had such a force Hitler might never have started. We hold that there must be practical plans for a rapid expansion of our Army and Navy, that there will have to be limited compulsory military training, that never again must we be dependent on others for essential war materials, and that the approaches to the United States must be safeguarded.

Robert Moses has expressed this new feeling about the foreign policy of the future in these words:

> We will go along with feeding the starving and undernourished everywhere, binding up the world's wounds, canceling debts and making loans, perhaps with some kind of League and World Court which do not require the surrender of our sovereignty and which frankly separate ultimate from immediate objectives, with moderate tariff barriers not involving the lowering of our living standards, and with immigration restricted in order to prevent the rushing in of the vast hordes who will attempt to seek escape from painful readjustments abroad.
>
> Our people will favor cooperation with other nations in the many benefits to be derived from improvement of communications, but they won't give up nationalism. They will be for sufficient American armament to insure respect, and for an internal economy which will not again make us dependent on others for vital needs. They will be for spreading democratic doctrine by example rather than by forcing conformity upon those to whom democracy is still a new experience. Does any sane person seriously contend that with the signing of the peace our armed forces should be quickly reduced to skeletons and stripped of appropriations and respect? Not after this war. This time we shall be more prudent. We shall not disarm until we see how sincere the rest of the world is about the new Utopia.
>
> Uncle Sam is neither a skinflint nor a fool. The middle road in world affairs may not be melodramatic, but it has always looked good to him. He knows this at least—that in the long run he will win the widest respect by refusing to overpromise and by being scrupulously careful to keep his word.

Mr. President, I do not mean to ignore or belittle the fact that thorny military and political decisions will have to be made. They will be difficult decisions, no matter how successfully we settle our material questions about which I have been speaking. The matter of control of any international military organization and our reaction to the continuation, resurrection, and extension of imperialism are two out of many thorny questions from which we cannot escape. The question of restoring small nations with-

out also restoring the European crazy-quilt of quarreling nationalities is another. There are many more.

But the fact still remains that the approach is important. The more matters are agreed on, the easier agreement becomes even on these thorny problems. And it is so very plain that there are things which we need in the world outside our borders, things which we must have in order to maintain not only our material standard of living but our democratic way of living—things which we need to maintain our influence for peace in the family of nations. These are the things which should be the basis of prompt agreements based on national interest, because these are the things on which Americans can agree among themselves and regarding which reasonable men of differing nationalities should be able to come to terms. For 50 years the American people have been divided on questions of foreign policy. I submit that the test of a sound foreign policy is "that those who have disagreed are brought toward agreement."

Let me summarize:

First. It is a sacred duty to achieve effective international collaboration after the war to prevent the recurrence of these slaughters. Only thus can we be worthy of the sacrifice of our fighting men.

Second. The political and theoretical approach to the peace divides the people and defeats its own purpose. We cannot assume that the aeroplane has automatically created a state of universal brotherly love. The touchstone of any American foreign policy must be that it unites the American people.

Third. We must develop a policy based on national interest guided by justice which will bring people together as Americans regardless of racial differences.

Fourth. Such a policy can be based on those things which we must have from outside our borders to maintain our democracy, our Military Establishment, and our influence for peace in the family of nations.

Fifth. Some of the things which should be the objects of international agreement are:

(a) Vital natural resources which we either lack completely or of which our supply is growing scarce. For example, we will soon be dependent on the rest of the world for oil.

(b) Equality with other nations in international radio, telegraph, and telephone.

(c) An opportunity for free competition in international aviation.

(d) A real chance for our new, big merchant marine.

(e) Equitable arrangements in the field of international exchange.

(f) Naval, military, and air bases to safeguard the approaches to the United States.

Sixth. Agreement on these practical matters will make agreement easier on the great political problems. It is a fruitful approach which will unite the people.

Indeed the challenge of making a conclusive peace is too compelling to be met in any other spirit. The sacrifices made by American fighting men impose the duty of developing world relations which will work, which will be accepted, and which will meet the issues of our time. We simply cannot afford the pride of opinion which says that it must be done a certain way or not at all. That the cosmic approach is attractive to many people cannot be denied. Certain aspects of it are attractive to me. In a less important cause we might tolerate it. But in the vital, soul-stirring task of making a just and lasting peace for our children and grandchildren we cannot afford this dubious luxury. We have the stern duty of being practical, of making a peace which will work. Only thus can we be worthy of the sacrifice of our fighting men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to commend and congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on the address he has just delivered. It is timely, challenging, and thought-provoking, and relates to a subject which should be called to the attention of the country and the Senate.

In connection with the Senator's statement I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Warwick M. Downing, an authority in my State, in regard to oil shales and the possibility of deriving petroleum products from coal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is the patriotic duty of all of us to take strong measures to prevent the imminent shortage of our national petroleum supply.

President Roosevelt, in his letter to Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., chairman of the Cole committee, of November 10, 1942, said:

"The immediate discovery of additional sources of oil is imperative."

Petroleum Coordinator for War Ickes, in Collier's of August 15, 1942, said, in referring to our oil reserves:

"The truth is that our oil reserves are low and getting lower. Even if we could be complacent about them, we would have no right to be. * * * During the 3-year period of 1938–40, the United States took 4,250,000,000 barrels of oil out of the ground, and during the same period only 2,500,000,000 barrels of new underground reserves were discovered.

"In 1941 it was even worse. That year we produced 1,400,000,000 barrels and discovered a mere 500,000,000 barrels treasured underground."

According to Petroleum Administration for War release, in 1942 we discovered 421,000,000 barrels of new reserves. Our consumption was 1,385,479,000 barrels.

Thus during the last 5-year period (1938–42), we consumed 7,035,479,000 barrels, and discovered new reserves of 3,421,000,000 barrels. The 5-year deficiency is 3,614,479,000 barrels greater than our production.

Senator ED C. JOHNSON, member of the Senate Committees on the Public Lands and on Military Affairs, said more than a year ago:

"I am told by military experts that if the present war continues 5 years—and it is likely to do so—that there will be an extreme shortage of motor fuel in this country, and that it will be necessary to extract the motor fuel from coal as Hitler is now compelled to do. We cannot afford to lose any battles and a lot of lives through any preventable shortage of natural resources."

Chairman Cole, of the Cole committee, on his retirement after 8 years of service in study of the oil situation, in a letter to the President, dated October 22, 1942, said:

"We are certainly headed toward disaster, Mr. President, if we cannot make provision at this time for an increased supply of nearby petroleum.

"The time lapse between the search for petroleum and its use where needed is at least 2 years.

"If we knew that one-fourth of our iron furnaces or steel mills would be out of commission within 2 years, and it took 2 years to build others, we would certainly do something about it, and do it now.

"We do not know that 3,800,000 barrels per day will be the limit for our war needs. Our needs may reach 5,000,000 barrels a day, in which case there is no present prospect of meeting them, and all the tanks and trucks and planes grounded in this country for lack of fuel will be of no account.

"The combination of these facts makes it imperative that many, many years before we have a collapse of our oil productivity, we have a substitute to take the place of natural petroleum.

"We have two stupendous possible sources of petroleum.

"First, the oil shales which are widely disbursed over our country and exist in almost limitless quantities in the intermountain country.

"Second, coal of which we have sufficient quantity for several thousand years, and which can be made a huge source of synthetic petroleum."

The worst of it is that new discoveries are dwindling and becoming less and less each year. Of course we are helped out somewhat by extensions to existing fields.

But the truth is that our oil fields today are overproducing and are not producing enough. William B. Heroy, Petroleum Administration for War Director of Reserves, in a statement to the Interstate Oil Compact Commission on April 3 of this month, said: "There is a normal decline in production from one year to the next of about 400,000 barrels per day in productive capacity"; and also that the initial daily production of wells completed in 1942 was only 259 barrels as against 1,077 barrels in 1937. He shows that what counts is productive capacity rather than estimated reserves.

Yet we are in the midst of a life-and-death struggle—how long the war may last, how much greater will be the petroleum needs of our fighting men, no one knows.

Mr. Ickes, at our meeting on April 15, 1942, said:

"That is why it is the solemn responsibility of each of us to see that this oil is available—adequate, ever-continuing supplies of it—this year, next year, and for as many years as this war may continue."

Mr. Ickes, in his Milwaukee speech of January 21, 1943, after saying that the complete fulfillment of the requirements of the military is the main responsibility of the Petroleum Administrator for War, and the task was his, said: "In the doing of it there cannot be—there must not be—any failure."

We must not take a chance of "too little and too late." If we fail in our duty to our country at this critical hour, if any of us fail, if Mr. Ickes fails, if oil is not available, adequate, ever-continuing supplies of it—this year, next year, and for as many years as this war may continue, if our war effort is stymied, or even impeded by lack of gasoline, or if civilian morale or war work at home is delayed by a like cause, those of us responsible therefor should be, and forever will be, disgraced, in the eyes of our fellow countrymen.

We have been summoned here by the Petroleum Administrator for War to advise him, to make suggestions that would prevent the awful calamity that begins to loom in the future.

We must remember it takes months and years to discover new reserves, and longer to put them in production.

We have heretofore urged a reasonable price for crude to make possible the necessary exploratory work. Petroleum Administrator Ickes has recently recommended a price increase of 35 cents per barrel. Petroleum is selling at only 60 percent of parity, and is the only commodity selling at less than parity. The average price for 15 years prior to the abnormal conditions caused by the flood of oil from East Texas and Oklahoma, was $1.85 per barrel. Inasmuch as wages have gone up, materials have gone up in price, skilled labor is almost impossible to obtain, and inasmuch as oil is more costly to find and wells must be drilled much deeper than heretofore, it is absolutely impossible for the average independent (who must be relied upon to do the successful discovery work) to hope to engage in any exploratory work whatever, unless the price of crude be raised.

We have asked the Honorable Secretary of the Interior to reduce royalties on the public domain—to the one-eighth royalty, a royalty that is universal in the industry, and have asked him to do everything freely, fully, and without stint, necessary to give every possible encouragement to the development of our public lands.

At our last meeting, we urged the speedy adoption of regulations under the O'Mahoney bill, a splendid law if liberally interpreted by the Interior Department.

We have tried to do our duty fully in our home States.

We are not discouraged, even if our recommendations have not been followed.

Though our recommendations heretofore have accomplished little, we are not here to criticize, nor are we here to discuss the past. We much prefer to praise the great amount of good that has been accomplished. We look solely to the future. All of us should present our ideas for betterment of conditions, and as a body we should recommend measures we think would be beneficial. I am sure Mr. Ickes would not have invited us here, and would not have declared that as a body or as a national conference, we run parallel with the war council, unless he expected us to speak out fully and fearlessly, whatever we may think will be good for our country's welfare.

Therefore, I will present briefly two recommendations:

FIRST RECOMMENDATION

That the United States Geological Survey, a body of very able scientific men under the direct control of Mr. Ickes, to be given the funds to help existing oil fields on the public domain to produce more oil, and to help discover new oil fields.

The personnel of the Survey is splendid. Its job is to conserve every barrel of oil possible on the public domain and on the Indian lands, and by secondary recovery methods and otherwise to cause all wells thereon to produce the maximum without waste. Its principal job, however, during wartime, at least, is to aid the search for new oil reserves. Indeed, nothing can be more important than for the Survey to map and geologize probable oil areas. In years past it has done such work, and such work has been extremely valuable. The American Association of Petroleum Geologists has recently published a book, Possible Future Oil Provinces of the United States and Canada. This book contains an index map, showing possible petroliferous areas, which comprise about one-third of Montana, nearly one-half of Wyoming, nearly one-half of Colorado, about one-quarter of Utah, nearly one-third of New Mexico, and about one-sixth of Arizona. In the January 1939 report of the National Resources Committee (predecessor of the present National Resources Planning Board), of which at the time Mr. Ickes was chairman, at page 293 thereof, also appears a map showing possible areas for the discovery of oil and gas. This map shows as possible oil-producing areas one-half of Montana, two-thirds of Wyoming, more than one-half of Colorado, nearly one-half of Utah, and four-fifths of New Mexico. In both maps the "possible" is the most favorable classification for oil-producing purposes.

No effort in connection with winning the war is more important than that the United States Geological Survey geologize promising sections of this vast area, as well as promising sections in other parts of the United States. Certainly Mr. Ickes ought not to have it said that in his own Interior Department, upon lands under his exclusive jurisdiction, the public lands, waste of oil and gas in considerable amounts should occur. Yet notwithstanding the importance of this work, the budget of the United States Geological Survey for the current year is only slightly over $500,000, substantially the same as it has been for some years.

I have examined the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and have been unable to find any recommendation for any increase for next year.

Plainly speaking, the United States Geological Survey will not have the necessary money to adequately police the public lands for the prevention of waste; it will have nothing whatever for the expense of mapping and geologizing new oil and gas areas. Yet we see immediately in front of us the growth of an organization created to aid in the war effort. I refer to the Petroleum Administration for War. This organization was not created until December 2, 1942, an outgrowth of the Petroleum Coordinator's office. Yet by December 31, 1942, it had on its payroll 1,118 employees in Washington and in district offices. It was given a budget for the present fiscal year of $3,365,000 and an additional $685,000 has recently been requested for immediate expansion activities. I mention this solely for the purpose of showing that when there is need, the men and the money are forthcoming. Certainly there is no greater need than that the United States Geological Survey should be supplied with adequate funds for the purposes I have just set forth. I am advised that an additional $500,000 to the United States Geological Survey would be sufficient.

SECOND RECOMMENDATION

That the Bureau of Mines, under the jurisdiction of Mr. Ickes, be immediately given the authority and the money to do whatever is necessary and proper preparatory to building plants to utilize our oil shale and coal for the extraction of synthetic petroleum.

On April 15, 1942, a little over a year ago today, we passed a resolution which it will be well to quote in full:

"We must not repeat the mistake of rubber. Is it not better to be alert, to plan ahead, to realize that we may have unforeseen events and disasters before final victory? Therefore, among other things, we should begin to get ready to make available for petroleum needs our proven deposits of coal and oil shale, which have all the oil we can possibly need during the war and for a thousand years in the future. We should not wait until the necessity is upon us, until it is too late. We should at least be in the blueprint stage. The Secretary of the Interior should be given the money to enable his scientific men to perfect the necessary processes, already fairly well worked out, and to build test plants."

What has been done about this extremely important matter?

Concerning oil shales, absolutely nothing; not a penny has been spent in research work for about 15 years. The Budget for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, above referred to, does not ask for a dime for any such work. Concerning coal, for the fiscal year 1942–43, $85,000 was provided for land, structure, and equipment for an experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel at Pittsburgh, Pa., and $80,000 was provided for expenses. The plant has not yet been completed. The Budget before mentioned, as I read it, proposes to appropriate $85,000 for the next fiscal year.

Dr. Arno C. Fieldner, chief of the Fuel Service of the Bureau of Mines, in his statement before the O'Mahoney Committee on October 12, 1942, concerning the availability and cost of coal hydrogenation for the production of gasoline and liquid fuels, says:

"The small laboratory plant at the Central Experiment Station in Pittsburgh, Pa., should be enlarged to pilot-plant scale so that the necessary data for designing commercial plants may be obtained. Also, there should be intensive research on the chemistry of the processes with a view to producing a product of higher octane value and also at lower cost. * * * The Nation should protect itself from disaster in this field such as has overtaken us in the field of synthetic rubber. Such protection involves the erection and operation of full-scale, industrial-size units so as to solve the engineering problems involved in these processes. * * * The cost of such a pilot plant is estimated at $2,000,000."

Very little is known in this country concerning processes to utilize coal or shale as a source for petroleum products. However, it is believed that Germany obtains at least half of her gasoline and motive fuel from coal. Without such utilization of coal, Germany could probably not have carried on the war, and Russia would have been greatly hampered.

Though in the midst of plenty, we are faced with the probability, or the possibility, of a shortage of oil, the most important material, the most strategic of all materials, absolutely necessary to win the war. We know that our petroleum supplies are dwindling. After the experience concerning rubber, it is possible that our national administration, with its eyes open, and after having been forewarned, will make the same mistake concerning oil? Long before we begin to run short of petroleum, we should have completed and thoroughly understood, the mechanics of extracting oil from our shales and from coal. When in the midst of a long war, where the issue may depend entirely upon the Nation having the greatest petroleum supply, it is suicidal, and indeed treasonable, for public officials to fail to complete detailed plans, so that when and if the need therefor arises, plants may be started immediately for the extraction of liquid fuel from our coal and oil shales.

This statement will not be complete until I give you briefly the facts and figures which show the immensity and value of our shale and coal deposits, a treasure beyond compare, the greatest of all our national resources.

We have in the United States in our oil shales, 92,144,985,000 barrels of recoverable shale oil. At or close to the common corner of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, shale beds contain 75,131,988,000 barrels of shale oil. These figures were taken from the statement of A. J. Kraemer of the Bureau of Mines to the O'Mahoney committee, on October 12, 1942, concerning the "Availability and Cost of Production of Shale Oil in the United States."

Our national coal reserves aggregate 3,180,765,230,000 tons, of which 939,457,443,000 tons are lignite coals, leaving 2,241,307,787,000 tons of higher-grade coal more suitable for extraction of hydrocarbons.

Of the coals other than lignite, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana, and Utah have a total of 1,095,656,254,000 tons, or practically one-half of the total reserves of like coal in the United States. These figures were obtained from the report of the Federal National Resources Committee of January 1939, of which Mr. Ickes was then chairman.

At the present rate of consumption of petroleum products, our Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado shales would supply our needs for 50 years at the present rate, even if a barrel of petroleum be not produced. A ton of coal on the average will produce more than a barrel of oil. Our coal reserves are sufficient to supply our coal and petroleum requirements for a thousand years.

Dr. Fieldner, in his statement before the O'Mahoney committee, says the estimated cost of producing gasoline from coal varies from 12 to 25 cents per gallon. Kraemer, in his statement before the O'Mahoney committee, estimates that crude shale oil may be produced at $2 per barrel. This doesn't include refining.

However, it must be strongly emphasized that very little is known in this country concerning the best methods of obtaining oil from coal or shale. The above costs are based on figures of the past. Concerning shale, open-pit mining, recently developed in our country, may be found practicable, and greatly reduce the cost; after intensive research, it may be found possible to extract the oil from the shale rock and refine it in one operation and with one heating, thereby reducing cost very materially.

If American ingenuity and American technical ability is put to work on the job, we may be assured that a substitute product will be made available at less, perhaps much less, than the above figures. Scientific men tell me that such cost would be greatly reduced if proper allowance be made for byproducts, which, by the way, are of the greatest importance. However, it is not a matter of a few pennies' difference in cost; it is a matter of national safety.

A comparison between the method of obtaining oil by wells from oil sands, and of obtaining oil from oil shales, will be illuminating. Each method takes time. After the first well, it may be 2 or 3 years before the field is drilled up and in production. It should not take any longer to build large plants to treat the oil shales. Both methods are expensive. The cost of the average oil well is more than $50,000. Such wells on the average will not produce 50 barrels a day for 20 years, their average life; but if so, the cost of wells or plant would be $1,000 per barrel per day for a limited time. An oil shale plant, producing 10,000 barrels a day, might cost $10,000,000, though probably less. This is at the same figure, $1,000 per barrel per day. The average oil well requires 161 tons of steel. This is on the basis of approximately 3 tons for each barrel of daily production. Kraemer says that a 10,000-ton shale oil plant would require only 15,000,000 pounds of steel, or at the rate of 1.3 tons of steel for each barrel of oil per day. No estimate is given for steel required in mining, but this would be small. The oil shale method, however, has this difference—a plant once constructed will last for the life of the shale deposit, and there will be no dry holes.

Unquestionably, it is entirely practicable to obtain liquid fuels or synthetic petroleum from oil shales and coal. The cost thereof, according to present knowledge, should not greatly exceed the cost of petroleum if petroleum was priced at parity. The amount of steel required is less. As between coal and shale, it is principally a question of what research will show. But an immense amount of work and intensive research is required to determine the best and most economical methods concerning both coal and oil shale. This work should be immediately started.

In respect to every other industry, the brains of our people have found ways to do the job better and cheaper. If this rule follows with respect to coal and shale, we have the right to expect as good or better products that will sell as cheaply or more cheaply than present petroleum products. The great advantage of obtaining these products from coal and shale is, that the risk of drilling (which, by the way, is becoming a very great risk, with few plums) will be entirely eliminated.

I am told that the necessary appropriation for shale is $800,000, and for coal from $2,000,000 to $5,000,000.

I am not urging that we start now to produce oil from shale or coal. It will never be possible to supplant crude oil or its products by extracting liquid fuels from either coal or shale. But nothing is more certain than that the day will come when our petroleum supply will be insufficient. God grant that day may not come during this war. But whenever it comes, especially if it should come during the war, we should be ready.

I have been asked to state the relative advantages as between using coal or oil shale as a source for liquid fuel. My information, briefly, is as follows:

There is really no basis of comparison as the products are entirely different. From coal, through hydrogenation, is manufactured a synthetic substance which may be used as a substitute for gasoline, and perhaps other petroleum products. This, however, is a complicated and expensive process.

From oil shale there is obtained by a fairly simple retort process, what I understand to be a low-grade petroleum or the equivalent thereof. This product may be refined, or may be used without refining for fuel oil. Shale oil is, in a sense, petroleum in nature's process of making.

The cost of a plant for shale is much cheaper. The cost of mining is much less. The cost of retorting the shale is much less than the cost of the complicated synthetic process relating to coal. On the other hand, a ton of coal will yield a larger quantity of the product. A serious problem concerning shale is the disposal of the dump rock.

As to the time element, a shale plant, being much less complicated, can be built much more quickly. The quantity of steel required is very much less—1.3 tons for the oil-shale plant per barrel of product per day, as against 6.5 to 14.1 tons for the coal plant per barrel of product per day. Shale rock has only the one use, whereas coal has other uses. The question of byproducts can be determined only by further research. The principal question is one of locality in relation to markets. Obviously, it would be better to build a plant in Pennsylvania for the eastern market, and in Colorado or Wyoming for the Rocky Mountain market. Shale fits in better with a declining petroleum supply. Our petroleum supply will be sufficient for gasoline and lubricating purposes for many years if oil shales supply, wholly or in large part, the liquid fuel demand, and coal is used in its natural state wherever possible. The Bureau of Mines believes that the work concerning both coal and oil shale should be vigorously carried on simultaneously.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED USE OF SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 35, to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator from Rhode Island move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from Rhode Island should ask unanimous consent that the pending appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside, and then ask for present consideration of the bill to which he refers.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the suggestion I was about to make.

Mr. McNARY. I would have no objection to that course being followed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 35. There is urgent necessity for immediate passage of the bill because the silver stocks of the country are running low, and the use of silver in the making of munitions is vital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as I began to say, there is urgent necessity for prompt passage of the bill. As Senators know, the bill has been pending for a long time. A similar bill was introduced at the last session of Congress, but failed of passage. The bill was introduced in the first days of the present session, and on May 12 the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which the bill was referred, made a unanimous report recommending its passage.

The silver stocks of the country are running low. They are needed for many purposes, but primarily for munitions. There is a large stock of silver, as is well known, at West Point and elsewhere, which may be used for these purposes but cannot be so used under existing law. The bill in question is very short, and perhaps I should summarize it in a few words. It makes available Government-owned silver under proper safeguards. The President is authorized, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities any silver which is in the ownership of the Government at the time. The price of the silver is set at 71.11 per fine troy ounce.

The bill contains the following proviso:

Provided further, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

The bill provides that the act shall expire on December 31, 1944.

Various objections have been raised to the bill, but they have all been met, and I understand there is at present no objection to its passage. The House, I am told, is awaiting the passage of this bill so it may take action upon it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to certain amendments to the bill which it seems to me he should offer at this time.

Mr. GREEN. I desire to offer certain amendments to the committee amendment. I thought I should make that offer after a brief explanation was made.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will make the offer of the amendments because there will be no objection to the bill if the amendments are included.

Mr. GREEN. It is my purpose to offer as amendments to the committee amendment the following:

On page 2, in lines 19 and 20, after the word "for", to strike out the words "use in furtherance of the war effort" and to insert the word "purposes"; and in line 22, after the word "needs", to strike out the words "contributing to the war effort."

I now ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the President is authorized, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell, or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, for use in furtherance of the war effort, including but not limited to the making of munitions of war and the supplying of civilian needs contributing to the war effort, and the converting of existing plants to those purposes, any silver held or owned by the United States: *Provided*, That no silver shall be sold under this act at less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided further*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

SEC. 2. This act shall expire on December 31, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say for the advice of the Senate with respect to the bill that during the month of November and December a bill somewhat similar to this was pending before the Senate. If the bill now before us had been before the Senate at that time objection would have been much allayed. The bill has been reconsidered and re-formed. In this bill there is nothing—and I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will confirm what I say—in this bill there is nothing either by word or intendment which affects or limits or impairs the present existing statute with respect to the acquisition, retention, and price of silver.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Senator is correct. The so-called silver purchase acts remain unaffected by it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with that in mind let me say to the Senate that I have an agreement with certain persons in authority, in view of objections which have been raised to proposed silver legislation, which objections are raised by me, that the proposed legislation will be so modified that the grounds for objection will be removed. I am not going into that matter in detail, because it does not involve Members of this body.

With that explanation, let me say that those of us who are interested in silver legislation, and who know, or think we know, the subject of silver, and who are always anxious to retain silver, under the Constitution of the United States, as a part of the monetary system of the country, realize that in this war effort it is necessary to use some of the so-called free silver in the Treasury, especially for war activities.

The language of the bill permits of the interpretation that free silver may be taken from the Treasury and used in industries that are not directly connected with the war effort. Those of us who are interested in silver have no desire to put any industry out of business. We have no desire to put out of business those who are engaged in the arts which use silver. So we have consented that there may be a limited use of silver in the arts, the whole program to be governed by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the chairman of the War Production Board.

So, with that purpose in mind, the bill can be passed by the Senate and I think can become law within a very short time. Passage of the bill will relieve many objections which have been raised, and will relieve those who have gone through the hardship of being deprived of the use of silver.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As I understand the bill, it would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to sell to industry within or without the United States, for consumptive and nonconsumptive purposes, any or all free silver which may be in the vaults of the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. Under certain conditions; yes.

Mr. BUCK. That in itself seems to be a very commendable and laudable objective. The bill also, as I understand, authorizes and empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to lend to industries in this country, for nonconsumptive purposes, any and all of its monetary silver. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may reply to the Senator?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer to the Senator's question is, Not the monetary silver—that is, not the silver that stands behind the currency in circulation.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in further answer to the Senator's question, let me say that the Treasury would be able to lend the silver for nonconsumptive purposes. In other words, the silver would still exist and would be in either the possession or control of the Government, so it still would be available for monetary purposes.

Mr. BUCK. Nonconsumptive purposes?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Then I was correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the Senator said "nonconsumptive"; yes.

Mr. BUCK. Yes; I did.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the use of the silver which stands back of the silver certificates which have been issued—and I understood the senior Senator from Oklahoma to say the other day that about $900,000,000 of silver certificates had been issued, and that is the silver which we are asked to lend to private industries—is at least unethical, and I am not sure that it does not raise the question of the integrity of the United States Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in that connection will the Senator from Rhode Island yield, so that I may answer the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The silver loaned to private industry within the United States for nonconsumptive purposes remains in the ownership and is the property and is in the custody of the United States Government. It is used only in facilities where there is no consumption of the silver and no impairment of it.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I understand that the silver goes out of the vaults of the Treasury and is used in industry for bus bars or what not; and it is the same silver that is back of the silver certificates which have been issued with the understanding that they can be redeemed in silver upon demand.

Mr. McCARRAN. The situation has not yet reached that point.

Mr. BUCK. It has not?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. BUCK. The bill would permit such use, would it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would permit it.

Mr. BUCK. I still think the ethics of the procedure are questionable. If the bill is passed by Congress and becomes law, certainly in the post-war era and thereafter this section of the bill should not be taken as a guide for the treatment and disposition of monetary silver.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree very heartily with the Senator; but the reason why we are in accord as to the provisions of the bill is that the emergency is now on us. Therefore we are going further now than we would under ordinary circumstances; and the provisions of the bill will cease having effect 6 months after the emergency or upon a definite date, if one is provided.

Mr. BUCK. If the exigencies of the war require that the action provided by the bill be taken, I am very glad to go along with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the only occasion for it.

Mr. BUCK. But I say it is a very dangerous precedent to be followed hereafter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I heartily agree with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should contain a rather definite statement with respect to the amount of silver the Government owns.

We now have almost 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver owned by the United States Government and under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. We have approximately 500,000,000 silver dollars coined. Each standard silver dollar contains one hundred-one hundred twenty-ninths of an ounce of silver, and for monetary purposes silver is worth $1.29 an ounce. Under the law the 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver which the Government owns, if coined into standard silver dollars, would amount to some $3,870,000,000. As stated we have in the Treasury a large number of standard silver dollars.

Recently the Congress authorized the Treasury to reduce to silver bars some 40,000,000 of those silver dollars, for the reason that such coined silver dollars had become worn and slick from use and therefore did not contain the full amount of silver. So those dollars have been melted into bars, and are subject to use as provided by the terms of the pending bill.

The record shows that we now have in circulation something over $1,900,000,000 of silver certificates. There is in the Treasury, behind each dollar of such money, either a standard silver dollar or silver bullion, to the full monetary value of the certificates. That makes it necessary to retain in the Treasury about a billion and a half ounces of silver. That leaves, then, about a billion and a half ounces of silver that are free, and not necessary to be kept in order to redeem our outstanding silver certificates. It is that billion and a half ounces of silver that the pending bill deals with in the main. If the time comes when the billion and a half ounces of free silver not being used for money and subject to the provisions of the proposed bill are disposed of in the war effort, then if additional silver is needed additional legislation may be required to enable us to use the silver that is retained as redemption for the outstanding silver certificates.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator for his statement. It clarifies the situation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendments which I propose, and I ask to have them stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 2, lines 19 and 20, after the word "for", it is proposed to strike out the words "use in furtherance of the war effort," and to insert "purposes"; and in line 22, after the word "needs", it is proposed to strike out the words "contributing to the war effort."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand that there were three amendments, but that they have now been combined into the two amendments just agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell, or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, for purposes including but not limited to the making of munitions of war and the supplying of civilian needs, and the converting of existing plants to those purposes, any silver held or owned by the United States: *Provided*, That no silver shall be sold under this act at less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided further*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

SEC. 2. This act shall expire on December 31, 1944.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1944

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries", on page 2, line 3, after the figures "$5,000", to strike out "$1,028,560" and insert "$1,072,270."

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Connally	Kilgore
Bailey	Danaher	La Follette
Ball	Eastland	Langer
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge
Bilbo	Ferguson	Lucas
Bone	George	McCarran
Bridges	Gerry	McClellan
Brooks	Gillette	McKellar
Buck	Green	McNary
Burton	Gurney	Maybank
Byrd	Hatch	Millikin
Capper	Hawkes	Moore
Caraway	Hayden	Murdock
Chandler	Hill	Murray
Chavez	Holman	Nye
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
O'Mahoney	Shipstead	Tydings
Overton	Smith	Vandenberg
Radcliffe	Stewart	Van Nuys
Reed	Taft	Wallgren
Revercomb	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Robertson	Thomas, Utah	White
Russell	Truman	Wiley
Scrugham	Tunnell	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF KANSAS FARMERS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, we have become so used to dealing in the upper brackets of the numerical system—hundreds of millions, billions, and hundreds of billions of dollars—that our mathematical senses may have become somewhat numbed in a good many cases to the relationship which still exists between the dollar sign and the individual.

I have received a letter from Ralph W. Asbury, a fine Kansas farmer near Hooser, Kans., which is typical of many others I have recently received from Kansas farmers. He enclosed an itemized summary of his receipts and expenditures from farming operations on his 320 acres of mortgaged land plus 60 acres of rented land.

Mr. Asbury says the manpower on this farm consists of two adults, and three children, the oldest a girl of 15 years. He says all of them work. The farm is appraised at $12,000 by the Federal land bank. Mr. Asbury says that the tax value of the livestock and equipment is $3,500.

According to this farmer's bookkeeping, he and the entire family made profits last year from the farm totaling $339.27, and for the first 4 months of this year, $113.93.

He believes that with his labor and investment he should make $1,000 a year; he says that a man can make upward of $27 a week in the towns as a common laborer. He is cutting down on his dairy operations this year, and says so are his neighbors. I ask unanimous consent to place his letter and a table in connection therewith in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOOSER, KANS., *May 10, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending a report of our farming business for 1942, also the first 4 months of 1943. We own 320 acres and are renting about 60 acres more. This is an average upland farm, which the Federal land bank appraised at $12,000. The tax valuation on the livestock and equipment is $3,500.

There are three adults, one 15-year-old girl, and two girls in the lower grades, and we all work to the limit of our endurance.

We have 25 milk cows and 2 stock cows, of which we are milking 21 at this time and selling separated cream, besides bucket feeding the 21 calves night and morning. We have 4 brood sows. Also 200 laying hens and 200 little chickens.

My reports will show you that our profits last year were $339.27 and the first 4 months of this year were $113.93. Corn was 80 cents last year and $1.24 last week, and hogs are going down every day.

How does Roosevelt and the Office of Price Administration expect us farmers to stay in business?

We can't depend on the promises of the Office of Price Administration from one week to the next.

The farmers here are all talking of slowing down to just what they can get along on. I have interviewed a number of these fellows and here are their answers:

No. 1. Sold all his white-face cattle which was $11,000. Had 100 hogs last year and none this year, milking just a few cows and keeping some chickens. He thought the Government was justified in doing something to stop inflation.

No. 2. Had 4 sows last year and about 20 cattle. Has 1 sow and 2 milk cows this year, owns 200 acres of land and out of debt. He says he voted for Roosevelt three times but he thinks we, the people, need to get rid of the whole New Deal bunch.

No. 3. Had about 60 cattle last year and 6 brood sows, but this year has 25 cattle and 3 brood sows. He has been a life-long Democrat but he now intends to merely exist until they get rid of Roosevelt.

No. 4. Had 22 milk cows and 8 sows last year, and this year has 5 cows and 4 sows and out of debt. Doesn't expect to any more than exist until they get rid of Roosevelt.

Our local banker told me there were a lot of people going out of the hog business. If Congress and the Senate don't do something to protect the farmers at once, at least 60 percent of them are going to cut down to a mere existence.

I aim to cut down to 10 cows and 1 sow. We are all working until we are so tired and sore we are hardly able to start a new day's work. We start at 5 a. m. and finish at 9:30 p. m., which is 16½ hours a day or 103½ hours a week. So I don't see how some folks can howl about 48 hours a week. Don't let Roosevelt make any more trade agreements without the Senators ratifying them.

Let me know at once if the Senate is going to help us farmers win this war or let the Office of Price Administration help Hitler win it.

I believe with the amount I have invested here, I should realize $1,000 a year profit.

A man can make $27 a week in any of these towns and a woman can get from $15 to $25 at just common labor.

Yours truly,

RALPH W. ASBURY.

Farm operating expenses, 1942:	
Feed	$653.47
Crop expense	38.92
Machinery repair	150.53
Auto expense	127.96
Stationary engine	17.84
Building-land upkeep	206.19
Livestock expense	471.57
Taxes and interest	304.42
Other	90.78
Principal on farm	200.00
Food	205.40
Clothing	42.16
Personal	31.38
Medical care	12.78
Household	47.94
Minor housing	11.77
Total	2,616.11
Money received, 1942:	
Poultry	39.72
Eggs	271.86
Dairy products	1,071.77
Cattle	1,111.74
Hogs	396.04
Other sales	62.25
Total	2,953.38
Yearly profit, including labor	339.27

FIRST 4 MONTHS OF 1943

Farm operating expenses, 1943:	
Labor	$95.37
Farm	77.58
Seed	121.16
Groceries	70.95
Clothing	33.98
Auto	43.64
Total	542.68
Money received, 1943:	
Eggs	138.03
Cream	317.89
Grain (for seed)	16.10
Hogs	184.59
Total	656.61
Profit for first 4 months of 1943	113.93

DEATH OF THOMAS RAYMOND BALL

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is with deep sorrow that I advise the Senate of the sudden death of Thomas Raymond Ball, a former Representative from the Second Congressional District in Connecticut.

Mr. Ball was a distinguished artist, and an architect of note. He served his State well—at least five terms in the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, both in its house of representatives and in its senate. He later was honored for his integrity of purpose and his general ability by being elected Representative from the important Second Congressional District of his State, serving with distinction in the Seventy-sixth Congress. He leaves a widow and a daughter.

The late Mr. Ball was a veteran, having served in the United States Army Engineers overseas for 2 years during the First World War.

Later, Mr. President, I shall extend my remarks, but at this time I wish his family and his friends to know that we here in the Senate share their sense of loss.

EFFECT OF ROLL-BACK ON LIVESTOCK MARKET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, last Tuesday I brought to the attention of the Senate the demoralized and chaotic condition of the livestock market at the five terminal livestock markets in thi country.

The conditions to which I refer resulted from putting into effect amendment 15 to order 169, which was the order issued by the Office of Price Administration to roll back consumer prices to the consumer and the worker, in connection with which it was contended by many distinguished Senators that arrangements had been made whereby the subsidy would be extended down to the producer.

As the conclusion of those remarks I thought I made a very constructive suggestion. In fact, my remarks were made only for the purpose of being constructive, and in sincerity I again renew the suggestion.

My suggestion was that a committee representing the leadership of the Senate go to the Office of Price Administration and, if necessary, to the President himself, with the view to having adopted immediately procedure whereby the subsidies can be paid—if they are to be paid—into the hands of the producer. I stated that unless some such action were taken we would have to expect decreasing receipts in the livestock terminals, and that the present conditions would continue to be demoralized and chaotic.

That was last Tuesday. Last night I received a telephone call and today I received two telegrams bearing upon the subject. Day before yesterday I received another telephone call from Chicago. I have received several other telegrams. I wish again to bring this question to the attention of the Senate. I do not desire to detain the Senate in its consideration of the appropriation bill which has been brought up, but the situation to which I refer is so serious that I feel it is my duty and responsibility to show what are the results in the terminal markets.

I have an Associated Press report from Chicago under date of June 17, which reads as follows:

Packers and commission dealers today watched with interest the effect on business at the Nation's major livestock markets following disclosure by the Government of details of subsidy payments accompanying the scheduled rollback in retail meat prices.

Spokesmen for packers and dealers asserted that the recent slowdown in activity at the stockyards here and in other major centers was due to the uncertainties of the terms of the subsidy payments—

That is what was contended here last Tuesday. It was the uncertainty of those payments that caused the slowdown, and it is being said now that the confusion was caused by the uncertainties of the terms of the subsidy payments. I continue reading—

to packers to compensate them for the rollback, which seeks to cut consumer prices 10 percent. The new retail prices become effective next week.

The payments, to be made monthly and to apply to livestock slaughtered beginning June 7, will be 1.1 cents per pound for cattle and calves; 1.3 cents per pound for hogs and pigs, and 0.95 cent per pound for sheep and lambs. Some packing-company spokesmen said preliminary calculations indicated the payments would not compensate fully for the reduction in resale prices.

That was spoken of last Tuesday in the Senate.

The article refers to a statement by Charles Rice, president of the Chicago Livestock Exchange, as follows:

Charles Rice, president of the Chicago Livestock Exchange, said the price roll-back might cause an even greater scarcity of beef in the regular commercial channels than now exists. The War Meat Board has declared that the Nation's armed forces are in critical need of beef. The Board met again yesterday, continuing its study of facilitating the operation of the Nation's meat program.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that at a meeting held by some of the Senators from the Corn Belt it developed, after discussions were had, and facts presented, that last week the military forces received only 30 percent of their meat requirements, and the week before that they received only 20 percent of their requirements. The article from which I have read shows that the

War Meat Board is meeting in Chicago in the effort to obtain beef for the armed forces.

I continue to read from the article:

Prices of both cattle and hogs weakened in yesterday's slow trade, and at the close of business some 4,000 hogs and 1,000 head of cattle remained unsold.

That is exactly what I predicted last Tuesday—

New receipts continued small—

It was said here that the effect of this order would be that they would not ship their cattle—

both here and in other centers. Cattle arriving at 20 leading livestock centers totaling only 29,000 head.

I trust the Senate will note this statement—

the smallest for June in the last 15 years.

Now at a time when we want cattle, the supply in yesterday's market was the shortest in 15 years, and only 29,000 head of cattle were sold.

Receipts for the corresponding day last week were 51,000 head.

That gives some idea of the market in the last 2 days and of its demoralized condition.

At one big plant here slaughtering crews were idle, the second day this week for workers at Armour & Co. At the Wilson & Co. plant, workers in the calf department have worked only 1 hour this week. They are guaranteed wages for 32 hours a week.

Think of that. They have worked only 1 hour this week, although guaranteed wages for 32 hours.

Gentlemen of the Senate, that was the condition in Chicago yesterday. Here is a telegram from the president of the United States Stockyards in Omaha in which he says that because of the small receipts the market responded yesterday 25 cents a hundred, but they are not getting receipts. He further says:

This price roll-back and subsidy program must be eliminated in favor of prices adequate to encourage maximum production.

I have also an editorial, taken from one of the leading newspapers. I shall not read it now, but I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

CONFUSION AFFECTS MARKETS

There was confusion on the Omaha market Monday. Trading was reported at from one-half to two-thirds less than it should have been. Packers were offering lower prices, from 50 cents to a dollar per hundred less than offering prices. The Office of Price Administration had promised recompense for a price roll-back to packers, but there was some doubt as to its ability to fulfill the promise. The fear was that Congress might curtail the Office of Price Administration's ability to get funds with which to make the payment.

President Harry Coffee, of the Union Stockyards, advised shippers to keep their offerings off the market until confusion over the situation is cleared. Sales made of fat cattle were at reduced prices and these mostly to small packers and speculators. Most of the sales were of feeders. In the meantime there is a shortage of meat offerings in many cities. Dealers do not have supplies, and customers, armed with cash and coupons, cannot buy what they demand.

The Office of Price Administration may solve its problem. The country wonders about how much wisdom will be applied to handling a bad situation by Washington authorities. In the meantime it hopes for the best.

Rolling back prices and promising a subsidy to processors might work out all right if the Office of Price Administration could guarantee the subsidy. With Congress in its present mood, opposing subsidies, the guaranty of the administration is not accepted at face value by processors.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. For the RECORD, I should like to read some information from Kansas which fits in perfectly with what the Senator from Nebraska has said. I hold in my hand a telegram, dated yesterday, from the president of the Kansas Live Stock Association, in which he says:

Kansas City, St. Joseph, and Wichita markets slow and uneven. Bulk sales 25 to 50 cents lower. Steers, heifers, and yearlings suffer from inactive buying. Cows and bulls about steady. Vealers weak to 50 cents lower. No encouragement to producers. Letter follows.

I have a letter which reached me yesterday from one of the most conservative and intelligent citizens of Kansas. He is a banker and livestock feeder. His name is Waugh, and the name of Waugh is known in Kansas for conservatism, integrity, and good faith as well as good business judgment. Mr. Waugh operates a bank at Eskridge, Kans., which is on the north side of what we call the blue stem country. In Kansas there is an area about 60 miles wide running from the Oklahoma line north nearly to Nebraska, which contains the most nutritious grasses for fattening cattle in the world. Annually perhaps 200,000 or 300,000 head of steers from the ranches of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado are sent to that territory to be put on grass and fed for the market. That area is recognized nationally as perhaps the best fattening region in the United States. Mr. Waugh writes as follows:

Some time ago, I purchased a drove of thin cattle and am feeding them for beef. These thin cattle cost a great deal on the market and the feed and labor are also very high. The Government, through their spokesmen, encouraged us to produce more beef and now through their manipulations, they are going to cause us to take a loss in our operation. They have caused the market to break 50 cents today in Chicago on cattle. It seems to me, that unless the Government adopts some sound policy with respect to the cattle industry, there will be a beef famine by winter. I have handled cattle for 25 years, but am going to quit just as soon as I can get out on the ones that I now have. If more meat is the Government's goal, they should allow the producer a fair profit for his labor and risk. Beef cattle are much lower than during World War No. 1, yet labor and other costs are much higher.

I may add, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska, on whose time I am trespassing——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. That I have had a hundred letters or telegrams from cattle feeders in Kansas which read just like the letter and telegram I have presented. If this country desires to avoid a meat famine, as, of course, it does, there must be a more dependable, more logical, more sensible, and fairer policy adopted than the one now in effect. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks.

The junior Senator from Kansas just made the prediction unless these conditions were corrected, there would be a meat famine.

Mr. President, I ask you and the other Members of the Senate, why there should be a meat famine in this country? The junior Senator from Kansas will recall that on Wednesday afternoon the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] called together Senators from the Corn Belt States. To that conference there had been invited as an expert and to give testimony Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He testified to facts which were a revelation to me. He stated that the cattle production of this country is on the increase and that it has been on the increase for the last 4 or 5 years. He stated to the committee that we now have on hand about 78,000,000 head of cattle, of which about 38,000,000 head were feed cattle.

Yesterday in my office I had the privilege of a visit from Chris Abbott, of Hyannis, Nebr., who is not only one of the largest ranchers in Nebraska, if not in the Middle West, but is also a director of the Burlington Railroad. He told me that there had been an increase of about 2,000,000 beef cattle in the United States in the last 15 months. So we have the cattle in this country. That is likewise the testimony of Mr. Hutson.

What else does Mr. Hutson say? He also stated that we have the corn in this country. Senators who were at the conference will bear me out when I say that Mr. Hutson stated that we had between 950,000,000 and 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn and that, comparing this supply with the figures of prior years, it was 200,000,000 bushels more than the average June carry-over. If we have that many head of cattle in this country, and if we have 200,000,000 bushels more corn, why in the world should there be a meat famine, when we need beef for our military forces and the civilian population?

There are many reasons given why that condition exists. One is that the cattle feeders are feeding on too narrow a margin. I wish to substantiate exactly what the writer of the letter read by the junior Senator from Kansas said and also the remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas that we have the narrowest meat-feeding profit we have had down through the years. It is so narrow that feeders

are going out of business by the wholesale. Why is it narrow? One reason is because the costs are high. Another reason is because feeders are uncertain of conditions. They do not know what will happen tomorrow relative to the price ceilings, and the orders, and, as a result, they are retiring from feeding operations.

It is said that the prices of cattle are satisfactory. I want Senators to know that the best corn-fed steers in the last 3 days have sold below $15 a hundred, whereas in World War No. 1 the price reached $17 a hundred, and the labor costs of 1916 and 1917 were far below the labor costs which now have to be paid. I also want the Senate to know that in the past 6 weeks the average price of fat cattle has been less than the point reached between January 1 and September 1, 1942. The cattle feeders have a right to have that high price paid, and the administration should see to it that it is, and that the market is not depressed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I yield to the junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator from Nebraska point out any place in this program where any of the bureaucrats, including the O. P. A., administering this program have paid the slightest attention to the law or to the expressed intention of Congress when it has provided the appropriations and made the law?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the junior Senator from Kansas is that if the law be interpreted correctly, or at least as I interpret it, the producers had a right to have the high point paid for cattle between January 1 and September 1, 1942, for the past 6 or 8 weeks during which the price has been less than that. So that the market for feeding cattle has become so narrow that the feeders are not feeding the calves.

Now let me give another reason why replacement cattle are not going into the feed lots. It is because of the ceiling on corn. If we expect to feed livestock—and when I say "livestock" I mean not only cattle, but poultry in Delaware, and poultry in Michigan—we must get corn with which to feed the live animals and the fowl, and it is absolutely necessary that the ceiling on corn be lifted, and it be allowed to flow through its natural channels, so that it can come off the farms and reach the cattle feeders and the industrial purposes for which corn is needed.

Some may ask, why? It is because we will eliminate the black market if we take the ceiling off, and we certainly do have a black market in this country today.

I have here another Associated Press report coming from Chicago on June 17, as follows:

TRUCK DRIVERS ROAM MIDWEST HUNTING CORN

CHICAGO.—Truck drivers, roaming the Midwest in an unprecedented hunt for corn, are buying the yellow grain at higher-than-ceiling prices and selling it profitably to farmers who need it to feed livestock, members of leading grain firms said Tuesday.

That is one reason, they said, why not as much corn as is needed is coming into marketing terminals, threatening, in the words of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, a complete shut-down in the corn-refining industry within the next 30 days.

A shut-down in corn refineries would affect such industries as textile manufacturing, paper making, aluminum and steel foundries, brewing, candy manufacturing, and innumerable others which utilize derivatives of America's most important grain.

Existence of an illegal market for corn, grainmen said, is common knowledge among the trade. The Baldwin Elevator Co., Decatur, Ill., commenting on the situation, said: "There probably never was such a storm of truckers roaming over the Illinois highways staging a veritable corn blitz on country elevators as in recent weeks. Now they are contacting the growers direct. With truckers being the privileged characters as to prices they can pay for corn, it does not look as though there will be a normal corn movement through regular channels even after producers have caught up with their work."

Reports to grain firms indicated similar situations in other Corn Belt States.

Meanwhile, major markets are not getting the corn they need. The amount of the maize in principal marketing centers at the start of this week was pitiably sma'l as compared with last year. The figures for three major terminals:

	This week	Year ago
	Bushels	*Bushels*
Chicago	4,300,000	14,870,000
Kansas City	706,000	4,598,000
Minneapolis	757,000	4,753,000

It is practically impossible to enforce corn ceilings at every fence post in the American Grain Belt, grain men said. The transactions are not officially recorded, as they are in marketing terminals, and the only persons who know about them are the buyer and the seller.

Mr. President, this message shows the seriousness of the present situation. Corn is being held in the elevators and on the farms because of a black market, in which the price is away up from 10 to 15 cents over the ceiling. That is another reason why we have a famine in beef.

If we let the livestock producers buy the corn, if we make it possible to feed the poultry the corn which can be bought through legitimate channels, if we take the ceiling off we will take a right step and a constructive step toward eliminating the famine staring us in the face so far as meat is concerned. Until that is done we will continue to have the demoralized and chaotic condition which is now confronting the cattle feeders.

Mr. President, one of the things we learned yesterday from Mr. Hutson was brought out by this question from me: "When will we get relief? When will the cattlemen know and poultrymen know that they will have feed?" I remember distinctly the question of the junior Senator from Michigan, when he said, "We really want to know when we can get grain for our poultry and livestock in Michigan."

Mr. Hutson said they were going to release this, that, and the other thing. The fact is that the only thing the Commodity Credit Corporation can release was released yesterday—that is, 10,000,000 bushels of corn, just 10 days' need for industrial purposes, which, according to Mr. Hutson, will have priority rating. It does not help the livestock situation one grain of corn.

He came to one conclusion. I do not know whether I can quote him correctly or not, and no record was taken of the hearing, but if I do not quote him accurately I hope some one who is present will correct me. He said just one of two things should be done. Either take the ceiling off—and he said he was prepared to take it off, though he could not speak for his department—or import grain from South American countries.

So, Mr. President, observe the situation in which we find ourselves in this great country of ours. I have friend after friend after friend today closing his feed lots because he cannot get corn and because the profit margin is too narrow. Yet we have the greatest number of cattle we have had in years, and we have a 200,000,000-bushel surplus of corn, but cannot get the two together because of the restricted ceiling on corn, and misadministration, in my opinion, of the Office of Price Administration.

I tell you, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, this is the most serious thing that has confronted the Senate in the 5½ months I have been a Member of it. Food is the No. 1 problem, and unless we can get the corn and the cattle together, unless we can get corn to the poultry and the livestock, we will have a famine, and there will be no excuse for it. The farmers of this country are the ones who should be making a profit on feeding the cattle and producing the corn, rather than the farmers of some South American country in which we do not have the stake we have in our own country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with the remarks made by the junior Senator from Nebraska, only this morning I talked with one of the packers of Cincinnati. There are some 16 or 17 different packers, small packers, in Cincinnati, which is not a great cattle market. The market is somewhat different from that in Chicago, with lighter cattle.

This gentleman told me that since Tuesday 4 of the 17 packers had stopped slaughtering altogether, and had closed down their plants; that 4 more of them will certainly close up next Tuesday; that a mass meeting of all the packers and grocers and wholesale distributors of food is to be held to protest against the present management of price control, particularly with relation to the roll-back on meat.

Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Nebraska that we face one of the most serious problems we have had to face. I think it is fair to say that this is no partisan statement. We have practically the same statement this morning from Mr. Chester Davis, the Food Administrator, himself. I read from a report of what he said in New York:

Chester C. Davis, in his first public address since his March 25 appointment as War Food Administrator, said yesterday that management of the Nation's civilian food supply was one of the most neglected problems on the home front and warned that "there is going to be chaos if it is not managed right." * * *

"Normally," he explained, "prices are the force that brings supplies to where they are needed. Where skillful management is not brought to bear, you're going to have chaos."

Mr. President, it seems to me that unless the entire food situation today is put into the hands of someone who is not predominantly concerned with price, who is not scared, above all things, about inflation, who is concerned primarily with production, we are going to have chaos and starvation in this country.

If the Senator will yield further, I may say that I am today proposing an amendment to the commodity credit bill which would limit seriously the extent to which subsidies might be paid.

The final situation which has practically stopped slaughtering in Cincinnati, as in many other cities, was brought about by the roll-back and subsidy plan. It seems to me that to a certain extent we have to make good on promises which have been made. Otherwise that plan should be stopped. If the stopping of that plan forces a complete reorganization of our food program, it will serve a useful purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his remarks, and I wish to conclude my brief statement by quoting a message the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] received this morning, as follows:

BERESFORD, S. DAK., *June 16, 1943.*

Hon. H. J. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned substantial cattle feeders of Beresford, S. Dak., and territory, hereby serve notice on our Government that we have complied with their request to increase the production of meat and in doing so now face financial loss. Under existing prices for livestock we will soon be forced to sell, as corn and grains are selling at ceiling prices, and we cannot continue to feed at the present level of prices for livestock. We surely will discontinue the feeding of livestock this coming year on the basis of present prices.

Martin Ebsen, John O. Stene, C. O. Peterson, Ole J. Stene, Ludvig Johnson, Melvin Ende, George Ende, Eric Soderstrom, P. N. Thormodsgard, Osmond T. Twedt, Ole T. Twed, Mrs. Grover Christensen, J. W. Birgen, Theo Muhlenkort, Felix Birgen, A. P. Sorenson, A. R. Olson.

Mr. President, I renew my request. I hope I have said enough that is constructive so that from both sides of the aisle, in a nonpolitical way, a committee may go to the Office of Price Administration, or to the President, if necessary, and see if there cannot be put into operation, if subsidies are to be paid, the machinery necessary to clear up the difficulty which the packers are now having relative to the subsidy, which is causing the demoralized condition, and to ascertain if there is not some plan possible whereby the ceiling can be removed from corn, so that it may go through its natural channels and reach the great purposes for which we need it now, in what, in my opinion, is the most critical year of our Nation's history.

CONTRACT BETWEEN NAVY DEPARTMENT AND STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the agreement between the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Navy Department relating to certain oil land development and to the further fact that this morning the newspapers announced that the Secretary of the Navy had canceled the agreement.

Mr. President, I deem this contract of such importance that I think every Senator should be familiar with it, and I ask unanimous consent that the agreement made and entered into between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, so that Senators themselves and the American people may see exactly how subtly the contract was drawn, and for the further reason that I expect to discuss the agreement further, very likely on Monday, and having it printed in the RECORD will enable Senators to follow the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the contract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 1, INCLUDING LANDS TO BE ACQUIRED FROM STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA AND OTHERS ON THE GEOLOGIC STRUCTURE CONTAINING THE ELK HILLS OIL AND GAS FIELD, KERN COUNTY, CALIF., AND FOR THE CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION OF THE OIL AND GAS CONTENTS THEREOF

This agreement is made and entered into as of the 20th day of November 1942, by and between the United States of America, acting by and through the Secretary of the Navy, hereafter referred to as "Navy," with respect to lands owned or controlled by the United States, and Standard Oil Co. of California, a Delaware corporation, hereafter referred to as "Standard."

Recitals: This agreement for the development and operation of Government-owned lands in the Elk Hills oil and gas field shall become effective when executed by the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, on behalf of the United States, and by duly authorized officers on behalf of Standard.

The purpose of the agreement is to conserve and protect the natural resources of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances within the geologic structure containing the Elk Hills oil and gas field in order to create an effective petroleum reserve in the ground for the use or benefit of the United States Navy, to assure adequate supplies of petroleum products for the United States Navy in order to facilitate the prosecution of the war, to achieve the greatest possible ultimate production of petroleum and its associated hydrocarbons through the development of the field as a unit, and to provide Navy with facilities for developing and operating the lands under Navy's direction.

Authority for this agreement is provided by the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252; 34 U. S. C. 524) entitled "An act to amend the part of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1920, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves;" the First War Powers Act, act of December 18, 1941 (Public, No. 354, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); Second War Powers Act, act of March 27, 1942 (Public, No. 507, 77th Cong., 2d sess.); Executive Order No. 9001 of December 27, 1941; Executive Order No. 9055 of February 10, 1942; and a directive letter from the President of the United States to the Secretary of the Navy, dated March 21, 1942.

The Secretary of the Navy, by the execution of this agreement on behalf of the United States, with the approval of the President of the United States, determines and certifies that this agreement is necessary and advisable in the public interest in order to:

(a) conserve and protect the oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances within the geologic structure containing the Elk Hills oil and gas field from waste and destruction;

(b) furnish supplies of petroleum products for the Navy in order to facilitate the prosecution of the war; and

(c) carry out the policy of the Government of the United States to conserve and maintain in the ground a petroleum reserve in the interest of national defense sufficient to provide the United States Navy with supplies of petroleum products as long as possible.

Witnesseth:

SECTION 1. CONSIDERATION

In consideration of the payment to be made by Navy to Standard of the sum of $1,748,408.75 and the rights and privileges granted herein by Navy, Standard agrees:

(a) To sell and convey to the United States by grant deed a good and sufficient title in fee simple to the following lands situated in Kern County, Calif., subject, however, to existing easements and encumbrances:

Southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 23, township 30 south, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian

South half of section 23, township 30 south, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian.

Southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 24, township 30 south, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian (according to the official plat of the survey of the said land returned to the General Land Office by the Surveyor General), excepting therefrom, that portion thereof conveyed to Elk Hills School District by deed recorded November 20, 1933, in book 411, page 312 of Official Records of Kern County, Calif., described as follows: Commencing at a point in the east line of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 24 which point is distant 330 feet north of the southeast corner of said southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section; running thence north along said east line a distance of 660 feet; thence at right angles west, a distance of 660 feet; thence at right angles south, a distance of 660 feet; thence at right angles east, a distance of 660 feet to the point of beginning. Also, excepting therefrom, all oil and gas in said lands as reserved in that certain United States of America land patent No. 695,254, dated the 1st day of July 1919, being Land Office serial No. Visalia 07529.

All that portion of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 24, township 30 south, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian (according to the official map of the survey of said land returned to the General Land Office by the surveyor general), lying south and west of the so-called Outlet Canal as same existed on June 14, 1932, date of the deed of said land from Commercial Land Co., a corporation, to Kern Investment Co., a corporation, recorded June 14, 1932, in book 446, page 63, of official records of Kern County, Calif.; excepting therefrom, that portion thereof lying within the townsite of Tupman as shown by map of said townsite, recorded September 2, 1923, in book 3, page 94, of maps in the office of the county recorder; also excepting a parcel of land 100 feet by 150 feet comprising 0.34 acre more or less, particularly described as beginning at the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of said section, and running thence north 89 degrees 54 feet east along the north line

of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 240 feet; thence south 51 degrees 36 feet east 150 feet to the true point of beginning of said excepted parcel; thence south 38 degrees 24 feet west 100 feet; thence south 51 degrees 36 feet east 150 feet; thence north 38 degrees 24 feet east 100 feet; thence north 51 degrees 36 feet west 150 feet to the true point of beginning; also, excepting therefrom all oil and gas in said lands as reserved in patent from the United States of America dated June 29, 1923, recorded July 16, 1923, in book 21, page 445 of patents; and subject to right-of-way for pipe line granted to Commercial Land Co., a corporation, by deed recorded November 4, 1935, in book 625, page 236 of Official Records of Kern County, Calif.

(c) Upon the expiration of the current term thereof, to surrender and terminate all of its right, title, and interest in and to that certain operating agreement dated November 30, 1938, between Mary C. Hagood, L. N. Hagood, and H. F. Davies, and any and all modifications and amendments thereof, covering United States oil and gas lease Sacramento, Calif., serial No. 031,888.

(d) Upon receipt of written notice that Navy has acquired all of the right, title, and interest of Kern County Land Co. in and to that certain parcel of land in Kern County, Calif., described as the west one-half, section 31, township 30 south, range 25 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, to surrender and quitclaim to the United States all of its right, title, and interest in and to those certain oil and gas leases dated March 10, 1920, and September 16, 1941, between Kern County Land Co., as lessor, and Standard, as lessee, and in and to any and all modifications and amendments thereof, covering said parcel of land.

(e) To sell and convey to the United States, concurrently with the conveyance of the foregoing lands and interests, all of its right, title, interest, and estate in and to all structures, improvements, equipment, and facilities located thereon, save and except automotive equipment, oil-pumping station and facilities (excluding stock tanks), and pole and pipe lines extending from said oil-pumping station to the point where said lines connect with Standard's main lines.

The foregoing money payment to be made to Standard is the sum of the following items:

(a) Surface value of lands deeded to United States by Standard; 8,297.60 acres at $10 per acre	$82,976.00
(b) Surface value of 48 acres in S½ sec. 24, T. 30 S., R. 24 E	2,276.70
(c) Present value of division equipment	157,801.60
(d) Payment to equalize exploration, development, and equipment costs on Standard's lands and Navy's lands	1,505,354.45
Total	1,748,408.75

The sums set forth in items (c) and (d) above have been computed as shown on exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part hereof, but as these amounts cannot be accurately determined at this time, proper adjustments will be made in the operating accounts of the parties hereto as soon as practicable.

SECTION 2. RIGHTS GRANTED TO STANDARD

(a) Development and maintenance of property: In consideration of the conveyances from Standard to Navy, of the conditions and covenants to be observed as herein set forth and for the purpose of effecting the economical development and operation, as a unit, of the lands described in section 4 (a) hereof, Navy hereby grants to Standard the exclusive right and privilege, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided:

1. To drill for, mine, extract, remove, and dispose of the oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon deposits in or under said lands, together with the right to redrill and repair any wells thereon and to use all property thereon belonging to Navy;

2. To purchase for Navy's account under this agreement necessary materials for the construction and maintenance thereupon of works, buildings, plants, waterways, roads, telegraph or telephone lines, pipe lines, reservoirs, tanks, pumping stations, or other structures, facilities, and services necessary for development and operations hereunder: *Provided,* That Standard shall agree to hold the United States harmless for injuries to or death of any person, and for damage to or loss of property of third persons occasioned by such use of said Government-owned property; and

3. To cover costs of ordering, handling, and storing material, supplies, and equipment, done at Standard's sole expense, to charge Navy with an additional 1 percent of Navy's share of the cost of casing delivered from seller direct to any well by Standard, 1 percent of Navy's share of the cost of casing similarly delivered from Standard's regular storehouse to a well, and 5 percent of Navy's share of the cost of all materials other than casing, but Navy shall be allowed its share of all rebates and discounts Standard receives in connection with such purchases.

(b) Navy's obligation to Standard to be paid in production: Standard shall be entitled to retain out of Navy's share of production, at the prices determined in the manner provided in section 4 (h) hereof, such portion thereof as shall cover Navy's share of the actual cost of developing and operating the lands covered hereby. If at any time Navy so elects, it may deliver to Standard royalty production due the United States from any lease or leases in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2, to be credited at not less than the current market price, to apply against its share of development and operating costs. If, however, at any time Navy's share of production under this agreement, and royalties from leases in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2, shall be insufficient to cover its share of development and operating costs, Navy may pay Standard in cash the amount of such deficiency or permit it to accrue as a charge against Navy's share of future production. If Navy elects to pay its share of development and operating costs in cash, it may do so.

(c) Rights-of-way: Standard is granted the use of as much of the surface of the lands subject hereto as may be necessary to maintain pump stations, pipe lines and other facilities required for handling and removing the oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons produced hereunder. The location of such other facilities as may hereafter be placed on said lands shall be subject to Navy's approval.

SECTION 3. STANDARD AGREES

(a) Bond: To furnish and maintain at all times a bond in the penal sum of not less than $10,000 with approved surety, or to deposit in the Treasury of the United States, United States bonds in the same amount, as surety therefor, conditioned upon compliance with the terms and provisions of this agreement; said bond shall be furnished to Navy when this agreement has been executed.

(b) Estimates of cost of work: To give notice to Navy's representative on the operating committee provided for in section 4 (m) hereof, of the estimated cost of any well to be drilled and of the construction of plants, buildings, warehouses, roads, or other works of a permanent nature estimated to cost in excess of $5,000, on the lands covered hereby. If in Navy's opinion, the estimated costs are too high, Navy shall so notify Standard within 20 days from the receipt of such estimate of cost and Navy may require Standard to secure bids from three responsible contractors regularly engaged in such work. If any bid is less than the estimated cost submitted by Standard, then Standard may either drill the well, or perform the work, at the lowest bid submitted, or may enter into contract therefor with the party submitting the lowest bid, which contract bid shall constitute the cost of the work.

(c) Processing wet gas: To process Navy's share of the natural gas produced from the shallow oil zone which contains sufficient gasoline or other hydrocarbons to justify processing, in a plant or plants on the lands covered hereby, or elsewhere, and Standard shall be entitled to retain as compensation, if processing is carried on in some plant owned by Standard elsewhere, and operated at Standard's sole expense, 50 percent of the natural gasoline and other hydrocarbons recovered from Navy's gas and of the resultant dry gas which is not used for fuel or for injection purposes. Should such gas be processed in a plant owned by Navy, and located on the lands covered hereby, as a part of the general operations conducted hereunder, then Navy and Standard shall share the costs and the resultant products in the proportions applying to oil produced from the shallow oil zone. If natural gas produced from other zones contains sufficient gasoline or other hydrocarbons to justify processing, such gas shall be processed under arrangements mutually agreed upon.

(d) Accounts and reports: To keep at all times true and correct books of account showing the production of oil, gas, gasoline, and other hydrocarbons, as well as all other data necessary or proper for the settlement of accounts between the parties hereto and the proper adjustment of their rights under this agreement. Such books, records, and accounts shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by any duly authorized representative of Navy, and Standard shall furnish Navy:

1. A written statement once each calendar month, in such form as may be prescribed by or acceptable to Navy, showing the production from the lands, the respective shares thereof of Navy and Standard, and the amount of expenses incurred during the preceding calendar month;

2. Upon request, a plat showing all developments, improvements, pipe lines, buildings, and other facilities and structures thereon;

3. An annual summary of the monthly reports of the preceding year with any adjustments and revisions necessary therein; and

4. Such other information relating to operations hereunder as Navy may specify.

(e) Inspection of premises and records: To keep open at all reasonable times for inspection by any duly authorized representative of Navy the lands covered hereby and the wells, improvements, machinery, and fixtures thereon, and all maps and records relative to operations, and of surveys or investigations made on the lands covered hereby. Standard shall also keep a daily drilling record, a log, history, and complete information on all well surveys and of all wells drilled or worked on, which logs, histories, information, and records, or copies thereof, shall be furnished Navy's representative on the operating committee within 30 days following the completion of drilling or work performed.

(f) Diligence: To exercise reasonable diligence in drilling and producing all wells on the lands covered hereby, to carry on all operations hereunder in a good and workmanlike manner, in accordance with approved methods and practices having due regard for the prevention of waste of oil or gas, damage to deposits or formations containing

oil, gas, or water, or other mineral deposits, for conservation of gas energy, for the preservation and conservation of the property for future productive operations, and for the health and safety of workmen and employees, and to plug or condition properly and effectively all wells before abandoning the same.

(g) Assignment of interest: Not to assign this agreement or any of its interest therein except with the consent in writing of the Secretary of the Navy first had and obtained.

(h) Conservation: To conduct operations hereunder so that the conservation of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons in the lands covered hereby shall be promoted and obtained, and production will be prolonged by orderly and controlled drilling and producing operations to the end that maximum economic recoveries will be made in an efficient manner and without waste, as defined by any law of the State of California or of the United States, or by any regulations promulgated or adopted by Navy pursuant to provisions of existing law.

(i) Wells: To drill all wells and conduct all operations in accordance with a well-spacing plan to be mutually agreed upon by Navy and Standard.

SECTION 4. NAVY AND STANDARD MUTUALLY AGREE

(a) Description of lands: That the lands covered by this agreement, approximately 43,793 (43,815) acres, embrace the area enclosed within the heavy black line on the map attached hereto marked "Exhibit B," and are described as follows:

Mount Diablo base and meridian

Township 30 south, range 22 east, section 24.

Township 30 south, range 23 east, sections 10, 12 to 30, inclusive, and sections 32 to 36, inclusive.

Township 30 south, range 24 east, sections 17 to 22, inclusive, section 23, northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter and south half; section 24, south half southwest quarter and southwest quarter southeast quarter; and sections 25 to 36, inclusive.

Township 30 south, range 25 east, section 31, west half.

Township 31 south, range 23 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, and sections 10 to 14, inclusive.

Township 31 south, range 24 east, sections 1 to 12, inclusive, and section 18.

Township 31, south, range 25 east, section 6, west half.

All above-described lands which are not now owned or controlled by Navy will be acquired by Navy at the earliest possible date and made a part of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 and all leases of such lands heretofore made will be terminated.

(b) Production

(1) Primary period: That for the duration of the war emergency, but for not less than a period of five (5) years from the date thereof, Standard may produce and take without current payment to Navy, but as hereinafter provided, Navy's percentage share of production from the shallow oil zone. During this period Standard may produce from such shallow oil zone (including its own percentage share thereof) a daily average of 15,000 barrels of oil, together with associated hydrocarbons, provided, however, that in no event shall more than 27,500,000 barrels of oil be so produced during such period without specific authorization from Navy. If at any time the existing shallow oil zone wells are incapable, under good operating and engineering practices, of producing such quantity of oil, Standard may redrill or repair existing wells or may drill additional wells into the shallow oil zone at such locations as shall be mutually agreed upon. In such case Navy shall be charged by Standard with its proper share of the "actual cost" of these operations and Standard shall take payment therefor out of Navy's share of production. If during this period, there is produced in any year from the shallow oil zone a daily average of more than 15,000 barrels of oil, together with associated hydrocarbons, each party shall take its percentage share of the excess production. Out of Standard's share of such excess it shall pay to Navy one-third thereof, which amount shall be deducted from Standard's obligation to repay Navy's share of production previously taken by Standard without current payment therefor. At the end of the primary period Standard shall, except as provided in 4 (b) (2) hereof, begin to repay any net balances due on Navy's share of said production previously taken. Such repayment shall be made as provided in section 4 (i) hereof or in quantities of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons equal to the net balances due Navy, and in the latter case, at the rate of one-third of Standard's current share of production from the shallow oil zone.

(2) Subsequent period: If, after such primary period, Navy should desire to limit production from the shallow oil zone to such an extent that Standard's share thereof would be insufficient to pay its share of operating, maintenance, and other costs and charges in connection with the lands covered by this agreement, Standard shall be entitled to produce from the shallow oil zone and retain without payment or reimbursement to Navy a quantity of production sufficient to cover such deficiency, but production shall not exceed an average of 750 barrels daily each year unless approved by Navy; provided, that when deficiencies, due to development and operating costs, shall accrue against Navy's share of future production, as provided in section 2 (b) hereof, Navy shall permit continuance of production, at a daily rate mutually agreed upon, until such deficiencies have been eliminated.

(c) Participation on basis of acre-feet of commercially productive formations: That Navy and Standard shall each own and share in the oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons in and produced from the lands covered hereby (except such portions thereof as shall be used in operations hereunder or unavoidably lost) and in the development and operating expenses hereunder in the percentage relationship that the acre-feet of commercially productive formations in each zone underlying the lands contributed by each party to this agreement bear, respectively, to the total acre-feet of commercially productive formations within the estimated limiting line of commercial productivity for each commercially productive zone.

(d) Estimated limiting lines of commercial productivity and participating interests: That the initial estimated limiting lines of commercal productivity have been established and a determination has been made of the estimated acre-feet of proved commercially productive formation for each of the present commercially productive zones within the estimated limiting lines of commercial productivity for such zones. Based upon such establishment and determination, the initial percentages of participation of Navy and Standard in production and in development and operating expenses for the present commercially productive zones are as follows:

Dry gas zone: Navy, 77.0492; Standard, 22.9508.

Shallow oil zone: Navy, 63.9301; Standard, 36.0699.

Stevens zone: Navy, 65.4517; Standard, 34.5483.

The above zones are defined as follows:

Dry gas zone: All of the dry gas sands above the top of the lower scales marker bed.

Shallow oil zone: All oil sands in formations of Pliocene age above the reef ridge shale.

Stevens zone: All oil and gas sands in formations of Upper Miocene age within the stratigraphic interval between the top of the reef ridge shale and the top of the zone of Valvulineria californica or associated faunas of Middle Miocene age.

The above initial estimated limiting lines of commercial productivity and the initial estimated acre-feet of proved commercially productive formation for each of the presently commercially productive zones are based upon an engineering report dated September 28, 1942, entitled "Estimate of Commercially Productive Acre-Feet of Formation Proved Zones Elk Hills by United States Navy and Standard Oil Co. of California Representatives," by Lt. Comdr. V. H. Wilhelm, United States Naval Reserve; Lt. Comdr. H. P. Stolz, United States Naval Reserve; Ensign M. C. Eastman, United States Naval Reserve, representing Navy, and Messrs. J. E. Gosline, G. C. Gester, W. F. Barbat, and Murray Putnam, representing Standard, which report is incorporated herein and made a part hereof by reference.

As other prospective zones are proved commercially productive by development, estimated limiting lines of commercial productivity for such zones shall be established and a determination made of the estimated acre-feet of proved commercially productive formation in each zone in the same manner as for the present commercially productive zones.

If any developments occur with respect to any commercially productive zone which, in the opinion of either Navy or Standard would reasonably warrant revision of the estimated acre-feet of commercially productive formation in such zone, either party hereto may give written notice to the other of its desire to have the estimated limiting lines of commercial productivity, and the calculations based thereon, revised. Within 30 days from the receipt of such notice representatives of Navy and Standard shall meet and review the data pertinent to the developments which have occurred. Revisions agreed upon shall become effective as of the date upon which such developments occurred if such date is definitely determinable; otherwise as of the date such request for revision was made. In determining the acre-feet of formation to be included in participation beyond the initial westerly limiting line of commercial productivity (as described in the said engineering report of September 28, 1942) for each zone, a systematic and progressive exploratory development program shall be used. A reasonable extrapolation from commercially productive wells, based on thickness and nature of productive formation encountered, shall determine such maximum westerly extension.

(e) Types of wells defined: That an "exploratory" well is one which either party elects to drill for the purpose of revising the participating percentages of the parties in any commercially productive zone, or one drilled for the purpose of testing the productivity of any unproved interval. A "development" well is any well other than an "exploratory" well. A "commercially productive" well is one which, based on a 30-day sustained production test, indicates from its production characteristics that it is capable of returning current operating costs, and, in addition, that if maintained on production at a steady rate, the cost of drilling and equipping the well would be amortized within a period of 5 years.

(f) Drilling of exploratory wells: That Navy shall be charged with the entire cost of drilling exploratory wells which it directs Standard to drill and which are not commercially productive. Standard shall have the right to drill exploratory wells without direction from Navy but shall be charged with the entire cost of drilling such wells which are not commercially productive. Actual cost of all exploratory wells, if commercially productive, shall be borne by Navy and Standard in the

same manner as the cost of development wells.

(g) Navy control: That Navy shall, except as limited in sections 4 (b), (d) and (f) hereof, determine the locations of wells to be drilled and the rate of prospecting and development on and the quantity and rate of production from the lands covered by this agreement. Except for purposes of adequate production tests of exploratory wells, no production shall be taken from any zone other than the shallow oil zone without the approval and consent of Navy.

(h) Disposal of products: That Standard will buy and Navy will sell Navy's share of production (except that taken by Standard under provisions of section 4 (b) hereof, and that taken in payment for Navy's share of "actual cost") at the average posted market price offered and paid by the major oil purchasing companies for crude oil and natural gasoline of similar grade and quality in Kern County, Calif., and at the highest price per thousand cubic feet (m. c. f.) for dry gas currently paid to Standard by gas purchasing companies for dry gas in Kern County, Calif. If at any time Navy is of the opinion that such prices do not represent the value of any product, Navy may elect to take its share of such product in kind and offer it for sale in accordance with provisions of existing law. Should Navy by so doing, receive a higher acceptable written offer, it shall notify Standard thereof and Standard may, if it so elects, take Navy's share and pay therefor on the basis of such highest acceptable written offer. If Standard shall sell any of the oil, gas or other hydrocarbon products purchased from Navy, it shall furnish Navy with copies of any agreement made covering such sale.

(i) Payment in refined petroleum products. That should Navy so elect, when Standard is purchasing Navy's share of production, it may, in lieu of accepting payment in cash, take from Standard the equivalent value thereof in refined petroleum products at such times and places as may be mutually agreed upon. Supplemental agreements shall be made to cover any such arrangements. Such agreements shall provide that Standard may charge Navy for such products on the basis of its current sales prices at the time and place of sale. Standard may arrange to furnish any such products through its subsidiaries or affiliated companies in which it owns as much as 50 percent of the voting control. Should Navy and Standard mutually agree Standard may return to Navy the equivalent value of the oil, gas, and associated hydrocarbons advanced by Navy to Standard under section 4 (b) hereof, in refined petroleum products, in the manner provided for above.

(j) Division of drilling and operating costs of development wells. That Navy and Standard shall each bear their respective percentage shares, as determined from time to time, of the cost of drilling and operating all development wells in the manner provided in section 4 (c) hereof; provided, that Navy shall bear the entire cost of restoring to production or abandoning all Navy wells standing suspended as of the date of this agreement, and similarly Standard shall bear the entire cost of restoring to production or abandoning all such suspended wells on its lands being conveyed to Navy. Should it be determined by the operating committee that any such wells cannot be economically restored to production, the accounts of the parties hereto shall be adjusted to cover the allowance made for such wells in item (d) of section 1 hereof, and the value of any equipment and materials salvaged shall be credited to the account of the party bearing the cost of abandonment.

(k) Ownership of wells, equipment, and other property: That Navy shall own all wells, equipment, and other property which may at any time be permanently located on the lands covered hereby and used in connection with operations hereunder, except drilling and other equipment belonging to Standard and furnished on a rental basis, and except the pump station, and pole and pipe lines specifically reserved by Standard. Navy shall hold in trust Standard's percentage share of wells, equipment, and other property, as determined from time to time, in accordance with section 4 (c) hereof. If at any time Navy shall remove any equipment or other property from the lands covered hereby, it shall reimburse Standard for its share of the value thereof at the time of removal.

(l) Payments to Navy: That when paid in value, Navy's share of production (except that portion thereof which is retained by Standard pursuant to this agreement) shall be due and payable on the last day of the calendar month next following the calendar month in which produced, to the Property Accounting Officer, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., for deposit in the United States Treasury. When paid in kind, Navy's share of production shall be delivered in merchantable condition on the premises where produced unless otherwise agreed to by the parties hereto. Standard shall not be held in any manner responsible or liable for loss or destruction of liquid products of Navy in storage, from causes over which Standard has no control. Navy and Standard shall mutually agree upon the basis for measurements of volumes and gravities of oil and of gaging their respective shares of production.

(m) Operating committee: To form an operating committee to handle field operations. This committee shall consist of two members, representing Navy and Standard, respectively. In case of disagreement between these representatives on any matter concerning field operations the matter shall be referred for settlement to the Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves and to the vice president of Standard in charge of producing operations, and if they fail to agree the question shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Navy whose decision will be final.

(n) Actual cost defined.—That "actual cost" as used herein means the entire cost and expense of development, drilling for and producing oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons from the lands covered hereby and of treating, storing, and transporting these products on said lands, and shall include:

1. Expenditures necessarily incurred in drilling and operating oil or gas wells, the maintenance, cleaning out, repairing, deepening, redrilling, and abandonment of wells, transportation, construction and maintenance of camps, roads, pipe lines, power and telephone lines, and such other facilities and services as are necessary;

2. Sums paid by Standard as compensation for, or in reasonable settlement of, damages arising out of injury to or death of any person, or damage to or loss of property of third persons, resulting from operations under this agreement;

3. Workmen's compensation awards and expenses on account of injuries to or death of, employees engaged in operations hereunder;

4. Compensation and expenses of field superintendent and other employees exclusively engaged in carrying out operations hereunder, including taxes assessed on or measured by the pay of such employees, and any accident, sickness, vacation and other company benefits accorded such employees;

5. Charges to cover rental of equipment owned by Standard while being used for operations hereunder;

6. Cost of planning and supervising work done at Standard's sole expense in connection with contracts entered into under the provisions of section 3 (b), hereof.

7. Special services of Standard's employees when required (other than those employees regularly engaged in operations hereunder) such, for example, as designing work performed by Standard's engineering department in San Francisco; provided, however, Standard shall not include under "Actual cost" items generally designated as "Overhead," "Head office expense," "Engineering," and "General administrative expenses."

(o) Relief: That the obligations of either party shall be excused or modified to the extent that such party is prevented or hindered from complying therewith by conditions beyond its control.

SECTION 5. NAVY EXPRESSLY RESERVES

(a) Right to acquire materials, supplies, and equipment: The right to acquire materials, supplies, and equipment for operations hereunder, if it can do so at lesser cost than the same can be acquired by Standard. Standard shall reimburse Navy to the extent of its share of the value of the items so acquired.

(b) Helium: The right to take the helium from any gas produced under this agreement, but Standard shall not be required to extract and save the helium for Navy. In case Navy elects to take the helium, Standard shall deliver all gas containing same, or portion thereof desired, to such plant as Navy may provide on the lands covered hereby, whereupon the residue gas shall be returned to Standard without substantial delay in the delivery thereof: *Provided*, That Standard shall not suffer a diminution of the value of the gas save for the value of the helium extracted.

SECTION 6. SECURING OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES

Navy agrees to use its best efforts to assist Standard in securing materials and supplies necessary for operations hereunder and in securing permission to drill and operate any well or wells hereunder which may be restricted by any governmental order or regulation, provided that the drilling of any such well, or the operation thereof, is conducted in accordance with good oil field and engineering practices.

SECTION 7. UNLAWFUL INTEREST

It is agreed that no Member or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner, after his election or appointment, or either before or after he has qualified and during his continuance in office, and that no officer, agent, or employee of the Department of the Navy shall be admitted to any share or part in this agreement or derive any benefit that may arise therefrom; and the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and sections 114, 115, and 116 of the Codification of the Penal Laws of the United States approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1109), relating to contracts, enter into and form a part of this agreement so far as the same may be applicable.

SECTION 8. COMMISSION, PERCENTAGE, BROKERAGE, OR CONTINGENT FEE

Standard warrants that it has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give Navy the right to annul this agreement or in its discretion, to deduct from the consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees.

SECTION 9. AMENDMENT

This agreement or any provisions thereof may be modified, amended, or terminated at any time by mutual consent of the parties hereto.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have executed this agreement.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
FRANK KNOX, *Secretary of the Navy.*
THE STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA,
H. L. COLLIER, *President.*
B. WHETCHER, *Secretary.*

I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, on this 18th day of November 1942, do hereby approve the execution of the foregoing agreement by the Secretary of the Navy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States.

EXHIBIT A

COMPUTATION OF CASH PAYMENT DUE STANDARD OF CALIFORNIA AS OF DEC. 1, 1942

(a) Surface fee to 8,297.60 acres at $10 per acre	$82,976.00
(b) Surface fee to 48 acres in sec. 24–30/24 at actual cost thereof to Standard	2,276.70
(c) Present value of division equipment:	
Navy buys 64 percent interest in Standard's equipment valued at $302,815	193,801.60
Standard buys 36 percent interest in Navy equipment, estimated value $100,000	36,000.00
Balance due Standard	157,801.60
(d) Navy pays Standard 50 percent of cost, less 5 percent overhead, of well 45–19–30/24, $321,580	160,790.00
Navy pays Standard 64 percent of cost, less 5 percent overhead, less net production prior to Sept. 1, 1942 ($230,875.41) less estimated net production prior to Dec. 1, 1942 ($63,000), $1,232,837.69	789,016.12
Navy pays Standard a balance to properly proportion developments costs:	
Navy contributes 166 wells valued at $15,000 each	2,490,000.00
Standard contributes 144 wells valued at $15,000 each	2,160,000.00
Value of all wells	4,650,000.00
Navy's 64 percent interest therein is worth	2,976,000.00
Navy's contribution was	2,490,000.00
Balance due Standard	486,000.00
Navy's proportionate share 64 percent of Geophysical Surveys, $108,669.27	69,548.33
Total due Standard	1,748,408.75

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think it is due the Senate that I make a brief explanation of the bill now pending. As is indicated by the report, the amount of the bill as it passed the House was $72,861,316. The amount added by the Senate committee is $55,027,825. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $127,889,141. The amount appropriated for the current year was $192,860,791.43. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1944 is $107,263,931. The bill therefore exceeds the estimates by $20,000,000, but is $64,971,000 below the current appropriation.

The increases in the bill are of two general characters. First, perhaps I had best discuss the addition of about $10,000,000 which applies to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. One-half million dollars was added to the Geological Survey appropriation, based upon a Budget estimate. That amount is primarily designed for oil and gas investigations. The supply of fuel oil in this country is gradually being reduced. There has been so little prospecting going on, because of the fixed price of oil, that we are in danger of having a serious shortage. For that reason it was felt entirely desirable that the Geological Survey examine structures throughout the United States to determine where oil can be found.

With respect to the Bureau of Mines, we have gone through the bill in various ways to encourage the production of metallic ores, and particularly I want to direct the attention of the Senate to a proposal to examine throughout the United States the various deposits of iron ore in order to determine their quantity and their quality.

We are approaching the time when the present known iron ore resources of the United States will have been exhausted. No man can see farther into the ground than another; so the only way to find new fields is by diamond core drilling, and money is provided for that purpose.

There are also provisions in the bill to continue the operation of pilot plants for the development of sponge iron, which takes the place of steel scrap.

With respect to other increases in the bill I wish to call the attention of the Senate to page 2 of the report, which contains recommendations made by Mr. Chester Davis, the War Food Administrator, with respect to the dire necessity for the production of additional food supplies. About last January, realizing that the conditions had changed very materially, I asked the Director of the Reclamation Service to examine various irrigation projects throughout the United States to determine where food could be produced within 1 or 2 years. Such a report was prepared. It has been carefully considered by the War Food Administration, and the increase recommended in the bill is to carry out the policy with respect to production of additional food, the need for which Mr. Davis has so well stated. To do that we have added to the bill about $2,300,000 for Indian irrigation projects, a total of $15,726,000 for the general reclamation fund, and a lump sum of $4,000,000 to take care of what are known as the Case-Wheeler projects. A large part of the increase is backed by Budget estimates.

I think it is due to the Senate to explain these larger increases. I now ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, has an agreement been entered into that the committee amendments be taken up first, or is it in order to offer an amendment to the bill at the appropriate place?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Massachusetts can ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 2, line 13, of the bill, to increase the amount of $108,620 by $30,850, so as to make a new total of $139,470.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HAYDEN. The purpose of that increase, as I understand, is to carry out a Budget estimate.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; a Budget estimate for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

Mr. President, if the amendment shall be agreed to this important Division will still have to operate with 5 fewer employees than it now has, a total of 46. If the increase is not now made, the services of 10 employees will have to be dispensed with. The problems which are facing that Division in Puerto Rico, in Alaska, and in the Hawaiian Islands are critical. Puerto Rico has a serious shipping, feeding, and unemployment problem. Of course, Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands are actually in the war zone, and the conduct of civil affairs is vitally important under such circumstances. The Chief of this Division, Mr. Benjamin W. Thoron, is a conscientious, high-type public official, and I for one am impressed with his testimony.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment is in order. It is not subject to a point of order. I shall be glad to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts on page 2, line 13, is agreed to.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I rise merely to say that I wish to support the Senator from Massachusetts, because I think that item should be raised to the amount of the Budget estimate.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 3, which has heretofore been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Grazing Service", on page 2, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$801,700" and insert "$827,700"; and on page 3, line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "$856,700" and insert "$882,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 10, after the numerals "1934", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$78,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, after "(52 Stat. 1033)", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil and Moisture Conservation Operations", on page 5, after line 14, to insert:

Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Department of the Interior, independently or in cooperation with other agencies, to initiate and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures on critical forest, brush, and grass areas under the administration of the Department of the Interior, including not to exceed $7,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at training courses and meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and purchase in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent Expenses, Department of the Interior", on page 7, line 12, after the word "to", to strike out "$57,900" and insert "$52,900", and in line 16, after the word "Service", to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 24, after the word "Department", to strike out "$400" and insert "$600", and on page 8, line 6, after the word "Mines", to strike out "$4,500" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question with respect to the amendment on page 5. I notice that the money is limited to "critical forest, brush, and grass areas." Does the Secretary of the Interior define those critical areas?

Mr. HAYDEN. The break-down shows that the $700,000 for which a Budget estimate was submitted is for fire protection within the Indian reservations, national parks, and in the areas controlled by the Grazing Service. It covers all the land administered by the Department of the Interior and is complementary to a much larger appropriation which we made for the Forest Service under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Specifically, would it be applicable to Colorado national forests, if the Secretary so decided?

Mr. HAYDEN. It would not be applicable to national forests in Colorado, but applicable to national parks in Colorado in the public domain, under the jurisdiction of the Grazing Service. It relates only to land under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding", on page 8, line 11, after the word "journals", to strike out "$167,500" and insert "$237,500"; in line 12, before the word "for", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$95,000", and in line 13, after the word "and", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration", on page 9, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$3,287,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Solid Fuels Administration for War", on page 11, line 12, after the word "services", to strike out "$850,000" and insert "$895,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office", on page 11, line 19, before the word "including", to strike out "$778,300" and insert "$790,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 15, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 7, after the word "motorboats", to strike out "$345,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 24, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$29,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 17, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$290,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Salaries and general expenses," on page 16, line 4, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$692,860" and insert "$704,620."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 13, after the word "available", to strike out "$49,000" and insert "$51,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial assistance and advancement", on page 20, line 10, after the word "lands", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$425,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$145,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 21, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 25, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after the word "including", to strike out "$20,000 for departmental personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Development of water supply", on page 25, line 18, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage", on page 26, line 3, after the word "below", to strike out "$220,000" and insert "$255,500"; in line 9, after the word "projects", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$55,830"; and on page 27, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$66,500" and insert "$71,170."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 22, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$125,000"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "$215,000" and insert "$220,000"; on page 28, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$125,000"; in line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "$215,000" and insert "$220,000"; and in line 5, after the words "in all", to strike out "$335,000" and insert "$345,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 17, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$10,000"; and in the same line, after the word "with", to strike out "$17,000" and insert "$19,990."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 1, after the word "project", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$11,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 4, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "$23,000" and insert "$26,650"; and in line 5, after the word "with", to strike out "$22,000" and insert "$24,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 11, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$11,250" and insert "$12,000"; and in line 12, before the word "from", to strike out "$3,750" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 19, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "$7,000" and insert "$8,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 2, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$10,850" and insert "$11,850"; and in line 3, before the word "from", to strike out "$13,150" and insert "$14,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 9, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "$4,000", and insert "$5,000"; in the same line, after the word "with", to strike out "$112,500", and insert "$117,000"; in line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "$113,500", and insert "$118,000"; in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "$112,500", and insert "$117,000"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "$113,500", and insert "$118,000"; and in line 15, after the words "in all", to strike out "$230,000" and insert "$240,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 22, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000"; and, in line 23, after the word "with", to strike out "$41,000" and insert "$43,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 8, before the word "reimbursable",

to strike out "$19,500" and insert "$20,000"; and, in the same line, after the word "with", to strike out "$35,500" and insert "$37,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 20, after the word "with", to strike out "$175,980" and insert "$189,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 16, after the word "reservation", to strike out "$18,500" and insert "$20,000"; and in line 17, after the word "with", to strike out "$26,500" and insert "$28,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 2, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 12, to insert:

Arizona: Salt River, $325,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 15, after the figures "$6,000" and the semicolon, to insert "Yuma, $145,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 15, to insert:

Idaho: Fort Hall, $285,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 17, after the name "Montana" and the colon, to insert "Blackfeet, $50,000; Crow, $205,000;" and in line 18, after the figures "$6,250" and the semicolon, to insert "Fort Peck, $180,000; Tongue River, $31,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 19, to insert:

Minnesota: Red Lake, $103,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 21, after the figures "$11,000" and the semicolon, to insert "Fallon, $23,000; Moapa, $304,000; Pyramid Lake, $71,000;"; and in line 23, after the name "Shoshone", to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$142,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 23, to insert.

New Mexico: United Pueblos, $97,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 35, to insert:

Wyoming: Wind River, $250,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 5, after the word "binding" and the comma, to strike out "$92,750" and insert "$192,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 6, after the words "In all", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$2,502,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education", on page 36, line 3, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$5,864,665" and insert "$5,894,205."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 12, after the word "heads", to strike out "$1,233,800" and insert "$1,245,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 9, after the word "diseases", to strike out "$5,642,300" and insert "$5,666,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 15, after the word "heads", to strike out "$570,680" and insert "$580,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration", on page 46, line 21, after the word "provisions", to strike out "$2,785,200" and insert "$2,780,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 4, after the name "United States", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$825,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 16, to insert:

Expenses incidental to the sale of timber on the Choctaw-Chickasaw Sanatorium Reserve: Not to exceed $2,000 of the funds held by the United States in trust for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes may be expended for expenses incidental to the sale of timber on the Choctaw-Chickasaw Sanatorium Reserve: *Provided,* That all payments from this appropriation shall be made in the same proportion as the interest of said tribes in such timber.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 24, to strike out:

Expenses of tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the current fiscal year money may be expended from the tribal funds of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes for equalization of allotments, per capita, and other payments authorized by law to individual members of the respective tribes, salaries and contingent expenses of the governor of the Chickasaw Nation and chief of the Choctaw Nation, one mining trustee for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, at salaries of $3,000 each for the said governor, said chief, and said mining trustee, chief of the Creek Nation at $1,200 and one attorney each for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes employed under contract approved by the President under existing law: *Provided,* That the expenses of the above-named officials shall be determined and limited by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at not to exceed $2,500 each.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Expenses of tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the current fiscal year money may be expended from the tribal funds of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes for equalization of allotments, per capita, and other payments authorized by law to individual members of the respective tribes, and for salaries and contingent expenses, as follows: Expenses of governor, Chickasaw Nation, not to exceed $2,500; expenses of chief, Choctaw Nation, not to exceed $2,500; expenses of chief, Creek Nation, not to exceed $2,500; expenses of mining trustee, Choctaw-Chickasaw Nation, not to exceed $2,500; expenses of Choctaw tribal attorney, not to exceed $2,500; expenses of Chickasaw tribal attorney, not to exceed $2,500; salary of governor, Chickasaw Nation, $3,000; salary of chief, Choctaw Nation, $3,000; salary of mining trustee, Choctaw-Chickasaw Nation, $3,000; salary of chief, Creek Nation, $600: *Provided,* That the attorneys for each of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes shall be employed under contract approved by the President under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 9, to strike out:

Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Oklahoma, including pay of necessary employees, the tribal attorney and his stenographer, one special attorney in tax and other matters, and pay of tribal officers; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing, and telephoning, and purchase, repair, and operation of automobiles, $185,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided,* That not more than $1,920 may be used for the employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, which employee shall be an Osage Indian and shall be appointed without regard to civil-service laws and regulations upon the recommendation of the Osage tribal council: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for traveling and other expenses, including not to exceed $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, of members of the tribal council and other members of the tribe, when engaged on tribal business, including visits to the District of Columbia or Chicago, Ill., when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Okla., including pay of the superintendent of the agency and of necessary employees, the tribal attorney and his stenographer, and pay of tribal officers; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and repair and operation of automobiles, $170,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available to pay the salary of the tribal attorney except pursuant to a contract in writing approved by the Osage Tribal Council and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further,* That of the said sum herein appropriated $7,500 is hereby made available for traveling and other expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, when engaged on business of the tribe, including supplies and equipment, not to exceed $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the collection of any income due the Osage Tribe of Indians or the enrolled members thereof where such income is not deposited to the credit of the said Osage tribal funds account or to the credit of the proper member's account.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads and Bridges", on page 56, line 6, after the word "amended", to

strike out "$750,000" anad insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation", on page 60, line 19, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$65,000", and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 2, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$73,000", and insert "$104,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 4, after the word "works", to strike out "$16,500", and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 17, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$90,000", and insert "$95,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 21, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$160,000", and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$130,000", and insert "$143,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 24, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$248,000", and insert "$265,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 7, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "$50,000," and insert "$70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 11, after the word "division," to strike out "$15,000," and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 1, to strike out:

For general investigations and administrative expenses, to be expended from the reclamation fund in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified for projects hereinbefore in this act under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," under the heading "Administrative provisions and limitations," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth, all to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, and to remain available until expended, as follows:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 10, to insert the following:

Construction: For continuation of construction, and for general investigations and administrative expenses, of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the reclamation fund in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," under the head "Administrative provisions and limitations," but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth, all to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, and to remain available until expended:

Boise project, Idaho, Payette Division, $500,000;

Deschutes project, Oregon, $250,000;

Klamath project, Oregon-California, $420,000;

Riverton project, Wyoming, $500,000;

Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain Division, $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 13, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$275,000", and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$45,000", and insert "$70,000"; and in line 21, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$65,000", and insert "$175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 22, after the word "fund", to increase the total appropriation from the reclamation fund from $1,388,500 to $4,084,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 11, before the word "from", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam Fund," on page 69, line 18, after the words "set forth", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress prior to December 31, 1943, on expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocations of such expenditures between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities in Boulder City (and whether such allocation should be retroactive).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Fund, Construction," on page 70, line 25, after the name "Arizona", to insert "$1,000,000"; and in the same line after the item just stated, to strike out "Not to exceed $200,000 from unexpended balances of appropriations", and insert "*Provided*, That this appropriation and appropriations heretofore made."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 11, after the words "Central Valley project, California", to strike out "$11,500,000", and insert:

Kennett division, $15,374,000, of which $1,900,000 shall be available for the construction of the Shasta Dam-Oroville transmission line and terminal facilities; Friant division, $10,640,000; and Delta division, $2,686,000; in all, $28,700,000;

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $3,600,000;

Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, $4,100,000;

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,985,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902;

Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $1,200,000;

Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,415,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is the only controversial item in the bill. I did not want the amendment to be agreed to without inviting the attention of the Senate to it. Shall we pass over for the moment the Central Valley project and the other projects mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am perfectly willing to have the amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 71, lines 11 to 23, is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator make an explanation of the projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I invite attention to page 2 of the report, where there appears a very illuminating statement by Mr. Chester Davis with respect to the absolute necessity for increasing food production. As I stated, the United States Bureau of Reclamation went all over their projects to determine where food could be produced next year and the year following. Mr. Davis indicates that food will be needed after that; because, as he very properly states in the report—

It should also be noted that food is in a category by itself insofar as the war and post-war situation is concerned. The minute the shooting stops, production of direct military items, such as ships, tanks, guns, airplanes, etc., can be suspended, but no such action can be taken with food. Unquestionably, the demand for it will be even greater for at least 2 years after the war has been won.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator how long it will take to complete the projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. All the appropriations recommended in the bill are based upon a study of the projects made by the Bureau of Reclamation, and then checked by the Food Administration, of which Mr. Davis is the head. The study shows that food will be produced there next year or the year following.

Mr. BYRD. The projects will be completed then?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; so far as the work covered by these items goes. Other things will be done subsequently. Of course, there will be other units, but the whole basis for these appropriations is that the projects will produce food within the next 2 years.

Mr. BYRD. Are any of these new projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are all old projects. In many instances, as, for example, in the Central Valley in California, dependence has been had on pumping, and the wells have gone lower and lower. This appropriation will produce food on farms which already have the equipment. The same thing is true of the Big Thompson project in Colorado, where there are 400,000 acres on which there is not sufficient water to finish the crop. The lands are valuable and highly productive. The same situation prevails in Washington and in other places. There is very little new development. In some cases there will be an additional unit alongside an existing project where the farmers can step over onto it with their existing equipment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the item headed "General Fund, Construction" a number of projects are listed. I do not see listed the Provo River project in my State. I should like to have the Senator state what the situation is with regard to that project.

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation is that in each case the committee took into consideration any unexpended balances heretofore appropriated. We inquired of the Reclamation Service with respect to that project. There is a carry-over of $2,000,000. The work would have been done if the War Production Board had not stopped it. There is no necessity of reappropriating the money. It is available. That is the only reason why the project is not mentioned in the bill. That is true of a number of other projects. We must always take into consideration the carry-over.

Mr. MURDOCK. My understanding is that all that is necessary for the work to be resumed on that project is a "green light" from the War Production Board.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. Mr. Davis states that he has taken the matter up with the War Production Board, and is quite hopeful that the Board will change its attitude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 8, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$275,000" and in line 11, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 12, after the word "construction", to strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$43,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 13, to insert:

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, including not to exceed $220,000 for surveys, investigations, and administrative expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia), all as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y, 590z), $4,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at this point in the bill, on behalf of the committee, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 73, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese who are in the control of the Federal Government may be utilized in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation, and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we passed the same provision last year, except that at that time we did not take into consideration prisoners of war. We provided for enemy aliens and Japanese who might be employed. This provision adds prisoners of war.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I understand, the language of the amendment is simply a repetition of the existing statute, and the only modification consists in adding the words "prisoners of war."

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey", on page 73, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 23, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$173,000" and insert "$182,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 15, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$880,000" and insert "$1,380,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$475,000" and insert "$510,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 25, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$74,000" and insert "$198,365"; and on page 75, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$64,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 2, after the name "Federal Power Commission", to strike out "$95,000" and insert "$275,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$59,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 6, after the word "binding", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$100,000"; in line 7, after the word "illustrations", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,855"; and in line 8, after the words "in all", to strike out "$295,000" and insert "$325,855."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 20, before the words "of which", to strike out "$339,600" and insert "$550,325"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$72,000."

The next amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 23, after the name "United States Geological Survey," to strike out "$4,474,600" and insert "$5,529,685."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 78, line 4, after the word "including," to strike out "$56,000" and insert "$57,000" and in line 5, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$67,765" and insert "$68,765."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 25, after the words "not to exceed" to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$69,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 1, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$673,200" and insert "$688,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$59,000" and insert "$64,900," and in line 22, after the word "industry," to strike out "$718,380" and insert "$727,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, after line 24, to insert:

Protection of mineral resources and facilities (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines, independently or in cooperation with other agencies, public or private, to initiate and augment measures to prevent subversive activities from interfering with the extraction and processing of minerals, including not to exceed $35,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed $5,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; not to exceed $3,500 for printing and binding; purchase of special apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", $475,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] offered an amendment including the following language:

Services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese who are in the control of the Federal Government, may be utilized in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to what extent the labor mentioned in the amendment, eliminating prisoners of war, is being utilized today.

Mr. HAYDEN. When the Japanese were included a year or more ago it was thought there might be quite a number of them, but it developed that most of the interned Japanese, or a large number of them, were shopkeepers, and so on, from

the towns, and no substantial number of them were obtained.

The prisoner-of-war situation, however, looks much better because of the return of prisoners from north Africa. We had General O'Brian, who has control of the prisoners of war, before the committee, and he indicated to us that all the ships which are going over to north Africa with troops now return with German and Italian prisoners. The prison camps are so located throughout the United States that it is expected to utilize a large number of prisoners in connection with agricultural activities. In the building of a canal, men can be worked in crews or gangs, and it is much easier to guard them than when they are scattered over a number of farms. It is not contemplated, however, that they will be employed near critical works, such as great power dams or hydroelectric dams.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is the point. It is not expected that they will be placed near any dam.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment would allow that being done, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the War Department were foolish enough to allow them to be employed in the vicinity of such places, it could be done, but as a practical matter it will not be done. The most substantial use to be made of them will be on irrigation canals at great distances from any dam, the same as in the case of employment upon farms.

There is one thing which is perfectly clear. Under the Geneva Convention, a prisoner of war cannot be employed in making a munition of war, but his employment in connection with agricultural development is accepted as being entirely proper. Therefore, if the prisoners of war were employed on farms in connection with the gathering of crops, digging canals, and so forth, or in connection with digging a canal for the purpose of getting water to a farm for irrigation, such employment would be proper. Such operations would come within the scope of the Geneva Convention, and would be highly desirable.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no quarrel with the objective sought through the amendment, but I think it might be interpreted as a wide-open amendment giving the sanction of Congress to the utilization of these men around great dams and other critical places.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; that is the last thing that would be done. It was not done in connection with the Japanese in past years, nor with enemy aliens. I can assure the Senator that it will not be done now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 4, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$340,000" and insert "$380,455", and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$67,000."

THE CORN SITUATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, some time ago the President of the United States vetoed what was known to the Congress and the country as the Bankhead bill. Among the basic commodities found in the Bankhead bill was corn. When the veto message was returned to the Senate I took occasion to make certain definite comments upon various phases of it.

The basic commodity of corn stands in a singular and a rather significant position insofar as any affirmative argument can be made upon the question of inflation, should the producers' price be increased. On April 7, 1943, when we were discussing the veto message to which I have referred, among other things I said:

> I am alarmed so far as the corn situation is concerned. I honestly believe that sooner or later there must come an adjustment of some kind with respect to the corn if we expect to release it from the cribs and the warehouses and the bins where it is being held at the present time.
>
> Mr. President, as I view the situation it is serious. I have talked on the subject before. I have given out statements to the press along this line. I have discussed the matter with men high in the Department of Agriculture and high officials in the Government, and have tried to give them the benefit of my advice, and whatever wisdom I may have upon a serious situation with respect to the way corn is being handled in the country today.
>
> I sincerely hope that the corn dilemma of the Nation will soon be solved. It will do much to restore confidence and aid the war effort in the Midwest, because it is just—it is fair, it is right—and it is not inflationary.

Mr. President, at that time I was merely making an argument that the price received by the producer for his corn should not be less than parity. As everyone knows, under an Executive order, at the time the Bankhead bill was being discussed and passed by the Senate corn was selling for less than the parity price. Two months have passed, and as time goes on the corn situation in America becomes more serious. I submit that today a calamity is threatening the war effort unless something constructive shall be done immediately.

It is my understanding that those in authority are grappling with this problem. It is my information, further, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has at the present time approximately 10,000,000 bushels of corn on hand which have been taken over through default loans. It is my further understanding that those in authority expect to call the loans on corn which have been made under the corn-loan program. Through this procedure they expect to obtain from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 bushels of corn. I remind the country now, Mr. President, that it is not absolutely necessary or mandatory that farmers sell this corn if the Government calls the loans, if the farmer is in a position to borrow a sufficient amount of money to take care of it. The amount of corn which may be released through this method is problematical and purely speculative. I am further advised that in addition to these measures some 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels now in terminal warehouses throughout the country are subject to requisition by the Government.

So at the moment we have the picture of only forty to fifty million bushels of corn being available for corn processors, for those who feed, and for other necessary purposes in connection with the war effort. Obviously that small amount of corn for grinding and feeding purposes only touches the surface of the emergency. To reach bedrock it will take another one hundred and fifty or two hundred million bushels of corn to tide us over until the next corn crop comes along. That is the far-reaching, economic problem which is now before the Economic Stabilizer, the Food Administrator, and other men high in the official life of our Government.

Recently I wrote Chester Davis about this problem. On June 17 I received from his Deputy Director a letter in which he says:

> The supply of corn products has been greatly curtailed recently by the inability of the corn refiners to obtain adequate quantities of corn to maintain maximum production. Such supplies of corn as are now obtainable are being used primarily for the production of starch and starch products which are directly needed for the war effort by such industries as aluminum and steel foundries, textile industry, paper industry, adhesive industry, and others directly important to the war effort.
>
> Corn is not flowing to market, but is being kept on the farm and is being fed to hogs and other livestock. This is only natural, as the corn when sent to market is worth $1.07 maximum (Chicago price), whereas it is worth anywhere from $1.35 to $1.60 when fed to the hogs.

Mr. President, that statement indicates the problem with respect to obtaining corn from the farmers at the present time. The farmer takes a bushel of corn for which he pays $1.07 and by feeding it to his hogs he receives as a minimum $1.35 for the same bushel of corn. Such an economic discrepancy cannot be justified. The man who produces the corn certainly should be considered, when the process of rolling prices upward or downward is started.

I continue reading from the letter:

> This situation places all of the commercial users of corn in a position of competing, without success, for corn in the hands of the farmer.
>
> In these circumstances the proper balance between animal production and industrial or commercial uses of corn is not maintained. The problem is of serious concern to the Administration and every effort is being made to work out a solution which will permit these essential industries to continue to operate.

Mr. President, unless an adequate solution is found for this problem within the next 6 weeks, certain industries will be bound to shut down and close. Only yesterday a processing plant in Keokuk, Iowa, was closed, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is now rushing corn there in order to keep the plant going on a temporary basis. The Corn Food Products Co., in Pekin, Ill., was threatened with closing, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is giving that company a few thousand bushels in order that it may be tided over for the moment. So it goes. In my State there are some 9,000 people employed in corn products and refinery industrial concerns who are depending upon the grinding of corn in order to keep them employed, and this

does not include the thousands working in the distilleries.

Not only that, but the corn-refining industry is so vital to the war effort, I undertake to say that within 6 weeks, unless this problem is solved, the textile industry will have shut down for lack of starch for warp sizing; the paper industry will have curtailed production through lack of starch; production of B board, which is the board used in the production of shipping cases for the Army, will have ceased; the sugar supply of the country will be reduced by about 20 percent of the present sugar supply—that is, production of corn sugar and sirup will have ceased, and, furthermore, we will have ceased shipping starch for lend-lease to England, where it is being used for the same purposes.

Not only does this situation affect the particular industries mentioned, but I am also advised that the distillers who are now making alcohol for war purposes are greatly disturbed over the situation, and that one or two of them have closed down as the result of failure to obtain corn.

Mr. President, what is there peculiar about corn in connection with the inflation theory which we hear constantly discussed? I deny that an increase in the price of corn will create inflation in this country in any degree. I will give the reasons for my statement. I stated them in a speech I made about 2 months ago and what I said at that time still holds good today so far as inflation is concerned.

Senators, hear me when I say that 80 percent of all the corn that is produced in this country is fed to hogs, cattle, horses, sheep, and poultry. Eighty percent of all the corn that is produced goes into the mouths of live animals. The consuming public is not affected one iota as a result of that for reasons I shall disclose later. Forty-nine percent of that 80 percent is fed to hogs; 11 percent to dairy cattle; 10 percent to beef cattle; 10 percent to horses; 18 percent to poultry; and 2 percent is used for stock in the cities.

What is the present situation with respect to the price of cattle, hogs, poultry, and sheep? I shall read some figures given by me in the speech made 2 months ago which I think will vary but little from the figures of today.

I said then, "Hogs carry an actual price of $14.67 a hundredweight; the parity price is $11.70 a hundredweight. Calves, a hundred-pounds $14.45; parity price $10.87. Cattle per hundred $12.80; parity price $8.73. Chickens, actual price 23.5 cents a pound; parity price 18.4 cents a pound. The actual price of butterfat, which comes from dairy feed, is 50.5 cents a pound, and the parity is 42.9 cents a pound."

I am discussing now basic commodities of the same kind.

If corn should rise, Mr. President, 10, 15, or 20 cents a bushel, or even 25 cents a bushel, the only individuals who would be affected would be the farmers themselves, the cattle farmer, the hog farmer, the poultry farmer, and the sheep producer. They are the ones who are getting higher prices for their products; they are the ones who will have to pay more for the corn if the price of corn should go up. Furthermore the man who is making alcohol for war purposes, the man who is making starch for war purposes would have to pay more, but those products would go into the war effort and would not affect the consuming public. No one can tell me that in view of the price the cattle producer, the hog producer, the sheep raiser, and the poultryman are getting for their products, they cannot stand to pay an additional price for corn.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Are not the producers to whom the Senator has just referred more interested in getting the feed than they are in the cost of the feed?

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question about that. The former distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. Townsend, is one of the men who are engaged in the poultry business on a large scale. He told me recently he would pay almost any price in order to get a few carloads of corn into his section of the country in order to feed his poultry adequately.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator mentioned the price of corn insofar as feeding purposes are concerned. In view of the fact that the Senator mentioned the textile industry, which is an important industry in my State, in which are employed some quarter of a million workers who are solely dependent on the finished product, which is completed by the use of cornstarch, it is my information that the operators of the textile industries, too, are desirous of obtaining corn and cornstarch regardless of the price, because the price is a small consideration in comparison with the total product.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my information—and it is reliable—that unless the corn industries in my State and other States of the Union are able to obtain the corn which is necessary for grinding purposes, for the making of corn starch, many of the textile industries in South Carolina will close, if they do not get the product I am discussing, and if they are to get it, something drastic must be done to move the corn from the bins and the warehouses on the farms in the commercial corn areas of the Nation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is exactly correct. The owners and operators of the cotton mills and the finishing plants in the Carolinas have advised me exactly as the Senator from Illinois has stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that those operators are paying more money for the corn? As the Senator from New Mexico has said, the question is one of getting the corn, and the operators are actually paying more than the ceiling price in order to get the corn. Is not that the Senator's observation?

Mr. LUCAS. It is not my observation; I know nothing about the matter other than from rumors continually being heard that buyers are constantly coming through my section of the country paying $1.25 or $1.30 a bushel for corn, and carrying it away from the farmers' cribs and bins in order to dispose of it for feeding purposes. So "King Corn" is now operating in the black market.

Mr. President, this is a serious situation, and it is one which has been the subject of comment and discussion for many months. At the present time, I am informed, approximately 900,000,000 bushels of corn are being held by the farmers throughout the Nation. I do not place any blame on the farmers for holding the corn; but something must be done to induce the farmers to move the corn into the ordinary channels so that the things can be produced which are vital and necessary for the war effort, and the men who are working in the industries still be kept on the job.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. On the subject to which the Senator is addressing himself at this time, I wish to say that it is really remarkable into what avenues this commodity goes. I hold in my hand a message received this morning from Los Angeles, Calif., addressed to me, stating as follows:

> Immediate action necessary on corn supply for commercial channels to enable us to secure supply of corn flour used in manufacture of wallboard used in Army and Navy contracts. Failure to relieve this situation will prevent completion of construction now in progress.

I bring this to the attention of the Senate so that we may all know the devious ways in which corn is used in the all-essential activities now proceeding.

I have another telegram which shows another avenue in which the use of corn is vital. This comes from Sacramento, Calif.:

> Advised by corn refiners that shipments of dextrose discontinued because of lack of material. Present ceiling price does not allow manufacturers to pay prevailing market price for corn, and manufacturers advise that present stocks are running out and plants will be forced to close. This area is dependent on corn sugar to help spread our volume in ice cream and sherbets, and losses would result because facilities are not otherwise available.

I draw this to the attention of the Senate in keeping with the expressions of the Senator from Illinois, with which I very heartily concur.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the very able Senator from Nevada for his contribution. It is a demonstration of the many ramifications involved in the corn program, from coast to coast, from the Lakes to the Gulf.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Apropos of the subject to which the Senator is addressing himself, I have just this moment received a letter from the Corn Products Sales Co.,

of Portland, Oreg., in perfect harmony with the Senator's remarks. With his permission, and with the consent of the Senate, I should like to have the letter printed as a part of my interruption at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORN PRODUCTS SALES CO.,
Portland, Oreg., June 14, 1943.

To Our Customers:

The extreme difficulty we are experiencing obtaining sufficient corn has brought about a critical situation in our industry. Every effort has been and is being made to obtain corn without success. Our plants are now operating at a greatly reduced grind and unless the situation improves in the very near future, we will be obliged to shut down.

The farmers are keeping their corn for hog feeding which at present is estimated to be worth $1.35 to $1.50 per bushel, instead of selling it to the grain elevators at the ceiling price for cash corn which is $1.07. Unless some action is taken quickly to change this situation it will be impossible for us to continue supplying our customers.

This industry requires only about 130,000,000 bushels of corn out of a total production last year of over 3,000,000,000, but at the rate corn is disappearing daily on the farms, it will soon be exhausted for commercial purposes, for it is estimated there are 140,000,000 hogs on American farms today. We feel that all our trade should be fully acquainted with this condition well in advance of such a catastrophe so they may in turn present these facts before their customers and Government representatives.

Yours very truly,

J. E. WALZ,
Vice president.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wish to reiterate what I have heretofore said with respect to the corn problem as it stands alone, and not in conjunction with sugar or wheat or any other basic commodity. No matter what is done in the way of increasing the price of corn, it will not be inflationary, in my opinion. I do not believe the law of supply and demand would permit corn to go so high that it could be said to be inflationary but, in any event, a ceiling can always be placed upon the price of corn if such should happen.

Would an increase in the price of corn increase the price of food which those employed in the defense plants, the white collar man in the city, and others must have in order to sustain life for themselves and their families? Not at all, Mr. President. The prices for butter, eggs, poultry, beef, lamb, and hogs are fixed by law. The ceiling is high enough, and no one in the O. P. A. or any other agency should ever place any further support to the prices of those commodities. The man who is raising hogs at the present time can pay $1.35 for corn and still make a fine profit on hogs; and I know what I am talking about. The corn-hog ratio has been all out of proportion almost from the very beginning of the program, and very little if anything has been done to bring the corn-hog ratio into proper line.

Anyone who says that the price of corn, as a basic commodity, standing alone, is inflationary, in my judgment makes a fallacious and unsound argument. The one thing desired is economic adjustment of the prices of these commodities among the farmers themselves. The farmer who is selling his hogs and the farmer who is selling his cattle and his poultry is going to have to pay more for the feed; yet he will get the same price for his products he is receiving at the present time. It is an equitable adjustment between those people, but at the same time it will bring the corn out from the bins and the warehouses on the farms, and give it to the industries of the country which are now ready to close down, practically, for lack of corn.

The administration spokesmen realize the seriousness of the situation, and drastic action of some kind must be taken. However, I do not want to see an attempt to roll back the prices of extra heavy fat hogs, refined beef, and other products, in order to meet the present situation. Whenever that happens trouble will come. The producers of hogs, of cattle, and of poultry have all adjusted themselves in line with the present prices. In my humble opinion, the only way by which we can satisfactorily meet that situation is to permit the price of corn to rise, at least, during the emergency. An emergency exists at the present time, and there will be an emergency until the next corn crop comes along in September or October of this year. I do not say that my proposal affords a solution, but it could very well be a solution to permit corn, for instance, during the next 3 months to go to a dollar and twenty-five cents a bushel, and then say that upon such and such a date, when the corn crop for this year starts coming in, and the emergency is over, the corn price by Executive order would then be moved back to parity price.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that such an administrative move would bring plenty of corn to the market, that the 900,000,000 bushels which are in the cribs and bins at the present time would flow through the proper channels, and the industries in question would obtain what is so vital and so necessary to carry on the war effort successfully.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say. I was never more concerned with any problem than I am at this time with the economic issue which threatens to paralyze the industry. The issue is real; it is vital. It is an issue which must be met, and met soon, in order to save these industries and to continue to promote the gigantic war effort which is so interwoven with the problem of the basic commodity of corn.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 647 to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument. In explanation I wish to say that in January the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument. A similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives. The House bill has passed the House of Representatives and is now in the Senate, before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. The Senate bill was reported from that committee, placed on the calendar, and was passed by the Senate a few days ago. I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys may be discharged from the consideration of the House bill and that the Senate proceed to consider it. If that is done, I shall offer the same amendments which were made to the Senate bill. After the amendments are agreed to and the bill is passed, I shall ask that action on the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the parliamentary procedure suggested by the Senator is the correct procedure. However, I wish to have it made clear whether the bills are identical in substance.

Mr. HATCH. The bills are identical in substance.

Mr. McNARY. The amendments proposed by the Senator will not change the objectives of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. I think not.

Mr. McNARY. Otherwise I should be obliged to object. I am familiar with the House bill, and I have no objection to its present consideration. If the amendments proposed will not modify the House bill, and if the two bills will be identical in substance, I think the course suggested by the Senator is a proper one to be pursued at this time.

Mr. HATCH. I can assure the Senator that the two bills, with the proposed amendments to the House bill, are identical in substance.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that he ask unanimous consent that the Interior Department appropriation bill, which is the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that he then ask for the present consideration of his bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, which now has possession of House bill 647, be discharged from its further consideration, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is discharged from the further consideration of the bill. Is there objection to its present consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 7, of the House bill, following the word "land", to insert the words "or interests in land."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I offer the amendment on the same page, line 9, after the word "Act" and the period, to insert:

In the event the Secretary is unable to acquire such property, or any part thereof, at a reasonable price, he is authorized and directed to condemn such property, or any part thereof, in the manner provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I offer an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "it", to insert "in a suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, those are the only amendments I care to offer. They merely conform to the action of the Senate with respect to the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 647 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the passage of Senate bill 37 be reconsidered and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the United States Army has been noted for its unusually fine esprit de corps for more than a century and a half. This unconquerable spirit engendered by the friendly competition between its several corps and services has made the American doughboy the envy of the world.

It is particularly fitting, therefore, on this anniversary of the establishment of one of the oldest, and perhaps one of the most spirited of the corps of the United States Army, the Quartermaster Corps, that we should at this time recognize and record with a feeling of deep gratitude the tremendous contribution made to the stability of the United States by this essential branch of our military forces.

The Quartermaster Corps was established by the Continental Congress on June 16, 1775, more than a year before the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It is older, therefore, than the United States Army itself. Beginning as a two-man organization, it is today approximately in strength 5 percent of the Army, and it is larger than our entire Army was prior to the enactment of selective service. It is not the size of the Quartermaster Corps, however, of which I wish to speak, but rather of the great contribution which it has made as the backbone of the armed forces in carrying our supply lines to the farthermost regions of the globe wherever American soldiers are needed and found, and of the commendable patriotic spirit with which this unusual unit of our military service has fostered, maintained, and developed the world-famed esprit de corps of the Army.

The true American spirit is based upon friendly competition—competition in industry, commerce, finance, agriculture, transportation, education, religion, physical development, and sports—in fact, all American life is permeated with the competitive spirit. It is this same friendly, competitive spirit engendered by and between the separate corps of the Army that has made us invincible, and we may well, therefore, pause today to recognize, thank and glorify the fighting quartermasters who have had so much to do with the building of this wholesome, friendly, competitive spirit within our armed forces.

I say "fighting quartermasters" advisedly, for World War No. 2 has given a new significance to that title. This is a war of supply lines. Supply lines are necessarily longer and more vulnerable, as the war is world-wide in scope and the theaters of war are to be found in every nook and corner of the globe. The advent of bombing from the air has scattered and diffused the fronts, and there is just as much element of danger in the rear ranks as in the front ranks, and actually more danger in the supply lines, which are considered by the enemy as the blood life of the army.

The Quartermaster Corps of today is called upon not merely to select, test, procure, store, and deliver clothing, food, and other supplies to our armed forces throughout the world, but today as never before, it is called upon to do its own fighting in the protection of such supplies until they reach the troops.

As a result of this relatively vulnerable new position of the Quartermaster Corps, they are properly known today as the fighting quartermasters. As a matter of fact, the percentage of casualties among Quartermaster troops on battlefields of this war has been high. The heroic work which is being done by the Quartermaster Corps, under constantly changing precarious conditions, is the pride of America, and we glory in their bravery and in their determination to fulfill the vow of their valiant leader, Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, in his pledge that the Quartermaster Corps will never fail the American troops. They have lived up to their pledge. They have not been found wanting in organization, precision, economical operation, or in bravery. Under the direction of this brilliant leader and outstanding administrator, the Quartermaster Corps of today has risen to the greatest heights in its history.

The Quartermaster Corps furnishes the proper food, clothing, and equipment for every range of climate, from the frigid Arctic to the sweltering desert. It carries the American standard of living with American soldiers to the four corners of the world. Wherever American troops fight, there is a quartermaster organization that functions as trustee for their well-being.

Quartermasters are fighters first, suppliers second. The first casualty in the attack on Pearl Harbor that precipitated the entry of this country into the war was a Quartermaster Corps truck driver. Quartermasters reached the high-water mark of gallantry during the siege of Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines when they fed and supplied American troops under unremitting Japanese attack from land and air. Amid a veritable rain of bombs they took time out from slaughtering attacking Japanese units to slaughter, dress and cook animals; thresh wheat and rice to be ground into meal; distill sea water so as to get salt; and deliver food and supplies to the remotest foxhole. Even mules and water buffalo were slaughtered for food. Coffee was brewed and rebrewed until the very grounds became white. So long as an ounce of food existed, it was put to use and, what is more important, was delivered to the fighting men.

Quartermaster organizations were with Army units occupying Guadalcanal. In the forefront was a laundry unit which blasted Japanese gun emplacements and sniper nests into oblivion, and then proceeded to set up their laundry. Equipment that was destroyed was speedily replaced, and service was continued for the front-line troops.

Docks and unloading facilities were nonexistent; and quartermasters unloaded ship after ship, carrying supplies ashore on small boats and hastily improvised rafts. Hundreds of natives were hastily pressed into service as employees. Doubling for longshoremen, they set a record for debarkation.

In the six-months-long campaign that resulted in the complete ousting of the enemy, quartermasters operated the length and breadth of the island, delivering the goods 8,000 miles from home. In a land where railroads were unknown, roads were practically nonexistent, and where there was no source of electric power, they set up operations in virtually 100 percent duplication of those furnished in an Army post in continental United States.

The New Guinea campaign was another red-letter achievement for the Corps. A Quartermaster Corps officer, Col. George DeGraaf, was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for organizing scattered units at a critical moment in the siege of Buna and rallying the men to assist in the crushing defeat of the Japanese.

Here quartermaster units delivered supplies over mountains and across jungles, through mud, muck, swamp, and slime, in an area no white man had ever seen before 1928. Our men took what the Japs could not. The enemy got within sight of Port Moresby, only to be driven back to the other side of the huge island, leaving dead, dying, and starving men behind them. The Japs could not supply their own troops and hundreds died as a result. The quartermasters did deliver the goods to our men, and helped chalk up another sensational victory.

Every form of conveyance was utilized. Supplies were carried as far as possible by freighter. Then they were unloaded to smaller craft and were carried still farther, often up rivers or streams. Then they probably would be transferred

to rafts, canoes, or dugouts, to go still farther. Finally, land transport alone would do, and the supplies were shifted to trucks and jeeps which crawled through territory where the automobile was unknown. From trucks, the shift was to the backs of mules, donkeys, and burros. Eventually, there came a point where even those animals could go no farther, and manpower took over the load. Quartermaster soldiers and natives hired for the purpose then took over, and carried supplies on their backs to the thick of the fighting zone. It was a terrific and incredible transportation problem, but the quartermasters were under oath to deliver the goods, and they did.

More than a year ago, the quartermasters set up huge supply bases on various islands in the south Pacific, many of them 2 months' sailing distance from the United States. The problems they encountered taxed, but did not overcome, their ingenuity.

Quartermaster units soon were operating their own canning factory, stamping out regulation-size cans from larger ones used to carry supplies and food in the initial landings. Fresh vegetables and fruits were obtained from natives, and were canned. Fish were caught in the sea and inland rivers, and were canned. Quartermasters sailed to nearby islands to bring back boatloads of live animals and poultry for slaughter. They had to bring them in alive because of the absence of refrigeration.

Quartermasters manufactured their own oxygen plants for welding and other purposes. They operated laundries, repair shops, and other services.

The South Pacific campaigns provided an acid test for the equipment the Quartermaster Corps furnished the Army, and it came through with colors flying. A hard-bitten, old-line Army officer remarked that he came out of the Buna campaign with a profound respect for the Army service shoe. Another declared the jeep and the C ration—both Quartermaster developments—were the eighth and ninth wonders of the world. Enemy clothing, food, and equipment simply could not stand up like American supplies.

The invasion of north Africa—the greatest undertaking of its kind in history—was in many respects a Quartermaster program. The supply problem was dominant. It was met in unprecedented fashion. Quartermaster supplies never failed to arrive, and they never failed to meet the bill.

The First Quartermaster Battalion has been cited by the Commanding General of the First Infantry Division for outstanding performance of duty in action in the Oran offensive. The citation reads as follows:

> The efficiency and ingenuity exercised by the personnel of this battalion in repairing and operating French vehicles, trains, and local facilities on November 8, 1942, was an important factor in the success of the Oran offensive. The rapid flow of much-needed gasoline, rations, ammunition, and water from the ships to the men in the front lines and the evacuation of casualties to the rear were maintained despite heavy enemy fire.

The second and third platoons of the battalion's company A were cited singly for especially meritorious service in the preliminary Tunisian operations. From December 9 through December 25, 1942, the two platoons carried ammunition, rations, and personnel from Algeria to the Tunisian front without the loss of a man or a vehicle. The movements covered hundreds of miles over unknown routes, under black-out conditions, in the face of severe rainstorms, heavy bombing from the air, and sustained artillery fire.

The collapse of German resistance in Tunisia saw tens of thousands of Germans surrender because they had no supplies. Yet huge quantities of supplies also were captured. The answer is, the Germans just could not deliver the goods. That the American quartermasters could and did do so was a contributing factor to the successful conclusion of that campaign.

We praise the Quartermaster Corps for its splendid military service, and at the same time we might well pause and recognize its tremendous contribution to the economic life of our civilian population.

Today the Quartermaster Corps is supplying more than 70,000 different items to the Army. To name but a few, they include food, uniforms, clothing, barracks equipment, tents, general supplies, horses, mules, dogs, flags, insignia, band instruments, hospital supplies, towels, hymnals, skis and snowshoes, coal, gasoline, lubricants, fuel oil, toilet articles, stationery, office machines and equipment, paper, harness, cutlery, hardware, ice, cleaning materials, insecticides, furniture, stoves, and other supplies of general issue or that are common to two or more branches of the Army.

In addition, the Quartermaster Corps conducts the Army's salvage and reclamation operations, operates Army laundries, cleaning plants and repair shops, handles certain phases of lend-lease activities, and procures a number of items for the Navy, Marine Corps, and other branches of the Government.

Through its severe testing in the field and its scientific checking in its various laboratories, the Quartermaster Corps has been enabled to advise and direct industry in constructive changes of products to meet unusual war conditions and other changed circumstances. The effect of this extraordinary service has been to enable industry at large in the United States to better meet the exacting demands of changing times and to avoid obsolescence of equipment and outmoding of products. Thus, this great branch of the service is daily making its contribution to the national post-war stability.

The Quartermaster Corps has a highly trained personnel. Regular Army officers with years of specialized training and experience behind them are guiding quartermaster supply activities around the world. Outstanding leaders of American industry have been called upon to serve in military and civilian capacities, making their valuable services available to the Government. Enlisted men are carefully assigned to the jobs for which they are best qualified, and more than 70 different trades are being taught. Officer-candidate schools continually produce needed new officer personnel, and are functioning not only in this country but overseas, even as far away as New Caledonia in the South Pacific.

But, in conclusion, I would return again to the esprit de corps of the United States Army which is so paramount in the operation of the Quartermaster Corps, and I would record again the fact that this competitive spirit, this unusual patriotic zeal, so exemplified by the fighting quartermaster, is greater even than the contribution of the Quartermaster Corps to post-war stability, to industrial mobilization and modernization, and is even more important than the strictly military contribution of this great branch of the service.

So, Mr. President, let us doff our hats to the spirit of the American doughboys, to the esprit de corps of the Army of the United States of America, and to the inspired leadership of one of the oldest of the Army Corps, the fighting quartermasters, on this, their one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1944

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, the committee amendments on page 82, line 4, which have already been stated, will be agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there are on the calendar three bills which came from the War Department, two of which have been on the calendar for 6 months. They are very simple bills. The War Department has repeatedly requested action on them, and I wish to ask the cooperation of this body with the War Department to the extent of granting unanimous consent that they may be considered at this time. It will take only a moment. Two of the bills have been on the calendar for 6 months, and the other is very necessary, or I would not make this request. I hope the minority leader will not object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, with the greatest of frankness, I have objected to these bills several times on the call of the calendar, mainly because Senators temporarily absent from the Chamber on official business so requested. I could not permit the Senator to have his way now, because I wish to see the pending appropriation bill passed. Let us take one bill at a time. The bills to which the Senator refers should take their proper place. After the appropriation bill is passed we can consider them. Let me look into the matter and get some idea of the general purposes of the bills. Are they the first two bills on the calendar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are three bills, including the first two bills on the calendar, which have been on the calen-

dar for 6 months. There is another one, on page 5 of the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall have to withhold my consent at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 17, and 26.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 15, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

" 'No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the silver purchase acts—namely, the acts of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said silver purchase acts except with respect to silver purchased or procured or transfers of any interest in silver bullion effected on or before June 30, 1943.' "

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "including the employment of not to exceed three temporary experts by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the Postal Service."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "mail" insert "*Provided further*, That after January 1, 1944, no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of the Government."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 1, and further insist on the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is that the amendment involving the use of penalty mail by the departments?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; that is the so-called silver amendment. This is the Treasury and Post Office bill, and the amendment to which I refer is the so-called silver amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator asking for a further conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 17.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we know to what that amendment relates?

Mr. McKELLAR. It relates to the employment of experts. The Senate inserted an amendment providing for the appointment of one temporary expert by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies into the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the Postal Service. The House amended the Senate amendment by providing for the employment of three such experts. My motion is to concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 26, and further insist on the Senate amendment. That is the amendment relating to penalty mail, about which I talked with the Senator from Massachusetts a few moments ago. The House undertook to cut off certain free mail of the departments on January 26. I am obliged to disagree to that amendment, and I hope the Senate will send it back for further conference.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I concur in the view of the Senator from Tennessee. I think that amendment would have a very crippling effect on the operations of the Government agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the amendments still in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$32,200" and in line 17, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$440,000" and insert "$443,245."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 3, after the word "aprons", to strike out "$328,380" and insert "$538,380" and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,500" and insert "$42,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, no land may be purchased except by authority of Congress. The committee has directed me to offer amendments affecting three minor purchases of land. The amendment which I now offer and send to the desk relates to the purchase of land at Bartlesville, Okla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

Purchase of land, etc., Bartlesville, Okla.: For the purchase of land in Bartlesville, Okla., which land may be acquired as an addition to the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines, and the purchase or construction of fences, temporary storage sheds, and other necessary structures, to remain available until expended, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 13, before the words "of which", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$704,500" and in the same line, after the word

"exceed", to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$22,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 22, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$114,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 14, before the words "of which", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$501,300"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$295,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 17, after the word "for", to strike out "western"; in line 21, after the word "and", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "coking"; in line 23, after the word "including", to insert "pilot plant construction and operation to utilize more fully found resources and"; on page 85, line 2, before the word "operation", to insert "purchase"; in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "two" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$38,000"; and in line 10, after the word "work", to strike out "$149,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the Senate has just approved the amendments in the item under the heading Investigation of Raw Material Resources for Steel Production. I had intended to address myself to these particular amendments today, but in the light of the desire to move along and get the bill out of the way I shall withhold my remarks until some time on Monday next. However, in the light of the very eloquent address delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] today, I think there is much to be said for amendments of the kind we are dealing with in this particular connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 22, to insert:

Gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense): For necessary expenses for pilot-scale tests on the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores, including laboratory research and maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; purchase or lease of land or buildings; construction and equipment of buildings; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $9,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $200 for printing and binding, books of reference and periodicals; purchase not to exceed $2,775 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while employed; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", $400,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before the committee amendment is agreed to, I wish to offer an amendment to it to make it conform to the provisions carried in the House bill with respect to all national defense items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, line 24, in the committee amendment, after the word "expenses", it is proposed to insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate should know that all the House provisions contain that language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a further amendment to the committee amendment, authorizing the Director of the Bureau of Mines to accept contributions from public and private sources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 86, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the figures "$400,000", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources, for the purposes hereof, and to carry out projects with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000", and in line 17, after the word "work", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to let this item go by without an explanation. I wish to have the RECORD show, and to advise the Senate, that 2 years ago there was appropriated a small amount for a pilot plant to evolve a process for the beneficiation of manganese ores in the central part of South Dakota.

To suggest to the Senate the value of these deposits I invite attention to a report from the South Dakota State geologist, Dr. E. P. Rothrock, which reads as follows:

The manganese deposit is remarkably uniform throughout the entire length. Manganese content of the nodules averaged 18.9 percent, a little higher than the average content for the material previously explored. There is enough manganese in this deposit to supply the iron and steel industry of the United States for several hundred years.

I wish to say further that with the appropriation made 2 years ago the pilot plant which was constructed and operated by the Bureau of Mines has done the work which we expected at that time it would do. A successful process was evolved for beneficiating the manganese in the ore nodules. The engineers having the work in charge know exactly how to do it, and they do it successfully and economically, bringing the manganese content up to about 19 percent. What is now needed is to ascertain how to bring that manganese up to such a percentage that it will be usable in the commercial trade. The Metals Reserve Company checked the figures and the process of the Bureau of Mines with a private engineering report of which I have a copy on my desk at the moment. The check which was made by the private engineering concern has brought the information down to the last detail, and it confirms the findings of the Bureau of Mines.

The recommendation for an appropriation of $1,900,000 is not entirely for equipment to be erected at or near Chamberlain, S. Dak. It is to enlarge the plant so as to make it a semi-commercial pilot plant so that small amounts of manganese may be actually processed and made ready for commercial use, to go directly to the steel industry. There will be a regular daily output, and possibly after a year of operation we shall be able to sell the processed manganese for about $200,000, making about 12 tons of ore a day available.

South Dakota believes that it has an ore which is very necessary for the war effort, and has insisted all along that the United States should have its own domestic manganese mines. With this appropriation we feel that we can prove the process, and that private industry and the steel mills will then take over and complete the development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks on manganese there be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks that part of the report on the subject which appears on pages 12 and 13 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEMICOMMERCIAL PLANTS FOR TREATING CHAMBERLAIN, S. DAK., MANGANESE ORE

It is well know that virtually inexhaustible reserves of manganese-shale deposits occur in the area contiguous to Chamberlain, S. Dak. The readily workable deposits contain something like 10,000,000 long tons in terms of metallic manganese.

The Bureau of Mines and other interested groups have shown that the shale may be mined cheaply by power shovels, and can be easily processed by crushing, screening, and hand sorting to recover nodules assaying about 16 percent manganese. The nodules may be calcined to a 23 percent manganese product which makes a satisfactory feed for matte-smelting, refining, and final sintering.

The demand for manganese sulfide, which has important war uses, can be supplied by stopping at the refining step. A final sintered product may be made which assays over 60 percent manganese, a highly desirable material for metallurgical uses. Pig iron is recovered as a byproduct.

Work in the field, in the laboratory, and in the pilot plants by the Federal Bureau of Mines has demonstrated the technical possibility and the probable practical feasibility of operating if the demand for the products is sufficiently critical.

An estimate has been made that a commercial plant capable of treating 20,000 tons of shale per day to produce 175 tons of 61 percent manganese sinter and 200 tons of pig iron on a daily basis might produce the manganese sinter for about $40 per ton. The complete plant of this size would cost from eight and one-half to nine million dollars.

Before risking an expenditure of this size, it would appear that the next logical step would be the construction and operation of semicommercial plants on a scale that would recover 50 tons of nodules per day from some 1,300 wet long tons of shale and produce about 12 tons per day of sinter assaying 61 percent manganese, an operation about one-fifteenth that indicated above. By using certain equipment now stored by the Bureau of Mines near Chamberlain, S. Dak., as a nucleus, it is estimated that $385,000 would be sufficient to construct and equip the necessary units of this semicommercial plant, and that $515,000 would be required for 12 months' operation.

Everything necessary for the production of crude matte can be made available in South Dakota. Because of power requirements and other considerations, however, it would be advantageous to locate the refining and sintering units at some other locality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 19, after the word "work", to strike out "$430,000" and insert "$495,875."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$38,000" and insert "$53,000"; in line 16, after "1944", to strike out "$478,500" and insert "$1,960,000"; in line 17, after the words "of which", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$335,000"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$17,500" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 3, to insert:

Magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense): For all necessary expenses for the conduct of investigations and development of methods for the recovery of magnesium from domestic raw materials, including naturally occurring brines, salt deposits, dolomite, magnesite, and brucite, by hydrometallurgy, direct reduction, and electrolytic methods, including laboratory research; maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores for metallurgical tests; purchase or lease of land; construction and equipment of buildings to house pilot plants, including employment by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $750 for printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; books of reference and periodicals; special wearing apparel and equipment for protection of employees while employed; and the operation, maintenance, and repair of three passenger-carrying automobiles; $525,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is necessary to perfect the committee amendment in the same manner as we did with respect to a previous amendment, by adding the national defense provision. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 90, line 5, in the Committee amendment, after the word "expenses", it is proposed to insert "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes"; and on page 91, at the end of line 2, it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to operate the said plants in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$90,000" and in line 19, after the word "employed", to strike out "$2,475,000" and insert "$4,010,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 24, to insert:

Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense): For all expenses necessary to construct, operate, and maintain, independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, a drainage tunnel, including lateral tunnels, to drain mining land in the Leadville, Colo., mining district, including the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or donation of lands, rights-of-way, or other interests in lands, or other property; the engagement by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of individuals, firms, or corporations, necessary to design and construct the tunnel; purchase, not to exceed $2,700, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, which may be used for transporting employees from their homes to temporary locations of employment; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; not to exceed $13,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and other items of expenditure otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment which is of the same nature as the ones previously offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 92, line 1, after the word "necessary", it is proposed to insert a comma and "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer now a proposal suggested to the committee by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], which provides for the sale of products by pilot plants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 94, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral products that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, valuable quantities of magnesium and other minerals are being produced and it was thought that the Government might as well obtain money for them.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the Senator, in a word, how does it modify the language of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. At the present time if the pilot plant produces magnesium the Government can give it to some company to work with, but cannot sell it. This is to authorize sales and to have the money placed in the Treasury.

Mr. McNARY. That is an excellent idea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, at the end of line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines, from $8,640,225 to $18,712,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service", on page 94, line 12, after the words "park system", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$375,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 17, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$161,110" and insert "$245,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 24, after the words "park system", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$26,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 96.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Texas that, under the unanimous consent order, the Senate is now considering committee amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will take but a moment, and I ask unanimous consent to consider it now because it relates to the pending item in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection and the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 96, line 6, after the word "features", it is proposed to strike out "$1,861,200" and insert "$1,876,200."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to increase this item only by $15,000. The reason for it is that some years ago the Federal Government, through an act of Congress, provided that what is called the Big

Bend National Park in Texas would be adopted as a national park provided the State purchased all the land and made a gift of the land to the Federal Government. That has taken place. The State of Texas, through its legislature, appropriated a very large sum—I do not recall all the details—to acquire the title to the entire area known as the Big Bend National Park. It is now about to be turned over to the Government. Titles have been perfected, and I understand the Park Commissioner of Texas is now in the city. So this item is merely an item of $15,000, sufficient to allow the Federal Government to employ some caretakers and others up to the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment is in order, inasmuch as it comes by reason of a situation created since the Budget estimate. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the same page, at the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], I ask that an amendment be considered by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 96, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

Patrick Henry National Monument: For completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill, and including all expenses incidental to such acquisition, to be known as the Patrick Henry National Monument, in accordance with the provisions of the acts of August 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 652), and January 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 18), $25,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 14, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$140,000" and insert "$170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 25, after the word "services", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$348,540."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 5, after the word "products", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$84,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "$459,000" and insert "$470,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 20, after the word "fur", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$115,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee amendment will have to be further amended and by direction of the committee I offer an amendment to authorize the purchase of a tract of land at Fontana, Calif. The amount involved is $11,300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 103, line 20, after the figures "$115,000", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "including not to exceed $11,300 for the purchase of the land, buildings, and other privately owned property at the United States Rabbit Experiment Station at Fontana, Calif."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 3, after the name "Territory of Alaska", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 16, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "$740,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 11, after "192–211)", to strike out "$130,000" and insert "$152,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 1, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$540,000" and insert "$620,315."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$4,147,350" and insert "$4,873,205."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration", on page 106, line 18, after "(16 U. S. C. 669–669j)", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 22, after the word "Service", to strike out "$4,897,350" and insert "$6,123,205"; and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$816,546."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Government of the Virgin Islands", on page 111, line 25, after the name "Saint Croix", to strike out "$168,820" and insert "$174,620."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$37,640" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 13, before the words "to be", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief", on page 114, line 2, after the name "Bureau of Mines", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 8. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly by way of wages, salaries, per diem or otherwise for the administration of the Jackson Hole National Monument as described in Executive Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 115, line 11, after the words "for the", it is proposed to strike out the word "administration" and insert "performance of any new administrative function or the enforcement or issuance of any rule or regulation occasioned by the establishment."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire if that is the committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Oregon it is.

Mr. McNARY. It has the endorsement and recommendation of the committee, I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has; it is a committee amendment. I may say, in connection with the amendment, that it is presented merely for the reason——

Mr. McNARY. Where does the amendment come in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 115, line 11. At that point the word "administration" is stricken out and in lieu thereof it is proposed to insert the words "performance of any new administrative function or the enforcement or issuance of any rule or regulation occasioned by the establishment."

The amendment has to do with the creation by Executive order of a national monument within the State of Wyoming in the Jackson Hole area after attempts to extend the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park by legislation had failed. The State of Wyoming has filed a suit challenging the legality of the act. The purpose of the amendment is to prohibit the use of any appropriation contained in this act to administer the monument as a monument, without interfering with the functions heretofore performed by the National Forest Service in fire prevention, the Bureau of Reclamation in administering the affairs of that bureau, or the wildlife activity in that area which is now within the forest or within the public domain.

A certain portion of this area was transferred by Executive order, properly, from one department to another. There is no desire to interfere with any of those previous functions, but the purpose of the amendment, approved by the committee, is to prevent the administration of the monument as a national monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 115, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the pe-

riod between June 30, 1943, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have three minor amendments to offer which I wish to have disposed of, but as the Senator from Tennessee desires to address the Senate, I shall wait until he shall have concluded.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as we all know, this war is costing a tremendous amount of money. At this time I wish to speak of a very practical method we adopted a little more than a year ago which has resulted in the saving of a large amount of money to the Government on war contracts. I refer to the renegotiation of contracts law, introduced by me and passed by the Congress a little more than a year ago and signed by the President on April 28, 1942.

Our country has been engaged in seven large wars—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and now the Second World War. Up until last April, so far as I can ascertain, no measure to prevent excessive profits in war contracts in any of these wars was ever passed by Congress. I felt that we ought to supervise the profits on war contracts, and with the help of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, we secured the passage of this renegotiation of contracts law.

When passed, the law was put into the hands of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson, the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James V. Forrestal, and Admiral Emory S. Land, of the Maritime Commission. They selected Mr. Maurice H. Karker, of the War Department, as Administrator, and other leading business men as aids, and I venture the assertion that no law ever passed by the Congress has ever been administered more fairly, more justly, or more successfully, than has this law. In the first 12 months there has been saved to the Government through renegotiation of war contracts the sum of $2,849,000,000 in round figures. It is the most stupendous single saving that has ever been made in the conduct of any Government, $1,062,000,000 in cash covered into the Treasury, and $1,787,000,000 in price reductions, which is exactly the same as cash. The Departments were successful in obtaining a comparatively small but most efficient personnel of less than 1,500, at an annual cost in salaries of about $4,500,000.

No contracts of less than $100,000 can be renegotiated; only the large contracts are renegotiated, under the law, and those which have been renegotiated have been renegotiated voluntarily by the contractors and by the representatives of the Government. There have been no law suits, no unseemly contentions, the Government representatives always being ready and willing to see that the contractors get reasonable and even generous profits, and the contractors being willing, for the most part, to return or reduce excessive prices under the original contracts. Of course, no doubt some contractors would like to have or retain the prices in the original contracts, but when shown that they are taking advantage of their Government while it is engaged in its greatest war, almost without exception they have acted as reasonable and patriotic citizens, and have yielded back excessive profits.

Mr. President, while most of our war contractors do not want to make exorbitant profits out of this war, those who do attempt to benefit disproportionately tend to discredit all industry and make wartime controls a necessity. I shall not give names, but I wish to refer to a few examples.

One company, upon sales of about $24,000,000, for 1942 made a net profit, before taxes, of 38.7 percent, and a net profit even after all taxes had been paid of five and one-half times the entire net worth of the company at the beginning of the year. Excess profits taxes did not solve this company's gouging the Government.

Another company made 52 percent upon its 1942 sales, and even after taxes, its profits for the year were almost 10 times its net worth at the year's beginning.

Another company realized a profit for 1942 of 26 percent, and after paying its taxes still had profits for the year which were greater than its net worth at the beginning of the year.

Still another company had left, after taxes for 1942, profits that were twice as great as its net worth at the beginning of the year.

These are actual cases, and there are numerous cases of this character which investigation has disclosed, and they demonstrate conclusively that taxes alone will not eliminate war profiteering.

It must be remembered that in controlling prices of war materials, even in the case of thoroughly conscientious and honorable contractors, controls are necessary if costs are to be kept down, waste is to be avoided, and inflationary trends are to be counteracted.

But it is claimed that these savings could be made by the collection of the excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax is all right in many respects, but it would not take care of a situation like this. In the making of these Government contracts the contractor always counts in as a part of his expense the Federal, State, county, and city taxes which he has to pay. This can be explained possibly better by a personal illustration. I know of a man who took a Government contract out of which he expected to make a million dollars, with the taxes estimated at $750,000, leaving $250,000 as net compensation to him, the contractor. Then came the new tax law, which forgave or canceled three-fourths of his taxes, leaving this taxpayer not only the $250,000 he expected to make in return for his services, but three-fourths of $750,000, or $562,000 in addition, making the contractor's net return for his work $812,000, instead of the $250,000 he had calculated as reasonable compensation to himself when making the contract. The renegotiation law will take care of all such excess profits.

The savings I have just referred to, however, are but a small portion of the total benefits of renegotiation. These savings from renegotiation mean a reduction of prices after the contracts are renegotiated. Contractors, realizing that excessive profits are being recovered and that excessive prices in existing contracts are being reduced through renegotiation, are agreeing to more reasonable prices in their new or renegotiated contracts. Of course, these savings are not susceptible of accurate measurement, but I am convinced that they will amount to more than the $2,849,000,000 actually saved as herein before stated.

Then, too, we have the equation of inflation. Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, a great authority on all matters of finance, has always contended that the excess-profits tax made tremendously for inflation. However that may be, the renegotiation of excessive prices in contracts does not make for inflation in any manner, shape, or form, but prevents inflation.

Mr. President, that is also a mistake. It is true that there is a provision in the Federal Constitution that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligations of the contract, but there is no reason why in cases of this kind, where such vast and excessive profits are made as almost to bring about fraud upon the Government, the United States cannot protect itself in the way I have spoken of in connection with renegotiating or changing contracts.

Such a law as the renegotiation of contracts law which we now have is absolutely necessary if we are to prevent inflation. There was no such law during the First World War, and it was estimated afterward that 23,000 new millionaires or multimillionaries were created in that war by reason of excessive prices in war contracts. It is the duty of this Government, therefore, to see that in a war excessive prices are not charged, and judging from the results of the first year's administration of this law it is quite easy to see that stupendous savings have been accomplished.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am very much interested in the Senator's speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. TAFT. I think but one thing should be added, and that is, that had there been no renegotiation of contracts law, 80 percent of the savings made would have had to be paid in taxes, so that the actual savings resulting from the renegotiation of contracts law really amounts to about 20 percent of the total amount which has been saved through the renegotiation of contracts law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are two answers to that statement. The first is that when the contractor is an

individual we forgive him under the recent tax law three-fourths of his last year's income tax.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell me how many such individuals there are?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know how many there are.

Mr. TAFT. I think the number is practically negligible.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about that. There are a great many of them.

Mr. TAFT. There should be an excess-profits tax placed on such individuals during wartime. They are engaged in the performance of war contracts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has asked the question, because I wish to compare the figures.

The total excess-profits tax collected from July 1, 1942, to April 30, 1943, a period of 11 months, was $3,757,211,910 for all businesses in the entire country. The estimated average for the year would be $4,240,775,538, while the amount returned to the Government under the renegotiation of contracts law was $2,849,000,000. Reduction in prices amounted to more than $3,000,000,000. That amount added to the $2,849,000,000 gives a total of $6,000,000,000, or $2,000,000,000 more than the entire excess-profits tax for the year. So the Senator's figures with respect to 80 percent which would be recovered in excess-profits tax are incorrect.

Mr. TAFT. What I wanted to point out to the Senator was that if there had been no renegotiation of contracts law and the $2,800,000,000 had not been returned, 80 percent of it or approximately $2,000,000,000, would have been added to the excess-profits tax, and we would have collected $5,600,000,000 in excess profits taxes instead of $3,600,000,000. So that the actual net saving is only about 20 percent of the figure mentioned by the Senator. I am not questioning the principle, I only think that the record should be accurate with respect to the savings actually accomplished.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I have the accurate figures here. It is perfectly manifest that if the excess-profits taxes of all kinds, nature, and description amount to only a little more than $4,000,000,000, and the renegotiation of contracts act brings in $2,849,000,000 in cash, and reduction of prices results in a saving of more than that amount in addition, the excess-profits tax could not possibly have reached the amount represented by that saving, which is more than $6,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the effect of renegotiation of contracts and taking that money back is to reduce the excess-profits tax of the company which returns the money. If the company had been able to retain the $2,800,000,000, then it would have had to pay additional excess-profits taxes equal to 80 percent of $2,800,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about that, because returns have already been made on the basis of the income.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I completely agree with the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If we recover the excess profits through taxes, they are returned to the Treasury, whereas if we recover through renegotiation of contracts the money is returned to the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, or whoever is back of the renegotiation proceedings.

Mr. McKELLAR. Evidently the Senator was not present when I first read the figures. For the first year, $1,062,000,000 has been returned in cash and covered into the Treasury of the United States, and the other $1,700,000,000 represents the amount that was returned as the proceeds resulting from reduction in price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want it all to go back to the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. That can be done easily by an amendment concerning which there would be no trouble. I do not have any objection to it all going back to the Treasury. I think the renegotiation of contracts law will bring more money into the Treasury of the United States than all excess-profits taxes, even up to 80 percent, would bring.

Mr. President, on May 3, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters, one from the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Robert P. Patterson, and the other from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal. A short while after I did so my good friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] discussed those letters. I happened to be absent from the Chamber at that moment and did not hear the discussion and did not read it until the next day.

Mr. President, I have such great respect for the Senator from Georgia, and such admiration for him, and I respect his views so highly, that I am reluctant to disagree with him. He is as fine a legislator as there ever was, and as fine a man as ever lived. He is exceedingly level-headed. I deeply regret that I cannot agree with him in this matter, but I cannot agree with him on any of the contentions he has made concerning the renegotiation of contracts law, for it has been shown to be the most successful law of its kind. The purposes of the law have been successfully carried out.

The bill providing for the renegotiation of war contracts was passed a little more than a year ago, it having become the law on April 28, 1942. At the time the bill was reported by the committee it brought about much discussion. Other plans were suggested, but finally this plan was agreed to by the committee and by the departments affected. It has been in operation a little more than a year, as I have stated, and has met with the wholehearted and cordial approval of the departments. So successful have they been under its provisions in saving the Government money that I think it should meet the approval of every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, during none of the prior wars has there been any regulation of war contracts, and in each of them there has arisen scandal growing out of the huge profits made by what are known as war profiteers. I was a Member of the Senate during World War No. 1 and have been a Member ever since. I remember distinctly that it was estimated at the close of World War No. 1 that America had 23,000 additional millionaires and multimillionaires growing out of excessive profits on war contracts. The remembrance of the situation that grew out of World War No. 1 made me believe that it was highly important that we should regulate war contracts. I believe, as we all do, in the sanctity of contracts. Our Federal Constitution provides that no State shall impair the obligation of a contract. That does not apply to the United States Government, but it is natural that we should give every consideration to the carrying out of an honest and fair contract.

Now as to war contracts, we must all remember that they are entered into under conditions where excessive prices for goods produced or for work done for the Government very naturally arise. The contractor, in most cases perhaps, has to change its business from a peace basis to a war basis. This results in uncertainty, and makes the contractor increase his price. How long the war may last is another uncertainty. The cost of labor is a vital uncertainty. The cost of materials is just as uncertain. The Government has to have these products in order to carry on the war, and that makes Government contractors peculiarly likely to ask prices which in ordinary times the Government representative would not agree to. I am not criticizing the contractor. Naturally, the uncertainty which surrounds him as to all the matters above stated makes him feel he must charge the highest prices in order to protect himself in the transaction. It is perfectly apparent to thinking persons that these contracts make the Government likely to agree to excessive prices and just as naturally makes the contractor raise his price to the highest figures so that he will be certain not to lose.

It was under these circumstances that the renegotiation of contracts law was passed.

I come now more specifically to the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He said:

> At the time of its passage (renegotiation), we had no wartime excess-profits taxes.

It will be remembered that the Renegotiation Act was approved April 28, 1942, at which time there was an excess-profits tax under the Revenue Act of 1941 running up to as high as 60 percent, and the Congress had under consideration the present law which increased that maximum rate to 80 percent—90 percent, less a 10-percent post-war refund. In this connection, the Senator from Georgia said:

> But now we have an excess-profits act which provides for a tax up to 90 percent, with only a 10-percent credit to be paid back after the war period.

This statement of my distinguished friend is absolutely correct, but it needs a little further comment. It is true the

maximum rate is 90 percent. The law provides that the taxes shall not exceed 80 percent of a company's taxable income, and from this is to be taken 10-percent of the excess-profits tax to be refunded after the war, and we all know it will be refunded. Therefore, the present maximum eventual over-all tax is not 90 percent, but about 72 percent.

Again the Senator from Georgia said:

If we were to apply the 80-percent excess-profits tax to the amount in question (the $2,500,000,000 in contract reductions) * * * all of their proclaimed savings except $250,000,000 out of the $2,500,000,000 would have been taken back anyway under the excess-profits tax act.

There are several answers to this proposition. In the first place, when many of these contracts were made the present income-tax law was not in force and the contractor did not have to pay even 72 percent.

In the next place, the Senator from Georgia assumes that all this $2,500,000,000 of profit would be subject to excess-profits taxes. It is true that most of it would, but because of the tax relief provisions wisely put in the law last year many war contractors have sizable exemptions from the excess-profits tax and therefore will not pay the rate he mentions on their profits.

In the next place, the contractor simply increases his prices to take care of the excess-profits tax and, therefore, much of the tax is really paid by the Government, and as Mr. Bernard Baruch says, makes for inflation.

Again we must remember that the maximum tax rate is not 90 percent but not exceeding 72 percent, as previously explained. Therefore, even if all war profits did come under the excess-profits tax, renegotiation has already recovered on one year, not $250,000,000, but more than $700,000,000 which would have escaped the excess-profits tax law. This is a very considerable amount of money, and one which is approximately 300 times larger than the cost of renegotiating contracts, which in round numbers is about $2,550,000 per year.

Again, by permitting the companies to keep this additional $700,000,000, the tax laws would have permitted some of them to make profits in 1942 which I am sure my distinguished friend will concede would be excessive and unconscionable. I do not think it wise to call names in this matter but we can give examples.

One company holding war contracts would have made a profit in 1942, after all taxes, which would have been 178 times larger than the company's earnings in 1937, and which would have given the company a 100 percent return on its net worth in a single year.

Another company, after paying all its excess-profits taxes in 1942, would have been left a profit equal to 580 percent of its average peacetime earnings and equal to an 83-percent return on its invested capital during a single year.

Another company, after paying all its excess-profits taxes in 1942, would have had left an excessive profit 13 times greater than its peacetime average and equal to a return of 130 percent on its invested capital during a single year.

Again my splendid friend the Senator from Georgia said:

How, if the procurement offices of the War Department and the Navy Department are not negligent in the first instance, has the administration of this act resulted in closer pricings on the part of war contractors?

I have already referred to this matter, but will specifically do so again here. The Government was in a position where it could hardly deny these excessive prices. The Government had to have airplanes; it had to have machine guns; it had to have rifles; it had to have ammunition; it had to have artillery; it had to have tanks and countless other arms and materials. It had to have them at the earliest possible moment because we were already at war. It was virtually, in a sense, at the mercy of the contractors. At the time the Government agents could not know what a reasonable price for the materials purchased was. The Government officials had had no experience in manufacturing these new materials. They were not to be blamed. The whole country demanded that these war materials be manufactured at once. Our safety as a nation demanded it. The question of cost was a secondary matter and necessarily had to be.

My good friend states that in the renegotiation of these contracts the contractors do not act voluntarily, that they are at the mercy of the Government renegotiators. I do not think this is so at all under the Renegotiation Act, and the methods which have been adopted to enforce it. But, assuming that the Senator is correct in his statement, the contractor is not one-tenth as much at the mercy of these negotiators as the Government was in the hands of the contractors when the contracts were originally made.

Again this question has been answered by the two Under Secretaries in their statements made before the Truman committee on the question of the necessity and desirability of the renegotiation law, in connection with which the committee said:

1. Because of the wartime need for rapid procurement of materials of war, new materials with which there has been no previous manufacturing experience and other articles previously manufactured only in relatively small quantities, some procedure for subsequent price adjustment is necessary and desirable if excessive war profits and costs are to be avoided.

2. Taxes alone will not do the job because (a) higher corporate tax rates are likely to encourage higher costs and discourage economical production; (b) no scheme of taxation has been devised which is sufficiently flexible to provide an incentive for efficient low-cost production; (c) a profit percentage which would fairly reward one war contractor with one type of financial structure would bankrupt a second contractor with a different financial set-up, and would provide inordinately excessive profits for a third contractor with a still different financial problem.

Again my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, recognizing the difficulties of pricing new weapons, nevertheless urged that experience should have removed these difficulties. Both of the Under Secretaries agree with this statement, and are experimenting with original pricing methods which should restrict the need for renegotiation.

However, the changing character of the war requires procurement of new types of articles every day. The planes which are contracted for now are very different from the planes procured before. The detection devices constructed for now are unprecedented. The war constantly demands new weapons, and contract prices for weapons not previously manufactured can never be fixed so accurately that the need for renegotiation will entirely disappear.

The changing character of industrial operations also makes contractors unwilling to work under an appropriately close price. Possible contingencies, like labor dilution, subcontracting failures, shortage of materials, increases or decreases in volume make contractors desire, for their own protection, very wide margins which, if the contingencies do not develop, become excessive profits. Renegotiation then can restore an equitable price.

My good friend from Georgia next said that renegotiation "is coercion" and that the contractor's "very life is at stake."

Mr. President, as I have said before, the departments have kept me fully advised as to what they were doing under these renegotiation laws from the very beginning. They employed the highest class of men to do the job. From time to time some of these men who actually have been doing the job have come to my office and told me of their work. All of those I have seen and talked with have evidenced the disposition to be just as fair to the contractors as they are to the Government. There has been, except on one occasion which was the propaganda effort last summer to have the act repealed, little effort on the part of the contractors not to carry out the intentions of this law. As I have already stated, some paid back or reduced prices before they were asked to pay back or reduce prices. There has probably been less trouble in the enforcement of this most righteous law than enforcement of any law in the history of our country. That is so because of the high character and the just and fair dealing of the heads of the departments affected, and especially of Judge Patterson of the War Department and Mr. Forrestal of the Navy Department, also Mr. Karker of the War Department, who have this matter in immediate charge. They have selected careful and prudent men to work under them and they have comparatively a very small set-up. The renegotiations of these contracts have not been coercive. It has been voluntarily agreed to. This fact is demonstrated by the record which shows that no contractor has appealed to the courts, although competent lawyers agree that such an appeal is open to all contractors.

The contractor is not at a disadvantage. The Army and the Navy need American industry as much as American industry needs the Army and the Navy. This interdependence is recognized by the Army and the Navy, and there is no disposition in either Department—even if it had the power—to deal unfairly with

contractors. Renegotiation has, in general, left contractors with a dollar amount of profits, both before and after taxes, which compares very favorably with peacetime earnings.

The entire number of officials and employees set up under this renegotiation act is less than 1,500. The entire cost to the Government in a year has been about $2,550,000.

Again my good friend said:

> What did the War Department do with the $560,000,000 in cash which it got back * * * did it go back into the War Department to be used without an appropriation of Congress? Is that sort of short-circuiting of the legislative branch of the Government to be commended?

The plain fact is that the act states that all money recaptured by repayment or suit shall be recovered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. All cash recoverings are being deposited as general receipts in the Treasury. The amount of cash recovered up to May 1 is $1,062,000,000. This has been paid into the Treasury. On the other hand, contractors who have not finished their contracts and who have not received payment thereon have had their contract prices reduced in sums aggregating $1,787,000,000.

In other words, where reductions are made the Government has to pay that much less and, therefore, has saved that much more money. Renegotiation has not short-circuited the legislative branch of the Government in any sense. All cash which is returned because of renegotiation is covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt and cannot be spent without a new appropriation from Congress.

Again my good friend the Senator from Georgia, said:

> It is impossible for the Treasury to know what its tax rates will yield when boards in Washington may themselves determine what is a reasonable profit.

As I am informed, renegotiation does not disturb the Treasury's position on balance at all. If renegotiation results in a cash refund, that money goes back into the Treasury just like taxes. If renegotiation results in a price reduction, then the department is called on to pay out that much less money. Renegotiation does not disturb the balance between Treasury income and outgo except that thus far renegotiation has brought the Treasury, in any view of the case, an additional billion dollars more than it would have obtained under the tax laws alone.

Again the Senator from Georgia said:

> I may be incorrect in this statement, but my information is that there are nearly 80,000 contracts which remain for scrutiny by the various renegotiation boards. It will take them 10 years to renegotiate the contracts at the rate at which they are now proceeding.

Whoever gave the Senator this information gave it to him incorrectly. In the first place, renegotiation does not deal with separate contracts but with entire companies regardless of the number of contracts the company may hold. There are between 20,000 and 25,000 companies to be renegotiated. This work is well along and will probably be completed within a year which will make a good record in view of the fact that tax liabilities frequently are not determined until several years after profits have been earned. The Navy has already completed renegotation with companies holding more than one-third of the dollar volume of contracts assigned to the Navy Department, and renegotiation has begun with contractors holding six-sevenths of the dollar volume contracts. The War Department is equally well along with its work.

Again the Senator from Georgia speaks of renegotiation determining excessive profits "without any legislative standard." It is true the renegotiation law does set up a legislative standard of reasonableness. Congress left renegotiation flexible because, as the Truman committee said, no single formula will eliminate excessive profits without doing injustice to some war contractors and giving windfalls to others.

The munitions business is a multifarious one. Some producers are low-cost and efficient, others are high-cost and inefficient. Some producers finance their own war plants, others have asked the Government to finance all their facilities. Some producers have experimented with their product and improved it, others have continued to do a routine job. Some producers have borrowed working capital from the Government, others have been able to finance themselves. Some producers continue to make exactly the same things they made in peacetime, others have undertaken the risk and labor of producing items entirely foreign to their peacetime business. Some producers have converted their plants, others have left their plants virtually unchanged. Some companies have enjoyed an enormous expansion of business, as much as a hundredfold; other companies continue to do about the same volume of business they did in peacetime. Because, therefore, each case presents its own mixture of these various factors, no single formula, except reasonableness, has yet been devised which will do justice to all contractors.

Again the Senator from Georgia says:

> Is it (the renegotiation) voluntary, when the Government officials can determine what is a reasonable profit or an unreasonable or an excessive profit, without regard to any standard.

Mr. President, my splendid friend is not correct in this assertion. The work of procurement is never done without regard to standards of value and equity and reasonableness. Negotiation and renegotiation cannot be reduced to the exactness of formulae which is possible in the revenue statutes, but they can and do follow defined principles and announced policies which are left to the discretion and judgment of experienced men of recorded accomplishment and reputation. It is to the everlasting credit of American industry itself that every settlement known to me which has been reached up to this time has been reached on the basis of agreement by the representatives of the manufacturing company and of the Government.

There is no denying that the representatives of industry are conscious of the existence of the statute and of the powers delegated by the Congress to the Secretaries thereunder. But there is equally no denying the effort on the part of the departments to reach sound conclusions and to execute equitable agreements any more than there can be denied the right of the individual company to appeal to the courts if the settlement is reached by administrative determination but is regarded as inequitable and unjust. I believe if my good friend had followed this matter as closely as I have he would not have used the word "coercion."

Again my able friend says these settlements are made on what are regarded as unreasonable profits, without regard to taxes due by the contractor.

The answer to this is that the variation in the rates of income and excess-profits taxes has been such for the past few years that the only comparable and stable measure of profit is net before taxes. But to say that determinations in renegotiation are made "without regard to taxes" is incorrect. These renegotiations are made with thoroughness, and the facts are determined and discussed, and every consideration is given to them. Businessmen naturally fall into the measurement of profits (whether before or after taxes) by relating them percentage-wise to sales volume; and because of this natural and common use they center the discussion of profits after renegotiation on that one figure, without taking into account the relationships of earnings to volume in the base years; to the meeting of production schedules; to the saving of critical materials and manpower; to earnings on capital; to the availability of inventive contributions; to contributions within the field of management and production ability; and all of the other thousand and one important factors, relationships, and ratios which are discussed, measured, and evaluated in the process of renegotiation. These conclusions are reached by the voluntary actions of the representatives of the Government and the contractors.

Mr. President, in my sincere and honest judgment, the Government would not have got a single dollar more as a result of excess-profits tax from these various contractors if there had been no renegotiation law. In my judgment every dollar of the more than $2,849,000,000 returned or saved under the renegotiation law has been just that much saved to this Government. There are so many exceptions and exemptions in the excess-profits tax law that the savings made under the renegotiations law, in my judgment, are absolutely savings, and these savings would not have been made if only excess-profits law governed them. We had an excess-profits law in 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920 but we all realize what enormous and excessive profits the contractors made in that war, notwithstanding the excess-profits tax law.

Mr. President, the first year's operation of the Renegotiation Act conducted by the Departments of War and Navy and the Maritime Commission demonstrates beyond the preadventure of a doubt the wisdom of the law and its enormous value to the Government of the United States. In the year between April 28, the time of the passage of the bill, and May 1, 1943, the act resulted in the elimination of excessive profits in the amount, in round numbers, of $2,849,000,000. Of this amount $1,062,000,000 represents cash refunds which have been paid into the Treasury of the United States as general receipts and the sum of $1,787,000,000 represents price reductions under war contracts, which are exactly the same as cash paid into the Treasury.

The break-down by departments is as follows:

	Recovery	Price reductions	Total
War Department	$698,000,000	$1,168,000,000	$1,866,000,000
Navy Department	330,000,000	609,000,000	939,000 000
Maritime Commission	34,000,000	10,000,000	44,000,000
Total	1,062,000,000	1,787,000,000	2,849,000,000

As to the personnel required to obtain these gigantic refunds for the War Department itself, including personnel of every character and classification, there were 1,033 employed in renegotiation on May 1, 1943, and it is probable that the other departments are not employing more than 400 additional employees.

The average employed by the War Department per week during the first year of the effectiveness of section 403, Public, 528, is estimated at 544 persons at an annual cost of salaries of $1,700,000. It is estimated that the same facts for all other departments engaged in renegotiation would not increase the numbers and costs by more than 40 percent; so the result is that there are not more than 1,433 employees engaged under the Renegotiation Act, and the total cost thereof is $2,380,000. Therefore the cost of collecting these refunds is less than 1 percent of the funds recovered. It is the most marvelously successful financial operation of the Government that I know of.

SENATOR BRIDGES' RESURVEY STATEMENT

On May 21, 1943, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] made a public statement covering a summary of results of a survey on renegotiation of war contracts conducted among 5,000 manufacturers.

As I read that survey, many of the manufacturers favor the act. Indeed, the survey shows that they felt that renegotiation was a good thing, but should be a prearranged part of the agreement. It is a prearranged part of the agreement, so far as all contracts made since the law was passed are concerned, and all contractors know of this law. I have no doubt that some feel that the excess-profits tax would take care of the matter, but our experience has shown that it does not. There is no nullification of any contract. It is simply a readjustment of the price fixed in the contract which price was made when neither the contractors nor the representatives of the Government understood or could understand what a reasonable profit would be. Common experience shows that the contractor simply includes the excess-profits tax by raising the price of the goods produced.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire stated that funds recovered through renegotiation remain with contracting agencies for respending. The act plainly provides in this respect as follows:

> All money recaptured by repayment or suit shall be covered into the Treasury as Miscellaneous Receipts.

During the first year's operation, as heretofore shown, $1,062,000,000 has been recovered and paid into the Treasury. The remainder of the money recovered has not been paid out on the renegotiated contracts at all, and is still in the money appropriated for the payment of these contracts. In other words, the $1,787,000,000 simply represents price reductions, but it is just as much a saving to the Government as if the money were covered into the Treasury as general receipts. The simple fact is that all funds recovered through renegotiation, amounting to $1,062,000,000, are deposited with the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and do not remain with the contracting agency at all, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire states that companies are kept in continuous jeopardy because they are not brought into renegotiation, and that actually renegotiation agreements are completed on only a small number of cases. Mr. President, it is estimated by the Department that approximately 25,000 contractors are subject to renegotiation on their operations for 1942. Over 90 percent of these contractors will be subject to renegotiation by the War and Navy Departments. Both of these departments are quite confident that renegotiation on 1942 operations will be completed by December 31, 1943. It is quite evident that few, if any, contractors will be kept in continuous jeopardy.

The Senator from New Hampshire then states that manufacturers favoring repeal of the Renegotiation Act were reported as indicating that it would be a simpler process to recapture large profits by the Treasury through excess-profits tax. As heretofore stated, with the many exemptions and credits that are given in the excess-profit schedule, I do not believe that any of this money recovered through the Renegotiation Act—or, if any, only a small sum—would be recaptured by the Treasury through the excess-profits tax. Mr. Bernard Baruch, one of the greatest experts in our country on taxes and inflation and one of the grandest men I know, has this to say:

> Excess profits (taxes), standing alone, have no effect whatever to check inflation. Their only effect is to increase it. Thus 20 percent of $500,000 is $100,000, and 20 percent of $1,000,000 is $200,000. One way to increase $500,000 profit to $1,000,000 without increased risk or effort is to double the price. For this reason there is more incentive to increase prices—and therefore profits—under an 80-percent excess-profits tax than there is without it. Indeed, the main result of such a system is to induce rapid price increase to absorb the tax. Precisely because it accelerates and in nowise checks inflation, the excess-profits tax—without more—offers no cure at all for war evils. On the contrary, it aggravates them

Mr. President, the Renegotiation Act has often been inaccurately interpreted as a tax act. Heavy taxation, as Mr. Baruch has so well stated, does not meet the problem, but tends to aggravate it by increasing the incentive for increasing costs. The excessive profits of war contractors are extremely irregular. They accrue to some contractors, but not to others. Taxation, which must apply equally to all war and civilian business, cannot keep pace with this erratic development of excessive war profits. Some contractors can continue their peacetime processes with little change. Others must attempt unfamiliar and unexplored operations. No formula for limiting profits can deal equitably with all these circumstances.

Renegotiation of contracts can do what taxation and flat formula cannot. It can fit the profits to the facts. It can reduce excessive profits, leaving reasonable profits untouched. It can reward low-cost efficiency. It can distinguish between degrees of risk and venture. It is the only device flexible enough to fit the variety of war industries.

In fact, Mr. President, renegotiation might well be called the substitution for peacetime competition in helping procurement in adjusting prices to a proper and equitable basis in connection with the emergency purchasing of a tremendous volume of war armaments and munitions.

Again the Senator from New Hampshire said, in speaking of the returns from his survey:

> There was a "tone" of resentment running through the mail-survey that the price adjustment agencies were "prosecutor, jury, and judge", combined, in the matter of renegotiation of contracts and there was no appeal from their rulings.

The opposite is actually true. There is a definite procedure for appeal from the determination of the price adjustment boards to the individual in each of the Departments to whom final approval of renegotiation has been delegated. In the cases of the War and Navy Departments, those individuals are the Under Secretaries of those Departments.

The members of the price adjustment boards are carefully selected; they are business and professional men of recognized ability, a large majority of them being drawn from the ranks of industry itself.

The members of the price adjustment boards definitely give contractors every opportunity to present all favorable factors in their cases, and those factors are

given due consideration in arriving at the amount of excessive profits involved. In addition to all that, Mr. President, those contractors are at all times given the privilege, if they are dissatisfied with the renegotiation, of appeal to the courts.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire asked of the contractors:

> Should there be an outright repeal of the law? * * * This question was answered in the affirmative in many reports with the suggestion that the excess-profits tax would take care of "recapturing" undue profits.

I have already discussed the utter inadequacy of recapturing profits by excessive-profits taxes. As heretofore stated, Mr. Baruch has demonstrated that in such cases the price is simply raised sufficiently to absorb such a tax.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated that almost all contractors agreed that renegotiation should be restricted to deliveries made after April 28, 1942, instead of to contracts for which final payments had not been received by April 28, 1942, as provided in the present law.

The trouble is that the procedure contended for would involve starting all over again on most of the estimated 5,000 renegotiations now in process. Certainly, no one would want to vote for such an amendment.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire suggested that renegotiation be restricted to contractors making over 3 percent of total sales—after taxes—during the taxable year.

Such a restriction would simply exempt many contractors who would definitely be left with exorbitant profits on war production. One illustration is submitted, but many more of a similar nature are available. According to my information obtained from the Department, one contractor's sales were approximately $100,000,000 in 1942. The net profit after income taxes was $3,000,000. If that volume had been exempted from renegotiation, it would have resulted in having the contractor left with profits equal to 71 percent of invested capital, and over 8 times as much as the average profits after taxes, left the contractor for the years 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire said that many of his letters from manufacturers stated that it would be "highly desirable" to have a joint board of all four Government agencies: Army, Navy, Maritime, and Treasury.

The Department advises me that the matter of necessity for uniformity in policy-making has been constantly before the price-adjustment boards. For many months, the Chairmen of the War, Navy, Treasury, and Maritime Commission Boards have held regular biweekly meetings to discuss pending questions as to which there might otherwise be some divergence in policy. Most, if not all, of the questions with which there has been some divergence in policy have now been reconsidered, and the results have been incorporated in a joint release by all four departments, namely, "Purposes, principles, policies, and interpretations," which is now available to contractors and to the public. The close collaboration between the Boards has achieved a substantial uniformity in policy.

The Senator from New Hampshire stated that most contractors desire renegotiation of over-all profits at the year's end, and one renegotiation only.

I am advised by the Department that it is the present policy and procedure of all renegotiation boards to conduct renegotiation on an over-all basis, covering the contractor's renegotiable sales and profits for the fiscal year, if the contractor so selects. Practically all renegotiations are now being conducted on that basis, and only in rare instances are renegotiations handled on an individual contract basis.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire stated that, almost unanimously, contractors stated that Boards should allow all deductions permitted by the Internal Revenue Code. Why, Mr. President, under subsection (c) (3) of the renegotiation statute, as amended, the Secretary—

> in determining the excessiveness of profits realized or likely to be realized from any contract or subcontract * * * shall recognize the properly applicable exclusions and deductions of the character which the contractor or subcontractor is allowed under chapter 1 and chapter 2E of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Senator from New Hampshire then said that a majority of the manufacturers who were questioned stated that products on which a maximum price had been established by the Office of Price Administration should be eliminated from renegotiation.

If such products were eliminated from renegotiation, in many cases the result would be that the contractor would be left with very excessive profits on the sale of those items. In many cases, the O. P. A.'s maximum prices are established to protect the marginal producers; and the more efficient manufacturer, because of large increases in sales of those products for war production, is left with a very high margin of profit, in many cases amounting to as much as three times his normal peacetime profits in terms of percentage of sales.

The next statement of the Senator from New Hampshire was that all manufacturers questioned agreed that renegotiation should be concluded definitely within 1 year after the ending of the contractor's fiscal year.

Mr. President, the statute provides the following limits on renegotiation for any expired fiscal year:

> Any contractor or subcontractor may file with the secretaries of the departments concerned financial statements for any prior fiscal year or years, in such form or detail as the Secretary shall prescribe by joint regulation. Within 1 year after the filing of such statements, or within such shorter period as may be prescribed by such joint regulation, the secretary of a department may give the contractor or subcontractor written notice, in form and manner to be prescribed in such joint regulation, that the Secretary is of the opinion that the profits realized from some or all of such contracts or subcontracts may be excessive, and fixing a date and place for an initial conference to be held within 60 days thereafter. If such notice is not given and renegotiation commenced by the Secretary within such 60 days the contractor or subcontractor shall not thereafter be required to renegotiate to eliminate excessive profits realized from any such contract or subcontract during such fiscal year or years and any liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor during such fiscal year or years and any liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor for excessive profits realized during such period shall be thereby discharged.

A joint regulation prescribing the form which the contractor or subcontractor may fill out and file has been printed and is available to contractors.

The Senator from New Hampshire next stated that the majority of manufacturers favor renegotiating only those contracts on which the Government and the contractor agree that the costs cannot be estimated with sufficient accuracy in advance.

No doubt in the case of many of the contracts on which very excessive profits have been made, both the contractor and the procurement officer of the Government thought that the cost was accurately estimated at the time when the contract was entered into. Experience in renegotiation has definitely proved that in a majority of cases large-volume emergency purchases of war munitions and armaments did not permit accurate estimates of cost at the time when the contracts were made.

The Senator from New Hampshire then stated that manufacturers say that renegotiation causes from very little to up to 30-percent increases in bookkeeping and accounting burdens.

Mr. President, it is the policy of the price-adjustment boards to base their determinations primarily on a study of the over-all profits of companies from their war contracts. Detailed audits are not attempted except in those cases in which the boards feel that the company's records, statements, or estimates are incorrect, insufficient, or misleading.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire said that contractors who produce efficiently, and at low cost, should be given higher allowances of profit than should inefficient and high-cost producers.

The answer to that contention is that it is the definite policy of the price-adjustment boards to reward efficient and low-cost producers. Low net cost to the Government, whether obtained through low costs and low prices in connection with the original contract or through later price reductions, is in general given more weight than any other factor in allowing higher margins of profit to the contractor in renegotiation.

The Senator from New Hampshire then complained of the time spent by the contractors in answering questionnaires.

It is quite evident that those answers are in the form of a general complaint against questionnaires of a number of Government agencies, and not in particular against the preparation of data and operating figures needed for renegotiation.

The Senator from New Hampshire next claimed that a majority of firms—especially those in the machine-tool industry—feel that provision must be made for reserves for the post-war period.

The fact is that the Senator does not mention that the machine tool industry in 1942, because of war production, received the benefit of over seven times the annual sales volume which the industry had in the base years, 1936–39, inclusive. In renegotiation of contracts of machine tool industry companies, the price adjustment boards are taking into consideration the fact that there will be some saturation of the market in post-war years and that those companies are therefore being left with higher profits than are companies in an industry in which saturation of the market is not taking place.

The Senator then said:

> Some manufacturers—and particularly the textile industry—feel that if their prices are controlled by the Office of Price Administration * * * and if they are now making the same article as before the war * * * they should not be subject to renegotiation.

Again, the Senator failed to take into consideration the fact that the textile industry and many other industries are receiving the benefit of greatly expanded volume because of war production being added to civilian production. This is particularly true of the textile industry. With approximately the same invested capital and administrative overhead which those companies had before the war, they are now handling from 2 to 10 times the volume they had in the 1936–39 period. The increased volume has resulted in very excessive profits in the cases of many of those contractors, in spite of the fact that some of their products are controlled by Office of Price Administration price ceilings.

Again, the Senator from New Hampshire declared that some manufacturers feel that more consideration should be given to those who have put their own capital into converting to a wartime plant and who have not taken the Government's money to do so.

It is the definite policy of the price adjustment boards to leave higher profit on war production to a contractor risking his own capital, rather than to one whose capital is all or partially provided by the Government in the form of D. P. C. plants or advances on contracts.

Lastly, the Senator from New Hampshire said:

> There was a strong advocacy for lightening the burden of renegotiation by making a basic distinction between standard articles that a company has manufactured prior to the war and products developed during the emergency in cooperation with the Army and the Navy.

The answer to that statement is the same as the one to the statement that products under O. P. A. ceilings should be exempted from renegotiation. On large quantities of the standard articles referred to, the contractors have not reduced their prices in line with the reduced costs which they have obtained largely as a result of having war-production volume on those items added to their normal civilian production. Since the prices of those standard items going into war production have not been reduced in line with reduced costs, excessive profits have resulted for many contractors on their sales of those items to the Government.

Mr. President, I hope Senators who are not present today will read in the RECORD what I have had to say.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are three minor amendments which I shall offer on behalf of the committee. One is in the nature of a transfer, on pages 36 and 37, where I wish to reduce the amount in the bill from $340,000 to $318,000. I send forward an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 23, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the figures "645" in line 4 on page 37, and insert in lieu thereof "$318,000."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is that the amendment which reaches its conclusion on page 86, line 17?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it is on pages 36 and 37. It is proposed to strike out "$340,190, including not to exceed $22,190 for payment of tuition for Chippewa Indian children enrolled in public schools and care of children of school age attending private schools in the State of Minnesota, payable from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. 645)," and to reduce the amount from $340,190 to $318,000.

The amendment is in the nature of a transfer, because the item is carried elsewhere in the bill.

Mr. McNARY. The amendment begins in line 23, page 36, I observe. Is it proposed to reduce the amount?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 107, line 11, I offer an amendment proposed by the committee, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 107, line 11, after the word "outfits", it is proposed to insert "plans and specifications for vessels, or for contract personal services for the preparation thereof."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is need to contract for the service on a basis of part-time employment. It is not necessary to employ someone all the year. The amendment would permit the part-time employment to be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now send to the desk and ask to have stated an amendment for the purpose of providing for purchase of certain lands in Nevada. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 105, line 24, after the word "reservations", it is proposed to insert "For the purchase (not exceeding $36,000) of approximately 6,000 acres of land and improvements thereon in Humboldt County, Nev., as an addition to the Charles Sheldon antelope range."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the amendment has received the approval of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it was recommended to us.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was recommended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and offer, by authority of the committee, an amendment on page 55. I am authorized by the committee to request unanimous consent that the amendment, affecting trust funds of the Shoshone Indians in the State of Wyoming, may be offered to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

> That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to the official roll of said tribe on the date of the approval of this act, and pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the accrued interest in the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Said bonds shall be purchased and registered in the name of each enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe and when issued shall be held in trust for such Shoshone Indian by the United States to the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be delivered to the owner thereof free from such trust. Said bond shall not be sold or encumbered in any manner by the Shoshone owner nor shall said bond become liable, payable, or subject to any debt or debts contracted by the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity, said bond, if not devised or bequeathed by will, shall descend to his or her heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law, subject to the existing trust. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond-purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course the amendment flies right in the face of the old rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill. Earlier in the day I discussed the matter with the Senator

in charge of the bill and the Senator offering the amendment. The amendment seems to provide for the taking of moneys out of the tribal funds of the Indians—not out of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if that were not the fact, I should not venture to offer the amendment. It deals solely with the funds of the Indians, and is presented at the request of the council of the Shoshone Indians who desire to have a participation in the sale of War bonds.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the amendment is probably one of the rare exceptions to the rule. I understand that it would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use the tribal funds to buy War bonds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. In view of that most commendable purpose, although I despise the practice of offering legislation on appropriation bills, and usually object to it, I shall not do so in this instance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I must say I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I want him to know that there is scarcely a meeting of the Appropriations Committee or of its subcommittees at which suggestions for legislation are not rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, earlier today there was delivered on the floor of the Senate what to my mind will be recognized, not only now but in years to come, as one of the outstanding speeches that have been made at this session or for many sessions of the Senate. It was delivered by the junior Senator from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The warning he gave to the country, the analysis he made of the items of the subject, and the factual matter contained in his address are so true and so important that I am indeed glad that he saw fit to deliver the speech. The subject is one in which many of us have been interested; but few of us have found the time to give the matter the careful attention and thorough investigation it deserves, and none of us have had the real ability that was demonstrated by the junior Senator from Massachusetts earlier today, to discuss the subject as he discussed it. His speech showed the fine study he had made.

In keeping with the thought expressed in his speech, we have had in the past, and there are represented in the pending bill, certain appropriation items by which money is placed at the disposal of the Bureau of Mines for use in exploring for war-essential materials in the United States and its possessions, and for conducting investigations as to their production. Our war-essential materials are, as was stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, in some cases rapidly showing that they are about to be entirely absorbed. We are destroying war essentials so rapidly that it behooves all of us to see to it that a more intensified study is made for the discovery and the production of bodies of war-essential metals and minerals as they appear in the ores and materials in the earth.

One item in the pending bill in which I have been especially interested goes along that very line. Many years ago—in fact, in the seventies—there was in the State of Nevada what was known as the Eureka mining district. It now has been practically abandoned because of the existence of certain physical conditions which made the mining of lead and zinc uncertain. In that district is a mine known as the Richmond-Eureka, the shallow levels of which produced substantial tonnages of lead and zinc ore in the past. In an effort to uncover new reserves, private capital has gone forward and has diamond-drilled in this area of what was once regarded as a great ore body; and there, through that investment of private capital, another great ore body, at a depth of from 2,000 feet to 2,250 feet, has been discovered. This lower-lying ore body, which is some 40 feet thick, contains both lead and zinc, bearing approximately 4-percent lead and approximately 10-percent zinc, both metals which are exceedingly important at this time. Early developments of this new find into a producing operation is clearly in the national interest; and since such development involves sinking a shaft at least 2,000 feet, plus extensive lateral work, it is important that the reserves of ore be definitely established.

It was the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada that in view of the fact that private capital had discovered this ore body, through the investment of a large sum of money in drilling which made the discovery possible; and in view of the fact that the ore there discovered is essential at this very moment for our war activities, it would be proper for the Government to make a reasonable investment and go forward and put down other diamond-drill holes to determine the exact magnitude and grade of the ore body.

With that in mind, I urged the Bureau of Mines to look with favor upon an appropriation sufficient to make these necessary tests, so that we might have at the disposal of the Government what the preliminary investigations point to as potentially one of the greatest ore bodies in the world containing lead and zinc.

I am happy to say that the Bureau of Mines thought well of my suggestion; I am happy to say that the Bureau of the Budget thought well of the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines; and I am happy to see that this afternoon, in keeping with the spirit expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] which to my mind should be prevalent throughout this country, the Senate has approved an item of $100,000 by which the Government of the United States, under the direction and guidance of the Bureau of Mines, will make further exploration to the end that we may bring to the Nation's hand vast ore bodies of lead and zinc, so much sought at this time. I am grateful to the Committee on Appropriations that that sum has been written into the bill, and has now been adopted by the Senate, for the exploration of what is known as the Richmond-Eureka ore body at Eureka, Nev.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] have both spoken of our essential war materials. As we know, from time to time there have been discussions of the work and services of the Board of Economic Warfare. I think the record will show that that Board has rendered a very great and indispensable service to the war effort in securing strategic, critical, and essential war materials.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the preliminary statement of Mr. Milo Perkins, Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, before the House Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With your permission, I want to review the general background of our operations on the economic warfare front as we take stock some 17 months after Pearl Harbor.

The plain fact is that Germany and Japan got a long jump on us in the world-wide economic battle that preceded the war itself. For years before they launched their military attacks, these countries had been conducting a shrewd and ruthless war of economic aggression through such measures as the building of ersatz industries and the heavy stock piling of strategic materials. They were building ahead for the economic as well as the military show-down that they knew was coming. We on the other hand, not having planned a war of aggression, were caught relatively flat-footed.

We are catching up now, however. There is a long way to go, but the United Nations are definitely not losing the economic war. Our economic strength is still rising while both Germany and Japan are beginning to show the first signs of economic strain.

As the war is intensified—particularly as it swings further into definite offensives—the economic side will become a bigger and a tougher job. Steadily increasing production of weapons calls for steadily increasing raw-material supplies, including those from foreign sources to offset the drain on our own stock piles and resources. Tightening supply and shipping situations throughout the United Nations call for greater selectivity in meeting the essential export minimums to the countries with whom we are doing business. Offensive strategy, replacing the defensive phases of the war, calls for more exact information about enemy economic strengths and weaknesses, to guide blockade policy and help determine strategic objectives which will be high on the priority list for destruction.

The Board of Economic Warfare works on the general economic warfare front through three administrative offices—imports, exports, and economic warfare analysis. Each drives toward objectives in its own particular field of operations.

IMPORTS

The Office of Imports is responsible primarily for the job of scouring the four corners of the world to locate strategic commodities needed in the war effort and then programing the necessary development and procurement operations to get them for the United States.

We in the United States have rather proudly referred to our country as the richest raw materials Nation in the world. This was perfectly true, and it therefore came as a shock to many of us to realize that we were far from self-sufficient in many of the basic raw materials needed to meet our war commitments. The rubber shortage was quickly understood by the public because we all use tires. Shortages in quartz crystals, various insecticides, mahogany, balsa wood, and certain strategic grades of mica were equally

critical, however. Dozens of other foreign commodities that few people ever heard of were needed in quantity and needed quickly.

Not many weeks after Pearl Harbor, we lost the vast raw materials resources of the Far East. Japanese invasion cut off more than 60 percent of our normal tin supplies, 95 percent of our quinine, 60 percent of our hard fiber, and practically all of our rubber. We lost valuable sources of various fats and oils. Soon the Burma Road was closed, stopping not only the flow of supplies into China but also stopping the flow, in reverse, of tungsten, hog bristles, tin, silk, and other vital supplies that had been coming to us out over the road. All this happened at exactly the time when the speed-up in our war industries demanded more raw materials, not less.

Many of the lost supplies could not be produced at all in the United States; others could not be turned out in sufficient quantity. We were face to face with the tremendous problem of finding substitute resources in those foreign areas of the world still open to us. This was a year ago. Today we can report that what had to be done has been done. Utilizing the services of existing Government agencies, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation and various subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and in close cooperation with the Department of State, we have been able to bring in adequate supplies of the commodities which the War Production Board designated as strategic, and directed us to go after.

There were maddening delays, and reserves were dangerously low at times, but the really vital needs have been met. In some cases commodities have been flown in from half around the world to meet supply deadlines. The Army Air Transport Command and the Navy Air Transport Service have used their returning transport planes to bring in tungsten from China, mica from India, quartz crystals from Brazil, and dozens of other highly strategic materials from supply points which would have been beyond immediate reach without air service to bring them to our war plants on time. The goods have come in; war industry wheels have kept turning.

The Office of Imports is directing more than 200 purchase programs in 40 different countries or areas. Nearly 600 individual items are included in this list of programs. They are grouped roughly into: Minerals and metals, foodstuffs, textiles and fibers, miscellaneous commodities. The volume of development and procurement operations for imports will run to about a billion and a half dollars during the present fiscal year. For next year the total will be above two billion.

As the search for raw materials grows more intense, a far greater degree of development work will be necessary to produce the things we must buy and bring out of other countries. It is becoming more and more necessary to program the preliminary steps thoroughly so as to be sure of the increased production we need. In very few cases is our import operation a simple matter of buying what we want. Today we must go out and fight just as hard to develop the goods we want to buy as we used to fight for the chance to sell goods back in the days when over-production made selling the most aggressive challenge to every business firm.

This part of the job gets tougher as we need more materials and must reach farther out into new and undeveloped fields to find them. Circumstances have forced our men to become economic commandos, literally penetrating new territory in the jungles of the world, to find new sources of balsa wood for gliders, cinchona bark for quinine, fiber substitutes to replace lost hemp, and a long list of vital minerals and metals without which technological warfare would be impossible.

A lot of side factors must be kept constantly in mind as these import operations are carried out. Transportation problems must be met; special area programs must be developed, with full consideration for related economies within the areas; price levels must be planned to induce maximum production, and yet not disrupt the domestic economy of the country involved; new producing units must be found and developed as older sources reach maximum capacity, often special equipment must be exported to make possible these increases in imports. The job can be done, and it will be done, but it will take a lot more ingenuity and drive in the year ahead of us than it took in the one behind us.

In all import operations, the interests of United States commercial importers must always be considered. If coffee is to be brought in, coffee importers handle the job, as agents of the responsible Government corporation. If fats and oils are needed, all United States oil importers are invited to join a special association to handle import operations. And so it goes through the long list of imported commodities. It's good business to use the skill and experience of these men now, and it's good business to help them weather the storms of this war economy so they'll still be in business when the war is over.

EXPORTS

The original duties of the Office of Exports centered largely around the job of export licensing to see that scarce strategic materials did not leave the United States, and that no shipments went to Axis Powers through sympathetic "blacklist" concerns in neutral countries. The whole function has now grown to include the more positive job of directing available exports to keep up the domestic and war economies of friendly countries, and to make possible the development and transportation of the materials we must import for our own war effort.

The United States finds itself today not only the military arsenal for the United Nations but also pretty nearly the only remaining supply house for commercial goods needed vitally by many of our allies. Latin America, which used to get a lot of its imports from Europe, must now look to us almost entirely. The same thing is true for other areas, to a greater or less extent.

We have got to keep the basic economies of these countries going. They are with us in the war effort, and they are turning out tremendous quantities of strategic materials we must have which we formerly got elsewhere. It is obvious that we must try to meet their most essential needs.

In the face of this demand, we are more and more up against the fact that we are forced to ration scarcities for export. We can't spare enough from our own stock piles to meet the full wants, and there aren't ships enough to haul all the exports other nations would like to buy even if we could spare the goods.

The answer is obvious: available goods and available shipping space must be carefully rationed. This adds tremendously to the export control job. It means more careful screening all down the line, to give a very high degree of selectivity. The job of dividing a deficit of goods is no easier on the foreign front than it is at home.

Briefly, the export job must be handled so as to get the greatest possible strength and solidarity on the Allied economic front. Exports must be kept from going to the wrong places; they must go to the right places at the right time, and they must go within available supply and shipping limitations. First things must come first. If country A needs some rolling stock to keep her basic industries in operation, she must get that rolling stock. If mining equipment is needed in country B, to get out tin, or mica, or tungsten needed by our war industries, country B must get that mining equipment

Realistic steps have been taken by our Office of Exports in recent weeks to see that the limited exports we can spare hit the nail on the head in the country to which they are sent. At the capital of each Latin-American country, representatives of our Department of State and Board of Economic Warfare sit down around a table with an agency representing the government of that country. With supply and shipping cards face up, this group makes a preliminary determination of the most vital import needs of the country in question. This determination becomes the first blueprint for our export shipments, subject to later changes made necessary by the availability of supplies and of shipping space.

For countries which are represented by purchasing commissions in the United States, a quarterly program plan was recently put into effect which will serve the same general purpose. Most essential needs of each country for both lend-lease and commercial imports will be determined definitely in advance, and shipments will be directed within these quotas.

Export control is an increasingly tough and exacting job as supplies become tighter. Every time a new commodity is rationed in the United States, tighter controls are necessary in export operations. Additional moves must be made by the Board of Economic Warfare to adjust export operations to the domestic picture. In 1942 we examined about a million and a quarter export license applications, of which something over half were granted. With the more exact study of transactions now required, we expect to have to handle about 2,000,000 export documents in 1943. That's between 6,000 and 7,000 every working day, and the work to be done on each application is becoming more exacting.

The scope of the export job is staggering. A total of 2,500 commodities and commodity groups are subject to export control. These commodities flow from approximately 16,000 United States export concerns to more than 140 different country destinations, and there are thousands of individual consignees. The control machinery must operate to see that no shipments fall into the hands of an importer who is known to be re-exporting to the enemy, stock-piling in warehouses, speculating at the expense of the good name of United States private enterprise, or who is in any other way unfriendly to the cause of the United Nations. We must also be sure that none of the materials in short supply here at home are used for any nonessential activity in the country of destination.

The whole job is complicated by the need to protect United States commercial exporters, just as far as it is physically possible to do so in a war economy. This is especially true of the smaller exporters. Just as in the case of importers, we need the trained services of commercial exporters now; we shall undoubtedly need them much more to spearhead United States commercial activities abroad when the war is over. This means that the Government export control machinery must perform a lot of service functions in addition to merely licensing exports. It must help get the goods produced, moved to the seaboard, and actually shipped. Board of Economic Warfare, as a claimant agency for commercial exports, goes before the War Production Board to present the case for the minimum of strategic exports considered essential in our joint Allied economy. It has working arrangements with the Office of Defense Transportation and War Shipping Administration, to assist exporters in getting the goods moved. The exporters themselves have organized several committees to help us with our work.

One special job carried out by the Board of Economic Warfare Export Office is the use of requisitioning authority to break loose goods which have been frozen at ports or in warehouses as a result of war developments. More than $73,000,000 worth of such material, ranging all the way from rubber to

trucks and airplanes, has been located through this machinery and channeled into constructive use by the United Nations. Much of it was originally held by business firms located in countries now dominated by the Axis.

ECONOMIC WARFARE ANALYSIS

The Office of Economic Warfare Analysis must gather all possible information about the industrial economy of each of our enemies. It must gather complete information on the economies of European neutrals in connection with its blockade work. It needs similar information regarding other nations in the world for the use of our other two offices as well as for that of the armed services. With these facts in hand, its business analysts, its engineers and other technicians must then map out the most effective economic warfare program which it is possible to carry out.

As the United Nations go all-out on the offensive, and start pinching in on the Axis, more comprehensive and exact information is needed about the enemy economy. Weak spots must be found, strengths must be offset, economic strategy must be accurately anticipated.

The success of economic warfare analysis is obviously measured primarily in proportion to the excellence of our information about the enemy. Information—a piece here, a scrap there—comes from many sources. Often the action based on such information is thrilling and dramatic, but the job of collecting and piecing together these scraps into a useful whole means tedious, painstaking effort. Among the sources available to us are various intercepts, the files of American offices of foreign firms like Mitsubishi of Japan, records and experience of American engineers who have worked in foreign lands, refugees and foreign travelers, captured enemy equipment, and even the secret sources of the underground. There is a close and continuing interchange of information with the British Ministry of Economic Warfare.

Sticking to the economic side—the business and industrial aspects—the Board of Economic Warfare gathers this material as a great backlog from which to reach the answers for many vital war operations. Working very largely under the orders of the appropriate branches of the Army and Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare analysts prepare literally hundreds of detailed reports on all phases of the world economic picture. The information is of no value unless it is kept current and up to the minute.

At the request of the Army, our men keep a running balance sheet of enemy production. It is always necessary to know how well or how poorly the enemy is doing in order to measure our own production requirements. To some extent the enemy's economic picture reveals his hand so far as strategy is concerned. Will lack of oil compel the Nazis to launch another desperate offensive in the Caucasus? Will the shortage of locomotives force curtailment of tank production? Will Germany's need for rubber and Japan's need for critical machine tools lead to large scale blockade running? What are the limiting factors on submarine production? These and countless other answers must be known for successful prosecution of the war, and the Board of Economic Warfare fills in the picture on the industrial and economic side.

Blockade measures stem from basic economic warfare analysis. The job here is to stop the leaks through neutral countries adjacent to the Axis, but in order to stop the leaks we must have accurate information. When we know the enemy shortages, and the bottlenecks in his economy, we are forewarned on what he may try to do to get supplies. Examination of the cargo of a blockade runner, for example, is quite revealing. For what materials is Germany willing to run the risk of blockade running? Board of Economic Warfare has joint representation with the British on the Blockade Committee in London. Decisions are reached by mutual agreement.

An effective blacklist system is an essential part of blockade work. Information gained from many sources makes it possible for the Department of State to keep the blacklist current. When a drug house in Latin America orders a large shipment of steel I-beams, we make an immediate investigation. When we learn that Royal Air Force bombs have destroyed the plant of the only German manufacturer of a certain type of needle, we watch the licensing of needles to neutral countries. And so it goes through an almost endless list of checks.

Preclusive buying, that interesting and necessarily secret operation, which locks up materials in neutral countries to keep them from reaching the enemy, is also dependent on reliable information. We can't afford to waste time or money buying up supplies which are not really vital to the Axis, or which couldn't reach it anyway. Much of what we buy preclusively is of great value to our own war effort, of course.

It is quite obvious that even such military action as determining bombing objectives depends partly upon sound economic intelligence and analysis. Working with the British Ministry of Economic Warfare and our own military intelligence men, we are able to supply information which is of value to the military in making final decisions. The Board of Economic Warfare does not select the targets, and, of course, it does not make any of the military decisions, but it is able to point out vulnerable spots from an economic and industrial point of view. Where are the bottlenecks in enemy production? Is it the assembly plant, the machine shop, the railway terminal, the power plant, or the steel mill?

Much of this activity on the economic warfare analysis front is, of course, very secret. By agreement with the armed services we have the most stringent regulations to protect the security of information available to us. You might as well tip off the location of your fleet as to give hints about your economic strategy or knowledge of the enemy position. This economic warfare analysis job is vital, it is directed 100 percent toward helping to win the war, and it becomes more complicated and demanding as the war develops along positive offensive lines. When the full story can be told, it will be one of the most fascinating chapters of the war record.

Sketchily and briefly, this is the broad front on which the Board of Economic Warfare is trying to carry out its part in the winning of this war. It is not a static or frozen program. Constant adjustments and changes must be made to meet a constantly shifting war situation.

We have operated from the beginning on the theory that we should work with and through other agencies wherever that is the most efficient course to follow; several of them receive direct allocations from our appropriation for strictly wartime functions they are performing for us.

We are going ahead on the conviction that any economic program which will help to shorten this war by a month, a week, or even a day is worth any reasonable price. Measured in lives, and remembering the men who died that last morning before the armistice was signed in 1918, all of us would agree that it is worth any price to shorten this war by a single hour.

As you proceed with your consideration of our budget, I shall be very happy to try to answer any questions you might have—on the record whenever possible; off the record if I may, when military secrecy is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Upper Missouri project, Montana, Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, $500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator making a statement with respect to his amendment, but I am compelled, as Senator in charge of the bill, to make the point of order against it, for two reasons: First, the appropriation is not authorized by law; second, it does not fit within the rule which we applied to all the other items in the bill with respect to reclamation projects. The proposal is to initiate a new project, which is primarily for power. I believe the total cost of the project would be more than $11,000,000. What we had in mind in offering the proposals which we offered was projects which will produce food. That aspect has not been demonstrated with respect to this particular project.

I wish to suggest to the Senator that if there are food-producing possibilities in the project, and if it can be brought to the attention of Mr. Chester Davis, the head of the War Food Administration, it might be considered later; but I cannot consent to it going into this bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator says.

Since it has not been possible to obtain a budget estimate for the amendment I have proposed in connection with the Canyon Ferry project in Montana, it is not my intention to press for its adoption at this time. I should like, however, to make a few brief remarks about this project because of its importance in the expansion of food production.

The preliminary survey report on this project has been approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation and is now in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, where I am confident it will receive approval very shortly.

This project is important because in the Missouri Basin above Fort Benton, Mont., there are 729,700 acres of rich farm land with full or partial irrigation water supply. In addition there are 337,400 acres of new land that can be irrigated. The Bureau of Reclamation, after an exhaustive study, has recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that the Canyon Ferry Dam and Reservoir be constructed on the Missouri River at a point 17 miles east of Helena.

This project would store 2,000,000 acre-feet of water and solve a conflict with down-stream power-right claimants which has resulted in a court decision prohibiting further diversions of natural flow of the river for irrigation purposes. Storage of surplus water in Canyon Ferry reservoir and regulation of its release to replace water consumptively used would allow expansion of the irrigation devel-

opment in Montana. The estimated annual yield of water by reason of Canyon Ferry development is estimated to be 216,000 acre-feet. This yield would allow a full water supply to be used on 171,000 acres of land now inadequately served with water, and would also supply 133,200 acres of dry land.

A complete description of this project will be found in the Senate Hearings on the 1943 Interior appropriation bill, pages 568, 569, 570 of the printed record. The importance of this project in connection with food production must be apparent to everyone. When it is formally approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and a budget estimate is prepared, I will seek this appropriation in some future deficiency bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order made by the Senator from Arizona.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2719 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

GASOLINE SHORTAGE IN THE EASTERN STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, some time ago I addressed an inquiry to the Petroleum Administrator for War, regarding the gasoline shortage in the Eastern States. At that time I inserted the inquiry in the RECORD. I have now received a reply, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, June 15, 1943.

Hon. H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I am happy to acknowledge your letter of June 3 in which you inquire as to the intensity with which tank trucks are employed in our efforts to transport petroleum supplies to the east coast.

First, may I point out that contrary to the advice given you, there are only about 105,000 tank trucks in the United States: Of these, 92,000 are marketing tank wagons used solely in the retail delivery of petroleum products and range in size from 500 to 2,500 gallons. The great majority of these are approximately of 1,000-gallon capacity. The balance of petroleum trucks on the road, roughly 13,000 in number, are classified as "transport units." These range in size from about 3,000 to 10,000 gallons, depending entirely upon the State laws in force in the States in which they operate.

Although it might be presumed that rationing has lessened the use of petroleum motortrucks throughout the country, such is not the case; nor would further rationing throughout the country in those areas not now as severely rationed as the east coast create idle transport truck capacity useful to the east coast. The most efficient sphere of operation of a transport type truck is in short-haul service in the replacement of tank cars. We have concentrated on substituting petroleum motor transports for tank cars throughout the whole country, and by so doing, we have gained from petroleum district No. 2, approximately 20,000 tank cars formerly used within that district and now employed in the long-haul service between the Southwest and the east coast. This campaign of substitution has employed fully every transport in the entire petroleum district No. 2, and we find that there are still many tank cars engaged in short-haul movements of essential industrial oils in that district for want of additional truck equipment.

Insofar as petroleum district No. 3 is concerned, there is an acute shortage of petroleum tank trucks of all types in the petroleum industry. This was brought about by our efforts to place rail short-haul movements upon trucks and the tremendous increase in military demand for both aviation and automotive gasolines in that district. Petroleum districts Nos. 4 and 5 are dependent upon motortrucks to a great extent, and there is no idle truck capacity in those districts. Within petroleum district No. 1, the east coast, there are at the present time some idle petroleum transports. This idleness is seasonal, however, and not brought about entirely by wartime conditions. In order that the personnel of the transport companies and the driver personnel of the oil companies can be maintained, we are making every effort to schedule certain movements within petroleum district No. 1 which normally move by rail, but which could move by motortruck.

I presume that you contemplate the employment of motortrucks to assist in bringing additional petroleum supplies into Petroleum District 1. Because of the scarcity of supplies it would be necessary to send such idle trucks as we could find unnaturally long distances to obtain the products desired. An operation of great distance is not feasible under present conditions for several reasons: First, because of State laws governing the size, weight, and licensing fees which vary widely; second, because of the labor problem involved requiring many times the number of drivers now employed; third, maintenance problems which, because of the age of trucks now on the road, is highly important; and fourth, the fact that such an operation would wear out many trucks so used in a comparatively short time. This would make necessary the manufacture of replacements involving the use of critical production facilities for very little net return in terms of barrels per day of petroleum moved. It must be remembered, too, that September will see the complete reemployment of any trucks now idle on the eastern seaboard in their normal activity of distributing fuel oil as well as other petroleum products.

All of the above has reference to the type of truck which we call transports. The tank wagon, retail delivery units, have not been considered because of the nature of their construction. They are small in the main, old, and sorely needed for local distribution, particularly in agricultural areas. A 1,000-gallon tank wagon operated between Texas and, let us say, New York could not be expected to deliver more than 4,000 gallons a month, a little over 3 barrels per day, if it were in continuous operation. Because of manpower and maintenance problems it would probably produce much less.

In conclusion, may I say that we are making every effort to employ motor units fully, but we are concentrating upon substituting them for inefficient rail transportation movements and are using the rail tank cars gained by this substitution to serve the east coast. Wherever we see any possibility of augmenting eastern supplies by the use of motor transports, we are very quick to employ them, but we feel that we must weigh the gains of such a movement against the inefficiency and waste of transportation equipment which might result from improper use of this form of transport. Our greatest concern is that these vehicles shall be maintained and operated in the service in which they are most useful as further construction of this equipment is necessarily limited.

Thank you for the opportunity that you have afforded us to comment upon this phase of our petroleum transportation activities. If there is any further information which you would care to have in this connection, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

PRODUCTION OF SYNTHETIC FUELS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, to establish and operate plants for the production of synthetic fuels.

This bill is the outgrowth of studies which have been made by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, by the Department of the Interior, and by the Bureau of Mines. A year ago, when the Secretary of the Interior appeared before the Appropriations Committee, he discussed the hydrogenation of coal with members of the committee. At that time an appropriation was made to allow certain tests to be carried on by the Bureau of Mines in one of its establishments. Those tests, together with the experience of Great Britain, Germany, and Japan, indicate that it is of the utmost importance that this country undertake immediately to develop its resources for the manufacture of synthetic fuels.

We stand in danger of being faced by—one might almost say—a scandal comparable to that surrounding the failure to produce synthetic rubber. Everyone knew that the country was dependent upon outside sources for its supply of rubber. There was knowledge in high places that newly patented devices and new scientific discoveries made possible the manufacture of synthetic rubber. Nothing was done, though the great need was apparent everywhere. The need now for petroleum and its products, including gasoline, and all the other types of liquid fuel, is apparent to everyone. We need it not only for civilian industry, but we need it also for the successful prosecution of the war. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the country to meet this need before it becomes so acute that disaster may follow.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as

a part of my remarks my letter to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to this measure and his response.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 8, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is daily becoming more and more clear that the full utilization of the country's supply of coal, oil shale, and other substances from which synthetic liquid fuel can be manufactured is essential if the Nation's needs, both in war and in peace, are to be met. As the hearings before the Western Minerals Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands have demonstrated our petroleum reserves are declining. Although the passage of the act of December 24, 1942, has greatly stimulated the search for oil on the public domain, the demand for fuel is so great that we cannot safely depend upon petroleum alone.

These same hearings have shown the existence in the United States of vast and practically unlimited deposits of coal as well as huge resources of undeveloped oil shale. Except for the work which the Department of the Interior has undertaken through the Bureau of Mines under appropriations heretofore made by the Congress for the study of the hydrogenation of coal, little has been done in this country to make certain that we shall be fully ready for the manufacture of large quantities of synthetic fuels to meet future needs. That these needs will be very great, the development of aviation already accomplished as a result of the war proves beyond any question. Already the nations of the world are looking forward to the problems of international air commerce after the war. Without a full and certain supply of liquid fuel, the United States may find itself unable to realize its full possibilities in air commerce.

The testimony of your experts before the Public Lands Committee indicates that Germany, England, and Japan have all used coal extensively for the manufacture of liquid fuel. Indeed, it is unlikely that Germany could have maintained its war machine without the motor fuel it has manufactured from coal. The results which have been accomplished in England seem to give assurance that that country will be fully supplied with synthetic fuels after the war.

The sad experience which we have had with rubber should be sufficient to warn us against a repetition in the case of motor fuel. We had made little or no advance preparation for the development of synthetic rubber and when the natural supplies were cut off, we found ourselves in a desperate situation. This can be avoided with respect to synthetic fuel if we act now.

I know from your own testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee and from my conversations with you and members of your staff that you are fully aware of the gravity of the problem. Both as Secretary of the Interior and as head of the Petroleum Administration for War, you are in a position to carry out a most effective and beneficial program for the development of synthetic fuel. It will be necessary, as you know, to provide legislative authorization if the Bureau of Mines is to be enabled to take the necessary steps to construct and operate demonstration plants to make fuel from coal, shale, and other suitable materials. The Western Mineral Resources subcommittee will be very glad to cooperate with you in the preparation of legislation to this effect and in outlining a public hearing through which the country will be advised not only of the need of an immediate program of this character, but of the existence in this country of the natural resources which are sufficient to keep the United States in its present position of leadership in all phases of industry, transportation and commerce which depend upon liquid fuel.

If you will suggest the terms of legislation which, in your opinion, are necessary to provide authorization for this work, I shall be very glad indeed to introduce a bill and to arrange for a hearing by the Western Minerals subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 16, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Your letter of June 8 expressing briefly your views on the advisability of a synthetic liquid fuel program strikes directly home on a matter of paramount importance. I hasten to comply with your wish that I suggest legislation to meet the situation. My Department will endeavor to make an adequate presentation of this matter before a Senate committee as you request.

You are absolutely correct, according to my way of thinking, that this country can no longer delay in embarking upon a synthetic fuel program. Those in my Department who are authorities on petroleum are in agreement with this idea. Our continuing study of reserves and the rate of depletion indicates clearly that unless we take action the end of the gasoline age is in sight. This development—and I fix no date for it—will inevitably bring major repercussions throughout our entire economy in peace as well as in war.

Fortunately, certain bureaus of the Department of the Interior are and have been aware of these trends and steps may still be taken to prevent the Nation from feeling the full force of future natural petroleum deficiencies. In particular, the Bureau of Mines has developed processes that actually have produced petroleum products and liquid fuels from coals, oil shale, gases, and other substances. We have also studied similar developments in other countries.

The time has come when we must get out of the test-tube stage into actual production. Past experiments have given us the scientific know-how but the way must be blazed for American industry to enter this synthetic fuel field, which inevitably will be one of the major industrial developments of the near future.

It is, in my opinion, the responsibility of an alert government to met such a situation forthrightly. Therefore, I propose that the Government harness its facilities to the business of blazing this path so that industry and private initiative may take up the work. Under present conditions we cannot rely upon industry to make the initial, unremunerative expenditure necessary to solve the technical and economic problems of synthetic fuel production. Therefore, I propose that the Government fulfill its duty on a demonstration basis, making its findings and experience available to industry so that it can take up the task of providing synthetic fuels on the scale necessary to safeguard this Nation's future.

Whether or not special legislation is technically necessary for this purpose, the problem is of such importance that it should be adequately presented to Congress and I, therefore, enclose suggested authorization legislation and await a hearing by Congress, which I hope will be available at an early date. The hour is already late and action cannot be delayed unless this country is prepared at some future date to undergo sacrifices and turmoil that would make our difficulties in establishing a synthetic-rubber program seem insignificant by comparison.

I have instructed Michael W. Straus, First Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior; Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines; Dr. A. C. Fieldner, Chief, Fuels and Explosive Service of the Bureau of Mines, and all agencies of the Department to take whatever steps may be necessary so that there may be a suitable presentation to the Congress of the problem and the solution.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, ETC.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that at the conclusion of today's session the Senate will adjourn until Tuesday next. In the meantime the Committee on Appropriations may possibly be in position to report at least two bills. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session, authority be given to the Committee on Appropriations to submit reports, including notices of motions to suspend the rule, and such amendments as may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BURTON S. RADFORD

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the calendar was called on June 15, 1943, Senate bill 1087 was passed without objection. There came from the House today House bill 2556, which is an identical bill with the one to which I have just referred. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate H. R. 2556.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 2556) for the relief of Burton S. Radford, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2556.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2556) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF ARMY DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senate would be good enough to grant unanimous consent for me to bring to its attention three bills which are on the calendar. Two of the bills have been on the calendar for several months, and the remaining one has been on the calendar for 30 or 40 days.

Mr. McNARY. I earlier objected to one of the bills, not because of the substance of it, but because of the absence from the Senate of certain Senators on official business. I have conferred with some of the members of the committee, and have ascertained that they have no objection. I have no objection. If the Senator from North Carolina will make appropriate statements with regard to the bills I shall appreciate it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to do so. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous

consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 218, to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge.

The Navy has already been given the same consideration which is provided for in the bill. It was granted several years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill (S. 218) to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the General Accounting Office shall relieve any disbursing officer of the Army charged with responsibility on account of loss or deficiency while in the line of duty, of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers, in his charge, where such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of said officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall have determined that the officer was in the line of his duty, and the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part: *Provided further*, That the determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That all cases of relief granted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That this Act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

TRAVEL COSTS OF DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 220, to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments.

The bill would provide for the payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel. At the present time it is necessary to have rate experts calculate the cost of transportation from one place to another of the families of Army and civilian personnel, and the Army desires the opportunity to decentralize the payments to field offices, and pay straight fare to the nearest point at 4 cents a mile for adults, and 2 cents a mile for children. It is said that the bill would save the Government considerable money, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to it whatever.

Mr. McNARY. Would the bill result in additional expense?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all. It would lessen the present expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 220) to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) in any case where, in lieu of transportation in kind, reimbursement for actual travel costs, or travel at Government expense, of dependents of military and naval, and civilian personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and War and Navy Departments is now or may hereafter be authorized by law, payment for authorized travel of such dependents shall be made after the completion of such travel (and subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section) on a mileage basis at the following rates:

(1) Four cents a mile for each dependent 12 years of age or more;

(2) Two cents a mile for each dependent less than 12 years of age but not less than 5 years of age;

(3) Nothing for any dependent less than 5 years of age.

(b) The provisions of this act shall apply irrespective of the mode of travel, but shall apply only with respect to such part of authorized travel as takes place within the continental United States (not including Alaska),

(c) Payments shall be made under the provisions of this act for authorized travel heretofore performed by the dependents described in subsection (a) of this section for which reimbursement has not been made at the time of the enactment of this act.

(d) Reimbursement for such travel shall be computed on the basis of distances shown in the official mileage tables of the War Department in effect at the time the travel is performed and if the distances cannot be obtained from the official mileage tables they shall be computed over the shortest usually traveled route.

SEC. 2. That during the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, or until such earlier time as Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may designate, and under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, claims heretofore or hereafter presented for reimbursement for travel of dependents and shipment of household effects (including packing, crating, and unpacking thereof) of military personnel, as now or hereafter authorized by law or regulations, performed or had at their own expense, may be submitted by and payments made to the military personnel concerned or such dependents as they may designate, or in absence of designation of a dependent by said military personnel, to such dependent as may be designated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or such person as he may authorize to act for him.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF ACTIVITIES OF WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1026, to provide for settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees.

The Army is merely asking for authority to make settlement of claims for damage on the part of employees of the Army up to the amount of $1,000.

Mr. McNARY. What is the calendar number?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is Senate bill 1026, Calendar No. 245. The bill was reported unanimously by the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. I understood the Senator to say that the bill had the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It had the unanimous approval of the committee, according to my recollection.

Mr. HILL. It not only had the unanimous approval of the committee, but the bill was given careful study by the esteemed distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. He went over it very carefully. He is one of the ablest lawyers in the Senate, and perhaps the ablest lawyer of the committee. He studied the bill carefully, and, as I recall, some suggestions were made with regard to amendments which were agreed to, and then the bill was unanimously approved.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Four or five Army officers appeared before the committee and were examined with regard to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. What happens if a man who has a claim against the Army does not get as much as he thinks he is entitled to? The tendency of the War Department is not to pay anyone anything.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The claimant would be entitled to file another claim, or he could have a private claim bill introduced in the Congress.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that that question was pretty thoroughly thrashed out in the committee. The bill takes no rights away from a claimant at all. He has every right he would have had. The object of the bill is to expedite and, if possible, get rid of claims without a great number of bills being piled up in Congress. It would not take away any right from a claimant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in section 1, page 1, line 8, before the numerals "$1,000", to insert "$500, or in time of war not in excess of"; on page 2, line 9, after the word

"including", to insert "claims for damage to or loss or destruction, by criminal acts, of registered or insured mail while in the possession of the military authorities"; on page 2, line 13, after the words "Government and", to strike out "in time of war"; on page 3, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$500, or in time of war $1,000"; in section 6, page 5, line 21, after the word "Army", to insert a comma and "including such personnel and employees engaged on civil works", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of War, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle and pay in an amount not in excess of $500, or in time of war not in excess of $1,000, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after May 27, 1941, when such claim is substantiated in such manner as the Secretary of War may by regulation prescribe, for damage to or loss or destruction of property, real or personal, or for personal injury or death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army while acting within the scope of their employment, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction, by criminal acts, of registered or insured mail while in the possession of the military authorities, claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages to real property incident to the use and occupancy thereof, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property, or the personal injury or death, shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee. No claim shall be settled under this act unless presented in writing within 1 year after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred: *Provided*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 1 year after its occurrence, any claim may on good cause shown be presented within 1 year after peace is established. The amount allowed on account of personal injury or death shall be limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, except that no payment shall be made to any claimant in reimbursement for medical or hospital services furnished at the expense of the United States nor, in the case of burial, of such portion of the expense thereof as may be otherwise paid by the United States. Any such settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or for personal injury or death of such persons, if such damage, loss, destruction, injury, or death occurs incident to their service. The Secretary of War may report such claims as exceed $500, or in time of war $1,000, to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the War Department for the settlement of claims under the provisions of other laws shall be available for the settlement of claims of the same character under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That portion of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 586), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of War is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property when the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of $1,000, occasioned by heavy gun fire and target practice of troops, and for damages to vessels, wharves, and other private property, found to be due to maneuvers or other military operations for which the Government is responsible, and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress at each session thereof through the Treasury Department for payment as legal claims out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.", is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; 31 U. S. C., 215-217), shall hereafter be inapplicable to the War Department.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015; 33 U. S. C., 564), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. The act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 880), and by the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1436), is hereby amended by adding, after section 5, the following sections:

"SEC. 5a. Any authorization or direction in this act to the Secretary of War, and any reference herein to a decision, declaration, or other action by the Secretary of War, shall include authorization or direction to, and action by, as the case may be, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes, acting under such regulations as he may prescribe. Any settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to the contrary.

"SEC. 5b. The provisions of this act shall be applicable also to civilian personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, including such personnel and employees engaged on civil works."

SEC. 7. The act of February 13, 1936 (49 Stat. 1138; 31 U. S. C. 224a), shall hereafter be inapplicable to acts of officers, enlisted men, and employees of the Army and officers, employees, or agents of the War Department.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army."

SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF OBLIGATIONS AGAINST CERTAIN MINE OPERATORS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 277, was reached at the time of the last call of the calendar, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] objected, and later stated that he would read the bill, and, if he saw fit, would withdraw his objection. Today the Senator has stated to me that his objections are withdrawn, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up at this time and considered.

Mr. McNARY. What is the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is Senate bill 27, relating to the suspension of the enforcement of certain obligations against mine operators. I spoke to the able Senator from Oregon about the bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the Committee on the Judiciary were agreed to when the bill was before the Senate at the last call of the calendar, and the question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who is or has been engaged in mining any mining property which he holds as a mortgagor or under a contract (1) providing for his purchase of such property, or giving him an option to purchase such property, and (2) requiring the performance of certain work on such property, or periodic or installment payments with respect thereto, or both, and who is unable to mine such property because of the operation of any statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States, or any agency thereof, may institute a proceeding in the appropriate district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction to be protected from forfeiture, penalty, and damages under the contract or mortgage under which he holds such property, in the following manner.

SEC. 2. The court may, in its discretion, if it finds that such person has been prevented by any of such causes from performing the work or making the payments required under such contract or mortgage—

(a) make an order suspending, in whole or in part, the requirement that such work be performed or such payments be made during the operation of such statute, rule, regulation, order, or requirement of the United States, or any agency thereof;

(b) stay any action based on breach of performance or payment for any such cause;

(c) make such other orders and disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties: *Provided, however*, That in no case shall such suspension or stay under (a) or (b) extend for more than one year after the termination of the present war.

SEC. 3. Whenever a proceeding is instituted in accordance with section 1 of this act the court may, upon cause shown, make a temporary order suspending the requirements for performing work and making payments under the contract or mortgage pending final disposition of such proceeding, or staying such action, and may make from time to time such additional and supplementary orders as may be necessary for proper disposition of the case.

SEC. 4. No person shall be held liable in any proceeding in any court for any damages, penalty, or forfeiture on account of any

act done or omitted to be done in good faith in accordance with or in conformity with any order or judgment of a court made pursuant to any provision of this act.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act, the term "person" includes any individual, partnership, firm, corporation, association, or other organization, or the legal representative of any of the foregoing.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war."

ORDER AUTHORIZING THE SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the forthcoming recess of the Senate the Presiding Officer of the Senate may have authority to sign bills or resolutions ready for signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry nominations under the War Manpower Commission; and

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer and/or promotion, in the Regular Army under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry C. Westover to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman Collison to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman D. Cann, of Atlanta, Ga., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill a newly created position.

Harold N. Graves, of Jacksonville, Ill., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill a newly created position.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, of Colorado, to be register of the Land Office at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Francis L. McNamee, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

Percy D. Fahnestock, from the State of Ohio, to be regional information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Guy A. Whitcomb, from the State of Ohio, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Harry C. Westover to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California.

Norman Collison to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Lewis M. Adams, Buffalo.
Bess B. Gorham, Pisgah.

NEW JERSEY

Ethel H. McDonald, Englishtown.
Henry N. McKay, Haddon Heights.
C. Melvin Johnson, Jr., Highlands.
Thomas Whittington, Sea Isle City.
Thomas H. Hall, Vineland.
Clara Katz, Woodbine.

NORTH DAKOTA

Nicholas J. Krebsbach, Velva.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George E. Hagen, Armour.
George B. Brown, Clark.
Nicholas W. Tobin, Wentworth.

TEXAS

Hilmar H. Wagner, Rowena.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All glory be unto Thee, O Lord, Most High, Thy boundless love and mercy resist all definition. We thank Thee that Thou dost stoop to our needs and failures and fold us in the embrace of a Father's care. We walk Thy earth and are cheered by the presence of Thy power and beauty. Accept our praise for the ministry of Thy service and for the wonderful providence with which Thou dost surround us. Stay our footfall that we may ever listen to wise public opinion, to the maxims and the restraints which form the unwritten code of public welfare. We pray for prudence where we cannot see our path, to avoid danger, to heed the warning of wisdom, and may we realize and enjoy the treasures of the soul which enrich human life.

Our country, may we never fail her; stored with education, wealth, and opportunity, do Thou fortify us with the spirit of self-abandonment, with fortitude of soul that it shall never be proclaimed of us that we are false to our great trust or untrue to our obligations. Blessed Lord God, let it never be said that the purpose of today will be the folly and the error of tomorrow. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 10, 1943:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

On June 14, 1943:

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

On June 15, 1943:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan;

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

On June 17, 1943:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a number of communications I have received from educational institutions favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Paul McNutt regarding the reduction of personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include a letter from Ferdie Deering, acting editor of the Farmer-Stockman, of Oklahoma City, Okla., addressed to Mr. Chester Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to a bill which I introduced yesterday as an amendment to the Social Security Act to preserve Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefit rights of members of the armed forces during the present war.

Under the existing provisions of the Social Security Act, the present rights of those who are inducted or who enlist in the armed services of the Nation may very well be lost solely through lapse of time.

The proposed amendment is very simple and freezes these rights of all persons in the armed services after December 6, 1941. The need for such an amendment was recognized by the administration when the Selective Service Act was passed.

In justice to the men and women serving the Nation today, this proposal merits prompt attention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article I wrote for the Hearst papers, published last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop in the Times-Herald, of Washington, June 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Dr. Paul Haensel, formerly of the Northwestern University, on the subject of the Spending Tax versus the Sales Tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS R. BALL

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the passing of the late Congressman Thomas R. Ball, who represented my district, the Second District of Connecticut, a couple of sessions ago. I feel it incumbent upon me to inform my colleagues of this sad event.

I knew ex-Congressman Ball very intimately. All his friends knew him as "Tommy." He was always conscientious, was a hard worker, and was an asset to our district. I am sure my colleagues will join in conveying to Mrs. Ball and to his family our heartfelt sympathy. I know that he will be missed not only in his home town, but in the district and the State. His passing is a loss to the entire country.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the announcement of the death of our former colleague from Connecticut, Thomas R. Ball.

"Tommy" Ball served with us as a Member of the Seventy-sixth Congress. He was one of four freshmen Congressmen from Connecticut who took the oath of office January 2, 1939. Since then two of those men, Dr. Albert E. Austin and Thomas R. Ball, have answered their final roll call and have gone on to the upper body to join their loved ones and their friends in the Great Beyond.

Tommy Ball was a faithful, hard-working representative of his constituents. He came here with the background of 10 years' service in the Connecticut General Assembly. He was particularly farsighted in foreign relations. Long before many of his colleagues saw the need of this country's entering the present World War, Tommy Ball was urging our active participation in the fight against the Axis Powers.

Following his defeat in 1940, our former colleague accepted a position with the Ship & Engine Co., of Groton, Conn. With this concern he put his every energy into the task of turning out badly needed submarines.

He was happy because he knew that in his work he was doing his part in the Nation's effort to bring about victory.

Connecticut has lost a fine public servant and the Nation has lost a loyal, patriotic citizen.

I join with the membership of the House in expressing our sorrow to his widow and to his young daughter.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with much grief that I rise to express my affection for one whom I respected very much. The sudden passing of the Honorable Thomas R. Ball, a former Member of Congress who represented the Second District from Connecticut during the seventy-sixth session of Congress, was a shock to all of us who know him.

I became attached to him during our service in the House of Representatives. He was a conscientious representative of the people at all times, loyal to his constituents, and sensitive to his responsibilities. He had a wide friendship in the House of Representatives.

His public service as a first selectman of the town of Old Lyme and later on as a representative in the general assembly from his community earned for him the respect and the admiration of the people of the State of Connecticut.

Tommie, as we all affectionately called him, was always polite, even under most stressing circumstances. Always gentle, he was nevertheless firm in his efforts in behalf of the principles for which he stood. As an architect by profession, he attained success in his vocation.

We all join in sympathy with his beloved wife and daughter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a short telegram on the food situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include letters to Senator Robert L. Owen on the formation and utilization of his global alphabet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Baldwin, Md.	Gale	Merrow
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	Morrison, La.
Barden	Gamble	Mundt
Barry	Gifford	Murphy
Bell	Gillie	Murray, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Gossett	O'Leary
Burchill, N. Y.	Green	O'Toole
Burdick	Hall,	Pace
Byrne	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Hancock	Pracht
Capozzoli	Hart	Price
Carlson, Kans.	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Chapman	Hendricks	Rizley
Cochran	Hoffman	Sabath
Costello	Jarman	Sheridan
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Ill.
Cox	Johnson, Ward	Slaughter
Crawford	Kean	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	Kennedy	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Keogh	Stearns, N. H.
Dickstein	King	Sumners, Tex.
Dies	Kleberg	Taylor
Domengeaux	Klein	Tolan
Douglas	LeCompte	Treadway
Eberharter	Lesinski	Van Zandt
Ellis	Luce	Vinson, Ga.
Ellsworth	McGehee	Vursell
Fay	McLean	Wadsworth
Fellows	Marcantonio	Weiss
Fish	Mason	White
Forand	May	Winter
Ford	Merritt	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2996, Rept. No. 566), making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 265), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ARTHUR G. KLEIN be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 266), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That THOMAS G. ABERNETHY be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 267), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONSENTING TO COMPACT ENTERED BY IOWA AND NEBRASKA ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARY LINE

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2794) to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes; it is.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman make a brief explanation as to what the bill provides?

Mr. GWYNNE. The bill simply provides congressional approval of a compact entered into between the legislatures of the States of Iowa and Nebraska fixing the boundary line between those two States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted with the majority members of the committee?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is a bill that was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has an act been passed by each of the States involved in this matter, approving the boundary line?

Mr. GWYNNE. It has.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this is merely a confirmation of the compact?

Mr. GWYNNE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the approval and consent of the Congress is hereby given to the compact effected by an act enacted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa entitled "An act to establish the boundary line between Iowa and Nebraska by agreement; to cede to Nebraska and to relinquish jurisdiction over lands now in Iowa but lying westerly of said boundary line and contiguous to lands in Nebraska; to provide that the provisions of this act become effective upon the enactment of a similar and reciprocal law by Nebraska and the approval of and consent to the compact thereby effected by the Congress of the United States of America and to declare an emergency," approved April 15, 1943 (House File 437, acts of the Fiftieth General Assembly), and the similar and reciprocal act enacted by the State of Nebraska entitled "A bill for an act to establish the boundary line between Iowa and Nebraska by agreement; to cede to Iowa and to relinquish jurisdiction over lands now in Nebraska but lying easterly of said boundary line and contiguous to lands in Iowa; to provide that the provisions of this act shall become effective upon the approval of and consent of the Congress of the United States of America to the compact effected by this act and House File 437 of the 1943 session of the Iowa Legislature; to repeal chapter 121, Session Laws of Nebraska, 1941; and to declare an emergency," approved May 7, 1943 (Legislative bill 438, fifty-sixth session of the Nebraska State Legislature).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the executive office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968), with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that our program is to complete this bill tonight and to take up tomorrow the military appropriation bill and dispose of it before adjournment tomorrow. In this program we have the concurrence of all members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle and I trust we will have the cooperation of Members to get these two bills over to the Senate by the end of the week.

With the passage of the Military Establishment's appropriation bill tomorrow we will have completed and submitted to the Senate all of the annual supply bills. So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, there will be only one more bill, a short deficiency appropriation bill, to take care of a few odds and ends, before recess.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is it not the understanding that if there should be a roll call on the War Department appropriation bill that the roll call will go over until Monday?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect to complete the reading of the bill for amendments tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In order that the House will understand thoroughly and so that no one will get away without having it fully in mind, the idea of not having a controversial roll call tomorrow is dependent upon completing this bill presently under consideration tonight; is that not correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct; we must complete this bill tonight in order to take up the Military Establishment appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. And everyone must stay here until we get the bill through.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And stay here tomorrow until we also get the Military Establishment appropriation bill through. With these two bills out of the way, we will have completed the appropriation program and, as soon as conference reports are agreed to, will be ready to recess at any time after the 1st of July.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not think it is clearly understood yet, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that if there is to be a roll call on the bill to be considered tomorrow that roll call will not go over until Monday?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice there has been a little conference on the other side and I would like to have a final statement from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as to the intention of completing the military appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding of the situation, which I think has been more or less ironed out, that there is not to be a roll call on this bill, the war appropriations bill, tomorrow, and that if the bill is taken up and considered a roll call will take place on Monday?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. But that could not be accomplished, on the other hand, if this bill that is now pending is carried over.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is carried over it is my personal opinion it should be disposed of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me say, after conference with members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the House, our program is to complete this bill today and we hope the members of the committee will stay with us tonight and help us pass it and send it to the Senate.

Then on tomorrow we hope to take up the military establishments appropriation bill and complete the reading for amendment.

If there is a roll call on the military establishment bill it will go over until Monday.

Mr. RABAUT. But there will be a roll call on this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There will be a roll call on the pending bill before adjournment.

Mr. RABAUT. When?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We hope to complete the bill and vote on it tonight.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, before we start reading the bill for amendment, not having taken any time under general debate, I want to take just a few minutes hastily to review the situation that confronts us as we consider a bill certain portions of which in my judgment are as vitally necessary to the war effort as the War Department appropriation bill which we shall take up tomorrow and which will probably pass without amendments.

We have to remember that this war is being fought not only with airplanes and tanks on the foreign battlefield, but that the effort to preserve our freedom and our way of life, to win this war and to overcome our enemies, extends in the foreign fields way beyond the battle line across into enemy territory, and on the home front into every realm of our civil life. The appropriations contained in this bill touch those features of our war effort.

The subcommittee that considered this bill spent long days and long tedious hours hearing the testimony. There are two volumes of testimony containing something like 2,100 or 2,200 pages. In addition to that there were probably another 400 or 500 pages of testimony that had to be off the record because of its highly secret nature. Those were not perfunctory hearings where some member of the committee half asleep would sit there and permit some departmental head to read a prepared speech and insert a lot of stuff in the record. Turn to it; you will see that the members of the committee carefully, conscientiously, and painstakingly inquired into these activities. As a result we bring you here a bill with a unanimous report of the committee, and insofar as the amount of money appropriated in the bill is concerned the figures have been unanimously agreed to by the committee, the minority as well as the majority—with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare. Let me repeat that if you will, and remember, this committee, the majority and the distinguished, able, and energetic minority——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wish to state that there was no agreement whatever upon the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I so stated; I excepted the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. TABER. It was as to amounts. There will be some restrictive amendments offered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I said as to the amounts appropriated with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare the committee had a meeting of minds. In doing that concessions were made on both sides of the committee.

Two or three of these activities I think have been cut dangerously low. The Office of Civilian Defense, in my opinion, has been scuttled, practically; I doubt if some of its important functions can be continued; and yet I am going to fulfill my agreement with my committee and resist any increase of appropriations. I am going to stand by my agreement with the committee and resist any increase of appropriations for O. W. I., although I believe in some of their activities, especially in their foreign service, where we cut them below what they had this year although our armies are now on the march and the need for this service, we are told by the General Staff, is greater than ever. I am going to resist increases, as I shall expect the other members of the committee to resist further cuts in this bill.

We have cut $139,000,000 out of this bill and it has been done by making concessions on both sides. I know perfectly well that no agreement I might make in the subcommittee, or any of my colleagues might make, could bind any gentleman in this House. You can offer an amendment to cut or any amendment to increase. I have no peculiar ability to pass on this any more than you would have except such information as has come to me because I sat through these hearings. Any other committee of the House of the same number of men could do as good a job and perhaps a better job, but the fact remains that the subcommittee having consideration of it has gone through it carefully and painstakingly and has had a meeting of minds. I hope it will be the pleasure of this House when it comes to considering these amendments to keep this fact in mind.

Every Member of the House can get up in the well of the House and criticize O. P. A., O. W. I., and a lot of these other agencies. There are things every one of them do that we do not like, that we could denounce, that we would like to change. I have no objection to that; I think perhaps some good comes from constructive criticism when it is not partisan and when it is not bitter, and when it is not destructive.

In the first place the O. P. A. is just getting started under its new management, Prentiss Brown. Let us give him a chance. The first thing Prentiss Brown did as O. P. A. Administrator was to say to Congress:

> Although you invited me to come back for $20,000,000 additional funds I am not going to; forget it; I will wait until the bill comes up.

The bill came up to us and we cut that appropriation for O. P. A. $12,335,000. We denied them 1,900 new investigators that they wanted; we denied them 1,235 other employees they wanted. We went even further, we said:

> In your office staff in Washington you have too many employees; you must reduce them by 412 below your present level.

That is what we did to O. P. A.; we have made a drastic cut notwithstanding the fact they told us there were eight rationing programs coming up in this next year. Now, of course, if the Congress wants to say as I have heard some Members say that we should disband it all and let it go to hell—that is one way to do it, that is one way to do it if you want to. Throw all the control of prices and rationing overboard, if you wish, and see what you bring down upon the head of

this Nation, see what your money will be worth, see what your savings bonds will be worth. You cannot reform O. P. A. by cutting its funds. I think we have cut them pretty heavy. Perhaps they should have had some of these people to go out into the field to investigate some of these black-market operations.

The Office of Civilian Defense got a bad name here because of the fan dancers and one thing and another. If you give a dog a bad name he never gets over it. They asked the Budget Bureau for $9,000,000 for their activities. The Budget cut them to $5,000,000 and our committee cut them to $4,000,000. I think we cut them too much although I am going to resist any attempt to increase it because I had an agreement in my committee. We did cut them too much. Under this cut I do not believe it will be possible for the Office of Civilian Defense to carry on their operations with the voluntary groups all over the country. All they will be able to do is to carry on their operations with the air-raid wardens and that type of operations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like for the Members to read the report on this before they vote.

The O. W. I. asked for $47,000,000. We cut $12,000,000 off of that request. We cut $5,000,000 off of an emergency fund that they asked. We cut $4,000,000 off of their overseas branch which I think was a dangerous cut. We cut $3,000,000 off of the domestic branch about which there has been so much criticism. We made a drastic cut there.

Next is the Board of Economic Warfare. I do not have time to take it up in detail. My time is practically up now, but I would ask the members of the committee, and I believe this is a reasonable request, to turn to the report of the committee, page 4. There are two or three pages describing the Board of Economic Warfare there. Read it, if you will. I ask you all to read it. I hope when you come to consider this that the Members of the House will consider the fact that the committee has earnestly tried to bring them a bill that is satisfactory and I hope you will take it into consideration and give it some regard and respect before you vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the members of the subcommittee did reach an agreement as to the amount of these appropriations that they would recommend, with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare. I am not going to discuss that now, because just as soon as the paragraph is read I intend to offer an amendment to cut it and the argument that I shall make in favor of the cut is absolutely irrefutable.

There was a dispute in the committee as to almost every item. There were many of us who wanted to cut more off the Office of Price Administration. If they had an efficient set-up in Washington they could stand a cut of a million dollars upon their departmental set-up beyond what was given them without hurting them a bit and at the same time improve the tone of their work. There is no question about that. On the other hand, I shall vote as I agreed.

In connection with the Office of Strategic Services there was a cut and, frankly, that was the only cut that I hated to see because it is the only outfit of those that are being presented to you here that is really contributing a major item toward the war effort.

The Office of Civilian Defense was not cut on any of the items where it is performing a real service such as the service which relates to civilian protection and whatever work might be done for the protection of our communities against air raids and sabotage. The things that were cut were the things that it is not supposed to do. Frankly, the cuts there were not as big as they should be for the good of that service.

We come now to O. W. I., which puts out the most ridiculous kind of propaganda and is loaded up with the worst kind of derelicts. There were 417 foreigners in the office in New York, some of whom were removed after the hearings, these people being employed without the slightest regard for the Federal Treasury or the effectivenes of the O. W. I. in the war effort. Frankly, we did not cut that outfit as much as it should be cut, but we did cut it $12,000,000 and that is better than no cut at all. That is about a 33-percent cut in the activities outside of the secret activities that we did appropriate for.

The other cuts were very nominal. Anyone in the House, be he on the majority side or the minority side, who thinks that we should go further has the perfect right to offer an amendment, and I hope that if anyone feels that he should offer an amendment he will do so. Of course, I shall stand by the bargain I made with the committee and I shall vote with my committee on those things to which I agreed. There never could be any question of that. When I make a bargain I live up to it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If we prolong the life of this O. P. A. for another year, that prevents us bringing in from the Banking and Currency Committee a substitute plan that would put other people in charge under a more workable theory of price control. I do not think this country can stand to have its supply line, its processing, producing, and distributing systems destroyed one after another at a time when we need these essential foods and goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything should prevent the Committee on Banking and Currency from bringing in a bill which will clear up this situation. It was intimated to us yesterday by the majority leader that we were going to be rid of the long-haired professors over in the O. P. A. and that practical people of business experience and character were going to take their places. I am hopeful that the suggestion the majority leader made to us may be realized. I do not think that in wartime I could dare to vote to wipe out the Office of Price Administration appropriation. I do think that I should, as I did yesterday, call attention to the fact that America is facing starvation next winter unless the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Food Administration are run with an appreciation of the problems that are before them, and unless we have competent people to pass on these questions. I think that absolutely must and should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Virginia has raised a question which I think merits an answer at this stage of the proceedings. I entertain a high regard for him and for the impressive contributions he has made to good government. I think he struck the key today when he said, "Can you reform an agency by reducing its appropriations?" His answer would be in the negative. My answer would be in the affirmative, and I propose to establish it if I can.

When we get to the Office of Price Administration I shall offer an amendment to reduce the amount in the bill by $35,000,000. This represents $22,500,000 which they are asking for over and above the current fiscal year appropriation for local offices, and about $13,000,000 over and above the fiscal year appropriation that they are asking for full-time personnel for the Washington office, for the 9 regional offices, for 108 district offices, and for 279 rental offices.

They had 4,600 people in Washington in 1942 and 5,063 in 1943. Their budget request was for 5,414 in the Washington office. Their budget request and as provided by the committee would include an over-all staff of 65,607 persons.

This is what they have had in the Washington office, among others: They have 191 accountants; they have 798 business specialists; they have 165 analysts; they have 896 economists; they have 394 attorneys; they have 170 statisticians; and then they have had some 2,100 or 2,200 clerks, clerk-typists, and clerk-stenographers.

Let us see how it works and why I believe you can reform an agency by reducing its appropriation substantially. This I give to you from House Document 891 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, which is the O. P. A. report for

the period from May 1 to July 31, 1942. You have to dig it out, but here it is.

They received a little over 4,500 complaints over that period; 185 were dismissed; 193 were settled without investigation; 110 were otherwise disposed of; 4,060 complaints were referred for investigation; 1,556 of those were completed, and then they were referred to the Washington office for review. What happened to these 1,556 complaints? Eight hundred and eighty-nine were closed, showing that there was no violation whatever.

What is the conclusion from these figures? First of all, there was no violation shown in 75 percent of the cases that were referred to the Washington office. This indicates that too many complaints are being investigated. It means that a good sifting job on the complaint is not being done in the local, in the area, and in the State and regional offices. If there were a better sifting of complaints you would not need so many clerks and stenographers, you would not need so many attorneys, you would not need so many enforcement personnel in Washington, and, for that matter, in the regional and in the State offices. In addition, you could substantially reduce the number of investigators.

What is the course of one of these complaints? Assume that John Brown runs a grocery store in Johnson Center. It is complained that he sold baked beans in excess of the ceiling price. An investigator is assigned. He covers the case and he makes a report to his immediate superior. Then what? Copies are made and filed here, there, and everywhere. Then it is referred to the State office for checking and rechecking. Then the report is referred to the regional office for checking and for re-checking. Then it goes to the national office, and it is handled at three or four levels in the Washington office.

There are many copies. They have their files so cluttered up with useless forms, with useless complaints, with useless copies of letters, that that is the reason they have to have such a huge staff of clerks, stenographers, and everybody else to handle this tidal wave of literature that washes through the regional offices and the Washington office.

Then it enters into their statistical picture. They have in Washington at the present time 170 statisticians. They get busy and assemble all this information, whether or not it is useful, and then place it into some kind of a report; and they must have clerks, they must have stenographers to provide the country with a variety of statistics and literature.

If there were careful sifting, if they did not bother so much about the little fellow, who seldom willfully violates one of these regulations, you could dispose of $35,000,000 worth of personnel in O. P. A. at the present time. The record will show that 88 out of every 100 complaints have been investigated. It cannot stand up in the light of good administrative procedure in Government or in business, and it indicates the inefficiency of the O. P. A. technique at the present time.

We had better cut and reform this agency by reducing its expenditures and get rid of some of the personnel that they are going to put out on the country. It is purely a question of lack of good, sound, efficient administrative technique. Prentiss Brown can get along with the money when we cut the $35,000,000. I entertain a real affection for Prentiss Brown. I served for many years with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House. I think he is a fine, able gentleman. But that does not make any excuse for or serve as an extenuation of a faulty technique in O. P. A. I am of opinion, since they have developed so much friction in the country, and have become a focal point of complaint from people everywhere, that it is our responsibility to cut this by $35,000,000. There are some who would cut it even more, but I shall be content to take out the extra money they are asking for the local offices, for an increase in the Washington, the regional and the area offices, and I believe it is fully justified. It still leaves $10,000,000 more than the amount provided for the fiscal year 1943.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They are fundamentally going to do that from now on, and worse, because they are trying to control the luxuries, and they ought to boil down to the fact that we can only afford to control the things that are absolutely necessary to keep this country in good health and fit to fight and win the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think much may be said on that subject. The question is whether or not $130,000,000 will be sufficient for the next fiscal year to do this job. My answer, then, to the question of whether you can reform an agency by substantially reducing its personnel and its administration centers is emphatically "Yes."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman's committee——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might clarify the matter first by saying that I am not on the deficiency subcommittee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then the gentleman has made a personal investigation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman find any inefficiency due to the fact that a large proportion of their personnel there consists of volunteers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not go into that phase of it, but I think there we run into another question, and that is the administrative competency of those who are in the area, in the regional offices, and those who have to do with the supervision of the field services here in Washington, and that, of course, I shall cover by another amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit another observation, I made some investigation myself when home recently concerning the difficulties in the home field, due to the fact that the personnel there was so largely of a volunteer nature. They would work a few hours this week and a few hours next week, and then somebody else would take the job, and the net result was total confusion in the field offices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is that they are paying so much attention to details that they have lost sight of the larger issue, and that accounts in large measure for recruiting unnecessary workers in many cases, and contributing to the confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. For reasons already stated, I think the O. P. A. has done more harm than good, and I think we have reason to think they are going to do worse in the future. I think that the time will come when the O. P. A. will go down in history like the walls of Jericho. and for the same reason, because there is so much complaint. Look at this roll-back and this subsidy program that they are contemplating. Of course, it is inflationary. The roll-back is the O. P. A.'s Ruml plan. It provides that the grocery bills you incur today shall be paid later by the returning soldiers and other future taxpayers. Of course, it is inflationary, but that is not the worst trouble with it. You already have seen three examples of roll-back—butter, the canning industry, and meat. You already know that the worst vice of it is that it is cutting production, and the question here today, as I see it, is whether we will have to force our people to support this unworkable policy administered by people who do not know what they should know about industries, and go on until the people learn by sad experience that governments can always create money and fill the people's pockets with money, and at the same time they may grow hungrier and hungrier, because you cannot eat money.

Representatives of the butter industry came here and showed the O. P. A. why, in their experienced judgment, a 5-cent roll-back on butter would be sure to cause a decrease in the production on the part of the farmers. The O. P. A. said, "We have already decided the policy." The canners came down here, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bulges with their complaints. You are not likely to hear much from the canners in the future. They are likely to be mute, because the newspapers announced that the O. P. A. would decide in the future which canners would have to take the roll-back out of their profits, or which canners would get a subsidy from the Government. That, you will be quick to see, is a political ax over their heads, and yet they already have reduced the acreage in canned vegetables and they already contemplate more reduction in acreage. Worst of all, in my opinion, is the meat program. I have been investigating the fact that for the first time in our country we do not have a differential between the price of finished cattle that have always been fed on the range and then brought to the midwestern plains, shipped there, and fattened there, and then shipped to the market—investigating as to why it should be eliminated by the O. P. A.

I discovered that it was the deliberate intention of O. P. A. to eliminate our

feeder industry and to ship the cattle straight from the range. What you get when you buy meat when it grows straight from the range to market is just hides, horns, hoofs, and bones. Those cattle, if I may use the vocabulary of the cattle country, when they come to our midwestern plains, take up feed that would otherwise be wasted and bring it to you and your people in the shape of food. Cattle are fed not merely corn. They also get foodstuffs that would otherwise be wasted, our grass, our hay that dairy cattle cannot eat, our green corn, and so forth. On account of the floods this year there will be a lot of green corn that we cannot harvest because we have gotten into the fields 30 days too late. It will be wasted unless we can send it to you in the form of beef and hogs. The hogs follow behind the cattle and we do not have to feed the hogs half as much as we would otherwise feed them if they could not follow the cattle. What happens? Here comes the O. P. A., as I discovered in the hearings on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and says, "We do not want to have the midwestern farmers feed the cattle, because we think it is a waste of grain."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The O. P. A. has said, "We want to change the feeding habits of America, because other nations have changed their feeding habits and feed our people grain and beans and soya beans instead of meat." I want you to ask your wives whether you can do as well without meat. I want you to appreciate before you prolong the longevity of this O. P. A. that it is cutting the processors and producers and distributors of this Nation and cutting down the supply of food. I want you to stop and think whether you want to send soldiers out to fight and men out to work to win the war on the same kind of a skimpy meatless diet that the Japanese eat. To me this is a very serious question. These O. P. A. professor-politicians are perhaps learned in their own fields, but when it comes to being dictators of all kinds of business about which they have no practical knowledge and when they are not willing to listen to those who do know what they are talking about, to me they are like the "physicians of no value" who came to Job in his day of trial to comfort him with platitudinous fallacies, for that is all they are using in the O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words just to sound one note of encouragement in the House. I am deeply gratified to be able to report that the contract whereby the Standard Oil Co. would have gained complete control of the oil in the naval oil reserve at Elk Hills, Calif., has been canceled, and it is a matter of profound satisfaction to me to realize that I brought that matter to the attention of the House on Friday, May 21, protested then against the contract, and called for a thorough investigation thereof.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

If I may make bold to address my remarks to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who spoke about reduction in the Budget of O. P. A., I think we can all agree that much of those expenses arise from various intricate and often incomprehensible rules and regulations that require a great deal of work to even understand. I shall not discuss at the moment whether or not those regulations may be right and proper. I believe many of them are wrong. But I want to call attention to the fact that in the field offices under the local boards in your home town and my home town a great part of the help there is volunteer. I understand that much of this is brought in through the civilian defense organizations, but it is volunteer. Those people are doing a splendid job within their limitations. However, there are distinct limitations upon the fine people who come in to do these jobs. Most of them work a few hours a day, perhaps twice or three times a week, sometimes daily, attempting to solve a terrific organizational problem, but many of them are inexperienced in office work. I have had occasion to go into two of such offices in my home district, and in both cases the members of the board requested that they be given enough permanent help to do the work they are called upon to do, and said that if they had a little more permanent help they would not require nearly so many volunteers. That would mean a material lessening of both the amount of hours of work and the amount of confusion which occurs by reason of inexperienced personnel working at intervals.

I think we all want to compliment those who have volunteered their services, but I think every one of us can realize the difficulties that arise from a requirement for too much volunteer service on a strictly voluntary basis; that is, they come and go as they please. It brings about a serious discontinuity in office routine.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, while I believe that much of the effort of the O. P. A. could be properly eliminated by a change of attitude at the top by abandonment of many policies that only confuse, by the separation of social planners from the policy-making group in the core of O. P. A., and their replacement by sound-thinking, sane, and sensible people; nevertheless, until that millennium arrives, I favor supplying the local boards with sufficient trained personnel, on regular employment status, to properly do the routine work.

I was not in favor of that method of price control which was adopted in 1941, but favored the method proposed by Mr. Bernard Baruch, which was embodied in the Gore bill. But my ideas did not prevail at the time as only 65 votes could be mustered for the Gore bill. The Henderson bill was adopted and proved to be unworkable, just as was forecast. It has since been amended and supplemented by other acts. But bad administration can ruin even the best-intentioned legislation. Sound administration can likewise overcome the shortcomings of poor legislation. The Price Control Act needs sound-thinking administrators, and we hope that Prentiss Brown may bring sanity to the O. P. A.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 6 words.

The gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] has asked us to confer with our wives as to what has happened with reference to the O. P. A. I spoke to my wife the other day with reference to the rising costs of food. In making a comparison between the price of food today and as of last year, she complains bitterly. Consider that in March, this year, the cost of living was 22 percent above the level of January 1, 1941, the basic date of the Little Steel formula. As of mid-May, it is estimated at 24 percent above that level. Thus the wage-rate adjustments to 15 percent above that same level cannot hold without adequate price roll-back. How can they when bread has gone up 22 percent; butter, 69 percent; milk, 18 percent; oranges, 116 percent; cucumbers, 141 percent; green peppers, 275 percent, and potatoes up 219 percent.

With wages fixed for the average wage earner and the ordinary housewife with a narrow purse, limited by virtue of that fixation of wages, how a person can reach after all of these foodstuffs that have gone up so high is beyond comprehension. Drastic remedies are essential. Drastic remedies naturally cause reactions in our minds and in the minds of others, that are somewhat unpleasant.

But we cannot help ourselves. We are compelled to use the medium of the roll-back, and we cannot use the roll-back without the subsidy.

Unfortunately, I find a provision in this bill which ordinarily would be subject to a point of order, to the effect that the O. P. A. cannot use any appropriation herein provided for purposes of subsidy, and, furthermore, I understand amendments will be offered to the effect that no funds may be used which are appropriated under this bill, for the purpose of administering subsidies that may be utilized through any other agency like R. F. C. or Commodity Credit Corporation.

The R. F. C. has the right, under the Price Control Act, under the authority of the President, to accord subsidies in the case of critical and strategic materials. Thus an attempt will be made in an appropriation bill to legislate, and unfortunately all points of order are waived, otherwise we would knock those attempted amendments into a cocked hat by making appropriate points of order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. If I understand the rule correctly, it merely waives point of order against the bill as reported, but the rule

does not waive points of order against amendments that may be offered to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. I hope we can get the aid of the gentleman from South Dakota in that respect so as to be able to sustain points of order when they will be made against the amendments that would graft legislation upon this appropriation bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I take it for granted you believe in the Fair Labor Standards Act and in the Wage and Hour Division. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New York this question: Do you know, at the fixed price of 46 cents a pound on butter in Chicago, what return the man gets who milks the cow?

Mr. CELLER. I am not aware of that, but I will say this, that no man should be forced to operate at a loss and that, if we are compelled to roll back the prices, the processor, the farmer, the distributor, the retailer, and the wholesaler, I think, should be amply compensated so as to make up for that loss, so that the consumer ultimately, the wage earner ultimately, and the housewife ultimately can buy sustaining food, clothes, and medicine within the limited spending range of those whose wages are frozen.

Now with reference to subsidies, there is nothing novel about subsidies; it is not a new idea.

I hold before you a menu from the House Office restaurant. It contains various articles of food and delectable dishes furnished us at most reasonable prices. Those prices charged us do not equal the cost of this food, its preparation, and its service. We pay the operating costs out of the contingent funds of the House. If that is not a subsidy, I do not know what a subsidy is. The prices charged us now over in the restaurant in the House and the lunchroom or cafeteria in the New House Office Building are noncommensurate with value received. Our meals are in part subsidized. Those eating places of ours are operating upon deficits which we make up by appropriation of the people's money. I give you some salient facts about our own food subsidy, as follows:

House restaurant in Capitol and cafeteria in New House Office Building

Fiscal year 1940:	
Receipts from operation	$78,049
Expenditures	108,685
Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress	30,636
Fiscal year 1941:	
Receipts from operation	89,104
Expenditures	115,773
Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress	26,669
Fiscal year 1942:	
Receipts from operation	114,318
Expenditures	137,034
Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress	22,716
Fiscal year 1943 (first 10 months—July 1, 1942, to Apr. 30, 1943):	
Receipts from operation	$140,522
Expenditures	156,970
Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress (10 months)	16,448
Estimated amount to be met through appropriation for months of May and June 1943 (2 months)	2,000
Total deficiency met and to be met through appropriation by Congress (12 months)	18,448

House restaurant was placed under Architect of Capitol October 1, 1940.

Cafeteria in New House Office Building was placed in operation Mar. 3, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, we can buy meals at the restaurant downstairs for 50 percent, and even less than that, of the price that we can get the same meals for elsewhere. If, therefore, we vote to give ourselves a food subsidy, we cannot refrain from according relief to the consumer who suffers immeasurably from high prices of food. There are some who partake of that subsidy and yet would deny that benefit to the housewives throughout the Nation.

That restaurant is run at an absolute loss, despite the fact that it has no light bills to pay, no rent to pay, no expense or outlay for linen or cleaning or repairs.

The same thing holds true as to the restaurant at the other end of the Capitol.

The persons who are bellyaching and carping about the subsidies are those who have been getting handouts all of these years. I refer to the farm bloc, I refer to the cattle bloc; and let me also remind the newspaper representatives up in that gallery that their publishers too are recipients of a gigantic mail subsidy. Most of the Republican newspapers are not in favor of subsidies; on the contrary they are opposed to subsidies, despite the fact that they themselves accept Government largesse.

Furthermore, subsidies are not something that have just arisen in this emergency. The whole Nation has been built up by virtue of subsidies. We built the transcontinental railroads with the use of subsidies; we built the canals with subsidies and, furthermore, our Government, even today, pays about $700,000,000 a year to keep down canners' prices of vegetables, to pay rail charges on gasoline to the East and coal to New England, to hold the line on imported goods, and to keep high-cost mines operating, like silver and copper.

And what is the tariff but a subsidy? And among the items on which subsidies are being paid are machinery, mahogany, sugar, wheat for the alcohol program, vegetable oil, and cocoa.

Why, subsidies have been used from time immemorial and we must use them in connection with this roll-back program in order to take care of the great margin between the prices which are fixed for wages and the prices which are being charged all over the country for food and clothing and medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Elmer Davis, chosen by the President to head the Office of War Information, is a sort of political weathervane blown hither and thither politically by every passing breeze, but strangely enough, always to the left. Indeed, he has frequently been left of the New Deal, and on one occasion supported Norman Thomas and was, for a while at least, a devout disciple of the philosophy of Karl Marx.

Now why do you suppose he was selected by the President to head this most important New Deal agency, created, of course, by Executive order? Was it because he was a highly paid radio commentator; or was it because of demonstrated executive abilities needed to handle a Government agency employing some 5,000 persons; or was it because of any superior talents as a newspaper man; or was it because it was felt by the President, and rightly so, that he would interpret the New Deal to the people of this Nation and to foreign countries as the President desired it interpreted?

Well, let us look at the record, as Al Smith would say, and see what are Mr. Davis' political antecedents. We find that in 1940 he was elected a member of the county committee of the American Labor Party in New York City, and in that position was active in its councils. We know, of course, that the American Labor Party in its leftist slant outdoes the New Deal; that, in fact, it was organized prior to the election of 1936 with the objective of forcing the New Deal to be even more radical than Mr. Roosevelt and its leaders generally at that time could stomach. We know also that this party is now being organized on a national basis to perpetuate the New Deal in power, and that at last accounts, although Mr. Davis has resigned from leadership of the party in New York, he is still an enrolled member.

Now how about the period preceding the last national election? Back in 1932 Mr. Davis wrote a letter to the New York Times in which he expressed preference for the National Socialist ticket, headed by Mr. Norman Thomas, over the Democratic ticket, headed by Mr. Roosevelt. Of course, the Socialist platform in contrast to the Democratic platform of that year, to which Mr. Roosevelt subscribed but never followed, was a radical one.

Said Mr. Davis in the letter to the Times I have mentioned:

> Personally I prefer Norman Thomas to Mr. Roosevelt. * * * And the Socialist program, not in its theories but as it would be realized in legislation and administration—to the democratic.

No, the blooming New Deal that had not yet uncovered its hand was too tame

for Mr. Davis' leftist tendencies and theories.

Again in 1932, Mr. Davis wrote another communication to the New York Times:

> Those of you who are going to vote the Socialist ticket this fall are accused of lack of realism. Why vote for a man who will not be elected? Well, even if Mr. Thomas is not elected, the heavy vote for him will make both Republicans and Democrats realize that the people are concerned about other things than the distribution of the offices.

Also:

> The development of the small Socialist Party of the past into a major organization is as big a job as the transformation of the Regular Army into the American Expeditionary Forces and that job must be started now.

Yes; Mr. Davis was a Socialist in that year, but in 1936 he was back in the New Deal, supporting Mr. Roosevelt for President. In 1937 he enrolled in the American Labor Party, but though he disapproved of the tactics used by Mr. Roosevelt in securing his third-term nomination in 1940, he is now both a Roosevelt administrator and a Roosevelt supporter.

How, with such a record of political activity, can Mr. Davis, even with the best of intentions, be an impartial, nonpartisan director of the Government's several agencies dealing with all sources of public information, the press, radio, and moving pictures? And is it any wonder that the Office of War Information, insofar as its domestic activities are concerned, should be transformed into a Government propaganda agency developed along the lines of the dictator countries?

Will the American people continue to stand for such a situation, one that has necessarily undermined their confidence in the press and has caused them to regard askance the information imparted by the radio commentators, including Mr. Davis himself in his weekly broadcasts, and the propaganda that is being fed to them ad infinitum et ad nauseum by the movies?

Mr. Davis recently described talk of a fourth term as "hot air." That he is one of the architects actually engaged in fashioning a fourth term can scarcely be doubted. That he is working for the continuation of Mr. Roosevelt in office and for the perpetuation of the New Deal, rather than the giving of factual information to the American people, is clearly shown by his attack on the American press last Monday, and in which he rebuked the able, patriotic, and independent newspapermen of Washington for reporting things in the Capital as they saw them, rather than as he, Mr. Davis, would have them reported.

Are we to pass by without protest and continue the existence of a so-called information agency, masquerading as such when in fact it is a full-fledged propaganda agency; something the American people have always abhorred and regarded as contrary to American concepts and principles? Or are we to demand that the left wing political head of this agency, a radical zealot, be superseded by someone in whom the American people can have trust and confidence and who will not betray that confidence by imposing upon them his own peculiar political beliefs?

I believe the time has come to investigate the Office of War Information; to clip its political wings, confine its activities to factual news reporting in accordance with the best American principles and traditions in this field.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that take care of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] who is seeking recognition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping the gentleman would let us read part of the bill before we had further debate.

Mr. TABER. No; I think if the gentleman from South Carolina speaks the gentleman from Wisconsin should be given the opportunity also.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have the high privilege and the great honor of presenting to you and the Members of the House the champion scrap gatherer of high school boys and girls, not only of South Carolina, but the champion for the United States.

I refer to Dial Rawl, of Gilbert, Lexington County, S. C., my district. This young man is occupying a seat at this time in the Members' Gallery.

I am delighted to have the privilege of presenting to you this high school boy, who, as stated, has won the national championship in the salvage drive held some time ago.

I want you, my colleagues, to know that I appreciate the fine applause which you have given this young man, to which he is entitled.

Dial Rawl is the son of a farmer residing on a farm in old Lexington County, a very important agricultural county in my district.

This young man is the type of millions of boys and girls whom we have on the farms in the rural areas in many States of the Union, that is, he is the type who will make good if given an opportunity and a fair chance.

During all of the years that I have served in the Congress of the United States I have in every instance not only given my unlimited time in trying to be of service to the great masses of the people but in being helpful to this type of young man, realizing the importance of trying to be of service to this great class of people with the hope of giving to them an opportunity to make good.

I have helped a great many boys and girls secure positions with the Government, and I am proud of the fact that many of them have taken advantage of their positions and their environment in connection with their work, going to school and to college, equipping themselves so as to be able not only to make good in their various lines of work, but to be able to make for themselves a real name.

This young man has had a wonderful trip to Washington with expenses paid because of having won the national championship.

I am delighted that I have had the privilege of entertaining him, his father, and mother on this occasion.

I am attaching hereto a letter in connection with the winning of this national championship, which should be of interest:

COLUMBIA, S. C., *June 3, 1943.*

Mr. PAUL C. CABOT,
Director, Salvage Division, General Salvage Branch, War Production Board, Washington, D. C.

(Attention Mr. Ray H. Haun.)

Subject: Dial Rawl, of Gilbert, Lexington County, S. C., national champion scrap collector for 1942.

DEAR SIR: The 1942 newspaper school salvage campaign held in South Carolina was won by a 13-year-old boy named Dial Rawl, of the Gilbert School in Lexington County, S. C. This boy, who was responsible for collecting 487,371 pounds of scrap, not only won top honors in South Carolina but for the whole United States as well, as per copy of letter enclosed from Mr. Ray H. Haun.

The South Carolina Press Association, who sponsored this campaign, offered as an additional award a trip to Washington and return, with all expenses paid.

Dial Rawl and his father and mother wish to leave Columbia Tuesday night, June 15, arriving in Washington Wednesday morning, and will spend Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 16, 17, and 18, there, returning home Friday night, June 18.

Former State Secretary T. E. LaGrone, of the South Carolina State Salvage Committee, talked over long distance with your Mr. Haun and the latter offered to make hotel reservations in Washington, to have a car meet Dial Rawl upon his arrival in the city, and to conduct him on a tour of inspection of the points of interest around the National Capital.

This office would be glad to have this verbal understanding confirmed in order that there may be no misunderstanding upon his arrival. We would ask reservations be made for a double room for his parents, with a cot placed therein for the boy, for the period of June 16 a. m. to June 18 p. m., the expense of course to be paid by the press association of this State.

We think it would be fine if this typical American youth, by reason of his outstanding loyalty and diligence, could meet Mr. Donald Nelson and other high officials of the War Production Board. It would seem that appropriate publicity of this boy's accomplishment would prove to be an incentive and inspiration to all the youth of the Nation for their continual and renewed efforts in all future scrap-collecting campaigns.

We plan to enlist the aid of our National Representatives for a trip to the Senate and House. However, it would appear appropriate, and we trust convenient, that this fine young American's stay in Washington be primarily sponsored by the organization for which he has labored so hard.

Your early attention and reply will be awaited with interest in order that plans for the trip may go through as outlined.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS A. EMERSON,
Executive Secretary for South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would have tried to be a little more courteous to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia when he asked to limit debate, but I wanted this time to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I asked the gentleman from New York, as you noticed, whether he believed in the Wages and Hours Act. He believed that 40 cents minimum wage is a fair minimum wage. Does he not believe in a fair return so far as the farmers of the country are concerned? No one here can contradict me, no one in this House, no one in Washington, no one in the Agricultural Department, or anywhere else who knows anything about the dairy business can contradict me when I make the statement that you cannot produce 46-cent butter at Chicago and pay any 40 cents an hour. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is a high-class farmer and gets his name in the big agricultural papers. I know he will not dispute that statement.

The thing I have against O. P. A. is that I am afraid they are going to starve the people of this country to death if we let them run hog wild like we have this last year. If I thought that that outfit was going to operate the coming year the way it has the past year when there seemed to be a deliberate attempt to put people out of business, having as little regard for the law or the spirit of the law as they have exhibited, it would not embarrass me at all to vote not to give them a red cent.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I shall be pleased to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy to hear the gentleman's observation, and I assure him I want to see that the farmer gets a proper price for what he produces, not only that but I should like to see him have an incentive to help him further increase production. I should like to keep wages where they are. Wages should not be increased and the roll-back should help the farmer. We want the cooperation of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the cooperation of others who think as he does in that regard, but if we did not have O. P. A. what would we put in its place? What would we have without it? We would have confusion worse confounded.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New York. I can see a subsidy program that is based on a commodity that is bringing more than the cost of production. I am in sympathy with a subsidy program that provides food for people in the low-income brackets who are caught at this particular time, but how in the name of common sense anyone can come out for a roll-back in the price of butter from its present level I cannot see. This morning I had the pleasure of asking Mr. Byrnes this question, "What, if any, is the reason or excuse for rolling back the price of butter when it is not bringing the cost of production? And when it will not justify a 40-cent per hour wage rate?" The 46-cent per pound Chicago floor price was fixed by Secretary Wickard and the O. P. A. Now the O. P. A. and other Government agencies want to roll the price back. If Mr. Byrnes answered it I cannot understand the English language. I have yet to find any proponent of the butter roll-back who can tell me where there is any common sense or any reason for rolling the price back on a commodity that is not bringing the cost of production.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Milwaukee.

Mr. McMURRAY. Would the gentleman please tell me whether or not this roll-back that is proposed and that is being carried out by the Office of Price Administration reduces the return that the farmer is getting for butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It will freeze the price for the producer regardless of his production costs.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman tell me how?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman from Milwaukee by saying that once you pick out any commodity for a roll-back the price is frozen at that level regardless of cost of production; and there is not a man on this floor who can deny that statement. In that way they freeze him at whatever it may be, at 46 cents in the case of butter, I pick out butter for the reason that if you want butterfat a little bit cheaper to the people, why pick out the people who get only 40 to 50 cents a pound? Why do you not step over here into Virginia and Maryland where they have had a butterfat price of 70 cents for a long time while out in the butterfat sections of the Middle West they received as low as 30 to 35 cents per pound? Why do we not go up into New York? And what happened up there in New York? You rolled back the price on fluid milk but you did not keep it. Why did you not keep it? You pick out a commodity here that is defenseless. The gentleman knows that, too, I may say to the gentleman from New York. You know you had a subsidy on fluid milk a few months ago. Why did you not keep it when you had it?

Mr. CELLER. That is a State matter. We tried to keep it but the dairy interests up there would not let us.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The dairy interests?

Mr. CELLER. The dairy interests had a peculiar notion about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Who was paying the bill for that subsidy? That is what killed it. Incidentally why do they not roll back the price of tobacco, that is 195 percent of parity? If oranges have risen in price, why roll back the price of butter?

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Since they talked about rolling back the price of meat, is it not a fact that hogs have gone down 1½ cents per pound?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I know the chairman of the committee is right. I appreciate his interest in fair play for all farm groups, and he has my sympathy in not being able to carry out his practical ideas. I want to say to the Members here today that as far as I am concerned, and I will put it in the RECORD, I wrote Mr. Wickard as late as a year ago last April subscribing to a subsidy program for products that are above parity prices. From there on you have some excuse for putting one on. Remember my colleagues, there are no calories in a roll-back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Board of Economic Warfare to carry out its functions and activities, including salaries of an Executive Director at $10,000 per annum and four assistants to the Executive Director at $9,000 per annum each, and other personal services (including aliens) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); procurement of services, supplies, and equipment (1) outside the United States without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and 3648, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 529), including the rental of office space and contracts for utility services for periods of 2 years in any foreign country where required by local custom or practice, and (2) within the United States without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, when the amount involved in any one case does not exceed $300; travel expenses (not exceeding $300,000 for travel within the continental limits of the United States), including (1) expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Board, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board, (3) payment to the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Board of actual and necessary transportation, subsistence, and other expenses incidental to the performance of their duties, and (4) expenses outside the United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821), and section 901 of the act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241), and (5) when specifically authorized or approved by the Executive Director of the Board or such other official as he may designate for the purpose, expenses of employees of the Board, including the transportation of their effects (in accordance with the act of October 10, 1940), to their first post of duty in a foreign country, or when transferred from one official station to another, and return to the United States; payment of living and quarters allowances to personnel stationed outside the United States in accordance with the regulations approved by the President on December 30, 1942; advances of money, upon the

furnishing of bond, to employees of the Board traveling in a foreign country, in such sums as the Executive Director of the Board shall direct; reimbursement of employees of the Board for loss of personal effects in case of marine or aircraft disaster; preparation and transportation of the remains of officers and employees who die abroad or in transit while in the dispatch of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference; the rental of news-reporting services; the purchase of, or subscription to, commercial and trade reports, newspapers, and periodicals; maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding (not exceeding $100,000); $36,150,000, of which amount such sums as may be authorized by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made, but no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Board of Economic Warfare, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor, in accordance with regulations issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance; *Provided*, That such sums as are included in this appropriation for special projects (classified in the estimates submitted to Congress as or under "Other contractual services") may be expended for travel expenses, printing and binding, and purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles without regard to the limitations specified for such objects under this appropriation but within such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may approve therefor and such Director shall report to Congress each such limitation determined by him: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Executive Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 4, line 14, after the semicolon, strike out "$36,150,000" and insert "$33,250,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman makes that request will he yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that some discussion on this amendment is in order. In order to know how much time will be required, I wonder if we can reach an agreement to limit debate? I would like to know how many expect to speak on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 45 minutes, the first 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are two other Members I am very sure will desire to speak on this amendment and they are not on the floor at the moment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much time does the gentleman think we should have?

Mr. TABER. Ten additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Make it 60 minutes, the first 10 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and 10 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say that the allotment of time in here is a little hard for some of us to understand. There are a good many Members of this House who get the floor when they want it and some of the rest of us have a hard time getting the floor and we cannot keep it after we get it. This is not at all directed to the Chairman of the Committee. I want to speak against this amendment and I should like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, make it 65 minutes, 10 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], 10 minutes by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to save $2,900,000, and I have split that up to cut $300,000 out of an increase of $500,000 in domestic travel inside the United States by the domestic branch of the O. W. I. They proposed to increase that from $150,000 to $650,000.

I propose to cut the increase for the Office of Imports $750,000. They propose to increase it from $1,000,000 a year to $2,500,000.

I propose to cut the Office of Exports, which is increased from $2,000,000 to $2,600,000 by $300,000.

I propose to cut the foreign travel which is raised in this bill from $600,000 to $2,789,000, or over four and one-half times, by $600,000. They want to use four and one-half times as much for travel with about the same amount of help.

On account of the increase in the Economic Warfare analysts, I propose a cut of $500,000 out of a proposed increase of $1,350,000.

With reference to the General Counsel's Office, they propose an increase of $259,000. I propose a cut of $100,000 of this.

On the administrative management, where they proposed an increase from $675,000 to $1,110,000, I propose a cut of $250,000 out of this increase.

Incidentally, may I say with reference to the Office of Imports that they have a crew there which draws an average pay of $3,500 per year. It is absolutely ridiculous the way they have spread out.

In reference to the Office of Exports, may I say that their present activity is being cut by the operations of the Lend-Lease Administration, which currently and in the next year will supply 70 percent of the exports, the other exports being only 30 percent of the total. I propose to cut their increase there so that it will only be an increase of $1,300,000, which is plenty.

The foreign-travel program is so absolutely ridiculous as to be almost beyond explanation. The increase proposed is four and one-half times, with about the same amount of help, and it is absolutely indefensible.

The economic analysts are planning this after-the-war stuff. They do not want the activities of the Board of Economic Warfare restricted after the war is over. They want to go along. These fellows are doing just the thing that is balling up our whole economic situation. They ought to be cut.

In the General Counsel's office there are 66 lawyers, with nothing for more than 2 or 3 to do. It is perfectly ridiculous.

I want to refer a little bit in the short time I have to some of the type of personnel before I get through. The administrative management proposition is absolutely indefensible. They want 16 percent of their total appropriation for administrative management and the clerical detail of handling their appropriation and drawing their checks. It is perfectly ridiculous. What I propose there is a cut of $250,000, which will put them down to about 13 percent of the total, and that is double what it ought to be.

They have 850 economic analysts, a perfectly ridiculous number. They have people in there who would almost surprise you. They took four persons over from the O. W. I. within a couple of months. They have one woman there at $3,200 who used to be a newspaper reporter, and that is her experience as an economic analyst. They have a man named Fleming at $8,000 as head economic analyst. He was formerly a publicity artist with the Department of Agriculture. He was formerly Chief of the Bureau of Graphics and Printing in the O. W. I. He has come over there at $8,000 as head economic analyst. What qualifications has he for such a position? None at all.

Here is a funny one: Joseph W. Martin, an intelligence officer, formerly with the Library of Congress at $3,800, taken over a month or so ago. Just think of it, taking a fellow out of the Library of Congress, a clerk over there, and making him an intelligence officer.

Here is Joseph S. Petty, former instructor at Harvard at $2,750, raised to $6,500. He comes in from the O. W. I., where he had nothing of that kind to do, a publicity job, but now he is a head economic analyst. That is the kind of people they have.

I have another one here who was a personnel officer in the N. Y. A. He received $1,260 in the N. Y. A. He is an assistant air transportation analyst. What they need one of those for nobody knows. He has been raised to $2,900.

Then we have a Chief of the Air Branch in the B. E. W. at $8,000. He used to be a professor of law. He has had no transportation experience whatever.

Here is a fellow who is an economic analyst whose experience is that of a dairyman and a poultryman.

Here is a fellow who is a principal attorney. He is getting $5,600. His qualifications are that he was an attorney with the Resettlement Administration at $2,000. They ought to know better than to put such people on their rolls. That is one of the reasons why I say it is so easy for them to cut in this agency.

I have analyzed these cuts. There is absolutely no disputing the fact that that organization would function a good deal better and a good deal more intelligently if they cut out that kind of employment, if they got rid of that bunch of supernumeraries who are a burden to it and who make it a cumbersome thing instead of something that is devoted to the war effort.

I know we will have a plea that this is devoted to the war effort, but let me tell you that this kind of a set-up is not devoted to the war effort. It is devoted to providing jobs for men who have no qualifications for them. I have been over the list of the men they have there.

There may be 3 or 4 percent of the group who have come from business and are experienced, but they are the exceptions to the rule. This job can be done and done much more efficiently if it is cut down to the point where they cannot keep these people on the roll who have no business there.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will have plenty of time to explain these things, if he can explain them. If he is going to rise here as an exponent of incompetent and unqualified help, that will help my amendment.

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TABER. That is the only thing the gentleman can argue in favor of keeping this item in here, as large as it is. I am trying to put some efficiency into this outfit by showing them where they can cut and how they can cut to make it a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, "Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown."

As these various appropriation bills have come to the floor of the House, I have sympathized most deeply with the poor, unfortunate, patriotic men who are willing to accept places as heads of these Government bureaus. If you will think back over the number of appropriations that have come in here, you will recall that there are any number of men who have gone into the service of their country in these Government bureaus who came and justified the appropriations, and when their names were brought out on the floor of the House there was nothing but vilification, abuse, and the most dire criticism of them. Few seem to appreciate the difficult job they have to perform.

The gentleman from New York, splendid gentleman that he is, gives three-fourths of his time to sarcasm, vituperation, and to denouncing the men at the head of the various bureaus, and most of his argument is a vehement statement as to personalities or some extraneous consideration.

I defy you to go back through the record and see where there have been any basic analyses of the job in any of these departments given by the gentleman from New York or the others which strike at the conduct of the work and the job they are doing. It is all criticism. I think we as Congressmen should be a little bit sympathetic to a charge of that sort because we are somewhat in the limelight ourselves. I have heard things about my colleagues in Congress that I do not believe, and it is the same way as to the bureaus. Let us be just a little more fair and see the job that these men are doing. All the criticism, all the vituperation, all the personal references do not change the fact that this is one of the most important war agencies of any department in the Government. What is being done is highly important, and bears the enthusiastic support of the War Department.

Let us see what these people are actualiy doing—not because you like or don't like someone. The B. E. W. has three divisions of its war work. One is the question of bringing imports into this country. What is that job? We need rubber, quartz crystals, insecticides, mahogany, mica, and dozens of other commodities that I could mention. The B. E. W. has been supplying these war needs and deficiencies. This Board of Economic Warfare, this Board under Milo Perkins, and Mr. Perkins, in my opinion, if I may differ with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is not only one of the best witnesses who ever appeared before our committee, but is one of the most competent men in Government service, and is doing, with his organization, a wonderful job. He is sending men all over the world, to see if they can get these important strategic materials, which we must have to wage a successful war. Sixty percent of our tin was cut off, 95 percent of the quinine, so important to the life of our boys, and many other things that I could mention. As to cinchona, of which quinine is made, that was almost completely cut off, and without it many, many soldiers, more than we realize, who have contracted malaria from being in tropical countries, would be in a desperate physical condition. They would have been without quinine had it not been for this group, who have gone to the far reaches of the world to get it, and all of these other necessities. The gentleman from New York can say, let us cut it down $600,000—that they don't need so many men in Africa, but if you do that, you will be doing a very ill-considered act.

The second job is export. This job is organized and export licenses are issued. The job was to see that the strategic materials in this country did not leave the United States, and, further, that none of these materials could directly or indirectly get to the Axis Powers. That job is a tremendous job, and unless you are informed you cannot realize how big it is. Talk about these cuts. You are going into an organization that has a tremendous volume of work to do, and this amendment would cut some most necessary functions. In 1942 there were one and a quarter million licenses that were examined, and it takes a tremendous force to do that. This business of exporting is not simply shipping to some fellow in South America who may apparently be a native of that country, but to know that he is not an agent of the Axis Powers.

The gentleman speaks about the great number of attorneys, and does it with all of the prejudice that he can inject into his remarks.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Kentucky, but I was just wondering whether in his praise of Milo Perkins whether the gentleman realizes he is one of the advocates of Government management and ownership in the post-war effort and one of the Hansen school of revolutionists in this country.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to say to the gentleman that while I do not like to make personal references, yet the gentleman will find that in his personal family relationship Mr. Milo Perkins has made a great contribution to this war, almost as much as any man can.

Mr. PLOESER. Oh, I do not doubt that in his personal family relationship.

Mr. O'NEAL. To continue with what I was about to say, in the B. E. W. they happen to have on the rolls 117 people who were drawing, prior to B. E. W. employment, between $6,600 and $7,500 per annum, 105 who were drawing from $7,500 to $10,000 per annum, 111 people who were drawing from $10,000 to $25,000, and from $25,000 a year they have 47, and that is as competent a group as you can find, and it is very easy to say that the whole thing is very poorly managed and that this is the craziest bunch you ever saw, but that does not mean a thing. The fact remains that the leadership in this organization is composed of some of the best brains in America.

I am about to conclude, but if I can in my time I would like to mention something about the job of economic war analysis. I am sorry that I cannot go fully into that. In the first place, we were asked to keep it off the record. But let me say as much as I can without saying too much of a military nature. The intelligent way to bomb Germany and Japan is to know what is there before you bomb it. You want to know where the

factories are located that are making highly important contributions to their war effort. You want to know how difficult it is to get to that area, and what is there, and the B. E. W. furnishes information of that character, so much so that it has drawn the highest praise from the Army. I think this amendment, by all means, if we are interested in the war effort, should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this appropriation and completely convinced that it should not be cut down, because I feel, as does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] that here we have a place where the best business brains have been gathered together for important war tasks.

The suggestion was made a few moments ago that perhaps only 3 or 4 percent of these men in B. E. W. had had contact with industry. I want to repeat to you a statement I made on this floor yesterday that of the 502 top people in this office, 380 of them have come from private business and nearly 10 percent of that number were drawing $25,000 a year before they came here. Why did they come? They came because they liked to fight, and their physical condition and their age has made it impossible for some of those men to fight at the front. They have given up $25,000 salaries to come into the Board of Economic Warfare and fight with economics against the Axis Powers. Where do you suppose the fighting is going on in Turkey today? Not in guns or tanks or planes. No. It is going on in the Board of Economic Warfare, insofar as our country is concerned, and in a similar spot as far as Germany is concerned. We fight in those neutral countries economically. Later we may be fighting with guns and tanks and planes, but now the preliminary work is being done by this fine agency.

I told the House yesterday that these 2 volumes of hearings cost us $15 per set and I hoped the Members might look at them. I hold up to you now pages 432 and 433 in part 2 of the hearings. There you will see a list of the previous business connections of more than 40 men who have given up jobs of more than $25,000 a year to come into this agency. You should remember that when you vote on this amendment and realize that many men have found a battle line in this great part of the war effort; that they are attracted to it as our young boys are attracted to the job of fighting against the Axis Powers.

There is involved in this motion an appeal to cut down travel expense. There is only one way you can fight an economic warfare, and that is to get there first. That means flying across oceans at great expense. There is only one thing you can do when you run out of quinine for the boys in Guadalcanal and north Africa, and that is to try to get the last remaining supply. When Japan cut off 75 percent of our quinine, the Board of Economic Warfare rushed to Ecuador, and they have brought back from that country a sufficient supply so that our medical service will tell us that there is enough for any emergency. I think that is an important part of the war effort. I know that all of us here today want to see that done for the boys who are facing climatic conditions different from those they have enjoyed before. We have no tropics in the United States, but the war strangely seems to have shifted chiefly to tropical locations. I think an important job has been done by this great, fine American organization in that particular field and we should give it sufficient travel funds to insure that it is able to get quickly to any part of the world.

If I could refer you again for just a moment to some figures I have here, I tried to indicate to you that in this group of people in the agency, 380 of the top 502 men had come from private business; that of this group 117 had previously made from $5,600 to $7,500 a year; that 105 made from $7,500 to $10,000 a year; that 111 had made from $10,000 to $25,000 a year; and 47 of them had made more than $25,000.

This is the smartest and most alert group of employees and executives in any of our war agencies covered in this bill. The Board of Economic Warfare has been doing a fine, aggressive job, and I think it would be too bad if its funds were to be reduced. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE—IS IT HIDING ITS LIGHT UNDER A BUSHEL?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, after reading the report on this bill and listening to some of the members of the committee tell of the glories of the activities of the various war agencies whose appropriations are included, I have been struck by the fact that the Board of Economic Warfare apparently rates very highly in the estimation of the majority of the committee. Its appropriation not only appears first in the bill, but it is one of the few agencies which has escaped without a reduction in the Budget estimates. B. E. W. asked for $36,150,000 and was granted the full amount, an increase of $13,206,154 over the amount that has been available in 1943.

The report speaks highly of the testimony of Milo Perkins, the Executive Director of B. E. W., and we are informed that his testimony needs to be read to realize the grave importance of the work that is being done by that organization on the world economic front and the crucial part it is taking in the war effort. Evidently Mr. Perkins is a very persuasive witness and aided by the effective assistance of his boss, the Chairman of B. E. W., our Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, he has done a good job of convincing the majority of the committee that their work is so necessary and valuable that not a single penny of its request for 1944 should be touched. One cannot help but admire B. E. W.'s persuasiveness.

But I was astonished to note in the hearings on page 443, the following statement of Mr. Milo Perkins:

> I learned long ago that in this town the more you can stay out of the limelight the more work you can get done. That is the way we operate in B. E. W. Witness our very small information staff.

Those are strange words to come from such a prominent new dealer as Milo Perkins who has been noted for his crusading zeal and ability as a supersalesman. Was it not Mr. Perkins who put over the stamp plan for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities? And has not Mr. Perkins been the Vice President's right hand bower in promoting his collectivism ideas for spreading brotherhood throughout the world?

I understand that the B. E. W. has an information staff of 18 people at an annual salary cost of $58,760. That is a very small staff according to New Deal standards. True, 18 is only a small part of the 3,200 Government publicity employees which the New Deal is requiring the taxpayers to pay, but it is 18 too many. But B. E. W. does not rely too heavily upon professional informational people for the great amount of favorable publicity which it has received. After all, the Vice President and Mr. Perkins are past masters in the art of getting publicity, and they do a good job of propaganda on their own.

Did not the Vice President recently take another trip through Latin America in the interest of promoting our good-neighbor policy down there? As Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, he must have been doing a bit of missionary work for B. E. W. export and import policies. Great publicity on this was had without the assistance of the B. E. W. professional information staff.

Have we not seen a number of press articles recently about the great work B. E. W. is doing in securing imports of strategic materials from all over the world? Have we not heard a great deal of the so-called preclusive buying operations of the B. E. W. in Spain, Portugal, and Turkey to keep the Axis from getting badly needed materials? Did not Mr. Perkins tell us in strong and vigorous terms a few months back how B. E. W. had stepped in to speed up the import program which it alleged was bogging down under the R. F. C.?

Much publicity has been issued about the so-called economic-warfare analysis work of B. E. W. Have we not often been told in glowing terms of what the B. E. W. is doing to wage economic warfare? I do not mean to question the value of a great deal of this work. My point is that B. E. W. is clearly not "hiding its light under a bushel," and to contend that B. E. W. is not in the limelight is to misrepresent the facts in the situation.

The Vice President and Milo Perkins have been very persuasive in selling their ideas and policies, and they have not succeeded in this by keeping still—the New Deal does not operate that way.

When hostilities cease and the facts are deliberated upon and a calm survey

made, the B. E. W. will no doubt be very much in the limelight, and only then might need its entire staff of professional informational propagandists to supplement the efforts of the Vice President and Mr. Perkins.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, when Pearl Harbor overtook us this country was utterly unprepared in many aspects to wage war. For instance, there was not enough mica available for our use to equip 1,000 airplanes, much less 50,000. You cannot make airplane spark plugs without mica. It has to be of a certain kind and quality. We had practically none. That is one of the thousands of instances demonstrating the necessity for the Bureau of Economic Warfare. My hat is off to that organization for the splendid job it has done and for the careful planning that has gone into it in spite of the high pressure under which the many imperious war necessities caused them to work. Its hastily assembled personnel has rung the bell of admirable achievement in thousands of cases wherein winning economic battles meant winning the war.

Criticism has been made of the propaganda agency or publicity staff of this organization. There are thousands of activities of this Bureau of Economic Warfare that it would be almost traitorous to divulge. There are only a limited few that may be publicized. This staff is not for the purpose of propagandizing those few known activities to keep the home fires burning, but to build fires and counterfires abroad that are necessary in order that we may get or save from unnecessary export the strategic materials we need and in some cases need desperately. On the import front of our economic battleground this publicity staff must soften the sales resistance to our getting. On the export front this staff must sell our program of export licenses to our allies who are trusting us to help them help us and the common cause. Into such efforts goes the propaganda of this agency. It is not for the aggrandizement of B. E. W., nor of any man, men, or agency, but solely for the achievement of the ends for which this agency of our national war effort was created.

Everything B. E. W. does is more or less of a secret, a war secret, and that is why we know so little about its victories.

But I want to say just a few words more with regard to this organization. No one could simplify an organization any more than Milo Perkins has simplified this one. Imports? Because we need such items as mica, tungsten, tin, hemp, and various strategic woods in our war effort. Exports? Because we have got to keep what we must have to make our country into a real and effective arsenal of the democracies, so that we may supply our friends and ourselves with war-making essentials. And the economic analysts, because unless they know their stuff and get the true dope on what sinews of war our enemies have and lack, we cannot intelligently plan our military offense or defense. Every drive made during this war, practically, by our enemies has been for an economic motive. Why was Rumania taken over? For oil. Why was Russia invaded? For oil and wheat and other raw materials of war. So it has been, and so it will be in most cases. Therefore we simply must know these economic answers if we are to plan our war effort wisely.

No one has ever claimed that B. E. W. has not done a grand job on each one of these three fronts of economic warfare—imports, exports, and economic analysis. The attack is made on personnel and personalities. Opponents say Milo Perkins agrees with the Hanson school of post-war thought for planning a world reorganization. Be that as it may, that is not what Milo Perkins is doing now. He, as much as anyone else in America, is bending every thought and energy of his nature to one engrossing passion—to do his utmost toward winning this war.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That is just exactly what Mr. Quinlan, Chief of the Coffee Section, said in a letter of February 13, 1943, and which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. HOBBS. I never heard of the gentleman and did not know there was such a letter.

Mr. TABER. He is one of the leaders.

Mr. HOBBS. I never heard of the gentleman to whom the gentleman from New York refers, but I am delighted to have the support of such a statement. I am indebted to the gentleman from New York for calling attention to the letter and for putting it in the RECORD. There is no harder worker, no more conscientious man in this House, nor a better American than the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, nor a man whose services are more welcome in this body.

But by saying that, I do not mean that I think him omniscient; as good as he is, he is still human, and we all reserve the right to disagree with each other.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I want to agree with what the gentleman from Alabama has said about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. But he, like the rest of us, sometimes makes mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed and all time has been allotted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama 1 minute from the additional 5 minutes unallotted.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to say this one thing further: Not only has this program been justified by competent and sufficient evidence to the satisfaction of our Appropriations Committee, but the need for the increase of this appropriation is perfectly apparent. Here we find ourselves in global war with an expanding personnel in the air, in the Army and in the Navy. Everything is on the upgrade, necessarily expanding, and it is surprising to me that the management of the Board of Economic Warfare has been able to curtail its need to only a $13,000,000 increase.

Members of the Committee, I beg of you that you do not deny a cent to any fighting force of our Government in this critical year of our war; do not go back on the Appropriations Committee of this House, which heard the evidence supporting every item, and has solemnly certified in this bill that every dollar of this $36,000,000 will be needed by this, our only fighting force engaged on our economic war front.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any occasion for bringing the war into the matter now under discussion. Every Member of this House can be counted on to do everything in his power to bring about victory at the earliest possible moment.

Neither do I think that personalities or prejudice have anything to do with the question.

The matter under consideration is simply a dispassionate, cold-blooded question of dollars and cents. We all want to make available whatever is necessary for the effective operation of this agency within its proper field—none of us want to make available funds in excess of those needed for the proper functioning of the agency. Personally, in the light of the testimony before your committee, I believe that a substantial slash in the Budget estimate is entirely justified.

The request before us at this time is for $36,150,000. This is 300 percent of the funds made available by the Congress to the Bureau of Economic Warfare for the current fiscal year. It is 57 percent in excess of the funds available this year, if we add the funds which the agency received from the emergency funds of the President.

The record indicates that there were only 2,819 people on the rolls of the agency in this country, as of April 30, although there was authorization for 3,197. The request contemplates that the number 2,819 be increased by 1,000 people, bringing the total up to 3,816.

I hold in my hand a list of about 175 of the personnel on the rolls of B. E. W. All of these persons have had a very substantial increase in salary as compared with their salary prior to entering the service of the Government or as compared with their initial salary with the Board of Economic Warfare or both.

The Justice Department has a salary average of $2,256, the Commerce Department average is $2,048, the State Department average is $2,000. What is

the salary average of B. E. W.? In the Bureau of Exports it will be $2,483, as compared with $2,472 in the current fiscal year. In the Bureau of Economic Warfare Analysis it will be $3,117 as compared with $3,077 in the current year. In the Bureau of Imports the average will be $3,508 as compared with $3,488 in the current fiscal year—$3,508 as compared with the $2,000 average for the State Department.

I have not time to go into further detail here. The gentleman from New York has given you a break-down, item by item, in terms of a table furnished your committee showing the dollars and cents requested for each of the major activities of this agency for 1944 as compared with actual expenditures in the current fiscal year.

Among other items in respect to which he suggests a very moderate cut is the travel item. I think a further cut could be made in this item without hurting any reasonable activity of this agency. Three million three hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars is requested for travel in 1944 although the estimated expenditures for 1943 amounts to $1,100,000. The increase requested amounts to about 300 percent.

I am not attempting to decry for one moment the important work which this agency is doing. I believe, however, that that work can be done on a more economical basis.

I believe also, that in the past, B. E. W. has expended money extravagantly and sponsored projects that had better not have been embarked upon. I believe that it has caused friction and duplication of effort with other agencies notably the Department of State and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries. I believe that it has been handicapped by theorists as distinguished from those with practical experience.

I am glad to note that Mr. Perkins feels that friction and duplication of effort have now been eliminated. I am glad also to note his conviction that the rigid control under B. E. W. is desirable only in respect to the period of the war.

I hope that B. E. W. will limit itself in the performance of its important work to a course which is realistic and practical and as economical as is consistent with the war effort.

I believe it will have ample funds for this purpose if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I join with my friend from Massachusetts in saying I have no purpose whatever in indulging in personalities. I certainly hope I shall not be charged by the gentleman from Kentucky or anyone else with indulging in vituperation and abuse. It seems to me we have a very practical, common-sense, cold-blooded proposition before us which is: To what extent should a Government agency be permitted and encouraged to carry on its activity in a wasteful and in an extravagant way? There can be no doubt that the Board of Economic Warfare can do and has done meritorious service in certain fields. I am not taking issue with some of the activities that the Board of Economic Warfare is carrying on; I am in no way critical of some of the very laudable things that have been accomplished. Those of us who are presently making an effort to reduce the over-all costs of the agency are doing so largely because we feel that the Board of Economic Warfare has not been a good householder. We have innumerable instances in the record of the hearings where very substantial increases in salary have been made to those identified with the activity. Let me explain what I mean when I say substantial increases; let me explain the practice in which this outfit indulges. The Board of Economic Warfare has conducted what might be characterized as a competitive effort with other Government agencies in securing analysts, specialists, economists, and all the other "ists" it has on its rolls. It has gone into the competitive field and by offering increases in salaries, substantial increases in salaries, it has induced employees from other governmental agencies to come over to its staff. It results in waste and extravagance. Unfortunately these characteristics are evident not only in the field of personnel but they also prevail in its entire field of operation. It wastes money. It wastes money in its travel program; it wastes money in its communications; it wastes money in its personnel program by carrying an excessive number in every category of employment. I want to point out a table I have in hand here and give you the number of analysts and specialists this group has gathered together.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of clarifying this proposition?

Mr. DITTER. I will yield in the hope that I may ask for further time.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have no objection to the gentleman's asking for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been allocated.

Mr. DITTER. If somebody is at hand who has not used his time, possibly he would yield it to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Masachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] reserved two places, 10 minutes of time, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania was allocated 5 minutes. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] wishes to release part of his 5 minutes he may do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts still has 5 minutes which has not been consumed. I suggest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be allowed that 5 minutes, unless there is objection.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the suggestion the Chair made to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree to the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I shall be very brief.

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is always very fair. Will he not explain to the Committee that the term "analyst" is a civil-service classification which embraces many different types of employment? Some Members seem to think when used in this connection it has some other connotation than that of the civil-service classification. It includes all types of jobs.

Mr. DITTER. I hope that I in no way created the impression by the use of the word "analyst" that I was casting any reflection upon any of those who might hold that position. True enough it is a civil-service classification. As my friend observes, the term "analyst" takes in a great number of groups of individuals. There are 853 odd analysts on the roll of the Board of Economic Warfare. There are 82 lawyers. The clerks and stenographers go up to 2,316. In all, O. E. W. has 3,816 employees. It is pay-roll padding at its best. It cannot be justified under any circumstances. The distinguished son of Virginia who has always been known as one of the men interested in economy of Government and who has established a reputation for it. I feel certain he will join wholeheartedly with me in paring down personnel to the bone, that the surplusage be eliminated, that the unnecessary jobs be ended, and that the Board of Economic Warfare carry on its objectives with the number of individuals which a reasonable and a sensible man would find necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I concur heartily with everything the gentleman has said. I just want to make this suggestion to the gentleman which I do not think has been touched on in debate. The Board of Economic Warfare performs one function none of us has said anything about that is very vital. Every single export of any description that goes out of this country has to be passed through the Board of Economic Warfare to be analyzed as to what it is and where it is going. In the beginning that was confined to critical war materials only to see that they did not get to our enemies. Now it covers every material and that, of course, takes a large force of clerical and statistical people.

Mr. DITTER. May I follow with the observation that a large number of those activities are overlapping activities with other agencies of government?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no other agency that does that.

Mr. DITTER. And other existing agencies of government could well look after the supervisory tasks to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It may be observed that no exports under lend-lease are included in the jurisdiction of B. E. W. at all.

Mr. DITTER. That is a splendid contribution. In other words, lend-lease is the great part of our export trade today. The B. E. W. has nothing to do with what we are giving to our allies and it in no way controls the exports that are going to England, to Russia, and to the other nations of the world under our lend-lease program.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Everything except lend-lease goes through the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. DITTER. But that "but" is so large that the justification which the gentleman from Virginia is trying to place on this new activity does not hold true. We are lend-leasing today to the tune of 70 percent of our exports. There is nothing left but the meager amount of 30 percent for Mr. Milo Perkins to handle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that when the gentleman from Wisconsin was called he was not present and, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] having spoken, therefore there is no opportunity for anyone to reply to anything that the gentleman from Wisconsin says as there should be in an orderly procedure. It creates a situation that is very unfair to this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Wisconsin was allocated 10 minutes to speak by unanimous consent just like the two gentlemen unnamed were reserved by the gentleman from Massachusetts and they have spoken. The Chair thinks it would be unfair to deny the gentleman from Wisconsin the time.

Mr. TABER. It is also unfair to our side in the normal course of parliamentary procedure when we have no opportunity to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the discussion on this amendment has revolved around the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare, the number of people, what they are doing, or what they are supposed to be doing, and also the quality and qualifications of that personnel. In order to better inform the Members of this House about the issue on which they have to vote, I am going to read to you copy of a letter written by Maj. Gen. G. V. Strong, who is, as all of you probably know, head of the Intelligence Division of the United States Army and chairman of the joint intelligence committee of the joint chiefs of staff.

I do not blame the Members for not listening to me, but I think they ought to listen to Major General Strong. His letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 12, 1943.

Mr. MILO PERKINS,
Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PERKINS: I should like to invite your attention to the developments of the past year in the use of reports prepared by the Board of Economic Warfare in connection with the activities both of the joint intelligence committee and the military information division of the General Staff. The economic material, furnished by the Board of Economic Warfare, has been most useful in connection with estimates of Axis capabilities, both in Europe and the Far East. The services performed by the Board of Economic Warfare, particularly in regard to the oil situation, have been outstanding and far more accurate than information received from any other source. As chairman of the joint intelligence committee of the joint chiefs of staff, I have come to lean heavily upon your Board of Economic Warfare representatives on the committee and on its subcommittees, in determining accurate and analytical questions which are of vital importance to sound decisions bearing upon tactical and strategical plans.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. Just as soon as I finish this letter.

Mr. JENSEN. I think I could give the gentleman some information about this letter. Every Member of the Congress has this same letter. You are spending a lot of time that you should be using to talk about something else. That is why the House is not in order. They do not want to listen to that. The Members have already read it.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps a good many Members of the House have read this letter. I may say that a good many Members of the House do not seem to be aware of what this personnel does or who these people are. I have some statements of my own to add, if I have time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman agree with me that a careful reading of this letter of Major General Strong would lead to the conclusion it would be just as sensible to cut down on this activity as it would be to cut down on some directly military matter?

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman from California. That is exactly the point I want to make. When you try to cut the appropriation of the Board of Economic Warfare you are doing a thing just as vicious as cutting the appropriation for the War Department. This ought to be understood by the members of this committee when they vote.

Mr. JENSEN. I would recommend that the gentleman go ahead and give his ideas on that letter because the rest of us have already read it and studied it.

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. This letter continues:

The reports and analyses submitted to the joint intelligence committee, through your representatives, have been of outstanding value and a material contribution to the over-all picture which is essential to sound intelligence and the basis for sound planning. In addition, your organization has been particularly helpful in various problems arising in the estimation of the Axis positions in regard to strategic materials, foodstuffs, industrial capacity, and potentialities of the German and Japanese war machines.

In the Government service we are too often prone to accept services as a matter of course and without any particular recognition. In view of the heavy burden which my organizations have undoubtedly placed upon yours, I desire to take this opportunity to express to you and, through you, to the personnel of your organization my very keen appreciation and heartfelt thanks for the close cooperation and the outstanding services performed by the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Very sincerely yours,

GEO. V. STRONG,
Major General, Acting Chief of Staff, G–2.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I have imposed upon the time of some of my colleagues in order to complete the reading of this letter. I did so because after listening to the arguments here against this agency I am firmly convinced that some of my colleagues have not read the letter and that some of my colleagues have no appreciation of the real issue on which they are being asked to vote. If all of my colleagues had had the opportunity which I have had and which other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have had of hearing the testimony in executive session of Mr. Milo Perkins, Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, I am sure that a great many of the statements made here about that agency, its personnel and its activities, would not have been made.

I am very sure that each man who votes for this amendment to cut out necessary funds from the appropriation for the Board of Economic Warfare would realize, if he had looked at the facts and listened to the testimony I have heard, that in doing so he is cutting out the very heart of our war effort, a part of the war effort that is just as important as the generals in the field and the troops under their direction. This is a war activity. This is an agency set up to fight this war. This agency has an outstanding record of performance, a record which is known to every man who has heard the testimony, a great deal of which must be given in executive session. Those who oppose this agency must be willing to say, "We want to cripple the Army, we want to cripple the war effort. We do not want the United States to fight this war efficiently and effectively."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I realize that the gentleman is on a committee that has heard much testimony in this regard, but

if he were on the Committee on Appropriations he would also realize that we must try to get at least as much for our money as we can, especially under the present conditions when we are scraping bottom and when the American taxpayer is going to be burdened from now on for Lord knows how long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] struck the keynote of this proposition when he said that he would not for one moment detract from the importance of this work. I think everyone who heard the testimony or who will read the testimony will agree that among these agencies this is one of the most vitally important. Then why reduce the Budget estimate, every dollar of which is needed?

No reason has been advanced why this $3,000,000 should be taken out of this already meager allowance. It has not been shown that any money was wasted, there is no indication that there has been any extravagance, it has not been shown that there is any maladministration. No reason has been advanced to show why this should be decreased.

It is true, as has been said, that some of these men were getting higher salaries than they drew in former positions, but—and this ought to be emphasized—none of these war agencies is outside the civil service. They are all under the Classification Act. The Civil Service Commission, and not the agency, fixes these rates of pay.

The evidence before the committee in the hearings shows that but for the work of this agency we would more than once have had to discontinue production in production plants turning out some of the most important machinery of war; that but for this agency we would not have had at the critical time strategic material essential to continuation of production of bombing planes and other war machinery.

We are in great peril. There is no assurance that the war is won; at least, we cannot afford to take chances. In view of the fact that they have given us no reason for making this cut, and the further fact that every dollar provided by the bill is needed—as a matter of fact, even more money is needed, and if any change is made in this figure it ought to be increased instead of decreased—in view of the fact that no case has been made, no reason has been given, no argument has been advanced, no evidence has been submitted as to why we should decrease this fund by one dollar, I submit that the amount recommended by the committee should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 112, noes 119.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 901), and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236), as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 622), and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors; not to exceed $55,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; witness fees; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; printing and binding (not to exceed $1,830,815, which limitation shall not apply to the printing of forms, instructions, regulations, and coupon books incidental to the rationing of commodities); maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles; traveling expenses (not to exceed $7,250,000), including (1) attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Office of Price Administration, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes in an advisory capacity without other compensation from the United States, or at $1 per annum, (3) reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them in official travel in privately owned automobile within the limits of their official stations, (4) expenses of appointees from point of induction in continental United States to their first post of duty in the Territories, and (5) expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobile (and including per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment), of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis; $165,000,000, of which sum not less than $59,551,042 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of $165,000,000 may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made, but unless otherwise authorized by law, no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Office of Price Administration, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor by the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance: *Provided*, That sums set apart for special projects (classified in the estimates submitted to Congress as or under "Other contractual services") may be expended for travel expenses, and printing and binding without regard to the limitations herein specified for such objects, but within such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may approve therefor and such Director shall report to Congress each such limitation determined by him: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or other employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known, in any manner whatever, to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required or requested to be filed by order or regulation of the Administrator, or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or copy thereof, or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; nor for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatever, except as hereinafter provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or any part thereof, or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosed or identified directly or indirectly nor to prevent the furnishing in confidence to the War Department, the Navy Department, or the United States Maritime Commission, such data and information as may be requested by them for use in the performance of their official duties: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce any maximum price or prices on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity unless and until (1) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined and published for such agricultural commodity the prices specified in section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; (2) in case of a comparable price for such agricultural commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture has held public hearings and determined and published such comparable price in the manner prescribed by section 3 (b) of said act; and (3) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined after investigation and proclaimed that the maximum price or prices so established on any such agricultural commodity will reflect to the producer of such agricultural commodity a price in conformity with section 3 (c) of said act: *Provided further*, That any employee of the Office of Price Administration is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the head of the agency, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of said Office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 10, line 6, strike out "$165,000,000" and insert "$130,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself. It proposes to take $35,000,000 away from the present appropriation and reduce it to $130,000,000.

If the amendment is adopted, I would suggest an additional amendment so as

to modify the amount that will be available for local boards, and reduce it to where it was in the current fiscal year, namely, $37,000,000 plus.

I need scarcely restate the facts I purveyed to the House earlier this afternoon with respect to the investigation I have made of this matter to indicate that if a more efficient technique is developed in O. P. A., not only in Washington but in the regional, in the area, in the State, and in the local offices, $130,000,000 will be ample not only for the purpose of policing this whole price problem but for making provision for an item that has not heretofore appeared, that is, $17,000,000 for reimbursement of banks for the services they provide on rationing coupons.

This is one of the agencies that has developed much friction. It is high time that the Congress deal with it in a very fair and forthright manner. I think the gentlewoman from Illinois was essentially correct earlier this afternoon when she indicated that as time goes on these frictions will develop and grow, consequently you will have an expansion of the whole black market idea throughout the country. If a remedy and a cure are to be provided, they should be provided now. It is essential that all of O. P. A. be streamlined at the present time, that they develop a little bit more business circumspection in that entire operation, and $130,000,000 should be ample for that purpose.

Years ago this sum would be almost unheard of for the purpose of policing the price structure of the country. It ought to be ample at the present time. I respectfully submit on the basis of the case that was made earlier today that $130,000,000 will be enough and that the House ought to adopt the amendment to provide for a cut of $35,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In considering how much, if any, funds we will provide for O. P. A., permit me to make this observation. There are two or three very definitely fundamental considerations that we ought to take into account. No. 1: Do you want any controls or any effort to control prices and rationing? If you do not, then obviously we ought not to appropriate anything at all, just let it go, and let those who have money buy the food, the clothing, the tires, the gas, and so forth, wherever they can buy it, and pay the highest price for it, and then see if anybody else gets anything that is left—let the prices run wild. Let the food and other rationed articles be auctioned to the highest bidder. Maybe that is the best way, but I do not think it is, and the Congress has not thought so, because we passed and we have on the statute books this price-control law. So, if we decide that we want controls, to prevent ruinous inflation, the next thing to decide is what kind of control we wish to have. If we do not like the kind of organic law that is on our statute books, then we should change the law. The Banking and Currency Committee, if it wishes to do so, can bring in a bill at any time changing the Price Control Act, making any regulations, restrictions, or changes which it wishes to bring in, but having decided by legislative action that we want this kind of control, then we ought to give them enough money to put it into effect and to carry out the program. I can agree with a great many of the criticisms that have been made. Some of this price control has seemed ridiculous to me, and some of the things have been changed, and as time goes on I have no doubt that there will be other changes. Some methods of enforcement have seemed to be terrible in my judgment. I believe that Mr. Prentiss Brown will try to improve this, but our committee went into this thing carefully, and by unanimous vote of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee, including our distinguished friends on the minority side who were on the committee, they felt this amount of money should be appropriated for O. P. A.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the gentleman would not interpret the view in the whole committee as an approval of everything that is in this bill, and as a foreclosure, without reservation of objection, of the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not made any statement that would be by the wildest flight of imagination construed as saying anything of the kind. I said that the subcommittee had heard the hearings on this bill and had decided unanimously that $165,000,000 ought to be appropriated for O. P. A., and that included the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. We composed our differences as best we could, and that is the unanimous vote of the subcommittee which had the hearings.

What does this proposed cut do? The bill we brought in here marked $59,000,000 for local boards, for rationing boards, just where the money is badly needed, and where help is badly needed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says cut them out, and give them only what they had this year. That would be a decided backward step in the operation of the price-control program, for the gentleman's motion cuts $35,000,000 off here, if it carries, giving to the banks $17,500,000, which we all say is the minimum amount they must get to carry on with the rationing program, and it cuts you down to $53,000,000 for all of the other activities of O. P. A., when they have eight additional rationing programs coming on. The worst thing Congress can do is to have a price control and rationing act in effect, and leave it in effect, and not give sufficient money to carry out the rules and regulations. If the rules and regulations are not right, then change them, and in many instances they ought to be changed, and in many instances I think they will be changed, but in good conscience we ought to give them enough money to carry out the rules and regulations that are made to carry it into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we cannot come to some agreement on time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 65 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman does not propose to cut off debate on other amendments pending on this paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 65 minutes.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest that it be on all amendments to that amount, that is, the money in the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amount of money in the paragraph.

Mr. CELLER. Does that mean all amounts in the paragraph? There is a provision in the bill on page 12 that no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This request does not apply to that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman object to making that 70 minutes? I was not here in time to stand up when the gentleman first made his request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Seventy minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and on the amount of money provided in this paragraph close in 70 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

PRICE AND RENT CONTROL NECESSARY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as bad as the O. P. A. has been, viewing it from the standpoint of those who consider they have been annoyed and harassed and irritated by the many rules and regulations, this country would have faced ruinous, runaway inflation without the Office of Price Administration or some kind of price and rent control. People who are paying $50 a month rent today would have been paying $100 or more per month for the same quarters. At the same time, the landlords who received the $100 per month would be able to purchase only $25 worth of what he bought for the $100. People who are now buying for $1 the things that they want would probably be paying two, or three, or four, or five dollars for the same thing. Those who have suffered or lost in profits or reasonable returns the most by reason of price and rent control are much better off than they would have been without these controls; since the money they obtain is worth so much more than it would have been worth without these controls.

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

In Russia today a half pint of milk costs $7, if you can buy that milk at all. A suit of clothes like the average person is wearing costs $450 in our money. A pound of butter costs from $70 to $90. Do not think for a moment that such inflation cannot happen here. Who will be blamed if that inflation happens? The Congress will be blamed and should be blamed for it, because it is within the power of Congress to place the instruments and weapons in the hands of the Executive department to stop inflation. If we want to do it we have the privilege and the power of doing it.

WILL WRECK PRICE CONTROL

This amendment will wreck the Office of Price Administration. So the question is, Do you want price administration? Do you want price control, or rent control, or do you not? If you do not want it, vote for this amendment and you will effectively destroy it and it cannot be properly enforced. If you want price control and rent control, you should vote against the amendment.

PROPER CHANGES BEING MADE

This amendment proposes a 20 percent reduction at a time when Mr. Prentiss Brown is doing his dead level best to do something in the way of placing more common sense in the administration of that act. I believe he is doing his best and some signs of progress are being made. He is delegating more power and authority to the local offices. He is giving them more rights and privileges to handle questions locally instead of coming to Washington. He has been doing a lot, and I am satisfied from the last few weeks' work of Mr. Brown that substantial progress has been made. If we want to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery and stop that progress, stop that common sense administration, the direction that the trend is now, this amendment would be the most effective way to do it.

WHO FIRST HURT BY INFLATION

If we have inflation who is the first person that it hurts? The person who is working on a fixed salary, on fixed wages, living on fixed income; the veterans of World War No. 1. There are hundreds of thousands of them who are receiving pensions and fixed compensation, and as we have inflation their incomes will be decreased in proportion. Old age assistance people and other people who are drawing small checks from State and Federal Governments will be the first ones to be hurt. The most effective step that can be taken toward giving them the inflation that will destroy the value of their money will be a vote for this amendment, which will effectively destroy the Office of Price Administration.

CRITICISM AGAINST ADMINISTRATION

I know there is a great deal of criticism against this organization. I do not believe any Member of this House has criticized it more than I have. I have pointed out their mistakes, and one by one they have shown me where they have been trying to correct those mistakes, and many of them have been corrected. I believe they are making an honest, bona fide effort, and I am willing to trust them, because we must have price administration. We must have these prices controlled or we will have runaway inflation. We cannot determine all these rules and regulations. Suppose the Congress were to attempt to do it; it would be in a worse mess and there would be more confusion than we have now. We cannot do it. We must leave it to the Executive where the power will be to correct those mistakes as they are made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Office of Price Administration, but I rise at this moment to call your attention to the vast sums which the Administration itself wastes.

There is immense and useless expense in the vast volume of printing that the Office of Price Administration sends out and the immense amount of mail that it spews forth upon your desks every morning and out into the mails in penalty envelopes, which increases the expense of the carriage of mails and the postal administration. Most of this stuff is consigned to the wastebasket.

On April 10, I received a release from the O. P. A. It said in effect that a committee had come down from the central part of this country to call upon Mr. Brown; that the committee endorsed the Price Administration; that it endorsed his ideas of keeping things stable; and that it endorsed the President of the United States in his efforts and in his directives, and so on; and the release added the names of 18 farmers who had endorsed the O. P. A. and had made the foregoing statements.

The O. P. A. thought it necessary to pat itself upon the back and to tell how it had been endorsed by 18 farmers in the Middle West. This release said that these 18 farmers had informed Mr. Brown that, while only a small percentage of farmers belong to the Big Four organizations—the National Grange, the National Farm Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Cooperative Council—this committee of 18 represented the views of the majority of American farmers. The release told how these 18 men had recently organized at Des Moines what they called the National Agricultural Mobilization Committee. The statement was full of self-praise, of self-adulation, and of self-serving declaration. The O. P. A. was as proud as a peacock in telling about how these 18 men were endorsing the President's directives and especially the acts of the O. P. A.

I was amazed when I received this statement through the mail, because I thought that O. P. A. should not use public money which had been exacted from the people by taxes in publishing and disseminating such a political argument which was purely political and self-laudatory in support of the O. P. A. and of the administration and of the President's directives in regard to ceilings, and so forth.

I was also amazed to know that this organization represented a majority of the farmers of the country and that it had been recently organized in my home State; so I then asked four of the Congressmen from my State if they knew about the organization or had heard of it and found that they had not; neither had I until O. P. A. spent our public money in telling me about it. I thought it was strange that an organization representing a majority of all the American farmers which had been organized in my State had never been heard of by the Congressmen from my State, but such was the claim of this committee of farmers according to the O. P. A. bulletin.

I was also amazed to know that O. P. A. was putting out a statement that the Big Four organizations including the Grange, the Farm Union, the Farm Bureau, and the National Cooperative Council, did not amount to much and represented only a small percentage of our farmers.

In fact, there were so many ridiculous statements in this release that I wrote the O. P. A. to ask about them, saying that I was surprised to read so many facts that "ain't" true. On April 17, in a letter, I told O. P. A. that four of the Iowa Congressmen had never heard of that organization and that it seemed strange that an organization which could speak for a majority of the farmers out there would not be known to our Congressmen. I also asked O. P. A. to kindly inform me for my future guidance just what authority there was in law for them to edit, print, put out, and mail at public expense political propaganda similar to this bulletin. "Is there any such authority?" I asked.

I also wrote it asking if O. P. A. would print and publicize a like statement if I would bring down to Mr. Brown's office a committee of 18 farmers from the Midwest who would claim that they represented a vast majority of the farmers of the Middle West in saying that they did not agree with some of the things that the Office of Price Administration was doing. I thought it would be fair for O. P. A. to circulate both sides of the story, if it cared to enter the field of political propaganda and spend our money in support of the political party now in power. I said, "Will you please do that?" Well, I have been honored with silence. That was on April 17. Then on May 18, just a month ago today, I wrote them another letter, and I said practically the same thing and asked the same questions. I said in effect, "If you desire to be fair with folks, why do you not publish both sides of it? If I bring down these 18 men, will you publish what they say?" Well, I have again been honored with silence and that was just 1 month ago today.

Now this sort of politics is not a thing that the Office of Price Administration should engage in doing. I believe that we have to get along with O. P. A., but let us require it to be fair and honest and upright and not spend so much money in printing party bulletins and in self-laudation and in politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been saying to the House ever since the beginning of the problem of inflation has come upon us, that the only way to meet inflation fundamentally is by a far more courageous tax program than we have now as well as by a program of compulsory savings in order to bring into balance the available buying power with the available supply of goods.

That is a tough assignment; it is a hard program. And it must have one further part in it—namely to prevent the sale of bonds to banks for new demand deposits written up on their books for the express purpose of buying the bonds.

In the absence of such a basic attack on inflation we are forced to have some program of price control. There is not any other way to prevent vast increases in the cost of living. Yet, we come now to the appropriation for the implementing of that work, and the very able gentleman from Illinois presents to us a proposition to seriously cut the appropriation for the carrying out and administration of that work. He gives us no logical or sound reason why there should be such a cut, except to say that a number of years back we would not have thought of spending this much money on a program of price control. That, indeed, is true, because a number of years ago we were not engaged in the greatest war in history and we were not confronted with more economic problems than any nation has ever been confronted with in the history of this earth as we are today. Once in a while it is apparently important to stress the fact that we are at war.

I could stand here and take up more minutes in very earnest and bitter criticism of some of the actions taken by the O. P. A. in fixing certain prices where I think they have been at fault.

I think prices should have been fixed on the basis of securing maximum production, especially of food production, but that does not lead me to think that you can control black markets or that you can improve this situation by crippling the agency, by cutting down its appropriation below a point where it can have an even chance to do a decent job.

That is an entirely different matter from the question of legislative action to attempt to correct some of the mistakes of O. P. A., as was pointed out by the very able gentleman from Virginia. All over this country we have got patriotic people serving on the local rationing boards. Many are working their heads off and their hearts out and doing it without the help or the paid staff they ought to have, and yet upon these local boards depends the very administration of the whole licensing program.

Sometime ago I sent out a questionnaire to several thousand people in my district. In that questionnaire I asked 33 questions as to the views of the people on 33 different matters of importance to the Nation today. And to the question, "Do you favor rationing?", the answer came back in the ratio of 98 "yes" votes to 1 "no" vote, because people know the only fair and just way to deal with the problem where there exists a scarcity, is to have such supplies as we do have fairly and justly distributed among the people. For the administration of that rationing program we have got to depend on this organization. And the job ought to be done better, not worse, than has been the case in the past. Yet the gentleman tells us that if this amendment is adopted that benefits will come from the cut. I do not think so; I do not think there is the slightest substance to his argument and I believe that the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas made a statement that Congress would be blamed and should be blamed for O. P. A.'s shortcomings and that is exactly what is happening. I went along with the gentleman last year creating this agency. I believed in it. I believed in it then and I believe in it now. However, hundreds of letters are coming to me from my constituents. Here is one you cannot dismiss as moonshine. Here is a letter from a lady with two sons in the service. In this letter she states:

> DEAR SIR: As a voter I will let you know how I feel about the Office of Price Administration, just taking large pay for doing nothing about the high cost of living. As a home owner I was forced to take low rent from a tenant who is receiving large pay. I cannot keep up repairs, mortgage interest payments on the rent received before July 1940. The cost of repairs and painting has gone up very much. Food has gone up three times.

Listen to these prices. We have, as I understand, sixty thousand-odd people on the pay roll of the O. P. A., sixty-some-odd thousand, one for every 2,000 people in the United States on the pay roll of the O. P. A., and yet here are the figures, and these prices are accurate because I have checked them.

Cabbage that you could buy in 1942 for 5 cents a pound is now selling for 15 cents a pound.

Sweetpotatoes that were selling for 7 cents per pound in 1942 are now selling for 23 cents a pound.

Spinach that was selling for 5 cents per pound is now selling at 19 cents a pound.

Onions, 3 pounds for 10 cents, now selling for 10 cents a pound. Lettuce that was 10 cents a pound in 1942 is now 19 cents a pound; apples that were 5 cents a pound are now selling at 15 cents a pound; and the lady closes her letter with this statement:

> And we cannot buy any potatoes.

I should like to have some Member of this body tell me how to answer this letter and how to answer it so that she will feel satisfied that we are doing something about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the gentleman writes to her he might tell her that six carloads of potatoes spoiled on the market here in Washington.

Mr. BENDER. And 60 spoiled in New York; $90,000 worth of potatoes spoiled in the markets of New York because they did not allow the proper refrigeration for these potatoes coming up from the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going into a detailed statement of my voluminous criticism against the Office of Price Administration. I attempted to do just that in part on yesterday and those of you who were not here in the late hours last evening will I hope avail yourselves of the RECORD and read its contents.

I want to correct one statement made here today. The statement has been made that the amendment to reduce, offered by the gentleman from Illinois, in the amount of $35,000,000 would result in a 20-percent reduction in funds for the Office of Price Administration. This is not true. After this reduction has been applied to the item carried in this bill the Office of Price Administration would still have an 8½-percent increase in funds over the amount of money appropriated to them last year. Last year we gave them $120,000,000; this will leave them $130,000,000 for 1944; so that is not an argument in any sense of the word.

I believe that with all of the flagrant abuse of power in O. P. A. some drastic action must be taken. It is within the power of this Congress to at a later date give them new money in a deficiency bill whenever we have found a definite improvement in the policies and the management of O. P. A. Until that time I feel that no Member of the House should take the responsibility of pouring new, good money into a bad rat hole. In my opinion the O. P. A. needs cleaning out from the front door to the back door. Prentiss Brown has had 6 months, but the policies of O. P. A. continue to be the policies of Leon Henderson, and as was revealed in the press of Washington here on yesterday the Smith committee of this House has now obtained some of the secret files of one of the former deputy administrators and general counsel of O. P. A. which reveal that the primary purpose of those who are in control of O. P. A. policies was not to control prices but to control industry, profits, and revolutionize the business of this Nation.

Price control by this administration has been a political mockery while prices have gone merrily on.

Months of intimate and careful study of O. P. A. policies and O. P. A. conditions on my part and on the part of committees with which I am connected in this House have revealed the same thing months ago. Some of the very men, one in particular, who have stood on the floor here to defend in a feeble way the O. P. A. have on repeated occasions denounced the policy of O. P. A. as absolutely and unqualifiedly dishonest. I want to add my word to say that it is the grossest kind of dishonest governmental policy and must be eradicated.

When O. P. A. cleans house and straightens out policy I shall be willing to increase where necessary their appropriations—but not until then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I expect the gentleman from Missouri referred to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Patman, who addressed the Committee a short time ago.

Mr. Chairman, I have had my say in the past in regard to O. P. A. and its personnel, and I have felt that when this appropriation bill was up for consideration, it was one time when we could function and give some relief to the American people from the ill-advised reforms and activities of O. P. A. I have several amendments that I am going to offer to the bill. Some of them are perfecting amendments and three are corrective amendments. In this time I wish to read these amendments because I feel you should know what they contain.

The first amendment I intend to offer reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promolugation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles to be sold at retail which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor.

That is to give the small retail dealer the same wholesale price which is now enjoyed by the chain stores and mail-order houses under O. P. A. orders. If you believe in the most-favored-nation clause for foreign nations you should certainly favor this amendment, because it applies the same principle to American citizens who are engaged in the business of merchandising products for civilian needs. In other words it gives equal opportunity to the small independent businessman as compared with the advantages now enjoyed by chain stores and mail-order houses. The small businessman is entitled to equal treatment when you consider his great contribution to the building of our country and the stability which he has given it.

While much has been said in favor of helping small business, little or nothing has been done. When we look at the records, we find that Federal agencies have done about everything that they could to destroy and liquidate small business concerns in this country. Now is your chance to afford a remedy and give some constructive help for the survival of small business. This amendment will give you an opportunity to show your colors if you favor the independent retail merchant.

The second amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any policy-making officer except the Price Administrator unless such policy-making officer has previously had not less than 5 years of practical experience in the pursuit of business upon which he is to formulate any policy for such pursuit or business.

I think this amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have an amendment pending at the desk which deals with that subject matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I gladly yield, offering this amendment to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will it not be a rather lonely place down there at O. P. A. if the gentleman's amendment is adopted?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have all been trying to get some experienced men in the O. P. A. to formulate policies. As the matter now stands the O. P. A. calls experienced men from all over the country, ostensibly to advise with them, but when businessmen and farmers come here they find they are not being called to give advice but to be told by the O. P. A. what is going to be done to them.

The third Andresen amendment, which I will discuss when I offer it for consideration, reads as follows:

At the end of the paragraph on page 13, insert the following language: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] that I followed her suggestion and I called my wife about this O. P. A. rationing and rollback to get her views on this thing. Here is what she told me.

First of all I want to tell you that we have four children running from 4 to 12 years. "Our milk bill for the month runs $35," she says. "If I scrimp and avoid all luxuries and only buy the real necessities we can get by with the rest of the food expenses at about $20 a week." That is $80 a month—$80 and $35 makes $115 a month. Besides that, I will go out here like you do and buy my lunch down in the restaurant and maybe a dinner once in awhile, and I spend about $5 a week upon myself for my food outside of what goes to the family. That makes $20 a month, which is a total of $135 a month for food. That does not include the laundry, the children's shoes, clothes, school expenses, and so on. We have nearly $40 a week for food.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I cannot yield to the gentleman. The gentleman said some things about Mr. Prentiss Brown that I did not like. I know Mr. Brown and every Member of this House from Michigan knows Mr. Brown and respects him. He is a very solid man and there is no comparison between him and Henderson. If there is any man who serves in this House and he can do a better job than Mr. Brown I would like to see him. I do not know of anyone I would have more confidence in to handle a very bad situation than Mr. Brown.

Now, let us take a working man who is making $1 an hour. He works 40 hours a week. He gets $40. Most of them have four or five children in their family. They want to give those kiddies milk, they want to feed them the same as I feed mine. They cannot buy food for more reasonable prices than my wife can and it is going to cost nearly $40 a week to feed a family of six.

Mr. Chairman, something has got to be done about that. Mr. Brown is trying to do that. You talk about a roll-back. I am in favor of that. I would go further. I would go further than a roll-back on food prices and I would go to the extent—I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will agree with me—of putting a subsidy on freight. I would put a 50-percent subsidy on every carload of food that comes in, cutting that freight cost on food one-half to the farmer. You take a man who raises a bushel of potatoes, let us say he gets 60 cents for that bushel of potatoes. It costs him another 60 cents to get those potatoes to the market. Then you have the commission men and the men in between who will take another 60 cents on it and by the time we get it to the consumer in the cities we pay $1.80 for something that the producer gets 60 cents for. I think every Member of Congress who comes from the cities would be in favor of subsidizing freight rates say to the extent of 50 percent of the freight cost, so that a bushel of potatoes would cost 30 cents to ship instead of 60.

I think we ought to get together and avoid this caustic criticism of Mr. Brown and the O. P. A.; they, without doubt, have done a good job. I asked my wife, "What about this rationing and price fixing? Do you think we ought to eliminate this rationing?" She says, "By no means. We must not eliminate any rationing. We would not get anything, the prices would be too high, as was the case a couple of months ago before they set prices and before this rationing went on." Certain foods at that time you could not get at any price. We were paying $1 a pound for butter before they put a price on it and started rationing it. That is where we would be if we did not have rationing. It is the greatest thing that could have happened to us.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. When your children and my children next winter do not get enough milk because of the food practices of O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture, then you go down to Brown and get the milk to feed your hungry children.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Brown has seven children, one of the largest families of any man in this Congress. Mr. Brown knows what it costs to raise a family of children. Mr. Brown is level-headed and he is doing a mighty good job of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has before it today a very difficult problem for consideration, this appropriations bill, in which we are about to authorize the expenditure of nearly $3,000,000,000 of the people's money to pay the expenses of a number of bureaus, some of which have been doing satisfactory work and most of which have shown lack of ability, lack of accomplishment, incompetency, waste, and extravagance.

Many Members of this Congress would like to reduce, in a substantial way, the appropriations for these various bureaus to a point much lower than has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee, which has held hearings in its attempt to determine how much money should be allotted to each of these various departments. It is difficult, with the lack of information that cannot be given to the House in the short time we are considering this vast appropriation, for the Members to really determine just how much of this money will be wasted, how much that is being asked for is not needed, and it has been difficult for the committee to determine to a satisfactory degree the amount of appropriations necessary for these various departments. Bureaus have been set up and departments extended until it baffles the efforts of Congress to determine the necessary amount of money needed.

I understand that amendments will be offered on the floor to reduce some of these appropriations to a point lower than recommended by the committee. I hope when these amendments are offered, in the interest of the people and in the hope of maintaining financial solvency for our Government, that drastic further reductions will be voted by this body. Members of this Congress generally and the people of this Nation know that there are two transcendent responsibilities resting upon this Congress, whose duty it is to represent the people of this Nation.

Our first duty, as we all realize, is to consider these appropriations and all other governmental matters with the dominant thought first of helping our Government to win the war.

Our responsibility secondly is to reduce, so far as is possible, every governmental expense not essential to the winning of the war. This second responsibility is almost as great as the first, because it helps to accomplish the first duty resting upon the Congress and helps to retain the American way of life which is given to us under our present form of government which we may lose even though we win the war unless we can maintain this country in a sound financial condition.

Here today we have an opportunity to help gain both of these objectives I have pointed out. We have an opportunity to reduce nonessential governmental expenses. We can do this by reducing these appropriations in this bill. We can do it without hurting the war effort and on the other hand such action will aid our war effort.

At this point I want to indicate where we can start in such reductions on this bill, the Office of War Information. Last year this department was given $35,847,292. This year, running true to form as all bureaucratic departments do, they have asked for $47,342,000. I note the committee has reduced that amount to $34,472,504. I want to commend the committee for this action; however, I would like to point out that this Department during the entire World War under the Wilson administration, did the war propaganda work at an expense of only about $5,000,000.

When the Office of War Information was set up it was for the purpose of propagandizing the foreign nations of the world, particularly with the thought of breaking through to the occupied nations such as France, Denmark, Holland, and others with news from this country tending to weaken the faith of the people in those occupied countries and of the Axis Powers as well, and for the further purpose of giving our slant on the news to all the nations of the world and particularly as a clearing house with the intent of protecting the news channels from securing news that might be detrimental to our war effort and those of our allies. It was charged with the further purpose of giving to the American people authentic news such as could be released, without endangering our war effort to the people of our Nation, so that they might know with as much certainty as possible the facts with regard to our military efforts, failures, and successes on the battle fronts of the world. These are, in substance, the work that was carried out under a like organization that served our people and our allies during the last war at a total expense of something like $5,000,000.

This like organization, the Office of War Information, has not only assumed those duties but it has gone far afield in attempting to propagandize the people of America in almost every walk of life. It has set up an organization the like of which was never contemplated by Congress and of sufficient numbers to amaze the people of this country. I phoned the Office of War Information this morning to try to get the accurate figures as to the number of people employed in this organization. I think you will be astounded to know, and I know the people of the Nation will be astounded to know, that they have now employed, according to their own statement this morning, as of May 30, 4,496 people.

I believe this following fact will astound the people and surprise many of the Members of Congress. They now have employed 417 aliens on their pay roll, many of them refugees and some of them, I am informed, were employed at high salaries to tell the foreign countries about the glories of the American Government who have not lived in this country for over 30 to 60 days. It would seem to me that a citizen and taxpayer of this country who had lived here and who knew something about the glories of America, to tell to Poland, for instance, could have been employed by Mr. Elmer Davis out of thousands of Polish-American businessmen, mechanics, physicians, or educators, who could talk the Polish language freely and who could do a better job of selling our Government of liberty to the people in occupied Poland, holding out to them the necessity of them maintaining their morale until the day of their deliverance. The same could be said in favor of our Americans of foreign descent representing the French, Danes, Norwegians, Yugoslavians, Greeks, and other foreign nations.

Volumes could be written in opposition to the wide extension and waste of this organization. It is the best example of bureaucracy running rampant. The answer should be given by the support of an amendment to reduce these appropriations by 50 percent today on the floor of the House, and, in my judment, it would help to win the war rather than to retard its efforts if half of the money they are asking for is denied them.

Here is another bit of news that I think the people are entitled to know and which will probably astound them. Mr. Elmer Davis, the head of this organization, who was selected by the President, is a former member of the American Labor Party of New York and in 1932 was an ardent supporter of Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate for President, and was active in speaking and contributing articles to magazines promoting his candidacy. Politically he has been left of the left-wingers for a number of years. Does it not seem strange that the President of the United States, in selecting a man to distribute the news for the Nation to its people, would select a man for this important position whose past political activities have been linked with the American Labor Party of New York and the Socialist Party? Mr. Davis, with the advent of the New Deal, became a militant supporter of this philosophy of government. Can there be any significance attached to the fact that he has widened his scope of news influence far beyond that which was expected of him to the point where he is apparently trying to influence the entire people of the United States on philosophies of government that have no connection with the propagandizing of or dissemination of war news? Can it be possible that his selection by the President was partly due to his left-wing philosophies of government? He holds a tremendous opportunity for influencing the American people in the many activities he has taken over in addition to speaking at Government expense over a Nation-wide hook-up of the air lines once each week. This power should be limited with a serious cut in the appropriations for his department.

Now, another one of the controversial questions coming up in this appropriation bill is the request of the O. P. A. for an increase of their appropriations from $120,000,000 for the past year to $165,000,000 contained in this bill. They ask for $45,000,000 above this amount, but in the wisdom of the committee that additional amount has already been cut out by a vote of the committee. This request gives the Members of this Congress the responsibility of careful thought and consideration. Every Member of this Congress has been anxious

that the O. P. A. organization administer its responsibility in the best interest of the people for the purpose of helping to prevent inflation. The record of this organization is so bad that were it not for the danger of inflation this Congress would not appropriate another dollar for its continuance, but the Congress should and will make sufficient appropriations to continue the O. P. A. in the hope that, bad as its record has been, there is yet the possibility that the Administrator will clear out of this Administration the theorists, crackpots, left wingers, college professors, and a thousand or more of its incompetent, inexperienced dreamers and planners who are attempting to control billions of dollars in business, most of whom have never had any business experience in the matters of which they set up as dictators today. The majority of the men who have been making the policies of this organization are under 35 years of age and have had no experience in practical business of any kind. This organization, if allowed the appropriations they request in this bill, sets up that they intend to increase the number of their appointees to the astounding number of 65,670 persons. They now have, in this organization, 896 economists, 394 attorneys, hundreds of university professors, and out of the whole lot who are drawing the highest salaries, the most many of them have ever drawn in their lives, there are very few competent businessmen who have made a success of their own business.

Here are some examples and some of the reasons why the O. P. A. has failed to meet its responsibilities to date.

The executive over the Nonferrous Metal Branch is an economist and professor with no experience in this line.

The price executive over building material is an oil economist.

The price executive over iron and steel is a college professor. Think of this. It is an amazing situation.

The price executive over Industrial Materials Division is a professor and economical expert, whatever that is.

The price executive over the Paper Branch is a political science professor of Princeton with no business experience.

The price executive over the Machinery Branch is an economist and professor and for the past 4 years has been an accountant. Would it not seem wise in this vast industry if they had brought to the Department as its head someone other than a professor, someone who knew machinery from top to bottom?

The price executive over Chemicals and Drugs controlling the flow and price of this line of goods throughout America, is a Harvard professor with no business experience.

Over the Restaurant Branch is an analyst and economist who formerly was employed by the Illinois Emergency Relief. He has never had any experience in the restaurant business or any other kind of business as an executive.

Here is another one, the price executive over consumer durable goods is an educator.

The price executive over Solid Fuels Division, this tremendous department, is a 30-year-old Harvard statistical economist, with no experience in business.

The price executive over the Petroleum Branch was a deputy revenue collector, was at one time in the Navy, and for 10 years an auto-finance executive, and he did have some minor experience in the oil business.

The director of textile leather is a Stanford University professor.

The price executive over meat, fish, fats, and oils, over this vast business so important to the people, is an Iowa professor with no business experience.

The price executive for the Food Price Division is 37 years old and an economist with the Department of Agriculture.

Over export and import price control there is a Harvard professor and lecturer.

The executive over the executive office and price department is 35 years old, an economist without business experience who was formerly on the political pay roll of the National Youth Administration and the health and charity department in Denver.

We succeeded in bringing pressure enough to bear recently to have the 34-year-old Canadian-born Professor Galbraith who was the chief price fixer for O. P. A., disconnected from the Department by resignation.

Mr. Porter in charge of rent control is a lawyer, a New Deal economist, a left-winger, a New Dealer who has been on the pay roll for years and who has had no special rent experience.

This is what is the matter with O. P. A. The Dirksen amendment which will compel every policy-making appointee to have had 5 years' experience in the line of business over which he will preside should be passed, and it will go a long way toward supplanting the terrible inefficiency and bungling of the administration of O. P. A. with men who have practical common sense and proven business ability.

I regret that time will not permit me to proceed further. Many other earnest and able gentlemen on the floor of the House have pointed out the great need in the interest of the people, not only for economy but for efficiency in the conduct of the affairs of this Government.

We on the Republican side who are leading the fight to cut these appropriations today have but one main purpose in our mind, that is, to cut out useless expenses, waste and extravagance in the hope of preserving the life of the little businessmen in dealing with the O. P. A., and to try to bring to its management men of experience who can make the O. P. A. program work fairly and justly for all of the people and to strengthen its influence against inflation. None of us want to wreck the organization. We all want to improve it and the way to improve it is not to pour fresh money and greater appropriations into the hands of these incompetent and reckless officials, but to say to them, you may have $130,000,000 granted you today. Go and cut out the deadwood and the incompetency and run this department efficiently so that you may show the people results and you can come back to Congress within 6 months or a year from now and you will have no trouble in securing the appropriations that you need.

The holding down of their appropriations and the amendments which are offered and will be offered to compel efficiency in the department is the only manner in which we can ever hope to see efficiency brought to this department which will enable it to use its greatest influence to prevent inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a few minutes ago sought to create the impression that because the distinguished subcommittee which considered this appropriation bill had agreed unanimously on the various amounts included in the bill neither the full Appropriations Committee nor this House should have any control over or have anything to say about the various appropriation items.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, may I say that I have the highest regard for this subcommittee; nevertheless, it may interest the Members of this body to know that the full committee was given only 20 minutes for the consideration of an appropriation bill for 18 war agencies and carrying a total amount of almost $3,000,000,000, involving an increase of about 65 percent in the amounts required for these agencies to operate in the coming fiscal year.

Our distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. CANNON] stated yesterday that wars are not alone won on the battlefield, that we must have industrial production on the home front, and that we must maintain civilian morale. I think everybody will agree with me that the time has arrived when it is necessary to go to some of these battlefronts and bring back some of the men who have been fighting our wars to bolster civilian morale. Nothing has been more ruinous to morale on the home front than the machinations and the manipulations of the Office of Price Administration.

We have been observing a controversy during the past few weeks over whether executive agencies shall expend several billions of dollars to roll back the prices of food products, involving the use of Federal funds to pay subsidies for the benefit of consumers, notwithstanding the fact that every committee of both bodies of Congress which has considered this proposal has definitely stated that it is opposed to the use of Federal funds for the payment of subsidies. This particular item for the O. P. A. proposes an increase of about 25 percent, or 14,000 employees, in the personnel required to operate this agency during the coming year.

No decision has been arrived at yet as to whether Congress will approve the rolling back of prices and sanction the use of funds to pay these subsidies, but today we are told that if we cut a single dollar from this appropriation for

O. P. A. we shall be jeopardizing the program of this agency. Surely Congress still has control over the purse strings, and has the right to limit the expansion of any executive agency. The people expect us to exercise some control through appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who voted against this O. P. A. bill and voted against it because I distrusted the management that I thought would occur under the administration of Leon Henderson. I am one of those who almost invariably vote for reductions in appropriations. But I think you are approaching this matter in the wrong way. We have had a change in the administration of O. P. A. I believe everybody here on both sides of the aisle will agree that Mr. Brown since he has been Administrator has been trying to improve the situation. The effect of this amendment will be to handicap the present Administrator in carrying out this law in the way it ought to be carried out. I think we would make a mistake in cutting the appropriation for two reasons, first, that it would hurt the program, and second, that if things went wrong the blame would be laid upon you as having failed to give the proper appropriation necessary to carry this program into effect.

This inflation threat is so dangerous, so imminent, and so important, that we ought not to take any chances of jeopardizing this program. I do not think we ought to burn this bridge down because we are mad at somebody, right when we are in the middle of it. I hope the House will vote down this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Permit me to say that no Member of this House has criticized the O. P. A. more than I. It is a matter of record that I have repeatedly criticized that organization and some of its policies before the committees and on the floor of this House. It will be recalled that I vigorously opposed many of the impractical regulations, orders, and policies of the former Price Administrator Henderson. I have no apology to make for such criticism. Moreover, I did not hesitate to criticize the present Price Administrator and certain O. P. A. policies when he appeared recently before the Committee on Appropriations. He has been mighty slow in getting his office reorganized. He still has too many impractical theorists in his Washington set-up. Yet, it is only fair to say that the present Price Administrator has ironed out a lot of its troubles. There is still a lot of room for improvement, but that improvement cannot be made by hamstringing the Price Administrator by slashing this appropriation an additional 40 percent. The Committee on Appropriations has already reduced the appropriation for O. P. A. drastically. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia that it would be a serious mistake, merely because some of us may be out of sorts or angry because of some unreasonable regulations of O. P. A. to make it impossible to function in the future as the pending amendment proposes to do.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that under the new administration men with the psychology made manifest in the testimony, like Paul Porter, and others, will be taken out of this new set-up?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not care to mention any individual, but I think there are a whole lot of people down there who ought to be gotten rid of. I think Brown is in the process of doing it, but he cannot do it overnight. It will take time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. May I ask the gentleman if he has any hope that we could ever find administrators who would make the exercise of the power of the Office of Price Administration popular among a profit-loving people?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I think in regard to this amendment as on the amendment on which we voted a short time ago, that we ought not to cripple an institution we ourselves have created. If we have built up an agency and it is not functioning or is wrong, we ought to repeal the law, but I am never in favor and do not expect to be in favor of trying to kill off an organization by an underhanded punch like denying it an appropriation. I think that is a very cowardly way to approach the question.

In connection with the agency that was discussed here just a short time ago, the statement was made that because a lot of men on the pay roll are receiving high salaries it is an extravagant institution, but we must recall that most of this work is emergency work, for instance, like shipping in wood from South America. It had to be done right away. Wood had to be found. We had to furnish this wood for the airplanes and for the fighting ships. It was not a question of taking our time to go out and do that work, or contracting for it; that wood had to be delivered. They had to send experts to South America to find where the wood could be produced. They had to put mills in to mill that wood. They did deliver it.

You cannot tell me that you are saving anything by denying an agency of that kind money enough to operate in this war effort. When the war is over and you have time to think it over, you will find there are a lot of things you could have saved some money on; but, for example, if you run short of gasoline and the word goes out to get some gasoline, they are going to get it in this country. They know how to get it.

Just because they spent a little extra money in employing experts to make that delivery, I suppose somebody in Congress will stand up and say we are spending too much money, but the things we must have we are going to get, because this country is not going to be defeated, no matter how many mistakes we make.

On this one item of wood, let me tell you what Milo Perkins says about it:

When any of our armed forces are hurled into the waters of the Pacific or the Atlantic, their safety may depend on the life rafts to which they cling. These rafts are made of balsa wood. Great Britain's famous Mosquito bombers, which roar over enemy territory dropping their death-dealing blows, are made in part of balsa wood. Balsa is a vital necessity in the United Nations war effort.

Before the war, balsa was used largely for the manufacture of toy airplanes. No one dreamed then that it would become an essential part of the real thing. Ecuador exported about 95 percent of the total supply.

The World War brought demands for five times the production needed in years of peace. Board of Economic Warfare was given the job of going after this production, and it is getting it. In Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other Latin American countries, Board of Economic Warfare staffs of foresters, millmen, and businessmen are directing the work. Arrangements have been made for mills and dry kilns, and a careful inspection system has been established to see that only balsa suitable for the war effort is shipped to the United Nations. This carefully selected wood is on the firing line.

Mahogany, too, is a war requisite, and in amazing quantities. When I first heard of it, I could think only of decorations for admirals' cabins. In fact, however, not 1 foot is being brought in for any such purpose. The beautifully figured furniture mahogany is not acceptable now. All that may be brought in under Board of Economic Warfare's rigidly enforced program is the straight-grained tough mahogany, which is used for airplane veneers and planking for small boats.

The amount of mahogany which Board of Economic Warfare was directed to procure in a year was almost twice as much as had ever been brought into this country in any former year from the sources which were still available. The Philippines are, of course, in enemy hands. Board of Economic Warfare was told first that it could not be done, but it is being done. The planes are flying, and the boats are being launched.

Established mahogany firms have become agents of the Government, under Board of Economic Warfare's program for bringing in the specification mahogany. This was done to take advantage of their experience, facilities, personnel, and established connections, and to make it possible for them to continue in business. Surveys by experienced foresters were made of lands not normally tapped for mahogany. Mills were set up in the producing countries, so that lumber could be shipped instead of logs, thus effecting great savings in shipping space.

In addition to balsa and mahogany, Board of Economic Warfare has recently been asked to get tremendous quantities of miscellaneous woods, such as yellow pine and ash which are found in Mexico and the Central American countries.

Planning effective programs for the procurement of each of these commodities, presenting different and complicated problems, requires the services of experienced businessmen and technicians. The Board of

Economic Warfare has these men. We must keep them on the job. They are performing a vital service on the economic front of this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] for 10 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely fear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], if agreed to, will strike at the very heart of this vital and necessarily expanding activity which stands between the American people and runaway prices and galloping inflation. Like most of the Members of this House, my admiration for the official conduct of the former Price Administrator was well under control, but I say to you that in my judgment we have now a Price Administrator whose feet are on solid ground, who is actuated by sound philosophy and who I am sure, if given opportunity, will effectuate a very rapid improvement in the administration of that Office, and will bring it into better favor with the Members of this body. I believe we ought not to be too impatient with Mr. Brown. I happen to know from contact with his office that he has in mind plans which will work out undoubtedly in time, which will give a very much better character to his establishment.

I call attention now to what this proposed cut would do to some of the most vital activities of the Price Administration. For instance, to the rationing program. It always is true that many of the most important and startling revelations brought out before our subcommittee of deficiencies are off the record. In this time of national emergency that is especially the case. I am going to show you some things that are secret, or just about a half-way secret, that are in the offing at this time. I refer to eight great new rationing programs. How in the world, if this cut is made, are we going to obtain the manpower to administer those eight great new rationing programs? I call attention to page 178 of the hearings, where there is a sort of ricochet reference to these programs, most of the discussion having been off the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Your departmental personnel has increased from 915 to 1,199, an increase of 284. What is the need for that increase?

Mr. KROEGER. These increases in the national office are in the rationing department, and with the exception of about 13 positions, is all related to the plans of new programs, rationing programs for commodities that we have not yet received specific directives on, but as to which there is some possibility that rationing may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. I note that your reference to those new programs is rather cryptic. You list them here as A, B, C, D, E, and so forth. It is pretty difficult for us to get any idea of what you may have in mind, or do you intend for us to have any idea?

Mr. KROEGER. Mr. Brown indicated in his opening statement that it would be preferable not to have these matters generally discussed because of the fact that a discussion of a specific commodity almost is certain to promote the need for rationing. I do not know to what extent Mr. Brown would want me to discuss this program.

Mr. BROWN. We will go into it as fully as you want us to.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not want to go into anything, Mr. Brown, that would prejudice the situation if it should leak out, because in these committees, regardless of how careful we are, information will seep out and if there is anything that would be published that would be of any disadvantage, I would not mention a thing, not a thing, and we do not want to hear it.

The chairman, I think, very wisely agreed it would be well not even to give our committee a definite description of these programs. At the present time 11 articles of common use are on a rationing basis, being set forth on page 12 of the hearings—automobiles, bicycles, gasoline, fuel oil, firewood, sugar, coffee, processed foods, meats, rubber, footwear, and shoes.

It is proposed to add 8 to these, and at the same time it will be necessary to carry on these 11 other programs, which are going programs. Bear that in mind. Our committee cut back the estimate for rationing. The Budget asked for 4,554 persons with a salary obligation of $12,587,495. We cut that back to 3,726, with a salary obligation of $10,173,335. The Budget estimated for rationing purposes that there must be a technical and administrative personnel of 2,507, and we cut that to 2,064. The Budget estimated 1,974 for technical personnel rationing, and we cut that to 1,662. With the drastic cuts that we already have made, what will happen to our very vital rationing program, in case the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is adopted? That is just one phase of the activities of the Price Administration. It applies not only to rationing but to price fixing and rent control. Mr. Brown, voluntarily on his own initiative, reduced the obligations for enforcement of the rental control $700,000 and has swept off 300 persons engaged in that activity. We have cut down the total number of personnel of Price Administration 3,563, with a salary obligation of $11,000,000. We have done that on our own initiative.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have only 1 or 2 minutes, and I prefer not to yield. I hope my friend will pardon me. In connection with the holding down of prices, I call attention to the testimony on pages 240–241, giving the very best estimate of what has been accomplished in controlling prices. It is an eye-opening record. You will find there a statement which reads as follows:

The cost to the Government of World War No. 1 inflation was 13.5 billion dollars. Total war expenditures were approximately $32,000,000,000, but 13.5 billion dollars of this total was made necessary by price increases. By preventing the pattern of price increases which occurred during the same period of the last war, Office of Price Administration had saved the Government 25.8 billion dollars on the cost of the war by the end of 1942. By the end of 1943, these savings to the Government will amount to over $70,000,000,000 if prices are held at current levels. This is two and one-half times the total cost of World War No. 1.

That is the estimated saving to the Government, accomplished by price control.

Now, as to the consumer, the statement further says:

Consumers would have spent nearly $6,000,000,000 more for the goods and services consumed since September 1939 if prices had followed the pattern of the last war. By the end of 1943 the savings to consumers will amount to over $20,000,000,000 with prices held at current levels.

That summarizes what the Price Administration has done for the people of this country. Even so, with the personnel with which it is now implemented, we hear of black markets all over the country. I wonder how many more of those black markets will be created and how wild they will go if this further personnel cut is made under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that putting an ex-Congressman or an ex-Senator in as administrator of O. P. A. is necessarily an improvement over a professor. At least, you cannot be sure it is an improvement unless you know that he has had some experience as an administrator. I have never heard anybody here say that this particular administrator has had that experience. Certainly there has been no evidence of great improvement in administration since his appointment several months ago. Certainly this administration is using the same policies that Leon Henderson instituted. It is this administrator, backed by the President, who is promoting the roll-back policy that may cause a price decrease perhaps, but will certainly cause a point-value increase, and that is what the housewife is interested in. She is interested in how many points she will have and how much food she can get to feed her family.

You say, "Let the Committee on Banking and Currency bring in a bill." What is the use? The way they have enforced this law does not follow the law. The law told them to stabilize prices at September levels. They encouraged prices to go up. That was illegal, and it is equally illegal to roll them back today, because the law does not direct them to roll back prices. That is not a stabilizing process. That is a disruptive process, which is keeping the corn from going to market in the Northwest, throwing out the feeder industry, shutting down the corn solvent and commercial alcohol industries. It seems to me, in talking to colleagues and asking them how they would vote on a proposition to hold up the funds of O. P. A. until we could get some kind of a practical deal with the administration to get them to change and adopt a workable policy, that the secret of our difficulty today lies in a very fundamental principle of government. It used to be that our Government was simple, that our laws were simple, but I think the O. P. A. shows more than any other example I have seen in the whole complicated New Deal administration that in a republic laws may become so complicated that the people cannot understand them. Congressmen cannot explain their votes

to the people. So today you hear Members get up on this floor and support this bill, saying, "You do not dare to vote to cut this appropriation, because if you do the people would think you were for inflation and for black-market prices and against price control."

I think it is about time we in Congress stop following along noisily but helplessly like a tin can tied on the end of the tail of a mad dog, and by mad dog I mean O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the basic argument that has been offered against this amendment is that it will somehow cripple O. P. A. or will somehow injure an agency important to the war effort.

If I understand the situation correctly, the amendment, even after it strikes off $35,000,000, still leaves the O. P. A. with $10,000,000 more than it had for this year. What would be the effect of the proposed cut, then, on the program of O. P. A., as offered for the coming year? It would have more money on which to operate than in the year just closing, but it might not be able to extend its activities into new fields. The result should be good for O. P. A. would have to confine itself to essential activities.

There are two ways, it seems to me, in which O. P. A. can save this $35,000,000 and still do a good job. The first way is to quit worrying about nonessentials and luxuries. Why not let people use their excess purchasing power in bidding for pleasure and luxury items if they want to do so? For example, they were trying to regulate the prices in bowling alleys out our way. I brought it to their attention and I am glad to say that they agreed there was more important work for their investigators than to be doing that, so they stopped it.

Recently I heard where they were spending a couple of thousand dollars fighting a rent-control case where the figures they are fighting are the figures that the F. H. A. says are necessary for the operation of an F. H. A. project and which the renters are willing to pay. Why should O. P. A. spend money to bankrupt an F. H. A. project?

So, I say that if they eliminate chasing windmills and nonessentials and concentrate upon the job of holding prices for the essentials of life they can do a job with the money offered.

A second way to save expense would be to use a less expensive system of price control. There are many instances in which it would be cheaper to use a base price and permit a percentage mark-up than to police every sale. As Herbert Hoover has said:

> It is easier to control a shower at the spigot than to chase down every drop of water.

The limited time does not permit one to go much into detail, now, but I have tried to analyze the criticisms and comment that has come to me on the O. P. A. It seems to me that they charge O. P. A. with three things. First, that it discourages production. You who are familiar with the meat situation and the situation among the feeders and the livestock industry generally certainly know what I am talking about. Feeders cannot continue and will not feed at a loss.

You people who have been concerned about gasoline should have heard Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, the other day say that he was asking O. P. A. to permit a raise in the price of crude oil to avoid the shortage that is impending. You who come from Oklahoma and Texas ought to know what that means. You know that unless there is a better price for crude oil there will be a greater shortage of gasoline than we have now.

The second thing that the present policies of the O. P. A. do is to demoralize distribution. The small stores in my part of the country have written me repeatedly that they are being advertised and inventoried out of business by the tactics of the O. P. A. That is a subject for a speech in itself but I am sure many of you know to what I refer.

Third, O. P. A. often confuses the consumer and creates the very condition it should seek to avoid. Witness the run on the shoe stores just a few days ago.

Here is a field for price control but the chasing of nonessentials, the discouragement of production, and the demoralization of distribution will result in short changing the consumer when the shortage of food and meat and gasoline and these other things rolls around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make two statements:

First. I think it is wholly unfair for us to get up here and find fault with Prentiss Brown, who, after all, has had just a few weeks or months to correct the errors that Leon Henderson made. Of course, I was never for Leon Henderson; I think he was misplaced when he was put in; but after we listened to the testimony as to what is being done by Prentiss Brown, I am quite sure that if you could have been on the committee you would have come to the conclusion that he is doing a good job and that he will weed out the undesirable spots in the O. P. A. He is doing a good job today, and is going to continue to do a good job.

Second. Here is enough evidence for everyone in this House to support this bill, I think, without cutting the bill as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. I am going to repeat what the gentleman from Indiana just stated to you, taken from the hearings in which it is stated:

> The cost of World War No. 1, through inflation, to the Federal Government, was $13,500,000,000.
>
> The cost of the war was $32,000,000,000.
>
> By preventing the pattern of price increase which occurred during the closing period of the last war—

Get that—

> by preventing the price increase, the Office of Price Administration has saved the Government $25,000,000,000 on the cost of the war by the end of 1942, and by the end of 1943 these savings to the Government will amount to $70,000,000,000 if the prices are held to current levels.

Surely we will all support Prentiss Brown in the amount of money he is asking for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this House of Representatives, and through it as far as my voice will go, the American people, to have mercy upon those fellow men and women of ours upon whom we place this great responsibility found in the O. P. A. It is a terrible, terrible burden to put upon any human being that he should stand between the American people and all those who love gain and profit in this Republic.

Every seeker for gain, every seeker for selfish things in the United States will assail them when they do not do their will. It is a terrible responsibility to put upon anybody, and I say to those who put it on them; give them their loyalty.

Of course, our constitutents will come to us; every fellow who is not making as much money as he thinks he should be making, every group, every class that thinks they are not getting what they would like to have or should be allowed, will come to them and tell them and us how bad they are.

They are American citizens, they are great American citizens, and they are entitled to justice as they undertake to save our civilization and sustain those who struggle to keep the flag of freedom flying in the skies of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with most of the Members who say that the O. P. A. has made some mistakes. I think the Congress of the United States has also made a lot of mistakes in its past history. I realize that the problem facing the Office of Price Administration in regulating our whole economy is so involved and so intricate that undoubtedly it will make many mistakes, but I want to point out to my colleagues of this House that there is pent up the waters of inflation, piled high behind this dam, and unless we give to this agency the power to make the dam secure against the pent-up waters, the dam will break and those waters will flood this land and we will be met with the same condition that existed in the last war.

I was in business at that time and I saw $5 shoes go to $13.50; $35 suits of clothes go to $90, and that is the thing we will face. Yet there are those who are trying to defeat price control and every effort toward control. Of course I realize those who want to engage in speculative inflation want no price control limitations. That is where unbridled inflation will take its place and every consumer in America will lose by it.

The news from our battlefronts as we eagerly scan each day's newspaper becomes more hopeful and encouraging. Our hearts swell with pride as we read of the achievements and victory of our boys in the armed forces.

We Americans are inclined to be overpessimistic in times of adversity and we

become too optimistic when success seems to be within our grasp. It is not my intention to be pessimistic in my remarks today. My intention is to be realistic and I hope that my remarks will be constructive.

While our boys are winning their military laurels, I fear we are losing in the fight against inflation here at home. This fight is a very involved and intricate one. There are many fronts to be faced. Our General Staff on the domestic front is facing many powerful selfish interests. These interests are fighting for the right to obtain tremendous profits for their great business enterprises. In many instances their desire for profit far exceeds their patriotic impulses.

The farm producers are demanding higher prices, notwithstanding the fact that the average price now far exceeds that of normal years. The wage earners, until the freezing order, have received repeated increases in their total daily earning power.

The great manufacturers and industries have increased their profits enormously. Every increase in price of commodities and wages tends to increase the pressure on the dam which holds back the flood waters of inflation. This pressure must not be increased regardless of which class insists on further price advantages. Unless we as legislators have the courage to withstand this pressure, whatever be its source, the dam will break and the flood waters of inflation will cover the land. The inflation spiral will raise prices of all commodities. The wage earners actual purchasing power will decrease and the speculators' profits will pyramid and the inequity that exists now between the different groups, which seems large now, will be magnified a hundredfold. And after the orgy of inflation, there will come the inevitable aftermath of depression, a depression which will make the depression of 1929 seem tame by comparison.

I seriously doubt if our economy can withstand another severe depression. I seriously doubt if our political economy can withstand the strain of mass unemployment again. And it is because I fear the results of economic chaos which must eventually follow inflation, that I sound this note of warning today. We must hold the line. We must freeze prices, wages, and profits in their present relationship in order that a more inequitable and disastrous result may not ensue. We must not stop, however, at the freezing of present prices which in many instances are inequitable. In order to obtain full production of food and manufactured articles, we must try to solve and remove those inequitables as quickly as possible.

Where farm prices are low, they should be brought to parity. Where wages are low they must be raised to the point where they will afford a decent standard of living for the wage earner. Where the cost of production is raised out of proportion to the selling price, this freezing price must be reestablished on a basis of present cost of production. Every manufacturer is entitled to a reasonable profit based on efficient plant operation. Every retailer is entitled to a reasonable profit for the service he renders the community. Every link in the chain of production and distribution is entitled to a fair recompense for the service which they have rendered society as a whole. When those profits become abnormal or exorbitant, they must be recaptured through renegotiation of contracts or by additional income taxes. During normal function of economic forces in our business world, I agree that subsidies would be inflationary, but I challenge the man within the hearing of my voice to assert that our economy is now operating on a normal functional basis.

Our business economy is no longer operating on the basis of free enterprise and free markets. The urgency of war has changed our economy and interfered with free play of economic forces. In the race against time to build, train, and equip a war machine, we have interfered with the delicate balance of an enterprise.

In order to produce the materials of war, our Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies dealing with financial subsidization, have loaned to small and great industries, billions of dollars for plant expansion. In many instances these loans have been made with privilege of amortization before profit computation, which will in effect subsidize American manufacturing to the tune of billions of dollars of usable plant equipment in the post-war era.

The farmers have been subsidized through Commodity Credit Corporations and increased prices on farm commodities to the point where their income is the highest in history. The wages of the American worker, through abnormal defense employment, has also increased and this might be termed a form of subsidy. It then becomes necessary to use subsidy for the purpose of rolling back the price of foodstuff to the consumer. If it becomes necessary to use one or two or three billion dollars per year to hold the line against uncontrolled inflation, where can the crime be? Is it not more important to use subsidies to adjust the disparity between the cost of living and the purchasing power of 130,000,000 people, than it is to allow the flood waters of inflation to cover our land? I maintain that it is the lesser of two evils. I maintain that the great portion of so-called white collar class who are ground between the upper mill stone of rising prices and the lower mill stone of decreased purchasing power, are entitled to some consideration. The great corporations of America were not afraid of subsidies when the Government financed their plant experiments on an amortization basis. The farmers were not adverse to receiving subsidies in the depression days before they saw the chance of the uncontrolled rise in food prices—why should we be afraid to use subsidies now to control the dammed up forces of inflation which will engulf our whole economic and political structure if released?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I very seldom find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but this afternoon I feel I must vote against the amendment he has offered to strike $35,000,000 from the O. P. A. appropriations. I have been exceedingly critical of the administration of the O. P. A. In my humble opinion they have made a mess in the administration of the Price Control Act.

More than any other agency of the Government, the O. P. A. is responsible for the most critical situation we face in our whole war program—the procurement and distribution of food. I feel that Congress has the responsibility of providing ample funds for the proper administration of the Price Control Act. If we fail to give O. P. A. the necessary funds, we must assume our share of the responsibility if the program continues to be a failure. As I understand the situation, most of the increased appropriation for O. P. A. carried in this bill will be used to provide additional clerical help in the local rationing offices. In addition to clerical help, the increased funds will be used for a large number of additional investigators.

In the city of Hartford, with a population of more than 170,000 people, O. P. A. has until very recently, maintained but a single office. Citizens who have to go to that office for information or to secure rationing forms have been compelled to stand in line for as long as 2 hours, on the outside of the door, both in rain and snow. Certainly our constituents are entitled to better service than that. Surely no one will contend that investigators are not needed in the O. P. A. setup. If black market operations are to be eliminated, O. P. A. must have an adequate staff of investigators.

I believe we should give them the funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee and once having given them the funds asked for, we should insist that these funds be economically expended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, our hindsight is so much better than our foresight that I hate to say to anyone, "I told you so." I felt sure when we began this program that it was not being started out on the right path. Leon Henderson, however, did not ask me how it should be done and I had little opportunity to impress my views on him as to how to combat inflation. Of course, I feared it from the beginning and fought it.

I told Leon Henderson on the floor of this House once, and twice privately, that I would be willing to vote him a quarter of a billion dollars for a year if he could prevent such a rise in the cost of living happening this time as happened in the other World War. He did not quite prevent a considerable rise but he held it down somewhat, therefore I believe we have made a pretty good investment thus far in O. P. A.

My friend from Pennsylvania has just pointed out from the RECORD, comparing corresponding periods in both World Wars, already we have saved $25,000,000,000. That is a pretty good return on the investment we have already made

in O. P. A. If we continue to hold the line to the same degree, we will save by the end of 1943 $70,000,000,000 and we shall win the war on the home front. Even if you do not think we are doing the job very well, remember the superhuman task imposed upon those in charge and the tragic effect upon the war effort and upon the country if no program of this sort is successful.

It pleased and heartened me greatly to hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] take the floor here a few minutes ago and oppose the amendment which would cripple the functioning of the O. P. A. The gentleman from Virginia knows better than most of us what mistakes have been made by O. P. A. He is looking into that matter very carefully. He probably realizes better than some of us the calamity of inflation. No doubt the gentleman from Virginia expects under new direction and a better policy for O. P. A. it will function better and more nearly perform the saving work for which it was established. Let us not hamper this agency. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be unwise for the Committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The entire subcommittee, Democrats and Republicans, have reported out an appropriation of $160,000,000 for the O. P. A. and it seems to me that with the type of men who are on this subcommittee, the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle can support the subcommittee and grant the appropriation it recommended unanimously. I hope and urge that the amendment offered by our distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] the time reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amount in the bill for O. P. A. is $165,000,000.

The bill carries not less than $59,500,000 for all expenses of local boards which is earmarked for that purpose in the bill and cannot be used for any other purpose by the O. P. A.

The bill contains $17,500,000 for the payment to banks for handling purchase authorizations under the ration banking plan and which is an uncontrollable item and would have to be paid by O. P. A. from any fund given it.

The bill contains $9,000,000 for printing of coupons, forms, and so forth, for all the ration programs which must be done if rationing is to be carried on and O. P. A. would have to spend it for that purpose.

Total of mandatory and uncontrollable items, $86,000,000.

This leaves for all other operations of O. P. A. in regional, State, district, area rent, and the Washington office for all expenses, other than local boards, for the rationing, price fixing, and rent control, $79,000,000.

The Dirksen amendment would have to be applied to this $79,000,000, in amount of $35,000,000, leaving available only $44,000,000.

The cut would in effect be a decrease of 44 percent in the 1943 authorization of O. P. A., not in the Budget estimate. In effect it would reduce the personnel authorized for O. P. A., other than in local boards, from approximately 24,000 to 12,800 or about 50 percent.

This in spite of the fact that there are eight new rationing programs for 1944 and new local price programs to be carried on.

If this is to be done you might as well abolish O. P. A. as to cripple it in this fashion.

If you adopt this amendment, you turn prices and rationing loose and let confusion follow.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The cut that the gentleman is speaking of means to reduce them 50 percent below their present level?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What effect would the adoption of this amendment have on the very effective and well-administered rent-control program?

Mr. RABAUT. It would have a drastic effect on it.

Let us take into consideration for a few minutes the group this amendment affects. There are 7,000,000 workers in industry today receiving less than 40 cents an hour. There are in this country on public assistance 3,110,000 people. All of their income is fixed. Number receiving aid: Old-age assistance, 2,230,000; dependent children, 350,000; the blind, 80,000; general relief, 460,000 persons.

In the local governments of this country, excluding the educational system, there are 1,990,000 persons affected who have not had a raise in 3 years and who at the present time must pay an increase in the cost of food of 50 percent. Their general cost of living has gone up 27 percent. So they are taking a cut every day of 25 percent. If you pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois you are sanctioning a further disregard for those already suffering under the Price Control Act.

I want to go further if that does not move you. Think about the folks back home of the soldiers at the front. I want you to think about those people. There we have military allotments to 2,000,000 people with a fixed income. That is $50 a month, $12 for the first child and $10 for each additional child of the family. There are 2,000,000 of them.

Vote for the amendment if you want to, turn them down, turn your back on those who are making the great sacrifices today, 2,000,000 of them back home.

If that does not move you, I want to tell you about the veterans who have been praised from time to time on the floor of this House. You have them in this country, and they have a fixed income, frozen, with an increase in the cost of living of 50 percent on food, and above 25 percent in the general cost of living. There are 860,000 of them in number.

Turn your back on them if you want to today, and vote for the Dirksen amendment to cut this bill further than it has already been cut, the sum of $12,000,000 by the committee that gave it consideration, a committee that sat for 5 weeks on the war agency bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is serious business. I was happy to see my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] in his wheelchair, a veteran of the last war, say, "I am sorry, I must differ with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois." Yes; Mr. Chairman, in the World War we had a $32,000,000,000 bill, of which $13,500,000,000 was inflation. If price control is abandoned and a similar percentage carried on in this war up to the present time, it would be $28,000,000,000, and if it carried on up to the end of the calendar year 1943, the sum would be $70,000,000,000 for inflation. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 130, noes 115.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. DIRKSEN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 149, noes 132.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after conference with the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, may I express the hope that on the remaining amendments this afternoon we can determine and dispose of them with 10 minutes' debate, 5 minutes to the side.

Mr. TABER. I think we should do that on everything down to the O. W. I.

I do not know whether you can get it as close as that on that particular paragraph, but we can on the current amendment and any other amendments to this paragraph or anything else that I know of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I express the hope that we can determine all these questions on the debate provided by the rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 13, after line 3, add the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used for payment of the salary or expense of any person who, directly or indirectly, pays any subsidy of any kind or character whatsoever, or who directs or authorizes the payment of a subsidy, or who participates in the preparation of or calculations for the payment of a subsidy, or who directs any other person to pay or prepare or calculate or supply information for the payment of a subsidy, or any person who, directly or indirectly, collaborates with, consults, cooperates with, or directly or indirectly aids any other Federal agency for the payment or the preparation of a subsidy; or of any person who engages or participates as aforesaid in the preparation, formulation, or carrying out of any plan or scheme involving the purchase of any commodity by the Government for the purpose of its resale at a price lower than that paid by the Government."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is not germane and is legislation on an appropriation bill. The rule under which this bill was brought into this Chamber waived all points of order with reference to limitations that were engrafted on the bill itself by the Appropriations Committee. For example, a proviso was inserted to the effect that no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments. This type of provision was made impervious to a point of order by the rule which brought this bill into this Chamber, but I believe the rule would not preclude a point of order I now make with reference to the amendment the gentleman from Illinois has offered. So I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and not a mere limitation of amount of appropriation nor a mere limitation of purpose of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The point needs no belaboring. This is purely a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it is not germane. The Chair thinks that the amendment is a limitation and is not subject to the point of order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does five things. It prevents any money from being used for the payment of the salary or expenses of anyone who pays a subsidy. It prevents the use of any funds for anyone who directs the payment of a subsidy or authorizes it. It refuses funds for anyone who participates in the preparation or the calculation of a subsidy. It refuses funds for anyone who directs any person in the payment or the calculation of a subsidy. It refuses funds for anyone who collaborates with any other Federal agency for the payment of a subsidy.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, it is an antisubsidy proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It refuses money for anyone who participates in or formulates a scheme for the purchase of commodities by the Government to be sold or resold at a price which is less than what the Government paid for it.

This last item is included because of the article that appeared this morning and the discussion which has been in the air which indicates that the Government is considering the purchase of commodities to resell to the public at ceiling prices, meaning that a new scheme is now afoot to bypass the interdictions in the law and also to get around the objections that have developed on this whole subsidy discussion.

I need not belabor this point on subsidies. They are a delusion. You pay a nickel on butter as a roll-back. The soldiers and the sailors for whom such great solicitude has been expressed are going to pay it in the generations to come. It is inflationary. Those who have been arguing inflation might well have that in mind, because it simply adds that much money and it depresses prices in the face of the highest pay roll index we have ever experienced in this country.

I think the design at the present time is to develop a real control of business through the O. P. A. Witness the testimony that was given before the Smith committee this week. Witness the excerpts and the extracts that were taken from the private files of the former general attorney for O. P. A., in which it was fairly well spun out, I think, that there was a thesis and a philosophy behind this whole business that undertook a great control over all the business enterprises of the country.

This to me is interesting about this subsidy business. It is not new. Working down in one of the agencies is a young chap by the name of Hector Lazo. He is quite an author. He authored this book early in 1942, under the title "Subsidies as a Solution for the Squeeze." He says:

> Absorbing the squeeze means taking the loss brought about by the price ceiling and, if possible, dividing this loss among all concerned so as to "hold the ceiling" (sell to consumers at the same low price) and still be able to pay higher labor, higher transportation, higher raw material costs.

"Take the lid off of everything else," says Mr. Lazo, who is the original user of that phrase "the hold-the-line order," which is expressed in this article, and who would then put a ceiling on and dip into the Federal Treasury so that we might share the cost all the way around and let those in generations to come pay the bill.

There is another argument against it, and that is the inequality. Consider for a moment the subsidy on butter. The fellow who manufactures less than 1,000 pounds a month cannot get a subsidy. He is in that low class which is not within the contemplation of this subsidy program. Consider the slaughterer who slaughters less than 4,000 pounds of meat a month, or 48,000 pounds a year. He is in that low bracket. He is not in line for one of these processing subsidies.

So it is proposed now under this subsidy program sooner or later to develop tremendous inequalities all over the Nation. It is inflationary, it is illusory, it is unequal. There is the danger that it will harden into permanency just as so many other emergent programs that started out in simple fashion long ago have now crystallized into rigid and permanent law. If we once embark on this, it will be too bad for this country, because it will mean complete control ultimately of the business structure of the country. The farmers do not want it. They have gone on record with their organizations, and this is the time to stifle it by adopting this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to regulations by O. P. A. and referred to the fact that a slaughterer who slaughters less than 4,000 pounds a month would not come under the regulation, permitting a subsidy. That means if he slaughters one average steer a week, he will come under the regulation, which shows that he is not very much of a slaughterer if he slaughters less than one steer a week. If there are reasons why these regulations should be changed, they can be changed.

On the general proposition of subsidies, ordinarily I am against subsidies. I do not think that is the right approach, but we are now at war, and in some way we must keep down inflation. If we do that, we must control it. We must leave it to the Executive. We pass the law, we grant the authority, and we give a lot of money and make it available, and we charge the Chief Executive with the responsibility of keeping down inflation. There are certain commodities where subsidies work very well, and others where they do not. If we exclude all subsidies, we will make some mistakes;

and if the executive department were to subsidize everything, the executive department would make some mistakes. So let us leave it to the executive department where, if a mistake is made, changes can be made more quickly than they can be made by the Congress. It takes months and sometimes years to change a law. What will this effectuate? The people of New England profited by subsidies to the amount of $140,000,000 last season, by reason of a fuel transportation subsidy.

In the matter of sugar the consumers profited to the extent of $58,500,000 by keeping down the cost of sugar to less than 6 cents a pound. During the World War, when we were at this period, sugar was selling for 30 cents a pound. Is not that worth while? Take the case of coal. The consumers profited to the extent of $40,000,000 last season by reason of the subsidy; and take the case of oil. The consumers profited there. So in some cases subsidies will work and in other cases they will not. So I appeal to the membership of this House to place this responsibility in the executive department and give the executive department latitude and plenty of money and the opportunity to keep down inflation, and when we do that, we will have charged the executive department with the responsibility. Then when we go back home, we will at least have a good conscience, and we will know that we have tried to do what the Constitution and the laws of this country say we should do—leave it to the executive department. We should pass the law and let the executive department enforce the law. I suggest that there has never been a time when we were nearer ruinous inflation, a time when it will take bales of printing press money to buy a loaf of bread, than we are right now, and I do not want to make another step in the direction toward that runaway inflation; and if we do anything to hamstring and cripple and jeopardize the executive department in the enforcement of the laws, and in preventing inflation, we are taking a step in the direction of making these dollars that we are paying the soldiers and their dependents and old-age assistance people, worth a very few cents instead of 100 cents on the dollar. So the thing to do is to vote this amendment down, and let us go into a legislative committee and have a full and complete hearing on this question. Then if it is necessary to have a general law on subsidies, let us pass that general law. Next week, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will probably be before this House, and in that bill logically this question will come up. That is a legislative bill. Then we can act on it, and base it on reports, and also the printed hearings, but now in this appropriation bill it is not the place or time to say deliberately that the people of New England this coming season will have to pay much more for fuel oil, so that the people in the coal regions will be compelled to pay several times as much for coal, or that the people of this country generally should be compelled to pay 30 cents a pound for sugar instead of less than 6 cents a pound, as we have it today. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 147, noes 94.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 160, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, at the end of line 3, strike the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce to which the price policy, maximum price or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is the real trouble with O. P. A.? In my considered judgment, the real trouble with O. P. A. is that those who are price executives and who direct price policies have had no business experience. They have had in some cases no governmental experience, and how we can get real efficacy in O. P. A. unless they have had some business experience and some knowledge of the field in which they are operating is beyond understanding. I shall make my argument from the record. Listen to me, and if I am not correct, I may be corrected. The data I submit are based on personnel information in the hearings.

The price executive over the Nonferrous Metals Branch is an economist, a professor, a consultant, who has had no business experience. The price executive over building materials is an oil economist. The price executive over iron and steel is a college professor. The price executive over the Industrial Materials Division is a Swarthmore professor and an economic expert. The price executive for the Paper Branch is a political science professor from Princeton with no business experience. The price executive over the Machinery Branch is an economist and a professor and for 4 years was an accountant. The price executive over chemicals and drugs is a Harvard economist and a Harvard professor, with part-time work in the Labor Department, with no business experience.

The price executive, over the Restaurant Branch, is an analyst with 7 years' experience with Macy, an economist, a statistician for the Illinois emergency relief. The price executive, over consumer durable goods, is a sales manager and editor. The price executive over the Solid Fuels Division, is 30 years old, a Harvard statistical economist, has been with the National Resources Planning Board and other Government agencies, with no business experience.

The price executive, over the Petroleum Branch, was a deputy revenue collector, was in the Navy, was for 14 years an auto finance executive, and for a few years in oil. The head economist, of the Economic Analysis Branch, is an economist, a social science research fellow, a Stanford professor. The director of the Textile, Leather, and Apparel Branch is a Stanford professor. The price executive for meat, fish, fats, and oils, is an Iowa professor with no business experience. The price executive, for the Food Price Division, is 37 years old, and was an economist with the Department of Agriculture.

The director over the export-import price control office is a Harvard professor and a Radcliffe lecturer. The executive over the executive office and price department is 35 years old, was a regional cooperative director of the F. S. A., regional price economist for O. P. A. at Denver, regional representative of the National Youth Administration, health and charity department in Denver, and regional labor adviser to the Resettlement Division. Then they have Mr. Galbraith of late memory, from Toronto University, from Cambridge University, and from the University of California. He is a B. S., M. S., Ph. D. He is 34 years old. He was on the National Defense Advisory Committee as economic adviser. He was a professor at Princeton. He was on the National Resources Rationing Board. He was assistant professor at Harvard and Radcliffe. He made public works studies for the National Resources Planning Board, which we liquidated in this House. He was assistant professor in 1938 and 1939. He was a Social Science Research Council fellow. He attended Cambridge University. He has been a teacher and instructor at Harvard, and he has had no business experience.

Now, about Mr. Porter, who directs the rent operations as deputy administrator. He is a lawyer. He is attorney for a string of newspapers. He was a special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture on informational work. He was assistant to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He was counsel for the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1937 to 1942. He was legal adviser to the National Defense Advisory Council. He is a member

of the Federal Communications Commission committee on administrative procedure. He has had no special rent experience.

There is the record. There is what is wrong with O. P. A. This amendment proposes to demand that anybody who formulates price policy for some industry such as the shoe industry ought to have at least 5 years of experience in the shoe industry.

If, in assembling this brief digest of the personnel history of a number of the price executives and directors, I have inadvertently made a mistake, I shall submit my regret in advance. But this digest appears to me to be an accurate statement of the case and indicates that the real problem in O. P. A. is lack of business experience in the key price and directive positions. I am of the opinion that there will never be sound operation of O. P. A. until more business experience is introduced to cope with its present problems. I trust the amendment will commend itself to your good judgment and acceptance.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the recital of the vocational backgrounds, which has just been given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], reminds me of an experience I had one morning when I was driving down to work. A man at a corner rode down with me. I learned that he had been placed in charge of a textile branch in one of the new war agencies. I asked him something about his background. I found that he was an investment or securities salesman up until Pearl Harbor. He was away on vacation at that time. When he came back to Washington his wife could not keep house without a telephone and he found that he had to get a job with the Government somewhere to become eligible for a telephone. So this investment salesman became director of the textile branch of one of the new agencies set up here.

I want to direct my remarks particularly to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his discussion of the amendment of this paragraph relating to subsidies. The gentleman is correct in saying that the adoption of the Dirksen antisubsidy amendment is going to prevent the payment of about a quarter of a billion dollars for subsidies on fuel oil and oil transportation to the East and New England every year. But the gentleman from Texas is not going to meet the subsidy issue by considering legislation that deals only with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

During the hearings on the appropriation bill for the civil functions for the War Department we had a great deal of discussion of the New England fuel-oil situation because of the argument that the Florida barge canal would result in the elimination of the need for that subsidy payment. Mr. Davies, who is the associate of Mr. Ickes in the Petroleum Administration, was before us. I want to read now from page 181 of the hearings.

I asked Mr. Davies about the operation of the pool, and he said:

> They participate in the pool, paying into the pool monthly to the trustee that sum which is calculated on the price increase allowed by the Office of Price Administration for its sales of the several petroleum products, gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil.

Subsequently, he explained, the companies put in their claim for the excess of their delivery costs over the old tanker system. If there is not enough in the pool, the R. F. C. puts in Government money to pay the claims. That is the subsidy and this year it was estimated the cost to the Government might reach well over $200,000,000.

At another point when I asked who prepared this plan, Mr. Davies replied:

> The subject was jointly considered by the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Petroleum Administration, and the Office of Price Administration.

You recall the language of the Dirksen amendment. It would effectively prohibit anyone from the O. P. A. having anything to do with the payment of such subsidies, as the gentleman from Texas has said, and legislation on the Commodity Credit Corporation will not touch the situation.

For I asked Mr. Davies:

> Then the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with it?
>
> Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Consequently the proposal of the gentleman from Texas that this matter be handled when the committee brings in some legislation dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation merely means that nothing would be done about it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman recall that Mr. Ickes said he was going to make application for an increase in the price of crude oil?

Mr. CASE. And he has made that application.

Mr. REED of New York. And it has been turned down?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. There are 150,000 wells on the front doorsteps of where the oil is needed, in Pennsylvania and New York.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and where transportation is available to get the oil there.

Mr. REED of New York. And the O. P. A. is simply standing in the way of a solution of this question?

Mr. CASE. Yes; by refusing to permit a price for crude oil that will induce oilmen to drill the wells. That is the point I tried to bring out earlier in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is a limit to everything. Certainly we have reached the limit on this amendment. The amendment would completely sabotage the whole price fixing structure. In effect, it would repeal the law under which the Office of Price Administration is operating.

As a matter of fact, without extensive research it would be impossible to say just what the effect of this amendment would be. No one can say at this time. I think no one would be able to tell without considerable inquiry and investigation just how far reaching this amendment is.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. What I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois I will ask the gentleman from Missouri. If the same qualifications are laid down to be a legislator in this body, how many Members would be here to pass on everybody's business, everything that they know nothing about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That might prove embarrassing.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would just like to have the gentleman say whether his understanding of the amendment does not mean that nobody except somebody with a specific interest in the textile business can have anything to do with the pricing of textiles, and no one except a man having a definite interest in the liquor business can say anything about pricing liquor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been said, it is difficult to accurately construe the amendment and its purport in a curbstone opinion. But there might be that inference.

Why adopt this amendment? The gentleman from Illinois, in support of his proposal, offered only one argument, and that was a list of employees with their background and a record of their previous employment. He did not tell you that the work of these men has been unsatisfactory.

He did not tell you there was any basis of complaint against the service they are rendering; he did not tell you that any one of them had proved to be unqualified or has discharged his duties inadequately. There is no basis at all, upon the evidence presented by the gentleman, upon which we could base any argument in support of this amendment.

If he complains that they are lacking in information relative to the industry with which they deal, it might be pointed out that committees from industry have been organized to collaborate with them in this phase of their work. If the Members of the House will turn to page 54 of the hearings, they will find there assurance that the interest of the industry is to be taken care of, through advisory committees appointed by the Price Administrator. There is an industrial advisory committee, as indicated on page 54 of the hearings, an industry advisory committee on price; and on page 55 and 56 of the hearings, advisory committees on food rationing,

automobile supply, fuel oil, miscellaneous products, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and it seems to me it goes much further than what he might have intended. He prohibits the payment of any salary of any person, not only who directs the formulation, but who engaged in the formulation. It seems to me that would include clerks and stenographers whose time may be spent in research, and it seems to me the amendment would prevent them from being employed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a pretty carefully drawn amendment. The very words "formulation of policy" was designed particularly to exclude attorneys, clerks, and stenographers. It only applies to directors, price executives, dealing with the formulation of policy, so I think there is not much to the point the gentleman makes.

Mr. GORE. The amendment goes much further than what the gentleman says; it prohibits "payment of any salary of anyone who engages," so that any part of their services or any part of their work on formulating a policy would be engaged in that sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, you have got to read a complete wording, and let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], it says those engaged in formulating the price policy, and certainly that excludes clerical help and it excludes attorneys, enforcement officers, research men.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, to sum up the whole matter, the question presented by this amendment resolves itself into a question of whether you want a price-control bill or not. It is a question of price control or no price control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 136 and noes 116.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we will be required to have a yea and nay vote on these amendments I shall not ask for tellers at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, lines 10 and 20, after the word "commodity", insert the words "including milk and the products of livestock."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is a clarifying amendment, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, lines 17 and 22, after the word "act", insert the following: "as amended."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for the same explanation and we have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, line 13, after the figures "1942", insert "As amended by Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this also is a clarifying amendment. The committee does not object.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 12, line 22, after the colon, insert *"Provided further,* That such maximum price or prices shall conform in all respects to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment setting forth the provisions of the price-control law of October 2, 1942. It simply requires that the fixing of maximum prices be in accordance with the provisions of the law and nothing else. I hope that the chairman of the committee upon investigation will accept it as a perfecting amendment to bring the provisions of the bill down to date.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which requires some consideration. It is difficult to say immediately just what the effect of it is. In view of the fact that it has not been submitted to the Budget officials or the committee and should have detailed study, I trust the committee will reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 113, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13 insert the following language: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities to be sold at wholesale which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that under the guise of limitation it proposes affirmative legislation. It is a proposition to restrict executive discretion. It constitutes legislation and is not in order on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a strict limitation on the appropriation and is not in the nature of legislation. All it does is to govern the activities of the O. P. A. in writing directives and orders with reference to wholesale prices providing that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles to be sold at retail which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price. Certainly it is in order and I hope that the Chairman will rule accordingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, for a long time I have noticed a tendency of permitting amendments which are not substantial limitations, but whose only words of limitation, are "provided further; that no part of this appropriation shall be used, etc.," or words to that effect. It is a practice which in my opinion is dangerous and which certainly should be limited.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is in order only if the Chair holds that the words preliminary of limitation used are sufficient to bring it within the meaning of a limitation, for other parts of the amendment constitute legislation. It is a directive to the Executive; it imposes an affirmative duty upon the Executive.

For a long while I have been very much disturbed about the stretching of the precedents in reference to amendments of limitation being held in order upon appropriation bills the only limiting words of the amendment being "no part of this appropriation shall be used," and so forth, the balance of the amendment imposing some new duty upon an official of the executive branch of the Government, compelling him to do or not to do something not provided for by existing law.

I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that under the guise of a limitation this amendment imposes an affirmative duty upon the Executive. Without regard to what decision the Chair may make today, sometime in the near future we must give serious consideration to how far mere words of limitation at the outset of an amendment can be deemed sufficiently limiting to warrant holding in order an amendment which in effect imposes affirmative duties upon some agency of the executive branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has offered an amendment to be added at the end of the paragraph on page 13. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made a point of order against it on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair calls the attention of the committee to the fact that the language attempted to be inserted by the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota really divides itself into two parts and in order that the Members may understand it the Chair will read the amendment for the information of the committee:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles sold at retail, which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor.

The Chair is of opinion that the first part of the amendment ending with the comma, were it offered alone, would be a limitation within the rules of the House and would not be subject to a point of order; but when the latter part is added, it goes beyond the point of a limitation and imposes upon the officials charged with the administration of this act certain affirmative duties and is subject to a point of order.

The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13, insert the following language: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, made such a vigorous argument on the point of order raised against my other amendment, which only sought to give the small independent merchants of the country a square deal in their struggle to live in competition with the chain stores, mail order houses, and the Government. I hope at some future time we may have an opportunity to consider the amendment, because if we do not pass such legislation before long most of the small retail merchants will be forced out of business by the O. P. A., and other governmental agencies.

The amendment that has just been read stops the O. P. A. from putting into operation orders requiring grade-labeling or the standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles. We have all gone through the fight on grade-labeling. All of you have heard about the standardization of hosiery and how the O. P. A. contemplates standardizing every garment, every food product, and all articles used by the civilian population. Here is one chance to stop bureaucrats in their mad scramble to reform and destroy business and agriculture.

We are fighting a war, and those of us in Congress and a large majority of the American people want to confine our efforts to winning the war. We should stop this attempt on the part of certain officials in Federal agencies of our Government in their determination to reform the business practices of our country. Let them get busy to help win the war.

That is all I have to say on the amendment. I think it is important for the salvation of our system of free enterprise in all lines of business.

I want to cite the illustration of one store in a community in my district, a clothing merchant, who sells a pair of overalls for $2, the ceiling price. His neighbor, a chain store next to him, sells the same overalls for $1.47. There is no reason why the man who operates the independent store should not have the same benefits as the owner of the chain store.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. As a matter of historic interest, over a century ago they did precisely the same thing, carried on the same type of regimentation in Japan we are now fighting.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about it. They want to label and standardize everything, do away with all brand and individuality of product so that there will be no difference between the suit of clothes that you have on and the one that the gentleman from Indiana may wear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Is it not true that the retail store that the gentleman speaks of that is required to sell the overalls at a ceiling price of $2 has to pay $1.58 for the same overalls that the chain store sells for $1.47?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct, and had my other amendment been approved, we would have corrected that situation.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Instead of the O. P. A. setting a seller ceiling price at wholesale on these items the gentleman speaks of it has violated the intent of the law and established a purchaser's fixed price, floor, and ceiling?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct. This particular amendment is directed more against the standardization and reform effort now being put into operation by the O. P. A., which most of the merchants and manufacturers of the country are objecting to. This is the only chance we will have to correct the situation because there will be no other opportunity for legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not also true that the blueprint for grade labeling was drawn a number of years ago in the T. N. E. C. hearings, and even though we may not have gotten into the war we would have had this thing foisted upon us? It is all right in that book, and if you would like to see it I will show it to anybody. It is right there.

The O. P. A. has repeatedly violated the spirit and intent of the price-control law. The law specifically provides against the issuance of regulations compelling changes in customary business practices. My amendment seeks to compel the O. P. A. to observe the law, and I therefore strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment proposes to give special privileges and a special status to certain commodities and thereby differentiate between them and other commodities. The chief vice of it, however, Mr. Chairman, is that it proposes to amend or rescind without mature consideration, without study or investigation established regulations of the Price Administration.

I trust the committee will leave the Office of Price Administration free to make its own regulations under conditions which permit accurate and authoritative information on the subject available. I hope the committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 124, noes 93.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 13, line 3, after the word "Office", change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs

on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, this amendment divides itself into two parts, commodities that have not yet reached parity and those that are not necessities.

As far as I am personally concerned, I see no reason on earth for O. P. A.'s meddling around with any commodity that is not a necessity. If I want to pay $100,000 or $500,000 for a painting, that is my business. Of course, that is a violent presumption; nevertheless, I use it as an illustration. So in this amendment I seek to throw out entirely from the control of O. P. A. any commodity that is not a necessity. Let that follow the legitimate channels of trade. I see no reason for interfering with business in that particular field.

Now we come to the food commodities, clothing commodities, and rent commodities, that are necessities. In relation to the food commodities I see no reason on earth for having any rollbacks on any food commodity that has not yet reached parity. What is the object of interfering, for instance, in my country with the dairy products and the canned vegetable products that have not yet reached parity? All you do by meddling with those food products is to decrease production. We are going to need food. I do not hesitate to go on record here and now by saying that next winter in the big cities we are going to have food riots.

We canned 20,000,000 cases of vegetables in Wisconsin last year. This year it will be at least 25 percent less than that. Too much interference, too much meddling, too much regulation by those who, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, have not had the slightest experience in the field they seek to regulate.

We are experiencing exactly the same thing now in our dairy products. Our production of cheese has fallen off very markedly. Our production of butter has fallen off. Yet we attempt and try again and again to encourage interference with these particular products by letting somebody who knows nothing about it set a regulation on them.

All I ask in this amendment is that they let these food products alone until at least they have reached parity.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much to say on this amendment. I think almost all of us are convinced as to how the vote is to go. On every one of the recent amendments there has been one solid vote on the other side of the aisle, irrespective of the merits of the proposition, as it appeared to me. Our friends to the left have decided that nobody but a big businessman can have anything to do with O. P. A. You could not have an intelligent professor; you could not have an intelligent man in any other line of work. By the amendment which you voted for unanimously, you have said that nobody is competent to hold a job who is not a big businessman and doing the job in the line he is assigned to. You voted solidly for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think my good friend from Kentucky wants to make a misstatement to that effect. There is such a thing as a little businessman who has some knowledge of a business, and there might be a possibility of the O. P. A.'s appointing a little businessman.

Mr. O'NEAL. Possibly I should not have used the word "big," but nobody but a businessman of long experience, and presumably successful experience.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It could be possible that a grocery clerk might know something about the grocery business, or someone else in that business who worked for an employer might know it.

Mr. O'NEAL. We just agreed to an amendment, which you over there voted for unanimously, providing that anyone who had anything to do with formulating a policy of any kind certainly had to be a businessman. You also voted for two or three other amendments here, which I doubt that I have time to discuss now, but which seem to me totally without logic and totally without reason whatsoever.

In this particular amendment we are again amending the O. P. A. law, the basic law. There is no question about it. You had a legislative committee which considered it a long time, and now you say by this amendment, if you vote for it, and I presume it will be voted for 100 percent on the other side, that irrespective of what the costs are, irrespective of the fact that the farmer or the laborer must get enough out of it to justify his furnishing his services or materials, if the price rises there is nothing you may do about it but let the consumer pay it. This amendment, as I understand, means that you could have no roll-back, you could not stop inflation, you could not stop prices nor reducing the cost to the consumer, which would be ruinous, in my opinion, to the farmer, the laborer, and the consumer.

A vote for this amendment is changing your O. P. A. law. It is making it impossible to stop inflation, it makes it impossible to control the price for the little man, the salaried man, for it is they who are suffering the most today. It is on the theory that there is nothing that we can do about it, and to let inflation come.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Kentucky, but I wonder if he really knows what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is trying to accomplish by his amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think I do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All he is trying to accomplish is not to roll back prices until they reach parity prices. I would not embarrass my good friend from Kentucky, but tobacco happens to be 195 percent of parity. I do not think that he would want me to roll back the price of tobacco 100 percent. All we are asking in the dairy business is not to roll back these prices below the parity price.

Mr. O'NEAL. To a point like that, which involves suffering and all that goes with it to the consumer, possibly to the farmer and to the laboring man. This is not the place to do it, by putting a limitation on an appropriation bill. It is not fair to all of those who have an interest in it. The gentleman thinks he is right, and he may be right about it, but I say it is not sound legislation, and it is not the proper thing for this Congress to write a law in that way. I think every group in this country in a time like this should not have its interest so lightly considered as to put a limitation on an appropriation bill and have us say, in effect, we will settle it so that nothing can be done about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 108, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 13, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the conduct of any program or the establishment of any price ceiling which will result in or has resulted in the curtailment of the production and processing of food."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, during the past months we have received a great deal of evidence on the floor of the House that the rulings, regulations, and actions of the O. P. A. were curtailing production of food—that they are destroying food. The best authorities agree that we are facing a food shortage. It is the duty of the O. P. A. to lend its influence toward the production of food and not toward curtailment and destruction of food. Vegetables and other foods rot in the field by the ton because of O. P. A. regulations. Dairy cows are sent to the slaughter because of prices fixed by the O. P. A. Dead cows do not give milk, but O. P. A. cannot understand that.

We need food and more food. Greater production is needed to feed our armed

forces, our allies, and ourselves. Anyone who seems to have his ear to the ground at all is aware of the fact that we are facing a great shortage of food. My amendment provides, in substance, that if the theories and practices of O. P. A. are such that they are going to destroy food that exists, or curtail its production or its processing, that O. P. A. should decide in favor of preserving and saving that food.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I happen to be one of those who has felt that the O. P. A., in fixing price ceilings, has gone too far in many instances, and in such manner has cut down production. But if I read the gentleman's amendment correctly, it would appear that administrative difficulties would arise.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it could be handled all right. The Food Administration is spending millions and millions of the people's dollars to produce food. This amendment is based on the position that if O. P. A. is destroying the production of food they should stop it.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree that the O. P. A. has, in many instances, been completely out of touch with the necessities of production. Production is of paramount necessity before the country, and we are all for it, but I am not agreed on the language and the breadth of the approach of your amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. The way to have cheap pork products for the consumer is to have more farmers produce a lot more pork. The O. P. A. seems to disregard that. They continually put into effect rules and regulations which curtail production, and the price goes up, we have black markets, and the situation grows worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to read this amendment for the benefit of the Committee:

> *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the conducting of any program or the establishment of any price ceiling which will result or has resulted in the curtailment of the production and processing of food.

All that amendment, if adopted, means is that you might just as well stop at this part of the amendment: "*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used." You might just as well stop there.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's conclusion is a little farfetched.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says it is a little farfetched. He does not say it is completely farfetched?

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman believe that the Office of Price Administration should go on and on destroying food?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] very pointedly brought to the attention of the Members just what the effect of this amendment would be. I repeat that if the gentleman had offered his amendment and used this language: "*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used," and had stopped there, he would have accomplished the same results as will be accomplished if this amendment is adopted. I do not think the House wants to go too far in adopting amendments. I do not want to get in the position of saying anything which might be construed as lecturing, because I do not like to be in that position, but I think the amendment goes entirely too far.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that this amendment goes too far. The Office of Price Administration has gone too far itself in curtailing the production of food by the way it has operated, but that would not excuse us for going too far on some things that we do. I appreciate the gentleman's sincerity, but I am afraid this amendment has too many possibilities for trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does not the gentleman feel it would effectively impose duties upon somebody to determine whether or not it would result?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Then why did not the gentleman make a point of order against the amendment, under the basis he expounded a little while ago? It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I would not want to say that. I do not want to substitute my opinion for the opinion of the occupant of the chair.

Mr. CASE. But the point was not raised.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that stage has passed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amendment was not subject to a point of order. It is clearly a limitation and under every rule of procedure it would be in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we will not discuss that. I am discussing the amendment. It goes too far and I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be of interest to the House at this time to be reminded of subsection (h) of section 2 of the Price Control Act.

That section reads as follows:

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

It so happens that I am the author of this provision and naturally have an interest in it.

The purpose of this provision is clear and distinct and there is no reason for there being any question as to exactly what was intended when it was made law.

Its specific purpose was to prevent the Office of Price Administration from interfering with the business practices, cost practices, or any other acts that were customarily in use in industry at the time of the passage of the act. The provision was designed specifically to limit the Office of Price Administration to the fixing of ceiling prices and to prevent it from changing any part of our economy.

Mr. Leon Henderson and David Ginsburg were strongly opposed to this provision when it was first offered by me in our committee, the Banking and Currency Committee. Notwithstanding this opposition it passed our committee unanimously and so far as I can recall had no opposition on the floor.

When it reached the Senate it was stricken by the Banking and Finance Committee. However, through the efforts of Senator VANDENBERG, with the permission of Senator Prentiss Brown, as I recall the debate, the provision was reinserted in the bill, with slight unimportant changes, and was then passed by the Senate.

We know that the O. P. A. has violated this provision right and left. It has wholly disregarded it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In my investigation and my contact with the officials of the Administration I have found this attitude, that they have utterly set aside and nullified subsection (h) of section 2 of the act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is ignored in their regulations, their interpretations, and in their enforcement of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct. I understand the statement has been made by one of the high officials of the O. P. A. that they felt they had to violate this section in order to enforce the Price Control Act.

Grade labeling, with which Mr. ANDRESEN's amendment deals, is only one of many violations of subsection (h) of section 2, the O. P. A. is undertaking.

If the O. P. A. would confine its work to what the law prescribes it would not need as much money as is requested in this appropriation measure.

The truth is the O. P. A. is using its legal powers and also grossly illegal powers in great measure to destroy private industry and set up a collectivist state.

This is felt by many Members of the House and has been given expression in the reduction of O. P. A. funds requested in this bill.

So that there can be no question as to the intended purposes of subsection (h) in section 2 of the Price Control Act,

I am herewith inserting, with the permission of the House, a copy of explanation I made of it in a letter to Mr. Ed Martin, secretary of the Ohio Newspaper Association, shortly after the Price Control Act became law.

Following is a copy of said letter:

FEBRUARY 11, 1942.

MR. ED. MARTIN,
Secretary, Ohio Newspaper Association:

The operation of subsection (h) of section 2 of the Price Control Act is intended to be comprehensive and broad in its scope.

The basic purpose of this provision is to limit the operation of the act to the placing of price ceilings, and to protect private competitive enterprise within the limits of such ceilings.

Once the ceiling on any commodity is fixed the concern producing it is free to carry on in the normal manner with respect to all of its "business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means, or aid to distribution."

Only in case of conduct which undertakes "circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act," shall there be any interference by the Price Administration.

To fully understand the latter phrase quoted above it must be read in connection with other provisions of the measure which are pertinent to it.

Business is free from interference in the management of its operating capital, setting up reserves for normal purposes, allocating funds for the various costs, etc.

Business may deem it essential under the disordered condition incident to the war to devote proportionately more than the usual amount of funds to one or another of its activities. It may be decided to be in its interest to spend more than usual, let us say, for advertising and less for some other purpose. In that event it would be permitted to do so.

This is important. Though the act provides that no license may be required as a condition of selling or distributing newspapers, periodicals, books, or other printed or written material, or motion pictures, or as a condition of selling radio time, this gives but meager protection to advertising. If there is to be adequate protection of advertising, as well as advertising selling agencies, it is necessary to safeguard advertising at its source—namely, the enterprise putting it out. This is one of the specific purposes of the subsection (h), section 2 of the price control bill.

Perhaps one of the most important activities of industry will be that of research. Great demand will in all likelihood be made upon practically all businesses to work out new methods of production and distribution. There is already great demand for substitutes which will likely increase as time goes on. With this provision an enterprise is free to devote proportionately more of its funds to the purpose of research.

Stated in a few words, the basic purpose of subsection (h) of section 2 of the price control bill is to confine its operation to the fixing of prices and to leave industry to run its own business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired on this paragraph.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Civilian Defense, including salary of the Director at not to exceed $10,000 per annum; traveling expenses (not to exceed $550,000); and printing and binding (not to exceed $200,000); $4,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to say that I believe that the cut in the appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense is a mistake. My reason, briefly, is as follows:

The Budget cut what the O. C. D. originally asked for by about three and a quarter million dollars. The committee cut another one and three-quarter millions off that amount.

What does this mean? The cut itself is more than the $1,600,000 which is the amount that the O. C. D. has been spending for what are called war services. What are those? The war services are things like maintaining the air raid wardens' organizations, a little equipment for them, and things like that.

There are 11,000,000 American citizens who have volunteered their services for one type of war work or another in connection with the program of the O. C. D., men and women like those who have volunteered to work at rationing boards; they are doing salvage work, some of them; they are taking care of children for working mothers, and they are doing any and everything they can find or that the O. C. D. can find in the local communities throughout the country to try to help win this war. Those people are not getting paid. Those are voluntary services, but there have to be a few people and a limited amount of expenditure in order to be able to recruit those people to put into effect such a program. This cut made by the committee is more than the amount of all that work.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to compliment the gentleman for his very excellent statement. What this cut will actually mean is that if any drives come up for salvage or for other things connected with the war, that would have to be set up on a Nation-wide scale, these 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 volunteers who have been working will have been disbanded and there will have to be set up a more expensive organization to supply that service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. That is what I am afraid of. And such organizations, as the gentleman has suggested, will have to recruit people for voluntary service, and each one will have the expense of going out and getting volunteer workers whereas heretofore all such work has been centered in the O. C. D. I do not think that ought to be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman be good enough to ask the chairman of the committee how much unexpended balance remains available for the O. C. D.? I do not find an explanation of that in the hearings.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will be glad to have that question asked of the chairman of the committee; I do not have the information.

I am afraid of what will happen under the circumstances. I do know these people have volunteered their services to help with the war effort and they may feel that Congress does not appreciate what they have been doing. I think it would be a very serious thing for such an interpretation to be placed on the action of the House.

Because of the temper of the House perhaps it would not be wise for me to offer an amendment. But I am very hopeful that the other body will have better judgment about the amount required than has been shown here.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the O. C. D.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have glanced through the hearings on the Office of Civilian Defense, in which I have been very much interested, and I think that the committee is to be congratulated on its recommendation to reduce the expenses of this organization by some $1,600,000. This reduction, to quote the committee, will "require severe curtailment, if not complete elimination, of the civilian war services."

I do not think that the gentlemen of this House appreciate just what type of an organization the O. C. D. was becoming, and would continue to be, if it had the funds it sought.

Now the O. W. I. in its domestic propaganda tells us that every block in every German city has its block leader, and each block leader makes inspections in every home to make certain that there are no violations of the law, and so forth.

This same block system in Germany collects funds whenever the Fuehrer needs public contributions.

Gentlemen, the O. C. D. has been striving to set up a block system in this country which would go into every home in the land, carrying political propaganda under the guise of official war facts.

What are the thoughts of these men who are directing the so-called civilian war services?

Mr. Chairman, two of the appointed executives of this O. C. D. had the unmitigated gall to refer to elected officials as Little Ceasars, and one of them, a Mr. Lackey, from New England, the home territory of Mr. Landis, said this:

> I know these Little Ceasars and I know that they can be "bottlenecks." Believe me, if you have a good live information committee, with a few genuine liberals, they will break these bottlenecks, and pretty quick.

Now, gentlemen, this country has come to a pretty pass when appointed employees on the Federal pay roll make such statements about elected officials. Nor is this the only questionable statement by such employees. This same Mr.

Lackey is quoted as telling other O. C. D. employees:

I think we are eager for the comradeship of fellow travelers in the transition to the extent that I find in the minds of people that are hungry to just not listen, but to raise the question that comes in their minds that they see that need.

Here we see that these people who are officials in the war-service section are eager for the comradeship of fellow travelers.

Once more I say that the committee is to be congratulated in recommending the curtailment of such activities.

This block system apparently has already been functioning in many parts of the country just as these gentlemen proposed. In Chicago, a city of Kelly-Nash fame, which operates some of the affairs of the Nation from the cellars of its auditoriums, apparently is operating successfully in the eyes of these fellow travelers. The morale section holds its meetings in the city hall. They are attended by 450 people. Let me quote what the O. C. D. man reports on this matter. He says that these people—

represent those who are most able to carry on the programs and ideas down into the communities, and finally into the blocks. They have begun on parallel programs in the community. In the blocks, of course, they have always had discussion meetings. The block leader is a type of executive. He is leading on his neighbors.

Need I emphasize that too much he is leading on his neighbors. I leave it to your imagination, gentlemen, just what Kelly-Nash executives would be leading on their neighbors.

But I most heartily congratulate the gentlemen of this committee for what they have done in exposing this type of personnel in what is supposed to be a nonpolitical organization, helping to bring a speedy victory so that our boys may come back home at the very earliest moment.

A year ago we had to step in and abolish fan dancing. This year we have had to step in and banish fellow travelers.

I hope that those people who are running O. C. D. will in the future confine their efforts and the expenditure of Federal funds to civilian defense. When they do that we can be assured that our boys will soon be marching home again triumphantly.

If this organization would spend less time propagandizing, which, after all, is the prerogative of O. W. I., perhaps it could do a better job on civilian defense, and see that the hose sent to the various cities fitted onto the hydrants for which they were meant. A little more concentration on civilian defense would also release needed manpower for essential war services, and I don't mean such civilian activities as the block system of our fellow travelers who would like to break our elected officials while our boys are facing the firing line in all parts of the world.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to see if we can have an agreement on limitation of debate?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, does that include 5 minutes to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he will answer the question asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] in due course?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I did not understand the gentleman's question at the time, but I have since learned he asked if there was any unexpended balance left in O. C. D. funds. There are none.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have risen to speak against the domestic propaganda program of the Office of War Information. At the opening of the debate today my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], an able and distinguished legislator, made the suggestion that those with constructive ideas would be well received by the committee which presented this bill to the House, and I present these ideas now as constructive suggestions to the work of the Office of War Information.

Thousands upon thousands of tons of canned literature and propaganda have been sent out for home consumption by the Office of War Information. This propaganda has been sent to every State in the Union, Mr. Chairman; it has come into my home State; it has come into every other Southern State. This domestic propaganda has in many cases, in the South especially, been sent to the county agents whose work is already heavy, whose duties are already burdensome on account of the war, but who have been compelled to distribute this domestic propaganda amongst our people, and thus perform a duty entirely foreign to their normal service to the Government.

Much of this literature, Mr. Chairman, that has found its way into our areas is designed, so they say, to promote better racial conditions in the South. All of the propaganda I have seen has been directed toward the purpose of instilling more patriotism and more loyalty into the people of America in support of their own Government in this war. Mr. Chairman, I say it is the people of America who are backing this war with their taxes, with their efforts, with their sacrifices, and with their own sons on the battle fronts. I submit to this body that there is no need for propaganda to evoke loyalty from our people; there is no need for this type of literature to try to rouse the zeal and the patriotism of our own people in the United States of America. In fact, I have thought if there is to be any literature sent to arouse the loyalty or the patriotism of anyone, it might be a good idea for some of our red-blooded American citizens back home to send literature to the Office of War Information to raise the character of the service rendered by some of these individuals and to bring enthusiasm and patriotism to their work.

But more than this, Mr. Chairman. Tons of the propaganda which was sent into the South has been a distinct hindrance to the war effort. It has dealt with the racial question. When it has fallen into the hands of the Negro, it has merely emphasized the racial question. When it has reached the hands of the white people of the South, it has resulted in friction, racial disturbances, and riots. At a time when unity is fervently desired by our people in order to win the war, this propaganda has opened the gap between two races of people living side by side in the South peacefully for 200 years, and has brought in distrust and discord. Goebbels, in all of his fiendish role, could not have desired a more perfect set-up than this which is being created in a land which believes unity is desperately needed to win this war.

Mr. Chairman, the money which we are spending on domestic propaganda is wasted money. I hope this Congress will eliminate it from this bill.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (hereafter referred to as the Coordinator), including not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; travel expenses, not to exceed $150,000; printing and binding, not to exceed $12,500; entertainment of officials and others of the other American republics; payment to employees with official headquarters outside the continental limits of the United States, in accordance with the Standardized Regulations prescribed by the President on December 30, 1942, of living and quarters allowances; grants of money or property to governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics; the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio scripts, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture scripts, motion-picture films, educational material, and such material and equipment as the Coordinator may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out his program; such other gratuitous assistance as the Coordinator deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; expenses of transporting employees of the Office of the Coordinator and their effects from their homes to their places of employment in the other American republics, or from their homes in the other American republics to their places of employment, and return, when specifically authorized by the

Coordinator; travel expenses of dependents and transportation of personal effects, from their places of employment to their homes in the United States or in the possessions of the United States or in the other American republics, of employees for whom such expenses were paid by the Government on their assignment to posts in foreign countries; causing corporations to be created under the laws of the District of Columbia, any State of the United States, or any of the other American republics, to assist in carrying out the Coordinator's program and capitalizing such corporations: *Provided*, That corporations heretofore or hereafter created or caused to be created by the Coordinator primarily for operation outside the continental United States shall determine and prescribe the manner in which their obligations shall be incurred and their expenses allowed and paid without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure, accounting for and audit of Government funds, and may, in their discretion, employ and fix the compensation of officers and employees outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the provisions of law applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That the Coordinator shall transmit to the President immediately upon the close of the fiscal year a complete financial report of the operations of such corporations; $30,685,000, and in addition thereto the Coordinator is authorized to enter into contracts during the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 in an amount not exceeding $18,000,000 for obligations necessary for and incident to his program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $300,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Coordinator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Coordinator is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of such radio stations and facilities, from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, request for the C. I. A. A. amounts to $33,860,000, plus $18,000,000 in contract authorizations as compared with about $37,000,000 in appropriations, plus $20,000,000 unexpended balance from the President's emergency funds for the current fiscal year. The committee recommendation amounts to $30,685,000, plus $18,000,000 in contract authorizations or $3,175,000 less than the Budget, the reduction being referred to in some detail in the committee report.

The C. I. A. A. has spent some $75,000,000 since its creation in 1940. I think that money has been spent which it would have been wiser not to spend. I think that projects and programs have been embarked upon which it would have been better not to embark upon. I think in the past there has been a very considerable duplication of effort.

The committee has been greatly impressed, however, with much of the work which has been done. All of our American sister republics, with one exception, have either severed relations or actually declared war on the Axis Powers. Economic assistance for the war effort and mutual understanding has been furthered.

Furthermore, the committee has been advised that all cultural projects have now been turned over to the State Department. Joy rides for the Ballet Caravan, the Woodwind Quintet, the Yale Glee Club, and the South American Skiers will henceforth be subject to the tender mercies of the Secretary of State.

The appropriation provides for continued radio, news, and motion picture programs on a reduced basis; for a so-called basic-economy program for 2 years, including health and sanitation, food supply and a limited amount of economic rehabilitation; and for a joint educational program to the extent of $2,500,000. I shall go along with the committee recommendation.

Particular attention is called to the fact that Mr. Rockefeller indicates that he does not intend to request any more money for the basic economy program, that he hopes to put health, food supply, and education on a basis which can be continued without further financial assistance from this country and that he estimates for 1945 a request for an appropriation of $25,000,000, $18,000,000 of which will be used to liquidate contract obligations, or about 50 percent of the request now under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Transportation, including traveling expenses (not to exceed $1,250,000, including reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for official travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations); printing and binding (not to exceed $250,000, including not to exceed $10,000 for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to provisions of law governing printing and binding (44 U. S. C. 111)); $14,650,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last words.

Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to bring to the attention of the House the fact as I have learned it from the Director of Defense Transportation that in the transporting of troops by Pullman car the Army troops are carried three to a section but the Navy is carried only two to a section. I know of no reason for this discrimination, nevertheless it exists. If they want to save transportation space the Navy can assign three to a section the same as the Army does.

Following are my letters to Mr. Eastman and his reply on this subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1943.

MR. JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director, Office of Defense Transportation, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EASTMAN: I have been informed that in the movement of Army personnel by Pullman, Army enlisted men travel three to the section, whereas Navy men, including Marines, travel two to a section.

Will you kindly confirm the truth or otherwise of that statement?

With my highest esteem, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: The loading arrangement for Army and Navy personnel as outlined in your letter of June 8 is correct, this being in accordance with travel regulations of the War and Navy Departments, respectively.

An effort has been made to secure modification of the Navy Department regulations so as to permit more favorable loading in line with the practice followed by the Army, but without success.

With all good wishes, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Information, including the employment of a Director and Associate Director at not exceeding $12,000 and $10,000 per annum, respectively; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment in the United States of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the provisions of law applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States; travel expenses (not to exceed $500,000 for travel within the continental limits of the United States), including such expenses outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act and section 901 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2015); expenses of transporting employees and their effects from their homes to their places of employment in a foreign country and return to the United States; purchase of radio time and purchase or rental of facilities for radio transmission, purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission, including real property, outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to the provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255) and other provisions of law affecting the purchase or rental of land and the construction of buildings thereon; advertising in foreign newspapers without regard to section 3828, Revised Statutes (44 U. S. C. 324); printing and binding (not to exceed $2,400,000, for such expenses within the continental limits of the United States), including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States with-

out regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, printing, duplicating, communication, and other machines, equipment, and devices; payment to employees with official headquarters outside the continental limits of the United States in accordance with the Standardized Regulations prescribed by the President on December 30, 1942, of living and quarters allowances; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651, Revised Statutes; purchase of 24 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States, may be acquired without regard to statutory limitations as to price and authority to purchase; acquisition, production, and free distribution of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, motion-picture films, photographs and pictures, educational materials, and such other items as the Director may deem necessary to carry out the program of the Office of War Information, and sale or rental of such items by contract or otherwise to firms or individuals for use outside the continental limits of the United States; such gratuitous expenses of travel and subsistence as the Director deems advisable in the fields of education, travel, radio, press, and cinema; not to exceed $145,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries; payment of the United States share of the expenses of the maintenance, in cooperation with any other of the United Nations, of an organization designed to receive and disseminate information relative to the prosecution of the war; $34,472,504: *Provided*, That, exclusive of amounts for unvouchered funds and the contingency fund, not more than $22,500,000 (including living and quarters allowances) shall be allocated to the Overseas Operations Branch and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Office of War Information is authorized in making contracts for the use of international shortwave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities, from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $600,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That $5,000,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall determine that such funds in addition to the other funds provided herein are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 26, line 6, after the word "branch", strike out the following words in lines 6 and 7: "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes, 7 minutes in all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we hope to be able to dispose of this paragraph with 10 minutes on a side in addition to the time allowed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate be restricted to 25 minutes beyond the time already allowed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my pending amendment by striking out in line 2, page 26, the sum of $5,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's request to strike out of line 4, page 26, the sum $22,500,000?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; $5,500,000 from the total amount of the bill allowed for the O. W. I.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desires to strike out the sum of $34,472,504 and reduce that by the sum of $5,500,000, and he seeks to strike out lines 4 to 6?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Page 26, line 2, strike out "$34,472,504" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,472,504", and on page 26, line 6, after the word "branch", insert a period and strike out the following words in lines 6 and 7 "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operation of the branch."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; that is not correct. "No money shall be allocated to the domestic branch." I wish to take $5,500,000 from the bill and provide that no amount shall be allocated to the domestic branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the correct amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Page 26, line 2, strike out "$34,472,504" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,972,504" and in line 6, after "branch", strike out the following: "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch", and insert the words "no funds shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that when the unanimous agreement was made limiting time it was in connection with the previous amendment that is entirely different from the amendment that the gentleman now offers. I know that the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Missouri would not want to take the Committee by surprise. It is possible that if the unanimous consent request was made to limit debate to the time it has been, objection might have been made if the amendment had been offered that the gentleman intended to offer. If Members later on desire to speak on this and they ask unanimous consent in the Committee of the Whole I hope the Committee will be tolerant because Members might have objected to the limit on this amendment where they would not on the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered and which was modified by unanimous consent would have the effect of striking from the sum total of the appropriation provided in the bill for the Office of War Information $5,500,000 and would place a limitation upon the bill to the effect that none of the funds herein appropriated shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch.

Surely the committee handling the bill will not take umbrage at this amendment, for they cut $12,000,000 plus from the amount recommended by the Budget due to the fact they were not satisfied the amount asked for was needed nor were they satisfied with the efficiency and efficacy of the operations of the Office of War Information as evidenced by their action in cutting the appropriation for domestic operations by over $3,000,000 or 37 percent. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people who when this month shall have rolled into history will have appropriated through their Congress more than $300,000,000,000 for war purposes since the 1st day of July 1940; who have through their Congress voted to tax themselves in unprecedented amounts to say that we do not know why we are fighting in this war. The type and character of the domestic propaganda foisted upon the American people through publications printed and distributed at Government expense by the Office of War Information is a stench to the nostrils of a democratic people. The character and context of the propaganda foisted upon our people by the media of the radio and the screen insult the intelligence of an average 6-year-old.

It is an insult to the patriotism and the sacrifices of the Members of this body and of the American people, whose brothers and whose sons have fallen from the skies in flaming combat, whose sons and whose brothers have gone down to the bottom of the sea with flags flying and guns blazing to await the resurrection call, and to the hundreds of thousands of others who will answer the last call when we invade Europe and roll back the armies of the Axis on a thousand battlefields to say they do not know what we are fighting for until they are told what and why by the Office of War

Information under the direction of Mr. Elmer Davis, of the American Labor Party.

It is more than a waste of public funds to permit the Office of War Information to spend $5,500,000 to inform the American people why we are at war and how to win it, when we have the only free and untrammeled press in the world to give us the facts without colorization or distortion. We should thank God in our daily prayers for America's free press. It is the strongest guardian of our liberty. When it is controlled by the Government our democracy will perish.

I affirm my faith in the accuracy, character, and truth of the information furnished concerning the conduct of the war and our domestic policies by the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, and newspapers of their kind. I have confidence in the character and ability of the fine, patriotic American citizens who sit in the press galleries of the House and Senate to furnish the American people with the truth and all the information available on the happenings here. I have confidence in their discretion in handling items from the War and Navy Departments. I prefer my information through a free and uncontrolled press on all phases of life in free America.

Mr. Chairman, America needs no Goebbels sitting in Washington to tell the American press what to publish or the American people why we are in the war, or to give us a colored interpretation of any domestic program. America needs no Virginio Gayda sitting in Washington, D. C., to hand down tinged news of a domestic program or to tell us how or why we should think or act or attempt to influence our thoughts and our actions.

I submit to you that the Office of War Information with its distinct state socialistic tinge has no business telling me or any other American citizen who has sons and brothers engaged in this great conflict why we are at war or how we should look upon domestic programs established by the Congress or set up by Executive fiat in the numerous bureaus and agencies in Washington, D. C.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is making a very impressive and impassioned appeal, as he always does, and he is very persuasive. The gentleman by his amendment cuts out all funds whatsoever from the Office of War Information for domestic use?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Correct.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. By that token, we shall have no agency whatever in the Government through which the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the State Department, or the other agencies vitally connected with the war may clear and coordinate their war announcements. Some of those war announcements, as the gentleman very well knows because he has had service not only as a distinguished veteran but on the Committee on Military Affairs, have to be timed. Some of them have to be withheld in the interest of our cause. They have to be coordinated. I can agree with a great deal the gentleman says about the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but it strikes me that we must have some medium, some agency. The gentleman does not leave anything; he wipes all of that out. If this becomes law, everything will be wide open to the press. The newsman can get any story he wants and let it go.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We have the Office of Censorship provided for in this bill. I have confidence in the discretion and the integrity of the American press. I would prefer the judgment and the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Naval Operations, who are directing the fighting energies of America, as to the character and detailed information furnished concerning our military and naval operations. Certainly, if I trust them with the lives of my sons and brothers in the field of conflict, I can and will trust them concerning news items of the activities of their Departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama prevails we may as well tear out completely the provisions for the O. W. I. appropriation from this bill. It would completely sabotage all the good work that may be attributed to the O. W. I. In this gigantic effort of the war mistakes were bound to happen. All wisdom, all perfection could not reside in any official who would head the Office of War Information. Elmer Davis is not infallible. He has recognized his mistakes, he has corrected them. The country was pulling in all different directions. All conceivable selfish groups come down here—all manner and kinds of blocs—and they selfishly endeavor to feed upon the tragedy of this war for their own greed and self-aggrandizement. They strike at all branches of the administration—O. P. A., B. E. W., and O. W. I.

It is essential for the O. W. I. to coordinate information and to tell the people of the country not only something of these selfish groups but what the war is about. The country does not know completely and fully what the war is all about. The aims and the aspirations of the Allied Nations are unknown, unfortunately, to many benighted parts of this country. It is essential, it is very essential, by picture and story, through the movies, through the newspapers, and through the radio to tell the story to the Nation. Mr. Davis and a distinguished array of talented gentlemen are endeavoring to do just that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Just what parts of the country does the gentleman think are benighted? All the parts of the country with which I have had any contact know what the war is about.

Mr. CELLER. Let the gentleman not tempt me for fear that I might tell some places that the gentleman would not like to hear about.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman must speak from his own experience, because I have not found any part of the country that does not know what the war is about.

Mr. CELLER. However that may be, O. W. I. serves an essential purpose, but this particular amendment would destroy every reasonable purpose for which the O. W. I. was instituted.

Not only do we have the sad spectacle of amendments of this character offered, but the Appropriations Committee itself ripped out of O. W. I. appropriations almost $3,000,000 for overseas purposes. The O. W. I. asked for a contingent fund recommended by the Budget of $10,000,000, and it was cut to $5,000,000. I think that was a woeful cut, because as you know, prior to the invasion, any successful invasion, it is essential that pamphlets be distributed to the populace as was the case in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, to win its good will, and the work of the O. W. I. saved thousands of lives of our soldiers. It will be essential for the O. W. I. to do this same thing in the Balkans, in Italy, in Sicily, and it is essential, therefore, that appropriate funds be made available to the O. W. I. for that purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. The amendment does not put a limitation upon the use of funds in foreign propaganda. It is designed to stop propaganda in this country.

Mr. CELLER. I understand that, but one broomstick was put between the legs of the O. W. I. by the pruning done by the committee, and now we are trying to put another broomstick between its legs and the O. W. I. will have a weary time getting along in any respect.

There should have been set up a special contingency fund of sufficient size for the O. W. I. so that it could handle with appropriate secrecy the planning stage prior to the beginning of military operations in new territory and also the activities following after the military operations are under way. We are approaching that tense moment where much depends upon the effective weakening of the moral fibers of the Axis peoples and, on the other hand, the strengthening of neutral inclination in our direction. It may be that before June 30, 1944, the O. W. I. may be called upon to establish new outposts in France, Italy, southeastern Europe, Norway, Burma, the East Indies, and in large areas of China now occupied by the Japanese. It is impossible to estimate the cost at the present time of assembling, training, and equipping teams for these areas. It must be remembered that the cost of north African operations to date rose beyond $2,000,000 over and above the estimate for the total operating cost for the 7 months following October 18, 1942. Consider the work that must be done

in the operating of printing presses, the disseminating of news, in helping the Army carry on combat propaganda in demoralizing enemy troops.

The success of O. W. I. in the north African campaign is generally acknowledged. Why impede its work in other areas? Are they not of equal crucial significance?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. If I thought $1 of this $5,500,000 is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, or that the adoption of this amendment would in any way retard the war effort, I would oppose it.

It is generally agreed by those who know that by December 31, 1944, our national debt will be three hundred billion. The recent tax bill, according to report of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, will take from the American people in taxes this year thirty-eight billion, and the President is insisting that another tax bill be passed that will bring an additional sum of twelve billion, making fifty billion in taxes the American people will pay in a single year, and none of us know how many billions in obligations the administration has incurred. It is likely the war will last for some time after December 31, 1944, and our national debt will continue to pile up. It may finally go beyond three hundred and fifty billion.

Much has been said about what we would do for our boys when they return from the war. I always place the defenders of our country and their dependents first, and, of course, we cannot do too much for them. One thing we can do, and that is to prevent waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, cut out all nonessentials, and hold down the national debt as low as possible. This great national debt may not affect a person of your age and mine as our activities must come to a close long before our soldier boys'.

I am deeply concerned as to what our boys will find when they return home. In the recent tax bill we entered upon a program of retaining 20 percent of the salaries and wages of the millions employed in this country. There are indications before the war is over this heavy deduction from wages and salaries will be increased. The interest on this great debt will be a problem, and if we continue as we have, when our boys return home they will have deducted from their wages and salaries for many years perhaps as much as 25 percent. They, their children, and their children's children will carry this load for the next 50 to 100 years unless we repudiate. This lessens the opportunities of them and their families to advance in life and to enjoy the high American standard of living.

Most all of the money put in Savings stamps and bonds represents the toil and sweat of more than 40,000,000 workers and the toil and sweat of the American people for years to come. Every dollar necessary should be spent to win the war, but no dollar should be spent unless it can be justified as aiding in our war effort.

The Office of War Information, and the Agency affected especially by this $5,500,000 under Mr. Mellett, insist on this money to get properly before the American people the war news and the activities of the hundreds of departments, bureaus, commissions, and other Federal agencies that have sprung up and grown to huge proportions under the present administration. I am convinced that millions have been and are being used by this Bureau and by Mr. Mellett for purely propaganda purposes, to promote the fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt and the activities of the New Deal agencies, and to continue them in power for another 4 years.

I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and other prominent Democrats of this House who have approved this amendment, that this sum of money is not necessary or essential in fighting the war. We must fearlessly do our duty and save every dollar of burden to the American taxpayer and to the future generations of our country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who opposes this amendment, says this money is needed as there are some remote districts or rather benighted sections of this country that do not know about the war or what we are fighting for. They know all about this war in my district and in Kentucky and what we are fighting about and for, and I am satisfied the people of Mr. CELLER's district, in the great city of New York, with their great newspapers, radio stations, and radios know about the war and what we are fighting about and for. In practically every family of this Nation there is some father, son, daughter, cousin, nephew, or uncle in our armed service. All of these families know about this war. Anyhow, whatever information Mr. Davis or Mr. Mellett, of the O. W. I., give out it must come through the War and Navy Departments. I would rather take my information from the reports put out by the War and Navy Departments and by the many able and disinterested radio broadcasting stations and the newspapers. They are less biased than Mr. Davis and Mr. Mellett. They do not owe their jobs to Mr. Roosevelt or to any of his departments, bureaus, or commissions, and most of them are not interested in perpetuating Mr. Roosevelt in office or continuing the New Deal in power.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that in every nook and corner of this country, in the window of every home, there is a service flag with a star on it, all the way from 1 to 6 or 10 to 12, representing the number of that family in the armed service?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why, yes; but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who is a New Deal partisan, wants some excuse for being for this agency. This is a useless, wasteful expenditure of the people's money, and the gentleman from New York ought to get up some better excuse than that which he offers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Was it not rather humiliating for the Congress of this country to get our information regarding the war from Mr. Churchill, who told us things that we had not heard about in our own newspapers probably because the opinion had been stressed to Mr. Churchill that we ought to know about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Davis no doubt had not consulted Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CASE. If there is a service flag in every window, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has said, I am wondering if the gentleman from Kentucky thinks there is anything that could be put out by this Bureau of War Information that would make the people any more informed about the war?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Certainly not. We are all tired of wasting money for this political propaganda.

FOURTH TERM AND POWER

There is no doubt in the mind of any well-informed person on the political situation in this country that Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate for the fourth term. Mr. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, having projected Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy some months ago, later on urged we have a short campaign in 1944. That was followed up by a statement of the First Lady of the land, Mrs. Roosevelt, on June 15, 1943, in which she delivered herself as follows:

> Of course, I think it would be a great step forward if the Government allowed all candidates to spend exactly the same amount and give them so much time on the radio and so much newspaper-advertising space and so much gas for traveling and actually meeting the people. It would be a good thing if this expense came out of our taxes.

For more than 11 years the administration has regimented, by use of patronage, the taxpayers' money, and other blandishments, agriculture, labor, and industry. Now, the First Lady of the land would regiment candidates and political parties, the radios, newspaper-advertising space, and the amount of money and gas expended and used in traveling to actually meet the people, and she said it would be a good thing if this expense came out of our taxes.

Mr. Davis, of the O. W. I., with the millions at his command and the power given him, exercises tremendous influence over the radios, newspapers, picture shows, and so forth, and Mr. Mellett, as supervisor of the radios, newspapers, propaganda issued by all the departments and agencies of the Government, and the picture shows of the country, has tremendous power. He, like Mr. Davis, is a strong new dealer. He, like Mr. Davis, will use these instrumentalities, in my opinion, to accomplish the ambitions of the President for a fourth term and continue the New Deal in power, with its 3,008,000 officeholders, and the policies, regulations, and directives of these New Deal agencies and activities.

This $5,500,000 will carry with it the control over radios, the picture shows,

and all this propaganda, and will become a tremendous force and power in political campaigns that are ahead of us. It would mean the administration through these agencies could secure, as they have in the past, millions and millions of dollars of free publicity from the press and from all the departments and agencies of the Government and this propaganda put out to mislead and deceive the American people as to the true facts and conditions of their Government and the economic life of the Nation, and I am not surprised to see the stalwarts of the New Deal fighting tooth and toenail against the Starnes amendment to keep this $5,500,000 in the bill, together with the control that would give to the administration of millions and millions of dollars of free advertising.

Of course, these agencies would not be at the disposal of the opponent of the President or his party. His close friends and associates would be in charge of all this. It would all be put out, as it has been, under the guise of aiding the war. Through the films of the various picture shows of the Nation that are run free for the Government tens of millions of people would be reached every week, and these films are shown at factories, parent-teachers associations, student bodies, and they do not overlook a bet in getting this free stuff before the people of the Nation. The President has access to the press a private citizen would not have. If he makes a purely partisan political speech yet it is carried by all the papers with the President's picture and also by radio. If he makes a partisan political appeal witih a Nation-wide hook-up, and if this amendment is not agreed to, the press, the radios, and the shows will be used to promote the fourth term and the candidates approved by the President and his New Deal associates.

Of course, the candidacy for a fourth term has been going on and will continue unabated until November 1944. It was clever of Mr. Walker in urging the Republicans to make a short campaign, and it was exceedingly clever of Mrs. Roosevelt to limit the amount of space any candidate could use on the radio and in the newspapers and the amount of money to be expended for traveling. In addition to the other advantages, the President has at his disposal $35,000 annually of the taxpayers' money for traveling expenses and speech making, and it was very natural for the First Lady of the Land to suggest that expenses of candidates be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The New Deal has been doing that in every election since 1933. They have spent billions and billions on some form or other of benefits or relief, and the voters in primaries and in final elections have been browbeaten and intimidated and in many instances made to believe they would lose these benefits if they did not support the candidates of the New Deal.

This $5,500,000 would be used in an attempt to popularize the New Deal and their policies and to promote the political fortunes of the New Deal candidates. The administration does not lose an opportunity in expending the taxpayers' money to try to influence the voters to back up the New Deal, its candidates, and policies.

We are fighting a great war. The fourth term should not have been projected into this situation. I propose to fight to eliminate every dollar that will not promote our war effort and benefit the American people. Mr. Mellett knows how to put the heat on. Some time ago he sent a letter to the picture producers in which he demanded the O. W. I. "receive copies or synopses of all stories which you contemplate producing and of the finished scripts." He undertakes to censor the pictures. This demand created consternation among the motion-picture producers of the Nation. A typical reaction is that of Mr. Walter Wanger, president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, one of Hollywood's most distinguished motion-picture producers, who wrote in the current issue of Public Opinion:

> These requests cause apprehension inside the industry. Outside editors generally took the position that a threat to freedom of speech in one medium affected all. The conclusion is logical and sums the national mind. Censorship before utterance is abhorrent to Americans who believe that autocracy can have no deadlier weapon than a blue pencil.

The power of Mr. Davis and Mr. Mellett is such that they have been able to secure the endorsement of their program by some of the picture producers of the country. These men have the power under their regulations to make or break most any picture producer. If their efforts were confined solely and only to the war effort and in trying to win the war instead of trying to win the election in 1944, it would be different.

Millions of dollars have been used annually to get out propaganda matter by the great multitude of bureaus, commissions and other agencies of the Government, which is sent out to the American people attempting to glorify the countless regulations and directives of these agencies, oppressing the American people and confusing the economic life of the Nation, and cutting down instead of aiding production and hindering rather than helping the war effort.

Believing that this $5,500,000 will be used for political purposes and to promote the fourth term of the President and a continuance of the bureaucratic control in Washington and the unwise policies of the New Deal, I am against this item in the appropriations bill, and I hope it will be eliminated.

I was glad to be present and have an opportunity to cut thirty-five million from the O. P. A. appropriations and to require persons in that agency to have the qualifications necessary to do a sensible, practicable, and reasonable job, and to vote for amendments that will cut out a lot of the confusion and hardships of rationing. The American people are willing to undergo any hardship that is necessary to win the war, but they do not desire their lives and businesses wrecked by a lot of impractical crackpots who find lodgment by the hundreds of thousands in these New Deal agencies of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take away anything from any agency that is necessary in the war effort. I want the various agencies of government to have such funds as will contribute to the war effort. It is well to examine an appropriation in that light at this time. We are dealing here with domestic propaganda.

I fail to see where it will help the war effort to fill our own land here with all sorts of propaganda. Propaganda probably has a proper place, but surely it has not come to the point that we need to flood the Nation with it. Its proper place is in foreign lands, not here.

Our people at home are making every sacrifice. They are toiling early and late. They have seen their sons and daughters march off to war, to foreign lands, some never to return. The fathers, mothers, and wives do not need Elmer Davis to remind them of the sacrifices they are already making. Do the men and women in the military and naval services need Elmer Davis, a member of the radical American Labor Party in New York, to tell them about the war? My sons overseas do not need this man to tell them about the war. They know, and millions of others also know. The ridiculous part of it is that much of this propaganda is being prepared in this office by and under the supervision of aliens, some of whom have been here only a short time, telling our people in America what they should do, and so forth.

Elmer Davis, instead of helping the war effort domestically, I think, is hurting it. The propaganda which he has put out in the form of pamphlets and otherwise has done a great deal to foment unrest, to create disunity, and to make the minority problem worse, much worse. His propaganda stuff has hurt the South. We have a serious racial problem in this Nation. We in the South understand that problem and know best how to deal with it. We understand the psychology of the race problem. Davis had 2,500,000 copies of a certain pamphlet printed and sent everywhere. This was done with the taxpayers' money. This pamphlet undertook to glorify one race in the war. We in the South wish to encourage that race. We are the best friends of that race. But such propaganda raises a race issue, which ought to be kept down. We want unity in this country. All over this country now we are having race riots, even in the North, and the type of propaganda which the O. W. I. has been sending out certainly does not hold that situation down. I tell you as a father, who has his all in this war, that we do not want anything that will create disunity. I therefore plead with you to have this stopped. For God's sake, give us unity in this country and let us get on with the war.

Now, I do not favor stopping the O. W. I. I think it can do some effective foreign propaganda. I only favor cutting out the domestic propaganda, because we do not need it and it will do more harm than good. Mr. Davis is a capable man. If he can help win the war by propagandizing abroad, I am for it, but do not flood our American homes with

stuff that we do not want. Let him send all the propaganda he wants to the Arabs, Italians in Italy, and anybody else over there, if it will do good.

Now, as to his news here. What is wrong with the Army and Navy giving out their own statements? They have press sections and skilled newsmen in them. They know what the facts are. No one can say it will hurt the war effort to let them do it. They did it in the First World War, I am informed. Do we need to spend millions and millions of the taxpayers' money to have another agency duplicate the very work which the War and Navy Departments are prepared to do?

I stand ready to give the O. W. I. all the money it needs for its foreign activity, propaganda and all. I am ready to give them all the money domestically which they need for administrative and necessary purposes which will contribute to the war effort. But I do not think we ought to chuck millions and millions of the taxpayers' money into useless, and even in many cases hurtful, domestic propaganda. I am, therefore, supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, although I think it goes too far. Whatever is absolutely necessary for the domestic function, I want the O. W. I. to have. By voting for this amendment, we can place the matter where they can put in the bill such money as can be used wisely and profitably on the domestic front. The conferees can handle that. But a favorable vote on the amendment will let the O. W. I. know that we want to put a stop to useless, costly, and even hurtful, domestic propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. I did not reserve any time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, to a new Member it is rather disheartening to witness the spectacle that has taken place in this Chamber this afternoon. I want to tell you Members on the floor that for some time I have been chairman of the speakers' committee on civilian defense back home, in a Republican State, as a Democrat. As chairman of that committee I have gone over and distributed, on countless occasions, pamphlets which were prepared by the Office of War Information, and it would do the Members of this body an awful lot of good if they would only read them.

The next thing I want to say is, in my judgment as a Member, and as a new Member, that the Elmer Davis you are here maligning has the confidence and the respect of the American people. I also want to say that I believe the real purpose here is to snipe at the Commander in Chief in the conduct of the war effort on the domestic front.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. In just a minute, please.

I would like to say that regardless of how you vote here today, to the American people I believe the conduct of the domestic part of Mr. Davis' war information program has been informative, instructive, inspirational, and absolutely essential to the successful conduct of the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to believe that this amendment is offered seriously. It is to be hoped that the committee will not take it seriously.

It is difficult to believe its purport is fully appreciated. It wipes out absolutely collaboration with everything in the continental United States—newspapers, radio, and motion pictures—upon which we must depend to control and create sentiment in this war.

We have the cooperation, to an extraordinary extent, of the American press. We have gratifying cooperation from the motion-picture industry. I have here a telegram which has just been handed to me from Will Hays, president of the Motion Picture Distributors Association, indicating the warm cooperation of the motion-picture industry as follows:

JUNE 18, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I note in report on hearings of your Committee on the War Agencies appropriation bill the inclusion of certain criticisms of the operations of the Office of War Information as they relate to the motion-picture industry. The effect of this is to suggest that Office of War Information has attempted to unduly influence the content of American motion pictures.

I speak from the best of information when I say that this view is not that of the industry. We have been greatly pleased by the understanding shown by the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information and by the complete lack of any effort on its part to dominate our operations. The industry on its own initiative offered to cooperate completely with the Government in the war effort, and the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information has aided our efforts to make our cooperation 100 percent effective. I know the motion-picture industry's feeling is one of genuine appreciation for the service being rendered to the industry.

WILL H. HAYS,
President, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association.

Mr. Chairman, we are receiving just as generous and patriotic cooperation from other avenues of publicity. For example, it may be noted that we are receiving, through cooperation with O. W. I., $142,711,000 worth of free radio service every year. I hope we can take a sober second thought on this amendment. It is difficult to imagine anything more serious in its effect upon the war effort.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman in his remarks earlier mentioned the fact of control of the press and moving pictures. The gentleman, I am sure, meant coordination of the information which they release.

Any Member of the House who knows anything about this knows that there is no effort of censorship in the Office of War Information; it is a coordinating agency; it undertakes to coordinate the releases from the different departments, but there is no effort, in spite of the hysteria which my remarks created, on the part of the Office of War Information to control the press. No one would vote for that, but what it undertakes to do is to coordinate war information, the releases by the war agencies, and it is not a censorship office as the gentleman referred to in his observation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman is correct. I said control when I should have said cooperation. The provision for censorship is carried in another item in the bill providing for the Office of Censorship under the direction of Director Byron Price. The Office of War Information is even more important because while censorship is largely self-enforcing, the dissemination of information vital to the war effort is an even more exacting and arduous activity. To quote Mr. Davis in his testimony before the committee, it is "an auxiliary to the armed forces whose effectiveness has been recognized by military commanders all the way down from Julius Caesar to General Marshall." The director submitted to the committee two personal letters from General Marshall strongly commending the Office of War Information and expressing appreciation of the invaluable service it has rendered.

Mr. Chairman, a vote to destroy that service is in effect a vote to handicap our armed forces by denial of a valuable and appreciated service.

The amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, since it was modified, be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 156 and noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Smaller War Plants Corporation, administrative expenses: Not to exceed $12,006,000 of the funds of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, acquired in accordance with the act of June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603), shall be available for the administrative expenses of said Corporation necessary to enable it to carry out the functions vested in it by such act, to carry out the provisions of section 2

of such act, and such other functions as may be lawfully delegated to it; including not to exceed $1,000,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws for special services, including audits notwithstanding section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (5 U. S. C. 55); printing and binding; reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; the hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and the objects specified in the general provisions applicable to the constituent agencies under the Office for Emergency Management: *Provided*, That, as determined by the board of directors, or such officer as may be designated by the board of directors for the purpose, expenditures (including expenditures for services performed on a force account or contract or fee basis) necessary in acquiring, operating, maintaining, improving, or disposing of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest (except property acquired for the administrative purposes of the Corporation), including expenses of collections of pledged collateral and expenses of service and administration of its loans, advances, and property under section 6 of said act, shall not be considered as administrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That no part of said $12,006,000 shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenses shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 28, line 6, after the word "exceed", strike out "$12,006,000" and insert "$18,000,000."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is hoped that this amendment will meet with the approval of both sides. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Small Business of the House, which has had much to do with the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The object of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to permit the small man to go to an office near his home and receive a contract, credit, new facilities, rehabilitation of his plant, if necessary, all right there within a few miles of his home and in the same way and manner that the big man receives that same service here in Washington. The object is not to require the small man to have to come to Washington, someone who does not know his way around Washington, and will have to employ a lobbyist or a broker and pay him a big fee to get him entree to the various offices where he can have his case considered.

The object of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to help small business, and the small manufacturers and producers of the country have been helped tremendously by the passage of this law.

Gen. Robert Wood Johnson is in charge of the administration of this section, and he will take this $18,000,000 next year and with it do a good job, and, how insignificant is $18,000,000 when compared with the good that that Corporation is doing every month and every week now.

The Budget arbitrarily reduced the amount to $12,006,000. Let us give General Johnson the amount of money that we agree it will take, and at the same time, give him the responsibility. We have no experience to go on in the past, because they have been under the W. P. B. This is the first time it has had to work on its own, to work by itself. At the end of the year, after he has used the $18,000,000, if he does use it, if he can account for it well, well and good. We can then make arrangements for the next year. But if he has not done so, a reduction can be made.

Mr. Chairman, let us not discriminate against small business by denying to them the comparatively small and insignificant amount compared with the billions of dollars and the contracts small business can get if we give them the services in the field, near their home, that the big businessmen now receive here in Washington where they have had paid lobbyists for just as long as we have had a government, and they know their way around.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. It is absolutely true, is it not, that this is the only agency in existence that the small businessman can appeal to?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely; it is the only one small business can appeal to, and certainly, Mr. Chairman, they are entitled to this comparatively small amount on the record they have already made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are we to understand the amendment the gentleman is offering will bring a larger number of small business concerns into the war effort? If so, I will heartily support it.

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly will bring in a larger number of the comparatively small businesses into the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered at the request of the Committee on Small Business of the House, a unanimous request that it be offered, and the House is asked to adopt it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the committee will support this amendment. I find myself in a rather unique position. I do not think any Member of this House has seen me rise before to support an increase in an appropriation bill; I usually enjoyably support decreasing them.

I am not sure in my own mind that it is absolutely essential to have $18,000,000. I am of the opinion that the Budget knows little or nothing about it and I am inclined to feel that the only course we can follow is that charted by the men in the Smaller War Plants Corporation who feel that this is the right amount of money necessary to do a good job. I think it is only right to confess that the Smaller War Plants Corporation under its first management, honest and conscientious as Lou Holland was, was a failure; that to date General Johnson has not accomplished any great deeds.

These things must be frankly admitted, but the way I view the matter, this is the last chance for the smaller manufacturers in this country to participate in the war effort, and if it fails now there is a great chance that the smaller manufacturers of the country will fail before the close of the war; so I am appealing to you, right or wrong the amount of the appropriation, to give the small manufacturers of this Nation this last chance.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very commendably and accurately I am sure, the gentleman says, not being a member of the subcommittee, he does not have any very accurate idea of the financial needs of this outfit. May I say to the gentleman, however, that the Bureau of the Budget made a very careful inquiry into this and came to the conclusion that $12,000,000 would be ample. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that $12,000,000 would carry them, and that includes the members of the subcommittee on the gentleman's side. We went into it very carefully and very painstakingly.

Mr. PLOESER. I have also gone into the matter of the Bureau of the Budget's investigation of this matter, and I am frank in telling the gentleman that I do not believe that the Bureau of the Budget can confidently tell the Smaller War Plants Corporation what they adequately need. They did tell them to take this $12,000,000 and come back in 3 or 4 months and get another $12,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has no confidence in his own subcommittee. He has repeatedly today thrown their judgment overboard and cut under them; now he cuts over them. I imagine the careful consideration of the subcommittee has not impressed the gentleman at all.

Mr. PLOESER. If I am to follow what the gentleman attempts to read into my mind, which does not exist, then I will assume that this House will follow its own design and increase it to $18,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the work that should be being done by the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I was not impressed with the gentleman who was at the head of it. I honestly feel that $12,000,000 is about all that we ought to appropriate for this purpose; I believe

it is about as far as we ought to go. If they need more on a deficiency and are really doing the job I should not hesitate to give them more but I cannot do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, we all realize the tremendous difficulty small businesses and small industry have had in taking a part in this war effort. In the first place, small business cannot afford to have representatives in Washington to find out about specifications and bids and the various things they must do in order to get war orders; so it is very much better to have in the field somebody who can contact these small business organizations and bring them into the war effort.

In company with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and other Members of the Small Business Committee, I have had an opportunity of examining the work that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is doing and I want to say to the Members of the House that General Johnson and his staff are working long hours. They work faithfully and late at night and they have gotten up a splendid plan and are having fine success doing those things necessary to help small industry and small business. They have a survey and have drawn up their plan, and their methods are showing good results. They are making headway and progress in bringing these small business organizations into the war effort. Anybody who says they do not have competent management, that General Johnson is not doing a good job, in my opinion just does not know what he is talking about. I believe we ought to give them a chance to do it. They have set up their budget. They cannot count on getting more money later. They must know now the amount they can count on. Give them a chance. I assure you every dollar spent by this agency will pay dividends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee entertained the warmest sympathy for this activity and we have shown that sympathy in a very practical way. This agency was given $7,500,000 last year. We have here increased that amount by something like 60 or 70 percent and instead of the $7,500,000 which they received last year we this year recommended an appropriation of a little over $12,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman must admit that at that time they were under the War Production Board and a lot of money came through the War Production Board, but it was not a success while under the War Production Board. This is the first time they have had an opportunity to be on their own and there is no experience to base it on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We gave them every benefit of the doubt. Instead of merely duplicating the funds given them last year we appropriated in excess of $12,000,000 this year, and increased their personnel from 1,000 to 1,786.

In addition to that we have given them the sum of a million dollars which was not given last year, to provide for the hiring of engineers and the engagement of the services of engineering firms in connection with the survey of small plants. And in addition to that the sum of $2,500,000 is provided in this $12,000,000 for employing the R. F. C. to act as agent in closing the loans.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment differs from all other amendments offered during the afternoon in that it proposes to increase an appropriation. Heretofore the proposals have been to save money, to retrench, to curtail, to economize. Now for the first time we have a proposition to increase expenditures. In view of the fact that every item in the supply bills not directly connected with the immediate prosecution of the war is being drastically reduced this year, and the further fact that we are in this bill increasing the appropriation for this agency by something like 60 or 70 percent, I trust the committee will approach this proposal with caution and deliberation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. The gentleman realizes, if the amount is not increased, many of these field offices will have to be closed and much of the field service that helps the real small businessman near his home will have to be curtailed and eliminated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Quite the contrary. We are increasing the appropriation, we are increasing the personnel. We are expanding operations. The Bureau of the Budget considered this, and the Subcommittee on Appropriations considered it. It was approved by the whole committee as it appears in the bill. In view of the consistent attitude of the committee this afternoon in favor of retrenchment, I am certain it will consider an increase to $18,000,000 in this item as wholly unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEFAUVER), there were—ayes 52, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, $50,000; the State of Maine, $50,000; the State of Massachusetts, $50,000; the State of New York, $50,000; and the State of Pennsylvania, $50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C., 1121–1123); and for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, $100,000; in all, $350,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the request for W. S. A., the largest item in the pending bill, is divided into three subitems as follows: $2,300,000,000 as compared with $1,150,000,000 in the current year for the revolving fund; $72,000,000 as compared with $48,000,000 for maritime training; and $350,000 as compared with $360,000 for five State marine schools. The committee recommends all three items except for a reduction in the first to the extent of $100,000,000, which Admiral Land and Mr. Douglas have indicated can be safely eliminated from the subitem providing for the purchase of ships.

The item for the revolving fund includes subitems for requisition, hire, and operation; for purchase of small ships; for reconditioning and conversion; for the operation of warehouses; for the operation of terminals; for degaussing and defensing; for miscellaneous operating expenditure; for cash to liquidate obligations to the Army and Navy; and for general administrative expenditure.

The item for training is to take care of the 1944 quota of 35,000 officers and 145,000 seamen, estimated as necessary for the ships we are constructing.

Details have been furnished the committee in large measure off the record. Generally speaking, the request is based on the assumption that the number of ships and tonnage to be operated in 1944 will be approximately double that in 1943. I am in favor of the committee recommendations.

Despite the shortcomings of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration in the past, the production of ships, so vital to the war effort, continues to pay eloquent tribute to the workers in our great ship-construction industry.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations for the war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation

that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], page 10, line 6; also on the amendment having to do with limitation of personnel on page 13, also the businessman's proposition on page 13, the Sauthoff amendment on the roll-back, page 13, and the Starnes amendment on page 26.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Andresen amendment having to do with grade labeling, on page 13.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when we come to the amendments on which a separate vote is asked, each one of them may be read immediately preceding the vote.

The SPEAKER. That will be done under the rule. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 10, line 6, strike out "$165,000,000" and insert "$130,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 185, nays 147, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—185

Allen, Ill.	Dewey	Hill
Andersen, H. Carl	Dirksen	Hoeven
Andresen, August H.	Disney	Holmes, Mass.
Andrews	Dondero	Holmes, Wash.
Angell	Dworshak	Hope
Arends	Elliott	Horan
Arnold	Elmer	Howell
Auchincloss	Elston, Ohio	Hull
Barrett	Engel	Jeffrey
Beall	Fellows	Jenkins
Bender	Fenton	Jennings
Bennett, Mich.	Gale	Jensen
Bennett, Mo.	Gathings	Johnson, Anton J.
Bishop	Gavin	Johnson, Calvin D.
Blackney	Gearhart	Johnson, Ind.
Bolton	Gerlach	Johnson, J. Leroy
Boren	Gibson	Johnson, Ward
Brehm	Gilchrist	Jones
Brown, Ohio	Gillette	Jonkman
Buffett	Goodwin	Judd
Busbey	Gossett	Keefe
Canfield	Graham	Kilburn
Carson, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	Kinzer
Carter	Grant, Ind.	Kleberg
Case	Griffiths	Knutson
Chenoweth	Gross	Kunkel
Chiperfield	Gwynne	Lambertson
Church	Hagen	Landis
Clason	Hale	Lanham
Clevenger	Hall, Leonard W.	LeFevre
Cole, Mo.	Halleck	Lemke
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock	Lewis, Ohio
Cravens	Harness, Ind.	Luce
Cunningham	Hartley	McCowen
Curtis	Heidinger	McGregor
Day	Herter	McKenzie
Dirksen	Hess	McMillan
Disney	Hoeven	McWilliams
Dondero	Holmes, Mass.	Maas
Dworshak	Holmes, Wash.	Manasco
Elliott	Hope	Martin, Iowa
Elmer	Horan	Martin, Mass.
Elston, Ohio	Howell	Merrow
Engel	Hull	Michener
Fellows	Jeffrey	Miller, Mo.
Fenton	Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.
Gale	Jennings	Miller, Pa.
Gathings	Jensen	Monkiewicz
Gavin	Johnson, Anton J.	Morrison, La.
Gearhart	Johnson, Calvin D.	Mott
Gerlach	Johnson, Ind.	Mruk
Gibson	Johnson, J. Leroy	Murray, Wis.
Gilchrist	Johnson, Ward	Newsome
Gillette	Jones	Norman
Goodwin	Jonkman	O'Hara
Gossett	Judd	Peterson, Fla.
Graham	Keefe	Pittenger
Grant, Ala.	Kilburn	Ploeser
Grant, Ind.	Kinzer	Poage
Griffiths	Kleberg	Ramey
Gross	Knutson	Rankin
Gwynne	Kunkel	Reece, Tenn.
Hagen	Lambertson	Reed, Ill.
Hale	Landis	Reed, N. Y.
Hall, Leonard W.	Lanham	Rees, Kans.
Halleck	LeFevre	Rivers
Hancock	Lemke	Robsion, Ky.
Harness, Ind.	Lewis, Ohio	Rockwell
Hartley	Luce	Rodgers, Pa.
Heidinger	McCowen	Rogers, Mass.
Herter	McGregor	Rohrbough
Hess	McKenzie	Rolph
Hill	McMillan	Rowe
Hoeven	McWilliams	Russell
Holmes, Mass.	Maas	Sauthoff
Holmes, Wash.	Manasco	Schiffler
Hope	Martin, Iowa	Schwabe
Horan	Martin, Mass.	Scott
Howell	Merrow	Shafer
Hull	Michener	Short
Jeffrey	Miller, Mo.	Sikes
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Ill.
Jennings	Miller, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Jensen	Monkiewicz	Smith, Ohio
Johnson, Anton J.	Morrison, La.	Smith, Wis.
Johnson, Calvin D.	Mott	Springer
Johnson, Ind.	Mruk	Stanley
Johnson, J. Leroy	Murray, Wis.	Starnes, Ala.
Johnson, Ward	Newsome	Stefan
Jones	Norman	Stevenson
Jonkman	O'Hara	Sumner, Ill.
Judd	Peterson, Fla.	Sundstrom
Keefe	Pittenger	Talbot
Kilburn	Ploeser	Talle
Kinzer	Poage	Taylor
Kleberg	Ramey	Thomas, N. J.
Knutson	Rankin	Tibbott
Kunkel	Reece, Tenn.	Towe
Lambertson	Reed, Ill.	Troutman
Landis	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Lanham	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
LeFevre	Rivers	Wadsworth
Lemke	Robsion, Ky.	Welchel, Ohio
Lewis, Ohio	Rockwell	West
Luce	Rodgers, Pa.	Wheat
McCowen	Rogers, Mass.	Whitten
McGregor	Rohrbough	Wickersham
McKenzie	Rolph	Willey
McMillan	Rowe	Wilson
McWilliams	Russell	Winstead
Maas	Sauthoff	Winter
Manasco	Schiffler	Wolfenden, Pa.
Martin, Iowa	Schwabe	
Martin, Mass.	Scott	
Merrow	Shafer	
Michener	Short	
Miller, Mo.	Sikes	
Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Ill.	
Miller, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.	
Monkiewicz	Smith, Ohio	
Morrison, La.	Smith, Wis.	
Mott	Springer	
Mruk	Stanley	
Murray, Wis.	Starnes, Ala.	
Newsome	Stefan	
Norman	Stevenson	
O'Hara	Sumner, Ill.	
Peterson, Fla.	Sundstrom	
Pittenger	Talbot	
Ploeser	Talle	
Poage	Taylor	
Ramey	Thomas, N. J.	
Rankin	Tibbott	
	Towe	
	Troutman	
	Vorys, Ohio	
	Vursell	
	Wadsworth	
	Welchel, Ohio	
	West	
	Wheat	
	Whitten	
	Wickersham	
	Willey	
	Wilson	
	Winstead	
	Winter	
	Wolfenden, Pa.	

NAYS—147

Abernethy	Furlong	O'Connor
Allen, La.	Gavagan	O'Konski
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gordon	O'Neal
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Outland
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Patman
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Patton
Beckworth	Gregory	Peterson, Ga.
Bell	Harris, Ark.	Philbin
Bland	Harris, Va.	Poulson
Bloom	Hart	Priest
Bonner	Hays	Rabaut
Boykin	Hinshaw	Ramspeck
Bradley, Pa.	Hobbs	Randolph
Brooks	Hoch	Robertson
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Bryson	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rowan
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Burdick	Kee	Sasscer
Burgin	Kefauver	Scanlon
Byrne	Kelley	Schuetz
Camp	Kerr	Slaughter
Cannon, Mo.	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Celler	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Clark	Lane	Snyder
Coffee	Lesinski	Sparkman
Colmer	Ludlow	Spence
Cooley	Lynch	Steagall
Cooper	McCord	Stewart
Cox	McCormack	Sullivan
Creal	McGranery	Taber
Crosser	McMurray	Tarver
Cullen	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
D'Alesandro	Magnuson	Thomason
Davis	Mahon	Voorhis, Calif.
Dawson	Mansfield, Mont.	Walter
Delaney	Mansfield, Tex.	Ward
Dilweg	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Dingell	Miller, Conn.	Weaver
Doughton	Mills	Wene
Durham	Monroney	Whelchel, Ga.
Ellison, Md.	Morrison, N. C.	White
Feighan	Murdock	Whittington
Fernandez	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Fitzpatrick	Norrell	Wolverton, N. J.
Flannagan	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Fogarty	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Folger	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman
Fulbright	O'Toole	Sabath
Fulmer	Pace	Satterfield

NOT VOTING—99

Anderson, Calif.	Drewry	Jackson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Eaton	Jarman
Barden	Eberharter	Kean
Barry	Ellis	Kearney
Bradley, Mich.	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Burch, Va.	Fay	Keogh
Burchill, N. Y.	Fish	King
Butler	Fisher	Klein
Cannon, Fla.	Forand	LaFollette
Capozzoli	Ford	Larcade
Carlson, Kans.	Gallagher	Lea
Chapman	Gamble	LeCompte
Cochran	Gifford	McGehee
Compton	Gillie	McLean
Costello	Green	Maloney
Courtney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mason
Crawford	Hare	May
Culkin	Harless, Ariz.	Merritt
Curley	Hébert	Mundt
Dickstein	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Dies	Hendricks	Myers
Ditter	Hoffman	Nichols
Domengeaux	Izac	O'Brien, N. Y.
Douglas		O'Leary
O'Toole	Sabath	Treadway
Pace	Satterfield	Van Zandt
Pfeifer	Sheppard	Vincent, Ky.
Phillips	Sheridan	Vinson, Ga.
Plumley	Smith, W. Va.	Weiss
Powers	Somers, N. Y.	Welch
Pracht	Stearns, N. H.	Wolcott
Price	Stockman	Woodruff, Mich.
Richards	Sumners, Tex.	
Rizley	Tolan	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Myers against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Price with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, at the end of line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce to which the price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Adminis-

trator as the case may be in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on this amendment I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 144, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—189

Allen, Ill.	Hagen	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Hale	Newsome
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Leonard W.	Norman
Andrews	Halleck	Norrell
Angell	Hancock	O'Connor
Arends	Harness, Ind.	O'Hara
Arnold	Hartley	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Heidinger	Philbin
Barrett	Herter	Pittenger
Bates, Mass.	Hess	Ploeser
Beall	Hill	Poage
Bender	Hinshaw	Poulson
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Randolph
Bishop	Holmes, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Jeffrey	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Rockwell
Buffett	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Busbey	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Johnson, Anton J.	Rohrbough
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rowe
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Sauthoff
Case	Johnson, J. Leroy	Schiffler
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ward	Schwabe
Chiperfield	Jones	Scott
Church	Jonkman	Shafer
Clason	Judd	Short
Clevenger	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Colmer	Kleberg	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Cravens	Kunkel	Springer
Cunningham	Lambertson	Stanley
Curtis	Landis	Stefan
Day	Lanham	Stevenson
Dewey	LeFevre	Stewart
Dirksen	Lemke	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Luce	Sundstrom
Dworshak	McCowen	Taber
Elliott	McGregor	Talbot
Elmer	McKenzie	Talle
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Taylor
Engel	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Fellows	Manasco	Tibbott
Fenton	Mansfield, Mont.	Towe
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Troutman
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio.
Gathings	Merrow	Vursell
Gavin	Michener	Wadsworth
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Wasielewski
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	Weichel, Ohio
Gilchrist	Miller, Nebr.	West
Gillette	Miller, Pa.	Wheat
Goodwin	Monkiewicz	Wickersham
Graham	Morrison, La.	Wigglesworth
Grant, Ala.	Mott	Willey
Grant, Ind.	Mruk	Wilson
Griffiths		Winter
Gross		Wolfenden, Pa.
Gwynne		Wolverton, N. J.

NAYS—144

Abernethy	Burdick	Dilweg
Allen, La.	Burgin	Dingell
Anderson, N. Mex.	Byrne	Doughton
Bates, Ky.	Camp	Durham
Beckworth	Cannon, Mo.	Ellison, Md.
Bell	Celler	Feighan
Bland	Clark	Fernandez
Bloom	Coffee	Fitzpatrick
Boren	Cooley	Flannagan
Boykin	Cooper	Fogarty
Bradley, Pa.	Creal	Folger
Brooks	Crosser	Fulbright
Brown, Ga.	Cullen	Fulmer
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Furlong
Buckley	Davis	Gavagan
Bulwinkle	Dawson	Gibson
	Delaney	Gordon
Gore	McMillan	Sadowski
Gorski	McMurray	Sasscer
Gossett	Madden	Scanlon
Granger	Magnuson	Schuetz
Gregory	Mahon	Sikes
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.	Slaughter
Harris, Ark.	Marcantonio	Smith, Va.
Harris, Va.	Mills	Snyder
Hart	Monroney	Sparkman
Hays	Morrison, N. C.	Spence
Hobbs	Murdock	Starnes, Ala.
Hoch	Murphy	Steagall
Holifield	Myers	Sullivan
Johnson, Luther A.	Norton	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomas, Tex.
Kee	O'Neal	Thomason
Kefauver	Outland	Vincent, Ky.
Kelley	Patman	Voorhis, Calif.
Kerr	Patton	Walter
Kilday	Peterson, Fla.	Ward
Kirwan	Peterson, Ga.	Weaver
Lane	Priest	Wene
Lea	Rabaut	Whelchel, Ga.
Lesinski	Ramspeck	White
Ludlow	Rankin	Whitten
Lynch	Rivers	Whittington
McCord	Robertson	Winstead
McCormack	Robinson, Utah	Woodrum, Va.
McGranery	Rogers, Calif.	Worley
	Rowan	Wright
	Russell	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—98

Anderson, Calif.	Forand	Merritt
Baldwin, Md.	Ford	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gamble	Nichols
Barry	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	O'Leary
Burch, Va.	Green	O'Toole
Burchill, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pace
Butler	Hare	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Phillips
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Plumley
Carlson, Kans.	Hendricks	Powers
Chapman	Hoffman	Pracht
Cochran	Howell	Price
Compton	Izac	Richards
Costello	Jackson	Rizley
Courtney	Jarman	Rolph
Crawford	Kean	Sabath
Culkin	Kearney	Satterfield
Curley	Kennedy	Sheppard
Dickstein	Keogh	Sheridan
Dies	King	Smith, W. Va.
Disney	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Ditter	LaFollette	Stearns, N. H.
Domengeaux	Larcade	Stockman
Douglas	LeCompte	Tolan
Drewry	Lewis, Ohio	Treadway
Eaton	McGehee	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McLean	Vinson, Ga.
Ellis	Maloney	Weiss
Ellsworth	Mason	Welch
Fay	May	Wolcott
Fish		Woodruff, Mich.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Buchill of New York against.

Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Lewis of Ohio for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Barry against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Price with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye" on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. HOWELL. No, I was just outside.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk proceeded to report the Sauthoff amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Are not the amendments to be taken up in the order in which they were adopted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold that they are to be adopted in the order in which they appear in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then in that case I think the Andresen amendment precedes this amendment, though I may be mistaken. They are both on the same page and same line.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Andresen amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Dirksen amendment prohibiting subsidies preceded both of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote was not demanded on that amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I thought they referred to the amendment on page 13 at the end of line 3, the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. Several amendments were adopted on that page of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did not ask for a separate vote on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not ask for a separate vote on that, Mr. Speaker. It was agreed to with the others.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Andresen amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13 insert the following language: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Forty-three Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 140, noes 85.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 13, line 3, after the word "Office", change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity, nor on any commodity which is not a necessity."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 105, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—229

Abernethy	Clason	Gross
Allen, Ill.	Clevenger	Gwynne
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, Mo.	Hagen
	Cole, N. Y.	Hale
Andresen, August H.	Colmer	Hall, Leonard W.
	Cunningham	
Andrews	Curtis	Halleck
Angell	Day	Hancock
Arends	Dewey	Harness, Ind.
Arnold	Dilweg	Harris, Ark.
Auchincloss	Dirksen	Harris, Va.
Barrett	Disney	Hartley
Bates, Mass.	Dondero	Heidinger
Beall	Dworshak	Herter
Beckworth	Elliott	Hess
Bell	Elmer	Hill
Bender	Elston, Ohio	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mich.	Engel	Hoeven
Bennett, Mo.	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Bishop	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Blackney	Fisher	Hope
Bolton	Fulbright	Horan
Bonner	Fulmer	Howell
Boren	Gale	Hull
Boykin	Gathings	Jeffrey
Brehm	Gavin	Jenkins
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	Jennings
Brown, Ohio	Geriach	Jensen
Bryson	Gibson	Johnson, Anton J.
Buffett	Gilchrist	
Burdick	Gillette	Johnson, Calvin D.
Busbey	Goodwin	
Camp	Gore	Johnson, Ind.
Carson, Ohio	Gossett	Johnson, J. Leroy
Carter	Graham	
Case	Granger	Johnson
Chenoweth	Grant, Ala.	Luther A.
Chiperfield	Grant, Ind.	Johnson, Okla.
Church	Griffiths	Johnson, Ward
Jones	Mruk	Smith, Ohio
Jonkman	Murdock	Smith, Va.
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Keefe	Newsome	Springer
Kilburn	Norman	Stanley
Kinzer	O'Connor	Starnes, Ala.
Kleberg	O'Hara	Steagall
Knutson	O'Konski	Stefan
Kunkel	Peterson, Fla.	Stevenson
Lambertson	Peterson, Ga.	Stewart
Landis	Philbin	Sullivan
Lanham	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Lea	Ploeser	Sundstrom
LeFevre	Poage	Taber.
Lemke	Poulson	Talbot
Lewis, Ohio	Ramey	Talle
Luce	Rankin	Tarver
McCord	Reece, Tenn.	Taylor
McCowen	Reed, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
McGregor	Reed, N. Y.	Thomason
McKenzie	Rees, Kans.	Tibbott
McMillan	Rivers	Towe
McWilliams	Robertson	Troutman
Maas	Robsion, Ky.	Voorhis, Calif.
Mahon	Rockwell	Vorys, Ohio
Manasco	Rodgers, Pa.	Vursell
Mansfield, Mont.	Rogers, Mass.	Wadsworth
	Rohrbough	Welchel, Ohio
Mansfield, Tex.	Rolph	West
Martin, Iowa	Rowe	Whelchel, Ga.
Martin, Mass.	Russell	Whitten
Merrow	Sauthoff	Wickersham
Michener	Schiffler	Wigglesworth
Miller, Conn.	Schwabe	Willey
Miller, Mo.	Shafer	Wilson
Miller, Nebr.	Short	Winstead
Miller, Pa.	Sikes	Winter
Monkiewicz	Simpson, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Morrison, La.	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton, N. J.
Mott	Smith, Maine	Worley

NAYS—105

Allen, La.	Folger	Norrell
Anderson, N. Mex.	Furlong	Norton
	Gavagan	O'Brien, Ill.
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	O'Neal
Bland	Gregory	Outland
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	Patton
Brooks	Hays	Priest
Buckley	Hobbs	Rabaut
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Ramspeck
Burgin	Holifield	Randolph
Byrne	Jackson	Robinson, Utah.
Canfield	Johnson, Lyndon, B.	Rogers, Calif.
Celler		Rowan
Clark	Kee	Sadowski
Coffee	Kefauver	Sasscer
Cooley	Kelley	Scanlon
Cooper	Kerr	Schuetz
Cravens	Kilday	Scott
Creal	Kirwan	Snyder
Crosser	Lane	Sparkman
Cullen	Lesinski	Spence
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Davis	Lynch	Vincent, Ky.
Dawson	McCormack	Walter
Delaney	McGranery	Ward
Dingell	McMurray	Wasielewski
Doughton	Madden	Weaver
Durham	Magnuson	Wene
Ellison, Md.	Marcantonio	White
Feighan	Mills	Whittington
Fernandez	Monroney	Woodrum, Va.
Fitzpatrick	Morrison, N. C.	Wright
Flannagan	Murphy	Zimmerman
Fogarty	Myers	

NOT VOTING—97

Anderson, Calif.	Douglas	Kearney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Drewry	Kennedy
Barden	Eaton	Keogh
Barry	Eberharter	King
Bradley, Mich.	Ellis	Klein
Burch, Va.	Ellsworth	LaFollette
Burchill, N. Y.	Fay	Larcade
Butler	Fish	LeCompte
Cannon, Fla.	Forand	McGehee
Cannon, Mo.	Ford	McLean
Capozzoli	Gallagher	Maloney
Carlson, Kans.	Gamble	Mason
Chapman	Gifford	May
Cochran	Gillie	Merritt
Compton	Green	Mundt
Costello	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Tenn.
Courtney		Nichols
Cox	Hare	O'Brien, N. Y.
Crawford	Hébert	O'Leary
Culkin	Heffernan	O'Toole
Curley	Hendricks	Pace
Dickstein	Hoffman	Pfeifer
Dies	Izac	Phillips
Ditter	Jarman	Plumley
Domengeaux	Kean	Powers
Pracht	Slaughter	Van Zandt
Price	Smith, W. Va.	Vinson, Ga.
Richards	Somers, N. Y.	Weiss
Rizley	Stearns, N. H.	Welch
Sabath	Stockman	Wheat
Satterfield	Sumners, Tex.	Wolcott
Sheppard	Tolan	Woodruff, Mich.
Sheridan	Treadway	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Wheat for, with Mr. Barry against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. BECKWORTH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 26, line 2, strike out "$34,472,504" and insert "$28,972,504"; and in line 6, after the word "Branch" strike out the following: "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch" and insert the words "and no funds shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 114, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—218

Abernethy	Hagen	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Hale	O'Hara
Allen, La.	Hall,	O'Konski
Andersen,	Leonard W.	Peterson, Fla.
H. Carl	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen,	Hancock	Philbin
August H.	Harness, Ind.	Pittenger
Angell	Harris, Ark.	Ploeser
Arends	Harris, Va.	Poage
Arnold	Hartley	Poulson
Auchincloss	Heidinger	Ramey
Barrett	Hess	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Beall	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Beckworth	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Bishop	Holmes, Wash.	Robertson
Blackney	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Bolton	Horan	Rockwell
Bonner	Howell	Rodgers, Pa.
Boykin	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	Jeffrey	Rohrbough
Brooks	Jenkins	Rolph
Brown, Ga.	Jennings	Rowe
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Russell
Bryson	Johnson,	Sauthoff
Buffett	Anton J.	Schiffler
Busbey	Johnson,	Schwabe
Camp	Calvin D.	Scott
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Carson, Ohio	Johnson,	Short
Carter	J. Leroy	Sikes
Case	Johnson, Ward	Simpson, Ill.
Chenoweth	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Church	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Clevenger	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Kinzer	Sparkman
Cole, N. Y.	Kleberg	Springer
Colmer	Knutson	Stanley
Cravens	Kunkel	Starnes, Ala.
Cunningham	Lambertson	Steagall
Curtis	Landis	Stefan
Day	Lanham	Stevenson
Dewey	LeFevre	Stewart
Dirksen	Lemke	Sumner, Ill.
D ndero	Lesinski	Sundstrom
Dworshak	Lewis, Ohio	Talbot
Elliott	Luce	Talle
Elmer	McCowen	Taylor
Elston, Ohio	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Engel	McKenzie	Tibbott
Fellows	McMillan	Towe
Fenton	McWilliams	Troutman
Fisher	Maas	Vorys, Ohio
Fulmer	Manasco	Vursell
Gale	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Weichel, Ohio
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	West
Gearhart	Merrow	Wheat
Gerlach	Michener	Whelchel, Ga.
Gibson	Miller, Conn.	White
Gilchrist	Miller, Mo.	Whitten
Gillette	Miller, Nebr.	Whittington
Goodwin	Miller, Pa.	Wickersham
Gossett	Mills	Willey
Graham	Monkiewicz	Wilson
Grant, Ala.	Morrison, La.	Winstead
Grant, Ind.	Mott	Winter
Gregory	Mruk	Wolfenden, Pa.
Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gross	Newsome	Worley
Gwynne	Norman	

NAYS—114

Anderson,	Coffee	Fernandez
N. Mex.	Cooley	Fitzpatrick
Baldwin, Md.	Cooper	Flannagan
Bates, Ky.	Creal	Fogarty
Bland	Crosser	Folger
Bloom	Cullen	Fulbright
Boren	D'Alesandro	Furlong
Bradley, Pa.	Davis	Gavagan
Buckley	Dawson	Gordon
Bulwinkle	Delaney	Gore
Burdick	Dilweg	Gorski
Burgin	Dingell	Granger
Byrne	Doughton	Harless, Ariz.
Cannon, Mo.	Durham	Hart
Celler	Ellison, Md.	Hays
Clark	Feighan	Herter
Hoch	Mansfield,	Sasscer
Holifield	Mont.	Scanlon
Jackson	Marcantonio	Schuetz
Johnson,	Monroney	Slaughter
Luther A.	Morrison, N. C.	Snyder
Johnson,	Murdock	Spence
Lyndon B.	Murphy	Sullivan
Johnson, Okla.	Myers	Taber
Kee	Norton	Tarver
Kefauver	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Kelley	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomason
Kerr	O'Connor	Vincent, Ky.
Kilday	O'Neal	Voorhis, Calif.
Kirwan	Outland	Walter
Lane	Patman	Ward
Ludlow	Patton	Wasielewski
Lynch	Priest	Weaver
McCord	Rabaut	Wene
McCormack	Ramspeck	Wigglesworth
McGranery	Randolph	Woodrum, Va.
McMurray	Robinson, Utah	Wright
Madden	Rogers, Calif.	Zimmerman
Magnuson	Rowan	
Mahon	Sadowski	

NOT VOTING—99

Anderson, Calif.	Fay	Mundt
Andrews	Fish	Murray, Tenn.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Forand	Nichols
Barden	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Gallagher	O'Leary
Bell	Gamble	O'Toole
Bennett, Mo.	Gifford	Pace
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Pfeifer
Burch, Va.	Green	Phillips
Burchill, N. Y.	Hall,	Plumley
Butler	Edwin Arthur	Powers
Cannon, Fla.	Hare	Pracht
Capozzoli	Hébert	Price
Carlson, Kans.	Heffernan	Richards
Chapman	Hendricks	Rizley
Cochran	Hoffman	Sabath
Compton	Izac	Satterfield
Costello	Jarman	Sheppard
Courtney	Kean	Sheridan
Cox	Kearney	Smith, W. Va.
Crawford	Kennedy	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	Keogh	Stearns, N. H.
Curley	King	Stockman
Dickstein	Klein	Sumners, Tex.
Dies	LaFollette	Tolan
Disney	Larcade	Treadway
Ditter	Lea	Van Zandt
Domengeaux	LeCompte	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	McGehee	Weiss
Drewry	McLean	Welch
Eaton	Maloney	Wolcott
Eberharter	Mason	Woodruff, Mich.
Ellis	May	
Ellsworth	Merritt	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Barry against

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Andrews.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when separate votes were requested on amendments, I asked for a separate vote on five amendments: On the Dirksen amendment for $35,000,000; on the Dirksen amendment regarding limitation of personnel; on the Dirksen amendment for businessmen; on the Sauthoff roll-back amendment; and on the Starnes O. W. I. amendment. Subsequently, a vote was taken on the remainder of the amendments en gross. Later the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] rose to a parliamentary inquiry and asked if the Dirksen amendment, page 13, line 3, limitation of personnel, had been voted on. The fact that two amendments were agreed to on page 13, line 3, confused me, and I informed the Speaker a separate vote on it had not been requested when, as a matter of fact, it had been requested. It was my error. That amendment, then, Mr. Speaker, the Dirksen amendment on page 13, line 3, on limitation of personnel, the subsidy amendment, has not yet been voted on either en gross or separately, and it is now in order to vote upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to read what the RECORD shows. After other matters:

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Dirksen amendment prohibiting subsidies preceded both of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote was not demanded on that amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I thought they referred to the amendment on page 13 at the end of line 3, the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. Several amendments were adopted on that page of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did not ask for a separate vote on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not ask for a separate vote on that, Mr. Speaker. It was agreed to with the others.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, Mr. Speaker; but I was in error in that statement as I have explained, because, as a matter of fact, it was requested. If the Speaker will call for the reporter's notes in which I requested separate votes on amendments he will see that I did request a separate vote on this amendment.

Therefore, it has not been voted on. It has not been voted on in gross; it has not been voted on separately; and it is now in order to vote on it separately, in accordance with the request.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I should like to state that I examined the notes of the reporter which disclosed that the Chairman did ask for a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment on page 13, line 3, the personnel amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not particularly care what the notes state; I think that this is the heart and soul of the bill before us and the membership of the House, particularly on the other side of the aisle, ought to have the intestinal fortitude——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. DINGELL. Just a minute; I am recognized; I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has been recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. You ought to have the courage to vote on it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There were a number who desired a separate vote on that particular amendment and the only reason it was not requested was because we all understood the gentleman from Missouri had made that request.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Earlier in the afternoon I went to the Clerk's desk and made a note on all amendments which had been adopted to make sure that this amendment would be included for a separate vote. I was here while the gentleman from Missouri was asking for separate votes and he did ask for a separate vote on that particular amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This afternoon, when the votes were being taken in the Committee of the Whole——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Unless unanimous consent is granted the gentleman cannot proceed.

Mr. RABAUT. The Chair has recognized me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This afternoon, when the votes were being taken in the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the announcement in the Committee of the Whole that he would not ask for a teller vote on this amendment as he would ask for a roll call, the yeas and nays, on it tonight.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not a question of personal opinion or what we should like to do; it is a question of what the facts are. The time has now passed for demanding separate votes, and the Speaker has already ruled as the RECORD shows that this amendment has been voted on with other amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Dirksen amendment on limitation of personnel, on page 13, line 3, has not yet been voted upon; it has not been adopted. We did not vote upon it en gross and we have not voted upon it separately. Under the parliamentary situation at the present time the Dirksen amendment has not been adopted. Unless a vote is taken on it now it will not be a part of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The RECORD will show what the facts are.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did demand a separate vote on the amendment in question, then a reference to the reporter's notes will show the facts. Even if the Journal does show that the amendment had been voted on, if, as a matter of fact, the opinion of the Journal Clerk is incorrect, the reporter's statement as to what the request was should control. The Journal is not conclusive until it has been approved by the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a reading of the reporter's notes on my request for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the remark of the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a reading of the reporter's notes on my request for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have that privilege, but the Chair, regardless of his personal feelings about this, must state that the Journal shows that the amendment was adopted in gross with other amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the reporter's notes reporting my request for a separate vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rule having been promulgated by the Chair, should we not proceed with the regular order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This amendment has not been voted upon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that the Journal shows that it has been adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Was my request for a reading of my request for a separate vote refused?

The SPEAKER. No. We do not have that part of the RECORD here.

The Chair holds that the amendment has been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. On this, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 239)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1943.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement by Mr. Cheney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill, H. R. 2943, and include therein a resolution adopted by the Federal Fire Council and a sample of their records and schedules under this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD about forest-fire protection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news release from the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter on the McKellar bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Gardner Advertising Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill just passed have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a part of an O. W. I. release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram I have received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain amendments and editorials, referred to in my remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter, referred to in my remarks made in the committee, and to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain letter in connection with my remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the death of our late colleague, Mr. Ball, of Connecticut, and I ask unanimous consent that those remarks may follow the announcement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCWILLIAMS] this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, and that my remarks may follow the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the regular business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DITTER, for 3 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr STOCKMAN, for this afternoon, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HÉBERT, and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (on request of Mr. RIVERS), and to Mr. RIVERS, for 2 weeks, on account of official business conducting an oil investigation for Naval Affairs Committee.

To Mr. FORD, for 1 month, on account of official business.

To Mr. POWERS, for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal

property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;* and

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2996. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 2975. A bill to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2997. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to issue food stamps to be used to increase the food-purchasing power of low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend section 168 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3002. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the States; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 3005. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Leo Gullo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James T. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3004. A bill to provide for the placing of the Reverend Connor B. Burns on the retired list of the Navy as a chaplain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1604. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Agnes Plocher, R. F. D. No. 2, Aurora, Ill., and 29 citizens of Illinois, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1605. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the Pajaro Valley, at Watsonville, Calif., urging retention of Japanese in relocation centers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1606. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of V. K. Beshgetor and 250 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1607. Also, petition of Elmer Mossberger and 20 citizens of Pontiac, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1608. Also, petition of William A. Allyn and 43 citizens of Holyoke, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. Also, petition of Ida Newton Black and 200 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1610. Also, petition of Mrs. W. P. Pettigrew and 14 citizens of Starr, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration be continued under its present leadership and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its facilities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1611. Also, petition of Elizabeth L. Roberts and 40 citizens of Hillits, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Lake and 12 citizens of Lake Worth, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1613. Also, petition of Olive N. Pettit and 25 citizens of Camp Hill, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1614. Also, petition of Mrs. O. A. Dahlgren and 20 citizens of Comstock, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1615. Also, petition of Myrta S. Hopkins and 50 citizens of East Aurora, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1616. Also, petition of R. A. LeClere and 58 citizens of Winter Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1617. Also, petition of Martha E. Washburn and 101 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1618. Also, petition of W. D. Boswell and 28 citizens of Waco, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1619. Also, petition of Rev. A. D. Oyer and 29 citizens of Gem, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1620. Also, petition of Cora M. Brunemeier and 40 citizens of Placentia, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1621. Also, petition of Lora M. Butzbach and 20 citizens of Anaheim, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1622. Also, petition of Mrs. L. J. Bain and 48 citizens of Capron, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1623. Also, petition of Bertha Rolfe and 55 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. Also, petition of Rev. Walter Thomas and 44 citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. Also, petition of Mrs. John Roseman and 30 citizens of Willoughby, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. Also, petition of Mary B. Leiter and 40 citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1627. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Parker and 20 citizens of Grove City, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportaiton of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1628. Also petition of Mrs. T. M. Cochran and 80 citizens of Orange, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1629. Also, petition of Mrs. C. O. Gulleen and 127 citizens of Genoa, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1630. Also, petition of Rosamond Davis and 60 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1631. Also, petition of Mrs. G. P. Hill and 368 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1632. Also, petition of Mabel Wood and 20 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1633. Also, petition of John R. Lemons and 30 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1634. Also, petition of Edith J. Denlinger and 97 citizens of Lemon Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1635. Also, petition of Ida O. Meiser and 118 citizens of Pacific Palisades, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1636. Also, petition of Harriet S. Shannon and 67 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1637. Also, petition of Sarah S. P. Stevens and 92 citizens of Newton Upper Falls, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1638. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Thompson and 71 citizens of Chula Vista, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1639. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 100 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1640. Also, petition of Martha M. Gould and 17 citizens of Gorham, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1641. Also, petition of Barbara Allen and 21 citizens of Alta, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1642. Also, petition of Sara Graves Clark and 40 citizens of Lexington, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1643. Also, petition of Mrs. Scott Cabeen and 152 citizens of Seaton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1644. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 119 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1645. Also, petition of 20 citizens of the State of Oregon sent in to Congressman LOWELL STOCKMAN, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1646. Also, petition of Ida Newton Black and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1647. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Frank Smith and 119 citizens of St. Petersburg, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1648. Also, petition of Mrs. Warren Enrich and 37 citizens of Ono, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1649. Also, petition of Minnie Dawley and 23 citizens of Forestville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1650. Also, petition of Elsie Montgomery and 119 citizens of Fairview, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

1651. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Royal Jones and 21 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1652. Also, petition of W. H. Brubaker and 40 citizens of Benson, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1653. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 40 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1654. Also petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 88 citizens of South Fork, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1655. Also, petition of Elizabeth O. Cass and 70 citizens of Harvey, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1656. Also, petition of Mrs. A. E. Keenan and 20 citizens of Carlyle, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1657. Also, petition of T. J. Miller and 123 citizens of Holton, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1658. Also, petition of Arthur L. Shusser and 220 citizens of Freeport, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1659. Also, petition of Georgetta Stonecipher and 70 citizens of Streator, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1660. Also, petition of 312 citizens of Robinson, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1661. Also, petition of 916 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1662. Also, petition of Mrs. Milton A. Slade and 40 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y. urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1663. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Alice M. Sweeney and 20 citizens of Everett and Malden, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war

and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1664. By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Petition of 217 citizens of Renville County and surrounding territory in Minnesota, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1665. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of 85 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Commitee on he Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who dwellest in the heavens and earth, we praise Thee; Thou who holdest up the soul of our Nation and suffereth not its feet to be moved, we praise Thee; let all our people praise the countless manifestations of our infinitely holy Creator. They glow in the sunlight, breathe in the morning air, blossom in the landscape, gleam in the radiant sky, giving hope and comfort in the hours of sorrow and loneliness.

Holy, holy, is Thy name; how many joys, how many exquisite raptures and how many moments of deep tranquillity are inspired by Thee. We pray Thee to banish our doubts, conquer our fears, and let us never allow the clock of progress to be turned back. Blessed Lord, problems are asking for solution and may we declare to our country and world that we shall never permit the foundations of freedom to be vitiated. Set up in all hearts Thy reign of grace, quicken every pulse to aspire, and may we claim the divine right to live and be free. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

The Clerk read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Journal and the RECORD for yesterday are not in accord on the subsidy amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I wish to make the parliamentary inquiry to ask what could be done to have the two records in conformity?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not necessary for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Journal to conform, because every Member has a right to revise and correct his remarks; but we go by the Journal of the House. As the Speaker very aptly and very wisely pointed out last night, it is the Journal that the Speaker has to go by, and that is what the House has to rely on.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Speaker is not bound by the Journal of the House and should not be bound by the Journal of the House until the Journal has been approved. The Journal represents the conclusion of the Journal Clerk as to what happened. On the other hand, the reporter's minutes are presumed to state correctly the words spoken in the Congress. Now, if there is a difference between the RECORD and the Journal—and I do not know whether there is or not—I do know that the Journal has no binding force or effect until it is approved by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Journal never has any binding effect until it is approved, and the House can repudiate the Journal or vote down a motion to approve the Journal of the previous day at any time. But I submit the Speaker was entirely correct yesterday in abiding by the Journal as it then stood and as it stands now.

Mr. RABAUT. That I may be correctly understood, anything I may say here is not in any way applying to the Speaker of the House. I have the greatest respect for the Speaker, as everybody in this body knows; but yesterday we had a request for a vote by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as is exemplified in the RECORD on page 6140. It calls for a separate vote on three amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On one of those amendments the House has never voted. It has not been voted en grosse, because there is a record here that a separate vote was requested. So it could not have been voted on en grosse. Evidently that part of the bill has never been passed. That is the point I am making. Does the House want to leave it in that condition or does the House desire to correct it? That is the only question I am asking.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that the Speaker was listening rather attentively when the request was made, and of all people who listen most attentively it is those charged with the responsibility of making up the Journal. The Speaker understood that there was no request for a vote on that amendment, and the Journal showed it. So, of course, as far as adopting the Journal is concerned, that is a question for the House at all times, but up to the present time I submit that the Speaker was entirely correct in his ruling on yesterday, that according to the Journal and according to his memory this amendment had been voted on.

Mr. RABAUT. The Speaker last night, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said—and I have no quarrel with the Speaker, and I want everybody to know that—but the Speaker last night said that the particular part of the stenographer's notes was not available at the time when the question was brought up. That is in the RECORD. Mistakes can happen any place. We are all human beings. All I want to know is whether the House wants to leave the two records at variance as they are, and show that we never voted on subsidies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows it has been adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. It could not have been adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was adopted en grosse with the other amendments.

Mr. RABAUT. It could not have been adopted in any manner, shape, or form, because we did not vote on it en grosse as a request for a separate vote is recorded in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Journal shows otherwise, with all due respect to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, page 6140.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the approval of the Journal.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, if the House wishes this discrepancy to stand, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under the right to object——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have called for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the approval of the Journal of yesterday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943," as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House and Senate document rooms.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 27. An act to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against

the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war;

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States;

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge;

S. 220. An act to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments;

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army; and

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution accepting an invitation to have four Members each of the Senate and House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 14, and 16 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 17 to the foregoing bill; that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 26 to the above entitled bill; that the Senate further insists on its amendments numbered 1 and 26 to said bill, requests a further conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Housing Agency.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 18, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith hand you my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to take effect immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 268) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., of Tennessee be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LUDLOW, O'NEAL, MAHON, CURLEY, TABER, KEEFE, and DWORSHAK.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report an original privileged resolution (H. Res. 269) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law No. 68, "An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax and for other purposes," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 22,000 additional copies of Public Law No. 68, "An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes." of which 20,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 2,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a number of communications I have received from educational institutions throughout the country favoring the continuation of the Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter I have received from a former Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, FITZPATRICK, KIRWAN, NORRELL, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD giving my reasons why I think the National Youth Administration should be continued.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCKGROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include resolutions adopted by the stockgrowers of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DATE FOR VOTING ON WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if consideration of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes is concluded today that the vote on the passage of the bill take place on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein a statement by Lieutenant General Somervell made before the Civil Service Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter from the Commissioner of Public Welfare of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROPRIETY OF ATTEMPT BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a leaflet dated June 14, 1943, entitled "Commerce Local Comment" published by the United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O. This was circulated in the departments here in town by Federal employees. It reads in part:

> Are you fighting for democracy on the home front? Write your Congressman to protest the Smith-Connally bill.

Now this seems to me to be very distasteful practice for Federal employees to be urging their Members to write Congressmen to protest the Smith-Connally bill.

If this sort of thing continues we may one day have Federal employees themselves striking against the Government that employs them. Federal employees of all classes, both elective and appointive, should remember that they are the servants of the people.

Mr. Speaker, such publications with such appeals as above referred to come under the head of pernicious political activity.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes; and, pending that, I should like to consult with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] as to time for general debate. I suggest that general debate be confined to the bill.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for an hour and a half. If the gentleman would be satisfied with 3 hours' time, debate to be confined to the bill, the time to be equally divided between the two sides, it would be satisfactory.

Mr. SNYDER. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have just received another request for 5 minutes. We will still leave the time at 3 hours if the gentleman will grant me an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 3 hours, to be confined to the bill, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New Jersey and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCGRANERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SYNDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago we added a new word to our vocabulary—"Dunkirk." It was an extremely dark period in our history—in the history of the world. Three years ago Germany's victorious army had been unbelievably

successful, and was completing the conquest of continental western Europe in less than a year from the time when England and France, the first strong democratic powers to cross swords with Germany, had entered the war.

A year ago the fortunes of democracy did not seem much brighter. We had then been in the war half a year, and, along with our allies, had suffered a succession of bitter defeats. Bataan and Corregidor had fallen not long before, after heroic but futile defense against overwhelming enemy forces. Wake Island and Pearl Harbor were names engraven in our memories. In fact, the one outstanding bright spot a year ago was the raid on Tokyo from "Shangri-La." We were fighting a defensive war, holding off and delaying the enemy as best we could while working day and night to turn our vast resources into the weapons needed to turn the tide in our favor.

Today, as I stand before you, not only is the outlook immeasurably brighter, but we can look back with pride on military victories in addition to industrial achievements during the past year. Our ground and air forces, with the invaluable assistance of the Army Service Forces, have been major participants in the wresting of north Africa from the Axis, and an American general was in supreme command. Our forces hold Guadalcanal and other strategic positions in the South Pacific after successful offensive operations in that theater. We have retaken the island of Attu from the Japs. Our forces are carrying out unceasing and ever-increasing blows against Germany and Axis-held Europe as well as in the Mediterranean, South Pacific, Aleutians, and other theaters. These blows alone have forced the surrender of Italian stepping-stone islands in the Mediterranean. Yes, we are on the offensive all over the world—we have taken the initiative from the enemy and shall not relinquish it.

The way has been hard. Seemingly unsurmountable obstacles had to be overcome. A huge army had to be builded and trained. We had to prepare for modern war—a war of air power and mechanized forces. We had to build an unbelievable number of airplanes, tanks, and other weapons, and we had to build better ones than the Axis Powers in much less time than they had to devote to preparing for war. That these great undertakings have been carried out successfully is now a matter of common knowledge, causing us justifiable pride and undoubtedly sincere regret to our enemies.

It all goes to prove, Mr. Chairman, what aroused America can do. It has the military genius, it has the industrial genius, and it has its great body of patriotic manhood and womanhood ever ready to do whatever part the Nation's need might require.

The Allied Nations are now on the march, and make no mistake about it. This budget we present to you today is to keep them on the march over the land and through the air.

Most of the readying process is in back of us. Henceforward it will be largely a matter of combat maintenance, but combat maintenance will be a very costly thing.

We are engaged in global warfare. It was testified before the committee that we maintain forces of one kind or another in more than 80 different locations all over the world. Our problem is not one of equipping and supporting one or two armies in as many different theaters but of equipping and supporting many different forces of our own and Allied Powers in many different and widely spread areas. Quantity, in that way, obviously must be many times what it would be if there were greater concentration.

This world-wide deployment will enable you better to appreciate the tremendous logistical problem confronting the Army and the Navy and the War Shipping Administration, and they are doing a most splendid job of it, in which air transport has a very big hand. I hope each of you will read the testimony of Gen. H. L. George, commanding the Army Transport Command. He relates a gripping story.

I am going to read one paragraph of that gripping story to give you an idea of some of the things that have been done by our air transport:

> When Rommel was pushing the British back into Cairo and it looked as if he was going to run the British out of antitank ammunition, we were called into service. There was none of this ammunition nearer than the United States or England and if it were attempted to send it by water it would have been a matter of 5 or 6 weeks at the best. There were appeals for ammunition—appeals to bring it by air if possible. The War Department received the request over here, and I received an order to move as much ammunition as possible. Within 24 hours from the time we received that order we had airplanes loaded down to capacity with antitank ammunition. The crews were impressed with the importance of their mission. They flew, in their enthusiasm, through some of the worst weather ever flown through, and they did so to get the ammunition over there. Within 72 hours from the time they left with the ammunition they arrived at Cairo.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget asked us for appropriations totaling $59,425,586,500. It also asked us to continue the availability of $12,472,839,200 of unobligated prior-year appropriations. That makes a total of $71,898,425,700.

Reappropriations, of course, have been asked in place of making new appropriations, and the table on page 3 of our report shows by services the combined amounts of new appropriations and reappropriations. The reappropriations merely represent deferred commitments for procurements we heretofore have endorsed and which still must be supplied, according to the word of our military leaders and counselors. And I want to say this, Mr. Chairman: The carry-over does not ensue from a too liberal appropriating policy, which one might infer, but, as it has turned out, from a too fast appropriating policy. Subsequent to the enactment of the current appropriation measure, along in the fiscal year, the War Production Board found that industry could not absorb the programs of the Army and the Navy and the Maritime Commission in toto and it became necessary to adjust the procurement programs according to those articles which the high command indicated should have first priority. That was one factor. Another, and a very important one, was a change in procurement programs to meet modified requirements in consequence of military programs determined upon by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This latter consideration, as you can well understand, has much to do with the size of the budgets we are called upon to endorse. Strategy is anything but static, and, as regards particular theaters, changes may become necessary often and quickly. Our military and naval leadership must have at their command, therefore, the quantity and kind of war munitions that unpredictable and particular situations make necessary.

Any man who wades through the voluminous tables of planned procurements presented by the armed services, as we must, becomes appalled by the quantities, and yet, because we cannot see around the corner or anticipate the enemy, they must be provided. Certainly, we cannot and should not, as laymen, disregard the word of our military experts and fail to provide for the real sinews of war in the measure they advocate. The program presently presented, including reappropriations, has been reviewed and endorsed by the War Production Board, and General Somervell has advised us that the amount of the entire Budget can and will be obligated by June 30, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that within the relatively brief period we had in which to hold hearings and get this bill shaped and through to the President for signature before the beginning of the new fiscal year, we examined as closely as we could into the details of the estimates. We had 9 volumes, comprising 1,439 pages of details. So do not let anyone tell you that we were not advised of the Budget contents. They have been examined from cover to cover, together with many special statements, presented voluntarily or requested during the course of the hearings. Based upon such inquiry, we recommend this bill to you in the form in which it has been presented.

Now, I wish to say this, Mr. Chairman, and I say it deliberately: It is my opinion—in fact, I feel that I can assure the House that we shall not be asked again to support another measure anywhere near approaching the amount of cash contained in this bill.

This measure today, as regards new cash, would fall considerably below the one of a year ago were it not for the new airplane program we are now called upon to underwrite. You may say that may again become necessary. I very seriously doubt it.

The new program means approximately 132,000 more airplanes for the Army and Navy, pyramided upon the 185,000 program which will be completed, we are told, by June 30, 1944.

Of course, when I say pyramided upon the 185,000 program, I disregard attri-

tion. We know that many of those planes will be washed out from one cause or another as a great many of them have already, but considering the production of our allies and the dwindling forces of our enemies we may be reasonably certain that the new program will about see us through to victory. It might be termed our combat maintenance program.

The new airplane program accounts for practically $25,000,000,000 of this bill. Including all classes of expenses for and on account of aviation personnel and matériel, this bill carries $36,000,000,000 for and on account of the air arm.

As to Army personnel generally, we shall about reach the ceiling in this bill for personnel costs. The peak objective—7,533,000 men—is scheduled for attainment by the end of coming December.

Construction is on the downward trend. For military post construction, the total, as we present it, is $464,469,000. Most of this sort of expense is in back of us. Since June 30, 1940, appropriations for such uses have aggregated $9,380,291,502.

These are signs pointing to a downward trend in appropriations. As General Somervell told us, we have reached a stage of financing a fighting army. Funds will be required principally for their pay and general well-being, and for procurement and delivery at the front of munitions of war to our own forces and to those of our allies in contact with the enemy.

Mr. Chairman, we have effected reductions in the Budget estimates aggregating $387,986,827 the details of which you will find set out for you on pages 5 and 6 of our report. We state there briefly the reasons.

These are not deferments or postponements. They represent genuine reductions and we have no reason to believe that they cannot be met. I might make one exception there. We arbitrarily cut the travel estimate $80,000,000, which is a flat reduction of 10 percent. I do not think there is a man or woman among us who does not have the opinion that there has been unnecessary travel going on. Our Naval Subcommittee set the precedent for this action. We have followed them. If we have cut too much, they can come back, but we say in the report that they have got to come back with evidence of a determined effort having been made to stay within the reduced amount.

We have cut off $127,148,000 for the pay of 84,300 civilian employees in the field service of the War Department. The Secretary of War told us we might do that. We print the text of his letter in the report—page 7—since the decision was made after our hearings had come to a close.

One of the big items in the bill to which I should direct your attention is discussed on page 8 of our report. We thought we had wound up with expediting production, but they tell us now that new and improved munitions continually are being evolved, making necessary plant extensions, new tooling, and, in some cases, new establishments. The estimate includes an amount of $91,989,000 under expediting production for contingencies. We have cut that out. There is contingent money in the projects themselves.

The estimates include $4,969,967,668 for lend-lease, but articles or services chargeable thereto are to come within prior ceilings upon the value of such aid as may be rendered. I might say there is plenty of leeway, since aid previously rendered has entailed appropriation charges of but $4,876,338,912, out of a possible total of $32,170,000,000 independently of direct lend-lease.

We have written in two or three limitations, to which I wish to direct your attention. They are set out commencing on page 14 of the report.

The first one relates to conscientious objectors not identified with the Military Establishment. I shall repeat what we say on page 14 of the report regarding the matter:

> It is the sense of the committee that no military funds should be employed on account of persons not identified with the Military Establishment by reason of classification as conscientious objectors. There is no evidence that any military funds have been so employed. The limitation is to make certain that they will not be. It would be incongruous, the committee feels, to use such funds upon persons possessing convictions or beliefs that relieve them from the foremost obligation of every citizen to his country.

The next proposition sounds a bit like W. P. A. The Army has an art project. It has civilian and military artists in this country and abroad. I shall let my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] tell you about it later. We just felt that General Somervell was right when he said this bill is for the support of a fighting army, and that picture painting might well be dispensed with.

Then, you will see that we have put a nonsubsidy provision in the bill.

We also have included in this bill a provision with respect to interchange of appropriations. We have provided that interchange shall extend to subappropriations, but, in so doing, it was not our thought or intention to take from the Army the discretion it now has. It was not our intention, let me say, to require a change in accounting methods or procedure, but merely to see that in the exercise of the authority it now has, that it shall not make any increase in any subappropriation in excess of 10 percent.

Another provision deals with educating persons in medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry. The Army proposes to pick up young men who profess an interest in such callings, and carry them through premedical, medical, and the interne period—a matter of some 51 months of intensive instruction. Fifty-one months is 4 years and 3 months. That is too long in our judgment. It is very doubtful if they would be of any value to the Army in this war, and, if that be not the purpose, the War Department should have no hand in the matter. If the proposition has justification for potential post-war civilian demands, let some other agency of Government assume jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I see no need to trespass further upon the time of the Committee of the Whole. Before concluding, however, I should like to express this thought: The very capable Deputy Chief of the War Department General Staff, Lieutenant General McNarney, termed this budget the "decisive budget." It will be the decisive budget only in case that we on the home front shall continue to work as hard as we can, reconciling ourselves to deprivations and pulling together as a team.

Our troops and our allies must have what they need as and when they need it in order to do a decisive job. If we do our part on the home front, I am confident that we may rely upon our boys on the battle fronts to press the offensive on the Axis until the very weight of the blows will force them into submission.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one further statement before closing. It was my privilege and pleasure yesterday to entertain in the dining room of the House 10 boys of the Army Air Corps, and the members and secretary of my committee. The 10 boys left our shores about a year ago in a Flying Fortress which they named the *Memphis Belle*. They flew the *Memphis Belle* to England and trained there for the bombing missions they would be expected to perform over the continent of Europe until the morning of December 7, 1942. On that morning they were instructed to make their first bombing mission.

I can imagine those 10 boys crossing the English Channel loaded down with bombs in that great Flying Fortress, accompanied by 200, 300, or 400, we do not know how many bombers, on that first mission. They saw their brothers, as Captain Morgan said yesterday, being shot at to the right of them and to the left of them, and being shot down, but, miraculously, they returned safely.

They made 25 such bombing missions over Germany and France, shooting down officially 8 enemy planes and putting 27 others out of commission. After doing a job like that, the Air Force commander of the United States in England said, "You boys deserve to go home and have a little rest." They flew the *Memphis Belle* back to Bolling Field.

If you had heard Captain Morgan tell us, as he did at the table yesterday, what those boys had to undergo in order that you and I might feel secure back here at home, taking their lives in their hands 25 times, with shells from the ack-ack guns bursting all around them, the anti-aircraft guns under them looking like a blaze of fire, I think you would agree that this bill should have your immediate and unanimous approval.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I shall yield to the gentleman from Montana in just a moment. I want to name these boys who officered and manned the *Memphis Belle*. The skipper is Capt. Robert K. Morgan, of Asheville, N. C., and the copilot, or, as Captain Morgan called him, the other pilot, is Capt. James A. Verinis, of New Haven, Conn. The navigator is Capt. Charles B. Leighton, of East Lansing,

Mich., and the bombardier is Capt. Vincent B. Evans, of Henderson, Tex. Their crew said they were the best in their lines in the Air Corps. The crew, and by rights we should include the officers as a part of the crew because it was just like one family, was made up of Sgt. Casimer A. Nastel, of Detroit; Sgt. Clarence E. Winchell, of Oak Park, Ill.; Sgt. Harold P. Loch, of Green Bay, Wis., who told us he got a greater kick out of duck shooting than shooting at the enemy; Sgt. John P. Quinlan, of Yonkers, N. Y.; and Sgt. Cecil H. Scott, of Altoona, Pa. As you see, they come from every part of the Union. Every one of them is the finest type of young America.

Now I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. In your hearings on this bill you interrogated the officers in charge of the Corps of Engineers. Did they mention anything about the development of water power in the Northwest?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. This is a matter relating to the civil functions bill of the War Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The Army engineers have been out in my section of the country carrying on surveys about the possibility of raising Flathead Lake. Under the war emergency powers I should like to know whether this was mentioned, and if so, what happened. I want the gentleman to know that this is a very serious matter affecting all the people of western Montana, hence my great interest.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It would not come under this bill at all, it would come under the War Department civil functions bill, which already has been passed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is there any appropriation in this bill covering the conscientious objectors' group?

Mr. SNYDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

FAMINE AMIDST PLENTY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, an army is not properly equipped without sufficient food. Early in the year there were a few of us who were convinced that our food supplies were rapidly diminishing and the surpluses spoken of by certain men in the Government as being so burdensome were rapidly becoming exhausted. Early in March I called the attention of the House to the dangers of a food shortage, believing then that it was better to save food while we had it than to be hunting it later on.

I declared war on waste, and launched my "lick your platter clean" campaign, and now, from the reports coming to my office, I have reason to believe that millions of dollars' worth of food are being saved.

However, at that time I did not think that in about 3 or 4 months we would actually be out of some of our most important foods. There were a few people who ridiculed the idea and thought it could not happen here. But since that time we have found ourselves unable to get potatoes and many other commodities have become so scarce that those which are not yet rationed are likely to be rationed soon. While the potato situation has apparently eased off, I am warning now that the new potatoes that have come along have been harvested before they matured, causing a great deal of spoilage in transit, and what is of greater importance, had most of them been left in the ground 3 weeks longer, until they had matured, the quantity in many cases would have been doubled. This has created a tremendous drain on our future supply, and unless the acreage is excessive and the season is extremely good we can look ahead to a more serious potato shortage during the coming winter.

It is now pretty well established that our production of food this year will fall far below that of 1942. There is little now that can be done about this since the planting season is past. We can only hope that a kind Providence will bless us with a good season and then do as Chester Davis, the War Food Administrator, is recommending: "Save every scrap."

Many of our shortages, however, are not due to scarcity. They are due to muddling in the O. P. A. and to a lack of coordination and cooperation in the various departments of government. There is a strong sentiment, and I concur in it, that what we need is an over-all food agency. We now have the War Food Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Shipping Administration, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Selective Service System, the Army Quartermaster Corps, the Lend-Lease Administration, and the Office of Economic Stabilization. Twelve units dealing in one way or another with the food problem and apparently no one of them can do anything without the balance of the agencies agreeing. This has created no end of confusion and made it impossible to move the supplies we have into the proper channels of trade.

It is admitted by those who know that there is plenty of corn in the country for every need, yet there is no corn moving and many feeders of livestock and poultry find themselves without feed. The reason this situation is not more desperate is because we are just now in the midst of our lush pasture season and are able to get along, but on July 1 these pastures get shorter and if we get the usual season during July and August and the feed situation does not improve our dairy and poultry production might be cut in half.

York County, Pa., last year produced 19,168,000 dozen eggs. Only one county in the United States produced more. That many eggs would supply an army of 52,515 men for 1 year. I am receiving complaints daily from these poultrymen stating that they are unable to buy sufficient feed of the proper quality to continue this scale of production. What is perhaps more serious is the fact that they are unable to get the proper feed for their growing stock, which means that they will not go into the winter in proper condition to produce normally.

This section also produces large quantities of dairy supplies as well as pork and beef. It is now thoroughly established that there is not going to be sufficient corn to feed the greatly increased number of livestock which the farmers have raised. This means that next fall and winter we will be slaughtering grass cattle instead of the usual corn-fed cattle which our markets demand.

It is true that the Administration has called in the loan on 47,000,000 bushels of corn but little of this will find its way into the elevators because of the price ceiling established by the O. P. A. There is much talk in the various departments of Government about a long-range program, but what we need is immediate relief. We need action or regulations that will bring this corn out of the cribs and make it available for industry and as feed for livestock and poultry.

So long as the price ceiling on corn is so low that it is more profitable to put it through livestock, particularly hogs in the Corn Belt, than it is to sell it on the Chicago market, the present corn famine will exist.

It is unthinkable that with about 1½ billion bushels of corn on the farms that a man is unable to buy a carload of corn. Subsidies will not be the answer and there is no one in the country who wants subsidies except a few men within the administration.

Apparently, the "hold the line" program has failed. A higher ceiling or cost of production figure is the answer and if the market price gets even a little higher than the cost of production and the farmer gets a little profit, that will not hurt him or the country. The Department of Agriculture has been admitting for years that farm commodities were selling in many cases far below cost of production.

Certain agencies of the Government are much concerned about support prices. That should be the least of their worries. I believe that if the ceiling price of corn would be raised to $1.25 a bushel on the Chicago market, we would find corn immediately moving into the channels of trade, and our feed and food problems would be largely solved.

Of course, I understand that such a step would create quite a complaint among dairy farmers and poultry producers but I think that matter would soon adjust itself, and, after all, it is far better to get feed at a higher price than not to get it at all.

When this matter is taken up with any of the agencies of the Government, about the only answer we get is: "We will hold a conference soon and see what can be done." Whatever is done depends entirely on whether or not they agree. This ridiculous condition is entirely re-

sponsible for the attitude the House took here yesterday when we declared open war on the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], I believe, has covered both in general and in a detailed way the break-down and the purposes of this War Department fiscal year 1944 appropriation bill, amounting to $71,900,000,000, the largest appropriation bill ever considered by any legislative body in the world. It is difficult for me or anyone else to make either an interesting or informative explanation of everything in this bill. In the first place, the interesting phases of it are matters that cannot be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that without a doubt during the 4 or 5 weeks of the hearings which were held on this bill more interesting and enlightening information was conveyed to the committee than ever before during any hearings since I have been a member of the committee, which goes back about 12 years.

I wish I could discuss here publicly the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army. Should any of the Axis Powers, in desperation, resort to gas attacks, I can tell the Congress and the country at least this much: That if they do and when they do, the American Army will be well prepared both offensively and defensively, as it is now, and the Axis Powers will rue the day this hideous type of warfare ever began.

I should like, for the benefit of the RECORD, to list just briefly some of the main items constituting this $71,000,000,000 bill. There is an item, as you know, of approximately $24,000,000,000 for the Air Corps providing for the completion of the Army Air Corps' program and covering the procurement of almost 100,000 planes, with spare engines and spare parts.

Then there is an item of approximately $5,000,000,000 included in this bill for military lease-lend requirements. There is an ordnance item, and a mighty important one, of approximately $15,000,000,000. I wish at this point I could tell you something of the testimony by General Campbell, the Chief of Ordnance, and his staff of officers, but I can say that research and development are bringing to us now new types of weapons, new types of ammunition, which we shall all hear about within the coming year, I am sure.

The engineer estimate is approximately $4,000,000,000. Chemical Warfare is slightly over a billion dollars. Next is the Medical Department, and in my opinion the unsung heroes of this war are men in that department. They are asking for $600,000,000, and this item has been granted. The Signal Corps are asking for approximately five and a half billion dollars. I think there have been developed by our United States Signal Corps the finest communication system, radio, radar, and other secret devices possessed by any nation in the world. Under the head of expediting production, there is an item of approximately $1,300,000,000. In this particular item, if my memory serves me correctly, there is about $314,000,000 for lend-lease machine tools.

Mr. Chairman, in my very humble opinion we have today the best fed, the best equipped, and the fightingest Army we have ever had in the history of the United States. It was my privilege yesterday to accompany Under Secretary of War Patterson and Assistant Secretary of War McCloy to Fort Dix in New Jersey, where the Fourth Division is in training. We traveled yesterday about 500 miles, 300 miles by air and 200 by jeeps. I should like to tell the committee, and I should like to tell the world my impression of this Fourth Division. It is the only completely mechanized infantry division that we have. Its complement of vehicles runs into the thousands. I cannot disclose the exact number. Its fire power is enormous, probably twice as much as an ordinary infantry division, and certainly 10 times as great as an old infantry division that you and I knew, Mr. Chairman, back in 1917 and 1918. This division is commanded by Major General Barton, of Oklahoma, and never in my experience have I seen a division commander who had the love, respect, and admiration such as this man has from his men. He is ably assisted by Brigadier General Prickett, of Kansas, and Brigadier General O'Brien, of Iowa. The regimental commanders and the junior commanders are simply splendid. The morale of the division is something that you can write home about. I talked with at least a score of enlisted men, and the only thing in the world they want to do is to get on the alert again, and move out and move over. I predict after seeing that division yesterday, not in review, but at the end of a week's maneuver, that if we follow it through this show we shall find that it will give a magnificent account of itself. No matter where it is sent, the Axis will certainly know it has been there.

It is hard for me and it is hard for anyone else to conceive of $72,000,000,000. In my wildest dreams I just cannot think of that amount of money. It is true that we went through these items carefully and it is true that we spent many, many hours and days going through them, but I am frank to admit that there are many items in the $72,000,000,000 that I definitely do not know all about, but I am willing to take the word of our General Staff, and when they tell me that these moneys are needed to promote the war successfully, I say that, as far as I am concerned—and I know the other members of the committee agree with me—the money should be granted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said that he made a careful study of these estimates. I find three and a half million dollars here appropriated for dog food; and with the waste going on around these Army camps and the swilling of hogs, how much care and consideration did the gentleman give to that item?

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly will. I am asking for information.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] about several things, but the gentleman did not give the gentleman from Pennsylvania a chance to answer. That item was gone into carefully. Colonel Daniels testified for the item. He testified that at the present time there were, I believe, 4,000 of these dogs being used by the Army, but he definitely testified that 39,600 dogs were to be used by the Army during the coming fiscal year. The item the gentleman refers to is for dog food at the approximate rate of 24 cents per day. Colonel Daniels testified that the use of dogs in the Army has been highly successful. He testified that the use of dogs in the Army is saving a lot of manpower, particularly on sentry and guard work and messenger service. There is a difference in opinion about the value of dogs in the United States Army, but again, in times like these, if an able representative of the War Department comes up and tells me as a member of the committee that is what they want and must have, I am for that. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman considers that the cooks and the help around the kitchens are too dainty to save any food that is left over around the kitchen?

Mr. POWERS. Oh, no; I do not think that is so. I think they are saving a lot of that, and probably feeding it to the dogs, and I imagine they are buying prepared dog food also.

Mr. WHITE. Three and one-half million dollars will buy quite a little dog food.

Mr. POWERS. I am not a dog fancier nor am I a dog expert. Again I am giving you Colonel Daniels' testimony.

Mr. WHITE. I also notice there was over $5,000,000 for books for the Army. You know that the Red Cross and the people of the United States are shoving literature, books, and periodicals to the Army just as fast as they can take them.

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. How do you justify $5,000,000 for books?

Mr. POWERS. There are a lot of these books which are books of instruction. Many of these boys are taking special courses and there are a lot of school books that are used in the various Army schools. All of that money is not for periodicals and newspapers.

Mr. WHITE. You assume that this is for 1 year's supply and that all the other books that have been bought in the past are not to be used in connection with these schools?

Mr. POWERS. Oh, no. The gentleman has a distorted idea of this. This is an appropriation bill for the War Department for the fiscal year 1944, meaning July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944. The moneys that are in here for the purchase of books cover that period. That does not mean that everything you have is going to be discarded and thrown away.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman says I have a distorted idea. In comparison

with the cost of the last World War, does not the gentleman think that $71,000,000,000 for 1 year is a rather distorted figure?

Mr. POWERS. My dear sir, I would not call it a distorted figure. I just call it a figure that is beyond my comprehension. The whole war is beyond my comprehension. I could comprehend something about the last war. That was fought practically in one place. The supply lines reached over 3,000 miles. This war is being fought all over the globe. The supply lines are tens of thousands of miles in length. I cannot conceive of the enormity of this thing and I do not believe the gentleman can either, but I am taking the word of the General Staff of the War Department, the people who are running this show. If they tell me this is what they need for the successful prosecution of this war and for ultimate victory, I am for it. Whether it staggers me according to its proportions or not, I am still for it.

Mr. WHITE. In the last war when there were 50,000 saddles ordered for 20,000 horses, you were in favor of that kind of an arrangement, were you?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. POWERS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman. I wish the gentleman would not try to put words into my mouth. In the last war I volunteered before I was 21 years of age. I was an Infantry soldier, a volunteer in the Regular Army of Infantry. Whether 20,000 saddles or 80,000 saddles were bought I do not know, because I had nothing to do with it. Maybe the gentleman did.

Mr. WHITE. You do not think there ought to be any curb on extravagance just because it is for the war?

Mr. POWERS. There should always be a curb on extravagance. If you can find any place in this bill where you can curb extravagance, I am sure the committee would be glad to hear about it.

Mr. WHITE. You think the taxpayers of this country are entitled to a little consideration?

Mr. POWERS. I think the taxpayers of this country are entitled to every consideration. I think if we had considered them a little more before war became imminent, when we built up an enormous national debt, a way might have been found to have averted this war; and that goes for your party, my dear sir.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate this committee, with the full realization of the amount of hard work they have put in on this particular bill. I fully realize that they could not go into all the details that might incorporate an 11,000,000-man army. I do hope that some of these days after this bill is passed they will have a little breathing spell and that they in conjunction with possibly another committee of this House will give very serious consideration to some of the tactics of our military men. Especially I want to incorporate here on page 30 where the Corps of Engineers have the privilege of rental, storehouses, grounds, and so forth, repair and alteration of buildings. I fully realize this committee possibly has not had time to go into that, but I have some very interesting information relative to what some of the Army officials are doing on the rental of these buildings. I trust it will be my privilege to submit that information to this committee at a very early date.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACHIEVEMENTS, MILITARY AND CIVIL, OF UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman. Today we have before us for consideration the Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944, to provide funds to finance a military budget of approximately $72,000,000,000, requiring an appropriation of approximately $59,000,000,000 in addition to available funds previously appropriated. This program contemplates an Army of more than 8,200,000 officers and enlisted men on the offensive.

This sum of money is the largest appropriation for the largest Army in our history. In fact it is the largest direct appropriation for any purpose in all the history of mankind. The funds provided for the Army during the past 4 years upon the recommendation of your War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations has given us the best led, the best trained, best clothed, best equipped, and best housed Army in the world. This Army is a balanced all-purpose force ready for offensive action anywhere in the world. Guadalcanal, Tunisia, and Attu attest the truth of this assertion. The striking successes of our Army in jungle combat, in desert warfare, and barren, snow-capped mountain wastes afford convincing proof of its mobility and striking power.

The brilliant tactical exploits and the fighting quality of our troops are well known to all. There is, however, an amazing story of successes achieved behind the battle lines which is not so well known, without which neither we nor our allies could have been on the glory road to victory today. I refer to the battle of production and supply—the tremendous task of selecting, training, equipping, housing, and transporting an army of several million men, while at the same time acting as the arsenal of democracy for our allies. Inasmuch as the greater portion of the billions we have appropriated, first for defense and now for offense, have been and will be spent for such purposes, I know that you and our people will welcome a report on these accomplishments. All of us share a feeling of pride in the achievements of our Army, of industry, our soldiers of production, and of all the people whose cooperation has made such successes possible. I can relate at this time only such information as will not endanger our military security. However, I can give you illustrative information sufficient to assure you we can successfully carry out this program for 1944, and that we can and will win this war.

Looking back over the few short years from the fateful days of September 1939, when Germany invaded Poland, and Great Britain and France entered the war, let us note some of the high lights of this Nation's accomplishments, both military and civil, which demonstrate so clearly that a democracy can not only keep step with, but can surpass the achievements of nations governed by dictators. Let it never again be said that the democratic processes are too slow and cumbersome to compete with the harnessed manpower of dictatorship. Democracy's accomplishments in this period of less than 4 years has established the speed record of all time.

STRENGTH OF THE ARMY

On September 1, 1939, the United States maintained on active duty a peacetime Army of fewer than 190,000 officers and enlisted men, including the Philippine Scouts, plus a National Guard of approximately 200,000 available for active service in times of emergency. Small increases in the strength of the Regular Army and the National Guard were approved on several occasions during the succeeding year so that on September 1, 1940, just prior to the enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act, the aggregate active strength of the Army was 325,000 plus the National Guard of approximately 246,000.

In order to effectuate the purposes of the Selective Training and Service Act, the Third Supplemental Military Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, approved October 8, 1940, provided for the induction of not more than 800,000 selective trainees, and further provided that the appropriation was not subject to any limitations with respect to enlisted strength nor as to the number of retired officers called to active duty. In all, the regular and supplemental appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941 made provision for an Army strength slightly in excess of 1,500,000.

For the fiscal year 1942, the regular Military Appropriation Act increased the authorized strength to permit a total of 900,000 selective trainees, which limitation was subsequently removed by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1942, approved December 17, 1941. Altogether, the regular and supplemental Appropriation Acts for 1942 provided funds to increase the Army to approximately 3,100,000.

The 1943 regular Military Appropriation Act set as its goal a further expansion to 5,200,000. This objective was increased to a strength of approximately 7,000,000 officers and enlisted men by the close of this fiscal year. The present budget for 1944 contemplates an Army of more than 8,200,000 officers and enlisted men by December 31, 1943, and to be maintained thereafter as long as may be necessary during this world-wide conflict.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman made that statement. I would like to know what is the difference in the amount carried in this appropriation bill and what was carried in the appropriation bill for the last fiscal year?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In the present fiscal year, which ends on June 30 next, we provided by direct appropriation approximately $43,000,000,000. There was an unexpended balance of $29,000,000,000 which we reappropriated, making a total of $72,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1943.

This bill directly appropriates $59,000,000,000-plus, and reappropriates $12,000,000,000-plus unexpended balance from fiscal year 1943, making a total of $71,000,000,000-plus.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The increasing goals of the Army, as outlined above, have been met according to schedule, largely due to the exceptional efficiency of the Selective Service System, to which I pay special tribute. The accomplishments of the Selective Service System since the Selective Service and Training Act became law on September 16, 1940, providing the democratic basis for selecting the great wartime Army we have today, is a highlight well recognized by all. These accomplishments were achieved largely because of the abilities and untiring efforts of both the administration of the Selective Service System and the patriotic citizens who have served so devotedly, as well as the willing acceptance and cooperation of all the people.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, followed closely by declarations of war by Germany and Italy against the United States, we had an Army of more than 1,600,000 officers and men trained, equipped, and ready for action. Equally important, we had in effective operation a system which made it possible to select the manpower to increase the Army in little more than a year to its present strength of more than 6,000,000, and which enabled us to land an offensive force in north Africa less than 1 year after Pearl Harbor. These are eloquent facts which have left a deep impression upon Hitler and Mussolini.

The selection of the men to comprise the Army was only the first step in the gigantic operation. The men had to be inducted, trained, clothed, fed, equipped, housed, and transported before they could become a well-knit, powerful fighting force. The National Guard, the Reserves, and Reserve Officers Training Corps had to be incorporated into the Army of the United States, and a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps organized. These steps were carried out efficiently and on schedule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY

In order to give proper perspective to the facts to follow, let me outline briefly the present streamlined organization of our Army, which, in addition to being a first-rate fighting force, is carrying out the largest and most successful business undertaking the world has ever known.

In order to better aline the Army for its wartime task, the War Department and the Army were reorganized, effective March 9, 1942. The new organization, under Secretary of War Stimson and the Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall, provided for a General Staff, the Army Ground Forces, the Army Air Forces, and the Services of Supply—later renamed the Army Service Forces—all with headquarters here, and in addition, such overseas departments, task forces, defense commands, commands in theaters of operations, and other commands as are necessary.

The Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, and Coast Artillery were consolidated under the command of the commanding general, Army Ground Forces, Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair. The mission of the Army Ground Forces is to provide infantry, cavalry, field artillery, coast artillery, armored force, antiaircraft, tank destroyer, and other ground force units properly organized, trained and equipped for combat operations.

Command of all individuals and units assigned to the Army Air Forces was vested in the commanding general, Army Air Forces, Gen. Henry H. Arnold. The mission of the Army Air Forces is to procure and maintain equipment peculiar to the Army Air Forces, and to provide air-force units properly organized, trained, and equipped for combat operations. Our Army Air Force is practically an autonomous group.

This committee has recommended an appropriation to the Air Forces for the coming year of $23,000,000,000, which is approximately the total cost of World War No. 1 for 1917 and 1918 for the Army and Air Force.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. There has been some talk with reference to an operating command for combining the Air Forces of the Army and the Navy. Was that matter brought to the attention of the committee in considering the appropriation?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That matter has been under discussion by members of the committee, as well as the Members of the House in general, for a number of years. It has been discussed with the War Department officials at various times as they appeared before us.

So far as the Army is concerned, the Army Air Force does its own procurement and for all intents and purposes is an autonomous group. As to a single Air Force for the Army and Navy no actual progress has been made. Each of these forces has a distinctive field of operations, and operate under different conditions. On procurement of raw material and certain items of ordnance there is a degree of unity.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman permit me to amplify the question I had in mind?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. ROWE. I did not mean the committee should have taken action initially that would bring about such a consummation; my question was directed more to whether the matter was brought to the attention of the committee in its hearings by the General Staff that such a move may be put into effect?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It has been discussed in past years by members of the committee and Army representatives.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that in theaters of operation where the Army and the Navy are operating today, we have a unified command in both the Army and the Navy, and whether such command is under the military or the Navy officer depends upon whether the naval activities or military activities predominate in that particular seetion. For example, in the south Pacific, General MacArthur is commander of both the Army and the naval forces. At Pearl Harbor Admiral Nimitz is in command of both the Army and the naval forces, so that where there is a joint operation of the two forces we do have what in effect is a unified command.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been much interested in the gentleman's remarks regarding the Air Force. I think this is an observation the able gentleman will agree with. The fact that Congress has been so liberal with the Air Force, which has permitted the expansion of the Air Force, is changing the entire character of the war and is permitting the American forces to drive the enemy out of the skies. Is that not correct?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement that more money is being appropriated here for the Air Force than the entire cost of World War No. 1.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. More money is recommended for appropriation in this bill for the Air Force than the cost of World War No. 1, so far as the Army and the Air Force is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The fact also is true that there is a vast difference between the cost of airplanes in World War No. 1 and in this struggle. In World War No. 1 the cost of our planes ranged from less than $10,000 each to around $15,000 each. Some cost even less, whereas the bombers of today cost $250,000 and more.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I too have appreciated the gentleman's very interesting and informative address.

The gentleman from Alabama always gives the House valuable information in addressing this body, but this is a tremendous bill. I am not a member of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings on this bill, and I have not heard all of the testimony on these appropriation items, but this I believe is the largest appropriation bill ever presented to this House for the War Department, is it not?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It carries the largest direct appropriation that has ever been presented to this House, or to any parliamentary body in all history for any purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will bear with me further for a moment. As I understand there is a reappropriation of $12,000,000,000 carried in the bill for the War Department over the appropriation made for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; carried over from 1943.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows that I am supporting the War Department and agree with him it is doing a good job. I am wondering, however, whether or not the entire appropriation is urgently needed at this time; whether or not the appropriation could not be reduced some and at the same time not impair the efficiency of the War Department or lessen the war effort.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In reply to that inquiry by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, who is one of the ablest Members of this body, the question he propounds was one which was uppermost in the minds of the members of the committee when we began the hearings on this bill. We took this matter up very carefully with the representatives of the War Department who appeared before us.

They assured us that with the facilities for production now extant and the few additional facilities to be provided for expediting production in this bill they would need every dollar of this money for the fiscal year 1944. We were assured by General Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, the War Department would be able to obligate every dollar of it during the fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman was on the subcommittee that went through these estimates with the Army representatives.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Was there any item in the bill that was reduced by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; quite a number of them.

Mr. WHITE. There are a number of items for which the Army asked more but which the Appropriations Committee reduced?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Could the gentleman give me any idea of the aggregate or the total?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; it is approximately $350,000,000. I will enumerate those items when I extend my remarks if the gentleman would like for me to. I can tell him now the most sizable cut we made was approximately $127,000,000 for pay for civilian personnel. The Army has approximately 1,300,000 civil employees. Statements were made by Under Secretary Patterson, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Kushnick before the so-called Ramspeck committee during the past week to the effect they expected to reduce civilian personnel during the coming year by approximately 100,000. With that information in mind we contacted Mr. Patterson and other War Department officials and told them we proposed to make the cut now. That was the largest single item. We took out approximately $90,000,000 contingencies of the Army engineers. That was taken out after full consultation with representatives of the Department. Those were the two larger items in the $350,000,000. There was one item of $80,000,000 for travel which was deducted.

Mr. WHITE. I am wondering whether, in making comparisons of the expense of operating the Army, figures produced in the last World War or other wars were used as a comparative basis for checking the cost per man, or anything like that?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No. I am going to touch on this very subject during the course of my remarks. I hope the gentleman from Idaho will bear with me and stay to hear what I have to say. We could not very well do it, for it is not logical. This is a mechanized war, and the cost now for equipping one man for service is far greater than it was before. The cost of production of tanks, of planes, and of motor vehicles by the hundreds and thousands is a very costly operation. There is no basis for comparison.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. I might observe to the gentleman in considering the over-all cost of appropriations for this war as compared with any other war that the cost per man has run to gigantic proportions above what is has ever cost before. Is not that a fact?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Unquestionably it is so because wages are higher than they ever were before. Tracing the item of labor cost from the time the raw material is taken from the earth or from whatever source it is obtained to the finished fighting product, labor costs represent between 70 and 80 percent of the cost of the finished product. We have appropriated for the War Department alone something in the neighborhood of $200,000,000,000 since the 1st of July 1940. The wage increases and overtime pay provisions since July 1, 1940, represent a sum total which is greater than the cost of World War No. 1.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement he has made and also ask him a question: When the national defense program first started I had some apprehension with regard to inevitable waste due to the speed with which we must carry it on, knowing full well that the necessary speed would enhance the cost enormously. We cut out competitive bidding on war contracts and that sort of thing usually called red tape and went to negotiated contracts. Does the gentleman believe there is any plan for changing back once more to a more systematic way of entering into contracts for the construction and war materials we need?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Unquestionably. As the gentleman knows, we were thrust into this war. It is a modern war, and the first step was industrial mobilization. We had to manufacture many things which never had been made in quantity before. There was no cost base on which to ask for bids, and it was necessary to relax the safeguards that we ordinarily call red tape for the sake of getting production. We had to go to manufacturers and say, "Here, we want mass production on this weapon or some other item necessary to a successful prosecution of the war. It has never been made before in quantity; we do not know what the proper basis of cost is." We entered into negotiated contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. I can assure the gentleman that industry has done a magnificent job. We have reached the point where now we have established a cost basis through experience in producing these new implements and devices, and now the Army will gladly go back to the competitive bid system as rapidly as possible. They prefer to do so.

INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

The transition of American industry from peacetime production to wartime production, accompanied by the tremendous expansion of production facilities and output, has been truly phenomenal.

An industrial survey of the plants of the country whose facilities could be utilized for war production was conducted a number of years ago. Based upon this survey and given requirements for our armed forces, a program of conversion was formulated which has been highly successful. With the amount provided in this bill we have appropriated a total of approximately $7,000,000,000 for conversion of plants and new facilities for war production purposes.

The inauguration of so-called educational orders to afford certain training to industry in the manufacture of munitions was initiated in the fiscal year 1940. This step helped pave the way for the conversion of industry to wartime basis of operation.

Four years ago our production lines were devoted almost entirely to civilian supplies—automobiles, radios, oil burners, and the like. Not only was a tremendous job of conversion necessary but new factories, shipyards, and so forth, had to be built, often in areas not hitherto devoted to such industrial activities.

Our first objective was defense; not only the strengthening of fortifications in and around the United States but, through our role as the arsenal of de-

mocracy, defense in the form of support for the democracies which were engaged in battle overseas. We fortified our coasts; we built airfields, posts, camps, and other military installations; and we established new bases and strengthened our existing facilities outside the continental United States to provide a steel ring of protection.

After the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it was still necessary at first to remain on the defensive, but our defenses were expanded to world-wide scope. We constructed airfields and bases across the South Pacific to protect our supply lines in that theater of operations. We built airfields and bases in Asia, Africa, South America, and other strategic places throughout the world. We worked unceasingly to produce the supplies and implements of war not only to match the resources of our enemies and to enable us to hold our own but to permit us to forge ahead and gain the definite and overwhelming superiority in airplanes, tanks, arms, and other implements of war which would enable us to take the offensive and bring the war to a successful conclusion.

Today our defenses are complete and our plants are in full production for offense. Today 10,000,000 Americans are engaged directly in the production of war materials, and our factories are producing more than all our enemies combined. With our allies, we have now taken the initiative from the enemy. We shall keep the initiative and we shall press the offensive until victory is ours.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman mentioned the fact that we are now producing more war material than all the Axis Nations combined. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what proportion the war expenditures since we entered the war have borne to the war expenditures of all other nations, Allied and Axis combined?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No such figures were made available to our committee. I do not have the information, and therefore cannot answer the gentleman's question.

The Ordnance Department of the Army Service Forces, which is responsible for providing the weapons required by our fighting forces, offers an outstanding illustration of the tremendous production job which has been accomplished. For many years the Ordnance Department has maintained 6 arsenals, the oldest being the Springfield Arsenal, founded in 1777, while the latest of the old-line arsenals is the Picatinny Arsenal, founded in 1880. In order to meet the tremendous production requirements of this war, the Ordnance Department has established 68 additional Government-owned auxiliary plants, operated by contractors. These 68 plants are located in 25 States and altogether occupy an area of approximately 900 square miles, which is greater than the combined areas of the cities of New York, Los Angeles, Cleveland, and Birmingham.

The United States Steel Corporation, General Motors, and General Electric are considered outstanding examples of industrial expansion. In approximately 40 years the United States Steel Corporation has expanded about 200 percent, General Motors about 800 percent, and General Electric nearly 3,000 percent. Yet in the last 3 years Army Ordnance production has expanded 70,000 percent.

In 1942 the Ordnance Department produced more than 10,000,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition, which is 3 times the amount which we produced during the whole of World War No. 1. Our production of artillery ammunition in 1942 was more than 180,000,000 rounds, which was an increase of 12 times our production in 1941. Ordnance expenditures for ammunition alone would build 1 Panama Canal each year for 9 years.

In 1942, 670,000 machine guns were turned out, a sixfold increase over 1941, while last month we produced 3 times as many pieces of artillery as in the entire period of World War No. 1.

Another responsibility of the Ordnance Department is to supply and maintain all motor and combat vehicles. Combined in a single column, these vehicles would surround the earth at the Equator.

Increased production has not caused Army Ordnance to cease striving for efficiency of operation, as shown by the fact that the number of Ordnance employees during the period from September 1942 to April 1943 was 14 percent less than the corresponding period a year earlier.

Old weapons have been redesigned and improved; revolutionary new weapons have been factors in our battle successes. The Garand rifle, the 105's, self-propelled mounts, the M4 tank and other new and improved weapons have given us superior mobility and fire power over our foes. Since World War No. 1 antiaircraft artillery range has been increased 100 percent, individual fire power 250 percent; the size of bombs, 300 percent, and the speed of tanks 700 percent.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

The Quartermaster Corps of the Army Service Forces, which among other functions is responsible for feeding and clothing our Army, provides further illustrative examples of the vastness of the production and supply task which has been encountered in establishing and maintaining a wartime Army of several million men.

Enough cotton cloth was purchased by the Quartermaster Corps for delivery in 1942 to make a belt 1 yard wide, long enough to extend to the moon and back.

The duck bought for delivery in 1942 would make a tent large enough to cover the entire District of Columbia.

Woolen cloth purchased for delivery in 1942 would be sufficient to cover a six-lane highway reaching from Washington to Tokyo, while enough woolen blankets were bought in 1942 to extend around the Equator one and one-half times if laid end to end.

ARMY AIR FORCES

The Army Air Forces provide us with another illustration of production achievements vital to our successful prosecution of this war. When the President in January 1942 announced that the combined Army and Navy program contemplated the production of 125,000 airplanes during 1943, it seemed a staggering, almost impossible objective—but we all set out to meet the challenge. One hundred thousand airplanes have been manufactured since we began our war-production task, almost 60,000 of them during the past 12 months and over 7,000 in the month of May 1943.

In January 1942, emphasis was placed on the need for defensive fighters and light and dive bombers. Strategic considerations subsequently dictated a major change with respect to types of aircraft to be produced. Instead of a larger number of small airplanes, the emphasis is now shifted to 4-engined heavy bombers, large cargo planes, and long-range fighters. The average weight of the larger planes to be produced this year will be almost double the weight of airplanes produced in January 1942. Because the size of planes varies, and larger planes require more man-hours of labor and more pounds of materials than smaller planes, weight is a more reliable basis for measuring aircraft production than number of planes.

Therefore, while in number of planes it might seem that we have failed to meet the objective announced by the President, actually the pounds of aircraft produced meet that objective on schedule. During the calendar year 1943, 911,000,000 pounds of air frames will be produced, followed by the production of over 1,400,000,000 pounds of air frames during the calendar year 1944. This program for 1944 is approximately 5 times the production of the calendar year 1942.

The Army Air Force is the largest in the world and is constantly growing. These funds provide for 273 groups with a personnel totaling approximately two and one-half million officers and men. They will provide 100,000 airplanes, of which 36,000 will be bombers, 38,000 fighters, 12,000 transports, and 9,000 trainers. Our fighters are equal to and in most instances better than those of friend or foe. Our Boeing B–17, called the Flying Fortress, is not only a superior bomber plane but is undoubtedly the finest all-purpose combat plane in the world. The long-range, heavy-hitting, speedy bomber is distinctively an American contribution in the field of combat aviation; furthermore, it is the outstanding weapon of this war.

GENERAL

In general, during the first year following the War Department's reorganization, the Army procured approximately $24,000,000,000 worth of supplies and equipment, including both matériel procured by the Army Service Forces, and aircraft and other matériel procured by the Army Air Forces. The Army Service Forces now are expending about $2,000,000,000 per month for production, while the Army Air Forces are now expending close to $1,000,000,000 per month for matériel.

It is interesting and important to note that the character of these expenditures is changing, for the capital requirements

are continually decreasing, while the amount spent for maintenance and operational purposes increases. For example, the Army Service Forces' production to meet capital needs in 1942 represented 45 percent of the total; in 1943, 27 percent; and, for 1944, will represent only 19 percent. Maintenance and operational requirements will continue to increase as more and more troops are placed in the field. For example, 30,000 tons of steel per month are required to provide gasoline containers in theaters of operation, which requirements will increase throughout the war as field operations expand.

CONSTRUCTION

Another major undertaking of our war effort has been the Army construction program, which is now nearing completion. This vast program, encompassing more than 10,000 projects at a total cost exceeding $9,000,000,000, is already 74 percent completed, and, including work actually in place, 92 percent of the program is either completed or under way.

To date the construction program has provided facilities to house a capacity of nearly 5,000,000 officers and enlisted men out of the scheduled maximum capacity of 5,300,000. Facilities have been constructed within the continental United States at more than 600 base posts and 400 subposts. These posts vary in capacity from 500 men to 100,000 men, with the average new facilities for the ground forces having a capacity of about 30,000 men.

Posts maintained extend over a total area of approximately 14,500 square miles, which is roughly equivalent to the combined total area of the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

Roads, runways, and parking space totaling more than 480,000,000 square yards have been constructed, which is the equivalent of 13 transcontinental highways, each 21 feet wide.

The railroads operated total 3,340 miles, which is about equal to the mileage from Boston to San Francisco.

Electric lines totaling 16,680 miles have been installed, or 5½ times the mileage across the United States. Approximately 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity are purchased annually, which about equals the combined requirements of the District of Columbia and Boston. The 65,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas required for 1944 is about 4 times the requirements of Washington, D. C.

The daily water supply of 500,000,000 gallons is equivalent to the daily requirements of the State of Michigan.

A total of 10,000,000 tons of coal will be required for 1944, which would fill a train of coal cars 1,165 miles long, reaching from Washington, D. C., to New Orleans, or from Birmingham to St. Louis and return. The 3,000,000 barrels of oil required during 1944 is equivalent to a 130-mile train of 15,750 tank cars.

The value of Army posts to be maintained in the continental United States, as to the close of the fiscal year 1944, is estimated at eleven and one-half billion.

On July 31, 1942, at the peak of activity of this construction program, a total of approximately 1,000,000 employees were engaged, which number has been reduced to a total of approximately 400,000 today as the program nears completion. While there will continue to be some need for Army construction in the United States after this program is completed, to meet new requirements for which existing facilities are inadequate or inappropriate, such new construction will be relatively minor and will be limited to military requirements which cannot be met by conversion of existing facilities. However, the continued employment of 100,000 persons will be required for the maintenance and repair of the Army facilities which have been constructed in the continental United States.

THE BATTLE OF TRANSPORTATION

I need not explain how vital transportation is to winning of this global war, nor that the Army transportation job today is bigger and more complex than ever before. In order to appreciate the size of the job and the accomplishments of the Army Transportation Corps and the transportation industry the following statistics speak for themselves.

For a proper prospective in weighing these statistics, particularly in comparison with the accomplishments during World War No. 1, certain facts should be kept in mind:

First. In World War No. 1, when our overseas military transportation was confined to the North Atlantic, the round trip averaged only 6,000 miles. In the present war, when our lines of supply extend to all continents and to many islands, the transocean distances have averaged 15,000 miles for the round trip.

Second. In the last war the United States Army obtained about 50 percent of its supplies and equipment in Europe, whereas in the present conflict the quantities obtained from foreign sources have been only a relatively minor part of our total requirements, and instead we are furnishing by far the greater portion of the requirements of our allies.

Third. The higher degree of mechanization in this war as compared with World War No. 1 is also significant. Instead of horses, mules, and forage, which were relatively simple to transport, the ports overseas now receive tanks, trucks, locomotives, airplanes, and mobile artillery—bulky freight, requiring greater ship space and skillful handling at every stage of transportation.

In the first 12 months of the last war, approximately 367,000 United States troops were transported overseas. In the same period of the present war, nearly 900,000 troops, or 2½ times as many, were transported. This trend is still increasing, for during the first quarter of 1943, 35 percent more men were shipped overseas than during the first quarter of 1942. These figures do not include troops which were overseas when we entered the war, nor those which have been flown overseas.

As for freight, during the first year of the last war, a total of approximately 1,725,000 measurement tons were shipped overseas, whereas in the same period of this war, a total of approximately 10,500,000 measurement tons, or eight times the volume, was transported. Even more significant, the Army cargo shipped overseas during the first quarter of 1943 was 2½ times the volume shipped during the first quarter of 1942. The number of ships employed by the Army has increased 62 percent during the last 6 months. The largest monthly total during the first year of World War No. 1 was approximately 450,000 tons, while in 1 month of 1942 the tonnage figure exceeded 1,500,000 tons, or nearly the volume for the entire first year of World War No. 1.

During the first year of World War No. 1, the cargo shipped from the United States to troops stationed overseas averaged 43 pounds per man per day, while for the same period of this war the average was 82 pounds per man per day, or nearly double the last war figure. To put it more graphically, approximately 1½ tons of food, clothing, and other supplies must be transported monthly to maintain one man in combat, and between 5 and 12 tons of equipment must accompany each soldier sent overseas.

The north African expedition was supplied with more than 700,000 different military items, ranging from razor blades and mosquito netting to 30-ton tanks, airplanes, mobile artillery, and locomotives.

A single infantry division expends 542 tons of ammunition in one day's firing; a single armored division uses more than 600 tons of ammunition and 78,000 pounds of food every day of action; a single mechanized division requires 18,000 gallons of gasoline every hour on the move, and 2,000 rubber tires were required in North Africa each day to replace tires which were worn out or destroyed in action.

Approximately 850,000 gallons of gasoline are required for our Air Forces based in the British Isles to stage a raid of 500 heavy bombers on Berlin.

RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

Railroad transportation in the United States is another major factor which deserves special mention and commendation. Although operating over fewer miles of track and with 20,000 fewer locomotives and 500,000 fewer freight cars, than in the First World War, the railroads have handled a much larger volume of passengers and freight traffic. The great increase in motive power makes it possible to run longer and more heavily loaded trains, and to move them faster. Also, the time which cars are permitted to spend inactive on siding has been substantially reduced.

During the period July 1918 to June 1919, which included the peak months of the freight movement of World War No. 1, the railroads handled approximately 11,200,000 short tons of Army freight, while during the first 12 months of this war, the figure was approximately 41,000,000 tons. The heaviest monthly movement in the last war was approximately 1,450,000 tons, as compared with 5,600,000 tons for the peak month of the first year of this war.

During the first 12 months of the last war, the American railroads handled approximately 2,700,000 troops, including inductees; in the same period of the

present war they handled approximately 11,600,000 troops, or more than four times as many. Of these 11,600,000 troops moved by rail in the first 12 months of the present war, almost 60 percent traveled on 21,000 special trains, which included almost 200,000 passenger cars and 80,000 baggage and freight cars.

As an indication that we are still stepping up the pace, in the first quarter of 1943, 2.7 times as many troops and almost 3 times as much freight was moved as in the first quarter of 1942.

In World War No. 1 at one time as many as 200,000 freight cars containing export freight were immobilized as a result of congestion at the principal Atlantic ports. Today the number of railroad cars waiting to deliver export freight at United States Atlantic ports rarely exceeds the minimum working stock of 15,000 cars.

AIR TRANSPORT

No picture of transportation would be complete without mention of the heroic service performed by the Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces. Using airdromes hacked from steaming tropical jungles and bleak subarctic wildernesses, flying in all kinds of weather, the Air Transport Command is moving strategic supplies and more than once has literally saved the day. Their lines cover 90,000 miles of airways over the world.

When the British were pushed back from El Alamein, they destroyed all their armor-piercing ammunition, which they soon needed to combat Rommel's tanks. The Air Transport Command took over and moved in 25,000 rounds in 5 days.

The severing of the Burma Road presented difficult problems of supply, but air transport has taken over and before long will be hauling greater tonnage than was formerly handled over the road. As the production program for additional transport planes is realized, an ever-increasing tonnage of Army freight and passenger traffic will be handled by air.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

During the First World War, the motor bus and truck industries were in their infancy, so the railroads stood practically alone. Today, however, in spite of equipment and rubber shortages, the bus lines are handling about 500,000 Army passengers per month, and about 400,000 tons of Army freight is being moved monthly by commercial trucks. To complete the picture, it should be noted that the Army also is utilizing inland waterways today more than ever before.

INCREASE IN RIVER TRAFFIC THROUGH ALABAMA PORTS ON THE TENNESSEE RIVER

The navigation channel developed by the T. V. A. is rapidly being completed, and the Tennessee River is becoming a highway for the movement of commerce. Two public-use terminals are under construction at river ports in Alabama. But even before their completion, military supplies are moving on the river and congested railroads are relieved.

At Guntersville the present facilities consist of a levee with a small freight house adjoining. A floating derrick is used for handling freight from barges to the levee. With these limited facilities, 13,384 tons of automotive vehicles for the Army were moved during the calendar year 1942—jeeps, ambulances, ammunition carriers, trucks, and heavy tractors, and from January 1 through April 30, 1943, a total of 16,731 tons of these vehicles was moved through the port of Guntersville.

At Decatur up to this time facilities for the transfer of freight have consisted of a railroad incline paralleling the river and a floating derrick. In the calendar year 1942, 14,493 tons of pig iron were handled with these facilities. During the first 4 months of 1943, 26,633 tons have moved through Decatur.

THE TRANSPORTATION CORPS IN ACTION

Let me give you a couple of specific cases of the Transportation Corps in action. On June 28, 1942, we received an emergency call from the British for immediate help in Egypt, requiring the shipment overseas of an armored-force detachment, accompanied by equipment including 300 Mark IV tanks, one hundred 105-millimeter howitzer mortar carriages, and some Air Corps personnel and equipment. The time limit set by the British appeal seemed almost impossible of accomplishment. However, 6 ships were loaded and dispatched in remarkable time. Several days out one ship was torpedoed. When word flashed by radio another and faster ship was loaded and on its way in amazingly short time. Traveling without escort it caught the convoy in time to be unloaded in its turn. The tanks carried by this convoy are credited officially with turning the tide against the Axis in Egypt.

Then again, the transporting overseas of the now famous Task Force A—the force that invaded Africa—was one of the biggest precision jobs ever accomplished. Orders for this convoy reached certain eastern ports less than a month before the convoy sailed on October 24, 1942. This convoy carried 86,000,000 pounds of freight and was combat-loaded; that is, loaded in such a way that the assault troops could disembark on hostile shores by small boats, carrying with them their jeeps, trucks, tanks, artillery, ammunition, food, and other supplies. Throughout this large, complex operation, extreme secrecy had to be maintained, and precision had to be achieved in every movement from the stowage of thousands of items to the actual sailing schedule. That both secrecy and precision were achieved is now history.

I know that we all take pride in the transportation accomplishments of the Army and the transportation industry.

SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

While our main efforts have been devoted to the steps necessary to defend the United States and to overcome the enemy, the driving force of that objective has given rise to many developments of science which are not only of direct benefit to our war effort, but will provide important new benefits to all the people in the times of peace ahead. I am sure you will be interested in some examples of these scientific developments which enable us not only to look forward to a world at peace, but to visualize a better life in the years to come.

MEDICINE

As there is scarcely anyone in the world who is not personally affected by the progress made in the science of medicine, let me refer to some outstanding developments in that field. The development of blood plasma for use by the armed forces is undoubtedly one of the most prominent contributions made by medicine during the current war. Its military advantages lie in the fact that it can be preserved for long periods, transported readily, and administered quickly without the delay of blood-typing tests. Thus, it is available for emergency treatment in the field as well as in the hospitals and, in addition to the resultant savings in life and limb, has contributed largely to the effective control of shock resulting from injuries, which was such a deadly scourge in the last war. Blood plasma undoubtedly will be highly beneficial in treating the injuries of a peaceful, but greatly expanded, industrial America.

Burns have constituted one of the most important and serious forms of injury in this war of intense mechanization, incendiaries, and high explosives. Accordingly the Army has devoted much attention to development of improved methods for the prevention and treatment of this type of injury. These advantages will be readily applied in the treatment of civilian burns, which is important when it is considered that in the United States alone approximately 6,000 persons die each year because of burns.

Army medicine has made great strides in the discovery, development, and use of a number of new powerful agents, such as the sulfa drugs and penicillin. While there is still much to be learned about these new agents, they have already proved far more effective in the treatment of certain diseases and injuries than any previously known agents, and their further potentialities are highly promising in the treatment of difficult diseases and injuries ranging from infantile paralysis, pneumonia, and venereal diseases, to wounds and fractures.

Tetanus, or lockjaw, has always been one of the most serious and feared complications of wartime injuries. Early in 1941 the Army made inocu'ation compulsory with the result that no authenticated case of tetanus has been reported from among immunized military personnel to date. It is to be expected that this development will be of extreme importance to the civilian practitioner of medicine in the future.

In addition to other duties, flight surgeons of the Army Air Forces have established and are operating an air evacuation service in every theater and along the air-transport routes from theaters of operations to the United States. During the active phase of overseas operations, 9,000 persons were evacuated from northeast Africa, 9,500 from New Guinea, and a comparative

number from the New Caledonia-Guadalcanal theater—in all, a total of approximately 30,000 persons. This service, combined with new therapeutic aids, has assisted materially in maintaining lower disability and fatality rates in this war. This development of new methods of transporting the sick and wounded will have a far-reaching effect in the peace to come. It will make available to all persons in this and other countries the facilities of the renowned medical centers.

Many other developments in the science of medicine, from new X-ray equipment and new apparatus for high-altitude flying, to insect repellents, could be discussed but the above examples are sufficiently illustrative.

COMMUNICATIONS

Probably one of the most outstanding developments which has been made by the Signal Corps is radar equipment, concerning which the first publicity has been given only recently. Undoubtedly, radar apparatus will find its place in the communication field and other civilian usage after the war. For example, it seems quite likely that radar apparatus can be used in the automobile industry. Medium-priced automobiles may be equipped with radar safety devices which will indicate by various lamp signals on the instrument panels, the danger of cars approaching intersections from either the right or the left, or will signal to indicate that a car wishes to pass on either side, and will further signal a warning when a red traffic light is set some distance ahead.

Other developments in the field of communications, which will be useful after the war, include the "Walkie-Talkie" short range radio sets, improved teletypewriter service transmitted by radio, and improved ship-to-shore radio telephone service. Furthermore, we can expect to have a much improved weather-reporting service after the war than ever before, in view of the developments with respect to radio meteorological equipment.

PLASTICS, FOOD, CLOTHING, ETC.

The Army Quartermaster Corps has contributed many developments which will be of benefit to the civilian population after the war. One of the most promising fields involves the use of plastics as a more-than-satisfactory substitute for various other materials. For example, we may expect to have raincoats made from plastic-coated fabrics, eliminating the need for rubber; plastic razors; buttons; and safety helmets. The Quartermaster Corps has also made important advances in the development and use of synethtic rubber, molded plywood, and so forth.

Research work in connection with food products will have important repercussions on the post-war economy. The dehydration of foods and other developments in the preservation of foodstuffs will increase the over-all use and consumption of perishable farm products. Also, the research which has been carried forward on nutritional problems will greatly increase our food knowledge, and should have considerable effect on food habits tending toward a healthier population.

One of the principal research contributions of the Quartermaster Corps during this war has been the intensive work on climatic research all over the world. Not only has this research produced specialized clothing and food for use in particular areas of extreme climate, but it has resulted also in other developments, such as automatic signal stations, vehicles for specialized transportation, and specialized shelter. In short, the average American has been provided with the wherewithal to live and work in any part of the globe, which will undoubtedly play an important part in the post-war developments of our territories, such as Alaska, the West Indies, and the Far East.

Other major advances have come from research in connection with textiles. Lightweight, weather-resistant, and water-repellent cloth fabrics have been developed, as have certain types of synthetic textiles for use in making strong, lightweight fabrics. Advances have also been made in the development of dyestuffs, fireproofing, waterproofing, and mildewproofing of duck and other fabrics.

AVIATION

Probably there are few subjects of more popular appeal than aviation, and the achievements of our Army Air Forces are followed with keen interest by all of us. We have all heard of feats performed by our Army aircraft, such as flying round trip across the Atlantic in less than 24 hours, flying one way across the Atlantic in little more than 6 hours, and maintaining a continual flow of air traffic throughout the world. With the exception of armament installations and a limited number of specialized items, all progress made in the building and operation of aircraft for military purposes will have a direct bearing on the development and operation of civil aircraft after the war.

Better fuels and lubricants have been developed, as have better engines and improved air frames, providing longer range and greater load-carrying capacity, with greater mileage per gallon of gasoline. Significant advances have also been made with respect to automatic flight controls and other flight instruments, radio equipment, landing devices, navigation equipment, oxygen equipment, and so forth. All of these developments will not only increase the speed and distance of civilian travel and the use of air express, but will also greatly improve the safety of air transport. Because of war necessity, these developments have undoubtedly been expedited many years ahead of what would normally have been accomplished under peacetime conditions.

CONCLUSION

I am confident that we have the right to feel that our country's safety is in capable hands; that to both the fighting and home fronts we have reason to say, "Well done." Six months or a year hence we will still be privileged to say "Well done." We must not slacken our quickening pace, nor the ever-increasing force of our blows. Our victory must be complete and the destruction of the Axis military power utter and final. When that happy day arrives we can look with confidence to a future where the rainbow of peace perpetually arches the skies over the world. And in our own way we shall enjoy freedom and security with the blessing of a Divine Providence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for the appropriation of a lot of money, so much money that there is a temptation on the part of most of us to feel that it is more or less a contingent fund designed to supply the Army with the things that it might need. We have been as liberal as that with the Army the last 2 or 3 years, ever since the war started in Europe. The fact that there are $12,472,000,000 of reappropriation of funds that were carried in previous bills and which will not have been expended when the end of this fiscal year comes and which would otherwise lapse indicates the liberality with which the Congress has provided for the Army and it comes very largely in items such as clothing and equipping, Army transportation and subsistence of the Army where there is quite a substantial amount, and in expediting production where there is over $500,000,000. The big items run $7,050,000,000 for Army ordnance, including guns, ammunition, bombs, and all that sort of thing, and there is an item of $900,000,000 involved for the Signal Service. The Signal Service has a tremendous lot to spend in connection with airplanes.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing a situation here at this time that we really ought to think about and mention in connection with an Army appropriation bill. I refer to the food situation. The present situation is due largely, and I say this deliberately, to the incompetence of the program that the President has been trying to put across in handling the food situation, his insistence upon subsidies and roll-backs and all those involved messes which can do nothing but promote and carry through an uncontrolled inflation.

We are in a most serious situation, a situation that calls upon the Congress in the days before we get to a recess to take some definite, positive action that will do our best toward seeing that the people have something to eat next winter and that we have something to take care of our troops with in the field. Perhaps the most serious thing outside of that that we have to contend with are these people who are running around, like former Governor Lehman of New York, promising the occupied countries that we are going to move in and take care of them on a liberal scale. We all know that we cannot take care of anything on a liberal scale along the food line. We are going to be lucky if we can provide the bare necessities for those whom it is our duty to take care of. I do not object to helping other people insofar as we are able, but I do not think it is desir-

able to promise these people something that we all know we cannot deliver.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman says something must be done about the food situation. Does the gentleman have any plan in mind that he would like to suggest to the House?

Mr. TABER. Yes. I do not know whether or not I shall have time enough to elaborate on it, but I shall try.

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, I have not looked with much favor on the roll-back or the subsidy plan, but the President at a recent conference at the White House asked certain Members of Congress if they had any better plan and, frankly, I was not able to suggest any better plan than the one he has. If the gentleman has one, I should like to hear it.

Mr. TABER. If I am able to get a couple of extra minutes I think I can give a general picture, which will need elaborating somewhat.

The subsidy and roll-back plan means absolute uncontrolled inflation. They talk about a couple of billion dollars. Let me tell you that it would take a couple of billion dollars to take care of the roll-back that is going to be suggested in connection with coal prices. The minute you start on that proposition it is absolutely impossible to stop. It is far more inflationary than a moderate increase in price to bring things up to a reasonable level where people can afford to purchase them.

On May 22 there was released a Bureau of Labor Statistics report which indicated that since January 1, 1941, there had been an increase in the cost of living, down to and including the middle of March of 21.7 percent; there had been an increase in the hourly pay roll of industrial workers of 37 percent; and there had been an increase in the size of the average pay envelope that was brought home of 57 percent.

What does this mean? It means that the moderate increases that would have to be made in the prices that people would have to pay for the foodstuffs would not so seriously affect the cost of living as to cause inflation. On the other hand, let me present the picture this roll-back and subsidy proposition would create.

A moderate increase in prices tends to make the purchaser of articles more careful in his purchasing. It makes him more selective. He will get the things he needs. If you have the roll-back and the subsidy you encourage inflation, and you destroy any systematic and orderly method of handling the problem. When you do it by ordering a roll-back of prices and provide no subsidy, you destroy your source of production, as you have in the meat situation. That is the picture I see. I shall try to get some time next week to elaborate on this question a little more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the majority leader if he can give us the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. I understand that if the Lanham bill, which is on that calendar, is objected to, the gentleman from Texas will be recognized by the Speaker to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Just what is that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a bill reported out of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and carries an authorization of about $200,000,000; I am not sure as to the exact amount.

Mr. ROWE. I believe the Lanham bill carries an authorization of $300,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand there are two parts to this authorization and that the bill carrying the $200,000,000 authorization, for hospitals, and so forth, is the one that is coming up Monday. That is my impression. I am sorry I cannot give more information about it.

Mr. MICHENER. It is one of those bills that is coming up Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is one of the bills relating to housing in connection with the war.

Mr. MICHENER. It deals with facilities?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is my understanding.

Then there is a possibility that if the bill S. 219, which is on the Consent Calendar, is objected to, it may come up under a suspension. The Speaker has that under consideration now.

Mr. THOMASON. What is that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers. Under the present law, if General Eisenhower, for example, were injured and had to be retired—we hope and pray that does not happen, and I cite this merely as an illustration—he would be retired with the disability benefits of a lieutenant colonel, whereas if a general in the Regular Army were similarly retired he would be retired with the full benefits provided for under the law for that particular rank. Or if General Chennault, for example, were to be retired as a result of something that happens during the war, and we all hope and pray that that does not happen, he would be retired with the disability benefits of a major, whereas if someone in the Regular Army suffered a similar disability and were retired, even though he had gone up through the various grades and arrived at the same rank, he would receive the maximum consideration the law provides for. I think the maximum consideration for retirement applies to the rank of major-general. In any event, he would get the maximum consideration. This bill is an attempt during wartime to equalize the disability benefits.

Then there is the legislative appropriation bill conference report. If the gentleman in charge of that bill wants to call up the conference report on Monday it is the intention to consider it then. I understand there is no controversy about it.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman will yield, does the equalization bill which the gentleman has just described apply to benefits for the men in the Navy as well?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs. I am unable to answer that question. I think it is confined to officers of the Regular Army. From a hasty examination of the bill, it appears to be confined to the Army.

Mr. PLOESER. The extreme case of Admiral Scott's widow is what prompted the question. I wondered why we could not deal with that now.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter over which the Committee on Naval Affairs would have jurisdiction.

Mr. THOMASON. If the gentleman will yield, this bill came out of the Committee on Military Affairs and of course deals only with the Army. Anything affecting the Navy would be under the special jurisdiction of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does this bill grant equal benefits to officers of equal rank in the Navy?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not believe it has anything to do with the Navy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, there is on the consent calendar a bill from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments relating to the Army and Navy. If it is objected to on the call of the calendar, the Speaker has indicated that it may come up under a suspension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] so that he may complete his statement of the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no definite knowledge from the Speaker as to that, but I accept the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that if the bill he has in mind is objected to it may come up under a suspension.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is a Senate bill, S. 972, reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on Rules is meeting Monday, I understand, to consider a rule on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. If a rule is reported out on that bill, it will not be called up before Wednesday. I cannot guarantee the day now, but it will not be brought up before Wednesday.

There are several bills in conference, and if conference reports are filed on them they will be brought up next week. The last deficiency appropriation bill will be marked up on Tuesday, so that that will be brought up some time next week. There are several conference reports outside of the conference report on

the legislative appropriation bill. There is the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and the State and Justice appropriation bill, which are both in conference, as well as the Interior and the Treasury and Post Office, and if the conferees agree, those reports will be brought up. The second deficiency bill is still on the Speaker's table. If that situation should be untangled, and the conferees agree, and a report filed, that will also be brought up next week.

Mr. MICHENER. On the whole, next week will be a most important week, and all Members should be present.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that. I should also add of course that there is the roll call which will come up on the bill now under consideration on Monday.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, about 19 months ago, a few days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, we brought to the House a bill carrying funds for lend-lease activities. At the time I described the bill as one that carried some body blows for Hitler. He has already felt some of those blows; he is about to feel more of them.

Today we are reporting an appropriation bill for our own Army, a bill that makes available $71,510,000,000, the largest single appropriation bill in legislative history of any country at any time. I should like to say that this bill, in my opinion, carries some knock-out blows for Hitler and some jabs for Tojo that will make him rue the day he ever sent his ships and men into a sneak attack upon an outpost of the United States.

I am not unmindful of the years the war could last; I know there are some hard, heavy days ahead, Mr. Chairman, but I predict that before the last dollar of this bill has been spent, the ambitious, conceited corporal of Berchtesgaden will be hanging on the ropes or down for the count while the smile will be wiped forever from the face of the "son of heaven," the Emperor of Japan.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation does not welcome war but when war comes we give it everything we can. And so, here we bring a bill that carries every dollar the committee had evidence to show was needed for a military purpose. I say that in spite of the fact that we did eliminate $387,000,000 of the Budget estimates.

This bill, as has been said, represents 3 weeks of daily hearings by the committee and months of work by officers in the War Department. The printed hearings run to 600 pages, but there was more off-record testimony in these hearings than in any bill which our committee has prepared. In passing I want to speak my word of personal appreciation for the courteous treatment accorded all members of the committee by the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], and for the excellent aid given every member by the clerk of the committee, Mr. John Pugh.

I might add that the War Department staff, General Carter, General Richards, and Colonel Moore and Colonel Dubbelde, were with us daily and readily responded to requests for additional detailed information upon any subject that we might request.

The chairman and the ranking members have already reviewed the bill for you. It is not my purpose to repeat what they have said. I wish, however, to high light some points about the bill in the hope that it will help Members in evaluating the content and force of the funds provided.

REVIEW OF MAJOR ITEMS

This bill provides $12,300,000,000 for the Finance Service of the Army. That is money for the pay of the Army and the pay of family allotments and dependency allowances.

This bill provides $15,100,000,000 for Ordnance—that means guns and ammunition. It may be more than we will use, but as one member of the committee I never want a boy to write from a battlefield that he was short on ammunition.

I might say in that connection that occasionally some of the ordnance plants are interrupted or discontinued in their operation. The reasons for that are varied. One reason in some instances is that there is no present need for the particular thing a given plant was supposed to provide. In another instance the Army has developed a new explosive, and it is more desirable to produce that than the former one. The committee has generally taken the attitude that it would be better to have some ammunition left over after the shooting than to run out of ammunition before the shooting is over.

This bill provides $7,600,000,000 for supplies and transportation. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee cut eighty million off the Budget estimates for Army travel, because we felt that there has been some travel in the past while military posts were being organized that will not be needed in the future. We think that travel in the continental United States can be reduced. So, to bring our ideas forcibly before the War Department, we cut the item for travel. With over seven billion still in the bill for supplies and transportation, however, it will be realized that the Army can get around and can get where it is needed.

The bill provides five billion six hundred million for the Signal Service. Others have spoken of this. You have heard it said that a single development of this war, radar, has more importance than any other item of comparable cost. Forces on land, sea, in the air and under the sea, must guide their movements by what radar brings you or tells the enemy.

The bill provides four billion one hundred million for the Engineer Service. Less than one-half billion of that relates to construction and that is largely in theaters of operation and relates especially to landing fields and operating bases.

The bill provides one billion one hundred million for Chemical Warfare. Personally I hope that most of what that money buys is never used. But even never used, it will be worth what we spend. The promise of the Commander in Chief that if the enemy uses gas, he will be met in kind would be an idle threat if we did not have the means to carry it out. We have.

The bill provides one billion three hundred million for expediting production. Here again the committee cut the Budget estimates. This time by $91,000,000. It was under the heading "Contingencies." As has been stated, we regard the expediting of production as important, but a sort of contingent fund itself. We left the amounts for specific projects. We hope that even in those amounts savings can be made, and we believe that under the direction of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, they will be.

The bill provides $600,000,000 for the medical and hospital departments. I wish every Member of the House would read the testimony given by the Surgeon General and his associates. You will find it contains the sort of information parents of boys in the Army will want to know. You will be interested in his statement of the possibilities in penicillin, a new preparation that may surpass the sulfa drugs in therapeutic value.

SAVINGS MADE IN THE BILL

This bill, Mr. Chairman, should be remembered, however, for two outstanding things. First, because it sounds an economy note. This is the first of the defense or war appropriation bills since Pearl Harbor in which Budget estimates have been cut. Last year, it was easy to say, "We had better give these fellows what they ask, and then if things go wrong, we will not be at fault." But with the war well under way, our subcommittee felt that we should scrutinize the requests carefully and add our screening to that of the Budget officers.

In this respect we followed the policy laid down by the appropriations subcommittee for the Navy Department headed by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. In addition to the two large items I have mentioned, there was a substantial cut in the allowance of money for the employment of civilian personnel. This was based upon the statement of Secretary Patterson that a cut of 84,300 persons could be made in the coming year.

Other reductions in varying minor amounts make up the $387,896,827 which the bill cuts below the Budget estimates.

In the matter of savings, however, I think it is fair to say that the major interest of the committee attached to the testimony of officer after officer on the subject of renegotiation. The cold figures as given us by Mr. Maurice Karker, Chairman of the Price Adjustment Board, were:

Six hundred and ninety-eight million dollars recovered in excessive profits realized.

One billion one hundred and sixty-eight million dollars saved by repricing and revision of contracts, a total of War Department contracts.

One billion eight hundred and sixty-six million dollars presently saved to the taxpayers in the cost of the war effort, and with that the uncomputed savings yet to come by refunds and revisions and

lower pricing in future contracts. The amount for Army, Navy, and Maritime together is $2,800,000,000.

At this point, I wish to read a few sentences from the hearings, giving the statement of various heads of Army branches.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman who testified on that matter give any proportions of that amount that were voluntary reduced at the suggestion of the contractor?

Mr. CASE. Yes; there was testimony of some voluntary returns. In general the attitude of industry has been very good and I think Mr. Karker said they had trouble with about only 10 percent of the contractors.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know of one case where at least $200,000,000 on a contract was given voluntarily by the contractor coming into the Government and saying that he did not want to receive the money.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and I may say that in the development of renegotiation procedure a year ago, it will be remembered that it was not to take care of the contractors who were willing to return the money, but it was to take care of the contractors who were not willing to do so, that it was necessary to pass that statute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. When the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] was addressing us a few moments ago, I made some inquiry about the same thing, the renegotiation of contracts, and suggested that that has been due to the fact that we departed from the competitive bidding system, because of the necessity of haste. Does the gentleman know whether there is any information toward a more conservative competitive bidding basis?

Mr. CASE. The Chief of Engineers told us that in every instance now he is using competitive bidding on a unit basis. Of course, the gentleman is referring to the early contracts. This subject of renegotiation is something that you will hear a great deal about in the next few weeks from the Naval Affairs Committee, from Ways and Means, and other committees of the House and the Senate. Every Member of the House will find it of profit and interest to read the testimony in respect to renegotiation that appears in the hearings. You will find the pages easily from the index. To illustrate how the renegotiations statute operates, I will read from the hearings at one or two points. Here is an instance given to us by Colonel Browning, head of the Purchasing Division, Army Service Forces. I read now from page 494 of the hearings:

Colonel BROWNING. I might take machine guns as an example. One of the companies that was renegotiated was a company which did $51,000,000 on a certain item with the War Department last year. Their prices were a little over $500 each. The comparable price of other manufacturers was $440 for one and $460 for another, and $330 for another. We renegotiated the first company and recovered $24,300,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Out of a total of how much?

Colonel BROWNING. Out of $51,000,000 worth of business. Then we went back to the same company and said we want reductions in your prices. We got a tentative agreement on a new price of $315, subject to a cost analysis at the end of June. The company does not have current cost figures, so at the end of June we will then take a fiscal inventory to determine what the actual costs are and the prices will be further reduced so that they will be in line with the actual costs.

Members have doubtless heard the charge that renegotiation destroys incentive for low costs. That is not true. The policy of the Price Adjustment Board is to reward low costs. Let me read further from the testimony:

Mr. CASE. In the case you have cited did you leave this company you referred to with any profit?

Colonel BROWNING. We left them with 20 percent profit, which was one of the highest profits we have allowed.

Mr. POWERS. Twenty percent gross?

Colonel BROWNING. Before taxes.

Mr. POWERS. How much did you leave them net?

Colonel BROWNING. That is very difficult to determine up to now under the Revenue Act of 1942. Generally, the reason we allowed them some 20 percent profit was that the price we finally got was $250 as against the next lower price of $330 and the next price of $400. We have allowed the lowest cost company 20 percent profit, the next 13½ percent profit, and the next one 4 or 5 percent profit.

Currently Members are being told that the machine-tool industry deserves special treatment or exemption from the statute. Let me read you Mr. Karker's comment on that point. I quote from the hearings at page 503:

Mr. KARKER. I will give you one illustration, which I think is typical of the whole industry: In the days before the war their sales were $7,500,000, and their profits, before payment of taxes, were about $1,850,000. This represents a profit of about 25 percent before the payment of taxes. The tax rates were much lower in those days and they had much more left after the payment of taxes than would be the case now, in time of war.

In 1942 they did a $50,000,000 business. Thirty million dollars' worth of that business was not renegotiable because it was largely with the Defense Plant Corporation, which you have not included in the statute.

Twenty million dollars of the business was renegotiable because it was business with departments which are covered by the statute.

On the $30,000,000 volume of business, which was not renegotiable, their margin of profit increased from 25 percent in the base years to 38 percent in 1942.

On the $20,000,000 worth of business over which we now have jurisdiction they made as much profit as they did on the nonrenegotiable portion—38 percent.

On the $50,000,000 worth of total 1942 business they made a profit of 38 percent—38 cents out of every dollar—and it is their contention that that profit is not excessive.

Mr. ENGEL. I have in mind a company that has made 1,740 percent on their invested capital and surplus. They made that profit in 1 year, after payment of taxes.

Mr. KARKER. This particular machine-tool company ended 1938 with a total net worth of $5,000,000. In the next 4 war years—1939, 1940, 1941, 1942—they have paid $5,000,000 in dividends and they have $15,000,000 of net worth now.

I know of another company, a different one from this, and they contend that they must be allowed in 1941 and 1942 to make 20 years' normal profits, which they regard as absolute security for them from now on to the end of their lives.

They want to make that profit on the backs of the people of the United States. They want that excessive profit, that outrageous profit, while they are making materials essential to our defense and existence.

This is not a Government war. This as a war of all the people. They are making a product essential to the defense of their own lives, their own homes, their own business, their own country.

Members will find in the hearings illuminating statements on various phases of the renegotiation proposition: Profits of large concerns before and after renegotiation, application of the statute to the textile industry, effect of the new modified tax plan upon the renegotiation of contracts, the problem of post-war conversion, the percentage of profit allowed, the number of employees, the disposition of savings, the procedure in renegotiation, the right of review in the courts, the exemption of small contractors, the background of the persons administering the law, and other like topics.

I will conclude my reference to the hearings on this subject by reading the following colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the Under Secretary, Mr. Patterson, found at page 578 in the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. I want to find out what we are doing to prevent making of another crop of millionaires out of this war. Have we done a pretty good job in preventing excessive profits and the making of undue and unreasonable sums of money by individuals out of this war while other people have given their all for it?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not think we can unless we have a system of contract renegotiations. * * *

Mr. MAHON. You think that has helped?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do. The excess-profits law will play a part, but they had that in the last war, and yet we know there were men who got rich from the work they did in furnishing supplies to the Army and Navy in the last war.

The committee was impressed, I think it only fair to say, by the high caliber of the men who are administering the law for the War Department. Mr. Karker, we learned, had been a commander in the Navy, coming up the hard way, was general storekeeper at Brest, France, in World War No. 1, later became chairman of Jewel Tea Co., Inc., and brought to his work, as did Colonel Browning, both military and business experience. Mr. Karker in no uncertain terms stated that his interest was "in the protection of the American way of life and American system of really free enterprise." At the conclusion of his appearance the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] said that in a dozen years on the committee, listening to hundreds of witnesses, he had never heard a clearer or more illuminating statement.

BACKGROUND OF RENEGOTIATION

Now, I know that many Members of the House have been disturbed by the complaints of some contractors; generally by those who have not met with the Price Adjustment Board and who

fear what they do not understand. Before any Member makes careless statements on the subject, or forms any conviction, I believe he should read the complete testimony on the subject.

Surely there is no one here today who has forgotten the stench in the aftermath of World War No. 1 when it was found that a host of millionaires had been created. And is there a Member of this body who has not pledged himself time after time that if war came again, there would be no blood money.

I know full well that some men are crying about the sanctity of contracts. I would join with them, were these normal peacetimes, in saying that we should have firm contracts. But I call your attention to two things:

First, even in peacetimes, courts can dissolve contracts that are repugnant to public policy. Is there any contract more against public policy than one which would let anyone make excessive profits on war business? Could anything be more repugnant to public policy than that any man should make and keep exorbitant profits while arming the country to carry on its war and your sons to defend their lives?

Second, I would call your attention to the situation out of which the renegotiation statute arose. In February 1941, the Supreme Court had handed down a decision in the old Bethlehem Shipbuilding case, a case that grew out of World War No. 1. The Court said that if a contract was closed and final settlement made, the Government could not recover even though unconscionable profits had been made. The Government lost its suit to recover.

We were then in the midst of the new preparedness program. Reports of huge profits were coming in. The representative of one shipbuilding company was quoted publicly as saying that his company's profits were so large you couldn't handle them with a steamshovel. The Naval Affairs Committee and the Truman committee were bringing to light case after case of exorbitant profits.

We were in the midst of the building and arming program. Many projects had to be started with letters of intent. You will remember the fight over the cost plus idea. You will recall the War and Navy developed the idea of cost-plus-fixed-fee contract but that in spite of that the huge profit stories kept coming.

The renegotiation idea was developed in hearings of our subcommittee to meet that situation: the need to have some measure for recovery of excessive profits that would not interfere with the speed desired in the construction and rearming program, a need to keep prices from going too high, a need to avoid the excessive inflation that would follow from paying more than a job was worth, far more than it cost.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that it makes some difference as to the time of the renegotiation whether or not the funds that are recaptured under renegotiation are returned to the funds from which the contract was paid, or are returned to the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. It makes a difference in this way. In case the money has been paid, it goes back to the Treasury. If the renegotiation is completed before the money has been paid on the contract, it simply represents a reduction in the prices under the contract and the money is never spent. A large item in the unexpended balances of the War Department is the amount saved by renegotiation.

WRITES AIR HISTORY INTO FUNDS

Mr. Chairman, the second thing for which this bill should be remembered is that the largest single item of appropriation in the bill is for the Army Air Forces, $23,700,000,000—a fund to provide an Air Force of 273 groups, 36,000 bombers, 38,000 fighters, 12,000 air transports, and 9,000 trainers, with spare engines and parts to keep them in the air.

I saved that for final mention intentionally. I did so, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that while I was a foot soldier myself as a marine in World War No. 1 and while I know that no method of attack will be successful unless the Navy clears the seas of the enemy submarine and carries our men and supplies safely, and that while I know there must be millions of foot soldiers to take and occupy territory in hard, bitter fighting, it is my conviction that the key to victory is airpower.

This bill, in providing $23,700,000,000 for the Air Forces, Mr. Chairman, writes into law the lesson of experience in this war. That lesson is that the force with air superiority can carry out its mission.

Air power was the secret of the blitz in its early days. Hitler had tanks, yes, but he sent hordes of planes over the lines and wrecked the railroads and the centers at which his foes planned to assemble their men and their equipment.

Air power was the secret in the loss of Norway, though hardly a secret when British Tommies scanned the sky in vain for planes.

Air power was the secret of the miracle of Dunkerque, when the tide began to turn and the British for the first time established a local air superiority over the Germans.

Air power was the secret of the Battle of Midway when Lieutenant Commander Waldron and Torpedo Squadron Eight turned back the spearhead of the Japanese attack and the big Army bombers went up from their land bases and smashed the fleeing Japs.

Air power was the secret of the Battle of the Bismarck Sea, that epochal battle when land-based Army planes skip-bombed into total destruction the Japanese armada of 22 ships in a fight that history may say was one of the decisive battles of the war and one of the strategically significant battles of all time.

Air power, coordinated with ground action, was what General MacArthur hailed as the new method of operation which drove the enemy out of the jungles in New Guinea.

Air power, overwhelming air power, going far behind the lines in Africa, made it impossible for Von Arnim to bring up his reserves, and sank the reinforcements the enemy tried to ferry across the Sicilian sea.

Air power is writing new epics daily. Pantalleria surrendered to air attack before a foot soldier had landed. And from out of the Pacific yesterday there came the story of 77 Jap planes shot down by the skill and strength of the air force America is building; 77 against a low of only 6 of ours.

Yes, a year ago there were stories ridiculing some of our planes. You read them; you heard them. This subcommittee, however, had had confidential hearings with General Arnold and General Marshall and General Echols. We were confident that our ships would stand up when put to the jobs for which they were made. And they have. This subcommittee, before my membership on it, started the production of the B–17, the Flying Fortress. Only yesterday, I heard Captain Morgan, of the *Memphis Belle*, and his crew, say the B–17 was the greatest ship on earth. They went to England last September. Today they are back after having carried out 25 daylight raids over Germany.

The B–17 will not always be the greatest of our ships. This subcommittee knows of other ships in the making that will be larger, faster, and go higher, and carry greater bomb loads. Some of the money in this bill will produce them.

Some of the money for the Air Forces in this bill will also produce some new, strange ships, different than anything the enemy has yet seen. But all these ships, big and little, strange and common, Mr. Chairman, will be carrying to the enemy one overwhelming message: "The Yanks are coming, the Yanks are here."

SEND THE WORD EVERYWHERE

That is the story, Mr. Chairman. Appropriation bills are cold things, a bunch of figures and dollar signs. I would like to make this bill a living thing for you. I would like to make it a living thing for the folks back home. I would like to make it a living thing for the boys at the front.

Yesterday there came to my desk the War Department's latest casualty list. Its opening sentence hurt. It said:

> Messages through the International Red Cross from Japan have notified the War Department of the names of more than 300 American soldiers who have died in prison camps since the fall of Bataan and Corregidor. Disease is stated in each case as cause of death. Malaria, diphtheria, dysentery and pneumonia are the major causes.

Those are American boys, Mr. Chairman, dying in Japanese prison camps. Boys who went out to the Philippines with the confidence that their Government, that this Government, that you and I would stay with them, would arm them, feed them, nurse them, and bring them back to their homeland. I have heard Colonel Romulo, last to leave the Philippines, tell of their faith, Mr. Chairman. He went up and down the lines in those last days, answering their questions. "When would help come? When would more planes come? When will the Americans be here?" "Maybe tomorrow," Romulo told them.

That tomorrow has not come yet, Mr. Chairman, and for some of them it can never come, but please, God, this bill will help to bring it for those who still live, even though today they be in prison camps. And it will come, for people all over the world who look to the cause of the United Nations as the cause of the common people.

If I could send word with the passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, to those people everywhere it would be that the armies of liberation are on their way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, the most discussed question in the United States now is the question of food. In the past few days the President has made it clear to Members of the Congress and to the country as a whole that he is strongly opposed to any unified administration of our food problem, and that consumer subsidies are to be the answer to the terrible muddle which his policies have brought about. Anyone who disagrees with him is accused of doing some "loose thinking." I question whether those who disagree with him can be lightly dismissed as loose thinkers, in view of the utter and tragic confusion which now exists.

My purpose in addressing the House today is to discuss the question of subsidy payments in connection with the handling of our food problem. At the outset, let me review very briefly the present status of subsidies and our existing policies in that field, before proceeding to a discussion of the particular phase of the subsidy question which is now in the forefront, namely, subsidies designed to reduce prices to the consumer. At the close I shall have a few words to say with respect to a bill which I have just filed, which I believe offers a constructive answer to the one type of consumer subsidy justified at the present time.

Subsidies are nothing new in our economic life. They have taken many forms and have appeared under different names. They have been applied for the benefit of many different groups. Some are specifically sanctioned by law and others have been available from broad grants of power. Let me be specific: In the agricultural field subsidies are being paid to the farmers for the growing of soybeans, flax, hemp, and peanuts. The Government purchases the crops at a set price and resells to the food or feed industries or to war-manufacturing industries at a considerably reduced price. For instance, in the case of peanut oil, the price paid by the Government is approximately 22 cents per pound, and the price at which the Government resells is approximately 13 cents per pound.

Subsidies are likewise being paid on an acreage basis in connection with soil-conservation practices. Subsidies are also being paid in the form of a fixed price of $130 per ton for conversion to peanuts. Subsidies are being paid, though in a different form, through activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The tariff is a subsidy in another form. Subsidies are being paid to the oil industry to take up the spread in cost between transporting oil by tanker or transporting it by tank car. Subsidies are being paid to high-cost producers of certain minerals in order to bring marginal production into being for those needed for war purposes.

Insofar as most of the subsidies mentioned above are concerned, the American public has accepted them with little question, even though in some cases the beneficiary is the producer, in others the consumer, and in still others the manufacturer.

The present controversy concerning subsidies centers principally on the proposals to resort to them as a means of rolling back prices of staple food products at the retail level. While the cost of food products to the consumer is increasing, a growing demand on the part of certain consumer groups, and particularly organized labor groups, has arisen for consumer subsidies, in order to hold the price of foodstuffs at an even level or to roll them back in certain instances. Opposition to such subsidies has been voiced chiefly by farmers, farm organizations, food distributors, food processors, and many economists, who point out that subsidies in themselves cannot arrest the upward trend of food-price levels, and have an inflationary effect from two points of view:

First. They artificially increase existing purchasing power which is already too great for the amount of civilian consumer goods available, and

Second. They can only be financed through additional governmental borrowings from commercial banks, thereby increasing the already over-swollen amount of currency and credit in circulation or available.

In support of their position, those who favor subsidies to roll-back or stabilize prices cite the British and Canadian experience. In so doing, they overlook certain essential facts. In both Canada and Great Britain prices of all the elements which go into the cost of living have been substantially stabilized, including wages, transportation costs, rents, clothing, and so forth. In both of those nations, the percentage of income which must be applied to food in order to maintain the people at a reasonable subsistence level is very much higher than in this country. In the case of England it is figured at 60 percent of income as against 40 percent in this country. Excess purchasing power has been much more effectively controlled through smaller initial per capita incomes to begin with, and then through taxation and loans. In England, all foodstuffs channel directly through over-all government purchases to the normal but controlled units of commercial distribution. The application of the subsidy is very simple. In Canada, which from the point of view of its over-all economy more nearly approaches our own situation, subsidies are an infinitesimal part of the price-adjustment machinery.

A detailed analysis of the subsidies paid in Canada reveals some interesting facts. A report has just been issued by the Canadian Government summarizing the Canadian experience in price controls, distribution controls, and subsidies, from their inception in 1940 up to April 1 of this year. In all, Canada has spent roughly $64,000,000 on subsidies, $34,000,000 of which have been applied to imported products, and $30,000,000 to domestic products. Naturally, Canada cannot control the prices at which necessary imports can be obtained, and has used the power to subsidize in this field largely in order to hold down the price of essential imports to the consumer. Of the $34,000,000 spent in such subsidies, $24,000,000 have gone to holding down the price of petroleum products, and only a few millions have gone to holding down the price of such imported foodstuffs or feeds as tea, coffee, sugar, and copra.

The $30,000,000 spent on subsidies for domestic products are divided about 70 percent for agricultural products and 30 percent for coal, leather, and so forth. Of the roughly $20,000,000 spent for agricultural products, nearly $10,000,000 have been applied to milk, butterfat, or butter, largely in seasonal subsidies, and the balance has been scattered in small amounts over such a wide range of things as strawberries, peaches, and so forth.

Any cold-blooded analysis of the figures that I have cited above shows that the actual amount of the Canadian subsidy, even though applied for the benefit of a population one-tenth the size of ours, is nevertheless infinitesimal compared with what the advocates of food consumer subsidies are contemplating in this country. Living costs in Canada show such a small rise as to warrant the conclusion that controls other than subsidies have been responsible for holding down living costs.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. May I add to your very instructive remarks this particular phase, that Britain received from us $1,500,000,000 worth of food, and sold it through regular channels, which money went into the Exchequer. Of that money only $750,000 have been applied to the roll-back.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct. It is also true, in fairness to the British, to say that a considerable portion of that has gone into paying for domestic foodstuffs which have been furnished in reverse lend-lease to our own Army.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. At the end of your statement you just said that the reason for the stabilization of prices was other considerations. Do you intend to tell us what those other considerations were?

Mr. HERTER. I would be glad to answer the gentleman. I have it here, and it will become a part of my remarks, but as my time is limited, I want to get to the particular bill that was filed yesterday which, I think, takes care of the most serious part of the cost of living increase in this country at the moment.

As has been pointed out many times, subsidies can be given many different names. There is one form, however, which differs quite radically from the others. Most subsidies involve an easily computable loss to the Government. The particular type that I have in mind is different in that it does not necessarily involve any loss. This is the so-called support price. It is a device whereby the Government guarantees to buy from the producer all of his crop not sold in the open market at a fixed price sufficiently high to insure maximum production.

This device was used in the last war by the United States Grain Corporation; it is being used today in connection with certain necessary commodities. The Government, in making this offer to purchase, in effect guarantees a minimum price. If the Government is obliged to purchase a large part of the product, it may or may not resell at a loss. Assuming that there is a demand for that particular product, there is no reason why it should sell at a loss. If there is no adequate demand for the product, the support price should probably not have been fixed in the first instance. This is a form of subsidy which it is of the utmost importance to maintain because the encouragement of maximum-food production today in many lines is absolutely vital. Its noninflationary effect is best stated by Mr. Ickes in his letter to Prentiss Brown, of April 6, 1943, in which, after advocating an increase in price of crude oil, he made the following statement:

> I recognize fully the dangers of price inflation. But price inflation connotes an unwarranted rise in prices without promise of increasing supply. My fear is that unless we are prepared now to permit some increases in oil prices in order to stimulate increases in our available supplies, our reserves will continue to be depleted at such a pace that only a drastic increase in prices—perhaps several dollars a barrel, as contrasted with a tenth of that amount if we act now—will be required to find and produce the oil we are certain to need both during the war and after.

I am confident that Congress is strongly disposed to afford every possible incentive to increasing production and in any discussion of subsidies we need to keep clearly in mind the fundamental differences between providing incentives to production and possible subsidies of one sort or another to that end, on the one hand, and subsidies designed to roll back retail prices on the other hand. It is the latter which are now under fire and which are open to such grave objection.

What class in the community is today suffering from increases in retail food prices? Obviously it is the person of small fixed income, such as the retired school teacher, retired civil service employee, the person with a small annuity, the recipient of old-age assistance, and so forth. That is the person—and as a group it is not an inconsiderable group—which is being badly caught today in the price squeeze. Most State and governmental employees have been given a wage increase to compensate for the squeeze. Most industrial workers have received wage increases which go far beyond the extent of the squeeze, but nothing has as yet been done for the category of individuals such as I have mentioned. In order to care for this group, I have filed a bill, H. R. 2997, which I shall also offer as an amendment to the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As reported by the committee, the intent of their bill is to forbid the types of objectionable subsidy to which I have referred above, but no provision whatever is made for the person who is being squeezed.

My bill is very brief and simple. It authorizes the War Food Administrator to put into effect a plan whereby stamps which can be used for the purchase of specified foodstuffs will be issued to certain eligible persons. The different State welfare authorities as designated by the Governors of the respective States will have the power to certify eligibles within the following three classifications:

First. Persons whose family income has not increased by 20 percent or more since January 1, 1939, and whose income is $1,000 or less for a single person, $1,200 for a married person, and $100 additional for each dependent.

Second. Persons who can show that 50 percent or more of their income must be applied for necessary nutritive food.

Third. Institutions or individuals who maintain persons in the first two categories, or who maintain foster homes for children.

Stamps can be issued to any individual only to the amount of 25 percent of his estimated budget for food, and are payable to food distributors from the office of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Stamps can be used in payment of only such foods as the Administrator, with the approval of the Surgeon General of the United States, specifies.

I have estimated that there are roughly 12,000,000 persons in the United States who would come within the eligible categories mentioned in the bill. I have estimated further that the average amount spent by each of these individuals per year for food is between $200 and $250. The value of stamps to which they would be entitled would, therefore, come to $50 or $60 per year. The total cost would run between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000 a year—a figure approximating that which the Government is now spending on the attempted rollbacks on butter, coffee, and meat, and a figure likewise approximating the cost of the recent bill which we passed in this House, providing for overtime pay for Government civilian employees.

Let me emphasize certain features of this bill.

In the first place, eligibles would be certified by existing welfare organizations in the respective States, and the actual manpower required for this operation is almost negligible, because the necessary machinery and personnel are already in existence. The administrative problem would not be great and no new Federal bureaucracy would have to be created. The Administrator could, of course, in the issuing of stamps, refuse to accept State certifications as beyond the scope of the broad limitations placed on eligibles in this bill. There would, therefore, be little danger of padded eligible lists.

Second. A single stamp is all that would be required, which could be printed in such denominations as the Administrator might deem best, and which would be simpler to handle than the blue and orange stamps used in the Department of Agriculture's Surplus Commodity stamp plan.

Third. By making stamps in effect currency valid for the purchase of certain foodstuffs, the Administrator and the Surgeon General of the United States could insure that they would be used only for the most plentiful or the most nutritive foodstuffs available at any given time in our markets.

I am convinced that the adoption of such a plan would be infinitely less inflationary, and infinitely more desirable from a social point of view than the consumer subsidy schemes which it is apparent the administration wishes to try. Two billion dollars appears to be the minimum figure so far advanced as the annual cost for the latter, and even if completely successful from an administrative point of view, which I would greatly doubt, would net each individual in this country perhaps $1 to $1.50 per month in savings, no matter how rich or poor they were. However, if the administration is expecting to rely on food subsidies alone to stabilize or roll back to any given date the cost of food, the cost might well run into the tens of billions, to say nothing of the new army of Federal personnel required for administrative purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries $71,000,000,000, the largest appropriation in the history of the country. It will, of course, be passed. Everyone will give to the Army whatever it needs to win the war. The subcommittee having the bill in charge is a good one. I have no doubt that every item has been carefully scrutinized.

The enormous sums being appropriated, however, raise in my mind a very important question. Should we not have some better means of checking up on the expenditure of these funds so that the people may be assured they are getting their money's worth? Evidence is accumulating that there is gross waste and extravagance in our war effort. Lend-lease funds are being used in certain foreign countries where the relation to the war has not been demonstrated. Costs in companies making war equipment have risen enormously. To get a soldier fully equipped and on the firing line costs us many times what it did in the last war.

Part of that is explained by the mechanized character of modern warfare. But a lot of it is due to the fact that the

executive branch is still tinkering with old reforms or laying the foundation for new ones. The action of the House yesterday in regard to the O. P. A. was not because of any opposition to rigid and effective price control. It was rather a protest against using the war as a guise to give the Government unnecessary control over the business of the country. Inefficient and inexperienced personnel are adding billions to the cost of building a fighting force. This war should not be made a plaything for theorists and crystal gazers. The job demands the attention of the best business minds of the country.

No one knows how long the war may last or what demands will be made upon the national resources. We must see to it that the bottom of the barrel is not reached before peace has been won. If that should happen the grandiose schemes now being presented for the future will be a hollow mockery. After all, there is a limit to the wealth and productivity of this country.

We must not forget, too, that all of this money must be paid back. We are appropriating under the excitement of war. We may be paying it back in the agonizing days of a depression. We are piling up debts when profits are being made, when wages are high, and jobs are plentiful. We may be paying it back when wages and profits are low and work is not to be had. Never was there a time when there should be closer scrutiny of all public expenditures. That includes also money spent for war purposes.

I realize that the spending of this money and the carrying on of the war is largely an Executive function. I have never favored the interference by Congress with the conduct by the Executive of the purely military phases of the war. That both by the Constitution and by military necessity is vested in the Commander in Chief.

But with the raising, the appropriating, and the spending of this money Congress has great responsibilities.

I am pleased to note from certain sources a suggestion that a committee of Congress be created to maintain a constant supervision over expenditures. This proposal should be adopted. The present situation urgently demands it.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of approximately $72,000,000,000 and, of course, it is the largest appropriation ever presented to the Congress and I assume to any other country in the world.

As I recall the last bill we passed some time ago in the House for the Navy called for an appropriation of nearly $30,000,000,000. The two bills carry more than $100,000,000,000 and we are also told by those in charge of the war effort that we will spend this year $106,000,000,000.

It is not my purpose in taking the floor to be critical or to say anything that might hurt the war effort, but when we reach the point of spending $106,000,000,000 a year and in passing a single bill which carries $72,000,000,000, I wonder if it is not time for us to stop, look, and listen.

I remarked on yesterday in a speech that by the end of 1944 our national debt would be approximately $300,000,000,000 and the war will not likely be over and the increase in the national debt will rise, and that our people are now called on to pay $38,000,000,000 a year in taxes and that would be increased to $50,000,000,000 annually in a few months.

I have observed here for some time, and I have gone along like you and raised very little question, and yet it gives me some pause to look at the empty benches in this House when a bill carrying nearly $72,000,000,000 is under consideration and a mere handful of Members on the floor. Whether we oppose it or not, it seems to me, under circumstances like these, every Member who could be ought to be in his seat today just to know something about what is carried in such a bill.

In nearly every other department, bureau, or branch of the Government, day by day, we hear Members on both sides of the aisle criticize the waste and inefficiency and the large amounts of money expended and the padding of pay rolls. We hear nothing about that in connection with the very big expenditures of these two great Departments of the Government, the War and the Navy. I wonder if they have too many people on the pay rolls; I wonder if there is waste and inefficiency in the Army and the Navy. We have some evidence of that in the renegotiation of contracts of the Army. They claim they are going to recover nearly $2,000,000,000—somebody was careless or inefficient if that happened—and perhaps recover a like sum in the Navy. Are we doing something that ought not to be done? Is there unnecessary waste or inefficiency? I ask myself and I ask the Members of the House, Are we doing our full duty in not looking into these items and seeing if there is justification for all the expenditures involved in these tremendous sums of money?

Our boys are fighting heroically and doing a swell job on land, sea, and in the air. I want them to have all the ships, bombers, planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions necessary to win the victory at the earliest moment possible. I want them to be the best-clothed, the best-housed, the best-cared-for, and the best-paid soldiers in the world. We should spare no expense to accomplish that purpose. At the same time, we should be alert and do what we can to prevent the expenditure of the American people's money not in the interest of winning the war and not to the best interest of the American people.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, the able chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and a loyal supporter of the war effort, according to press reports, raises the same question and discusses the advisability of putting a limit of $75,000,000,000 on expenditures by the War and Navy Departments. He pointed out that the Army had indulged in wasteful purchase of hotels for the Army and the Navy had obtained funds for facilities that might be questionable. He further called attention of the country that he was certain many war agencies were overstaffed. Senator BYRD's committee claimed there were at least 300,000 unnecessary Federal civilian employees. Senator GEORGE further pointed out that unnecessary expenditures of the Army and Navy and the overstaffing of the Federal agencies had become a point of irritation to the citizens and when the people finally find out they have been footing the bill for a great many things that are not only useless to the average citizen but are directly competitive with him in his struggle to live they are going to have something to say about it. He continued that other countries had made the mistake of bleeding their domestic economy white and we might well profit by their mistakes.

Congressman ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, a very able, intelligent, and industrious member of the Appropriations Committee, stated in a speech on the floor of the House the other day that he had secured from the Federal Census Bureau the amount of property listed for taxation by all of the people of the United States. The Census Bureau records disclose that the total value as listed by the taxpayers of the Nation of all their property—real, personal, mixed, and intangible—amounted to approximately $150,000,000,000. The one hundred and six billion the administration demands for this year for war purposes is more than two-thirds of the assessed value of all the property of the United States, according to the Census Bureau record, and the three hundred billion debt you will see at the end of 1944 will be double the assessed value of all the property of all the people of the United States.

Is it not about time that we study carefully the demands of the administration and see to it that these enormous sums are justified by the needs of the Army and Navy? I think the people of my district, as well as yours, would feel better if they knew that we are scrutinizing most carefully these expenditures. We hear speeches day by day on both sides of the aisle criticizing the waste and inefficiency of the other departments, bureaus, commissions, and agencies of the Government. For the last 11 years this administration has not striven to make a record of economy. They have boasted of the enormous sums that they have expended.

Let us win the war most certainly, but let us save our country from bankruptcy and reduce the burden to the American taxpayer as much as possible. At the best, it certainly will be heavy enough.

There is a lot of talk about what we are going to do for the boys when they get back after winning the victory. One of the important things is this: What are we doing to the boys on the home front while they are winning our battles? We have embarked upon a new system of collecting taxes, 20 percent is to be withheld at the source from the salaries and wages of thirty or more million employed people in this country. When these boys come back home with this $300,000,000,000 or $350,000,000,000 debt on their backs, do you think we are going to stop the withholding of this

tax at its source? More than likely it will be 25 to 30 percent, and they will not pay it just for 1 year; they will pay it as long as they live, and their children and their children's children will be paying it, and this $300,000,000,000 or $350,000,000,000 debt may not then be discharged unless we repudiate it. Not criticizing this great committee of the House, I wonder if we know and are finding out all the things that we ought to know; I wonder if the members of that committee know how many factories and shops are being built and operated with American money in India, in Canada, in South America, in Australia, and in various other countries in many parts of Europe, and on the islands of the sea? I wonder if the committees know?

I wonder if we know how many are being built and operated and what they are costing the American people. I want our country to do its full share in the winning of this war. Last year Great Britain spent $22,500,000,000 on the war. This year, the new year beginning April the first, she revamped her budget. Did she increase it 59 percent as we have? No; she cut her budget down $2,000,000,000 and they propose this year to spend only $20,500,000,000 to our $106,000,000,000; in other words, our country proposes this year to spend on this war effort more than five times as much as Great Britain. Yes; look at the figures. Russia is spending $15,000,000,000 annually. Taking Great Britain, Russia, China, Canada, Australia, India, and all the British Empire with its 500,000,000 people and its 16,000,000 square miles of territory you will find that the United States is spending from two to three times as much as all these countries combined. Yes; I wonder what our boys are coming back to? Coming back to a bankrupt country, coming back to debts and taxes taking their opportunities away from them and their families. Will your son, will my son come back to something, to opportunities? Not a dollar should be spent unless it can be justified for the winning of the war.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the eloquent gentleman from Kentucky has complained of the large expenditure provided in this War Department appropriation bill, and he has posed the question, What are the boys coming back to? One of the purposes of this bill is to insure that the boys will come back at all. For one, I say that any necessary amount of money spent to insure the return of one single American boy from abroad to his native land will not be too great a sum for us to spend. When I place in the balances blood and money, my sympathies will be with the blood, and I know the gentleman from Kentucky would share that sentiment.

I realize this is a big bill, the biggest appropriation bill ever proposed by the Congress, and I realize that some of the money proposed in this bill will be wasted; it is inevitable—haste makes waste, and war makes waste. I also realize that while officers of the Army and enlisted men of the Army have frequently been decorated for valor and bravery they have very rarely, if ever, been decorated for the saving of public money.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. CREAL. As said by the previous speaker, it is a sad commentary that during the consideration of this great bill and the amount it carries the number of Members on the floor does not exceed 50. Those here, though, are presumed to be more watchful than the others. Does the gentleman know of a single vote present in the 50 that is going to be cast against this bill?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I do not believe a single Member of this Congress will vote against this bill, and also let me say that while there are but few Members on the floor on this Saturday afternoon, the Members will be present to vote on Monday.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the Army is not the most frugal organization in the world. The chief mission of the Army is not to save the money of the taxpayers, but, of course, the Army should refrain from waste and save every dollar that can be saved. War is expensive at best. This committee has carefully investigated the different items in this bill and has urged every possible economy on the part of the War Department without sacrificing the war effort. I cheerfully admit that the Army takes better care of the men in uniform—takes better care of the Nation's pride and honor in combat—than it takes of the pocketbook of the taxpayer. Waste is one of those unfortunate things in war which cannot be prohibited or prevented. It is impossible to tell what money will be needed by the War Department during the 12-month period beginning with July 1 of this year, the period for which we are appropriating $72,000,000,000. It must be evident to anyone that it is utterly impossible to know precisely the exact amount of money which should be appropriated. Who knows how many ships carrying precious cargoes of material will be sunk in the Atlantic and Pacific—cargoes that will have to be replaced? If one does not know how many ships will be sunk and the cargoes they will carry, then he cannot calculate with precision the number of tanks, the amount of munitions and various supplies that must be shipped—that must be manufactured.

This bill carries money for the care of prisoners of war in America or elsewhere in the world. No one knows how many prisoners of war will be captured by our forces during the coming year. We now know that we have over 300,000 prisoners; we now know we have about 9,000 prisoners who have been transported to this country and who are working in this country, but it is impossible for us to know how long the war will last, how many prisoners there will be, and what the costs will be, because those facts can only be revealed by the developments of the future; we cannot predict with accuracy the fortunes of war.

Who knows how much money we should appropriate for poison gas? Our President has recently recognized the threat that poison gas might be used against our soldiers overseas and he has reminded the world that if poison gas is used we propose to be ready to meet it, and by virtue of the action of this Congress our men wherever they may be in the four quarters of the earth will be able to meet and give back in double portion the poison gas that may be used against them. Who knows, however, but that every dime spent for poison gas will in a sense be wasted in that the gas will not be utilized? Yet we recognize that if we are not prepared the enemy will resort to the use of gas. To be honest about it, this bill is just an intelligent guess as to our future requirements; that is the best that it can be. The officers of the Army have worked for months in order to perfect the items and this committee has been working for weeks trying to bring in a good bill, has been working intensively all of the last month in trying to bring in the very best possible bill; but this war is so big that no mind can completely embrace it and the stakes are so great and the victory to be won so much desired that no price in money can be placed upon it.

The hope was expressed by representatives of the War Department that this would be the "decisive budget," the decisive appropriation bill, that this would be the amount of money provided by the Congress and the American people to win the final victory. Let us hope that it will be. Certainly without it there can be no victory. And if it takes more, the American people stand ready to provide it.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to speak at length about this bill because the bill is desperately important and I am very much interested in it, being a member of the Committee on Appropriations which prepared it. However, the bill has been so well presented by my colleagues who have preceded me that it is hardly necessary to say much more about it. They have covered the major features of the bill. There are many side lights, so to speak, which I had hoped to discuss with you but I fear I will hardly have the time.

One of the entrancing things in connection with our war effort is the question of transportation. Transportation is the key to successful war. Transportation is related to practically every element of war. Transportation plays a part in so many transactions having to do with war—the movement of men, food, ships, planes, ammunition.

The soldier is transported to the induction center, to the Army camp, to the various schools of the Army and finally he is transported to the point of embarkation. He is then transported overseas, he is further trained, and he is transported to the front. War is movement, war is transportation.

One of the most romantic stories of the war is now being written by Gen. H. L. George and those who serve with him in the Army Air Transport Command.

The Air Transport Command has 100,000 miles to traverse throughout the continents and oceans of the world. I repeat, 100,000 miles. The Transport Command is able to deliver the goods because we have provided the money, the equipment, and the men. General George told of an instance where the British at Cairo were in a desperate situation because they did not have adequate antitank ammunition. A call was sent out and the Air Transport Command got the message. In 72 hours antitank ammunition was delivered at Cairo and the day was saved for the United Nations at that vital spot and at that vital time.

General MacArthur called for an especially needed item which had to be furnished in a hurry and within 12 hours after he had sent his message to America for this equipment it was on the Pacific coast. Within an additional 48 hours it was delivered in Brisbane, Australia, by the Air Transport Command. It has been a marvelous story, this story of transportation. Those planes circle the earth carrying precious cargoes of men and supplies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have boasted of being the most self-sufficient in the world and perhaps we are, but we have found that in this great global war we lacked many of the sinews of modern war. By airplane and otherwise those precious items, such as mica from India and other strategic material from elsewhere have been brought in by the men who fly the skyways.

There is no way of getting away from transportation. There is the transportation of men overseas. The committee was told confidentially the exact number of men who have now been transported overseas, but I cannot announce that figure. Several months ago, I believe, War Department officials announced that a million or more men had been transported. I think that it is a heartening thing for the American people to know that in the transportation of this vast number of American fighting men overseas, only fifteen hundred have been lost in transit. There have been only two disasters of any magnitude, whatever. Our Army, Navy, and the British have done a marvelous job in the safe transportation of American boys to the points of destination.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. You are transporting them in the wrong direction. It is the Pacific where we ought to be fighting now, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. I say we ought to be fighting wherever the enemy challenges on any battle front of the world. Unless I am incorrectly informed the boys who fly the skyways and who fight on the ground and who ride the tanks are fighting in both the Pacific and the Atlantic. Just this week we read where 77 Japanese planes were shot down at Guadalcanal by an efficient American air force with the loss of only 6 American planes. I say the American men who wear the uniform have fighting blood in their veins and they are fighting wherever they find the enemy and they will press the issue until the day of victory. The strategy and the proportion of men to be placed in the various theaters of war are something, of course, that we cannot very well discuss and certainly we cannot determine upon the floor of this House.

We have provided for the care and transportation of the wounded. I asked Surgeon General Magee this question: "Can the American fathers and mothers of this Nation be assured that their sons, if wounded, will receive the very best treatment possible?" He said, "The American fathers and mothers can be assured that the Medical Corps of the Army is giving them the best treatment that can be given anywhere. The most modern equipment is used and the best skill that a skilled medical profession can provide."

In this war of transportation we even use dogs. Some of you may have read in the paper this morning that the food bill for the dogs amounts to about 25 cents a day per dog. Some have ridiculed the idea that the Army should use dogs, but the dog has always been man's friend, and if General Eisenhower or General MacArthur can send a dog or a pigeon on the wing to carry the message, I say let us send them whenever we can save a man. Let us save the man.

But I see that I have just about utilized the 15 brief minutes allotted to me. I am just beginning to discuss some of the interesting side lights of the bill and I am sorry that I cannot continue.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a number of references have been made today to the small attendance on the floor for the consideration of this gigantic bill. Yesterday almost the entire membership were on the floor continuously for 10 hours as we considered the war agencies appropriation. Although the amount involved was sixty-eight billions smaller than this bill, we had over 2,000 pages of committee hearings to consider. Today, on this $71,000,000,000 bill, we have 589 pages of hearings, with the most interesting questions answered by—"discussion off the record." In their speeches today on this bill my colleagues have very carefully omitted any reference to facts which would inform us of the military uses, situations, tactics, strategy, and logistics which would justify this vast expenditure.

I am not objecting. This is as it should be, but I want to explain for the RECORD, why the attendance is so poor today. It denotes no lack of interest by the absentees in this great bill, no lack of concern for the war effort or for the astronomic cost of it. All of us know that, whether we are here or not, we cannot find out the facts which are needed to pass judgment on this appropriation. We must trust the committee, and the committee members have frankly said that they, in turn, must trust the Army and its officials who say they must have certain things, in certain quantities.

I hope that events prove they are worthy of this great trust. We know there has been extravagance and waste, but war itself is wasteful. I know personally many Army and War Department officials who are deeply conscious of their gigantic responsibility, and I believe that instances of abuse of their great responsibility are exceptional. In any case, we must trust them.

We must get to the fighting men the things they need for victory. That means taking the word of their leaders as to what they need.

I intend to vote for this gigantic bill. A $71,000,000,000 appropriation paralyzes the imagination. It is not dollars we are appropriating, but human energy and property, the resources of the country we pledged to victory when we declared war.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, it has been my purpose from time to time whenever possible for me to do so to visit some of our Army training camps. I think it is incumbent upon the Members of Congress whenever it is possible for them to do so to investigate on their own the type of training and equipment that is being given our troops who are going to go out into the battles of this war.

Recently it was my privilege to visit one of our infantry training replacement centers in Texas, specifically, Camp Wolters, Tex. It is a camp of which many of you may have perhaps never heard. I was curious about it. I was interested in it. I found there conditions which rather opened my eyes to the type of training and the treatment our young men in the Army are receiving.

I found the camp to be excellently located and exceptionally well equipped with buildings and facilties, except that there was a shortage of training area; an additional area is to be provided in the immediate future. It is under the command of a splendid soldier, Gen. Bruce Magruder. The plans and training operations are under the direct charge of Colonel Welker, an able and experienced officer.

We know that it is the basic training policy of the War Department to give these men 13 weeks of intensive training, and when the word "intensive" is used it probably does not fully describe how intensive it is because it certainly is the highest type of physical training that a young man could have, and bear up under the strenuous physical effort.

I was interested in seeing some of these troops marching a mile in 12 minutes, under a sun of 91° or 92°, and carrying a 40-pound pack and an 8- or 10-pound rifle. This means they were marching at 128 steps to the minute, which is pretty tough on a hot day. They have to be tough to take it.

I was interested in the morale of these men. It was excellent, as was the training. I was interested in the morals of the camp and the surroundings of the camp. So are the parents and friends and the country as a whole. Venereal disease is practically nonexistent at this

camp. I found that the city of Mineral Wells, near which the camp is located, heartily and fully cooperated with the Army and the Army with the community in keeping the camp followers away from both the camp and the community. Mineral Wells is proud of this camp and its record—and this feeling is reciprocated by the Army.

I found the food to be excellent and well cooked, and that the mess halls had signs urging the soldiers not to waste any food. I found, through inspecting the kitchens and waste receptacles, that very little if any food is wasted. The Army in that camp is certainly conserving food supplies.

I made it a point to consult with the Red Cross and the Chaplains of the camp, both Catholic and Protestant, to find out what their feelings are as to the condition of the morals and the morale of the men in the camp. On the whole they feel that the moral and physical fiber of the men and the conditions in the camp are excellent.

I mention these things because, as an old doughboy myself, I was interested in what type of training our infantry was getting.

I found these men were being trained under battle conditions. They crawl under a low-strung wire, they have dynamite exploding around them, they have machine guns firing live ammunition just over them, so these soldiers know what some of the battle conditions will be when they enter combat.

I found that some of the promises that have been made to the effect that most of the youth of this country will have a year's training before being sent overseas are not exactly correct, because I found that many of these men who receive the 13 weeks' training go directly from that camp as casual replacements overseas. They are not getting the promised year's training. I think that perhaps to some extent more seasoning would do most of these men some benefit before actual combat.

There were in that camp some units where as high as 50 percent were college men. One battalion in that camp had the highest intelligence quotient of any battalion in the history of the United States Army. These men are going over as buck privates. They are taught to be tough. They have a special section and a special part of the training where dirty fighting is taught them, where they are taught all of the elements that men in the Army must know in order to kill the ruthless enemy they must meet.

Camp Wolters is performing its mission of training in a magnificent way. Ably commanded, well officered, it has some outstanding officers in charge of the specialist training of this camp. It would be impossible, I believe, to find more efficient execution of the intensive training that is crowded into the short training period.

It would be my observation that these young men receive in their 13 weeks of basic training at that camp a great deal more than was ever included in a much longer period of training in World War No. 1. While I recognize that the hardening and training process is much more intense than in World War No. 1, it might on the other hand be advisable that serious consideration be given to spreading the hardening process a little further in time and that more seasoning be given to troops before being sent overseas that is permitted in the 13 weeks time.

The type and intelligence and physique of the enlisted men of this camp were the highest that I have seen. At this particular time and under these conditions a very high percentage were college men. No one could observe this type of enlisted men without having a grave concern as to the future well-being of this country, for these fine men represent the intelligence and future generation of this country if care is used in conserving manpower. They are being toughened and trained physically and mentally. They must have the balance to adjust themselves in civilian life after this war, and it is our solemn and serious duty to consider now the possibilities of rehabilitation of these splendid young men who may be physically and mentally scarred by their war training and war experiences.

We are appropriating the greatest appropriation in the history of civilization, either in war or peace. That appropriation will be an idle gesture if those charged with its administration do not function honestly and intelligently in behalf of those who pay the bill. That applies not only to the administration of the funds but also—and what is more precious—to the training, care, and preservation of the manpower of this country. It imposes upon the Congress the recognition of plans and future legislation for the rehabilitation of this manpower when the war is over. We must win this war—the administration of this war must be not only honest and efficient but humane and intelligent.

The morale of the soldier in battle is largely controlled by the type of officer that is in command and the type of leadership that is exercised. It is created also by many other things. The fighting soldier must realize that after the battle is over that his country shall have for him a continuing and helpful, humane, and sympathetic understanding of the problems which he faces upon his rehabilitation and return to the pursuits of peace. Let none of us in or out of Congress be haunted by the thought that we have in any way or manner been in the slightest degree neglectful or careless of our responsibilities to those men of our armed forces.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a tremendous amount of work. It is tireless, painstaking work for the members of the committee on Appropriations; and it is work dealing in large figures where accuracy and judgment is most important. It is likewise a most historic work, as this is the largest appropriation bill of all time. No doubt, the able and distinguished chairman and his associates who serve with him on the subcommittee will treasure as a fine recollection of a most useful service the work which they have patriotically contributed to the war effort in working out this most important bill.

Mr. Chairman, during the last few weeks a great deal has been said about help for the Chinese. It has been said that what the Chinese are interested in is in the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and other immigration laws which prevent a citizen of China from entering the United States. It has further been said that the Japs are using these laws to fill the Chinese mind with propaganda that we are not interested in China or in her citizens; and that this lack of interest is illustrated by the fact that we permit these laws to remain upon our statute books in spite of our professions of friendship. It is most unfortunate that during the middle of a great war in which the life of this Republic as well as that of China is at stake, the question of immigration should be brought here to becloud the issues of this titanic contest. Problems such as this can well await the return of peace when we with calm minds can explore future immigration policies of our Nation and we can then add to the perplexities of the problem the freshness and the knowledge of the newly won victory. The solution which we may apply today may not be the one of tomorrow. Certainly the propaganda emanating from the Axis nations will be nonexistent when the clouds of war shall have been pushed back by the gentle breezes of returning tranquility in the world; and it may be then that the Chinese Government may have ideas of its own on this subject.

But more than this, Mr. Chairman, the repeal of these laws at the present time cannot help China. The repeal of every immigration law which has been passed by this Nation during the last 100 years will not help China one jot or one tittle. Even if there were Chinese immigrants ready, able, willing, and anxious to come to our shores, the exigencies of war will not permit them to travel over the Pacific Ocean to America. They are not able to migrate to other lands having no immigration laws or restrictions at the present time; and they most assuredly would view the removal of any law upon our statute books as merely an idle boast and empty gesture, designed to retain their good will when what they need and want is real help.

Mr. Chairman, I have recently talked to some of our people who have been to China and made a study of the situation there. They tell me that what China wants is arms, ammunition, airplanes, tanks, and war equipment. The delivery of one airplane to China will be worth literally barrels of repealed statutes to them. The help we should give those brave people, who for over 5 years have been fighting the Japs for their very existence, should be measured in terms of bullets and bombs and not in terms of lip service or of grandiose gestures. We should give them the equipment with which to defend themselves, their families, their homes, their towns, their cities, and their nation. We should give them the means to drive the invaders back to the coasts of China, out of their despoiled and destroyed countryside. We

should give them means of bombing these marauders of a peace-loving land out of existence as they cling tenaciously to the Chinese coastal cities in a last desperate effort to protect Japan itself from destruction. And finally, we should place in willing and trained Chinese hands the weapons needed to bring about an actual destruction of Tokyo, Yokohama, and all of Japan engaged in fashioning instruments and instruments of war.

I have studied with great interest the record made by our own flyers in China. I have studied the records made by Stillwell's soldiers and Claire Chennault's men, commonly known as the Flying Tigers. These adventurous and daring American flyers have given blows where they will really count. They have, with the most meager material and smallest possible numbers given such an account of themselves that it will form the basis of American legend in the centuries to come. Outnumbered sometimes a hundred to one, they have met, fought, and driven the Japs out of the Chinese skies in an almost incredible manner. I am informed the ratio of losses in Jap planes to those of General Chennault is approximately 35 to 1 in his favor. Nowhere in the entire world can so much be done with so little as is possible today in China.

Listening to the stories of General Claire Chennault and his Flying Tigers against the Jap gives the Chinese heart the encouragement which it needs in this great hour of stress and strain upon its national life. Adding up Jap losses gives Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his men the courage they need to carry on the defense of a raped, plundered, and impoverished homeland. It is for more help of this kind, and not for the repeal of laws passed years ago which can be of no earthly assistance, that Chiang Kai-shek pleads today. If they who talk of immigration problems, are truly interested in a great people fighting against hopeless odds far out into the setting sun, they will give the force of their influence and their vote today to getting to China more weapons of war, more guns, planes, tanks, and equipment, and thereby give to the Chinese people a hope, a courage, and an assurance which the repeal of all of our immigration laws cannot give them in their desperate hour.

Let us then stop our prating about immigration and give those people, our allies, real fighting help in their struggle for existence.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in this appropriation bill is startling. Nevertheless I am confident this committee has diligently considered every phase and carefully gone into the necessity for this vast amount of money. It is true the sum is enormous, yet we prepare our soldiers and pay our soldiers and take care of our soldiers three times better than all of the other countries allied with us on the face of this earth. Therefore it gives me pleasure to support the bill and to give high praise to the committee that has diligently labored and served so well to bring before us this clear, concise, and necessary appropriation.

One of the gentlemen who preceded me spoke at length for home consumption. The fact is we all know war is nothing but waste and destruction, but it is my desire to furnish every necessary dollar to see that our men and women are taken care of and given all the comforts, privileges, and pleasures possible on their foreign mission, and certainly to have at hand the most modern implements of war, and these in abundant quantities. Their job is a 24-hour job, 7 days a week, and 365 days in the year, without portal-to-portal pay or time and one-half for overtime. Their duty has no limit, and it is a sad sight here at home that we are watching today when men retard the production of the supplies our soldiers may need so sorely. I regret that I will not be here Monday when the vote is taken on this bill, but it so happens I have accepted an invitation to attend the North Carolina State convention of the American Legion. Yet were there any doubt as to the overwhelming passage of this bill, I would forego the above pleasure.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, when we cast our vote on an appropriation bill like this of unprecedented magnitude we do so trembling with the thought of its consequences for good or ill upon our country. I confess that I, too, have had some of the gloomy fears as expressed a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], who while sanctioning an appropriation to any extent necessary for our war effort, nevertheless cannot help thinking of the future solvency of the Nation. However, those gloomy forebodings have usually been dispelled when I took the view as expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. It is impossible properly to compare material things and spiritual things. I take Congressman MAHON'S view, as he seemed to imply it, that no price is too great to pay for that which we hope this war will accomplish. Such a hopeful prospect is the only viewpoint I can have when I cast my vote upon the greatest appropriation bill in human history.

Just today I saw a printed advertisement encouraging the buying of bonds. It said, "Uncle Sam asks you to invest 10 percent of your earnings in order to guarantee 100 percent for yourself." One-tenth will not be the right fraction relative to the material wealth of our country which must be expended in this total war for the protection of the remainder of the material wealth of the country. I am willing to spend any necessary portion of the material wealth of this country for the preservation of our blood and the higher values for which we are fighting. We never ask the amount of the surgeon's fee but only ask whether the operation will save the patient's life. There are some things on which no price ceiling can be placed.

I asked the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] earlier in the debate, and later I asked the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], whether it was contemplated to have any change in the letting of war contracts from the existing plan of negotiation of contracts back to the customary plan of competitive bidding. Both of these outstanding members of the committee, who have had the whole problem of the cost of the war in mind, indicated to me that there was a hope to return to the more businesslike method of competitive bids. This pleases me greatly for I had supposed that after the first great need of haste in defense and preparation had passed, and some of the necessary experimentation finished, we would be in a position to figure dollar costs on a more careful basis.

At the very outset of the program for defense, long before we were in the fighting war, I remember that I asked on the floor of this Chamber whether negotiated war contracts would not lead to waste and extravagance. I was told that it was necessary then in order to save time and get things done quickly, for the very safety of the country depended upon such a course with all of its risks. No doubt the future will inquire of us concerning the wisdom of carrying on the production end of the war in this manner, because we all know that such a method of letting contracts for war materials and supplies and war construction on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis all has had far-reaching consequences upon our economic system. Our justification must be that at that date we had no time for any other course of effective action. The safety of the Nation was hanging in the balance, and the delays caused by red tape must not be permitted to slow us down.

It is gratifying indeed to hear from the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman STARNES, the gentleman from South Dakota, Congressman CASE, and others that so many war contracts have been renegotiated and such great savings have been brought about to the Public Treasury. This has been done along with great accomplishments. Again I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], for calling to our minds the marvelous achievements not only of the men in the field but of the soldiers of production on the home front. We must not be too narrow in our definition of these soldiers of production in such a total war as this. I wish the gentleman from Alabama had had the time to tell us more about the volunteer services of so many millions of loyal citizens who are not paid out of this appropriation or any other appropriation which Congress may pass.

Yes, this is the greatest of all appropriations. I cannot conceive the magnitude of this sum. It is intended to go to many millions in the armed services and to other millions in the production services, but not to an equal number of millions

who are doing their bit in the volunteer services. All together about 130,000,000 Americans are contributing toward the victory for which we hope this appropriation will be the most telling financial effort. The price, though staggering to the imagination, is not too great. What will a man give in exchange for his soul? What is the worth of the soul of a nation?

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on Minnesota farm operators' plants.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, no one can serve on the Ways and Means Committee without learning it is easier to spend money than it is to raise taxes. Consequently I have frequently voted to reduce appropriation items. I have seldom voted to increase them and still more seldom suggested to the Appropriations Committee that it may have been in error in turning down some budget recommendation or some departmental request.

I feel, however, on the basis of limited information, and largely on the basis of general principles, that the Appropriations Committee made an error in turning down a very modest request of the War Department for about $125,000 for the employment of a limited group of outstanding American artists to paint in foreign countries pictures of our boys, but not of our generals, and of foreign battle scenes.

George Washington employed outstanding artists who have left us imperishable canvasses of the Revolutionary War. Lincoln employed artists who at that time were supplemented by Brady and other famous photographers. McKinley employed artists to paint pictures for us of the Spanish-American War. Great Britain and Canada in this war have gone into this phase of perpetuating the war record on a big scale. The Navy has employed artists, and the Army has a project in the field now on which we have spent about $30,000. A request was made to appropriate an additional $125,000 to supplement the photographic service, to bring to us inspirational canvasses which could perpetuate a record of the biggest war of all time, and we hope the last war of all time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me in the case of wars mentioned up to this one they did not have moving pictures. In the case of the British, which the gentleman mentioned in this war, they have lend-lease.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentlewoman from Illinois has completely missed my point. She probably recalls those lines of Wordsworth, who, speaking of the English plowman, said:

> A primrose by the river's brim,
> A yellow primrose was to him;
> But it was nothing more.

We can take photographs of what happens in Europe, but my point was it takes the vision and artistic skill of the artist to bring to us the inspiration which only an artist can put on canvas. Since only 4 percent of those elected to the House stay here as long as 5 years and few are remembered for as long as 5 years after they leave, a photograph of Members of the House hung in the office of the Sergeant at Arms is good enough. I want to see a picture to the memory of those who die in this war good enough for the Hall of Fame. This has been done in previous wars, and I think we would be penny-wise and pound foolish, as well as lacking due concern for some eight or ten million men who are going into the worst war of all time, not to do for them what we have always done for our soldiers, to perpetuate on canvas as well as in movies and other photographs what they did to preserve our liberty.

At the present time both the Navy and the Army have art projects. The pending proposal is to end the art project for the Army only, notwithstanding the fact it has the wholehearted endorsement of General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and of the War Department. The War Department's viewpoint was thus expressed by General Reybold who testified before the House subcommittee:

BACKGROUND OF PROJECT

There is more than ample precedent and justification for the establishment by the War Department of a project to create a historical art record of America's part in this war. The precedent was first set in the Revolutionary War, when Gen. George Washington appointed three artists for that purpose, whose paintings have been historically of great value; the leader was John Trumbull, foremost artist of the time.

During the Civil War, President Lincoln appointed four official artists, one of them the eminent Winslow Homer, and in the Spanish War President McKinley likewise appointed two artists.

During the First World War, Great Britain, France, and Canada employed artists from the very start of the war, using a total of over 100. In that war the United States did not start its art recording until January 1918, then commissioning 8 officers in the Engineer Reserve Corps. These 8 men produced 277 paintings, and many others were contributed by an additional group of 12 arists employed on the home front.

In the present war Great Britain in November 1939 set up a War Art Advisory Committee, representing various interested agencies, and is using both commissioned, enlisted, and civilian artists to record every phase of the operations of its armed forces. In 1940 the official artists numbered over 40, and many have been added since. Their productions have already appeared in posters, exhibitions, post cards, and the Illustrated London News. The entire collection probably will be preserved with that from World War No. 1 in the Imperial War Museum established for that purpose.

Canada, which was the first to send artists to World War No. 1 and has hung the more than 1,000 resulting pictures in the National Gallery of Canada, set up at the start of this war an Art Advisory Commission and is using many enlisted artists as well as some 15 especially appointed. Australia's organization very closely parallels that of Canada, while Russia has employed several hundred artists for the same purpose.

It should be noted that at the beginning of this project, before any artists were appointed, the Chief of Staff communicated with the commanding generals of every one of our theaters of operations, outlining the nature and scope of the proposed project; every one of the theater commanders, Eisenhower, MacArthur, and the others without exception, replied giving full approval.

NEED FOR PAINTING AS WELL AS PHOTOGRAPHY

It has been suggested that the camera alone can produce an adequate record of this country's activities in the war; but the camera is limited by weather, the light, and what is before it at the moment of exposure, while the artist can recreate what he has seen or even what others have seen, can emphasize the features that tell the story of the particular event and omit the nonessentials. Perhaps the best evidence of the popular demand for war paintings is offered by the action of Life magazine, which now has supplemented its staff of photographers by a nearly equal number of artists.

CUSTODY AND UTILIZATION OF THE PAINTINGS

All paintings are to be returned, through the Art Advisory Committee, to the War Department. Final plans have not been completed for their full utilization nor for where they shall be permanently preserved, but it is expected that they will first be reproduced in the daily, weekly, and monthly press. The Metropolitan Museum, the National Gallery, and many State institutions have requested showings, and the Book of the Month Club has expressed interest in publishing a compilation of the paintings. There is no doubt that a record of great historical value and popular interest will result.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite apparent from the hearings that the fight in the subcommittee against this item was led by a member whose opinion that the project was a foolish and unnecessary one was based upon a newspaper story and formed before any testimony concerning it was presented. It is further apparent from the hearings that the full committee could not have maturely considered the item because much pertinent evidence requested by the subcommittee was not printed in the subcommittee hearings. I therefore hope that some member of the Appropriations Committee will from the floor offer an amendment to restore this item to the bill, and if that be not done that the item will be restored when the bill reaches the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the largest appropriation measure that has ever been presented to any legislative body in the history of the world. When we approach the time when we cast our vote on this legislation we wonder what the implications may be respecting a measure of these huge proportions—a bill calling for the stupendous sum of $59,037,599,673 of new appropriations and with the sum of $12,472,839,200 on reappropriations—and we are amazed at the frightful requests which have been made by the President, and the War Department, for funds with which to prosecute this war. Every American is appalled at the immensity of this appropriation bill. We do not know how much money is embraced in this measure; we see the figures, but we cannot appreciate

the amount. When we remember that the cost of the last World War, including loans made to foreign countries, totaled approximately $41,000,000,000, then we reflect that this one appropriation bill far exceeds the total cost of that war. Yet when the Army experts come before us and state that these sums are absolutely necessary to our victory in this war, and that the sums set forth in the pending measure must be forthcoming, what can the representatives of the people do, other than to make the appropriation? We must win this war. We must win it both quickly and decisively. We must not yield the life or lives or our men and boys beyond that which is absolutely necessary for our speedy victory in this conflict.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that this measure provides for the sum of $23,700,000,000 for the Air Corps of the Army. That is a stupendous sum of money. Our Air Corps has certainly done a fine job. They have struck relentlessly and certainly. We have attained the position of air superiority over our adversaries; we must retain that superiority. That will aid us in the final drive for victory. We must not yield in our efforts on the home front in that production of the essential war materials and supplies, and the planes, which have played such an important part in this war, must be produced and they must be supplied to our Army on every battle front.

When we contemplate the many and various branches of our Army, and their needs, we find that the Ordnance Service and Supplies of the Army constitutes a large part of the service which provides the equipment for that fighting force; that means there must be more tanks, guns, ammunition, bombs, and every kind and character of fighting equipment, and this measure provides more than $15,000,000,000 for that branch of our Army. The supply and transportation of our fighting forces, and this is limited to our Army, is not one of the small items, because this bill provides more than $7,000,000,000 for that essential branch. Yes, that amount appears to be very large. I am convinced that it is large; yet, the Army officers, and the experts upon whom we must rely, state that this sum, and all other sums contained in this bill, must be provided, and provided at once, in order to assure our total victory in this war. As we view this measure—while we are appalled at the immensity of the money involved in this appropriation—we must realize that our people have but one aim today, and that aim is to win this war, and to win it as speedily as possible. We cannot turn our backs upon our boys, our neighbors' boys, and our friends who are fighting the battles of our country; they are out there aiding in the preservation of our country, and our American way of life; they are fighting for our country, and for every American citizen.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, while this measure appears to be very large—it may be too large, and all of this huge amount may not be absolutely necessary, yet I cannot say that it is too large; I do not know—the people generally do not know whether this appropriation is too large or too small. We have to accept the demand of the Army experts. We cannot place our judgment against that of those who are schooled in the art of warfare and who know the attitude of the enemy and the requirements upon our part to defeat the enemy. If we cannot rely upon the Army experts, then upon whom may we rely in this grave crisis? So, as we approach the hour when we must cast our vote upon this measure—the largest one contained in a single appropriation measure in the history of the world—we must be guided by our fervent desire to win this war and the statements made by the Army experts that this sum is necessary for our victory in this war.

These are serious days in our country. I shudder when I look forward into the future when, throughout the coming years, the people of this country will be faced with the staggering debt created both before this war and since we became involved in this titanic struggle. May I impress upon the membership and upon the country that it is highly essential that every nonessential item of spending money must be entirely eliminated. Every useless and needless employee in civilian personnel must be released from the Federal pay roll. We must pull up our belts and practice the strictest economy in every department of Government. The waste and extravagance must be stopped and we must get down to the sole business of winning this war. Every other project which costs money must be abandoned in this crisis.

In the final analysis of things we must create unity in our country—and that unity cannot be established and maintained unless all of our people march forward in unison toward the ultimate goal of victory in this war.

To this end the people of this Nation have pledged themselves, and I hope this pledge is never broken by any group of our people until victory is ours.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

WHAT PRICE VICTORY?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the fact that I happen to be on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy does not in the slightest detract from my intense interest in this War Department appropriation bill. I think it rather intensifies it, at least to the extent that I feel the recommendations of the subcommittee, which has given so unselfishly of its time in the many exhaustive and exhausting days and hours of study to all the matters and things involved and included and contained in the bill and its recommendations which were examined and approved by the full Committee on Appropriations, should be appreciated and adopted.

It is true, as has been suggested, that the figures which we use these days, and which are involved in this measure, from a dollar standpoint, are astronomical. They are, however, only indicative of the tremendous price we are called upon to pay to make good our boast, as freemen, in order to leave us of this day and generation, respectable, to say the least, in the eyes and in the opinions of those who shall come after us.

Despite any and all our contentions, we owe an unavoidable debt of responsibility to our children and grandchildren, not measurable in dollar values, for what we shall leave them.

We have our opportunity to make and to leave, clean and cleared, the Augean stables, bloodied and dirtied and made filthy, so far as civilization is concerned, by those men Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini, the stooge.

OUR DUTY

It is right, meet, and our bounden duty, Mr. Chairman, to undertake to do that job and not to quit until it is done, whatever may be the price, or how great shall be the cost of the glory of its accomplishment.

'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows: for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the western stars until I die.
* * * * *
To strive, to seek, to find—and not to yield.

When life and liberty and honor are involved, dollars are no measure of the obligation which anybody owes to anybody.

It is, however, our responsibility to spend dollars right, in order to win the war. It is further our duty to furnish the sinews of war for all time and every time, whatever the cost, until victory is won.

It is not for us to measure by taxes or the value of treasure, the worth of the life, liberty, and rights of those who come after us.

To save ourselves is also our own selfish interest.

I am in favor of the passage of this bill as it is written, and I bespeak your consideration of it, and that your action may be unanimous in its favor.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my tribute to the members of the subcommittee who have reported this bill. I know they have spent many trying hours and days to report out the largest appropriation bill for the conduct of the war in the history of the country.

I am heartily in favor of approving this bill and intend to support it, because I agree with what the gentleman from Texas has said that any amount of money that we appropriate to bring back our boys to their homeland will be cheap. However, we cannot discharge our obligations as a Congress, as an Appropriations Committee and as an Appropriations Subcommittee by voting billions of dollars. To emphasize what I mean, I call your attention to the testimony of the Comptroller General before another committee of the House—the Civil Service Committee. Excerpts and conclusions of the reports from his testimony appeared in the daily press, and I went to the trouble to get portions of the original transcript of the testimony. The part I want to emphasize is that the obligation of this Congress does not end with the appropriation of money or a

Congressman saying "Aye" on an appropriation bill for the Naval or Military Establishments, for the Maritime Commission, for the War Shipping Administration, or for the war agencies that were provided for yesterday. We owe the further obligation to see that we get a penny's worth of war effort and a penny's worth of defense for the country for every penny appropriated.

That is the subject matter of Mr. Warren's testimony. Let me read what Mr. Warren said:

Mr. REES, under the gentle guise of war, the word "economy" has been deleted from the dictionary.

Thrift and prudence, ordinary prudence in the expenditure of other people's money has gone out of the window. * * * The country is in the grip of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor. He is writing his ticket and he is getting what he writes.

Mr. Warren further said:

Well, of course, it is a fact that thousands of people are down in the Government from private business. I do not mean to condemn their actions or motives, but I do say that sometimes the contracting officials of the Government are either nitwits or else. * * * I am not against contractors, understand. * * * I want to see somebody that is looking out for the Government. I am for the taxpayers of this country.

The chairman of the committee said:

I do not want to draw you into the details of this subject but I happen to be on the Merchant Marine Committee also and I know your position about the requisition of ships. As a matter of principle it seems to me that the operation of the War Shipping Administration has been tinged with too much sympathy for the people from whom the ships were requisitioned and that there has not been enough sympathy for the taxpayers.

And I might add at that point: For the boys and the girl at the front.

Mr. Warren further stated:

Mr. WARREN. I found that in the War and Navy Departments, as well as the Maritime Commission.

* * * * *

My observation is that Congress has practically no information on how the appropriated money is spent. Members of the Appropriations Committee will tell you that it is a hit-or-miss affair with them in the development of the various appropriation bills.

I might say to you gentlemen that several times in the last 18 months I have been in executive session with members of the Appropriations Committee on this very subject. While not seeking it and not having the force to do it, in response to questions from that committee, I told them that the General Accounting Office, if they saw fit to pass the legislation, would create a special unit for the information of Congress, * * * to go into these different departments and see that the appropriations were judicially and economically expended, * * * not to pass on policies or anything like that but to inform the Congress as to how the money was being spent.

* * * * *

The Appropriations Committee, however, decided it would attempt to do that itself, and I understand it has made a start in that direction at this session of Congress.

Mr. Warren then told the Ramspeck committee that he thought an organization, responsible only to Congress, should do this work, and added:

Mr. WARREN. I do not mean any snoopers or anything like that. I mean constructive criticism that you, as a Member of Congress, would receive. You have practically no idea of what is going on in any agency, including the General Accounting Office, when you vote these enormous appropriations. It is merely a hit-or-miss affair.

* * * * *

There is a very much maligned man around here, a bureaucrat. I am not a bureaucrat and never will be one. I think I speak the language of the Congress, but Congress has gone far afield under the guise of war in letting down the bars. * * * There are thousands of expenditures that are made that are legal but grossly extravagant. * * * I have reported 168 cases to the House Appropriations Committee of legal but grossly extravagant and improper expenditures ranging from cocktail parties, which were legal, to gross abuse of air-mail freight, travel, and telephone, and things like that, covering a wide field. That information is being furnished constantly to the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the Comptroller General. But we must not let friendship abrogate a requirement of duty under the law.

In 1921 the Budget and Accounting Act specifically required the Comptroller General's office to do the things he suggests now another staff should do in his place. The 1921 law provides as follows:

SEC. 312. (a) The Comptroller General shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and shall make to the President when requested by him, and to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the General Accounting Office, containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds as he may think advisable. In such regular report, or in special reports at any time when Congress is in session, he shall make recommendations looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures.

(b) He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The Comptroller General shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

(c) The Comptroller General shall specially report to Congress every expenditure or contract made by any department or establishment in any year in violation of law.

The Comptroller General is not a witness in the hearings for the presentation of the Army's request for funds in this bill.

For the men and women at the front, for a penny's worth of war for every penny appropriated, we now should call on Mr. Warren for his recommendations under the 1921 Budget and Accounting Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense: To enable the Secretary of War, without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes, to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the War Department during the fiscal year 1944, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of War are desirable in expediting production for military purposes, $657,011,000: *Provided*, That expenditures from any appropriation under this heading may be made without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 3, line 17, before the period insert "*Provided further*, That section 403 (a) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public, 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, is further amended to include Defense Plant Corporation and Defense Supplies Corporation and to provide that the term 'Department' also shall mean Defense Plant Corporation and Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively; and in the case of such corporations, the term 'Secretary' also shall mean Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Incidental expenses of the Army: Postage; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster Corps, including the care of officers' mounts when the same are furnished by the Government; compensation of clerks and other employees of the Quartermaster Corps, including not to exceed $900 for any one person for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States Disciplinary Barracks; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activities of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal services); for the operation of coffee-roasting plants; for maintenance of Quartermaster branch depots, including utilities; for tests and experimental and development work and scientific research to be performed by the Bureau of Standards for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred in advance; for such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for supplies, services, and other expenses essential in conducting instruction of the Army in tactical or special activities and in the operation of Arm or Service Boards not otherwise provided for; for burial of the dead as authorized by acts of May 17, 1938 (10 U. S. C. 916–916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and of the Army of the United States who die while on active duty, including travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communication service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites, $262,965,473: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or den-

tistry whose instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions cannot be completed in 2 years or who are not enlisted in the Army of the United States;

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: Page 21, lines 10 to 16, inclusive, after the colon strike out the remainder of line 10 and all of lines 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and insert: "*Provided*, That appropriations in this act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within 2 years: *Provided also*, That such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely restates the language so as to clarify and bring about the purpose and intent of the committee, that two requisites be met, one that they can complete this training within a year and the other that they must be enlisted in the armed forces.

Mr. STEFAN. As enlistees?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. CASE. This is in harmony with the provision which has been in the bill relating to the aid to students. It is to prevent Federal funds being used to secure a deferred status to any student for the purpose of getting an education and creating security from military service.

Mr. STEFAN. I think when an amendment has been offered, before it is accepted, it should be explained to the House so we can understand it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is the explanation satisfactory?

Mr. STEFAN. It is.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, supplies and transportation, $6,411,549,008, to be accounted for as one fund.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word "fund."

Mr. Chairman, we have heard that this is an enormous appropriation bill; we have heard that we have an enormous debt; and practically solidly both sides have voted for these enormous appropriations, sometimes without a dissenting vote and sometimes with as high as two or three against, and yet we ought to vote against these bills if we are against them; we ought to vote for them if we are for them, but the general all-around criticism of the size of the debt—something that both sides of this aisle voted for on roll calls with practical unanimity—is not a subject of just criticism. We know why the cost has been and will be great. It is because we want other nations which are fighting Hitler to keep up their work. The very nature of this war is such that we prefer to give the money. Insofar as I am concerned, having a boy in the Army, I prefer that a Russian, a Chinaman, an Englishman, or anybody else who wants to take a bayonet and help do the fighting be permitted to do so even at our expense. It lessens the chances of having to furnish more American men to be slaughtered. That is why we are financing so many other people to keep them in the fight. Not to furnish them implements of war would only cost us more men and a longer war. So we are going to be more liberal in these days of liberality and share these arms with other people. We want the Russians to fight as long as they will fight. We are perfectly willing to give them this money that they may continue to fight. That is why these huge bills are voted by Democrats and Republicans alike. So I have no complaint about financing this war in this way because it is different from the other wars. Who would not prefer to give money and materials to our allies if it shortens our own casualty list?

I want to take part of the time at my disposal to answer one question that was asked about food that was sent to Britain. When I first read it I thought it was something that should be looked into, especially its distribution. The Government of Britain sold it to distributors, and the distributors sold it to the British public. At first blush some months ago I said: "Maybe that is not right"; but when I came to look into it, I found there was not one blooming thing in it. It is correct so far as that transaction goes. We did not send that over there like we did in the days of relief because some part of the population did not have something to eat; we sent it because Britain as a whole had nothing to eat, and if we ever get anything back—and we probably will not—it will be the Government of Britain's I O U. We do not want to go into the retail grocery business to the various customers in England who come in there and get it. I prefer John Bull for a creditor, and I do not expect to get it back from Suspinsky at the corner grocery. We will either get it from John Bull or we will not get it at all; we cannot get it from all of his folks there. John wanted it, because he did not have the food for the army that is fighting his and our battles, nor sufficient food for the rich or for the poor. So it does not make a straw's difference what they did in their form of distribution. It is reasonable to presume that Britain knew best how to distribute the food which she didn't have until it was sent under lend-lease to help them in their war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to get a little information from the gentleman from New Jersey. I should like to know if there is any shortage of cotton material for cotton uniforms.

Mr. POWERS. According to the testimony given by the Quartermaster General, no.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have been disturbed by the number of enlisted men I have seen here in Washington in the last few hot days traveling around wearing woolen uniforms and in many cases with woolen blouses.

Mr. POWERS. That is a situation about which I know nothing except from observation. The men the gentleman saw might have been troops who came from some northern camp who just arrived in Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Some provision should be made here through the Quartermaster General's office so that when these fellows come to this hot city and stay for 4 or 5 days lodged across the river some place that they could draw cotton uniforms.

Mr. POWERS. I agree with the gentleman; I think that should be taken up.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In Pennsylvania Station in New York last Tuesday I saw about 75 men apparently waiting between trains wearing heavy ski boots.

Mr. POWERS. They were paratroopers.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It looked as though they were wearing skiboots. It seems to me there must be some oversight somewhere when troops are compelled to take 600-mile trips with shoes of that kind in weather of this kind.

Mr. POWERS. I think the gentleman is referring to the paratroopers. The boots the paratroopers wear are reinforced at the ankles and are higher than the ordinary high shoes. Where they were traveling to I cannot say, nor why they were wearing them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. From the description the gentleman gives I believe they must have been paratroopers. These things may seem foolish and picayunish——

Mr. POWERS. No; they are not picayunish at all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But we cannot do too much for the comfort of these men. As I say, these things may seem small, but even so we should be assured that we can go to the members of the subcommittee with them and get their cooperation to correct these apparently minor mistakes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has brought up several good points. I do not think that his observations are picayunish. In fact, I think they are most humane. If we had a few more humane observations from a few more people along the lines of the gentleman from Connecticut, we would all be better off.

The gentleman from Kentucky takes the position that having voted for the $71,000,000,000 we should not criticize the way the money is spent.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CREAL. The gentleman misquoted me or else he did not understand me.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not desire to misquote the gentleman and I do want to understand him.

Mr. CREAL. After you vote for it you do not want to bellyache about it afterward.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that after we vote $71,000,000,000 if we do not have the best-equipped and the best-fed and the best-housed and the best-cared-for Army, then, to use the gentleman's expression, I am going to bellyache.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I discussed this same matter with three sailors on the street in Washington last week. It was one of our hot days. They had on their woolen uniforms. I asked them why they did not have on their white uniforms during the hot weather. Their answer was that they preferred to wear the dark uniform because it did not wrinkle and muss so easily. That was the reason they were wearing them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Every man for his choice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barracks and quarters, Army: For the maintenance, installation, repair, operation, protection and rental of buildings, structures, grounds, utilities, flying fields, fortifications, and appurtenances thereto, or other facilities required for military use; and for each and every object of expense connected therewith, including (a) the procurement of supplies, equipment, fuel, printing, binding, communication services, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, at the seat of government and elsewhere, (b) the purchase, rental, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, (c) the manufacture, procurement, purchase, storage, issue, and transportation (including research, planning, design, development, inspection, tests, and the handling) of water, gas, electricity, fuel, tools, machinery, and equipment, (d) construction of additions and extensions to and alterations, improvements, and rehabilitations of existing facilities, (e) and the furnishing of heat and light for buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902 (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations, authorized by War Department regulations to be used for a similar purpose, $582,912,400: *Provided*, That the amounts to be assessed and collected from nonmilitary interests on the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, Va., for expenditure in the maintenance, repair, and operation of wharves, roads, sewerage systems, and other utilities at said reservation shall be fixed by the Secretary of War during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, in proportion to the service rendered to such nonmilitary interests: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental of offices, garages, and stables for military attachés: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction of a permanent nature of an additional building or an extension or addition to an existing building, the cost of which in any case exceeds $20,000: *Provided further*, That the monthly rental rate to be paid out of this appropriation for stabling any animal shall not exceed $15.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 33, line 11, strike out "$582,912,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$580,152,400."

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As I understand, this amendment has to do with the funds for fighting forest fires?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has the assurance that if this fund is taken out here it will be included in the agricultural appropriation bill, which is in conference?

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad the gentleman from South Dakota asked that question, because since we started the consideration of this bill this afternoon the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], of the Agricultural subcommittee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, came here and gave us assurances that this amount had been put in the agricultural bill by the conferees and suggested that we take the money out of this bill. The amount would be used to protect the interests of the Army as we intended that they would be protected.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman says it has been put in by the conferees?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman also has assurances that the House conferees and the gentlemen he has mentioned—the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee—are agreeing to it in conference so that it will be in the bill and will be accepted?

Mr. SNYDER. I have been so informed.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. Will the $2,760,000 be under Army jurisdiction and spent by the Army the same as it would be if it were in this bill?

Mr. SNYDER. It will be tantamount to that.

Mr. POWERS. Is this satisfactory to the Army?

Mr. SNYDER. I have no reason to believe it will not be.

Mr. CASE. And to the Forest Service?

Mr. SNYDER. I am certain as to that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope that the gentleman will give the House every assurance that when these fire-fighting appropriations come before the full Committee on Appropriations that he will do his part in the future to see to it that they remain in the bill in adequate amount. The gentleman well knows that the very great forest areas in the United States, and particularly on our coast, are the most vulnerable points that we have.

Mr. SNYDER. I am very much in sympathy with all fire protection. My great State has great forest areas, you know.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My colleague from California expresses my concern. I am sure we all want to be certain that the forest areas on the Pacific coast are protected from these flares and incendiaries that may be turned loose on that area during the dry season. We have the problem there at the present time of less personnel in the civilian departments of the great cities on the Pacific coast and there are immense fires that they are unable to take care of with their civilian equipment.

Mr. SNYDER. I see no reason why the change we are proposing should affect the situation. The measure of protection would be the same in either case.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I am greatly concerned about this appropriation, too, because the appropriation to which the gentleman has referred in the agricultural bill has not yet come out of conference, and, if anything should happen to it and it not pass, we will be short not only that amount but this.

Mr. SNYDER. The conferees have agreed, I am informed.

Mr. ANGELL. But it has not been reported back, according to my information. I understand from the gentleman that the elimination of this item for forest protection had the full approval of all the gentlemen who are concerned in that direct appropriation.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. ANGELL. If anything should happen, we will get it back when it comes from conference?

Mr. SNYDER. If it does not work out as we say it will and as we have been assured, we shall take care of it in another way, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. ANGELL. With the gentleman's assurance, I will be glad to let the matter drop here.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. How will the gentleman's amendment affect the total amount as reported on line 4, page 34?

Mr. SNYDER. I was about to ask permission that the Clerk be authorized to change the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be privileged to change the total to conform with the action just taken in striking out this item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, sitting here listening to debate on this, the largest appropriation bill ever presented to the House of Representatives, has caused a few philosophical ruminations and brings to mind that we have a new book on the market by Walter Lippmann concerning our foreign policy, which he claims to be relatively nonexistent. I have not yet had an opportunity to read that book, but having read two reviews of it, it would seem that the book is calling attention to the fact that if we are to have a foreign policy we must be prepared to meet the commitments which that foreign policy entails. I have an idea that if this country had been prepared to meet such commitments in the past 50 years this appropriation would not now be before the House. If we have had no recognized commitments, we as a Nation should have had some realization of our liabilities. At all events, this enormous sum with the other sums that have been and will be spent to win this war, to say nothing of the thousands of lives of the most promising young people of this country that are going to be lost in this war, should give contemplative pause to every Member of the Congress and every man and woman in the United States.

Lately I have begun to receive some letters from home, not complaining, but wondering what all this may lead to. As the casualty lists and the public debt mount higher, as our troops win glorious victories over our savage enemies abroad, as selfishness and greed are faced down by the spirit of selflessness and sacrifice at home, there arises a determination that it shall never be said of this war that although the operation was successful the patient died. This war must be won both abroad and at home or else it will have been worse than futile. Those of us who are not called upon to risk our lives can do no less than our utmost to see to it that we have a country and a life worth returning to for those who offer their all and win.

But, most important, we must establish, maintain, and be prepared to meet the liabilities of such a foreign policy that this shall not happen again. The present operation must be successful and the patient must live.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted me, I desire to include with these remarks portions of an address delivered on June 11, 1943, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco by Mr. Walter Lippmann, as reported in the Los Angeles Times of June 12, 1943. Mr. Lippmann's remarks follow:

With your permission, I shall talk to you this evening about the foreign policy of the United States. Two events are approaching which compel us to make up our minds about what this Nation needs to do, what it means to do, and how it means to do it.

We are in the first place approaching the grand climax of the war. Whether the decision comes this year, next year, or the year after, we are no longer, as Mr. Churchill put it a few months ago, at the end of the beginning. We have reached the beginning of the end.

We are in the second place approaching a national election, and the transcendent question which faces us is whether we can lift foreign policy above party politics and above personalities. If we are not able to do this, then we can have no American foreign policy before the winter of 1944–45. We shall have to wait until after the elections to know what is to be our foreign policy. I submit to you that we dare not wait that long to make up our minds. We have to know very soon indeed what we want and what we mean to do. We simply cannot, we just dare not, wait two years, leaving everything up in the air, nothing decided, nothing definite, nothing clear.

HOW TO DEFEND IT

The real question is: What do the American people have to defend in order to live their own lives, and how can they most surely defend it? When we know how to answer this question we shall have formed our foreign policy.

Now I am going to astonish you, perhaps, by saying that while the United States had a foreign policy in the nineteenth century it has not had a foreign policy in this century. Within less than 50 years, the lifetime of many of us here this evening, we have fought three wars. We were not prepared to fight any one of these three wars. We have not known how to make peace after these wars were won. We did not know, as I shall show you in a moment, how to make peace with Spain. We did not know how to make peace in 1917 after the First German World War. And today we are in grave danger of not knowing how to make peace after the Nazi-Japanese allies have surrendered.

The proof that we have had no foreign policy is, I submit to you, beyond dispute. When a nation fights three wars in half a century, and is unprepared to fight them and unable to make a workable peace after they are won, then it has no foreign policy.

TO BE PREPARED

To have a foreign policy is to know what is coming and to be prepared for it.

When I speak of American foreign policy I mean a policy which takes account of American interests which are so vital that they must be defended with American lives and then makes it certain that no foreign power can hope to challenge this country successfully. In the last analysis a good foreign policy is one which will either convince all potential enemies that they dare not attack us or make it absolutely certain that they will be crushed if they do.

In 1898 we fought a war with Spain, and as a result of Admiral Dewey's victory in Manila Bay we conquered the Philippines. In the treaty of peace the Philippine Islands were placed under the American flag. Now this was a great, new foreign commitment.

If that great commitment to the Philippines was to be backed up, it is clear that the United States had to have a navy, and it had to have a chain of powerful naval bases on the whole long 7,000-mile line from California through Pearl Harbor to Manila. Without that the Philippines could not be defended.

Now in 1898 Spain owned all the islands between the Philippines and Hawaii. But President McKinley, though he took the Philippines, asked for only one other island, Guam. The rest of the islands he left with Spain. But, having lost the Philippines, these islands were no longer of any use to her, and so Spain promptly sold them to Germany.

In the First World War Japan seized these islands from Germany. And, once again, when we made peace we had no policy of safeguarding our interests. Japan was allowed to keep the islands north of the Equator. On these islands, as we now know to our sorrow, Japan developed the great naval base at Truk. From these islands Japan launched the attack on Pearl Harbor. Because Japan held these islands it was impossible for us to send help to MacArthur and Wainwright.

GROWTH OF A POLICY

Now I hope I have by this illustration made clear what I mean by saying that we have had no foreign policy. A nation which had a foreign policy and understood it would never have accepted the commitment to defend the Philippines without making it certain that its fleet could reach them. Yet we made the immense commitment in the Philippines; we failed to take the necessary measures which made it a solvent commitment.

Now let us look at our other great commitment, which is the defense of the Western Hemisphere, and see how the founding fathers of the Republic went about the business of shaping a foreign policy.

It was not until 1823 that the founding fathers of the Republic formed a foreign policy which the whole Nation accepted. Eighteen hundred and twenty-three, as you know, is the year in which President Monroe announced to Congress and to the world that the United States would not permit the power of continental Europe to reconquer the Spanish colonies, which had declared their independence, and would permit no foreign power to acquire new colonies in this hemisphere.

Now this was a tremendous foreign commitment, especially for so small a nation as the United States then was. It meant defying an alliance composed of France, Spain, Austria, and Russia.

What did the fathers of the Republic do before they announced the Monroe Doctrine?

They authorized the American Minister in London, Richard Rush, to negotiate with George Canning, the British Foreign Secretary. When they were perfectly sure, only when they had received his report in September 1823, that the British Fleet would oppose the European powers if they tried to invade the Americas, did they decide to proclaim the Monroe Doctrine. As a matter of fact, Britain issued an ultimatum to France forbidding intervention in this hemisphere 2 months before Monroe announced the Monroe Doctrine.

The founding fathers made the great commitment only when they had covered it. They knew exactly what they were doing.

Do you realize that since 1899—for nearly 50 years—we have undertaken to defend at the risk of war the lands and the waters around them from Alaska to the Philippines, and from Greenland to Brazil and Patagonia? Do you realize that this is almost 40 percent of the surface of the globe? And that within this vast area we insist that no other great power may enlarge its existing dominion, that no new great power may establish itself at all?

The question is, how do we propose to do it?

CONSIDER OUR POSITION

Now consider our position. What is the strategic position of the United States? It is, I submit to you, as follows:

Between the New World and the Old there is an ocean of sea and air.

The two Americas are in relation to the rest of the world islands in this ocean.

They are also islands in respect to one another. For the Isthmus of Panama is not an effective land bridge.

Moreover, the greater part of the inhabited portion of South America, below the bulge of Brazil, is at present more easily accessible by sea and, in some respects, by air to and from Europe and Africa than it is to and from the arsenals and military depots of the United States.

At the same time, North America is more accessible to and from the British Isles, western Europe, Russia, and Japan than it is accessible to and from South America or China or the South Pacific.

That is the position on which United States foreign policy has to be based. In essence we are a great continenal island in the midst of

a great oceanic lake. The shores of that lake in the midst of which we lie are the coast of Britain, France, Spain, Portugal and Africa, of Russian Siberia, Japan, and China.

Now suppose Chicago were on an island in the middle of Lake Michigan. Let us suppose that Milwaukee was another island at the western side of the lake and Springfield were an island at the southern end of the lake. Chicago has to decide how to defend itself and also Milwaukee and Springfield. Now let us suppose that the shore line of the lake is held by four foreign nations, which we shall call Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan.

How do you, as responsible citizens of Chicago, form your foreign policy? Do you say, let us forget about Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan; they will not attack us, and if they do we shall sink their ships if they come near us? Or do you say, we are going to have such a big standing army, navy, and air force on Chicago Island that nobody else can enter Lake Michigan? Or do you say, the way to make the island in the lake secure is to come to a lasting, dependable agreement, based on self-interest, with as many as possible of the nations on the shores of Lake Michigan; and if we cannot make lasting, dependable friends of all of them we shall at the very least make a firm alliance with some of them; we shall do this so that we shall never have to fight all of them combined.

That, I think, is in rough outline the necessary foreign policy of the United States.

HISTORIC COMMITMENTS

I am proposing that we police our own historic commitments in the Western Hemisphere and in the Pacific and that we form a foreign policy which makes it certain that we can surely cover these commitments.

In my view, if we do this we shall make a long peace, not everywhere on earth, but in the region where we live, not an everlasting peace, because nothing lasts forever, but peace at least for our children and our grandchildren.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGRANERY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, further proceedings on the bill will go over until Monday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unainmous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Dr. William P. Jacobs, of Clinton, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole and include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. John Paschall, editor of the Atlanta Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Wisconsin and also a resolution adopted by the State legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. DITTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. BONNER, for Monday, to attend North Carolina State convention.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 27. An act to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 220. An act to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Yaguez River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

505. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Turpentine Run and its tributaries, island of St. Thomas, V. I., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3006. A bill to improve the general social welfare of the United States and to coordinate and equalize social development with mechanical and scientific development by encouraging public thought upon social and governmental techniques; and to provide for an expression and recording thereof; to provide a reservoir of carefully analyzed and succinctly stated information on such techniques, such information to be classified, recorded, and maintained for ready reference; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3007 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make awards of compensation or pension retroactive to date of discharge or death in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3008 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to include participation in military and naval campaigns, etc., on a parity with active war service and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to further define the term "veteran of any war," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr MURDOCK:

H. R. 3009. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; and for the relief of owners of gold mines required to suspend operations by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3011. A bill making an appropriation for the relief of resort owners and for the aid of convalescing veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1666. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. Ross Manley of Rives Junction, Mich., and signed by some 44 other residents of the vicinity, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1667. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 320 residents of Jackson County, Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1668. Also, petition signed by 41 residents of Lawrence County, Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1669. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from the Woolcott Milling Co., of Harrisburg, Ill., opposing the administration's theory of subsidizing business, stating it would be a waste of the taxpayer's money and contrary to the principles of democracy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1670. Also, communications from B. N. Beane, mayor of the city of Metropolis, and Wayne Kerr, of Harrisburg, Ill., favoring the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1671. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Alvena Rimstidt, of Salem, Oreg., and 49 other citizens of Marion County, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1672. Also, petition signed by C. A. Isbell, Canby, Oreg., and 19 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1673. Also, petition signed by Rev. Willard P. Andersen, of Canby, Oreg., and 38 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of love and mercy, the whole realm of truth resounds with Thy praise. Ever enable us to see Thee in creation, preservation, and in the redemption of this wide world. Almighty God, we are standing in the midst of a mighty contest against the powers of rebellion, against regular and organized government; these darken the face of our sky, deepen the criticism of our democracy, and give encouragement to the enemies of freedom.

Blessed Lord, in these most solemn moments, grant that our purpose and our ambition may not be ill-starred, but be vindicated by honesty and sincerity. They who brave the storm and heed the greater light of truth shall identify themselves with an era in which men shall be born to happiness and shall no longer close their eyes in helpless appeal. Dear Lord, the hour is imperative with no room for doubt or hesitation; be Thou our voice clothed with the supremacy of divine power. How blessed is the prerogative and privilege of making our country the objective of our greatest devotion and sacrifice. Inspire the Congress to feel the unity and the inspiration of a high, common purpose, ever on the side of him who battles for the truth. The Lord God be at the side of our President and his advisers as they toil devotedly for those undying sanctities which make men free. In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 19, 1943, was read and approved.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNYDER) there were—ayes 54, noes 0.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—344

Abernethy	Cannon, Mo.	Engel
Allen, La.	Carson, Ohio	Feighan
Andersen, H. Carl	Carter	Fellows
Anderson, Calif.	Case	Fenton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Chenoweth	Fernandez
Andresen, August H.	Chiperfield	Fisher
Angell	Church	Fitzpatrick
Arends	Clark	Flannagan
Arnold	Clason	Fogarty
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Folger
Barrett	Coffee	Forand
Bates, Ky.	Cole, Mo.	Fulbright
Beall	Cole, N. Y.	Fulmer
Beckworth	Colmer	Gale
Bender	Cooper	Gallagher
Bennett, Mich.	Cox	Gathings
Bennett, Mo.	Cravens	Gavagan
Bishop	Creal	Gavin
Blackney	Crosser	Gearhart
Bland	Cullen	Gerlach
Bloom	Cunningham	Gibson
Bolton	Curtis	Gilchrist
Boren	D'Alesandro	Gillette
Boykin	Davis	Goodwin
Bradley, Pa.	Dawson	Gordon
Brooks	Day	Gore
Brown, Ga.	Delaney	Gorski
Brown, Ohio	Dewey	Gossett
Bryson	Dickstein	Graham
Buckley	Dilweg	Granger
Buffett	Dingell	Grant, Ala.
Bulwinkle	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.
Burch, Va.	Disney	Gregory
Burdick	Dondero	Griffiths
Burgin	Doughton	Gross
Busbey	Durham	Gwynne
Butler	Dworshak	Hagen
Byrne	Eaton	Hale
Camp	Elliott	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Canfield	Ellis	Hall, Leonard W.
	Ellison, Md.	Halleck
	Elmer	
	Elston, Ohio	

Hancock	McGregor	Rolph
Harless, Ariz.	McKenzie	Rowan
Harness, Ind.	McMillan	Rowe
Harris, Ark.	McMurray	Russell
Harris, Va.	McWilliams	Sabath
Hartley	Maas	Sadowski
Hays	Madden	Sauthoff
Heidinger	Magnuson	Scanlon
Hendricks	Mahon	Schiffler
Herter	Maloney	Schuetz
Hess	Manasco	Schwabe
Hill	Mansfield, Mont.	Shafer
Hinshaw	Mansfield, Tex.	Sheppard
Hobbs	Marcantonio	Short
Hoch	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hoeven	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hoffman	Mason	Slaughter
Holifield	May	Smith, Maine
Holmes, Mass.	Merrow	Smith, Ohio
Holmes, Wash.	Michener	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Miller, Conn.	Snyder
Horan	Miller, Mo.	Somers, N. Y.
Howell	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Hull	Miller, Pa.	Spence
Izac	Mills	Springer
Jackson	Monkiewicz	Stanley
Jeffrey	Morrison, La.	Starnes, Ala.
Jenkins	Morrison, N. C.	Steagall
Jennings	Mott	Stefan
Jensen	Mruk	Stevenson
Johnson, Anton J.	Murdock	Stewart
Johnson, Calvin D.	Murphy	Stockman
Johnson, Ind.	Murray, Wis.	Sullivan
Johnson, J. Leroy	Newsome	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, Luther A.	Norman	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Norrell	Sundstrom
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Taber
Jones	O'Brien, Ill.	Talbot
Jonkman	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Judd	O'Connor	Tarver
Kean	O'Hara	Taylor
Kee	O'Neal	Thomas, N. J.
Keefe	O'Toole	Thomas, Tex.
Kefauver	Outland	Thomason
Kelley	Patman	Tibbott
Keogh	Patton	Towe
Kerr	Peterson, Fla.	Troutman
Kilday	Peterson, Ga.	Vincent, Ky.
Kinzer	Pfeifer	Voorhis, Calif.
Kirwan	Philbin	Vorys, Ohio
Kleberg	Phillips	Wadsworth
Klein	Pittenger	Walter
Knutson	Ploeser	Ward
Kunkel	Plumley	Wasielewski
LaFollette	Poage	Weaver
Lambertson	Poulson	Weichel, Ohio
Landis	Powers	Weiss
Lanham	Price	Welch
Larcade	Priest	Wene
Lea	Rabaut	West
LeCompte	Ramspeck	Whelchel, Ga.
Lemke	Randolph	Whitten
Lesinski	Rankin	Whittington
Lewis, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.	Wickersham
Ludlow	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Lynch	Reed, N. Y.	Willey
McCord	Rees, Kans.	Wilson
McCormack	Richards	Winstead
McCowen	Robertson	Winter
McGehee	Robinson, Utah	Wolfenden, Pa.
McGranery	Robsion, Ky.	Wolverton, N. J.
	Rockwell	Woodruff, Mich.
	Rodgers, Pa.	Worley
	Rogers, Mass.	Zimmerman
	Rohrbough	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—86

Allen, Ill.	Culkin	Kearney
Andrews	Curley	Kennedy
Baldwin, Md.	Dies	Kilburn
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ditter	King
Barden	Domengeaux	Lane
Barry	Douglas	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Drewry	Luce
Bell	Eberharter	McLean
Bonner	Ellsworth	Merritt
Bradley, Mich.	Fay	Monroney
Brehm	Fish	Mundt
Burchill, N. Y.	Ford	Murray, Tenn.
Cannon, Fla.	Furlong	Myers
Capozzoli	Gamble	Nichols
Carlson, Kans.	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Celler	Gillie	O'Leary
Chapman	Green	Pace
Cochran	Hare	Pracht
Compton	Hart	Ramey
Cooley	Hébert	Rivers
Costello	Heffernan	Rizley
Courtney	Jarman	Rogers, Calif.
Crawford	Johnson, Ward	Sasscer
Satterfield	Stearns, N. H.	Wheat
Scott	Tolan	White
Sheridan	Treadway	Wolcott
Simpson, Pa.	Van Zandt	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Va.	Vinson, Ga.	Wright
Smith, W. Va.	Vursell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Ramey.

Mr. Hare with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Vard Johnson.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Pace with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Costello with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Green with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. King with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS FOR UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the Radio Communication Service of ships of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 2 and 3, strike out "present war and for 6 months thereafter," and insert "until July 1, 1945."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "the President by proclamation or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorandum sent by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and the Railway Brotherhoods, to the President of the United States, requesting a veto of the so-called Connally-Smith bill. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript will cover one and three-fifth pages at a cost of $72. I ask that the memorandum be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an address delivered by Dr. Eckridge at the Cumberland University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I made to the Dairymen's League Cooperatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BANK OF AMERICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Aeppendix.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, 1934

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Resolution 254 for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the resolution?

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to turn over to the Attorney General certain confidential reports filed with the Library of Congress in 1934 by the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I believe, at that time was the chairman. It has the unanimous approval of the committee. It is for the purpose of allowing the Attorney General to see these reports in an effort to assist him in the prosecution of certain alleged un-American activities. An amendment has been added, to the effect that the report shall be turned over to the Library Committee, so that if the Attorney General wants to see the

report, he can see it through the Library Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I had no notice that this resolution was to be called up, although I appeared before the Committee on the Library when it was being considered, and requested an amendment to the resolution. I would now like to inquire whether or not the resolution has been amended in a way that will permit any committee of the House of Representatives to see this material, or whether or not it is restricted to the Attorney General? I would like to ask the gentleman if any change was made in the wording of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution and the proposed amendments will be read for information.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 254), as follows:

Resolved, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to deliver to the Attorney General, for such use as the Attorney General may deem appropriate, all material deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including the contents of a sealed package inscribed "House of Representatives, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1934. Hearings Confidential," the content of which package shall be returned to the Librarian of Congress after the Attorney General has made such use of the same as he has deemed appropriate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library"; in line 3, strike out the words "the Attorney General" and insert "that committee"; in line 11, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library"; in the same line strike out "he" and insert "it."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a very important question involving the House of Representatives. The committee known as the McCormack-Dickstein committee in 1933 and 1934 made an investigation. They filed a report and recommended that certain laws be passed, which were passed, in connection with un-American activities. In connection with the investigation, some very important material, and I will say outstanding, astounding, and startling information, was obtained. It was of such explosive character that they did not feel they could afford to make it public. It was the first time in the history of this Government, as far as I have ever been able to ascertain, where such information was placed in a box. It was sealed up. Under the law, section 147, title II, of the United States Code, information obtained by an investigating committee should be turned over to the Clerk, and the Clerk, in turn, turns it over to the Library of Congress. But in this particular case it was turned over directly to the Library of Congress with this understanding, that this package would never be opened and the contents of it revealed except after passage of a resolution by the Congress—not just by the House of Representatives but by the Congress. In view of the statute which says that the House of Representatives has control of its papers, this simple resolution will be sufficient to authorize the inspection of that material. But that is not the point exactly. The House of Representatives asked that this investigation be conducted.

The House of Representatives appropriated the money with which to conduct the investigation. The material and information obtained by that committee should be used by other committees. The fact of the business is that when the Dies committee was created, that should have been the first material to go to the Dies committee, because it involved un-American activities. I can state to you it involved some very startling information. I brought it to the attention of this House several years ago and it went by unnoticed. In 1940, when I was appearing before the Dies committee, I requested that committee to offer a resolution and ask permission for the Dies committee to examine this information. That was 3 years ago, in 1940. Nothing has been done about it. The Attorney General, of course, would like to have this information and I would like to have him have it, but at the same time he is an appointive officer, and it places us in the position of being willing to turn over this information, which is very valuable, to an appointive officer of our Government and deny to our own people who are investigating this very question the right and privilege and opportunity of inspecting these papers.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. As I understand the resolution, it provides that these very important papers—if they are—will be turned over to the Committee on the Library of this House.

Mr. PATMAN. Will they be subject to inspection by other Members of the House?

Mr. McGRANERY. I should feel that the House has confidence in the discretion that its own committee would use in permitting the inspection. I would like to correct the gentleman. As I read the resolution it does not provide for turning over anything to the Attorney General, but it does provide for the turning over of these papers to the committee itself. This inspection will be made under the direction of the committee. I certainly feel that if a matter of importance would be before one of the other standing committees of the House, the chairman of that committee might certainly go before the Committee on the Library and discuss with them the question of the inspection of these papers. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman agree that any committee of this House—certainly the House can trust its own committees. There is the Kerr committee. They should have this information. The Dies committee should have this information. Why should other committees be compelled to go before the Committee on the Library and convince them that they should see this important information? I cannot understand that. I hope the chairman of the Committee on the Library will agree to an amendment which will permit any committee of this House to inspect that material. That is fair. That is reasonable. I hope the gentleman will agree to such an amendment. If he will agree to it, of course I shall have no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did the gentleman at the hearing receive any information that indicated that the Attorney General alone should see these papers?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] appeared for himself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who were on this original committee. I will state now that that committee did a fine job. They did an excellent job. They finished up their job rapidly and made reports and recommended legislation which was passed, and then they quit. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] insisted that the Attorney General was the only one who should, under any circumstances, be allowed to inspect this material.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. I would like to say for the information of this House that this very important trial is now in progress.

This information, if it has any relative value or merit in the trial of these cases before the Court, the Attorney General's office ought to have that evidence, and should not be hamstrung by a particular amendment which we can work out as among ourselves with a committee that will exercise judicial discretion in the power we grant. I do not think that, in view of the tremendous importance of this question to the American people, any Member of this House will be opposed to the passage of this resolution.

Mr. PATMAN. In reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, may I state that this was called to the attention of Congress more than 3 years ago, and is brought up now at the request of those who are conducting hearings to see if use cannot be made of this material.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. We are dealing here with enemies of the American Government and I cannot understand why there ought to be any secrecy about this report or these hearings.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, so far as the committee are concerned.

Mr. NORRELL. I cannot see why it should not be turned over to different committees of the Congress, the press, and the American public.

Mr. PATMAN. I would not be willing to turn it over to the press without it first being considered by a committee.

Mr. NORRELL. I am willing to turn it over to everybody.

Mr. PATMAN. Not until the matter has been made public. There are certain things involved here that should not be made a matter of public discussion, but there are certain things that are material to the investigation and the files ought to be made available to these committees.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the Congress ought to have acted on this resolution before now.

Mr. PATMAN. We should have done it years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us get the situation clear. If there is anything of an explosive nature in it—of course, my mind cannot go back and remember all of the things that took place in 1934—but if there is anything of an explosive nature in it, I have no recollection of it at the present time. The committee pursued the regular procedure. At the end of the committee's consideration the late Congressman Kramer was acting as secretary and sent the files to the Librarian.

By statute it is provided, in section 144 of the United States Code, as follows:

> The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to deliver to the Librarian of Congress all bound volumes of original papers, general petitions, printed matter, books, and manuscripts on June 6, 1900, in, or that may thereafter have come into, or may come into, the files of the House, which, in his judgment, are not required to be retained in the immediate custody of the file clerk; and it shall be the duty of the Librarian of Congress to cause all such matter so delivered to him to be properly classified by Congress and arranged for preservation and ready reference. All of such matter to be held as a part of the files of the House of Representatives, subject to its orders and rules.

Instead of delivering it to the Clerk, apparently it was delivered direct to the Librarian.

At the present time the Department of Justice has some cases pending and its representatives would like to look at the record and papers on file in the Librarian's office. That is the immediate situation which prompted the introduction of the pending resolution.

So far as any committee is concerned, a separate resolution can be introduced at a later time.

Mr. PATMAN. Why wait until a later time? Why not do it now, so that the committees of the House will have the same privilege of examining that testimony that is in the hands or custody of the Librarian.

Mr. McCORMACK. The pressing situation is that cases are pending which the Department of Justice wants to try and certainly I do not think the gentleman from Texas is going to object to that.

Mr. PATMAN. That could be done if they give them this authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but I do not know how far reaching such amendment might be. Let me make this statement: As chairman of the special committee, I desire to state that about 90 percent of the information received resulted from anonymous sources. I have no criticism to offer of anyone who feels it necessary to publish any amount of testimony as a result of such investigation, which might result in the reputation of decent men being destroyed.

We went into executive session so the committee could find out whether on the information received we would be justified in acting upon anonymous information in public hearings. It was our duty to investigate all information called to our attention, but, in all decency, it was our duty to investigate the truth of this anonymous information and to bring the persons in later if we wanted them. Hearsay evidence was obtained, and we certainly would not let such witnesses appear in a public hearing where the reputation of honorable people, on hearsay evidence, might be destroyed. Every piece of evidence that was pertinent to the investigation was made public; every bit of the evidence that was adduced as a result of inquiries, that was considered pertinent to the matter under inquiry, was made public; it is in the public hearings, and that evidence was marked separate from the hearsay evidence. I remember some of the hearsay evidence. I remember some of the evidence related to the activities of the Japanese and that might be of importance at the present time. The purpose of this resolution is to enable the Department of Justice to see what evidence is in the papers on file and determine whether or not any of it can be used in connection with the trials, and so they can go into that matter now and see whether they wish to use it.

I personally have no objection to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Texas, but I think it should be introduced as a separate resolution and considered by the Library Committee.

So far as I am concerned if the House votes to make it all public I do not care, but certainly I would not vote to make public evidence that is hearsay, evidence that is taken in executive session where a witness is allowed to say anything he or she wants to say, hearsay evidence in relation to honorable people. For instance, we had the late Gen. Smedley Butler before us. There was a Fascist plot in this country. They approached Smedley Butler. Smedley Butler was pulling them on. He was a fine American, as we all know. He was getting the evidence from them and he gave the evidence to us. Those who approached him were giving him a lot of this information to the effect that this person or that person would do this or would do that and not saying that they were a part of the plot, but indicating that they could be influenced, that they were interested in a vicious un-American plot. We uncovered a certain group in New York who had sent a man over to Europe to investigate the Fascist set-up in various nations where it existed among the veterans of those countries. In connection with General Butler's testimony the names of a number of very fine honorable men were used. He was told by others, not by them but by others, something in relation to those men that you, or I, or no honorable man would for a moment believe or place credence in. General Butler told the committee a lot of stuff, but some that he told us was hearsay evidence. We made public all of the evidence that he gave that was pertinent, that was material, and that was competent in any way, but where hearsay evidence was used that naturally and properly should be kept in executive session. Certainly after these years it is going to do no good to make public a lot of evidence of that kind. I have no objection personally, but I think the thing should be looked into by the committee. This resolution should pass today and the gentleman from Texas should introduce a separate resolution tomorrow and to go before the Committee on the Library. Then the matter can be considered separately.

To have an amendment adopted to this resolution today without knowing what its implications might be—while my offhand opinion now is that I would not object to it, I would not want to say that I would want to see such an amendment accepted where we have an immediate situation to meet. I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not want to be put in a position of stopping the Department of Justice from being able to see whatever the files contain.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has known for a long time about this, and, of course, it could have been introduced long before. I am not going to be swept off my feet by any urgency of the case when it has been neglected for many, many years. Doutless some of this evidence should not be in the public press; some of it should remain confidential and executive. Why say that we can only trust the Committee on the Library? Why not trust other committees of the House? Why say that the Committee on the Library is the only one we can rely on? I know they are good Members of Congress, and they are reliable, responsible, but, at the same time, there are other committees of this House that have these problems directly in charge and should have this same power, and right, and privilege of inspecting that material. Take the Japanese situation: I happen to know that there is an amount of information about the Japanese. The gentleman touched on it briefly. I can say a lot about it; and who can tell, if this information had been available, I am not so sure that we would not have known more than we did before the Pearl Harbor attack. Here we are in the House of Representatives seeing a committee trying to get valuable information, so valuable that they break a precedent of 150 years to place it under lock and key, and then we do not use it at all, and other committees, either, do not have access to it. Let me invite your attention to the fact that when this evidence and material, that package we will say, was delivered to the Library of Congress, the committee was not content just to say: "It shall not be made public;" the committee required the Librarian at that

time to sign a statement—it is in the committee hearings—are those committee hearings printed? The effect of that statement is——

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a suggestion if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to suggest that it may be pleasing all around that this matter be laid aside for the time being.

Mr. PATMAN. I should like to be notified if it comes up again; I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] to notify me. I was not notified that it was coming up today; I just happened to be here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will notify the gentleman from Texas before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] to call up this resolution.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws his request.

REPORT ON THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce to the House that on tomorrow at 10 o'clock Judge Marvin Jones will appear before our committee, the Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, room 324, to give an account of the food conference held recently in the State of Virginia. This is an open meeting and any Member of the House interested will be very welcome to meet with us and hear about this conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the press be invited?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a eulogy delivered by Senator REED, of Kansas, at the funeral of our late colleague, U. S. Guyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

THE CRITICAL FOOD SITUATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not recess until it has taken some constructive action with regard to the food problem. It is daily becoming more confusing and critical. The administration either cannot or will not recognize its importance.

The appointment of Mr. Chester Davis as Food Administrator was widely hailed as an excellent one. Mr. Davis understands the problem. He has tried to do a good job. He is still doing a good job insofar as he is permitted to do so. Yet the situation has steadily deteriorated. Not only has the administration failed to give Mr. Davis the over-all power which he must have but he is not even consulted on vital matters. I was shocked to learn that the roll-back of meat and butter prices was put into effect without any consultation with the Food Administration. This program vitally affects both prices and production.

Unless some competent man is given the power to handle all phases of the food problem, this Nation, with its vast resources, will go hungry before many months are over. Congress cannot absolve itself of responsibility by saying the Executive is at fault. It is our obligation to act and to act now by setting up a real Food Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two articles by Malcolm W. Bingay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on War, Peace, and Education by Dean H. H. Schroeder, of the Illinois State Normal University, my alma mater.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon at the conclusion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this Washington Post happens to be the purveyor of the filth concocted by one Drew Pearson, whom I denounce as a filthy and cowardly villain, a venomous slanderer, and an insinuating rogue, who makes his living in the blackening of other men's reputations and the practice of blackmail blackguardism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Governor of South Dakota on the future of the Missouri Valley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter he has received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of a death in the family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article and a short quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by Attorney Harold J. Wilson, of Burlington, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONNALLY-SMITH BILL AND THE A. F. OF L.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the A. F. of L. official publication, American Federationist, on page 6 announced that it intended to defeat for Congress all those who voted for the Connally-Smith bill. The statement reads:

> Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted, we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it.

Now the A. F. of L. has asked the President to veto that bill. I wish some labor spokesman would advise me whether, if the President signs that bill, the A. F. of L. is going to give him the same dose it promised Congressmen who voted for the bill. Will Mr. Green, Mr. Murray, and Mr. Whitney throw their political strength against the President to keep him from a fourth term? Do they intend to support the President if he signs the bill but oppose Congressmen who voted for it?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that the propaganda that is being put out denouncing Congressmen for their patriotic vote is inspiring this coal strike that is now paralyzing our war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, considering post-war planning, I have obtained a copy of the Keynes plan for international trade stabilization, and also the Morgenthau plan, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include them. I have an estimate that the cost will be $403.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Flag Day address by William E. Leahy of the Washington Lodge of Elks. I am advised that this will cost $56.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith desire to resign from membership on the following committees:

Census, Education, Election No. 1, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Revision of Laws.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 1291, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana objected.

ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL FROM EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2468, authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. BENDER objected.

ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2553) directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism.

Mr. STEWART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. HOFFMAN objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

REDUCTION IN COURSE OF INSTRUCTION, NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 879) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy, approved June 3, 1941."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy" approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That until the termination of the present war, and until 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to reduce the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy from 4 to 3 years and thereafter to graduate classes which have completed such reduced course of instruction."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

QUARTERS AND SUBSISTENCE, MIDSHIPMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2629) to provide an allowance for quarters and

subsistence for midshipmen in the Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That midshipmen of the Naval Reserve, when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind, shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted by law and regulations to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind.

With the following committee amendment:

That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an identical Senate bill, 1067, on the Speaker's desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2629, was laid on the table.

UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pensions, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I think this bill is improperly reported from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not this one of the bills on which arrangements have been made to call it up by suspension at the end of the call of the Calendar?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Chair's information is that the gentleman from Mississippi has consulted the Speaker with that in view.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PHARMACY CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the medical department of the Regular Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That (a) the first sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out "the Medical Administrative Corps" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Pharmacy Corps."

(b) The second sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The number of officers of the Medical Corps shall be 1,424, and of the Pharmacy Corps, 72."

(c) The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after 3 years' service, to the grade of captain after 6 years' service, to the grade of major after 12 years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after 20 years' service, and to the grade of colonel after 26 years' service."

(d) The last sentence of the third paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of future promotion, any person so appointed in the Medical or Dental Corps shall be considered as having had, on the date of appointment, service equal to that of the junior officer of his grade and corps now in the Regular Army; and in the Veterinary or Pharmacy Corps sufficient service to bring him to his grade under the rules established in this section."

SEC. 2. The last two sentences of section 24 (c) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "Existing laws providing for the examination of officers for promotion are hereby repealed, except those relating to physical examination, which shall continue to be required for promotion to all grades below that of brigadier general, and except also those governing the examination of officers of the Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Corps. Officers of said four corps shall be examined in accordance with laws governing examination of officers of the Medical Corps."

SEC. 3. The fourth sentence of section 24 (e) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between ages of 21 and 32 years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring four years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe."

SEC. 4. The first and second provisos of section 47 (c) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, are amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That any medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to a Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, or Veterinary Corps unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for a course of training at the rate of 90 hours of instruction per annum for the four college years, and if at the end of two years of such training he has been selected by the professor of military science and tactics and the head of the institution for advanced training, and has agreed in writing to continue in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the remainder of his course at the institution, and has agreed in writing to pursue the course in camp training prescribed by the Secretary of War, he may be furnished, at the expense of the United States, with commutation of subsistence at such rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as may be fixed by the Secretary of War, during the remainder of his service in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, not exceeding two years: *Provided further,* That any Reserve Officer who is also a medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to such Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, or Veterinary Corps unit for such training, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 3, strike out the words "second sentence" and insert in lieu thereof "third sentence."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "24 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "24c."

On page 3, line 6, strike out "24 (e)" and insert in lieu thereof "24e."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "47 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "47c."

On page 4, line 14, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon, and insert a period after the quotation marks.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF HOSPITAL TO ST. LAWRENCE, NEWFOUNDLAND

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 118, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct, and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy.

Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. GERLACH objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

MARINE BAND AT MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2683) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., from September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such convention, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $8,137.40, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this

Act: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed $5 per day each for additional living expenses while on duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EQUALIZING DISABILITY BENEFITS, UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to explain the bill, so that the House may understand the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to equalize retirement benefits that might accrue to officers in the service, as among the various components. In that connection let me say that if those who are commissioned in the Army of the United States should be disabled in line of duty, they would be retired in the grade they had attained. but not so with the National Guard officers and Reserve officers and Regular Army officers. All of those officers holding a permanent rank in wartime are promoted only to a temporary rank, and if they are injured in line of duty, so that they must be retired, they are, under present law, retired in their permanent rank rather than in the temporary rank to which they have been promoted.

Let me give you an example. If General Eisenhower, who is a full four-star general, and Maj. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle and Lieutenant General Knudsen and Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault should be flying together in a plane or traveling in an automobile together, and all of them should become disabled in the same accident, they would be retired in this manner: The full four-star general, Eisenhower, would be retired as a lieutenant colonel, because that is the rank that he holds. Maj. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle would be retired as a major, because that is his permanent rank. Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault would be retired as a captain, because that is his permanent rank. Lieutenant General Knudsen would be retired as a lieutenant general, because his appointment is in the Army of the United States. Therefore, of the four he would be the only one to enjoy that benefit.

I might give you one more example which will illustrate what would happen. The commanding officer of the Air Transport Service is Major General George, who holds as permanent rank that of lieutenant colonel. Serving under him is Brig. Gen. C. R. Smith, who was president of the American Air Lines and who was appointed directly into the Army of the United States. If those two officers should be injured, the brigadier general, who is serving under the major general, would be retired as a brigadier general, whereas the major general would be retired in his permanent rank of lieutenant colonel.

Such discrepancies exist all through the service under the law as it now stands. The purpose of this bill is to correct that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I give another illustration? This was furnished me by the War Department. Take the case of officers serving as majors, under temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, each of whom holds a permanent commission as first lieutenant in his component. For example, a Regular, Reserve, or National Guard, who was originally appointed as a first lieutenant from civilian life under Public Law No. 252, the Regular, Reserve, and National Guard men would be entitled to receive only 75 percent of the pay of a first lieutenant. We will assume they all had the rank of a major. They would only receive 75 percent of the pay of a first lieutenant, while the person appointed from civilian life or from an officers' candidate school would be entitled to receive 75 percent of the pay of a major. Should there have been a fifth officer who was thus injured and who was a retired first lieutenant but was serving at the time under temporary appointment as a major, he would not be entitled to any additional compensation by reason of the injury, and would be returned to a retired status with the regular pay of first lieutenant.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill relate only to retirement for disability incurred in line of duty?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Does it make any provision to take care of officers who have been wounded during the present war prior to the date of the enactment of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does. It does not allow any benefits to accrue prior to the date of enactment, but it does take care of every such case and will allow benefits to start as of the date of the enactment of this bill in cases that have developed prior to enactment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that under the law an enlisted man who receives injuries in line of duty does not get retired but receives benefit payments? And is it not further true that such an enlisted man must submit himself to physical examination at any time the Government sees fit to question whether his injuries still exist in an incapacitating degree or not? As to these officers do you not propose to retire them and let them engage in any business under the sun, let them draw their higher rate of retirement, without any possibility of examination at any later date? No matter what happened to them, they still remain on the Government pay roll and engage in private business, make any amount of money they can, and if they completely recover they can still draw this pay, can they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is my understanding that as far as the continuation of the physical disability is concerned, the same law applies to the officers as does to the enlisted men, and that in either event they are allowed to follow such civilian pursuits as they see fit.

Mr. POAGE. You say the same law applies to them. Maybe I am wrong. I ask for information. Are the officers involved to receive compensation benefits under this bill for their injuries or are they to receive retirement pay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said the same law applies as far as continuation of the disability is concerned.

Mr. POAGE. Do you mean the retirement may be terminated at any time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not certain, but that is my understanding.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman is wrong. I think the retirement cannot be terminated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are not setting up any new retirement laws. We are simply equalizing the law which is on the books today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that this bill extends to various components of the Army the same privileges as are now enjoyed by naval officers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Naval officers already enjoy these benefits, exactly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that retirement for age cannot be terminated, but retirement for disability may be terminated when the disability ceases?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I intend to offer. In view of the situation, I think it would be more proper to have my amendment taken up in a separate bill, and I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have been asked to ask some questions with reference to the retirement features of this bill. Under this bill a Regular Army officer receives one type of retirement and a Reserve officer receives a different type. Is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only to a certain extent. I do not think it is quite right to say that they receive a different type of retirement. There are few differences that arise from the fact that a civilian officer is only in for the duration of the war, whereas a Regular officer is a career officer, and the only difference is that the career officer has the benefit of a retired officer in that he may trade at the commissary and he may trade at the post exchange, and be treated in an Army hospital, whereas the civilian officer cannot do so.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it correct that the Regular Army officer is put on one retired list and the Reserve officer or the National Guard officer is put on another retired list?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Although both officers may have been injured, as the gentleman has just illustrated, in the same action, and both may receive substantially the same type of injury, and both may be subject to the same circumstances, as far as is possible in receiving and sustaining an injury, but they are kept on different retired lists. I would like for the gentleman to explain why this is the case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just as I tried to explain, the Regular officer goes into the Army to make a career out of it, and as a part of his compensation he takes into consideration these benefits that will come to him by reason of his service. For instance, he knows that in the future sometime he is going to be given the right of retirement, and when he is permitted to retire he will have the right to trade at the commissary, at the post exchange, and the right to receive hospital treatment in Army hospitals, a right that is going to continue. Whereas you and I, if we go in as civilian officers, go in simply for the duration of the war, without expecting to make a career of the service, but so far as the actual retirement pay is concerned it is under this bill the same for officers of the same rank regardless in what component they serve.

Mr. BROOKS. But the gentleman will realize this: That an officer retired ceases to be of service to the Army whether he be a Regular Army officer or a Reserve officer, if he is retired he is out of the service of the Army, although he suffers to the same extent from disability that the Regular Army officer suffers. Should there be any difference?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the gentleman raises a question that he knows troubled some of us in the subcommittee hearings, but I think it is a question that can be satisfactorily answered.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, there is an additional reason why a difference in status has to be made between the career officer and the temporary officer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; in that connection, the career officer can be recalled into active duty.

Mr. MAY. He is subject to recall at all times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. And that difference ought to be kept in mind; that is the reason for having career men as well as temporary officers; otherwise it would be necessary to maintain a large army at all times.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. To my mind this is a very important bill, and I would like to know whether it has been unanimously reported by the committee and whether hearings have been held on it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Hearings were held and the bill was unanimously reported; it is a bill that is requested by the War Department in order to even up these inequalities that exist today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I see it, this bill proposes to equalize, to use a popular but less descriptive term than the plain word "increase," the retirement benefits payable to certain officers. However, according to its provisions I do not see how it equalizes these benefits, because, as the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee points out, the Federal Government can call back the Regular officers into active service, whereas there is no such opportunity to call back the Reserve officers who may have retired.

It seems to me, that if the purpose of the bill is to put them both in the same relative position then we should not attempt to pass a bill of this character and I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain how he reconciles the claim, that this bill would place all officers on the same basis with the very situation he described.

Mr. MAY. There is no difference except this one, which I think is the outstanding difference, that one man is a man who makes a career of the Army service; he is a soldier in the Army of the United States and subject to all kinds of orders at any time.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Whereas the temporary officer is not.

Mr. POAGE. Then there is a difference between the two services, is there not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. But with the law as it stands now they cannot meet that condition.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. I do not quite understand how this is going to equalize the benefits.

Mr. MAY. The explanation for the bill was based on that very thing.

Mr. POAGE. What is the explanation? If a man, for instance, is a regular captain but is a temporary general and is injured, then he would be able to retire as a general rather than as a captain.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right if this bill becomes law, but not so as the law now stands.

Mr. POAGE. He simply has been given something extra when he was given the opportunity to occupy a position temporarily. He certainly could not complain. This bill seems to assume that the individual was injured by being given the temporary promotion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask this question: Suppose the gentleman himself has the rank of captain in the Regular Army but in this war is temporarily a lieutenant general. Suppose, for example, that I came from private life into the Army with the rank of lieutenant general. Suppose further that the gentleman and I are in an airplane accident and both of us are injured. I will receive the retirement benefits a lieutenant general would be entitled to under the law, yet the gentleman from Texas holding the temporary rank of lieutenant general would get the retirement benefits of captain. Does the gentleman think that is what he would be entitled to?

Mr. POAGE. If there is any merit in our system of discriminating according to rank and of giving an officer greater retirement because he is injured than is given a private; if there is any merit in that kind of discriminatory system which we have operated under all through the history of the country then I would say the situation described by the majority leader would be equitable because under those circumstances I would have adjusted myself to the standard of a captain and my status of living would not have changed. The only reason in the world why there is a distinction between a private and a major, or lieutenant, or full general is simply because we have built up a social system under which the officer is at more expense and has established a more expensive standard of living than the private. The life of an officer is not worth any more than the life of the private, and the leg of an officer, if he loses it, is not any more valuable to him than the leg of a private. I do not contend that this bill establishes any new principle in this regard but it does continue an old practice which rests solely on the assumption that certain individuals have established a social standard and an economic standard that requires for its maintenance a higher retirement benefit or compensation payment than is required to maintain the economic standard to which someone else is accustomed. Now, if I have been a captain in the Army and had made that my vocation, then I have been living on the standard of a captain. If Mr. Knudsen ha gone into the Army from an extremely highly paid position as lieutenant general, he, of course, has to maintain a higher economic standard than I; and Mr. Knudsen would be about the only person to whom the gentleman could refer because his is the only case I recall where a civilian has been taken into the Army as a lieutenant general. I do not contend that the system is sound. But if it is there would be no injustice as I see it in the situation described.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Army of the United States or of any component thereof, except an officer of the Regular Army, who incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade and becomes entitled to retirement pay because of such disability shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 2. Any officer of the Regular Army who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be retired for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall have the rank and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for an officer of such higher grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 4. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs additional physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War, or such person or persons as he may designate, shall find that the additional physical disability is incident to service while on active duty in the higher grade and not less than 30 percent permanent.

SEC. 5. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same grade as that held by him on the retired list, receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 6. The benefits of this act shall apply to officers of the Army of the United States who were retired subsequent to April 6, 1917, or who may hereafter be retired for physical disability in line of duty in time of war or any emergency declared by the President, or within 6 months thereafter, determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, including any officer given a temporary appointment in a higher grade under the act of June 16, 1936, who has been retired for physical disability in a lower grade.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not apply in any case unless proceedings to obtain the benefits provided herein are initiated within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment held at the time when the disability is incurred or the disabled officer's release from active duty, whichever occurs earlier: *Provided*, That such proceedings may be initiated within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act in any case where such termination of appointment, retirement, or release from active duty occurred prior to such approval. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to limit the power of the President under existing law, or to affect the right of any officer of the Regular Army to have the rank and retired pay of a higher grade than herein provided, or of any other officer of the Army of the United States to have the retirement pay of a higher grade than herein provided, if entitled thereto under other provisions of law.

SEC. 9. No back pay shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act. The provisions of this act shall not otherwise affect the method in which officers are to be retired.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out lines 5 to 9, both inclusive, and substitute the following: "who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be granted retirement pay for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "retired", insert "or granted retirement pay", and in line 8, after the word "retired", insert "or granted retirement pay."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an appropriate time to call attention to the very significant statement made a few days ago by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. I consider his statement to be a startling one. He called the attention of the country to the fact that production in May of material for our Army and the armed forces which was scheduled to rise 2 percent over the April figure had actually declined 3½ percent, a difference of 5½ percent. What circumstances entered into this we do not know, but what they are should be looked into and if they can be made public should be made public. I express the personal hope that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House will look into this matter at once.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield gladly.

Mr. MAY. The House Committee on Military Affairs for the past 2 years has been accustomed to assembling in the War Department for conferences on the question of production and the progress of production and on the whole Army set-up. Such a meeting is scheduled for this coming Thursday. Regardless of that meeting or what it discloses, the House Committee on Military Affairs is very much interested in this statement of Judge Patterson who knows generally what he is talking about, who is reliable and truthful. If that is the condition we certainly will look into it and look into it at once.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to have the gentleman make that statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me it is not necessary to go very far to find the cause of this slowing down in our war production if the gentleman will just read the papers. The coal strike is one of them, the dictatorship of John L. Lewis; the others are strikes in our defense industries, one of which is in progress right now, if I am not mistaken, in one of the Ford plants in Detroit, Mich. As long as the Congress is not supported in its efforts to put a stop to these things they are going to continue, and our boys at the front are going to pay with their lives.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the strike in the Chrysler plant in Detroit, immediately when it took place and was in effect a day and a half, I made a telephone call, and I was told that that strike alone had reduced the Army plane production about 500 planes.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky says, but I think he is one strike behind the hounds, that he will find there is a foremen's strike in progress right now in one of the Ford plants manufacturing airplanes in Detroit. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that I think a mistake is being made in certain quarters by playing along with this thing now. We ought to outlaw these strikes, and we ought to let the American people know that we are not going to stand for them as long as this war is going on. I am informed there has been a 9,000-foremen walk-out in the Ford war-production plant up to the present moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The statement of Under Secretary Patterson made such an impression upon me that I feel the matter should be looked into and I know the assurance of the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs will be carried out effectively and that the public will be advised insofar as the information can be given to the public. Personally, expressing my own views, this is no time for the letting down of production, neither is this any time for overconfidence. We have won some telling and effective victories, but the hard part is still ahead of us. The men at the front are possessed of confidence and determination to fight and win, but they know the dangers of overconfidence.

We on the civilian front must have that same spirit of confidence and determination to do our part, but we must also recognize the danger of our overconfidence.

Everything on the home front inconsistent with the maximum production of weapons of war, indifference among management or employees, unnecessary absenteeism, overconfidence, industrial disputes, lock-outs, strikes, suspension of work or stoppages of any kind must not be engaged in and will not be tolerated by the great majority of the people at home. There should be no one on the civilian front, as a matter of fact, who should tolerate or engage in such actions. One thing we must rest assured of and that is that such actions will be opposed and condemned by 100 percent of those who wear the uniform in this war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that nothing is more important at this critical hour than a discussion of the very ques-

tion raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. When the Assistant Secretary of War stated that our production of war materials had fallen off 5½ percent from what it was in a previous month, he was giving us sound, vital information upon which it is necessary for the Congress and the administration to act if we are going to win this war.

The administration is now reaping what it has sowed. I predicted when they put through the Walsh-Healey Act, when they passed the Wagner Act and rammed through the wages and hours bill, in violation of all logic and in disregard of everything for which both political parties and all political philosophers on whom we had ever relied have stood, we would come to the very showdown we now face.

In every community today the crepes are appearing on the doorknobs of homes of boys who are dying on every battlefront in the world. Every time there is a slow-down, whether it is dictated by John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, Bill Green, or anyone else, it deprives those boys of the weapons of war, and they pay for it with their lives.

The best paid laborers on the face of this earth are the men and women today who are working in war industries in America. Their pay is all out of line with that of the farmer or the soldier, all out of line with what such workers are receiving in other countries; and yet we find this wholesale coal strike that virtually paralyzes our war effort in a large number at least of the essential factories that are producing war materials. We find this week a strike of foremen in a Detroit aircraft plant at a time when the boys on Guadalcanal, the boys in north Africa, the boys on the high seas, who are going down in flaming seas of oil, and who cannot strike except at the enemy, are all suffering for want of the weapons of war these workers are supposed to be supplying.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will examine the hearings of the House military Affairs Committee on the numerous bills we have had recently he will find that the foremen of the country are seeking to organize as an independent union which means that there will be nobody to bargain collectively.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; some of them want to take over the Government. That is the trouble with this bureaucracy, that is the trouble with certain exclusive labor organizations that are dominated by a few labor racketeers. The average member has no voice in the matter. I think it is about time we let them know that the American people are going to run this country through the Congress, the Senate and House of Representatives, and the President of the United States. They have threatened me with political destruction, but I want to say that one of the least punishments they could inflict on me, or on my country perhaps, would be to defeat me for reelection for Congress.

I am ready to meet the responsibility of wiping those laws from the statute books, if necessary, and putting teeth in legislation that will prohibit and prevent the slowing down of these war industries or any other industries supplying the material or the fuel necessary to carry these industries on. We cannot afford to lose this war.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a very brief observation?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman recalls that several months ago I said on the floor of this House that we were already operating under a labor government that was rapidly running into a labor dictatorship which, if not stopped, would soon advance to the stage of despotism. We are now in the stage of dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. Some of the very same forces that are stirring up these strikes are stirring up race riots throughout the country. They seem determined that the American people must fight a race war, and a racketeers' war, at a time when we are taking every boy and every man available and sending them to the battle front. I am sorry the President did not sign the antistrike bill the day it struck his desk. I wish he would sign it now and put an end to the uncertainty. I regret that we could not make it stronger. The fate of America may be at stake in this controversy. The President should act now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDERS PLACED BY ONE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT WITH ANOTHER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 972, to amend section 7 (c) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask either the sponsor of the bill or the chairman of the committee reporting it what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It is requested by the Secretary of the Navy, as shown by the committee report.

I am advised that concretely the purpose of this bill is to provide that when the Navy, as it does, procures from the Army small arms and ammunition, as well as a large part of the field artillery used by the Marine Corps, it shall give the Army the same time in which to construct that equipment and deliver it as the Navy would give if it made a contract directly with a contractor. In other words, this is to put the Army in the same position in the delivery under a contract with the Navy with respect to small arms that an independent contractor would be if the contract were made with the contractor rather than with the Army.

The Comptroller General has advised that the bill would give to the War Department and other governmental agencies the same latitude as to the availability of moneys set up in working funds as is now enjoyed by the Navy Department. The Navy Department advises that this bill should pass now because we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, and if it does not pass, many orders for small arms and ammunition, given to the Army, will have to be made over again, inasmuch as they will lapse with the close of the current year.

Mr. CASE. I have read the report as carefully as I could in the limited time available since the bill was called to my attention. It would appear that the bill seeks to extend the availability of funds appropriated to various Government agencies, and in particular, according to the explanation given in the report, it is intended to continue the availability indefinitely of appropriations made for the War Department. It is stated that the Navy Department already has this privilege, but the privilege does not extend to the funds of the War Department, yet the request for the bill comes from the Navy Department and there is no report of any request from the War Department.

It occurs to me that there is fundamentally a sound reason for a distinction between the making of funds permanently available to the Navy and to the Army, and that goes back to the constitutional provision that Congress shall have power to raise and support armies but that no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say to the gentleman that while, as I have stated, this bill comes to the Congress at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, the reason the request is made by the Navy is that it is the Navy that is primarily interested.

Mr. CASE. But apparently money of the Army or the War Department is involved and there is a basic question in the extension of availability to Army funds indefinitely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will try my best to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CASE. In view of the fact that the request comes from the Navy Department to affect Army appropriations, in view of the fact that this legislation has not been called to the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittee which makes appropriations for the War Department, and in view of the fact that we specifically try to place limitations upon the availability of funds for the War Department, I am constrained to ask that the bill go over without prejudice at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman withhold his request temporarily

so that I may make this statement, and then the gentleman may pursue his course.

Mr. CASE. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say to the gentleman that the Navy Department informed me and the committee which considered the bill that this request was made by the Navy Department primarily because the Navy Department is affected. The Navy Department already has the power that it requests the Army be given in this case. It does not affect the Army except as to orders placed with the Army by the Navy Department, and I am advised that such is its purpose.

This bill does not propose to extend the time for contracts indefinitely. The bill, as it states on its face, only proposes to extend the time as the Navy now has the time to get its contracts performed by private contractors. As it states, the bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It further provides that, and I quote from the bill:

> Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

I am advised and I have before me a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the effect that the reason it is imperative that the bill be passed as promptly as possible is to utilize the remaining days of the fiscal year to clear those transactions that still remain to be completed between the Army and the Navy, involving among other transactions the arms and munitions to which I have referred, consisting of small arms, cannon, and ammunition, for which the Navy makes contracts with the Army because the Army manufactures those arms, these contracts being made in an effort to avoid competition.

Mr. CASE. The bill apparently is intended to extend the availability of certain funds to the War Department. As a member of the committee which has placed certain limitations upon the availability of Army funds, I must ask that the bill go over without prejudice until we can have an opportunity to determine whether or not the War Department really wants this. There is nothing in the report to indicate their attitude.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I repeat that this bill does not involve War appropriations; it involves Navy appropriations.

Mr. CASE. On that point, then, I think the record should show that the report states:

> As it now stands, the War Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on orders necessarily delayed.

Consequently, it would appear by the language in the report that funds of the War Department are involved.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error. The bill and the report as a whole show that only Navy appropriations are involved.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 650) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 10, 1932 (heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 14, 1933, June 12, 1934, May 24, 1935, June 5, 1936, June 16, 1938, and May 24, 1939), granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Garrison, N. Dak., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "by", strike out "an act" and insert "acts."

Page 1, line 5, after "June 5, 1936," insert "March 24, 1937."

Page 2, line 4, after "within", strike out "1 year" and insert "2 years."

Page 2, line 5, after "within", strike out "three" and insert "four."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BROOKLYN CENTER, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2649) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn." (Public Law 525, 77th Cong.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved April 20, 1942, granting the consent of Congress to (or authorizing) the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "(or authorizing)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.,' approved April 20, 1942."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL TERM, DISTRICT COURT, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1622) to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska, at Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph of section 4 of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved March 2, 1921 (41 Stat. 1204, U. S. C., title 48, sec. 102; Compiled Laws of Alaska, 1933, sec. 1092), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"One general term of court shall be held each year at Juneau, and such additional terms at other places in the first division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Nome, and such additional terms at other places in the second division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Anchorage, and such additional terms at other places in the third division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Fairbanks, and such additional terms at other places in the fourth division as the Attorney General may direct. Each of the judges is authorized and directed to hold such special terms of court as may be necessary for the public welfare or for the dispatch of the business of the court at such times and places in their respective divisions as any of them, respectively, may deem expedient, or as the Attorney General may direct; and each shall have authority to employ interpreters and to make allowances for the necessary expenses of his court and to employ an official court stenographer at such compensation as shall be fixed by the Attorney General. At least 30 days' notice shall be given by the judge, or the clerk, of the time and place of holding the several terms of the court."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out "Attorney General" in lines 1, 4, 6, and 7, 9, and 14 and 15, and insert in lieu thereof in each instance "Judicial council for the ninth judicial circuit."

Page 2, in lines 18 and 19, strike out "Attorney General" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

UNNECESSARY RENEWALS OF OATHS OF OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments, approved August 14, 1937."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 640), be amended to read as follows:

"That civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States and employees of the District of Columbia who, upon original appointment, have subscribed to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be required to renew the said oath because of any change in status so long as their services are continuous in the department or independent establishment in which employed or in the government of the District of Columbia, unless in the opinion of the head of the department or independent establishment or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the public interests require such renewal."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

OYSTER GROWERS CLAIM AGAINST UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2614) to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. That the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine claims for damages to oyster growers upon private or leased lands or bottoms arising from dredging operations and use of other machinery and equipment in making such improvements: *Provided,* That suits shall be instituted within 2 years after such operations shall have terminated."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY OF RETIRED OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 693) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to entitle those officers of the Army retired between the dates of June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, and have not had less than 10 years' commissioned service, to receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active-duty pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I notice in the report of the committee that the Budget Bureau is opposed to this bill, also the Navy Department. I think we ought to have an explanation from the author of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in his statement that the Navy Department did submit an unfavorable report, but if the gentleman will read it, he will see in the paragraph just preceding its objection that it says the bill does not affect in any way the Navy personnel. Therefore, I cannot see why the Navy Department objects to the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Why does it not include the Navy, but affects the Army only?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does affect the Army only. This relates to a small group of officers who retired between June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, in answer to a mandate carried in an appropriation bill, calling on the Army to reduce its officer personnel by a certain figure. The reduction had to be made by January 1, 1923. That is the reason that this particular period applies. The appropriation act was signed, I understand, on June 29, 1922, and the reduction was to come about by January 1, 1923. The Army used all kinds of persuasion to get those officers to retire. There are 70, about, or not over 70, probably not more than 50 officers left in this category, and their average age, I believe, is around 66 years. Every other officer who has retired either voluntarily or as a result of the class B board, and who has 10 years' service and World War service, has been given this benefit already. These are the only officers who have not been given this particular retirement benefit.

Mr. KEAN. What happened to the Navy officers who were retired owing to the Disarmament Conference in 1921?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know, but so far as I know no appropriation bill carried the mandate to the Navy to reduce its officer personnel.

Mr. BROOKS. When the pay bill was passed last year, it seems as though those are the only groups left out. This in effect is a report that includes this particular group by omission, because they were omitted on the list of the pay act last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has answered one of my questions when he indicated why the dates June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, were included in the bill. May I ask why "not less than 10 years' commissioned service" is inserted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know how that happened to be the original criterion, but it has been, and is, with reference to all these other World War officers who have been retired not less than 10 years. I believe, too, that under the regular retirement laws, in order to get retirement pay, an officer must have had 10 years of active service.

Mr. COLE of New York. What danger is there that the passage of this bill may create a precedent under which, at the end of this war, we will extend to any Army officer who has had 10 years of service and who retires, the full 75 percent disability compensation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that this bill would create a precedent, because we have had at least two, or perhaps three, before this, which have done the same thing as to the groups covered by those laws. Moreover, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in at least one of those measures we gave the same benefits to officers who had actually been retired by action of the B board. The officers covered by this bill were never before any B board. They came out in voluntary cooperation with the War Department, answering the mandate of Congress to reduce officer personnel.

Mr. COLE of New York. But is there not a very strict distinction between officers retired under B board operation? They were retired involuntarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. And these officers covered in this bill retired voluntarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But under every pressure the Army could bring upon them in order to reduce the officer personnel.

Mr. COLE of New York. But there was nothing in the law at that time that required them to retire. They were simply persuaded by the Army officials to do so?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Army was directed by Congress to retire their officer personnel down to a certain number, and naturally they encouraged every officer they could to do so.

Mr. COLE of New York. But none of these men was let out of the service or retired under compulsion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all, but we might say under duress.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to make sure that the passage of this bill will not establish a precedent by which officers or personnel of the Army or the Navy, at the end of this war, who may have served 10 years will come in and make claim for 75 percent retired compensation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how it could.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, is hereby amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"The retired pay of any officer of the Army retired between the dates of June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, who has not less than 10 years' commissioned service, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay."

SEC. 2. No back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of the foregoing amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY STATUS OF WARRANT OFFICERS APPOINTED TO COMMISSIONED GRADES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2349, to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1941, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States," approved September 22, 1941, is amended by inserting after the second proviso a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That no warrant officer temporarily appointed as a commissioned officer under the authority of this act shall suffer any reduction in pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the time of such temporary appointment."

SEC. 2. No back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to December 7, 1941, by reason of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2836, to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that this will cost $5,000,000, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF INDUCTION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1991, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 5 (f) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended, to read as follows:

"(f) Any person 18 or 19 years of age who, while pursuing a course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act during the last half of his academic year at such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed until the end of such academic year, without regard to the date during the calendar year on which such academic year ends: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not prevent any person who has begun his academic year since January 1, 1943, from being deferred until the end of the first half of his said academic year.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "while", insert the word "satisfactorily" and before the word "course", insert the word "normal."

On page 1, line 8, before the word "his" insert the words "one of", and add an "s" to the word "year."

On page 2 strike out everything following the word "ends" in line 3 and all of lines 4, 5, and 6, and insert in lieu thereof ", or until he ceases to perform satisfactorily such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date which would constitute the end of his academic year if he continued to pursue satisfactorily such course of instruction."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GRATUITY BENEFITS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2188, to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I understand there was some provision in the bill under which the War Department objected and proposed an amendment to be offered to remove those provisions from the bill. I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to explain it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The statement of the gentleman is correct and I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment that was prepared by the War Department, which, if adopted, will meet its objections to the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to know briefly what the bill will provide as amended?

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 2188, is intended to clarify and correct the interpretatior of the existing law respecting the payment of gratuities to the beneficiaries of soldiers who die as the result of wounds or disease, not the result of his own misconduct, in the service.

The intent and purpose of the gratuity payments, under our existing law, was that the same should go to widow and/or children as dependents to bridge over the 6 months period following the death of the veteran, or if there was no child, or widow, then the same should be paid to dependent relatives, designated by the soldier, for the purpose of continuing the support of the soldier for the period of 6 months, and until the dependent relative could, in a measure, rehabilitate himself or herself.

In the case of *Spotswood* v. *United States* (80 Court of Claims 836), decided March 4, 1935, the court decided that in the case of death of a beneficiary, after the death of the soldier, the gratuity payment vested in the estate of the deceased relative, and the same was subject to the payment of the debts and claims of creditors of such estate. That was not the intent of the Congress in passing such law.

The amendment here proposed does not disturb the existing law respecting the payment of the gratuity to the widow or children, if any, of the veteran. It merely provides that in the event the first beneficiary designated by the soldier dies prior to the payment of such gratuity by the Government, then the same shall not be paid to the representative of such estate, for the benefit of creditors, but the same shall be paid to the next beneficiary designated by the veteran, who shall take the same. This would merely give the interpretation to this law which was intended by the Congress.

In the Spotswood case, supra, in rendering the decision, the court said:

The right of action on such claim, in the absence of a provision to that effect in the statute creating it, is not abated by the death of the person having the claim, but passes it to his legal representative, who can prosecute it to judgment.

This amendment merely writes into the law the interpretation intended by the Congress, and the language which cures the ill suggested by the court.

I have a particular case in mind, which caused me to introduce this bill, which is as follows: Lt. Robert W. Carr, of the United States Air Corps, was killed when his plane fell on September 28, 1942. His death was in line of duty, and not the result of his own misconduct. His mother died prior to his death, and he was fully emancipated by his father. He lived with and contributed largely to the support of his grandparents both prior to his entry into the service, and after he was a member of the armed forces. This veteran named as his first beneficiary, James W. Arbuckle, his grandfather, and he named his grandmother, Julia Ann Arbuckle, as his second beneficiary, all as provided by the act of December 17, 1919. Thereafter, and on December 6, 1942, the grandfather, James W. Arbuckle, departed this life, leaving a very meager amount of property, but leaving numerous creditors whose claims would, if the gratuity payment should be made to his estate, many times absorb the entire estate, and leave the grandmother, who was named as the second beneficiary, penniless and destitute. The decision of the Spotswood case, supra, would make imperative the payment of the gratuity to the estate of James W. Arbuckle, and this Government money would go to pay his creditors. Under the amendment here offered, this gratuity would not be paid to the representative of an insolvent estate, but the same would be paid to the

next dependent relative named by the veteran to aid in the support of such person, as was intended by the passage of the original law.

An amendment will be offered by the Military Affairs Committee, which will clarify the language in the bill, and with which amendment I am in full accord. The language contained in such amendment which will be offered has the entire approval of the War Department.

It is my hope that this legislation will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman from Indiana is to be congratulated on this bill and also the committee is to be congratulated on reporting it. I think it is a very constructive bill. I would like to ask one more question, however.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will be happy for my distinguished colleague from California to ask any question he may desire respecting this proposed legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I had a couple of cases of people who are now in the service where a man had failed to designate anybody as a beneficiary and I understand that under the present law his wife would automatically get the benefits.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct. The wife would be entitled to receive the gratuity payment, if living, and if there are living children they would receive the same in case of the wife's death.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But if he does not happen to be married his mother or his father or some other person is not now eligible unless they are specifically designated.

Am I correct about that; is that the purpose of the bill to correct that situation?

Mr. SPRINGER. This bill does not correct that situation. You are entirely correct in your assertion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana complete his answer to my question.

Mr. SPRINGER. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from California that this bill does not correct that particular situation to which he has directed my attention. If a veteran is married, if he has a wife, or if he has children, then automatically the payments will go direct to them, but it is the duty of the soldier to designate the beneficiary of his kindred, as dependent relatives, and then the payments will be made to them in the absence of his having a wife and children, if they come within the requirements of the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. But, as I understand, any debt made by the soldier, or incurred during his last illness, any unpaid debt incurred during his last illness, and all funeral expenses, will be taken care of before the money is transferred to any other dependent?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I explain to my friend that gratuity payments do not go to the soldier, nor to his estate. Such payment goes to the dependents of the deceased soldier. After the money is paid by the War Department to the beneficiary, of course the beneficiary is in position to control it; it becomes a part of the estate of the beneficiary to be applied only for the support of the dependent. The intent and purpose of the gratuity payments is to take care of the dependents, who take under the law, or those designated by the veteran, who were dependent upon him prior to death, in order to bridge over the period of 6 months following such death by way of support and aid. Let us understand definitely that the gratuity payment does not go to the estate of the deceased soldier. The amendment which I have here offered is merely to prevent the payment of the gratuity into the estate of a deceased beneficiary, in which case the same may be used to pay the claims of creditors, and to compel the payment of the same to the next and subsequent named beneficiary, who is living and capable of taking the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That 41 Statute 367 (title 10, ch. 25, U. S. C., sec. 903) be amended by inserting at the end of section 903, aforesaid, the following language: "*Provided further*, That in event of the death of the widow of any officer or enlisted man, without children, and without unpaid debts incurred during last illness and funeral expenses, or in the event of the death of any other beneficiary named by the officer or enlisted man, prior to the payment of such gratuity by the Government, then the said gratuity shall be paid to any other beneficiary named by and related to the soldier, who is still living, in the order designated by him, who was dependent upon him: *And provided further*, That such gratuity payment shall not be made by the Government to any executor or administrator of a deceased dependent relative, as defined by law, for the benefit of the creditors of his or her estate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct' (41 Stat. 367) approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 269; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903 A) be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end of section 903 a further proviso to read as follows: '*And provided further*, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated.

"'2. Nothing herein shall be construed as to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval.'"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not like this amendment. The bill provides that, in the event of death, the widow of the officer or enlisted man without children and without unpaid debts incurred during his last illness, the funeral expenses, and so forth, "the money shall then be paid to the next beneficiary."

I do not think this amendment is a proper provision. There may be relatives in some other State, some distant State, or perhaps some foreign country, but certainly any debts for doctors' bills, medical bills incurred by the soldier during his last illness, and also all funeral expenses, ought to be paid before this money goes to the next-named beneficiary.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should not the amendment be amended to read that the money shall be distributed according to the laws of the State in which the soldier died?

Mr. RANKIN. I did not write the bill nor the amendment. I would agree to let the bill go through with that understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman is construing the amendment wrong or else he is construing the law which is already on the statute books wrong. As the law stands the benefit is not drawn to take care of any debts that the soldier leaves. This does not take care of his last illness; it is nothing in the world but a bonus or gratuity that goes to a particular person designated by the soldier, provided such person falls within a certain classification. The soldier has the right to designate two such beneficiaries. The wife or child is automatically a beneficiary. Under the interpretation of the Comptroller General if the first beneficiary dies following the death of the soldier but before the payment of the money, the money must be paid to that beneficiary's estate to the absolute exclusion of the other living dependents. It does not matter how distressful their condition may be, under this ruling it must be paid to the estate of the first beneficiary. We in the committee felt that the other beneficiary who is equally dependent and who is living and who is in need ought to have the money rather than the estate of the person who has died.

Mr. RANKIN. I believe that the bill as first written provides:

Where an officer or enlisted man dies without children and without unpaid debts incurred during his last illness, and funeral expenses.

Of all things that we have tried to take care of in all veterans' legislation it was to provide for the soldier in his last illness and to provide for his funeral expenses. What assurance has he that his funeral expenses will be taken care of, or his hospital bill or his doctor's bill in his last illness? It might deprive him of that treatment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Who is deprived, the soldier?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; because this does not pertain to the soldier. This is not payable until after his death.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the point I am making.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is not payable until after his death; this is a gratuity to be paid to his living beneficiaries.

Mr. RANKIN. But this is to take care of his last illness and burial expenses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; not at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I misread the English language.

The bill reads as follows:

That 41 Statute 367 (title 10, ch. 25, U. S. C., sec. 903) be amended by inserting at the end of section 903, aforesaid, the following language: "*Provided further*, That in event of the death of the widow of any officer or enlisted man, without children, and without unpaid debts incurred during last illness and funeral expenses.

Does not that mean his own funeral expenses?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not one bit; this deals with his beneficiaries.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC ACROSS GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2912, to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill relates to the charging of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge in the State of California.

It seems that at the time the bridge was constructed a permit from the Secretary of War was necessary since the two ends of the bridge rested on Government property. In granting that permit the Secretary of War reserved to himself the right to issue passes to whomever he might designate for free use of the bridge. During the years that have passed since the bridge was constructed that right on the part of the Secretary of War has been extended to such a great degree that now a substantial portion of the traffic passing over the bridge is Government people passing under free tickets given to them by the Secretary of War.

This bill would withdraw from the Secretary of War that privilege, but in withdrawing it the bill reserves to the Government free passage for any military personnel, his own personal property, or any military equipment he might have with him. At first it seems to me that the reservation should also be extended to any Government-owned vehicle which might cross that bridge. After consultation, however, with the gentlemen from California [Mr. LEA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. ROLPH], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], I now see a distinction between this bridge and other toll bridges over which the Congress has exercised some jurisdiction, and I therefore should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to explain a little more fully as to why the War Department should have the right to exempt from passage over this bridge its own vehicles.

Mr. LEA. The Golden Gate Bridge, as everyone knows, is one of the most outstanding bridges in the world. It was constructed entirely at the expense of the people of the political division of California which was created for that purpose. The Government did not pay one cent for the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge.

The Golden Gate Bridge has done much more for the Government than the Government has done for the bridge. There is, in my judgment, no reason why civilian Government traffic is entitled to free passage over this bridge. An effort was made to secure aid in financing the bridge through purchases of securities by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but aid, even to that extent, was refused.

The courts have recognized that the Federal Government has no right to free tolls over an intrastate bridge where it has contributed nothing to its construction. Ninety-one civilian agencies have sought a toll-free privilege over this bridge, but not one of them made any sacrifice or contribution to its construction.

It is true, aid to the construction of the bridge was given by the Secretary of War in granting a permit for the construction of a bridge, and the construction and maintenance of approach roads over the adjacent military reservations.

The construction of the bridge worked no hardship or sacrifice to the Government. It could have been located at no site to better serve the Government.

Each side of the entrance to the San Francisco Bay through the Golden Gate is lined with great forts. The bridge directly connects these forts. The Golden Gate Bridge furnishes a means of immediate movement of troops and supplies from one side of the bay to the other. The bridge contributes greatly to the mobility of troop movements and defense for the San Francisco Bay area. It has vast military value for the defense of the west coast.

The approach roads constructed by the bridge district, and the replacement of old structures on the reservation by new ones, cost the bridge district $2,300,000. It provided the military reservations with much better roads than they ever had before. It provided six-lane boulevards instead of second- or third-class roads. The military personnel were provided with side approaches without grade crossings to the approach roads and the bridge.

In addition to this, the permit properly enough provided that whenever the Secretary of War determines that military necessity requires it, he shall have a right "to take complete control over the bridge, and the roads herein authorized to be extended, and may regulate and control, or suspend, all traffic thereon."

The permit granted by the Secretary of War required that all Government traffic should have the toll-free privilege. It provided that all military and naval personnel, and their dependents, should have the toll-free privilege whether used in performance of duties to the military forces or otherwise. It is a broader toll-free privilege than has been required of any other bridge in the United States.

The bridge district had no option. It had to accept the terms of the permit or not construct the bridge.

Great abuse has attended the exercise of this toll-free privilege. Had this free traffic paid tolls it would have amounted to an average of over $26,000 a year for the 6 years the bridge has operated. In several months during last year the toll-free vehicles enjoyed a privilege for which other like users of the bridge were paying over $50,000 a month.

Over 2,000,000 vehicles have crossed the bridge without paying toll under the wide requirements of the permit. Thousands of persons have used the bridge who were not traveling on Government business but served only their own social and business purposes. The privileges of the permit have been shamefully abused.

This bill proposes to abolish the toll-free privilege so far as civilian traffic of the Government is concerned. It abolishes the toll-free privileges for dependents. It does propose a toll-free privilege for the Nation's military forces and for military traffic which moves in the performance of duty.

Under the proviso of this bill, H. R. 2912, exemption from tolls is granted to persons belonging or attached to the military forces. This provision is broad enough to include members of the military forces, as well as persons attached to them, who are required to pass over the bridge as part of the performance of their duties.

The military forces include not only the Army, the Navy, and the marines, but also, at the present time, the Coast Guard.

The privilege also extends to the conveyance, personal baggage, and the military property of the United States, in charge of persons within the exempted class. This provision would make one of the exempted class traveling on a common carrier, for instance, free from the toll but would not exempt the conveyance. An employee operating a vehicle transporting military property in the performance of his military duty would be exempt as well as the conveyance. One belonging or attached to the military forces merely traveling to and from his place of employment, or to or from his home, would not be in the perform-

ance of such military service, or entitled to the exemption.

The right to toll-free passage is, in any event, subject to the provision that an order for duty in the military forces of the United States be presented which requires a performance of such duty to pass over such bridge. Exemptions thus defined would not give the privilege to the dependents of military personnel, or those who are merely friends or guests of such personnel. The dominating thought of the exemption is that the toll-free privilege is given to those only who in the performance of their services for the military forces have the duty of so traveling over the bridge. In that case such person, and the property of the United States in his charge, are entitled to the toll-free privilege.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman tell the House that the total amount of this free Government traffic now totals 15 percent of the entire traffic on the bridge?

Mr. LEA. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who owns this bridge now?

Mr. LEA. It is publicly owned by the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District. That is a political subdivision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever revenue comes in goes to some public agency out there?

Mr. LEA. Yes. There is not a cent of profit in it. The only object of this bridge is to give lower tolls to people who use it.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. The publicly owned Golden Gate Bridge was built during the depths of the depression at a cost of $35,000,000 without one dollar of Government aid.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that made a study and had extensive hearings on this Lea bill to fix tolls for vehicles traveling over the Golden Gate Bridge. It is an intrastate bridge. The Federal Government has made no contribution to the cost of construction of that bridge. It is true that at both ends of the bridge it gave these political subdivisions, the Golden Gate Bridge Commission which represents the communities that are involved and furnished the money under legislative act, the necessary sites to build the bridge. In addition to that, of course, the bridge commission has spent millions and millions of dollars on access roads, and it has furnished more convenient egress and outgo from these various forts and military establishments out there.

I was on the Pacific coast investigating the housing problem and as a representative of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I was asked personally to make an investigation of the toll situation on the Golden Gate Bridge. After spending some time on that bridge I was amazed to see the type of traffic that is deadheading over the bridge. The people of California and the people of the United States will never enjoy a free bridge if that condition continues to exist. I was informed by the officers in charge that it has gotten to a state where they are authorizing them to print 50,000 passes at a time in order that they may pass them out to anybody who they think may be entitled to use this intrastate bridge, which is controlled by a public body and paid for by the taxpayers of that State.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These as a rule are the families of men there in the service who are working in war plants in connection with this war, are they not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Some of them are. Some of the people who are using the bridge; yes. There are many men who are using that bridge who work in defense plants, but they pay. I am talking about Government officials. There are 94 bureaus out there that are using the bridge, whereas on every other bridge in that State they have to pay a toll.

Mr. RANKIN. Do other citizens of that part of the country pay a toll on this bridge?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Everybody but these people?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. If it is necessary for these people to go across that bridge to carry on the work that is necessary to win this war and to defend Mississippi and California, does not the gentleman think they ought to pass over it without paying a toll?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. No; I do not think so. When they go by way of the Oakland Bridge, where the shipyards are located, they are obliged to pay a toll.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his speech almost is reverse English from what we had when we tried to take the tolls off of the Cape Cod Canal. I am not much for toll bridges at all.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Neither am I. That is why I wanted to see this one eventually be free.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about this bridge being built in the pit of the depression. Now, about these people crossing it, the reason the people are crossing the bridge is because of the war activity in that area; it is because of the activity that the war has inspired out there, which in turn has intensified the traffic. You will probably penalize the people to an extent that it will handicap them in the discharge of their duties for which they are sent to that remote section of the country.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will make an examination and investigation of this bill, he will find that it will penalize nobody but people from the other Government departments and bureaus and make them pay toll the same as if they were going over the Oakland bridge.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going at it that way, why do you not go at it in the same way as if you were coming in here with a bill for Government participation?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This does give free passage for all Army, Navy, merchant marine, or Coast Guard personnel in any activity in which they happen to be engaged.

Mr. RANKIN. The chances are, I do not mind saying to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that that is an extreme danger zone. We need not deceive ourselves. We have a war in the Pacific, a very serious war. If this war should be brought to our shores, it will involve more than almost any other city in the country the city of San Francisco, and it will be necessary for the traffic across the Golden Gate Bridge to be intensified and multiplied many times. I think it is a bad time to bring up here a bill to impose a toll and restrict the use of that bridge, when that use is being brought about or increased as a result of the war activities.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there are 91 nonmilitary agencies of this Government that use the bridge toll-free.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot accept that.

Mr. WELCH. The language, the War Department grant, that permits the use of the bridge by these agencies was ambiguous, and not intended by the attorney for the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. The toll-free privilege is not enjoyed by those who work for wages in these activities on either side of the bay. That is not the trouble. Primarily, the difficulty is with those who are going for their own social advantage.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California that you can restrict that by holding down the issuance of the passes to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers.

Mr. LEA. This gives an exemption to all those who go across there as a military duty, both the traffic and the personnel. I call attention to the fact that the courts have decided that the Federal Government has no right to exact free toll of privately constructed bridges to which they do not contribute. To demand such a toll is a confiscation of property. These civilian agencies that are enjoying the free-toll privilege made no contribution whatever. There is a reason why the military forces should be given this privilege, because the Government could have some claim because the ends of the bridge rest on military

reservations, but there is no reason in the world why the Government should deadhead on a bridge that is built by the taxpayers of that particular State.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LEA. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that request.

Mr. RANKIN. I want the bill to be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DONDERO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2936, to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the appropriation of $200,000,000. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] to explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understand that this bill is coming up later under a motion to suspend the rules. Can we not save time by having the explanation come then?

Mr. PRIEST. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he consulted the Speaker with reference to being recognized for the purpose of bringing this bill up under a suspension?

Mr. LANHAM. I have, and that permission has been granted. I was thinking that, if there was no objection, we might simply save that much time.

Mr. COLE of New York. I may say to the gentleman that in view of the amount of money that is involved, $200,000,000, in spite of the fine explanation the gentleman might give, I would ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the bill goes over without prejudice, it can be called up under a suspension, of course; but if objection is made can the bill also be called up under a suspension?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. In either instance, can it not, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF COLE PIPE LINE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2520, to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth section of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1945."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That section 8 (b) of the act entitled 'An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce,' approved July 30, 1941, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'but relief so granted by the President shall not in any case be for a period extending beyond 5 years after June 30, 1945.'

"SEC. 2. Section 9 of such act is amended by striking out the date 'June 30, 1943' and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1945.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLLS OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, that bill will be returned to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That tolls may be charged for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, including military or naval personnel and their dependents and civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business, but such tolls shall not be in excess of the tolls charged for the passage or transit of other traffic over such bridge: *Provided*, That any person belonging or attached to the military forces of the United States shall, together with his conveyance, personal baggage, and the military property of the United States in his charge, be allowed passage or transit over such bridge free of toll, if he presents an order for duty in the military forces of the United States which requires him in the performance of such duty to pass over such bridge.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and include two short resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the committee for the painstaking manner in which it has gone into every phase of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district, almost from the beginning, and for having favorably reported this bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate Bridge is one of the engineering marvels of the modern age. Its magnitude and beauty are only surpassed by the majestic Golden Gate itself—that world-famous marine highway which connects the great Bay of San Francisco with the Pacific Ocean.

The Golden Gate Bridge had its official inception when I introduced the following resolution as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on November 12, 1918, which I prepared in collaboration with James H. Wilkins, long time mayor of San Rafael:

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco has been impressed by the discussion relative to the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate by the Federal Government; and

Whereas it is evident that the construction of such a bridge would be of incalculable value to San Francisco by connecting it directly with the northern and central counties of the State and with the transcontinental railroad system; and

Whereas such a bridge would add a feature to the Bay of San Francisco without parallel in the world; and

Whereas it is a necessary step to determine by expert examination whether the project involves insurmountable engineering difficulties or prohibitive cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be urged to promote the necessary legislation providing for a preliminary survey and report with a view to determining whether the projected bridge is practicable or not.

Adopted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, November 12, 1918.

Ayes: Supervisors Brandon, Deasy, Gallagher, Hayden, Hocks, Hynes, Kortick, Lahaney, McLeran, McSheehy, Mulvihill, Nelson, Schmitz, Suhr, Welch.

Absent: Supervisors Hilmer, Power, Wolfe.

J. S. DUNNIGAN,
Clerk.

Approved, San Francisco, November 13, 1918.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr.,
Mayor.

The passage of this resolution marked the beginning of a long uphill fight that tried the souls and patience of those men who pioneered the project. During the years immediately following, much opposition developed to the project because of the many differences of opinion which developed as to its feasibility, the selfish ferry interests which

held a monopoly on all bay transportation using this as their principal argument against its construction.

Nevertheless, there were those public-minded citizens who believed that the construction of the bridge was entirely feasible. They were supported in this view by such outstanding long-span bridge engineers as Ralph Modjeska, Joseph B. Strauss, and others, who maintained that the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate was not only feasible, but that it could be built at a reasonable cost.

With the need for such a connecting link in the transportation facilities between the great empire to the north and the city of San Francisco constantly growing more important, a meeting of citizens was called in 1923 by Frank P. Doyle through the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce. At this meeting I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a citizens committee of five. This committee consisted of Joseph Hotchkiss, Frank L. Coombs, Capt. I. N. Hibbard, Frank P. Doyle, and myself.

In the months which followed, the citizens committee of five laid much of the groundwork which reached its culmination in the enactment of legislation by the California State Legislature creating the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district composed of San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties.

In the meantime, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, of which I was a member, continued its active participation in the project by adopting the following resolution which I also introduced, and which was approved on September 7, 1923:

Whereas the commercial, financial, and economic development of the State of California, and particularly the cities and counties located on and adjacent to San Francisco Bay, would be accelerated by the establishment of modern and rapid transit facilities; and

Whereas tentative plans have been prepared by J. B. Strauss, of Chicago, and M. M. O'Shaughnessy, chief engineer of the city and county of San Francisco, for the construction of a bridge connecting the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, which plans are both practical and economical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the War Department be respectfully petitioned to improve or correct, if necessary, the proposed plans for said bridge between the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, and to order that a hearing be held in the near future, to determine whether or not said bridge would be a hindrance and obstacle to navigation in said waters.

Adopted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 4, 1923.

Ayes: Supervisors Bath, Colman, Deasy, Hayden, Hynes, McGregor, McSheehy, Morgan, Mulvihill, Powers, Robb, Rossi, Schmitz, Scott, Shannon, Welch, Wetmore—17.

Absent: Supervisor McLeran—1.

J. S. DUNNIGAN, *Clerk*.

Approved, San Francisco, September 7, 1923.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr., *Mayor*.

Because the bridge rests on Federal military reservations on either side of the Golden Gate and crosses navigable waters, it was necessary to secure a grant from the War Department. In reaching its conclusions on the issuance of this grant, the War Department held exhaustive hearings before United States Army Engineers in the city of San Francisco, at which the strategic importance of such a bridge in national defense plans was demonstrated. It was pointed out that the large number of military and naval establishments in and around San Francisco at that time would be directly connected by the bridge and eliminate the use of the circuitous and antiquated ferry system, which required three-quarters of an hour as compared with less than 5 minutes by use of the bridge.

The important geographical and strategic location of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area to the security of this Government in the event of war in the Pacific and the fact that the bridge would bring the huge empire to the north of the Golden Gate into direct traffic communication with the great seaport city of San Francisco, were both emphasized. That high naval and military officials were aware of this importance is amply indicated by a statement made by Admiral Charles F. Hughes, while Chief of Naval Operations, in testifying before a congressional committee, when he said:

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. For its natural advantages and its location San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific.

Full justification of these early predictions are to be found in the fact that today San Francisco is the greatest port of embarkation in this country, if not in the entire world, and that the San Francisco Bay area is a literal beehive of military and naval activity. Within that area are to be found the Presidio Reservation, one of the largest in the country, which was established during the Spanish regime, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Miley, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, Mare Island Navy Yard, Hamilton Field Bombing Base, other great airfields and military establishments at Sacramento and Stockton, the Sausalito shipyards, the great naval base at Hunters Point, as well as a host of other war industrial establishments. In addition, a large percentage of food supplies and materials necessary to sustain our forces on the Pacific are produced in the Sacramento, Napa, and Sonoma Valleys and in the great redwood empire. They are brought into San Francisco over the Golden Gate Bridge.

On December 20, 1924, the then Secretary of War, John W. Weeks, in a communication addressed to me as chairman of the commercial development and bridge committee of the board of supervisors, stated that the project met with the entire approval of the War Department. He instructed the proponent to proceed with their plans and advised them of the conditions under which this approval was given and the permit granted.

Immediately following this the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge was assured, for the necessary State legislation was then enacted creating the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district. An election was held under the provisions of the laws of the State of California to provide a bond issue of $35,000,000 to finance the project, which required a two-thirds majority favorable vote.

Because of the interest shown throughout the preliminary stages by Joseph B. Strauss in gratuitously furnishing his services, a contract was entered into appointing him as chief engineer. Associated with him at the express request of the bridge directorate, of which William P. Filmer was chairman, were Messrs. O. H. Ammann and Leon S. Moisseiff, world renowned bridge engineers, whose contributions were largely responsible for changing the design of the bridge from the ugly cantilever type originally proposed, to the graceful suspension bridge now spanning the Golden Gate.

And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I may be forgiven for my pardonable pride in having been directly associated with the Golden Gate Bridge from its inception, both as a member of the original citizens committee of five and officially as a director of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district from its creation to the present time.

The value of the Golden Gate Bridge to national defense is further demonstrated by the fact that practically all north and south troop and supply movements along the entire Pacific coast pass over the bridge to save the time which would be lost by the use of a long-since-outmoded privately owned ferry system. The value of the time-saving bridge would be incalculable in the event of an attempted invasion at any point along the Pacific coast.

As I have already stated, this great bridge is one of the engineering marvels of modern times. It is the longest single clear-span bridge in the world, being 4,200 feet in length. It is 700 feet longer than the George Washington Memorial Bridge, which crosses the Hudson River. The towers, which support 36-inch cables, carry the full weight of the bridge span and are 746 feet above mean high water, or approximately 200 feet higher than the Washington Monument here in the Nation's Capital. These 36-inch cables contain approximately 80,000 miles of wire and were woven in place on the bridge at the rate of 173 tons of wire per day. The vertical load on each pier is 164,800,000 pounds, and they are sunk into bedrock. Their great size can probably be appreciated to some extent by a description of the south pier at the San Francisco end of the bridge. Its depth extends from 44 feet above to 100 feet below the water level, its base area is 80 feet by 160 feet, while its top area is 65 feet by 140 feet, and it contains 152,311 cubic yards of concrete.

This magnificent structure was built during the depth of the depression and

without a single dollar of Government aid, and it marks the triumph of public enterprise so well demonstrated by the city of San Francisco and her sister counties to the north.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, It was my privilege to accompany the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative HOLMES, when he inspected the Golden Gate Bridge. On behalf of the people of my district I thank him for his generous and complete report of the Government toll situation as it actually exists. I thank him for his remarks today.

The military and naval forces on official business will continue to pass over toll free. This is as it should be. For 90 different Government agencies to use this bridge toll free has been an abuse of every idea in the original permit. The distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has unanimously passed H. R. 2912 and I trust the House itself will do likewise. It is in the interest of fair play to the taxpayers of the highway district.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, responding to the inquiry raised by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I want to point out that the Golden Gate Bridge, on each end, rests on property of the United States. This land was paid for and vast damages were paid to the National Government for the moving of certain buildings, the buildings still being intact and usable by the Government. While the bridge has been tremendously useful to the Nation during this war, not 1 cent of its cost was paid by the Federal Government. All the money came or will come out of the tolls collected or the taxes levied by the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district. It is only reasonable and fair that everything but military traffic should pay its way, when riding over the bridge. Ninety or more Governmental agencies, relations of military personnel, and others are now using this bridge free. This bill only provides that the traffic of that kind pay the toll the same as any citizen who uses the bridge.

Thank God that the citizens of this bridge district had the courage and the vision to build this bridge, which would be invaluable in the event of any attack on the San Francisco Bay area. They built it and are going to pay for it and all they ask is that "deadhead traffic," never dreamed of when the permit was granted, pay its way.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on H. R. 2183.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 7 (c) OF ACT OF MAY 21, 1920, AS AMENDED

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 972) to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 972, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (c) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes", approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1648), is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. This bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It does not involve Army appropriations, but only Navy appropriations, so far as the armed services are concerned. It is a Senate bill. The bill amends section 7 (c) of an act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), so that it will read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapes under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

Section 2 of the act of June 22, 1936, is hereby repealed.

This bill was passed upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, as shown by a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated April 5, 1942, which letter is incorporated in the hearings of the House Committee on Expenditures, to which this bill was referred. During the afternoon this bill was called on the Consent Calendar and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] called my attention to the following language in the House committee report:

As it now stands, the War Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on orders necessarily delayed.

That is a typographical error. That language should read:

As it now stands, the Navy Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the War Department on orders necessarily delayed.

The report was gone over carefully and I am unable to say whether the typographical error was my own, or whether it was an error in the printing, but the report followed similar language in the said letter of the Secretary. It had not been called to my attention previously. It is an error, and I am correcting it now. The bill itself shows, and the report of the committee as well as the hearings in the Senate and the hearings in the House, that the purpose of this bill is to enable the Navy Department, without competing with the War Department, to procure from and give orders to the War Department for small arms, small arms ammunition, and a large part of field artillery used by the Marine Corps.

Due to the inability of the War Department to obligate Navy funds allocated to it for the purchase of small arms in the same manner that the Navy obligates funds to a private concern, the War Department is unable to handle Navy contracts efficiently in all cases.

The purpose of this bill is to place the Army on the same status that a private contractor is placed. Under existing law, if the Navy Department gives orders for arms and for guns to a private contractor, the question would not arise and those funds would be available not only for the fiscal year but for a period of 2 years. My understanding is that in general, under existing law, money that is appropriated by Congress must be obligated before the end of the fiscal year and payments must be completed within 2 years thereafter. Unless the funds are obligated before the end of the fiscal year, the authority to obligate those funds will lapse, and unless payments are made within 2 years, the moneys appropriated will revert to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

Unfortunately that has not been true with respect to contracts placed by the Navy Department with the Army Department. The purpose of the bill is to provide that orders placed by one Government agency or department with another shall be considered as obligations, as set forth in the report of the committee, and to place those contracts made by the Navy Department with the Army Department upon the same basis as if the Navy Department had made a contract with a private contractor.

As stated in the report, the Comptroller General has advised that the bill would give to the War Department and to other governmental agencies the same latitude as to availability of moneys set up in working funds as is now enjoyed

by the Navy Department. The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department, with the approval of the Budget, and it has the approval of the Comptroller General.

I read in this connection from the letter of the Secretary of the Navy transmitting his request to the House. This letter is embraced in the report of the committee in both the House and the Senate, for the passage of this legislation:

> While, as noted above, the Navy Department has authority under the act of June 2, 1937, to obligate its appropriations by such intergovernmental orders, the Navy Department is impeded in carrying out its program by the fact that the War Department does not have corresponding authority, so that the latter Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on the orders necessarily delayed.

As I have stated, the report of the committee follows this language, but as I have also stated, the language is not correct and I might add is confusing. It is correct to say the Navy Department cannot pay the Army Department. The Army Department is debarred from making the contracts if they cannot be executed within a year.

I am advised by the Secretary of the Navy that this legislation is important because we are approaching the end of the fiscal year. It is important that the bill be passed as promptly as possible in order to utilize the remaining days of this fiscal year to clear those transactions that still remain to be completed between the Army and the Navy. The situation is more critical at this time than it would normally be, since it was as recent as March 31 that the Bureau received an additional $1,000,000,000 in supplemental appropriations. The War Department, under existing circumstances, needs fully 30 days to process Navy orders, and this would concentrate the whole supplemental program into a space of less than 2 months. I am advised that the specific instances requiring passage of this legislation in order to prevent delay, to prevent duplication, to prevent competition between the Army and the Navy, involve Navy requisitions of June 22, 1942, $2,047,000, and Navy requisitions of June 25, July 10, and July 30, all in 1942, involving large amounts of money.

Unless there be some questions by some Members of the House, I should like to say in conclusion that this bill was considered by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. It was referred properly to the Committee on Expenditures in the House. It is recommended, as stated by the Secretary of the Navy, and is necessary to enable the Secretary of the Navy to procure small arms, including cannon, used by the Marine Corps, from the War Department.

Unless there are some questions I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statements which have been made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] calling attention to the fact that the confusion in this bill arose over a misstatement in the report. I think the language which is in the report follows the language which is in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, so that I think possibly the occasion for the confusion goes back further than the gentleman from Mississippi or the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am advised that is an error.

Mr. CASE. However, on the face of it, as the report came to us and as the bill came to us on the Consent Calendar, it would appear that we had legislation requested by the Navy Department, dealing with funds of the War Department. As a matter of fact, upon analysis, it appears that the truth is that these are funds of the Navy Department which it turns to the War Department to be deposited in a special fund to complete the procurement of certain ordnance items which the War Department buys for the Navy Department.

As has been stated, the Navy Department can get rid of its funds before the end of the fiscal year by placing a contract with private contractors. When those contracts are placed with the War Department, however, inhibitions of existing law would make the money lapse if not actually expended or obligated by the War Department before the end of the fiscal year.

I am going to go along with this legislation because of the war situation, but I do think attention should be called to the fact that section 2 of the bill before us repeals section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936, for which there was a sound reason at the time it was passed. That section which is repealed reads as follows:

> After June 30, 1936, advance payments under the provisions of title VI, part 2, of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933 shall have no longer period of availability for obligation than the appropriation from which said advance payments are made.

Certainly it is sound legislation that the Congress should provide that money should not be made available for expenditure indefinitely. On the face of it, the repeal of this section would indicate a tendency to repeal the prohibition against indefinite availability of funds.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am advised that the insertion of that section is necessary, and I am sympathetic with the gentleman's statement that funds ought to be returned promptly, any part that remains unexpended; but the Navy has that power now with respect to private contractors, and inasmuch as we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, while I am in agreement with the gentleman's statement personally, I think he is justified in going along with this bill, because it will take a great deal of time to get another bill started through the other body and back to this body. So I think we can now take care of the subject matter by an amendment to the bill.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement the gentleman has made. I am calling attention to the repeal of this provision because I think, when Congress comes to revise some of the wartime legislation, this is one section to which attention should be given. I am not suggesting that under present conditions anyone would try to exploit it, but what this bill does is to create the possibility for the Navy Department, or any other branch of the Government to which it applies, when it comes to the end of the fiscal year, with a considerable balance of funds on its hands and not wanting to have that money revert and go back to the Treasury, to say, "Here, we have this money; is there any reason why we should not use it?" And then to place some new contracts, in order to obligate the money before the end of the year in order to capture any money that had not been actually expended.

I merely call attention to the fact that there might come a time under which such use of this legislation could be made.

Because of the present situation and our common understanding that demands for production are so heavy, and that it may be impossible to complete certain contracts in the few days before the end of the fiscal year, I am not opposing the bill. It would be unfortunate, with the war in progress, if the contracts could not be completed. But, Mr. Speaker, when we review wartime legislation, here is one piece of legislation that should be reviewed, and Congress, at that time, should reassert existing law, which provides that appropriations shall not be available for expenditure indefinitely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say that, of course, they do not have an indefinite period; the appropriations are carried over for an additional 2 years. Under the terms of this bill may I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is provided that funds shall be governed and obligations paid as now provided by law?

Mr. CASE. Yes, the appropriation can lapse in time if other law so provides, but it does remove the control of Congress over certain funds by extending their availability when otherwise they could not be used. Also, by repealing section 8 of the act of June 22, 1936, apparently it destroys limitations on the availability of other funds that might be in the hands of some agencies or departments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; but the funds would not be available under the section here, following the year in which they were appropriated. I was advised to that effect.

Mr. CASE. I hope the gentleman is correctly advised, but certainly the question having come up, that statement ought to be made a part of the legislative record on this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. And if the gentleman finds that there is any other matter which is not taken care of that

should be corrected, I will join him in making the correction.

Mr. CASE. I am sure the gentleman feels that way. Since in the War Department appropriation bill we carry a definite period of availability for funds, as a member of the subcommittee concerned with that bill I did not want this legislation to pass without calling attention to the fact that it should be reconsidered when we come to reviewing and revising or repealing wartime legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$300,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker this bill relates to title II of the so-called War Defense Housing Act and authorizes an additional appropriation under that title.

Title II of this act does not have to do with housing as such but with public works and so-called community facilities within these areas where defense housing has been constructed under the act to the extent that housing is not otherwise available and cannot be supplied by private capital. Under title II funds are used for such things as extensions of water systems, sewerage systems, access roads, and additional school facilities as the need for such facilities may be augmented by the in-migrant workers and their families, such additional hospitalization as may be approved arising from the same cause, and so forth.

In the authorizations which have heretofore emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with reference to this act, the funds authorized under title II have equaled one-half of the funds authorized for the actual construction of the housing. The appropriations which have followed these authorizations have been in exactly the same ratio.

In the last Congress we appropriated $600,000,000 for additional war housing of this character. No further authorization or appropriation has been made with reference to title II or the servicing of these war-housing projects in the respects which I have indicated, and this bill provides for an authorization of $200,000,000, which is only one-third of the authorization and appropriation heretofore made for housing since there has been any authorization or appropriation for these public works or so-called community facilities.

Under title II at present there are $175,000,000 worth of approved applications pending for which no funds are available, and there are many other applications not yet approved by reason of the fact that no money is available to meet the requested aid. These various facilities are scattered all over the United States in these various housing project areas, which are areas of congested defense industry where great numbers of in-migrant workers have been brought into the communities.

The committee was unanimous in its report on this bill. It realized the urgent necessity for this work to be done.

I should like now to afford an opportunity to anyone who wishes to make any inquiry with reference to it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas how much is included in this $200,000,000 for public schools? And what part of the $175,000,000 in applications on hand represents requests for public-school facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman those figures accurately from memory, but I should like to tell him the nature of the funds that are distributed and allotted for educational purposes.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the gentleman in doing that if he will also explain to the House what the procedure is on the part of the Federal agency in granting funds for public school facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. I will. There is no purpose under this act to interfere in any way with the operation of any school where funds are made available by loan or grant in these various congested areas. The law specifically provides:

"No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be extended pursuant to this title, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this title relating to or any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title to or on behalf of any such school prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction.

When these in-migrant workers are brought to one of these congested defense areas and it is necessary for this public housing to be constructed in order to provide them suitable living quarters which cannot be otherwise provided, there is by reason of the fact that many of them have taken their families with them quite an addition in many instances to the school population. There is no desire or purpose to have those children of in-migrant workers made a burden upon the communities into which they are taken. When a school is built within a war housing project itself for the accommodation of these children it is a temporary structure that is built by the Federal Government for that purpose. When an addition is necessary to an existing school within one of these areas then the addition is made to that school. There has been no controversy whatever with reference to the construction. The survey is made to determine what is necessary.

Then frequently, by reason of the number of children of these in-migrant workers being considerable, an additional teaching force is necessary. Those teachers are selected by the local authorities. Whenever an application is made for an addition to a school or for additional teachers under the provisions of this act a survey is made, consultation is had with the people of the local district or area, and they get together and determine what should be done to meet that local need.

Then the construction that is necessary is made in practically every instance by competitive bids through a contractor. There has been no controversy with reference to that feature of it. The money is paid to the local district authorities of the schools to pay for the additional teachers necessary. In other words, the Federal Works Agency does not in any way interfere with the operation or the curriculum or any of the other features of their normal school development.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman state that the funds which are herein authorized are to apply only in cases where the housing is built as temporary housing and may be removed?

Mr. LANHAM. No; because in some instances, and especially with reference to plants that will be continued perhaps in reduced operation after the war from the standpoint of our national defense, it is wiser policy to place an addition on an existing school which would not necessarily be temporary because there would be a permanent need for it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean, must the housing be of a temporary nature in order that the additional authorization for improvements contained in this bill

shall apply to that particular area. Is that the case?

Mr. LANHAM. No; not necessarily. If these in-migrant workers are brought in, they are the basis of the consideration. For instance, if the school population has been materially increased by the addition of the children of these in-migrant workers, although there might be available housing in the community for them, there would still be an additional burden upon the schools.

Mr. HINSHAW. As the gentleman knows, in the district which I represent, there is much additional housing that has been built for war workers and not through this particular agency. It has been done through the F. H. A.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do the funds authorized in this act apply to that type of condition; that is, for the improvement of the sewer system, schools, and so forth, in that kind of an area, or must it be solely the kind of area that has defense housing in it?

Mr. LANHAM. We are trying to look after these war areas from the standpoint of their needs. Of course, most of the housing to which the gentleman refers has come through the Federal Housing Authority under legislation emanating from the Banking and Currency Committee. I assume that perhaps in that law there is some provision with reference to that particular feature.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; there is not.

Mr. LANHAM. But we try through this act, insofar as we can, to meet these community facility needs which the war and the war industries have imposed upon these various communities.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly the question I want to ask because I have one of those areas that does not have any defense housing project in it, but nevertheless, it is built up with a great many new small homes that were built under F. H. A. to house war workers. What I want to know is, Do the funds authorized in this act apply to such necessary improvements as must be made in those particular districts?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, I am inclined to think that they would, although the provisions of this act were put in with special reference to this particular situation, but I should be glad to take that up with the administrative authorities to find out to what extent such provision is not in the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it less fair to aid a community which has already aided itself than to aid a community that has not aided itself?

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, I am very anxious to see all these communities that have had burdens placed upon them by these migrant workers taken care of.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope that the gentleman will cause the law to be so amended that it may include an area such as I have described.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Further in reply to the gentleman from California, I believe I am correct in the assertion that it is not necessary to have a housing project in order to participate in these funds. If it is an area where you have migration and it is caused by a war industry, whether or not you have a housing project you are eligible to the Federal Works Administration funds as set forth in this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. That is my interpretation because the whole basis of the consideration is the extra burden on the population caused by these in-migrant workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to first make an observation, then ask a question. May I say that the gentleman has filled his promise to me when the original legislation was up that this would apply to school facilities. I recall that I asked that question at the time. I want to say, too, that the Federal Works Agency has done well in my State and I have no complaint to make except in reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, namely, To what extent are the local school authorities enlisted in the survey to determine these projects?

Mr. LANHAM. They are enlisted, they are consulted with reference to their needs. A survey is made by them, a survey is made by the Federal Works Agency, they get together, they determine their local needs, and they try to meet those needs.

Mr. MURDOCK. In other words, it is not someone in the community outside the school system, but the superintendent and his fellow workers?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct; the educational board that has control over the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the Federal Works Agency carries out the matter as the gentleman has discussed it.

Mr. LANHAM. They have. I have heard some talk of a new directive that is going to change the rules and regulations. We had the general counsel of the Federal Works Agency come before our committee and he said there was no such directive and there was no such contemplated change in the rules and regulations.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Am I not correct in the assertion that there was not a single department head nor any of our local people back in our local areas that objected to this particular bill? We had no objections to it whatever.

Mr. LANHAM. There is no doubt about the necessity for this money. They have not had a penny since we appropriated the $600,000,000 for the additional war housing.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is not going beyond the bounds of reason to say that many school authorities in this country feel, and there is apprehension, that an effort is being made on the part of the powers that be in Washington to gain control of the public schools of this country. I believe that apprehension to be well founded.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my friend that it was for that reason that in the original law we placed that provision I quoted, so that as far as this law is concerned it cannot be done. Under this act it cannot be done because all they can do is construct such additional buildings as may be necessary for the increased burden in the schools. Then as to the money that they supply for additional teaching force, the teachers are selected by the local authorities themselves.

Mr. DONDERO. What becomes of these school buildings after the emergency is over or at the end of the war?

Mr. LANHAM. This is purely a duration measure. The act itself provides that there shall be disposition at the end of the war of the property constructed under this act. With reference to the housing, such of it as was originally permanent, and some then had to be, although it is practically all temporary now, will be sold. The temporary housing will be sold or salvaged. These various sewer extensions, water extensions, and things of that kind, will be disposed of in these various cities or communities upon the best terms the Government can make, but they are now absolutely necessary for carrying on our war work.

Mr. DONDERO. Are these school buildings permanent in nature or are they simply temporary in nature?

Mr. LANHAM. They are usually temporary, especially where they are built within the housing project area itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas. He is doing a good job.

Mr. LANHAM. Sometimes there may be a community where there is a permanent plant like an airplane plant that will be carried on with reduced production after the war, and some in-migrant workers will still be there, which will make a permanent need. Under those circumstances it is frequently much better to put a permanent addition upon an existing school building than it is to build one that is merely temporary.

Mr. DONDERO. Do the Federal authorities that administer this Act cooperate with and through the State educational authorities in the various States, in addition to the local school boards?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, but the local school board, of course, and the Federal Works Agency are the best ones to determine what the existing war need is in a particular place. The war need in this regard is not general in any State, it is in these congested defense areas. For instance, with reference to sewerage, when they get their applications back to Washington, the agency gets the approval of

the Bureau of Public Health." When they get these applications back in school matters they consult the Office of Education.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman says that certain allocations are made. Are they made on the basis of the priorities available?

Mr. LANHAM. At first we did have some trouble with reference to priorities under this act, but we are assured by the War Production Board and by those who have the administrative control of this Act that those matters have all been settled and that they anticipate no further trouble in the matter of priorities for these essential war works.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is not that a very recent thing?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, relatively recent.

Mrs. BOLTON. If, on the other hand, there may be some allocations that have been made for which no priorities have been granted——

Mr. LANHAM. They would come under the recent decision, if they are still pending.

Mrs. BOLTON. But possibly some of the need for those approved and not having priorities has passed, so that there are allocations made for more money than is expendable.

Mr. LANHAM. There are at present $175,000,000 approved applications.

Mrs. BOLTON. I know they are approved, but not on the basis of priorities.

Mr. LANHAM. They are approved on the basis of need, and we have been assured by the War Production Board that where that need exists they will get the priorities.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but the priorities have not actually been gotten.

Mr. LANHAM. There has been no money to do the work. The applications are pending. They have scraped the bottom of the barrel and there have been no funds either authorized or appropriated under this title since we appropriated the $600,000,000 for the housing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but some of those that were appropriated for have not had priorities, so that there could be a fund that is available for present use.

Mr. LANHAM. The authorities tell us they are out of funds and have all these applications pending.

Mrs. BOLTON. If some investigation were made. some funds might be available.

Mr. LANHAM. My belief is that they are going to find it very difficult to get along on the amount herein authorized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What proportion of the $200,000,000 carried in this bill will be used for services rather than for construction?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman, from memory, those exact proportions—they were presented to us in the hearings—but necessarily quite a little bit of it goes for services. It goes for services in supplying teachers, for instance. It goes for services in supplying hospitals.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As chairman of the committee the gentleman surely has some information he can give the House as to this amount of money, and the proportion being used for services.

Mr. LANHAM. In a way it is all services, even the construction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not talking about the construction. I am talking about paying personnel for child welfare and for other matters.

Mr. LANHAM. I see now to what the gentleman is referring. With reference to these child welfare centers, in each of these communities where these in-migrant workers come with their families, there are a great many young children whose parents are working in these war plants. A great many of the children are under school age; they cannot even attend school, and the parents could not work unless there was some supervision and care of their little children during the time they do work. So we have made provision for their care. However, their parents pay for all their food, and they pay for a good part of their supervisory care. There are some instances where they pay as high as 80 percent, and but for the fact we do that, these parents could not work in these war plants.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I still ask the gentleman from Texas how much of this money is going for operating expenses?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman means with reference to child care?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I mean altogether, for recreation, for child welfare, and everything else. How much is going into actual construction of the buildings?

Mr. LANHAM. Those figures are in the hearings and it may be that some other member of the committee may remember them accurately. But both the construction and the service are needed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman give me any idea?

Mr. LANHAM. Most of it, of course, is for construction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill is certainly in no shape to be passed under suspension of the rules. It involves $200,000,000. We cannot find how much of it is for construction and how much is for nursing or child welfare or for recreational facilities or educational work that the Federal Works Agency is going to finance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman might ascertain how much was spent out of the former $600,000,000 appropriated for construction, and how much was actually used for other purposes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I could not find out anything; there are no hearings, but we find that $175,000,000 of applications have been approved, and we don't know by whom.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I cannot yield. The gentleman can perhaps answer some of these questions in his own time. I don't know whether $175,000,000 has been approved by the War Production Board or not. I understand that $50,000,000 of the amount they still have has not been approved and will not be approved by the War Production Board. There is a $400,000,000 bill for this same Federal Works Agency that is to come up before the Rules Committee tomorrow, and these two bills should be considered together, and under rules, where we would have some hearings and where we would have an opportunity to learn the facts and consider amendments and not be shoved through under suspension of the rules. I found out today that one board of education was offered $4,700 by a Federal Works agent. They asked what for, and were told for child care, for taking care of children. The board then said that they took care of their own children without Federal help. And they were then asked whether they could not use the money anyhow, because it was available for them. I would like to know how many instances like that are going on. I found out to my amazement that these facilities, which as far as the figures here show go for not merely public utilities but for various kinds of welfare and recreational facilities, are available not only to communities that the Federal Works Agency have built, but in any other community where there is any war industry that needs help or can be persuaded to accept it. We have other Federal agencies—I do not know how many of them—that are attempting to come in and use local existing agencies. What we have here is obviously another attempt by a Federal bureau to take on a lot of activities that have nothing to do with its real business, the construction of buildings.

It seems to me that unless and until we can get the facts, and the hearings, and find out how much is approved for what and gear this in with the $400,000,000, we had better not pass this bill. There is no attempt to give us the full facts. As to the proportions for various purposes we don't know. As to the educational facilities here is another example of where a Federal bureau comes in and says, yes, there is money for education: of course, we have nothing to do with the kind of education that you furnish, but you have to come to us for the money.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. There is nothing in the Lanham Act that has anything to do with education, only insofar as an emergency in connection with a war industry is concerned, at those school facilities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Who determines this emergency?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The local authorities, together with the Federal Works.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; and unless the Federal Works says there is an emergency and that the money is to be used

for educational purposes, the community does not get it. That gives the agency control of the situation. What in the world has the Federal Works to do with education or with recreational matters, or with taking care of babies?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The gentleman should get the whole picture. The gentleman should read the Lanham Act. The gentleman himself is referring to two different appropriations out of that act, and one is providing for school facilities, sewer mains, water mains, and even child care.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Child care under a Federal Works Agency.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This provides facilities and has nothing to do with the care of children, but in industrial areas——

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In war areas, whether Federal Works has anything to do with the area or not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. If it is a war emergency proposition they make a contribution, but they have nothing to do with the hiring of the help.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the kind of thing I am trying to stop, contributions by rival agencies in the name of war emergencies, so as to perpetuate and expand the powers of the agencies, and paralyze local initiative and responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio, and knowing his splendid record I am of the full realization that he has not read or carefully analyzed this bill, because this bill is simply enabling legislation giving $200,000,000 to continue a program that my distinguished colleague voted for twice before and never raised his voice in objection.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply an extension of facilities. It does not include the construction of a single house. It takes care of schools, sewers, hospitals, and other facilities the need of which is caused by the immigration of labor and where the local community cannot stand the additional burden of the required additions.

The technique of those who oppose various legislation is changing, Mr. Speaker. The technique of some of the bureau heads who do not have their own way is changing. They used to come before our committee and set forth their argument—it seems as though the committee was a little tough on some of them and inquired into the operations of their particular department. Now, these department heads, or their assistants stay away from our committee and wait until the bill comes on the floor of Congress and then they call up their particular friends especially those from their own State and ask them to make certain speeches and give these friends certain figures which that particular bureau head cannot back up in any manner, shape or form. I know the gentleman who called my colleagues from Ohio, and he is a distinguished citizen of Ohio. I hope some of these days he will have the intestinal fortitude to come before our committee when he opposes certain legislation so that we can question him about some of the activities of the department which he heads. He wants to control part of this money. That is the whole story behind this opposition. This particular individual, in a policy-forming department, wants this money turned over to him so that he can promote himself into a job and take away from our local school people and local municipal officials the rights that they have under the Lanham Act.

There has been no one before our committee who opposed this bill. We have had extensive hearings. We gave this bureau head the right to come before us, but he did not appear. But he has certainly made the telephone wires buzz in the last 24 hours.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There are no hearings available to us to answer the questions and the chairman of the committee cannot answer them. He cannot answer these natural questions that come up when we try to find out how this money is being spent.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. LANHAM. Since reference has been made by my distinguished colleague to the fact that $10,000,000 have been used for that purpose, the people to whom he refers wanted us to turn over $20,000,000 to them to use as they pleased.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct; and that is the crux of this whole situation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In spite of all that has been said, do you not think that this Congress is still entitled to know how much money you have actually spent in the construction of buildings, how much money you have actually spent for public service, how much you contemplate spending out of this appropriation for construction, and how much you expect to spend for services?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman could get that information by picking up the telephone and asking the administrative authorities.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I cannot get it from the chairman of the committee that has held hearings on the floor, I do not believe I can get it from the gentlemen downtown. It is hard for me to understand the reticence that exists among the members of this committee. Why do you not want to tell the Congress what this is for?

Mr. LANHAM. I have nothing that I am withholding, nothing that I am not entirely willing to disclose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, whether you are withholding it or not, we have not had the information.

Mr. LANHAM. I have just told you with reference to this matter where $10,000,000 was spent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are talking about an entirely different matter. You are not talking about your own bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say that question on a few separate items was asked of our distinguished chairman on one particular bill. I might say to my distinguished colleague, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that if we were to ask him about all the details of every one of his bills that comes before us for consideration, we would have quite a time getting him to explain them. The hearings will show a complete break-down of all items—covering the money spent, and, I believe, a chart showing the contemplated expenditures. But remember, Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply for a continuation of a program that is now in progress of giving assistance to local districts who find they need money for schools, hospitals, extension of sewers, and other facilities—the need of which is caused by additional people coming into their district to participate in the war effort—and which they as a local unit cannot finance alone—and before this money is allocated or spent the local people are consulted and 90 cases out of 100—the request for this assistance comes from the local people. This money is not spent where it is not wanted—only when it is absolutely needed.

We have had no one appear before the committee in opposition to this bill. And, we had the absolute assurance that the local people will be taken into consideration on the educational situation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to ask the gentleman about one thing: I understand there has been no objection registered with the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. My school administrator in my State tells me some of the administrative procedures under this original act have been unsatisfactory. We have been trying to get a hearing and I am asking for information about it. Have there not been registered with the committee protests on the part of educational administrators regarding this?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the State superintendents wanted us to turn the money over to their educational funds. It is a temporary measure, for the duration of the war.

Title II involves matters with reference to the public schools, public roads, and many other governmental agencies. If these various functions under title II were turned over to these respective agencies, the cost of administration and the increase of personnel would be greatly enhanced. The investigations with reference to school needs have been made in the local communities by the local

school authorities and they have presented their allocations and there has been a survey by these local boards and by the Federal Works Agencies to determine these needs, and I think it can be truthfully stated that these local school boards have been generally well satisfied with the operation.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman sure of that? In other words, was he or not impressed with the soundness of the argument made by the State administrator and others that there will be made objections on the part of local administrators?

Mr. LANHAM. I was not, because this is merely a temporary provision for the duration and that is why it is being handled in this manner. We have not sought to make this a permanent law. Congress can pass on that independently when that question arises.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let me just make this statement. We have appropriated in the past $1,200,000,000 for public housing, and I can appreciate what is needed in many parts of this country because I have personally made a very thorough inspection of the housing program. I am familiar with the operations of municipalities, and in connection with the increased construction of homes, whether it be public homes or private, in the war areas, that has certainly required an extension of public facilities, and that situation cannot be helped.

We have tried to keep the operations separate under the two Lanham acts, one of which deals distinctly with the Federal housing and the other distinctly with facilities in connection with the development of the housing program.

We did not give the Federal Works Administrator one cent when we increased the public housing appropriation $600,000,000 last fall. There are pending in many of these war emergency areas today requests for additional sewer facilities, water facilities, hospital facilities; there are many units that must be provided in these communities. We must give the Federal Works Agency more money in order that they may continue to build these facilities that are very, very necessary to enjoy the benefits of the housing programs, and the money has been authorized for that kind of facilities.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to know where there might be available to the Members of Congress a statement as to the States in which this money has been spent that was previously appropriated and for what purposes.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I have a copy of that in my office. They were inserted in the hearings that we have held for the last 3 or 4 weeks. My impression was that the hearings have been printed and were ready for distribution.

Mr. BUSBEY. We can get that from the gentleman's office, then.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes. Regardless of what has been said, we are not trying to build up through this medium of appropriation any other department of Government. When we get through with this emergency housing program we want to be in a position where we can liquidate and salvage whatever we can out of the money we have spent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the time of debate be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous consent request could be submitted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this bill be extended for 10 minutes and that I be allotted 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman having 3 minutes but I should object to his request that debate be continued for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that debate on the bill be extended 10 minutes and he be allotted 3 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will modify his request to 3 minutes I will not object. We have another bill to be called up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes on the pending bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have such confidence and faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which committee brings this bill to the House that what I am about to say is in no way to be taken as opposition to the bill or in criticism of the committee. The service of our able friend and colleague on the committees of this House and in this House is an important contribution to the legislative work of this Nation.

What I said a few minutes ago was that there was apprehension among school officials of many of the States of this Union that there was an indirect or subtle effort being made on the part of bureaus in the Federal Government to obtain control of the public school system of this country. That suspicion or apprehension is well founded. For example, all of us know that in another body a bill has already been introduced to provide a subsidy to the extent of $300,000,000 annually, $200,000,000 of which is to pay school teachers. If that is not an effort to gain control, political or otherwise, of the school system of this country I do not know what is. Under the guise of war, social gains, and the extension of Federal aid, attempts are being made to gain control of public education. We all know that the war effort has created problems in many communities that the local units cannot solve. I come from such a community. Within sight of my home there has been constructed in the metropolitan area of Detroit the tank plant that is making the 28-ton tanks, the medium tanks, and also the naval arsenal making guns for the United States Navy. With the coming of these two factories, one of them erected in a cornfield, there came tremendous problems that local school boards, and local officials, could not solve without help. It is obvious that the Federal Government must step in and aid those communities. The bill before us has as its objective the providing of such aid. I am in favor of this measure and shall vote for it.

In supporting this bill I also insist that our public school system be kept under the control of our local and state authorities.

In the last 10 years a Federal colossus of 92 new agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions have been established in the Nation's Capital. Confusion and chaos is the result and a growing resentment among the people. Let us be sure that by this legislation we do not add to the powers of any one of these bureaus, particularly the Federal Works Agency, in the administration of this act.

In this connection I call particular attention to the following letter I received from Dr. Eugene B. Elliott, superintendent of public instruction, Michigan:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Lansing, Mich., June 18, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONDERO: I understand a new bill appropriating funds for schools and other community facilities in war areas has been introduced in Congress.

The act which has been in effect since the start of the war has been known as Public Act 137, or the Lanham Act. Under this act we have had several school building and maintenance and operation projects in Michigan.

The Lanham Act wisely carries a provision which states that the operation of this act must in no way interfere with the administration, operation, or the instructional program in schools. While it seems that the Congress has made itself perfectly clear in the matter of school operation, nevertheless the act is administered by the Federal Works Agency, a noneducational agency, and we understand there is a recent directive to the effect that it will not be necessary for this agency to have certification of need from the State department or United States Office of Education for either school construction or maintenance and operation funds.

In other words, the procedure is something like this: a Federal Works Agency person makes direct contact with the school district, both in preparing the application for funds and subsequently delivering the checks in person to the school boards. Along with this, in some programs, there is a service audit by the Federal Works Agency, which means that it not only audits the funds but also the services rendered by the school district. It is our feeling that this kind of procedure will eventually affect administration, supervision, operation, and even the instruc-

tional programs in the schools. We therefore recommended that the act be further amended so that all funds for school construction, and maintenance, and operation be channeled through the United States Office of Education, and in turn through the State department of education. They are the legal and constitutional educational agencies.

These Lanham funds amount to less than 1 percent of our school operating funds and it seems entirely unnecessary and undesirable that a Federal engineering agency retain a separate staff to deal with school operation.

It is our hope that you will give this matter your very serious consideration because we feel that it is fundamental to State-Federal relationship.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE B. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, in previous legislation from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, enacted by this House and known as Public Act 137 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Lanham Act, a provision was included to the effect that the operation of the act must in no way interfere with the functions of the public schools in the States. I urged that provision before that committee, and I am gratified that it was adopted by the Congress and made a part of the law of the country.

I am well aware that there are people in the Federal Government and perhaps some in the Federal Works Agency who desire to bypass and completely destroy that provision of the law by going into local school districts, through representatives of that Agency, make direct contact with local school boards, prepare applications for funds, make payments direct to the local school authorities in person, and completely ignore the State and county school officials. If the expansion of public-school facilities, authorized under this and previous legislation, either in the construction of additions to local school buildings or the erection of new buildings are to become a part of the school systems of the States, then certainly the county and State officials should be consulted as to the need and type of buildings to be constructed in the same manner as local school districts now have their school programs for school buildings approved by State authorities before they proceed. Such is the law in Michigan and undoubtedly is the law in many of the States of the Union.

The question may soon become an issue in this country whether or not the taxpayers want the control of their educational systems placed in the hands of some bureau or agency in Washington, a thousand or two thousand miles away, or whether those who down through the years have administered the needs of public education, the local school board, shall continue to function. That is the issue in a few words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from the superintendent of public instruction of Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 63, noes 22.

So (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of the legislative business in order for the day and any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] may be permitted to speak for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Thursday next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Edward R. Murrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS AFFECTING COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, AND RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pensions, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and Veterans Regulations, as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to benefits provided under Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended; Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; and under laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as amended: *Provided,* That where solely as a result of the definition of the term "child" in paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series as amended by this act, the child or children of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection would be entitled to benefits under the general pension law or service-pension acts reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, the rates of service pension applicable to such child or children shall be those provided in Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended.

SEC. 2. Section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 450), is further amended by adding a new subsection (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Any benefit payable or paid by the Veterans' Administration shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 556a, 454a), as now or hereafter amended: *Provided,* That in any case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay may be made in the discretion of the Administrator to the wife of such veteran for the use of the veteran and his dependents: *And provided further,* That payment of death benefits to a widow for herself and child or children, if any, may be made directly to such widow, notwithstanding she may be a minor. The act of August 8, 1882 (22 Stat. 373; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 44), is hereby repealed and any other law in conflict herewith is modified accordingly."

SEC. 3. Paragraph XXI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"XXI. Any person entitled to pension or compensation under any law or Veterans Regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration may renounce his right thereto. The application renouncing the right shall be in writing over the person's signature and upon filing of such application, payment of such benefits and the right thereto shall be terminated and he shall be denied any and all rights thereto from date of receipt of such application by the Veterans' Administration. The renouncement provided for herein shall not preclude the person from filing a new application for pension or compensation at a future date but such application shall have the attributes of an original application and no payment will be made for any period prior to the date thereof."

SEC. 4. Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents: *Provided, however,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

SEC. 5. When any person entitled to compensation, pension, or other gratuity under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration is located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or of any of its allies, any award of such benefits in favor of such person shall be terminated forthwith and such

person shall not be entitled to any such benefits except upon the filing of a new claim accompanied by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing that the claimant was not guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act: *Provided*, That no compensation, pension, or other gratuity shall be paid for any period prior to the date of such new claim: *Provided further*, That while such person is located in a territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies, any part of the benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled may, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be apportioned and paid to the dependents of such person who are in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by such enemy, except that the amount so apportioned and paid shall not exceed the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

SEC. 6. Paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "of a World War II veteran—who was married to the veteran prior to the expiration of 10 years subsequent to the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

SEC. 7. Paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VI. The term 'child' shall mean a person unmarried and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 years the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a stepchild if a member of the man's household; an illegitimate child but as to the father only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the putative father of such child: *Provided*, That the payment of pension shall be continued after the eighteenth birthday and until completion of education or training (but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years), to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn."

SEC. 8. Paragraph VII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VII. The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided*, That no more than one father and one mother, as defined, shall be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to such father or mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of entry into active service by the person who served."

SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph I (a), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended, (a) by inserting after "April 1, 1920;" the phrase "or during an enlistment or employment entered into on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress"; and (b) by inserting after the phrase "or active service in the World War" the phrase "or in World War No. 2."

(b) Paragraph I (b), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment."

SEC. 10. Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress shall be considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 11. Section 1 (c) of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended by section 1 of the act of July 19, 1939 (Public Law No. 198, 76th Cong., U. S. C., title 38, sec. 503 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of compensation under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. In determining annual income any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered: *Provided*, That where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued hereunder, payment to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow."

SEC. 12. Paragraph V, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), is amended to read as follows:

"V. (1) Pension, compensation, or retirement pay authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to which a person was entitled prior to the date of his death, and not paid during his lifetime, and due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to death under existing ratings or decisions, or those based on evidence in the file at date of death, shall, upon the death of such person, be paid as hereinafter set forth:

"(a) Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of the veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay, all or any part of such unpaid amount, to the veteran or to any other dependent or dependents as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

"(b) Upon the death of a veteran, to the surviving spouse; or if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children, dependent mother or father in the order named;

"(c) Upon the death of a widow or remarried widow, to the veteran's child or children;

"(d) Upon the death of a child, to the surviving child or children of the veteran, entitled to death compensation or pension;

"(e) In all other cases, only so much of the unpaid pension, compensation, or retirement pay may be paid as may be necessary to reimburse a person who bore the expense of last sickness and burial: *Provided, however*, That no part of any of the accrued pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall be used to reimburse any political subdivision of the United States for expense incurred in the last sickness or burial of such person;

"(f) Payment of the benefits authorized by this paragraph will not be made unless claim therefor be received in the Veterans' Administration within 1 year from the date of death of the beneficiary or 1 year after date of this enactment, whichever is later, and such claim is perfected by the submission of the necessary evidence within 1 year from the date of the request therefor by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided, however*, That a claim for compensation or pension by an apportionee, widow, child, or dependent parent shall be deemed to include claim for any accrued benefits.

"(2) A check received by a payee in payment of pension compensation, or retirement pay shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, become an asset of the estate of the deceased payee.

"(3) All acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed."

SEC. 13. Paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VI. (A) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, any pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month: *Provided*, That the amount payable for any such disabled veteran, entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability under the provisions of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, shall not exceed $8 per month. Where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

"(B) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, and shall be deemed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be insane, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay for such veteran shall be in the amounts specified in (A) above: *Provided*, That in any case where the estate of such disabled insane veteran derived from any source equals or exceeds $1,500, further payments of such benefits will not be made until the estate is reduced to $500. Any such veteran without such dependent or dependents, when maintained at his own expense in an institution, shall be subject to the foregoing limitations but shall be paid such amount otherwise payable as equals the amount charged for his care and maintenance in such institution not exceeding the amount the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines to be the charge as fixed by any applicable statute or valid administrative regulation: *Provided further*, That all or any part of the penson, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of any such veteran may, in the discretion of the Administrator, and in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator, be paid to the chief officer of the institution wherein the disabled veteran is maintained, to be properly accounted for by said chief officer and to be used for the benefit of the disabled veteran; or may be paid to the guardian of the disabled veteran in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; or, in the event the dis-

abled veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent, may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be paid to his wife or apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent; or otherwise be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended.

"(C) Any veteran subject to the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be deemed to be single and without dependents in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary: *Provided*, That in no event shall increased compensation, pension, or retirement pay of such veteran be granted for any period more than 6 months prior to receipt of satisfactory evidence showing such veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent.

"(D) The pension of any disabled veteran who is an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on the date of this enactment, shall not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C) above.

"(E) The provisos of section 3 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 383; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364b), and of sections 2 and 4 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492, 493; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 365a, 365c); that part of the proviso of section 5 of the act of July 3, 1926, extending to and ending with a semicolon (44 Stat. 807; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321a); the second proviso of section 5 of the act of June 9, 1930 (44 Stat. 530; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321c); the third proviso of section 1 of the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 786; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381–1); the first proviso of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370c); and all other provisions of law or regulation in conflict with the foregoing provisions are hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

SEC. 14. (a) The surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person, entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 472b, 472b–1, 357b), shall be entitled to receive compensation or pension at the monthly rates specified below:

Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 (equally divided) with $10 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided). As to the widow, child, or children, the total amount payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $100.

(b) The surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person, entitled to peacetime service-connected death pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 1 of Public Law No. 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 731), shall be entitled to receive pension at the monthly rates specified below:

Widow but no child, $38; widow with one child, $49, with $10 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $19; no widow but two children, $28 (equally divided) with $8 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided). As to the widow, child, or children, the total pension payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $75.

(c) As to such persons who now are on the compensation or pension rolls or are applicants for compensation or pension and are found entitled, at said rates, the compensation or pension or increase thereof at the rates authorized in (a) or (b) of this section shall commence on the 1st day of the month following the month in which this act is enacted, and as to those filing claims hereafter and found entitled to said rates, compensation, or pension payable under this section shall begin as authorized in existing law and regulations: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation or pension authorized by this section shall not be awarded for any period prior to the 1st day of the month following the month of enactment of this act.

SEC. 15. Paragraph XIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"XIII. Not more than one award of pension, compensation, or emergency officers' or regular retirement pay, shall be made concurrently to any person based on his own service. The receipt of pension or compensation by a widow, child, or parent on account of the death of any person, or receipt by any person of pension or compensation on account of his own service, shall not bar the payment of pension or compensation on account of the death or disability of any other person. This paragraph is hereby made applicable to all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Section 4715 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 25) and any other laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

"Pension, compensation, or retirement pay on account of his own service shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active service pay.

"The third proviso of paragraph 2 of section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 26); the last proviso of paragraph 2 of section 3 of the act of January 28, 1915 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 27), and any other provision of law or veterans regulation contrary hereto is hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

SEC. 16. This act shall be effective from the date it is approved and necessary adjustments in awards shall be made effective unless otherwise provided herein, the 1st of the calendar month following adjudicative action, or the 1st of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier. In all other cases benefits authorized by virtue of this act shall be effective from date of receipt of claim therefor under this act and subject to the provisions that death compensation or death pension shall be effective as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran: *Provided*, That in no event shall payments authorized by this act be made for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	O'Leary
Andrews	Elmer	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Fay	Pfeifer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fish	Phillips
Barden	Fitzpatrick	Ploeser
Barry	Ford	Ramey
Bates, Mass.	Furlong	Randolph
Bell	Gamble	Rivers
Bonner	Gavagan	Risley
Boren	Gifford	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Satterfield
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Schuetz
Brehm	Halleck	Scott
Brooks	Hare	Shafer
Buckley	Hébert	Sheridan
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Short
Camp	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Capozzoli	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Carlson, Kans.	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Celler	King	Snyder
Cochran	Lane	Stearns, N. H.
Cooley	LeFevre	Taylor
Costello	Luce	Tolan
Courtney	McLean	Towe
Crawford	May	Treadway
Culkin	Merritt	Van Zandt
Dawson	Monroney	Vincent, Ky
Delaney	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Mundt	Voorhis, Calif.
Dilweg	Murray, Tenn.	Wheat
Ditter	Myers	Whelchel, Ga.
Domengeaux	Nichols	White
Douglas	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Eberharter	O'Konski	Wolcott

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call, 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion by Mr. McCORMACK, furthere proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS AFFECTING COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, AND RETIREMENT PAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill is improperly brought in by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and that it belongs to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order comes too late. The committee has reported the bill, and it is now under consideration under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. LESINSKI. I know; but Mr. Speaker, the bill was brought in to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in typewritten form on one day, passed the same day, and filed the same day. There was no time for the chairman of any other committee to make an objection at the time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan does not know it, but a motion to suspend the rules suspends all rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The purpose of a motion to suspend the rules, of course, is to suspend all rules of the House.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was prepared at the instance of the Veterans' Administration. It is designed to correct certain inequalities arising under existing law with a view to simplifying adjudicative practices and administrative procedure by establishing uniform provisions wherever that is possible.

A great deal of confusion and embarrassment has grown up in the Veterans' Administration with reference to administering the various laws that have been passed touching beneficiaries of veterans' legislation. This measure is designed to straighten out those inequalities.

Under present law, when a service-connected disabled veteran goes to a hospital, if he has no dependents his compensation is cut to $15 a month. This bill raises it to $20 a month.

Under the present law when a man without dependents who is drawing compensation for a non-service-connected disability goes to a hospital, his compensation is reduced to $6 a month. We raise it to $8 a month.

A great many men have asked why veterans' compensations have been reduced when they go to hospitals, that is, veterans who have no dependents. Back in the twenties we found that a great many men would go to hospitals and stay there, thus depriving other veterans of the use of the facilities they needed. For that reason this provision was written into the law. However, owing to the increase in the cost of living these provisions have been inserted increasing the pay as stated.

The only objection raised by the Bureau of the Budget was to the language with reference to non-service-connected disability cases. I am sure that if the man in the Bureau of the Budget who handled the measure had understood it thoroughly he would not have raised that objection.

The bill also provides for adjusting the compensation of widows of service-connected World War veterans in order that there might not be so many different brackets. You will find that they are all given the same pay as the widow of a service-connected World War veteran who has reached the age of 50 years.

This would increase the cost of this bill $4,536,000 a year. General Hines, in his letter to the Senate committee, has this to say:

> In view of the inequalities which will be corrected, the changes which would result from simplification of adjudicating practices and administrative procedure, and the fact that the saving effected will materially reduce the additional cost, it is desirable that this legislation be secured at the earliest possible date.

There are some other amendments on page 7. There is one amendment to which I wish you would all pay attention. The practice has grown up, it seems, during the present war of keeping certain men in the Army until they finally break down mentally, nervously, or physically and then discharging them on the theory that their disabilities antedated induction into the service. In order to take care of those cases we have inserted this amendment:

> That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

When the Army or Navy takes a young man into the service, it is the duty of the Army or the Navy to examine him carefully and not to keep him there for a year or two, until he breaks down, and then attribute his disability to a pre-war disorder.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. Is that retroactive for those that have been discharged, who have served for 90 days?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I believe the whole bill is meritorious, but I wonder if the Chairman would not agree with me that some proviso should be written into the bill, probably in the other body, to this effect. You are taking out the proviso for medical opinion. Would it not be well to put in section (b) a proviso that would protect the Government against deliberate fraud at the time the man goes into the service.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not have to protect against fraud, because fraud vitiates everything it touches.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not have in mind what we might call legal fraud, but a person could cover up from the Army doctor the fact that he is a diabetic, and he might be there for 90 days.

Mr. RANKIN. I think any cases of that kind would be so rare that we probably would never be called upon for special legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Perhaps I do not make myself clear, but that is quite prevalent, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], as this is an amendment to the former World War legislation, in my opinion it is retroactive. On the last page section 17 reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

I think that probably would help to answer the gentleman's question. This applies to veterans who have service-connected disability. I think that provision is entirely in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word with reference to the jurisdiction of this committee. This bill was referred to our committee by the Speaker. It was asked for originally by the Veterans' Administration. We called the Administrator before the committee and went very carefully over the matter and amended it in certain respects. There is no question about our committee having jurisdiction of the bill. We should have jurisdiction of all legislation concerning disabled veterans of World War No. 2, because they are all interlocked, through insurance, to hospitalization provisions, and through other and sundry legislation and regulations, which all comes under the jurisdiction of our committee. The committee has jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, and of legislation affecting it, and we should not only have this legislation, which is very properly referred to us by the Speaker, but we should have jurisdiction of all legislation touching disabled veterans of this war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that all disabled cases are processed through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. And where their compensation is affected as a result of their being hospitalized, through our legislation, it is all so interwoven and interlocked that it would be necessary for us to handle them both.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. There has been quite a difference as to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Committee and other committees. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that instead of having three different committees, we give jurisdiction to one committee, and eliminate all this friction that has existed for the last two sessions?

Mr. RANKIN. I have never asked for that change. The Committee on Invalid Pensions has jurisdiction of Civil War pensions. There are a few Civil War widows still living, and I would prefer to let that legislation remain as it is until that problem is out of the way. For that reason I have never asked for a consolidation of these committees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The supply of the report is exhausted. Was the gentleman's committee unanimous in reporting this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please explain section 10 on page 7?

Mr. RANKIN. That section reads as follows:

> SEC. 10. Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress shall be considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

That was recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and gives these boys the benefit of that service whenever it comes to considering the question of longevity. For instance, if a man has been there for a certain length of time, that time is to be taken into consideration.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that my committee is a Civil War committee. It has jurisdiction of all wars, excepting the World War.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, the gentleman is entirely wrong. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes. I should like to bring attention especially to the very important provision of the bill with respect to the time a man is taken into the service. I quote the amendment which provides that at the time he is taken in he will be considered sound physically and mentally.

(b) That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

It is an extremely important division. Many Members are having difficulty with the claims of disabled veterans who are their constituents. I will yield later to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] who will give some cases in point. I bring to the attention of the House again the fact that General Hines asked for this legislation. The legislation has the unanimous support of the committee. There was no opposition to it at all in the committee. Our committee has worked in perfect harmony. It had the unanimous recommendation of the veterans' organizations, men who have fought so consistently down through the years for benefits for veterans. I know the disabled of this World War are very grateful to the Congress for providing machinery by which their claims may be speedily adjusted. I remember very well the difficulties they had during the First World War, especially before the World War Veterans' Committee was set up.

I am delighted that all widows have $50, which is what only women over 50 years receive under the present law. Also, for the increase for the men without dependents in hospitals, from $15 to $20 seems right, and from $6 to $8 for non-service-connected cases.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this cover the ladies who have gone into the service as well as the men? It covers the nurses and the women doctors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It does not cover the WAAC's so far as national life insurance is concerned. I hope it will soon cover them. It does include them all in the hospital benefits. The WAAC's, WAVES, the SPARS, and marines receive their compensation under the civil employees' rules and regulations. I hope that will be adjusted later because it seems only fair when they take the place of men in the service that they be given the same benefits. They have no combat duties, as the gentleman knows, but they release men for combat duties. Sixty thousand WAAC's already have released four divisions of men for active duty and four divisions were the number of our men used to fight in Africa.

The gentleman may remember the House recently passed legislation for the WAAC's, the WAVES, and the marines. When they pass the Senate and the President signs the bills these groups would then come under the provisions of this bill. The legislation for the SPARS will pass soon, I am sure. All groups have done magnificent work.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] who has one or two cases that he would like to present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have sent for my files covering three cases, two of which I would like to inquire about. Before I inquire, I want to say I am heartily in favor of this legislation as it is a long step in the right direction. I just hope that further amendments will be made to the law in due course to take care of cases such as those I will discuss.

The first case I wish to inquire about is the case of a man who was inducted into the armed service and who protested and whose wife protested at the time of his induction, that he was a sick man, suffering from tuberculosis and that while his case was improving he was still running temperatures. Nevertheless the examining physician said he was O. K. and he was inducted. Within 2 weeks after he was inducted he was in a hospital, suffering horribly, and in due course when his release was requested he was asked to sign a waiver saying that the Government was in no way responsible. He did not want to sign the waiver but found that he would not be released until he did. He finally signed it and was discharged with a medical certificate stating that prior to his induction he had had valvular heart disease and aortic insufficiency. On induction it was remarked that he had an excellent, strong heart. I want to know whether this case, which resulted in less than 60 days in service instead of the 90 days provided in the act, is covered in any way?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from California that this bill would not change the status of a man in that condition unless he had been in the service for 90 days.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have another case of a fine strong young man who was called from the Reserves into active duty. A few days after he was called to active duty he was given all three shots, I believe for yellow fever, at one time. He was sent out the next day on a maneuver in temperatures of from 95° to 100°, and he came down shortly after the maneuver with a high temperature and went out of his mind. He was treated as a demented person instead of as a sick man and nearly died. He was later declared to have been suffering from dementia praecox prior to active duty by an Army retirement board and was retired without allowances as insurable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. He was discharged as being in a hopeless, helpless condition, more than 90 days after his call to active duty in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. RANKIN. If the veteran's disability was caused by the shots given him, he would be entitled to compensation. If he was suffering from dementia praecox, which is a progressive mental disease that gradually grows worse until the patient dies, and was suffering from it at the time he was in the service, this bill would not cover it.

Mr. HINSHAW. He was suffering from nothing whatever except medical malpractice and improper treatment in the Army hospital, and they discharged him on the ground that he had dementia praecox and was incurable, yet with 3 months of treatment by competent physicians, after discharge, he was quite normal again. He had no dementia praecox and never did have.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, if he is totally well, he has not been injured.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, at some appropriate time in the future I intend to ask for time to discuss several bad cases, including this one, in some detail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the D. A. V., and the Purple Heart organizations. It also has the endorsement and support of the head of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines. It should have the support of everyone who is interested in equality and justice for the veterans of this and all past wars.

I desire to take up the bill and deal with it section by section. Section 1 I shall pass over because it is merely descriptive. Section 2 contains two provisions. The first one provides that in case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, any compensation, pension or retirement pay may be made to his wife at the discretion of the Veterans' Administration and without the appointment of a guardian.

The lawyer Members of the House will appreciate the importance of that provision to the veteran. I have had experiences of my own in handling estates or money for members of the armed forces of the last war, who were incompetent or deceased, and the court costs and bond and so forth necessary to handle that little money practically ate it up, taking it away from the widow or the children of the veterans. That provision in itself is worth the entire bill.

The next portion, section 2, provides that when death benefits are payable to the widow of a veteran or for the child, it will be paid to the widow for herself and for the child, even though the widow

herself be a minor. Many cases have arisen where the wife of a veteran was not of age, and the Veterans' Administration could not pay the money that was justly due her without a guardian being appointed or administration taken out, thus eating up a portion of the money that rightfully belonged to the family of the veteran.

Section 3 provides that any person entitled to a pension, compensation, or benefits, may rescind or reject his rights to this compensation for any reason he may choose, and later apply for it again without in any way having the rights in the second application altered or changed except that on the second application it must start from the date of application and will not be retroactive.

Section 4 provides that any person found to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or aiding the enemies of the United States shall forfeit all benefits, provided, however, that the Veterans' Administrator may, in his discretion, pay benefits that otherwise would be due the soldier or veteran to members of his family upon his death.

Section 5 deals with persons entitled to compensation, pension, or gratuities who are located in an enemy country.

Section 6 refers to widows of World War No. 2 not married prior to the expiration of 10 years subsequent to the end of hostilities. I think it is fair to state that section means it will prevent marriages for the purpose of getting benefits or compensation of a soldier knowing that he is about to die.

Section 7 defines a child.

Section 8 defines parents, father, and mother.

Section 9 extends the benefits of the present veterans' facilities just the same to veterans of World War No. 2 as are extended to the veterans of World War No. 1.

Section 9 also contains the 90-day presumptive clause, referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, that any person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days is presumed to have been in sound condition when examined and accepted in the service, except as to defects, infirmities, and disorders noted at the time of acceptance.

It was the feeling on the part of the members of the committee when this section was under discussion that it was up to the Army doctors to find out what was the matter with the soldier when he was accepted.

The remaining sections are equally important to the veteran and his dependents in order that they may secure equity and justice.

The additional cost of the bill will largely be offset by the savings that will ensue from the simplification of procedure.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the ranking member, Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and the members of the committee are to be congratulated in bringing to the floor such a constructive and forward-looking piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the discussion among the Members of the House as to the problems of jurisdiction on veterans' legislation. I would like to say this: I believe if we were going to have an operation on our eyes we would not go down and select a chiropodist to perform that operation. Likewise, all legislation in behalf of our veterans who served in World War No. 2 should be referred to the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, because that is the only committee that has the experience and benefit of the knowledge of the veterans' problems, through many years of handling that legislation in the House. And I wish to say that our World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, under the direction of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], has made its place not only in the history of this country but also in the hearts of the veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart are wholeheartedly behind this legislation, and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the chairman of this committee, has the confidence of these organizations. I do not believe there is a man in this Congress who has the welfare of our veterans at heart any more than the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. For many years he has labored in behalf of the veterans and has faithfully carried out the policies formulated during the time when the late Honorable Royal C. Johnson was chairman of the committee; and as long as he is a Member of this House I know he will continue to do so.

As a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also of the American Legion, I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that we are deeply grateful to him for the wonderful service that he has performed for the veterans of this country, and I know that the mothers, fathers and veterans of World War No. 2 will be forever deeply appreciative of his untiring efforts in their behalf.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in what space of time I have had to glance at the bill I think the bill is in the right direction. But what I want to call your attention to is this: The bill is called up under suspension, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] secured the privilege, under the rule, when she demanded a second, and under that procedure the minority, if there is one, is precluded from demanding the right to be heard.

I am calling attention to that now because I do not believe such practice in the future should be permitted, and that if a second is demanded it should be demanded by those who are opposed, or those in the minority whether on the minority side or on the majority side, so that those who are opposed to any legislation would not be deprived of the right to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not correct the opposition did not demand a second? Therefore it is only because of the interest of the lady from Massachusetts in the legislation that she demanded the second.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, the lady from Massachusetts does not need any defense as we all know of her activities; she has always been active and is entitled to a great deal of credit for the splendid work she has done. We have had the question before the Rules Committee for the last 3 years and I have been trying to eliminate the friction that exists between these committees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not, after all, under the jurisdiction of the Speaker to decide to whom the second shall go? The gentleman did not ask for a second; he made no demand. No one else asked for a second. I know the gentleman wishes to be fair. This procedure has been followed numerous times this past year.

Mr. SABATH. So far as my memory of the precedents goes it is to the effect that when a second is demanded it is demanded by the opposition to the pending bill. The rule for debate under suspensions provides 20 minutes on each side—20 minutes for and 20 minutes against, the 20 minutes in opposition going to the Member who demands a second. That means that he desires to be heard in opposition to the bill. The gentlewoman herself asked me before she agreed to yield to me whether I was for the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did.

Mr. SABATH. With the kindliest of feeling toward the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who yielded 2 minutes to me, I wish to say that I have taken the floor in an endeavor to protect and make effective the rights and privileges of the minority accorded them under the regular rules of the House whether it be on the Republican side or the Democratic side. I believe it is setting a bad precedent to recognize a Member favoring legislation to second a motion for the suspension of the rules because it deprives the minority to be heard in opposition to the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, 7.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many years the Congress of the United States has repeatedly expressed its interest in the welfare of veterans and their dependents. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I have the honor to be a member, has proposed and secured the enactment of laws to put veterans of World War No. 2 on the same basis with respect to benefits as the veterans of the First World War.

We have before us today a bill from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill is the result of hard work by our committee. It proposes certain very badly needed changes in laws relating to veterans' affairs. It is an important preliminary step which must, in my opinion, be taken by Congress if we hope to make effective our manifest desire to do all we can for those sturdy citizens who today are giving their all for the Stars and Stripes.

I do not believe that there is any opposition to this bill on its merits. It is exceedingly regrettable that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has attempted to raise a false issue in our discussion of this bill. It would be unfortunate if through some jurisdictional squabble between committees of this House we should sidetrack this legislation. Certainly the veterans of the past war and those to be veterans of this war would not understand or appreciate such action.

It was suggested early in the debate that this legislation may have been hastily drawn. The reverse is true. The bill is carefully drawn. It is fully explained in a carefully drawn report available to each Member of the House. Extensive hearings were held on this legislation. Everybody interested was given opportunity to appear. I may say that the Veterans' Administration, as represented by the Administrator, Gen. Frank T. Hines, appeared and expressed approval of this bill. General Hines suggested some helpful things which were included in the bill. Every national veterans' organization in the United States appeared and expressed, through its representatives, approval of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a great and terrible war. It is the worst the world has ever seen. The question of veterans' legislation will become increasingly important because the war is presenting new problems which must be met by the people's representatives in Congress. Let us face the problems posed by this bill today. Let us approve without a dissenting vote this legislation which means so much to our fighting men and their dependents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the importance of this legislation now with reference to the millions of men and women who are presently in the armed forces and many of whom will qualify for the type of relief provided hereunder. It is a tribute to the Veterans' Administration that its representatives have come before this committee and have outlined those provisions which they feel will facilitate the operation of its work in view of the tremendously increased load which is expected. I should like to emphasize again that the action in reporting out this bill was unanimous on the part of the committee after hearings were duly had and with the endorsement of the various veterans' organizations which have been related here this afternoon.

The importance from the administrative point of view lies in the experiences of those in the armed service today. The welfare of these millions of Americans must be planned and assured now. This bill deserves the unanimous support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio yields back one-half minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules of the House and pass H. R. 2703. This measure amends quite a number of pension and compensation acts and will bring substantial benefits to many disabled veterans who do not now receive compensation, and it will increase the compensation of many veterans, and it will increase the pensions of thousands of widows and children of veterans. It confers on veterans of World War No. 2 many of the benefits now enjoyed by veterans of World War No. 1.

While this measure does not go as far as myself and many other members would desire it to go, yet we are advised that this is the best bill that can receive consideration at this time. Being brought up under suspension of the rules, there is no way to amend the bill as submitted by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I am satisfied that they have brought out the best bill possible under all of the circumstances, and I am very glad to have an opportunity to be present and to give it my unqualified approval and support, and trust that it will be adopted without a single vote in opposition.

Among the helpful features in this bill are the following:

Every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, and disorders noted at the time of acceptance and enrollment.

The applications of many disabled veterans have been denied and compensation withheld from these disabled veterans on the ground that their disabilities were contracted prior to their entry into the service, when there was no notation that any disabilities existed at the time they were examined, accepted, and enrolled. We think it very unfair to the disabled veterans when they apply for compensation for the Government to go behind its own records and deny compensation to these veterans. The presumption is that the doctors who examined the veterans on their acceptance for service did an honest and fair job, and when these boys are once accepted the Government should not be permitted years thereafter to claim that they were not in good condition at the time of acceptance, when the records made by the War and Navy Departments showed that they were in good condition at the time of their acceptance. This is a most desirable amendment, and I am very glad to give it my active support.

This measure amends another act in that it provides that the disabled veteran shall receive compensation from the date of his discharge if it be shown that he had service-connected disability at the time of discharge, provided he filed his claim within 1 year from the date of his discharge. Under the present law he can only secure compensation from the date he makes his application.

This measure increases from $15 to $20 per month the amount of compensation that can be paid to veterans without dependents confined to some Government hospital. This measure would greatly benefit disabled veterans of World War No. 2, and it makes in order the payment of increases of benefits to thousands of disabled veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and the Spanish-American War veterans.

At the present time a different rate of pension, according to age, is paid to widows of veterans whose death was due to service. Those under 50 years of age now receive $38 per month, and those over 50 years of age receive $45 per month. Under this measure, these widows without respect to age will receive $50 per month. It is pointed out that the younger widows, in many instances, have children and other family obligations that make it necessary to receive as much pension as those who are over 50 and without young children and other family obligations.

Under the present law widows of veterans receive so much for themselves and so much for each child, according to its age. This measure grants to the widow $13 per month for the first child and for additional children, in all not to exceed $65.

Under the present law, where there is a child or children but no widow, the rate is $20 per month for the first child, $33 per month for two children, $46 per month for three children, and $8 for each additional child, with the total amount to children without widow not to exceed $83. Under this measure, children with no widow, the first child will receive $25 per month, two children $38 per month, each additional child $10 per month, with the total amount for children without widow not to exceed $100 per month. It can be seen at once that this measure will be very helpful to widows and children of deceased veterans.

This bill also will benefit many veterans and their dependents in liberalizing the procedure.

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ENTITLED TO INCREASE

There are quite a number of bills now pending in the House and Senate that propose granting a straight increase of from 15 to 25 percent on the pensions of the veterans and their dependents who are now on the pension rolls. It is generally conceded that the cost of living has increased 25 percent since the acts were passed granting these pensions, and by reason of this great increase in the cost of living hundreds of thousands of our disabled veterans and their dependents have been hard hit indeed. It is a source of regret to me and many others in the Senate and House that we have not had an opportunity to vote on some one of these bills. We have been assured, however, by the chairman and some of the members of World War Veterans' Legislative Committee of the House that some time this summer or fall one of these bills will be reported to the House, and that we will be given an opportunity to vote on it. There has been a great increase in the incomes of the American people generally. We must not overlook the needs of our disabled veterans and their dependents. Under lend-lease and other activities we are literally giving away to people of other nations, in money, food, clothing, and other supplies, tens of billions. These supplies are going to the people of every nation in the world, with the exception of Germany, Italy, Japan, Rumania, and Hungary, and the people of many of the countries that we are helping have not joined with our country in actual warfare against the Axis Powers.

I wish to repeat what I have said many times on the floor of the House, Senate, and elsewhere, one of the best investments that this country can make in promoting national defense is to do justice to those who have and are defending our country on land, sea, and in the air, and their dependents. To know that this great country will never neglect them or their dependents in case they become disabled or lose their lives must add greatly to the patriotic zeal of our boys. Our boys everywhere are doing a wonderful job, as did the veterans of all of our other wars, and we want them to know that they and their dependents come first in the hearts and minds of the patriotic people of this country. They have and are defending and protecting us and we must do everything possible to defend and protect them and their dependents, and in the generosity of this Nation to the people of other countries let us not neglect those who have a first and everlasting obligation upon us—our own defenders and their widows, orphans, and dependent parents, I feel I express the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House and the Senate and the American people, that our committees handling legislation for veterans and their dependents will respond to this sentiment and report the measures to the House and Senate in the near future, and give the House and the Senate an opportunity to give substantial help to our veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this bill which is now before us for consideration (H. R. 2703). As the title of the bill states, its purpose is to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes. With reference to the bill, General Hines said:

> In view of the inequalities which will be corrected, the changes which would result from simplification of adjudicating practices and administrative procedure, and the fact that the saving effected will materially reduce the additional cost, it is desirable that this legislation be secured at the earliest possible date.

This bill was prepared at the instance of the Veterans' Administration. I am advised that this bill is being supported not only by the Veterans' Administration but by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart. It will bring about changes in veteran administration which have been needed for some time. It will do away with confusion and will simplify and adjust veterans' compensation so that the inequalities which now exist will be done away with. While it is true some increases are provided in compensation, which will result in an increased cost estimated to be $4,536,000 a year, it will place veterans on an equality and the additional cost will be well spent.

The members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation are deserving of commendation for their work in perfecting this legislation and bringing it to the House for consideration and adoption. Members of the committee have explained in detail the various provisions of the bill. No good service would be served by adding to these clear explanations already given. I do, however, desire to call attention to the amendment to the bill, reading as follows:

> That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

There has developed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the administration of veterans' compensation which this amendment will eliminate. On June 1 I called to the attention of the House a protest which was contained in an editorial appearing in Disabled American Veterans Semi-Monthly of its issue of April 29, entitled "We Protest." It was contended that an alleged procedure or practice in the War Department in the issuance of certificates of disability or discharge was being engaged in where pressure was being brought upon servicemen to sign affidavits or make admissions without full knowledge or information, to the effect that they were suffering from disabilities alleged to exist prior to their induction into the Army, as an inducement to secure certain benefits. Such allegations and admissions in many cases were without any foundation in truth. I sent to the Secretary of War the following letter:

MAY 21, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has called to my attention a practice which he states exists in the War Department of discharging disabled servicemen with foreign combat service, on the basis of alleged preexisting disabilities, and requiring them to prejudge and prejudice their case by signing releases of all disabilities before receiving consideration for present disabilities.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me if such a policy does exist, and the reason therefor.

Yours truly,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

To this letter I received the following reply from John W. Martyn, Administrative Assistant:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of May 21, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning disability discharges from the Army, which question was brought to your attention by Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Army regulations provide that a certificate of disability for discharge will state whether such disability was incurred in line of duty or not in line of duty, together with the facts upon which a decision is based; whether the enlisted man declined treatment for the relief of the disability when the same was directed; whether disability was due to his own misconduct or whether a preexisting disability, injury, or disease was or was not aggravated in line of duty by active military service, together with the nature of duty causing aggravation.

All individuals subject to disability discharge are examined by a board of officers who give consideration to the interests of the Government and of the enlisted man equally and impartially. Questions of doubt which cannot be decided factually are resolved in favor of the enlisted man. Whether the disability becomes apparent inside or outside the continental United States has no bearing on the decision as to the preexistence of the disability.

Pensions are paid by the United States where it is determined that disability resulted from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty when such disability was incurred in or aggravated by active military service, unless the result of the individual's own misconduct.

On March 17, 1943, Public Law 10 (78th Cong.) was enacted, amending Veterans Regulations No. 10, granting hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to individuals honorably discharged for non-service-connected disability.

I trust the above information is sufficient to clarify this subject for your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, as shown by this correspondence, there is considerable question as to whether or not there are not sound reasons for the protest to which I have referred. When our Government accepts these servicemen into military service, after subjecting them to critical and exhaustive examinations to determine their fitness for service and freedom from any disqualifying ailments, such an examination should be binding upon the Government. Certainly after these men have been subjected to the rigors of exacting military service in foreign lands under conditions requiring a maximum of physical endurance and courage, they should not, upon the development of disabilities, be discharged from the Army under a pretense or claim that the disabilities from which they were suffering existed prior to their induction into the service. This amendment is intended to prevent this injustice being practiced upon our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us here in the Congress want to deal honestly and fairly with our men and women in military service. They have answered the call of their country in this tragic hour when its very existence as a nation is threatened, and they are burning their bridges behind them and placing their lives in jeopardy that this Nation and those of us who remain at home may be permitted to live in peace and safety when the war ends. By reason of their great contribution and sacrifice we must see that every fair and decent consideration is given to them and their dependents.

As I said in discussing this matter June 1 in the House, when the war ends, and God grant it may be soon, upward of 10,000,000 of the young manhood of our Nation will be returning to their homes. The first question that will present itself to them is, What will be their opportunity in their homeland to which they offered their lives to defend? Will they find remunerative employments open to them where they may again enter into the responsibilities of citizenship in a free world? These post-war problems require the consideration of every one of us, particularly Members of the Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of enacting the necessary legislation to make possible the reabsorption of these servicemen from a war economy into civilian pursuits in a world at peace. We must not only be certain that the men who return disabled and broken in body and spirit will be cared for with every consideration possible, but we also must make certain that the able-bodied will not be turned loose in a world which offers them no hope for continued self-respecting employment. It may well be that for a year or a year and a half after peace comes that our Government will find it necessary to continue the servicemen on the Government pay roll pending the time that avenues of employment open to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to support this legislation and trust that it may soon become the law of the land.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration H. R. 2703. This bill provides more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by the Veterans' Administration. It liberalizes the compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans, their widows, and their orphans. I shall support the bill. It has the unanimous approval of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Order of the Purple Heart, and the approval of General Hines of the Veterans' Administration.

In the brief time allotted to me it is not necessary to go into an extended explanation of the provisions of the bill. One of the best features of the bill is contained in section 9, which provides:

> Every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

Many cases have been called to my attention since we became involved in the present World War of men having been inducted into the armed service and having been subjected to the hardship of military training for a period of more than 90 days who broke down mentally and physically and who have been discharged from the Army and sent home, carrying with them a discharge reciting that they were suffering from the disability or mental infirmities on account of which they were discharged at the time of their induction into the service. Some of these men, due to their violent mental condition, have been put in jail. The parents of others have been burdened with their support and care when they were financially unable to provide for the discharged soldier. This provision of the law takes care of that sort of a case.

Section 13 of the act provides that when a disabled veteran, having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, any pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month—this is a raise from $15 per month—provided that the amount payable for any such disabled veteran entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability shall not exceed $8 per month.

By section 14 of the act the surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of Public Law 198, shall be entitled to receive compensation or pension at the following monthly rates: Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. Where there is no widow, but one child, $25; no widow, but two children, $38, equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided. The total amount payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $100.

In the case of a widow or children entitled to peacetime service-connected death pension, the widow with no child is pensioned at the rate of $38; widow with one child, $49, with $10 for each additional child. The total pension payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $75.

The act has many other meritorious provisions. It is a fair measure and I am glad to give it my support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is unanimous, Mr. Speaker; that is all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will take the 3 minutes left to me.

First, I wish to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. I think he ought to report out the resolution before the Committee on Rules to straighten out this jurisdiction of veterans' legislation. It should go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. As to the gentleman's criticism as to who was entitled to recognition under this motion to suspend the rules, I desire to say that nobody who was opposed to the bill demanded a second.

We followed exactly the same procedure that has been followed by all other committees and by all other chairmen and ranking minority members on all other legislation that has come before the House during this session and in previous sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this committee has had a difficult problem in trying to take care of the World War veterans and the veterans of this war and at the same time keep wild and unnecessary and unjustifiable legislation off this floor. If we had so desired, we could have kept you in hot water day in and day out, but I have followed the procedure laid down by my predecessor as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the Honorable Royal Johnson, of South Dakota. We have looked to the best interests of the veterans and the best interests of the country, and we expect to continue that program. There was no division in the committee on this bill, and I think every other bill we have reported this session was reported unanimously.

We do not harass the Congress by holding hearings day in and day out. We do not harass the Veterans' Administration by constant hearings; but we do investigate and try to find out what legislation is necessary and justified, then bring that legislation to the floor of the House.

If we cannot get the Rules Committee to give us a vote on that rule, I hope every Member of the House will sign petition No. 8 in obedience to the request of the veterans' organizations of the country, and let us forever settle this jurisdictional question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 194, noes 0.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Robert L. Norton which appeared in the Washington Post of June 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick and also a news article by Frank Waldrop appearing in the Washington Times Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FARM HOMESTEADS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now that the Federal Government has canceled billions of dollars of legitimate taxes owing to it by prosperous taxpayers, and while we are giving away billions more in support of the economic life of our allies throughout the world, I think it most timely that we begin devoting more thought to some of the serious problems confronting us right here at home. And it might be well for us to think about spending a little of our money in effecting a permanent solution of some of these problems. The importance of this will become more evident in the months that lie immediately ahead of us.

The outstanding domestic problem that will confront this Nation at the close of the war will be that of rehabilitating our people on a self-sustaining basis.

Common sense dictates that the Government cannot go on forever supporting the people, but the Government can provide for each individual and each family an opportunity to support themselves, and it is the duty of the Government to do this.

There will be millions of men now in the armed forces who will be entitled to an opportunity to earn a decent living for themselves and their families. And millions more who are now in vital war industry must be afforded a like opportunity.

There are those who believe that the Government should meet this issue through direct employment by the Government, or by the Government actually furnishing food, clothing, and shelter for these individuals and their families. Such a program would of necessity change ours into a communistic government with the will of the individual absolutely subjected to the will of the state.

There are others, including myself, who do not believe that the Government should actually provide the food, shelter, and clothing for these individuals, but that the Government should provide for each individual or family an opportunity to earn for himself in the private walks of life these essential elements of life.

This task can be accomplished under our great American system of Government which is designed not to destroy but to foster and encourage private initiative, self-reliance, and individual effort. In accomplishing this task, however, under our traditional system and philosophy of government it is essential that we remember one simple and elementary, yet fundamental, truth and that is that our civilization is deep-rooted in the soil of this country and if it is to survive we must ever turn back to the soil for the essential nourishment and inspiration. We will have to start first with the land as the basis of our program.

I do not mean by this that every individual must turn to the soil for a living, but I do mean that the soil must inevitably furnish the basic means of livelihood for these millions of individuals who are to be rehabilitated.

As an initial move in such a program there first lies ahead of us the tremendous task of revising our national land policies so as to rehabilitate those who already live on the land and gain their livelihood by tilling the soil.

Next, we must throw open the fertile soil of this country to ownership by millions of families who may care to accept farming and the tilling of the soil as the means of owning a home and providing a livelihood.

To accomplish these things we must revise and modernize our traditional national land policy, weeding out those features that tend to blight and kill, and making such changes as will stimulate healthy growth.

In this discussion today I wish to point out some features of our national land policies which I believe to be destructive and to suggest some changes which I believe will prove beneficial.

Long before I ever seriously aspired to a seat in this great deliberative body it became evident to me that unless something was done by some unit of the Government, either the State or the Federal Government, or both, to protect the farm land of this country for the ownership and use of the farm families of this country it would not be many years before the independent farm family living on its own land and secure in the ownership of its own farm home would vanish.

Living as I do in a rural community I have observed through the years that one by one the independent farm families have lost their farm homes and as a result they have likewise lost their means of independent livelihood.

The reason they have lost their farm homes has been the same in practically every instance. The farm has been made the collateral or security for financial obligations.

The farmer does not produce enough on the farm under normal conditions to meet these financial obligations and at the same time provide a living for himself and his family. Consequently he defaults in the payment of the farm debt and the mortgage is ultimately foreclosed.

May I point out here that in certain respects a tenant farmer occupies a more secure economic position than does the farmer who owns and operates a farm that has a mortgage over it, for under the laws of this country, on a farm that is operated by the owner, the holder of the farm mortgage has first claim to the proceeds of the farm, while on a farm that is operated by a tenant, the tenant has first claim to the proceeds of the farm. And when a farm is not producing enough to pay both the mortgage and support the farm family, the only way that the mortgage can be satisfied and the farm family can be assured of a living out of the operation of the farm is for the farm operator to give up his title or ownership to the land and become a tenant farmer.

In this way the terms of the farm mortgage are met by the transfer of the title to the mortgage holder, and the farm family is assured of a living by becoming a tenant farmer.

This is exactly what has been going on in this country for many years.

In the early life of this Republic the foreclosure of a farm mortgage did not necessarily mean tenantry for the farm family, because there was plenty of free land available for any family desiring free land. The farm family could remain independent by the simple process of moving to a plot of free land and again establishing a free farm homestead.

At the same time laborers engaged in pursuits other than farming were not forced to accept the terms of employment which they considered unjust and unfair. They were not dependent upon their employer for a living. The Government was always ready to furnish them with a free farm where they could live in freedom and independence.

Whenever the burden of debt or the injustices of employment became destructive of the rights of any citizen, he could always find refuge and relief in the free land of this country.

From the day when Columbus first sighted land on October 12, 1492, and the cry went up from the ship, "Land, land," free land has been one continuing and inspiring element underlying the progress and development of our great western civilization.

Without the millions of acres of free land and the vast free resources that were available in this country for occupancy and ownership by everyone who cared to take advantage of the opportunity, our theory of free government could never have prevailed.

Every one of the Thirteen Original Colonies was settled primarily by individuals and families who sought land which they could own themselves and upon which they could establish their homes and live in peace and security. This is likewise true of each of the 48 States of the Union.

In the beginning there was seemingly an unlimited amount of free land—land enough for all who might desire to own land and establish a home. Through the years, however, the frontier has been pushed back, the desirable free land has been homesteaded and placed in private possession, until today there is no free land left, and the opportunity for an individual or a family to gain possession of a free plot of land upon which to establish a free home has vanished. The free farm homestead is no longer a sustaining element in the life of our Republic.

We must again open up to our people this gateway of opportunity which is so essential to human liberty and to the preservation of human rights. We must again make available to individuals and to their families this channel of nourishment and inspiration if we are to continue to grow and prosper as a free people. This cornerstone of human freedom must be maintained if we are to preserve for our people the right to live in liberty and in the pursuit of happiness.

This can be done by modernizing our traditional land policies.

We must all remember that ours is a comparatively new civilization, and we are comparatively a virgin country. We are not beset with so many of the problems which confront the people in other lands. We are not an overpopulated Nation. We have 2,000,000,000 acres of land within the bounds of the United States of America, and 130,000,000 people, composing about 40,000,000 families. So you can see that if all the land in America was equally distributed it would be possible to give each family 50 acres of land.

Over 500,000,000 acres of our land is still under public domain representing mostly submarginal land that is not suitable for farm homes. Approximately 1,400,000,000 acres is in private ownership, and there are only 7,000,000 farm families.

So you can see that if the farm land was equally distributed among all the farm families, each family would own 200 acres of land.

It is, therefore, evident that we are not confronted with the problem of too many families or too little land.

Our problem is a comparatively simple one of making the farm land available for ownership by the farm family.

I am convinced, however, that if we are to accomplish this task we must proceed upon the theory that the farm homestead is both the home of the farm family and the instrumentality through which the farm family supports itself.

The lawyer can live in his home, but does not make his living out of his home. The manufacturer, merchant, the industrial laborer, the banker, lawyer, all live in their homes but do not make their livings out of their homes.

With the farmer, however, it is different. His farm is both his home and his means of livelihood.

If we are to proceed upon the theory that the farm is strictly a commercial operation then it is not necessary for us to take any legislative action, for that is just what we have been doing. It is easy to see that under the present system farms are being acquired by absentee landlords or by large farm operators who are farming for strictly commercial purposes and that farm land ownership in the United States has been gradually drifting into the clutches of practices which have prevailed in commerce and industry for centuries, and which, when permitted to go unchecked, have invariably destroyed the independent farm home, and reduced agriculture to a condition of serfdom. So long as we continue to consider the farm homestead as strictly a commercial institution, I do not see how we can possibly remedy this situation.

Proceeding upon this theory during the last quarter of a century Congress has devised numerous means of aiding the farmer. The Federal land bank plan was initiated. At first this seemed to be the ideal solution. However, it soon developed that the Federal land bank was only a means of helping plunge the farmer deeper into debt and the facts show that during normal times more Federal land bank mortgages are foreclosed than are ever paid by the owners. Then, too, the Federal land bank had no provision assuring homesteads for small independent farm families.

Then came various other legislative measures all of which have failed to accomplish this desired result, primarily because of the false premises upon which they are based.

During recent years there has been a growing tendency to give the farmer a better price for his commodities and I heartily subscribe to this as being only fair and just to the farmer and placing his products on an equal footing with the products of other activities. However, let us remember that with the increase in farm prices there runs concurrently an increase in all the other prices throughout our entire economic structure with the result of increased cost of living and increased land values so that little is accomplished by this process toward aiding the farmer to regain for himself his own free homestead.

In this connection we might just as well face the candid fact that the average farm under ordinary conditions will just about yield for the owner and his family a reasonable livelihood. In other words, the average farm is the means of a living for the farmer and his family and can hardly be described as a commercial institution from which the owner may hope to gain any substantial financial profit.

There are those who in recent years, in their efforts to solve this problem of farm home ownership, have introduced theories which have heretofore been foreign to our way of thinking. They believe in solving the problem through a system of bureaucracy or a planned economy, which would regiment the farmers under a highly centralized communistic and paternalistic rule—a system which would make all the farmers the tenants of the Government. As I say, this theory is new to the American way of thinking and is now being vigorously promoted by those who are either not familiar with the American theory of Government and the plan of our free institutions, or else who do not believe in our American way and who are deliberately attempting to replace it with their own theories and their own philosophy of life. If the doctrine which they advocate prevails it is bound to stifle the private initiative and the individualism of the people of this country and thus lose to them the great heritage which has been gained for them by our forefathers who conceived and designed our American theory of Government. After we have won this war and should we gain domain over all the world, still if we have lost our rights as American citizens we have then lost the very soul of our American Republic. "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

There is a third method of approach in solving this problem, and that is for us to apply the real genuine old fashioned American theory of government and the American philosophy of life.

Proceeding along this line there are several approaches that can be made, any one of which is comparatively simple and will prove effective.

I have introduced legislation designed to partially accomplish this result, and I wish to briefly explain the provisions of this very simple measure, H. R. 1300, which is entitled "A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families."

May I also call your attention to H. R. 1287, which deals with the same subject matter. It is more far-reaching than H. R. 1300, but, in my opinion, it offers a more practical and common sense solution of this problem.

Both of these measures are very easily understood, and either measure can be placed in operation without the necessity of new or additional Government agencies.

H. R. 1300 provides that the Federal Government, through the General Land Office, regain title to farm lands by the purchase of farm mortgages or liens

upon farm property. It provides that the lands so acquired be divided into homestead tracts; that there be assessed against each homestead tract its pro rata share of the purchase price; and that these homestead tracts then be made available for private entry and ownership under our Federal homestead law.

The bill would, in effect, give aid first to the farmer who already owns his own farm home, but who has over it a farm mortgage debt which he is unable to pay. It first rehabilitates the family now living on the farm. It then opens up for private entry by other families homestead tracts that are not now available.

Some of those in high places in our Government who seem intent upon destroying our free institutions and substituting a bureaucracy have for many years been familiar with my efforts and when I introduced this measure several years ago they had already laid the ground work of opposition by inspiring many honest, sincere Members of this House with the thought that this proposal is visionary, impractical, and tremendously extravagant. Such is not the case and I regret that some of my colleagues have fallen for this bait before taking the time to really study the provisions of this proposal and its practical operations.

This is by far the most economical, the simplest, and the most effective approach to this vital problem.

With a sum equal to less than two-thirds of the amount of the taxes that Congress has just canceled, under a program of this nature the rural population of America can be rehabilitated on an absolutely self-sustaining basis and the understructure of a sound domestic economy can be firmly established.

May I state to you briefly how it would operate? Suppose there is a farmer in your district who owns 1,000 acres of land and who now lives on that farm. He has a mortgage on the farm for $6,000. It is evident that the farmer and his family alone cannot operate this entire acreage which means, of course, that they must have tenants living on the farm with them or else they must employ hired labor. The farmer finds that he is not able to operate the farm and at the same time pay the $6,000 debt. He is faced with a mortgage foreclosure and he loses all his 1,000 acres, which includes his own home, because he is unable to make the required payments.

Under this measure this farmer may apply to the General Land Office for help. The General Land Office will then proceed to appraise the farm and if it is found that the mortgage of $6,000 is not in excess of the value of the entire 1,000 acres, the General Land Office may purchase the mortgage and gain complete title and absolute possession of the 1,000 acres.

The General Land Office will then divide this 1,000 acres into proper size farm homestead tracts. Each homestead will contain such acreage as is necessary for the support of an average size farm family under normal conditions in the particular locality where the farm is located. Let us assume that in this instance a homestead will contain 100 acres. The General Land Office would then proceed to divide this 1,000-acre tract into 10 homestead tracts of 100 acres each and to charge against each of these 10 homestead tracts its pro rata share of the indebtedness of $6,000. Assuming that each of the 10 homestead tracts was of equal value, the debt charged against each of them would be $600.

The farmer who originally owned the 1,000 acres would then be permitted to choose for himself one of these 10 homestead tracts, and he would be given title to this tract of 100 acres but would be required to pay the indebtedness on this tract ($600) over a period of not more than 40 years. The other 9 homestead tracts would be held by the General Land Office and be made available for entry on the same terms by other families.

Thus it can be seen that by this simple procedure this farmer would not have to lose his farm home and be reduced to a state of tenantry, but would be able to cut down his holdings to the size of a homestead tract which he could operate himself. At the same time nine other families would be permitted to gain ownership and possession of a farm homestead which they likewise can own for themselves as a home and can operate themselves.

This is the very heart and essence of this legislation. You can see that it does not have one element of communism or of bureaucracy in it. It does not contain one element of paternalistic control. And it does not in any way take from the individual or his family any of their rights or liberties. On the other hand, it regains for these individuals and these families their rights and their liberties, and protects them in the earning of their own livelihood through the sweat of their brow while living in their own farm home.

There are provisions in this measure which will further protect these family units by preventing the further mortgaging of any tract of land coming under its provisions until the owner has paid fully the debt owed to the United States Government.

There are other provisions of the bill which would permit the General Land Office when it is determined that the land involved or any portion of it was submarginal to retain such submarginal land as a part of the public domain. The reason for this is very evident. If a plot of land is not capable of sustaining a family certainly it is absurd to encourage a family to gain possession of such a piece of land in the hope of making a living for themselves.

In my opinion this measure strikes at the very heart of the problem of farm home ownership and provides a modern application of our national homestead laws to this great national problem.

Every penny of the funds appropriated for this purpose will be backed by the finest collateral on earth, the soil of the United States of America, so that not one penny of this money will be lost to the taxpayer of America.

One of the most important features of this legislation is that it places in one agency of the Government, the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, the function of providing opportunity for families to secure homes for themselves. At the same time it leaves in another altogether separate and distinct agency of the Government, the Department of Agriculture, the function of assisting in land practices. And it is only by completely divorcing these two avenues of Federal assistance that we can be sure of preventing encroachment upon the rights and liberties of those to whom the Government is lending aid and assistance.

This is the only proposal before the American people, and insofar as I know, the only proposal which has been made to the American people since I have been in Congress which again makes available for entry by those desiring farm homes vast areas of farm land without imposing upon the farm land or upon the farm population one additional penny of debt in any form, and which grants this opportunity without carrying with it any element of communism or paternalistic bureaucracy.

I realize that at present the primary duty of Congress is to do everything within its power to win the war. At the same time I call your attention to the fact that after this war is over, and some day it will be over, the American people will turn again to the normal way of living, and it is most important that we have ready for that day a domestic program which will take care of our people and help them in the preservation of their liberties and their rights while gaining for themselves an honest living by the sweat of their brow.

Millions of boys who are now fighting on our far-flung battlefields will some day come back home. Many of them will be crippled for life. All of them will have the right to expect from their country an opportunity to earn a decent living, and more than ever, we are going to have to turn again to the soil of this Nation for a means of livelihood.

The Government cannot go on forever supporting the people, but it is a duty of the Government to provide the opportunity for its people to support themselves.

It has been a policy of this Nation through the years to grant to the men of our armed forces lands, bounties, or homesteads, and while the methods pursued may not always have been perfect this has, in my opinion, been a very sound basic policy.

This legislation which I am proposing will not only rehabilitate the families now living on farms, but it will also provide homes and means of livelihood for the men now in our armed forces and for other deserving American families.

At the same time, it will prove a tremendous factor in stabilizing the family life of our people, strengthening the moral fabric of our country, and making all of us more secure in our rights, our freedom, and our liberties.

This measure is now before the Public Lands Committee of the House and I hope that we may be successful in getting early and favorable consideration of it by the committee and by this body; for this, in my opinion, is good, sound

legislation based upon good, old-fashioned American common sense, and it offers a program that will be free of the elements of bureaucracy, communism, and paternalism, and all other new theories that are so foreign to the traditions and principles of our great people, and so destructive of our rights, our liberty, and our independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on House Resolution 98, authorizing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate grade labeling, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] had this to say:

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has made some investigation along the lines of this resolution as it relates to the grade labeling of canned goods. There were a number of witnesses before the committee and I think I should at this time for the sake of the record, repeat to the House the statement of one of the witnesses before the committee. Witness was Mr. Carson, who represents the great co-op organization in the Nation. He stated that his organization had recently purchased a cannery in the State of Missouri. That after taking over the cannery, they made an analysis of the operation of the cannery during the year 1942, and they found that during the year 1942 this cannery had paid for empty cans $36,000 more than the farmers were paid for all the farm commodities that went into the cans. Let me repeat that: The empty cans cost $36,000 more than all the farmers received for the products that went into the cans. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who seem to take delight in charging that all of the increased cost of living today was brought on by those who toil in the fields, from daylight to dark, and to whom we must look for our food.

I have profound respect and high personal regard for our distinguished colleague from the great Southland. The gentleman from Georgia, Representative PACE, is an outstanding Member of this House and is tireless in his efforts for the farmers of the entire United States. I regret exceedingly his absence today. I telephoned the Congressman's office but he is away on official business. My reactions to Mr. PACE's statement are first, he has an idea that the steel and can manufacturers are making enormous profits and second, the returns to the canners are out of all proportion to the amount which the farmer gets for his products. In my district in San Francisco are located headquarters of many California canning and can-making companies as well as headquarters for the one concern on the Pacific coast manufacturing tin plate. In San Jose, close to my district, is located the outstanding manufacturing establishment making canning machinery. Processing of foods means much to California. In justice to the good people of my State, I desire to correct the impressions which apparently are in Mr. PACE's mind. In my opinion most canners, can manufacturers and steel producers are really not making exorbitant profits. As a matter of fact, I know of many firms that have had stormy and, in certain cases, disastrous financial careers in becoming established in these three fields. As far as the manufacture of tin plate is concerned it is only within the last few years that the Columbia Steel Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, has commenced the manufacture of tin plate. Previously all the tin plate used in California was brought in from eastern tin plate mills, and at present the local mill does not supply the entire local consumption. Although tin plate is manufactured in but few States—California, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—demand has expanded enormously. Whereas in 1923 tin plate accounted for only 3.6 percent of the finished rolled steel produced in this country, since 1932 it has taken nearly 9 percent of the total output. Visualize if you please the tens of thousands of persons given additional employment. Visualize further the new wealth created in America from this healthy industry.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from San Francisco.

Mr. WELCH. Is my colleague aware of the fact that the United States Steel Corporation limits the output of steel by the Columbia Steel Co., its subsidiary, whose plant is located at Pittsburg, Calif., to 10 percent of the tin plate used by the canneries in the State of California?

Mr. ROLPH. I had no idea that it was limited to 10 percent. That should be changed and corrected at once.

Mr. WELCH. The United States Steel Corporation put a limit on the output of steel by the Columbia Steel Co., its subsidiary, of 10 percent of the tin plate used by the canneries in the State of California.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank my colleague for his observation.

May I take this opportunity of congratulating my colleague on the very splendid work he has been doing in trying to establish a large steel output on the Pacific coast. I commend him, and I think he deserves a great deal of credit.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Commenting on the statement made that the canners are making exorbitant profits, just recently the Michigan delegation met with the Michigan canners, who showed conclusively that they could not absorb in their share of the profit on canned goods an increase of 15 percent in wages which they were asked by the administration to grant. They showed clearly that it could not be done.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman means under the ceiling prices?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; their margin was too small to permit it.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no particular reason to defend the gentleman from Georgia any more than that I have been on the committee with him for several years, but I think the gentleman from California has possibly misinterpreted what the gentleman from Georgia tried to point out. I think what the gentleman from Georgia did try to point out in the hearings, which I attended, was that the product itself represented a small part of the cost of canned goods. Further, I am sure the gentleman realizes that not only the amount of material that is available but also the ceiling that has been placed on his people must be taken into consideration, and that, therefore, they are not making exorbitant profits. I think the gentleman from Georgia is cognizant of that fact because at the present time they are not in a position to overcharge for their tin plate.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much indeed for his observation. May I say that I do not think that for many years the price of tin plate has been out of line with the resale price of canned goods. That is the impression I want to correct, because it means much to the industry, to my district, and to my State.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I wish to thank the gentleman from California for throwing some light on this question because the canners are a very important outlet for the products of our farmers. I am under the impression, however, and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, that the American Can Corporation and the Continental Can Corporation control most of the available cans for use by the canners of this country. Because of this dominant position, and because a system of leasing, they control all the machinery. Thus does the cost of cans become a large, fixed cost not always in proper ratio to other factors. Am I in error in that statement?

Mr. ROLPH. As I understand, the American Can Co. and the Continental Can Co. are the dominant factors in the can-making business, but there are other concerns. Of course, not nearly as large as those companies. However, I would say that those two concerns do dominate a large percentage of the business in this country.

Mr. HORAN. I have understood that that is one of the big factors in the overhead cost of runing a cannery.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman does not mean running a cannery, he means running a can-making plant.

Mr. HORAN. In operating a cannery, where you have to figure in labor, the cost of raw materials, the cost of canning, the cost of machinery leases, and a few other costs, all of which have to be repaid in the end from the sale price to the consumer, the fixed costs, such as the cost of the cans and the leasing of the machinery, become burdensome out of all proportion when canned goods have to be sold in poor markets, anemic markets such as we have had. The cost of labor and raw materials from the farms are the main movable margins

going into that operation that can absorb the losses. The canners have to hold the sack and be responsible for the salability of that product, naturally they are subject to some unjust criticism by a public not always cognizant of all the facts.

Mr. ROLPH. I have figures I shall submit later giving the relative costs per can of certain products. In my opinion, they are not exorbitant, particularly due to the fact that if these goods were not canned they would go to waste.

Standard abstract of the United States for the year 1940, House Document 976, page 670 shows the value of farm crops in California as being about $350,000,000. The national total was some $3,600,000,000, or, in other words, California produced approximately 10 percent of the farm products of the entire Republic. The question arises as to what percentage of the country's fruit and vegetable crops is canned. Upon taking the matter up with the National Canners Association, I find that only 10 varieties make up the great bulk of canned vegetables. These are asparagus, beans, beets, carrots, corn, peas, pumpkin, spinach, squash, tomatoes. Considering these for the year 1942, 67 percent of the total United States production was canned and the other 33 percent was offered for sale on the fresh market. I also asked what percentage of these crops would be lost if they were not processed. While no definite statistics are available, you can well imagine that it would be utterly impossible to dispose of such large quantities of fruits and vegetables on the fresh market. The offerings could not be promptly absorbed when ripe and unless the products were processed and preserved, financial loss from spoilage would be ruinous. Importance of canned fruits and vegetables to the national economy is well indicated by percentages on a money-value basis. While we have no comparison between the canned and fresh-market values, still the value of all canned fruit and vegetables amounted to about $1,000,000,000 last year. The industry contributes to the economy of practically every State in the country as well as to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Actually there are only three States, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Nevada, which do not sustain plants canning either fruits or vegetables. At the peak of the season about one-half million people are employed; at the low point about 100,000. At the peak of the season—September 1—last year, those on the pay roll totaled some 325,000 persons. Not included are employees working in factories canning other items such as fish, baked beans, and so forth, in other words, winter-packed products. At present lack of manpower is a most serious problem and one which is causing every company deep concern. Efforts are being made to get high school students as well as women to take the places of men who formerly worked in canneries and who are now entering many branches of the service or in war industries.

Now, referring particularly to tin plate. This is an industry requiring enormous capital investments. For instance, a new steel company has recently started at Fontana, Calif. I understand the outlay is well over a hundred million dollars. The plant will be practically self-contained, having company-owned sources of ore and coal. The concern will roll plates, bars, and structural shapes but no tin plate. If sheet rolling equipment is added it will take additional large expenditures.

At this point I want particularly to stress that all the pig tin used in this country is imported. The principal sources of supply before the war were the Far East, Bolivia, and South America. A small quantity, about 60 tons, comes from Alaska. Our annual consumption is about 75,000 gross tons. At present we are importing a certain quantity of pig tin and also ore from South America. Ore is being smelted in a plant in Texas. From figures recently released returns on the securities of American steel companies have been low, indeed. One of the principal hazards in the steel industry is the constant development of improved methods and processes which necessitate constant buying of new equipment. Obsolescence is particularly rapid. Steel companies are exceptionally large units, and steel making is involved and highly technical. Research for improved methods is going on at all times.

In 1938, the container industry ranked third among consuming industries of steel, accounting for 9.1 percent of the total production of finished steel. The upward trend and increasing importance of the container industry as a consumer of steel can be seen from the following table:

Estimated consumption of steel by the container industry, 1923-38

Year	Consumption of hot-rolled iron and steel (thousands of gross tons)	Percent of total hot-rolled steel production
1923	1,205	3.6
1924	1,210	4.3
1925	1,427	4.3
1926	1,348	3.8
1927	1,408	4.3
1928	1,619	4.3
1929	1,707	4.2
1930	1,670	5.7
1931	1,415	7.4
1932	1,037	9.9
1933	1,759	10.5
1934	1,557	8.2
1935	2,039	8.5
1936	2,455	7.3
1937	2,874	7.8
1938	1,908	9.1

Source: Computed by apportioning individual hot-rolled product totals on the basis of Iron Age distribution reports and by allocating jobber shipments to ultimate consumers. See M. W. Worthing, The Distribution of Steel Products to Major Consuming Industries, United States Steel Corporation, Oct. 30, 1939.

Can-making companies are comparatively few. In testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee in November 1939, Dr. H. A. Baker, president, American Can Co., was asked by Acting Chairman King:

How many companies manufacture cans?

Dr. Baker's answer:

Food can manufacturers: The American Can Co., Continental Can Co., National Can Co., Owens-Illinois Can Co., Crown Can Co., Phillips Can Co., Heekin Can Co., Pacific Can Co., and Heinz Co. In the milk-packing field practically all of the large canners of milk make their own cans, such as Borden, Pet, Carnation, and so on. In the general line of manufacture of tin containers, I believe there are something over 50 small companies in that field.

Principal reason for this condition is that equipment for making cans is special and intricate, requiring huge investments. Furthermore, sales resistance is acute because makers of cans are particularly rigid in writing specifications and after a connection is once established customers are loath to change. For this reason it is difficult for new firms to enter the field. On the other hand, the canning companies are many. I quote from Monograph No. 35 on the subject of Large Scale Organization in the Food Industries. On page 51, we read, as follows:

The canning of fruits and vegetables is an industry composed of many individual firms. There are, in the industry, at least a dozen big corporations operating chains of canneries and the tendency during the last 20 years has been definitely toward the growth and expansion of such firms. On the Pacific coast, concentration of corporate control has reached the point where two or three organizations pack over half the total supply of the canning crops produced in that region. But in most other parts of the country the industry is still characterized by relatively large numbers of independent canning firms.

The two outstanding corporations in the canning industry are the California Packing Corporation and Libby, McNeil & Libby. Dollar sales of the California Packing Corporation amounted in 1937 to over $61,000,000, those of Libby to well over $74,000,000 (chart VIII). No other canning firm has anything like the volume of business done by these two organizations.

The California Packing Corporation was incorporated in 1916 to consolidate the interests of four firms operating in California and other Pacific Coast States. These four firms themselves previously had bought or otherwise acquired a number of smaller canning companies. Following its organization, the California Packing Corporation expanded its operations to other sections of the country, notably by the acquisition of the Midwest Canning Corporation, with plant facilities in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and other Midwestern States. In addition to its operations within the United States, the company is a large factor in the growing and canning of Hawaiian pineapple. It also engages in salmon packing, fruit drying, and coffee manufacturing. Some of the produce which it packs is grown on its own ranches and land holdings. Like most other big food processors, the corporation has built up its own sales organization for distributing its products and does not use jobbers and brokers as do the smaller canners.

Libby, McNeill & Libby was developed as a subsidiary of the meat-packing firm of Swift & Co. As previously described, the meat packers agreed under the consent decree of 1920 to give up their interests in the canning of fruits and vegetables, and since that

time Libby, McNeill & Libby has operated as a nominally independent concern. It had been brought to the status of a large organization while still under the control of Swift, and has grown comparatively little during the last 10 or 15 years.

In set-up and method of operation, Libby, McNeill & Libby is similar to the California Packing Corporation. It, too, is engaged in the canning business on a national scale and carries on many related enterprises. In addition to the canning of fruits and vegetables, it packs salmon, meat, pineapple, and other tropical fruits.

There are at least a dozen other canning companies, which operate sizable chains of canneries, have their own brands and sales organizations, and conduct their businesses along the lines already described for Libby, McNeil & Libby and California Packing Corporation. Most of these companies have developed since the World War and represent a definite change in an industry formerly comprised almost entirely of small firms.

The story of the manufacture of tin plate is one of the romances of the steel industry. As long ago as 55 B. C. the early Romans coated copper vessels with tin to make them suitable for use as containers for food and drink. They secured tin from mines in Cornwall. The first tin plate industry as such is supposed to have started in Bohemia about 1240 A. D. Up to 1620 there is no record of tin plate being made elsewhere, for its manufacture was carried on with the utmost secrecy and the art was passed down from father to son.

Little further was heard of tin plate until 1720 when a plant was established at Pontypool in Monmouth, under the management of Maj. John Hanbury. It was during operations at that plant that Hanbury and Payne, in 1728, perfected the manufacture of thin iron sheets by rolling and thus assured the success of their industry.

Up to 1875 nearly all tin plate had iron for a base. There were two grades produced, charcoal iron made with charcoal alone as a fuel, and coke iron made with a mixture of charcoal and coke. The charcoal iron was the better product and plates made from it generally carried an extra heavy coating of tin.

By 1880 steel sheets or plates had been generally substituted for iron sheets in the manufacture of tin plate. Today the most modern equipment known to steel manufacture is used in the production of tin plate. In spite of that, however, to produce 1 ton of tin plate, requires about 58 man-hours of labor in a steel mill, or more than any other finished rolled product.

The method of producing tin plate by making the final reduction in the thickness of the steel while it is cold, rather than at red heat, is a rather recent advancement. Cold reduction makes steel hard and brittle and it must be annealed, treated by heat, to make it soft and ductile. To anneal the plates they are stacked in huge boxes which are placed in enormous ovens and subjected to a temperature of about 1400° F. for 16 to 18 hours. When the boxes are withdrawn from the furnace they are allowed to cool to atmospheric temperature, which takes from 40 to 48 hours.

Annealing has enlarged the pores of the steel, and if tinned without further processing, the plate would absorb too much tin and would not present a bright, silvery appearance. To overcome this difficulty the plates are passed through another set of cold rolls, which produce a dense, polished surface on both sides which again flattens them, but without hardening and without brittleness. The plates are then carefully inspected for surface defects, accuracy to size and gage, flatness; and those which pass inspection are sent to the tinning department. Here they are coated with a flux of zinc chloride or ammonium chloride, which removes any dirt, grease, or perspiration stains and prepares the surface for its coating of tin. The plates must be as clean and as mechanically perfect as is humanly possible.

The plates are next immersed in a bath of molten tin protected from the atmosphere by a layer of palm oil. This serves to keep the tin from solidifying too rapidly and to assure an even coating of high luster. The plate is drawn out of the tin by rolls, which strip off the excess tin and distribute the remainder evenly over the surface. After cleaning and polishing, the plates are graded by carefully trained inspectors, who examine each plate minutely on both sides for defects. Their skill becomes more apparent when it is known that there may be 17 major defects, any one of which would bar a plate from being classed as a "prime," a tin plate with no defects discernible to the naked eye.

Last year—1942—the tin mills of the United States produced almost 2,658,000 net tons of tin plate.

Year by year since 1890 the production of tin plate has mounted higher and higher in an almost unbroken chain of advance. In that year there was no tin plate produced in the United States. All that was used here was imported from Wales, and so great was Welsh supremacy because of low labor costs, that earlier tin-plate enterprises launched in 1873 and 1874 could not withstand the pressure of the competition, and by 1878 had ceased production.

The growing importance of tin plate in American home life and the urgency of a home industry led to insertion of a clause relative to tin plate in the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890. The levy was 2.2 cents per pound on imported tin plate. Provision was made, however, that if after October 1, 1897, American manufacturers had not produced in any 1 fiscal year as much as one-third of the quantity of tin plate imported, the tin plate clause of the act would become nonoperative.

Almost overnight American enterprise met the challenge. By the end of 1891 there were 20 tin mills in operation and 10 under construction. At the close of 1897 there were 69 mills in operation and 7 projected. American manufacturers once again demonstrated their ability. American ingenuity may always be relied on to meet any issue.

Cans made from tin plate have perhaps played the foremost role in transforming marketing of foodstuffs from a local to a Nation-wide industry.

In war, the tin can has proved invaluable. The immense problems of supplying our fighting forces on all the many battle fronts is made possible by canned foods. Tin plate deserves to be ranked along with rails, structural steel and the other steel products as an outstanding contribution to civilization. Tin plate is an important factor in maintaining high standards of living. Of interest are the unit costs of tin cans to retail sales prices of certain products. On page 14022 of part 26 of the hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee in January 1940 we find these figures:

Commodity	Retail price (cents)	Estimated tin plate costs (cents)	Tin plate cost as proportion of retail price (percent)
1. Tomatoes, No. 2 standard	8.8	1.22	13.9
2. Beans and pork, No. 1	7.4	.88	11.8
3. Green beans, No. 2	11.2	1.22	10.9
4. Corn, No. 2 standard	11.6	1.22	10.5
5. Peas, No. 2 standard	15.1	1.22	8.1
6. Peaches, No. 2½ can	18.6	1.48	8.0
7. Pears, No. 2½ can	21.3	1.48	6.9
8. Pineapple, No. 2½ can	22.4	1.48	6.6
9. Pink salmon, 16-oz. can, tall	13.4	.87	6.5
10. Asparagus, No. 2 can	29.5	1.22	4.1
11. Canned salmon, 16-oz. can, tall	25.7	.87	3.4

Perhaps more intriguing than the story of tin plate is the history of commercial canning. What would happen in the present war effort without canned foods staggers one. Our fighting forces would absolutely be at a standstill without food in cans.

The history of canning goes back to the year 1795 when the French Government offered a prize of 12,000 francs for the discovery of a practical method of food preservation. France was in the grip of a revolution at home and at the same time was at war with several hostile European nations. Consequently, the need for adequate food supplies for her army and navy was acute. It was not until 1809, however, that a Parisian confectioner succeeded in preserving certain foods in especially made glass bottles which had been kept in boiling water for varying lengths of time. In the next year, 1810, his work was made known publicly in a treatise entitled "The Book for All Households or the Art of Preserving Animal Substances for Many Years." The underlying principle of the various methods of food preservation is basically the same; the development of conditions within a food—temporary or sustained—which are unfavorable for the growth of spoilage organisms. Thus, for example, if a food be chilled, heated, or desiccated, or if it be made excessively acid by some proper

means, it immediately becomes an unfavorable medium for the development of micro-organisms. In commercial canning, carefully prepared raw food contained in a sealed container is subjected to definite elevated temperatures for the proper period of time and then cooled. Heating the contents of the can produces an unfavorable temperature environment for spoilage organisms which may be present in the food; consequently such organisms are destroyed and their growth inhibited. The permanently sealed can then prevents reinfection of the food by spoilage organisms present in the air. This is the basic principle of commercial canning. The industry was first introduced in the United States from England about 1820, and the first American establishments were set up in Boston and New York. The phenomenal growth of the industry in the United States and throughout the world in the last hundred years may be attributed—aside from the scientific approach—to the development of, first, the art of container manufacture of both tin cans and glass jars and bottles; second, the canning processes themselves; and, third, canning machinery.

The United States has become the greatest producer and consumer of canned foods in the world. The present-day tin can, which is 98.5 percent of sheet steel with a thin coating of tin, is manufactured on wholly automatic lines of machinery at a rate in excess of 300 cans per minute. In contrast, in can-manufacturing operations a little over a generation ago, a skilled artisan could make 600 cans in a 10-hour day. The improvement of the tin can as the cheapest and most serviceable container for mass production is marked by the advent of the sanitary, or open-top can, about 1905–08. This development answered many of the canner's practical problems by eliminating the use of solder in sealing the can and a perfect closure was guaranteed by the double-seamed top and bottom. In a typical year, the industry uses 10,000,000,000 tin cans for the Nation's harvest. California is listed in the 1937 census as having 406 establishments, the great proportion of which would be fruit canneries situated near the orchards. Other geographical areas are noted for a specialty, that is, Hawaii for pineapple, Alaska for salmon, and so forth. As far as the nutritive aspects of canned foods are concerned, modern canning practices embody procedures and methods designed to protect the vitamin and mineral content of the food. Canned foods, whether in tin or glass, are as safe and wholesome as similar foods prepared for the table by the best home methods.

Referring again to the investigation of concentration of economic power, conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee, we find in monograph No. 23 brochure on agriculture and the national economy the following on page 23:

As far as the national market is concerned, concentration of control has not progressed very far in the canning of fruits and vegetables except for certain specialized crops. Of much more importance to the farmer is the concentration of buying power in local markets which is represented by the canning companies. In order to assure themselves of adequate supplies, canning companies cannot afford to locate their factories too close to each other. In consequence, there is often only one canner and at the most usually not more than three or four to whom the farmer can conveniently haul his produce. As a result competition in buying is between the canner and the fresh market rather than among the canners themselves.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. I have no reason to differ with anything the gentleman has said, but as he rather took his text from what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] said, and like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], I was present in the committee, and also heard Mr. PACE. I do not think that he meant any reflection upon the tin business or its production or anything like that. He was merely illustrating one point, that the farmer gets so little of the consumer's dollar, which he pays for the product. That is so little comes to the farmer, who is the actual producer in the first instance. Mr. PACE merely mentioned that as a general item, the package in which the food is found cost more than the food itself.

Mr. ROLPH. I was particularly conscious of that.

Mr. CREAL. I do not think that he even gave that one thought any more than anything else, as, for instance, we talk about $12 for a ton of cabbages that retail for about $500 a ton. I do not think that he had any idea in any of his talk of any kind of an attack at the tin-can business.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much. I am very delighted that Mr. PACE has given me the opportunity to bring this out. I am sure Mr. PACE will also be glad to have the whole proposition discussed in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to compliment the gentleman from California on his presentation of one of the other phases of the total production of food. This whole productive process is a very complicated one in our modern economic world.

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Frequently we have a too narrow definition of who is an economic producer. I represent a farming community, and naturally I am thinking of the first producer, who gets the raw product out of the soil. Naturally I think the farmer gets too small a proportion of the total amount paid by the consumer, but the tin-can producer, the steel manufacturer, the middle men, and the transportation agencies are all in the production picture nevertheless. As to the relative part of the total cost each production factor should receive there is a considerable disagreement. I think it would be well for most of us to take a course in truly scientific economics, to determine just what is the relative share of each producer of what the consumer pays.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes, gladly.

Mr. HORAN. I am very glad that the gentleman brought out the whole picture of the canning industry. In the matter of wastage of food, I might say that we had our whole pear crop ready one year, boxed for the market, but we could not sell it. That was in 1931; so we took them out of cold storage and shipped them to a cannery and had them canned on our own account. We learned something about the canning business. There is the matter of the fixed and the adjustable cost factors, and it is not a simple thing when we get into the matter of an anemic market to have some costs absorb all of the losses.

Mr. ROLPH. I feel grateful to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ROLPH. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. As one who hails from a district in which one of the greatest canning operations in the world is carried on, a district in which there are iron deposits in great abundance, iron deposits which, it is hoped, will be developed in the near future, I am especially interested in both phases of the gentleman's discussion.

For his lucid explanation of a very complex subject, one which is of great concern to city dwellers and ruralites alike, we all owe the gentleman from California a definite debt of gratitude. I deem it a privilege to be able to arise to compliment the gentleman on his splendid effort.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman, and I am sure he will be specially interested in the remarks of my address which I am about to give in conclusion.

California is proud of her outstanding role in developing superior qualities in canned goods. California is proud for contributing so greatly to the food supply of the entire world. California is proud of her far-flung canning industry including grower, processor, distributor, and those who deliver our products.

Mr. Speaker, California thanks you and the Members of Congress for your aid in developing Central Valley. When water from Central Valley flows on additional irrigated lands in the Golden State we will provide foods in still greater abundance.

Recent canned food production figures in the United States

[Figures given are in case lots (1 dozen to a case)]

	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
FRUITS					
Apples	2,584,162	2,331,581	2,620,373	2,672,328	1,755,621
Applesauce	1,892,187	1,887,256	2,353,250	3,161,001	1,526,551
Apricots	2,075,631	3,332,814	2,982,467	5,727,996	1,729,486
Blackberries	746,391	486,651	596,341	493,218	534,248
Raspberries	531,098	517,746	388,584	623,564	319,287
Cherries, red pitted	1,855,045	2,562,683	1,450,335	2,471,982	1,694,813
Cherries, sweet	526,162	535,393	569,785	518,979	730,232
Grapefruit	2,398,352	3,747,822	2,410,904	4,279,240	3,654,697
Grapefruit juice	739,844	2,556,124	2,235,699	6,016,240	8,021,828
Peaches	8,936,335	11,746,634	11,509,593	13,992,140	10,401,016
Pears	6,163,362	4,766,874	6,104,365	5,115,962	4,848,090
Plums	206,856	152,016	116,040	288,532	70,086
Prunes	1,130,785	1,757,457	1,891,364	1,697,271	934,987
Grapes	136,812	105,998	108,067	121,859	93,532
Figs	222,670	216,550	313,930	412,481	260,299
Pineapple (Hawaiian)	9,000,000	10,000,000	12,000,000	12,500,000	10,000,000
Pineapple juice (Hawaiian)	2,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	7,500,000	5,000,000
Fruit salad	1,381,724	1,340,547	1,465,186	1,256,492	938,455
Fruit cocktail	1,167,851	1,649,907	2,156,808	3,152,313	1,941,814
Strawberries	108,676	181,057	133,205	126,051	94,860
Loganberries	352,645	225,576	164,643	66,078	195,786
Gooseberries	34,471	49,549	57,379	57,195	47,287
Blueberries and huckleberries		212,488	252,138	441,988	185,009
Orange juice	342,678	1,107,209	1,227,186	1,646,059	1,306,183
Lemon juice		100,000	300,000	352,422	425,000
VEGETABLES					
Asparagus	2,149,131	2,519,958	2,790,994	2,703,966	2,403,214
Beans:					
Green	5,157,128	6,031,152	5,675,399	8,681,119	9,108,933
Lima	1,280,812	1,133,776	1,512,737	1,449,040	1,863,486
Wax	1,143,234	1,129,955	954,070	1,370,724	1,806,064
Beets	2,196,116	2,461,768	2,490,250	3,210,403	3,176,207
Carrots				940,480	703,655
Corn	11,267,807	21,471,417	14,621,189	23,541,224	20,469,518
Peas	15,741,569	24,698,633	16,552,816	23,467,479	25,458,647
Pumpkin and squash	1,381,424	833,355	1,767,847	1,507,708	1,195,177
Spinach	3,602,131	4,318,001	4,143,167	6,136,051	2,883,106
Tomatoes	22,376,349	26,984,642	24,208,740	26,076,094	22,960,184
Tomato juice	5,703,920	9,286,590	13,104,809	13,444,972	8,942,894
MILKS					
Evaporated and condensed milk	40,779,724	43,535,000	48,122,230	44,371,057	

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed in Fremont, Nebr., November 17, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers; also a letter from B. A. Gronstal, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, relative to the roll-back and subsidy payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a reply on the part of Mr. Aubrey Williams, of the National Youth Administration, in which he lists more than one hundred manufacturing companies who commend the work of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER BY GRADE LABELING CANNED FOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, two major problems face our Nation today—the winning of the war and the protection of the domestic economy at home.

The greatest foe to the domestic economy is the threat of inflation, which will affect the standard of health and the general welfare of 130,000,000 people. There are many facets to the problem of inflation, and I wish to speak today on the one facet of protecting the consumer by grade labeling canned foods.

The subject of protecting the consumer is one which will never be exhausted. The development of quality standards has been taking place in every line of endeavor since commerce and trade began. For many years the phrase "caveat emptor"—let the buyer beware—was the banner under which all commerce was carried on. All types of fraud and deception, lying, cheating, and adulterating were considered smart business. An accompanying principle was the "let the public be damned" in public relations of the businessman to his customer.

As civilization advanced, however, certain of these principles began to lose their former adherents and there grew up in the guild world a pride of workmanship, denoted in most instances by the attaching of the name of the craftsman to his product. Upon this high standard, quality product, which proudly bore the name of its creator, there developed a demand for this particular article greater than its shoddy or cheapened competitive article—and let me say right here that I believe in the competitive system. I believe in the pride of individual creation. I believe in the preservation of the brand names and the protection of the owners of those brand names in their built-up equity therein, insofar as it does not work a hardship upon society as a whole, or become a detriment to the health of our people.

Let us go back to the passage of the Pure Food and Drugs Act in 1906. The same arguments that are used against quality designation or grade labeling today were used against the passage of this act, which is now considered one of the best protective acts the consumer enjoys. Would it have been wise at that time, because there were a few large manufacturers of drugs who kept faith with their consumers and sold their drugs under a brand name, to have refused to pass an act which would compel their unscrupulous competitors to employ the same safe standards and the same purity standards to their product?

I realize that those who held a high standard for their products were in the minority when considered in the aggregate, that a majority of the drugs the people were buying did not come up to standards of purity and quality. Therefore, for the benefit of the consuming public as a whole, we extended to them the protection against those unscrupulous or substandard-drug manufacturers. I, of course, realize that the Pure Food and Drugs Act does not completely cover the field. I realize that continuous investigation and in many instances prosecution, is necessary to protect the consuming public, and if I had time I could show you many cases which I have here in my file as late as the years 1942 and 1943 where indictments have been issued against manufacturers for transgressions of this act. This will continue to be the case as long as there are two principles—the principles of right and wrong in this world.

We have had a more recent protective law passed, known as the truth in fabrics bill. If I may be pardoned for referring to my own experience of some 20 years in the handling of fabric merchandise, I can say that, as a retailer, I welcomed this partially protective law, as protecting not only the consuming public but as a protection to the legitimate retail merchant against unscrupulous competitors. You will notice that I said "partially" protective. I realize the fact that this law applies chiefly to all-wool or part-wool fabrics. I realize that the law has its weak spots and is inadequate to fully cover the field of consumer protection.

In my research work on this subject, I enjoyed very much the book Fables in Labels, which was written by the respected chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Subcommittee, Congressman BOREN. I might say that I agree almost in entirety with his treatise on this subject. The information contained therein, I can verify from 20 years of experience in the purchasing and selling of fabrics and I wish to quote from page 64, of this book a fundamental moral principle which I believe is at stake in this phase of the grade-labeling program, along with all other legislation which is

planned for the protection of the great mass of our people:

Government with the aid of its laboratories and specification writers, has been able to judge quality and to take advantage of the best possible value at the lowest possible price. Is the ultimate consumer to be deprived of this same advantage?

I believe that if the Government finds it to its interest to apply performance standards to its purchases, such information should be made available to the consumer.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has stated here, the known fact that the Government has been able to set up standards of quality and "take advantage of the best possible value at the lowest possible price" and he further questions, "Is the ultimate consumer to be deprived of this same advantage?" And then he answers this question. I quote again: "I believe that if the Government finds it to its interest to apply performance standards to its purchases, such information should be available to the consumer," and this very simply and completely put is the reason that I request this protection for the civilian consumer.

The Government long ago established certain specifications, both as to content and performance, which had to be met by those who had supplies they wished to sell to the Government. The fact that these specifications had to be met by the suppliers of Government matériel has not discouraged competitive bidders. The record will prove that there has always been a sufficient number of bidders who found it profitable to supply the Government according to these specifications, and I challenge anyone to state that our boys in the armed forces have not received better equipment and foodstuffs as a result of this method of protective purchasing. Incidentally, I might state here that every can of edible foodstuff which is sold to the Government—and that runs into millions of cases—must pass rigid tests of quality requirements and must be grade-labeled to show that they have met these requirements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They require A. M. A. grading but not grade labeling.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The grade labeling is on the case.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the case but not on the can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; of course not. No one is going to substitute adulterated cans in a case when the case is marked.

Some of the canners who furnish these quality products to the Government are opposing this grade-labeling program to the consumer for their own selfish reasons. This grade-labeling program is not opposed in its entirety, however, by the canners. There are many canners now who are voluntarily complying with United States Government standards or, more specifically, the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. One of the greatest retail chains of grocers in the United States, having some 3,000 retail outlets, has built up immense consumer acceptance on these principles. I have a letter in my possession from this great chain, which says that not only are they satisfied with these A, B, C grades, but they are expanding the program to other products which they sell. Many canners in my own State of California are also complying voluntarily with the Agricultural Marketing Service standards.

As I stated before, I believe in brand protection. To those manufacturers who have built, by adhering to quality standards, a consumer acceptance of a particular brand, I believe they merit protection, but as a merchant with practical experience, I realize that this is not enough protection for the ultimate consumer for in my own experience I have known of the rise and fall of quality standards behind a specific brand. Any businessman will testify that this is a common occurrence. A company will build up a quality product. They will market it under a brand name, will popularize it with the consumer by a high-pressure advertising campaign. After a period of time, it has enormous consumer acceptance. Suddenly the article begins to deteriorate in quality. It may be due to financial difficulties of the firm, a change of ownership, a capitalization of the firm's earning power by overissuance of stock, or it may be through a deliberate policy of adulteration for the purpose of excessive profits.

Regardless of the reason, during the slide down the hill on the toboggan of declining quality standards, the consuming public is defrauded of millions of dollars in merchandise values. Therefore, I say to you that the brand name is not enough. It must be accompanied by a quality designation label to which the consumer may refer at any time as a measure of the value of the merchandise which he is purchasing. No legitimate canner should object to this. In my opinion, only those canners who are practicing deception or intend to perpetrate fraud upon the American people would object to this reasonable request. Any cry of socialism in regard to grade labeling is specious and for the purpose of beclouding the real issue of protecting the 130,000,000 consumers, robbery through deception, or withholding vital information.

I realize, of course, that the canners who are guilty of practicing deception or have intention to perpetrate fraud on the American people are in the minority when compared with the legitimate concerns. However, the illegitimate concerns and some of the legitimate concerns are raising the old cry of "Government interference with business," and claiming that grade-labeling regulations will cut down their profits and that they are now on the verge of bankruptcy.

I wish to call to your attention the cases of two great packing corporations which operate in my State of California. I do not know their attitude on grade labeling. I do have an analysis of their profits for the past 4 years, taken from the authoritative corporation records of Standard & Poor's Corporation reports. In the case of the California Packing Corporation, their deficit in 1939 was approximately two and one-half million dollars. Their profits for the years of 1940, 1941, and 1942 were approximately $11,000,000. During the past year of 1942 their profits were $4,893,122. In the case of Libby, McNeill & Libby, their deficit in 1939 was approximately three and one-half million dollars. In the 4 succeeding years, ending March 1, 1943, their profit was approximately $13,000,000. In the present year of 1943 their profits were $3,270,029.

Now, may I point out the fact during the past 3 or 4 years both of these companies have packed millions of cases of canned food for the use of our armed forces, each and every case conformed to quality specifications of the United States Government and was grade labeled accordingly? The records show that this protection which was extended to the boys in our armed forces was not a detriment to these great canning corporations, but, on the contrary, was a very profitable business arrangement. Here are the facts that substantiate my arguments that grade labeling is not a burden to the canner, and certainly the protection which has been extended to our boys in the armed forces should be extended to their mothers, wives, and babies at home.

If we agree then that the consumer should be protected from fraud in ordinary times, how much more necessary is it that he be protected during this time of food shortage, when the housewife is faced with the necessity of making every point in her ration book count?

Her failure to do this means substandard diet and the deterioration of the health of the members of her family. If she uses her precious points to purchase a can of food from the shelf of her grocer and then upon opening it she finds it is substandard in quality, she has not only been defrauded of her money, but due to the quota of ration points allowed her, she cannot replace it with a better quality of canned food. As there are thousands of brands, she may well make this mistake many times unless she can find a can which bears, beside the brand name, a quality designation mark.

I feel that the Members of this Congress owe a duty to every consumer in their districts today more than ever before, because of the point-rationing system. I believe that these laws should have been passed before now. I have been told that it is now too late to grade label the 1943 pack of canned goods. I am not in a position to judge the merit of this statement. If it is too late, I can say without fear of contradiction that the delay has been occasioned by the canners' lobbies who have opposed grade labeling for their own selfish reasons and have brought pressure to bear both within and without the Office of Price Administration.

If it is too late to label the 1943 pack, the public will pay the penalty for our dilatory procedures and I hope Halleck-Boren committee's findings will be such as to merit their recommendation that changes be made in the O. P. A. regulations or, better still, that proper legislation be brought before the Congress to enable us to extend the protection the consumers deserve into the field of canned foods.

If the time be too short for this protection to be applied to the 1943 pack, I am sure that by acting in an expeditious manner, we can extend this protection to the consumers of the 1944 pack.

I regret very much to see the attitude of the Republican bloc and their recruits from the Democratic side, as shown in their recent votes of June 18, in which they were successful in denying all funds to those departments charged with protecting the 130,000,000 consumers from fraud and deception. In so doing, it is my opinion, they have failed in this phase of the battle against inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR A FOOD FAMINE NEXT WINTER

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the wintry blasts of next January will find the American people subsisting on roll-backs and subsidies instead of food, unless Congress acts at once to correct the damage now being done to food production and distribution by utopian schemers in the O. P. A. and other New Deal agencies.

When famine strikes home next winter in New York City and other large consuming areas, roll-backs and subsidies will not count. It will then be a question of getting food at any price, if it can be secured at all. Within 6 months, most legitimate food dealers will be out of business because of inability to secure supplies from food processors, and the black market will flourish in the handling of beef, pork, poultry, butter, eggs, vegetables, and other essential foods. Patriotic citizens who refuse to patronize the black market and pay outrageous prices will go hungry. Processors and manufacturers of food products are now being placed in a position by the O. P. A. so that they will only receive a small trickle of supplies to meet the demands from all sources. There is a question in my mind if they will be able to get enough supplies to take care of the requirements of our armed forces, to say nothing of lend-lease commitments.

After months of observation and daily argument with O. P. A. officials, I am convinced that these planners are not interested in securing a maximum production of food products. Can it be possible that these social and economic reformers in the New Deal desire to bring about a scarcity in food and chaos in the processing and distribution of it, as an excuse for them to take over in every field and give the American people what is called a "socialistic new order." It looks that way to me.

I do not blame Prentiss Brown for the mistakes of the O. P. A. He inherited Henderson's clique, consisting of hundreds of inexperienced policy makers who operate from blueprints. With the exception of cating food, most of them have not had 1 day's experience in the production, processing, or distribution of products for human or animal consumption. To appease the American people, the administration has discharged two or three of these supermen like Ginsberg and Galbraith, but, by and large the administration continues to appoint men of the same caliber to take their places.

It appears that the administration does not want men of experience to handle the food problem. Intellectual schemers within the New Deal are now doing their best to discredit Chester Davis, one of the few men in administration circles who has the practical experience and knows the answers on the food problem. He has been hamstrung at every turn. He was called to Washington to solve the problem, only to find that New Deal schemers in the O. P. A. retained the whip hand in the formulation of food policies.

Chester Davis, as War Food Administrator, must be given full authority over the production, handling, and distribution of food in order to avoid disaster for the American people. He may not be able to correct all of the mistakes of the O. P. A., but I am satisfied that with full responsibility, he will put into operation plans for maximum production and better distribution, without raising prices to consumers. And, let me say right here, the farmers of the country are satisfied with the prices they are now receiving on most products. What is needed most, is the elimination of uncertainties in food planning, and by placing the control of food in the hands of an experienced official confidence will be restored, and we will go forward toward maximum production, as well as improvement in our distribution system.

I want to cite one illustration, and that is the case of corn. At the present time, war industries and other manufacturing plants are closing down because they cannot get corn, which is made into adhesives, gums, starches, sugar, sirup, and many other essential products. The Government owns more than 10,000,000 bushels of corn, and we are informed by the Department of Agriculture that there are several hundred million bushels of this product in storage in the commercial corn area. Thus far, those in charge of corn have not devised any way in which it may move to the industrial plants. Congress has no jurisdiction over this matter, but I can tell you frankly, that if something is not done about it promptly, all of the bakeries and candy manufacturers, in addition to manufacturers of corn products, will shortly close down.

Farmers in southern Minnesota engaged in dairy, hog, poultry and beef production are asking me to secure corn for them. I have urged the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell them corn from Government supplies which are now being stored in steel bins throughout the commercial corn area. You may wonder why we have a corn shortage in southern Minnesota, which is in the commercial corn area. The shortage in corn took place because the A. A. A. would not let our farmers plant enough corn in 1942 to provide feed for livestock on the farm without being penalized. For several years, I have tried to put through legislation which would permit farmers to plant corn for silage purposes in addition to their regular corn allotment under the A. A. A. New Deal planners stopped favorable action on my proposal. If my suggestion would have been law in 1942, we would have had 500,000,000 bushels more corn on hand with which to feed 125,000,000 pigs, and large additional supplies to take care of beef cattle, poultry, and for all of the needs of industrial plants in the country. I am sure that under the direction of Chester Davis, this situation will be remedied for 1944, if he is given control over food production and distribution, but that is too late to do any good this year.

The time has come for a show-down if we are to meet our commitments, feed the men in the armed forces, and avoid famine at home. The administration refuses to act with intelligence, and it is, therefore, up to Congress to take action before it is too late, and that should be before we take the summer recess.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) on account of death in immediate family.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m.,

Tuesday, June 22, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 23, and Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

506. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $42,500 (H. Doc. No. 240); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

507. A letter from Howard R. Stinson, representative of the United States, Belle Fourche River compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of the proposed Belle Fourche River compact between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming, together with a signed copy of his report on the compact and the proceedings relating to its negotiation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

508. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of April 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

509. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill "to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

510. A letter from the Secretary, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the Library.

511. A letter from the Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1942; to the Committee on the Library.

512. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the expenses of the offices of recorder of deeds and register of wills of the District of Columbia," approved April 24, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Crown Mountain water courses and their tributaries, island of St. Thomas, V. I.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. House Resolution 254. Resolution directing the Library of Congress to deliver to the Attorney General certain papers; with amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DISNEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2888. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; with amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2540. A bill to regulate the possession, control, maintenance, and use of carrier pigeons; with amendment (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1381) granting a pension to Callie Ellis, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3012. A bill to create the Japanese Deportation Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr O'LEARY:

H. R. 3013. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of December 29, 1941, so as to make the provisions of said act applicable to officers or employees certifying to pay rolls of the Selective Service System for payment by Army disbursing officers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3014. A bill to provide for the making of loans and grants to veterans of the present war to aid them to purchase farms and homes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3015. A bill to amend section 403 (i) (1) (ii) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, relating to the exemption of contracts for raw materials with the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the Maritime Commission, and subcontracts thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to suspend certain orders and proceedings under the provisions of title I and titles II of the Public Utility Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Japanese nationals and certain persons of Japanese descent should be deported at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Hubert McMahon and Barbara McMahon, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1674. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Alice R. Mayhew and 18 others, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. By Mr. BRYSON. Petition of Edith C. Casterline and 14 citizens of Winters, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1676. Also, petition of Mrs. Pope Brooks and 12 citizens of Winnsboro, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration be continued under its present leadership and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its facilities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1677. Also, petition of Mary S. Kirk and 37 citizens of East Waterford, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration

of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1678. Also, petition of Bessie Lathe Scovell and 64 citizens of Cook County and Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1679. Also, petition of Rebecca T. Bigham and 13 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1680. Also, petition of Mrs. G. L. Endeman and 121 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1681. Also, peition of Anabel Boyle and 68 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1682. Also, petition of Anna McHatton and 57 citizens of Akron, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1683. Also, petition of Mrs. G. C. Reed and 21 citizens of Kirkland, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1684. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. Cornish and 27 citizens of Osborne, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1685. Also, petition of 17 members of the First Methodist Church of Chula Vista, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1686. Also, petition of Minnie V. Reid and 20 citizens of Costa Mesa, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the wining of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1687. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of 39 citizens of the State of California, urging the passage of House bill 2052, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1688. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco building and construction trades council, requesting the Administrator of the National Housing Agency to give consideration to San Francisco's most serious and acute housing problems to the end that priorities be granted for the construction of 5,000 modest homes for all workers in the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1689. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition transmitted by Arthur C. Menke, tourist court owner, of Las Vegas, Nev., and signed by some 35 other tourist court owners of the vicinity, protesting against Regulation 9A, issued by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1690. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by George N. Taylor and 31 other citizens of Tillamook County, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1691. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Deland, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. J. Warren Hastings, Ph. D., minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, we thank Thee for our heritage as a nation. We are thankful that our forefathers were led by Thy Spirit when they came to these shores and that Thy Spirit has been constantly in evidence in the life of our country. We are thankful for the resources of our land, our farms and cities, our great forests, and all the good things of life that Thou hast given us. We thank Thee for the great wide-open spaces, for the snow-capped mountain peaks, for homes and happiness and families, for schools and social institutions, for the indomitable spirit of our people, for the fact that all races and all classes are represented in the melting pot that is the United States of America. We thank Thee that beneath and above all of this is the most wonderful idealism in the world.

Wilt Thou, dear Father, help us to be worthy of our heritage? Help us to do our utmost to take all that has been passed on to us—passed on as institutions, as ideals, as hopes, as material gifts, as national traits and characteristics. Help us to take all these things and use them and improve them during our period of service in this country. We realize, dear Lord, that we cannot lead and serve in human strength alone; that if we try to carry on, whether our job is big or little, and depend upon nothing but human resources, ultimately we fall. May we then, O Lord, work in the power of Thy Spirit as we serve and lead the people of this great Nation. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF PERU—UNION OF PAN-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY BODIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, transmitting a motion or resolution of that body concerning the establishment of a committee having for its purpose the encouragement of the union of the pan-American parliamentary bodies, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APRIL 1943 REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of April 1943, containing statement of loan and other authorizations, etc. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

A letter from the representative of the United States Belle Fourche River Compact Negotiations, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation on the proposed Belle Fourche River Compact (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the board of directors of the New York Automobile Association, favoring a congressional investigation to determine whether there has been and is an unjust discrimination in the regulations pertaining to the distribution, sale, and use of gasoline in the eastern seaboard States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Hiram A. Spry, of Munith, Mich., praying for relief—special compensation—for an injury incurred by him while serving in the United States Navy during 1918 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Albert, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Resolution 64

"Joint resolution urging Wisconsin Members of Congress to meet with the Wisconsin Highway Commission and representatives of Wisconsin counties to obtain proper allocation of road materials to such counties

"Whereas Wisconsin is faced with a serious condition relative to maintenance and repair of county trunk roads due to extremely bad break-up conditions this spring; and the policy of the Bureau of Public Roads of severely cutting applications for bituminous material needed to maintain and repair such roads; and

"Whereas every effort has been made to secure sufficient material through the St. Paul office of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, but without avail; and

"Whereas Wisconsin's investments in these black top county trunk roads are estimated to be more than $20,000,000; and

"Whereas Wisconsin is a dairy State and one of the prime producers of vital food products which must be moved over these roads to meet urgent wartime needs; and

"Whereas Wisconsin's total requirements for maintenance and repair of these county trunks for this current season are 9,392,670 gallons and the allotments received to date total 6,150,650 gallons, leaving a balance of 3,242,020 gallons still required; and

"Whereas this situation has been accentuated by the Bureau of Public Roads improperly allocating full requirements to 18 counties and practically full requirements to another 23 counties, leaving 30 counties in desperate need of over 80 percent of the total balance required for the entire State; and

"Whereas it has now reached the point where the season has progressed so far that immediate action is necessary by the Federal agency to allocate to Wisconsin counties the right to purchase materials if available to repair and maintain these county trunk highways: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby urges Wisconsin Congressmen and United States Senators to meet with representatives of the State Highway Commission and representatives of the county highway commissioner's association at Washington, D. C., at a date to be agreed upon in an attempt to get the proper allocations of road materials for Wisconsin counties in order that Wisconsin's huge investment in county trunk roads be protected and that these roads be kept in proper repair and maintenance to insure the delivery of dairy food and farm products during this critical war period; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Wisconsin Member of Congress."

ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION OF DARIEN WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter which I have received from Miss Margaret R. Brash, corresponding secretary, Darien Women's Republican Association of Darien, Conn., relative to a resolution adopted by that association at its annual meeting held on May 19, 1943, concerning the so-called Ball, Burton, Hatch, and Hill resolution.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DARIEN WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION,
Darien, Conn., June 19, 1943.

The Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Room 354, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the annual meeting of the Darien Women's Republican Association, held on May 19, 1943, the following resolution was recommended:

"Whereas four Senators—two Democrats and two Republicans, BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL, have introduced a resolution by which a committee can be set up to study, confer, cooperate, and advise on all problems which will present themselves as the war reaches a victory, and this without committing the American people to any policy or any terms; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Darien Women's Republican Association, assembled in the annual meeting, do recommend that this resolution be withdrawn from committee and debated on the floor of the Senate, to the end that we may have a forum to which we, the people, can listen, and a means whereby we can evaluate the wisdom of such a course; and, if the Senate approves the forming of such a committee of Members, proceed to appoint a group of its Members, equally divided between the two parties."

Very truly yours,

MARGARET R. BRASH,
Corresponding Secretary.

AID FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 43, which I recently introduced on the floor of the Senate, entitled "Establishing a Division for the Physically Handicapped in the United States Employment Service," I should like to point out that I recently received a copy of a communication issued by Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, president of the United States Civil Service Commission, in which he sets forth certain objections to the joint resolution in its present form.

I have, in addition, recently received a letter from Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., in which he successfully replies to the objections raised by Mr. Mitchell, and in which he again makes clear the need for immediate action in the consideration and enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 43.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters of Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Strachan be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that both these communications be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, in order that that committee may be in a position to make an immediate and thorough analysis of the comparative merits of these respective communications.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the committee will see fit to take early and favorable action toward the solution of the very vital issue which is covered by Senate Joint Resolution 43.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1943.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Further reference is made to your letter of April 21, 1943, requesting a report on the Commission's views regarding Senate Joint Resolution 43, entitled "Establishing a Division for the Physically Handicapped in the United States Employment Service."

Section 2 of the bill provides that—

"The Director of the United States Employment Service is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such persons as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the Division, to establish such number of subdivisions thereof as in his judgment may be necessary to carry out the functions of such Division, and to provide for an accredited representative of such Division in each of the offices of the United States Employment Service throughout the United States. So far as practicable, the personnel of such Division shall be selected from physically handicapped persons."

The Commission is not favorable to the proposal in section 2, quoted above. The Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is a general law containing pay scales which are presently applicable to over 1,000,000 Government employees in the departmental and field services. It sets legislative standards for determining the salaries of positions on the basis of their duties and responsibilities. Such a provision in the resolution would not be in the best interest of orderly salary administration, which involves recognition of the principle of equal pay for equal work, and would tend to establish unequal rates of compensation for rehabilitation specialists in one Government agency as compared to other Government agencies. Rehabilitation service calls for the highest professional qualities, and it would be unfortunate to set aside all consideration of the merit-system standards and place emphasis on physical condition alone in the case of the employees of the Division. Such a system of employing the handicapped would reverse the philosophy of rehabilitation, which puts qualifications for the job first as the most effective way of assisting the physically handicapped. They want to feel they are rendering adequate service.

The Commission during the past year has taken steps to speed up the utilization in suitable employment of the abilities and aptitudes of employable handicapped persons in the Federal civil service, and agrees that such steps are necessary in connection with employment in private industry. Through the Commission's program, thousands of such persons have been placed in Federal positions for which they are qualified.

A separate division for the physically handicapped, as outlined in Senate Joint Resolution 43 would be considerably less effective and efficient than a central planning and advisory committee to study, promote, and coordinate a program calling for the employment of the physically handicapped. Such a committee would place proper emphasis on the fullest possible use of the handicapped in each bureau of the War Manpower Commission, rather than establishing a separate division in the United States Employment Service.

In accordance with established procedure, this report has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, who advises the Commission that there is no objection to the submission of the report.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
1376 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1943.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: Acknowledging your letter of June 7, enclosing copy of letter from Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, President, United States Civil Service Commission, of May 12, to the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman, Senate Committee on Education and Labor, as per your request I beg to submit my views thereupon.

As one who, in earlier days, was representative of the organization primarily responsible for enactment of the present classification law, I believe I am familiar with its provisions, and would further say that, insofar as its genesis and operation in relation to the physically handicapped is concerned, I believe I know more about it than does the President of the Civil Service Commission.

The question (raised by Mr. Mitchell) as to whether or not the Classification Act would be fractured, broken, or irremediably disrupted by passage of the proposed resolution (Senate Joint Resolution 43) is not particularly in point. The director of the proposed division, for example, could establish any given set of standards relating to qualifications (other than physical) and pay, that may be desired, and these need not, necessarily, be in contravention to classification pay scales, or qualifications.

Further, the resolution states, "So far as practicable, the personnel of such division shall be selected from physically handicapped persons." That does not make it mandatory that all employees be chosen from the ranks of the handicapped, or, in fact, any employees at all, for that matter. And, even if all employees were chosen from the handicapped, as a matter of justice and equity, I ask you, "What would be more appropriate than an agency for the handicapped, operated by the handicapped?" Our first vice president, Mr. Jesse D. Gross, in commenting upon the proposal that there is objection to making physical disability a preferential factor in employment, very pertinently states, "It would, indeed, be but belated justice if, now, physical disability should be made a preferential factor in employment, as a change from the past and present extreme of it being a detrimental factor in employment."

The good President of the Civil Service Commission, like many others who do not distinguish between "rehabilitation," per se, and employment placement techniques—a thing entirely apart from rehabilitation—proceeds to arbitrarily aline the proposed division for the physically handicapped (designed to be set up solely as an employment proposition), with the Vocational Rehabilitation Service. Such is not the intent. Indeed, if the writer had his way—in the light of his own past observations—there would be no mixing of the two—at least not under the present set-up.

I am quite confident that Mr. Mitchell's confusion in this matter is due to the fact that, in all likelihood, his letter was probably drafted by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, member, United States Civil Service Commission, and more recently also a member of the War Manpower Commission, and who, in my opinion, for the past 2 years has evaded, sidetracked, and otherwise derailed development of any comprehensive over-all policy relating to Federal employment of the physically handicapped.

Rehabilitation, as stressed by Mr. Mitchell, it is true, is part of the task of regeneration and utilization of the handicapped—at least in such instances where either treatment, application of orthopedic, prosthetic, hearing, aids to sight, or other devices or appliances to aid and restore to full or partial usefulness the handicapped individual, or, education and training, may be concerned. But this does not necessarily mean that there are not many positions which could be held, by many types of handicapped, without any treatment or training. In short, acceptance of the status quo, making use of their respective abilities for work, right now or later, which they may be qualified to do, without rehabilitation processes being applied.

Rehabilitation to Mr. Mitchell's mind, apparently, is the junction where treatment, training, and placement meet; but, it may be pointed out that, in the absence of traffic signals, there is always a great deal of confusion at such intersections.

With respect to paragraph 4 of Mr. Mitchell's letter, may I not inform you that in association with Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, chairman, House Committee on the Civil Service, I presented to the Civil Service Commission, even before this Nation entered the present war, what was, I believe, a thoroughly workable plan relating to employment of the handicapped. Sad to relate, the Commission, as is usual when suggestions are developed apart from their own staff, did nothing about it for a long, long time. It will be noted from attached marked copy of address of Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, that he generously credits me with having initiated the survey of the handicapped made by the Civil Service Commission, on which largely the present employment policy relating to the handicapped is presumed to be hinged.

However, before that time, operating under civil service regulations, many otherwise qualified handicapped could not be appointed, because of their disability. For example, it is only a short time, relatively, since the Commission in its wisdom held fast to the rule which would have, if literally applied, forbidden appointment of the late Thomas Alva Edison because, forsooth, "he could not hear a watch tick at a distance of 15 feet." And this is but one of many instances which might be cited.

The position of this federation, representing the handicapped, is, that in all agencies where their interests are at stake, they should have adequate representation. We believe, frankly, that there has been a sort of caste system built up in agencies dealing with the handicapped and that representatives of this caste—not handicapped themselves—have been and are more concerned with preservation and advancement of their own interests than actual aid to the handicapped. There are, of course, notable exceptions to this. But we are determined to continue our campaign, which has already received approval of a large number of Members of Congress as well as other eminent men and women in public and private life, that agencies handling the problems of the handicapped shall be staffed, insofar as practicable and possible, by the handicapped. We indignantly refute the idea that anyone could understand the problems and psychology of the physically handicapped as well as those who, themselves, are so afflicted. In short, Senator, we shall fight for actual representation—not theoretical representation—in high and low places where the interests of our people are concerned.

We shall do this as a matter of sound economic policy—in assisting to put a floor under the present wobbly and wholly inadequate program for the handicapped—and, as a matter of humanitarian principle, social justice, and equity. We do not wish to continue in the unhappy plight of having others do our thinking, or acting, for us. We believe that, in our ranks, there are sufficiently well qualified handicapped to head or staff, any agency of Government. In fact, we might point out that the Chief Executive himself is physically handicapped. Disability should not be a deterrent to employment, provided other qualifications are present.

In paragraph 5 of Mr. Mitchell's letter, which I believe to be the voice of Esau, although the hand of Jacob, because it is, in fact, but a repetition of the endless evasions with which those of us who represent the handicapped have had to contend, emanating, among others, from the aforesaid Mr. Flemming, since this paragraph expresses the opinion that—

"A separate division for the physically handicapped, as outlined in Senate Joint Resolution 43, would be considerably less effective and efficient than a central planning and advisory committee to study, promote, and coordinate a program calling for the employment of the physically handicapped. Such a committee would place proper emphasis on the fullest possible use of the handicapped in such bureau of the War Manpower Commission, rather than establishing a separate division in the United States Employment Service."

I respectfully point out, in reply to Mr. Mitchell, that this federation, from the beginning, has persistently called for a Bureau of Welfare for the Physically Handicapped, a central agency to handle all the problems of the handicapped, but, with proper observance of the rights and functionr of existing agencies.

Second, if Mr. Mitchell's statement is to be accepted literally, in view of the fact that various plans and programs looking to establishment of just such a committee as he proposes, have been laid before his, and other Federal agencies during the past 2 years, why then, have not such agencies already established such central organization? It seems rather late to me, to now announce that which should have been clear to any thinking person 2 years ago, especially in the light of the fact that I was one of those who proposed to these agencies that very program they now project as coming "like a thunderbolt, full-armed, from the head of Jove" as their very own.

Third, in fact, Mr. Mitchell's statement is simply the familiar cry of the bureaucrats. When faced with necessity for taking definite action they, invariably, seek refuge in "let's form an advisory committee." That has, to their minds, the desirability of stalling definite action, so that the original proposal may either be pigeon-holed and forgotten, or completely emasculated by later amendments, as well as taking away from Congress its prerogative to adjudge the matter upon its merits and, if justified, writing a sensible remedy into basic law.

Fourth, it must be pointed out that the War Manpower Commission, as now constituted, is but an ephemeral institution. It has no standing in basic law, and exists solely by virtue of Executive order. We seek a permanent, definite policy and program for the handicapped, Senator; not merely an illusory, vague, and temporary "hand-out."

Further, suppose such advisory planning and coordinating committee were formed, would not one of its findings, if such findings were based upon sound reasoning, be, that as one step in the development of a national program for the physically handicapped there be a division for the physically handicapped, in the United States Employment Service?

How could they escape that conclusion? Is that not dealing with the subject at the source, or, at least, one source? Remembering, all the while, that in this instance, we are talking, solely, about employment of the handicapped.

Surely, even the august minds now composing the War Manpower Commission and its alter ego, the Civil Service Commission—whose brilliant coups-de-etat have so electrified the Nation, particularly the Congress—

that these agencies, of late, have been recipient of fulsome compliments for the splendid results emanating from application of their methods and plants. Indeed, so much so, that various congressional committees are today frenziedly seeking new words in their lexicons to describe the present muddled manpower situation in its entirety.

Certainly, even these great minds would have to admit, there is no way in which to bypass a fact, and a fact in this instance is that there are, according to Mr. McNutt's own figures as submitted to Mr. Ramspeck, 23,000,000 or more physically handicapped citizens in this country, and a fair percentage of these are possessed of skills and aptitudes which would avail in the war effort, either with or without additional treatment or training.

If it is intended that the so-called Vocational Rehabilitation Service must be the funnel through which all these people are to be strained, then I submit somebody is kidding. How could their boasted economical force of 22 specialists even augmented by the meager total of States' rehabilitation services employees—probably less than 500 all told—handle the specialized problems of 23,000,000 people, or even any considerable number of them? Specially so when it is considered that, by comparison, there are more than 1,500 United States Employment Offices scattered through this broad land, and in them, logically, the handicapped would find facilities for registration for employment far easier and certainly to greater advantage to themselves and to the country than in going through the endless fol-de-rol imposed by the United States Rehabilitation Service.

This federation, Senator, wants things in their proper perspective. It believes there has been too much intermeddling by outsiders in matters which they "wot not of." It does not necessarily follow that a specialist in rehabilitation is likewise a specialist in placement, and there is no way in which a corps of placement experts could be better developed than as an arm of the United States Employment Service as, from your own long experience as Secretary of Labor, I believe you would agree.

We do not desire to make invidious comparisons as to the methods by which such agency should be staffed insofar as abrogating the Classification Act is concerned but, we point out, that recently various responsible Government heads have severely criticized the Civil Service Commission for the miserable quality of personnel it has sent them through its own channels and we respectfully submit, if a proper directorate of the proposed division for the physically handicapped in the United States Employment Service is selected, we do not see how the head of such could do a much worse job in picking personnel than has the Commission, on the basis of testimony of those executives who are presumed to know what they are talking about—among others, the Honorable Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General and former Member of Congress.

The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped wants the Rehabilitation Service to be properly staffed and funded. We are just as much concerned in development of their side, as we are that of employment, through suitable placement. But, in proposing establishment of a division for the physically handicapped in the United States Employment Service, we are, we believe, placing this work where it properly belongs, and we do not understand why the Civil Service Commission has anything to say about the conduct of the United States Employment Service in this instance, since no violation of the Commission's own personnel policies are involved. Further, we refute the thought that the Rehabilitation Service, as now constituted, is either equipped or funded to handle all the problems of the handicapped. Sad experience has proven otherwise.

In conclusion, we respectfully submit, the problems of the handicapped today are acute and demand full consideration by the Congress because any effective remedy will, of necessity, have to be, or, at least, should be, developed through enactment of law, rather than by Executive order, which last is subject to the vicissitudes of change of mind, or administration, later, and, if adverse, would leave the handicapped in that future day in worse plight than ever before.

Therefore, we insist that this is Congress' job and not that of any bureaucrat. We respectfully urge that consideration be given Senate Joint Resolution 43 on its merits, and not because of an opinion of an agency which has, already, to my belief, shown itself to be wholly indifferent to and unable to perceive the ramifications of the problems of the physically handicapped in their true light, to say nothing of failing to prescribe or apply adequate remedies for such situation.

We say this, Senator, as representatives of the physically handicapped, who, because of having long been ignored, we now believe stand in need of vigorous representation before Congress and the various Federal, State, and other governmental and private agencies—and we say this conscious of the unpleasant fact that in bygone years there has been no over-all representation of the handicapped whatsoever and they have been at the mercy of individuals who, we believe, are absolutely indifferent to, and ignorant of, our needs and aspirations.

We hope, therefore, that you will not falter, but will renew your efforts to pass Senate Joint Resolution 43, thereby aiding not only the handicapped, but the Nation as well, through facilitating increase in manpower supply. We extend our heartiest appreciation for your splendid work on this measure and assure you that we shall continue the fight with you.

With best wishes and personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President.

RESOLUTION OF WICHITA (KANS.) KIWANIS CLUB—FEEDING OF STARVING CHILDREN IN NAZI-DOMINATED COUNTRIES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Wichita (Kans.) Kiwanis Club, endorsing Senate Resolution 100 and House Resolution 117, pertaining to the feeding of the starving children of Europe in Nazi-dominated countries. The resolution is signed by Dr. T. A. Williams, president.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Wichita Kiwanis Club, That we hereby endorse Senate Rsolution 100 and House Resolution 117 of the National Congress pertaining to the feeding of the starving children of Europe in Nazi-dominated countries. We believe that the future peace and welfare of the world depends upon preserving the people of the democratic countries of Europe.

We are convinced that the conditions in these countries are terrible beyond expression. In all of these Nazi-occupied countries children are dying of starvation and a whole generation is in danger of extinction.

We believe that means have been provided whereby this work can be done without giving aid or assistance to the enemy. We earnestly urge upon our Kansas Senators and Congressmen the careful consideration of this matter and that they work for the passage of the above resolutions or others of similar nature and do everything in their power to secure permission for the various agencies which have charge of this matter to pass food through the blockade for the starving children of Europe.

STATE OF KANSAS,
Sedgwick County, ss:

We, Thomas A. Williams, president, and C. E. Holgerson, secretary, of the Wichita Kiwanis Club, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was passed unanimously at the regular meeting of the Wichita Kiwanis Club held June 18, 1943, at which 180 members were present, after listening to an address by Howard Kershner, executive vice president of the International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees, speaking under the auspices of the Federated Council of Churches of Christ in America, the American Friends Service Committee, and the National Committee on Food for Small Democracies.

Witness our hands at Wichita, Kans., this 18th day of June 1943:

DR. T. A. WILLIAMS,
President.
C. E. HOLGERSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF GRAND FORKS (N. DAK.) TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY—ABOLITION OF LITTLE STEEL FORMULA

Mr. LANGER presented a resolution adopted by the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Trades and Labor Assembly, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a daily newspaper published an article Friday, April 9, that originated in the office of the President of the United States, stating a strict adherence to the Little Steel formula would be followed by the War Labor Board in establishing wages and ceiling prices on all commodities affecting the cost of living; and

Whereas on the same date in the same newspaper a news item from Office of Price Administration headquarters in Washington disclosed that prices on white potatoes for May and June had been increased 20 cents per hundred pounds and dry onions had been increased 20 cents per 50 pounds; and

Whereas a 15-percent wage increase limit as of January 1, 1941, is grossly unfair and inadequate to meet increased living costs since January 1, 1941, as figures can be obtained from reliable sources that living costs increases vary from 21 percent to 35 percent; and

Whereas Congress has turned thumbs down on the proposition limiting salaries to $25,000 per year, and freezing wages and not salaries based upon profit is discriminatory; and

Whereas including the Victory tax, income tax, purchasing of War bonds, Red Cross donations or other war agencies the workers' pay checks compare to depression years; and

Whereas to count additional hours worked per week as an increase in wages is a subterfuge and should be discounted by all fair-minded citizens because additional hours worked means extra profit per man-hour; and

Whereas wage increases should be figured on increased production as well as increased living cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly petition the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to order the War Labor Board to abolish the Little Steel formula for adjusting wage issues; and be it further

Resolved, That the above instruct the War Labor Board in settling wage disputes that such settlements be based upon increased production and living costs statistics as pro-

vided by the United States Department of Labor covering the area nearest the town or city in which the increase in wages is sought.

C. P. O'NEILL,
Chairman of Legislative Committee.

Adopted by the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly in regular session June 9, 1943.

B. M. RYAN,
Secretary-treasurer Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly.

Concurred in by the following affiliated local unions:

Motion Picture Operators, No. 231; Typographical Union, No. 288; Switchmen Union, No. 288; Musicians' Union, No. 485; Steam and Operating Engineers, No. 722; Building Service Employees, No. 104; Beet Sugar Refinery Employees, No. 21446; Meat Cutters' Union, No. 377; Railway Carmen, No. 814; City and County Employees, No. 148; Machinists' Union, No. 810; Occident Mill Workers, No. 22569; Postal Clerks, No. 139; Pressmen's Union, No. 192; Fire Fighters' Union, No. 405; Carpenters' Union, No. 2028; Barbers' Union, No. 601; Bakery Workers, No. 400; Bartenders' Union, No. 598; Bricklayers' Union, No. 3; Electrical Workers, No. B, 949; General Drivers, No. 581; Mill Workers, No. 19177; Plumbers and Steam Fitters, No. 424; Railway Clerks, No. 488.

RESOLUTION OF SIOUX INDIANS OF THE DEVILS LAKE RESERVATION, N. DAK.—CLAIMS OF SIOUX INDIANS

Mr. LANGER also presented a letter from the tribal secretary of the Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, Warwick, N Dak., together with a resolution adopted by the Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, which letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARWICK, N. DAK., *May 22, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: We, the tribe of Devils Lake Reservation, the Indians at Fort Totten Agency, Fort Totten, N. Dak., held a meeting on May 20, 1943, at 1 p. m. relating to our two bills, H. R. 34 and H. R. 37. Our attorney, Traynor, was present at our meeting and he explained things clearly concerning our claims against the Government. Over 65 Indians attended this meeting. Many older Indians used a voice in this discussion in regard to bills H. R. 34 and H. R. 37.

At this meeting the Sioux Indians of Devils Lake Reservation approved and passed a resolution, which I am sending separately.

Now to come to the real truth. Every Indian voiced and cried what shall we do, if this war is on and no one knows when it will end. So at this time we older Indians, and all the rest that have no land, no income, some unable to work, what shall we do? We used to make a little living through the winter and even through the summer months, by selling our own hay meadows, dry wood, fence posts. Now today, through our Indian Agency at Fort Totten, N. Dak., our officials working at the Indian Agency, what can a poor Indian do? Even trust patent Indians can't get a permit for their hay meadows on their own allotment. The same with the posts and dry wood. So, how are they going to live? Are these rulings or laws made through the Indian Bureau or Department, or are these regulations made here in this office of Fort Totten, N. Dak.?

Therefore, we, the Indians of the Fort Totten Agency, are crying for mercy wishing our claims to be favored. These bills are H. R. 34 and H. R. 37.

We, the Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, fully thank you for introducing our rights to the Government. Honorable, please attach our resolution in with the bills, H. R. 34 and H. R. 37, to show that we Indians are using a voice when the hearing is set.

Sincerely,

Mr. MIKE C. JACKSON,
Tribal Secretary, Warwick, N. Dak.

P. S.—Please answer as soon as possible about the hearing of our bills.

RESOLUTION

We, the true American Indians of the United States of America, residing on the Devils Lake Reservation, Fort Totten, N. Dak., ask and pray the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, to act and favor our claims, bills H. R. 34 and H. R. 37.

Our great, great grandfathers waited piteously for years to see or hear the United States Government make a determination. Stories of years and today have been handed down from generation to generation, and today we orphans definitely believe that our fathers' words were solemnly true. Today, our forefathers are all dead and gone, those, especially, who waited to hear a decision from our Government. We know that the Government has deprived us of many of our treaties.

We, the Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, with full heart and will, that our rights be approved, are anxious to loan the Government 50 percent of our rights toward our war of today for War bonds. Today in this World War No. 2, we have many of our Sioux Indian boys from the Devils Lake Reservation in the war, on foreign soil, fighting for their country, their fatherland, the United States of America. Yes, fighting for the land where we poor Indians were born; for us, who for years have been waiting piteously, praying to have the Government interest itself in our two claims, bills H. R. 34 and H. R. 37.

Have mercy on us poor Indians, and see that action is taken on our bills. We pray the Government that be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

This resolution was passed and approved by the Sioux Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, Fort Totten, N. Dak., on May 20, 1943, at 4:00 p. m.

With thanks and good wishes,

Sincerely,

GEO. MCK. C. JACKSON,
Tribal Secretary, Warwick, N. Dak.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING RECESS—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The following notices of motions to suspend the rules were filed on June 21, 1943:

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2513), making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, page 24, line 11, after the word "activities", under the heading "General supervision and instruction" and following the word "activities", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That from the funds provided for salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia public schools the board of education is authorized to pay the salaries of such teachers, not to exceed one in each junior high school and one in each elementary school, as may be assigned, at a grade not higher than P-3, to supervisory duties in connection with pupil guidance."

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2513), making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely, page 41, after line 17, under the heading "Juvenile Court", insert the following:

"The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to obtain psychiatric service for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia from the United States Public Health Service, and, at the request of the Board of Commissioners, the Surgeon General is authorized to detail the necessary medical and other personnel, not to exceed one psychiatrist, one psychologist, and one nurse, for this purpose."

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2513), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely, page 72, after line 9, insert the following:

"The Commissioners are hereby authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., growing out of the construction of the Franklin Street Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $47,177.05, for the sum of $32,279.83; and the Commissioners are further authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the said company, growing out of the construction of the Eastern Avenue Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $13,684.14, for the sum of $10,999.45."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2513, making appropriations for the District of Columbia government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2513), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely, page 23, line 18, under the heading "Public Schools, Operating Expenses, General Administration" and after the word "available", insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Board of Education is authorized to assign the Acting Superintendent of Schools to the salary schedule for the Superintendent of

Schools, contained in the Teachers' Salary Act of 1924, during the time the said Superintendent is granted leave of absence without pay by the Board of Education, and this appropriation shall be available for payment on that basis of the salary of the Acting Superintendent."

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 55, after line 10, insert the following:

"For necessary expenses, including personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the carrying out, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of a penny-milk program for the school children of the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture, and for the carrying out of a food-conservation program in the District of Columbia, including the supervision of Victory gardens and the canning of the products thereof, $75,000: *Provided*, That collections from the milk program shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, and that reimbursement for such canning shall be in kind and for the benefit of public-welfare institutions of the District of Columbia."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2513, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1944, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report from that committee, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 326) thereon. I shall ask that the bill be considered at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HILL. Would not the Senator want to have it taken up now so that it will be before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have it made the unfinished business, and I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator in charge of the bill spoke to me today about it. I am exceedingly anxious to get through with the appropriation bills. I am advised that the bill reported by the Senator from Wyoming is under the current appropriations for the District of Columbia and less than the Budget estimates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is under the current appropriations and under the Budget estimates.

Mr. McNARY. In consenting to such a request as has been made, I have always coupled any consent on my part with an understanding that should any controversial matter arise, and any Member of the Senate should desire the bill to go over today, that that practice will be conformed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There will be no objection to that at all.

Mr. McNARY. With that understanding, I have no objection to the bill being made the unfinished business, to be considered today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 6. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control; without amendment (Rept. No. 327).

By Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 328).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 715. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 329).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

S. 683. A bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 330).

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 861. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 331).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 1004. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication; without amendment (Rept. No. 332).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1140. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 333).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; with amendments (Rept. No. 334).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1242. A bill to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; with an amendment (Rept. No. 335).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of Reuben J. Solomon; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 1245, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; and

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1248. A bill to repeal the authority to make subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1249. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal Section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1251. A bill to amend an act entitled "An Act providing for the expenses of the offices of recorder of deeds and register of wills of the District of Columbia," approved April 24, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1252. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119) relating to water conservation and utilization projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1253. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works, viz: Improvement of the channel in the St. Johns River from Palatka to Lake Harney, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1254. A bill relating to wage limitations and adjustments by governmental agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1255. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1256. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1919; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1257. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT—INCREASE OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES.

Mr. WAGNER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and to have printed in connection with it, in the body of the RECORD, a statement with reference to the proposed bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement referred to by him will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1245) to amend section 105 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the family allowance of servicemen having wives and children, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bill is as follows:

Today marks the close of a year's operation under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. This is an appropriate moment to offer changes which are desirable for the morale of our armed forces and the common good, in the light of a full year's experience under the act and the future course of inductions into the armed forces.

While the functioning of the act has given rise to many problems, I am proposing at this time legislation dealing only with the serviceman's immediate family—his wife and children. These dependents, classified in category A of the act, receive $22 from the serviceman's pay, to which the Government adds $28 for a wife without children, $40 for a wife with one child, and $10 for every additional child. The total monthly check thus comes to $50 for a wife without children, $62 for a wife with one child, and $10 for every additional child.

About 10 percent of enlisted men now in the Army are fathers; and men whose children were born after September 15, 1942, are now being called for induction. Repeated warnings have been given that millions of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will shortly be subject to call.

It is doubtful whether the present schedule of allowances was framed from the viewpoint that large numbers of men with children born prior to Pearl Harbor would have to be called into the armed forces. The schedule itself does not meet the practical needs of that situation in the average American family. A childless wife may properly be deemed part of the manpower force, and be expected to seek employment in aid of the war effort when her husband is inducted. A wholly different situation is presented when the wife has one or more small children. The War Manpower Commission in official announcements has declared: "The first responsibility of women with young children, in war as in peace, is to give suitable care in their own homes to their children. In order that established family life may not be unnecessarily disrupted, special efforts to secure the employment in industry of women with young children should be deferred until full use has been made of all other sources of labor supply." The Commission further declares, however, that "barriers against the employment of women with young children should not be set up by employers. The decision as to gainful employment should in all cases be an individual decision made by the woman herself in the light of the particular conditions prevailing in her home."

The greatest increase in the family budget obviously comes at the point when the wife has one or more children to rear and support. That requires the maintenance of the home and the family unit. The act at the present time takes no practical account of this fundamental basis of family life. While the childless wife receives $50, the wife with one child receives only $62, and $10 for each additional child. These sums for one or more children are utterly inadequate to carry out the national policy of maintaining the serviceman's home and family. When large numbers of fathers are called into service, as is now contemplated, the wife and mother will be forced under the spur of necessity to seek employment, and to place the burden of her children's care upon others, including community child-care centers already overburdened. At the beginning of this year, there were already 2,300,000 mothers (with children under 16 years of age) in the active labor force—either working or seeking employment.

Everyone will agree that long-established homes and family units should not be disrupted unless this is essential for military victory. I am willing to follow the considered judgment and decision of our War and Navy Departments and of our Commander in Chief, who are charged with making military plans and building the forces needed for victory. What Congress should do, however, is to amend the Servicemen's Allowance Act so that it can be of the greatest possible help in keeping families intact when the father and breadwinner is called into the armed forces. The children of our servicemen should have at least this minimum of protection against the hazards and uncertainties of the war and its aftermath.

The bill I am proposing makes a simple but important change in the Servicemen's Allowance Act. The bill provides that the Government's contribution for the first child of a serviceman shall be double that made in the case of a childless wife. And for each additional child, the Government's contribution would likewise be increased 100 percent. Thus a childless wife would, as now, receive $50 a month. The wife with one child would receive $78 a month, and $20 would be added for each additional child. Even these amounts are hardly enough for minimum subsistence under present price levels in many parts of the country. I am asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which already has under consideration a number of other measures to correct various inequities in the operation of the act.

TIMES OF HOLDING ELECTIONS FOR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES AND PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS — AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1089) relating to the times of holding elections for Senators and Representatives in the Congress and Presidential electors, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, at the proper place insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. Effective 30 days following the date of enactment of this act no part of any appropriation made by this act, or any other public funds, personnel, services, or property shall be used to enforce, directly or indirectly, further compliance by any processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer with, or to prosecute further a violation by any such person of—

"(1) any rule, regulation, or order issued for the purpose of establishing a maximum price for any commodity intended for civilian consumption or use, where any court in any proceeding to which such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer is a party finds (A) that such rule, regulation, or order does not afford to such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer a generally fair and equitable operating margin, (B) that the provisions of such rule, regulation, or order operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in the industry or trade of such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer, unless such changes are necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule or requirement, or (C) that such rule, regulation, or order was issued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory committee composed (in addition to members appointed to represent unorganized or otherwise unrepresented branches of any affected industry) of representatives and alternates chosen by, and assigned to such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representatives of each branch of such industry.

"(2) any rule, regulation, or order relating to distribution, allocation, or rationing with respect to a commodity intended for civilian consumption or use (except priorities regulations or orders, to the extend that the preferences granted or withheld therein are authorized by statute), where any court in any proceeding brought to enforce compliance by such person with, or to prosecute a violation by such person of, any such rule, regulation, or order, finds (A) that provision has not been made for the allocation or distribution of such commodity through the usual and established channels of trade (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, or retailers) in the same proportion as that in which such commodity was distributed or allocated during the calendar year 1941, or (B) that such rule, regulation, or order was issued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory committee composed (in addition to members appointed to represent unorganized or otherwise unrepresented branches of any affected industry) of representatives and alternates chosen by, and assigned to such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representative of each branch of such industry."

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2968, making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN THE PACIFIC COAST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 159), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to February 25, 1943 (relating to an investigation of an existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort) be, and the same is hereby, increased by an additional $5,000.

REPORT ON FISCAL RELATIONS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Senate a report on fiscal relations of Federal, State, and local governments submitted to the Department of the Treasury by a special committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations appointed by him. I as unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 160), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a report on fiscal relations of Federal, State, and local governments submitted to the Department of the Treasury by a special committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations appointed by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that a brief statement, explanatory of the report submitted by the special committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A copy of the report has been submitted to me at my request, and it is my desire that it be printed for the use of the Senate. It is my understanding that under the resolution 150 copies will be available at the Senate Document Room for Senators and 300 copies at the House Document Room for the use of Members of the House.

This report is a comprehensive inquiry into the problem of Federal, State, and local government fiscal relations by a special committee appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, emininetly qualified to examine into the question. It represents the findings and independent conclusions of a special research staff with members in and outside the Treasury and is not to be considered as representing any official view. I believe it a valuable study which should be available to the Congress, and it is for that purpose I ask for adoption of the resolution.

CONDITIONS AMONG LIVESTOCK FEEDERS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have before me what is known as the "Fremont Resolution." It has to do with a mass meeting held at Fremont, Nebr., last June 14. In the meeting this resolution was passed, relative to the cattle situation on the farms, in the feed lots, and also in the markets. I ask that this resolution, received from Harry Gardner and Herman Dinklage, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I know the resolution will be of interest to all members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREMONT, NEBR., *June 19, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: For your information, the following wire was sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt June 18, 1943:

"The following resolution was passed in Fremont, Nebr., June 17, 1943, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers and feeders, representing many thousands more:

" 'In order to guarantee an adequate supply of pork, beef, and lamb for (1) the armed forces, (2) the civilian population, and (3) lend-lease, that they demand that James Byrnes, Director of Office of War Mobilization, rescind his order which is effective Monday, June 14, 1943, rolling back wholesale prices and ordering subsidies to be paid on beef, pork, and lamb, and if it is not immediately rescinded the producers and feeders of the Corn Belt States will request all feeders and producers to withhold the marketing of slaughter animals effective Monday, June 28, pending compliance with their demand, and further, that the feeders of the Corn Belt States demand that the reflected price on meat animals be sufficient to cover cost of production.

" 'During the last week, because of the break in prices of live animals marketed, the producers and feeders have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The request to withhold the marketing of slaughter livestock would be made to save the producers from these losses during this period of uncertainties. Further, the Corn Belt producers and feeders of livestock stated in a resolution, "We, the livestock feeders and producers from 28 counties in Nebraska and 9 in Iowa, oppose the roll-back and subsidy program on meat, butter, and coffee as un-American, inflationary, and discriminatory." The livestock producers and feeders of the country at the request of the proper authorities in charge and at your personal request, have increased the production and marketing of livestock to the highest levels in the history of this country. The decision to keep slaughter livestock off the market would not mean a strike in production because the production of meat tonnage would continue on animals now in feed lots. Many feed-lot operators, however, already have been discouraged from buying additional livestock and have ceased making replacement purchases, with the result that thousands of feed lots already are empty or are rapidly being emptied. In this, they are influenced not only by price roll-backs recently announced but also by the fear of further price reductions by the same method in the future.

" 'The apparent lack of understanding on the part of people in Washington as to the seriousness of the food situation and their unwillingness to request and accept the counsel and advice of people with knowledge and practical suggestions for solution, gives them no choice but to take drastic action and insist that this whole problem have your personal, immediate attention.'

"HARRY GARDNER,
"Oakland, Iowa,
"HERMAN DINKLAGE,
"Wisner, Nebr.,
"Resolution Committee."
HARRY GARDNER.
HERMAN DINKLAGE.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, a little while ago my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] presented for the RECORD a resolution, known as the Fremont resolution, which was adopted by a mass meeting at Fremont, Nebr.

In connection therewith, and immediately following in the printed RECORD, I should like to have placed a statement addressed to the consumers of the United States by two farmers, Harry Gardner, of Oakland, Iowa, and Herman Dinklage, of Wisner, Nebr. This statement will indicate, I believe, very fairly that any roll-back, if one is due, belongs to the producer whose prices have already been reduced more than the roll-back which was originally promised to the processors of these products. Immediately following the statement, Mr. President, I should like leave to include an editorial appearing in the June 20 issue of the World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Consumers of the United States:

In justification of their concern over probable effects on livestock and meat production of recently announced dressed meat price roll-backs, representatives of the livestock feeders group which has protested the action so vigorously, today called attention to these facts and figures.

Cost of producing a pound of beef on an animal in feed lots of the Middle West today is running from 18 to 22 cents per pound, live weight. The ceiling price on the highest grade of dressed beef since last Monday's 2-cent roll-back is 20 cents per pound while medium to good quality live steer are selling on the markets at 14 to 15 cents per pound. Those live prices are 4 to 7 cents below the actual cost of putting the meat on the steer, and even the most efficient feeders have been operating at a loss.

It is partly because of this disparity between gain cost and selling price on live beef that many feed lots in the Middle West are rapidly being emptied. Their operators aren't quitting the fattening of cattle willingly, but are being forced out of business by inequitable ceiling prices which take no account of cost of production.

Stockmen have been trying for the past year or more to convince the Government that this situation was developing. As long ago as the spring and summer of 1942, they held meetings at Omaha, Des Moines, and elsewhere designed to call to the attention of Washington officials the unfair set-up under which they were trying to operate. Instead of relieving the situation by rasiing price ceilings to levels which would allow even a small margin of profit, the Office of Price Administration has taken one step after another to force prices into an even more unfavorable position.

The hog grower and feeder today is in the same position as the cattle feeder. He is receiving on the average only a little over 13 cents a pound at market for his hogs, or a net return at home of somewhat less than 13 cents.

Comparing live cattle and hog selling prices with the cost, in various parts of the country of the different cuts of beef and pork makes the disparity all the greater. Because of advanced costs, chiefly higher wages paid to labor, in transporting, processing, and distributing livestock and meats through wholesale and retail channels, the margins between wholesale and retail prices have been widened materially. These high retail costs, however, do not get back to the feeder or the grower. All he gets is what remains of the live market price after feeding, shipping, and marketing charges are paid. At present, that is less than nothing.

Producers of livestock have figured out that the total saving to the average American individual for an entire year through the recent roll-back of prices would amount to no more than about $4. Consumers have the highest incomes in history with which to pay for food and other farm products, yet farmers and livestock raisers and feeders are being asked to pay, through the roll-back, to cheapen still further the cost of living for the Nation's consumers.

Stockmen have looked with distaste on growing black-market activities. They have noted that each new step toward greater regulation of meat production and distributing have increased the amount of meat slaughtered and sold through illegal channels, and they feel certain that this latest roll-back will still further lessen the amount of livestock handled legitimately, where the meat produced will be available to the armed forces and law-abiding consumers.

Hence the encouragement of production through fair prices for livestock will not only increase the total amount of meat available, but it will lessen the inducements to black-market operations. These, producers believe, are desirable aims.

HARRY GARDNER,
Oakland, Iowa.
HERMAN DINKLAGE,
Wisner, Nebr.

[From the Omaha Sunday World-Herald of June 20, 1943]

A DARNED GOOD PRICE

"The farmer is getting a darned good price for his product," said Office of Price Administration Administrator Prentiss Brown to the Senate Banking Committee.

He so commented when he was told by a committee member that farmers are receiving less for their cattle because of the roll back. The Office of Price Administration chief didn't question the facts that the roll back is causing confusion, shrinking cattle receipts, and weakening the market.

He said only "The farmer is getting a darned good price."

It isn't possible that Prentiss Brown, banker, lawyer, and vice president of a sugar refinery, knows as little as that about prices. Certainly the farmers aren't fooled into believing that the size of the figure on a price tag determines "a darned good price."

Midwestern cattlemen can assure Prentiss Brown that it is possible to make more money on 10-cent cattle than on 15-cent cattle. If corn were selling at 25 cents a bushel 10-cent cattle would be a gold mine.

But the realities of the situation are that corn, if it can be found at the legal ceilings, is a dollar a bushel and that it costs about 20 cents to put a pound of corn fat on an animal that will bring 15 cents on the hoof.

For the cattlemen the same situation would obtain if corn were $2 a bushel and the going price for cattle were 30 cents. Prentiss Brown might call that a "darned good price" but it would be a very bad price.

Nor do the cattlemen want such a price spiral. What they want is a wholesale beef price that reflects cost of production. The principal cost of production for corn-fed cattle is corn. What with the current 90 percent Government loan on corn, the favorable corn-hog ratio and the understandable reluctance of farmers to part with corn at the ceiling price, a reduction in the price of corn is not practical.

What the cattlemen want is an increase in beef prices that will reflect a profit for corn-fed cattle. Until cattlemen can get such a profit no price is "a darned good price."

A TRIBUTE TO RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Tribute to Russia," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at Newark, N. J., June 21, 1943, at a meeting under the auspices of the Russian War Relief, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS AT MOOSEHEART SCHOOL

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the commencement exercises at the Mooseheart School, Mooseheart, Ill., and a brief article from the Aurora Beacon News relative to Seaman Birtcher which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT TOUCHDOWN CLUB LUNCHEON

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MEAD at the Touchdown Club luncheon at Washington, D. C., June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR RELATIONSHIPS — EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments upon the speech delivered by Senator LODGE in the Senate on Friday, June 18, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR SOCIAL SECURITY—ARTICLE BY MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Planners Study Freedom From Want," written by Msgr. John O'Grady and published in the magazine America of the issue of May 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON DINNER—ADDRESS BY AMBROSE O'CONNELL

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Thomas Jefferson Dinner address delivered by Ambrose O'Connell, executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Commodore Hotel, New York, N. Y., on June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE—ADDRESS BY ROBERT NELSON ANDERSON

[Mr. KILGORE (at the request of Mr. GLASS) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our American Heritage," delivered in Martinsburg, W. Va., May 16, 1943, by Robert Nelson Anderson, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and former president of the Federal Bar Association at an "I Am An American Day" rally, under the auspices of the Martinsburg Bar Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD STATE—ARTICLE BY S. W. BRYANT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "World State," written by S. W. Bryant, of Clay, W. Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL—ARTICLE BY OWEN L. SCOTT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Achievement of General Marshall," written by Owen L. Scott, and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WINNING THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "This Time We Must Win the Peace," delivered by William G. Carleton, of the faculty of the University of Florida, at the annual district conference of Rotary International, 167th District, at Jacksonville, Fla., on April 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEAT SITUATION—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vast Cattle Surplus Piles Up as Meat Famine Increases," written by Jefferson G. Bell, and published in the New York Times of June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF WEST OAKLAND (CALIFORNIA) CARMEN'S INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of West Oakland (California) Carmen's Investigating Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE OF VIRGINIA LEE CUT GREEN BEANS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by J. J. Simon, of Thompson, N. Dak., relating to the price of Virginia Lee cut green beans, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS AMONG CATTLE FEEDERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed to him by Gordon Labree, mayor of Casselton, N. Dak. with reference to the conditions among cattle feeders, which appears in the Appendix.]

RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Riots in Los Angeles" from the Chicago Sun of June 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN RESOURCES

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Demand Heavy on Resources" from the Baltimore Sun of May 24, 1943, and an editorial entitled "American Resources" from the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., of May 25, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

STRATEGY AND CONDUCT OF THE WAR—ARTICLE FROM THE CARROLLTON (ILL.) PATRIOT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Don't Know How," from the Carrollton (Ill.) Patriot of June 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW STRATEGY SPEEDS WAR ON JAPAN—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Strategy Speeds War on Japan," by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERFERENCE WITH FREEDOM OF SCHOOLS—LETTER FROM CLEMENT T. MALAN

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Clement T. Malan, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Indiana, on the subject of the Federal Government's interference with the Freedom of American Schools, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN-FUND-RAISING DINNER AT THE DUQUESNE CLUB OF PITTSBURGH

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, during the past few years our friends on the other side of the aisle have, with derision, frequently referred to the $100 dinners, the $50 dinners, the $25 dinners, and souvenir campaign books given and put out by the various Democratic organizations, as if they were illegal acts.

And, only recently one of the Senators from the other side of the Chamber referred to some $5 and $10 contributions from postmasters.

Last week, when the antistrike bill was before the Senate, I objected to it because of the discrimination placed therein against campaign contributions from labor organizations.

Today I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a feast to be held at the Duquesne Club of Pittsburgh tomorrow night which will outdo in many ways the Biblical feast of Belshazzar, as described in chapter V of the Book of Daniel, verses 1 and 4, as follows:

> Belshazzar the King made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.
>
> * * * * *
>
> They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

If that feast were being held today, the quotation undoubtedly would include the god of aluminum and the god of oil.

The invitations to this feast of Belshazzar are being sent out in the name of W. L. Mellon, chairman of the board of directors of the Gulf Oil Corporation and the present head of the great Mellon dynasty, A. W. Robertson, chairman of the board of directors of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh, and Frank F. Brooks, president of the First National Bank of Pittsburgh.

The last feast of a similar nature was given by the late R. B. Mellon, an uncle of William L. Mellon, at his home in the east end of Pittsburgh. On the night of the election in 1916, and when it was flashed over the wire that the New York World and the New York Times conceded the election of Charles Evans Hughes as President, the then Senator-elect in Pennsylvania, former Secretary of State in President Taft's Cabinet, rose and led the assembled guests in singing the Long Meter Doxology.

Some Senators now present have not forgotten the morning after.

The lords of the feast, I understand, are to be addressed by Republican National Chairman Spangler, and the former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, now the junior Senator from New Jersey, Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES.

Two hundred and fifty hand-picked representatives of industry and big business are the invited guests, and the object, I am told by one of the outstanding Republican leaders in my State, is to raise $2,000,000 for the 1944 campaign.

I note, with pleasure and admiration, that they look to Pittsburgh as a more fertile field for the raising of campaign funds than Philadelphia. I understand they sought only $250,000 in Philadelphia.

I know that in one presidential year a Republican campaign fund of $6,000,000 was raised by one of the industrialists from western Pennsylvania.

Everybody should realize that the money being requested by the sponsors of this dinner from the industrialists in the Pittsburgh area will come from the tax forgiveness measure and the war contracts entered into for the purpose of winning the war and saving the United States of America.

Now, I know why the Republicans laughed and derided the Democrats for having $100 dinners.

They are now having one that is costing $8,000 per plate.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the future of this country unless the Congress of the United States is willing to assume its responsibility in correcting some very fundamental evils which have grown up as a part of the labor policy of the present national administration. I think it is a fact well recognized by all thinking people throughout the country that for the last 5 or 6 years the policy of the present national administration has been a subservient policy under which the big bosses of organized labor have dictated and by which the labor-leader racketeers of this Nation have plundered, waxed wealthy, and become politically powerful. And I do not think that the Congress of the United States, in view of its own record, has anything to brag about, or of which it can be very proud, so far as doing much, if anything, to correct the situation.

It is true that a few days ago we did get around to the point of passing some "milk and cider" legislation providing that when the labor condition in a war industry became so bad that nothing else could be done about it, the President could do what he has already been doing before the passage of the law, that is, take over industries and operate them. I can think of nothing more pleasing to Communists and communistic labor leaders than for Congress to pass a law providing for the Government to take over and operate industries. That is exactly what they want to see happen in this country. This law not only provides for the Government to take over and operate industries, but it places in the hands of labor the club with which it can force the industries to be taken over by the Government. If labor votes to strike, the Government does not penalize labor, but instead, penalizes the owners of the property by seizing their property. In other words, the law provides punishment for the hold-up victim instead of the bandit.

It is also true that we placed in that law a proviso that the War Labor Board in conducting its hearings, could at least require the attendance of witnesses, and we made it a violation of law to promote a strike in an industry after the Government has taken over. There is another section of the law we passed a few days ago which I think is very amusing and it is section 9, which prevents labor unions from contributing to political campaigns. That certainly imposes no hardship on labor organizations. It only forces them to not give away their money. Labor organizations can only rejoice over that provision. The only ones who are hurt by that provision are the politicians who may thus be deprived of the contributions.

I have the feeling that when the Democratic Party accepted from one labor union a contribution, reported closely to approach the figure of a half million dollars, the foundation was then laid upon which was built a superstructure which some Members of Congress had in mind attempting to destroy when that political-contribution restriction was inserted in the War Labor Disputes Act. Senators will note, however, that the law does not prohibit labor organizations from lending money to politicians, and it is quite generally recognized that there is little practical difference between a gift and a loan to a politician. If anyone is inclined to feel that in passing that law we in Congress have anything to brag about, please bear in mind that it is certainly a very mild piece of labor legislation, and, furthermore, that even with this "skim milk" legislation we were careful to insert in the act section 10, which provides that the act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities.

In other words, a careful reading of the act will convince many people who know what our real labor problems are that it does not provide any permanent relief from the dictatorship of organized labor which has been set up in this country during recent years. I, along with many other Senators, voted for the bill, because I could not see how it could do much harm, and I was hopeful that it might do some good. But in supporting the bill, I did not think we were doing anything more than administering some emergency treatment to a labor situation which had gotten completely out of hand.

In pointing out the weakness of the labor law just passed by Congress, I intend no criticism of those who sponsored it or supported it. I am simply stating that in my opinion it is weak-kneed legislation, that is does not touch side, top, or bottom of the fundamental causes of our labor problems, and that it is a se-

rious mistake to try to deceive the public into believing that the law which we passed has solved the labor racketeering problem of this Nation.

The labor organizations themselves state that the Smith-Connally bill will not prevent strikes. In big bold advertisements now being run in newspapers by labor organizations this statement appears: "This bill will provoke strikes. It won't prevent them." Evidently the President did not consider that the bill would prevent strikes because he had it on his desk in time to sign it and make it law before the present coal mine strikes began but he did not sign the bill. All evidence shows that the bill we passed is not the kind of bill that is needed to stop strikes and other labor racketeering practices which are retarding the war effort.

We hear much talk about the fact that a few of the so-called bosses of organized labor gave a no-strike pledge, or promised that they would be good for the duration of the war, but I am inclined to rely more on the record than I am on promises—and what is the record? According to the figures given out by the United States Department of Labor, during the year 1941, at a time when this Nation was engaged in an all-out production program to try to prepare to defend ourselves against a war which it was apparent we were going to be forced into, at a time when we had already called thousands upon thousands of our boys from their homes and had them scattered all over the Nation in training camps, without enough guns with which to use in training and without other necessary war supplies, what record did these bosses of organized labor make? There was lost in the United States during that year 23,047,556 man-days because of strikes. Then came Pearl Harbor, and our entrance into the worst war of all history. Let us see what has happened since Pearl Harbor. I secured from the Department of Labor the record of strikes, and this record shows that we have lost over 6,000,000 man-days because of strikes after Pearl Harbor up to April 30, 1943. And, to make the picture more horrifying, there has not been a single month since Pearl Harbor, including the month of December 1941 when there has been fewer than 84 strikes in progress, and from that on up to the disgraceful number of 395 strikes in the month of April, this year, the latest month on which statistics are available.

Think of that, Senators, and others who have sons in the military service fighting to save this Nation and depending on full production on our home front to back them in their battles. Under this so-called no-strike-pledge agreement, which by the way, is a strange new fashion entirely foreign to our form of government by law, over 5,000,000 man-days of labor have been lost on account of strikes since Pearl Harbor, not including the contribution made by John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers. I say, Mr. President, it is a tragedy that these strikes, slow-downs, absenteeism, and other labor-leader racketeering should be going on during this great war crisis. It is a double tragedy that Congress does not enact legislation which will put an end to such sabotaging of our war effort.

Now, let us go back and check the record; let us see how the foundation was laid upon which these strikes of 1941, and those which have occurred subsequent to that date, were brought about. It is true that the Nation is today operating under the National Labor Relations Act which was passed long before we entered the war. At the time the act was passed, it was stated by those who favored it, that it was designed to protect the rights of the man who toils, the rights of the average laboring man. If we go into the matter a little further and study the law in light of subsequent events we find that the National Labor Relations Board has uniformly held that an employer has no right to talk to his employees and express his opinion concerning vital labor matters which might come up in the relationship between employer and employee. We find something else. We find that the Board has uniformly accepted, and it has either condoned or approved, the use of all manner of force by labor unions to drive the workmen into these unions. This law denies to the employer the right of frank, open discussion with his employees, but permits the most flagrant coercion of employees by the labor union racketeers.

I introduced in the Senate some time ago a bill designed to make this law fair, that is, to improve its fairness by providing that it shall be unlawful for anyone, either the employer or the labor union, to coerce employees. In other words, I want to remove coercion entirely. I do not believe the employer should be allowed to coerce his employees, nor do I believe that the union should be allowed to use coercion. This bill, S. 727, still peacefully slumbers in the Committee on Education and Labor where it has reposed since February 15, 1943.

I introduced another measure as an amendment to this law, which is designed to force the National Labor Relations Board to respect the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, by making it clear that any employer has a right to discuss openly and frankly with his employees all phases of any problem which might affect the relationship between employer and employee. This bill, S. 726, also peacefully slumbers in the Committee on Education and Labor where it has reposed since February 15, 1943.

I introduced in the last Congress, and reintroduced in this Congress, a bill to make it unlawful anywhere in the United States at any time to use force and violence to prevent any person from following a lawful vocation. This bill, S. 189, peacefully slumbers in the Committee on the Judiciary, where it has reposed since January 7, 1943. An exact duplicate of that bill was introduced by me on August 4, 1941, and never got out of solitary confinement in the Committee on the Judiciary, having died in that committee when the Seventy-seventh Congress expired.

A few days ago I called the attention of Attorney General Biddle to a case in Missouri where the Government was trying to build a pipe line to supply oil and gasoline to the eastern seaboard, where a gang of thugs through the use of force and violence were attempting to stop construction. They attacked and seriously injured men working on this job. When I called this case to the attention of Attorney General Biddle, he advised me that the case did not violate any Federal law.

On the 12th day of March House bill 653 came to the Senate, it being the bill introduced in the House and directed through the House by Representative HOBBS, of Alabama. The bill seeks to prevent robbery and extortion, and it even goes so far as to provide that robbery and extortion in this country shall be unlawful even when practiced by labor unions. It still remains in the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate.

It is my deliberate opinion that we cannot maintain democratic government in this country if we allow the closed shop and the check-off to become the established policy in American industry, and today we are witnessing the situation of the War Labor Board issuing orders which require employers to become dues collectors for these labor unions, which require employers to fire their own employees if the employees cease to pay their labor union dues. In other words, we have now established, as a part of our Government machinery, a board which by its rulings is striking at the very fundamental principles of American government, but, apparently, few persons in official capacity are concerned about this.

I also have introduced Senate bill 191 which would abolish the closed shop, and thus prevent the labor-leader racketeers from standing at the gates of our war factories and forcing our honest laboring men to pay $25, $50, $100, or some other sum of money, for their God-given right to work here in this land of the free. If ever there was a disgraceful racket in this Nation, that is it, and it is a legal racket, permitted and condoned by Congress. That bill also peacefully slumbers in the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, where it has reposed since January 7, 1943.

We are attempting to fight a World War and to feed the world with a 40-hour week and time and one-half for overtime—and it simply cannot be done. Attempts to follow this policy have resulted in the necessity for all of our war industries to operate with three shifts instead of two, and the result of this has been that we have just about drained all the labor from our farms. It is obvious to all who are in a position to know, that as a result of this policy, we today face a food shortage in this country which is not only serious, but is tremendously dangerous, and that unless we reverse our policy we shall see famine and food-rioting in this Nation.

I have introduced a bill (S. 190) which would abolish the 40-hour week by abolishing the penalty of time-and-one-half pay for work done in excess of 40 hours

a week, and would result in having payments made on the basis of the established hourly wage scale for each hour worked. The law which imposed the penalty of 50-percent increased pay for work performed in excess of 40 hours a week was enacted during an era of widespread unemployment, and was intended to force employers to divide the work among more employees. That law was a good one then, and served a good purpose. We have no unemployment now, but have an exactly opposite condition—a shortage of labor. Therefore, to keep this outmoded law in effect serves two extremely bad purposes: First, it increases our manpower shortage, by forcing employers to employ three men to each job that could be done by only two men, or pay a penalty of 50 percent on each hour's work done by each employee in excess of 40 hours a week. If the penalty pay were abolished the work now being done by 42,000,000 employees working 40 hours a week could be performed by 28,000,000 employees working 60 hours a week, and each of the 28,000,000 employees would receive 50 percent more pay each week. That would release 14,000,000 employees for other jobs, and would greatly help to solve the manpower shortage; second, keeping this outmoded 40-hour-week law in effect during this time of manpower shortage greatly increases inflation, by constantly and automatically increasing wages per hour every time an additional hour of work over 40 hours a week is performed by an individual.

If ever a misstatement of fact was uttered, it is the statement being made so often by some people in high places that wages have been stabilized. Here are figures to prove that such statements are not true: An employee working 40-hours a week at $1.50 an hour earns $60. That is an average wage of $1.50 an hour. When that employee works 41 hours a week he receives $62.25, which is an average of $1.517 an hour, or an increase in pay of .017 an hour. If he works 42 hours, his rate increases 3½ cents. Each hour's work increases the average hourly rate, until he receives $1.625 an hour, for a 48-hour week, or an average increase per hour of 12½ cents. So wages are not stabilized. They automatically increase as each hour is added over 40 a week.

Under the present law, to have our 42,000,000 workers shift from a 40-hour week to a 48-hour week would increase production only 20 percent, but would increase labor cost 30 percent. On the basis of $1 an hour average base wage, the excess of 30 percent increased cost over 20 percent increased production would amount to $504,000,000 a week, or $26,208,000,000 a year, one-third—or $8,736,000,000—of which would be paid out as increased wage rates, and would be purely inflationary to that extent. Inasmuch as the increased wages accounted for by increased wage rates caused by the penalty overtime law apply mostly to goods going either directly or indirectly to the government, they represent an additional amount of money to be paid out of the pockets of our already overburdened taxpayers. My bill, S. 190, would correct this gross injustice, but it has peacefully slumbered in the Committee on Military Affairs, where it has reposed since January 7, 1943.

Mr. President, I claim that all those bills seek to correct fundamental errors in laws now on our statute books. I say to you it is my opinion that unless the Congress of the United States takes action which is designed to put an end to the domination and control of the industries of this country and of the Government itself by the racketeering elements, when the period of reconstruction comes, following this war, the situation which we will face then will be worse than any situation which the Nation has ever faced before. Whenever government by law seeks to build up the power of racketeering elements, and whenever it has gone far enough to prove that racketeering power has been built up, and when the Congress of the United States is apparently unable to correct the situation, the Nation faces a grave crisis. Of course, the labor racketeers take notice that many bills are introduced, but that they seldom get out of committee. They know that when a bill finally gets through one branch of Congress, it often is killed in the other branch. They know that when a bill finally does pass both branches of Congress, it is usually so weak that it will not retard their racketeering activities. They know they receive only petting from all branches of the executive department. Knowing all that, they feel privileged and secure to run wild with their racketeering and to trample under foot every right and principle that American citizens hold dear—even to calling strikes in war industries in time of war, thus depriving our boys at the battle front of the weapons they need in fighting for the freedom of our Nation and the protection of their own lives.

I have always believed in the right of labor to organize; I still believe in it. I have always believed in the right of labor to form unions and to have membership in those unions. I have always believed in the right of labor to use its economic power through strikes, at least during times of peace. I have always favored, and I now favor, legislation which will prevent employers from coercing their employees in the matter of labor relations. But, on the other hand, I am opposed to allowing anybody, whether it be a labor-union racketeer from outside or a labor-union racketeer from the inside, to attempt to coerce and to use force and violence to drive employees into unions, whether they want to go into these unions or not.

I have always been a friend of laboring people. I was bred and born of honest, hard-working parents and have performed much hard manual labor myself. My fight is not against the rank and file of honest laboring people who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, but is directed against those labor-leader racketeers who toil not, but wax rich from the loot they chisel from the pockets of honest working people by charging them for their God-given right to work.

At this time, when our boys are fighting and dying on foreign battlefields, it is discouraging in the extreme to me to be forced reluctantly to the conclusion that we still have in this country many people in high places who are thinking more about the election in 1944 than they are about correcting some of the fundamental evils which now are slowing down the war effort and which ultimately will wreck the whole economy of this country, if they are not corrected.

We are fast vesting the power to control every line of business in the hands of boards and bureaus in Washington; and we are fast building up the power of labor racketeers who live and grow fat off the products of labor, and we are setting up those men in places of power and authority, to dictate to the would-be Government czars and bureaucrats.

Mr. President, one thing is certain. If we permit the Office of Price Administration to continue to reduce the price of farm commodities in order to appease the demands of a whole host of bosses of organized labor, then you and I and every other American citizen will be called upon to pay the price, and the price is going to be insufficient food for our people at home as well as for the boys in the service.

What I have said to you today certainly indicates that bills which I have introduced in the United States Senate on these fundamental issues have not been received enthusiastically by the committees to which they have been referred. I have been considering the introduction of a bill in the United States Senate to abolish the whole O. P. A. set-up, but I have been waiting with the hope that a Senator who might have better luck in getting his bills out of committees than I have had with some of mine, would introduce such a bill. I stand ready to join hands with other Senators and aid in the abolition of the O. P. A., root and branch. When the price-control bill was first being debated on this floor I opposed it and stated that the correct name for it should be the antiagricultural bill instead of the price-control bill. We in the Senate were able to secure some amendments to the bill as it was originally introduced, and farther down the road the executive department of Government and the bureaucrats claimed it was a war measure. I was determined to support all war measures—and have supported all war measures asked for by our Commander in Chief—so I voted for the price-control bill.

We amended it because we accepted at face value some assurances which probably we should not have accepted, and now we find that in its actual administration the measure has become, in fact, the truly antiagricultural bill which I called it in the very beginning.

At the time of its consideration, in January 1942, I also stated that its enactment would tend to decrease production of food and would lead to a serious food shortage in this Nation. That food

shortage is now here, and if O. P. A. and other bureaucrats continue their ruinous tactics we shall perhaps have a food famine and food rioting in the United States.

The cry went out to the farmers, the poultry raisers, and the stock raisers of this Nation to produce food. They responded patriotically to this demand of the Government, but what is happening to them? The man who has invested all of his savings in equipping his little farm to produce poultry, under the promise of the Government that poultry and poultry products were seriously needed, is today facing a price situation in which he cannot meet the cost of production, and when he complains of this, he is told that it is necessary to curtail the production of poultry because we do not have enough feed. Then we look across the street in Washington, D. C., and find another bureau, which has been requiring the farmers and others who produce feed to sign agreements to reduce the acreage of feed crops. One department of our food-producing industry is being told to produce more food, which requires more feed; and another part of our agricultural industry is being induced to produce less feed.

I have received from all over the country letters from stock raisers, farmers, and poultry producers; and the story which I get from all of them is the same. The Office of Price Administration fixed the price of milk and then raised the price of feed. The dairymen then started losing money so fast that they had to sell their milk cows for slaughter and quit business. People who were unable to buy fresh milk started buying canned milk, and now canned milk is being rationed. The whole economy of the country is being destroyed by trying to fit it into the scheme of a group of Washington bureaucrats. The sooner a Senator who believes he might be luckier than I have been introduces a bill in the Senate to abolish the whole Office of Price Administration set-up, the better I will feel about it.

We have in this country today, operating under the Manpower Commission, national, regional, and area offices, all designed to work out a plan to conserve manpower. There is being drained out of every line of civilian industry every possible man and woman who can be taken, to fill the ranks in war-production plants. It is my judgment that if this goes on for another 12 or 15 months, there will be a break-down in the civilian economy, which is certainly essential and necessary to support the war effort. Grocery stores, a reasonable number of department stores, laundries, hardware stores, restaurants, hotels, and numerous other purely civilian lines of business absolutely must go on if the war effort is not to be interfered with; but institutions of this nature are closing up every day. If we had already done all the things that are reasonable and necessary, I feel that the American people would willingly go forward to the very end of the road to requisition and, if necessary, draft from civilian industry every ounce of manpower that could possibly be spared. I think it is generally recognized that if we should abolish the 40-hour workweek, with time and one-half for overtime, and fix the wage scale at whatever rate was determined fair and equitable, but require all the war industries to operate on two 10- or 11-hour shifts instead of three shifts of 7 or 8 hours each, we could advance our war effort, and at the same time we would save our civilian economy.

My judgment is that it does not matter where a man is working, we have a right in a great emergency to demand that each and every one put forth every possible effort to see that the whole war effort goes forward at the most rapid pace possible. If a man is working in an airplane factory, a tank factory, a grocery store, or a laundry, or in any other line of business which is essential and necessary, then everything which the Government can do should look toward securing the maximum use of the manpower available and not restricting the number of hours to be worked.

The American people as a whole know that the fact that the eyes of too many persons in Washington have turned toward the election bulletin board of 1944 is the reason why many fundamental problems are not being solved. The people of this country are tired of seeing every known device adopted to mollify and satisfy the leadership of particular groups and classes and the responsibility for failure loaded on the great rank and file of the people throughout this Nation. The people of the United States are tired of seeing the American farmer impoverished to satisfy the demands of organized labor for a reduction in food prices. The great middle class of our people are demanding that something be done about these fundamental matters. The average man has sense enough to know that we cannot put chickens in the butcher-shops by increasing the price of feed which the poultrymen must pay, and decreasing the price of chickens. The average man knows that we cannot have milk and butter by increasing the cost of production and at the same time decreasing the price for which the dairyman can sell his product. The great rank and file of the American people feel that they have been experimented on enough. They are tired of all these theoretical schemes which do not work. They are tired of the process of appointing a group of czars to run the whole war effort and control the whole civilian economy, and then, just as soon as the czars become unpopular, creating a new group of superczars. The American people are about ready for fewer czars, and more production instead of more rationing. I, for one, believe that there are some fundamental things which we can do in this Congress now and which should be done. There is some fundamental labor legislation needed, and now is the time when it should be passed; but Senators know that every time a piece of legislation comes to the floor of the Senate it has a limitation in it that it is to stand only for the duration of the war emergency.

The right of the American citizen to work on any project paid for by American taxpayers is a right which the Government is obligated to protect. Neither in war nor in peace should a man be required to be a member of a labor union in order to exercise this right. The right of a man to follow a lawful vocation without intimidation, coercion, or the use of violence to prevent him from following such vocation is a right which every American citizen should be allowed to exercise, not only during a war period but during a period of peace and prosperity. Either in wartime or in peacetime it is absolutely essential that the National Labor Relations Act be amended so as to protect the employer in his rights and to protect the employee from coercion from any source. We are building in America a government of boards and bureaucrats, and apparently we have gone so far in delegating power and authority to boards and bureaus, and to various and sundry agencies, that the Congress of the United States itself is now afraid to legislate on these fundamental matters. I think the time has come for the Congress to quit talking about the labor union bosses and their domination of the American Government unless we are willing to do something about it. We have the power to legislate on these matters, and if there ever was a time when we should legislate, I think it is now.

As I have already stated, I am willing to follow the leadership of any other Senator who feels that he may be luckier than I have been in getting bills out of committees. If any Senator will introduce a bill to abolish the O. P. A., I will support it; and so far as I am concerned, he can add several more alphabetical agencies and I will not fall out with him. Furthermore, it is not material to me whether the Senator who introduces such a bill be a Republican or a Democrat. I would like to see some action. The O. P. A. has made a complete flop. It may turn out to be a national disaster. We face in this Nation today a situation in which theorists and star-gazers in the O. P. A., who wish completely to regiment every line of business in the country and completely make over our whole system of distribution of merchandise, who even now want to change the appetites of the people and tell them not only the amount of food they shall eat, but what kind of food they shall eat, are working hand-in-glove with other bureaucrats in Washington who hold similar ideas, in an effort to use the war emergency to force their ideas of governmental reform upon the people of this Nation.

During recent months we have all had an opportunity to read from time to time many of the propaganda articles which are being distributed by various governmental agencies to promote their pet philosophies of government and excuse their own inefficiency. I am inclined to believe that the gold medal should be awarded to the group of propaganda dispensers who have been assigned the task of feeding the American people the dope to excuse the O. P. A. and other governmental agencies for the mess they have made of handling the food situation. By the foolish and unworkable regulations they have issued, those inefficient bureaucrats have practically stopped the functioning of the normal machinery of production and distribution of food

products. They started with a barrage of newspaper articles and letters to the farmers, cattle raisers, dairymen, and poultry raisers, urging them to raise more cows, more hogs, and more chickens, and produce more eggs, stating that the very life and health of the Nation depended upon these essential food commodities. But as time went on, and as the theorists in the bureaus sought so to regulate the production of food and its distribution so as to facilitate the grouping of all elements interested into one gigantic collective unit, maintained by subsidies paid out of the Federal Treasury, they accomplished only one result and that was to create a food shortage which threatens our whole civilian population as well as our war effort. Now they have turned loose on the people those same trained propaganda experts and publicity agents, and they have assigned them the task of convincing the American people that we do not need meat, eggs, and milk. It is the job of this long-haired propaganda brigade to make the people believe that it is wasteful to produce feed crops and feed the crops to cows, hogs, and chickens. It is their job to make the American people believe that we ought to liquidate our herds; that instead of feeding the proteins to the cattle we ought to eat the proteins ourselves.

Mr. President, I say that the campaign which is now getting underway is a reflection on the intelligence of the American people. First, the bureaucrats got the whole machinery of production of food so messed up that food is not being produced and a shortage is occurring. They now come along and try to sell the people the idea that no harm has been done because we did not need the food to begin with. I would not be the least surprised to see some of these propaganda experts, who are working for their communistic masters, blossom forth any day with an article explaining to the American people that it is a great waste of food to allow our dairy cows to graze on the blue grass, clover, and Bermuda grass throughout the Nation; that we should kill the dairy cows, feed the carcasses to the dogs, and let the people eat the grass. They have regulated everything else, and now they propose to change and regulate the appetites of the American people.

They are trying to do it under the guise of advancing the war effort. Every man who knows anything knows that under the conditions which prevail at this time, the farmers, livestock producers, poultry raisers, and dairymen who have responded so loyally to the request of the Government to produce food, are today being forced to sell at less than cost of production. But when one goes to the O. P. A., or to any of the other alphabetical agencies, and points out to them that they must allow the price of milk, butter, eggs, pork, and beef to be maintained at a figure which will yield the cost of production with at least some margin of profit, he is told: "No. We are going to roll back the cost of food. We must hold the line." If we keep "holding the line" by the O. P. A. formula, I am sure we shall all wind up, in the not far distant future, trying to "hold the bread line," or possibly trying to hold our place in the bread line. How do the bureaucrats propose to roll back the cost of food and "hold the line"?

They propose to force the Congress to provide the money to pay subsidies for food production. In other words, they propose to reach into the Treasury of the United States and take money out of the Treasury to pay the cost of food production rather than to allow the cost to be paid by those who purchase the commodities. Yet they tell us that they are trying to prevent inflation. I say that at this time, when it is an admitted fact that the great rank and file of the consuming public is earning more money than it has ever earned before, it is the wrong time, if we wish to prevent inflation, to reach into the Treasury of the United States and draw out billions of dollars and hand them out as a bounty instead of allowing the cost of food to be paid for by the consumer.

Why have some persons suddenly become so thoroughly sold on the idea of letting the taxpayers pay the cost of food production instead of having it paid directly by those who buy and consume the food? I think I see in the whole scheme the "fine Italian hand" of those who are sold on the philosophy of a communistically organized society and a communistically controlled agricultural industry. I think I see the hand of some of those who are looking toward the election bulletin board in 1944 rather than toward the immediate problem of winning the World War and maintaining our American form of government. If I correctly appraise the situation, this is the way some of the theoretical planners figure it all out: If they can use the O. P. A. to roll back the cost of beef, pork, eggs, milk, and butter—as is now being so eloquently demanded by the C. I. O. and A. F. of L.—when the election takes place in 1944 they will say to the organized consumer groups: "Just look what we did for you. Don't forget us at the polls." Common sense teaches the planners that the farmer, the dairyman, the livestock producer, and the poultry raiser are at the end of their rope. They know that those people must have help. They know that if they do not allow the cost of foods to increase, they will not have the food. How do they propose to do this? Instead of having the consumer pay it, they propose to take it out of the United States Treasury, and tie up another block of votes. They want to put the dairymen, the livestock producers, the farmers, and the poultry raisers in such a position that every time they sell anything, they will receive a supplemental check from the Government; and they hope that those supplemental checks will hold agriculture in line in 1944.

Just how they are going to explain to the people the method whereby they reach into the Treasury of the United States and take out three or four billion dollars and give them away without creating inflation is something I have not yet figured out, but I assume they will have a perfectly plausible story to tell in answer to that question when it is propounded.

The bureaucrats and the persons whose minds are definitely made up to change our whole form of government are now endeavoring to force Members of Congress to choose between allowing the great agricultural classes to go broke and see the country without food or, on the other hand, to accept their political scheme of taking the money out of the Treasury of the United States to pay subsidies for food production. They have served notice on all of us that they will not allow the cost of foods to go up sufficiently to meet the cost of production for those who are responsible for feeding America and the world.

Personally I am hopeful that the Congress of the United States will stand firm, and demand that agriculture be allowed a fair price for what it produces rather than be forced to accept a handout from the United States Treasury. But whether Congress will be able to withstand the pressure of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., led by the big labor bosses, and the pressure of the communistically minded, officially appointed and unappointed bureaucrats, I do not know. I think I do know, however, that the American people are not so dumb that they will not see through the whole scheme. I wish to say to my Democratic colleagues that if any of them are looking to the election in 1944, and if they believe that pussyfooting with the labor situation will be popular with the American people, I think they are mistaken. Let me say to the Republican Members of the Senate that if any of them believe they can sit through the present period of time and do nothing to correct the labor situation, and then go to the polls in 1944 and lay all the troubles at the door of the Democrats, I think they are mistaken. I believe the American people are about "fed up" with the idea of having a Government run under the supervision and direction of labor-union bosses, and operated to suit their peculiar whims. The people are demanding that Congress legislate to guarantee the right of every American citizen to follow any lawful vocation without the fear that he will be set upon and beaten up by a gang of thugs and goon squads. I believe the American people are opposed to robbery and extortion as it is defined in House Resolution 653, which the Senate has not acted upon, and which apparently it does not intend to act upon. I believe the people are opposed to robbery and extortion, whether practiced by labor unions or by anyone else. I believe the American people realize that the situation which we face today is the direct result of playing politics with organized labor. I believe that American farmers realize that they have been made the "goat" in this whole proceeding, and I also believe that when election time comes in 1944 this sentiment of the American people will be definitely reflected at the polls.

American fathers and mothers who have sons on the battlefield are disgusted when they read of strike after strike in essential war industries, and they wonder what restraining influence

prevents the Congress from doing anything to correct the situation. Furthermore, they wonder why it is that when Congress seeks to do anything, it seeks to limit it strictly to the period covered by the war. I, for one, am ready to vote on some of the necessary labor legislation, as well as other legislation to which I have referred, and I hope that it may be brought out of the committee to which it has been referred to the floor of the United States Senate.

At this time I wish to state that the people in my State are ready, willing, and anxious to make any necessary sacrifices. They are willing to put every dollar they own into the war effort, and take their last shirt off their backs in complete material sacrifice along with sacrificing their precious sons who are giving up their lives on foreign battlefields. But it is the utterly silly and ridiculous rules, regulations, and edicts of O. P. A. and other Washington bureaucrats of which they bitterly complain. It is the pampering and petting of labor leader racketeers by our national administration and Congress about which they become so thoroughly disgusted and enraged. It is the predominant political planning and plotting for votes and retention of political power which they so clearly see in almost every move made under the guise of the war effort that greatly antagonizes them. They are not complaining about the way the war is being conducted or what it costs; it is the way the home front is being restricted, regimented, and wrecked that is so alarming to them, and they are demanding that something be done about it before it is too late. They are such thorough red-blooded Americans that they believe we will get along better in wartime and in peacetime by sticking to our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our true and tried system of private enterprise, instead of destroying the greatest government on the face of the earth, our American democracy, by giving our American form of government blood transfusions of communism, hypodermics of socialism, and face-liftings by propaganda. Let us quit copying the King's customs and quit promising all the people of the world from Patagonia to Podunk a prosperous post-war paradise by prepaid parcel post. Let us win the war, establish the peace, and go back to work—for America.

I always have believed and still believe that American citizens should have the right to strike during peacetime; but during wartime when our sons are drafted and forced to fight, and perhaps die, on foreign battlefields, I believe that anyone who lays down his tools and strikes on the home front should pay the same penalty that soldiers would pay who would lay down their war weapons and strike on the battlefield. It is exactly the same kind of unpatriotic cowardice for a civilian on the domestic front to quit his job and lay down the tools which produce the weapons so urgently needed by our soldiers on the far-flung battle fronts, as it is for the soldier on the battle front to lay down his weapons and quit in the thick of the battle; and those guilty of this cowardly trick should be dealt with in the same manner. Many of our brave sons have already lost their lives in this horrible war because they were not furnished with sufficient fighting equipment to protect their lives; and the reason the necessary equipment was not there was that it had not been manufactured here on the home front, due to men being out on strike in our war factories. Let the lawmakers of this Nation explain their failure to stop these strikes to our soldiers when they return after this war is ended—those who shall return. We constantly hear of people on the production front here at home being referred to as "soldiers" in our war against the Axis Powers, just as the men in the Army are called soldiers. Let us make that statement true in every respect by enacting legislation which will put a definite and complete end to these cowardly strikes in the United States of America during this terrible war crisis. I strongly advocate and recommend legislation of this type without delay, and will vote for its enactment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 972. An act to amend 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); and

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 26 to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. DWORSHAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 997. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the medical department of the Regular Army;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled, "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941;

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims;

H. H. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska;

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge;

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Ry.;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;* and

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 997. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska; and

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims.

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the pending business is the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. The Constitution of the United States makes the Congress of the United States responsible for the government of the District of Columbia. The Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia and the Appropriations Committee charged with the duty of providing funds by which the government of the District is administered, do not take up very much time of the Senate. We are coming to an end of the fiscal year. There are several appropriation bills of the utmost importance nationally which will be presented to the Senate very shortly. Some of the appropriation bills are now in conference, and are involved in great controversy. So, Mr. President, I hope that it will be possible for the Senate to devote at least the next hour to the consideration and disposition of this particular appropriation bill. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment; that the committee amendments be first considered, and that, thereafter, if any amendments are proposed, they may be taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this bill as it passed the House carried a total of $54,789,434. Since that time supplemental estimates have been received in Senate Documents Nos. 41 and 44 totaling $832,978. Some deductions and alterations have been made, so that the bill, as reported to the Senate, is under the estimates which have been submitted to the Congress by $394,456. Furthermore, it is below the appropriations for the current fiscal year by $812,821.

The total appropriation, under the bill as reported to the Senate, is $55,493,210. The appropriations last year amounted to $56,306,031.

With this preliminary statement, I hope the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I always make it a custom, which I think a proper one, to have a quorum called before we start on another bill. That is what I wanted to do before the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming, but I was not recognized before the Senator proceeded. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	McCarran
Andrews	Ellender	McClellan
Ball	Ferguson	McKellar
Bankhead	George	McNary
Bilbo	Gerry	Maloney
Bone	Gillette	Maybank
Brewster	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Millikin
Brooks	Gurney	Moore
Buck	Hatch	Murdock
Butler	Hawkes	Murray
Byrd	Hayden	Nye
Capper	Hill	O'Daniel
Caraway	Holman	O'Mahoney
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Radcliffe
Connally	Langer	Reed
Davis	Lodge	Revercomb
Downey	Lucas	Reynolds

Robertson	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Russell	Tobey	Wheeler
Scrugham	Truman	Wherry
Shipstead	Tunnell	White
Smith	Tydings	Wiley
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson
Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	
Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I repeat, the bill as it passed the House contained total appropriations of $54,789,434. The net amount added by the Senate committee was $703,776, making the total reported by the Senate committee $55,493,210. This is less than the total estimates submitted for the next fiscal year by $349,466. It is less than the appropriations for the current year by $812,821.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of the District appropriations has made a careful analysis of the requests made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by citizens of the District, and we feel that we have reported a bill which is substantially without controversy and which should have speedy approval.

The orderly procedure would now be to consider committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "General expenses—Executive Office," on page 2, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "$274,280" and insert "$279,640."

CONDITIONS ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I picked up a copy of the New York Times today and noticed reference to a report signed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and my colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], pointing out the confusion which has existed in the various departmental agencies of the Government. I intend to speak somewhat upon that subject, and I wish to congratulate the members of the committee for the very able report they have submitted calling attention to the confusion which exists in Washington at the present time in the departments of the Government.

Mr. President, the time has now come for a more sober evaluation of where we are and what we, as a nation, should do. The first flush of excitement, the anger and hysteria of December 7, 1941, the sanguine optimism of many of our people that we could defeat the world in a few months, must be replaced by a cold, logical, and scientific consideration of all of the facts to the end that we may wage hard and effective war today, tomorrow, next year, the year after, and even 3 years hence, if need be.

The great majority of our people and most of the active personalities in each of the old parties are united in their will to defeat Japan and the Axis at the earliest moment. We want to accomplish this objective with the least loss of life and the subordination of every sectional and group interest and activity. At the same time we are determined to preserve our way of life and the principles of liberty and political equality contained in and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Our differences lie in the means of attaining these objectives.

Our first objective is to win the war.

The American people have every reason to be proud of the achievements of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Each and all have given an excellent account of themselves in actual combat.

No one doubts or has ever doubted the ultimate results of their efforts.

American productive genius, as represented by agriculture, business, and labor, has likewise done a magnificent job toward winning the war.

It is, however, regrettable that elsewhere the war effort has not reached the high plane worthy of the military achievements of our armed forces and the outstanding accomplishments of agriculture, capital, and labor.

The conduct of the war on the political side has had many serious defects. Some of these were perhaps unavoidable, but for many there is little excuse.

Plan has tumbled upon plan as fast as some of the bright young bureaucrats could think them up. Do this; do that; do not do this; that is wrong; that is right—have succeeded each other in glittering confusion. The result in many instances is chaos. Our enemies must rejoice at the "confusion worse confounded" that besets us in this land.

Three factors are chiefly responsible for this condition:

First. The lack of any sound over-all planning.

Second. The so-called Washington method by which operations on the home front are directed.

Third. The unfortunate choice of many of the men selected to administer the war program.

Domestic confusion is, then, primarily due to the lack of any well-considered plan, to impractical administrators, and to inept administration by the executive branch of the Government. It is not due to any failure of agriculture, capital, or labor, or to any lack of understanding by the people themselves that the Nation is at war.

An elaborate and extensive system of Government control has been built up haphazardly. Successive measures have been determined upon by reason of so-called emergencies and by the successful pressure of some sectional or group interest, none of which is related or coordinated to any general conception. Such a system is bound to be wasteful and inefficient. It is bound to be injurious to all interests, except those which are immediately served, and, ultimately, as their range extends, injurious even to those interests.

Dual and antagonistic policies have been permitted to grow up and expand, with the inevitable conflict of high personalities. The appointment of committees or boards representing many different and divergent viewpoints, in the effort to make all parties happy, has in turn resulted in a clash of interests, in confusion, and in lack of direction.

As a further consequence the Government itself has become overgrown. The confused mass of bureaus and agencies has from time to time been reshuffled with promise of improvement which all too often has failed to materialize.

To add to the confusion, men have been placed in high, responsible administrative positions, for purely political considerations, without regard to their aptitude to do the work assigned to them. Lacking practical knowledge of the functioning of our economy, it is small wonder that at times the people do not know which way to turn.

One glaring example of administrative inefficiency and irresponsibility is the manpower muddle. Let us examine briefly some of the facts. The Congress has been informed by military leaders that they desire to have approximately 11,000,000 men under arms by the end of this year. That means about one-third of our total adult population. As the selective-service law now works such an army will take four-fifths, 80 percent, of the physically fit American men between 18 and 38 years of age. Under such a program fathers, regardless of the age and number of children they have, will be taken along with the rest.

On this question of how large an army we should have, I am perfectly content to let speak for me men and publications who supported the administration's foreign policy long before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Samuel Grafton, New Deal columnist and an ardent supporter of the so-called second front, writing in the Washington Star, has this to say:

> Manpower: Let us take the figure of 13,000,000 men suggested by Major General Hershey as the ultimate size of our Army. We must multiply this by 18, for we have been told that 18 workers are needed in industry to back up each soldier. The product is 234,000,000 standing for the number of able-bodied men and women we would need in the factories to supply the armed forces.
>
> That is an even 100,000,000 more people than there are in the country—including those in rompers, wheel chairs, and institutions for the criminal insane.
>
> The Truman committee also has been adding up our manpower needs as estimated by various war agencies and has almost fallen out of its chairs to find that we would need

a country of approximately 300,000,000 people to meet all estimates.

A couple of weeks ago I spotted a new trend toward fantastically huge conceptions of the war. That trend is moving along briskly. Fowler W. Harper, Deputy Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, comes right out and says it: "130,000,000 people may not be enough." But we have no more.

Working within this trend, someone in Washington has estimated that we need 40,000,000 more tons of steel per year than we can produce. It will be a peculiar war if it calls on us for 100,000,000 more people than are alive, to work 40,000,000 tons of steel which don't exist.

Our plan has been to be stronger than the enemy everywhere, simultaneously, though he is satisfied when he is stronger than we are at one specific point, at which time and point he acts.

Hitler went into France with a breakthrough force one-tenth the size of the French army; it was quite big enough for that specific planned task. The French obviously needed ten times as many soldiers as Hitler because they did not know what they wanted to do. There is no limit to your needs when you don't know what you need.

Thus we have tried to meet every request of every one of the services, all at once; it is only recently, for example, that the Navy has canceled plans for a couple of ships for 1946; but there is much stuff still tied up for that remote argosy.

The slogan of our program has been: "Let's build that, too." To start with a specific war program and ruthlessly subordinate the interests of the several services to it is difficult; there are vested military and naval interests as well as vested commercial interests. The easiest way out is to try to build everything, honoring all requests, and keeping everybody happy; the catch-breath point comes when we look around and find we need 300,000,000 people to carry on.

So stanch an administration advocate as the New York Times recently devoted one of the longest editorials that has appeared in that newspaper, questioning the wisdom of raising too large an Army. The New York Times does not agree that the decision for an 11,000,000-man Army is irrevocable, or that those who question its wisdom want to fight a soft war, or that the Army decision is an expert one, and that any questioning of it is necessarily inexpert.

The Army's argument is that because our enemies have a certain number of divisions, we must have more than that number in order to win. The Army says that because Germany has 13½ percent of its total population in the Army, we must have the same percentage, or more. The main point is that they imply that the total war effectiveness of a nation is measured by the number of men in the armed services. Obviously, that is a dangerous fallacy. It is particularly so in modern war, in the kind of a war we are fighting, in which we are the arsenal and the food supplier for all our allies, for most of the world.

On the point of the importance of food let me quote from an article by Mr. George Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun. This is what Mr. Sokolsky says:

I was in Petrograd during the first year of the Russian Revolution. I was there when Kerensky rose and fell; I was there when the Communists seized the power of the state; I traveled slowly across Siberia in the spring of 1918.

It is from this experience that I write today on the subject of food, because that alone explains the collapse of the Russian front in 1917 and the change of the average Russian worker and peasant from a docile, obedient person into a dissatisfied, bitter opponent of government. The slogan of those days was, "Peace, land, and bread." The people were hungry and they wanted peace that they might have food.

Prior to the World War Russia was one of the principal food exporting countries of the world. But during the World War Russian food production collapsed, principally because too large a share of the agricultural manpower was taken off the farms and mobilized for military and industrial purposes. Roughly, 14,000,000 Russians—mostly peasants—were shifted from food and fiber production to military purposes. Agriculture was left to old people, women and children, and they were inadequate. The country shifted from food surpluses to starvation.

If that is not what we are on the verge of doing, I do not know what we are doing or where we are going.

The article continues:

Men and women who literally hated the Bolsheviks greeted the regime of Lenin and Trotsky because they hoped that the change of regime would bring peace and bread.

Even in this war Soviet Russia has been forced to lease-lend foodstuffs—from the United States—because apparently a similar phenomenon occurred. The mobilization of manpower for military purposes and the seizure of the Ukraine by the Germans left Russia without adequate food supplies. Germany in the World War did not suffer a military defeat, but the home front collapsed, because food could not be produced in sufficient quantities.

Modern war requires balance between the armed forces and the food and munitions of war for the armed forces. It must be obvious to anyone that there is just so much in the way of raw materials and just so much manpower. Whatever raw materials and manpower are used in one direction, cannot be used in another. We are experiencing that problem on every hand. If we use steel and man-hours for building war vessels, we have just that much less of both for building merchant vessels. The problem is that simple. We have only one apple. We can cut it into two pieces or a thousand pieces, but we still have only one apple to cut up.

In our case the situation is even worse. Our internal effort must be balanced against the size of the combined fighting forces of the United Nations, for we are the suppliers of not only our Army, but the armies of the British Empire, of Russia, of China, of Australia, and of the Fighting French. Already we are supplying the armies and large numbers of the civilian population of more than half the world.

Yet before the present war the United States was not on balance an exporter of foodstuffs. Between 1933 and 1940 we were limiting production, plowing under crops, reducing the food-animal herd, and paying bounties for reduced agricultural products.

Today, in consequence, our country is face to face with the most serious food shortage in our history. Unless prompt and effective action is taken to increase agricultural production, we are apt to encounter a disastrous condition.

This problem is not going to be solved by ultimatum, by ridicule of Congress, or by prejudice. It involves complicated economic and social situations. The question is not one of politics; it is a question of agriculture; it goes to the very life of the people.

What does not go into the ground will not come out of it. Even when a crop appears, it has to be harvested, or there will be no food. All this requires machines and manpower.

Considered from this viewpoint, it is clearly dangerous and unwise to make a comparison between the size of the German Army and our Army, as the military leaders do. We have landed an army in Africa. We must keep it supplied. If we land troops on the European continent, we must keep them supplied. Not only must we keep them supplied, but we must keep the Russian Army supplied, we must keep the French Army and the Chinese Army supplied, and we must furnish England and India with the supplies and war materials they need. In addition to all that, we have been supplying great quantities of materials to South America and to every other country on the face of the globe that has sent its representatives here to say to us, "Unless you do this and do that, we might turn to the Axis." What we are really doing in South America is buying loyalty with gold.

Obviously, our war effort in connection with such operations is a different one from the war effort of Germany. Furthermore, we do not have to police any occupied countries. It should be remembered that Germany has occupied a number of large countries, and must police them.

We must use a far greater percentage of our strength in building and manning troop transports, merchant vessels, freighters, and tankers, in keeping open the life line to our men and to those of our allies on far-away shores. Without that life line, the armies in Africa or Europe or the South Pacific are lost.

To build that life line and keep it open, will require the services of millions of men who otherwise might themselves be a part of the armed services. It will require the use of raw materials which otherwise might go directly into the making of guns, tanks, and airplanes.

Let me quote from the February 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

Furthermore, the United States is the only important arsenal and granary available to the Allied Nations. British industry works miracles under great difficulties, but no Englishman likes to think what would have happened to his country if America had not responded to Mr. Churchill's plea to "give us the tools." Russia has lost some of her largest industrial centers and thousands of square miles of her best food-producing areas. China has no industrial system in the modern sense and cannot conduct all-out war against Japan unless or until her soldiers are supplied from somewhere else. However you slice it, the end man on the production line is Uncle Sam.

So I repeat what I stated a moment ago: However it is sliced, the end man on the production line is Uncle Sam—the United States of America.

For this reason the maintenance of the American civilian economy is not a matter

of a soft war versus an all-out war, as some people appear to believe; on the contrary, it is the minimum requirement for fighting any kind of war. Shipments now of tanks to the Russian armies or food to the civilian population of Moscow might have a more direct bearing on the result of the war than training new American recruits for some action planned for later in the year. A worker making escort craft to protect our convoys is at least as essential to the winning of the war as his brother doing K. P. at a training camp.

It is impossible to be dogmatic about the precise point at which the size of the Army threatens the effective operation of the civilian economy, upon which depends the military success of all the United Nations. But the size of the Army must be determined with the understanding that, if our American industrial and agricultural machine cracks because it is too thinly manned or denied needed materials, it won't make much difference how many soldiers we have.

When we talk about the size of the Army it is not a question of how many men we can get, but rather how many men we can afford to put in the Army without seriously disrupting our supply lines, defense plants, and essential civilian activities at home. The select committee on national expenditures of the British House of Commons stated the question well in its report of March 26, 1942, when it said:

What distribution of labor between industry and the armed forces will secure the maximum strength for defeating the enemy, taking into account the combined resources of this country and her allies?

Is it not clear now why military men alone are not qualified to be the sole judges of how large an army the Nation should have? Is it not obvious that in reaching such a decision the expert opinion of agriculture, mining, shipbuilding, machine-tool, airplane, and labor specialists should be obtained, studied, and analyzed? So far as we have been informed in Congress in closed committee sessions, no such expert knowledge was pooled in reaching the decision. Any Senator who raises the question on the floor of the Senate is told, "But the Army needs them; we cannot question the Army."

Already we are experiencing frightening labor shortages in agriculture, in industrial plants, and in the copper mines producing for war. Our industrial economy—both labor and management—is doing a magnificent job. Our production for armies and civilian populations is so vast that it staggers the imagination.

Total war is not only a military problem; it is a problem of the total economy of a nation. We must have the considered opinion of the experts on that economy before we can risk decisions on which the whole future fate of the Nation hangs.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in his radio address on April 18 on the American Forum of the Air attacks this problem from a different angle. He said:

The United States is fighting two major wars, thousands of miles from our shores, against strong, fierce, and relentless foes. Unfortunately, shipping determines and limits the amount of fighting we do against them. Each soldier across the ocean, in addition to his own transportation, must be supported by 20 tons of supplies each year. Our shipping experts are agreed that by the end of 1943 shipping will limit us to an army of 2,700,000 men on the far-flung battle fronts of the world.

According to the press, the Army has now mobilized 6,500,000 men—3,800,000 more than we can possibly use at the front. It is apparent that the Army is already large enough if we hold it at its present strength. Therefore, outside of the 18-year-old class, we should stop inducting men this very day. Every month 100,000 boys become 18-year-old men; 73,000 of them are extra good soldier timber, sufficient for all replacements if the Army be held to its present strength.

I quote the Senator from Colorado because he is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and has given a great deal of thought and study to this particular subject.

What about shipping facilities for men and equipment? Are our shipping facilities adequate to ship equipment for an Army as large as that contemplated by the War Department? The Truman Committee and Admiral Land have furnished some significant information on the subject.

In its recent report on shipbuilding and shipping—report No. 10, part 8, April 22, 1943—the Truman committee had this to say:

Everyone realizes that the war is one of transportation. Victory depends upon our ability to transport the armed forces and the supplies which they will need to the several distant fighting fronts. It is no military secret that we do not now have enough shipping to supply our allies with the weapons and food which they require and to transport and maintain overseas as many soldiers as we can train or as much material as we can produce. For lack of shipping space we are compelled to forego importation of much material valuable in war production or useful for essential civilian purposes. Gasoline and fuel-oil shortages on the eastern seaboard are caused primarily by lack of tanker capacity. In short, shipping is one of the greatest bottlenecks of the war effort. * * * The limitation upon the construction of shipbuilding at the present time is not shipyards and their facilities for construction. It is (1) the shortage of certain components and (2) the shortage of manpower.

Why does the administration want an armed force of the size now demanded? Perhaps David Lawrence, editor of the United States News, and a consistent supporter of the administration's foreign policy, has the right answer. In the usually reliable and well-informed United States News published by Mr. Lawrence he tells us, in the issue of April 30, 1943, that—

United States armed forces total 7,600,000 men at present, about 6,000,000 in the Army. Barely 60,000 of these men are in action right now. A colossal piling up of men and munitions is occurring in the United States. A big army at home is needed to soak up vast quantities of war equipment. It isn't probable that an Army that big—8,200,000—can be overseas before 1946, if then. War materials are backing up in the hands of troops immobilized in the United States. A vast inventory of both trained men and weapons is accumulating, unused. The pile-up of unused weapons adds pressure for creating a big home army so that equipment can have the appearance of use in hands of troops in camps. Actually the whole United States relation to the war depends on decisions relating to use of ships, on allocations of merchant-ship tonnage to war theaters. Jesse Jones now is finding that the war plants he was criticized for building too slowly actually are turning out weapons in so much greater volume than can be moved that officials who once criticized him are wondering what to do with the weapons they are getting. High officials are beginning to be concerned over the public reaction that will occur when it is learned that vast quantities of weapons are piling up in this country and are not being put to use.

Mr. President, the statement which I have just quoted from Mr. David Lawrence's United States News is pretty strong. I have quoted it because, as every one knows, Mr. Lawrence is a very accurate observer and writer.

I should like to have some one tell me what will be done with a big Army which we cannot transport overseas. It is necessary in the war not only to provide food and equipment but to maintain the morale here in the United States of America. Can any one tell me that with a big Army scattered all over the United States—from California to Maine—with boys having nothing to do, practically, except training here and there, that we shall be able to maintain the morale of the Army? I doubt there is a Senator here who does not receive letters from boys in the Army who formerly lived in his State, stating that they want to go overseas, or do something instead of lying around in the camps. The morale of the people of the country is not only breaking down but the morals of the people as well.

In my judgment, one of the reasons why race riots have taken place in Los Angeles, and in Detroit, as well as in other cities throughout the country, is that large forces of boys are scattered around in military camps with nothing to do. They want action. They want either to have action, or the right to return to civilian life. I have not been able to find any one who can give me any reason for the situation to which I have referred. One day I see a statement to the effect that we are going to do one thing, and the next day there is a statement to the effect that something else will be done.

To complete the picture, allow me to quote from the May 21 broadcast of Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of War Information. Mr. Davis said:

We are fighting a two-front war—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked the Senator from Montana to yield because I have in my hand a letter which I have received from a young man who recently went into the Army. The statement he makes is so expressive of the opinion which I have received from other young men in the Army that I thought it would be appropriate to read it at this time in view of the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The young man to whom I have referred writes:

DEAR SENATOR: I realize I have been rather neglectful in keeping you informed as to my Army life, but, as you know, ye 'ole Army routine allows little time for letter

writing, although we love to get letters. Suffice it to say that I am well, happy, and enjoy the Army a lot. At first I was a bit disappointed to find myself with a military police outfit, but in due course discovered that it was one of the best in the service. Our training was intensive and excellent, and I have come more and more to believe that nothing in the world can withstand the tremendous efficiency of this Army.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am glad to have that comment, but I can say to the Senator that I have received letters from men in the camps of his State containing complaints because they are not in active service but are lying around the camps in the State of Wyoming. I have received similar letters from many other places in the United States, and I doubt there is a Senator in this body who has not received letters of similar character.

To complete the picture, allow me to quote from the May 21 broadcast of Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of War Information:

We are fighting a two-front war, and on both sides, we must travel great distances to meet an enemy who is fighting fairly close to home. As Mr. Mark Sullivan wrote this morning—

And I am still quoting from Mr. Davis—

in the matter of gas and oil alone, American fleets, armies, and air forces probably use up more of it in the mere business of reaching the enemy than we use in fighting him after we get there. Attacking Germany first we have the assistance of two nations that are close to Germany—Britain and Russia—whose logistical disadvantage is by no means so great. For the war against Germany, a great deal of the Allied force is close by.

There we have it in a nutshell. There is no shortage of military manpower either in England or in Russia. There is no problem of logistics for either England or Russia. No wonder Mr. Churchill said, under far more serious conditions for the Allies than those which exist today:

Give us the tools and we will finish the job.

What is true in the west is even more true in the east. For China with her half billion population does not, as Madame Chiang recently stated, require men but the materials of war. This involves not only production of the materials, but the clearing of the road to China, and that, at the earliest moment.

In order to clear that road we have to furnish in the United States the materials to equip a British Army of approximately 2,000,000 men in India. Approximately 2,000,000 was the figure given to me of the British Army in India. I believe the figure to be correct.

I do not mean to infer from all this that America does not need a strong and effective Army, Navy, and Air Force, or that we should not contribute all reasonable military assistance to the fighting forces of our allies on the far-flung fronts. On the contrary, I firmly believe that a strong and vigorous Army, Navy, and Air Force, well disciplined and well trained, is a vital necessity for our country. But I do mean to state, and emphatically so, that our primary contribution to our allies should be in the form of food, supplies, and munitions of war. We are, in fact, the front behind the front, without which the front itself could not exist. When we started out we were going to be the arsenal of democracy. We were going to turn out the tools to be used in winning the war.

Mr. Marshall Andrews, writing for the Washington Post on March 7, said:

Warfare never was a simple matter of counting noses and taking into the field a greater number of men than the enemy could muster. If that had ever been true, the nation with the largest male population would have been invincible without ever having to fight a war. Rather have wars been won or lost, aside from moral factors, by the ability of nations to supply and feed their armies after the armies themselves have been raised.

Today's armies require an infinitely greater amount of supplies than armies have ever required before in history. They travel in motor vehicles and fight in motor vehicles protected by armor. Their weapons consume limitless quantities of ammunition and their motor vehicles limitless amounts of fuel.

They fight across distances of water which no general in his right mind would have dared try to surmount a few hundred years ago.

All these things, these motor vehicles and these automatic weapons with their vast appetite for ammunition, and the great water-borne supply lines which must be maintained in the face of enemy opposition, have made industry fully as important in warfare today as armies themselves. And the people who work in these industries as well as the soldiers who fight in the armies must be fed and clothed and transported.

That is why manpower and the proper disposition and use of manpower has become a problem which threatens to disrupt the front behind the front unless something intelligent and forthright is done and done soon to meet it.

I wish to call attention to an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick appearing in the New York Times of June 19, 1943, which I will read:

ABROAD—FOOD AS AN ELEMENT OF GRAND STRATEGY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The sudden awakening of this country to the vital importance of food as a war weapon marks the first general recognition of the central fact of this war. We have talked a lot about the home front, the production line, the morale of populations under bombs or under abnormal strains and shortages. But we are just beginning to grasp the idea that this is really a civilian war.

The military show is stupendous. The armies engaged are the largest in history. There never were so many generals. The earth literally trembles under the mountainous mass and weight of the weapons employed. Sometimes, looking at great cities burning like bonfires, at islands leaping into the air, at airplanes in 100,000 lots, it seems as if mankind had never seen battles before. For the first time military power appears to rule the world.

Yet, while this conflict is a test of new arms, and of the use of old arms on a new scale, no expert pretends that any one of these weapons, or all of them together, will win the victory. Modern fighting instruments have to be orchestrated to be effective, and the orchestration calls for balance, timing, imagination, a quality of conducting undreamed of in the greatest campaigns of the past. It calls for brain power in some proportion to the shattering fire power.

And that's the least of it. The organization behind the front is the crux of the vast enterprise. This is a struggle on so many planes that it cannot be waged on one plane. Generalship can no more carry it alone than the bass drums can play a symphony. Armies cannot carry it alone. Soldiers, pilots, sailors are the heroic spearhead; but the overwhelming majority of the combatants are civilians. The top strategists have to be civilians because the major battleground lies far behind the lines, not merely in the fields of war production and supply but in every field of human activity, in the physical reactions and mental processes of nations.

HOME SHORTAGES ALREADY LOOM

Americans are only beginning to understand what total war means. The fantastic amount of the latest war appropriation bill puts it into figures. "The money cost of global warfare is frightful," said the House committee in asking for $71,000,000,000 for 1 year's war budget. But even this mythical sum does not make the picture as real as the statement of Food Administrator Davis that under ideal conditions—far better than can be hoped for in reality—there will not be enough food in this country, probably for years to come, to satisfy all the claims for food.

These claims come from all fronts. What the testimony piled up in the last few weeks amounts to, in fact, is that our most serious war problem will not be to produce enough soldiers or planes or tanks or ships to beat the enemy. The problem will be to produce enough food to win the war. And though former President Hoover, on the basis of his experience as Food Administrator in the last war, has been warning the country for 2 years that "failure to place food production on an equality with munitions would bring disaster," it is only now that shortages in rationed supplies and cries of alarm from all quarters cause people to wonder if the arsenal is weak where it should be strongest.

For today all nations, at last including our own, are conscious as never before of food as a weapon of war and an instrument of policy. Total war depends on food as limited and local conflicts do not. Not only is food essential to the fighting power of armies, the full rhythm of war production, the health and spirit of the civilian populations, but there can be no real peace, and therefore no real victory, without sufficient food.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the article is as follows:

FREE EUROPE MUST BE FED

Most of the European peoples we liberate will be physically weakened and mentally warped by years of semistarvation. A correspondent in the Journal de Geneve quotes a sentence from a report of Professor Richet, of the Academy of Medicine, to the French Ministry of Agriculture, which must be true of every occupied country. "As a result of undernourishment," he says, "10,000,000 Frenchmen are today condemned to slow death." This does not include the 2,000,000 Frenchmen on prisoners' rations in Germany. It does not include the millions already dead or dying of starvation in other occupied countries. If the war is prolonged, the nations we count on to rebuild a free Europe will be tragically decimated.

Without large surpluses of food the United States cannot fulfill the pledges we have solemnly made to these nations. Former Governor Lehman spoke the other night of plans to supply the Italian people with food as soon as they surrender. But the chief argu-

ment against the President's appeal for surrender is that it would entail feeding the population. And although the capitulation of Italy would certainly shorten the war, it is quite likely that drastic shortages on our own food front would affect the attitude of the American people on this and like questions of high policy.

This illustrates how food will and must be a prime factor in the war strategy at home and abroad. For this is a civilian war in which management of domestic resources is of the highest importance and military success will be vain unless exploited by great statesmanship.

Mr. WHEELER. So I say, Mr. President, the boys who are taken into the Army, and all of whom it is impossible to use, are bound to eat more food, and we are not able to furnish either supplies or food for the armies of the various countries who are fighting the war with us.

Will we ever learn that this is no time to take a chance; to leave it to guesswork or to unplanned optimistic belief that it can be done. That way lies disaster for the people of this land.

I have discussed army size simply to illustrate that there has been no adequate consideration given to the proper utilization of our manpower, either civilian or military.

In my opinion it is clear that under present conditions we are preparing to draft too many men into the armed services. It is clear that the program of giving no consideration to the marital status of men—of making every man a number in order to fill a quota—is the fault of the selective-service law and should be corrected.

Today, throughout America, there is a growing realization that when fathers of families are drafted we are breaking up the bulwark and foundation stone of American government—the home. It would be a hollow victory, indeed, if in order to wage totalitarian war we destroyed that which foreign ideologies have deliberately destroyed—the home and family life. Fascism and communism have as one of their basic tenets that the individual is nothing; the state is supreme. Under those governments children are the wards of the state. Do we want by indirection to bring that about in America?

It is unthinkable that an administration which has talked more about building and making secure the home should unwittingly countenance policies which will destroy the very essence of American democracy. Today we have the Social Security Act, the home owners' loan, Federal housing laws, and many others, all aimed at strengthening the family through a greater social security.

Draft American fathers, and the existence of the American home is jeopardized. The wife and mother is left with bewildering and cruel alternatives; she must depend upon her parents for support, always supposing her parents are able to help her, or she must place her children in an institution while she looks for work in order to help support them. It is impossible for a mother to support herself and her children on the allotment she receives from the Government, and each day of rising prices for foodstuffs makes the task more impossible. But even if the allotment were doubled or tripled, the chief problem would not be met, namely, the problem of making American children wards of the state and of breaking up the American home.

It is no answer to say that fathers must go forth to fight to protect their children. Fathers can fight more successfully, more effectively, and more permanently for the welfare of the Nation by fighting on the home front. If they are needed on the farms, or in the mine or factory, by all means let us put them there to replace single men or young married men who have no children. But it is imperative that so far as possible, the home itself shall not be broken up; else all that we are fighting for will be ashes in our mouth.

Mr. President, what kind of a soldier do you think a father of three or four children will be when he knows his wife has to work in a factory and that the children are either in an institution or running around the streets? Where will his thoughts be? They will be with his wife and children back home. Are they getting enough food? Has his wife found a job? How is she making a living? Who is watching over the children? A thousand and one thoughts that only a father of children can know will come into his mind. Every mother and father know that children need the care and advice of their parents and that no institution, however good, can take the place of a good mother and father.

Speaking over a radio network on a March of Time program a few weeks ago, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, pointed to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency, traceable directly to the changed conditions brought on by the war, and he urged all Americans to lend their hands to preserving the home front. He said:

As a nation we have failed to realize the seriousness of the increase in youthful crimes since the outbreak of war. Here is a problem that is approaching a national scandal.

Last year, arrests of girls under 21 years of age increased 55 percent. In the first 3 months of 1943, arrests of girls under 21 for crimes against common decency increased 93 percent.

I should like to see some of our friends laugh that one off.

The age of the offenders is a tragedy that cannot be overlooked. Eighteen-year-olds led in the number of persons arrested last year. But the causes are not new—they are merely aggravated by the spirit of wartime abandon, general restlessness, a don't-care attitude, and changed conditions brought on by the war.

Consider the case of two youths, age 15 and 17, who sought to wreck a fast passenger train. Their home existed in name only; they were left to shift for themselves.

Left to shift for themselves because their father was taken away for service in the Army, their mother had to go to work in a factory, and the boys were left to shift for themselves around the streets.

In other cases, two 9-year-olds burned down a defense factory causing over a million dollars in damage. A 16-year-old boy pushed two younger boys over a cliff to their death. Practically every community in the land has been shocked by the revelation of tarnished lives of young girls.

Is there any Member of the Senate who does not know that when there is a large number of boys such as those in the camps, as we have seen them, and as we see them every day, Mr. Hoover is giving a correct picture?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator has mentioned two boys being pushed off a cliff. That happened just outside the city of Denver, and one of the boys who was pushed over was the son of a soldier.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. Hoover continued:

Last year, young people under 21 accounted for 15 percent of all arrests for murder, 50 percent of all arrests for burglary, 34 percent of all arrests for robbery and larceny.

Think of it. Last year young people under 21 accounted for 15 percent of all the arrests for murder, 50 percent of all the arrests for burglary, 34 percent of all the arrests for robbery and larceny. I continue the quotation:

Why, we should ask, does this condition exist? Many parents are working irregular hours and consequently neglect their children. The American home is not the place of learning that it once was. The overwhelming majority of youthful offenders come from homes that have been broken—where mothers and fathers have forgotten their obligations to their children.

They come from homes where the father and the mother, instead of taking care of their homes, are working in the factories and leaving the children to run around by themselves.

Families by the hundreds have migrated to defense centers where there are inadequate housing and recreational facilities. Many young people with no appreciation of economic responsibility have left schools to take well-paying defense jobs. Seeking new thrills and excitement, they have been able to buy pleasure that are morally depressing.

Law enforcement is understaffed. Juvenile courts and probation officers are overworked. The constructive programs of youth-serving agencies have not been adequately supported. There is too much theory in crime prevention and not enough constructive effort.

The time has come when all Americans must lend their hands to preserving the home front.

How are we to preserve the home front when we take the married men with children and put them in the Army, already having more men than we can possibly transport overseas, according to testimony before the committees, or probably can use overseas, not only in the year 1943, but in 1944? Yet it is proposed that we take the fathers.

Furthermore, there are not in many of the mines and factories the number of men who are needed to turn out the materials with which to make the tools for our allies, and the people in other countries. In South America there is not much manufacturing. The South American countries, which are our allies, have large numbers of men, and we are sending large quantities of tools and other things to those countries. The United States of America is practically the only country left that can furnish the Allies food. We are the only country that can

supply Russia with the food which at present she needs almost more than she needs anything else. We are the only country that can furnish England with the food she needs. We are the only country that can furnish the tools the other countries need. Yet day after day and day after day we are taking men and putting them into the Army, and cutting down on the production of tools and other necessary things.

Mr. President, that is one phase of the matter, but looking at it from the moral side, we all know from the daily reports, as well as from reports which are not published in the newspapers, that the morale of the people of this country is being broken down by rationing, and by the fact that there are such large groups of men in the camps with nothing to do. The girls, the children of the country, are turned into criminals because they are compelled to rove the streets, with no father or mother to look after them.

Mr. President, this is our problem today. It is one which faces Congress. Numerous Members of both branches of Congress have expressed grave concern over the effect on American home life. They feel, and I feel, that to draft married men who are the fathers of small children tends to break down the morals as well as the morale of the people of the country.

From start to finish, our Government officials have kept the people and the Congress in a state of utter confusion with respect to manpower requirements for war industry and essential civilian activities, and with respect to the number of men needed for the armed forces. To say that American families are bewildered is putting it mildly. Plan has tumbled upon plan.

Brigadier General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, stated in September 1942 that we could look forward ultimately to a total of 13,000,000 men in the armed forces. Secretary of War Stimson then testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 15 that the number in the Army at the end of 1943 would be 7,500,000 men. Thereafter the Government announced its intention to raise an armed force of 10,824,000 men and women by the end of the year. Now we are told they are not going to take that many, after all. Tomorrow—no doubt—they will change their minds again.

I read a statement a short time ago to the effect that married men with children were to be taken by August. Then a statement appeared a couple of days ago that the Army would not take married men until the first of October. A statement was then published in the newspapers to the effect that they were not going to take married men until the first of January, or that possibly they would not have to take them at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think there is anything, outside the very major causes, which could be more disturbing and result in greater interference with the continuity of any war effort than this continual backing and filling, telling young men one day they are to be called next month, then telling them tomorrow that they will not be called for 2 months, then telling them the day after tomorrow that they will be called next week? That has been the policy uniformly followed by the Selective Service System, by the Manpower Commission, and by the War Department itself.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These various officials go around and make speeches continually upsetting to the men. I myself know, from experience with some young men who are going to be called and expect to be called, that as soon as they know when they are to be called their composure will be entirely restored. But they have been completely upset in their business, their schools, or in whatever they may be doing by this continual backing and filling, and contradictory advice from various so-called authoritative sources as to when they are to be called, or what they are going to do when they are called. It seems to me that there is a disgraceful break-down in the administration.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with the Senator. A few days ago I received a letter from a married man with children, who lives in Chicago. He said that because of his conviction, based upon official statements, that married men were not going to be called, he proposed to buy himself a home. He paid $1,000 down on his home. After having done so he said he read in the newspapers that married men with children were to be called. He then forfeited his $1,000 deposit on the home he had meant to buy. After having done so he was told that married men with children would not be called before next August. Later he saw another statement to the effect that married men would not be called at all. He said in his letter to me:

> I do not know what to do about my business. I do not know whether to sell it or not. I do not know what to do about a home, or whether I should send my children to college.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that I know of a young married man with one child, who has no means outside his own salary, which is a very good one for a man of his age at the present time. Some time ago he was advised that he was likely to be called. The advice was that sent through the public press by one of the pronunciamentos issued by the Selective Service. He was prepared to quit his job, and almost did so. He also made arrangements to have his wife get a job, because it was necessary for her to support her child and herself while her husband was away. A few days later came the announcement that married men with children would not be called for some time. His wife relinquished the job she had practically obtained. In the next few days, however, came another announcement which indicated that he was likely to be called at any time, and that man and his wife are now completely upset, and justly so. They do not know how to make their plans for the next week, the next month, the next 6 months, or any other time. The man is perfectly willing to do his duty for his country at any time he is told what his duty will be. I say that the policy pursued by the Government up to this time represents an inhuman cruelty to such people as these.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, by reason of the fact that I introduced a measure to amend the Selective Service Act, which was referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and which provided for the complete deferment of married men with children, at least until such time as the Army officials knew definitely whether such men were to be taken or not, I have received from one end of the country to the other literally hundreds and hundreds of letters from married men with children saying exactly what the Senator from Missouri said a married man has written to him:

> I am willing to be called if it is necessary that I be called, but for pity's sake tell me what will be done, so I may know how to conduct my business; so I may know whether I can send my children to school next year, or whether it will be necessary for my wife to obtain a job.

Mr. President, there is no excuse on the part of the officials of the Army or on the part of those who have responsibility for the Army program, for the confusion which exists with respect to manpower. We find "confusion worse confounded," and there simply is no reason or excuse for it, and its continuation cannot be supported by any reasonable argument.

Mr. President, it is asserted by Army officers that it is necessary that married men be called so they may be given training. If the full number of men who are called into service cannot be transported overseas this year—and we know they cannot be transported because of our present shipping requirements; and we know that only 2,000,000 men can be shipped in another year, and that more than 2,000,000 men will be left in this country, why should the Army begin to induct married men now, and drill them and train for 2 or 3 years, when they cannot possibly be used for combat service? Such a policy simply does not make sense. Why, the Senate Military Affairs Committee has not reported a measure dealing with the situation is beyond my understanding.

With reference to available manpower, Secretary of Labor Perkins stated in September that she did not believe there would be any real labor shortage which would make it necessary for Congress to enact legislation regulating the use of manpower. At practically the same time, Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, asserted that a manpower shortage was imminent, and that legislation to control the allocation of the labor supply was imperative. The War Manpower Commission tells men to get into war industry or be drafted. The Selective Service System tells them that taking a job in a war

industry is no assurance that they will be deferred, and then turns completely around and threatens them with induction if they do not.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we all know that for a while young men with physical defects were not taken by the Army, and they were considered to be exempt from induction. We now find that the Army has changed the rule in this respect, and men with certain physical defects are being taken. For a time men over 38 years of age were taken into the Army, and then the Army began discharging such men. It was said that a great many men of those two types would break down in training, and certainly they could not be given hard training for combat service. Surely, however, single men over 38 years of age could be used to perform many services in the Army, thereby, if necessary, releasing able-bodied young men for combat service.

Developments this week indicated that the draft of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers would be delayed at least until October, but the usual confusion over that question reigned with the continuance of conflicting official statements.

Major General Hershey told a House Appropriations subcommittee in testimony made public Monday:

> Our present intention is to continue to leave the interdiction on the induction of fathers until we have to take them.

Mr. Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission in turn testified it would be necessary to draft all men between 18 and 37 years of age, except those deferred for reasons other than dependency, in order to meet this year's goal.

There we have two conflicting statements.

Asked by Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, Republican, of Wisconsin, if he acquiesced in this view, General Hershey said, "Yes, sir, I do, in general." Can anyone make any sense out of this kind of talk? The whole business is a travesty. But for many it is tragedy.

Mr. President, I am not placing all the blame for this condition on the Selective Service System. The Selective Service must furnish the number of men it is called upon to furnish by the Army, but certainly some one in the Army is responsible for the confusion which exists, and certainly responsibility rests in the various bureaus for the confusion which prevails in the public mind by reason of the contradictory statements which are constantly being made.

There are no men in the United States between 18 and 45 years of age who can tell from day to day where they stand with reference to their registration under the Selective Service Act. They and their families are kept in constant turmoil and uncertainty by these conflicting statements and rulings. There is not a man, I repeat, in the United States, between the ages of 18 and 45, who can tell where he stands. Officials may make certain statements with respect to policy, but their statements can be reversed or changed tomorrow.

I call attention to an article which appeared in the June 17, 1943, issue of the Washington Star, as follows:

BUSINESSMEN REQUEST SENATE PROBE OF ARMY POLICY ON MEN OF 37—ASSOCIATION SAYS MANY ARE DISCHARGED AT 38 AFTER FINANCIAL LOSSES

The Southeast Business Men's Association, Inc., has requested Chairman REYNOLDS to have the Senate Military Affairs Committee investigate military policy with regard to service of 37-year-old men.

Pointing out the Army's present policy is "working needless hardships on the public as well as resulting in large expenditures of Government money," Dolan Donohoe, president of the businessmen's association, asked the Senator in a letter yesterday whether remedial steps could not be taken.

Mr. Donohoe's letter asks that the Army definitely say if the armed services can use men who are 37 years of ago, "whether fathers or otherwise." He said the association has received a number of complaints regarding the induction of 37-year-old men.

"These men have been inducted into the armed services at the age of 37, furnished clothing, and have been trained for a number of months," he pointed out, "then upon reaching their thirty-eighth birthday, in a great number of instances, have been requested by their commanding officers to seek a release.

"A great number of these men, upon receiving notice of induction, have resigned from their jobs or sold their businesses at a financial sacrifice, have sold their homes and automobiles at a loss, and then after 4 or 5 months have been told to return to civilian life.

"In some instances these individuals have advised the commanding officer that they desired to remain in the armed service for the duration in order to do their bit. In some cases, because of the failure of the individual to take voluntary action to obtain a release, these individuals have been placed upon constant distasteful assignments, such as guard duty or kitchen police duty in an effort to force them to return to civilian life."

A short time ago I read a newspaper article in which it was stated that approximately 243,000 men would be drafted in the month of July. Later, I read a statement to the effect that the number of men taken would be only 150,000. I think those figures are approximately correct. The statement also was made that for the remainder of the year there would be a reduction of the number which it previously had been stated would be taken. Then I called up the Selective Service System to ask about the situation. They said they could not tell me because it all depended on how many men the Navy would take and that the Navy was coming into the picture. The figures I gave are the figures for the Army. The Selective Service System did not know how many men the Navy would call for, so they could not state whether the figures were correct.

Mr. President, another thing which seems to be completely wrong is that in some States fathers who have children have been drafted, whereas in other States fathers with children have not been drafted. After all, the act was called a National Selective Service Act, but, instead of being a national selective service act, it has been a service act based upon various interpretations and applications in 48 different States. In some cases married men with children have been taken, while in a nearby State or a neighboring county single men have been left at home.

Mr. President, it is high time that Congress put an end to the confusion that exists. I have no idea that the executive departments will put an end to it; I have no idea that the War Department will put an end to it; I have no idea that the Selective Service System will put an end to it; I have no idea that any other executive department or agency will put an end to it. I am worried about it, not merely because of the drafting of married men with children, not merely because here and there the confusion has caused hardships, but I say to the Senate without fear of contradiction that what is being done is breaking down the morale of the American people, and that the riots which are occurring are one of the best evidences that there is confusion and a breaking down of the morale, as well as of the morals, of the American people—caused almost entirely by the confusion which exists in Washington and which is created in the minds of the people of the country by the conflicting statements which are issued.

Mr. President, American families have a right to know the facts. They have a right to know, insofar as possible, what to expect and what is expected of them. They are more than willing and anxious to do their part, but they want to do it in the American way, in the democratic way. They do not want to be herded like a bunch of cattle, nor do they want to see a dictatorship—military or otherwise—established in this country.

As I said a moment ago, I introduced a bill providing that no married men with children should be drafted. I suggested to the Committee on Military Affairs that I would modify the bill so as to provide that no married man with children should be taken before January 1. I did so because, after a careful examination of all the facts, I felt there were no circumstances which would warrant the taking of such men before that time. I could not imagine anything happening between now and then which could warrant the taking of such men, nor could I see how they could possibly be used. However, if they are to be taken, certainly a definite time should be stated, and it should not be changed from time to time.

As things now stand, no business institution or other employer can count on whether such men can be retained in employment, or for how long they can be retained. No married man with children can count on whether he must close up his business, or when he will have to close it, or whether he can buy a home, or whether he should renew his lease, or whether to send his children to school, or what to do with them. What kind of an employee will a man make if he does not know what the next day has in store for him? Can anyone tell me that having that kind of confusion is helping the war effort or is aiding the morale of the people?

Notwithstanding the fact that I introduced that bill many months ago, the Committee on Military Affairs has not yet taken any effective action. Notwithstanding the fact that the Kilday bill has been passed overwhelmingly in the House, the Senate committee has not seen fit to report it to the Senate. I think the Senate should definitely say whether under the circumstances we need to draft such men. If it is found necessary to draft them, some definite date for their drafting should be stated. A definite time should be specified; for instance, they should be told they would not be taken for 6 months or for a year. Something definite should be stated. They should not have to depend upon the whims of bureaucrats who say one thing one day and another thing the next day.

I was glad to read in last Saturday's newspaper that the authorities have decided to postpone the taking of such men until October. However, there have been so many confusing statements on the subject that no one can depend upon what he hears or reads.

The people can accommodate themselves to any settled state of affairs, because under it there are no fears for the future. They cannot accustom themselves to a state of affairs which varies from day to day, because each day gives birth to fresh fears, and there is no telling what the end may be.

The manpower situation is merely one glaring example of the waste, inefficiency, and confusion due to the lack of any overall planning of the war effort, inexperienced administrators, and inept administration. There are hundreds of similar situations, although they are less important in that they involve mainly the money and resources of the people, not the lives of the children of the Nation and their future.

The debate over inflation has been turned into a debate over food prices; the debate over food prices has become a debate over the effectiveness of Congress; the debate over the Congress raises the issue as to whether we shall remain a democratic republic or be translated into a totalitarian tyranny; and so it goes.

One thing seems certain. It is a disservice to our fighting men to permit matters on the home front to continue in their present state. We must stop all this confusion—the confusion with reference to price fixing, the confusion with reference to rationing, the confusion with reference to the draft, and the confusions which arise from dual and antagonistic policies of the Government.

I have spoken of confusion in connection with rationing. One day an administrator says we in the East are going to have all the gasoline we want. The next day another administrator says we in the East shall not get any gasoline for many months, if at all.

All this illustrates what takes place when there is government by men as contrasted to government by law. A man can change his opinion overnight, but he cannot change the law. He may evade it, but he cannot change it.

We already are having too much evasion of the law and too much bypassing of the Congress.

In closing, let me say again that Thomas Jefferson not only was the great founder of the Democratic Party but was a great statesman and a great philosopher. He said in substance, "Do not put your faith in any man; put your faith in the law."

The biggest mistake the Congress of the United States has made in recent years is that, instead of writing the powers into the law, it has been turning them over to the executive departments, to some men in Washington, to heads of bureaus who state their views one day and change them the next, so that the people do not know where they stand or what the law is or what it will be the next day. Under such conditions, the average citizen of this country—the average businessman, the average workingman, the average father or mother—does not know what to count on. It makes no difference what the law is; if they only know what it is, they can accommodate themselves to it. But no one can accommodate himself to the confusion which exists in various departments, when one department says one thing one day, and the next day another department says something else. Today, no married man with children can accommodate himself to the situation when he sees from day to day the conflicting statements made by various bureaus with reference to when he is to be called into service.

THE ALASKAN GAME SITUATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there are on the calendar two bills relating to Alaska which, because of the situation which exists in that Territory, the Delegate from Alaska is very anxious to have considered and acted upon. One of the bills deals with the Alaskan game situation, which calls for additional legislation because of the war. There is an unregulated amount of hunting there at the present time, and the Interior Department has asked me to endeavor to have these bills passed at the earliest possible moment.

I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bills. I know of no objection to them from any source. In the interest of orderly procedure in the Territory of Alaska, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bills.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the interest of orderly procedure in the Senate, I hope the Senator will postpone his request for at least 20 minutes, so that we may act upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is the pending business. Consideration of this bill began immediately after the Senate assembled at noon. The first committee amendment is still under consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think that is a fair request. I have no desire to delay consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. However, the bills to which I refer have been on the calendar for some time. The hunting season is approaching in Alaska, and I felt that I owed it to the Department to make an effort to have the bills disposed of. I do not think there will be any controversy over them. That is the reason I rose. Mr. Gabrielson, of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interior Department, and the Government of Alaska are anxious to have the bills disposed of to end the confusion in Alaska between civilians and soldiers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the reasons for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I had not thought that the bills could be disposed of quickly, I would not have risen.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriation bill can be disposed of very quickly if we can concentrate upon it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1944

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment reported by the committee, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Auditor's Office", on page 4, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "$145,810" and insert "$153,010."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets," on page 5, line 16, after the word "purchase", to strike out "including exchange", and, in line 18, after the figures "$9,675", to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Superintendent of the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets, upon requisition previously approved by the Auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money, not exceeding $100 at any one time, to be used exclusively in connection with investigations and detection of short weights and measures, and to be accounted for monthly on itemized vouchers to the accounting officials of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 6, line 22, there is a typographical error, a misplaced apostrophe. I move that the word "Peoples' " be stricken out, and that the word "People's" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Utilities Commission", on page 6, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$85,400" and insert $97,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board", on page 7, line 21, after the word "binding", to strike out "$33,365" and insert "$36,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Zoning Commission", on page 8, line 4, after the numerals "1938" to strike out "$9,280" and insert "$10,720."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Register of Wills", on page 9, line 22, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$79,056" and insert "$83,556".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Recorder of Deeds", on page 10, line 7, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$116,730" and insert "$127,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses", on page 12, line 1, after the word "before", to strike out "the District Court of the United States for" and insert "the courts of the United States and of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 15, after the word "law", to insert "notice of public hearings, publication of orders and regulations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 6, after the word "binding", to strike out "$63,885" and insert "$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Central Garage", on page 14, line 1, after the words "executive office", to strike out "$1,950" and insert "$2,650", and in line 2, after the words "in all", to strike out "$68,060" and insert "$68,760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 21, to insert:

CENTRAL CONTROL OF EMERGENCY AMBULANCE SERVICE

For all expenses necessary to enable the Commissioners to carry out a plan for the organization, control, and dispatch of emergency ambulance service, including personal services, printing and binding, telephone rental and installation, radio equipment, repairs to Health Department ambulance, and first-aid supplies and equipment, $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Refund of Erroneous Collections", on page 16, line 15, before the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Free Public Library", on page 17, line 17, after the word "librarian", to strike out "$489,096" and insert "$495,036."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$49,875" and insert "$43,225."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 13, to insert:

Not to exceed $7,000 of the unexpended balances of the amounts made available by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1940, for the preparation of plans and specifications for the new central building of the Public Library of the District of Columbia shall remain available for the same purposes and under the same conditions and limitations until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sewers", on page 19, line 8, after the figures "$393,750", to insert "together with not to exceed $250,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $630,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 13, to insert:

For payment of rental of property occupied by the District of Columbia for the storage of construction materials in square 3584, for the period beginning May 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1944, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection and disposal of refuse", on page 21, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$543,900" and insert "$713,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 11, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,168,400" and insert "$1,453,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Schools—Operating Expenses", on page 24, line 2, after the words "crippled children", to strike out "$8,801,150" and insert "$8,898,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 18, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $20,175 for the maintenance of science laboratories contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for 1943 is continued available for the same purposes during the fiscal year 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capital Outlay", on page 29, line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "shall be constructed in conformity thereto" and insert "all such construction shall be in conformity to such plans and specifications."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Recreation Department", on page 31, line 4, after the word "binding", to strike out "$416,760" and insert "$496,118."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department", on page 36, line 12, after the word "clinics", to insert a comma and "and including also housekeeping assistance in cases of authentic indigent sick"; and in line 16, after the word "rent", to strike out "$708,375" and insert "$754,820."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 11, after the word "travel", to strike out "$208,602" and insert "$214,202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 17, to insert:

For repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Henry School to make it suitable for use as a health center in conjunction with the facilities now existing at the Polk School, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

For all expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of a health center at the Henry School in conjunction with the facilities now existing at the Polk School, including personal services, $6,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 20, after the word "sidewalks", to strike out "$10,230" and insert "$12,630, together with not to exceed $5,100 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $12,600 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 4, to insert:

Not to exceed $10,000 of the appropriation of $50,000 for repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, is continued available in the fiscal year 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 11, after the word "chief", to strike out "resident physicians" and insert "medical officers"; in line 12, after the word "at", to strike out "$5,600" and insert "$6,000"; in line 13, after the word "at", to strike out "$3,200" and insert "$3,500", and in line 16, after the word "labor", to strike out "$974,707" and insert "$985,107."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 11, after the figures "$8,000", to insert a comma and "together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $6,500 for an additional amount for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, contained in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, at the end of line 4, to increase the appropriation for the Washington Home for Incurables, from $15,000 to $19,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Courts—Juvenile Court", on page 41, line 11, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$120,175" and insert "$121,595."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Municipal court for the District of Columbia", on page 42, line 5, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$234,190" and insert "$240,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia", on page 43, line 2, after the numerals "1942",

to strike out "$52,310" and insert "$54,443."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 2, to strike out the subhead "Miscellaneous" and insert the heading "Probation system"; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Probation system" and insert "Salaries and expenses"; in line 6, after the word "services", to strike out "$25,240" and insert "$29,680", and in line 7, after the words "in all", to strike out "$26,740" and insert "$31,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public welfare—Board of Public Welfare", on page 43, line 11, after the word "service", to strike out "$185,540" and insert "$203,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Child Welfare", on page 44, line 14, after the word "Board", to strike out "$305,000" and insert "$286,000 together with not to exceed $19,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Jail", on page 45, line 21, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$142,750" and insert "$149,230."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the the subhead "General administration, Workhouse and Reformatory, District of Columbia", on page 46, line 8, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$637,544" and insert "$641,344."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 16, to insert:

For an additional amount for the acquisition by the Commissioners of additional land for the workhouse and reformatory, $750, and the appropriation of $25,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, shall continue available in the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a clear title cannot be assured through conveyance the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said State, and not to exceed $750 shall be available for expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Training School for Girls", at the top of page 50, to insert:

For the acquisition of a site in Maryland for the National Training School for Girls, including the preparation of plans for permanent buildings and traveling expenses, $42,000: *Provided*, That title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of said property, the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such property as may be selected in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, and expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of said appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 13, to insert:

For the construction of temporary buildings for the National Training School for Girls on a new site to be acquired in Maryland, including furniture and equipment, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial Home School", on page 52, line 8, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$20,000, including $15,000 for repairs and alterations to buildings on the site, 5300 Loughborough Road NW., to make them suitable for use by the Industrial Home School."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm", on page 52, line 13, after the word "services", to strike out "$157,560" and insert "$161,160", and in line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$159,560" and insert "$163,160."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Assistance", on page 53, line 12, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "including not to exceed $73,170 for personal services,"; in line 13, after the item just above stated, to strike out "$450,000" and insert "together with not to exceed $225,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943"; and in line 17, after the word "milk", to insert a comma and "and burial of indigent residents of the District of Columbia, and the certification of persons eligible for any public benefits which are or may become available as may be approved by the Commissioners."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$298,400" and insert "$243,400, together with not to exceed $55,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 23, after "(49 Stat. 747)", to strike out "$685,465" and insert "$635,465, together with not to exceed $50,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Highway fund, gasoline tax, and motor-vehicle fees—Street improvements," on page 70, line 18, after the word "until", to strike out "July" and insert "June."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 15, to insert:

MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING AGENCY

For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942, $2,500, together with not to exceed $8,000 of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water service—Washington Aqueduct," on page 76, after line 14, to insert:

Fo an additional amount for the construction of a covered reservoir of approximately 20,000,000-gallon capacity on United States Government-owned land adjacent to the present filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan filter plant, with all necessary appurtenances and auxiliaries, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $69,500, to continue available until expended, and the authorized limit of cost of the said reservoir, appurtenances, and auxiliaries is hereby increased from $620,000 to $689,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Department," on page 77, line 14, after the words "For personal services", to strike out "$239,760" and insert $244,860."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia presented several amendments to the Committee on Appropriations. In the absence of the Chairman of the District Committee [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is detained at a meeting of one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer in his behalf the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming in behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, after line 17, under the heading "Juvenile Court," it is proposed to insert the following:

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to obtain psychiatric service for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia from the United States Public Health Service, and, at the request of the Board of Commissioners, the Surgeon General is authorized to detail the necessary medical and other personnel, not to exceed one psychiatrist, one pyhchologist, and one nurse, for this purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under the same circumstances, and in behalf of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, line 11, after the word "activities", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That from the funds provided for salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia public schools, the Board of Education is authorized to pay the salaries of such teachers, not to exceed one in each junior high school and one in each elementary school, as may be as-

signed, at a grade not higher than P–3, to supervisory duties in connection with pupil guidance."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under the same circumstances and on behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming in behalf of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Commissioners are hereby authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., growing out of the construction of the Franklin Street Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $47,177.05, for the sum of $32,279.83; and the Commissioners are further authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the said company, growing out of the construction of the Eastern Avenue Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $13,684.14, for the sum of $10,999.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 18, under the heading "Public schools, operating expenses, general administration", and after the word "available", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the Board of Education is authorized to assign the Acting Superintendent of Schools to the salary schedule for the Superintendent of Schools, contained in the Teachers' Salary Act of 1924, during the time the said Superintendent is granted leave of absence without pay by the Board of Education, and this appropriation shall be available for payment on that basis of the salary of the Acting Superintendent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer a final amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

For necessary expenses, including personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the carrying out, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of a penny milk program for the school children of the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture, and for the carrying out of a food-conservation program in the District of Columbia, including the supervision of Victory gardens and the canning of the products thereof, $75,000: *Provided*, That collections from the milk program shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, and that reimbursement for such canning shall be in kind and for the benefit of public-welfare institutions of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator in charge of the bill if the amendment has the recommendation of the legislative committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does. Each of the amendments which I have offered has the recommendation of the legislative committee.

Mr. McNARY. I know that the first two or three amendments which were offered by the Senator from Wyoming had the recommendation of the legislative committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The first three were presented on behalf of the legislative committee itself. The amendment adopted a moment ago was merely an authority to the District Board of Education to pay the salary of the Superintendent of Schools to the Acting Superintendent during the leave of absence of the Superintendent without pay. The amendment now under consideration provides for the penny milk program, which was approved in the Department of Agriculture bill with respect to schools throughout the country.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that, but that item is still in controversy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has reference, I presume, to the milk provision in the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. But there is a conflict of views with respect to that provision between the Senate and House conferees, and being one of the conferees, I know whereof I speak. It has gone back to the House for further consideration. However, I do not urge that situation against the proposed amendment. I think it fits very well into the picture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 2513, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GLASS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN, conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 274, House bill 338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, H. R. 338, to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am somewhat familiar with the purposes of this bill and the bill which immediately follows upon the calendar. I discussed the matter with the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings, with the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. Dimond, and Dr. Gabrielson, the head of the Fish and Wildlife Service. I have no objection to the present consideration of the bills, providing they do not lead to controversy, and that no amendment shall be offered. If any amendments are offered which will change the purpose of the bills, I shall ask that they be restored to the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 338?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION OF THE ALASKA GAME LAW

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider calendar number 275, House bill 332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 332) to revise the Alaska game law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 332) to revise the Alaska game law, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 15, line 24, after the word "bird", to strike out "game fish"; on page 16, line 3, after the word "bird", to strike out "game fish"; on the same page, line 9, after the word "bird" to strike out "game fish"; on page 24, line 18, after the word "game", to insert "or fur"; and on the same page, line 22, after the word "hunt", to insert "or trap."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar number 328, House bill 2536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise, and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is quite appropriate, but I think the able Senator who is moving to proceed to the consideration of the bill should make a brief statement concerning its general purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I intended to do so.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the Senator make a statement in explanation of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it seems to me we should have a quorum before discussing the pending bill, which is an important one.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well; I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Andrews	Hawkes	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Pepper	Wilson
Guffey	Radcliffe	
Gurney	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, Federal aid for vocational education and rehabilitation was inaugurated in 1920. In short, there has been a joint Federal-State partnership in the rehabilitation of handicapped and disabled persons for the past 23 years.

With the onset of the defense program, with the tremendous increase in the number of persons employed in industrial plants in the United States, and with the prospect, sad though it may be, that many thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of men in the armed services, will be unable to establish service connection of their disabilities, it became clear that it was necessary to strengthen, broaden, and enlarge the program.

Furthermore, I should point out that, although the actual language of the statute as passed in 1920, and as amended, would seem to authorize the utilization of Federal funds for physical rehabilitation, no such moneys have heretofore been made available, and only in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, and Wisconsin has there in the past been any appreciable amount of money expended by the States alone for the physical rehabilitation of disabled and handicapped persons.

The net result is that, over a long period of time, there has been built up a backlog of cases involving handicapped persons who, the testimony before both the House and the Senate committees indicates, could be quickly and speedily rehabilitated and made available for employment on the farms and in the industries of this country by the provision of funds available for the purpose of physical rehabilitation, as well as for an enlarged program of rehabilitation training.

Measures dealing with this broad general subject were introduced, if my recollection serves me correctly, in August of last year. They were simultaneously introduced in both Houses, Representative BARDEN of North Carolina having introduced in the House of Representatives a companion bill to the one I introduced in the Senate. Extensive hearings were held upon the measures. As a result of the hearings, at the outset of this session of Congress a new proposal was introduced.

The House committee worked on the bill intensively for 3 months. As I recall, there were held 33 meetings of the full committee for both hearings and work upon the bill itself. The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor held hearings and worked diligently on a bill.

Finally a bill was reported to the Senate. Senators may remember that in the meantime there has been introduced in the Senate a measure providing for the rehabilitation and vocational rehabilitation training of veterans with service-connected disabilities, which had been referred to the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance dealing with veterans' affairs. A companion bill which was introduced in the House of Representatives had been reported from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and had passed that body.

On an occasion earlier in the present session I succeeded in having my bill taken up for consideration, but the Senate declined to consider it for any great length of time and displaced it with a bill dealing exclusively with veterans having service-connected disabilities. After that bill had displaced the Senate bill, I asked that my bill be re-referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Finally, on June 11, the Senate received House bill 2536, which passed the House of Representatives virtually without opposition.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not had opportunity to examine carefully the bill which has come from the House and is now before the Senate, and I should like to ask the Senator whether there is anything in the bill dealing with the matter of rehabilitation of veterans.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is not one single item, or sentence, or line in the bill dealing with the rehabilitation of veterans with service-connected disabilities. Of course, the Senator knows what happened in regard to a great many thousands of veterans after the last war, and what I fear will happen after this war—that thousands will have disabilities which all of us will be convinced are service-connected, but which fact cannot be established from a medical standpoint, and they will have to be rehabilitated, if they are rehabilitated at all, as a result of this joint Federal-State program. Many thousands of veterans of the last war who could not establish the service connection of their disabilities were rehabilitated under the Federal-State program.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very familiar with that.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose that any veteran could apply, as a citizen of his State, for rehabilitation under the joint program?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly he would be more inclined to apply to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Since the Congress determined to have a distinct and separate plan and program for veterans with service-connected disabilities, I assume that if any of such veterans are rehabilitated under the State-Federal program it will be after the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has determined that he desires, and thinks it best for the veterans, to have them rehabilitated under the joint program, and it will be as the result of some amicable and equitable arrangement which he may make with the Federal Security Administrator and the various State rehabilitation agencies.

I wish to make it crystal clear that both the Senate and the House of Representative having spoken so emphatically, although in my opinion unwisely, against any joint program for the rehabilitation of veterans with service-connected disabilities. I have yielded to that decision, and such veterans have been completely eliminated from the pending measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the able Senator in what respect the bill in any way changes the existing relations between the Federal Government and the State vocational rehabilitation authorities?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit me to finish my general statement, I shall come to that point.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us what the estimated cost of the program is?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is very difficult to give any estimate of the ultimate cost, first, because we have no way of knowing how long the war will last. The longer the war lasts, the greater the number of persons who will be disabled in industry, and undoubtedly there will be more veterans with non-service-connected disabilities who will have to rely upon the Federal-State system for their vocational rehabilitation.

The best estimates we can obtain seem to indicate that a program of from twelve to fifteen million dollars might be envisioned in the near future, but because no accurate estimates could be made we have not fixed any limitation on the appropriation which should be made, but have preferred to leave that matter to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, who can deal with the problem from fiscal year to fiscal year as appreciation is gained of its magnitude.

Mr. President, I desire to say a word in behalf of the program as it has thus far been operated. There has been no tendency to build up any top-heavy Federal administrative peresonnel set-up. The whole program has been carried on at the level of 22 Federal employees, including all the clerical employees. The program has resulted in the rehabilitation of more than 200,000 persons in the United States. The average for the last several years has been about 50,000 individuals.

As I said earlier in my remarks, because of the enormous acceleration of the industrial operations in the United States there has been naturally a great increase in the number of persons disabled. Some months ago, although until that time there had been only a 30-percent expansion in our industrial employment, there had been a rise of 70 percent in industrial accidents. So Senators can realize the large numbers of persons who are being disabled. Such a condition always occurs when there is a tremendous expansion of employment and industrial activity. Long hours of work, fatigue, unfamiliarity with safety regulations, and inexperience in employment—all such factors and others combine to produce a very high relative accident rate when there is an enormous expansion in industrial activity.

Now a further word as to the need for physical rehabilitation. As I have said, heretofore Federal funds have not been available for that purpose. There has been very little of it done. But now from all the evidence it is clear that by the extension of the purposes of the general program to include physical rehabilitation a large number of persons may be quickly rehabilitated.

In this connection I wish to point out that great care has been taken, both by the House committee and the Senate committee, in drawing the terms surrounding and safeguarding the physical rehabilitation program, and I can state emphatically that there is nothing in this measure which can in any manner rightly be construed to inaugurate any kind of a State-Federal health program. I believe that great credit should be given to the House committee, and particularly to Dr. WALTER H. JUDD, a very well-known surgeon, who is a member of that committee, and who worked very diligently in drafting the provisions of the bill so as to make it perfectly clear, by way of statutory safeguard, that the program is only to be one of physical rehabilitation in direct relation to making the individual fit for training and for remunerative employment.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] quite properly asked me for a statement as to any changes which may have been made in the Federal-State relationship. In general I may say that nearly all the changes made in this bill in the months the subject matter has been under consideration have been in the direction not only of paring down the Federal power as embodied in legislation introduced but also to some extent in further specifying and detailing Federal power under existing law. For instance, I may say to the Senator from Michigan, one change is that the States in submitting their plans shall have to submit only one plan, and not have to submit their plans annually, as, under existing law, they have had to do for the past 23 years.

Furthermore, subsection 5 of section 2 (a) provides that the plan shall "contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system."

The subsection, however, limits the Administrator's duty in approving the plan in this respect to a determination of "whether the plan contains such provisions" and makes it clear he "shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, method of selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such provisions."

This provision changes existing law under which there is an annual submission of the qualifications of all State personnel for Federal approval or disapproval.

Subsection 6 states that the plan shall "provide such methods of administration other than the establishment and maintenance of a merit system, as are found by the Administrator to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan."

This limits the requirement of approval to administrative provisions of such importance as to be necessary for proper and efficient administration, in contrast with existing law under which all administrative provisions may be passed upon by the Administrator.

Subsection (b) of section 2 requires the Administrator to approve any plan which he believes to be feasible, and which complies with the foregoing provisions, unless it contains restrictions substantially increasing the cost of vocational rehabilitation in the State or seriously impairing the effectiveness of the State plan in carrying out the purposes of the act. This provision requires approval instead of merely authorizing it, and greatly reduces the area of Federal discretion which is given in existing law.

Then skipping over to section 4. This section safeguards the States from arbitrary action by providing that funds may be withheld only where the Federal Security Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, finds that in the administration of a State plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the plan approved by the Administrator under section 2, or a failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing rehabilitation or similar services. After such a finding, the Administrator will not make certifications for payment to the State as long as such conditions exist.

I think I have summarized the principal changes made in the Federal-State relationship, and I think I have demonstrated that such changes as the bill proposes are in the direction of delimiting rather than expanding the authority which the Administrator now exercises under existing law and has exercised for 23 years.

I may say, Mr. President, that there was not one shred of evidence before the Senate committee, or before the House committee, to indicate that there had ever been any abuse or arbitrary exercise of the power which the present Administrator now has under existing law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Dealing with the question which I submitted, and which the Senator has just been answering, I wish to ask him to be good enough to let me read a letter from the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan, dealing specifically with this measure, and pointing out what seem to be the objections of the department of public instruction, as well as the State Board of Control for Vocational Education in Michigan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator, is it a recent communication?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; the letter is dated May 14, 1943.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the Senator can perhaps comment more specifically upon the things in the letter which interest him. I am quoting from Dr. Eugene B. Elliott, who is the very able and seasoned superintendent of the department of public instruction at Lansing, and I may add that I think we have a rather favorable vocational rehabilitation operation in the State of Michigan. This is what he says:

I have read the provisions of H. R. 2536—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the pending bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. The letter continues:

and I am certain that this contemplated legislation could seriously affect Michigan's vocational rehabilitation program.

Section 3 (a), part 4, indicates the entire State administrative costs would be paid by

the Federal Government. This would cause State rehabilitation workers to be controlled by the Social Security Administrator irrespective of section 2 (a), part 5. One hundred percent payment of State salaries from Federal sources in itself makes this control probable.

This bill deals with administrative details which are now responsibilities of the States. For illustration, section 2 (a), part 9, states "the Administrator may establish maximum fees which may be paid for training and maximum duration of training; maximum schedules of fees for surgery, therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, and for prosthetic devices; and maximum rates of compensation of personnel." Each State varies in conditions and not one of these maxima can be assumed to fit the needs of all States. Such administrative details should be cooperatively determined by the individual States.

The language of the bill promotes the enlargement of the facilities of the Federal Social Security Agency and grants very broad powers to the Administrator. He is to provide for the compliance with regulations, and he may delegate to any officer or employee of the United States such of his powers and duties, except the promulgation of regulations, as he finds necessary or expedient in carrying out the purposes of the bill.

As I have maintained since the initiation of new rehabilitation legislation, the present act is a very good one.

Referring to the existing law, I apprehend.

I read further:

A very broad service, including guidance, training, appliances, maintenance, and even physical restoration, may be maintained under its provisions. Michigan has not been restricted in the development of its rehabilitation program by the present act. Why pass a new act without cause and create the possibility of enlarged Federal control? Some States may need more adequate funds. This could be solved by a more adequate appropriation for them. Perhaps a reasonable allotment of funds could be granted all States upon an unmatched basis in order to guarantee a minimum program. Beyond this minimum, each State should finance a fair portion of all of the costs.

I also have a letter from Mr. George H. Fern, director of the State board of control for vocational education, which substantially repeats the comments made by Dr. Elliott on the pending proposal. I should like very much to have the benefit of the Senator's highly informed judgment on the subject.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, of course, I hesitate very much to take issue with the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan; but I must say that his interpretation of the language is at variance with that of every other person of whom I know who is familiar with it. In the first place, it is true that the bill does provide that the Federal Government shall assume the entire burden of administrative costs, but provisions which have been written into the proposed statute will make it absolutely impossible for the Federal Security Administrator, or for any other person who is charged with the responsibility of administration of the act, to have any control whatsoever over the employees of a State.

Let me say to the Senator that we have gone so far as to spell that out, and the only thing at all the Administrator can have anything to do or to say in relation to personnel is to make certain that the State plan provides for a merit system before it is approved. I do not know how the Senator feels about that, but I think that in dealing with matters of this kind we should have a provision that qualified persons shall administer Federal-State funds in a field such as this.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am very much interested in the objections made by the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan. I noted four of them as the Senator read the letter. Let me say to the Senator that in the committee I made every one of the four objections, and that three of them are dealt with by amendments. The only one which is not covered by amendments made by the committee since the letter was written is the one dealing with the question of having 100 percent of the administrative expenses, instead of 50 percent, paid by the Federal Government. I did not persist in my effort to reduce that to 50 percent because I rather felt that what the Senator from Wisconsin has said is correct. The mere fact that the Federal Government paid 100 percent might give a little more moral suasion to the administrators; but in no way, as I see it, would it enable them to do other than to pay the administration costs incurred. I do not think it would provide control.

Of course, today we have in the unemployment compensation a precedent for having the State pay 100 percent of the administrative costs. So I do not insist upon that one point.

All the other three objections made by the superintendent of public instruction are dealt with by amendments which I hope the Senator will discuss.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was about to come to them, but I desire to emphasize the fact that I think the apprehensions of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan are entirely unfounded insofar as there being any possibility of control over the actual administration of the law or over the personnel, because those points have been amply safeguarded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, I should deduce that at the time when the letter was written, the original text might have justified the objections of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan; but as the bill is amended, the complaints are answered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am coming to the question of whether they are answered.

I wish to say that in my opinion Superintendent Elliott is absolutely wrong in feeling that this measure would broaden the power of the Federal Administrator. As the bill passed the House, it proceeded in just the opposite direction. I could quote at great length from statements made on the floor of the House by members of the committee in pointing out the fact that they had reduced, rather than enlarged, the Federal power which has been exercised for 23 years.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question for information, since I have not had much opportunity to study the matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. At the State level, are all appointments to be made by the State itself?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They are.

Mr. GEORGE. Appointments of employees in all capacities?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; of every employee.

Mr. GEORGE. They are not to be made by the Administrator?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They are not to be made by the Administrator. If the Senator will turn to page 3, line 18, I should like to read the language there contained. This is what the State plans shall contain before they are approved:

(5) Contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system; the duty of the Administrator in approving a plan shall be solely the determination of whether the plan contains such provisions, but the Administrator shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, method of selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such provisions.

Under existing law which has been on the statute books for 23 years, and about which there never has been any complaint, so far as I know, the States were required to make an annual submission of the qualifications of all State personnel for Federal approval or disapproval.

Now they will submit a plan; and if it contains provision for a merit system and if it is approved, that is the end of it so far as the Administrator is concerned in his activities in relation to employees in the States, except in case there should be any violation of the general provisions for a merit system of selection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so as to permit me to return to Dr. Elliott's letter for a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield. I should be glad to have the Senator return to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As understand the letter, the only point of comment in Dr. Elliott's letter which has not already been met by the committee amendment is that relative to the general question of paying 100 percent of administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury.

May I ask why it is found necessary to recommend a change in the existing system of paying administrative expenses, which I understand is a matching system?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the first place, it was felt that a great deal of the increase has been due to the war. It is due to the fact that this country has had to expand tremendously its indus-

trial operations, and that there are expected to be thousands of persons coming out of the armed services who will not be able successfully to establish the service connection of their disabilities, and who will have to rely upon this system for their rehabilitation training. It was felt also that in view of the situation confronting the States, this is an additional contribution which the Federal Government should properly make.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator might point out that the State must also supply vocational rehabilitation to any civilian employee of the United States Government. The State must pay half the cost. So, as between the States and the Federal Government, the proposal is not so unreasonable.

The ony question which the Senator from Michigan raises—and it is a perfectly proper question—is whether the fact that the Government would pay 100 percent of the administrative cost would in some way give greater control over the personnel than would exist if it should pay only 50 percent of the administrative costs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In all my experience I have never seen the Federal Government extend its control over the purse strings of a given operation without sooner or later expanding its authority to direct the subsequent use of funds.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states a legitimate objection to any Federal-State plan whatever. He is entirely correct in doing so. That is why I think there must be appropriate caution. However, we certainly cannot say that we are to abandon Federal-State plans. We already have a dozen Federal-State plans, and undoubtedly there will be some slight extension. We must pick and choose and try to retain as much control as possible in the States. That has been my effort in endeavoring to frame suitable amendments to the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let there be no mistake about my attitude toward the bill in general. I do not want to do away with the State-Federal relationship in this connection, and I wish to support the pending measure. I merely wish to be sure that the viewpoint of one of the ablest vocational-rehabilitation managers in America is adequately considered and reasonably met. I am speaking not of myself, but of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I may say that the bill was sponsored and put through the House largely by the Senator's distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Education. It seems to me that he has given away a good deal more than I would have given away under the circumstances. I am sorry that the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Michigan did not communicate his views to the Senator's colleague in the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, let me say to the Senator from Ohio that it is at the direct and specific request of the distinguished Representative from Michigan that these further safeguards are brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in comment on the colloquy which has just taken place.

First of all, let me repeat that there has not been one shred of testimony or evidence before either committee, in all the months the bill has been under consideration, that during the past 23 years there has been any justification for any of the fears which Superintendent Elliott has expressed. The bill goes in the direction of restricting the power which has been in the hands of the Federal Government for 23 years in this field, and not in the direction of expanding it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment, but I wish to say a few words in my own right.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator misunderstands or misinterprets the statement of the superintendent of public instruction. I do not think he has complained about any Federal invasion heretofore. On the contrary, I think he is so totally satisfied with the relationship which has heretofore existed that he wishes to be sure it is not disturbed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The point I wish to drive home is that so long as he has had anything to do with this program he has been operating under a statute which has given the Federal Government much more power than the pending bill would give it. I am becoming a little tired of constantly hearing the statement made, by persons who ought to be familiar with the situation, that what we are attempting to do is to broaden the Federal power when, as a matter of fact, the net effect of the bill would be to delimit it, to express definitely what it is, and, in my opinion, to work out a program which would be much more a Federal-State program, so far as the statute is concerned, than we have had under existing law for 23 years.

In connection with the statement which the superintendent makes with regard to the fact that the administrator may establish the maximum fees which may be paid for training, and the maximum duration, and matters of that kind, the Federal Government has had that authority under existing law. The only new power which would be granted under the bill would be to extend that right to the matter of physical rehabilitation. The Senator will see, if he will stop to consider the question for a moment, that it is absolutely essential to establish maximum provisions and maximum limitations. Otherwise great abuses might develop, and an unnecessarily costly system might be established. The sole purpose of establishing maximum limitations would be to prevent any excessive fees or charges.

To repeat, this power has existed for 23 years. There has never been any complaint about it. It has been carefully and judiciously administered, and I feel that we can be assured that it will be so administered in the future. As I have said, the net effect of the proposed legislation is to move in that direction.

Let me take up another point mentioned by the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Michigan. On page 4, line 19, the language of the bill as it passed the House provided that a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall "provide for compliance with such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator may establish."

That is similar to language in the existing law. It had never occurred to me that exception might be taken to the provision that the State plan shall provide for compliance with Federal regulations. The Senator from Ohio raised that question, and seemed to feel that under some administrators that phrase might be selected as a means for excessive use of power, so the Senate committee has recommended an amendment, in line 19 on page 4, to eliminate the words "for compliance with", and in line 22, to strike out the word "establish" and insert "find reasonable and necessary" so as to provide that the State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall "provide such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator may find reasonable and necessary."

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that after all, certain safeguards to make certain that the broad general objectives of the legislation shall be economically and fairly achieved are inherently necessary in any joint Federal-State program. Certainly the Federal Government has a right to see that the money which it puts up is not wasted, but is spent for the objectives upon which the States and the Federal Government agree. After all, no State is compelled to accept the program and take Federal money. It can reject it if it so desires.

I feel that with the amendments which the committee have recommended, we have met practically all the objections with the exception of the one directed to the point about the Federal Government paying the entire cost of administration. I firmly believe—and I think if the Senator had the time to read the House record and the statements of House Members, the report of the House committee, and the report of our committee, he would agree with me—that we have properly and very meticulously safeguarded any possibility of abuse of power flowing from the fact that the Federal Government would pay all the administrative costs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I intend to speak later on the bill; but I wonder if the Senator wants me to explain at this time my views on the amendments, in connection with his discussion of the questions raised by the superintendent of public instruction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is immaterial to me. I shall be glad to have the Senator do whatever he prefers to do.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to explain the difference between the original bill and the bill as now proposed to be amended, and the reasons why I objected to the bill as originally drawn.

The original bill required the State plan to provide for compliance with such rules and regulations as the Administrator might make. To that feature I made very strenuous objection; because if the Administrator under a State-Federal plan could at any time lay down new rules and regulations, in my opinion he could practically administer the act.

What we did in writing the amendments was to propose that the State in its plan must provide rules and regulations which must meet the approval of the Administrator before he approves the plan. That would give him rather arbitrary power. He might require proper rules and regulations. He might prescribe maximum fees—that is, that more than a certain amount could not be paid; and he might prescribe that the plan could not be made available to certain classes of persons. In other words, he might prescribe limitations. But once he approved the plan, the State would then be free to administer under the plan, and the Administrator would have no more to do except to determine whether the State was complying with its own rules and regulations and its own plan which it had made. That is the distinction between the effect of the bill in its original form and the effect of the bill as it is proposed to be amended.

I think the objection of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan was a very reasonable one. The State officials could make new rules and regulations at any time. The provisions of the plan would require that they would have to be complied with. If they did not comply with them, they would be cut off from all funds. My view is that if there are to be rules and regulations, they should be made by Congress in the first instance, or should be made in the plans which are submitted for approval, and that once they are approved the Administrator should no longer have any right to cut off the funds or to change the rules and regulations or to interfere with the administration of the act.

That seems to me to be an essential feature of State-Federal plans, if we are to have State plans, and are not to have the Federal Government administer the act.

In the Committee on Education and Labor the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin agreed that that position was a perfectly proper one, and the amendment was agreed upon. I think it meets the fundamental objection of the superintendent of public instruction, who himself would be subject to the administration and control of the Administrator. Under the amendment there would be Federal control. As the Senator has said, when the Federal Government puts up money it is going to have something to say about how it is spent; but it would not have, as I see it, anything beyond the right to insist upon compliance with certain definite rules which would be in the original plan as approved by the United States Government. I think that is a very good model for all State-Federal plans. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, it is true the original act was one of the first State-Federal acts passed. Its language was in very broad terms. It has not been abused, but it has been administered by the United States Office of Education, which has always been very careful to preserve the rights of State boards of education. The administration of the act is now to be turned over to the Federal Security Administration. I did not have quite the same confidence that there would not be an attempt to abuse it. Consequently, I thought we should insist on these changes. Since they have been made, I think they meet the objection which has been made by the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would it seriously violate the objectives of the bill if the division of administrative expenses were to remain, as at present, on a matching basis with the States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes. I think it would be a very serious blow to the whole contemplated program. It would result, in having only about one-third less money made available to the respective States for the actual rehabilitation training and physical rehabilitation of individuals within the States. I have consulted frequently with persons representing State administrators of the various plans. I have not had the privilege of conferring with Superintendent Elliott; but I have conferred with many others during the months I have evinced some interest in this matter. They have come to see me. They all feel very distinctly that any amendment such as the one suggested would strike a very serious blow at the entire program, in the light of the situation which confronts us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is such a rarity for a State government these days to try to insist upon paying such a large proportion of its own bills, that I do not want the attempt to go by default. However, if I understood the Senator correctly, I could not possibly hope to lure him into an agreement to take to conference an amendment restoring the administrative expenses to a matching, 50-50 basis.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I could not do that, because I believe such an amendment would cripple the whole program, in the light of the tremendous load which as a result of the war program is being placed upon the various States, so far as the persons who are disabled in industry are concerned.

I think I have thus far in this discussion forgotten to mention the fact that one of the great backlogs of cases piling up upon the States is constituted of persons who are called up for examination by the Selective Service boards, and who are found to be physically handicapped. Under the present order, they are then referred to the boards; and the State organizations are simply swamped.

To reduce the program by one-third would, in my opinion, be a very serious mistake, and I shall certainly appreciate it if the Senator will not press his amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As the bill was passed by the other House, did it provide for payment by the Federal Government of the entire administrative expense?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it did.

Mr. GEORGE. At this time the Federal Government also pays the entire cost for disabled soldiers with non-service-connected disability; does it not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; the State pays one-half the cost. That is one of the reasons for having the Federal Government take up the entire administrative burden.

Mr. GEORGE. That would be a very strong reason.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We are providing in this bill something which the House bill did not provide, namely, that persons in the Civil Air Patrol, the Aircraft Warning Service, the Civilian Defense Corps, while on active duty and in the line of duty, and seamen and officers of ships operated by the Maritime Commission shall have the State systems available to them at Federal expense.

Mr. GEORGE. Wholly at Federal expense?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Wholly at Federal expense.

Mr. GEORGE. But not so in the case of persons with non-service-connected disabilities?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; not so in the case of persons with non-service-connected disabilities.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know at what point the Senator has arrived in his discussion of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Neither do I, so the Senator and I are at one in that regard.

Mr. BROOKS. On page 3, in subsection (5), I find there is a provision reading as follows:

> Contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system.

Will the Senator explain to me what he means by merit system for the selection of the employees?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The provision is the usual one which has been incorporated in statutes passed heretofore, wherein it was desired to make certain that the persons appointed were selected

as the result of an examination which would be a proof that they were qualified for the work to be undertaken. In other words, to be entirely frank with the Senator, it was my feeling that the bill would affect disabled veterans who could not establish their service connection; persons injured in war industries who have been handicapped; individuals who are handicapped from birth, by congenital handicaps, physical handicaps of one kind or another, such as blindness; and it seemed to me that we certainly should not change the policy which we have followed in cases of this kind, of making certain that the individuals who are working with those who are handicapped should be properly qualified.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask if that is not the provision of the Social Security Act with respect to all the activities in which the States participate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is; the Senator is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. GEORGE. It was worked out very carefully. I think it is not necessarily a civil service but it is something that approximates it within the States, so there are certain standards set up——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Precisely.

Mr. GEORGE. To which the administrative officers must conform or with which they must comply.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Georgia has stated it better than I could.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. But a civil-service system would come within a merit system, would it not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, it falls within that category.

I think, Mr. President, I have outlined the principal objectives of the measure, the changes which it would make in existing law, and the enlarged objectives which it seeks to attain. If any Senator desires an explanation of the committee amendments I shall be glad to offer it as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, in section 2 (a), paragraph (1), page 2, line 25, after the word "disabled", to strike out "persons" and insert "individuals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (4), line 15, after the words "only to", to strike out "such classes of individuals as shall be approved" and insert "classes of employable individuals defined."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (5), line 18, after the words "as to", to strike out "the qualification of personnel for appointment" and insert "personnel"; and, in line 21, after the words "maintenance of", to strike out "personnel standards" and insert "a merit system."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (6), page 4, line 4, after the word "than", to insert "the"; and in the same line after the words "maintenance of", to strike out "personnel standards" and insert "a merit system."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (9), page 4, line 19, after the word "provide", to strike out "for compliance with"; and, in line 22, after the word "may", to strike out "establish" and insert "find reasonable and necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (10), page 5, line 11, after the word "duty", to insert "and to any war disabled civilian (as defined in section 10)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3 (a), page 6, after line 3, to insert:

(1) the necessary cost (exclusive of administrative expenses) to such State under the plan of providing vocational rehabilitation during the period for which such payment is to be made to disabled individuals certified to the State by the Administrator as war disabled civilians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)", and in line 11, after the word "training", to insert "and medical examination."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, page 6, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)," and in line 17, after the word "individuals", to insert "(not including war disabled civilians)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, after line 7, to strike out:

(C) medical examination where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or the occupational limitations of the person examined.

And insert:

(C) transportation, occupational licenses, and customary occupational tools and equipment not mentioned elsewhere in this subsection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (b), page 8, line 4, after the words "prescribed in", to insert "general."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, paragraph (1), page 9, line 23, after the word "provision", to strike out "required by section 2 (a) to be included in the plan, or any restriction on expenditures imposed in conflict with section 2 (b)" and insert "of the plan approved by the Administrator under section 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 10, line 18, after the words "Costs of", to strike out "furnishing such facilities and", and insert "constructing and establishing such facilities and furnishing such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, paragraph (2), page 12, line 1, to strike out "or to contract with other agencies, including foreign agencies, for the making of such studies, investigations, or reports by such other agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, page 12, paragraph (3), line 4, before the words "to conduct", to insert "until July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (4), line 12, before the words "to provide", to insert "until July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (c), page 13, line 6, after the words "authorized to", to strike out "promulgate such regulations", and insert "make rules and regulations governing the administration of this act"; in line 10, after the words "except the", to strike out "promulgation of" and insert "making of rules and"; and in line 11, after the word "necessary", to strike out "or expedient."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 22, to strike out:

DEFINITION

SEC. 10. As used in this act, the terms "vocational rehabilitation" and "vocational rehabilitation services" mean any services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation. Such terms shall not, however, be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary but a State plan may be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services.

And insert:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "vocational rehabilitation" and the term "rehabilitation services" means any services necessary to render a disabled individual fit to engage in a remunerative occupation; and

(b) The term "war disabled civilian" means—

(1) Any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, for services as a civilian defense worker) disabled while serving at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress—

(A) in the Aircraft Warning Service; or

(B) as a member of the Civil Air Patrol; or

(C) as a member, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, of the United States Citizens Defense Corps in the protective services engaged in civilian defense, as such protective services are established from time to time by regulation or order of such Director; or

(D) as a registered trainee taking training in accordance with regulations prescribed by such Director for such protective services; and

(2) Any civilian disabled while serving at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as so declared as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel owned or chartered by the Maritime Commission, or the War Shipping Administration, or operated under charter from

such Commission or Administration; but no individual shall be considered to be a war disabled civilian unless he is disabled as a result of disease or injury, or aggravation of a preexisting disease or injury, incurred in line of duty during such period, not due to his own misconduct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think there is another amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 10, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following new sentence:

In carrying out his functions under this section, the Administrator is authorized to utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency, and to enter into agreements and cooperative working arrangements with public agencies and private persons, agencies, and institutions, within the United States, its territories, and possessions, for services and use of facilities of such persons, agencies, and institutions, and to compensate them and such units for such services and use.

On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 to 21, both inclusive.

On page 11, line 22, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)."

On page 12, line 4, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

On page 12, line 12, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which have just been stated may be considered en bloc. I will state briefly their purpose. The committee has decided to continue provision for administration in the District of Columbia as it is under existing law. The Senator from Ohio felt that this language, which is being shifted, really, from line 14, on page 11, to line 10, should be in the section dealing with the District of Columbia, because it is only in the District of Columbia, under the contemplated statute, that such power would be exercised by the Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this bill provides for direct administration by the Federal Security Administration in the District of Columbia. This is rather an unusual provision, and I should not have agreed to it at all if the practice had not already been along that line. Apparently, from the beginning, the United States Office of Education has operated directly in this vocational training field in the District of Columbia. I do not think it is a wise thing for Federal bureaus to do; in general, it seems to me perfectly clear that it should be done by the government of the District of Columbia, and they should put up 50 percent, just as each State puts up 50 percent. But the House committee consulted the members of the District of Columbia Committee of the House and we consulted the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, and, so far as we could get their opinion, it was that we had better not disturb the existing system. So we have left it in the District of Columbia.

The other part of this amendment meets another objection raised by the superintendent of public instruction in Michigan. The bill as originally drafted provided, on page 11, that the Administrator may "utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency, and to enter into agreements and cooperative working arrangements with public agencies and private persons."

Obviously, if this is to be a State plan, it is clear that the Federal Security Administrator should not be enlarging Federal agencies and should not be making cooperative agreements for training with private schools, and that sort of thing, but it ought to be left to the States themselves to administer. I objected to it, and as the amendment now provides the only use of these powers would be in operating in the District of Columbia, where the Federal Government would have to have power to do these various things if it is to operate directly. So it was agreed that these words be put in section 6, so that power could only be exercised in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I think the other objection is met. When the superintendent of public instruction of Michigan read this, he thought it provided Nation-wide power to enlarge Federal facilities, to which I objected strenuously, as did he.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator agree with the verdict of the able Senator from Wisconsin that the bill does not enlarge the Federal control of State educational vocational training, and is not intended so to do, and is not intended even to be a start in that direction?

Mr. TAFT. I agree in general with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. As to what the intention is, I could not say. This is the end of a rather long battle. When this measure was first introduced, it provided a very considerable extension of Federal control and Federal operation.

The Senate will understand that vocational rehabilitation consists of two very distinct parts. One is training, and the other is physical rehabilitation. If a man has a broken leg, it means having his broken leg fixed, or if it has to be cut off, provision for an artificial leg. There are all sorts of medical treatments which may have to precede training before a man can be rehabilitated. Those two things are very distinct. Training is education, and physical rehabilitation is medicine, and may extend to a very considerable amount of medical service.

The bill as originally introduced really provided that the Federal Government would operate directly itself in the medical field, leaving the training to the Office of Education and the State departments of education. To that I objected very strenuously, because it seemed to me it would mean beginning a Federal service throughout the Nation, with hospitals and various kinds of medical facilities, and I believed that was not a wise plan.

The bill has been substantially changed, and it now provides for complete State operation, of the medical end, as well as of the training end. The attempt to amend it is due to the fact, I think, that there was some suspicion that the Federal Security Administration was trying to expand a Nation-wide service in the medical field.

The 1920 act covered both training and medical service, but no medical service has ever been provided under it. The funds provided were very limited. The existing law only provides $3,000,000 a year to the States, which the States match, so that the whole program has cost only $6,000,000 throughout the Nation. It was confined entirely to training, and there has been no medical service.

The purpose of this bill is to extend those State plans, however, under the general control of the State boards of education, which have been administering the training, to include medical service, as well as physical rehabilitation.

I estimate that the cost will run as high as $15,000,000 a year, instead of $6,000,000 a year. I do not believe it would go very much beyond that. Of course, it will be somewhat higher during the war, because the Administrator is given the power to increase the Federal expense above 50 percent, but that power is strictly limited to the war period, and immediately after the war it will recur to a 50–50 proposition throughout the Nation.

The original bill, as I have said, was one of the first State-Federal bills. It was written in very broad terms, and in my opinion the Senator from Wisconsin is correct in saying that as set up, without very much thought, under the general language used the Office of Education probably had more power to control the plan than the Administrator has under the pending bill. But historically not much attention was ever paid to it. The Office of Education held very closely to strict State control, and no criticism whatever has been raised.

There was one feature in the original plan which I think was rather interesting, which has been left out of the plan now before us, which perhaps looks in the opposite direction. The original bill provided that if any allotment were withheld from any State, the State board of such State might appeal to the Congress of the United States, and if the Congress should not, within 1 year from the time of such appeal, direct such sum to be paid, it should be covered into the Treasury. In other words, if a State were deprived of money, it could appeal to Congress, and Congress had a year in which to act.

I agreed to the elimination of that, because a State can appeal to Congress anyway. As a matter of fact, the State of Ohio did appeal to Congress on the Social Security Act, and had introduced a bill several sessions ago which tried to restore a million dollars of which the State was deprived. Congress did not act. I think we can do just about what was provided in the original bill, but it

is rather interesting that the bill in 1920 provided for an appeal to Congress, and no bill since that time has done so. It is eliminated, but I do not think that substantially changes the remedies of the State.

Mr. President, what I have been most interested in, in connection with the bill, is the setting up of a proper State-Federal relationship. I think it is one of the most serious of existing problems Congress has to face. There are a good many State-Federal plans, and we are likely to have some extension of them. I think we are likely to see an extension of them in the medical field particularly, and I am very much interested in seeing that State-Federal plans retain control in the State government, that the initiative be in the State, that the State have the right to submit its own plan, and that there be included other conditions necessary to insure that it be not administered from Washington. Such Federal control as there may be shall be simply Federal supervision, if you please, the right to object when the powers of the State are abused in some way, and to insist on adherence to the plan.

One of the important features of the program, it seems to me, is that Congress shall so far as possible lay down in the statute itself the provisions with which it wants the States to comply, that Congress shall state the conditions upon which the States are to get the Federal money. If the Administrator is able to come in and make new regulations from day to day telling the States how they must operate the plans, he would become the administrator of the plan. It seems to me vitally important that we establish the principle that the Congress itself lay down as many provisions as possible.

If the matter requires variation among the States, the Administrator could be given power to approve or disapprove the detailed provisions of a State plan; but once he approves a plan, and the State adheres to it, he should have nothing to say about the administration of the plan.

It may be that some States will not do as well as others. In some a plan may be very poorly carried out, but I think that is inherent in retaining any system of local self-government in the United States. A city with a poor government is going to have a poor government, and the poor results of a poor government. But when we decide we want a State to participate, they should have a right to administer the plan as they see fit, within certain proper principles which may be established.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the bill provide that the States shall derive one-half of the cost of the program from the Federal Government?

Mr. TAFT. That is the basic principle, except in the case of the administrative expenses, in which case they get a hundred percent, instead of 50 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Ohio stated he was principally interested in the relationship between the Federal and the State governments established by the bill. I took it that the Senator approved the relationship established in the bill. Does the Senator think that, in regard to programs of this character, and similar programs providing for Federal aid for education, old-age benefits, and other benefits of a similar character, the correct principle is the matching principle, so that the State pays 50 percent of the cost in a given State, and the Federal Government 50 percent, without regard to the ability of the State, its per capita wealth, and other considerations of that kind?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has now entered another subject which I think opens up a wide question. I have felt we should have a uniform rule, but I am quite willing to discuss, and I believe any committees considering postwar problems should consider, the question whether there should be different treatment of different States in accordance with the economic conditions of the States. I am perfectly willing to consider that, but until a comprehensive survey shall be made, I should be opposed to making any variation.

As a matter of fact, in the committee I suggested another plan, which was that we might work some kind of joint State-Federal tax program, under which the Federal Government perhaps collects the income tax and allots back a certain amount to the State, and in which there might be some over-all provision as to a greater amount being returned to States which are poorer than is returned to other States. There are various ways in which the matter might be handled.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Florida that the bill contains a provision which will confer on the Administrator the power to give larger sums of money to any State which has approximately exhausted its available funds up to July 1, 1945; so that States which find themselves in such a position that they cannot provide further funds will not on that account be denied an opportunity to carry on this program up to July 1, 1945.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say so, from time to time Congress passes various bills which set up Federal-State relationships. I wish it were possible for a standing committee of the Senate, or a special committee, to work out something in the way of a fair relationship or the appropriate contribution for the State and the Federal Government to make in programs which are joint enterprises between the two sovereignties. It will be remembered that the able Senator from Texas brought up the point in connection with the so-called security appropriation, and various formulas have been suggested. I do not know what would be the appropriate committee to act with respect to such matters. Perhaps it would be the Finance Committee. Every time we enact a law which contains a 50-50 matching principle, I think we perpetuate a wrong principle of contribution between the two governments. I simply wanted to voice that sentiment.

Many of the States in the South do not have sufficient per capita wealth to make it possible for them to put up as much money for training purposes or educational purposes or other purposes as some other more fortunate States can advance. For that reason our people gain less from Federal aid than they should, and I am sure the Federal Government would like to see its benefits spread as evenly among the deserving as may be.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to add only one more thought. The question of the kind of services for which we should extend Federal aid is one which Congress certainly will have to determine in a comprehensive way. My own view is that we should not during the war, in the first place, extend Federal aid to any new project, unless it is directly related to the war. I would be opposed to the consideration of this bill now, even though I am for the general principles of the bill, except for the fact that at the present time there is a great demand for manpower; that these rehabilitation boards say they can rehabilitate many men; that they have a much greater demand arising out of the war because these men who are injured can now obtain a job if they get themselves rehabilitated, whereas 2 years ago there was no chance, and the boards did not bother with them. So they have an increased application of men who want to be rehabilitated, and such rehabilitation is directly related to the supply of manpower for the war. I think that makes an exception for immediate consideration of this particular bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if I correctly understand the financing proposed under the bill? Will the financing be done by the Federal Government up to a certain time, until the State legislatures meet and adjust the contribution on the basis of 50–50?

Mr. TAFT. During the next year or two the provision in the bill leaves the situation wide open. The Administrator may give any State 50 percent, 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent, and require the State to put up as much as it has available.

Mr. MAYBANK. And in proportion to the need of the State?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. There is no retroactive feature as to getting 50–50, but from the first of July 1945, it will be 50–50 unless a larger provision is made. Do I state the provision correctly, I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish only to add that after the State legislatures at their next regular meeting have been in session for 60 days, the power of the Federal Administrator to extend money would terminate unless the States had exhausted their funds.

Mr. TAFT. So that if the State legislatures meet next year they will have to make some provision?

Mr. MAYBANK. And in spite of the legislatures not having made some provision until July 1945, should there be need, the Administrator may carry on?

Mr. TAFT. The Administrator may carry on even if the legislature does not meet. In most States, at any rate, they will not meet, of course, until 1944.

Mr. MAYBANK. But if a legislature did meet in 1944, and was unable to appropriate the money, the Administrator could still carry on?

Mr. TAFT. I am not sure about that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my interpretation that it would be in the discretion of the Administrator as to whether the State had virtually exhausted its funds available for this purpose. Therefore it would be a question of judgment, but in every State that was able to appropriate money I should think, under the terms of the bill, if it shall be enacted into law, the Administrator would insist on the State appropriating the money it was able to appropriate after the legislature has been in session at its next regular meeting for 60 days.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask a further question. In the opinion of the Senator, does that require the State to appropriate 50 percent, or is it left to the discretion of the Administrator whether it shall be 10 percent, 20 percent, or 50 percent?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My interpretation is that up to July 1, 1945, if the Administrator was convinced that a State could not, out of its available revenues and resources, provide 50 percent, he could provide an additional amount. But, as I have stated previously, it is my belief that the Administrator, under this proposed act, will require the States to provide what they are financially able to provide. On the other hand, we do not want, during the war, any breakdown of this program because a particular State may be in financial difficulty.

Mr. TAFT. I will read the subsection covering this point. It is very short.

(b) In the case of any State found by the Administrator to have substantially exhausted its funds available for necessary expenditures specified in subsection (a), he may increase amounts payable to such State under such subsection during periods prior to July 1, 1945, under such conditions as shall be prescribed in general regulations promulgated by him.

I think that is a wide-open power up to the 1st of July 1945, whether or not the legislature meets.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator has said.

Mr. TAFT. The only other point to which I think attention must be drawn in the matter of Federal aid is the activity to which we are to give Federal aid. I do not think we ought to give Federal aid for any basic local expenditure. I do not believe we ought to give Federal aid for grade-school and high-school education. I do not think we should give any aid for the operation of city or county or school districts. I do not think we should give any aid for judges or the maintenance of county courthouses. I do not think we should give aid to local roads or for the ordinary type of public buildings. It is only when we run up against the kind of expenditures which States have not made, which their financial expenditures are not geared to meet, that I believe we should consider Federal aid. We saw the greatest example of that in the case of unemployment in which the States were wholly unable to provide the money required for unemployment and relief.

We have extended some aid to education, but it is in connection with the incidental things which were not covered in the ordinary State school systems of education, some aid to vocational education, aid to adult education, aid to specialties in which people do not take much interest and in which we want to stimulate an interest. We have done the same thing with some kinds of special medical service. Of course, the theory is that the States after all are very limited in their money-raising power and cannot go beyond a certain amount and provide a tax system to obtain the money. But we have to remember that no one in the Federal Government has yet found any tax system for the Federal Government which will pay the Federal Government's expenses, or pay any of the sums we are now extending to the States. So there is an equal argument on that side against extending Federal aid of any kind when there is not the money or the nerve to set up a tax system to raise the money to be furnished the States.

It seems to me that the Federal aid should be confined to what might be considered new functions of Government to which the State is not geared and to various incidental things in connection with medical aid and education. I foresee some extension both in the educational and medical fields; but it does seem to me that the basic services of education and health should be provided by the local districts and by the State governments. I think this particular subject of this bill is one which should not perhaps have been handled under a Federal program; but it has been handled in that way for over 20 years; and it seems to me that in the case of vocational rehabilitation the only way to provide adequate service is to extend the Federal Government's powers, to give more money and to provide wider assistance.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the bill in its present form meets the requirements which we should impose for Federal-aid bills, and I hope very much that the Senate will pass it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report submitted by the Committee on the bill may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in order to complete the statement of its legislative history.

There being no objection, the report (No. 320) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

STATEMENT

The bill (H. R. 2536) proposes no fundamental change in the principles or objectives of the present vocational rehabilitation program. It would, however, provide a basis for greatly strengthening and improving the program.

In the case of the blind, for example, existing law does not permit administration of the cooperative program by the State blind commissions, though these are the normal agencies for providing vocational rehabilitation along with other services to people handicapped by blindness. Instead it requires that this part of the program must be administered by the State board of vocational rehabilitation. Representatives of State blind commissions testified before your committee that with certain other liberalizations in the existing Federal law, if it were so changed that the blind commissions could administer vocational rehabilitation of the blind, an adequate blind program could be achieved within the general framework of the existing Federal-State program. The bill includes this change.

H. R. 2536 would also remedy the present great inadequacy, or complete lack of, necessary physical restoration under practically all programs, with the exception of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Wisconsin. Federal funds are made available for half the cost of necessary physical restoration services. Such services are to be included as a necessary part of an approved State plan under an amendment proposed by your committee.

The bill also strikes out the existing provision as to any maximum amount which may be made available by Congress, and the maximum amount which may be allotted to States under the formula prescribed in the statute.

The bill recognizes that an adequate program will require expenditures, particularly for the next few years, much greater than the Federal and State expenditures which have been made in the past, but has not abandoned the basic principles of Federal-State matching.

Most State legislatures have already adjourned after making vocational rehabilitation appropriations which average $60,217.02 per State for each year of the biennium. These amounts are grossly inadequate. The situation calls for, and the bill contains, temporary provision to supply the necessary funds.

Except for clarifications, limitations on expenditure, and similar changes in existing law, the matters above outlined cover the general scope of the bill. The amendments proposed by your committee will be referred to in the analysis of the bill as reported.

NEED FOR THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

There was a common agreement among all witnesses testifying before your committee as to the need for a greatly expanded vocational rehabilitation program. It was stated that at present more than 2,000,000 cases need the attention of the State rehabilitation services as speedily as it can be given them. It was also pointed out that during the past 3 years there has been an increase of about 30 percent in the employment of workers in industry, but on the other hand there has been an increase of 70 percent in the incidence of disablement among workers in industry. These accidents have mounted steadily with the great influx of untrained workers and the increase in size and tempo of industrial operations. In addition there are civilians whose disabilities are more directly connected with the war. Injuries are daily occurring in the protective services, such as the Civil Air Patrol. The sailors who man our merchant ships are being injured in appreciable numbers.

How many disabilities will arise from military service in the present war is difficult to estimate. Some guidance is afforded by experience in the last war when somewhat under 5,000,000 men were in our armed service, with an expeditionary force of some 2,000,000 intensively engaged for a relatively short period. From these forces there were 330,000 applicants for rehabilitation within

a 10-year period; 179,000 of these were placed in training. It may be anticipated that utilization of improved medical techniques, including the new sulfa drugs, will result in a much higher percentage of recoveries by those who suffer wounds than was true in the last war. Unquestionably, the incidence of disablement to this war will be very great. While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed by recent legislation to provide vocational rehabilitation at Federal expense to veterans with service-connected disabilities, and H. R. 2536 does not in any way affect this duty, it is obvious from experience that in many cases disabilities will not be provably service-connected.

It was also clear from General Hines' testimony that he expected to utilize vocational rehabilitation services provided under State plans during the period ending 6 years after the termination of the war that he is authorized by law to provide such service. Thereafter, as has been the case with veterans of the first World War, considerable vocational rehabilitation of veterans of the present war will doubtless be carried out under the Federal-State program at joint Federal and State expense.

From the long-range point of view there is no question but that the problem of disability is a problem which can be met only by large expenditures of public money. The very fact that a person who is normally a breadwinner is disabled often raises a relief problem as to him and his dependents. From the viewpoint of both Federal and State treasuries, and of the disabled persons themselves, experience has demonstrated that the best as well as the most economical approach for meeting the situation is an appropriate program of vocational rehabilitation. Where a disabled person may be made fit for employment, through rehabilitation, and become a tax producer, rather than a tax consumer, it would seem poor economy to deny him these necessary services. This is the dollars-and-cents justification of the program.

The exigencies of the present manpower situation present an additional basis and emphasize the need for the amendments of H. R. 2536. There is immediate need for all disabled who may be placed in industry. In many instances this may be done very speedily, as it is largely a matter of determining what kind of job the disabled individual may fill, bringing together the prospective employer and the disabled individual, and persuading each that the disability does not prevent the prospective employee from acceptably filling the job. In other cases prosthetic appliances or relatively simple operations may result in the early return of the disabled person to employment. In other instances training around a person's disability is required. Frequently this can be accomplished in a relatively short period.

EFFECT OF BILL ON EXISTING LAWS

Disabled individuals, whether their disability is war-connected, or arises from industrial or other accidents, or from congenital causes, may receive rehabilitation services to the extent provided by the States under the existing Federal-State program. This program, particularly in its training aspects, has yielded very large returns for the modest expenditure of Federal and State funds which have been available. However, in view of conditions previously mentioned, it was felt necessary to make some modifications in the present law.

Limitations on amounts of Federal grants

The existing provisions limiting the total of funds available for grants and allotting these funds to the States on the basis of their proportionate populations discourage States from properly developing their programs. This limitation has been removed.

The bill, as amended by the committee, provides that the grants to the States shall include the cost of providing vocational rehabilitation services to such war-disabled civilians who are certified to the States.

Exclusive of certified war-disabled civilians, grants cover one-half the cost of providing disabled individuals rehabilitation training, maintenance, and certain other services specified in the bill, such as necessary corrective surgery, therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic devices, and also cover the costs of administration.

To take care of the present emergency it is provided that for the next 2 fiscal years further grants of necessary funds may be made available when a State is found to have substantially exhausted its own funds and accordingly cannot longer match the Federal funds.

Physical restoration

Provisions as to physical restoration services limit such services, both as to scope and as to recipients, so as to avoid any possibility of making the vocational rehabilitation grants available for a State health or medical program.

Physical restoration must be particularly emphasized in speedily placing large numbers in productive employment. The testimony made clear that relatively simple operations are all that are needed to make a great many people available for work. Provision of physical restoration by the States under existing law is not forbidden. It has not been provided in the past because of the limitation of funds and the feeling administratively that expenditures for such restoration were not authorized. Hence, the present clarification.

Further limitations

H. R. 2536 authorizes use of Federal funds for rehabilitation services only when necessary. Thus (except for war-disabled civilians certified to the State) eligibility for maintenance, physical restoration, and prosthetic appliances is limited to cases where a financial need for such services is found after full consideration of all other benefits available to the individuals. Further, the State plans will provide that vocational rehabilitation will not be afforded unless the individual comes within a class which may be rendered employable, and there will be rules, regulations, and standards designed to limit the use of Federal funds. The bill otherwise clarifies the Federal-State relationship, and makes plain that States have the responsibility of selecting the individual cases to be handled and the type of treatment to be meted out in such cases, and the scope of the State plan. The States are not required to do anything. The bill merely specifies certain conditions a State plan is to meet if the State is to receive Federal grants. It should be mentioned that the Federal act has been most wisely administered, and that the changes in the act limiting Federal authority do not exclude any authority which has been exercised to date.

State plans, including qualifications of all State personnel, are submitted annually. Under the amendments there would no longer be any requirement that the provisions of the State plan covered by these clauses, as well as the provisions showing the plan, policies, and methods of carrying out the work, be submitted annually for Federal approval or disapproval. Also States will be protected against arbitrary withholding of funds by the new requirement for a public hearing before any such action, and a statutory limitation as to the grounds upon which withholding can be based.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BILL AS REPORTED

Section 1 of the bill amends the act of June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, ch. 4). The sections referred to below are, unless otherwise indicated, the sections of the act of June 2, 1920, as amended by section 1 of the bill.

Section 1: This section provides that the moneys made available pursuant to this act shall be used for making payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) which have submitted and had approved by the Federal Security Administrator plans for vocational rehabilitation of disabled individuals.

Section 2: Subsection (a) of this section sets forth certain provisions necessary for a State plan to be approvable under the act.

Clause 1 of this subsection follows existing law in requiring that the plan shall designate the State board of vocational education as the sole agency for administering the plan, but changes the law by providing that where the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind, is also authorized to provide them with any rehabilitation service, the plan must provide for administration by such blind commission or other agency of that part of the plan under which such rehabilitation service is provided for the blind. It also provides that where a State has established a rehabilitation commission prior to the enactment of the present amendments to the act, the State board may delegate operation of all or any part of the plan to such commission.

Clause 2 in general follows existing law and states that the plan shall provide for the appointment of the State treasurer as custodian of funds received under the act from the Federal Government.

Clause 3 also follows existing law in general and states that the plan shall show the policies and methods of carrying out the work thereunder. It does not, however, require such submission each year, as is the case under existing law.

Clause 4, in order to limit the use of Federal funds to cases where the individuals can be effectively rehabilitated and put into employment, provides that the plan shall limit vocational rehabilitation thereunder to classes of employable individuals defined by the Administrator.

Clause 5 provides that the plan shall contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system. The clause also limits the Administrator's duty in approving the plan in this respect to a determination of whether the plan contains such provisions, and makes it clear that he has no authority with respect to the selection, method of selection, tenure of office, or compensation of anyone employed in accordance with such provisions. This changes existing law under which there is an annual submission of the qualifications of all State personnel for Federal approval or disapproval.

Clause 6 states that the plan shall provide such methods of administration other than establishment and maintenance of a merit system, as the Administrator finds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan. This limits the requirement of approval to those administrative provisions of such importance as to be necessary for proper and efficient administration, in contrast with existing law where all administrative provisions may be passed upon.

Clause 7 states that the plan shall require the State board to make such reports as may be called for by the Administrator.

Clause 8 substantially follows existing law, and provides that the plan shall forbid the use of any money paid to the State under this title for the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any land for administrative purposes.

Clause 9, in order to avoid the expenditure of Federal funds for extravagant, unnecessary, or ineffective services, states that the plan shall provide for rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon

the basis of which Federal grants are made under section 3 (a) as the Administrator may find reasonable and necessary, including (A) provisions designed to secure good conduct, regular attendance, and cooperation of trainees and reduction of allowance in case of on-the-job training, (B) maximum fees for and duration of training, (C) maximum schedules of fees for surgery, therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, medical examination, and prosthetic devices, and (D) maximum rates of compensation of personnel.

Clause 10 states that the plan shall provide for making any services provided under the plan available, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty and to any war-disabled civilian. This clause with respect to civil employees of the United States follows existing law, but the requirements as to war-disabled civilians are new.

As defined in section 10 (b), the term "war disabled civilian" means (1) civilians (except those paid for services as civilian defense workers) disabled while serving after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the war in the Aircraft Warning Service, as members of the Civilian Air Patrol, or as members of the United States Civilian Defense Corps (including registered trainees); and (2) civilians disabled while serving during a corresponding period as officers or members of the crew of a vessel owned or chartered by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or operated under charter from such Commission or Administration. The disability in any such case must be incurred in line of duty and not due to the civilian's own misconduct.

Subsection (b) of section 2 requires the Administrator to approve any plan which he believes to be feasible, and which complies with the foregoing provisions, unless it contains restrictions substantially increasing the cost of vocational rehabilitation in the State or seriously impairing the effectiveness of the State plan in carrying out the purposes of the act. This provision requires approval instead of merely authorizing it, and greatly reduces the area of Federal discretion which is given in existing law.

Section 3: Subsection (a) of this section provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation the sum of amounts determined by the Administrator to be equal to (1) the necessary expenditures (exclusive of administrative expense) for the vocational rehabilitation of war disabled civilians certified to the State by the Federal Security Administrator, (2) one-half the necessary expenditures (exclusive of administrative expense) for providing rehabilitation training, medical examinations, and services specified in the bill to other disabled individuals, and (3) the necessary expenditures for the proper and efficient administration of the plan. The services (other than rehabilitation training, medical examinations, guidance, and placement) are to be provided only in case the individuals are found to require financial assistance with respect to such services after full consideration of their eligibility for similar benefits. The physical restoration services are limited to necessary corrective surgery or therapeutic treatment which will eliminate or substantially reduce the handicap to employment within a reasonable length of time, necessary hospitalization of not more than 90 days in connection with such surgery or treatment, and prosthetic devices essential to obtaining or retaining employment. Maintenance is limited to the period of training. Transportation, occupational licenses, and customary occupational tools and equipment are also to be provided for disabled individuals who require financial assistance.

Subsection (b) provides that the Administrator, under conditions specified in general regulations promulgated by him, may increase the share of Federal participation in the cost of providing rehabilitation training and specified services, but only during the period ending June 30, 1945, and only where the State has substantially exhausted State funds available for such purpose.

Subsection (c) provides the method of computing and paying amounts to the State. Federal payments are to be made on a prepayment basis, determined on estimates of anticipated expenditures for the period under the State plan. Adjustments are made in subsequent periods to the extent the actual expenditures which are matchable are greater or less than the estimates. This provision authorizes adjustments, not previously made, with respect to grants made prior, as well as subsequent, to the enactment of this bill. These payments will be made prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Section 4: This section safeguards the States from arbitrary action by providing that funds may be withheld only where the Federal Security Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, finds that in the administration of a State plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the plan approved by the Administrator under section 2, or a failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing rehabilitation or similar services. After such a finding the Administrator will not make certifications for payment to the State as long as such conditions exist.

Section 5: This section authorizes the Administrator, in order to facilitate the operation of State plans, to furnish needed special facilities and services to State boards to two or more States on a cost basis and to establish such needed facilities. The cost of constructing, establishing, and furnishing such facilities and services to a State is specified to be an expenditure under the State plan, and is to be paid for by deduction of an amount equal to such cost from payments to the State under the act.

Section 6 follows existing law by authorizing the Administrator to provide vocational rehabilitation services as defined in the act to disabled persons actually residing in the District of Columbia and to formulate a plan of cooperation with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the vocational rehabilitation of any such disabled residents as are civil employees of the United States disabled while in the performance of their duty.

Section 7: Subsection (a) authorizes the Administrator, in carrying out his duties under the act, to utilize the facilities of his Agency, and to enter into agreements with other public and private agencies, persons, and institutions for the use of their facilities and to compensate them for such use, to make studies and reports on various aspects of vocational rehabilitation, and, until July 1, 1945, to conduct appropriate courses of instruction for personnel or detail them to such courses of not more than 6 weeks' duration conducted by others, and provide personnel so detailed with necessary materials, subsistence, and other expenses.

Subsection (b) specifies the method of payment to Federal and other agencies for the use of facilities and for services rendered in connection with the administration of the act.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Administrator to make rules and regulations governing the administration of the act and provides for the delegation of authority by him, except the making of rules and regulations.

Section 8 requires the Administrator to make annual reports to Congress on the administration of the act.

Section 9 authorizes an annual appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, including an equitable share from District of Columbia funds of the sums made available for carrying out the purposes of section 6.

Section 10: This section follows existing law in defining "vocational rehabilitation" and "vocational rehabilitation services" as any services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation. The types of services included are not specified inasmuch as section 3 includes a description of the various services in addition to training, which will be recognized. Section 10 also contains a definition of "war disabled civilian" which has been previously referred to.

Section 11 provides that the act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act."

Section 2 of the bill repeals, as of July 1, 1943, the act of February 23, 1929, as amended, since the provisions with respect to the District are included in section 6 and elsewhere in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended.

Section 3 of the bill: Subsection (a) of this section maintains the effectiveness, despite the amendments of this bill, of provisions of the act of June 2, 1920, as previously amended, and of the plans and regulations thereunder, until 90 days after approval of this bill. It also maintains the effectiveness of the plan formulated with the Employes' Compensation Commission under the act of February 23, 1929, as heretofore amended, until modified or superseded.

Subsection (b) is designed to give a State time to enact legislation enabling it to comply with the provisions of this act. It provides that if on the date of enactment of the bill a State cannot fully comply with the conditions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as hereby amended, such State may, if it complies therewith to the extent possible, secure the benefits of this act until 60 days after the legislature of such State first meets in due course. It further provides that where the State legislation enacted cannot be given an immediate effective date, the 60-day period would be extended to the earliest effective date which could be given in such State to legislation passed within such 60 days. It conditions any extension on the compliance by the State to the extent possible with the amended act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which he asked to have considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2536 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

VISIT TO SOLDIERS RETURNING FROM NORTH AFRICA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as the final of a series of visits which General Somervell, the Commanding

General of the Army Service Forces, has arranged for members of certain Senate and House committees concerned with War Department problems, all Members of the Senate are cordially invited to join in a visit on Thursday evening, the 24th of June, to the New York area where they will be privileged to talk with our own soldiers who are returning as casualties from the North African front. Arrangements have been made to go to the Halloran General Hospital and to certain other points on Staten Island. I can assure the Members of the Senate that they will not want to miss the opportunity, and I hope every Member of the Senate will find it possible to make the trip. I think the members of the committee who can avail themselves of the opportunity to make the trip should do so, so that they may talk with boys from their own States who have been wounded in action in the service of the country. Opportunity will be given to study the high caliber of medical care and service which the Army is giving our soldiers.

Mr. President, I am confident that under the able and splendid direction of General Kirk, who recently was confirmed as Surgeon General of the United States Army, splendid service will be given to our men. All the Members of the Senate to whom I have talked and who have had the privilege of meeting General Kirk have been greatly impressed with his qualifications and experience, and believe they are such as will make him one of the finest Surgeon Generals we have ever had.

In connection with the trip I have mentioned, it is planned to leave Washington by special Pullman train on next Thursday evening, arriving in New York on Friday morning. That day will be spent in the New York area, and the return to Washington will be on Friday evening. Members of the Senate planning to participate in the trip should communicate with Colonel Watt, in the office of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in order that the necessary arrangements may be made for them.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I wish to express my appreciation to General Somervell and to the War Department for the opportunity to welcome back home and to talk with our boys who have been wounded in the execution of the successful North African campaign. As I have just stated, if Members of the Senate desirous of taking the trip will be kind enough to furnish their names to Colonel Watt, the necessary arrangements will be made for them.

EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR ARMY OFFICERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers, which were on page 1, line 4, to strike out all after "Army," down to and including "grade" in line 9, and insert "who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be granted retirement pay for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under temporary appointment in a higher grade shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade"; on page 3, line 7, after "retired" to insert "or granted retirement pay"; and on page 3, line 8, after "retired" to insert "or granted retirement pay."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SERVICES OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS IN AID OF LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago I brought to the attention of the Senate a matter relative to House bill 2292 and a corresponding bill, Senate bill 676. At this time I wish to repeat the statement I made at that time. Therefore I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3:

> Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on April 6, a House bill (H. R. 2292) to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces was received in the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
>
> The companion Senate bill (S. 676) was considered by the Military Affairs Committee on May 4, amended by substituting the text of the House bill 2292, and approved. This action was taken by the Military Affairs Committee after consultation between the Military Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee and it was found agreeable to that committee, through its chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that the Military Affairs Committee take jurisdiction. The Senate bill, as amended, was accordingly reported to the Senate and placed on the calendar. When the calendar was called, an explanation should have been made, the Foreign Relations Committee should have been discharged from further consideration of the House bill, and that bill should then have been passed by the Senate in place of Senate bill 676. Inasmuch as Senate bill 676 was passed, however, on May 20, I now ask that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of House bill 2292 and that the House bill be now passed by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what the Senator from North Carolina has read is a matter of record. It was not necessary to read the RECORD simply in order to make the motion. Is that the motion the Senator makes?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the motion I make.

In that connection I might add that I spoke to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] regarding the matter.

Mr. McNARY. There is no objection to the motion. The only objection is, not to taking the action requested, but to making such a voluminous record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of House bill 2292.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2292.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2292) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPERATIONS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, upon two previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to the activities of the Postmaster General who is also national chairman of the Democratic Party. Today I regret to inform this body that the large volume of mail I have received from every section of the country overwhelmingly endorses the criticism I made of Mr. Walker.

Frankly, the people do not believe that a man, be he Republican or Democrat, should be at the head of one of the greatest businesses of this country, employing hundreds of thousands of men, giving out contracts involving hundreds of millions of dollars, exercising powers involving the life or death of newspapers and magazines, and at the same time be at the head of a political party.

I know of no Federal law which has met with greater approbation from the people at large than has the Hatch Act. The people believe that the money raised from the taxes they pay should not even indirectly be used to build up a huge political machine which can be used to fight the people themselves. Rightly or wrongly, the people believe that when a man takes a job on the Federal pay roll he should devote his time exclusively to earning his money. The Civil Service Act has clearly defined that to be the policy of this Government, and every Senator knows how jealously that act has been guarded.

Here we have a situation in which a rural mail carrier, a post-office clerk, or a postmaster cannot take part in politics, but the man who appoints them, and who has hundreds of thousands of employees working under him, is today occupying the chairmanship of a great political party. We see the Postmaster General, with thousands of rural mail carriers under him, covering every nook and corner of this country, dispensing patronage at the cost of millions of dollars of public money. It is obvious that a man cannot serve two masters at the same time, so Mr. Walker is constantly called upon to choose between serving the best interests of the United States Government and the best interests of the Democratic National Party, and surely the best interests of these two must often be in conflict.

Only a short time ago JOE MARTIN resigned as chairman of the Republican Party because he stated he could not fulfill his duties as a Member of Congress and at the same time be chairman of the

Republican Party. Surely the duties of the Postmaster General in these terrible times, when fathers and mothers all over this country are so anxious to use the mails to send letters and packages to their sons and daughters in the armed forces all over the world, are sufficiently heavy for any man without his assuming the additional heavy responsibilities of the national chairmanship of a political party.

Indeed the Republican Party has found the duties of the national chairman so heavy that not only do they require Mr. Spangler's full time, but he has numerous deputies; and it is my understanding that the set-up for the Democratic Party is even larger.

There can be no question about the conflict of duties. We all remember that only a short time ago Mr. Walker asked that politics be adjourned, and that there be only a short campaign, lasting about a month. The Republicans offered to accept his proposition provided the President would announce that he was not a candidate for a fourth term. Mr. Walker declined to accept that offer. On the contrary, he promptly started to tour the country, to inspect post offices he said. He traveled thousands of miles and was gone approximately a month. But who accompanied him? Was it someone who was helping him with the post-office work? It was not. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say that Mr. Walker was not on a political junketing trip when we consider who accompanied him.

All the people of the country, be they Republicans or Democrats, are entitled to a fair deal. One of the wonderful things about our American way of life is that we have courts in which a litigant can file an application for a change of venue when he believes that a judge is prejudiced.

The new judge may not be as good a judge as the one disqualified, but the litigant is happy because he believes he is getting a square deal. The publishers of newspapers and magazines, however, have no chance in America to file an affidavit of prejudice. If they are only of moderate means they are entirely at the mercy of the Postmaster General. He can break any publication almost overnight. His power in revoking the second-class mailing privilege on any pretext reminds one of the powers of the old Czar in Russia. His lieutenants on the Democratic National Committee, by simply passing out the word, can compel the average small publisher to fall into line or face starvation. He can hound and crucify any publisher, however high his ideals, upon almost any pretext.

Very ugly rumors persist in Washington that although Mr. Walker has barred as obscene 70 magazines, after a farcical hearing before three of his subordinates, if the right lawyer were hired—for example, a former chairman of the Democratic National Comimttee—they could be reinstated. In this connection I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Mr. James Farley is not a lawyer and is not involved.

Why should a wealthy magazine owner be obligated to pay a former chairman of the Democratic Party an attorney's fee to get Mr. Walker to change his mind and say that a magazine which he had barred as obscene is, in fact, not obscene at all?

Mr. President, it will be remembered that about a year ago when an attempt was made to throw out the postmaster at Monroe, Wis., a former commander of the American Legion of Wisconsin, and replace him with a former brewery operator, I produced the canceled checks showing that a postmaster in North Dakota had paid money to the Democratic county chairman, to the State Democratic chairman, and to the National Democratic Party. It will be recalled that I endeavored at that time to have an investigation of the charges that this procedure was followed throughout the country, as I believed it was—incidentally this money, nearly always paid on the first of each month, amounted to over $5,000,000 a year—but that investigation never took place. The Senate may rest assured that the demand for this investigation will be renewed and renewed and renewed until we ultimately have it. I serve notice now that if we cannot find out now how much postmasters are mulcted by the National Democratic Party, we will get that evidence when we have a Republican President.

The time has not yet come in America when a group of politicians can assess the postmasters all over this country and get away with it. I challenge Mr. Walker to demand an investigation to show how much the postmasters have paid to the Democratic National Party during the past 10 years, and I ask only that I be placed as one of the minority members upon the subcommittee to do the investigating.

How filthily contemptible, when a postmaster drawing a measly little salary of $100 a month in a little town is obliged to pay tribute to Caesar. But contemptible as this is, it is a thousand times worse to intimidate the publishers of newspapers and magazines by the constant threat of revoking their second-class mailing privilege. Already I have told about one magazine, the Police Gazette, which mailed out a quarter of a million copies in 1936, paid for by the Democratic National Committee, but which became obscene overnight when in 1940 it advocated the election of Saltonstall, the Republican Governor of Massachusetts, as President.

What a travesty on justice! We have the courts open and functioning. Mr. Walker has never filed a complaint with the Attorney General to prosecute anybody for sending obscene literature through the mails. Mr. Walker makes no effort in court to arrest anyone. He must know that, if this literature is obscene, filthy, and lewd, he should have the publishers put in the penitentiary where they belong. Surely having the same editions which he says are unfit for the mails distributed by freight, express, and busses, and putting them on sale on thousands of newsstands, is no solution to the problem.

Possibly one of the reasons Mr. Walker has not joined us in the crusade we have had in effect in my State for the past 6 years to clean up lewd and disgusting literature is that he has been too busy trying to hold down two jobs at the same time. It is my belief that he should resign one or the other. He should do as JOE MARTIN, chairman of the Republican Party, did, and should either quit as chairman of the Democratic Party or resign as Postmaster General.

BOUNDARY AGREEMENT BETWEEN INDIANA AND KENTUCKY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 62, correcting the boundary line between the States of Indiana and Kentucky. On the same day the House passed House Joint Resolution 131, covering exactly the same subject matter. I ask that the House joint resolution be laid before the Senate at this time and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary, and said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky are hereby approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas, by decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Indiana against Kentucky, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in 163 United States Reports, the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky between certain terminal points therein described was fixed and established; and

Whereas neither of said terminal points reached the low-water mark of the right side of the Ohio River, forming the remainder of the boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth; and

Whereas, owing to the fact recited in the preceding literary paragraph hereof a dispute has arisen as to the boundary line connecting said terminal points with said low-water mark; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of Indiana and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky appointed commissioners to study said question for the purpose of ascertaining the true and legal boundary line thus in dispute; and

Whereas said commissioners agreed upon the true and legal boundary line; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Indiana passed an act known and desig-

nated as Enrolled Act No. 19, House, bearing the signatures of Hobart Creighton, speaker of the house of representatives; Charles M. Dawson, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana, under date of January 29, 1943; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky passed a like act known and designated as House bill No. 375, bearing the signature of Stanley S. Dickson, speaker of the house of representatives; Rodes K. Myers, president of the senate; and the signature and approval of Keen Johnson, Governor of Kentucky, under date of March 9, 1942; and

Whereas the said acts provided in substance that upon the approval and consent of the Congress of the United States the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall be as follows:

Commencing at a point on the line between sections 15 and 14, township 7 south, range 10 west, and sixty-seven and twenty-five one-hundredths chains south of the northeast corner of section 15, the same being the beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line as fixed by the Supreme Court of the United States in Indiana against Kentucky, decided May 18, 1896, and reported in 163 United States Reports; thence south no degrees 53 minutes 15 seconds west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence upstream at low-water mark on the right side of said river. Also beginning at the same beginning point, to wit: The beginning point in the description of the part of the boundary line between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky as fixed by the Supreme Court in the case above recited and following that line to the end of so much of said boundary line as was fixed by said decree; thence due west to the low-water mark on the right side of the Ohio River and thence downstream with said low-water mark on the right side of said river; and

Whereas the said acts of the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky constitute an agreement between said State and said Commonwealth establishing a boundary line between said State and said Commonwealth: Therefore be it

SAFEGUARDS TO RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE OF UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in order to correct a typographical error in House bill 2612, which the Senate passed a day or two ago, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States, to make the following change in Senate engrossed amendment numbered 1, viz: In the language inserted by said amendment, before the word "until", insert "period"; so that the phrase inserted will read: "period until July 1, 1945,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TO MARSHAL STALIN—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HULL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the message which the President of the United States sent to Marshal Joseph Stalin yesterday, which was the second anniversary of the attack by Germany upon Russia.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, with reference to the anniversary.

There being no objection, the message and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Marshal JOSEPH V. STALIN,
Commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
The Kremlin, Moscow.

Two years ago tomorrow, by an act of treachery in keeping with the long record of Nazi duplicity, the Nazi leaders launched their brutal attack upon the Soviet Union. They thus added to their growing list of enemies the mighty forces of the Soviet Union. These Nazi leaders had underestimated the extent to which the Soviet Government and people had developed and strengthened their military power to defend their country and had utterly failed to realize the determination and valor of the Soviet people.

During the past 2 years the freedom-loving peoples of the world have watched, with increasing admiration, the history-making exploits of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the almost incredible sacrifices which the Russian people are so heroically making. The growing might of the combined forces of all the United Nations which is being brought increasingly to bear upon our common enemy testifies to the spirit of unity and sacrifice necessary for our ultimate victory.

This same spirit will, I am sure, animate us in approaching the challenging tasks of peace which victory will present to the world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. Hull's statement follows:

Tomorrow, June 22, marks the second anniversary of the Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union. For a period of 2 years the armed forces of the Soviet Union have been gallantly and successfully defending their country against the aggressor. In two great summer offensives the Nazis have failed to attain their avowed aim of annihilating the Red Army. As the third summer opens, the Nazi legions in Eastern Europe find confronting them millions of Russian soldiers well equipped and of high morale, prepared not only to meet any onslaught but also to hurl back the invader.

It is appropriate that we again today give expression to our admiration of the courage and spirit of self-sacrifice displayed by the whole people of the Soviet Union in successfully defending themselves and their country and in making such signal contributions to the eventual complete defeat of the powers of aggression.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I observe among the appointments in the War Manpower Commission a number of appointees for the State of Indiana. I think we should defer consideration of those nominations until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I ask that all nominations in the War Manpower Commission, except those for the State of Indiana, be confirmed en bloc, and that the nominations for the State of Indiana be passed over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want it to be understood that there will be opposition, but I wish the Senators from Indiana, particularly the junior Senator [Mr. WILLIS], to have an opportunity to observe the appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the War Manpower Commission, with the exception of those for the State of Indiana, are confirmed en bloc, and the nominations for Indiana will be passed over.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

William J. Cronin, Jr., of Connecticut, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the New Haven area office.

Morris J. Kaplan, of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Walter Orie Ware Lee, of Virginia, to be principal industrial specialist, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Gerald B. Leighbody, of New York, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum, in the Buffalo area office.

Joseph H. Louchheim, of New York, to be principal administrative analyst, Office for Field Management, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Abe L. Savage, of New York, to be principal information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Frank B. Stilwell, of Ohio, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dayton area office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Ordnance Department

Maj. George Walter Vaughn
Capt. Elmer Matthew Webb

To Cavalry

Lt. Col. James Brian Edmunds

To Coast Artillery

Capt. Jacob George Reynolds

To Air Corps

First Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer
Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen
Second Lt. Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr.
Second Lt. James Moore Boyd
Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle
Second Lt. Robert Usher Gaines, Jr.
Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr.
Second Lt. Jay Jaynes
Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis
Second Lt. John Raymond Sands, Jr.
Second Lt. Samuel Frederick Stebelton
Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to the examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be colonels, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1943

Joseph Dogan Arthur, Jr.
John Stewart Bragdon
George Jacob Richards
Lehman Wellington Miller
Douglas Lafayette Weart
Earl Ewart Gesler
John French Conklin
×William Frazer Tompkins
×Douglas Hamilton Gillette
Donald Angus Davison

To be colonel, Ordnance Department, with rank from June 12, 1943

×Henry Spiese Aurand

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Flynn G. Humphreys, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve (Chaplain Corps), offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the light of all the ends of the earth, who maketh the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice, hear our prayer and mercifully incline Thine ear to our petitions. Most merciful Father, who showest Thy children the path of life, in whose presence there is fullness of joy, and in whose right hand there is pleasure forever more, we thank Thee for Thy mercies, for the safety and rest of the night, for the hopes and duties of the day. Knowing Thee, we know all we need to know of the unknown future, near or far away. May this day, then, be a day of holy peace and happiness in our land and in our hearts.

O Heavenly Father, in these dark days of trouble and disaster, turn our feet back to the tabernacles of the most high, the altars of the church, and the ways of godliness. Bless and guide, we pray Thee, these servants of Thine in the work of this day, that through them the people of the Nation may know the joy of serving Thee with one heart and one mind. In this hour we pray for leaders of the Allied Nations of the world, and especially for the youth of our land who are serving on the far-off battlefields of the nations of the earth. We pray for their comfort and safety; we pray that the sacrifice which they are making will not be in vain, because of our failure at home. Give peace, O God, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven, for the sake of our Saviour and Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JAMES J. McENTEE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for permission to address the House to pay my tribute of appreciation to a man who has done a magnificent job for the youth of our Nation, Mr. James J. McEntee, the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Not only have I the privilege of knowing Mr. McEntee very well, personally, and working with him, but also I have the privilege of representing him in Congress. He is a resident of my district, the thirteenth, in New Jersey. Recently he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to give an account of his stewardship as head of the C. C. C. That organization was brought into being by the Labor Committee of the House and was one of the most efficiently run agencies of the Government. It has given thousands of boys a chance to become useful citizens who might otherwise not have had the opportunity and there are many thousands of them serving today in the armed forces of the United States, grateful for their chance to repay their Government for the opportunity they received under the guidance of the C. C. C.

Jim McEntee is a representative of one of the great labor organizations of the country, the American Federation of Labor, and worked up through the ranks of organized labor to a position of responsibility and trust. He used the utmost intelligence and, above all, understanding, in the discharge of his duties as Director of the C. C. C.

It is with pride and gratitude that I pay this tribute to a man whom we all respect and whose ability we all admire.

Thanks, Jim McEntee, for the grand job you have done.

CANADA, EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitation tendered by the Speaker of the Senate of Canada and joint-president of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada branch, to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, during the period June 26 to July 1, 1943, at which the Dominion of Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association will be host to a delegation from the United Kingdom Parliament and probably to delegations from the legislative bodies of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $1,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by the Governor of Georgia, Hon. Ellis Arnall, at the Governors' Conference yesterday at Columbus, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a statement from the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on the N. Y. A.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address which I delivered on War, Peace, and Aid. I learn today that the speech is a page longer than allowed and will cost $135 extra. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent, in spite of the additional cost, to extend the address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, daily I am receiving letters from worried taxpayers back home asking how the new tax laws will affect them. This epidemic of headaches for taxpayers is spreading all over the country. I am answering my inquiries by sending this "aspirin" that cures these taxpayers' headaches. It is known as House document 237, entitled "The Current Tax Payment Act of 1943." I consider it the A, B, C of this new tax program, and I would say that it ought to be named Easy Steps for Taxpayers. It was prepared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED.]

I have exhausted my supply of this "aspirin." I think the House should at least authorize 100,000 copies of it, in view of the fact that our bureaus have sent out complicated questionnaires that create headaches all over the country, and this document will at least allay worried taxpayers' headaches.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, 1934

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 254, authorizing the Librarian of Congress to deliver to the House Committee on the Library all materials deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I have no objection to the Attorney General's Office having access to these papers, but the Attorney General's Office made such a fiasco in its recent activities in Mississippi that I have not the confidence that I ought to have in the Attorney General's Office, and especially since that episode has probably contributed to the Nation-wide race troubles we are having today. These are secret papers. They contain information that was acquired by the Committee on Un-American Activities almost 10 years ago. I am not willing for these papers to get out of the jurisdiction of a committee of Congress unless a photostatic copy of every one of them is retained.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I feel that some care must be given to this question, just as does the gentleman from Mississippi, but if the gentleman will carefully read this resolution as it is proposed to be amended, these papers do not go to the Attorney General; these papers go to the Committee on the Library, and then if the Attorney General wishes to see them he may come up and see them in the presence of the Committee on the Library, or at least the committee can safeguard them. That is the object of it. I personally am not willing to take the responsibility of withholding these papers from the Attorney General at this time when some people who are likely affected by these papers are on trial. I hope the gentleman will not object; I am not going to object. The Committee on the Library can permit any Member or committee of the House to inspect these papers and I have reasons to believe they will be reasonable in the exercise of this discretion.

Mr. RANKIN. I feel that if this will help the Attorney General's Office in the trial of these cases we should let him have them. Those cases should be tried now. I am not objecting to the Attorney General's having access to these papers, but I do not want these papers to get out of the hands of the Congress of the United States, because there is information in them, as I understand it, that is vitally necessary for the Congress to have access to in the future. I do not want to do anything that will delay the prosecution of these people who are under indictment. I do not care what these Communist newspapers say, I want these people brought to trial immediately, and if they are guilty they should be convicted and punished. I do not want to withhold any information that would aid the Department of Justice in that respect; but I certainly want to see that these papers are retained where the Congress will always have access to them.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I wish to inform the gentleman from Mississippi that when this resolution was originally drawn it provided that the papers were to be turned over to the Attorney General. The Committee on the Library saw fit to amend the original resolution so that the papers now will be kept in the custody of the Committee on the Library. This has been agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. So these papers will be retained by the Committee on the Library in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know nothing about what these papers contain, but I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that if there is anything in them that will aid the cause of justice, let the Attorney General have them; but why should not Members of Congress at least have access to the papers? The chances are that the papers contain a lot of hearsay; nevertheless, if they are to be made available to the Attorney General why not make them available to Members of Congress?

Mr. RANKIN. As soon as the Attorney General gets through with the prosecution of these cases I hope he will get busy prosecuting these Communists that are stirring up these zoot-suit riots and these race riots all over the country that are doing more harm than anything else except these unjustified strikes in our war industry. I hope the Attorney General will wake up to the fact that the Communists are stirring up race troubles from Detroit to El Paso.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to deliver to the Attorney General for such use as the Attorney General may deem appropriate, all material deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including the contents of a sealed package inscribed "House of Representatives, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1934. Hearings Confidential," the content of which package shall be returned to the Librarian of Congress after the Attorney General has made such use of the same as he has deemed appropriate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "The Attorney General" and insert "that committee."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library."

Page 1, line 13, strike out "he" and insert "it."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Hon. Paul V. McNutt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement made by Hon. Marvin Jones before the House Committee on Agriculture concerning the food conference held recently in Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LT. FLYNN HUMPHREYS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, our visiting chaplain this morning was Lt. Flynn Humphreys, chaplain in the Navy. Early in this war he expressed a desire to get into it. He obtained an appointment and gave up for the duration one

of the best pulpits in my home city of Huntsville, Ala., that of the Central Presbyterian Church. During the time he has been in the service he has seen much, as the ribbons which he wears on his breast indicate.

He has just returned from Attu. He was there during the taking of that rocky stronghold from the crafty Japanese. To talk with him about those operations is to know better how the Japs tenaciously held on and savagely fought to the death to the last man. It is to know better how long and how hard is the road ahead before we have won this war. He has been in action, ministering to the dying sons of ours. He has had them die in his arms unafraid and confident that their dying was worth while. To hear him tell of them is to remind us of the terrible responsibility resting on each one of us back here on the home front to see that that faith has not been misplaced and that their death has not been in vain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD under an extension of my own remarks an address by the Honorable Chester Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times by Arthur Krock on June 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Missouri Senate in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Catholic magazine America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

THE CORN SHORTAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is another of the hundreds of protests I have received:

> We supply egg and milk producers covering area 25 miles north and south, 10 miles east. Absolutely impossible secure corn; none on hand. Hundreds of feeders will have to do without. Relief must be given immediately. Posting this on billboard for them to read showing our efforts their behalf. It's up to you.
>
> SOUTHHAVEN FRUIT EXCHANGE,
> CORNELIUS BUS, *Manager*.

I passed the buck and replied as follows:

> Your wire received. Corn shortage due to the President's New Deal policy and Agricultural Adjustment Agency program. If the poultry dies and the milk cows go to the slaughter house, it is the fault of the President's New Deal bureaucrats. Make your protest to them.

Mr. Speaker, I have done all I can to remedy the situation. I have protested many, many times. I am now as always ready to go along with those Members who wish to abolish these bureaus which are interfering with production so that we will be able to get poultry, beef, eggs, and the food we must have next winter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent editorial from the Norwich Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged report (H. Res. 270, Rept. No. 572), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2869, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriation for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) "making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$1,087,800: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of the secretaries, exclusive of temporary additional compensation, and exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall correspond with those of the assistant administrative grade (grade 7 of clerical, administrative and fiscal service): *Provided further*, That the annual basic compensation of the secretary to a circuit or district judge shall not (exclusive of temporary additional compensation) exceed $3,200: *And provided further*,

That the salaries of law clerks shall correspond with those of the assistant professional grade"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 27, and 28.

EMMET O'NEAL,
MICHAEL KIRWAN,
JOE HENDRICKS,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Nos. 1 to 19, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for employees and other items, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 21: Appropriates $291,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $289,200, as proposed by the House, for Capitol Buildings.

No. 22: Appropriates $306,955 for maintenance of the Senate Office Building and provides that the unexpended balance of $7,300 for the same purpose shall continue available until June 30, 1944, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating $313,560, as proposed by the House.

No. 23: Appropriates $2,570,280 for salaries of clerks of courts, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,542,900, as proposed by the House.

No. 24: Restores the provision of the House, proposed to be stricken out by the Senate, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the cost of maintaining the office of clerk in certain United States district courts.

No. 25: Appropriates $1,087,800 for salaries of officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, instead of $987,100, as proposed by the House, and $1,137,100, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the provision of the House relating to the salaries of secretaries and law clerks of district judges; and inserts the proposal of the Senate amended to eliminate the provision relating to retroactive salary increases.

No. 26: Appropriates $391,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $390,000, as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses, United States courts.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

No. 20, relating to $100,000 for preliminary work in connection with preparation of a new edition of the United States Code. The House managers will recommend that the House insist on its disagreement.

No. 27, relating to the terms of court at Greenwood, S. C. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 28, correcting a section number. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

EMMET O'NEAL,
MICHAEL KIRWAN,
JOE HENDRICKS,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the statement speaks for itself. We bring back for a vote of the House three amendments in disagreement, which will be explained later. I do not believe there is much necessity for explaining the amendments which are covered in the statement of the managers on the part of the House because most of them are amendments to the Senate part of the bill. As you know, the House writes its own appropriation bill and the Senate practically always approves what we put in the bill for the House. We in turn pass the bill relating to Senate matters to the Senate, and have no hearings on the items nor do we question what they do with reference to their own appropriations.

I think there is nothing else in the report itself that needs further explanation except for the three amendments in disagreement, which will be considered later.

Does the gentleman from Indiana desire to make any statement on the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I believe not.

Mr. O'NEAL. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: On page 28, line 10, insert the following:

"For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code, including the correction of errors as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1541), $100,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 20.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEOGH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 20 and concur therein.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEOGH. May I be advised as to the disposition of the time on this motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky has the floor and controls the time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I shall explain to the gentleman from New York what the chairman of the committee has in mind.

The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws [Mr. KEOGH], appeared before the subcommittee before this bill was presented to the House, asking for $100,000 to be used in the preparation of a code. The details of that matter will be explained later. The committee did not put that item in the bill because, for one reason, in the opinion of the committee, the way it was drawn the appropriation was not authorized by law.

Later the gentleman from New York offered an amendment in the Committee of the Whole which was considering this bill and the amendment was adopted. When the amended bill was presented to the House for action a separate vote was demanded and, on a record vote, the amendment of the gentleman from New York was defeated.

The gentleman from New York went to the Senate, and I may say certainly with the knowledge of the chairman and possibly other members of the subcommittee, because all of us wanted to extend all the courtesies we could to a committee of the House and to the gentleman from New York. The Senate inserted an amendment authorizing this study and appropriating the money for that purpose.

I want to be very frank with the House and state that the chairman of the subcommittee was not opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I felt that the work has to be done some time and that it is a most important work. But due to the fact that the House had voted on a record vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, I stood with my committee, so we bring this amendment of the Senate back to the House with the recommendation that the House further insist on the House position.

Personally, I have very little to say on the matter because, frankly, at heart I feel that possibly it is just as well to do this now as to do it later. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is the gentleman who opposed the amendment and made the point of order which resulted in a record vote on it. It is my purpose, I may say to the gentleman from New York and to the gentleman from Minnesota, to try to divide the time which I control, the balance of the hour, fairly between the two sides, those who are for this proposition and those who are opposed to it. The center aisle has nothing to do with the allotment of the time. I shall be very glad to try to divide the time as equitably as I can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was before the House previously the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. O'NEAL] said at the outset of the debate:

We are not willing, as a committee, to put it in this bill. I think perhaps the committee members will vote against it, but we

believe the work is highly important. Its cost is $100,000, and we wanted this Committee of the Whole to decide whether or not we would go ahead with this expenditure at this time.

The vote in the Committee of the Whole was 103 to 67 in favor of the amendment. After the bill was brought back to the House a separate vote was demanded and on a division the amendment carried 92 to 72. A point of order was then made that a quorum was not present and on a roll call vote the amendment was defeated—yeas 177, nays 184, not voting 73.

If the Congress does not feel that this work is satisfactorily done or that it is not of great advantage to the country, then the Congress can very easily and properly refuse any future appropriations for codifications of other branches of the law. However, all of you have seen the District of Columbia Code which was prepared for the first time in the history of this country as a completely annotated edition of the code. The Committee on Revision of the laws did that work at a cost of $32,500. Anyone who has had occasion to refer to this code will undoubtedly agree that this work will be of great value to the country.

The last time the Judicial Code of this country was revised was in 1911. It was done under the direction of a temporary commission at a cost of approximately $230,000. For years it has been generally agreed that codification of the various branches of the laws of the United States would be of great value to the bar and to individual citizens. For at least 25 years this has been practically the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, whether the House was controlled by the Democrats or Republicans. In respect to the present appropriation, every member of your present committee, both Republican and Democrat, are supporting it. Our opponents have been kind and generous enough to frankly admit that this work is important and necessary and would have lasting value. Their opposition is based on the premise that it should not be done in wartime. However, Napoleon found time to codify the laws during his military campaigns over Europe at a cost relatively greater in those times than would be the present cost to us. His codification of the laws has been one of his lasting contributions to civilization. I feel sure that this codification would also have a very lasting and permanent value and that if it is further delayed it may never be done. Also I feel that, with his experience in the codification of the District of Columbia Code and the United States Code, not one could be better fitted to be the chairman of the committee conducting this work than the able gentleman from New York.

One argument made against this amendment previously was that it would only be of benefit to members of the bar and the legal profession. Actually the opposite is more true. It would be of greatest advantage to the everyday average citizens of the United States. Most lawyers charge on the basis of the services rendered. Naturally one of the chief items in their bill is the amount of time which it is necessary for them to spend looking up the law on the subject. While the laws are in the jumble which now exists, obviously the legal profession must spend more time and study in research and consequently render higher bills to their clients. In addition, it is extremely difficult at times for the judges who are trying the cases to find the proper reference in the statutes; and if they should make an error due to this cause, then an appeal is necessary and the client has to bear the cost of that. The savings which would result from codification would be directly reflected in lesser fees paid by clients to their lawyers. Furthermore, the average man would be able more easily to understand just what the statutory law on the subject was.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Latin proverb to the effect that "amid the clash of arms the law is silent." The law may be silent in parts of the known world today but it is very vocal in the United States of America. The proposal now is to grant this appropriation for the recodification of two titles of the United States Code Annotated, to wit, titles Nos. 18 and 28.

The first of these is embraced in three volumes which refers to the Criminal Code and criminal procedure. The second is embraced in the remaining nine volumes, which relate to the judiciary.

The first compilation of laws under the Committee on Revision of the Laws, constituted in 1868 under the rules of this House, was in 1873. It is a singular fact and rather a coincidence that these laws were enacted on the 22d day of June 1874, 69 years ago today.

Since that time there has been enacted the Judicial Code, the Criminal Code, and more recently we have had the passage of an act providing for the promulgation by the Supreme Court of new criminal court rules. I direct attention, first of all, to the fact that the Judicial Code embraced in these 9 volumes, since it was enacted, has been amended over 200 times. I cite that to show the necessity for bringing this code up to date.

With reference to the proposed criminal rules, may I state something to you since I have had the privilege and opportunity of examining these new rules? They are in a draft form and have been submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. You understand that these rules will be integrated as a part of the criminal law. Under the rules as presented there are nearly 313 pages, and they are printed in an appendix of 29 pages—of forms—there are 56 of these rules. There is a constant advance and growth in the development of law. It is not static, it is not stationary, and we must keep abreast of it by having the law current at all times, and the reason for that is perfectly simple. It must be readily accessible to the people who must use it, not only to the lawyers and the courts, but to all of the departments of government and to everyone who must deal with the Federal statutes.

I would like to give you the advantage of a set of figures which I dug up in the last few days. The credit for this must be given to the Honorable Walter Chandler, a former Member of this House, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and, in my judgment, one of the ablest men ever serving here. I want to tell you now what he pointed out not only as a reason for a revision of these rules and laws but also the necessity for keeping abreast of them. First of all, he referred to those sections relating to the judiciary not expressly repealed which should be repealed or incorporated in the new Judicial Code, 88 sections of them; and, second, the provisions included in title 28, United States Code, which have been amended or superseded by later legislation found elsewhere in an existing compilation, some 17 sections. In other places there is no indication at all in the sections in question that they are affected by the last provision. Forty-four sections are involved in the third classification. Fourth, these provisions included in title 28, United States Code, which have been amended or superseded by later legislation not mentioned in an existing compilation, 14 sections in all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when this matter first came before the House it was through an attempt made to insert this amendment. It is now again before the House. This amendment calls for an expenditure of $100,000 for preliminary work toward recodifying the laws. I do not know how much the whole job will cost. There has been no estimate furnished us as to how much it will cost. I think the evidence before our committee established that there had been negotiations entered into or discussions had with one or more law-book companies, and it was proposed to pay them $85,000 to do, I presume, what we would term this "preliminary work" toward the recodification of these laws. When the matter was presented to the committee originally, the committee would not incorporate it in the bill. When the bill came on the floor of the House, the amendment was offered. It went to a roll call vote, and the House defeated the amendment. It seems to me that the action of the House at that time was wise. One of the reasons is that to me this is no time to attempt to recodify these laws. We have many rules, regulations, directives, and what-not which will expire at the expiration of the war or 6 months thereafter. We could not make an up-to-date codification of the laws at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the last Supreme Court decision in which it is held that the rules and regulations and orders and directives of men in the employ of the various departments are law, how can anyone codify the law? How is it possible? You cannot keep them up to date, because they come out daily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think that is the situation which con-

fronts us regularly, and will continue until this war is over. We are confronted with a proposition here, Mr. Speaker, where this matter has not been submitted to the Budget. It has not been recommended by the Budget, and has not been recommended by any department of the Government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman knows that this item was submitted to the Budget, but being an item for legislative estimate, the Budget Bureau makes no recommendation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I do not know about that, but I thank the gentleman. The Budget did not recommend it, as the gentleman says, because it is a legislative matter. I do not care what the reason is. The statement I made is correct. It has not been recommended by the Budget, it has not been recommended by the Department of Justice, by the courts, or by any other agency of the Government that I know of.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman knows, as a matter of policy, that the Bureau of the Budget makes no recommendation with respect to items for the legislative branch?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to mislead the House in attempting to imply that this item was the only one that the Bureau of the Budget made no recommendation upon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. No; I am not making that statement at all. I say it has not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, by the courts of this country, by the Department of Justice, or by any other agency of government. I admire the gentleman from New York in his great desire to accomplish a work. I think it would be in good hands if he did the work, but I do not think this is the time to do it. Every day we read statements in the papers from the Treasury Department that we must raise taxes in order to get money to carry on the war. They are asking the boys to spend their dimes to buy stamps to win the war; they are asking that we save manpower; and to do everything that can be done to help the boys across the water. Here we are asked to take $100,000 at this time to make a preliminary work in connection with recodifying the laws, although we have been getting along very well without it. I think it was in 1929 that authority for recodification of laws was granted by an act of Congress, and we waited from 1929 until this year of national emergency to come here and say, "It is a must case; we must do it now." I think we would be much better off if we would wait until this emergency is over. It may be at that time there will be need for employing some manpower and this might well be used at that time. We should wait until things are stabilized and then we will have an opportunity to have this job done when it will be lasting and of benefit.

Now, there is one other matter I would like to speak of.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman in his remarks gave the indication to me that this was just to start some general preliminary work. Naturally, this will make a complete codification of two branches of the law. So that if nothing further is ever done, you will nevertheless have two completed items as a result of this codification. If they prove satisfactory, you can go on from there or not, as future Congresses see fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The amendment reads:

> For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I cannot yield. The gentleman has much more time than I. In fact, I felt the gentleman from New York should have made his statement and given us a chance to reply instead of waiting. However, that is something that we have no control over.

There is one thing that I want to speak about. When this bill went to the other end of the Capitol many amendments were added. The House, in conformity with its usual practice, has receded, and receded, and receded. That is about all we know—to recede. This is the only amendment added in the Senate about which there is any real objection and about which any effort will be made to carry the bill back to conference. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that the House of Representatives, when it takes a stand, as it did in this case on a roll-call vote, should stand by the position it has taken. I am getting mighty tired of seeing legislation day after day and week after week go to the other side of the Capitol and there be materially changed in many, many ways, and then come back to the House, always with the House of Representatives receding. I think it is high time the House of Representatives stood up and asserted its rights on legislation, and when it takes a position it should stand by that position.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course the motion made by this committee is to further insist upon the position of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes. I appreciate that. I think the chairman of the subcommittee indicated to us that he favored the amendment that had been offered.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman's subcommittee wanted to be perfectly frank about the matter and did state that he thought it was probably as well to do it now as later, and has always taken that position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is right. The gentleman has done good work as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Speaking about the House receding, does not the gentleman think it is about time we called upon the Senate to take some action on the Smith bill and the Hobbs bill that we sent over there and they have pigeonholed for a year or two?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that this matter is one about which a lot of work has been done. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] for his industry as well as his ability. I understand that he was so industrious that he went around and secured some 29 or 39 letters from Members who were absent when the other vote was taken. He is such a fine gentleman that he almost disarms you before you could ever enter into any sort of discussion with him. I have the highest regard and respect for him. I admire him for the position he has taken. He took the position, as I understand, that he is chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws and if he does not get funds he is not going to be able to do anything in the next 2 years, and therefore we should keep him occupied and we should pass this amendment so that he will have something to do. I say I admire his industry. I admire his ability. He presented this matter in one of the finest ways in which any matter could be presented to any committee. I want to pay him the highest kind of compliment that it is possible to pay him. But after all, we are trying to legislate, not in the interest of an individual or to satisfy the desire of someone to do work, even though that work might be worth while.

We are trying to legislate here in the interest of the people of the United States and at this time, under the present emergency, with the condition we find ourselves in regarding finances, the need of money to carry on the war, and with the prospect of a great many more taxes, it seems that the House once having taken action on this matter should stand by the action heretofore taken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, as to the necessity for codification of the law, I would like the privilege of referring the House to just one out-of-date section of the code which reads as follows:

> In all contracts made for service for the House of Representatives involving the employment of horses, the expenses of keeping such horses shall be covered by the contract; and no money appropriated for contingent or other expenses by the House of Representatives shall be expended for stables or forage.

That shows how antiquated some parts of the laws are.

The fact is that the American Law Institute at this time is preparing a restatement of the laws of all the States of the United States; the fact is that I

was a member of a committee in Pennsylvania which recently completed a codification of the criminal laws of Pennsylvania; the fact is that in all the 16 legal systems of the world you will find that after many wars, the old and the new laws were codified; that is true with respect to the Napoleonic Code, the Hammurabi Code, and others, all came about as a result of a conflict.

If there is any time to have a codification, in my judgment, it is right now.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to take the opportunity to say that I have been associated with the gentleman on that same Committee in Pennsylvania, and I would like to pay tribute to the very constructive work he did in the codification of the laws and I know that he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to thank the gentleman. I will say that in Pennsylvania they are now working on a codification of the code of criminal procedure. Certainly there is no better time to start than the present.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, with my chairman's permission, I think this might be a very logical time for the gentleman who is offering the amendment to tell the House what it is all about. May I inquire if the gentleman from New York would like to explain to the House his amendment?

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman desire to yield time to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I desire that he take his own time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] 5 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to remain as impersonal and objective about this discussion as I can. We have just heard a general colloquy as to who should open and who should close, which really is not pertinent.

I presented the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and to concur in that amendment and the effect of supporting that motion will be to enable the Committee on Revision of Laws to undertake, for the first time since 1911, a substantive revision of the titles of the United States Code dealing with the Criminal Code, the Judicial Code, and the judiciary.

Mention has been made to the prior action taken by the House. Permit me to call attention to the fact that in the Committee of the Whole, on the consideration of this legislative appropriation bill, my amendment, similar to the one now before the House, was adopted by a vote of 103 to 67. When the Committee went back into the House and a demand for a separate vote on the amendment was made, the amendment was agreed to by a standing vote of 92 to 72. It was only on a point of order of no quorum, and an automatic roll call following, that the amendment was rejected by a vote of 177 to 184.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. In other words, those who heard the discussion voted in favor of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEOGH. I do not like to draw any conclusion with respect to that, because I am sure that everybody who voted on the roll call knew what he was doing. I think it is rather significant, however, to note the votes taken in the Committee of the Whole and in the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes; I shall be delighted to.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me the House probably would be more interested in finding out what the gentleman proposes to do if the $100,000 is given to him than in the votes.

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate the gentleman's asking me that question since it affords me the opportunity to tell the House our purpose and plans. I have gone before the committees of the House and of the other body upon the unanimous request and with the unanimous approval of our committee. We know, dealing as we have for the past 5½ years with an attempt to make understandable to the public at large the laws that are enacted here, the problems that face the public when they attempt to determine what the state of any particular section of the law is.

The policy of drafting legislation in the form of statutes at large, to my mind, is not befitting the greatest legislative body in the world and unless and until we erect a permanent framework within and around which all future new and amendatory legislation may be drafted, in code language, the country, the bench, the bar, and this House will not know the precise status of any law. The gentleman has asked me to tell you what we propose to do.

We propose to bring to this body for its final approval and enactment into positive law, a model judiciary code and criminal code, the kind of codes that this great body should present to the people of the greatest country and we propose to do it with this appropriation, the smallest amount that has been asked for any work of a similar kind. This body authorized the appointment of committees by the Supreme Court for the promulgation of rules of civil procedure and criminal procedure. Those committees have expended upwards of $200,000. We permitted them to do that. What your Committee on the Revision of the Laws wants to do is to act as it should; we want to do the legislating for the country. We do not want the continuance of the policy of delegation of authority to legislate. Sure, it is a dry, it is a monotonous job, but it is one that is badly needed. The country has cried for it.

The question has been asked: Who wants this work? The gentleman, I am afraid, indicates a complete lack of knowledge of the situation, although I mean not to be discourteous to him, when he inquires as to who wants this work done. The American Bar Association for years has been advocating it; every member of the Federal judiciary has been advocating it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. We propose to take every statute at large that has been enacted since the Revised Statutes were enacted in 1874; we propose to integrate those existing laws into a unified, intelligent, coordinated, criminal and judicial code. We propose to consider the effect upon existing law of every decision of every court in this country and we propose to integrate and correlate these rules of civil procedure and of criminal procedure. We propose to do that and we propose then to come back to this House for its approval of our work and we expect in that work to repeal expressly all obsolete, all inferentially repealed, and all redundant laws that are still on our books.

The gentleman has asked how we propose to do that. The committee has considered that and has considered it very carefully. Your Committee on the Revision of the Laws will always retain active supervision and control. That is what we propose to do, and that is my reply to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes; I shall be delighted to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. TABER. In connection with this work is it proposed to take the mass of Executive orders that result from any of the language that is involved in sections of the code that are gone over so that we may have a complete picture of what the law is so the House may proceed upon that if legislation is brought in?

Mr. KEOGH. Quite naturally we shall consider the effect of outstanding Executive orders on existing law, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the United States Code, by law, contains only those laws which are of a permanent nature, and generally Executive orders, as the gentleman well knows, are not permanent law; they have the effect of law only so long as they are in force.

Mr. TABER. But, if the gentleman will yield there, that depends upon the statute under which those Executive orders were issued and in a great many cases it is permanent law unless it is repealed or changed by subsequent action of the legislature or the Executive.

Mr. KEOGH. I will not go into that phase of it any further, but we propose—and finally—to bring before this body and in all probability it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—a model code by which and from which we shall have a permanent framework of laws and thereby the country will know what the laws are.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that the sum expended for revising and consolidating the laws of Massachusetts was

$450,000, that there was appropriated for the State of Connecticut $300,000, for the State of New Jersey $600,000, and for the State of West Virginia $300,000 for the same purpose?

Mr. KEOGH. My recollection is that the gentleman states the figures correctly.

May I close by saying that I am, of course, appreciative of all the fine things the gentleman from Indiana has said of me. I can return them to him in kind. I know very well he has given this matter careful consideration and I am sure the gentleman will not mind my saying that some of the points he has raised indicates that he has perhaps not given to this subject quite as much consideration as your standing Committee on the Revision of the Laws has. We have been charged by you to do this job; that is our responsibility and we are asking you to give us the means to discharge that responsibility. I hope the motion to recede and concur will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 last the House defeated on a roll call vote of 184 to 177 this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Nothing has occurred since that time, Mr. Speaker, to change my opinion that this item of $100,000 should not be inserted into the Legislative and Judiciary appropriation bill.

I, personally, can well see Mr. KEOGH'S desire for a substantive revision of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code, which titles deal with the Criminal Code, and criminal procedure and the Judicial Code and the judiciary.

We all recognize that this is a very worthwhile and necessary work, but, Mr. Speaker, there is much worthwhile and necessary work today that we must subordinate to the one thing that at all times we must hold before us, and that is, the winning of this greatest of all wars America today is engaged in.

Last April 8 I opposed this insertion of $100,000 because it is nonessential expenditure at this time and it is not designed to aid in any way the war effort. We are not, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, justified in utilizing manpower at this time in a measure of this sort, however desirable, when that manpower is needed as it has never been needed before in all lines of industry and when by so doing we will be breaking faith with the people of the United States of America.

This is one of the numerous worthwhile projects that we will need to give employment to people following the successful outcome of the war. It is not the sort of project, Members of the House, that must be done today. There has been no proof given here by the author of this amendment in any way that can be construed that this work will be much harmed by laying it upon the shelf for the duration of the war.

Our subcommittee worked long, tedious hours to cut this bill down $3,000,000 below the last year's appropriation. Will you not aid us in preserving these savings and vote against the pending amendment which would add $100,000 to the total of the bill?

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts in this case? On April 8 the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] offered an amendment which was defeated by the House on roll-call vote. This appropriation has to do mainly with a committee in the House of Representatives and I personally resent the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the other body has seen fit to do something that the House of Representatives never does, and that is to insert an amendment of this nature, already defeated by the House, and which should rightfully be considered as a portion of the section of the House bill dealing with appropriations for our own legislative department.

My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] possibly had every right to go over to the other body and persuade the gentlemen there on the corresponding subcommittees to insert this particular amendment after it had been here defeated. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have every right to stand up here today to explain to the House why, in my opinion, this amendment already defeated by the majority of this House, should not be permitted to be inserted into this bill:

First. The manpower situation is too serious in this great Nation of ours today, while we are fighting a war of survival, to allocate to any such proposal as this the services of possibly 40 or 50 able-bodied men, that the doing of this proposed work would in all probability entail.

Second. I believe the House should reserve onto itself the right to say, as it has previously declared in this case, whether or not certain provisions shall be inserted in the House section of the legislative and judiciary bill.

Third. We will need just such jobs as this to give employment immediately following the war.

Personally, I would be willing to vote twice the amount if necessary to do a good job at that time rather than to spend $100,000 now at a time we cannot afford to waste manpower in what is definitely stated in the committee amendment here before us as for preliminary work only.

Fourth. Other gentlemen will bring out or have brought out here today the fact that numerous directives which have the force of law are being issued at this time so as to make practically impossible the proper recodification or revision of any titles of the Code.

Fifth. May I call your attention to the language on page 28. It states:

> For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new addition to the United States Code, $100,000.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if it takes $100,000 for the preliminary work in connection with this particular code, how are we to know how much it is to cost for the actual publication and such?

With all due respect for the gentleman from New York, for whom and his committee I have the utmost respect, I do not feel that this is the time, Mr. Speaker, to embark upon an expenditure for which we are asked to give $100,000 simply for preliminary work.

At a time when we are faced with the prospect of not being able to produce enough food for this Nation of ours and for our soldiers abroad because of the shortage of manpower, I cannot agree to this particular amendment, small as it may appear to some, but representing to me as it does not so much the money involved but the manpower all along the line that it is going to take to do the job at this time. The one big thing today is to win the war. When that is accomplished I shall be glad to aid the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] in his worthy desire to recodify properly the laws of our country.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I was a little bit disappointed in the answers that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] made to me with reference to what they propose to do. He seemed to think that a question of that kind indicated ignorance. Of course, I realize the importance of a recodification of the laws, but I wanted to be sure that the gentleman from New York grasped the situation confronting him. When he finished answering the question with reference to the effect of these Executive orders and that sort of thing upon the statutes and what the statutes were, I have grave doubt as to whether he grasped what the situation was that is confronting him. I came here with an open mind, but his answers to me greatly disturb me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree entirely with the gentleman from New York that we cannot recodify these laws at this time, when almost every day there comes out a directive or an order from the executive department that has in itself the force of law.

Mr. TABER. All of those must be codified along with the laws in order to arrive at what the laws are.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from New York is entirely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we have gotten into considerable confusion and misstatements of the facts, though it has been done inadvertently In the matter of economy, we have been penny wise and pound foolish. More time is being taken up by 531 Members of Congress trying to find out what the law is and what it was they have passed; trying to find out where the law and the numerous amendments are and what they mean. One hundred times more time is wasted in looking up the law in the various volumes and books than ever will be taken by those who will codify the Judicial Code and the Criminal Code. This codification is not only for the protection of the Members of Congress, or for their

convenience; it is for the protection and convenience of the American people. The American people have a right to know what the law is and where to find it.

The idea of always trying to hide behind, but not in the uniform, does not count here today, because, after all, the soldiers out there in the field are as much entitled to know what the law is and they are just as much interested in having it codified. We keep on passing laws, but neither we nor anyone else knows where to find them. We pass law upon law amending and modifying existing laws without end and no one knows what the law is unless he devotes months and even years to clear up the amendments. Surely under these conditions no person on this floor should object to codification. It is said that there is a great deal of confusion about the edicts and Executive orders. The Executive orders are not a part of the law. The law gives the Executive the right to make orders, but the orders must be made under the law, and if the law is codified, then you know where the Executive order comes from, how it fits into the law, and until you know that, you do not know what the law is or whether the Executive order is in keeping with the law. You do not know whether the edict or the Executive order is legal unless you know the law that authorizes it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just until I read an extract from a statement by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, at one time chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. It is to be found in the preface to the Code of Laws of the United States, under date of June 30, 1926, signed by Roy G. Fitzgerald, chairman, and reads as follows:

> This Code is the official restatement in convenient form of the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, now scattered in 25 volumes—i. e., the Revised Statutes of 1878 and volumes 20 to 43, inclusive, of the Statutes at Large. No new law is enacted and no law repealed. It is prima facie the law. It is presumed to be the law. The presumption is rebuttable by production of prior unrepealed acts of Congress at variance with the Code.

That is an effective answer to the matter of the Executive orders.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Here we have a situation where we have the responsibility of codifying the laws of the country, the laws that we have and are making, and if my memory serves me correctly, my friend from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] says that we ought to be out there fighting the country's battles with our soldiers. I would like to know what the codification of the Judicial and Criminal Codes has to do with our boys and how it can possibly interfere with the war efforts. If that were so, then let us all adjourn and go over there, and let someone else codify the laws that we have made so that when we and the boys return we will find the job done and the laws codified once and for all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from North Dakota is one of the distinguished jurists in the House and I ask him the question whether anybody inside or outside of Congress can say what the law is.

Mr. LEMKE. You cannot say what it is unless it is codified. It is the only way to know whether an Executive order or edict is in keeping with the fundamental law as passed, and that is what this committee is trying to do, not only for you today, but for tomorrow and for the years that are to follow. Unless you do this we are wasting our time, and yet you say the work of our committee shall not be recognized.

There is no other committee in this House that has asked for less money than the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, of which I happen to be a member, and of which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] is the chairman, and I know of no other chairman who has worked so diligently and so hard to accomplish a real result.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman knows that the purpose under this is to completely codify two statutes, 18 and 28, and not to go into a general preliminary survey that would require a lot of money to get results from. In other words, when we get done we will have a complete unity as far as two branches of the law are concerned, and not just a lot of preliminary matters.

Mr. LEMKE. I am very glad that the gentleman called my attention to that. I assure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that he is mistaken. This is not a preliminary work, this is permanent, complete codification of two codes, the Judicial and the Criminal Codes, and when we get through with these two codes, we will come back here and ask for more money to go ahead and complete the codification of the entire laws of this Nation and get them codified and arranged so that you and I know what they are, and where they are, and that is the whole question here.

I say again, let us forget personal peeves, let us forget that this appropriation was put in by the Senate after we had defeated it here in the House, first carrying it on a voice vote, then carrying it by a standing vote, and finally on a roll call where there were only 184 Members voted against it and 177 for it. It was never defeated by a majority vote of all the Members of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 85, noes 43.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 122, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—234

Anderson, Calif.	Hays	Outland
Anderson, N. Mex.	Heffernan	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Heidinger	Patton
Bell	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mo.	Hinshaw	Pfeifer
Bishop	Hobbs	Pittenger
Blackney	Hoch	Plumley
Bland	Holifield	Poage
Bloom	Horan	Pracht
Bolton	Howell	Price
Boykin	Hull	Priest
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	Rankin
Bryson	Jeffrey	Reed, Ill.
Buffett	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Jensen	Richards
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson
Burdick	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Judd	Robsion, Ky.
Camp	Kee	Rodgers, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Keefe	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Kelley	Rohrbough
Chiperfield	Kennedy	Rolph
Church	Keogh	Rowan
Coffee	Kerr	Sabath
Cole, Mo.	Kilday	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Kirwan	Sasscer
Cooley	Kleberg	Sauthoff
Cooper	Klein	Scanlon
Cox	Kunkel	Schiffler
Cravens	LaFollette	Schuetz
Crosser	Lane	Scott
Cullen	Lanham	Shafer
Curtis	Larcade	Sheppard
D'Alesandro	Lea	Sikes
Davis	Lemke	Slaughter
Dawson	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Day	Lewis, Ohio	Smith, Va.
Dewey	Luce	Smith, W. Va.
Dilweg	Ludlow	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	McCord	Snyder
Disney	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Dondero	McGehee	Sparkman
Doughton	McGranery	Spence
Drewry	McKenzie	Stanley
Eaton	McMurray	Stevenson
Elliott	McWilliams	Stewart
Ellison, Md.	Madden	Sullivan
Feighan	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Fellows	Maloney	Talbot
Fenton	Manasco	Talle
Fernandez	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Tibbott
Folger	Mason	Towe
Forand	May	Troutman
Fulbright	Merritt	Vincent, Ky.
Gale	Michener	Voorhis, Calif.
Gallagher	Miller, Conn.	Vursell
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	Wadsworth
Gearhart	Miller, Pa.	Walter
Gibson	Mills	Ward
Gillette	Monkiewicz	Wasielewski
Gordon	Morrison, La.	Weaver
Gorski	Mott	Weiss
Gossett	Murdock	Welch
Graham	Murphy	Wene
Granger	Murray, Tenn.	West
Gregory	Myers	Whelchel, Ga.
Hale	Norton	White
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitten
Hancock	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Harless, Ariz.	O'Connor	Winter
Harris, Ark.	O'Konski	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harris, Va.	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Hart		Wright
		Zimmerman

NAYS—122

Abernethy	Andersen, H. Carl	Andresen, August H.
Allen, La.		

Angell	Gilchrist	Merrow
Arends	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Arnold	Gore	Mruk
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Grant, Ind.	Norman
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Norrell
Beckworth	Gwynne	Pace
Bender	Hagen	Phillips
Bonner	Hall,	Ploeser
Brooks	Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Ramspeck
Burch, Va.	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Burgin	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Busbey	Hoeven	Rizley
Butler	Hoffman	Rockwell
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Holmes, Wash.	Russell
Carter	Hope	Schwabe
Case	Jennings	Short
Chapman	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Anton J.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Johnson,	Springer
Clevenger	Calvin D.	Stearns, N. H.
Colmer	Johnson, Ind.	Stefan
Compton	Johnson,	Stockman
Crawford	J. Leroy	Sumner, Ill.
Creal	Johnson, Ward	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Jones	Taber
Dirksen	Jonkman	Tarver
Domengeaux	Kean	Taylor
Durham	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
Dworshak	Knutson	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	Lambertson	Weichel, Ohio
Elmer	Landis	Whittington
Elston, Ohio	LeCompte	Wigglesworth
Engel	McCowen	Willey
Fisher	McGregor	Wilson
Fulmer	McLean	Winstead
Gathings	McMillan	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Maas	Worley
Gifford	Martin, Mass.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Neal

NOT VOTING—74

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Fay	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fish	Newsome
Barden	Fitzpatrick	Nichols
Barry	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Furlong	O'Hara
Beall	Gamble	O'Leary
Boren	Gavagan	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Powers
Brehm	Green	Ramey
Buckley	Gross	Randolph
Cannon, Fla.	Halleck	Rivers
Capozzoli	Hare	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Hartley	Sheridan
Cochran	Hébert	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	Jarman	Starnes, Ala.
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Steagall
Culkin	Kearney	Tolan
Curley	Kilburn	Treadway
Delaney	King	Van Zandt
Dickstein	LeFevre	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Lynch	Wheat
Ditter	Magnuson	Wolcott
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton, N. J.
Eberharter	Monroney	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Powers.
Mr. King with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JONES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 65, line 1, insert: "SEC. 204. Terms of court at Greenwood, S. C.: Section 105 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'at Greenwood the first Mondays in February and November' in the third paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'at Greenwood the second Mondays in May and December.'"

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on this amendment, it is purely a matter of local interest to the people of South Carolina and that part of South Carolina, and I believe it does not merit very much discussion. Therefore I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Page 65, line 7, strike out "204" and insert "205."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a correction. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes on the conference report will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2714), making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5; insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 60 and 61, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, has the gentleman discussed this with the ranking minority member?

Mr. TABER. I shall not object at this time to the bill going to conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which one of these is the Rural Electrification matter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That does not come in this bill. This is the urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report an original privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 237, Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 53,000 additional copies of House Document No. 237, Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to Public Law No. 68, "An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes," approved June 9, 1943, of which 45,000 shall be for the use of the House Document Room, 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate Document Room, 2,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANADA, EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2481), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 53, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 101, 102, 108, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 23, 24, 50, 54, 68, 77, 89, 90, 95, 96, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 115; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert the following "$1,498,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,898,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $9,100 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$658,843"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,127,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,481,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,826,649"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$149,595"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,787,376"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$282,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$223,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,767,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$257,128"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$822,629"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$472,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$169,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$416,131"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,978,537"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$940,280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,531,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

"To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $496,011) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $101,357; in all, not to exceed $746,168, of which not to exceed $44,110 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery

stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further,* That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,678,065"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 147, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further,* That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further,* That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,675,136"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,069,391"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum of $1,278,649 where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$177,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$364,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

CORRECTION OF TOTALS, ALLOCATIONS, ETC.

The following amendments are in adjustment of totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.: Nos. 2, 4, 6, 9, 16, 17, 24, 40, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 76, 77, 83, 96, 104, and 105.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,498,184, instead of $1,473,184 as proposed by the House and $1,528,184 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $1,679,105 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,704,105 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 5, administrative expenses: Appropriates $439,257 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $488,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, regional and State field offices: Restores the language of the House, stricken out by the Senate, prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, with an amendment permitting the use of not to exceed $9,100 for maintenance of the radio office at San Francisco.

Amendment No. 8, Yearbook of Agriculture: Appropriates $178,000, as proposed by both the House and the Senate, but retains the House language. The amount appropriated is the amount estimated to cover the cost of binding in cloth and to provide a quota of 400 copies for each member of the House and 550 copies for each Member of the Senate.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 11, Puerto Rico: Appropriates $140,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13, Administration and coordination of extension work: Appropriates $658,843, instead of $638,843 as proposed by the House and $688,843 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 15, Economic investigations: Appropriates $2,127,236, instead of $2,077,236 as proposed by the House and $2,177,236 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 23, Insular experiment stations: Appropriates $83,292 as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 27, cereal crops and diseases: Appropriates $547,070 as proposed by the House, instead of $575,860 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28, cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: Appropriates $422,940 as proposed by the House, instead of $445,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29, drug and related plants: Appropriates $62,250 as proposed by the House, instead of $65,530 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30, forage crops and diseases: Appropriates $292,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $357,370 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31, forest pathology: Appropriates $239,100 as proposed by the House, instead of $256,945 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Appropriates $1,361,828 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,428,249 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33, irrigation agriculture: Appropriates $134,900 as proposed by the House, instead of $142,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: Appropriates $286,160 as proposed by the House instead of $301,223 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35, Plant Industry Experiment Farm: Appropriates $48,550 as proposed by the House, instead of $51,109 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, soil and fertilizer investigations: Appropriates $320,130 as proposed by the House, instead of $336,976 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37, soil survey: Appropriates $149,595, instead of $49,595 as proposed by the House and $205,430 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38, sugar plant investigations: Appropriates $350,340 as proposed by the House, instead of $368,780 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39, tobacco investigations: Appropriates $120,520 as proposed by the House, instead of $126,860 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 41, fruit insects: Appropriates $399,130 as proposed by the House, instead of $404,130 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, gypsy and brown-tail moth control: Appropriates $350,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $363,060 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44, Dutch elm disease eradication: Restores House language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the enactment of laws by the States in which the appropriation is to be expended, requiring owners of property to remove diseased trees without expense to the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 45, forest insects: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $199,680 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 46, truck crop and garden insects: Appropriates $282,340, instead of

$232,340 as proposed by the House and $323,520 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47, cereal and forage insects: Appropriates $350,170, instead of $330,170 as proposed by the House and $380,170 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction under the Senate figure will eliminate the proposed increase of $30,000 for work on the European corn borer.

Amendment No. 48, barberry eradication: Appropriates $223,250, instead of $173,250 as proposed by the House and $423,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49, cotton insects: Appropriates $140,730 as proposed by the House, instead of $148,139 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50, pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: Appropriates $637,460 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House. The appropriation agreed upon restores the House cut below the Budget $57,460 and also provides the supplemental Budget estimate of $180,000.

Amendment No. 51, insects affecting man and animals: Appropriates $165,940, instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52, insect-pest survey and identification: Appropriates $130,000, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House and $140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53, foreign parasites: Appropriates $19,740 as proposed by the House, instead of $20,775 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54, control investigations: Appropriates $66,585 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55, insecticides and fungicide investigations: Appropriates $113,820, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $119,815 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58, agricultural engineering investigations: Appropriates $257,128, instead of $217,128 as proposed by the House and $297,504 as proposed by the Senate. The entire amount of the increase over the House figure is to be applied to farm structures as related to potatoes and other war crops.

BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 62, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $416,131, instead of $366,131 as proposed by the House and $508,781 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $50,000 above the House figure is toward the supplemental Budget estimate of $250,000 and provides in full for the project of $42,650 for development of equipment and methods for home food preservation under wartime conditions. The remainder of the increase is allocable to other projects under the supplemental estimate, within the discretion of the Department.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $1,900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,946,342 as proposed by the Senate.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 67, national forest protection and management: Appropriates $14,978,537, instead of $12,826,826 as proposed by the House and $15,393,537 as proposed by the Senate. This provides an increase of $2,151,711 for emergency forest fire control, and disallows the Senate increase of $415,000 for forest plantation care.

Amendment No. 68, farm and other private forestry cooperation: Strikes out this item, as proposed by the Senate, which is re-inserted elsewhere in the bill under Senate amendment No. 82 (which see).

Amendment No. 69 forest management: Appropriates $400,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $542,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70, range investigations: Appropriates $250,000, instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $267,200 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $100,000 over the House figure is for the additional work in Louisiana and the continuance of work in the Southeast, proposed under the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 71, forest products: Appropriates $940,280, instead of $800,000 as proposed by the House and $989,765 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72, forest products: Eliminates the language, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the use of $30,000 of the appropriation for the purchase of land adjacent to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 73, forest survey: Appropriates $140,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $199,363 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74, forest economics: Appropriates $75,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $118,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75, forest influences: Appropriates $75,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $132,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82, farm and other private forestry cooperation: Appropriates $746,168, instead of $646,168 as proposed by the House and $808,110 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 85, sale of Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at not less than parity prices: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the House language unqualifiedly prohibiting the sale of Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price and substitutes therefor the Senate language with certain amendments prohibiting, with various and sundry exceptions, the sale of such commodities below parity or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941. (See this item in the body of the report, ante.)

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 89, limitation to $500 of payments to any one person or corporation: Accepts the Senate action in striking this limitation from the bill.

Amendment No. 90, limitation of administrative expenses to 50 per centum of the amount so expended under the Act for 1943: Accepts the Senate action in striking this provision from the bill.

Amendment No. 91, prohibition against State or county information employees: Restores this provision, stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to permit the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates $170,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $193,623,000 as proposed by the House.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 101, general administrative expenses: Appropriates $401,315 as proposed by the House, instead of $451,315 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102, soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: Appropriates $1,071,573 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,196,573 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103, soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates $19,130,000, instead of $17,130,000 as proposed by the House and $20,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMI-ARID AREAS

Amendment No. 106: Retains the item, inserted by the Senate, amended to appropriate $1,000,000, instead of $1,278,649 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION

Amendment No. 108: Strikes out the item, inserted by the Senate, appropriating $150,000 for the Consumers' Counsel Division.

MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 109, market news service: Appropriates $1,084,570 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,141,655 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110, market inspection of farm products: Appropriates $474,137 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,430 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111, marketing farm products: Appropriates $388,250 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $363,250 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 112, 113, and 114, Standard Container Acts: Authorizes the carrying out of the Standard Container Acts, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $10,000 therefor, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115, Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts: Appropriates $1,042,428 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $992,428 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117, Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates $364,070, instead of $350,000 as proposed by the House and $378,140 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 119, Commodity Exchange Act: Appropriates $300,000, instead of $225,000 as proposed by the House and $325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference failed to reach any agreement as to the following amendments:

Totals, Allocations, Corrections of Text, Etc.

The following amendments relate to totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc: Nos. 12, 14, 19, 22, 25, 79, 80, 120, 121, 123, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 10: The House appropriated $300,000 to carry out the Act of April 24, 1939. The Senate struck out the House language and appropriated $555,000 for additional cooperative extension work for allotment to the States and Territories within the discretion of the Secretary. The purpose of the appropriation is to prevent the loss to any State of funds on account of census changes. The conferees agreed upon the Senate language, but it is brought back in disagreement because it contravenes legislative authority. It is the purpose of the managers on the part of the House to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. In agreeing upon this action the conferees of both bodies agreed that they would not hereafter support this item unless substantive legislation has been enacted authorizing it, and are suggesting to the legislative committees of the respective bodies having jurisdiction of the subject matter that they report suitable legislation to the two Houses for the purpose of ascertaining the will of the Congress respecting the continuance of this appropriation.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 18, salary of Chief of Bureau: Authorizes the salary of the Chief of the Bureau at $10,000 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 20, salary of Administrator: Authorizes the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 21, Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates $2,463,708, instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House, and

authorizes the use of $63,708 of the amount for allotment during the fiscal year 1944, the same as in 1943, to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population. The House managers will move to recede and concur. The conferees agreed that they would not recommend this item another year, unless it has been authorized by law, and the same suggestion is made to the appropriate legislative committees as in the case of amendment No. 10, under the Extension Service.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 26, diseases of animals: Authorizes the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Md. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 78 and 81, forest fire cooperation: Appropriates $6,300,000, instead of $2,492,210 as proposed by the House, and authorizes the use of $2,300,000 without matching by States or private owners for preventing and suppressing fires on critical areas of national importance. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates $25,000,000 for the War Food Administration and authorizes the payment of the salary of the Administrator at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment making the provisions of law relating to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, under which salaries not in excess of $10,000 may be paid, applicable to appointments under the War Food Administration.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates $400,000,000, instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87: Strikes out the House language limiting the appropriation to payments "for compliances with soil-building practices and water conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended" and inserts language making the appropriation available "for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended", etc.

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes the House provision prohibiting incentive payments.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building.

Amendment No. 93, purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, etc.: Inserts the provision heretofore carried in the bill and stricken out in the House on a point of order, authorizing the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, etc., for advancement to farmers to enable them to comply with the program. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 94, payments to tenants and sharecroppers on Government-owned lands: Authorizes payments to tenants and sharecroppers on Government-owned lands who comply with the program. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 97, parity payments for crop years 1943 and 1944: Inserts a provision authorizing the Secretary to make commitments for parity payments on the 1943 and 1944 crops.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Amendments Nos. 98 and 99, Federal crop insurance: Appropriates $7,818,748, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House language providing for liquidation of the corporation.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 100: Inserts language, stricken out in the House on a point of order, enabling the Soil Conservation Service to place its warehousing facilities at the disposal of other Federal agencies in the field. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 107, exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities: House managers will move to accept the language of the Senate, amended by striking out the word "expansion" and adding at the end of said language the following: "but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration." This amendment authorizes the use of $50,000,000 of the so-called "30 percent fund" for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. The House and Senate conferees are in agreement with respect to this authorization that (1) they will not favor the renewal of this authorization next year unless the same is specifically authorized by substantive legislation; (2) under the proposed language, the Department is to have administrative discretion respecting the expenditure of the school milk and lunch fund, including the allocation of said fund to the several cities or communities in which the same is to be expended; and (3) the use of the fund to enable the distribution of milk to relief clients other than school children in connection with the school milk and lunch program, at less than market prices, as shown by the House hearings to be currently in effect in New York City and certain other cities, is to be discontinued.

MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 116, United States Warehouse Act: Appropriates $464,115, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 118, Packers and Stockyards Act: Inserts language, stricken out in the House on a point of order, authorizing the bonding of market agencies and dealers. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 122, loans: Appropriates $30,000,000, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 124, examination of Federal land banks and joint stock land banks: Authorizes such examinations once per annum instead of twice yearly and provides for the assessment in advance of banks so examined to cover the cost thereof. This provision was stricken out in the House on a point of order. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

FARM TENANCY

Amendments Nos. 125 and 127, farm tenancy: Strikes out the House provision appropriating $500,000 for administrative expenses and inserts it on a subsequent page (see amendment No. 127) with an appropriation of $1,326,070, together with an authorization of $30,000,000 for loans out of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 126: Inserts new language appropriating $29,607,573 for administrative expenses and authorizing loans from Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds in the amount of $97,500,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the House, prohibiting loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 134: Inserts language providing that on farms on which the substantial portion of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or insect infestation, cotton may be planted, produced, and marketed without regard to present marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and without causing the producer to be subject to deductions or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted 134 amendments to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill as it passed the House. As you will observe from the conference report, the Senate has receded on 33 of those amendments. The House has receded on 18, and in connection with a large number of other amendments where the House, if it adopts the report of the conferees, will recede with amendments, the Senate has made substantial concessions to the viewpoint of the House.

There are a number of very important amendments that are still in disagreement. However, not so considerable a number as we at one time anticipated might be true. They aggregate some four or five or possibly six amendments. I do not intend to discuss all of the items included in the conference report, but I do wish to make particular reference to some three or four of the outstanding matters in which I conceive the House is especially interested, and I shall then undertake to answer as best I can any questions that Members may desire to address to me.

With regard to the appropriations provided by the Senate version of the bill for forest-fire protection, both on national forest domains and in the cooperative fire-protection work and on critical areas where the emergent need for such protection may develop, the House conferees have agreed to the Senate position insofar as we could. What I mean by that is, insofar as the appropriations for forest protection and management is concerned, where the amount provided by the Senate was authorized by law, we have included the amount requested by the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. In just a moment I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

In connection with forest fire cooperative work, where the limitation of the authorization is $2,500,000, and where the proposed Senate amendment of $2,300,000 for use in critical areas is not authorized by law and where the Senate

has exceeded for the cooperative fire protective work the amount of the authorization by $1,500,000, the subject matter could not be included in the conference report, but the House conferees will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. During the consideration of the appropriation bill for the War Department Saturday afternoon we were assured that the conferees were agreeing to place in the agricultural bill the same amounts, as I understand it, that we were asked to deduct from the War Department appropriation bill at that time.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the Chairman of the full Committee, and myself gave that assurance to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the subcommittee, and the $2,760,000 carried in the War Department bill would have been duplicated in this bill unless what was in the War Department bill might have been removed therefrom by an amendment, and that, as I understand it, was satisfactory to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. CASE. That was done. The purpose of my inquiry was to determine whether the same amount was included in this bill.

Mr. TARVER. That is the information we had. The clerk of the full committee made an investigation of the subject matter and gave us that information. Of course, it is not the desire of the Congress to make the same appropriation twice, once in the agricultural bill and once in the other bill.

Mr. CASE. The reason I ask the question is that on page 12 of the conference report, as I read the first amendment, No. 67, under "Forest Service," it states:

> This provides an increase of $2,151,711 for emergency forest fire control.

As I recall the amount the reduction determined upon was about that sum.

Mr. TARVER. $2,760,000, but the gentleman will recall that $2,300,000 is included in a later portion of the bill for use in critical areas.

Mr. CASE. That is all right; I wanted to have a record of it.

Mr. TARVER. I shall direct particular attention to the action taken by the conferees in connection with amendment No. 85, relating to the use of administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the disposition of Government-owned or Government-controlled agricultural products at less than parity prices. That is a subject matter upon which we have considerable debate and disagreement with the Senate in prior years. We have agreed with the Senate conferees, subject, of course, to the approval of the House, upon the modifying language which you will find set out in the report of the managers on the part of the House. That language is more restricted in the exceptions to the general rule than was the language carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. This language will permit exceptions in cases of five different types:

First, agricultural commodities which have deteriorated; second, grains sold for the purpose of feed; third, grain sold to the farmers for seeding purposes; fourth, any agricultural commodities which are used for experimental purposes in new or byproduct uses; and fifth, the sales which are permitted of peanuts at less than the peanut parity price for use in the manufacture of oil.

The language of the Senate defining the initial inhibitions against the use of Commodity Credit Corporation administrative funds for the purpose of sales of agricultural commodities at less than parity, before exceptions were stated, has been agreed to rather than the language carried in the House bill, but that portion of the Senate amendment, in the judgment of the House conferees, does not differ materially from the language the House provided.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. As I read this language it would appear that there is nothing in this that in any way conflicts with the present legislation governing the sale of wheat for feed. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TARVER. That, I think, is correct. However, I call the gentleman's attention to the concluding language of the provision, which reads:

> *Provided further,* That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further,* That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat, the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn.

Mr. HOPE. That language is substantially the same language.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. That language is substantially the same language which is included in the last two pieces of legislation providing for the sale of wheat?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I think that is true.

As I said awhile ago, I think with the exceptions provided in the amendment as reported in the conference report, the language will be more restricted from the standpoint of the sale of agricultural commodities by the C. C. C. than was the language included in the bill for the present fiscal year.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. This would be true, however, that this places no limitation on the amount that might be sold for feed and it would not be necessary hereafter for the Commodity Credit Corporation to secure any additional legislation.

Mr. TARVER. Provided the amount sold for feed complies with the restriction with reference to the price at which it should be sold: Wheat at not less than corn parity and corn, of course, at not less than corn parity.

Mr. PACE. But with no limitation on the amount itself.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly. There are a great many items in the report to which it is probably unnecessary to refer, but there are three errata in the statement of the managers on the part of the House that I think it desirable to call attention to for the purpose of having the record speak the truth.

Amendment No. 23: Insular experiment stations. The statement is made in the statement of the managers on the part of the House that it appropriates $83,292 as proposed by the House instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate. It will be observed that in the conference report it is stated that the House receded from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 23 and, of course, the report controls. The statement in the statement of the managers to the effect that the Senate receded is an incorrect statement and the total amount appropriated, if the conference report is agreed to, will be $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

In connection with amendment No. 70, range investigations, I quote the language from the report of the managers which is also in one particular incorrect—

> Appropriates $250,000 instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $267,200 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $100,000 over the House figure is for the additional work in Louisiana and the continuation of work in the Southeast proposed under the Senate amendment.

The statement is incorrect in that it states that the entire increase of $100,000 is for the two purposes named. As a matter of fact, $12,500 is for the work in Louisiana, and $20,450 is for the work in the Southeast; and not all of the $100,000 was intended for those two activities. I wish to make one other correction in the report of the managers.

I call your attention to amendment No. 128 relative to a limitation applicable to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. It is stated that the House managers will move to recede and concur. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment and will not submit the motion which it is stated in the report of the managers as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be submitted.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I care to say unless Members desire to ask questions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This question of funds for rural electrification will come up in a separate amendment, will it?

Mr. TARVER. That amendment is in disagreement and it is not included in the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I did not understand the statement with reference to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. I stated that the statement in the statement of the managers

as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that the managers would move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment is incorrect. The managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will be discussed at a later time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we have made as much progress in so short a space of time as we have, comparable to the difficulties we had with this bill last year. Members may recall that it was 9 days after the end of the fiscal year before we finally completed action on the agricultural appropriation bill.

We have had three sessions with the Senate. They have been in a reasonably agreeable mood, and the House went there also in the same kind of felicitous frame of mind; so we have made considerable progress in discussing most of the 134 amendments.

I may say with relation to farm security, about which there has been considerable question, that at a proper place in the proceedings the chairman of the subcommittee will offer an amendment dealing with farm security and farm tenancy which represents a compromise which I think will be agreeable to the House and which I believe will finally find acceptance with the Senate.

I wish to take just a moment to pay tribute to the clerk of this subcommittee, Arthur Orr. When we finished our conference yesterday afternoon at 4:15, it then became his responsibility to get busy and prepare this conference report and the statement of the managers. He labored incessantly, and I think he left this Capitol this morning at 2:30. It is a tremendous strain upon the clerks of the Appropriations Committee as we come into these final days of the fiscal year, and so here and now I want to pay testimony to the diligence, to the fealty, and to the faithfulness of the clerk of this committee and the clerk of the other committees. I ask you all to join with me in giving Arthur Orr a great big resounding hand of applause.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time than necessary to say that I think this whole House ought to appreciate not only the work of the clerk of the committee, who has been faithful, arduous, and indefatigable, but also the very fine and excellent generalship of our genial chairman of the subcommittee, a great parliamentary strategist, who has succeeded in bringing to the House at this time out of chaos, a bill so well drawn as it is to meet and to satisfy all of the pressure which has been brought to bear on us from so many sides, to which we have acceded, admittedly, to some extent, resented and resisted as vigorously on the other, in order to compromise and to try to bring you a good bill, as we have done. We have worked as a nonpartisan group. It is probably too much to ask you to do the same or as much or as well.

We have tried to save money for the people and to make money for them. It will be easy to go the way of subsidies, but you want to remember we have repudiated that principle. The people pay the bills. Subsidies are indefensible sops.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 13, line 18, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $555,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, and 21 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 15, line 5, strike out "$13,903,950" and insert "$14,238,950."

Amendment No. 14: Page 15, line 24, strike out "$14,542,793" and insert "$14,927,793."

Amendment No. 21: Page 23, line 2, strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,463,708."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, and 21.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments have to do with a subject matter upon which the House has apparently fixed its policy during prior years.

Amendment numbered 10 relates to an appropriation of $555,000 for the Extension Service to prevent certain States from losing any of the funds that they otherwise would have received on account of shifts in farm population.

Amendment numbered 21 relates to the same subject matter, affecting the appropriation for the Office of Experimental Stations. There is in the last-mentioned amendment the sum of $63,708.

Our subcommittee during prior years has indicated that in its opinion these appropriations which are not authorized by law should not be made and we have on some two or three occasions undertaken to resist agreeing to the Senate amendments; but the House has always finally agreed to the Senate amendments including these amounts in the agricultural appropriation bill, so your conferees have felt that this procedure is in accordance with the will of the House and that we as servants of the House should submit the motion to recede and concur in those amendments.

Amendments numbered 12 and 14 have reference to totals only affected by the action taken on the other two items. You will note, however, in the conference report, and I trust that this will meet with the approval of the House, that we have indicated our desire that if these appropriations which are extra legal are to be continued, the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate should report for the consideration of their respective bodies legislation which will authorize them and that the conferees feel that these appropriations ought not to be made next year unless prior to next year the Congress shall have passed legislation making them in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are in the very unhappy position of operating under a law providing that these funds be apportioned for extension and experimental work; then we come along and torpedo and ignore absolutely our own legislation. That is not the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture and something ought to be done before we go to work on the 1945 appropriation bill some time after the turn of the year.

Mr. TARVER. I am in absolute accord with what the gentleman says.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to be generally agreed and conceded that the gentleman's committee should not come here with legislation next year unless he has statutory authority to do so. Year after year your committee has been coming before the Rules Committee and asking for a special rule to waive all rules of the House in order that you might violate the rules of the House. Year after year the same suggestion has been made.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I have heard that speech many times. May I say that the gentleman without objection on his part, so far as I am advised, participated in the action of the Rules Committee in reporting a rule on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill which made in order $200,000,000 worth of appropriations not authorized by law, that your committee has reported to the House rules for the consideration of numerous other appropriation bills including provisions which were not authorized by law and, so far as I know, you have not refused a rule for the consideration of any appropriation bill except the Agricultural appropriation bill when that rule was requested.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is the worst offender.

Mr. TARVER. I do not care to hear the usual speech made by the gentleman in extenuation of his indefensible actions.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Clerk that certain changes will have to be made in the amounts of the two amendments affecting the totals in 12 and 14. So I ask unanimous consent to withdraw those two amendments from the request that I have made

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman wants to make one of his witty speeches——

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question in order that the House may, if it sees fit, agree to amendments numbered 10 and 21 and reject amendments numbered 12 and 14 which are incorrect. I ask that the House take that action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendments numbered 10 and 21 and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer substitute motions with regard to amendments numbered 12 and 14 which are on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be privileged to withdraw his motion.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion which was formerly made with reference to amendments 12 and 14 and submit other amendments stating the correct amounts of the totals, which are on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MICHENER. I object to that, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman asked to withdraw a motion, and he can do that only by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that in the House a motion may be withdrawn as a matter of right.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagrement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,198,950."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,857,793."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: On page 18, line 11, after the comma, insert "including the salary of the Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: On page 19, line 19, stike out "$24,282,186" and insert "$24,798,443."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$24,623,443: *Provided*, That the appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *Provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is a provision such as we have included in the last several supply bills passed, in order to take care of the situation if the final enactment should not be completed before July 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: On page 19, line 24, after "Administrator" insert "including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: On page 23, line 10, strike out "$6,937,500" and insert $7,001,208."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 24, line 15, strike out "$7,176,802" and insert "$7,257,218."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, that is a total. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: On page 26, line 13, after the comma insert "including the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Maryland."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 78: On page 61, line 22, strike out "$2,492,210" and insert "$6,300,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter to which I referred in undertaking to present the conference report to the House. It is the increase in the amount made available for forest-fire cooperation, and also in connection with the appropriation of $2,300,000 not carried in the House bill for forest-fire protection in critical areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: On page 61, line 23, strike out "$72,418" and insert "$87,418".

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 80 and 81 be also read and considered together with amendment No. 79, as they all relate to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the other amendments mentioned.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 80: On page 61, line 23, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

Amendment No. 81: On page 62, line 1, after "Columbia" insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize expenditures not to exceed $2,300,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 79, 80, and 81.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 65, line 22, insert:

"WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing, and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedules."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "individuals", where it occurs in said amendment, strike out the language down to and including the word "amended", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 69, line 11, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 86. In doing that I point out that in the presentation of this bill to the House on April 14, I expressed my views regarding the subject matter of this amendment, and the amount of money which ought to be made available to carry out the obligations of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for certain types of benefits, according to an announcement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on December 5, 1942. I have offered this motion, therefore, because it represents the viewpoint of the members of the subcommittee, other than myself. I shall now be glad to yield time both for and against the motion which I have made, to gentlemen who desire recognition for that purpose.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina offers a preferential motion that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 86.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, in the words of the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, that we have often heard on this floor: "Men, this is an important matter, and I want you to hear me." Prior to this year we had an obligation to the farmers of this country to the amount of $500,000,000, in connection with the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program. For the present year we have a definite obligation to the farmers to the extent of $400,000,000 in connection with soil conservation, tied in with production. I wonder if there is a single Member on the floor of this House who does not realize that at this time the serious problem that confronts this country is the possibility of a tremendous shortage of food products this year. I wonder if there is a single Member on the floor of the House who does not realize that those who oppose my motion at this time in this great emergency are simply adding to the dissatisfaction and confusion under which farmers are trying to operate their farms and that they are defeating proper production. I am speaking now as a farmer at this time. My farm is definitely tied in with the soil-conservation program, which is one of the best programs we have ever had in connection with all of these farm programs. Every tenant farmer working on a share-crop basis is carrying out a definite program entered into last fall in connection with production and soil conservation, which is so necessary and essential at this time to bring about the production that you are going to need, not only to win this war, but to win the peace. My committee and I have been doing everything possible during the past year, 1942, and up to this good hour to get over to the various war agencies, and those in charge of our farm programs, the serious situation confronting agriculture. And now certain Members have gotten into a certain state of mind—that is, they are going to break down every New Deal program by taking advantage of this emergency regardless of merits or contracts with farmers.

As I stated awhile ago, this particular item is for soil conservation and is tied in with production. It has nothing to do with subsidy or incentive payments; it is as stated, tied in under the soil-conservation program, with production of crops that we will need so badly to win this war. I hope that you will support my motion, so that our Government will be able to carry out its contracts with the farmers of this country, who are working long hours to produce the necessary food to win this war.

I want to tell you before this year is ended I would not be at all surprised if you do not have considerable trouble in a great many of the cities and certain sections of the country because of hungry people.

I hope that my motion will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that the conferees have taken off the lid on the $500 limit on these payments again this year. It may be the part of wisdom for us, as Members of Congress, when agricultural products are bringing 50 to 75 percent of parity, like in 1939, to take money out of the United States Treasury to help the farmer over the hill. But in view of the situation that exists today, I just wonder how much wisdom there is to take moneys out of our great grandchildren's inheritances and send out checks of $10,000 to $100,000 to big operators.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield in just a minute. We agreed in this House to limit these payments to $500. If there is anyone who can stand up here and tell me why you want to have these big checks of $10,000, $20,000, $30,000, or even $100,000 paid to insurance companies or big land owners of this country at this time, I would like to know what argument you are going to make when they ask you for a roll-back subsidy to feed the people in the low-income brackets of our country. If we can give out five, ten, or fifteen or seventeen thousand dollars to Campbell out in Montana each year for raising wheat or for not raising it year after year, right during this war, and then say we cannot help pay the grocery bill for someone whose income has been frozen at $9 a month in the form of an old-age pension, I say it is not, in my opinion, a fair and reasonable national policy. It is something that will slap back in the face of the big farmer operators when this war is over.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman feel that Congress should keep faith with the Secretary of Agriculture, the individual official who was authorized to

make these commitments? Does not the gentleman feel that Congress should keep faith with the farmers to whom the commitments have been made?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely want the New Deal to keep its word with everybody, and most assuredly with the farmers and with all other groups. But there is nothing in what I have said that would give them any reason for not keeping faith, because there is nothing in what I have said that indicates we cannot legally and morally restrict these payments to $500. You do not have to pay up to $100,000 in subsidy checks when it is not based either on common sense or common justice. It most assuredly does not make sense during wartime.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] does not prevail and is not adopted, then we are breaking faith with the farmers of America, because we have promised them this $400,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman I was not talking about the total money that goes to the farmers. I am talking about the size of the checks that are being paid to the big operators at this time, 6,400 big operators in Texas obtain $12,000,000 a year, or more than 150,000 farmers in New York State. Does that make sense even in peacetime?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, that is not involved in the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I discussed this matter with the gentleman one other time. How are you going to be fair with the farmer who happens to own quite a lot of land and has 10 or 12 or 15 or 50 renters, and say that he shall not receive more than $500, and he has to tell his tenants that they are out of the program; because the landlord will automatically go out when the payments are limited? Are you going to say to that man that he will not get any money and then say to the man a mile down the road he is going to get up to $499?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is just a matter of philosophy. If the gentleman thinks it is good governmental policy to take money in the form of $1,000 to $100,000 checks out of the United States Treasury at the present time, you can follow that program if you so desire but I do not believe in it. If we subsidize anyone it should be the man that owns, lives on, and operates his own farm.

Mr. ARENDS. Let us pay them all in fairness, or else pay none.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If we are going to do that we will have to change a lot of things, because a large percentage of the farmers of the United States get only $20.

The list of payees is increased by making thousands of $20 payments in order to show that a high percentage of the farmers are in the program. Most of the money goes to the big operators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2869, a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be up for consideration tomorrow. This agency of the Government has made some mistakes and we may not agree with everything it has done, but, as a whole, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation has done a great job for the American people.

I will undertake to give briefly some of the accomplishments of this Corporation from the time it was created up to the present time, and I hope, when the bill is up for final passage, that we all will see the necessity of extending the life of this Corporation which has been so helpful in stabilizing the prices of agricultural products.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation was created in 1933 to deal with the agricultural surpluses and the depressed financial condition of farmers at that time the total cash farm income in the United States was less than $5,500,000,000. The cash income of cotton growers was less than $600,000,000 and of tobacco growers little more than $150,000,000. In contrast with these low figures in 1933, the cash farm income in the United States in 1942 totaled more than $16,000,000,000 and it is expected that the aggregate will be even larger this year. The cash income of cotton growers in 1942 totaled more than $1,500,000,000 and of the tobacco growers nearly $500,000,000.

Now, of course, all of this satisfying increase in income is not entirely the result of the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation. During the last 3 years we have had a war economy, and at such times prices always rise. Nevertheless, the Corporation has contributed importantly to the increase in farm income during the last 10 years, through its loan and purchase operations tending to increase the prices received by farmers and to stabilize farm income. But the Corporation has done considerably more, through the building of granary supplies of commodities which have made possible enormous increases in livestock production during the last few years and—with regard to cotton—made supplies available for the expanded wartime production of military and civilian goods.

A few years ago the critics of the Corporation looked at the huge supplies of feed and fiber and said they would never be marketed in the normal channels of trade. The fact is that today the Corporation is practically out of corn, and its loan and owned stocks of cotton are little more than half what they were in 1939. The Corporation owns today more than 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and holds as collateral for loans an additional 135,000,000 bushels. A few years ago these large stocks of wheat would have been regarded as excessive, but at the rate of our present consumption of wheat for food and feed plus the fact that the 1943 wheat crop has been estimated at only 730,000,000 bushels, it is certain that the granary supplies of wheat will have been reduced sharply by the summer of 1944.

The earliest operations of the Corporation in 1933 dealt with cotton and corn. The average farm price of cotton in 1932 had been about 6½ cents a pound and the average farm price of 1932-crop corn was 32 cents a bushel. Nearly 2,000,000 bales of 1933 cotton went under Government loan and nearly 268,000,000 bushels of corn. These loans were important factors in raising prices of the 1933 crops, cotton in that year averaging farmers better than 10 cents a pound as contrasted with 6½ cents for the 1932 crop; and of corn, better than 52 cents a bushel. Since that time the price of cotton has never fallen below 8½ cents as a season average price and it is now approximately 20 cents a pound or practically at parity, despite a prospective 1943–44 carry-over of approximately ten and one-half million bales. The price of corn since 1933 has never averaged less than 48 cents a bushel and it is now approximately $1.03 a bushel.

The value of the granary created by the Commodity Credit Corporation was proved at the very outset when drought struck the Nation in 1934 and the big quantity of corn which had been put under loan was drawn upon to help make up the deficit in our feed supplies and thus prevent an even greater liquidation of livestock than that which actually occurred. During the last 10 years more than 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn were put under loan, but the loan stocks now total less than 100,000,000 bushels. During the 4 years of good crops from 1938 through 1941 more than 700,000,000 bushels of corn went under loan and were subsequently utilized to expand our livestock production.

Loans have been made on more than 25,000,000 bales of cotton during the last 10 years. But at the moment the loan and owned stocks total less than 7,000,000 bales, most of the remainder having been redeemed by farmers. The most cotton going under loan in any one year totaled 5,600,000 bales in 1937 when the South produced a record crop of nearly 19,000,000 bales. In December 1939, the total of owned and loan stocks was nearly 12,000,000 bales, of which about 7,000,000 bales were owned by the Government. By August 1940, the owned and loan stocks were down to 8,000,000 bales. But when the 1940 crop came in the stocks increased again and by January 1941, the total was a little more than 11,000,000 bales, of which the Government owned about 6,000,000 bales.

The big reduction in cotton stocks for war needs was begun at this point. The Corporation exchanged 600,000 bales of cotton for rubber in a barter deal with Great Britain, and we wish now that the amount could have been much larger. During the fiscal year 1940–41 there was

a reduction of nearly 90,000 bales in the Government stocks as a result of trade exchanges of low grades for high grades. The following year the Government sold more than 1,000,000 bales to the domestic trade under a general sales program authorized by Congress and sales for export totaled more than 400,000 bales in addition. During the last few years more than 50,000 bales of cotton have been sold in connection with the development of new uses for cotton, as well as 25,000 bales in connection with the Government's mattress program. The lend-lease shipments of cotton to date have totaled approximately one and one-half million bales.

During the last 2 years the Corporation has played an active part in the Government's program to increase the production of the higher qualities of cotton especially needed for the production of military goods. The effort has been not only to increase the output of long staple cotton but to improve the quality of cotton grown all over the belt. In its cotton-loan programs the Corporation has offered special inducements toward this end through its premiums on grades and staple lengths. So great has been the utilization of the higher qualities of cotton during the last 2 years, that unless we have an unusually good grade crop in 1943, many mills may have to use lower grades than have been used during the past year. Studies are now under way in connection with the advisability of making changes in specifications of Government purchases of cotton goods, as well as other means of economizing in the use of the scarce qualities of cotton. In view of the limited supply situation with regard to the higher qualities, a program must be worked out looking toward greater use of the shorter staples and lower grades in our lend-lease program.

As it has gained in experience the Corporation has frequently been able to come to the aid of the cotton farmers in ways which were not obvious a decade ago. In April of this year a proposal was made by some elements of the cotton industry to put a ceiling on cotton prices. The difficulty of administering such a ceiling may well be imagined when you consider there are more than 600 different qualities of cotton, which would mean more than 600 different prices.

The Corporation has cooperated with other Government agencies in making possible the use of cotton bagging to supplement the supplies of jute available for covering the 1943 cotton crop. Approximately two and one-half million patterns are being offered for sale by the Corporation at the present time and additional quantities will be available when contracts with manufacturers of cotton bagging are completed. The Corporation is also selling a surplus of first-cut cotton linters which are not needed by the Government for chemical uses.

Commodity Credit Corporation loan and purchase programs have greatly benefited the tobacco growers. Loans to date have been made on approximately 200,000,000 pounds of tobacco and purchases have totaled nearly 700,000,000 pounds. Loans are now outstanding on a little more than 11,000,000 pounds, and the Corporation owns about 286,000,000 pounds of tobacco. Most of the loans and purchases have been made since the outbreak of World War No. 2 in Europe. Shortly after the outbreak of the war British funds were necessarily withdrawn from the tobacco markets. The loss of this business was a great shock not only to our tobacco growers but to all those engaged in the buying, packing, and selling of tobacco for export. To cope with this situation a plan was worked out under which tobacco would be bought by export companies either for the account of or for sales to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the companies to hold an option to repurchase the tobacco at cost plus charges. In this way it has been possible to maintain the British market for American tobacco without loss to our growers.

In 1932 the season average farm price of flue-cured tobacco was less than 12 cents a pound. In 1942 the season average was better than 38 cents a pound. Prices received by farmers for the major noncigar types of tobacco in 1942 were the highest in many years. The price of burley tobacco, averaging 42 cents a pound, was the highest on record, and the price of flue-cured was the highest since 1919. Cash farm income from tobacco in 1942 was more than $483,000,000 as compared with less than half that sum in 1940.

In connection with the production of fats and oils, the Commodity Credit Corporation is playing an important war role. In the South we are especially concerned with the production of peanut and cottonseed oils so vitally needed this year to help make up the deficit in imported fats and oils and to make possible adequate supplies for civilian and military use, as well as export to our allies.

Prior to World War No. 2 the United States had normally imported 15 to 20 percent of its supplies of fats and oils, and exported only small quantities. War reduced the volume of imports and increased the demand for exports, a situation which was further aggravated after Pearl Harbor, since a large part of our imports had previously come from the Pacific. To meet this situation the Department of Agriculture last year urged farmers to increase the domestic production of soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts for oil, and offered in this connection to support the prices of these oil seeds at specified minimum levels. A comparable support price for cottonseed was offered. Farmers planted record acreages of soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts. The volume of peanuts picked and threshed totaled more than 2½ billion pounds as compared with less than 1½ billion in 1941.

The need for vegetable oils is so great that this year the production goal for peanuts has been raised to more than 5,000,000 acres. In order to induce the attainment of this goal the War Food Administration has proclaimed the discontinuance of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and has announced a one-price system under which prices to farmers will be supported at $130 to $140 a ton. The program will be operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation under contracts with handlers, who will purchase, store, and sell farmers' stock peanuts only for the account of the Corporation.

The normal trade channels, including peanut-producing cooperative associations, crushers, and shellers, will be used by the Corporation agents under handlers' contracts. Purchases from producers will be made at uniform prices which shall be not less than $140 per ton for Spanish and Virginia types and $130 per ton for runner type with appropriate differentials for grades. These prices are approximately 17 percent below the ceiling prices for farmers' stock peanuts but about 75 percent above the value of peanuts when sold for crushing for oil and meal.

Peanuts will be sold by the Corporation for cleaning and shelling for edible uses in relation to ceiling prices and for crushing purposes at their product value. On a basis of existing ceiling prices for products, farmers' stock peanuts for crushing are worth $75 to $85 per ton, depending on oil and protein content. Profits received by the Corporation on the sale of peanuts for cleaning and shelling will be applied against the loss on sales of peanuts for crushing and to other costs including inspection, grading, handling, interest, and storage.

Growers of peanuts, in a referendum held April 26, 1941, had approved marketing quotas for peanuts produced in the calendar years 1941, 1942, and 1943. In the proclamation issued last week the War Food Administrator indicated that the termination of marketing quotas is necessary to effectuate the declared policy of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and in order to meet the present national need for increased production of vegetable food and feed products.

During the last 5 years the Corporation has made loans on more than 1,300,000,000 bushels of wheat. The loan stocks now total less than 135,000,000 bushels and the Corporation owns about 330,000,000 bushels which had been relinquished by farmers under the nonrecourse provisions of the loan program. This is the largest quantity of wheat ever owned by the Corporation and it is in addition to nearly 300,000,000 bushels sold by the Corporation for feed and for manufacture into industrial alcohol for the production of war explosives.

The Corporation's feed-wheat program has been especially helpful to the dairy and poultry industries in the deficit feed-producing areas in that it has made possible the continued production of milk and eggs at the high levels needed during this period of war. When the wheat loan program was instituted in 1938 the farmers were averaging only 56 cents a bushel for wheat. The latest price report of the Department of Agriculture shows that in mid-May of this year, the average farm price of wheat was $1.23 a bushel.

Only last summer it appeared as though the United States had a 2 years' supply of wheat, predicated upon an expected disappearance of 800,000,000 bushels a year. The fact is that during the wheat-marketing year now drawing

to a close the disappearance of wheat has exceeded 1,000,000,000, bushels and the carry-over is the equivalent of little more than a 6 months' supply. The winter wheat crop now being harvested has been estimated at only 500,000,000 bushels, and it looks as though the spring wheat crop to be harvested later in the season will total only 229,000,000 bushels in addition. Thus, we will have a total supply of only 1,300,000,000 bushels of wheat during the coming year or only about 250,000,000 bushels more than the prospective disappearance during this period. In view of this situation and the fact that the total supply of feed grains is insufficient to maintain livestock production at its present wartime level, the War Food Administration is increasing the wheat acreage allotments for the crop to be planted this fall.

Prior to the entry of the United States into World War No. 2 the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation dealt mainly with the making of loans on basic farm commodities. A large proportion of these loans were made by local banks with payments guaranteed under the nonrecourse provision of the Commodity Credit Corporation contracts. By taking large quantities of commodities off the market in years of flush production the Corporation made possible not only the maintenance and stabilization of prices at fair levels to producers but made possible the accumulating of supplies which ultimately proved so valuable in our wartime food expansion program. Other features of this program during the last 2 years have included price supports to farmers at levels which encouraged them to increase the production of war crops.

An invaluable activity during the last 2 years has been the financing by the Corporation of purchases of food for lend-lease. This operation has made possible the purchasing of food during seasons of flush production and the stabilizing of prices during these periods of the year. The Corporation purchases to date for lend-lease have totaled approximately $2,000,000,000, of which more than three-fourths have been repaid and the remainder is represented by moneys still owing the Corporation or by inventories of commodities earmarked for future shipment.

Another wartime activity of the Corporation has been its control over the importation of practically all agricultural products coming into the United States. Practically all of these operations have been conducted without loss, except with regard to coffee and sugar, where the Corporation pays a part of the increased transportation costs for the purpose of preserving the ceiling prices of these commodities. The management of agricultural imports by the Corporation has kept at a minimum wartime disruption of trade with our allies and friendly neutrals. It has made possible the continuing of exports from these countries within the limits of available shipping space. It has also provided outlets for commodities formerly exported to the Axis countries.

The Corporation states that the primary purpose of its purchase and resale operations has been to increase the production of food and industrial products vitally needed in these wartimes.

During the last 10 years loans and purchases of all commodities by the Corporation have totaled approximately $6,000,000,000, of which $2,000,000,000 were on account of purchases for lend-lease during the last 2 years. Loans and purchases by the Corporation other than for lend-lease during the last 2 years have totaled about $2,000,000,000 as contrasted with $2,000,000,000 during all of the preceding 8 years.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret the conference committee eliminated the amendment that was placed in this legislation by the House limiting soil-conservation payments to $500 for an individual participating in the farm program. It ought to be understood that these limitations were on soil-conservation payments. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years this Congress has appropriated a half billion dollars each year for soil conservation. About forty or fifty millions of this amount was paid to about half of the farmers. About 80 percent of those who have taken part in the soil-conservation program since it began got less than $100 each. Life insurance companies and other big operators have been paid thousands and thousands of dollars that they really did not need and who should, of course, have been willing to conserve their soil without payments from the Federal Treasury.

Soil-conservation payments were made in the first place for about three purposes: To help the farmer out at a time when prices were extremely low, to help conserve the soil, and for the purpose of cutting down the amount of crops raised. Millions of dollars have been taken from the Federal Treasury to pay farmers for not raising crops. They were advised that by cutting down their acreage and reducing the amount of crops they would be entitled to payments therefor. We operated too long on the theory we could have prosperity on a program of planned scarcity. It seems to me that rather than spend $500,000,000, most of which will go to big operators, it would be much more sensible to release the restrictions, let the farmer plant all the crops he can and pay him a recent price for all of the crops he raises. Mr. Speaker, in 1941, and in other years, we paid about half of the farmers approximately 10 percent of the amount appropriated and paid about $40,000,000 to administer the act. The rest of the money went to the large operators. By striking out the $500 limitation, the sky is the limit as to the amount anyone may receive if he complies with the program. Mr. Speaker, we have a different situation from that which existed a few years ago. We find ourselves today with a food shortage facing us. We curtailed our acreage of corn. Now we have a shortage of corn. There is a shortage of beef and other meat products. Personally, I am concerned with regard to food shortages. Mr. Speaker, farmers in general are not looking for subsidies. What they want is a decent and fair price for their products, such prices being in line with what they are required to pay for the things they need. Farmers do not want to be restricted. They want a free hand and an equal chance with the other fellow. Let me say again, I am in favor of a fair soil-conservation program, reasonably administered but I do not think funds should be appropriated at this time to be used for the restriction of growing crops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 8 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first, let us define the issue. The issue is not the subject matter discussed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. That particular amendment that he alluded to was agreed to in conference and is not before us now. The amendment before us now is the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to increase from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 the amount of available money for soil conservation and domestic allotments.

This should really be reduced to $200,000,000 rather than increased to $400,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at the moment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How can you say that when the sky is the limit?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment and I am opposed to writing another $100,000,000 into this bill because it will violate every action that this very House has heretofore taken. On Friday last this House adopted a proposal in connection with the Office of Price Administration against subsidies. Tomorrow a proposal will come in here in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, section 6 of which was written by the Banking and Currency Committee of this House, with an interdiction and restriction upon subsidies. Are we going now to write $100,000,000 in this bill which is clearly a subsidy? Two hundred million dollars is enough for soil compliance practices. To be accurate about it, $187,000,000 will be enough. The gentleman from South Carolina proposes now to write in $100,000,000 extra in the face of every expression this House has taken on the subject of subsidies. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] raises the question of good faith, but he can examine every document that has come from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration or from the Secretary of Agriculture, and he can examine the text of every radio speech that the Secretary made in which he says that the farmers would receive it contingent upon appropriations that are made by the Congress—he made no promise, he made a sort of conditional intimation that if the money were voted then that program would be carried out. There is more than enough for soil compliance, there is more than enough for soil-build-

ing practices. Why add $100,000,000 when it is not needed?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean to leave the impression with the House that the Secretary of Agriculture has made no commitments with regard to this fund?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean to say that the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture have not made a single commitment that is not conditional upon appropriations by this Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, if I understand the situation, Congress authorized the Secretary to make commitments up to $500,000,000. He has made commitments up to $400,000,000 and, of course, the gentleman is correct in saying that the receipt of the money is conditioned upon the action of this Congress in redeeming the faith of the Government that is involved in these transactions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the gentleman is incorrect. The program itself is conditioned upon an appropriation made by Congress. I suggest that the gentleman read the text of official statements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, either he made commitments or he did not make commitments. If he did not make commitments the gentleman's argument, of course, is sound; but if he made those commitments the gentleman as a Representative ought to redeem the faith of this Government and not break faith with the farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There could be no absolute commitment until Congress provided the money.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not?

Mr. FULMER. That is what I wanted to ask, how the Government could make any commitment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not make that statement; I said they were contingent upon the appropriation of the money. I suppose that on Wednesday the House will take action supporting that which it took last Friday, taking action to adopt section 6 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and once more set its foot down against a subsidy proposal. Are we going to follow that or are we going to be inconsistent here today by writing in another $100,000,000 in this bill for payments other than soil-building practices?

Mr. COOLEY. How is a subsidy involved in this proposition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because it is divorced from soil compliance, and that is the distinction that ought to be made. There is a soil compliance and a soil-building practice which runs to the land, it does not make any difference who owns the farm, if the soil is enriched or is rebuilt, if the payment inures to the enrichment of our natural resource, the soil, which is a very justifiable payment. It does not make any difference whether John Doe, Jim Brown, or Jack Smith owns 160 acres or half a section, if he farms it in accordance with the prescribed procedure that money runs to the soil. It is proposed now to come in for subsidies that are in addition to that and for which this $100,000,000 would be used.

When the matter was first before us the $400,000,000 was to be distributed as follows: About $187,000,000, as I recall, for soil-compliance practices—and nobody quarrels about those. Then, in addition, we were going to make a payment of 11/1000 cent a pound on cotton. That would be an estimated $77,000,000. We were going to make a payment of a little over 3 cents on corn; that would have taken $50,000,000; 9 cents on wheat that would have taken $60,000,000; $1.10 a ton on peanuts that would have taken $791,000; $651,000 for rice; $7,000,000 for tobacco, and $19,500,000 for range land. It had nothing to do with soil building, nothing to do with these practices of enriching the earth. It is a subsidy pure and simple. So this amendment ought to be voted down overwhelmingly, because if it is approved we repudiate what we did on Friday, we repudiate every expression against subsidies that has heretofore been made by this House and we shall find ourselves in a very anomalous position when the Commodity Credit bill comes to the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. How much money will be needed to carry out the commitments which the farmer understood were made at the time he signed up for farm compliance in this program for this year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For soil-compliance payments?

Mr. CASE. For all payments of whatever nature that he understood he was to get, that he signed up for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The $300,000,000 would cover all those soil-conservation practices.

Mr. CASE. Is that what he understood he was going to get?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did not understand he was to get anything, as a matter of fact, until Congress provided the funds and the Department of Agriculture has made that contingency quite clear.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I would like to know what the testimony indicates regarding the commitments which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture from this fund.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that what the law and testimony indicates to my mind is not necessarily the viewpoint of my colleagues on the subcommittee. I took the position when the bill was presented to the House that section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make commitments for these benefits in advance of the year in which they are to be paid up to but not exceeding the amount of $500,000,000. The evidence discloses that the Secretary, on December 5, 1942, announced the program for soil-conservation payments and for these acreage-allotment payments—adjustment payments, as they are sometimes called—for which the Budget estimated $400,000,000 would be needed to comply with the obligations of the Government. That is about as far as I think I could go with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if he has regarded the commitments as conditional, as discussed a moment ago by the gentleman from Illinois, or if he regards them as moral obligations of this Government?

Mr. TARVER. I regard them as a moral obligation of the Government. I so expressed myself originally when this bill was presented to the House. The Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law offered the farmers of the country certain benefits for certain performances and the farmers by execution of farm plans accepted the proposition which to my mind makes a contract. It seems to me if this plan should be changed it ought to be changed for next year and not for this year. But that is only my individual view. I am not speaking for the subcommittee because all the members of the subcommittee except myself entertain the contrary view.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has discussed the point I had in mind and that is that the faith of the Government is involved in these transactions and we should now redeem the faith of the Government.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I want to ask the Chairman of the subcommittee a question. I would like to know if Chester Davis has made a statement relative to the commitments made by the Government to the farmers?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. Mr. Davis appeared before the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations and I quote this from his statement:

> The first important point I want to discuss is the $100,000,000 cut made by the House in the $400,000,000 agricultural conservation appropriation. In December 1942, the Department of Agriculture announced the provisions, including rates of payment, for the 1943 agricultural conservation program. It is customary to make the announcement in December so that farmers may study the program in advance of the planting season and make the necessary plans to participate. Farmers responded on the basis of the announced provisions and rates. Since this program is one of several designed to bring about the greatest production of food for the country, I feel that the $100,000,000 eliminated by the House in the item "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources" should be restored, and that the House language, which may be interpreted to mean that these funds cannot be used for acreage allotment payments, should be eliminated. In this way the Department of Agriculture will be able to carry out the announced provisions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, thus fulfilling the commitments in response to which farmers have participated generally and in large numbers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I understand from Mr. Davis' statement that back in December the Department of Agriculture announced such a program.

Mr. TARVER. On December 5.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In order to carry that program out the Secretary stated that he would need $400,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. The Budget has estimated it would be that much.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Davis concurs in that statement.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And having made the proposition in December, he thereupon asked the House for $300,000,000 for incentive payments. This is for incentive payments. The House refused to give him the $300,000,000 and the subcommittee announced on the 15th of February that it would not supply the money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is in error about the $300,000,000. He undoubtedly meant to say $100,000,000. The Secretary of Agriculture asked approval of an estimate of $100,000,000 for so-called incentive payments which estimate was denied by our subcommittee. It has not been restored by the Senate. That is not in any way involved here. He asked originally $400,000,000 for these payments which are here involved and the Budget approved that estimate.

Mr. COOLEY. And he regarded it as a commitment and as a moral obligation of this Government?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. And he cannot carry out that obligation unless the House now provides the money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that on February 15 two subcommittees of the House denied that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that on February 15, before anybody had planted any crops anywhere, before a single acre in the United States had been seeded, the House refused money for this purpose?

Mr. COOLEY. I did not understand the gentleman from Georgia to put that interpretation upon the actions of the House. The gentleman from Georgia announced in the beginning that out of the seven members of the subcommittee he was the only one who took this position, the other six members taking the position that having denied the money we were under no obligation and that the Government was under no obligation. The gentleman has read Mr. Chester Davis' letter. Does not that letter indicate that he, who is now in charge of the food program, regards it as a commitment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Two subcommittees denied subsidies for this purpose long before any farmer could have accepted a proposition to plant for incentive payments. There could have been no commitment.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not consider this a subsidy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is money for subsidy purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the argument submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina. The implication of his remarks was that we need these funds to produce more food for wartime. It is just exactly the opposite. The more money you appropriate for subsidies to take land out of production the less food we shall have for the time being. The soil-conservation program is a long-time program. It certainly is not a war program. If we took everything off it would be the best thing consistent with the war-food program, if we had no control at this time, so the argument certainly does not hold good that this is part of a food-producing program for the war effort.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. That is the trouble with the statements a great many gentlemen make. There is no control over any crop in this country at this time, this year, except cotton, and that has been increased 10 percent. We have a lot of surplus cotton.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is not that the best reason why this money should not be voted, that the quotas have been suspended on everything except cotton?

Mr. FULMER. Not at all, for the reason that this money was promised to the farmer. It was said, "If you will plant 50 acres of this and 100 acres of that and forego this other crop, you will receive these payments." They are doing it. They are expecting this money. Every move that is made by O. P. A. and this Congress at this time is destroying these farmers. You are going to wake up with a tremendous shortage of food.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Let me reiterate what the chairman of the whole committee, the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON] said. This was called to our attention early in February. Both the Subcommittee on Agriculture and the Deficiency Subcommittee denied subsidies, after the Secretary of Agriculture had come before us and before any crops were put in the ground for 1943. We went on record definitely against any subsidy payments for this year. If they have gone out and in defiance of two committees of the House and made commitments, we of the House are not under obligation to go back on the stand we have taken a half a dozen times on these subsidies and incentive payments and vote $100,000,000 more to reverse ourselves at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's statement indicates that he himself regards these transactions as commitments.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No, I do not.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is taking the position that they are made without authority, but the Secretary did have authority by law to make these commitments. If they are commitments, we ought to carry them out.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. He had no authority to make them after the House spoke, and the House is superior to the Secretary of Agriculture, when it has spoken, where it originates appropriations. I sincerely hope that the House will sustain the attitude of the committee on this proposition.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House should make very sure just what it is doing at this time. There is a tendency to confuse two entirely different propositions. The amendment presently before us is amendment No. 86, which relates to payments under the Soil Conservation Act and embraces two different types of payments, one for soil-conservation practices and the other the C. A. P., the crop adjustment payments. Some of the debate that has come in would confuse the issue with the vote that will come on amendment No. 88, which is related to incentive payments.

If you want to stand by the action of the committee when it served notice upon the Secretary of Agriculture and upon the farmers of the country in February that the committee would not make an appropriation for incentive payments, when we come to No. 88 you should vote to stand by the House position and not yield, but do not confuse that vote on incentive payments with the vote we have now on payments under the Soil Conservation Act, which embraces two types of payments, soil-conservation and crop-adjustment payments, both under the law in operation for several years.

When the representatives of the Department of Agriculture went out to the farmers last November or along about that time and signed them up on a crop plan for their compliance in this crop year, they held out to them at that time, without any adverse notice from the Committee on Appropriations or anybody representing this House, that they could make payments to them under the law for two things, for soil-conservation

practices and for crop adjustment. No notice was given to the Secretary of Agriculture and no notice was given to the farmers at that time that there would not be money available for making those payments.

The question I asked the gentleman from Illinois was designed to bring out the fact of how much money is needed to carry out the commitments the Secretary of Agriculture or his representatives in good faith made with the farmers at the time the farmers were making their crop plans for this year. I would yield to anybody who could authoritatively tell me how much money is needed to carry out that commitment. I yield to the chairman of the committee if he can tell me how much money is needed to carry out the program that was held out to the farmers at the time they were asked to sign up.

Mr. TARVER. All the evidence submitted to the subcommittee was that $400,000,000 would be required. I am not familiar with any other evidence submitted.

Mr. CASE. If that is $400,000,000, it is an obligation, and it is the same obligation under which the Congress appropriated money to carry out and make payments under the original triple-A act after it was invalidated by the Supreme Court. After those commitments had been made and the farmers had adjusted their crops, although the act was invalidated, Congress recognized the obligation and made the appropriation to carry it out. We find ourselves in a situation where a similar principle of good faith is involved here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall use the 3 minutes. There is just one thing I want to say about it, and I hope I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, to clear up one question. In response to a question asked the chairman of the subcommittee by the last speaker, he stated that this understanding was that last year in December when the Secretary of Agriculture announced a farm program for this year, commitments were made in a sum around $400,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. That is the amount which the Budget estimated will be necessary to make good the promises made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. When the farm program was announced?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I further understand from the chairman of the subcommittee that Mr. Davis, who now has charge of our food program, recently made the statement that this Government was committed in the sum of $400,000,000 to the farmers of America.

Mr. TARVER. That is Mr. Davis' position, that it will take $400,000,000 to carry out the obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in his usual very effective and seductive way, able legislator that he is, differentiated as between amendment No. 81 and amendment No. 88 insofar as the amount is concerned. That was good parliamentary strategy, but poor policy. He knows just as well as I do that if you give 81 the million dollars, it is only for the purpose of using it for subsidies though a rose by any other name smells as sweet to some people. Such action taken is against that reckless fiscal policy to which this House has so often registered itself so sensibly in opposition. This amendment is a subversive method of accomplishing and establishing an undesirable and reprehensible course for the Government to follow. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman cannot yield the time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That is so, and I agree. However, I can yield for a question, as the gentleman will agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to interrogate the gentleman from Vermont, and just to make this matter authentic, let me read to the House the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 12th of February, given to the subcommittee:

> All rates of payments under the 1943 agricultural conservation program are, of course, dependent upon the actual amount of appropriations by Congress.

Further, on page 817 of the hearings he says:

> The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose; and the amount of such payments will necessarily be within the limits finally determined by such appropriation.

Mr. CASE. I just want to ask the gentleman from Illinois what time they plant winter wheat in Illinois; whether or not that would do any good—a statement made in February—if the farmer had already planted wheat back in the fall?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend forgets that the statement of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration containing this language in their official bulletin went out as early as November of last year.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I hope that we will clearly understand this issue. We shall have a roll call on the pending motion, and the House should definitely determine just what its position is with reference to this subject matter. I have my view of the law and the obligations which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture, by authority of law, but I am not a Solomon. I may be entirely wrong. The other members of my subcommittee have indicated that in their opinion I am wrong, but I feel that it is my duty to express my views and convictions in the matter to the membership of the House, to do what I can to clarify the issue.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield now. There is no question, at least I have never heard any raised, but that the Secretary of Agriculture had authority last fall to commit the Government to payments under that program, up to but not exceeding $500,000,000. That is the construction placed by the Solicitor of the Department on section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I have never heard that construction questioned by anybody. The Secretary of Agriculture did announce a program, and the Budget estimated that it would require $400,000,000 to pay the obligations of the Government under that program. I read a while ago the statement or part of the statement made by Mr. Davis in regard to this subject matter. Some question has since been raised with regard to what he did say. I do not desire to cumber the RECORD by a repetition of what I read awhile ago, but let me read this additional part of his statement before the Senate committee which I think clarifies his position:

> Please let me emphasize that the commitments I refer to were made last winter and apply to this year's crop, much of it already in the ground. With regard to crops to be planted this fall and in 1944, the House inserted language that limits all conservation and adjustment commitments to $300,000,000. No prior commitments have been made on that next crop, and I see no reason why we cannot operate under the House limitation.

In other words, Mr. Davis says that the Government is obligated to make these payments that the Secretary promised in his testimony on this year's crops, but with the limitation that the House has put on the program for next year's crop, and with what may be done under that program he finds no fault. But he cannot see and I cannot see how we can place ourselves in the attitude of repudiating an obligation incurred under authority of law to the farmers of this country. If you do not provide this $100,000,000, which brings it up to the Budget estimate and does not exceed the Budget estimate at all, as contemplated by the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] then in my judgment you are repudiating an obligation of the Government.

This incentive payment business that we have heard so much about did not arise until February. That was the $100,000,000 Budget estimate which we declined for incentive payments to bring about the production of some eight or nine war crops in increased quantities. That is not in this bill. That was rejected by the subcommittee in the House and never has been put in in the House or the Senate, in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. Those payments are not to be made out of this fund in any event. The only payments which the Secretary has contracted to make were announced by him on December 5, 1942. I hold in my hand the Georgia A. A. A. handbook, giving the

exact payments which are promised to the farmers of the country, issued in March of this year. Similar handbooks were published in every State. Are you going back on that promise—what your Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law promised to do?

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Have not these payments always been contingent upon subsequent appropriation?

Mr. TARVER. For 7 years this practice has been followed. No other practice has been followed since we had this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 81, noes 103.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and three Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 175, answering "present" 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—185

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Kefauver
Allen, La.	Doughton	Kelley
Andersen, H. Carl	Drewry	Kennedy
Anderson, N. Mex.	Feighan	Keogh
Bates, Ky.	Fernandez	Kerr
Beckworth	Fisher	Kirwan
Bland	Flannagan	Kleberg
Bloom	Fogarty	Klein
Bonner	Folger	Lane
Boykin	Forand	Lanham
Bradley, Pa.	Fulbright	Larcade
Brooks	Fulmer	Lemke
Brown, Ga.	Gathings	Lesinski
Bryson	Gibson	McCord
Bulwinkle	Gilchrist	McCormack
Burch, Va.	Gordon	McGehee
Burchill, N. Y.	Gore	McGranery
Burdick	Gorski	McKenzie
Burgin	Gossett	McMurray
Byrne	Granger	Madden
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Case	Gregory	Maloney
Celler	Hagen	Manasco
Chapman	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Mont.
Clark	Harris, Ark.	Mansfield, Tex.
Coffee	Harris, Va.	Marcantonio
Colmer	Hart	Martin, Iowa
Cooley	Hays	Merritt
Cooper	Heffernan	Miller, Nebr.
Cox	Hendricks	Mills
Cravens	Hobbs	Morrison, La.
Creal	Hoch	Morrison, N. C.
Crosser	Hoeven	Murdock
Cunningham	Holifield	Murphy
Curley	Hope	Myers
D'Alesandro	Hull	Norton
Davis	Izac	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jackson	O'Connor
Delaney	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Hara
Dilweg	Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Konski
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole
Disney	Kee	Outland
		Pace
Patman	Scanlon	Thomason
Patton	Sheppard	Vincent, Ky.
Peterson, Fla.	Sikes	Voorhis, Calif.
Peterson, Ga.	Slaughter	Walter
Pfeifer	Smith, Va.	Ward
Poage	Smith, W. Va.	Weaver
Price	Snyder	Weiss-
Priest	Somers, N. Y.	Wene
Rabaut	Sparkman	Whelchel, Ga.
Ramspeck	Spence	White
Rankin	Starnes, Ala.	Whitten
Richards	Steagall	Whittington
Robertson	Stefan	Wickersham
Robinson, Utah	Stevenson	Winstead
Rowan	Stewart	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Sullivan	Worley
Sabath	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Sadowski	Talle	Zimmerman
Sasscer	Tarver	
Sauthoff	Thomas, Tex.	

NAYS—175

Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Neal
Andresen, August H.	Hancock	Phillips
Angell	Harness, Ind.	Pittenger
Arends	Heidinger	Ploeser
Arnold	Herter	Plumley
Auchincloss	Hess	Poulson
Baldwin, Md.	Hill	Powers
Barrett	Hinshaw	Pracht
Bender	Hoffman	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Howell	Rizley
Bolton	Jeffrey	Rockwell
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Rodgers, Pa.
Buffett	Jennings	Rogers, Calif.
Busbey	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Johnson, Anton J.	Rohrbough
Canfield	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rolph
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, J. Leroy	Schiffler
Carter	Johnson, Ward	Schuetz
Chenoweth	Jones	Schwabe
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Scott
Church	Kean	Shafer.
Clason	Keefe	Short
Clevenger	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Compton	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	LaFollette	Springer
Curtis	Lambertson	Stanley
Day	Landis	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Lea	Stockman
Dirksen	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Lewis, Ohio	Sundstrom
Durham	Luce	Taber
Dworshak	Ludlow	Talbot
Ellis	McCowen	Taylor
Ellison, Md.	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Elmer	McLean	Tibbott
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Towe
Engel	Martin, Mass.	Troutman
Fellows	Mason	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	May	Vursell
Gale	Merrow	Wadsworth
Gallagher	Michener	Wasielewski
Gavin	Miller, Conn.	Weichel, Ohio
Gearhart	Miller, Mo.	Welch
Gerlach	Miller, Pa.	West
Gifford	Monkiewicz	Wigglesworth
Gillette	Mott	Willey
Goodwin	Mruk	Wilson
Graham	Murray, Wis.	Winter
Grant, Ind.	Newsome	Wolfenden, Pa.
Griffiths	Norman	Wolverton, N. J.
Gross	Norrell	Woodruff, Mich.
Gwynne	O'Brien, Ill.	
Hale		
Hall, Edwin Arthur		

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Robsion, Ky.

NOT VOTING—70

Allen, Ill.	Cochran	Fitzpatrick
Andrews	Costello	Ford
Baldwin, N. Y.	Courtney	Furlong
Barden	Culkin	Gamble
Barry	Cullen	Gavagan
Bates, Mass.	Dickstein	Gillie
Beall	Dies	Green
Bell	Ditter	Halleck
Boren	Douglas	Hare
Bradley, Mich.	Eaton	Hartley
Brehm	Eberharter	Hébert
Buckley	Elliott	Jarman
Cannon, Fla.	Ellsworth	Judd
Capozzoli	Fay	Kearney
Carlson, Kans.	Fish	Kilburn
King	Nichols	Simpson, Pa.
LeFevre	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tolan
Lynch	O'Leary	Treadway
McMillan	Philbin	Van Zandt
Maas	Ramey	Vinson, Ga.
Magnuson	Randolph	Wheat
Monroney	Rivers	Wolcott
Mundt	Satterfield	
Murray, Tenn.	Sheridan	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York, against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Andrews against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Douglas against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wheat against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

General pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. ROGERS of California, Mr. WENE, and Mr. HEIDINGER changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLOOM changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY. I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 69, line 12, strike out the remainder of line 12 after the figure down to and including the word "inclusive", in line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "To remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 87.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to what I am about to say.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to insist upon disagreement with Senate amendment No. 87 has been offered by me in behalf of the subcommittee with whom I have not had an opportunity to confer since the vote was had by the House agreeing to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 86. The position of the House, it seems to me, with regard to this amendment, if it should vote to insist upon its disagreement with Senate amendment No. 87, would be rather contradictory. Senate amendment No. 87 provides that this $400,000,000—which was $300,000,000 until the House accepted the Senate amendment—should be used only for payments for compliance with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended and eliminates, as I understand its meaning—that is if we disagree and the Senate accepts our position—it would eliminate payment of the amounts authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Secretary's announcement of December 5, 1942, for other than soil-conservation practices; in other words, you have now provided the money, $400,000,000 for carrying out the program which he announced on December 5, 1942. If you now insist upon disagreeing to Senate amendment No. 87 you will be in the attitude of saying that you will provide the money but you will not allow it to be paid out for the purpose for which the Secretary announced it would be paid; so I am raising the question now for the interest of all the Members of the House as to whether they ought to further insist upon their disagreement to Senate amendment No. 87 or whether or not in compliance with the action you have just taken in agreeing to the $400,000,000 you ought to agree to that amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I have a preferential motion which I will offer to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 87. Will not that take care of the situation?

Mr. TARVER. If the House takes that action, it seems to me, it would iron out a contradiction here because if you do not take that action you are in the position of appropriating $400,000,000 to carry out the Secretary's program and then saying that half of the type of payments offered shall not be paid.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of offering this motion?

Mr. TARVER. I will be glad to. However, I simply want to call the attention of the House to the subject matter. I have offered the motion to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment, but I think the House should consider this matter carefully before it takes action.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. COOLEY: Mr. COOLEY moves to recede and concur in amendment No. 87.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to discuss the motion which I have just offered because it has been very intelligently discussed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first, let me ask about the parliamentary situation. I think the last motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina was a preferential motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. To recede and concur. A division of the question has been asked for by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 87, on which the vote will recur, is this: When the bill was before the House, the House provided that $300,000,000 was to remain available until June 30, 1945, for programs under the A. A. A. Act of 1938 for soil-building practices and compliances and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation Act. If this language is taken out, of course, it opens up the whole proposition for any kind of payment they might want to make under the act of 1938, including the types of subsidies referred to earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The act to which the gentleman refers does not contain any provision regarding subsidies at all. It only authorizes the Secretary to make certain commitments within the purview of that legislative act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the essential point is that if the language as adopted by the House and stricken out by the Senate is preserved then the funds can be used only for the purpose of soil-building practices and compliances and water-conservation practices and nothing more.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. And less than $300,000,000 will be required for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point is we are voting now on policy and not on money. If we recede on the policy adopted by the House the money that will be left over can revert to the Treasury and not be used.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Solicitor in the Department of Agriculture has ruled this soil-conservation money can be used for the payment of subsidies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman means the compliance money.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Whatever it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not under the language of the House. It was tied down so it could not be used for any subsidy purposes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina prevails, then the Secretary can use it for subsidies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. What is the gentleman's understanding of the Senate language?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate struck out the provision that the House put in which would limit it to soil-compliance practices, soil-building and water-conservation practices and nothing more.

Mr. PACE. And extends it how far?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until the 31st of December 1943.

Mr. PACE. It extends the use of the money for what purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The money will be used for any purposes then, that the Solicitor, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Administrator of the A. A. A. might interpret it could be used for under the original act, and I may say they have placed some very singular constructions on the language of that original act, notably that they can use $125,000,000 for the type of incentive payments which was represented to us early in February.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not mean that the payments concerning which they testified in February are in any way involved in this appropriation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but the Secretary and the Solicitor did say they so interpreted the language of the act of 1938 that they could use the money under the original act for incentive purposes and this ties the thing down to soil conservation purposes.

Mr. TARVER. May I read the language inserted by the Senate for which the $400,000,000 was provided in its version of the bill:

To remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive.

In other words, the Senate inserted language simply providing that these funds should be paid out in accordance with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It means, then, that if the Secretary or the Solicitor

makes an interpretation of the act of 1936 or 1938 to the effect that the money can be used for a subsidy or an incentive purpose, that, of course, is the construction that will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. I think they will be bound by the announcement which has already been made by the Secretary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that if the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted, the result will be that we will appropriate this year $400,000,000 for the same purposes for which we appropriated this money last year, except that last year we appropriated $450,000,000?

Mr. CASE. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For exactly the same purposes, and it will be used in exactly the same manner?

Mr. CASE. Yes. There is nothing new up to this point. However, if we want to make a change for next year we should serve notice in advance. Furthermore, we should insist on retaining the House language in amendment No. 88, to prevent the use of any of the funds for incentive payments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The proper way to do it would be to insist on amendment No. 88 when we come to it.

Mr. CASE. Yes, I think that is correct. That is what I tried to point out earlier today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So there is no objection to agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to recede and concur and then insisting on the position of the House with respect to amendment No. 88?

Mr. CASE. In answer to that, let me say that the reason I asked for a division of the question is to make it possible, if the parliamentary situation permits, to give the House an opportunity to say that while we are going to take care of the commitments made last year this money shall not be used to make that kind of commitment again. Consequently, I propose to offer a limitation by a motion to concur with an amendment, which would add this language:

Provided, however, That no part of the funds appropriated under this head will be available for expenditure to announce or prepare a program for payments in subsequent years other than for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended.

The issue we have on the pending amendment is merely whether or not you want the money to be available for making the payments this year on the basis of the commitments that were made with the farmers last fall when they were signed up.

In proposing to concur in the amendment with an amendment—I am not sure that it is in order, but if it is I propose to offer it—my purpose is to serve notice on the Secretary that he cannot use any of this money to set up a program for next year for anything other than the purely soil-conservation practices. That, as I get it, is what gentlemen have been advocating here today, except that they have wanted it retroactive. I am not opposed to reducing A. A. A. funds, but I am opposed to changing the rules of payment after a crop is planted.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I think that if the gentleman will look at the language stricken out by the Senate in its amendment No. 92, he will find that the objective he has in mind will be served by insisting on disagreement to the Senate action in striking out that language. In that connection I call his attention to the fact that Mr. Davis, in the statement I read to the House, did not raise any objection to the House language which the Senate struck out by its amendment No. 92. That language reads as follows:

Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000.

In other words, if the Senate amendment is rejected and this language remains in the bill it will limit the program next year to $300,000,000 and also limit it to soil-conservation and water-conservation practices.

Mr. Davis said that it would be all right to do that for next year, but he said that it ought not to be done for this year after the program for this year had already been announced. So I hope the gentleman will not offer his amendment but that the House will insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 92, leaving that language in the bill, which ought to be sufficient for the gentleman's purposes.

Mr. CASE. If there is a clear understanding that money will not be used to set up the crop-adjustment payments for another year, I have no need to offer an amendment, but I want the language to be certain.

Mr. TARVER. I understand that that will be expressly provided if Senate amendment No. 92 is stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The only reason I felt that we ought to make the full payment this year is to provide what the farmers understood when they signed up—that they would receive both soil conservation and crop adjustment payments. If we serve notice on them that that is not to be the case for next year, then we can consistently hold the money down. I do not know that $300,000,000, for that matter, is necessary if you limit the payments to soil conservation. That might be reduced still further if only 187 or 200 million is needed for that part of the payment this year. But certainly we ought to serve notice on them in advance if a charge is to be made. With an understanding, then, that the Secretary understands that the limitation in the language which the gentleman from Georgia has cited puts a prohibition on next year's program and that he proposes to ask the House to stand by that language, I shall not insist on offering the language of my preferential motion at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the gentleman's understanding that his purpose can be promoted by adopting the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina and by agreeing to the views expressed by the gentleman from Georgia, so that the amendment will read for the current year just as it was for last year?

Mr. CASE. If I do not offer my amendment, then the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not use 5 minutes. I am as they say getting kind of sick and tired and fed up with a lot of loose and irresponsible talk by those who do not appreciate their responsibilities to the Government but take themselves too seriously.

I should like to tell my Republican friends that those who are inclined to vote for this as well as those who voted for the $100,000,000 addition, and those who were not present or cared not to be present to vote are making a contribution to the Democratic campaign fund, as subsidies, to be used against them.

That is only a selfish reason why they should vote against subsidies as a principle which cannot be defended, never has justified itself, and has been repeatedly repudiated by Congress on both sides of the aisle.

I am surprised at the absence of some Members today who ought to be here to support our action at this time.

I am constrained to believe they must be for subsidies else they would have been here to support a committee which has tried to represent the position of the House, in the conference report.

I have no question to make as to their right to vote their convictions.

I do question their judgment as they failed to be here to vote against subsidies so insidiously involved in this subsidy proposal. That failure to be present to vote already has cost the taxpayers $100,000,000 and that is a lot of money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 81, noes 110.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—166

Abernethy	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, La.	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	O'Konski
Beckworth	Hagen	O'Neal
Bland	Harris, Va.	O'Toole
Bonner	Hart	Outland
Boykin	Hays	Pace
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Patman
Brooks	Hobbs	Patton
Brown, Ga.	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Bryson	Hoeven	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Price
Burch, Va.	Hope	Priest
Burchill, N. Y.	Hull	Rabaut
Burdick	Izac	Ramspeck
Burgin	Jackson	Rankin
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Richards
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Case	Kee	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kelley	Sabath
Clark	Kennedy	Sadowski
Coffee	Keogh	Sauthoff
Colmer	Kerr	Scanlon
Cooley	Kirwan	Schuetz
Cooper	Klein	Sheppard
Cox	Lane	Sikes
Cravens	Larcade	Slaughter
Creal	Lea	Snyder
Crosser	LeCompte	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	Lemke	Sparkman
Curley	Lesinski	Spence
Curtis	McCord	Starnes, Ala.
D'Alesandro	McCormack	Steagall
Davis	McGehee	Sullivan
Dawson	McGranery	Tarver
Delaney	McMillan	Thomas, Tex.
Dilweg	McMurray	Thomason
Dingell	Madden	Vincent, Ky.
Domengeaux	Mahon	Voorhis, Calif.
Doughton	Maloney	Walter
Drewry	Manasco	Ward
Feighan	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Fernandez	Mansfield, Tex.	Weiss
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Wene
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	Whelchel, Ga.
Folger	Merritt	Whitten
Forand	Mills	Whittington
Fulbright	Morrison, La.	Wickersham
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	Winstead
Gathings	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Gibson	Murphy	Worley
Gilchrist	Myers	Wright
Gordon	Norton	Zimmerman
Gore		

NAYS—177

Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon, Mo.	Elmer
Anderson, Calif.	Carson, Ohio	Elston, Ohio
Andresen, August H.	Carter	Engel
Angell	Chenoweth	Fellows
Arends	Chiperfield	Fenton
Arnold	Church	Gale
Auchincloss	Clason	Gallagher
Barrett	Clevenger	Gearhart
Bender	Cole, Mo.	Gerlach
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Gifford
Bennett, Mo.	Crawford	Gillette
Bishop	Day	Goodwin
Blackney	Dewey	Gossett
Bolton	Dirksen	Graham
Brown, Ohio	Disney	Grant, Ind.
Buffett	Dondero	Griffiths
Busbey	Durham	Gross
Butler	Dworshak	Gwynne
Canfield	Ellis	Hale
	Ellison, Md.	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.	Ludlow	Schiffler
Hancock	McCowen	Schwabe
Harness, Ind.	McGregor	Scott
Heidinger	McLean	Shafer
Herter	McWilliams	Short
Hess	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hill	Mason	Smith, Maine
Hinshaw	May	Smith, Ohio
Hoffman	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Holmes, Mass.	Michener	Springer
Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Conn.	Stanley
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Stearns, N. H.
Howell	Miller, Pa.	Stefan
Jeffrey	Monkiewicz	Stevenson
Jenkins	Mott	Stockman
Jennings	Mruk	Sumner, Ill.
Jensen	Murray, Wis.	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Anton J.	Newsome	Sundstrom
Johnson, Calvin D.	Norman	Taber
Johnson, Ind.	Norrell	Talbot
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Hara	Taylor
Johnson, Ward	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, N. J.
Jones	Phillips	Tibbott
Jonkman	Pittenger	Towe
Kean	Ploeser	Troutman
Keefe	Plumley	Vorys, Ohio
Kilday	Poage	Vursell
Kinzer	Poulson	Wadsworth
Kleberg	Powers	Wasielewski
Knutson	Pracht	Weichel, Ohio
Kunkel	Reece, Tenn.	Welch
LaFollette	Reed, Ill.	West
Lambertson	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Landis	Rees, Kans.	Willey
Lanham	Rizley	Wilson
Lewis, Ohio	Rockwell	Winter
Luce	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
	Rohrbough	Woodruff, Mich.
	Rolph	
	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Robsion, Ky.

NOT VOTING—87

Allen, Ill.	Fay	Miller, Mo.
Andrews	Fish	Monroney
Baldwin, Md.	Fisher	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Ford	Nichols
Barry	Furlong	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	O'Leary
Beall	Gavagan	Philbin
Bell	Gavin	Ramey
Bloom	Gillie	Randolph
Boren	Green	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Brehm	Hare	Rowan
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Sasscer
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Ark.	Satterfield
Capozzoli	Hartley	Sheridan
Carlson, Kans.	Hébert	Simpson, Pa.
Cochran	Heffernan	Smith, Va.
Costello	Jarman	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Johnson, Luther A.	Stewart
Culkin	Judd	Talle
Cullen	Kearney	Tolan
Dickstein	Kilburn	Treadway
Dies	King	Van Zandt
Ditter	LeFevre	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Lynch	Wheat
Eaton	McKenzie	White
Eberharter	Maas	Wolcott
Elliott	Magnuson	
Ellsworth		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Andrews against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Douglas against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wheat against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

General pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Talle.

Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. SASSCER. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY. If he were present he would vote "aye." I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 69, line 24, strike out lines 24 and 25 and on page 70 strike out down to and including the words "incentive payment."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 88.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language stricken by the Senate, insert *"Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments, if and so long as such payments are under any law or Executive order taken into consideration in the determination by the Price Administrator, or other authority, of the maximum or ceiling or parity prices of farm commodities."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House a few weeks ago the following amendment was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and was adopted and written into the bill:

Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

When the bill went to the Senate this proviso was stricken. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has moved that the House insist on the amendment, and my proposal is a substitute for that amendment. The difference between us is that my amendment would permit incentive payments, provided they are not taken into consideration and deducted from the maximum or ceiling price established for the commodity.

I supported the Cannon amendment when it was first offered. I spoke in favor of it, and I did so because, having no other alternative at the time, I wanted to register my complete disapproval of the present practice of the administration and the Office of Price Administration, when fixing ceiling prices on farm commodities, of deducting from the parity price all payments, soil building, parity, incentive, and all others, paid to the farmers.

I suppose you understand how it works. For example, they have set up a program for this year under which they promise to pay the cotton farmers 1 1/5 cents per pound on the normal yield of their allotted acreage, provided the farmer will plant so many acres of peanuts. That part of it is not so bad, as peanuts are a vital war crop. But, and here is the trouble, when they go to fix the ceiling price on cotton they insist on deducting this 1 1/5 cents from the price of cotton. Although the farmer has gone to the extra expense of buying more machinery for peanuts, high-priced seed, and so forth, and has done everything requested of him, he has the money paid him for doing those things taken away when he goes to sell his crop.

They propose to do exactly the same thing to the wheat growers, the corn growers, and many others. It is no more than a common fraud and a gross misrepresentation to the farmers. They are led to believe they will receive certain payments if they cooperate in certain respects, obey the regulations, control their production, incur additional expense, and then find out when they go to sell their crop every penny paid to them is being deducted from the price of the crops they sell.

I cannot be a party to, and I do not think you want to be a party to fooling the farmers of this Nation, and that is what my amendment seeks to prevent. I think it would be very unfortunate if this House should take the definite position that we are not going, under any circumstances, to make incentive payments. You are going to need incentive payments, and need them badly. For example, you have today thousands of farmers growing flaxseed for the first time in their lives, growing soybeans, and growing peanuts and other war crops. They do not know how deep to plant the seed. They have to buy new machinery to cultivate them with. They do not know how to harvest them and they are going to have poor crops and poor yields. Is it wrong in this critical hour to go to those people and say, "If you go to this additional expense, if you produce the crops so badly needed to win the war, we will pay you an incentive for doing it?" You are doing it with Irish potatoes today and I have not heard anybody complain about that. You are paying them $50 for each extra acre. Every Irish-potato grower in the United States this year will get $50 an acre extra for his extra acreage. Why? Because they have had to expand their crop, because people are growing them who never grew them before. They have to buy additional machinery. The potatoes are needed badly, and the Government has said to the Irish-potato producers, "We will pay you $50 an acre extra for every additional acre of Irish potatoes you grow this year." That is the smart thing to do, provided after a man has incurred the expense and has suffered losses, you let him keep the $50. I supported the Cannon amendment because I am not going to be a party to telling farmers in my State or in your State, "Yes, I will give you 5 cents a bushel on corn, or 12 cents a bushel on wheat, if you plant so many soybeans and flaxseed," and then when he sells his corn, take that 5 cents away from him by fixing the ceiling price on corn at 5 cents under the parity price.

That is one of the reasons corn is not moving today, because the corn producers of this Nation see the rank injustice that has been visited upon them. That is one reason you have a shortage of corn. It is not because it is not in the Nation. It is. It is in storage; but the corn producers of this Nation know it is a damnable outrage that they have been paid this little payment in order to do things, and then when they move their corn to market they are told, "We are going to take it from your price. We have given you a nickel in one pocket and will now take it out of the other."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would not the net effect be to write into the law the real provisions of the so-called Pace-Bankhead bill?

Mr. PACE. Not the Pace bill. I wish I could.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not the Pace bill, but the Bankhead bill which was vetoed? Would that not be the net effect?

Mr. PACE. Only partly. My amendment says this: "That the farmer is entitled to parity price in the market place." My amendment sees that he gets it. Then if he makes an additional sacrifice, if he is to increase production and incur additional expenses to produce a crop that has never been produced before and suffers losses, then you can make him an incentive payment to do that. It is exactly what you are doing with Irish potatoes today. What are you facing on Irish potatoes? You are facing a situation when your Irish potatoes move to market, of having this $50 an acre deducted from your price and cut it down below parity. Do you think that that should be done after you have persuaded the farmer to plant his acreage and produce a crop, then say, when he comes to market, "We are going to take it out of your price"? They say, "We gave you $50 an acre, but when you move to market we are going to take it away from you." This House should now go on record, in this critical hour in our Nation's food supply, against any such practices. My amendment relates only to incentive payments, which is the only subject before us at this time, while the Bankhead bill, which was vetoed, related to all such payments, parity payments, soil-building payments, as well as incentive payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The incentive payment in your amendment——

Mr. PACE. It is quite different from subsidies.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know the feature, but it only applies, as you illustrated it by the potato crop—that incentive applies only to the extra acreage planted?

Mr. PACE. The increased production for war purposes, yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that the incentive payment would not be included in figuring parity?

Mr. PACE. That is right and I am quite sure the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I supported the previous motion of the gentleman from Georgia, but in this instance the natural consequence is that there would be an immediate increase in the cost of living.

Mr. PACE. Oh, no, no. The gentleman has it exactly reversed. My amendment would increase production, give you a greater supply, and help reduce the cost of living.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. I think the present practice is reducing production; is preventing the expanded production that we need. I think the farmers of this Nation are entitled to fair parity prices, fairly administered. Then if you must go further to get expanded production that costs you twice as much as the normal crop, then you should offer incentives to produce that extra crop. It would not increase the cost of living. As it is now there will be no incentive payments, nothing to deduct from parity prices in establishing ceiling prices and very little increase in production, while if you authorize incentive payments and do not deduct them in fixing prices, there will be

no change or increase in the price, but a greatly increased production.

I do not think the roll-back and subsidy program of the O. P. A. is authorized by law. If you will read the Price Control Act, which is the only law on the subject, it authorizes the Office of Price Administration to pay subsidies to producers. Nowhere in the act or in any law that I have been able to find is anyone authorized to subsidize a processor. But the law expressly authorizes, in order to increase production, the payment of a subsidy to a producer. The incentive payment is the increased production method of getting the crops we need.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Suppose we adopt the gentleman's motion, is there any money in this bill that could be used for the purpose of paying incentive payments?

Mr. PACE. Oh, that is a different question. I do not think this House should go on record definitely and finally as saying that we shall not pay incentive payments, because I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas that I think next year this Nation is going to face a most frightful situation on food, and we will regret it.

Mr. HOPE. I think we can meet that situation when we reach it.

Mr. PACE. If the Congress will authorize reasonable incentive payments for the necessary increase in war crops and prevent these payments from being later deducted from the farmer's price, and will provide sufficient funds for the various price-support programs now being carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation, we will not need any roll-backs or subsidies but will place the War Food Administrator and the farmers of the Nation in position to produce the crops and provide the food so necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and proper morale on the home front.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is very little I want to say about this amendment, except to say that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] very freely confessed that indirectly it was writing into the law, through the instrumentality of an appropriation bill, the so-called Bankhead bill which was full of controversy when it was here, full of controversy when it was in the Senate, was vetoed by the President, and came back to us and was finally pigeon-holed in the Senate.

Now would it not be bad practice to try to spell out all of the implications of this amendment? I say, from the contents of the language submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, that I could not completely spell out all of the implications contained therein. That would require some careful study.

He says no funds shall be used for incentive payments unless or so long as they are deducted from ceiling prices and parity prices. I think that is a fair summary of them. How are you going to put that on? Negatively you are invalidating the language that we wrote into this very act when we said that no money shall be used for incentive payments because he says none of the money shall be used for incentive payments, as long as they are used for a certain purpose. In other words, in a left-handed way you are putting the approval of the House upon the use of money for incentive payments unless it violates this question of deductions from the ceiling price and deductions from the calculations of the parity price. I do not propose to go along with that kind of a prolix move.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I am at a loss to understand what the effect would be, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment. It simply would be a limitation on any funds in this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. HOPE. In its operation, and I am not aware that there are any funds in this bill that could be used for incentive payments, inasmuch as the House has refused to recede and concur in the Senate amendment discussed just previous to this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true, but on the other hand the House has increased the amount of funds in this particular section by $100,000,000, and suppose they can be used for those purposes, as the Solicitor and the Secretary of Agriculture have told us they could use them for incentive payments; that is what they stated to the subcommittee in February. If that is the case, then there might be $100,000,000 in this bill that could be used for that particular purpose.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think, however, that under the language contained in the House bill, limiting those funds to compliance with soil-building and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotments Act, that any of this $400,000,000 could be used for such incentive payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under that language, no; but we will not have completed action on this bill and will not have completed this section, no matter what we do on the amendments that will be offered on this disagreement since we are still going to be faced with that situation and the whole thing is up in the air. This section still requires Senate action and further House action, and one cannot at this time predict what provisions will be finally adopted.

Mr. HOPE. I am in agreement with the gentleman and I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, but I still do not see that it will have any effect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may not.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent from the suddenness of this amendment that very few of us realize just what the amendment will accomplish. Certainly I have no knowledge as to the implications of the amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made his contribution. The gentleman from Illinois follows very closely all matters coming before the Appropriations Committee, and it is very apparent to me that he is uncertain; he was confused, and I know that some of the sentiments he expressed here represent my own thoughts at this moment. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] frankly admitted that by indirection he is trying to accomplish something that has already been attempted by direction and which the President has vetoed. Of course, no one knows, if this amendment is adopted and should finally stay in the bill, what action the President will take, but some day some President is going to veto an appropriation bill when a rider is put on that proposes to amend the law, but one thing is certain, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is an indirect way to try to accomplish what the Bankhead bill undertook to do and which bill, the President vetoed.

There are several reasons why I think those who represent agricultural districts should vote against this amendment. First, the fact that if it is adopted there is always the threat of a veto hanging over it. Second, the fact that no one of us knows what this amendment accomplishes, what it does or what its results will be. Certainly I do not think the House should legislate under circumstances such as exist here where we have an amendment offered by one who is not a member of the committee in charge of the bill and no member of the committee undertakes to express any thought on it.

If some member of the subcommittee or the conference committee made a motion to recede and concur with an amendment at least we would know that that Member was conversant with the subject and could convey to the House some information as to just what would result if the amendment were adopted. Even if you or I disagreed with his position we would have some sound premise upon which to think and to legislate, but this amendment leads us entirely into the field of uncertainty. I think under these circumstances the wise thing for us to do would be to defeat the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I hope the gentleman will accept my assurance that there is nothing uncertain about the amendment. It simply states that if a farmer is paid an incentive to increase production he can get the money in his pocket.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand; I have read the amendment, but the gentleman has admitted that indirectly he is trying to accomplish what the Bankhead bill did by direction, which bill has been vetoed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] frankly admits that he has no

knowledge as to what the results will be. With all due respect to the opinions of my friend from Georgia I am frank in stating that I have no knowledge about how this amendment will work if it should be adopted.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who certainly thinks clearly on agricultural matters, expresses uncertainty by the questions he asked of the gentleman from Illinois. I feel that under these circumstances and the uncertainty of the House as to what this amendment will do, coupled with the fact that the President has already vetoed a bill which had the same objective, the wise thing for the House to do is to defeat this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there need be no confusion, misunderstanding, or misapprehension about this amendment. In addition to the objections which have been advanced by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts, there are two considerations which have not yet been referred to, both of which stand out as clear as crystal.

The first is that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] reduces the House provision from a positive prohibition to a contingent prohibition. As it stands, the House prohibition is absolute. Under it there can be no incentive payments from funds carried by this bill.

But the proposition of the gentleman from Georgia is to make it prohibitive under circumstances and nonproductive under other circumstances. Under certain conditions it is effective and under other conditions it is wholly ineffective.

The House language is unequivocal. On a yea and nay vote the House by a two-thirds majority voted to proscribe incentive payments. The House is opposed to incentive payments and the country is opposed to incentive payments. But here is a proposal to weaken the prohibition against incentive payments and under circumstances probable of realization defeat the will of the House. On that ground alone the amendment ought to be rejected.

The second consideration, while not discussed here this afternoon, was indirectly referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]. The House proposition against incentive payments, as it stands, is a prohibition against the expenditure of money. No money shall be expended in incentive payments. It is a retrenchment of expenditure. It is a proposition to save money. It protects the Treasury. It protects the taxpayers. On the other hand, the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Georgia is a proposition to spend money, a proposition to increase expenditures. On a contingency it proposes to pay incentive payments which shall not be counted in estimating parity.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Is not my amendment also a proposition to get something to eat?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On the contrary, economists are agreed that it will in the end restrict production. That is one of the reasons the farm organizations are opposed to incentive payments.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennnsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia would be to add to the cost to the consumer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The answer to the gentleman's question is obvious.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in the last minute I have that this amendment is acceptable to no one. The farmers do not want it. The President does not want it. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has indicated, the consumers do not want it. The committee does not want it. The farm organizations do not want it. Strangely enough, even the Department does not want it. And by a decisive roll call, the House indicated it did not want it. This time it ought to be unanimous.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment may again be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment may again be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language stricken by the Senate, insert "*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments if and so long as such payments are under any law or Executive order taken into consideration in the determination by the Price Administrator or other authority of the maximum or ceiling or parity prices of farm commodities."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language which the Senate has stricken and to which the motion relates may also be read.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes, 34, noes 150.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that it may be in order to suspend now further consideration of the conference report and resume its consideration tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, may I ask the majority leader about the change in the legislative program for tomorrow and Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow consideration of the conference report which was not completed today will continue. Following that there will be consideration of the last deficiency bill. I am hoping that on Thursday we will be able to take up the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That will not come up before Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It will not come up tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three different subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter relating to N. Y. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech of a constituent of mine. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will amount to $99. I ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 28, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by General Marshall at Columbia, Ohio, on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by the Honorable W. D. Jamieson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Walter Wanger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S RIGHT HAND KNOWS NOT WHAT HIS LEFT HAND DOES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in Columbus, Ohio, the Governor of my State, Tom Dewey, made what I would term a purely political speech. He sought to advance his own political cause by criticism which I would say was carping. He joins the myopic league of gripers and the bellyachers against the Government. If ever there was a man as far as I know him—and I think I know him fairly well from his works and his words in New York—who is enchanted with his own importance, it is Governor Dewey. I would say that he surveys himself daily in the mirror and says to himself, "Would I not make a great President?"

Yesterday at Columbus, Ohio, Governor Dewey could not resist the temptation of having his little say about our National Government and at the same time, if I might say, tooting his own tin horn.

He talked of avoiding surrender to the failures of the National Government. He talked of the incredible deficiencies of the National Government. He talked of not waiting forever for Washington to discover the laws of economics. He talked of not retiring to an ivory tower to invent something new and different.

A mighty man is he, so he says, but lacking the perspicacity to see that he cannot revile in one clause and praise in another if credence is to be given to any part of his statement. New York State solved the farm manpower shortage, but, he admits, with the aid of the United States Employment Service and—I quote—

> In cooperation with the Farm Security Administration, we have brought additional permanent workers into the State.

If that is not surrendering to the failure of the National Government, what is? We might entitle his entire talk Success Through Failures. In view of his heavy scorn for the deficiencies of our National Government, I cannot resist the temptation to quote Mr. Dewey again:

> All this was done by the process of collaboration between all farm groups and Federal, State, and local agencies.

It is truly incredible how one man in the same breath and in the same paragraph can talk of the failures of National Government and then state—again the obliging quotation:

> We have found that there are enough men in Washington whose primary concern is to get the job done so that we have had many examples of fine cooperation.

We are grateful to Mr. Dewey for his reassurance.

Gasoline shortages were corrected by the Office of Petroleum Administration, and in negotiation for the necessary bottoms in the matter of grain from Canada, "we are receiving the most sympathetic cooperation from Chester Davis." So what are these failures?

No purpose would be served he said—

> in analyzing the incredible deficiencies of the National Government in its 10-year campaign to restrict food production in the United States.

Not Mr. Dewey's purpose, certainly. Mr. Dewey does not choose to remember that the act authorizing the establishment of the Federal Farm Bureau likewise authorized it to restrict planting of unnecessary crops. That was in 1930 under Mr. Hoover's administration—a Republican administration. The restrictive program, it is implied by Mr. Dewey, was the result of New Deal thinking. In 1930 the Federal Farm Bureau viewing the desirability of restricted and planned crop planting sent its men about the farms in an effort to persuade the farmers to cease planting crops of which there existed a surplus, namely, cotton, wheat, and tobacco. The program, it is true, was informal, but viewed during the Hoover Administration as economically sound. I might say in passing that Mr. Hoover's statement that land planting since 1932 has been reduced 47,000,000 acres did not take into account that a considerable fraction of this acreage was devoted to cotton, of which we still have a huge surplus and that a good part of the remainder was marginal land which should never have been brought under the plow. Even Mr. Dewey admits we have wheat in goodly supply.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. With reference to that 47,000,000 acres, I can say to the gentleman that the wheat acreage since 1933 has been reduced to 55,000,000 acres at the present time.

Mr. CELLER. I do not doubt that some of the so-called new dealers caused some of that reduction, but I want to say that the whole idea of reduction of crops is not to be laid at the door of the Roosevelt administration in its entirety; that the matter started with Hoover.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can tell the gentleman, too, that I was here at the time and there was no reduction in the farm acreage during the so-called Federal Farm Bureau—the gentleman should have said "Board," because the Farm Bureau was not a creation of the Congress.

Mr. CELLER. I am sorry; I will accept that correction. I meant Federal Farm Board; not Bureau.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There were no reductions under that except that the farmers reduced themselves.

Mr. CELLER. I did say that it was more or less advisory, but the idea did stem from the Hoover administration to reduce the amount of acreage under the plow.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is pretty far-fetched.

Mr. CELLER. I must take exception to the gentleman's statement when he says it is farfetched. There is no doubt that the whole idea originated at the time that Mr. Hoover was in the Presidency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that Governor Dewey made some reference to the very fine work done by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. CELLER. He made reference to the fine work done by almost a dozen different agencies in one breath, and then, in another breath, he tried to strike them down in toto, strike down the entire administration. He did that for his own selfish political self-aggrandizement.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observation I meant to make is that that agency will not be able to continue unless the House concurs tomorrow in the motion that will be made to enable that agency to continue to some extent effectively during the next fiscal year.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLAR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I should like to add this, for the reason that it was set up as an emergency agency. We were told long ago that when these emergencies ceased to exist the administration would undertake to correct and get rid of a lot of these things. Now, Mr. Dewey may have put his finger on the right thing.

Mr. CELLER. It may be that he put his finger on the right thing as far as giving us a handle with which to whip him is concerned. He did that all right, beyond peradventure of a doubt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the same kind of a licking you gave him in New York last election?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Or any other time he has ever been before the people?

Mr. CELLER. I assure you I had no part in that. If we had had our way in New York, "we," who have a little more wisdom in that regard, he would not have been Governor of our State.

Mr. Dewey pours his wrath on O. P. A. Of course, O. P. A. must bear the onus of guilt, says he. O. P. A. has yet to discover the laws of economics, Mr. Dewey tells us. Does he mean the law of supply and demand, a laissez faire policy, particularly in times of war with each man for himself, as the elephant said dancing among the chickens, and devil take the hindmost? Follow the law of supply and demand and never mind about the equities of price control and rationing. Let those who have the money for necessities do the buying and as for those who have not, "let them eat the cake."

This morning I read this headline in the paper:

> Vast supplies of cattle are piling up and meat famine gets worse—

Meaning the meat famine in New York City. The subheading is:

> If half the excess was slaughtered it would supply 200,000,000 persons with beef for a year exclusive of military needs.

That is the assertion of various heads of the ranchmen's associations. Governor Dewey says naught about the resistance of the cattle bloc and these ranchmen against placing a ceiling on cattle prices on the hoof to cut the cost of living to New Yorkers in his own State. He dare not offend the cattle bloc. They have many votes in a Republican national convention.

Be it remembered that it was the policy of the Department of Agriculture that early in the war increased the price of hogs in order to encourage the raising and fattening of them. Mr. Dewey sees corn only in relation to hogs. Raise the ceiling on corn and you must necessarily raise the ceiling on dairy products, poultry, milk, and eggs. Certainly raising the ceiling on corn would in no way release the meat since the farmers would still withhold the corn for feeding and fattening their hogs, fearing that prices on hogs would still advance, but I fear you cannot get that into the skull of Mr. Dewey. It is Mr. Dewey, I am afraid, that reduces the problem to simplicities, a problem that can only be ultimately solved by the farmers, the cattle growers, and the Department of Agriculture, and the O. P. A. working together.

There is no use of trying to fling epithets at each other, they must sit down around the table and work out this intricate problem. It can be done, but it cannot be done if we have carping critics like Governor Dewey.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the trouble. The gentleman puts his finger right on the trouble. The O. P. A. refuses to sit down and talk it over with men who are experienced in the business. They call them in to Washington but they tell them what they are going to do to them.

Mr. CELLER. Let me say this in answer, and then I will yield further. I do not think that is quite a reflection of what O. P. A. is doing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But it is.

Mr. CELLER. They have called in men who are interested, businessmen and others, but when you have all these various blocs and organizations pulling in every conceivable direction they cannot have the interests of the public at heart. It is most difficult not to yield under such dreadful pressure. They all want to batten and feast at the expense of the tragedy of the war. O. P. A. is almost powerless.

Mr. CELLER. And we now have a man in Mr. Prentiss Brown, who wants to do a good job. Give him a chance, do not unduly criticize, do not castigate him at all times.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Here we stand with 79,000,000 head of cattle, which is the largest supply in the history of the country, and with 125,000,000 pigs, which is high, and you will go hungry next winter in New York.

Mr. CELLER. Why?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because the distribution system has broken down in the country as the result largely of the O. P. A., and unwise regulations.

Mr. CELLER. I say it is due in part to the selfish interests who are holding back the slaughtering of that cattle, and they should not hold it back, if they are patriotic. They are holding the slaughtering back for higher prices. If half that surplus of cattle were slaughtered, they would have enough beef to supply 200,000,000 people, regardless of the Army and the Navy, and it is proof positive that the cattle bloc in the first place does not want to put a limit price on the hoof, they want to get higher prices, and the highest prices that they can command for their goods, and to my mind, especially during these perilous times, that is tragic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman should not charge the farmers and others with being unpatriotic, because they are serving a useful purpose in helping to win the war.

Mr. CELLER. I do not mean the individual little farmer, but some of the larger groups. I probably should revise my remarks so as not to put the onus on them. I did not mean to be all-embracing in that regard.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know of any farm bloc in Congress?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, I am not going to belabor that point. You know there is a farm bloc.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to something that happened today. Our friends from the city today voted a subsidy of $100,000,000 the boys in the House had passed before and that is supposed to trickle down into the pockets of the farmers, and the big majority of the Representatives here from the rural sections voted against it. So it seems to me that there is much more of a political bloc than a farm bloc or any other kind of a bloc.

Mr. CELLER. We were led to believe it would help the farmers. We voted for it and I voted for it with an idea that it would help the farmers, and I think we are helping them if the soil conservation program will be properly administered and nobody tries to put a broomstick between the legs of those who are trying to administer the law. We in the city have always endeavored to help the farmers. We have the interest of the farmer at heart. We have never denied the farmer his due, but when it comes to trying to cut down prices for the average housewife in the city, we do not get the reciprocity that we are entitled to from the members in the rural sections.

Mr. McCORMACK. The vote today would seem to indicate that those who represent the city are much better friends of the farmers than those who represent the farming districts.

Mr. CELLER. That is a very wise statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just stated he wanted to help the farmers. Were you helping them when you went with the teamsters' union and prohibited the bringing of produce in there so that you could get something to eat without the payment of $8.60 for a little truck and $9.40 for the big truck?

Mr. CELLER. I am afraid the gentleman is too strong a labor baiter for me to understand his statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. CELLER. What is untrue?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That I am a labor baiter.

Mr. CELLER. I do not hesitate to say that the gentleman has never been a friend of labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. The gentleman doesn't have any more understanding of that than of the farm

proposition. All he understands is the needle trade.

Mr. CELLER. That is a little unfair, that sort of argument.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the same sort of argument you make here.

Mr, CELLER. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] repeatedly brings up this matter of the teamsters in the city of New York and he should be made to learn that in the city of New York every possible facility has been worked out for the farmers markets, and for protection for the farmers to bring their produce there. If there was any hesitancy on the part of law enforcement agencies with regard to the teamsters, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] should remember that there was a decision by the Supreme Court that bound all of the law-enforcement agencies on that question. But as far as the farmers are concerned, those who come into the city of New York, all of their organizations endorse the type of marketing administration that we have in the city of New York. They are given full protection and every possible consideration.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman speaks truly indeed. As far as the violence of some of the members of the teamsters' union, the so-called local in that area, of New York is concerned, I criticized them most severely for their activities. Daniel Tobin, international president of the Teamsters' Union, did likewise. If the gentleman would read the minority report on the Hobbs bill he will see that I did not hesitate to denounce the actions of the members of that local union.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Every one of those racketeers has been prosecuted and sent to jail. There is not one of them around in New York City today. That is, in any manner hounding the farmers or any other group that does business in the various markets.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was that done by Tom Dewey?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He did some of it. He is entitled to credit. I do not deny giving him credit. But he could not have done anything if there had not been an honest mayor of the city of New York in the person of Fiorello La-Guardia.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to state food inflation cannot be controlled by rationing, roll-back, subsidies, and ceiling prices on food generally, but to leave free the price of cattle on the hoof, that is like filling a bag, open at two ends. You cannot control unless you control all along the line—wages and prices of cattle as well. We control wages, but for example we do not control the price of cattle on the hoof. That is the open bag at the wrong end.

Governor Dewey says nothing of the weight of the hog that plays so imporant a part, or the discouraging of the fattening of beef animals or the role of Chester Davis in raising the price of hogs. The details are too difficult for Mr. Dewey to assimilate. It is simpler to throw it on O. P. A. which continues in its struggle to hold the line. Mr. Dewey apparently is not worried about that line or the ultimate consumer. He is clever enough not to offend the farm or cattle bloc. We have these vast quantities of beef and pork, but the growers refuse to release the supply. If Governor Dewey had the courage he would demand a ceiling price on the hoof, and in a way force beef and pork to the seaboard. But he is too skillful a politician.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

NEW DEAL FAILURES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] should spend so much time delivering a speech which sounds as though it was written by the prize smear artist, Charley Michelson, criticizing Governor Dewey. It is apparent that Governor Dewey delivered what the gentleman from New York considers might be a knock-out blow to the New Deal. Because Tom Dewey has time and again floored the New Deal in the city and State of New York, every effort will be made to discredit him. It may be, too, that envy and jealousy have some part in inducing the gentleman to speak.

His attention is called to the fact that envy and jealousy are prone to create a state of mind that is apt to lead men, as he evidently was led, into extravagant and exaggerated statements. His attitude seems to be that it is unpatriotic for anyone to criticize the New Deal. That is the customary, the narrow and the unfair method adopted by the warmongers, the internationalists, the new dealers and the fourth-term advocates. That method is no longer effective. Its advocates have overworked it. No longer do the people listen to the cry that their neighbors, whom they well know to be loyal and patriotic, are disloyal.

Throughout the country is growing the feeling that many of those who use that method of smear in lieu of argument have something which they, themselves, wish to conceal. More and more when people hear the cry of fire, they begin to look around to see if the smoke is not coming from the squawker himself.

New York, while it is still the tail, is no longer the tail that wags the dog. The city of New York, much to its chagrin, has found that it is dependent upon the great Middle West for the food it eats from day to day. New York, which in days gone by was prone to tell us how to conduct our daily affairs and how to live, to tell us when we could and when we could not, at its rate of interest have a loan, has now learned that it is no longer the master of the financial and industrial policies of the great producing Middle West and as is usual with those long accustomed to wielding unmerited power in a tyrannical manner, now begins to whine about the treatment received from those it has so long attempted to dominate.

Republicans are not the only ones who are criticizing the New Deal. The severest, the most biting, the most devastating criticism of the New Deal comes from Democrats. As an illustration, look at the first page of the morning Times-Herald, the caption reads, "Democrat Senators cite peril to home-front war effort—Five charge bungling of vital defense tasks by administration." That caption refers to the report of five Democratic Members of the other body and among the charges are the following:

LAG IN PRODUCTION CITED

1. Government spokesmen have developed no clear policies to integrate the various agencies dealing with economic stabilization, and procedure has been "by groping, tentative steps by hemming and hawing, by halfway measures."

2. The Nation is plagued by recurring strikes and administrative failure to attack the roots of unrest.

3. There has never been a genuine requirements committee to coordinate military, lend-lease and civilian requirements.

4. Production is not up to capacity, but despite the clamor for greater production, huge stock piles of war materials lie unused.

5. The approach to the manpower problem has been "a monotonous series of piecemeal and groping measures."

6. There is no policy as to subsidies, regarding which there is disagreement among the various agencies and within the ranks of the individual agencies.

7. Gasoline shortages due to distribution problems disrupt transportation of war workers and war goods and hamper production, while Government agencies offer only the prospect of more shortages. Meanwhile railroad labor and management have testified that supplies of oil for the petroleum-starved Eastern States might be tripled by effective use of the railroads.

The report further states:

With the country in the grip of a coal strike the Senators found: "We are plagued by recurring strikes and by administrative failure to attack the root causes of unrest. * * * Recent labor unrest is more significant as a symptom rather than a cause of disorganization on the home front. In 1942 and in the first 4 months of 1943 one-twentieth of 1 percent of total labor time was lost through strikes.

"Inefficient control and direction of production cause manpower losses several hundredfold greater. Willful, knowing, and deliberate retardation of production of critical material by industry, labor, or Government agency during war is, in fact, treasonable. But

neither threats of compulsion nor exhortation can substitute for a rational organization of the domestic front."

It is doubtful if any Republican ever said more along that line.

But that is not all. Not long ago a distinguished Member of the other body, a Democrat, exasperated by the justifiable complaints of his constituents wrote a letter in which, among other things, he said:

That the responsible officials were "taking orders from somebody and that what they are doing is only part of a plot to change our Government into communism, socialism, or some other foreign isms which means a dictatorship and regimentation of our people and abolishing our private system of enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include these statements to which I will make reference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Governor Dewey evidently, obviously, as did those of the opposite political faith who have just been quoted, rendered a patriotic service when he directed attention to just a few of the policies of this administration which are interfering with production and with the war effort itself.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In that very speech he praises highly the various departments under the New Deal administration, so if he praises those very departments, how can the gentleman come to the conclusion that he is reviling the administration?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Governor Dewey was not reviling the administration. He was calling attention to a few, a very few of its destructive actions. Of course, it is difficult for the gentleman from New York to understand what the New Deal with its spending of the billions of dollars, and in all this expenditure, with the hundreds of thousands of employees, I say, it may be difficult for the gentleman from New York to find any fault with anything that the New Deal has done, or is doing, but if memory serves me correctly it has not been 3 months since the gentleman from New York took one of the departments of the New Deal administration down the stretch and called its administrators practically everything they could be called in parliamentary language.

It makes a difference, apparently, when the gentleman from New York is criticizing the New Deal. That is one of the things that some of us object to. But we retain the right to criticize. The gentleman is in the same situation as the mother with a spoiled child who objects to anyone calling attention to its dirty face, its purloining ways, but who wants to keep all criticism under cover at home, who wants to do its own washing of the dirty face, but inasmuch as we are an essential part of this Government, inasmuch as we have to answer for the dirty face, the destructive ways of the wayward child, we reserve the right to criticize.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct that I did criticize one of the departments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will say you did. That is when it interfered with the needleworkers' trade, you were very ready to criticize.

Mr. CELLER. No, my criticism had nothing to do with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right for once. It was another gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] who as I recall was speaking for the garment workers who referred to the needle workers. You were talking about the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and speaking for the manufacturers of cheap jewelry, when you wanted the silver for them.

Mr. CELLER. It had nothing to do with the use of silver. It was purely a matter that had nothing whatsoever to do with anybody in my district, none of my constituents. I felt that the man who was in charge of the civilian branch of the War Production Board was not doing his duty by civilians, and that is what I criticized, but because I cannot agree with one branch I do not say everything is bad, everything is black.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I remember you were speaking in support of your amendment to a Treasury Department appropriation bill and your amendment as you stated would preclude the expenditure of any of the appropriations under that bill for the carrying out of provisions of the Silver Purchase Act. I do not know what you put in the RECORD, but I do know, for I heard you, that you certainly characterized in no polite or laudatory manner some department officials. I will say this to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on the doctrine of chance alone, because of the multiplicity of its acts, there must be something good in the New Deal, it could not possibly all be bad. The planners have done their darnedest and I may not use a more emphatic word—they have done their darnedest—as a Member at the other end of the Capitol said, to establish a dictatorship and to bring about communism, fascism, or some other form of foreign ism. That they have not succeeded is not due to any fault of theirs.

In the same issue of the Washington Times-Herald of June 22, but in another column at the top in bold black-face type appears this lead: "Nelson pledges early relief on gas ban in East." Then appears the statement:

War Production Chief Donald M. Nelson said yesterday that Government officials are resolving differences over the critical east coast gasoline-fuel-oil problem and promised relief for civilians "in the very near future."

In the same column, lower down, appears in black-face type the following caption, "Gas ban to continue for duration—Ickes." Then this statement:

Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes said today that the ban on nonessential use of gasoline in the Eastern States probably will last for the duration and warned that the time will come when stricter gasoline controls will be imposed on the Midwest.

When an administration cannot bring order out of confusion which exists here as to its domestic policy, is there any chance, anything to be gained, by now planning for the solution of all post-war problems?

Let us at least get out of bed before we start the day's work. This administration would undertake to solve world post-war problems, while it cannot here at home even start in an orderly manner the task of solving the immediate problems which face us.

Here we have the ridiculous situation of one high administrative official telling us one thing, another gives us a contradictory statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under Secretary Patterson says that production of war materials has fallen off 5 percent, and Mr. Nelson says that was wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And which is right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We do not know; we do not know what to believe.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can you know when you get statements of that kind from the heads of the departments?

Then here is another one. On page 11 of the same paper again in bold, black-face type extended across two columns are these words:

Food officials say housewife was "sucker" in Office of Price Administration roll-back.

Below it we find the following paragraph:

War Food Administration officials yesterday blamed Office of Price Administration theorists for financial losses, often severe, suffered the last few days by most producers, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers of meat and butter under the Government-ordered roll-back of prices.

Declaring that there was no way to estimate how large the over-all losses of the meat and dairy industries would be but admitting that in many instances they probably would be quite large, the War Food Administration officials who requested their names be omitted from any story, said that in many cases the housewife was made the "sucker" in the deal.

Here again we have two departments in this wonderful administration which we are told must not be touched by criticism—you would have us adopt the slavish idolatrous attitude of worshipping at the feet of the New Deal—and yet one comes along, one administrative agency comes along, it is perfect, and it tells us that another perfect branch of the administration is to blame because the handlers of meat and butter have sustained losses, some of them very severe, and that we are confused because of the actions of the second Government agency. Why, the whole administration is shot through and through with incompetency, waste, extravagance, and worse.

And then we have what? We have the coal strike. Why, why is the coal strike with us? Because this administration has lacked either the courage or the inclination—and you can take your pick—to establish a fair firm labor policy. More than 3 years ago from the Well of this House on a somewhat similar occasion I asked: "Who is the big boss,

John L. Lewis or President Roosevelt?" And to this day, to this day, the people do not know, or if they have an opinion all too many of them are of the opinion that the real boss is John L. Lewis, for so far Lewis has had his way and he has had his way why? He has had his way because this administration from the very beginning has been engaged in and has carried on a political alliance with organized labor leaders and labor politicians, sacrificing time and time again the good of the people in order to obtain the vote of those labor organizations, and that in spite of the fact that the last elections demonstrated beyond any question that those labor leaders did not speak for the rank and file of labor, for if they had many a man who is here today would not be in this House.

This coal strike is with us again today; doubtless it will be called off and again postponed by John L. Lewis before midnight tonight, because the President has been playing politics. But it will be back again if Lewis does not have his way.

If any of those who opposed war prior to Pearl Harbor were to interfere with production of munitions of war as have some of our labor leaders who have instigated strikes, he would have been behind the bars long ago.

On page 1 of this same Times-Herald, under today's date, June 22, in large type extending across the front page are these words:

Franklin D. Roosevelt orders end of Detroit riots; 23 dead.

Down below, but still in large type, is the caption:

United States troops moved to city in emergency. Hundreds arrested; 600 are injured.

Then follows the statement:

President Roosevelt early today ordered all persons engaged in "unlawful and insurrectionary" rioting in Detroit to return to their homes immediately.

The White House statement read:

I do hereby command all persons engaged in unlawful and insurrectionary proceedings to disperse and retire peaceably to their respective abodes immediately and hereafter abandon said combinations and submit themselves to the laws and the constituted authorities of said State (Michigan).

The President did the right thing when he called out the Federal troops to quell the rioting, the killing in the city of Detroit. A Federal statute which has often been quoted by me from the well of the house, gives him that authority, makes that procedure his duty, but oh, how different was the situation in the city of Flint and later in the city of Detroit and other Michigan cities back in 1937.

Yesterday, acting upon the request of the Governor of Michigan, the President, as was his duty, called out the Federal troops to protect the lives of Negroes and of whites. But back in 1937 when armed goon-squads, acting under the orders of his then political ally, John L. Lewis, who now defies him, marched into the city of Flint, took over the factories of that city, denied the use of public streets to citizens of our State, there was no action from him. The then Governor of the State, Frank Murphy, who now sits in the Supreme Court, who if he goes in the front door walks in under the legend carved in marble "Equal justice under law," called out the National Guard of the State to protect the lawless seizers of private property from police of the city of Flint, to protect them from the sheriff and the sheriff's deputies of the county of Genesee.

Governor Murphy had been called back from the Philippine Islands by the President to run as a candidate for Governor of Michigan; with the aid of the President he was elected and when rioting, lawlessness, the defiance of the courts of the State were instigated by the President's then political ally, John L. Lewis, Governor Murphy, later rewarded by the President by appointment to the Supreme Court, aided the strikers in defying the law and in defeating the efforts of the law officers of the State to end rioting, violence, and lawlessness.

Where, oh where was President Roosevelt then? He was in the White House; and, according to Governor Murphy, he was in daily communication with the President. On that occasion when insurrection prevailed in the city of Flint for 6 months, F. D. R. ignored the Federal statute which required him to protect citizens. He then sat in the White House as silent as a graveyard, his lips as tightly sealed as those of the shell of a clam. When a word from him would have ended the lawlessness and the violence carried on by his political ally, he was as dumb as an oyster.

Thank God that once, at least once, whatever his motive, the President of the United States did the right thing by calling upon the Federal troops to suppress race riots. But do not be deceived, these riots in Detroit are not the result of Nazi or any other foreign propaganda unless it be the propaganda of Communists who have long stirred up race feeling.

This administration, if it wants to fix the responsibility for the Detroit and other race rioting need only to search its own household. There has been race feeling in Detroit for more than 2 years. This administration sought to cause an intermingling of races—knowing as it should have known that that effort would bring trouble. When the administration back in '37 deliberately gave aid to the wrecking crews of Lewis, it sowed the seed which it has ever since cultivated and kept watered—the seed of class feeling, which has grown and blossomed into riots between the white men who wanted to work, and the white picket lines which were determined that men should not work until they paid tribute and into riots between white men and colored men.

Right here in Washington month after month this administration has been planting the seeds of discord between the races. This administration has followed a policy which required whites and colored to intermingle in eating places, in lavatories, in public conveyances, and elsewhere regardless of the wishes of the individual. Now no one has more respect for the colored man than have I. I was brought up in the little town of Constantine, St. Joseph County, Mich. My grandfather's farm, a farm which I today own, and which he reclaimed from virgin timber, is in Porter Township, Cass County, Mich. In that county prior to and during the Civil War was one end of a branch of the underground railway over which slaves from the South, on their way to Canada, traveled and where many of them stopped off and, ending their journey, made their permanent homes. Those colored men, when they left the South were slaves, when they reached Michigan they were free men; they were given homes.

They worked, they saved their money, they became landowners, they became businessmen; they became merchants and producers of merchandise. Yes, they were respected; they were honored in their communities; they became part of the community; they held local office; they took part in public discussions and were considered and were treated for what they were, loyal and patriotic, God-fearing, industrious, thrifty, American citizens.

There was no discrimination because of color or of birth, but there was no intermarriage; there was no attempt by the whites to invade the domestic, the home life of Negroes, and the Negroes made no attempt to interfere with the home life of the whites. Each was equal and to all was given equal justice under law. That is true to this day in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, except in one or two spots adjacent to Chicago and which have been reached by the New Deal teachings and by the writings of Eleanor Roosevelt.

It is only in those cities, in those localities where the Communists, with their antireligious doctrine, where the New Deal, with its so-called social planning, has interfered and brought discord and antirace feeling that we have or will have trouble.

We have this race rioting now because of the encouragement given by those who are stirring up race feeling and who have been stirring up race feeling for, lo, these many months given, I say, by people high in the favor of this administration. The President's wife herself could do a great deal to end this racial feeling which is sweeping the country, which is causing these race riots, which has caused the death of 23 men in Detroit within the last 48 hours; she could do a great deal to stop that if she would go home and attend to her housework, quit her silly, foolish talk, and end activities which, whatever may be her intent, give encouragement to others who bring about these riots.

Notwithstanding the shortage of transportation, the First Lady, though she has a beautiful, comfortable home in Hyde Park, one in the Executive Mansion here in Washington, goes up and down the countryside contributing nothing at all to the war effort by setting an example of needless, useless travel which can have no good effect upon the average citizen. Typical of many communications received by me is the one which came in on Monday, the 21st, from a resident of the District, and which reads, in part, as follows:

Just why can this woman chase all over and the taxpayers have to stay at home. My wife is ill, and I wanted to send her to Florida. Could afford it, but I couldn't get reservations. In fact, was denied the right to send her last early spring. She is worth a dozen like the wife of the President.

Hundreds of thousands of our people have somewhat similar thoughts. They would like to see the Hopkinses, the President's wife, and some others who are hot for war get down and contribute something aside from words, toward the war effort.

Let me say again to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that, brought up as I was, associating as I did from my early boyhood days with Negroes, hunting and fishing and engaging in high-school sports with them, I learned to respect the Negroes and never have I lost that respect, but today I have no use for the man or the woman who teaches the Negro communism, who attempts to use him for political purposes, who, under the guise of helping him, creates a race feeling, brings about rioting in which always the Negro gets the worst of it.

As we all know the situation here in Washington is tense. Whites and blacks who are patriotic should join together to see that those who are taking advantage of the war to create race feeling, end their activities. Let the Negroes here in Washington have equality of opportunity. Had I my way, notwithstanding my firm conviction that we must practice economy, I would vote for the expenditure of millions, yes, billions of dollars to give the Negroes of Washington the best section of the city for residential and business and additional purposes and then I would say to the whites, give them equal justice but stay out of their section except as you are invited and to the Negroes I would say you follow the like procedure. We will transact business, we will get along in governmental affairs, you shall have equal opportunity; but we will follow nature's law, which good Negroes and good whites desire to follow. There will be no intermarriages. There will be no crowding and there will be no pushing and to those whites and to those Negroes who want to intermarry, who want to mingle the blood, whether they be man or woman, whether they be private citizens or members of the President's official family, I would say, do not attempt to run counter to the laws of nature, do not attempt to create another race, which will be neither black, white, nor yellow.

I would say to the agitators on both sides that they should not attempt to exploit their own races for political advantage. That is one thing that is wrong, that is one cause of the trouble. It is idle, I believe, for northern Republicans and northern Democrats if you want to put it that way, to come in here with their anti-lynching bills, their anti-poll-tax bill when we have occurrences like we had in Detroit, a blot on the fair name of our city and State. Due to what? Due to the seeds that were sown there by John L. Lewis, seeds sown then and watered by this administration when they let the violence go on for 6 months in 1937, a violence which smoldered underground, as evidenced from time to time by strikes in our factories. When men of the Negro race were elevated or demoted that feeling was stirred up, and has continued all the time. Law and order were set aside and strikes continued. Why? All to obtain political advantage.

Let me conclude by saying that I hold no brief for Tom Dewey. I care not whether he or some other man is nominated as the candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency. I only voice one thought in that connection, and that is I hope that the Charlie McCarthy of your party, Wendell Willkie, never appears on our ticket again.

Let me end with the statement that unless this administration quits playing politics, unless it makes the defeat of our enemies its chief objective, unless it ends the confusion and the chaos, the destructive policy which it is pursuing here on the home front, this war will be prolonged and the war's end will find the Republic as we know it—destroyed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 1 day, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); and

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 23, and Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, June 23, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

514. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 270. Resolution for the considera-

tion of H. R. 2869, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 573. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 574. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 575. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 576. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3018. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3021. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3022. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3023. A bill to promote farm ownership by providing for Government-insured loans to veterans to enable them to become owners of farm homes through long-term, low-interest-rate loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3024. A bill to secure to the producers of agricultural commodities a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3025. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus Army materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3027. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works—namely, improvement of the channel in the St. Johns River from Palatka to Lake Harney, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H.R. 3028. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3029. A bill to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 237, "Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943"; to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1692. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, calling upon the proper authorities to maintain in full force and effect all measures available for the duration of the war, to the end that no person of Japanese race shall be permitted to enter upon or remain in the Pacific coast area from which persons of Japanese race have been excluded by orders now in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1693. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the members of the Shields Farm Bureau Advisory Council, Morgan County, Ohio, opposing farm price roll-back and subsidy payment on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1694. By Mr. HOPE: Petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. Also, petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. Also, petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the committee on the Judiciary.

1697. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 110 citizens of Polk County, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1698. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1699. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the New York State Hotel Association, requesting that after all of the gasoline requirements of the armed forces of the United States have been met, such gasoline as is available or allotted for civilian use should be allotted on a parity basis in such fashion as to secure that the citizens of all States should have an equal share; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1700. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Clara Sylvester Emery, of Rockland, and 230 other citizens of Knox County, Maine, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1701. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of Townsend Club No. 1, of Cassadage, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1702. Also, petition of the New York State Automobile Association, Albany, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale, distribution, and use of gasoline in the Eastern Seaboard States; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, once more a new day with its golden hours lies before us. We are grateful for a laboring place in Thy vineyard and that in work that keeps faith sweet and strong Thou callest us to be fellow laborers with Thee.

In the midst of crushing cares and frenzied fears may the healing balm of Thy presence restore our jaded souls. Forgive the petulance of our impatience, which is revealed in our discouragements, in our hasty judgments, in our childish outbursts, because the kingdom of love and justice and peace seems so long delayed. Forgive the impertinence that would hurry on the dawn, that would thrust impious hands across the pattern Thou art weaving, that would outrun Thy perfect will for us. Strengthen us to play our part in the life of our times, to think clearly, to speak kindly, to act bravely, to walk in the light as Thou art in the light, to keep the faith, to finish our course and, falling on sleep, to gain the crown—the approval of the Master of all good workmen. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 22, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for

other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 27, and 28 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill and agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) accepting an invitation to have four Members each of the Senate and House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 30), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 53,000 additional copies of House Document No. 237, "Questions and answers containing an analysis relative to Public Law No. 68, 'An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes,'" approved June 9, 1943, of which 45,000 shall be for the use of the House Document Room, 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 2,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417);

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind;

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Andrews	Hayden	Reynolds
Ball	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Holman	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bone	Kilgore	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Stewart
Bridges	Langer	Taft
Brooks	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Caraway	McNary	Truman
Chandler	Maloney	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Gillette	Overton	Wiley
Green	Pepper	Willis
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gurney	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MEETING OF CANADA BRANCH OF THE EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, accepting an invitation to have four Members each of the Senate and House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943, appointed on behalf of the Senate the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to attend the meeting.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 70)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $45,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FISCAL RELATIONS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 69)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a report from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting in response to Senate Resolution 160, agreed to June 22, 1943, a report on fiscal relations of the Federal, State, and local governments, prepared by the committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations, and calls the matter to the attention of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the report be referred to the Committee on Finance, and that it be printed as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Women's Auxiliary of the National Maritime Union of America, of New York City, N. Y., praying for Government subsidies to aid in rolling back living costs and also the appropriation of adequate funds to carry on the work of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A statement by the State Camp of Pennsylvania, Patriotic Order Sons of America, protesting against the reversal of a former flag-salute decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case involving certain members of Jehovah's Witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the National Society, Daughters of the Revolution at New York City, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the National Labor Relations Act and the enactment of legislation requiring all labor organizations to incorporate, to publish their financial status at stated times, to keep their membership lists open for inspection by properly authorized officials, etc.; favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment limiting the term of office of the President of the United States to two terms of 4 years each, and expressing the desire of the National Society, Daughters of the Revolution, that the sovereignty of the United States be maintained inviolate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Dellvale and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU—OBSTETRICAL CARE, ETC.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have received from Dr. Robert

Mueller, the President of the St. Louis Medical Society, the following telegram with reference to House bill 2935, the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 23, 1943.*

Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the St. Louis Medical Society have been informed of the passage of House bill No. 2935, which is now before a Senate committee for discussion and action. The medical profession believes that this bill will place in the hands of incompetent and untrained people other than the recognized medical profession the care of expectant mothers of children of servicemen. The members of the St. Louis Medical Society request your support in the defeat of this bill, since as stated above it will permit people who are not trained in obstetrical practice to care for and deliver wives of servicemen. This is in reference to the appropriation bill of the Children's Bureau.

ROBERT MUELLER, M. D.,
President, St. Louis Medical Society.

I have also received a similar telegram from Dr. James Stewart, the State health commissioner of Missouri, to the same effect. Also a similar telegram from T. R. O'Brien, a community health league official of St. Louis Mo. I ask that these telegrams may be referred to the Appropriations Committee for its consideration in connection with House bill 2935.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams presented by the Senator from Missouri will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH PLATTE (NEBR.) UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE—REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this week the Senate passed a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Included in it was an appropriation for the development of irrigation, so as to make available food produced on irrigated lands.

This morning I received in the mail from the secretary of the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce, an organization which includes about 50 towns in Nebraska, a resolution which asks that the War Production Board lift the freeze order on machinery used for the development of irrigated lands. The machinery which digs the ditches and levels the land is under a freeze order issued by the War Production Board.

It is one thing for us to appropriate funds to bring in land so that it can be irrigated and produce food, but it is another thing to get the machinery to develop the land.

This resolution should be of intense interest to the chairman of the subcommittee having the Interior Department appropriations in charge, and I also should like to bring it to the attention of the Senate. I ask that the resolution be printed as a part of my remarks and referred to the proper committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is an emergency in the United States of America, as to the production of food and foodstuffs not only for our own Nation, but also for our allies; and

Whereas the War Production Board has placed a freeze order upon the program of the National Reclamation Association, which stopped all work on irrigation projects in 17 Western States; and

Whereas the restriction upon the production, sale, and use of machinery has had the effect of precluding the development and leveling of irrigable land located in completed irrigation projects, including the central Nebraska (Tricounty), Middle Loup, and North Loup irrigation districts for which there is now available, and in storage, sufficient water to supply over 170,000 irrigable acres for a period of 2 years; and

Whereas there are numerous feasible planned irrigation projects in settled communities in said States in which production of foods can be heavily increased by supplying supplemental water under construction programs at small cost; and

Whereas in order to do this for the crop year of 1944, it is imperative that heavy machinery of the Le Tourneau type, technical assistance, and financing be obtained immediately, and that it will probably be necessary in order to obtain maximum development that long-term credit facilities be made available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce, assembled in annual meeting at Alma, Nebr., on this 15th day of June A. D. 1943, That—

1. The program of the National Reclamation Association in requesting the rescission of the freeze order by the War Production Board, upon irrigation projects in these 17 Western States be endorsed.

2. That the restriction upon the production, sale, and use of heavy machinery for leveling purposes in irrigation projects already completed be lifted. That technical assistance and financing and long-term credit be made available for such purposes.

3. That irrigation projects, feasible for increased production in settled communities by the use of supplemental water, be allotted funds for immediate construction and completion.

That copies of this resolution be forthwith sent by the secretary to the National Resources Planning Board, now in session in Omaha, Nebr., and to all Congressmen and Senators, the Governor and State engineer of the State of Nebraska, and the Congressmen of northern Kansas.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH PLATTE (NEBR.) UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE—DAM ACROSS THE REPUBLICAN RIVER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also present a resolution adopted by the South Platte (Nebr.) United Chambers of Commerce at their annual meeting relating to the construction of a dam on the Republican River in Harlan County, Nebr., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congress has authorized the construction of a dam on the Republican River in Harlan County, Nebr., and the Army engineers have completed the design work in connection with the construction of said dam and the Army engineers are now ready to start actual construction of same as soon as Congress makes available an appropriation for said work: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce at this, their annual meeting, in Alma, Nebr., June 15, 1943, go on record as unanimously urging early construction of this dam, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Nebraska Member of Congress and Senators, also to Governor Dwight Griswold, and State Engineer Scott, and ask them to do everything possible to secure a sufficient and immediate appropriation to start this work.

PROHIBITION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference certain petitions and to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the petitions received by me praying for the enactment of Senate bill 862 and Senate bill 569, prohibiting the advertisement by radio and otherwise of alcoholic beverages.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Connecticut: Yalesville	53

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference certain petitions and to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the petitions received by me praying for the enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Connecticut: Yalesville	45
Florida: Eustis	36
Maryland: Chesapeake City	45
Total	126

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present certain petitions for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the petitions which I have received praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and in connection therewith I wish to suggest that the Committee on Military Affairs report the bill favorably at the earliest possible moment.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arkansas: De Witt	14
California: Santa Monica	1
Connecticut:	
Bantam	10
Bristol	68
Canterbury	29
Central Village	13
Cheshire	31

Connecticut—Continued.	
Cromwell	88
Danbury	11
Danielson	79
Durham	14
Franklin	11
Groton	23
Hartford	85
Hazardville	42
Kensington	24
Lebanon	10
Litchfield	19
Madison	27
Meriden	47
Middlefield	3
Middleton	33
Moosup	71
Mystic	40
New Haven	36
New London	49
Niantic	34
Norwalk	53
Norwich	23
Oneco	46
Plymouth	9
Putman	40
Scotland	21
Somers	36
Somersville	9
Stamford	133
Sterling	12
Thomaston	37
Wethersfield	16
Willimantic	88
Windsor	57
Yalesville	52
Yantic	6
Total	1,480
Illinois:	
Dixon	23
Mount Vernon	23
Pontiac	67
Rock Falls	23
Sterling	2
Total	138
Maryland: Baltimore	187
Massachusetts:	
Hyde Park	40
Newton Upper Falls	75
Revere	32
Total	147
Minnesota:	
Albert Lea	71
Cambridge	48
Donnelly	26
Roosevelt	36
St. Paul	11
Total	192
Oregon: Oakland	23
Pennsylvania:	
Clarke	39
Landisville	1
Lehighton	58
Palmertown	21
Waymart	21
Total	140
South Carolina: Greenville	47
Texas: Quitman	1
Virginia: Portsmouth	20
Washington:	
Bremerton	37
Burlington	28
Total	65
Grand total	2,455

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 758) to amend section 3 (c), Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing a uniform allowance for certain officers in the Army of the United States, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 336) thereon.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of C. W. Holder; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 1260, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1261. A bill providing for the use by the States and their political subdivisions of certain equipment and material of the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1262. A bill relating to certain proceedings in the district courts of the United States where property is requisitioned under the act of October 16, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1263. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; and

S. 1264. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ISSUANCE OF FOOD STAMPS TO LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to issue food stamps to be used to increase the food purchasing power of low-income individuals, and for other purposes.

In effect this is a bill to subsidize the man of modest means so that he may eat and live through this war.

The bill has been developed by my distinguished colleague, Congressman CHRISTIAN A. HERTER. I was so impressed with his argument and have for so long been aware of his talents that I desire to introduce the bill in the Senate so that we might in this body have the advantage of having this proposition before us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1260) to authorize the War Food Administrator to issue food stamps to be used to increase the food purchasing power of low-income individuals, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TRUMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND TERRITORIES IN FINANCING SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BARBOUR to the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public, elementary, and secondary schools, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa (Mr. GILLETTE) and myself I submit and ask to have printed a proposed amendment to Senate bill 1108, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, so that if by any chance the Senate shall consider the measure today, the amendment may be available in printed form to Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BANKHEAD (for the Committee on Banking and Currency) and Mr. CLARK of Missouri each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for

other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RESPECTING CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS—ALLOCATION OF MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, AND MANPOWER

Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MOORE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 161), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto, whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address dealing with the bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, delivered by Senator WILEY in New York City, June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REPEAL OF CERTAIN IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio address prepared by him on the subject of immigration and some of the current proposals to repeal certain immigration restrictions, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIGHT OF AGRICULTURE FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality," written by him and published in the Missouri Farmer for June 1, 1943, together with editorial comment, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSTALLATION OF MME. WEI TAO MING AS A MEMBER OF KAPPA BETA PI

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings incident to the installation of Mme. Wei Tao Ming, wife of the Chinese Ambassador, as a member of Kappa Beta Pi, international legal honor sorority, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE SYNTHETIC RUBBER SITUATION—ADDRESS BY HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the synthetic rubber situation, delivered by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., on June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS IN SOUTH DAKOTA—EDITORIAL FROM THE HURON (S. DAK.) HURONITE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to campaign contributions in South Dakota, published in the Huron (S. Dak.) Huronite of June 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (MAINE) PRESS HERALD

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial concerning the National Youth Administration, published in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL IN THE PORTLAND (MAINE) PRESS HERALD

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fine Speech," dealing with American foreign policy, published in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPREME COURT QUORUM—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Supreme Court Quorum," published in the New York Times of June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2798, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes, and so forth."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection to considering the bill at this time. I am not at all familiar with the purposes of the measure. I am greatly interested in highway legislation, particularly in any bill which would affect the appropriation policy heretofore framed by the Congress. I think the Senator should, in advance of making his motion, state generally what are the objectives of the bill. Otherwise I should want to have it go over until I could have opportunity to examine it.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I shall be glad to explain the bill.

Mr. MCNARY. I did not have any warning the motion would be made, and, so far as I am advised, no other Senator had. If the bill provides for any change in the policy heretofore adopted by the Congress, I should ask that it go over until we have had an opportunity to study it. Therefore I should like to have the Senator make some statement as to the importance of the bill, and what it means.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, replying to the Senator from Oregon. Under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941, funds were made available to the various States in accordance with a formula provided by law in order to meet the emergency highway transportation needs.

Because of the difficulty experienced by the States in obtaining labor, equipment, and materials to carry out their highway programs, it has been impossible for the States to obligate these funds.

Section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765) provides that these funds, together with all Federal road funds apportioned to the States prior to December 31, 1941, if not obligated by the States on or before June 30, 1943, shall be reapportioned among the States. The section further provides that no State having an unobligated balance in its road fund shall be entitled to participate in the reapportionment.

Mr. MCNARY. I am particularly interested in knowing whether the bill contemplates a change in the appropriation of highway funds.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Only in very minor respects, which I shall explain later. One point is that the sum of $50,000,000 is provided for future highway planning, and afterward the money will be obligated to the various States.

Mr. MCNARY. I do not wish to get into an argument with the able Senator. What I have in mind is that some proposal has been made to change the existing ratio among the States. At present the arrangement is one-third based on population, one-third on area, and one-third on the extent of the post roads. I am curious to know whether this bill in any way changes the plan and formula we have followed for many years.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It does not.

Mr. MCNARY. That is what I desired to know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with an amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I do not think the able Senator from Nevada has concluded the statement he began to

make with reference to the bill now before the Senate. The inquiry I interposed was whether the bill would change the formula now in existence. I think the Senator should set forth clearly the purposes of the bill.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, this bill, providing for amendment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1916, as amended, was reported unanimously from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Section 1 of the bill provides for a change in the definition of the term "construction" so as to include rights-of-way. Heretofore, except in strategic highways for national defense, the States have provided the rights-of-way for Federal-aid projects. It is a matter of common knowledge that much of the highway construction that will be required following the present war will involve a change and a relocation of existing highways. So that the first section of the bill is to provide that both the States and the Federal Government shall share in the cost of rights-of-way for the construction of highways.

Section 2 of the bill is to prevent a lapse of highway funds and continues in force until 1 year after the present war. The pressing need for the passage of the bill arises from the reversion and reapportionment provisions in existing Federal-aid highway legislation, where funds are unobligated by the States.

Under section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 the funds apportioned to the States unless they are obligated revert to the Treasury and are reapportioned among the States. It is well known that because of the difficulty in public construction arising from priorities and the war there is practically a cessation in highway construction at the present time.

Section 2 of the pending bill provides for a continuation of the time for the allocation of projects to the States and a matching of those projects by the State without provision for reversion and reapportionment. There is at present allocated to the States on projects unobligated as of April 30, 1943, that would be affected by a lapse on July 1, 1943, the sum of about $68,000,000. These funds are allocated to the States under the formula of the Federal Highway Act. On July 1, 1944, those funds would amount to about $171,000,000. These funds have already been authorized. They are not being obligated because of the difficulties not only in highway construction but in all other construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks I may include at this point table No. 1, showing as of April 30, 1943, the amount of unobligated funds, by States, which, if still unobligated after June 30, 1943, would no longer be available to the States in the absence of corrective legislation. These amounts represent only part of the total of $171,544,373 which would expire on July 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Unobligated balances of regular funds, availability of which will expire on June 30, 1943, as of April 30, 1943*

State	Highway	Secondary or feeder	Grade crossing	Total
Alabama	$554,325	$231,532	$501,789	$1,287,646
Arizona	16,611	81,904	101,101	199,616
Arkansas	49,978	36,322	238,673	324,973
California	11,284	27,054	1,520,728	1,559,066
Colorado	195,796	193,550	476,911	866,257
Connecticut	80,135	104,180	402,832	587,147
Delaware	1,093,697	175,859	82,182	1,351,738
Florida	815,254	152,049	578,945	1,546,248
Georgia	2,202,412	442,745	1,014,679	3,659,836
Idaho	116,723	7,345	293,449	417,517
Illinois	906,154	90,568	1,264,293	2,261,015
Indiana	91,333	495,577	665,335	1,252,245
Iowa	43,535	150,690	27,789	222,014
Kansas	1,695,842	693,754	695,980	3,085,576
Kentucky	11,989	----------	112,719	124,708
Louisiana	2,199,138	192,029	601,628	2,992,795
Maine	24,565	2,134	150,856	177,555
Maryland	103,313	199,928	54,367	357,608
Massachusetts	1,680,944	271,347	859,798	2,812,089
Michigan	53,282	106,508	70,763	230,553
Minnesota	236,423	83,780	690,460	1,010,663
Mississippi	605,317	96,096	345,327	1,046,740
Missouri	225,586	509,788	947,036	1,682,410
Montana	2,135,692	534,708	480,395	3,150,795
Nebraska	1,810,155	348,653	186,780	2,345,588
Nevada	46,061	15,026	101,188	162,275
New Hampshire	220,812	6,004	221,621	448,437
New Jersey	509,968	326,318	576,531	1,412,817
New Mexico	518,446	3,718	344,760	866,924
New York	726,638	164,093	2,506,037	3,396,768
North Carolina	1,337,480	225,305	915,332	2,478,117
North Dakota	647,448	492,847	586,930	1,727,225
Ohio	596,454	699,070	31,045	1,326,569
Oklahoma	3,410,923	294,379	1,023,828	4,729,130
Oregon	3,299	66,897	389	70,585

TABLE I.—*Unobligated balances of regular funds, availability of which will expire on June 30, 1943, as of April 30, 1943*—Con.

State	Highway	Secondary or feeder	Grade crossing	Total
Pennsylvania	$586,260	$179,182	$1,590,792	$2,356,234
Rhode Island	122,310	5,658	174,959	302,927
South Carolina	42,280	164,866	663,747	870,893
South Dakota	961,600	475,563	571,139	2,008,302
Tennessee	1,117,182	190,421	348,384	1,655,987
Texas	1,558,606	959,384	1,358,795	3,876,785
Utah	----------	187	50,077	50,264
Vermont	58,032	4,074	16,013	78,119
Virginia	652,329	126,511	602,523	1,381,363
Washington	297,094	7,161	138,520	442,775
West Virginia	297,603	326,467	187,811	811,881
Wisconsin	1,033,879	172,493	1,243,741	2,450,113
Wyoming	107,319	----------	192,352	299,671
Hawaii	440,805	141,345	185,256	767,406
District of Columbia	20,718	9,287	----------	30,005
Puerto Rico	13,960	144,894	135,018	293,872
Total	32,286,989	10,429,250	26,131,603	68,847,842

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may include as a part of my remarks table No. 2, showing the total balances in the amount of $171,544,373, which would all expire on July 1, 1944, unless obligated before that time.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Balances of funds apportioned to all States available for programed projects, as of April 30, 1943*

State	Public Works, 1934	Public Works, 1935	Works program, highway	Works program, grade crossing	Regular Federal aid	Federal aid, secondary	Federal aid, grade crossing	Total
Alabama	----------	----------	----------	$10,325	$2,638,080	$596,189	$906,917	$4,151,511
Arizona	----------	----------	----------	----------	939,199	316,999	228,741	1,484,939
Arkansas	----------	----------	----------	----------	904,891	224,941	570,087	1,699,919
California	----------	----------	----------	----------	793,697	669,813	2,307,186	3,770,696
Colorado	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,445,324	502,658	728,529	2,676,511
Connecticut	----------	----------	----------	83,390	80,772	211,101	564,374	939,637
Delaware	----------	----------	$5,200	----------	1,573,886	259,893	178,221	2,017,200
Florida	----------	$34	----------	----------	2,225,209	389,541	874,145	3,488,929
Georgia	$58,351	8,916	65,389	904,138	4,681,851	876,646	1,502,734	8,098,025
Idaho	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,066,379	73,057	456,737	1,596,173
Illinois	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,041,767	771,070	2,262,035	5,074,872
Indiana	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,328,537	910,976	1,161,281	4,400,794
Iowa	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,954,516	587,184	349,903	2,891,603
Kansas	----------	----------	----------	----------	4,182,321	1,128,888	1,174,369	6,485,578
Kentucky	----------	----------	----------	----------	229,509	319,467	465,672	1,014,648
Louisiana	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,604,991	323,276	914,842	4,843,109
Maine	----------	----------	----------	----------	580,956	133,346	282,732	997,034
Maryland	----------	----------	7,395	157,791	721,912	343,380	248,842	1,479,320
Massachusetts	----------	----------	5,796	94,654	2,971,453	497,186	1,242,078	4,811,167
Michigan	----------	----------	----------	----------	350,144	628,622	197,535	1,176,301
Minnesota	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,362,306	549,681	1,208,910	4,120,897
Mississippi	----------	----------	425	2,381	1,990,629	403,011	654,690	3,051,136
Missouri	----------	----------	----------	13,505	3,145,047	1,020,694	1,517,298	5,696,544
Montana	----------	----------	----------	----------	4,126,176	883,043	738,848	5,748,067
Nebraska	----------	----------	192	----------	3,029,640	691,898	515,703	4,237,433
Nevada	----------	----------	----------	----------	262,092	215,677	197,226	674,995
New Hampshire	----------	----------	----------	----------	701,000	90,038	317,659	1,108,697
New Jersey	----------	3,328	----------	19,051	1,764,543	545,870	947,529	3,280,321
New Mexico	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,435,433	170,244	519,348	2,125,025
New York	----------	----------	56,176	516,661	5,286,848	412,426	3,816,242	10,088,353
North Carolina	----------	----------	----------	1,923	3,480,826	636,826	1,422,601	5,542,176
North Dakota	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,123,964	751,238	881,886	3,757,088
Ohio	----------	----------	----------	24,723	949,963	1,305,883	812,864	3,093,433
Oklahoma	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,649,446	686,120	1,459,233	7,794,799
Oregon	----------	----------	----------	----------	550,616	351,167	389	902,172
Pennsylvania	----------	----------	----------	213,835	3,010,296	823,563	2,663,983	6,711,677
Rhode Island	----------	----------	----------	----------	609,810	82,543	270,997	963,350
South Carolina	----------	----------	----------	89,459	879,601	396,945	957,483	2,323,488
South Dakota	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,515,713	747,533	820,887	4,084,133
Tennessee	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,198,036	554,571	725,154	4,477,761
Texas	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,962,250	2,047,737	2,440,616	11,450,603
Utah	----------	----------	----------	----------	1	116,726	174,422	291,149
Vermont	----------	----------	----------	----------	360,023	59,228	112,051	531,302
Virginia	----------	----------	1,741	65,109	2,478,056	446,015	971,160	3,962,081
Washington	----------	----------	----------	----------	910,589	23,708	437,851	1,372,148
West Virginia	65	----------	1,167	----------	847,649	515,494	222,131	1,586,506
Wisconsin	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,398,837	586,361	1,720,413	5,705,611
Wyoming	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,088,083	144,231	322,253	1,554,567
Hawaii	----------	----------	----------	----------	920,993	225,379	281,294	1,427,666
District of Columbia	----------	----------	----------	----------	21,218	93,321	89,699	204,238
Puerto Rico	----------	----------	----------	----------	47,221	231,246	300,524	578,991
Total	58,416	12,278	143,481	2,196,945	90,422,299	25,572,650	44,138,304	171,544,373

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, section 3 of the bill is an important provision and it looks toward highway construction as public work following the war. I may say that I know generally of no more satisfactory public works to provide work for the unemployed in all of the States of the Union than highway construction.

Section 3 provides that there shall be eligible for expenditure with the Federal Government matching in preparing plans for post-war construction not to exceed $50,000,000 of the Federal aid highway funds for all purposes heretofore appropriated. In other words, heretofore the States and the State highway commissions have prepared the plans for construction. This section is merely an enlargement of section 9 of the Defense Highway Act, which provides that there shall be appropriated $10,000,000 to prepare plans and that the local interests and the Federal Government shall share equally in those plans. In the post-war program where the Federal Government must make large appropriations for highway construction, it is preeminently proper that we should provide now for plans so that we will have available to the States and to the Federal Government adequate plans already prepared for the essential highway construction that must follow the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks I may include a break-down of the $50,000,000 that is referred to in section 3 of the bill, in which there will be a designation of the exact amount which each State will have available for planning purposes.

There being no objection, the break-down was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apportionment of $50,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sec. 21 of the Federal Highway Act

STATE AND AMOUNT	
Alabama	$1,073,685
Arizona	737,698
Arkansas	879,398
California	2,052,843
Colorado	920,452
Connecticut	318,057
Delaware	250,000
Florida	736,147
Georgia	1,287,986
Idaho	634,020
Illinois	2,020,185
Indiana	1,232,715
Iowa	1,275,186
Kansas	1,293,058
Kentucky	955,360
Louisiana	762,633
Maine	444,348
Maryland	415,242
Massachusetts	670,583
Michigan	1,556,139
Minnesota	1,380,023
Mississippi	919,522
Missouri	1,519,138
Montana	1,037,280
Nebraska	1,020,507
Nevada	654,359
New Hampshire	250,000
New Jersey	651,596
New Mexico	829,669
New York	2,469,884
North Carolina	1,235,019
North Dakota	765,365
Ohio	1,802,996
Oklahoma	1,162,017
Oregon	$849,827
Pennsylvania	2,093,567
Rhode Island	250,000
South Carolina	693,473
South Dakota	804,186
Tennessee	1,086,546
Texas	3,252,287
Utah	576,142
Vermont	250,000
Virginia	936,400
Washington	807,890
West Virginia	563,183
Wisconsin	1,231,947
Wyoming	638,436
Hawaii	250,000
District of Columbia	250,000
Puerto Rico	253,006
Total	50,000,000

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, section 4 provides for an additional allotment of $15,000,000 for the construction of roads to strategic materials, primarily minerals, the amount now available having been expended; that amount being $10,000,000.

Section 5 provides for a survey of a system of express highways by the Department of Public Roads and for a report to the Congress within 6 months.

Section 6 provides for reimbursement to the States for road damage occasioned by military operations on the various roads.

Section 7 provides for special disbursement of not to exceed $20,000,000 in connection with roads damaged by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides. This section in the committee amendment was proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I will ask him to make an explanation of it, as it pertains particularly to the Southern States and to the Mississippi River Valley.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. As I understand, the able Senator from Nevada is now discussing section 7, on page 5 of the bill?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MCNARY. What is the purpose of that section? It was not contained in the House bill.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I will ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who proposed the amendment in committee, to explain the amendment to the Senate.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, paragraph (a) of this section would provide an additional $20,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges, both under the Federal-aid highway system and on secondary and feeder roads which have been damaged or destroyed by recent floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides. It also would authorize the appropriation of such sums of money as may be necessary to make reimbursement for the funds expended for the repair or rebuilding of the damaged highways and bridges covered by this section.

Mr. President, this is an emergency fund which is provided from funds already appropriated but parts of which are still unexpended; and the money would be made available for those special emergency purposes. The section provides that the funds may be reimbursed by subsequent appropriations, as needed.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, at this point let me inquire whether the distinguished Senator has any estimates of the amount of damages done to the roads by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and landslides up to the present time, and not already covered by other legislation.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. We have various estimates, but they cannot be accurate at this time. Of course, the money will not be spent except as the estimates come in and are certified as accurately representing a need which actually exists.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I say that, of course, we have some estimates, but, as the able senior Senator from Oregon realizes, immediately following the floods it will take some time to make surveys in order to determine the losses.

Mr. MCNARY. Does the language have particular reference to the floods which have occurred along the Mississippi?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Yes; and everywhere else in the several States where they occur.

Mr. MCNARY. Have they occurred elsewhere in the country?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Yes; in the Arkansas River Valley and the Missouri River Valley. The item is not a new one.

Mr. MCNARY. I am curious to know how much money is to be taken out of appropriations to States to meet the liability of the Federal Government to restore such highways. To what extent would the funds heretofore appropriated be depleted?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. They could not be depleted by more than $20,000,000, because the bill authorizes the making of appropriations to reimburse the fund.

Mr. MCNARY. The $20,000,000 is not the maximum sum which might be used for that purpose; because the amount spent would be reimbursable, would it not?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. That is the maximum amount of the emergency fund provided in the bill with the amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. I am not particularly criticizing that. I am asking for information. I notice, however, that on page 5, in line 20, it is provided:

> And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended from time to time under the authority of this section.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. That would be to reimburse the $20,000,000.

Mr. MCNARY. I appreciate that; but that is in the nature of a revolving fund, is it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; but it is not merely for this fund. It is a fund to be created for this purpose.

Mr. McNARY. Of course; and that is fixing a liability upon this road fund to the extent that destruction of the highways occurs. Is not that the correct interpretation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would fix the obligations to the extent that the damages and losses are certified.

Mr. McNARY. Now the Senator is getting back to my first inquiry. Has the committee any data to indicate to what extent the liability and the demands upon funds heretofore appropriated for use for this purpose between the Federal Government and the States have developed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand and interpret the provisions, the amount would not exceed $20,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I do not so understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I may refer to the history of this matter, let me say that I think the first appropriation of this kind was made in the case of the State of Vermont. Serious floods occurred there, and the making of repairs was authorized in this manner.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The next appropriation was made in the case of a flood on the Ohio River and in Kentucky. Then we adopted this standard form, and placed sums of money in the fund from time to time.

The present situation is that the amount left in the fund is not sufficiently large, it is estimated, to take care of the damage caused by the floods which have occurred this year in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator estimates that the $20,000,000 is not to be the maximum liability in connection with the destruction of highways by hurricanes and floods; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; from time to time we shall have to meet the situation.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it is estimated that the $20,000,000 provided for in the bill will be ample to meet the present damages caused by floods.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; that is some of the information which I have sought. However, I understand that the bill does not limit the liability to $20,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does until Congress increases the amount.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that; but the Senator knows, as I know, that when we say it is to be reimbursable, it would necessarily, as a moral obligation, be presented here, and we should have to appropriate sufficient money to meet the liability.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I am trying to find out what is the net liability.

Mr. HAYDEN. No one knows what is the net liability.

Mr. McNARY. Has not the committee made some estimates?

Mr. HAYDEN. All we know is that there were very serious floods in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys this year, and that the floods have done great damage to the highways. If we follow the policy heretofore adopted by Congress, we shall aid in the rehabilitation of those roads; and it is estimated that the total amount involved will be less than $20,000,000. That is why we placed that limitation in the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; that amount is stated in round figures; but the statement is not made under the general policy of the act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the floods have occurred so recently that up to now we have been unable to obtain accurate estimates.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. There have been floods in other sections of the country. How are we to determine which communities will have priority in obtaining such relief?

Mr. HAYDEN. The statute is general in character and applies to the entire country; but the immediate occasion for the bill is the extraordinary flood which recently has occurred in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. Whatever the situation may be in any State, the language will be applicable to it. The matter can be taken up by the State highway commission with the Commissioner of Public Roads, and an adjustment made, if it is justified.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, when Congress has failed to provide relief in specific instances, if the damage was due to an act of God—a flood, let us say—occurring a year ago, any community which suffered from such a flood could ask for relief under the bill; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there was a statute on the books all along. We have reenacted it from time to time, after establishing the principle, as I have said, first in the case of a flood in Vermont, and subsequently in the case of a flood in Kentucky. The thought was to handle the situation by a general statute which would lay down a rule to go by, and then from time to time to make an appropriation, thus indicating how far Congress would go.

What is now proposed to be done is to appropriate $20,000,000 to take care of whatever damage has occurred.

Mr. WILEY. Let me state a specific example. Last year, in my State there was a very destructive flood in a certain community. The flood damaged all the sewers, tore up the streets, and practically put the community out of business. At that time we sought to obtain some relief. We have not been able to obtain it. Why will not we be entitled to some relief under the bill, the same as will the folks on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the bill is confined to repairs to roads under the Federal-aid highway system. That is all we are taking care of. We are concerned only with roads on which, heretofore, Federal money has been expended along with the money of the States.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, if a Federal highway goes through a city, it could obtain relief under the bill; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question relative to the section. Is the State required to match the fund?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; what we do is to say that the contribution is made because of an emergency, an accident. The damage may be caused by a flood or a hurricane, as sometimes happens in Florida.

We say that the contribution from the Federal Treasury is to be made in the attempt to restore the State highway system to the condition in which it was prior to being damaged by an act of God.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand, the State highway department must make application.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; it must make application and prove its case.

Mr. GEORGE. But so far as concerns the repair of roads torn up, it is not necessary to match the Federal appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. On page 3, section 4, what is the effect of increasing the amount from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000? What kind of feeder roads are involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are called access roads, to sources of raw material needed for the war. If there is timber in a forest, and there is no way to get to it, the access road money is used to build a road to bring the timber out.

Mr. TAFT. Does it include roads leading to camps and camp sites?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the access roads are primarily for access to raw materials.

Mr. TAFT. Do such materials include only timber?

Mr. HAYDEN. Timber, or any kind of metals. I know of instances of mining properties being made accessible because molybdenum, tungsten, or some of the rarer metals were needed. The type of road depends upon what means of transportation is used to get the materials out. None of the access roads are high-class roads. They are primarily trucking roads.

Mr. TAFT. Are such roads all in the Western States?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I understand that some of this kind of work has been done in the timber sections of Wisconsin and Michigan. Wherever there are raw materials which are needed for the war, this is the way to get at them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On that point, I remember that a year or two ago we had a very ambitious system laid out on a map showing so-called strategic roads, which included practically every square inch of highway in the United States. It was sought to bring the whole system into the war effort. The Senator will remember what I am talking about.

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember that it was urged—and I thought very properly——

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator and I disagreed at the time.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was urged—and I thought very properly—that if we expected to move over the roads of the United States large numbers of troops and great quantities of material which would be required by the war, we would have to improve the roads. History has absolutely justified that view. We are tearing our highway system to pieces by excessive military and industrial loads. It would have been of great advantage to have made the improvement. Ultimately we shall have to do it. The cost will be more than if we had done it in the first place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I wish to inquire is whether all the so-called strategic roads are to become eligible for the new aid.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The so-called access roads are entirely off the strategic system. The purpose of access roads is to reach raw materials needed for the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a further question, if the Senator from Nevada will yield.

I am intrigued by the language of section 9, at the bottom of page 8. The language is:

> No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Who is sought to be bypassed by that provision?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is the Director of the Budget, who impounded a large amount of highway funds. The State highway departments feel that he did not exercise good judgment, and they would rather trust the judgment of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the Senator, under the existing system the Director of the Budget has some authority in respect to the exercise of discretionary power to expend this money; and now the effort is being made to bypass the Director of the Budget, and to leave the Commissioner of Public Roads monarch of all he surveys in respect to those decisions. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not the basis of it at all. The idea is that if the Congress of the United States makes appropriations and authorizations for the construction of highways for which, in its judgment, money should be expended, the will of the Congress should be carried out. The will of the Congress has been thwarted in this respect, as in many other respects.

Mr. VANDENBERG. By whom has it been thwarted?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has been thwarted by impounding money through the Bureau of the Budget. It has been thwarted also, of course, in another way, by withholding permission, so far as the War Production Board is concerned, to obtain the necessary strategic materials to carry on the work. That may be really the more serious difficulty. Whatever the difficulty is, we have always this problem before us: The Congress makes up its mind that it wishes certain things done; but the question is, Can the executive branch of the Government be compelled to do the things for which Congress has appropriated money? This is a step in the direction of trying to indicate that we want the policy which we have adopted carried out. Whether or not the effort will prove to be effective is something else.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says that one of the things which has happened is that this work has been interrupted by adverse priority decisions from the War Production Board.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does section 9 mean that the War Production Board can have no further priority authority over this sort of construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. This section relates to impounding or withholding funds. No one but the Director of the Budget impounds or withholds funds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the example which the Senator gave regarding priorities does not apply to section 9?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was trying to say to the Senator that there is more than one way of stopping the execution of the will of Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am particularly interested in finding out who it is we are after in section 9.

Mr. HAYDEN. It could not be anyone but the Director of the Budget, because he is the only official of Government who can impound or withhold funds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under what authority does he impound and withhold?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what we want to ascertain. We inserted this inhibition for the purpose of determining whether the will of the Congress shall be supreme, or whether the will of the Bureau of the Budget shall be supreme. I think that if the Congress shows that it is in favor of having its own views carried out, they will be carried out. That is my judgment. But if we supinely let the Bureau of the Budget veto any provision it pleases in any bill, it will not be long before it will be vetoing more than the road bills. It has been vetoing road bills for several years, and we think that such legislation ought not to be vetoed in that way.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On what basis did the Bureau of the Budget veto these road allocations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the slightest idea. I know no more about it than does the Senator from Michigan. I know that the Budget Director impounds those funds, and keeps them impounded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator does not know any more about it than I do, we are certainly moving in the dark.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are not moving in the dark. We are moving to stand by the views of the Congress, as expressed in the law; and I do not think the Bureau of the Budget has any right to veto a measure after it is passed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator if the Director of the Budget——

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That depends entirely upon the nature of the appropriation. If it is a discretionary appropriation, someone must exercise discretion.

Mr. McKELLAR. This was not a discretionary appropriation at all. It was an appropriation for the specific purpose of aiding the road program in the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has it any connection with any directives issued by the President of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not so far as I know.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Bureau of the Budget is the only Federal agency which can impound funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only veto we have had up to date is from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may be misinformed, but I understood that this was generally related to the fact that a Presidential directive, or something of that nature—perhaps a regulation of the Bureau of the Budget—was seeking to confine highway expenditures for the duration to road improvements definitely essential to the war effort. If that be the rule which we are trying to waive, I am not in favor of waiving it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that is the rule at all. I think such funds were impounded before we got into the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems rather curious that we should attempt to enact legislation which seeks to withdraw some of the obvious checks and balances which evidently now exist and have heretofore existed. Apparently, however, I am not getting to the bottom of the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Nevada concluded his statement?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not care to discuss the bill further. I congratulate the able Senator from Nevada for having brought the bill up at this time and asked for its immediate consideration. I regard it as an important measure, in view of the conditions which obtain, and I hope it will be passed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Charles M. Upham, engineer-director of the American Road Builders' Association, addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. Upham is one of the country's foremost engineers. Over the past several years he has made an intensive study of the economic aspects of the highway program.

More recently he has concluded a comprehensive report on the post-war highway problem, which, in my opinion, is

the most authoritative and exhaustive study on the subject yet made. His letter in support of the bill under consideration includes an exceptionally clear analysis of the importance of its provisions with regard to adequate preparation for the post-war era.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I understand the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads now has under consideration H. R. 2798, amending the Federal Highway Act.

Among other provisions, this proposed measure would make Federal-aid funds available for the preparation of surveys and plans in connection with post-war highway improvement. Such a procedure has long been advocated by the American Road Builders' Association, and recently incorporated in a formal plan for a post-war highway program adopted at the annual meeting of the Association, May 5-7, in Chicago.

The importance of post-war planning cannot be over-emphasized and I may say without fear of contradiction that the entire future of the highway program rests largely with preparation made between now and the end of the war.

Section 1 of H. R. 2798 pertaining to rights-of-way is most important. It is a well-established fact that one of the greatest obstacles in getting highway projects under way is the problem of land acquisition. Under the constitution and laws of many States this is a long-drawn-out procedure and quite frequently involves lengthy litigation, before actual possession can be obtained. The construction of many necessary highway projects have in the past been unduly delayed because of rights-of-way difficulties, even in those cases where the improvement would have eliminated severe hazards to both life and property as well as expediting the free flow of traffic. However, the consequences of such delays in the past are rather insignificant compared to any prolonged tardiness in promptly getting the post-war highway program under way. In order for the highway industry and profession to assume its full responsibility in the postwar era it is essential that rights-of-way must be acquired and plans be perfected to such a degree that contracts can be let and projects started when needed. The many inherent delays in acquiring rights-of-way would defeat the very purpose of the post-war highway program if such action were deferred until after the war. It is the position of the American Road Builders' Association that immediate steps should be taken to assure the acquisition of necessary rights-of-way to accompany such plans as must be prepared between now and the end of the war. They are a part and parcel of the same, and one is of little value without the other. Obviously you cannot construct worth-while projects without adequate plans nor can you build a highway without the land upon which to construct it.

There should be no question as to the immediate enactment of section 2. It is the purpose of section 2 to prevent the loss of funds allocated to States but which are not obligated as now required by law. Sixty-eight million dollars of such funds would lapse on June 30, 1943, and $103,000,000 on June 30, 1944. These unobligated funds, approximately $171,000,000, are not remaining idle due to any nonfeasance on the part of the highway departments of the several States. The fact is, these unexpended balances from previous authorizations exist mainly because of conditions arising out of the war and beyond the control of the highway departments. Due to manpower and material limitations, a substantial percentage of projects which would have normally been constructed with these funds, have been precluded from commencement or have been canceled after the work had been started, by directives of the War Production Board. It therefore would seem to be equitable and requisite to hold these funds available to the several States during the continuance of the emergency and for a reasonable time thereafter, thus preventing a loss of the funds to the highway program. Heretofore, funds which have lapsed due to their unobligated status have been reapportioned among the States. However, section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides that such funds can only be reapportioned to those States having no unobligated funds. Inasmuch as each one of the 48 States now has unobligated balances on hand this would mean that the funds would revert to the Government and be lost entirely insofar as highway use is concerned. Therefore, the American Road Builders' Association strongly supports section 2 of the bill and hopes it will receive the favorable consideration of your committee.

Section 3 would authorize the Commissioner of Public Roads, in cooperation with the highway departments of the several States, to expend unobligated Federal-aid funds (regular, secondary, and grade-crossing) for engineering and economic investigations of projects for future construction; and for surveys, plans, specifications and estimates, as well as the acquisition of rights-of-way for post-war highway improvements. The importance of this section cannot be overemphasized.

I am sure you are fully cognizant of the experience during the depression which resulted from a last-minute rush to provide jobs. Soon after the initial effort it was found that jobs on useful public works could not be created overnight but required many months of advance planning. This factor alone was the primary cause of the bogging down of an orderly program and the resorting to the Work Projects Administration type of program or so-called made work. If we learned one lesson from the depression it was that useful jobs cannot be created merely by dumping billions of Federal dollars into the market. Such pump-priming efforts failed then and they will fail again. Not only must the funds and plans be ready at the necessary time but the work must be carried on in the most efficient manner.

Experience has shown almost without exception the most efficient manner of carrying on construction work is by the contract method. This method of construction carries many benefits and results in great savings in construction work. The only excuse for doing construction work other than by the contract method is that in an emergency sufficient time might not be available for the preparation of plans. This bill makes provision for the preparation of plans far in advance of construction so that every facility for efficient and economic procedure will have been made.

Engineer's estimates of costs can be made in order that the reasonableness of the contractor's bid can be ascertained prior to making the contract. Savings derived from the efficiency of groups of contractors supplied with the proper equipment could be obtained. The contract can be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, thus assuring the lowest cost, having taken advantage of the competition of the efficiency and economy on the part of the contractor.

Therefore, it is imperative, in order to prevent a repetition of wasteful work and leaf raking, that we proceed immediately with sound plans which will guarantee useful work. Sound public works projects require good plans and good plans require time. Consistent with the war effort we should devote our immediate and utmost energy toward perfecting a post-war highway program which will meet the demands of traffic and post-war employment.

While the American Road Builders' Association strongly endorses H. R. 2798 we would nevertheless like to suggest the desirability of an amendment which would reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for road damage occasioned by military operations.

Due to the tremendous amount of concentrated war traffic in certain areas, the roads have been substantially damaged. In some cases this traffic consists of military movement of Army and Navy vehicles while in others it consists of the movement of vehicles operated by contractors for or on behalf of the Army or the Navy. Section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 makes partial provision for such conditions and provides for the rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways substantially damaged by the Army or Navy. However, we are informed that the Public Roads Administration has held that it is only authorized to reimburse the States and their political subdivisions where the damage was occasioned directly by the Army or Navy; and further that no relief can be had in those cases where road damage has been sustained due to the operation of vehicles by contractors engaged in the movement of material for or on behalf of the Army or Navy. Thus we are confronted with a paradoxical situation where road damages arising out of war activity are reimbursable in one case while in a similar case such damage is not reimbursable. From the viewpoint of the highway agency involved, be it State, county, or city, there is no basic distinction between damage done by vehicles operated by military authorities and damage done by vehicles directly serving military projects. In many instances roads adjacent to airports, shipyards, cantonments, manufacturing plants, and other war activities have literally been torn to pieces by vehicles carrying loads in excess of those for which the roads were designed and further damaged by a concentration of traffic far beyond the capacity of the road. Certainly there should be some relief in such cases.

At the same time it is appreciated that it is rather difficult to provide legislative relief without making the Federal Government responsible for excessive claims. For example, should section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 be amended in such manner as to provide for reimbursement for damage done to highways by contractors hauling for or on behalf of military authorities, the coverage would for all practical purposes be all-inclusive. Practically all of the truck traffic on the highways today is either directly or indirectly engaged in the movement of material and supplies for or on behalf of the Army or Navy, or other Federal agencies engaged in the prosecution of the war.

To overcome this situation I would like to suggest the inclusion of a provision in the bill which would permit the Commissioner of Public Roads to reimburse the States or their political subdivisions for road damages sustained by the extraordinary and concentrated movement of vehicles operating in direct connection with the construction of war facilities or under other specific military requirements. Such an amendment would make provision for relief in appropriate cases and

at the same time protect the Federal Government.

If your committee contemplates holding hearings, or if you desire any further information, I will be pleased to make a personal appearance or submit such statements as may be required.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES M. UPHAM,
Engineer-Director.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Nevada if he is prepared to discuss section 8 of the pending bill.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I will ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to make an explanation of the section about which the Senator from Oregon inquires.

Mr. HAYDEN. Section 8 of the bill was adopted by the committee at my request. From time to time there has been upon the statute books authorization to acquire toll bridges in order to make them free. However, as in this instance, a limitation has always been imposed.

In the provision under discussion the Senator from Oregon will note that if a State takes certain action prior to January 1, 1945, toll bridges may be acquired and made free. The existing authorization to take over toll bridges has expired, and it becomes necessary to reenact the same general type of statute.

Mr. McNARY. Then the amendment is in the nature of reenactment of a law hertofore passed by the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is the same principle. If a toll bridge is acquired pursuant to recommendation of the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration, the Federal Government will contribute 50 percent of the cost of acquiring the bridge and making it a free bridge. That is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On page 3, in section 4 of the bill, will the able Senator from Arizona advise me why the maximum amount has been increased from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000? What is the basis of fact upon which the increase is made? I see no explanation of it in the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will look on page 5 of the House report he will find the following statement:

Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law 646, 77th Cong.), provides that of the $260,000,000 fund made available for access roads $10,000,000, now almost exhausted, shall be available for access roads to sources of raw materials. That limitation has operated to prevent construction of many projects which have been certified as important to the national defense. The purpose of section 4 of the bill, therefore, is to raise this limitation to $25,000,000 and make it possible to use more of the access-road funds for building these roads to sources of critical raw materials. Such roads are of low-type construction into mining and timber areas to make it possible to develop mines and produce needed raw materials and make them available for use in the war effort. The removal of this limitation is deemed of the utmost importance by members of the committee.

In other words, a total of $260,000,000 was heretofore appropriated by Congress, of which $10,000,000 could be used to build access roads for access to raw materials. The needs in connection with the war effort are such that that amount is not sufficient, and we raised the limit to $25,000,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then it is in no sense an appropriation of new money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. It is merely an increase in the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 6. Section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941 (Public Law 295, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. Emergency repairs: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both, by any other agency of the Government or by any person or contractor employed by or contracting with the Army or Navy or any other agency of the Government 'in the performance of contract work in connection' with the prosecution of the war or national defense. The Commissioner is authorized on behalf of the United States to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine any claim accruing subsequent to May 27, 1941, submitted by the State highway department of any State, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, for reimbursement of the cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

"Such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant shall be certified to Congress for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by the Commissioner unless notice of intention to file such claim has been presented to him within 30 days after the occurrence of the damage upon which the claim is based, except that in case of damage caused by maneuvers such notice shall be filed within 30 days after completion of such maneuvers: *And provided further*, That in either case such notice of damage accruing before the passage of this act shall be filed within 30 days after the passage thereof."

SEC. 7. (a) Not to exceed $20,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, as an emergency relief fund, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways (including secondary and feeder roads) which he finds, after investigation, have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended from time to time under the authority of this section.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any money heretofore apportioned to any State under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or section 4 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, which is unobligated on the date of approval of this act shall be available for expenditure for the rehabilitation of roads and bridges as provided in section 3 of the act approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993), section 4 of the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 633), and paragraph (a) of this section, without regard to the limitation of funds contained in such sections: *Provided*, That any amounts made available to any State under the provisions of this paragraph may be used to pay the share of such State in the cost of any project authorized by this section.

SEC. 8. The act entitled "An act to aid the several States in making, or for having made, certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1937, as amended by section 1 of the act approved July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1066), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That in the case of each and every State which, prior to January 1, 1945, shall have constructed or acquired any toll bridges serving the approved system of Federal-aid highways, and which has caused or, prior to January 1, 1945, shall cause any such toll bridge or toll bridges to be made free, the Federal Works Administrator shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay out of the regular and secondary Federal-aid road funds apportioned to such State not to exceed 50 percent of such amount as may be approved by the Federal Works Administrator as the current reasonable value of the physical property, exclusive of rights-of-way, of any such bridge which the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall certify to him will contribute to the war effort: *Provided*, That no payment of Federal funds shall be made on account of any such bridge which was not constructed in accordance with plans and specifications which would meet the standards required under the Federal Highway Act at the time such bridge was constructed: *Provided further*, That no such payment shall be made which will exceed 50 percent of the current reasonable value of the physical properties of any such bridge, nor shall such payment in the case of any bridge which was constructed or acquired with the aid of Federal funds or with the aid of a grant from the Federal Government exceed 50 percent of the current reasonable value of the physical properties of such bridge which remains after deducting therefrom the share of cost or of grant already paid by the Federal Government, and any amount so paid on account of any such bridge from regular Federal-aid road funds shall be used for matching unobligated regular Federal-aid road funds available to the State for expenditure in the improvement of highways on the system of Federal-aid highways, and any amount so paid on account of any such bridge from secondary Federal-aid road funds shall be used for matching unobligated secondary Federal-aid road funds available to the State for expenditure in the improvement of secondary or feeder roads: *And provided further*, That if the State, or the political subdivision or subdivisions thereof in which any such bridge shall be located, shall be unable to acquire such bridge by purchase agreement or by condemnation under the laws of the State with reasonable promptness and the highway department of the State shall certify such fact to the Federal Works Administrator the Administrator then shall have the authority to acquire and make free any such bridge which the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall certify to him will contribute to the war effort, by condemnation in the manner provided by section 14 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 or under title II of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, subject to the condition that the highway department of the State shall agree to

assume one-half the cost of so acquiring any such bridge by the Federal Works Administrator and to accept such bridge after it is acquired and thereafter maintain and operate it as a free bridge.

SEC. 9. No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure, by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the able senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who is absent on official business, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The first sentence of section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 is hereby amended by inserting after the last word "both" a comma, and adding the words "or by any agency private or public engaged in work in furtherance of the war effort, under contract with the Government or any department thereof."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee has already cared for the identical situation covered by the proposed amendment. Heretofore under the first sentence of section 10 reimbursement could be made for damages caused by the Army or Navy. What the senior Senator from New Jersey is trying to do by the proposed amendment is to provide for reimbursement in the event of damages caused by a Government contractor. From a reading of the bill it will be seen that that is the only change to be made. The language of the committee amendment is as follows:

SEC. 10. Emergency Repairs: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both, by any other agency of the Government or by any person or contractor employed by or contracting with the Army or Navy or any other agency of the Government "in the performance of contract work in connection" with the prosecution of the war or national defense.

So in that way the same principle has been taken care of, I believe, in better language than that of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the able Senator from Arizona, I shall not press the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask one further question about section 9 of the pending bill because it seem to be so mysterious.

Is the Senator from Arizona sure that the only thing which section 9 would do would be to bypass the President? Is the Senator sure that we are not also asked to eliminate some other statutory checks and balances, such as checks upon expenditures which are perfectly normal and natural in the course of our business?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not the intention of the committee to do so, and I do not see how that result would follow. The only official of Government who may impound or withhold an appropriation is the Director of the Budget.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So the only intention of the Senator is to bypass the President's Director of the Budget?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, befor the bill passes, I desire to offer an amendment. My attention was called several days ago to the fact that the War Production Board in administering the existing law regarding the construction of access roads has not interpreted the language of the law as being sufficiently broad to cover petroleum oil fields and oil refineries. The law which we are amending so as to increase the amount of money that will be available for the construction of access roads reads as follows:

That (a) section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941 (Public Law No. 295, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$260,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for access roads to sources of raw materials."

Under the present construction program petroleum is not regarded as a raw material.

Mr. President, the amendment which I suggest is a very simple one. I am sorry I have not had time to write it out for the clerk. It is on page 3, line 14, to strike out the figures "$25,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000", and by inserting after the word "materials" a comma, and the words "including petroleum."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Has the Senator anything in writing from any official of the Government holding that petroleum is not a raw material? Who ever put such a statement as that on paper?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps it is not quite so bald as that when it is written on paper, but I have a letter which I have just received from the head of the Mining Division of the War Production Board. I will send the letter to the desk and ask the clerk to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: You have asked whether or not it is the present policy of the War Production Board in certifying access roads projects under the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the act of July 2, 1942, to consider as projects for which such certification may be made, projects for access roads to oil fields or oil refineries.

The present policy of the War Production Board is not to consider projects for access roads to oil fields and oil refineries as eligible for certification under this statute. As you know, the amount of funds available for certification by the War Production Board for these projects is exceedingly limited. Last year at the time the amendment was adopted allocating $10,000,000 for this purpose, it was made very clear that the access roads which the War Production Board was particularly interested in were roads to mineral areas and lumber areas. Furthermore my recent report to Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, in connection with the requirements for funds for the coming year in the amount of $17,000,000, specifically covers estimates only for roads to mines and timber areas, and the maintenance and engineering cost of roads to such areas.

I do not wish to indicate that we do not feel that there may be need for access roads to oil fields and oil refineries. I am only saying that we have not considered the requirements of such roads in our statement of the needs for funds for access roads or in connection with our certifying access roads projects.

Yours very truly,

A. S. KNOIZEN,
Director, Mining Division.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield, let me say that I cannot read into the letter which has been read an assertion on the part of the writer that oil is not a raw material and that access to it is not necessary. He simply says that, because of the limited amount of funds, roads are not being built to oil fields. I do not think it would change the situation in the least if the Senator's amendment were adopted; it seems to me it would not have any practical effect at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would. Probably the Senator, in the confusion which attended the offering of the amendment, did not hear the proposal. If he will look on page 3 of the bill, in line 14, he will find that the committee has proposed to increase the amount of money available for the construction of access roads from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000. My amendment proposes to increase it to $50,000,000 and to insert the words "including petroleum"; so that the authorization will be sufficiently broad to cover oil fields, and the amount of money available will be sufficiently large to permit such applications to be considered, at least. There is nothing mandatory about the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Whether the amount of money provided is sufficiently large is one thing, and that is the only issue raised in the letter. There was not money enough to go around, and so that they were not building roads to oil fields. If the Senator wants to correct that situation by increasing the amount of money made available I should not object, but I hesitate to specify a particular commodity as though Congress were concerned only with the development of oil wells as against everything else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think there is any danger of such an interpretation.

Mr. HAYDEN. When Congress in the law used the words "raw materials," it meant raw materials of every kind and character.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no question about that.

Mr. HAYDEN. And whenever we include a specific material, it is a limitation on the broader term. As a legislative matter, I must object to that. If the Senator wants to appropriate twenty-five million or fifty million dollars for this purpose, that is another matter. All I know was that the matter was presented to the committee, and it allowed $25,000,000. Does the Senator think that

$25,000,000 worth of roads needs to be built to oil fields?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I have no means of knowing. I am confronted with fact that the War Production Board, up to date, has declined to make any allowance for the construction of access roads to the oil fields, although the need for the construction of such roads is almost as great as any need the Government faces in the conduct of the war.

Mr. HAYDEN. Are the roads the Senator has in mind expensive?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, not particularly.

Mr. HAYDEN. What would the cost be a mile—a thousand dollars?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps that.

Mr. HAYDEN. How many miles?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am in no position to say where new oil fields will be discovered or how many miles of road will be needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is $25,000,000 needed, as suggested by the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will recall, it is an authorization. If he desires me to change the amount from $50,000,000 to a smaller sum, then he is merely asking that the amount of money available for the construction of highly necessary roads shall be limited. The fact that we are here today increasing the allowance from ten to twenty-five million dollars is in itself a demonstration of the fact that when Congress passed the original law its estimate was not sufficiently broad. Let us not make the same mistake now.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator would suggest some reasonable change which we might be able to hold in conference, so far as I am personally concerned, I would not object to agreeing to it. I do not see how we could hope to hold in conference an amendment doubling the sum recommended by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Take it to conference doubled, and perhaps the conferees can get what the petroleum industry needs.

The Senator from Arizona will recall that before the committee acted upon this measure I discussed this particular matter with him, and of course I know how busy he has been on the Committee on Appropriations, as some of the other Senators have been. It was our understanding at that time that an effort would be made to write into the report a statement with respect to the belief of the committee that petroleum should not be excluded.

I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference, and I am sure it can be worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. HAYDEN. Suppose the Senator did not ask for quite $25,000,000? What does he think is really needed? Would five million or ten million dollars' worth of roads do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will compromise on $15,000,000, but I am only guessing. The Senator is cutting it down.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator can offer his amendment, and the Senate can vote on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want the Senator to agree, because it is such a reasonable proposal.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. How long is the transportation by pipe line from Wyoming to the Atlantic seaboard, and how much surplus pipe-line capacity is there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what that has to do with the matter.

Mr. GUFFEY. It has a great deal to do with it. We cannot get gasoline or oil at seaboard now in sufficient quantities, and we cannot use the tankers from the Gulf coast area.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the purpose of the pending amendment is to provide for building roads from the fields themselves, where there are no pipe lines, and in many cases no means of transportation at all, not even roads. Perhaps I should say that if it be true, as the Senator says—and it doubtless is true, as we all know—that the pipe-line facilities are not sufficient to transport the oil that is needed in the East, and by the War and Navy Departments, that is another argument for the inclusion of the amount which is requested in the amendment.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am sorry I cannot agree with the reasoning of the Senator from Wyoming on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the question is put, permit me to say that I find the members of the committee coming to me and saying, "Why do you not make it this or make it that?" Let the Senator from Arizona suggest a figure for which he will be willing to make a fight in conference, and I will accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think an increase from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 could be justified in conference, but that is the only change that should be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the understanding that the conferees on the part of the Senate will make a vigorous fight for this additional allowance, of course, I shall be very glad to accept the suggestion. The need is great. There is no material of which the country is in greater need at this moment than petroleum. So I accept the change, and modify the amendment to provide for an increase to $35,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$25,000,000", and insert "$35,000,000", and by inserting after the words "raw materials", where they occur the second time in said section 6, as amended, a comma and the words "including petroleum."

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2798 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. REED, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. I submit the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill. The House has agreed to the Senate amendments, and, therefore, there cannot be any controversy. I should like to get the bill behind us, as many other appropriation bills are pending. I send the report to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) "making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$1,087,800: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of the secretaries, exclusive of temporary additional compensation, and exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall correspond with those of the assistant administrative grade (grade 7 of clerical, administrative and fiscal service): *Provided further*, That the annual basic compensation of the secretary to a circuit or district judge shall not (exclusive of temporary additional compensation) exceed $3,200: *And provided further*, That the salaries of law clerks shall correspond with those of the assistant professional grade"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 27, and 28.

MILLARD TYDINGS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EMMET O'NEAL,
MICHAEL KIRWAN,
JOE HENDRICKS,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I have announced, the House having agreed to the Senate amendments, there is no further action that the Senate need take.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SAVE THE FOOD OF AMERICA FIRST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have just heard it stated on the floor of the Senate that there is a great need for money to be made available for the transportation of oil. I say the greatest need in America today, and the necessity which should be attended to first, is the need of saving the food of America.

As we scan the headlines and read the magazines, yes, even as we listen to what is said on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, we realize that friction is constantly arising and interfering with the constructive operation of our minds. In other words, we let friction between various classes and various groups and even governmental agencies interpose to prevent the constructive action which is required.

There is another thing almost as bad as the continual friction. For instance, a few days ago in the United States Senate the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] rose and made some loose statement in relation to a $10,000,000 banquet. I do not think that is an appropriate subject to discuss on the floor of the Senate, especially when in the Middle West food is spoiling.

Mr. President, I am not very often in the position of desiring to scourge anyone out of the temple, but I feel righteous indignation every now and then as I look about and see how we miss the mark, indulging in the little things when really big things are ours to do.

I have referred to friction. We must get rid of it. The Nation is at war; its safety is at stake; and we cannot let petty minds and petty things interfere with our consideration and proper disposition of the larger problems.

The other matter besides friction to which I wish to refer is the lack of cooperation, and I desire particularly to dwell upon that today in the few minutes I shall occupy because lack of cooperation on the home front, as manifested by the recent strike in Pennsylvania, by the riots in Detroit, and by inept statements on the floor of the Senate, is a very serious condition which may be likened to a cancerous growth. Cooperation is imperatively necessary now, and that thought brings me to the point I wish to stress.

Mr. President, when our boys in Tunisia were advancing there were also in that country from our Department of Agriculture men with brains. They saw the waving fields of grain, yet war was on. What happened? I shall now mention the name of a man whom I should like to see brought back and utilized on the home front. The name of the keen American to whom I refer is Parisius. I do not know him. But the minute the Axis was defeated and thrown out of north Africa the thought came to him, "I have to save the food I see about us here. I have to save it, first, because the Tunisians have to eat, and if I save it for them my country will not have to transport food for them. I have to save it so that the ships which would otherwise be carrying food to the soldiers on the battle fronts can be utilized for carrying munitions and transporting reenforcements."

Mr. President, this is the point. Think of it. This man had the foresight and the intestinal fortitude to go to the Army and order gasoline and oil diverted from American supplies for utilization on the agricultural front in Tunisia. How many men he used I do not know, but he obtained results. He had military loading equipment diverted to farm work. He obtained sacks and twine to provide—for what? For harvesting the grain crop in Tunisia. He was an American who knew how to do things, and, having the knowledge, he acted.

Mr. President, I wish to bring to the notice of the country a contrast. For months on this floor I and other Senators have called to the attention of those in Government the serious threatened danger to our food supply. Two weeks ago I spoke on the floor of the Senate and called attention to the fact that we must have additional labor in Wisconsin; that Wisconsin would probably produce from 40 to 45 percent of the pea crop of the country this year; that the men who ordinarily worked in harvesting that crop had been drained into the war plants and into the Army, and that the peas would rot in the fields unless we obtained quick action. We thought we could get action.

I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture. I also talked with officers of the War Department and with officials of the Manpower Commission. I wrote a letter to Mr. McNutt, but received no reply. Finally, I was told that a representative would be in the field in Wisconsin last Monday. This was the result after 2 weeks of effort. Today I received a telegram from N. P. Verhulst of the Wisconsin Canners Association, in which he says that the number of additional workers needed in the State of Wisconsin to help harvest the pea crop is at least 1,500. Seven hundred and twenty men are needed for Dodge and neighboring counties alone. He says:

> We are advised today no Jamaicans are available for Michigan, but possibly 200 will be assigned from New Orleans. Not more than 250 soldiers can be made available from Camp McCoy. They will be given 3-day passes, which may be renewed. Apparently no chance of getting troops as such. Erb still here and he is hopeful balance of men needed can be obtained from civilians.

Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly on the subject of the civilian's responsibility, and I wish to devote a few moments to that subject. I wish to say parenthetically that the Government has failed to make plain to the people in the local communities the seriousness of the situation. I believe that if the Federal Government does not furnish the needed help from the camps, from among prisoners, civilians in the towns and cities must close up their shops in order to harvest the crops and enable this food to be canned.

Former President Hoover and others have spoken of the serious situation with respect to food. In Tunisia Germans and Italians surrendered and came into our camps and were fed of our food which was cooked. It was definitely ascertained that the cooked food in cans was a great factor in determining the victory of the Americans and the British and the Free French in Tunisia.

Mr. President, a pea crop is coming on; a corn crop is coming on; there are crops of other vegetables, tomatoes, spinach, and others, coming on. If we cannot obtain the necessary help to take care of these crops in a State such as Wisconsin, what are we to do in relation to the wheat crop when it comes on?

Mr. President, I suggested to Army officials 2 weeks ago that troops in camps, such as Camp McCoy, be used to harvest these crops. I said to an official this morning, "Why have you not put those men out into the fields?" "We are going to place a few of them there," he said, "but you know that Army red tape requires that they not stay out over 3 days." So the Army can send a group, and then in 3 days' time send another group, and then another group. If we are to persist in that course, if gold-braid artists are to keep on running the show in that way, there is bound to be trouble ahead.

"Save the food first," should be the cry. Our boys in the camps will not have the food they require, the civilians in this country will not have the food we require, all because of a lack of what I call cooperation or collaboration. All the world today, especially some of our great New Deal friends, is talking about collaboration on the foreign front with foreign nations. Yet we have not learned the simple A B C's of collaboration on the home front to save food for our own stomachs, to save food for our own boys who will need it.

After we had pushed the Axis out of north Africa we saved the crop there by utilizing the military. Not only did we utilize their gasoline and their machinery, but undoubtedly the soldiers themselves were used. We ought to be able to utilize our boys who are in the camps at home, many of whom learned, as I did, at a youthful age to work in the canning factories for 15 cents an hour and to perform that hard labor which now must be done. When crops such as peas come on workers must be on hand immediately. A matter of 20 hours delay may spoil a large portion of the crop. Yet when we try to obtain assistance we are pushed around from Dan to Beersheba, from department to department, and we may hear as an official said a couple of weeks ago, "If the Department of Agriculture should certify that help is needed, then the War Manpower Commission could certify as to the emergency, and then the Army would be in the position to act."

Mr. President, if the military forces on the foreign fronts had acted as we are acting on the home front there would not have been any successful action at Midway; there would not have been any success in Tunisia; Attu would not have

been taken; there would simply be failures.

I desire to say parenthetically that when Mr. Justice Byrnes was appointed to his position as Assistant President I hoped we would be presented with the over-all picture of someone reaching forth and making a determination which would result in action. But it does not look as if the mechanism is operating in that way. It is simply another department, and simply another bureau head.

Mr. President, we have heard about slow-downs in war production due to strikes, and we know there is a tendency on the part of some to forget that we have a war on our hands. Our boys on all the fronts in the world are not lying down. A failure of our military supply may cost the lives of thousands of American boys. So I repeat, I want to save food. In spite of all handicaps the farmers of this country have done a magnificent job. I believe even in my own State the people in the villages and the cities do not realize the magnificent job the farmers have done. The old farmers, many of whom had thought they were through with farming, are back on the farms, with their wives and their grandchildren, working the clock around, 70 hours a week, with the handicaps of lack of machinery and lack of labor. They have gotten the seed into the ground. Now the question is whether the crops can be harvested. I have received letters from those farmers saying that they cannot do the heavy work; they are too old, the children are too small. I repeat, Mr. President, that I wish we had on the home front, among the so-called planners, some of the efficiency which was manifested in Tunisia by Mr. Parisius. I hope we can do what was done in Africa when the harvest was on, when the firing was just over, when our wounded boys were returning, and the dead were being buried. They had time to save the harvest in Tunisia. If we only have the brains and if we get rid of the friction, and begin to collaborate, we have time now to save the food on the home front.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a release dated May 20, 1943, issued by the Bureau of Public Relations of the War Department. In the release the employment of prisoners of war on the basis of the Geneva convention is mentioned. I ask that at this point in the RECORD the release may be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR TO BE BASED ON GENEVA CONVENTION

Plans for the disposition of prisoners of war are under study, and their availability for farm work, as well as for other types of permissible labor, is being considered, the War Department announced today.

With any specific project for the employment of prisoners, a basic consideration must be whether it conflicts in any way with the terms of the Geneva Convention. These rules will be scrupulously observed. It is hoped that the humane and considerate treatment that War Department policy will accord to America's prisoners of war will be reflected in similar treatment of American soldiers who are prisoners of war of the Axis Powers.

Under the Geneva Convention, prisoners must be afforded protection against violence, abuse, public curiosity, and exploitation of any kind. Subject to these reservations, all prisoners of war, except officers, may be required to work at any project not directly connected with military operations.

Prisoners employed by the Federal Government will be paid at the rate of 80 cents a day. When working for a State or private contractor, their pay will be at a rate decided upon in advance between the employer and the prison camp commander concerned. The rate, however, may not be less than that of 80 cents a day paid by the Federal Government.

Officer prisoners may not be compelled to work. Nevertheless, the Geneva Convention provides that they must be paid, in accordance with their grade and in line with specific arrangements between the enemy powers. The allowance for German and Italian officer prisoners will be the equivalent of $20 per month for warrant officers and first and second lieutenants; $30 for captains; and $40 for those in the grade of major and above.

Enlisted men among the prisoners who are not provided employment will be given a monthly allowance of $3. Noncommissioned officers will be assigned to supervisory work only, unless work of this nature is not available and they specifically request a remunerative occupation.

Prisoners may not be made to work longer hours than the civilian population engaged in similar work in the locality, which, except in emergency, will not exceed 10 hours daily, counting the time consumed in going to and from work. In all respects, prisoners will be treated with the respect due honorable soldiers. The free mail privileges accorded United States military personnel will be granted prisoners.

Rations for prisoners will be the same as those provided United States troops. To the extent practicable, these rations may be altered to suit the preference of the various national groups. Officers, however, may use their allowances to supplement the fare.

Pursuant to the Geneva Convention, orderlies must be provided officer prisoners from among the enlisted prisoners. These will receive pay at the rate of 80 cents a day.

Prisoners will be required to wear the clothing they had at the time of their capture unless it is unfit for use. Reclaimed clothing, if available, will be furnished when prisoners' clothing is unfit for wear. If reclaimed clothing cannot be provided new clothes will be given.

Prisoners' uniforms will be dyed dark blue, and marked in white paint with the symbol "P. W." They may wear their insignia of rank and decorations.

Prisoners will be organized into companies of 250 men under a company commander, an officer of the Army of the United States. In turn, battalions will be formed within the camp, all under the camp commander.

Companies will perform their own administration as far as possible. From their own numbers they will have first sergeants, platoon sergeants, cooks, barbers, tailors, cobblers, etc.

Work performed in the maintenance of the camp or in the administration of the company will not be paid for except for the 10-cent daily allowance. However, when such work keeps a prisoner from a job for which he would be paid, he will be allowed the sum he could otherwise have earned.

Camps will be made up of prisoners of the same nationality.

Prisoners may organize into associations to administer self-government and to facilitate liaison between prisoners and company and camp commanders. Squads, platoons, companies, battalions, and camps may have a leader who serves as spokesman for the unit. They may make request or complaints to the company or camp commanders. Complaints may also be made directly to the Legations of the protecting powers, or upon request, complaints to camp commanders must be forwarded to the Legations. Prisoners may keep their personal effects, including personal articles of value. All money, bonds, etc., will be taken and held in trust for the prisoner, however. All arms and implements of war, maps, and other documents will be confiscated.

Camp commanders may allow prisoners to receive visitors twice a month.

A full program of sports and athletics will be provided prisoners. All necessary equipment and sufficient space for games and competitive sports will be provided by camp commanders.

The War Department is prepared to handle, in a proper manner, all prisoners of war that will be received in this country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, now let me read excerpts from a letter which I received a few days ago. It comes from a farmer at Green Bay, Wis.:

I do not believe that our American people or those in the administration realize that we are facing a food shortage and unless the red tape and bungling is cut out, the American people are going to have a sad awakening on or before January 1, 1944.

As a farmer, part time and operator of one farm and managing another, I realize what the labor situation is and I am wondering what the farmers are going to do when it comes to haying, harvesting, threshing, and silo-filling.

This mistaken idea that city high-school boys and city women are going to be able to help the farmers is all wrong—they would be only in their own way and in the farmer's way. When the word "skilled labor" is used, if there is any place that skilled labor is necessary, it is on the farm. In order to be a good farmer, I have found it necessary to have been born and brought up on a farm and also to like it, as there are so many details connected with the feeding and care of livestock and the proper care of handling milk, that no one unless they are familiar with the work can do the job right.

Then he writes of German prisoners who should be made available. It was in relation to the prisoner-of-war situation that I requested to have the press release printed in the RECORD.

Then the author of the letter refers to the question of canning factories, a question which I have stressed for some weeks. I read further from his letter:

In Green Bay we have two large canning factories, and 17 miles west, at Seymour, we have another, and I know that all of the men connected with those plants are worried about being able to get the necessary help.

* * * * *

Now, Mr. WILEY, something must be done and done quick, as the harvest season for the different crops is drawing near and unless the necessary help is provided the farmer, many of our crops may stay in the field.

Mr. President, that letter sets forth the situation. We are missing the boat in many respects. As was suggested in the report made the other day by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I think it is due to the fact that too many people are trying to do the things which should be done. I believe that the statement contained in the report that we

could get rid of 300,000 persons in the Government service is accurate. They are stepping on each other's toes; they are falling all over each other. When we try to get someone to do something he passes us on to someone else. Then, when we try to obtain collaboration between one department and another department, we are given what is known as the Washington merry-go-round, or the run-around, and we do not obtain the desired results.

Mr. President, I desire now to discuss another phase of the subject of food. Recently in one of the committees it was brought out that there are millions of acres of land which still are not being used—they are fallow. Some say it is too late to use them. Of course, it is too late to plant corn for use as food, but it is not too late to plant it for use as silage. It is not too late to plant other crops which would be useful in feeding livestock. This year we have 20,000,000 more hogs to feed, and the problem is where to obtain the feed for them. This year we have more cattle than we had last year, and the problem is where to obtain the feed to give to them in the feeding lots. Without sufficient feed for the hogs and cattle, we may get no more meat than we obtained last year, and probably not so much.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. The food situation presents a serious problem, not only for our boys who are on the battle fronts, not only for those of us at home, but in relation to the feeding of the people of Europe. In the newspapers we read many articles by writers who seem to indicate that Germany is going to collapse. I do not believe that will occur for a long time. However, if Germany should collapse, we would see continental Europe a blazing inferno, a hell of hate and vengeance and hunger, with little Hitlers rising everywhere, and revolutionary groups mushrooming up everywhere, and taking advantage of the chaos. In order to antidote the hunger which would precipitate such revolutionary movements, we must have food. In order to antidote the hate and vengeance we must have the power and authority to step into the picture. We will have the power; we will have the military force if our boys get the food they need. But will we have the food to send in quickly to bring the chaotic conditions to an end? We will not have it if we continue to bungle as we have in the past.

The other day, in returning to Washington, when the train was passing through Indiana and Ohio, I saw field after field of stubble corn which had not been plowed. That situation is all too apparent everywhere. We talk about feeding the world. Not only shall we be called upon the supply the food to the barren areas, but there will have to be doctors and nurses to take care of the sick and to combat pestilence. However, food is primary. Today, I am talking on the subject Save the Food First.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Government will have to make sure that more crops are raised, that more money and more machinery are made available for the land. Because of the serious labor shortage situation in the canneries of Wisconsin, today I am particularly stressing that point; because if in the next week we do not obtain the necessary men, a large percentage of the pea crop will become unavailable to feed the people of this country and to feed our armed forces.

Let us, as far as possible, make certain that what should be done will be done. In Wisconsin there are 180,000 farms. Just before I left my office I received word that some 600 men are being certified into that area. If that means that Jamaicans are being certified, the question is whether they will be able to do work that will be of some help. But I have also understood that the Army is going to release a few men for 3 days at a time.

Why must we behave like boys when we have a man's job to do? The Army will not amount to anything unless it gets food; and the basis of Army food is in large measure the products which come from the canneries of my own State.

Mr. President, I trust that these remarks will result in the local communities, villages, and cities waking up to the need of doing everything possible to husband food crops and preserve them for the great effort which must be made to achieve victory. I hope that the Government will cut the red tape and utilize the men in camps in our vicinity so that the food will be saved. Save the food first.

SUBSIDIES FOR WAR PRODUCTION—STATEMENT BY HON. JESSE H. JONES

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a statement has been submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, concerning subsidies which have been paid, or which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is under obligation to pay. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy and sell, or to subsidize, those materials which are designated by the President as critical and strategic.

Subsidies in one form or another have been a matter of administration policy since 1940, first, in the defense program and later in the war effort.

Due to submarine warfare Defense Supplies Corporation is paying excess transportation charges, and in some instances excess cost, on petroleum products. The estimated net cost of this operation for 1943 is from ninety-five to one hundred million dollars, and probably from forty to fifty million dollars for 1944.

For the same reason the Corporation is paying excess transportation costs on coal to New York and New England. The estimated cost of this program for the year is $25,000,000.

Defense Supplies Corporation paid transportation costs in distributing sugar throughout the country up to December 16, 1942. This included sugar from Cuba and the cost of moving beet sugar from the West to the New England area. Since then, Commodity Credit Corporation has handled sugar. Disbursements have been approximately $23,000,000.

All Chilean nitrate of soda imported from July 1, 1942, to June 1, 1943, is for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation. Sale of this nitrate of soda with Office of Price Administration price ceilings will result in an estimated loss of $7,000,000, of which about one-half is due to transportation costs.

Because of the critical shortage of fibers for rope and binder twine which was brought about principally because of the loss of the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies, Defense Supplies Corporation is purchasing fibers in Mexico, the West Indies, and east Africa. This fiber is landed in the United States wherever possible and the high costs of the fiber and the high rail transportation costs to destination will result in an estimated loss of approximately $5,000,000 for 1943.

The purchase and resale of idle tires will result in a loss to Defense Supplies Corporation estimated at $20,000,000.

Formerly this country obtained its supply of jewel bearings almost entirely from Switzerland. In order to induce American manufacturers to produce them, Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to purchase the output of American manufacturers at a price which entails a very substantial loss. It is estimated this loss will approximate $7,500,000 a year.

In order to obtain the necessary production of aluminum rivets which are used principally in airplane manufacture, it was necessary to have them produced by high-cost manufacturers who were not normally in the business. Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to subsidize the production of these rivets, at an estimated loss of $5,000,000 for a year.

This applies also to aluminum rods and bars, on which the estimated loss is $1,000,000.

Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to pay the excess cost of purchasing petroleum coke at inland locations, transporting it to the west coast, and processing it into calcined coke. This is done to avoid interference with the maximum production of 100-octane gasoline and Navy fuel oil on the west coast. The estimated loss is $2,500,000.

Metals Reserve Company has been paying premiums on certain excess domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc since February 1, 1942. At the present rate of premiums and production this will cost approximately $53,000,000 a year, but due to efforts to further stimulate production, this cost may be increased to as much as $80,000,000 annually by the end of 1943

Metals Reserve Company is purchasing and selling idle and excess inventories of raw materials and partly and fully fabricated materials frozen in the hands of the holders; it is also purchasing scrap metals where the cost, including preparation, handling, refining, freight, etc., will entail substantial losses. It is estimated that in 1943 these losses will aggregate $27,000,000.

Metals Reserve Company is encouraging the production of various and sundry metals in this country through buying them at a high price and selling them at ceiling prices.

In addition to copper, lead, and zinc, these include arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chrome, cobalt, fluorspar, graphite, iron ore, kyanite, magnesium, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, rutile, spodumene, talc, tantalum, tin, tungsten, and vanadium. The loss on these items probably will be about $25,000,000.

These materials come from one or more of the following States: Pennsylvania, Utah, Texas, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Idaho, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Vermont, Michigan, Arizona, Missouri,

Alabama, New Jersey, Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and New York.

Metals Reserve Company is paying abnormal transportation costs and losses on the purchase of various metals and minerals from Latin America and elsewhere abroad. The estimated loss on these for 1943 is about $25,000,000.

In the manufacture of synthetic rubber, the purchase of natural rubber from foreign countries, the purchase of scrap rubber for reclaim purposes, and the development of new sources of rubber, the cost is problematical. These activities are carried on by Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Company.

In the case of meat and butter, the Price Administrator announced a reduction of approximately 10 percent to the consumer on these items. Obviously if this reduction were rolled back to the cattle and hog raiser and the price of cattle and hogs were reduced accordingly, the supply of meat would be retarded at a time when the maximum supply is most needed.

For this reason, the Director of Economic Stabilization directed that I arrange with an agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pay subsidies on meat and butter to assure maximum production. The President approved the payment of these subsidies up to $450,000,000.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries act as service agencies in the war program. When the President, the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Rubber Director, the Director of Economic Stabilization establish the need for plant facilities, materials, services, or supplies for which no other provision is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through one of the above-named subsidiaries, when requested to do so by the appropriate war agency, and with my approval, undertakes to provide them. In this way it serves those responsible for war production and war policies. Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor I make policies.

PAYMENTS BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a few days ago I requested Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to furnish me with a statement concerning the commodities or products on which the Commodity Credit Corporation were making payments, either by way of subsidy or incentive payments, in support of the war production program. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the statement. It contains very valuable information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Oilseeds: Prior to World War No. 2 the United States had normally imported 15 to 20 percent of its supplies of fats and oils, and exported only small quantities. War reduced the volume of imports and increased the demand for exports—a situation which was further aggravated after Pearl Harbor since much of our imports had previously come from the Pacific. The United States was now faced with a potential total reduction of 1,000,000,000 pounds of imports and an increase of 1,500,000,000 pounds in exports, or a net change in our import-export position of about 2,500,000,000 pounds. To meet this situation, the Department of Agriculture urged farmers to increase the domestic production of soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts for oil, and offered in this connection to support the prices of these oilseeds at specified minimum levels. A comparable support price for cottonseed was offered. Ceiling prices on oil and oil products, subsequently announced by the Government pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act, were such as to bring the agricultural commodity below the support or floor price level. Farmers meanwhile had planted record crops of soybeans, peanuts, and flaxseed.

So as to make good on the promised support or floor prices and at the same time preserve the price ceilings, the Commodity Credit Corporation entered into contracts with processors under which the processors agreed to pay the minimum support prices to farmers and to sell the oil meal and cake at prices stipulated by the Corporation at levels designed to maintain a favorable relationship with the prices of livestock. The Corporation on its part agreed to relieve the squeeze on processors in the amount of ½ cent per pound of vegetable oils, and to purchase soybeans at the support price and resell them at lower prices based on their processing value. It was also necessary in this program to ship large quantities of soybeans from the Middle West to southern, eastern, and western crushing plants, since the capacity of the mills in the Middle West was insufficient to produce the record quantities of oil and meal needed in the war program. This entailed shipping and storage expenses which were absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The cost of maintaining the supporting prices and price ceilings and making adjustments between areas to utilize fully the plant capacity is expected to total $28,216,711 for 1942. In view of the even greater need for vegetable oilseeds in 1943 and the higher prices prevailing for alternative crops, support prices for the 1943 oilseed crops have been increased, and on the basis of existing ceiling prices, it is probable tha there will be losses in connection with the 1943 crops, particularly peanuts, substantially greater than in connection with the 1942 crops of oilseeds.

Feed wheat: As in the case of the vegetable oil crops, it became necessary after Pearl Harbor to step up sharply the production goals for meats, milk and eggs. To help farmers expand the production of these products the Corporation offered to sell 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at prices in favorable relationship to the prices of livestock, dairy and poultry products. The wheat was to be drawn from the large granary supplies which had been accumulated in previous years of good crops. The price of cracked wheat delivered to producers was the 1941 wheat loan value at point of delivery or the Commodity Credit Corporation sale price for corn per bushel at point of delivery (whichever should be lower). Not all of this wheat was sold prior to the end of the fiscal year 1942.

In July 1942 Congress authorized the Corporation to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed during the 1943 fiscal year at not less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn. By now the numbers of livestock and poultry were the largest on record, and unprecedented quantities of feed were required to help satisfy the wartime needs for livestock products. Despite record supplies of feed grains and byproduct feeds in 1942–43 great quantities of wheat were also fed. By March 1943, the Corporation had sold out the entire offer of 125,000,000 bushels of feed wheat.

By joint resolution of Congress in March, the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to increase the sale of feed wheat to 225,000,000 bushels and the minimum price was increased to the parity price of corn. By early June the additional quantity of 100,000,000 bushels had been sold, and it is expected now that Congress will further increase the authorization an additional 30,000,000 bushels to take care of feeding requirements during the remainder of the current fiscal year. The cost of the 1942 feed wheat program through June 30, 1943, is expected to total approximately $88,000,000.

Grain alcohol: To facilitate the production of industrial alcohol for the manufacture of explosives, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in cooperation with the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, and the Defense Supplies Corporation, in January 1942 inaugurated a program for the sale of Government-owned stocks of corn and wheat to distillers at specified prices in line with ceiling prices established by the Office of Price Administration. Besides conserving sugar and molasses in the production of war alcohol, the use of granary stocks of corn and wheat for alcohol production would yield additional quantities of byproduct feed for livestock. During the year, arrangements were made with distillers for the use of proportionately larger quantities of wheat in the mixtures of grain for distillation; during the last quarter of 1942 the contracts with processors provided for the use of equal quantities of corn and wheat. Meanwhile a process had been developed which made possible the salvaging of large quantities of mill feed for livestock production and during the first quarter of 1943, wheat was offered to millers for the production of granular flour for sale to distillers at specified prices. During the second quarter of 1943 the sale of corn for manufacture into industrial alcohol was discontinued and the price for wheat was based upon the ceiling price of corn. From January 1942 through April 30, 1943, the Corporation sold about 30,000,000 bushels of corn and 33,000,000 bushels of wheat for manufacture into industrial alcohol. Losses in connection with these sales through June 30, 1943, are expected to total $27,700,000.

Coffee and cocoa: In May 1942, the Corporation was designated as the Government agency for the importation of most agricultural commodities. These commodities include a wide variety of fats and oils, coffee, cocoa, and many other products. Practically all of the operations are self-supporting, the principal exception being coffee and sugar. In order to maintain domestic ceiling prices on coffee the Corporation pays a part of the increased ocean transportation cost of importing coffee into the United States. All coffee is brought into the country by importers who hold licenses issued by the Corporation. After a shipment is completed and all costs of making the shipment are known, the importer bills the Corporation for the costs of war risk and marine insurance and ocean freight which are in excess of normal peacetime rates. The Corporation also pays 75 percent of any excess rail freight charges incurred on shipments within the United States due to diversion of shipments from normal ports of entry. The cost of the coffee program through June 30 will total $1,495,000.

In connection with importations of cocoa the Corporation assumed the loss on cocoa contracts acquired by the Corporation at the beginning of the program in July 1942. The methods of making payments to importers were the same for cocoa as for coffee, except that the importers of cocoa were not licensed. The cost of the cocoa program, most of which was incurred at the beginning of the program, totaled $635,289.

Sugar: All sugar imported by the United States is under the control of the Corporation, the Corporation paying the increased costs of marine and war risk insurance, ocean

freight, handling charges, and internal rail transportation in order to permit sugar to be sold to consumers at existing ceiling prices. The Corporation is also paying for the same purpose the increased costs of internal rail transportation on sugar produced within the United States. The excess costs of importing foreign sugar and of moving foreign and domestic sugar within continental United States are absorbed by paying bills covering such costs submitted by refiners and distributors who have carried out the actual importation, refining, and distribution of sugar for consumption. Estimated expenditures under this program through June 30, 1943, total $10,416,605.

In addition to the operations carried out during the current fiscal year a price support program has been announced in connection with the 1943 sugar-beet crop. Under this program sugar beets will be purchased from processors at an average price of $11 per ton, and then resold to processors at an average price of $9.50 per ton, if ceiling prices on sugar continue at their present level. Under this program, the processors must agree to pay producers an average price of $11 per ton for beets.

Pork purchase program: To relieve the "price squeeze" on small packers, growing out of ceiling prices on hog products and rising prices on hogs, and to assure continuing large supplies of pork products to be processed from the record 1942 spring pig crop, the Corporation, in September 1942, offered to buy pork from small packers up to 60 percent of their total pork production at lend-lease prices plus a consideration payment of 25 cents per 100 pounds live weight for each full 25 cents by which the 7 market average for barrows and gilts exceeded $13.50. Market prices ultimately worked out more favorably for small packers, and only one packer took advantage of the program, the cost of which has been slightly less than $400. This program has now been discontinued.

Fluid milk: The Corporation instituted in October 1942, at the request of the Office of Price Administration, and upon approval by the President, a purchase and resale program designed to reconcile milk prices to farmers under milk marketing orders and ceiling prices under which dealers operated, and thereby maintain production in the New York metropolitan area. Milk purchased by dealers at the prices dealers were required to pay farmers under the milk marketing order was purchased by the Corporation at these prices and then resold to the dealers at prices commensurate with the ceilings. The dealers had made a showing that they could not pay farmers the order prices and at the same time remain within the ceiling prices. In November a similar program was instituted in the Duluth-Superior (Minnesota-Wisconsin) marketing area, and in December the program was extended to Chicago.

On January 1, 1943, these programs were superseded at the request of the Office of Economic Stabilization by a temporary increase (until April) in the Office of Price Administration milk price ceilings, pending the development of a program of milk marketing economies to be worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture. On March 30 the Office of Price Administration announced continuance of the higher ceilings until economies in distribution should be put into effect.

On April 1, the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture announced temporary approval of increases in milk prices at both the producer and retail levels in Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, and Baltimore area, following hearings showing the need for increased prices to farmers. The President thereafter issued the hold-the-line order, and on April 15 the War Food Administration announced that milk prices in these three areas would be stabilized at existing retail levels through a program similar to those described above under which farmers would receive the increases approved as of April 1, the losses to be absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The program was subsequently extended to the Alexandria, Va., Harrisburg, Pa., and Wilmington, Del., areas.

These milk programs will involve losses through June 30, 1943, of $3,431,725.

Cheese: The Corporation announced in December 1942 that it would buy all American cheddar cheese delivered to factories, on the basis of 27 cents per pound at Plymouth, Wis., and then resell the cheese to factories at 23¼ cents. An extra one-fourth cent per pound is being paid on cheese having a moisture content of 35¼ percent or less. Under this program, designed to stimulate the production of cheese and to hold down the prices to consumers, the factories are required to pass on to farmers the difference between the sale and repurchase price. The cost of this program through June 30 will be about $10,228,555.

Dairy cattle: In the fall of 1942, because prices of dairy cattle in some areas were below beef cattle prices, dairy cattle were being sent to slaughter. In January 1943, the Corporation, in cooperation with the Farm Security Administration, instituted a program designed to keep dairy cows in production by buying cattle suitable for dairy production at beef-cattle prices and selling them to other dairy farmers at dairy-cattle prices. The estimated cost of this program through June 30 will total $352,000. Dairy-cattle prices have now advanced and this project has been discontinued except for the purchase of heifers to prevent the sale for veal. It is expected that the purchase of heifers will be made at prices that will not result in a loss to the Corporation from their resale.

Corn price adjustment: In April 1943, the Office of Price Administration increased the ceiling price of corn in the surplus producing area from $1.02 per bushel to $1.07 per bushel, Chicago. The former ceiling of $1.02, basis Chicago, for eastern and southeastern areas was maintained. To facilitate the movement of corn from surplus to eastern and southeastern deficit areas where feed is needed to maintain dairy and poultry production, the Corporation offered to purchase corn at the prices prevailing in the surplus area and resell such corn on the basis of the ceiling prices in the deficit areas. The program applied originally only to whole grain, but in May it was extended to the corn content of shipments of mixed feed as well. It is estimated that the loss to be absorbed as a result of this operation through June 30, will total $1,500,000.

Dry beans and peas: A loan and purchase program designed to increase the production of dry beans and peas as needed sources of vegetable protein for civilians, armed forces, and our allies has been announced in connection with the 1943 crops. The Commodity Credity Corporation will make loans on 1943 crop thresher-run beans and peas of all classes (except tepary and mixed beans) stored on farms or in warehouses, and has offered to purchase beans and peas at prices specified in a War Food Administration announcement dated April 7. The purchase prices announced for 1943 crop beans are higher than existing Office of Price Administration ceilings, and if the Office of Price Administration ceilings are not increased for 1943 beans, the difference between the support prices and ceiling prices will be absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation through purchase and resale operations. On the basis of current support and ceiling prices, losses on 1943 crop beans to be used for domestic civilian consumption are estimated at $10,000,000.

Processed vegetables: In January 1943 a price-support program for vegetables for processing was announced. Because of increased production costs growers were assured of prices roughly 25 percent higher than 1942 prices. For tomatoes the support prices for 1943 averaged $24.25 per ton for the country as a whole, compared with $19.37 in 1942. Comparative prices for other crops are as follows: Green peas, $81.50, compared with $63.93; sweet corn $18 compared with $13.50; snap beans $91 compared with $75.38. Commodity Credit Corporation will purchase that portion of the pack sold for civilian use at the 1943 support prices and resell to processors at the 1942 season average in order to maintain the present price ceilings. An amount of $25,000,000 has been allocated to absorb losses on vegetables packed for the civilian trade from the 1943 crop.

CAMPAIGN FUND-RAISING DINNER AT THE DUQUESNE CLUB OF PITTSBURGH

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, yesterday my noble colleague [Mr. GUFFEY] made reference to a dinner to be held tonight in the Pittsburgh, Pa., Duquesne Club, at which the Republican National Chairman, Mr. Spangler, is to speak. In his efforts to impress the world at large with the awful evil of such a thing, the Senator attempted to use the biblical feast of Belshazzar as an apt analogy. By deftly avoiding the complete context of the story, and setting forth but a few well-chosen verses, he attempted to hold this meeting, and all who will attend it, up to the light of public ridicule and contempt.

But let us consider the whole context of the story. Belshazzar was a ruler, who feted and feasted his followers and officialdom from the funds in the public coffers, collected from the taxpayers of the land. My colleague is a member of that modern officialdom which has, over the years, increased both the number and scope of that class which is salaried and sustained by the public funds, which in turn are collected from the taxpayer.

The banquets held by this officialdom, with which my colleague is not unfamiliar, were really Belshazzarian affairs. They were attended by the high and low of officialdom, and those who attended plunked down their $100 stipend before they could even sit at the table. That stipend, incidentally, originated with the hard-working taxpayers of the land, and it was routed through the United States Treasury to the members of that officialdom as wages and salaries, and then poured back into the party coffers to be spent in securing the continued and uninterrupted power of those identical forces of officialdom, of which my colleague is one. Such, indeed, were the feasts of Belshazzar.

How different from this is the dinner to which my colleague has referred. I will not attend the dinner. I have not been invited. I am not a member of the club. But the men who will attend that banquet tonight are not sustained by the public funds. Quite the contrary. They are men of enterprise and courage, who have achieved success in life and respect among their fellows through hard work and continued application to a worthy task. Though these men have never seen fit to endorse me in any great numbers when I have aspired to public office, they are nonetheless worthy American citizens. I sincerely trust that men and women of all parties will never be denied the privilege and opportunity of meeting with their chosen represent-

atives, and reviewing with them the problems of the times. For if ever that privilege is denied, the American system of constitutional government will likewise be denied.

But getting back to the story of Belshazzar in the book of Daniel, we find, as my colleague stated yesterday, that "they drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone." That might well have been—in the present case—sometime before last November, when the present officialdom was riding uninterruptedly along secure, it thought, even from the people.

We are informed in the next two verses that some handwriting was seen to appear upon the wall, and that "the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." These words rather well describe the state of my colleague after the election returns for last November were in and posted.

The story goes on to tell us that Belshazzar and his courtesans were vexed and troubled that they could not decipher the handwriting on the wall. How like the present day that is.

In yet a later verse of the story we find:

> And this is the writing that was written, mene, mene, tekel, upharsin.
>
> This is the interpretation of the thing: Mene—God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.
>
> Tekel—Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.

These could well be the sentiments of the present day.

Finally we are told that the handwriting on the wall was prophetic, indeed, and that the kingdom of Belshazzar was lost.

The handwriting is again on the wall. My colleague knows it. In his despair and bewilderment he has seized upon this particular dinner—which I am reliably informed will cost the truly tremendous sum of $2.75 a plate—as an occasion to vent his temper and to throw some stones.

Quite aside from the story of Belshazzar, I am told that there is an old proverb about men who live in glass houses.

LEST WE FORGET—THE HOME FRONT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Nation is engaged in a great war, which in its last analysis is a war for our survival, nothing short of that. Too many minds in America conceive the war effort in terms of the operations of the armed forces of this Nation—the military, naval, and aircraft strength of the country. Oftentimes I think we forget some of the agencies created here at home whose prime function is to aid in winning the war. I have several in mind. The Congress, in its wisdom, is cutting appropriations for many such agencies. I do not criticize that policy, but before we cut to the bone appropriations for some of the agencies, before we thus force some of them out of existence, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an article placed in my hands today by a thoughtful citizen of my State, which impressed me very greatly, and which I think is a timely message to the Senate of the United States. The title of it is "Lest We Forget," and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET

"Home front sags dangerously," says the Senate War Mobilization Committee in a headline of the Washington Post, June 22, 1943. "Our troubles are due," states this committee to—

"1. Lack of centralized direction of the war effort.

"2. Failure to mobilize fully the will and energies of all groups."

Just as these charges are made, the appropriation for a major centralizing and mobilizing agency is laid on the chopping block. From the $5,600,000 budget of the Office of Civilian Defense the amount necessary to carry on civilian war services is eliminated by the House of Representatives. The House has voted to remove the central mechanism for directing a most important group—the millions of volunteers who are doing the things that make a country strong for war. The prospect for those whose will to win can be expressed only by nonmilitary service is dismal indeed without the driving power that comes from organization, from volunteer offices that locate manpower and route it to vital areas of need, from committees of citizens that the special and informed interest in problems that vex thousands of communities, from the over-all community planning that will fall apart in many places when civilian war services are officially labeled as nonessential by the Congress. When the House votes 345 to 0 to spend seventy-one billions for the Army after refusing one and six-tenths millions for the Army of civilian war workers (1/44,375) we can hardly wonder why the home front is sagging.

Americans have never sagged when they have been fully informed. On the home front we are not an invincible America because we are not an informed America. As long as strikes, race riots, black markets and internal confusion fill the air we are anything but invincible. Our industrial production is making possible the favorable news from the military front. We started into this war with a long record of unity and industrial proficiency. But no nation can survive the turmoil that is building up in America this moment; gargantuan appropriations for arms only postpone the awful day of reckoning. Before our disunity reaches the stage of decisions that are irrevocable and from which there is no retreat, let us do everything in our power, use every channel, for bringing genuine understanding of what we are up against to every last American citizen; and let us give him every opportunity to invest not only his money, but his time and energies in the winning of this war. The effect on the total morale of the country, which is directly related to "sagging," of the work of volunteers in civilian war services cannot be overestimated. For not only are there millions who feel deeply the relation between military success and community welfare as evidenced by the billions of hours they cheerfully give to keeping the home front strong, but these volunteers have a tremendous lifting power on all the rest of the population. To cast aside this upsurge of patriotic effort because of economy reasoning, would seem to approach the acme of shortsightedness and to deny one of the most obvious facts that this cruel war has taught us—namely that the mailed fist becomes a lily pad without the strong blood and controlled nerves of a unified body.

The home front sags. What are we doing about it? What if it sags further? Do we prop it up by estranging a large part of the population from the war effort at home? Do we strengthen it by wiping out a successful device for pulling together Federal war programs as they relate to the use of volunteers in local communities, and for giving support to the local efforts to bring order out of chaos?

Unless the Senate restores the appropriation asked by the Office of Civilian Defense for Civilian War Services, we can expect more sagging—and we will pass up the biggest bargain in man-hours of important work that this expensive war offers.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Andrews	Hayden	Reynolds
Ball	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Holman	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bone	Kilgore	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Stewart
Bridges	Langer	Taft
Brooks	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Caraway	McNary	Truman
Chandler	Maloney	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Gillette	Overton	Wiley
Green	Pepper	Willis
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gurney	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1108, Calendar No. 289, which provides for extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rise only to express the hope that the Senate will agree to take up the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama or the minority leader, or both, if an agreement has been reached as to the procedure in

connection with consideration of the bill and, if so, what it is. My reason for making the request is that at least three amendments have been proposed to the bill, and none of them is printed. So far as I am concerned, I should like to have them printed in order to have an opportunity to read them before being called upon to vote on them. That is why I ask whether an arrangement as to procedure has been made.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator's inquiry. The very distinguished and accommodating senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator in charge of the bill, conferred with me, as also did the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. We came to an agreement that today the able senior Senator from Alabama would explain the purpose of the bill, the Senator from Ohio would discuss the measure generally, and such other Senators as are in possession of facts and are ready to proceed with a discussion of them would do so, and that the other matters regarding amendments would not come up until tomorrow. We all expressed the hope that tomorrow it would be possible to obtain a final vote in the afternoon.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that statement conforms with my understanding of the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Oregon, whichever one has the floor, yield to me? I desire to ask a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may it be understood that there will be no vote today on controversial amendments?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I tried to express the thought, but probably did not succeed in doing so as explicitly as has the Senator from Missouri, that there will be no votes at all today on amendments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to discuss the bill generally; but I have an amendment which I propose to offer for one of the committee amendments, and I do desire to discuss that amendment when the committee amendment comes before the Senate for consideration. A number of other Senators have expressed to me the desire that no votes be had today on controversial amendments.

Mr. McNARY. I can assure the Senator that there will be no votes on his amendment, the Taft amendment, or one to be offered by the able senior Senator from Ohio in conjunction with an amendment of the able Senator from Vermont. Is that sufficient assurance?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, at this time I desire to make a very general statement about the bill and the outstanding issue involved in it. The primary purpose of the bill is the continuance of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Let me say in the beginning that I look upon the Commodity Credit Corporation as the most helpful, the most useful, and the most necessary agency of the Government in aid to agriculture and to the farmer. The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized in 1933, as I recall, when the first cotton loan and the first corn loan ever made by the Federal Government were authorized. The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized to carry out and to administer those loans.

From time to time additional duties and responsibilities have been imposed upon the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is the only agency authorized to provide loans upon the basic and semibasic and comparable agricultural commodities, and in a position to do so. In some respects it is similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has all such powers with reference to business and industry and individuals who are not engaged in agriculture.

So, Mr. President, in the first place in view of the fact that the life of the corporation will expire on the 30th of June, I regret that such a controversial subject as the subsidy has been drawn into issue. The Committee on Banking and Currency, which always has had jurisdiction of Commodity Credit Corporation legislation, held hearings on the original bill, and then met in executive session for the purpose, as I supposed, of reporting the bill. When the committee met in executive session, although there had been no intimations in the hearings that the issue might be projected, an amendment was offered which now is contained in modified form in section 5 of the bill as reported by the committee.

So, Mr. President, the bill went to the calendar, although we had held no hearings at all upon the subject of subsidies or upon the effect the section might have upon either the general program of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying on a program to increase war production. Consequently, even with the bill on the calendar, I called meetings of the committee in the absence from the city of the able chairman of the committee. I was the ranking member, and the member in charge of the bill; and the chairman of the committee turned over to me the right to call meetings of the committee. I called a meeting of the committee, and we commenced hearings, and held hearings for 4 or 5 or 6 days, on the subject of subsidies. Those hearings were very interesting. Able men representing different viewpoints on the subject came before the committee and gave their views, and were subjected to cross-examination by numerous members of the committee. Those discussions and those hearings and the presentation of the views from the different standpoints of the witnesses who came before the committee were very informative, as I say.

Mr. President, we considered the whole problem at great length. We did not limit our consideration to the provisions of the amendment which had been included, but we went into a general consideration of the whole problem of subsidies, both those for agricultural purposes, those for industrial purposes, and those for the conduct of the war effort.

Finally, at a meeting of the committee held this morning to consider whether or not, as a result of the hearings had in further consideration, a majority of the members of the committee desired to present there any different views or any amendments which would change the original amendment which brought about the controversy, we went into a discussion in executive session. The discussion was very largely founded upon an amendment by the very able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which had been given to the press and which was understood in a general way by many members of the Senate. As most of us know, the Senator from Ohio was a part of the Hoover food administration. At that time he gained very wide experience. The Committee on Banking and Currency, in the consideration of the price-control laws which have been passed, had the benefit of the Senator's experience on all the problems of food production, price control, and food distribution. We profited by it. The Senator has been in direct and intimate contact with this whole subject. He was at that time, and has been throughout the consideration of the two price-control bills which Congress enacted.

I think I can say properly and correctly that every member of the Committee on Banking and Currency has very great respect for the knowledge, information, and judgment of the senior Senator from Ohio upon the food problem. I say that although he sits on the other side of the aisle. I made a similar expression about Mr. Herbert Hoover. I found myself very much in accord with his views when the price-control measure was before us, and I did not hesitate to express that view.

At any rate, we took the Taft amendment, as it has been called, as a basis for consideration in the committee this morning, with some amendments offered by me changing the amount in the Taft amendment. The discussion lasted for an hour and a half, in a perfectly friendly and harmonious way, with good attendance, and with all members, in my judgment, doing their best, giving their best thought, with the best motives and intentions, to bring about something which would be in the public interest and for the welfare of the country at this time, when threatened inflation and other problems hang over us. In that attitude and spirit of adjustment we

finally reached a conclusion which is written into what is known as the Taft amendment. It was generally agreed to, although there were some reservations by members of the committee of the right to vote against any subsidy at all. However, if any subsidy is to be continued, I think I am safe in saying that this amendment is agreeable to all the members of the committee who were present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has stated that the amount in the Taft amendment was changed in the committee. Will he tell us what the amount was and to what extent it was changed?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. I think it might be well to have the amendment read.

I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 16, it is proposed to strike out through line 12, on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

(a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $500,000,000 and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(e) The President may transfer any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (c) hereof for use under paragraph (d), or any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (d) for use under paragraph (c). The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may exercise any of the powers conferred herein through any of its subsidiary corporations.

(f) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers, or the sale of feed wheat, as authorized by existing law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] gave me a copy of his proposed amendment, which was submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee this morning, and amended in committee. It appears that the amount which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow has been increased from $250,000,000 to $500,000,000, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow $175,000,000. That is a very substantial addition to the amount which the Senator from Ohio originally proposed. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama can tell us what prompted the committee to make the increase of several hundred million dollars in the authorization?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be very happy to undertake an explanation, because I sponsored the increase, which was agreed to by the committee.

My philosophy about the situation is that on the subject of agricultural production or price control we should not have a general, across-the-board subsidy program, such as that in operation in Canada and Great Britain. On the other hand, however, I believe that there are times and conditions under which subsidies are advisable on specific commodities and to carry out specific purposes. Merely because a strong wind of opposition has blown up, I do not believe that we should blindly condemn or put under absolute prohibition practices which have been engaged in by the Government over a period of years, practices in which I participated, and in which my good friend from Vermont participated.

We all know that we entered the period of the depression when prices of agricultural commodities, particularly, were pressed down by reason of circumstances entirely beyond the control of the producer. I shall not go into the numerous circumstances which caused such conditions. We know that the farmers were put at a very great disadvantage in comparison with other workers. They were put at such a great disadvantage that they became the lowest-paid major group of workers in all the country.

When the depression came, we had no way of fixing prices by law, because the question of supply and demand—the old, fundamental law—was involved. In making an economically sound proposal it is always necessary to consider that great law. So what occurred? I know the Senator is well advised concerning it. I know most of the other Members of the Senate are well advised on the subject. We undertook in the main to find some way—and we did it without party division, I am pleased to say—by which the incomes of farmers could be brought nearer into line with the incomes of industrial workers, and of the general masses of the people.

The solution which we first fell upon was the parity payment program, appropriations for parity payments to help equalize the incomes of the farmers, to help give them a larger purchasing power, and a larger debt-paying power, in order that they could contribute their part in starting the wheels of industry throughout the country. They were down and out, with their backs to the wall. So we established the program of parity payments through appropriations of the Government, based upon the idea of lifting them up from time to time until their incomes should reach parity level, and then discontinuing the program.

If that was not a subsidy, I do not know what a subsidy is. In fact, the definition of subsidy is of paramount importance when people are blindly and broadly opposed to subsidies in all forms.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The subsidies of which the Senator speaks are appropriate for agricultural appropriation bills. What I hoped he would tell us, and what I asked him to tell us, was how this amount happened to be raised this morning by several hundred million dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will give the Senator the information which he desires.

I will not take the time to go into the second subsidy program which Congress adopted for the farmers. We had many subsidy programs for industry, business, and manufacturers. Some have argued that parity is a subsidy. I shall not go into that subject; it is too controversial. However, as the Senator well knows, there have been subsidies for many other industries.

So certain plans were made, not on the basis particularly of parity, because that was not involved. I merely mentioned parity appropriations as an illustration, and to point out that most of us have voted year in and year out for subsidies through parity appropriations, and for the same reason we have voted—we did so a few days ago—to increase the amount of soil conservation and domestic allotment appropriation by $100,000,000. The matter is still pending in the other House. We did so notwithstanding the charge made here and there that that was a subsidy. Many voted against it on the ground that it was a subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator that I voted for it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know the Senator voted for it. He nearly always votes soundly, from my viewpoint, when the subject of agriculture is involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe Congress should authorize all subsidies if they are to be paid, and I would vote for some of them. I do not believe they should be left to

the executive department to apply here and there as the whim may move it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Two phases of this problem are involved in the bill. One is the R. F. C. In the R. F. C. a number of plans have been put into operation during the war, which are still in operation, such as the payment of subsidies to transport coal and oil to the East. In other words, the Government appropriates very large sums of money to pay the increased cost involved in the transportation of those commodities to the points where they are sorely needed. So far as I know, there has been no opposition from any section or group of people to the payment of those transportation subsidies in order to equalize the cost of supplying coal and oil to the people of certain sections. That is something that is in the R. F. C. program. It is included among the activities in which the R. F. C. has engaged, a list of which was read from the clerk's desk.

Mr. AIKEN. However, that could not have been the reason for raising the amount to which I have referred.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; but I cannot tell the story all in one breath. Give me time. Be patient, my friend.

Let us come to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have merely tried to give a few illustrations. I am not attempting to exhaust the subject, as the Senator well understands. The amount first suggested by the Senator from Ohio was $100,000,000. When he proposed his figures, I thought they were tentative. At any rate, there is a reason why the figures were increased. A proposal with reference to the treatment of the commitments heretofore made by our Government was submitted and agreed upon in the committee.

Coming to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senator is familiar with the Steagall Act. I have a copy of it before me, and I shall read the section to which I refer so there may be no misunderstanding about it. It is as follows:

> Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities—
>
> Taking into consideration the amount available—
>
> so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor.

Mr. AIKEN. What particular commitments did the committee have in mind when it raised this appropriation or authorization up to $500,000,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me get through with the Commodity Credit Corporation first. Let us finish that, since we have come to it, and not move away from it. Then we will take up the other matters.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in pursuance of the specific authorization which it has followed from time to time, and in view of the very urgent insistence on an increase in the production of food for war purposes undertook to bring about such an increase. The Senator has not forgotten the cry which was raised on the floor of the Senate, in the committee having to do with manpower and in the Committee on Appropriations, of which the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who sits in front of me, is a member—he has not forgotten the very insistent demand, the cry of alarm about the food situation and food prospects. So, not only because the law expressly authorized it, but in compliance with an outstanding public clamor and demand, the Department undertook to bring about an increase in the normal production of certain important and essential food crops.

Take the case of peanuts. The price offered last year proved to be totally inadequate; it did not pay the actual expenses of production. The farmers took land out of cotton production, out of corn and other production because the Government asked them to increase their peanut acreage. As a result they lost money, and the Department finally, after a thorough investigation, so ascertained. As we moved along in the march of time, when it became more apparent and more generally recognized that there is danger ahead regarding the food supply, the Secretary of Agriculture went to the farmers this year and, with the law behind him and the need recognized, said, "We want an increase of a certain percentage in the production of peanuts so that we may obtain peanut oil"—which is one of the most valuable of the vegetable oils—"and if you will increase your acreage we will pay an additional price"—which was specified—"for your peanuts." In compliance with that offer——

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Was the price of peanuts put at the parity price?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are two kinds of peanuts, the edible and the oil peanuts, as they are used in the trade. The use of peanut oil in industry is of recent origin. Farmers have been devoting their crop to edible peanuts. The present price agreed on for edible peanuts is slightly below parity, but the parity point on oil peanuts is far below that. So it was necessary to pay above the parity price in order to get the additional acreage.

Mr. WILLIS. Was the subsidy intended to raise the price above the parity price?

Mr. BANKHEAD. To raise the quantity. In fact, there was paid for oil peanuts a price above the parity price, but it was below the price for edible peanuts.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have heard no complaint about any suggestion of the Government increasing the price in compliance with the will of Congress, stated in the law, so as to develop an increased production, but does not the matter to which this bill pertains include subsidies for rolling back prices, thus causing an uncertainty in the minds of the people either as to what they will get for their products or what the consumer will pay for them? Is not that involved in this bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; and I will come to that. I have just stated to the Senator from Vermont that I cannot deal with both sections at the same time, and I am not quite through with the Commodity Credit Corporation matter. The Senator from Vermont wanted to know why the amount available under the commodity credit program was increased, and I am about to tell him. Then, we will go back to the other proposition, which is on a different basis.

Mr. AIKEN. If $175,000,000 is for the purpose of increasing the peanut crop——

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; not peanuts alone.

Mr. AIKEN. And hemp and flax and similar crops, I do not think we would disagree on that at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think we will disagree when the Senator and others understand the facts about the matter.

So that there might be no misunderstanding, we obtained from the Commodity Credit Corporation through Mr. Hutson a list brought down to date of the programs which they have announced to the farmers and are now administering. It includes oils and fats, such as peanuts, soybeans, and flax, and their commitment for these oils, which are so essential, amounts to $60,000,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In the dabte in the Senate the other day it appeared that the payment for flax and other crops the production of which it was desired to increase was to be handled under the Rural Agricultural Administration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the Senator is in error about that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what the debate was about for practically an entire afternoon.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That had reference to nonrecourse loans by the Regional Agricultural Corporation, in the effort to develop some new crop, such as flax or soybeans, which farmers had not previously been producing. That, however, has nothing to do with the Commodity Credit program.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Suppose the Rural Agricultural Corporation makes nonrecourse loans; is it the idea that the Commodity Credit Corporation will come in and pay the price?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the Commodity Credit is paying the producers a certain price for these commodities which they would not get in the market by themselves. It is an additional payment to the market price to encourage production.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In addition to the nonrecourse loans made by the Agricultural Credit Corporation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Commodity Credit has nothing in the world to do with the nonrecourse loans.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is in the nature of a premium, is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is an incentive payment to encourage an increase in the production of certain crops.

On the list we find canning crops, $25,000,000; beet sugar, $25,000,000; edible dry beans, $10,000,000; cheese, $25,000,000; foreign commodities, that is, coffee, cocoa, and similar commodities, $9,000,000. The total runs up in actual administration to about $165,000,000, as I recall.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is one of the items the Senator read canning crops?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Canned fruits, which are a very important item, as the Senator knows, in the diet of the people of the country.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did the Senator mention cheese among the products?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; cheese is listed for $25,000,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That will help counteract the reciprocity with Canada on cheese which broke the cheese market in the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not trying to go into all those phases of the subject. I am trying to answer the question of the Senator from Vermont. I know it was asked in good faith; I have no doubt about that; I know the Senator from Vermont too well to think otherwise; but here is a list of items which the Commodity Credit, in good faith and under the authorization of law, has included in its program. Nobody today would want to withdraw those payments, in view of the scarcity of our food supply. In that situation, because it is called a subsidy, would anyone think of condemning the program, and saying, as is proposed in some of the amendments, that none of those items shall receive payments and to none of them shall advances be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation? It is totally inconceivable to me that any intelligent Senator who understands all the facts would desire to turn down that sort of a program and leave the farmer in the lurch.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa and myself he will find that the things he has mentioned are all provided for in our proposed amendment. That is, we have no objection to incentive payments for the express purpose of increasing production when we must have increased production. So, if this $175,000,000 appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation is for that purpose, we can have no difference of opinion on that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator will read the amendment, he will see that the money made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation is for carrying out the programs which have already been authorized and announced, and they are given no money to venture on any other program of a similar nature, however much it may be needed. I fear we are making a mistake in providing that sort of a limitation at this time, in the middle of the year, with our food supply mounting and growing all the time, but, nevertheless, in order to bring about a fair and equitable adjustment of the conflicting views of the members of the committee—and doubtless of the Senate, upon that particular question—we have limited the Commodity Credit Corporation to the payment of the money it was authorized to obligate itself for, and to pay for nothing else.

Mr. AIKEN. I think these things have already been authorized by the Congress, but the $500,000,000 to the R. F. C. is what I should like an explanation of.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be very glad to turn my attention to that now. I know that is a very controversial question. I do not anticipate any serious contention when the facts are understood about the Commodity Credit program. I recognize that the other is much more controversial. But let me state the ground upon which I acted. I was motivated by the belief—the knowledge—that in good faith, acting under an opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, and acting in line with views theretofore expressed on this floor by the able Senator from Ohio about the legal authority, it was thought, and upon good authority, that the R. F. C. had the power to make these loans and these commitments.

Mr. AIKEN. How has the R. F. C. any choice in the matter when called upon by certain other agencies of the Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They may not have any choice; I did not go into that, but the requests were made, as the Senator knows, by regular agencies of the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. They came about as the result of an Executive directive.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think so; but to me that makes the case stronger, not because of any difference in my estimate of the authority of both legislative branches, but an Executive order from the President, the head of the Government, naturally must be complied with by all the agencies of the Government. In that case, it cannot be said the action was taken by a little subordinate in the Government. It was done right at the head, and if anyone is to be criticized about it, I agree with the Senator, the President is to be held responsible for it. Whether it is commendable or to be criticized, I have no disposition to shield or protect him in the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree that he has to assume a great deal of responsibility. Nevertheless, the Congress should not abrogate its own responsibilities in this matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, but that may not apply so much to past transactions as to future.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the future which concerns me just now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am now directing my remarks to the R. F. C. and the $500,000,000 program. That program was put into operation by the President of our country. The testimony before the committee showed that to be so. It showed that the President ordered it. So, I have stated frankly to the Senator, the President is responsible for what was done. The President did it, I think, in good faith. He did it in view of his philosophy—with which I am not in full accord—that subsidies would help reduce the cost of living to the consumers. With that belief, and with the legal advice that he had the power to take the action, he caused this program to be put into effect.

It was announced all over the country, over the radio, through the newspapers, and otherwise, that a certain roll-back in prices of certain commodities would be brought about, the commodities being limited to meat, butter, and coffee.

I shall not discuss the question whether I would have made such an order or not. That is not involved. My own personal, independent judgment is not involved, as I do not think the judgments of any Members of Congress are involved at this time, under the circumstances, except in directing their action toward the future.

If the President had the color of authority—and I have not heard any serious doubt expressed about that; I have not heard much question, in the hearings or elsewhere, about his actual authority under the law to make the directive—the directive having been issued, he having gone to the country with it, having provided for a roll-back of 10 percent to the consumer in the prices of these special commodities, and having provided, through the subsidy program, that the roll-back should not reach back to the farmer, the producer——

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the Senator understands that farm prices have already rolled back 10 percent, following the announcement of the order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They will roll up again as soon as the facts are learned. The Senator need not concern himself about that. They rolled back on the statement of the packers that there was no adequate provision for their payment, and they quit buying, as the Senator knows, because the cash was not in hand. They have never been too cooperative with any farm program, as the western Senators know. At any rate, the whole plan provides a great benefit for consumers, a protection for processors, and a protection for the producers.

Whether that is wise in government I am not undertaking at this time to say. I have some personal doubt about the widespread operation of it, but the cry went out from the packers that they did not know whether they were going to get the money or not. They stopped buying, according to the newspaper reports, and naturally when the purchasers were temporarily out of the market that drove down the price of the cattle offered to the packers.

Does the Senator from Vermont or any other thoughtful person believe that when the packers become fewer in number—and I believe they have now become fewer in number—and when subsidies are paid to them, they will stay out of the market and not buy every pound

of beef cattle, or hogs, or any other meat animals offered to them, when there is a real competitive fight between the packers for the purchase of meat animals? Do not worry about what they will do, Senators. They will come back into the market and buy.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as the Senator from Alabama, has interrogated me, I will say that I believe fully half of the farmers of the United States will never receive the subsidy. They are prohibited by the regulations of some of the departments themselves from obtaining the subsidy. No subsidy is provided for half of them. The subsidy will go only to those who will sell to the monopolistically inclined packers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who does the Senator from Vermont say will never receive the subsidy?

Mr. AIKEN. Half the farmers of the United States will never receive the subsidy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not expecting the farmers to receive a nickel of it, of course. It is simply expected that they shall not have the price rolled back on them, that they shall not be put to a disadvantage. This is the program I have just announced. The packers receive the money, because they are required to sell to the distributors at a 10-cent reduction, and the packers claim they cannot afford to do so. They claim they do not have sufficient margin of profit to sell at such a reduction in price.

Mr. AIKEN. The $500,000,000 then is to permit the President to carry out his roll-back and subsidy program as regards butter, meats, and coffee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly it.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to ask a question. Under what provision of law did the President begin this program without coming to Congress to obtain permission, or to obtain the money necessary to carry it out?

Mr. BANKHEAD. He did not come to Congress to obtain permission to begin this program.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Who did?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No one. Members of Congress went up in the air about the whole matter. The President is not asking for a thing in the world in connection with the situation. A proposal was made in Congress to stop the subsidy payments and terminate the program.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The program was inaugurated by the President under what provision of law?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know that I have the provision before me, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will probably discuss that feature. There is a provision with respect to the matter in the original Price Control Act. If it were not for the fact that in doing so I would exhaust the patience of the Senate, I would proceed to a discussion of that matter. I have the provision on my desk, but I do not care at this time to go into a detailed discussion of it. The Senator from Ohio can give a reference to the provision in the law.

Mr. TAFT. Section 5 (e) of the Price Control Act of 1942.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest that the Senator kindly examine the section. I previously stated—I do not know whether the Senator was present when I made the statement—that the President had the advice of the Attorney General of the United States before acting; that he had legal authority to act. A copy of the written opinion by the Attorney General is contained in the hearings on this measure. That is the authority under which the President acted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I assume, of course, that the Attorney General stated in his opinion upon what provision of law his opinion was based.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The opinion is contained in the hearings. It is the official opinion of the highest legal authority in the United States.

I shall proceed now to direct attention to the reason for the proposed increase in appropriations for the R. F. C. program, concerning which the Senator from Vermont has made inquiry. It was testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I think it is admitted all around, that the R. F. C. program will cost approximately $450,000,000 to carry on for 1 year. Of course, the R. F. C. has no legitimate place in this bill, because the bill provides for the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The functions of the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation, with respect to agricultural matters, as I have previously pointed out, are along entirely different lines, and the authority under which each agency acts is different, and their actions are for different purposes. But because of the fact that some Senators were in a hurry, I assume, to get action on the subsidy question, and to stop the subsidy, if possible, as quickly as they could, what is commonly called a rider was placed on the bill including the limitation and restriction on the R. F. C. I do not criticize Senators for taking that action. They had a right to do so.

When it developed that the cost of the meat and butter program would amount to $450,000,000—and there are some other items to which the R. F. C. is committed, which are not specified, but they are in the list which I had read at the desk—in discussing the matter before the committee today we agreed that it was well to provide a little margin above the actual estimate of the cost of the program. So, it was my viewpoint, and certainly the viewpoint of the majority of the committee, that if we were going to do anything with respect to the matter—and I am addressing myself now to the inquiry made by the able Senator from Vermont—we should permit the Government to carry out the announced program which is now in operation, and under which the status of many persons in the last few weeks has been changed, instead of cutting off the program completely. If we are to stop a program of this sort and terminate it, we should pay sufficient respect to our Government and to its officials to complete the transaction upon which the Government has entered, especially in view of the fact that it had legal authority to undertake the program. In the meantime we are undertaking the program. In it we will find a fair test, in a small way, with respect to whether the subsidy program is of sufficient advantage for Congress to continue it.

Mr. President, if the measure in its present form is passed it will result in the termination of a subsidy program so far as any future action is concerned, so far as any new decisions are to be announced. In other words, we have cut the cloth to fit the pattern of a completed program, and then instead of cutting off the program at the end of this calendar year, or at some other time, we thought it was best to let it be carried out, if it was going to be carried out for any time at all, in line with the announcement and in line with the administration of the program. That is the reason we propose to increase the amount, because $250,000,000, it develops, is only about half enough to carry out the program. We ought to carry it out or repudiate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For how long a period does the Senator refer to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. For 1 year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Alabama is that we should authorize the appropriation of $500,000,000 in order to keep a promise which the President has made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not altogether. I do not base my contention on that ground altogether, but I do say that it is something which deserves very great consideration by Congress, regardless of what party one belongs to, or to what party the President may belong. The President is the President of the United States. He is in charge of the food production of the United States. The administration of food production is under him, through his selected agencies. He is in charge of price control and the fight on inflation. I submit that if Congress takes the action proposed by some to be taken it will, with respect to the matter of inflation, take that much responsibility off the President of the United States and assume it itself. If evil results from such action, who will be to blame? Congress, of course. If Congress decides to cut off any experimental effort, without a fair trial, simply to repudiate a program which the President has announced——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator from Alabama that the President had any authority whatsoever to make those promises. I am wondering if we are to be obligated to make appropriations to carry out the President's promises, regardless of whether we believe he had a right to make them. If so, what is to become of this Government of ours?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator believed the President had the right and power to make the promises, would he then favor carrying out the promises?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is satisfied that the President did not have the power to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not the question. I am asking the Senator frankly. He has debated my question. I shall not press him about it.

Mr. AIKEN. No, Mr. President; if I thought the President of the United States was going outside the law, I would favor any action of Congress to get back inside the law just as quickly as possible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the Senator this question: If the Senator decided that the President was within the law, what would he do?

Mr. AIKEN. If I thought the President was, indeed, within the law, I would support him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am delighted to learn that. I wish the Senator would study the law.

Mr. President, I shall not take any further time. I know that the subject is not a particularly interesting one, at least to those Members of the Senate who already have made up their minds about it. I have endeavored in a frank and straightforward way to answer the Senator's questions as to why the amount was increased by agreement of the committee. If there was a member of the committee who opposed the increase, I did not so understand. As I said, there were at least two reservations on the whole subject of subsidies; but it was recognized that if we were in good faith to carry out the program, the full amount we provided would be required. So we decided we were going to advocate the carrying out of the program in good faith, with the express provision that unless Congress hereafter changed the whole program, the present program could not be extended.

If nothing else has been accomplished, those who have opposed the subsidy have at least brought about on this subject a stop order on the Executive, after the conclusion of a reasonably small program affecting the cost of food to the people of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator has answered my question, and I thank him. I appreciate the courtesy he has shown in proceeding at length to explain the situation to the Members of the Senate. Furthermore, let me say that I can agree with the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the authorization to the Commodity Credit Corporation; but I cannot agree with the $500,000,000 appropriation to enable the R. F. C. to carry out commitments of the President which I feel he had no right to make.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, it is the Senator's right to take that position. I hope he will change his mind, and will decide that the President did have the right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The more I hear of the debate, the more confused I become.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me ask the Senator which side he started on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I started on the side of Uncle Sam.

Senators are considerably handicapped by having an amendment discussed without having copies of it before them, in order to enable them to follow the discussion. A few moments ago I understood the Senator from Alabama to say that under the proposed amendment, which I do not have before me, the only subsidies which would be paid would be subsidies on coffee, dairy products, and beef.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me say to the Senator that the original amendment of the Senator from Ohio was approved by the committee. The only changes proposed by the committee were in the amounts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question about which I desire clarification is this: Under the proposed amendment, on what commodities are subsidies to be paid? I understood the Senator from Alabama to say a moment ago that they would be paid on only coffee, dairy products, and beef.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said those were the commodities involved in the R. F. C. roll-back program. I read a list of commodies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is no specification of the commodities. The amendment attempts to impose an over-all financial limitation on all subsidies. The $500,000,000 for the R. F. C. would be practically exhausted by the coffee, butter, and meat subsidies which have been announced, if they continue for a year. However, they could be stopped after 30 days, and the money could be used for other subsidies, if it was desired to do so. The attempt has been not to impose a limitation on a subsidy on any particular commodity, but to impose an over-all limitation on all the money which might be spent during the next 12 months under the general subsidy policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the over-all limit on the total amount which is to be spent on all commodities and subsidies?

Mr. TAFT. On general subsidies, $500,000,000 for the R. F. C., and $175,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, a total of $675,000,000. However, under paragraphs (a) and (b) no limit is imposed, for reasons which I shall explain later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do paragraphs (a) and (b) appear in the committee amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do they appear at any other place in the bill? In other words, must the committee amendment be agreed to in order to have paragraphs (a) and (b) approved by the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. If the Senator wanted to have paragraphs (a) and (b) without the remainder of the amendment, he would have to move to amend the committee amendment by striking out paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (f), and so forth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And if the Senate should vote against the committee amendment, it would strike out paragraphs (a) and (b), and paragraphs (a) and (b) would not appear in any other provision of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct—unless an amendment containing them separately were later offered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, with one further statement I shall yield the floor. I take it that the Senator from Colorado was not in the Chamber when I pointed out the commodities involved in the Commodity Credit Corporation program. Meat, butter, and coffee are being administered solely under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's roll-back program. The Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with those items. Those are the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's items, for which the $500,000,000 is proposed to be provided.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Ohio to the fact that, in my opinion, the Senator from Colorado has raised an important question. It is with reference to paragraphs (a) and (b) of the committee amendment. The very purpose of paragraphs (a) and (b) is now being carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under its present authority, is it not? So, if paragraphs (a) and (b) were not agreed to, or if the amendment in its entirety were rejected, there still would be, would there not, the authority which exists today, and which would continue to exist, for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to do the things which are provided for in those paragraphs?

Mr. TAFT. I think that certainly would be true as to the provision for subsidizing the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production, which appears at the end of the amendment. I think that some of the other things they are doing are of questionable legality—exactly like the other subsidy which was referred to before. But so far as the copper program is concerned, for instance, I think the authority is clearly contained in the Price Control Act to carry out that program, without any further legislation.

The amendment was proposed because in attempting to impose an over-all limitation it was necessary to make exceptions of the things of which we approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to make one other statement to the Senator from Colorado. When we separate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's meat and butter subsidy program which is covered by subsection (c), and go down to subsection (d) which covers the Commodity Credit Corporation's program, the amendment as recommended by the committee, and which I had, and which will be printed in the RECORD and will be available to Senators in the morning, provides that in the last line, after the words "increases thereof", there be inserted the words:

All commitments heretofore made—

As I have frequently stated in my remarks, this provision would apply only to commitments now in effect, and would provide that they be carried out in good faith. I repeat the language just read, and continue:

All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator have a list of the commitments?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not in the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not in the amendment; but does he have a list of them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I read it. The commitments are oil, fats, including peanuts, soybeans, and flax.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will find a list of subsidies in the hearings on pages 13, 14, and 54.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to have the Senator read the list into the RECORD again if it is already in the RECORD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The list is here. The Senator may look at it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio desires to proceed this afternoon or wait until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to proceed this afternoon.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the committee amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and the general question of payment of subsidies and the policy which Congress ought to adopt. I am almost more interested in having Congress adopt some policy on the question of subsidies than I am in having any particular policy followed. I do not believe we can escape our responsibility to determine what ought to be done under the present circumstances.

The subsidy question started with the Price Control Act, in which Congress approved the general policy of subsidies for certain purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator read that paragraph of the act?

Mr. TAFT. I am about to read it. Section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act reads as follows:

(e) Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payment to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof:

It goes on to provide that in the case of any commodity which is defined as a strategic or critical material, those powers shall be exercised only through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In other words, it was intended that the minerals which the R. F. C. was already handling should remain in its hands.

After the passage of the Emergency Price Control Act, of course, what makes these particular roll-backs questionable under this provision is the requirement that they should be made for the purpose of increasing production. The difficulty with that provision as a method of control is that when we give a subsidy we do it, as a matter of fact, for a number of different purposes. If we subsidize the processor of a commodity such as soybeans, the crusher of soybeans, we may do it in order to increase the price of soybeans, but we also do it in order to prevent a price increase in the product, the soybean oil. In other words, every subsidy may have a number of different purposes, and it is almost impossible to separate the purposes.

I, myself, believe, in spite of the opinion of the Attorney General, that the roll-back provisions and the subsidies to provide for roll-backs are illegal. My support of the amendment is in spite of that fact.

Certainly the spirit of the act contemplated the direct use of a subsidy to reduce the price; but, nevertheless, it is very difficult to distinguish those purposes, and I see no way by which we can step in and question the opinion of the Attorney General. I see no way by which any court could do so, and I believe we must face the fact that those subsidies have actually been promised and are being paid.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may be able to explain the matter, inasmuch as for about 3 weeks I sat on a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry taking testimony on the matter of roll-backs and subsidies. In the course of those hearings there appeared before us many officials of the executive departments and other witnesses who are known to represent the administration's viewpoints. Of all those witnesses, not one of them gave any testimony that the roll-back and subsidy were for the purpose of increasing production. All the testimony was that they were solely for the purpose of reducing the price to the consumer. They put great emphasis upon reducing the price to the underprivileged. When I speak later upon this subject I shall show that the underprivileged get it in the neck instead of in the pocket.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Of the witnesses to whom I have referred, not one testified that the subsidy was for the purpose of increasing production.

Mr. TAFT. The argument which was made was that under the Price Control Act, the Price Administrator had a perfect right to roll back the prices, and could reduce the prices. Not only that, but it has been claimed that by the act of October 2, 1942, which provided that the September 15 prices should remain in effect, he had an instruction to do so; that he had the instruction from Congress; that if he rolled back the price of meat, he would be forced to roll back the price of cattle and the price of hogs; that if he had done so, and had carried out that policy without a subsidy, the production next year would be reduced; and that, in order to prevent that, and to maintain production, he had a right to subsidize the processor.

I did not agree with him. I, myself, think that such action is illegal. I do not believe it was ever authorized by law. However, the general question of subsidy has been pursued steadily ever since the passage of the Price Control Act. We now have, and will continue to have, an elaborate system of subsidies of one kind or another. They are set out on pages 13, 14, and 54 of the hearings.

For instance, let us consider what Mr. Jones has been paying. I read from page 13 of the hearings:

Due to submarine warfare, Defense Supplies Corporation is paying excess transportation charges, and in some instances excess cost, on petroleum products. The estimated net cost of this operation for 1943 is from ninety-five to one hundred million dollars, probably from forty to fifty million dollars for 1944.

For the same reason, the Corporation is paying excess transportation costs on coal to New York and New England. The estimated cost of this program for the year is $25,000,000.

A subsidy has been paid on sugar in order to have beet sugar shipped to the east coast and to other places where there is a shortage of sugar. That subsidy has cost approximately $20,000,000 a year.

All the Chilean nitrate of soda imported from July 1, 1942, to June 1, 1943, has been for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation. Sale of this nitrate of soda within the Office of Price Administration price ceilings will result in an estimated loss of $7,000,000, of which about one-half is due to transportation costs.

Approximately $5,000,000 will be paid in 1943 for replacements or substitutes for rope and binder twine imported from Central America and other tropical points, to replace the loss of jute and rope from the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies.

Formerly this country obtained its supply of jewel bearings almost entirely from Switzerland. In order to induce American manufacturers to produce them, the Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to purchase the output of American manufacturers at a price which entails a very substantial loss. It is estimated this loss will approximate seven and a half million dollars a year.

Approximately $5,000,000 is being used to subsidize the production of aluminum rivets of a particular type. An estimated $1,000,000 a year is used to subsidize the production of aluminum rods and bars.

The Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to pay the excess cost of purchasing petroleum coke at inland locations, transporting it to the west coast, and processing it into calcined coke. That is

done to avoid interference with the maximum production of 100-octane gasoline and Navy fuel oil in the west coast at an estimated loss of two and a half million dollars.

The copper subsidy has cost about $53,000,000 a year. That amount is required to pay for the high cost of the production of copper. Of course, a much larger amount is saved because the price of copper is maintained at all the basic mines at 12 cents a pound, and the Government has not had to pay 18 cents a pound or even more, I believe, at the higher-cost mines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Insofar as metals are concerned, they are in a little different category from any other commodity which is handled by the R. F. C., because the Government is the ultimate purchaser of the metals.

Mr. TAFT. That is the essential point; not that they are metals. The same principle might apply to timber, or to a number of other products of an agricultural nature with which we have attempted to deal in our amendment by providing that there shall be no limit upon the subsidies which may be paid for any article which goes into equipment or munitions of war. Obviously, a Government subsidy for a commodity of that nature is returned to the Government through the price which it pays for the commodity itself. In fact, in many cases the Government may receive back, through the price which it pays, much more than the amount of the subsidy. So that particular kind of subsidy is justified, not because the commodity is a mineral or a metal, but because it is a material for which the Government itself ultimately pays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct, because the Government is the ultimate purchaser.

The question I wish to ask the Senator has to do with paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of the committee amendment. I should like to discover the relationship between the limitation in paragraph (c) and the authorization in paragraphs (a) and (b). The $500,000,000 limitation in paragraph (c) reads as follows:

> All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled at the said sum.

Will the Senator explain the effect of that provision?

Mr. TAFT. It applies only to the provisions of paragraph (c), and has no relation to paragraphs (a) and (b), which are unlimited in respect to the amount which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may borrow and pay in subsidy. I thought it was unnecessary to limit the amount in paragraph (b) because, as I have said, the Government must receive back most of the subsidy, by its very nature.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then paragraphs (a) and (b) are not limitations upon the present practice, are they?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I think I can explain the purpose better if I go ahead with the general provisions of the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Ohio has probably covered the matter about which I desire to make inquiry. If he has, I apologize to him, but I have been kept in a meeting of the Appropriations Committee throughout the afternoon, and will have to return there. I think that the amendment prepared by the Senator from Ohio is an excellent one, and is very clearly written and understandable; but there is a sense of doubt in the minds of those who will be called upon to operate the program, and, for their benefit and for the RECORD, I should like to ask two questions. I think I myself understand the matter clearly. One question is, Is it the Senator's understanding and purpose to permit within the limits of the money he proposes to provide subsidies to roll back prices?

Mr. TAFT. It is my intention to do so; yes. I think the words "prevent price increases," according to the Government's interpretation of the words as they have already interpreted them, are sufficient to cover a roll back of prices.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, and I think he will agree with me that that was the understanding of the Committee on Banking and Currency after it discussed that particular language this morning.

Mr. TAFT. That was the understanding.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask one more question for the RECORD. This question is also asked on behalf of those who are to be called upon to administer this program provided the amendment should be adopted and the bill should become a law. In connection with the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) they hope it will be made clear that those subsections are in addition to the authority contained in subsections (a) and (b).

Mr. TAFT. I think there is no doubt that that is so. That is what the Senator from Colorado asked, and that, I think, is perfectly clear.

Mr. MALONEY. It certainly is clear to me.

Mr. TAFT. If any Senator has any amendment to suggest to make it clearer, I should have no objection to it.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think it requires an amendment, and I asked the question on behalf of and prompted by the request of those who will administer the proposed act. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the Senator to say, in the first place, that he does not think the Price Control Act, either the original act or the amended act, is legal authority for the theory of subsidy involved in the roll-back program of the O. P. A.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, that is my opinion. I think there is an argument the other way; I have heard such an argument; but my opinion is that it at least violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the act.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to hear the Senator make that statement.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that I have put up a strenuous argument with the attorney for the O. P. A. in the Banking and Currency Committee on the subject.

Mr. GEORGE. The O. P. A. attorneys can argue anything, and they can prove almost anything, so far as legal questions go. That is why one of the O. P. A. attorneys has gone, I may parenthetically interject. However, I am glad to hear the Senator make the statement he has made.

Now I should like to ask the Senator if at any time the question of subsidy has appeared in this body or in the other body of the Congress there has been any sanction or approval of the subsidy principle which the O. P. A. is now undertaking to apply?

Mr. TAFT. I should say that the Price Control Act itself applies a general principle of subsidy or authorizes for the purpose of increasing production.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly; that is one way to control prices. The Congress knew that, in the final analysis, that is the only way to control prices.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senate when it had the subsidy bill before it in December showed its very clear intention not to authorize such a subsidy policy when that bill was sent back to the committee. In other words, my answer to the Senator is that I know of no general authority from Congress authorizing this program.

Mr. GEORGE. It is true, I think, that when the Congress has been called upon to speak it has expressed itself against such a practice.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is practically true.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have the Senator answer another question at this point, if he will. I am sure he intended to discuss it, but I should like to get it clear in my mind. His amendment, as I understand, provides a specified amount of money, $500,000,000, plus an additional sum to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is it the purpose of the amendment to stop this type of subsidy at this point and to go no further with it?

Mr. TAFT. The amendment would stop subsidy payments at approximately the present Government commitments. It would provide enough money to carry out the program for 1 year, until the 1st of July 1944, and then prohibit the making of any further commitments which could again place us in the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. GEORGE. We will be placed in the same situation again; for when any department or bureau wants to bypass Congress, and really has the purse strings in its hands, it can find some excuse; but that is another matter. I

did not ask the Senator the question to divert him.

I understand that the sums authorized by the amendment are to be used only to comply with present commitments until a certain date, and to stop the practice, so far as the amendment goes, which, of course, is as far as the Senator can speak.

Mr. TAFT. At least, it is true that the Price Administrator might tomorrow call off the roll-backs and raise the prices of butter and meat; and in that case he could use the money for other subsidies. The amendment is intended not to direct the kind of subsidy he shall pay or the purpose for which he shall pay it, but simply to impose an over-all financial limitation on all subsidies during the next 12 months.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I was trying to get at. I did not make myself very clear. At the end of that time, when prices cease to be held at the point where they have been rolled back, what is going to happen?

Mr. TAFT. Then we will have to let them go up.

Mr. GEORGE. Why not let them go up now?

Mr. TAFT. That is a fair question. Perhaps action could be taken to let them go up now. I do not know whether the Congress should take the responsibility of saying, after executive agencies have determined the price of meat to be such a figure, "We refuse to permit that; we intend to raise the price of meat 2 cents a pound." These things are largely questions of maintaining the status quo. A new status quo has been provided. If we want to raise the price of butter 6 cents, we can prohibit subsidies.

Mr. GEORGE. But that is not so much the point. The point I was making is that here is a limited program; here is approval of a roll-back prices program; confessedly it is limited as to time, and it is limited as to money; but when it is through we propose to go no further. Then we will be in worse shape than we are today. That is the question which I wish to submit to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. We will probably not be in any worse shape than we are today. It seems to me we will have some lower prices than we have today.

Mr. President, I should prefer not to be interrupted for a few moments; I should like, at least, to make the main statement of why this amendment is proposed and what its purpose is.

When we passed the Price Control Act we supposed—at least I supposed—that, so far as any food subsidy was concerned, the Food Administrator would have to come back to Congress for an appropriation with which to pay it. I think it was stated on the floor that the Price Control Act contained no appropriation. They have availed themselves of the provision which was put in the law retaining in the R. F. C. power over metal and to pay copper subsidies and similar subsidies—they have availed themselves of that authority to extend subsidies to food without any appropriation by Congress by means of having the President declare that meat and butter and coffee are strategic and critical materials. That is the whole basis on which the R. F. C. is now financing this assumed roll-back.

Of course, if that is legal, and if we simply pass it by and do nothing, there is no limit to which that subsidy policy may be carried. I am not perfectly certain, because it is almost impossible to find out what the ultimate borrowing power of the R. F. C. will be, but my impression is that the R. F. C. has approximately seven or eight billion dollars which it can devote to the purposes for which it may use its money. I think all that money is committed to something, but many of the commitments are commitments which the R. F. C. knows it will never be called upon to make good, and the $450,000,000 it has agreed to supply in this case is simply taken out of some other commitment and turned over for this purpose.

What concerns me is that if no action is taken by Congress we may find a subsidy of $2,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 or any other sum the R. F. C. sees fit to decide upon. I do not believe that is in accord with the Food Control Act.

There was advocated before us by Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., an annual subsidy of about $2,000,000,000. In a press conference the President mentioned $2,000,000,000. If we subsidize on the basis of the English subsidy, which is what has been proposed, and is used as a model here, it will cost them at least $2,000,000,000 a year. As a matter of fact, the English subsidize about 12½ percent of the total consumers' food bill. If we should subsidize 12½ percent of our consumers' food bill, the cost would be well over $3,000,000,000 a year. Furthermore, as the pressures now being experienced, and the tremendous Government spending force prices us—and I think prices are going up anyway—the second year we would have a more stupendous bill, if we tried to maintain the price level where it was the first of January of this year. I think that unless some action is taken we may well find ourselves embarked on a $2,000,000,000 subsidy program this year, and a $4,000,000,000 subsidy program next year.

It is the prevention of the adoption of such a policy with which I am most concerned, and I think that simply cutting off all subsidies would be a rather drastic way of preventing it. Congress has done nothing about preventing payment of subsidies. We have known that subsidies are being paid, and we have permitted it, subsidies very much of the same nature as the one now presented. Of course, the pending proposal has brought the question to the fore, because this is a big subsidy, and this is the first time we have seen any indication of a general consumer subsidy all across the board. So the question has been raised. But the subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation are exactly of the same nature. The Commodity Credit Corporation, in subsidizing, for instance, the production of cheese, found that the price of milk had risen to such a point that no one could make cheese and sell it for the price at which cheese was selling. Therefore, in order to maintain the price of cheese at that point, the Corporation proceeded to subsidize all the processors of cheese.

We had very much the same situation in the case of cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans. The prices of those products rose. We did not control them. They got to the point where no processor could buy the products and crush them and sell the oil without losing money in the transaction. So the Commodity Credit Corporation stepped in and proceeded to subsidize all the processors of soybean oil, peanut oil, and cottonseed oil.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but the reason why they could not buy those products and process them was that a ceiling was put on oil very early.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly, and I think it was too tight a ceiling. But the argument is that by subsidizing those oils, and thereby preventing an increase in the prices of the oils, we avoided the necessity of increasing the price of lard and of the prices of other oils which we do not have to subsidize. Therefore, by subsidizing one product we saved the consumer two or three times that much in the amount he had to pay for all the oils.

Mr. President, there are instances in which the payment of a subsidy is a wise policy. Subsidies have been used by other governments. There are instances, I believe, in which for a small amount of money it is possible to subsidize a considerable amount and prevent a price increase, and it is a very valuable weapon in the general course of fighting the battle of inflation. I do not like to deprive the Administrator entirely of that power. I should prefer to say, "You have to pick out the things which are really worth while and use the money for those purposes, but you will not have any more. Here is the amount of money available. You cannot undertake a general subsidy all across the board."

I think a general subsidy of the consumer is probably more inflationary than raising prices. In the first place, if there is a $2,000,000,000 subsidy, the Government has to borrow $2,000,000,000, and presumably borrow it from the banks, because the Government is borrowing all it can now from individuals and corporations and savings institutions. I think a general subsidy, from which the consumer merely gets the advantage of the exact amount of money the Government pays, is likely to be more inflationary than otherwise.

The argument is that if we can hold the price level, then it will enable us to hold the wage level, and by holding the wage level, we will prevent another increase of prices and prevent gradually rising inflation. I think it is possible that if we could absolutely hold everything steady that might be true, but, of course, the fact is that we have not succeeded in doing anything of the kind, and I do not believe we can do so. I feel reasonably confident that if we subsidize in the amount of $2,000,000,000 we will still see prices rising, in spite of the subsidy.

The inflation problem is a serious one. I think, however, it has been somewhat overemphasized. I have never agreed with the theory that we can for once and

all fix prices and wages and hold them. I do not believe we can do that, even with a subsidy. Of course, those who do believe in that would have to support a subsidy policy because there is certainly no other way by which to maintain a flat level.

As a matter of fact, what has happened in this country is that the cost of living—the cost of goods purchased by wage earners, as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics—has increased about 24 percent since the 1st of January 1941; that is, in the 2 years preceding the 15th of last April, an average of 10 percent a year, and fairly constant. There has been no greater rate of increase in the last 4 months than in the 2 years before that time. At the same time the hourly wage rates increased in the neighborhood of 40 percent, and average weekly earnings increased in the neighborhood of 57 percent, as compared with 24 percent increase in the cost-of-living rate. The general effect of the activities of the Price Administration therefore has been reasonably successful—certainly far more successful than the attempt to control wages through any voluntary program.

While prices in the first 3½ months of this year rose 3 percent, hourly wage rates, Little Steel formula, and all, rose 4 percent in 3 months. Average weekly earnings rose 5 percent. So that so far as the war worker is concerned, he has no right to ask for a subsidy.

It is pointed out that there are many groups in this country whose real earnings are less than they have been, because their wages have not been increased—school teachers, for instance, and many others—while their cost of living has increased. So that it is not entirely fair to say that the consumer has no case. Some consumers have a case, while other consumers do not have a case.

In general, I do not think there is today any tremendously serious threat of inflation. I am not primarily concerned about inflation, and I think it has been a mistake to wave prevention of inflation as the first policy of the Government, and disregard other policies, for there are two other elements which must be considered. The first is production. We must attain production, regardless of price. It is better to have meat at almost any price than to have no meat at all, the situation in which a good many cities find themselves today. Production is even more important than price.

There is another element which I think is important, and that is a sense of justice. I do not think we can maintain the morale of the people if we are to say to workmen, for instance, "Yes; the cost of living has risen 25 percent, but we will increase your wages only 15 percent."

I do not think that simply because it is war time we can say to the small packers, "You must buy cattle and sell the meat at a loss." The packers may do so for a while, but cannot continue to do so indefinitely. The general attitude on the part of the Office of Price Administration has been that justice makes no difference; that "our one rule is to hold the line, and we do not care whether we are fair to you or not." At least that is the kind of treatment my constituents have received. I think such a policy is a mistake. I think all these things should be taken into consideration. I believe that efficient price control, efficient management, with courage, and a real sense of working with the trade, getting its advice, following what it advises in connection with these controls, would have held the price even better than it was held, and would have done so with more justice, and with less adverse effect on production.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that if we have an efficient administration of price control we can hold the rise to 6 percent a year instead of 10 percent a year. Even if we have a rise of 10 percent a year for 5 years, if finally the rise goes to 50 percent, it is not going to be a calamity. It is going to be unfortunate for many persons. But in the World War the cost of living went up 100 percent. That was too much. It resulted in creating hardship, and should be avoided. If the present war should continue to the end of 1946, with an increase of 10 percent a year, in 4 years of war and 1 year pre-war, resulting in a total of 50 percent increase, I would not regard that as serious. So I believe the price control is sufficient.

On the other hand, I think we must use every weapon we possibly can use to prevent increases in prices. I do not like to take the attitude that we shall not under any circumstances have any power to subsidize. I do not know how I can draw the distinction between different kinds of subsidies. It is really a question which, as I see it, must be left with some discretion to the Administrator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may suggest that there are two kinds of subsidies, those legalized and authorized by Congress, and those which are not.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, but Congress never has considered the subsidy question seriously, it never has decided what its policy in that respect should be. I think I am as much disposed as anyone to criticize the Government for doing things which are illegal, but approaching this question I am willing to begin de novo and decide what ought to be the subsidy policy of the United States Government. I have tried to write in my amendment what I think ought to be the subsidy policy of the Government, that is a reasonable sum for use in subsidies, and one which does not in its very nature permit what might be called a general consumer subsidy, and does not permit an absolute "hold the line" policy. The whole effect of the use of this $450,000,000, according to Mr. Gilbert, the economist for the O. P. A., will be to reduce the cost of living only 1.1 percent. Frankly I do not think it is worth it. I felt $250,000,000 was enough to do what I had in mind. The committee thought that so long as these commitments had been made it would be better to make the sum $500,000,000. I am willing to go along with that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to try to become technical with respect to the language in the Senator's amendment, but I wish to ask a question. In paragraph (c) of section 5 this language is found:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $500,000,000.

Then as an afterthought—and that is my language—

> And to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944.

My point is that the restriction is placed entirely upon the amount which can be borrowed, not upon the amount which can be used. If the R. F. C. has another $500,000,000 on hand in some of its revolving funds, or otherwise, which it can use, it will have a total of $1,000,000,000 to use for this purpose, because no limitation is placed on the use of the money by the language of the Senator's amendment. The limitation is placed on the amount which can be borrowed.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator should read the first part of the section. I shall be glad to consider the question, but it rather seems to me that when we say that the R. F. C. shall not "pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities * * * or borrow any money * * * except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress," the R. F. C. is barred completely from using any other money. Then there is a positive authority given the R. F. C. to borrow $500,000,000, and to use that sum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I make perhaps is not sound, but in the first paragraph the Senator's amendment provides:

> Except as provided in this section—

And further along in the amendment no limitation is placed on the amount, the amendment simply providing:

> And to use or allocate any part of said sum.

Mr. TAFT. The language is:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $500,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944.

Not some other sum. I really do not think the amendment would authorize the use of 1 cent more than $500,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Jesse Jones came before the Senate subcommittee on food to testify on this very matter. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], was present in the committee meeting as was also the

distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. If my recollection is correct, and I think it is, Mr. Jones told us that he had money to pay the $450,000,000 subsidy. We asked him where he was going to get the money, and he said he had it. He said that if he needed more he would come to Congress for it. That appears to be exactly what he has done. He has come to Congress asking for $500,000,000 more.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. Jesse Jones did not write the amendment. I wrote it. It seemed to me the committee amendment contained in the bill was inadequate. It only limited the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It did not limit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at all. It seems to me that if we pass the bill in its present form we would practically O. K. the general policy, and leave the situation wide open. My interest is to provide a limitation. If Mr. Jesse Jones came to Congress, I can assure Senators he would ask for at least $1,000,000,000. Mr. Jones came here last December, as I recall, and asked for $1,000,000,000, and the committee voted to give it to him. He said he did not think he had to come, but that he always wanted to consult Congress. When the measure came before the Senate it turned down that provision, and the measure was returned to committee. The next time Mr. Jones did not come before Congress and make a request. He simply went ahead and subsidized.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Ohio knew that Mr. Jones had $450,000,000 would he still approve giving him $500,000,000 more?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Jones does not have any money in that sense. He has certain borrowing power, and he has repeatedly testified before our committee and before other committees that all that borrowing power is committed. There is a bill pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency to provide him with $5,000,000,000 more.

In spite of that fact Mr. Jones found $450,000,000 when the President asked him to. I can only assume that it came out of money which he had committed, but which he knew would never be called for. If he took it out of that class of money there is about $7,000,000,000 more of the same kind of money in the R. F. C., and I see no reason why he should not find $7,000,000,000 as well as the $450,000,000 he previously found, unless we shall limit his power.

Mr. AIKEN. We should limit it.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that the whole problem really arises out of the unfortunate condition into which we have gotten in connection with the Government corporations and the fact that they are not subject to the rules governing appropriations. They have money available for rather vague general purposes. Under the act passed by Congress, the R. F. C. has money available for almost any purpose. Unless we adopt a restraining policy with respect to the R. F. C. we shall not impose restraint such as we usually exercise through appropriations. That is the reason this measure attempts to impose a new kind of restriction which we have never imposed heretofore, by providing that no money, corporate or otherwise, shall be used for certain purposes, except in accordance with certain policies which we declare. I am perfectly confident that is a sound principle. Whether the Congress wants to allot $500,000,000, or whether it wants to allot $250,000,000, or whether it does not want to allot any money, is up to Congress. What I am interested in is to lay down a policy which will prevent the continuation of a wide-open subsidy policy which, before we get through, may well amount to $5,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the Senator concludes his discussion of the point of production, I should like to ask him how the amendment, if agreed to, would provide for encouraging the production of beef, if the subsidy is paid.

Mr. TAFT. It would not, unless those in charge chose to subsidize certain packers. I suppose it is conceivable that they might subsidize certain packers. They might subsidize certain types of beef if they thought that by so doing the production of beef would be increased.

Mr. WHERRY. If the packer were subsidized, would there be any assurance that the subsidy would go back to the producer?

Mr. TAFT. The subsidy would have to be made on that condition; yes. The Senator asks me if it is possible. I say it is possible if the subsidy is used, without increasing the price of cattle, to increase the production of certain kinds of cattle. There is some question whether the kinds of hogs now being brought to the stockyards are too heavy for some uses, and there is a desire for different kinds of meat. Subsidies can be used for all sorts of purposes. I think some of the purposes may be very effective in giving the farmer more money for certain commodities, and yet holding down increases in prices.

Mr. WHERRY. But the operation thus far, since last Tuesday, has been to roll back the prices to consumers, without any assurance that the subsidies will go to the producers; is not that correct?

Mr. TAFT. It would be possible, if it were desired to do so, to make any roll-back illegal, and to force the restoration of the prices which have been rolled back. That would be a possible provision which could be added to the amendment, in addition to what it already provides. However, as a matter of fact, in principle there is not much difference between rolling back the price and subsidizing the commodity or increasing the price and subsidizing the commodity. The result may be to give the producer more money; but the net result, when we get through, as I see it, is not any different in kind. I think the roll-back is not very different from the subsidy, but I think it could be done in such a way as to give the benefit to the producers.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the provisions of subsection (a):

> (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

There are a number of products on which such increases have occurred. The principal ones are coal and oil. Nearly all the increases have resulted from increased costs of water transportation or from the elimination of water transportation. I say they are justified largely on the ground that before the war we had certain relationships between different parts of the country. The result of the increased cost of transportation has been to discriminate against some sections of the country, as contrasted to others. A mill in Pittsburgh may pay for coal the same price it paid at the beginning of the war. Unless a subsidy is granted, a similar mill in New England, making the same products, would have to pay a great deal more for coal. I think the general policy of subsidizing increased costs of transportation due to the war is one which will tend to restore the balance existing before the war, and will tend to prevent discrimination. Discrimination of that kind, it seems to me, might well be prevented by having the taxpayer pay the bill, rather than by calling upon one section of the country to pay it.

I estimate that the subsidies which now are in force under subsection (a) are costing approximately $160,000,000 a year. The exact amount of the increase is not very easy to determine, but the figure of $160,000,000 seems to be the consensus of opinion.

Subparagraph (b) reads in part as follows:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay the subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations.

I have already said that if subsidies are to be used to keep down the costs of production of the things the Government is going to buy, it is fairly obvious that we cannot lose any money. At worst, we simply would take money out of one pocket and put it into another. At best, as in the case of the copper subsidy, by holding down the cost of the copper from the low priced mines to 12 cents, we might save the Government four or five times as much money as it would actually pay out in a subsidy.

Added to that are the subsidies to high-cost-of-production minerals to increase the production thereof. In the case of some minerals, possibly even in the case of high-cost oil, the production is not going to the United States Government, but at least in part is going to the civilian population. Therefore, we added the clause:

> And to subsidize the high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

We added it as an instance in which, by the payment of a small amount of money, we might save the consumer, as well as the Government, a considerably larger sum of money.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The term "minerals" usually includes oil. Does the Senator think that is sufficiently established so that it is not necessary to state specifically that oil is included in the term "minerals"?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. I can only say that the distinguished former Senator Brown, of Michigan, felt that the term "minerals" properly included oil; that oil was a mineral, not a metal.

Mr. GEORGE. The courts have so held.

Mr. TAFT. I think so. That is my impression.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Technically, in the law of oils and gas, we refer to oil as a mineral.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think oil is a mineral.

Mr. President, the other provisions are simply to the effect that the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to pay up to $175,000,000. That is a little more, I think, than they are committed to. So far as I could ascertain, I do not think they are committed to more than approximately $125,000,000 or $150,000,000, on the subsidies they have announced. The committee seemed to feel somewhat more generous toward the Commodity Credit Corporation, because they felt the Commodity Credit Corporation was interested only in increasing production, that the subsidies they might make would be in nearly all cases producers' subsidies, and that they were not subject to a charge of being interested in roll-backs.

Mr. President, I do not think I like a subsidy better than does anyone else. I know very well that I do not like the idea of a general consumer subsidy or the use of subsidies to hold the price level where it is. I do not think it can be done. I do not think it should be done. I think an attempt to do it would do more harm than not to try to do it.

On the other hand, I see nothing basically wrong in the principle of subsidies. We have been paying the farmers subsidies. We pay subsidies, in effect, in the way of relief payments. We pay subsidies to the poorer consumers. Hardly a day goes by that we do not approve a subsidy to someone. I cannot see anything simply in the principle of a subsidy which should lead us completely to invalidate any and all subsidies which may be proposed. I do not think we can go into the question of this kind of subsidy or that kind of subsidy. They are almost impossible to define. It is almost impossible to tell what situations may arise.

Therefore, I have felt that the proper way to limit subsidies is to impose a broad financial limitation, to bring all kinds of expenditures for subsidies within that limitation, and then to leave to the discretion of the administrative officers the determination of how that amount of money shall be used. That is the question affected by this particular amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I tried to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio some time ago. At that time I did not wish to interrupt the trend of his thought. I should like to ask the Senator this question: He admits that his amendment introduces an authorization for a theory of subsidy entirely new and different from that authorized under existing law; does he not?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it is a new theory as compared to that authorized under existing law. I think the existing law provides no money. We are providing money with which to do something for which we have not heretofore provided money.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio another question. Does he believe that under existing law there is any authority whatever—to be more specific, under section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act—for the kind of roll-back policies which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in conjunction with the Office of Price Administration, has attempted to place in effect in the last 2 weeks?

Mr. TAFT. I stated in answer to the Senator from Georgia that in my opinion the attempt to pay subsidies for a roll-back was not authorized by the Price Control Law. The Senator is correct in that respect. On the other hand, I stated that I did not see very much difference between that kind of a subsidy and one which is paid to prevent an increase in the price of a product. In principle they seem to be exactly the same.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that the Senator from Ohio is a very distinguished lawyer. As a legal proposition, he must admit that at the present time there is no authority whatever in law except section 2 (e), for what has been done in the past few weeks by the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. At least, I understand that to be the contention of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. That is my opinion. The attorney for the O. P. A. claims that there is legal authority, and we had quite a strenuous argument in the committee on that question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the representative of the O. P. A. claim that there was any authority aside from section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act?

Mr. TAFT. He claimed it under that section.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator from Ohio admit that his amendment would authorize a new form of subsidy hitherto unauthorized by law?

Mr. TAFT. I think it would.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator for his frankness.

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion the original Price Control Act did not cover a subsidy to pay a roll-back; and I think this amendment does cover a subsidy to pay a roll-back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was sure I would get from the Senator a frank and succinct answer, and I thank him for his frankness.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate in connection with this proposal, because I think it has already been well covered by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is in charge of the bill, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has just concluded.

I wish, however, to point out for the RECORD two or three things which I think are important. First, I should like to say that in my judgment the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Senate—and, if this proposal prevails, the country—are indebted to the Senator from Ohio. He has submitted what I regard as a very sensible and fair amendment.

I should like to emphasize the fact that it serves notice on those in charge of the subsidy program that there is a limitation on how far they may go. It serves notice on them, as well as the country, that the Congress is concerned, and makes provision that before the expenditure of additional money for subsidies, Congress must be consulted.

I approach this new subsidy proposal with some fear. I do not like this form of subsidy, and it was after some reluctance that I concluded that the public welfare could best be served by the adoption of the kind of program proposed in the Taft amendment.

We are at the moment confronted with an unlimited subsidy program. I think that those directing the program now in effect have gone beyond the provisions of the law, and if this amendment does nothing more, it removes any question of illegality from the subsidy program already under way. I do not know how better we could do anything about it than by way of the amendment proposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio does more than that, although I think that in itself is extremely important. It gives those in charge of the price-control program what appears to me to be the last chance to prevent runaway inflation. The whole purpose of the subsidy program, so far as foodstuffs are concerned, is to prevent a runaway inflation, and to provide for the stabilization of prices and wages. I believe that every Senator knows that if we permit prices further to rise, which is the alernative to this amendment, there will be further demands for wage increases, and then there will be a constant jockeying between price rises and wage increases. I do not think anyone will challenge that statement.

The Taft amendment would certainly improve the morale of the American people, which is greatly upset by the price rises which have occurred and the increases which are threatened. In short, Mr. President, the proposal appears to me to be the lesser of two great dangers.

As members of the committee know, I have long wanted to provide a standard of operations and a limitation on the expenditure of funds. In the committee I asked Mr. Brown and his associates if they would not give to the Congress a list of the commodities which they intended to subsidize, or which they felt they might

find it necessary to subsidize under their program. I was even anxious to write such a list into the law, and we discussed that thought in the committee.

I think it might be well to point out that I have just received an answer to that request. In a moment I shall submit it for the RECORD, but first I wish further to point out, and emphasize, in case this undertaking should later prove to be a failure, that the amount of money provided in the Taft amendment meets the desires of those in charge of the program. I understand—and I should like to be corrected by the able Senator in charge of the bill or by any other member of the committee if I am mistaken—that the $500,000,000 provided for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in keeping with the wishes and desires of Mr. Brown and Mr. Jesse Jones and others. It is my understanding that the $175,000,000 provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation meets the apparent needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is important that this statement now be made a part of the RECORD because I do not want Congress criticized if at some time in the future there should be a request for additional funds, as I assume there may be. I do not want the charge to then be made that there was not complete cooperation, at least in the Senate. We are meeting not only the needs but the wishes of those in charge of the program.

Mr. President, this afternoon I received a letter in answer to the request which I made, and to which I earlier referred. The letter was prepared by Mr. Richard V. Gilbert, economic adviser of the Office of Price Administration. Mr. Gilbert was one of the principal witnesses appearing on more than one occasion at the hearings which were held upon the bill. The letter is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: Mr. Brown has asked me to send you the list of cost of living items which are now being subsidized, together with the list of items which we think may have to be subsidized in the coming year.

I am attaching a table showing the items now being subsidized. Of the list, only meats and butter are part of the roll-back program.

In the near future we face a serious situation in the case of family flour and bread. The rise in the parity price of wheat since last year will entail a rise in the loan rate, which will force a material increase in the price of flour. Unless a subsidy is used, the price of family flour and bread will have to be increased.

In our thinking with regard to the roll-back and subsidy programs, we have reached the conclusion that it would not be feasible or wise to roll back or to subsidize a large range of cost-of-living commodities. For administrative reasons we would rather confine the subsidy program on a limited list of items of mass consumption. The prices of these items could be reduced sufficiently to secure whatever reduction in the cost of living was considered desirable and to offset such increases in the price of minor items as proved to be necessary to maintain or increase production of these items.

In addition to meats and butter, we are thinking tentatively in terms of milk, family flour, corn-meal, bread, the major canned fruits and vegetables, and perhaps potatoes. Administrative difficulties have appeared which raise considerable doubt in our minds as to whether coffee would be suitable for subsidy.

Later this afternoon I shall send you a memorandum setting forth the case for the use of subsidies and the standards we propose to apply in their use. As you will see from this memorandum, a subsidy program can be set up with adequate safeguards guaranteeing against unwise and inflationary use of this instrument.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD V. GILBERT,
Economic Advisor.

In addition to the letter which I have just read for the RECORD, I should like to have printed, immediately following the letter, the table referred to therein, showing the items now being subsidized.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Present subsidies on cost-of-living commodities* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount of subsidy on civilian purchases	Cost of 1943 program	Level of subsidy
Meat:			
Beef and veal	102.2–128.5	102.2–128.5	Packer.
Pork	128.1–169.4	128.1–169.4	Do.
Lamb and mutton.	12.6–13.6	12.6–13.6	Do.
Butter	81.0	81.0	Manufacturer.
Canned vegetables:			
Crop costs	25.0	25.0	Canner.
Wages	5.0	5.0	Do.
Cheddar cheese	10.0	26.0	Manufacturer.
Coal	40.0	[2] 40.0	Importer into New England.
Coffee	1.1	[3] 1.5	Importer.
Fats and oils	13.2	[4] 15.0	Refiners.
Soybeans	11.0	[4] 12.0	Processor.
Nicotine sulfate	1.8	[5] 1.8	
Petroleum	50.0	145.0	Importer into district I.
Puerto Rican food.	2.5	[6] 2.5	
Sugar beets	46.4	15.0	Refiner.
Sugar transport		43.5	Do.
Tires	20.0	20.0	
Wheat for livestock.	39.0	55.0	Livestock feeders.
Corn price adjustment.	3.8	[7] 6.0	Shippers.
Fiber and flaxseed.	2.2	5.2	Manufacturer.
Subtotal	594.9–663.5	742.2–811.0	
War-risk insurance.	[1] 55.0	[1] [8] 55.0	
Total	649.9–718.5	797.4–866.0	

[1] Break-down into civilian and Government commodities not available.
[2] Cost in fiscal year 1943–44.
[3] Cost May 1942 through April 1943.
[4] Cost of 1942 crop.
[5] Fiscal 1943.
[6] Three quarters ending June 30, 1943, at an annual rate.
[7] June 1943, at an annual rate.

Mr. MALONEY. For many reasons I think it is important that the letter be placed in the RECORD at this time, because Senators will recall that earlier today the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] questioned the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as to how much further the O. P. A. authorities might go in connection with subsidizing other commodities. I wish to make the record clear upon that point. There is no limitation, under the Taft amendment, on what the O. P. A. authorities might subsidize so long as they remain within the limitation of the amount of money therein provided. However, the letter which I have just read clearly points out how far they expect they might be compelled to go.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. What principles are set up by which the Bureau is guided in fixing subsidies? Is there anything except the limitation in amount which may be prescribed?

Mr. MALONEY. No; that is the only limitation.

Mr. WILLIS. There is no principle or standard, or yardstick of any kind provided to control the operations of the Bureau?

Mr. MALONEY. As I understand, the only limitation is the amount of money provided in the Taft amendment, and whatever consolation one may obtain from the letter which I have read into the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. Then we are conferring authority upon the Bureau and giving it the right to exercise discretion and judgment with respect to the standards.

Mr. MALONEY. I am not entirely sure that I understand the Senator. I have said that there is no limitation on subsidizing commodities excepting as to the amount of money provided in the Taft amendment, or what is now the committee amendment. However, the Senator from Ohio is present and if he disagrees he may possibly wish to answer the question of the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. The question of whether subsidies may be levied is left to the arbitrary judgment of the Bureau, is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. I think the agency must be governed by whatever circumstances may arise, and there is no limitation in the kinds of commodities.

Mr. WILLIS. No limitation other than as to the amount of money which may be paid.

Mr. MALONEY. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the amendment about which he is probably not advised. I refer to the so-called committee amendment. Paragraph (d) of the amendment would provide a limitation to—

All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into.

Mr. MALONEY. I am glad the Senator from Alabama has brought that up, and particularly since the Senator from Ohio is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator did not hear the statement of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I have stated that there is no limit to the kinds of commodities except the money limitation.

Mr. TAFT. I did not mean they had to carry out the program for a full year,

if necessary. They made some press releases about it. They have not made anything which I would call a commitment except to the packers who are required to sell at a loss, with the understanding that they will get subsidies. It is a commitment to them. I do not think there is any commitment to continue the program beyond today if they do not want to. They can pay the difference.

Mr. MALONEY. That is my understanding, but that is not the question now raised.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is on the Commodity Credit Corporation and not the R. F. C.

Mr. MALONEY. I was talking about the R. F. C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article setting forth the views of Chester Bowles upon this subject. Mr. Bowles, who is the O. P. A. director for the State of Connecticut, is held in very high esteem in my State and by the O. P. A. authorities in Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWLES SEES SUBSIDY REIN ON INFLATION—BELIEVES BY SUBSIDIZING FEW ESSENTIAL PRODUCTS COST OF LIVING CAN BE KEPT IN LINE

Prevention of inflation was shifted into the lap of Congress by Chester Bowles, State O. P. A. director, Monday night. In his regular weekly broadcast, he said that effective price control would be impossible without a congressional appropriation to be used as subsidies. A subsidy program might cost $2,000,000,000, he estimated, warning that an increase in the cost of living by 20 percent would cost $15,000,000,000 to consumers.

"If we are going to do a complete job of price control," Bowles stated, "we will need, sooner or later, some additional subsidy money from Congress. If we do not get it, retail prices are going to continue on up. There are no two ways about that," he said flatly.

NOT FREE FROM DANGER

Bowles admitted that subsidies "are not free from danger and subsidies are not cheap." He pointed out that many medicinal drugs are also dangerous unless administered by skilled physicians. "Subsidies likewise should be applied to our economy only in the case of dire necessity," stated Mr. Bowles.

"Whether we like it or not, the facts are clear," Bowles summarized. "The limited use of subsidies, with all their dangers, is the one and only way in which we can meet higher production costs and still keep the prices you pay in the stores from moving steadily upward."

Defending the cost of subsidies, Bowles asserted, "They only cost a fraction of what inflation would cost." Explaining his stand, he said, "By subsidizing a few essential products, we can hold the entire cost of living in line. If instead of using subsidies, we allow those few prices to go up, pressure will quickly develop for price increases on other products. The resulting increase in the cost of living will then lead to an increase in wages, until the whole cost of living moves forward on a broad and expensive front."

SUBSIDY CUTS BUTTER COST

Bowles pointed out that subsidies had already reduced the price of butter by 5 or 6 cents and announced that, effective next Tuesday, reductions in the price of meat of from 2 to 8 cents would result from subsidies.

"Grade A round steak, for instance, will come down from a top legal ceiling price of 48 cents to 42 cents a pound," Bowles revealed. "Hamburger from 33 cents a pound to 29," he continued. "Grade A lamb chops from 66 to 60 cents, veal cutlets from 52 to 46 cents. Grade A bacon, sliced, from 47 to 42 cents." Bowles termed these "major price reductions" which "will mean a noticeable drop in your weekly food budget."

Dollars-and-cents ceiling, Bowles declared, is the only method of making price control "really effective." Because prices heretofore have been controlled under different types of ceilings, "it has often been hard to tell when you were being charged too much." This difficulty will be done away with the complete establishment of State-wide price ceilings, Bowles predicted.

With the sole exception of fresh fish, all food items will be under this dollars-and-cents control "very shortly," Bowles promised. "Fresh fish," he explained, "may never be under dollars-and-cents ceilings. Offshore fishing has been sharply curtailed and there is the constant problem of spoilage."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an Associated Press dispatch from the city of Chicago entitled "Serious shortages for civilians seen in coming months." I wish Senators to understand that I ask that the article be printed particularly because of my interest in the civilian supply bill, which was sponsored by myself, the Senator from Ohio, and the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERIOUS SHORTAGES FOR CIVILIANS SEEN IN COMING MONTHS—FURNITURE EXECUTIVE WARNS STOCKS ARE DANGEROUSLY LOW

CHICAGO, June 21.—A serious situation in civilian home goods supplies will be reached in 4 or 5 months, "unless the Government applies remedies at once to avert impending shortages that result from cutting civilian supply below minimum comfort standards," Roscoe R. Rau, executive vice president of the National Retail Furniture Association, said today.

In a statement at the opening of a 10-day summer home furnishings market at the American furniture mart and the merchandise mart, Rau stated that "available home goods supplies have never before been so limited in the face of such great demand."

"This is the eleventh hour," Mr. Rau said. "The fat of retail inventories has been reduced to a thin cushion that cannot much longer absorb the shock. Any realistic prediction as to the future of home goods stores must recognize that a serious situation will be reached in 4 or 5 months unless the Office of Civilian Requirements and other War Production Board agencies move to apply remedies at once. * * *

"Limitation of consumer durable goods has reached the level where it carries a direct threat to the war effort," he added. Shortages now existing, he said, include bedding and bedsprings, cutlery and kitchenware (less than 2 months' supply), baby carriages and juvenile furniture, wood furniture for eating and sleeping, and repair parts for home equipment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Civilian Goods in Wartime" from the Nation's Business for April 1943. The article was written by Mr. Charles H. Kaletzki, whom I do not know. The article deals with the civilian supply situation, which everyone knows to be serious and dangerous.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVILIAN GOODS IN WARTIME

(By Charles H. Kaletzki)

With our reserve stocks of consumer goods well-nigh depleted, and our distributive system perilled as a result, the time has come to initiate a drive to protect our civilian economy by resuming some production of consumer goods. Without that, the successful financing of a global war will be impossible.

Now, after 15 months of experience in actual war, the scope of military operations is becoming plain and we can see more clearly the dangers that lie ahead. It is now time for government to encourage consumer-goods production if—

1. The fundamental needs of American families are to be met even on a curtailed standard of living.

2. The distributive system which has been the basis for the creation of American wealth is not to be destroyed, thus opening the way for another system detrimental to American business.

3. The life of small American communities, which are the very essence of America, is to be maintained.

4. The opportunity for the obscure individual to rise is to be held as a promise to succeeding generations.

It is essential that government make it the responsibility of some substantial agency to bring these things about.

A year ago, a high Treasury official was told:

"If we destroy our distributive system, we destroy our wealth-producing facilities, on which you must depend for taxes—and for the sale of bonds."

His answer was:

"This is all-out war. Some are going to become wealthy, perhaps. Many more probably will lose. What of it? Hundreds of thousands of lives may be lost. No one knows whose lives. So it must be with business. Let the chips fall where they may. Those who cannot withstand the pressure will have to go."

Apparently such foundation thinking in high places in Government was the background for curtailment.

"The people of England have proven they could do without. We in America can do without, too."

But time has shown that England—her consumer goods production virtually stopped—her wealth-producing facilities thus shrunken—had to be rescued by the Lease-Lend Act. Who can lease-lend to us?

The English pattern apparently was the basis of the government demand that people stop buying to invest in War bonds and stamps. It was unpatriotic to buy anything more than barest essentials. Indulging in luxury was traitorous.

In spite of the propaganda against buying, our retail stores in 1942 had the greatest dollar volume in history. It was greater than the fantastic totals of 1929. Figures for 1942 submitted by only 30 chain-store organizations showed a sales increase of 11.4 percent—with a total volume of $4,877,118,361.

To do that volume it was necessary to dip deep into the reservoir of commodities which had been built up in the preceding years. Today the shelves of many stores are becoming bare. The smaller merchants are being told their stocks cannot be restored until after the war.

PENNIES AT WORK

Yet it is important that the men and women who are in war work, and earning money never before dreamed of, should be able to get something—no matter what—

besides an accumulation of greenbacks as pay for their work

Every dollar spent for merchandise is divided into many parts. Perhaps less than 25 percent represents the basic cost of manufacture. Several enterprisers and many hands might share even in that portion. Another portion goes to selling through the distributor, jobber, wholesaler, and retailer on its way to the consumer.

At each step, the few pennies taken from the consumer dollar accumulate with the volume of sales. They support American institutions, provide the funds for the payment of rent and taxes; send children to schools and colleges, maintain the common social services; permit contributions to the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the churches, and all the other things bound up with our way of life.

Remove merchandise from our stores, and there is no need for the merchant to advertise in his local newspaper. But the small-town press in America is vital to the maintenance of morale because a free press, the one sure means of keeping the people thinking the right way, can be maintained only through advertising. The newspaper publisher is not paid by public funds. He is paid by the business he operates—the business of printing the advertising of his local merchants. Publication of our 12,000 or more daily and weekly newspapers can continue only so long as stores have merchandise to sell.

Probably 90 percent of the merchandise needed for mercantile establishments is produced in factories tha are actually the "small business" of this country.

It is perhaps inherent in the philosophy of American business that only those who consider themselves the victims of monopolistic pressure are regarded as "small business." Concerns able to function freely or without domination of so-called "big business" are somewhat reluctant to think of themselves as "small business."

Yet, in reality all American business is "small business," except that which is specifically under the control of corporations so large in their capital structure, or in their operating affiliations, as to dominate the market in which they operate.

We should stop thinking of "small business" as the small "papa and mama" grocery store, the family-run repair shop, the village grist mill, or the small-town general store. The man in an upper bracket of earnings may not like to be thought of as a "little man"—but on a Nation-wide evaluation of his business stature, he might not be entirely at home in the company of General Motors, United States Steel, Du Pont, or our communication and transportation giants. Concerns whose volume runs into millions could well be "small business" in the American scheme.

FORGOTTEN RETAILERS

There has been a great cry that the so-called big companies have received the contracts for war material at the expense of the smaller. Early adherence to that method largely was responsible for the rapid development of the production facilities which have given us an offensive advantage. The smaller plants now are getting a larger share of the business. Few industries which could be converted have not been so converted. The business is being spread. Production of war material is well in hand. Large and small industries will continue to produce heroically for the military.

Now, then, is the time to say to American business:

"Let's rebuild the fences of our civilian economy."

The merchants of the country feel that they are the forgotten men—parasites on society in the eyes of official Washington. Change that attitude and the man behind the counter will swell with pride because he, too, then is a fighting man alongside his son off somewhere in Africa.

Recent testimony by representatives of wholesale and retail associations has clearly indicated that Government agencies have avoided consultation with such associations. Rather have they chosen other sources of information not nearly so likely to be well informed. These trade associations are respected in their fields. Their officials can well bespeak the support of their members for any program intended for the common benefit.

Eliminate the stigma of saboteur from the factory that cannot be converted. Make it work—out in the open—to preserve the civilian economy.

Government cannot ignore the creator of anything new in these times because we need new things to replace what has necessarily been eliminated. Tell the manufacturers that it is their duty to create new things—out of nothing, perhaps—and without the help of anyone except the janitor. They will find the way.

Who knows where there may be lurking another nylon—or rayon—or some form of synthetic rubber. The chemist is in his youth—literally.

Send out the call. Encourage genius. Stimulate the imagination of every boy in college—every laboratory technician—every adult scientist to find something new—something great—something trivial. Something that will make some one better pleased with his lot. And be sure that people understand it is not unpatriotic to buy it. It is buying that keeps money in circulation—that creates taxable wealth.

Some machinery must be available to produce these new things. Governmental departments must cooperate more closely in granting priorities for what is essential to the civilian economy.

The distribution of great sums on war contracts and the subsequent taxing of profit is not enough. Payment of high wages and subsequent subtraction in taxes and enforced saving are not enough. Such dollars are taxable only once, unless they are set in circulation in the channels of consumer trade.

MUST TRADE TO PAY

No one wants even to think in terms of business as usual. No one even expects to buy a pound of butter or a roast of beef as before. If necessary, and all believe it necessary, we can get along beautifully with oleomargarine, meat substitutes, a suit of overalls, and last year's hat. Those things are not important.

But, if we are to be the arsenal of the United Nations—and if we are to pay, for the present at least, for all the munitions which we are supplying, our sources of wealth must be enlarged—not curtailed.

The maintenance of commerce in the United States is essential to that creation of wealth.

It is important, therefore, that government help set in motion the development of every form of manufacture that can possibly provide consumer goods without interfering with the efficiency of the war-production program.

Victory will be achieved because it is the will of the people of America to win this war. Just as it is possible to perfect the organization for military victory—it is likewise within the realm of American ingenuity to find the way for preservation of our economy. It is a challenge to every American.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, presuming upon the time and patience and generosity of the Senate for a moment longer, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Why Not Deal Congress In," by the scholarly Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The article appears in the Coronet magazine, which was placed on the news stands yesterday. It deals with a subject of great importance. As modestly as I can, I should like to invite attention to the fact that I introduced a resolution which would—using the language of the Senator from Michigan—"deal Congress in." Hearings were held on the resolution before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I am among those Senators who are hopeful that the resolution, which would create a committee to cooperate with the President, may be reported to the Senate in the near future. The resolution is referred to in this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT DEAL CONGRESS IN?

(By Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG)

You can't be expected to play a poker hand if you aren't allowed to see the cards. Translated into the sterner lexicon of war this means that Congress cannot cooperate effectively if it is denied the total war information which wise decisions require. Today there is no adequate war liaison between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government. Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee often has to get its information from the newspapers. The executive and the legislative functions are not in intimate gear. That is why I wrote the President 1 week after Pearl Harbor asking him how he would react to the creation of a Joint Committee on War Cooperation. And that is why Senator MALONEY of Connecticut has proposed Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. Democracy cannot function in a vacuum.

The actual conduct of a war is necessarily an Executive function, and no one wants to interfere with these Presidential prerogatives. But sooner or later Congress inevitably enters the equation. The President can go his own way up to the point of declaring war; but only Congress can declare it. The President, in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief, runs the war; but only Congress can provide him with the implements. The President can negotiate a peace; but only the Senate can make it valid. It is an inextricable partnership from beginning to end.

Then, why aren't both partners working together in total, mutual confidence to best further the war effort? The reason is that there is no medium of constant contact to put the executive and the legislative gears of war in mesh.

It is not enough that military and naval leaders are constantly testifying to the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees regarding their immediate needs. Behind these mechanics lie the great, deep, basic questions of war policy, war strategy, and peace aims. The task of controlling them is assigned to the President. But except as Congress knows the pattern, it cannot intelligently cooperate in implementing it; and except as the President knows the congressional mind in respect to his pattern, he may head for needless trouble—and the country with him.

Of course, the strategy of a global war cannot be conducted in a show window. The White House cannot very well discharge its war function in a town meeting of 531 Senators and Congressmen. There would be too many leaks in a crowd of that size. But these handicaps simply emphasize the need for the creation of a small, select committee to act as the constant agent of Congress in intimate contact with the Chief Executive. All information available to the President should be instantly available to them.

The function would necessarily be highly confidential. This committee could not even openly report to Congress—unless so grave a dissent to Presidential policy should arise as to make the committee willing to take the appalling responsibility of laying the controversy bare. Yet, here would be a safety valve, made up of trusted representatives of the Congress, who would always be available to advise their colleagues on the most helpful legislative attitudes. Americans as a whole might well be better satisfied to feel that total war information being withheld from them was by no means solely lodged in an airtight White House compartment.

During the Civil War, Congress created a Committee on the Conduct of the War, which tangled Lincoln in so much red tape that it is always now pointed to as the horrible example we should avoid at all costs. The trouble was that the committee literally tried to conduct, a function which must remain in Executive hands. Yet even the historians who criticize it the most bitterly concede that the mere fact of the committee's existence probably prodded the Union war effort into victory in much faster order. And today's proposed Committee on War Cooperation would deliberately profit from this record and refrain from interfering with the war functions of the Executive. It would simply add effective functioning for the Legislature—and thus be a boon to the common welfare.

It is no reflection on a man's eyesight to say that he can't see in a dark room. And it is no reflection on congressional wisdom to say that it cannot act without knowledge. Let me give you a striking example. On January 3, 1943, the State Department issued its famous White Paper outlining, for the first public time, the story of our relations with Japan preceding Pearl Harbor. Mark you, this was 13 months after Pearl Harbor. Even the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations did not know that our Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, had notified our Government on January 27, 1941, that "there were reports from many sources that Japanese military forces planned a surprise attack at Pearl Harbor in case of trouble with the United States."

Nor did we know that when the new Jap Ambassador, Nomura, arrived on March 8, 1941, the "President well realized the probability that Japan had already gone so far in a policy of conquest that it would be impossible to persuade her to stop." We did not know that on May 11, 1941, Secretary of State Hull told Nomura that "we propose to resist (Hitler) when and where such resistance would be most effective, whether within our own boundaries, on the high seas, or in aid of such countries as Great Britain."

We had generalized information. But we did not know what Churchill told his Parliament following the Atlantic conference; namely, "that the United States even if not herself attacked would (probably) come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured." Throughout that desperately vital year of preparation—from January to December, 1941—the Congress had to guess at its share of impending responsibility.

We knew, generally, that the Japs submitted a proposal on May 12. We did not know it demanded that we desert Chiang Kai-shek if he would not make a separate peace with Japan. We knew, generally, about the American proposal of June 21. We did not know that the Jap invasion of Indo-China, which our diplomatic spokesman bitterly opposed, caused our State Department to decide it "could see no basis for pursuing further the conversations in which (they) had been engaged." We did not know that this created "a situation in which the risk of war became so great that the United States * * * was confronted no longer with the question of avoiding such risk (the encirclement of the Philippines), but from now on with the problem of preventing a complete undermining of our security."

On August 6 the Japs counter-proposed again. Two days later their proposal was again denied. We most certainly did not know that on August 17 the President handed the Jap Ambassador a statement to the effect that if Japan persisted in pursuing her policy of military domination by force we would be compelled to take any and all steps to safeguard the rights of American nationals and insure the security of the United States.

To make a long story short, this diplomatic interchange continued. Prime Minister Konoye proposed a personal conference with Mr. Roosevelt. The idea was rejected without some sort of preliminary assurance of a different Nippon attitude. By November 3, 1941, Ambassador Grew again "warned of the possibility of Japan's adopting measures with dangerous suddenness which might make inevitable a war with the United States." Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had to wait until January 3, 1943, to find that out.

Then came the prize hellion from Tokyo—Special Envoy Kurusu—bent on more "peace" talk. On November 20, we learned 14 months later, Secretary Hull gave our final reply and Kurusu said "it was the end." Meanwhile, Knox and Welles had been commissioned by the Cabinet to make some speeches "to prepare the people for such developments." On November 28 Hull again warned the Cabinet that the Japanese "might make the element of surprise a central point in their strategy." On November 29 Hull told the British Ambassador—not Congress—that "the diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and that the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and the Navy." Nine days later, Japan struck out of a clear sky on a peaceful Sunday morning and the war was on.

Now, do not mistake me. The American record is consistently aboveboard throughout this distraught year. I do not even remotely imply any criticism of it. The negotiations with the treacherous Japanese could not have been conducted on a klieg-lighted movie lot.

Yet it is not impossible, under equivalent war circumstances, for Congress, acting through a responsible liaison committee, to have its responsible war leadership wholly informed of all such developments so that the resultant information, though still highly confidential, shall permit of intelligent congressional guidance. I wonder whether Pearl Harbor would have been so completely surprised on the morning of December 7 if the repeated warnings against such surprise had previously been a matter of discussion between the executive departments and a joint committee on war cooperation?

In the matter of post-war planning, we again question how Congress can act wisely if it has no connecting link with Executive commitments and policies regarding the attitudes of our allies. For instance, the very morning that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau was telling some of us about his plans for post-war international stabilization as a great secret, our plans were told to the world in London. Is it right that the American people should get their information about our foreign policy in press dispatches from London? This is a point never to be forgotten—when you deal Congress in, you come that much closer to dealing in the people. After all, it is their country.

Here's just one counter sample of the utility of candor between the Executive and Congress. The morning after General Eisenhower landed in north Africa, General Marshall called some 20 Members of Congress to a confidential room in the Pentagon. He frankly told us of the tremendous advantage of Eisenhower's cooperation with Admiral Darlan—an advantage reflected in saving thousands of American casualties otherwise expected, in saving at least 2 months' precious time in our offensive, in saving at least half of the French Fleet, in saving Dakar without the loss of a single life. Marshall begged that nothing should be said or done to upset the Darlan relationship.

What was the result? The disclosures remained absolutely confidential, but somehow they totally stopped any congressional criticism. The whole truth was invincible. It was invaluable to the President, to Congress, to General Eisenhower, to the war effort. It was just a little preview of the possibilities of a joint congressional committee on war cooperation.

Well, that's the whole story. Answering my letter of December 15, 1941, the President said he would welcome such a committee if Congress should choose to create it. But he adroitly suggested that there might be considerable congressional opposition to any plan which would thus concentrate the war liaison in a comparatively few congressional hands. He was quite right. But the tremendous necessity persists. The plan will not work, unless it is wholeheartedly embraced by all concerned. But upon that basis, a joint congressional committee on war cooperation can do much to integrate and unify the American war effort, to reinforce our dedication to total victory, and to democratize the process by which we win the war and then the peace. Yes, it is past time to "deal Congress in."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe that the amendment which he has been discussing will have any effect on the shortages of civilian supply to which he referred?

Mr. MALONEY. By itself, I am very fearful that it will not. I think it is all-important that the Congress pass and the President sign the civilian supply bill to which I referred. I think it important that we have a civilian supply claimant under statute. I rather expect that if such a law shall not be enacted—the bill has already passed the Senate—the executive branch of the Government will find it necessary to set up by Executive order a claimant for the civilian population of our country, with some powers.

Everyone knows, and I doubt that anyone knows better than the very able Senator from Wyoming, that the civilian supply situation in this country is becoming desperate, and in the matter of a few months I fear we will find ourselves confronted with another chaotic situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, but I think he misunderstands my inquiry. I thought he had been addressing himself solely to the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to subsidies.

Mr. MALONEY. I was, and then I put an article into the RECORD, and I thought that was the matter to which the Senator referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand how the Senator was misled.

Let me say preliminary to the question which I shall again propound, that I have read the printed amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, and I have read

the committee amendment, which has not yet been printed, and I am frank to say that it seems to me that neither amendment deals with the primary problem. Both of them undertake, within certain limits, to place a restriction upon the power of the O. P. A. or of the R. F. C. or of the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay subsidies. But neither of them, it seems to me, offers any solution for the primary problem which now confronts the country, namely, the production of the foodstuffs which are needed for the armed forces, for the civilian supply, for lend-lease, and for the vast program of war relief which is being undertaken.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. Not for the moment. I did not understand the question of the Senator from Wyoming in the first place. I understand it now.

Those who advocate the program contend that it will increase production. I am fearful that without it there is a likelihood of curtailment of production, or a lack of production, or a failure of production in certain circumstances. But I should like to call attention to the fact that the primary purpose of the Taft amendment, as I understand it, is to bring about stabilization of wages and prices in this country so as to prevent a runaway, wild inflation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite agree with that, because the main purpose of my amendment is to prevent what we might call an over-all subsidy program, a $2,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 program. The fact that such a program is prevented will, to my mind, prevent the successful application of an absolutely arbitrary price level.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to make this point, because if the Government adopted the policy of maintaining by subsidy an absolute level of prices, I am convinced it would never get production. I am convinced that if we are to get production we will have to have a gradually adjusted price level. It should be very gradually adjusted. It will help hold down subsidies a little, but I think that if the Government goes ahead with what has been suggested as a policy, and use whatever may be necessary to maintain the cost of living, it will not have the nerve to use Government money in subsidies to secure enough production.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out right there that the first thing I said when I rose was exactly what the Senator from Ohio has now said, that without the limitation of this amendment there would be no restraining influence on the program already adopted, that the administration could spend billions of dollars, that it had its own subsidy program, and that it became necessary for Congress to do something about it. I want the Senator to know that I understand that important purpose of his amendment. But stabilization is the aim of the subsidy program.

Mr. TAFT. I understand. I do not purport to say that the amendment is intended to increase production, but I do say that it seems to me it would prevent the application of a policy which I think would be fatal to production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Connecticut will yield to me, the answer of the Senator from Ohio confirms the opinion which I have. I am aware of the position which he has taken at the outset in regard to price-control legislation, but I realize from observations which I have been making, and from the reports which come to me, that producers throughout the United States, particularly of agricultural commodities and of food, are now under the greatest handicap, and that the production of agricultural commodities and of food is being cut down. So it seems to me the primary objective of our consideration now should be not alone the assertion of some degree of congressional control over the payment of subsidies, an objective with which I thoroughly agree, but that we should not fail at this time so to write the amendment that we shall once more encourage the production of agricultural commodities. The most unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves, it seems to me, is that there is no hesitation to pay whatever prices may be necessary to obtain other materials, but not as to food.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator to say it is a combination of circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Subsidies were proposed by the O. P. A. and others, as I have understood, in order to stabilize prices and wages. They do have a bearing on production. If you roll back prices without a subsidy you destroy needed production. In the State in which I live the dairy farmers have maintained they were not making money, that they were actually losing money, that they could not continue in the dairy business unless there should be an increase in prices. A price increase there and price increases elsewhere, which would be justified if an increase were allowed in one instance, would ultimately result in a demand for higher wages. It would not be only higher wages in one or two instances, because when foodstuffs rise in price a demand is created for higher wages all across the board, and that means the man in the furniture factory wants higher wages, which means an increase in the cost of furniture. We would start dealing only with foodstuffs, but would finally find ourselves confronted with an increase in the price of everything. Unless we subsidize or raise prices, there is in my State a danger of curtailed production. We do not want to increase prices, because we want to keep wages stabilized. So I think that without the Taft amendment or something like it there is a danger of curtailed production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That leads me to the next question, whether there is anything in the Taft amendment which would in any degree whatsoever furnish such encouragement or support to the producer as would prevent him from going out of business.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; there is something in the amendment which would do just that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is it?

Mr. MALONEY. In paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 5, dealing with strategic and critical materials, and so forth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Paragraph (a) deals with transportation.

Mr. MALONEY. Paragraph (a) deals with transportation; yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That does not help.

Mr. MALONEY. It might save people from going out of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not save a producer from going out of business.

Mr. MALONEY. Then I did not clearly understand the Senator's question, but paragraph (b) would certainly keep the producer in business. The whole purpose of the original act was to pay a subsidy in order to obtain additional strategic and critical materials which otherwise could not have been mined. I do not think that is in keeping with what the Senator had in mind, but he asked whether there was anything in the amendment which did that sort of thing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There seems to be an assumption that there is nothing in the amendment which does not help the producers.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not have that impression.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Others have.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the impression I have.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have observed that. Let me point out also that certain commodities have gone considerably beyond the price level; in other words, commodities in which my friend the Senator from Wyoming is interested have reached a rather high point compared with the former prices, and it is desired, or it becomes necessary to get such commodities in line with others. What is the procedure? How is that to be done if runaway prices occur? There are only two ways to do it. One is to roll back the price to the producer, and the other is to roll back the price to the processor. Discretion exercised with respect to the prices of fresh vegetables. It was thought they had gotten too high. Then there was the suggested program of rolling the prices back without subsidy, so that the producer would take the loss.

Let us consider meat. We all know there has been a discussion, into which I shall not enter, with respect to meat, as well as butter, being out of line. Here is a program which proposes to roll them back. But the effort is not to roll prices back to the producer, but to roll them back and let the processor pay the loss. It is proposed that the roll-back stop at the processor, and that he pay the loss. That, of course, saves a reduction to the producer and a consequent loss in production.

Mr. MALONEY. That is my view.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a remark at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What my distinguished friend from Alabama has said——

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think the Senator is going to query me, but that he is going to make a statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. I shall yield the floor by saying, Mr. President, that subsidizing foodstuffs is foreign to my natural desires. It is not a thing I want to do. I join in the effort to pass this bill because I think under all the circumstances it is important to do it. I should not like to dynamite the home in which I live, but every Senator knows that a time comes when a great conflagration is raging when, in an effort to stop the fire, it becomes necessary to dynamite homes which are not on fire. I think we are now in that kind of a situation, and that is what motivates my interest in and support of the pending bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I intend to make only a few remarks. The statement of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that the subsidy program contemplated by the amendments brought in by the Committee on Banking and Currency would prevent a roll-back upon the producer is, I think, very sound in theory, but very unsound in practice. The announcement of the subsidy program which the amendments are intended to implement, was followed immediately by a substantial decline in the price paid the producer of live animals.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was not that the result of the fear on the part of the processors that there would be a roll-back on them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was no doubt due to psychological elements, but the fact is that the price did roll back. When we discuss this problem on the floor of the Senate, and in the newspapers, and on the radio, we are constantly talking about the roll-back. The roll-back from the very beginning meant just what the word implies, rolling the cost back from the consumer to the producer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what it has been interpreted to mean.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the R. F. C. and the O. P. A. program of paying subsidies to the packers was announced it was followed immediately by a fall in the price of live animals.

I picked up a Washington newspaper which had over an article what to me was a very expressive heading: "Price of meat is reduced—if you can find any."

We need meat. We need food. We need to raise agricultural commodities. Agricultural commodities are as important now, to a war effort, as are guns, tanks, and airplanes, because we cannot feed an Army unless we have agricultural production. We can do none of the things we are asked to do and are endeavoring to do unless we continue to produce agricultural commodities.

A program which does not supply to the producer the incentive to produce fails in the most important of all the objectives we should have in mind. I have read this afternoon the two amendments which will be under consideration tomorrow. There is a striking fact about them both. They would amend the existing law by eliminating the provision of the Emergency Price Control Act which requires that subsidies shall be paid to producers. Under both amendments, the subsidies might be paid to anyone. Under both amendments, subsidies might be paid to whatever persons the Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might select.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is a fundamental weakness. If we can agree, as I think we must agree, that the production of agricultural commodities is an absolute essential; if we can agree, as I think we must agree, that the conditions which have existed since we passed the Emergency Price Control Act have resulted in discouraging production, then it seems to me that our objective in amending the bill now before the Senate should not alone be to assert congressional authority over the amount of the subsidy; our concern should also be to determine to whom the subsidy is to be paid, and even more important than that, our concern should be to make certain that when the bill leaves this Chamber it will be drawn in such language that the agricultural producers of the country will know that it is the intention of the Congress, the intention of the Government, to encourage and to protect the production of agricultural commodities.

If we fail to do that, Mr. President, we shall have added nothing toward the solution of the perplexing and confusing problem which is discouraging production in every ranch State and farm State of the United States.

TEMPORARY CANCELATION OF VISIT TO SOLDIERS RETURNING FROM NORTH AFRICA

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] gave notice that all Members of the Senate had been invited by Army officials to join in a visit to the New York area on the 24th of June. I am told by some Senators that they wish to leave the city this afternoon, and some will probably leave tomorrow. In view of the congested docket and the legislative program we must complete between now and June 30, including appropriation bills and conference reports, some effort should be made to advise Senators not to leave the city. I have discussed the matter today with the very distinguished acting majority leader, who got in touch with the War Department, and I should like to have him make a statement so we can advise the Senators who contemplate going to New York that the trip should be called off.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the absence on very important official business of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I beg to advise the Senate that I have been in touch with the War Department. The War Department recognizes the urgent situation confronting the Congress at this time, the necessity and the compulsion for the passage of appropriation bills by next Wednesday. The War Department recognizes that many of them are war bills and carry money for the war effort. Recognizing that situation, the War Department has authorized me to advise the Senate that the proposed trip, leaving Washington tomorrow, Thursday evening, June 24, and visiting hospitals in New York City, and other places in that vicinity on the next day, Friday, June 25, has been temporarily postponed. The trip, as originally planned, to leave Washington on the 24th, will not be made. The War Department advises me, however, that the trip will be made later, at a more convenient and practical time. So the trip, as planned, will not be made. It has been temporarily postponed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, yesterday in executive session certain nominations in the War Manpower Commission were under consideration; and the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] courteously requested that the nominations be passed over until he could obtain the approval of the junior Senator from Indiana.

Having previously notified the Committee on Military Affairs that I had no objection to the confirmation of the nominations, I now request unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WILLIS. As in executive session, I request that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 23 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Donal F. McGonigal, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

Wilfred Bradshaw, of Indiana, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Indianapolis area office.

John R. Kelly, of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Muncie area office.

Edward D. Connor, of Indiana, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum, in the Chicago area office.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we humbly pray that the mountaintop may soon glow with the glory of a redeemed future and the valleys echo with the voice of peace; that the skies of the world may be cleared, all ominous clouds rifted, and the altars of the Prince of Peace be encompassed by the children of our Father in heaven. Dear Lord, for this good earth, we thank Thee; we would have our feet press its soil for a thousand years to come; O keep us looking unto the heights, beyond whose clifts eternal rest abides.

Teach us that no one can call Thee Father without having man for a brother. Manifest unto us the wonder of the Great Name which stands for brotherhood, tolerance, and for the oneness of the family of God. In wisdom, unselfishness, and sacrifice, grant that our lives may become most persuasive, humble, and tranquil. Dear Lord, if every possessor of wealth, every wielder of authority and power prayed daily: "Thy kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven," what a blessed world there would be—paths of peace, of plenty, and of pleasantness for all—hail the day. We pray for the enlargement of spiritual vision that we may discover the riches of happiness which prayer has the power to unseal. In the Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an Act entitled "An Act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint Resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of H. R. 2612.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GLASS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. TAFT and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

JUNE 21, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to tender herewith my resignation from the following committees: War Claims, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOSEPH ALOYSIUS CONRY

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very painful duty to direct the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives to the death of former Congressman Joseph Aloysius Conry. Congressman Conry served as a Member of the Fifty-seventh Congress from 1901 to 1903, inclusive.

Few men have been permitted as wide a field of experience and as large a measure of opportunity for usefulness to one's fellow man and one's country than did Congressman Conry. Nearly half a century ago, he was elected president of the Boston Common Council, which position he held for 2 years, bringing to that turbulent body a dignity and a poise such as it has never previously or since experienced. In 1898 he served as a member of the board of aldermen for the city of Boston and became chairman of that body during the first year of service, then as a Member of Congress, and upon the termination of his service in that body he resumed the practice of law which had been interrupted during his term in Congress.

In 1912 he was appointed consul to represent Russia in which capacity he served for many years. During his term of service as Russian consul he was decorated by the then Czar of Russia, Nicholas II, and designated a Knight of St. Anne. From 1911 to 1916 he served as a director of the port of Boston and from 1922 to 1925 as traffic commissioner. In these various positions of prominence and honor held by him, he was responsible for a large measure of the progressive and humanitarian measures that through his leadership became law in Massachusetts. He worked indefatigably for the benefit of the underprivileged and for the development of the resources of the Nation, State, and city. He not only took rank as a statesman but as an orator and a profound student while never losing the common touch, since regardless of how exalted the position which he might hold to his friends and acquaintances he was always known as "Joe." When I think of Joe Conry, whom I have known during my entire lifetime and who shared with me the responsibilities of administration, both in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the municipality of Boston, there comes to my mind the lines of his old friend, John Boyle O'Reilly—who speak-

ing of a friend who had passed to the great beyond, said:

He ruled no serfs and he knew no pride,
He was one with the workers, side by side,
He would never believe but a man was made
For a nobler end than the glory of trade.
He mourned all selfish and shrewd endeavor,
But he never injured a weak one—never.
When censure was passed he was kindly dumb,
He was never so wise but a fault would come.
He erred and was sorry; but he never drew
A trusting heart from the pure and true,
When friends look back from the years to be
God grant they may say such things of me.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 577), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, last week when the bill providing appropriations for the Office of War Information was under consideration, I did not realize how bad the foreign branch of that outfit was. I have in my hand a memorandum indicating that they entered into a contract in violation of the law with an organization known as Short Wave Research, Inc., incorporated by a group of people most of whom are on the preferred list of the Dies Committee. They have paid that outfit $400,000. The contract was to provide personnel and perform personal services, whereas the only kind of a contract they were authorized to enter into with any organization was for supplies and material, for which the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes were waived. It is an utterly lawless, irresponsible outfit, which is doing us no good abroad or at home.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some tables prepared by the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein three telegrams regarding the prices of potatoes and other derelictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made on the second anniversary of Russia's entrance into the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the riots in Michigan must be a great comfort to the Nazi government and the Axis countries. I am sure that what happened was a direct result of propaganda carried on by native Fascist groups and Axis agents. I have every reason to believe that the Governor and the mayor will be able to cope with the situation and of punishing the persons responsible for the movements tending to bring about such riots.

Two years ago I called the attention of the Dies committee to the K. K. K., which had been operating for a number of years in Michigan, and asked the committee to investigate that organization. If the Dies committee did investigate the Klan they certainly did not go far enough, especially in Michigan. They have publicized their investigation of almost everybody in this country but the K. K. K. and some other native Fascist groups. For months the Klan with the help of other subversive groups has concentrated on inflaming whites against Negroes, so as to start a racial war in the Midwest. The F. B. I. and investigators of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division both stated that their investigations showed that the situation was deliberately aggravated by Klansmen and other rabble-rousers. The Ku Klux Klan recruited thousands of new members and today it has about 18,000 members spread throughout the key automobile plants. These members are engaged in spreading rumors that lead to fights and strikes. They unite with the members of the recently revived Black Legion and cooperate with former leaders and members of the seditious National Workers League. They may change their name to fool the public but their nefarious activities are carried on. For example, the Klan was officially disbanded but its former Grand Dragon has reorganized its members into the United Sons of America. This organization is officially classified as a social club, but it is run along the pattern of the Klan as to ideals and tactics. It is about time that something be done to stop these friends of Hitler in our midst. It is high time that we expose this menace to our unity and give an effective answer—in no uncertain terms—to the subversive elements within our own borders who are trying to spread the vicious principles of fascism and nazi-ism so as to weaken and disorganize the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by the former Postmaster General, James A. Farley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news item appearing in the newspaper published at Weyauwega, Wis., which to me shows governmental bureaucracy at work at its worst.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent, the father of seven children, who indicates the benefit the Farm Security Administration has been to him and his family in getting them established upon a farm in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RACE RIOT IN DETROIT

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said and a great deal thought seriously about what is happening in Detroit. It is terribly regretful, and it is an actual national disgrace as well as a State disgrace. I am wondering if those who participated in that riot in Detroit did not get their precedent from the lawlessness which occurred in the sit-down strike that was sanctioned practically by the Governor of the State, who was later elevated to the Supreme Court of the United States, and which was looked on complacently for weeks and months by the national administration. I wonder if there is not some responsibility for the terrible crime in Detroit today because of the lawlessness permitted under national and State sanctity, only a little while ago.

ATTACKS ON INTERNED JAPANESE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE RACE RIOT IN DETROIT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SCARCITY OF MEAT

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain telegrams and resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a West Virginia wholesale company to its customers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the New York World-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to the corn crisis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the chamber of commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent statement on the food situation by Mr. Frank Gannett, publisher of the Gannett newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter received from Clement C. Malon, State superintendent of public instruction under the N. Y. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE MYSTERIOUS DISAPPEARANCE OF THE POTATO

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONNALLY-SMITH BILL

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, within the 1-minute limitation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the developments of the last 24 hours emphasize the inadequacy of the Connally-Smith bill to deal with the existing situation. The first requirement of the Connally-Smith bill is that the Government must take possession of any mine or factory in which there is a labor dispute. Why should the owners of a mine—when they are willing to obey every Federal law—have their property confiscated by order of John L. Lewis?

The President must not bow to John L. Lewis. It is time we found out who is actually the Commander in Chief of our great war machinery. If Lewis can dictate the terms under which coal will be mined, including the requirement that the Government must operate the mine, then he is mightier than the President of the United States. The American people will never approve of such a proposition at a time when steel furnaces are being banked and our Army and Navy denied munitions.

I repeat what I said a month ago, that any individual or group of individuals who attempt to slow up the war effort by defying legally constituted authority should be jailed for at least the duration of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks that I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Stars and Stripes, and also an editorial from a paper published in Lowell, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire this time in order to reply to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] a moment ago. He misstated the facts when he told this House that he asked the Special Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate the Ku Klux Klan and they did nothing about it. His statement is not in accord with the truth. We investigated that organization thoroughly, subpenaed all of its records, took possession of them and examined them carefully from the date of incorporation of the Ku Klux Klan down to the present date. We have held both open and executive hearings. The head of the Klan appeared before us, as well as other officials of the organization. The records disclosed that there were approximately 6,000 paid members in the Ku Klux Klan in the whole United States of America in the year 1942, when we conducted the investigation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE RACE RIOT IN DETROIT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all regret the serious race riot in Detroit and the death of the citizens of Detroit. We all commend the President for the courage which he has shown at least once in calling in the Federal troops. But let us not forget that three politically powerful men in the United States contributed to this present trouble. The President called Murphy back from the Philippine Islands to make him Governor of Michigan. John L. Lewis marched his armed goon squads into Michigan and took possession of the city of Flint and other cities, and the President of the United States stood back of Murphy when Murphy called out the National Guard, which aided the strikers and Lewis' goon squads in their seizure and retention of the factories and private property in Michigan. He did it for 6 long months. This violence in Detroit is just what might have been expected from the seeds sown by Murphy and the President of the United States when they are cooperating in their political allegiance with John L. Lewis, and they

now have him on their hands with his coal strike.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, God only knows the situation is bad enough without making it worse by utterances which only tend to aggravate it. The injection of politics into it, in my opinion, is unnecessary. It is best for us to wait until after the unfortunate situation is over, when charges are made, whether correct or not that appeal to the emotions, can be made without aggravating. I am very sorry the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made the statement he did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. We want to solve it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will give you some more of it in tonight's special order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, you have your special order. I am making my affirmative statement. We are all Americans. It is a complicated question. An appeal to emotions, particularly appealing when emotions are running rampant, thinking men refrain from making statements which tend to aggravate. I hope the situation will be adjusted very quickly; that emotions will subside; that no Member will make intemperate statements which will aggravate, but that if statements are made they will be such as shall calm the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the further consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2481.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Johnson, Calvin D.
Andrews	Doughton	Judd
Baldwin, N. Y.	Douglas	Kearney
Barden	Eaton	Kilburn
Barry	Eberharter	King
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Lea
Bradley, Mich.	Ford	Lynch
Brehm	Gale	McMurray
Buckley	Gamble	Monroney
Byrne	Gavagan	Mundt
Cannon, Fla.	Gillie	Myers
Capozzoli	Green	Nichols
Chapman	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
Cochran	Hartley	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	O'Leary
Costello	Heidinger	Pace
Culkin	Herter	Philbin
Dies	Jarman	Ramey
Rivers	Sheridan	Treadway
Rizley	Simpson, Pa.	Van Zandt
Satterfield	Sparkman	Vinson, Ga.
	Tolan	Wheat

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names. Without objection, further proceedings, under the call, will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 92: On page 70, line 22, strike out the proviso after "*Provided further*" and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 71, and insert ": *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 92.

In explanation of that motion I wish to point out that this amendment has reference to the scope of the agricultural adjustment program for the next year and the action suggested by the motion offered by myself on behalf of the committee is in conformity with action heretofore taken to amendment No. 87.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 93: On page 71, line 20, after the words "this item", insert ": *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1943, 1944, and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 93. This is language carried in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year and in bills for previous fiscal years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 94: Page 72, line 7, insert: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1943 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 94.

This was the language which was carried in the appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for the present fiscal year and has been carried in the appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture for previous fiscal years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 97: Page 74, line 6, insert: "To enable the Secretary to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco, pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, he is authorized and directed to make such commitments or incur such obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity for the crop year 1943 shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for such commodity under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and for the crop year 1944 on the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1944 agricultural conservation program: *Provided further*, That for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944 the Secretary may provide by regulations for reduction in payments for failure to comply with the acreage allotments, limits, or goals under the agricultural conservation program for 1943 or 1944, as the case may be.

"For payments on the 1943 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) of the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1943 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price; and for payments on the 1944 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1944 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to

parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97.

This is the amendment inserted by the Senate authorizing the contracting of obligations for parity payments on the 1943 and 1944 crops. It is of particular interest to the Representatives from wheat-producing areas of the country. I think that none of the other agricultural commodities upon which parity payments could be made would be affected by the proposed Senate amendment.

I am prepared at this time to yield time to any gentleman who may desire to discuss the motion which has been made on behalf of the committee that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the chairman of the subcommittee takes the position that we further insist upon the disagreement, because here again we are confronted with the subject that was discussed at great length on yesterday. We were advised, I believe, that there is only one commodity, namely, wheat, in this particular item that might share in the benefits of a continuation of the so-called parity authorization and I notice from figures that were submitted to me this morning by the Department of Agriculture that whereas the market price of wheat is $1.46, the parity price is $1.44, as of the 19th of June.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. You are not speaking of the farm parity price?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking of the market price.

Mr. HOPE. Not the farm parity price?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. HOPE. One dollar forty-four is not the farm parity price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is every reason to believe, of course, that as time goes on the very fact of a carry-over that will be 60,000,000 bushels short of last year with a probable 250,000,000 bushel cut in the crop last year, that wheat will certainly reach parity, so that no single commodity will need to avail itself of a continuation of this contract authorization, and I am glad the House will insist upon its further disagreement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, lines 17 and 18, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 99 may be considered in connection with amendment No. 98, as it relates to the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read amendment 99.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 99: Page 76, line 21, strike out after the word "newspaper" the rest of line 21, 22, 23, 24, and lines 1 and 2 on page 77.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 98 and 99.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 98 and 99.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, my interest in agriculture is such that if I felt that the program which has been authorized by Congress with relation to wheat and cotton in connection with crop insurance is a feasible program, is a program which in the long pull may be carried on without undue expenditure on the part of the Government and with benefit to the wheat and cotton producers of the country, I would be in favor of its continuance.

A careful examination of the evidence we have had from year to year during the operation of this program will, it seems to me, carry conviction to the mind of any reasonable person that the program has demonstrated its futility, its unwise extravagance from the standpoint of governmental expenditures. I believe that the Congress now ought to give serious consideration to its abandonment.

We reported this bill to the House with the diminished appropriation which was intended to care for only the execution of existing contracts and to prevent the making of further contracts, after the present crop year. I do not recall that there was very much insistence in the House in connection with that part of this bill that the program ought to be continued.

I do not recall at the moment that an amendment was offered seeking to increase the amount of the appropriation so as to permit the continuance of the program as contemplated by the Senate amendment. There are certain outstanding facts to which I desire to call your attention. The Government has paid out in indemnities in the 4 years of the program approximately $17,000,000 in excess of receipts. During those 4 years and not including the present year, it has expended in administrative costs somewhere between $23,000,000 and $24,000,000, making a total loss to the Government in the 4 years of the program of approximately $41,000,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot at the moment, but I will before I yield the floor.

I think an examination of this evidence demonstrates the fact that our embarking upon this program has been a mistake. I believe that more benefits are being obtained from it by the people who are working in the employ of the Government carrying out the program than by the wheat and cotton farmers of the country. So far as the cotton farmers are concerned, in one of the county papers in a county in my district 2 or 3 weeks before the time for making applications for insurance this year closed the statement was carried that only one farmer in that county had applied for insurance, and that was true despite the fact that in every county paper for weeks the program had been advertised and it also had been propagandized through administrative personnel in the field.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I ask my distinguished colleague from Georgia if he does not believe that if after we have suffered the flood that recently deluged the Mississippi Valley these farmers had the opportunity to go into a program like this they would not readily seize the opportunity. For example, in my district, one of the great cotton-producing sections, we have lost 20 percent of our cotton due not to floodwater but to water that covered the ground long enough to destroy our cotton; and in the Missouri River Valley——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I know the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Let me state the situation.

Mr. TARVER. I will yield the gentleman some time later; I cannot yield further now; I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This is the time we should deal with these programs. We ought to take consideration of them.

Mr. TARVER. I think the farmers in the gentleman's district who suffered disaster by flood, had they known what was going to happen, would have taken out the insurance, so far as that argument of the gentleman is concerned, and I think that would probably be true of any other farmer in the country who had reason to apprehend loss of his crop from flood or other cause, but I do not think this program as a whole appeals to the cotton farmers. The evidence we had before us, as I recall it, indicates that less than 10 percent of them have participated in it. Only a minor percentage of the wheat farmers of the country have participated in it. I think, as I said awhile ago, that those who derive the greatest benefit from the program are the ones on the Federal pay roll.

I shall not be dissatisfied with any decision you make about this matter. It seems to me, however, we are spending here—all of us are responsible who voted for these appropriations—we are spending an undue amount of Government funds in an effort to carry very small benefits to the agricultural population of the country. I feel that the program has demonstrated its futility and it ought to be abandoned. If you feel differently, then you ought to vote down

the motion I have made to insist on our disagreement with the Senate with regard to this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the crop insurance program was inaugurated it was clearly understood that it was an experiment of great magnitude, an experiment which the Government itself alone could afford to undertake. It was likewise understood that a period of 10 years might be required to determine the success of the experiment. It was originally contemplated that approximately $100,000,000 might be required for the purposes of this experiment. The wheat program has been in operation for approximately 4 years and I do not believe that under all of the circumstances the record has been too bad.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit, the cotton program has been in effect for only 1 year.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Another thing, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, said that in one of the counties of his district only one farmer had taken out crop insurance. If the boll weevil had hit his district as it hit ours 2 years ago when most of the farmers lost 75 percent of their crop, his farmers would be more interested in insurance.

Mr. COOLEY. We are in the position of having embarked upon a very worthwhile program, one which has promise of success, but before the success of the program can be determined we are asked to abandon it and close up shop, and at a time when we have in existence 3-year contracts which have been made with farmers. Personally it does not affect me one iota; I do not believe I have a contract in my district. Wheat is not commercially grown in my district; it does not mean anything to the farmers of the Fourth District of North Carolina at this time; but it does mean a great deal to the farmers of this Nation and probably will at some date mean something to the people of my own district and State.

I believe that to abandon this program now would at once expose the Federal Government to the full measure of relief burdens in time of crop failure. No one can deny that such agricultural relief averaged more than $60,000,000 per year over a 10-year period from 1926 to 1936. This program has not cost anything like that. In the flooded areas of this country which are now flooded there is no telling how much damage will be done and the Congress will provide millions in the way of direct relief in those areas but if those people had this crop insurance they themselves would be carrying a part of the relief burden.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Does not the gentleman feel this is a very poor time to abandon the program when we are trying to produce food for the war?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do and I want to insist on the House continuing this program. Of all times, this is the most inopportune time to abandon it.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not a fact that the evidence was brought out before our committee that many old-line insurance companies took 6 or 7 years or more before they could definitely work out a satisfactory program?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. If I had the time I could give the House a comparison of the activities of this Corporation with the private insurance companies of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Is this not also a matter of good faith on the part of the Government because of promises already made?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I may say, in fairness to the committee, they anticipate that the three and one-half million dollars provided will be sufficient to liquidate and to carry out the good faith of the Government as it may be involved in these contracts.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. For the 3-year contracts?

Mr. COOLEY. Just to liquidate those contracts. It does not mean this will be a going concern. It will be a corporation in the process of liquidation at a time when it is greatly needed. As I have said before when the crop insurance program was first initiated it was generally estimated that it would take at least 10 years to formulate a satisfactory program, and to meet any losses that might be incurred in excess of receipts during that period of experimentation an authorization for the appropriation of $100,000,000 was made. It should be noted that only 40 percent of the time suggested has thus far elapsed, and that the losses thus far incurred have involved only 20 percent of the authorization given. It is believed that over a long period of time receipts—premiums— will be sufficient to meet losses—indemnities—as originally planned by the program.

SAFEGUARDING GROWERS' INVESTMENT

Many thousands of wheat growers who expected that the program would be continued for at least 10 years have invested their money in premiums during the past 4 years without having collected any indemnities. In some instances, these premium payments already exceed the amount the grower would receive if he had a total loss in a crop year. These farmers are expecting the insurance to be available to them when they have a bad year.

PARTICIPATION IN WHEAT INSURANCE

The participation of growers in the Federal crop-insurance program for wheat is increasing, in fact, has increased from 165,775 farm units in 1939 to approximately 500,000 farm units in 1943, making the present participation about one-third of all such farm units throughout the country. The President's committee, appointed to study and report upon crop insurance, based its findings upon the assumption that not to exceed 50 percent of the Nation's farm units would participate during any given year.

A COMPARISON WITH PARTICIPATION IN OTHER INSURANCE

Hence, the present participation in the wheat insurance program is about two-thirds of the peak the President's committee estimated might finally be reached, and compares favorably with farmers' participation in other long-established insurance. For instance, a widely distributed sample of farm families has disclosed that 43 percent carry life insurance, 34 percent, owning automobiles, carry automobile insurance, and only 10 percent carry health and accident insurance.

GOVERNMENT'S INVESTMENT IN CROP INSURANCE

The Federal Government now has a substantial investment in this pioneering endeavor to formulate an insurance program for the growers of wheat and cotton. A part of this is represented by operating experience as well as by actuarial information that could be obtained in no other way than through the actual operation of such an insurance program. As a result, definite improvements have been made in the program during each succeeding year, and the Corporation is just now arriving at a place where it can draw more and more upon its experience, and less and less upon theory.

REDUCTION IN COST OF ADMINISTRATION

Even though participation in the wheat insurance program has been increased each year, during the past 4 years, to where it is now three times as great as at first, the administrative expenses have been greatly reduced, as is evidenced by the fact that the average cost per insured farm for 1943 will be only 29 percent of such cost in 1939. This saving has been made possible by reducing the number of branch offices from 7 to 4 by utilizing the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the purchase and sale of wheat and cotton commodities, and by effecting every other possible economy including a material reduction in the number of employees.

COMPARING COST WITH THAT OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

The period of high administrative cost is past. This is demonstrated not alone by the cost records of the Corporation, but through a comparison of such records and similar costs experienced by privately owned agencies. An outside committee of experts appointed by the Corporation for the purpose of studying its operation and comparing same with private insurance agencies, found after studying the expenses of more than 500 stock and mutual fire-insurance companies that the administrative expenses of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation over the first 3 years compare favorably with these private agencies.

THE COTTON-INSURANCE PROGRAM

The number of farm units that participated in the crop-insurance program for cotton was 176,497 in 1942, that number being slightly in excess of the number of farm units that participated in the wheat-insurance program in 1939. Since this was the first year of its operation, sufficient time has not elapsed to properly evaluate the cotton-insurance program, but in the main, the benefits realized by the growers have been about the same as those realized by the growers of wheat during a like period. In this connection, it should be noted that all-risk crop insurance had been advocated for many years in the wheat-growing areas before the initiation of the program, whereas in cotton-growing areas such insurance has been advocated for a much shorter period of time.

AN OVER-ALL PICTURE

From 1939 through 1942, the Corporation insured a total production of 363,446,000 bushels of wheat on 1,310,191 farms. Premiums totaled 41,876,662 bushels. Losses were suffered by 407,202 farmers. Indemnities paid them totaled 62,436,809 bushels. In providing this insurance protection, the Corporation sustained a net loss of $17,417,271 from its capital stock.

BALANCED OPERATIONS WITHIN REACH

Through the continued application of experience to the development of the program, substantial progress has been made in improving the operating position of the Corporation. A 3-year contract, a major change to stabilize operations of the Corporation, is in effect for wheat in 1943 for the first time. This and other changes in contract provisions, as well as refinements of the actuarial structure, will result in continued improvement of the Corporation's operating position. Furthermore, these changes and the direction of current progress give very definite promise that a position of balanced operations will soon be reached.

I hope that the House will not be responsible for the defeat of this the first effort of the Government to provide an all-risk crop insurance program for the farmers of the Nation. Just because the cotton program has not been successful and has not made money during its first year's operation, certainly does not justify the abandonment of a program which was only started 1 year ago. I urge that the program be continued and I hope that the House will vote for my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, anyone could take considerable time in speaking on the merits and the demerits of the crop-insurance program. The pitiful thing to me is that in the midst of the greatest emergency that we have ever had, at a time when farmers have more problems than ever before in the history of the country, including shortage of labor, shortage of machinery, the farmers being engaged in the most hazardous business of any other group, you propose to strike out the insurance program on the ground it is too expensive. What a joke.

Prior to the passage of this program—you can go back to the RECORD—you appropriated millions almost annually, as high as sixty millions at one time for relief. We have cases where the Government is now holding notes that people signed at a time when they knew they would never have to pay them back, purely for relief. There are bills now pending to cancel that indebtedness.

I want you to look at this file of propaganda. That comes from one bankers' association. They are hell-bent, Mr. Speaker, to wipe out the land banks, the intermediate credit banks, the Production Credit Corporation, and the seed-loan agencies all in the face of what the farmer has to contend with, as previously stated, at this time in this great emergency. If we want to do those things, why should we not wait until after this emergency?

May I state that my committee realizes that this bill and many other bills dealing with the farm programs will have to be revamped, and we propose to do it but not now. Take the cost-plus contracts. What did the Congress do, and you and I who compose the lower House? We spent $17,000,000,000 in building plants at the expense of the taxpayers, because private industry would not take a chance with their own money. Then you go to work and tell them to buy materials at practically any price, hire labor at any kind of wages, have them hang around, make the amount as large as possible, including waste and advertising and you tell them then, "We will pay you a guaranteed profit on all of it." I do not hear anybody kicking about that. But in the face of the many problems confronting the farmers today you would slap them in the face by telling them you will have to plant your crops and take chances on floods, droughts, and insects. We are not going to permit you to pay a premium and insure your cotton and wheat crops.

I want to beg this Congress at this time to continue this program, so that it might have a chance to work out on a sound basis. This has been in effect only 1 year as far as cotton is concerned. It was understood that Congress was to pay all the expenses until we got the program on a working basis. Take the total losses, say $17,000,000, and compare same with $25,000,000 to $60,000,000 appropriated for relief over a period of a few years. My God, at a time when we are faced with the most disastrous situation in connection with crop production, the thing we need so badly to win this war. Now you propose to tell the farmers next year, "You can take your own chances with the bugs and boll weevils, take your own chance on what you are going to get for your crop." You are going to add another serious problem to their other many serious problems. I hope Members will not take advantage of this situation for propaganda or political reasons to destroy this program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think that if we are going to repeal this act it ought to be brought up through the legislative committee and not through the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. FULMER. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the farmers' friend, is absolutely right.

I have been engaged in farming all my life and know what I am talking about. Farmers are engaged in the most hazardous occupation of any group in this country. They plant their crops not knowing what they are going to reap, they take it to the market not knowing what they can get for it. As an individual he cannot fix or demand a fair price; on the other hand, he is forced to pay fixed prices for the things he buys.

I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am confident the House will support the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee. I think we are being called upon to do what any sensible corporation would do, certainly any corporation engaged in the insurance business. We have tried the program for 3 years on some crops and 1 year on cotton. Certainly we have figures enough to prove that we cannot successfully write crop insurance.

Reference has been made to the appropriations we have made in the past for farm relief. If that is going to be necessary and we must vote relief in some form for the farmers, let us do it in the name of relief, let us not try to operate an insurance proposition on growing crops when all the experiments of every insurance company that ever tried it have indicated that it cannot be done on an insurance basis.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman says he is in favor of voting relief.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In the name of relief, but not by subterfuge.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Over a 10-year period we have spent almost $60,000,000 for relief. Does not the gentleman believe it is better to give the farmers a chance to carry their own load through this method of crop insurance, which has never cost as much as relief?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; I do not think so.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. For example, in the Missouri Valley we had a damage of $40,000,000. Those wheat farmers were wiped out. This program would have saved them. It would have saved every farmer had they all been in that program, and you would not have any problem of relief.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The record shows they will not go into the program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They are being educated and more are going into it from year to year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the debate here has evidenced two facts quite patently. One of those facts is that the American farmer is being deterred from participating in this insurance program because of the advocacy by such distinguished gentlemen as the gentleman from Connecticut who has just spoken—sincere, honest, and able men—who insist that the farmer look to relief rather than to insurance to make him whole. What inducement is there for an intelligent farmer to pay out a certain percentage of his crop as an insurance premium when gentlemen like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] say by plain implication: "We will open the public Treasury and make good your every loss without your paying anything"?

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia says that only one cotton farmer in his district has applied for insurance.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is misquoting me.

Mr. HOBBS. I always take pleasure in yielding to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I said that according to the record only one farmer in that county had applied for insurance, not in my district.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to misquote him.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman certainly misquoted me. I think the gentleman should yield because I certainly did not say that I preferred giving them relief. I said if there is a relief need, let us do it in the name of relief and not do it by insurance as a subterfuge.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to misquote him. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman at any time.

I am sincerely sorry to have misquoted these distinguished gentlemen, but their corrected statements are just as illustrative of the point I am making as were the statements I attributed to them. That point is that their attitude and remarks deter farmers from taking crop insurance. I am surprised that any man in that Georgia county, knowing the position of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia, an able friend of the farmer, should have applied for crop insurance. I am surprised that when such persuasive and able gentlemen lead Congress to take the position it is taking, any farmer should apply for crop insurance, knowing that we prefer the dole to a sound business proposition.

This is as sound a program as was ever offered to the American farmer. It is his only chance of sane, cooperative elimination of the need of largess. You may just as well argue that because the prophecy of old that "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea" has never been fulfilled we should tear down our churches, abandon our missionary programs, and do away with everything the church stands for in its program. The delay in the fulfillment of that prophecy is not failure. Its fulfillment waits, not because of the lack of soundness in the program, but because of the weakness of its human partisans. Infinite, divine wisdom made its plan for the salvation of the world dependent upon the loyalty, devotion, and diligence of those who accept that insurance. We have failed to accept the plan and to sell it to the others who need it.

The gentleman from Connecticut comes from Hartford, the insurance center of the world, yet with all of the sound institutions that have been built there, for the first 10 years of the insurance business in the United States they did not have on the books all put together as much insurance as our crop insurance has issued in the first 4 years of its existence. Hartford saw failure after failure, yet they did not quit. Millions of dollars invested in those insurance companies were lost, but the companies carried on and came back until today insurance is one of the strong pillars upon which the edifice of our financial system stands.

That will be the history of this great forward step in sound government if we continue this program even for the 10-year period that we envisioned at its start as the minimum testing period. Give it the chance we said we were going to give it and it will make good. There will be no loss. The farmers will not have to come here with their hats in their hands begging for a dole. They will insure themselves and be glad to do it, for they would rather be self-sustaining than dependent upon gratuities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we kill this fine institution now without a trial, will it not for many, many years to come damn it in the public estimation and prevent an attempt to reestablish it at some future time?

Mr. HOBBS. I agree with the distinguished gentleman's implication, but I do not limit it to "many years to come," I say forever. This is the time when we either take the position that we as a Congress are competent to devise a wise and stable crop-insurance program, built upon sound actuarial principles, or else damn forever such an undertaking.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] who emphasized in his speech today that this is low tide for the farmer. This is high tide for the farmer. This thing came in with relief, when we were establishing all these other agencies under that easy money and credit period. The farmers are now at high tide. They do not need this kind of relief and they are not asking for it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I cannot yield. I want to defend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]. Insurance is a sound institution in this country, and our farmers can participate in a regular, sane, businesslike proposition. The people are more interested in this than anything else. Like Farm Security, the fellows who have the jobs and not the fellows who are seeking the loans are interested. It is these people who have the jobs. The farmers are not asking for this. They are at high tide, they do not need relief. It is not relief anyway. There is a business basis for it, and they are willing to go to that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I take issue with any one, but I was in the insurance business before I came up here. There is no insurance company that will cover these risks, covered by this insurance, and I want to say in connection with the cotton program, that it has been in existence only 1 year, and I say as a former farmer, for 18½ years, that this insurance program is one of the best programs, not only for the farmer, because he pays the premium, but for the country. If you want food and feed, if you want food for your sons in the Army, for civilians and feed for your livestock and poultry you had better have every inducement you can give to the farmer, not alone for the farmer, but for the entire country.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion is insurance. Insurance is nothing new. It has been established for years. A lot of private companies have been established. But private companies never succeeded in insuring crops, because no private company is large enough to insure crops throughout the Nation. As a result, after many hearings, and after careful consideration, Congress adopted this plan as a permanent plan, not as a relief plan.

The result to date is very encouraging. In 4 years the amount of wheat shortage or premium shortage is only 20,000,000 bushels. This in 36 States. In other words, changing the wheat premiums to cash, the loss is less than $16,000,000 in 4 years in 36 States. This loss was sustained in carrying out and building up the system of crop insurance. The improvements have been remarkable. Last

year the financial loss was comparatively small, only 1,770,000 bushels in excess of the premiums paid. Again, putting that into dollars, the loss was only $800,000 in 1942, for insuring those who wanted to be insured in wheat crop production in 36 States.

I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, you are making a mistake unless you continue crop insurance. You are going to face this in the elections, and that is not a threat, but 32,000,000 people engaged in agriculture are going to resent the kind of packages you are handing them in the lower House. The Senate had common sense enough to resurrect it, after you made your first mistake. Please do not make a second mistake, or you will have to rectify it later on.

It is an incorrect statement to say you cannot make a success of crop insurance. We know that Lloyd's insures everything, and Lloyd's is still in business, and we are going to continue in business if we give this crop insurance an honest, fair, and legitimate trial. This is shown by the improvement made every year, when last year the loss was only 1,700,000 bushels of wheat in 36 States of the Union, which again, reduced to dollars, was a total loss of only $800,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the small amount of loss in the Western States, such as the gentleman's State, and my own, is due primarily to the fact that we had an unprecedented rainfall, and our crops were extremely good, but that the insurance would have proven very good if we had the usual dry years?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes; the gentleman is right. My State paid 1,500,000 bushels more in premiums than it received in losses.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, in considering this question, I think Members should take into consideration that at least three-fourths of the farmers of this Nation, when they plant a crop, are taking a chance on everything in the world they own. The crops of at least three-fourths of the farmers can be destroyed, and they are bankrupt. That is not true of many other businessmen. With the farmer the insects may come, drought may come, or the floods may come and destroy their crops, and they are bankrupt. Is it so bad for the Federal Government to set up an agency, when no private enterprise will do it, whereby these farmers can pay a premium and insure themselves against bankruptcy? Is that such a terrible thing?

It is true that the record up to now has not been perfect. I said before and I repeat that I hope to see this program worked to the point where it is self-sustaining, where the premiums paid by the farmers will not only pay the losses, but will also pay the administrative costs.

We are working toward that end. To begin with, the premiums had to be paid in commodities. The wheat had to be stored and kept for months, and there was that expense. That has been changed. To begin with, they wrote a policy for only 1 year. A new policy had to be solicited each year, and that was expensive. Now they are authorized to write a policy for 3 years. It is an enormous program. It is going to take several years to perfect it and put it on a self-sustaining basis, and I hope you will concur in the action by the Senate in appropriating $7,000,000 to continue this agency, if you please, that gives the farmer the privilege of taking out insurance, paying the premium, and saving himself from causes over which he has no control whatsoever, such as floods, drought, and insects.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This only involves $3,500,000.

Mr. PACE. It is true the House committee authorized $3,000,000 to liquidate the Corporation. This is to authorize $7,000,000 to continue the Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman realizes this is only for administrative expenses. It does not cover the amount that is paid out for indemnities. That comes from the capital funds of the Corporation, also Government money.

Mr. PACE. The principal reasons advanced for the discontinuance of the crop insurance program are the limited participation in the program and the losses during these first few years of development.

After 4 years of wheat insurance approximately one-third of the wheat farmers are insured. Even though other types of insurance have always been available to farmers, only about 43 percent of the farmers carry life insurance, 10 percent carry health and accident insurance and of those who have automobiles only about 34 percent carry insurance.

It was never anticipated that there would be 100 percent participation in the program. The President's Committee on Crop Insurance of 1936 set up a figure of 50 percent as a reasonable expectation.

The original act prohibited the use of a long-term contract for 3 years. Each year it has been necessary to rewrite the insurance. Now with the term contract, new business written each year will add to that already written. In other words, participation can only go up.

As the program becomes more established and farmers become more familiar with insurance they will carry insurance regularly rather than merely taking it for a trial.

It has been the experience of private insurance companies that it is difficult to get a foothold in the business. Only about 25 percent of the American fire and casualty stock companies have survived.

The program was originally started without experience to go on. It is to be expected that the program will be improved as experience is gained. The experience gained for any year cannot be worked into the program until the second year thereafter. The loss ratio for the 1942 wheat program was lower than for any of the preceding years, yet the program for that year was planned after only 2 years of experience.

Many improvements in the program have been made, such as the adoption of a term contract, the requirement that farmers insure all farms they have in a county rather than to pick and choose the farms they desire to insure in any year, separate treatment for improved farming practices, and substantial increase in premium rates.

The program was started with data for individual farms that was poorer than originally anticipated. Each year the Corporation has gained new data as crops are harvested and is gradually improving its actuarial data. Average yields and premium rates have been established on about 3,000,000 wheat and cotton farms and these data are being constantly improved. This represents a substantial investment of the Government that would be lost if the program were discontinued. The losses in the program in 1939 and 1940 were largely due to drought in the Plains States, which is the high-risk wheat area. There was considerable adverse selection in those years because farmers anticipated poor crops when soil moisture was short. In 1941 and 1942 moisture conditions were good in that area, but the Corporation could not hold its business to collect premiums, because it was limited to a 1-year contract. Had the business been held in the Plains States the net balance for those years would have been improved by about 5,000,000 bushels. The losses in 1941 and 1942 were due to heavy winter kill in the areas further east. It is not expected that these will reoccur frequently.

This year there will be considerable loss from flood. Some 250,000 acres of insured wheat and 80,000 acres of insured cotton have been damaged. This will mean losses for the Corporation. This is exactly why we have a corporation to protect those farmers who lose their crops through such catastrophes. The Corporation is releasing damaged acreage now for planting of other crops needed for the war effort and will adjust losses where there is no prospect for any of the crop as quickly as the facts can be established.

This program is devised to help farmers meet their own catastrophes. In the past the Government has carried out relief measures which have been much more expensive than the maintenance of the crop-insurance program.

The Corporation has been streamlining its program, having reduced the cost per contract from about $27 in 1939 to $12 in 1942 for wheat. Cotton cost per contract in 1942 was about $17, much less than the costs the first year for wheat.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest country on earth. We can make more mistakes to the square inch

in this Congress and still get by with it than any place in the world. For 9 years I have been trying to convince this Congress, especially the Republican side, that food is our strongest element of national defense. Many of you wonder why I try to convince them, and I want to tell you why I do. If I am in the Republican Party and it is right, I want to keep it right. If I am in the Republican Party and it is wrong, as this one is, I am staying in there until I make it right.

I have tried to convince this Congress that the greatest power of self-defense of any nation is food. History is full of examples of that kind. There never was a war won in the history of the world unless the winner had food and its loser did not. Here we are in this situation, not only feeding ourselves but called upon to feed the world, and yet we take 2 or 3 days in this Congress to hobble the fellows who produce the food. First, the Government took away their men; the Government agencies foreclosed their farms; and, finally, you are about to take away this insurance. You, this Congress, is trying to take away the only agency that is putting these bankrupt farmers back on their feet so they can produce. You are going to do that this afternoon if you can. Apparently this Congress does not want more production. You desire to destroy the Farm Security program. You are doing everything you can against the very men in this Nation who are producing the most essential thing there is to this Government right now, food. If you are going to abandon this insurance, why do you not do it at a time when you can do it without injury to the Government? You seem willing to jeopardize your own Government if by doing so you can make the farmers' burden greater. I am convinced of one thing, that you are not going to understand this farm question, you are not going to understand what it is to be hungry until you get hungry. I hope I can live long enough to see these farm destructionists hungry. Now, if you have any common sense left, and I very much doubt it, you will not destroy crop insurance until the war is over.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, there is no particular reason why I should speak in favor of Government insurance for either wheat or cotton for my district does not raise any. My State raises no cotton and very little wheat, comparatively. But farmers take a chance on everything on earth—wind, bugs, beetles, markets, diseases, floods, droughts, blight, blister, hail, frost, tornadoes, sandstorms, prices, and everything else. During consideration of this proposal in the committee I studied the figures on wheat, which program has been in vogue for 4 years. The amount that the Government is losing on wheat is decreasing every year. You cannot expect any insurance company to make dividends from its start. This experiment, I believe, should be continued until we can see what the final result is, because there is no other place in this world where the farmer can get that kind of insurance. If this loss is decreasing, probably next year or in subsequent years it may show a gain and not show a loss. We had better go ahead with it. Let farmers have an opportunity to get insurance.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In enumerating all the bad things that come to the farmer, I would mention the Office of Price Administration along with the beetles and the drought and the floods, and so forth.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Very well. I stand corrected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to conclude the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at every argument that has been made this afternoon. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] said that this is better than a dole. The gentleman forgets that only 1 out of every 10 cotton farmers has asked for this insurance. Only 1 out of every 3 wheat farmers has asked for this insurance, and it has been applicable to wheat for 4 years. So what are you going to do about the other 9 cotton farmers and the other 2 out of 3 wheat farmers in case there is a crop failure?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I cannot yield just now.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] says that no company has been big enough to handle crop insurance. What the gentleman means is that no company in the world has been big enough to handle the losses on crop insurance. That is what he means.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said there has been a good record. Let us look at the record. The gentleman says there has been a reduction of administrative expenses. Has there? In 1939 the administrative expense was $4,500,000. In 1940 it was $5,750,000. In 1941 it was over $5,000,000. In 1942 it was $8,000,000. If that is a reduction in administrative expenses, going from $4,500,000 to $8,000,000, then it is a new brand of arithmetic that I have never seen before.

It has been said here today that it was an experiment. How long do we have to experiment with the matter? It has had 4 full years in relation to wheat and 1 year in relation to cotton. Can we not determine whether it is sound or unsound in a period of 4 years? Are we going to be like the old uncle in the play who came to visit for a week and stayed for 17 years? Are we going to start out with an experiment with increased losses year after year with no hope that they will ever be less?

What are the losses for this year? Here they are. Taking the difference between the premiums we collected and the indemnities which we paid, and then adding the administrative expenses, we have a loss of $41,086,000 in this venture in 4 years. That is the uncontroverted record.

When the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, says this is probably meant to insure the jobs for those on the pay roll he comes pretty close to the truth. There are 630 people on this pay roll.

This applies only to cotton and only to wheat. We have lost money consistently, year after year on wheat. We have lost money for the first year on cotton insurance, to the tune of one and three-quarter millions, with only 1 out of every 10 cotton producers availing himself of this insurance.

I do not pretend to speak for the farmers of America. All I know is that the average farmer is a hard-headed, hard-fisted, hard-working, patriotic businessman, who can see through a grindstone if it has a hole in the middle; he can tell whether it is bad or whether it is good.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me make one other observation. Hunger has been discussed here and lack of food. This has no relation to hunger or to the lack of food. If a crop has failed, it has failed, that is all; and I do not think that crop insurance is going to produce any more food, so I cannot follow that argument in connection with this issue. What I can see is that we have experimented now for 4 years with wheat and 1 year with cotton, and in the past 4 years we have lost over $41,000,000, and I think it is time to call a halt.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I will tell him why it does have some relationship to crop production.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee has provided $3,500,000 to provide for the liquidation of the Corporation under which the insurance program is carried on. I hope the House will sustain the position that the conferees took on this item and that it will vote down the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. I can tell the gentleman why it is going to affect production, because farmers are faced with a shortage of labor, shortage of machinery and everything else, and with no chance to be insured. I, as a farmer, am not going to take all the risks; I am going to cut down on my production, unless there is some protection afforded me, and raise only enough commodities to take care of my own needs, whereas, if I had insurance to take care of a possible loss in crop failure, to meet my costs and pay my premiums, my production would be maintained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a different estimate of the farmers of America in

wartime. They are diligent and patriotic citizens who, under any circumstance, will do their utmost.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman from Illinois refers to the fact that the Government had paid cotton farmers so much money and had lost so much money on insurance. I want to remind the gentleman that the Commodity Credit Corporation has made out of the cotton farmer at least $50,000,000 in the last 10 years, and that the Government now holds title to 3,200,000 bales of cotton on which they have a profit of $30 per bale, or $96,000,000. So the Government has made out of the cotton farmers $150,000,000. Now the gentleman does not want to give $1,000,000 back to carry on the insurance program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But why continue the operation of the Federal crop-insurance program, in the face of its constant losses?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Anticipating that the gentleman would oppose the crop-insurance program, I asked the Department for figures on premiums. This is what I have: Approximately 75 percent of the wheat farmers of Illinois have their 1943, 1944, and 1945 wheat crops insured. Losses in that State for 1942 were more than six times the premiums collected. The net loss in Illinois in 1942 was about 1,500,000 bushels out of a total net loss for the country of 1,800,000 bushels. Some of the heaviest flood losses this year occurred in the State of Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only difficulty with that argument is that we do not raise a great deal of wheat in Illinois. Why did not the gentleman ask for some figures on Kansas or Oklahoma?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman from Illinois has said that only one out of three farmers took advantage——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Wait a minute; let me clarify that: Only 1 out of 10 cotton farmers and only 1 out of 3 wheat farmers.

Mr. LEMKE. That is just as much as to argue that because wheat farmers as a whole have not taken out hail insurance the old-line companies should get out of the hail-insurance business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer to that is that the hail-insurance companies had to go out of business irrespective of how much business they had because they could not stand the losses. Now, do you want your old Uncle Sam to go on year after year absorbing enormous losses that no private insurance company could take? It will get worse as time goes on because the agitation is now going to be to include corn, to include flax, fruit, and to include a great many other commodities upon which the loss is proportionately even greater.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that the wheat farmers are insured at a constantly decreasing rate, yet there are not as many wheat farmers going into it as there were when it started?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Has the gentleman found any regular old-line insurance company which has successfully dealt in crop insurance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not a single old-line company has ever been able to handle crop insurance; they could not take the loss.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that no private corporation in America could undertake a program of this magnitude and that is the reason they have not undertaken all risk crop insurance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will go further than that and say there is no corporation in the world that could undertake it because it could not take the loss.

Mr. COOLEY. But the Federal Government has undertaken it and the gentleman wants to abandon it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amount of loss to the Federal Government is bound to increase as the program continues.

I ask that you vote down the motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken; and the Chair, being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—yeas 83, noes 110.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 208, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—160

Abernethy	Burchill, N. Y.	Cunningham
Allen, La.	Burdick	Curtis
Anderson, N. Mex.	Burgin	D'Alesandro
	Camp	Davis
Beckworth	Carlson, Kans.	Dawson
Bland	Coffee	Delaney
Bonner	Colmer	Dilweg
Boren	Cooley	Dingell
Boykin	Cooper	Domengeaux
Bradley, Pa.	Courtney	Dworshak
Brooks	Cravens	Fay
Brown, Ga.	Creal	Feighan
Bryson	Crosser	Fernandez
Bulwinkle	Cullen	Flannagan
Fogarty	Kefauver	Peterson, Ga.
Folger	Kelley	Pittenger
Forand	Keogh	Poage
Fulbright	Kerr	Price.
Fulmer	Kirwan	Priest
Furlong	Kleberg	Ramspeck
Gale	Klein	Rankin
Gathings	LaFollette	Richards
Gibson	Larcade	Robinson, Utah
Gilchrist	Lemke	Rogers, Calif.
Gordon	McCord	Rowan
Gore	McCormack	Russell
Gorski	McGehee	Sabath
Granger	McGranery	Sadowski
Grant, Ala.	McKenzie	Sasscer
Gregory	McMillan	Sauthoff
Hagen	Maas	Scanlon
Harless, Ariz.	Mahon	Sheppard
Harris, Ark.	Manasco	Sikes
Hart	Mansfield, Mont.	Slaughter
Hays		Snyder
Heffernan	Mansfield, Tex.	Spence
Hendricks	Marcantonio	Starnes, Ala.
Hobbs	Martin, Iowa	Steagall
Hoch	Miller, Nebr.	Stefan
Hoeven	Mills	Stevenson
Holifield	Morrison, La.	Stewart
Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, N. C.	Stockman
Hope	Murdock	Vincent, Ky.
Horan	Murphy	Voorhis, Calif.
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Ward
Izac	Myers	Weaver
Jackson	Norton	Weiss
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Brien, Mich.	Whelchel, Ga.
	O'Connor	White
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Konski	Whitten
	O'Toole	Wickersham
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Outland	Winstead
	Patman	Worley
Johnson, Okla.	Patton	Wright
Kee	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

NAYS—208

Andersen, H. Carl	Gallagher	Maloney
	Gavin	Martin, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Mason
Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	May
	Gifford	Merritt
Angell	Gillette	Merrow
Arends	Goodwin	Michener
Arnold	Graham	Miller, Conn.
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Griffiths	Miller, Pa.
Barrett	Gross	Monkiewicz
Bates, Ky.	Gwynne	Mruk
Beall	Hale	Murray, Wis.
Bell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norman
Bender		Norrell
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.		O'Hara
Bishop	Halleck	O'Neal
Blackney	Hancock	Pfeifer
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Bolton	Harris, Va.	Ploeser
Brown, Ohio	Heidinger	Plumley
Buffett	Herter	Poulson
Burch, Va.	Hess	Powers
Busbey	Hill	Pracht
Butler	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Canfield	Hoffman	Randolph
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Reece, Tenn.
Carson, Ohio	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jeffrey	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Jennings	Rizley
Chiperfield	Jensen	Robertson
Church	Johnson, Anton J.	Robsion, Ky.
Clark		Rockwell
Clason	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rodgers, Pa.
Clevenger		Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Rohrbough
Compton	Johnson, Ward	Rolph
Cox	Jones	Rowe
Crawford	Jonkman	Schiffler
Curley	Kean	Schuetz
Day	Keefe	Schwabe
Dewey	Kennedy	Scott
Dickstein	Kilday	Shafer
Dirksen	Kinzer	Short
Disney	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Dondero	Kunkel	Smith, Maine
Doughton	Lambertson	Smith, Ohio
Drewry	Landis	Smith, Va.
Durham	Lane	Smith, W. Va.
Eaton	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Elliott	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Ellis	LeCompte	Springer
Ellison, Md.	LeFevre	Stanley
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Stearnes, N. H.
Elmer	Lewis, Ohio	Sullivan
Elston, Ohio	Luce	Sumner, Ill.
Engel	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Fellows	McCowen	Sundstrom
Fenton	McGregor	Taber
Fish	McWilliams	Talbot
Fisher	Madden	Talle

Tarver	Vursell	Wilson
Taylor	Wadsworth	Winter
Thomas, N. J.	Wasielewski	Wolcott
Thomas, Tex.	Weichel, Ohio	Wolfenden, Pa.
Thomason	Wene	Wolverton, N. J.
Tibbott	West	Woodruff, Mich.
Towe	Whittington	Woodrum, Va.
Troutman	Wigglesworth	
Vorys, Ohio	Willey	

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Ill.	Eberharter	Mott
Andrews	Fitzpatrick	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ford	Newsome
Barden	Gamble	Nichols
Barry	Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Gillie	O'Leary
Bradley, Mich.	Gossett	Pace
Brehm	Green	Philbin
Buckley	Hare	Ramey
Byrne	Hartley	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Satterfield
Capozzoli	Jarman	Sheridan
Carter	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Case	Kearney	Sparkman
Cochran	Kilburn	Tolan
Cole, N. Y.	King	Treadway
Costello	Lynch	Van Zandt
Culkin	McLean	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	McMurray	Walter
Ditter	Magnuson	Welch
Douglas	Monroney	Wheat

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sparkman for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wheat against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. McMurray for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

General pairs:

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Welch.

Mr. King with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Case.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Ditter.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such district for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MAHON, COFFEE, ANDERSON of New Mexico, STEFAN, DWORSHAK, and JENSEN.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 100: Page 78, line 7, insert after the word "Service" the following: "and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This is language which was carried in the bill when it was reported to the House, but stricken on a point of order.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 107: Page 81, line 4, insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32 in a sum not exceeding $50,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1944 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the word "expansion" and the comma preceding and following said word.

And at the end of said amendment, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the language inserted by the Senate providing for what is known as the school-lunch program. This is an activity which appears to be extremely popular in the country just at the present time.

When the hearings were had before the House subcommittee with regard to this bill the administrative authorities contemplated using out of section 32 money, $56,000,000 for this school-lunch program and related activities, and $25,000,000 from section 32 funds which were recommended for reappropriation by the Budget.

Our committee in formulating the bill had nothing to do with section 32 funds which are included in a permanent appropriation, but we did question the authority of the administrative officials to use section 32 money for the purpose of carrying on a school-lunch program.

The committee had no power to deal with the matter in a satisfactory way. As I have said, the section 32 money was not included in our bill, but we did raise that question. The insistence of the administrative authorities was that under paragraph 2 of section 32 they had the authority to use this money for the school-lunch program. Paragraph 2 of that section reads as follows:

Encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means from the normal channels of trade and commerce.

The committee was unable to see that it is necessary at this time to use section 32 money for the purpose of diverting agricultural commodities from the normal channels of commerce by causing their use in the school-lunch program. There is no surplus of foods at this time and no necessity for expending these moneys in order to encourage the consumption of foods and the disposition of food surpluses. So in the hearings we demonstrated to the administrative authorities our conclusions that this expenditure is probably not authorized.

The administrative authorities appear to have adopted our position in the hearings before the Senate subcommittee and requested the insertion of the language which is now under discussion and which proposes to expressly authorize the use of $50,000,000 of section 32 funds for the purposes of this school-lunch program.

Our committee is willing to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The amendment strikes out the word "expansion" where it occurs in the Senate language, where it expressly provides for the expansion of the existing program, and it further provides that these moneys shall not be used for the purpose of carrying on any program formerly carried on under the Works Projects Administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I should like to explain the meaning of this proviso upon which the House conferees have insisted. It appears from the evidence that some $2,200,000 of section 32 moneys are being used this year for the purpose of supplying milk to relief clients in certain cities of the country, some four or five in number, including the city of New York. In other words, the relief clients are required to

pay 5 cents a quart for the milk and the Government pays the difference from these section 32 funds to the dairymen who furnish the milk.

There are at least 2 objections to that procedure: One is that if there should be a relief program carried on out of these funds it ought to be general throughout the country and not limited to some 4 or 5 cities. Another reason is that any such relief program ought not to be carried on out of section 32 funds, which are primarily intended to aid in the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities, of which there are practically none at this time. So we have insisted upon the insertion of that limitation in connection with our motion to recede and concur.

We further state, as you will note in the conference report, that this school-lunch program, if it is to be a permanent matter or if it is to be carried on after the next fiscal year, should be authorized by law. We state that so far as our conferees are concerned, both on the Senate side and on the House side, we will not approve an appropriation for this purpose for the succeeding fiscal year unless in the meantime the program has been expressly authorized by Congress.

A great many people view the school-lunch program as an exceedingly important and well worth while thing. Their viewpoint with regard thereto may be correct. I think a great deal of good has been accomplished in that program, but I think the Congress should examine carefully the question of whether it desires to authorize by law the continuance of such a program. I do not believe any further appropriations after this one ought to be made until Congress has taken affirmative action expressly authorizing this type of appropriation.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Just how far does the Federal Government expect to participate in the administration of these school lunches in the different districts, if at all?

Mr. TARVER. The Federal Government cooperates with the sponsor in each locality who supplies the lunches to the children, the Government contributing a portion of the cost of the lunch, the sponsor contributing a portion of the cost of the lunch, and most of the children contributing a portion of the cost of the lunch. The lunches are furnished free only to children who are certified as being in need. To that extent this is the carrying on of the work formerly done under the Work Projects Administration. We are not continuing the Work Projects Administration. If this is a matter which ought to be carried on, in our judgment it ought to be specifically authorized by Congress. The appropriate legislative committees ought to draft and report to the House and Senate legislation authorizing it, and it ought to be done in accordance with law and not by taking the farmer's money, his 30 percent of the tariff receipts which are intended for section 32 purposes, and diverting those funds to a use which was certainly not contemplated by the Congress at the time section 32 was enacted.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Under what power is the Federal Government taking all the people's money and dishing it out to a few cities to help buy the milk for the people of those cities?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will examine the hearings he will find that I insist they had no authority to do that, that they were violating the law in taking this section 32 money and undertaking to carry on a relief program in New York, Boston, and two or three other cities of the country.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If I may make the observation, that sort of use of public funds would lead to every conceivable sort of use and probably to actual corruption.

Mr. TARVER. I hope the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, will report legislation to the House which will result in that sort of abuse of administrative authority being stopped. I do not know how the subcommittee on which I serve as chairman could do it except by the limitation we are here recommending to the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, the speeches being made in behalf of this fifty million are quite interesting to me, especially in the face of such strong opposition to farmers by those who are for this appropriation. When it comes to farmers you are compelled to kick them in the pants. Here at this time, when everybody is employed, and at larger wages, and are receiving more income than ever in the history of the country, you appropriate fifty million for milk and lunches for school children. This was an emergency program when we had considerable surplus farm products and many people needed relief. I wonder what is going to happen after this war, when we have millions of unemployed people that will not be able to buy food and clothing? But this is a different proposition. You have heard from home. Oh, this will pass, without any trouble, and yet just a few moments ago you refused a few millions to permit the farmers to be covered by insurance to take care of their crop failures in order that they may remain on the farm and the production of necessary food to feed you and win this war. I cannot understand how you can kick farmers around unless it is because they are unorganized. I am calling this to your attention with the hope when hunger confronts this country and when you have to face millions of unemployed people after this war, you will see just how foolish it is to play politics. You should have former Congressman Rich here to remind you from day to day: "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois Mr. [DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us see what the equities really are here. In 1935 we passed the act of August 24, 1935. A great majority of the Congress at that time sat on the Democratic side of the aisle. A very distinguished gentleman, Mr. Marvin Jones, an able gentleman from Texas, was the chairman of the Agricultural Committee that reported that bill. In that bill was a section called section 32. Section 32 provided that 30 percent of the tariff and customs fees should be set aside and put into a permanent fund to be used to deal with this whole question of agricultural surpluses. In other words, if you wanted to subsidize sending a little wheat to China, to get it out of the country, dip into this fund, and if you are going to add 4 cents out of the Federal moneys, to the cost of a quart of milk in Manchester, New York, Chicago, or St. Louis, to get it off the market, that is what that fund was intended for. But I am not unmindful of the fact that it dealt entirely with surplus commodities. Under that whole proposition they started the so-called school-lunch and school-milk program, selling milk for a penny to school children.

It has been in effect for quite some time. It is easy to set up a program like that, but it is very difficult to dismember it later. It has been in effect all these years. Surpluses, however, no longer exist. So there comes a demand, notwithstanding the fact that there is no surplus, that this program be continued. The Federal Government undertakes about one-third of the cost. The purveyors and parent-teachers' associations and local community associations in the neighborhood of the school do all the work, and they make provision for it. Since it has been in effect for a long time it is pretty difficult to discard this program at once.

I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that this has been under way since 1938, and as a matter of fact, I suppose nearly everybody in the Congress, more or less, voted for the 1935 act, which contained the section 32 proposal. I admit the condition has now changed. But the set-up has been made. The cooking equipment and the serving equipment has been established in these schools. So they believe they ought to continue. I think they are prepared to take care of 4,200,000 children under this program. We, however, have submitted an amendment through the chairman of the subcommittee to provide that none of the funds shall be used for W. P. A. activities. That means simply this: Among other activities, they were paying 4, 5, or 6 cents a quart out of Federal funds for every quart of welfare milk sold in various large cities. They were paying 5 cents a quart in the city of New York. I think a similar amount in Manchester and about the same amount in Boston.

In other words, where there was a supply of milk that had to be gotten to welfare clients, the State welfare agency would pay 4, 5, or 6 cents and Uncle Sam would pay 5 or 6 cents, and so that milk was purveyed to welfare clients. That money has been restricted. This money will be used only for the serving of school lunches and the penny milk program. Where children can afford to pay for the

milk, it is my understanding they pay for it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Under the provision the gentleman just mentioned, would that make janitors and school teachers ineligible to 1-cent milk?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so. I think this is meant only for school children.

Mr. KNUTSON. But in the past I understand quite a few of the janitors and teachers received this penny milk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not heard about it. That abuse, of course, has not been disclosed to our subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. This has been referred to children in the cities. It is not restricted, is it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. In some localities members of the board of education or those in authority have rejected the proposal and would not accept it. In other places it has been instituted, but there is no limitation as to the size of the town or any area in the United States where this may not apply. The Federal Government undertakes about one-third of the total cost of this program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Since this money is to be used exclusively for purchase of food surpluses, and since there are no food surpluses, will not this money revert to the Treasury?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is one of the difficulties, and that is why the Senate wrote this provision in the bill. This illustrates the difficulty between the House and the Senate. The Senate can write any kind of legislation in a bill so long as they take it back for a separate vote. We are restricted so that we can write no legislative provision in an appropriation bill if somebody makes a point of order. That rule does not obtain in the Senate. They have infinitely greater flexibility and latitude in writing legislative matters in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Only children who cannot afford it are permitted to avail themselves of this penny milk. Children who can afford it are made to pay for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned that fact.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Therefore, I think we are making a sound investment in building up the bones of these children. They are the next generation upon whom the burden of this war will fall. Further, this program is not restricted to the cities. Any school organization in the rural communities can take advantage of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill, on the whole, carries almost as much money as we appropriated, after I was a well-grown man, for every purpose of government. Yet I am for it and expect to support it, except as to a few details, this being one of them.

After I was a grown man I remember Reed, of Maine, was Speaker of the House of Representatives. For the first time this country appropriated a billion dollars, and we Democrats made ready to assault the Republicans forcibly about it. But that brilliant Republican leader, Speaker Reed, of that day, answered us by saying that under the administrations of the Republican Party and its great, patriotic policies this had become a billion-dollar country. That answer was pretty successful, because, according to my recollection, they carried the next election.

I am going to support this bill, immense as it is, but if I live and am allowed to stay here, it is the last one I ever expect to support for any such amount as is now carried by this bill. We should cut down expenses in this country and reduce taxation if we ever want to see the people happy. This is not the time to do it, however. With this war upon us we must not do anything to break the high and noble spirit of agriculture, and even those measures that were emergent in character should not be dispensed with until this second emergency of the war is past.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we cannot reduce operating expenses now, that is, peacetime expenses, when we have more money in the banks, more people profitably employed getting more money than they ever got before, certainly we will not be able to make much of a reduction in the post-war era when there will be a great deal of unemployment, unless the Republicans get in, of course.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. My dear sir, I think the country remembers too well what your party did for this country after the last war to allow it to administer its affairs after this war.

Mr. KNUTSON. That depression to which my distinguished friend refers was due to World War No. 1 that you folks promised to keep us out of back in 1917.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. If my friend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is going to attack the righteousness of our entering into the last war, as he did attack the righteousness of our provisions to prevent getting into this one, I am not going to debate that with my friend, because I might lose my temper.

But really much of this so-called New Deal program was emergent in character, to help us recover from the disaster of the last war, followed by the almost equally great disasters brought upon us by the Republican Party's administration for 10 years of this country's affairs.

Much of our New Deal legislation was declared to be emergent by our great leader, and the chief criticism I have of his leadership is that he has not become ready to do away with much of that emergency legislation and help us to get back to an economical government based upon current necessities.

I am not in favor of an appropriation of $50,000,000 to feed school children in the city, town, and country; that is purely for socialistic purposes and it ought to be voted against by every good, old-time Republican and every good, old-time Democrat of this House. Let the States, towns, and counties furnish the lunches if it should be done at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are about to experience the greatest tax bill that has ever been imposed upon them in the history of this or any other country, and yet we are here considering today an item of $50,000,000 for free lunches, at a time when we need every dollar that we can raise to buy tanks and planes and guns for our boys all over our fighting fronts.

It seems to me that we could hardly go home and look our constituents in the face if we spent $50,000,000 for a purpose of this sort at a time when the families of America have the greatest cash income that they have ever had before in the history of this country.

I recall a few months ago I was down in Missouri and they were having a homecoming at the little country school where I went for 3 or 4 years as a boy. The neighbors from far and near had gathered with their basket lunches. The teacher, with considerable pride, took me down into a new basement that had just been built and fully equipped. They did not have a basement in that school when I went to school. He took me down and showed me the equipment and all the paraphernalia for furnishing free lunches to the children going to that country school.

I could not understand it; frankly I could not. In the days when I went to that school, when corn was bringing from 15 to 20 cents a bushel and wheat 35 cents a bushel, we did not have very much money in those days, but every boy who ever went to that school had with him his lunch. And yet today, here in one of the richest farming sections of the country, we are confronted with the idea of hiring a W. P. A. cook to go out and serve free lunches to those school children. Such a thing as that was absolutely unbelievable to me.

There was not a family within driving distance of that school who could not keep a cow, who could not have in their cellars stores of vegetables, who did not have their smokehouses filled with everything that any boy or any girl needed, right there on their farms, in abundance, and yet we had the spectacle of

hiring a cook to go out and furnish free lunches to the school children.

Upon inquiry I found that that is being duplicated tens of thousands of times in the country schools all over the Nation.

So when I learned today that the great and distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol had stuck in this bill a provision to spend $50,000,000, at a time when our Nation is fighting for the very liberties that we all love, I just wondered whether the Members of this body would even consider it for a moment.

If we had starving children I would say, "Yes, for the love of God, let us feed them." If we had hungry children I would say let us feed them, no matter *what the cost is*, but here in a land of plenty, when we have millions of surplus on all sides, to think of spending $50,000,000 when the people of this country are paying more taxes than they have ever paid before, I am just wondering if the folks back home will not think the Congress has gone crazy.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Even if they were needy, does not the gentleman think that the county or the town supporting the local school itself should provide what is necessary to take care of even the needy children, instead of having it made a matter for the Federal Government to pay for?

Mr. BELL. Yes; of course, it should be handled by the local communities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not get off the beam with respect to this matter, and that—despite more heat than light—we will be inclined to give sensible consideration to what originally your subcommittee and the conference committee is undertaking to do. Do not forget it is your subcommittee, trying to represent you, which is asking you to support your own attitude.

You have here a chance to vote $50,000,000, with the limitation, and with suggestion, that never again will we vote a cent for such purpose. I know we cannot control subsequent legislation only by suggestion. I just ask you to remember what your conferees are up against in bucking the Senate conferees who are insisting that Chicago and Boston, Manchester and New York were and are entitled to a continuance of what they have had, as a W. P. A. sop, so recklessly spent. The bill is to provide substantially for feeding all school children with the contributions, with respect to which the chairman of the committee has made sufficient explanation. It excludes the mayors and the municipalities which took advantage of the law to feed school children and fed their municipalities at the taxpayers' expense. That was an inexcusable abuse of a grant of taxpayers' money made for a justifiable purpose. We put an end to that by our report and recommendation. You can take it or leave it.

I do not care ordinarily to spend $50,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for anything any time unless justified, but if we are to spend $50,000,000 as suggested on the premises we ought to know that it is being spent without the unlimited right on the part of anybody to continue an unlicensed use of our appropriation made for another purpose. We have so constricted the use. Vote for our recommendation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the present time it is true that we have no considerable agricultural surpluses. It is also true that a major part of the population of this country is making good incomes. But it is also true that there are a good many families in this Nation whose incomes have not increased a single bit as a result of this war; and that the very children who will benefit from this penny-milk program are the same ones on whom the future of America depends. These youngsters must be prepared as best they can be to take up the task of guiding this Nation in the post-war world. They are the generation of youngsters who are growing up in the midst of war.

If there is any good investment that I know of I think this is it. We may be short of milk in this country; I earnestly hope not, but if we should be we should be absolutely certain that such supplies as we did have go to children in the form of milk instead of being used in any other way. This program has never been administered as a Federal program; it has been administered by people locally in the local schools. Indeed, it has not been carried on at all unless local people sponsor and take full responsibility for carrying it through. I think it is right that such a program as this ought to be authorized by Congress. Certainly I think it is appropriate to the time. For one part of a just rationing program is to see that minimum needs, especially of our school children, are met.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia to recede and concur in the amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the House divided and there were—ayes 82, noes 34.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 116: On page 86, line 24, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$464,115."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No 118: On page 87, line 17, after the figures insert ": *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary may require reasonable bonds from every market agency and dealer, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to secure the performance of their obligations, and whenever, after due notice and hearing, the Secretary finds any registrant is insolvent or has violated any provisions of said act he may issue an order suspending such registrant for a reasonable specified period. Such order of suspension shall take effect within not less than 5 days, unless suspended or modified or set aside by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 120: Page 88, line 18, strike out "$5,866,708" and insert "$6,234,755."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendments numbered 120 and 121 are both totals. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report Senate amendment numbered 121.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 121: On page 88, line 19, strike out "$1,298,413" and insert "$1,369,763."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120 and 121.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 122: Page 89, line 15, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 122 and concur in the same.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House the provision for lending this money through the R. F. C. went out on a point of order and I offered the amendment to put the $20,000,000 back in the bill as an appropriation. The reason I did not ask for the full $30,000,000 at that time was that under the parliamentary situation I feared I would not be able to get it, and might have lost the entire amount.

Senator RUSSELL at the other end of the Capitol took this proposition up and got the amount raised to $30,000,000, the amount asked by the administration and the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

This rural electrification program has been the greatest one for the benefit of the American farmers ever instituted. On May 12, 1938, we passed my amendment for the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification. That started us out on a program that has done more for the American farmer than anything else that has ever been done in the last 50 years.

I know they will tell you that materials are scarce, but we are gradually getting more and more materials as time goes on, and besides the Securities and Exchange Commission is breaking up certain large holding companies. The properties of a great many power companies are being thrown on the market. Where these small communities exist, parts of those small systems are being offered to these cooperative power associations where they can buy them and use them as a nucleus to electrify the surrounding country.

What we propose to do here is to lend them the money for that purpose. Remember, this money is divided into two parts. One-half is to be prorated as the Rural Electrification Administration sees fit. The other half is to be divided among the States according to the ratio of unelectrified farms in that particular State to the number of unelectrified farms throughout the Nation. If you will bear with me for just a moment I want to show you what this program has done.

I am glad to note that Mississippi stands at the head of the list in the percentage of increase in electrified farms since 1934.

In 1934 western and central Europe had 90 percent of her farms electrified. Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified. Some European countries had 100 percent of their farms electrified. How do you suppose we stood in the United States? We had 10.9 percent of our farms in the United States electrified, or about one-ninth of the percentage they had in Germany, France, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark. We had 10.9 of our farms electrified to 90 percent in Japan.

This program has done more, I repeat, to give to the farmers of this country hope, encouragement, and relief from drudgery than anything else that has ever occurred. Mississippi went from 2,802 electrified farms in 1934 to 40,330 in 1942, or an increase of 1339.3 percent. The average increase throughout the entire Nation was 214.2 percent. I am inserting a table at the end of these remarks showing the increase in each State.

Mr. Speaker, these are loans. Not one dollar of this money is to be given away. This money will all come back with interest, and it will add more to the wealth of the Nation than any other similar amount of money that could possibly be provided.

Some of these cooperative power associations in my district have already paid back every dollar they borrowed. They do not owe a cent. These cooperative associations throughout the country are begging now for more funds in order that they may extend their small lines in order that they may buy out these small systems and spread this service to every farmer in the surrounding country.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is not the activity showing itself to be a good business investment?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, the best in the world. It not only is enabling the farmers to live at home with some satisfaction, but it is adding more stability to the community, to the value of his property and the wealth of the community than anything else has ever done.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I mean, is it not paying in dollars and cents?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. I dare say that we will not lose a dollar of it. We have over 800 of these associations now. I wish I had the map here to show you how they cover every State from Florida to Washington and from Arizona to Maine.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. In connection with what the gentleman from North Carolina has just pointed out as to the effect upon the stability of the community, this morning there was a real-estate man who thought that perhaps Congressmen could save some money so he sent me a list of property that he had for sale. In every instance he was careful to point out that rural electrification was available and he also pointed that out as one of the principal points in favor of the property he was trying to sell.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; where I live we have electrified the tenant houses on practically every farm reached by these rural lines, whether the tenants are white or black.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have always voted for these appropriations, but will the gentleman tell me two things, first, how much money has been appropriated up to now by the Congress for rural electrification?

Mr. RANKIN. I have those figures here I think.

Mr. MAY. Well, approximately the amount.

Mr. RANKIN. I have those figures. In 1937, we provided $50,000,000; in 1938 $30,000,000. In 1939, the year we really got started, we provided $140,000,000. I mean we loaned that amount. In 1940, we dropped down to $40,000,000, until they could use up the amount on hand. In 1941, we provided $100,000,000, in 1942 $100,000,000, and last year only $10,000,000. The gentleman can add it up.

Mr. MAY. One more question. Is that a rotating fund that revolves and goes back into the system?

Mr. RANKIN. The money that they collect for power, they use either to pay on their debts or extend the service. They are not operated for profit. This is the most popular activity in which we have ever engaged, so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. This money that is paid back, does it go into the Treasury, or does it go back into circulation again?

Mr. RANKIN. This money that is paid on these lines, of course, is paid back to the Government.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Does it go back into the Federal Treasury or does it go back to the R. E. A.?

Mr. RANKIN. It goes back to the Federal Government; it goes into the Federal Treasury. These are loans that are being repaid by these cooperative power associations.

I will always owe a lasting debt of gratitude to some of the Republicans who joined with the Democrats in 1938 and helped to put over my amendment for the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification, because on that day we did more for the American farmers as I said, than Congress has ever done for them at any other time, because we started them out on a program of rural electrification that is going to make this the richest, the most powerful, and the most satisfactory country on earth in which to live.

I sincerely trust my motion will be agreed to. Do not strain at this gnat and then swallow the camel. Remember that there are more than 4,000,000 farm homes begging for electricity, and this is your chance to help them get it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a table issued by the Rural Electrification Administration showing by States how many farms there are, how many were electrified in 1934, how many are electrified now, and what the increase has been.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Comparisons of rank, percentage, and number of electrified farms, 1935, 1940, and 1942, by States and for the United States

Area	Farms Jan. 1, 1935 [1]	Farms receiving central station electric service Dec. 31, 1934			Farms Apr. 1, 1940 [1]	Farms receiving central station electric service Apr. 1, 1940			Farms receiving central station electric service June 30, 1942 [3]			Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1942		
United States	*Number* 6,812,350	*Number* [2] 743,954	*Percent* 10.9	*Rank*	*Number* 6,096,799	*Number* [1] 1,853,249	*Percent* 30.4	*Rank*	*Number* 2,337,160	*Percent* 38.3	*Rank*	*Number* 1,593,206	*Percent* 214.2	*Rank*
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	231,746	33,907	14.6	41	51,020	22.0	40	39,967	361.6	17
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	18,468	5,607	30.4	24	7,900	42.8	24	2,323	416.5	14
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	216,674	21,303	9.8	45	31,810	14.7	45	28,867	980.9	3
California	150,360	81,093	53.9	1	132,658	107,904	81.3	4	111,070	83.7	4	29,977	37.0	47
Colorado	63,644	7,145	11.2	25	51,436	14,823	28.8	25	22,230	43.2	23	15,085	211.1	26
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	21,163	16,995	80.3	5	18,080	85.4	2	7,942	78.3	39
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	8,994	3,545	39.4	21	4,710	52.4	20	2,919	163.0	30
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	62,248	15,476	24.9	28	16,800	27.0	33	11,100	194.7	28
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	216,033	42,409	19.6	33	64,740	30.0	31	57,784	830.7	6
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	43,663	25,439	58.3	13	31,930	73.1	12	18,497	137.7	33
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	213,439	80,027	37.5	22	106,510	49.9	21	78,131	275.3	18
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	24	184,549	91,127	49.4	17	116,730	63.2	14	93,254	397.2	16
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	213,318	73,308	34.4	23	105,280	49.4	22	73,233	228.5	24
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	156,327	27,960	17.9	37	38,070	24.4	36	24,846	187.9	29
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	252,894	38,607	15.3	40	50,530	20.0	41	42,050	495.9	10
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	150,007	16,058	10.7	44	22,560	15.0	44	19,734	698.3	9
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	38,980	20,221	51.9	15	22,530	57.8	17	8,571	61.4	41
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	42,175	17,170	40.7	20	23,630	56.0	18	16,839	248.0	20
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	31,897	26,220	82.2	2	25,990	81.5	5	11,496	79.3	38
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	187,589	131,126	69.9	7	146,200	77.9	7	104,048	246.8	21
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	197,351	50,075	25.4	26	72,840	36.9	26	59,057	428.5	12
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	48	291,092	26,078	9.0	46	40,330	13.8	46	37,528	1,339.3	1
Missouri	278,454	17,893	6.4	31	256,100	39,204	15.3	39	57,070	22.3	39	39,177	219.0	25
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	41,823	7,947	19.0	34	10,110	24.2	37	7,342	265.2	19
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	29	121,062	22,832	18.9	35	29,630	24.5	35	20,086	210.4	27
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,573	1,555	43.5	19	1,490	41.7	25	544	57.5	42
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	16,554	10,845	65.5	10	13,210	79.8	6	3,715	39.1	46
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.5	4	25,835	21,298	82.4	1	21,800	84.4	3	6,638	43.8	44
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	34,105	4,479	13.1	42	6,790	19.9	42	5,440	403.0	15
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	153,238	102,283	66.7	9	113,010	73.7	11	55,185	95.4	37
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	38	278,276	67,627	24.3	29	90,100	32.4	29	80,428	831.6	5
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	73,962	3,218	4.4	48	4,470	6.0	48	2,502	127.1	36
Ohio	255,146	4,048	18.8	19	233,783	137,680	58.9	11	164,330	70.3	13	116,282	242.0	22
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	179,687	20,149	11.2	43	29,730	16.5	43	24,082	426.4	13
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	61,829	36,369	58.8	12	46,010	74.4	10	28,171	157.9	32
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	169,027	94,081	55.7	14	105,880	62.6	15	60,698	134.3	34
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,014	2,457	81.5	3	2,770	91.9	1	795	40.2	45
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	137,558	27,568	20.0	32	49,350	35.9	27	45,554	1,200.0	2
South Dakota	83,303	2,939	3.5	36	72,454	3,981	5.5	47	6,800	9.4	47	3,861	131.4	35
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	247,617	38,884	15.7	38	57,400	23.2	38	47,673	490.1	11
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	418,002	79,127	18.9	36	110,860	26.5	34	99,394	866.8	4
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	25,411	17,411	68.5	8	18,960	74.6	9	2,830	17.5	48
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	23,582	12,213	51.8	16	14,050	59.6	16	6,105	76.8	40
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	174,885	42,144	24.1	30	50,130	28.7	32	35,176	235.2	23
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	81,686	58,283	71.4	6	62,140	76.1	8	22,080	55.1	43
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	99,282	25,199	25.4	27	31,600	31.8	30	27,953	766.5	8
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	186,735	87,556	46.9	18	103,100	55.2	19	63,894	163.0	31
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	40	15,018	3,474	23.1	31	4,880	32.5	28	4,353	826.0	7

[1] U. S. Census Bureau. [2] Edison Electric Institute, Statistical Bulletin No. 4. [3] Rural Electrification Administration survey, 1942.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi is laboring under the impression that any member of this subcommittee is attacking the Rural Electrification Administration, that impression is not justified by the facts. I know that I and, I think, every other member of the subcommittee are very deeply interested in the R. E. A. and believe in the R. E. A., believe in providing sufficient funds for the operations of R. E. A. and in the continuance of that organization. The committee has endeavored in the House bill to provide reasonable funds for its continued operation.

Let me call your attention to the facts. Just getting up here and bragging on the R. E. A. and what it has done and how useful it has been does not touch the question you are asked to pass upon here, topside or bottom. The question is, How much money does the R. E. A. need for the next fiscal year in order to operate satisfactorily?

It had $30,000,000, not $10,000,000, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, but $30,000,000 for this fiscal year. It had $10,000,000 loan funds contained in the agriculture appropriation bill, together with an unobligated balance of $10,000,000, and $10,000,000 worth of allocations which were subject to rescission, making a total of $30,000,000 the R. E. A. had available in this fiscal year.

How much did it use? Look at the hearings. I have them here before me. Through a date in January of this year, of that $30,000,000 they have been able to obligate—obligate, mind you, not expend—a little over $3,000,000. You know the restrictions that exist at the present time upon the use of copper and other materials absolutely necessary in the construction of R. E. A. lines. It is true that the War Production Board has made concessions to the R. E. A. in providing some types of material, steel and aluminum, for the construction of extensions to existing lines, but the volume of expenditures for those purposes will necessarily be comparatively small.

There also exists the question of whether the people who use those materials, after the war is over and they are able to get copper, may not want to take out the steel and aluminum work and substitute copper for it, and whether the work done with copper and aluminum may not be of a temporary character anyway.

There has been appropriated by Congress and allocated by the R. E. A.—and I read from page 1217 of our hearings the testimony of Mr. Craig—$460,000,000 since the program started, and there has been expended during the period of the program only $364,000,000, leaving a balance of approximately $96,000,000 which, according to the evidence of Mr. Slattery, had not been allocated. Subsequently Mr. Craig said that $20,000,000 of that had been obligated, but it left a balance, according to the uncontradicted evidence, of $76,000,000 that has been allocated from the appropriations made in previous years that they have not been able to spend.

I want to read from the evidence of Mr. Craig of the R. E. A.:

> Mr. TARVER. Therefore you have $76,000,000, deducting the $20,000,000, for which you say the work has been done, that has been made available in prior years and has been obligated, but in connection with which the work contemplated could not be done on account of the scarcity of materials?
>
> Mr. CRAIG. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does this $76,000,000 surplus that apparently has been allocated revert to the Treasury or does it remain as a surplus with the R. E. A.?

Mr. TARVER. It is available to the use of the R. E. A. They have their $76,000,000 that they have been unable to spend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

They have for the present fiscal year available $30,000,000, of which they have

been able to obligate through a date in January only a little in excess of $3,000,000. It is true they contemplate allocation of funds for the possible acquisition of certain electric lines throughout the country which may at the time of allocation be planned for incorporation into some new R. E. A. projects. Under the R. E. A. Act they cannot buy these lines except as an incident to setting up new R. E. A. projects which would serve unserved rural persons. The Comptroller General will permit them to buy such lines for that purpose, but he will not permit them to buy such lines where it is just merely a matter of acquisition of additional lines and where no additional rural persons will be served.

The position of the committee is simply this: $20,000,000 is far more, in addition to the funds otherwise available to the R. E. A., than that organization will be able to spend for the next fiscal year. There is no use of raising the money to $30,000,000, any more than there would be in raising it to $50,000,000 or $100,000,000. When we had the bill in the House, the gentleman from Mississippi suggested but $20,000,000. The sky is always the limit with him when it comes to the question of appropriations for the R. E. A. He suggested all he wanted then. But when the Senate through its enthusiasm for the R. E. A. and because somebody said that it was doing a good job, as it is, raised it to $30,000,000, then the gentleman from Mississippi goes along, and if they had raised it to $100,000,000, the gentleman would be here offering to concur in that amendment.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. TARVER. I will yield to the gentleman, and I ask the gentleman if that is not true. If the Senate had amended the bill so as to make the amount $100,000,000, would not the gentleman from Mississippi have been in favor of it?

Mr. RANKIN. And I will say to the gentleman that when I first asked for my first $100,000,000 for rural electrification the gentleman from Georgia voted against it. That $100,000,000 allotment was what really started rural electrification on its way in this country. If we could get materials, I would favor providing $100,000,000 a year until we electrified every farm home in America.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I have supported R. E. A. continually but I have always opposed appropriations that were excessive and unnecessarily large and the record which I have given shows that you have had $76,000,000 more than you could spend and which ought not to have been appropriated, and as a Member of Congress I do not intend to vote for an appropriation of moneys which cannot be wisely spent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am interested to know whether or not the gentleman's committee inquired into the question of whether or not hundreds of utility companies, under the Holding Company Act, section 11, the Securities Exchange Commission has been bringing about dissolution of the power companies, and making them available for purchase by the R. E. A.; and to whether a lot of the utility companies of the country are gradually being absorbed.

Mr. TARVER. The committee had no evidence justifying any such conclusion. As I said a while ago, the committee is sold on the idea of the R. E. A., and it wants to make sufficient provision for it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not now. But the committee does not want to make provision largely in excess of the needs of the R. E. A. W. P. B. has placed restrictions on the use of materials, bringing about conditions under which the R. E. A. cannot spend more money than is available to it now, and its available funds will be largely in excess of the $20,000,000 carried in the House version of this bill. Under any circumstances the Congress is going to be here, and the Congress under the influence of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi will make available undoubtedly at any time any additional funds that may be necessary, but now there is no more use for appropriating $30,000,000 than there would be for appropriating $100,000,000, because you cannot expend the amount carried in the House bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I agree most heartily with the gentleman from Georgia, but I want to know whether the committee went into the question. The gentleman said that there was no evidence to warrant any such conclusion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is now some years since I have taken part in discussing this item. I envy the enthusiasm of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I attended a moving picture gotten up by the Federal Government. I have not yet gotten over the effect of it on me. A poor farmer, who had nothing in the way of electricity, had nothing that brought in cash except the sale of his milk. Suddenly he had all the gadgets of electricity, much of which I could not possibly afford myself, and I marveled as to how he got them. A good salesman must have induced him to buy much more than he could afford. It is small wonder that many places are for sale, as a gentleman just commented upon, and that electricity was available as a selling argument. I expected the place shown in the picture would be for sale. How could the man pay for those gadgets? The final figures may be reassuring, but it is one of those activities that are fast growing, and losses must be expected. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] wisely stated that with all the enthusiasm of the supporters of this item, we expect many private power companies to be absorbed and public ownership greatly increased.

We are gradually being socialized, and yet the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] hates socialism. Why, he is the greatest exponent of socialism here in his advocacy of his T. V. A. The point is that no wonder these places are being sold. That picture gotten up by the Government seemed to assure us of that. What a lot of money that man must have borrowed, or was the picture simply an imaginary case?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the farmer from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I am a farmer. I work hard at it, at times. I can sympathize. I have a farm that I cannot sell, because there is no electricity available, but I am not asking for public funds to be used to bring it to me.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not asking for it?

Mr. GIFFORD. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not, the gentleman does not want the farmers to have it. The gentleman did not vote for it before.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am like the gentleman from Georgia, I am simply trying to watch expenditures. I have let the gentleman run along pretty freely, and the gentleman now seems to want more than the R. E. A. needs.

Mr. RANKIN. All of the money comes back to the Federal Government.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am simply giving the gentleman a warning. I wanted to remind you of that beautiful picture, to state that it is small wonder that the property is for sale. That is the point I wish to make. Encouraging indebtedness beyond the power to repay.

Mr. RANKIN. And that is the way you Boston farmers farm.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I want the gentleman to understand I am a successful farmer and I do not have electricity on my farm.

Mr. RANKIN. I apologize. I find the gentleman has a cranberry bog.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, and quite a little more of other kinds of farming for many years. I have had dairy herds and would be willing to enter a milking contest with the gentleman from Tupelo.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of some Members would lead one to believe that we are making an appropriation here for the expenditure of funds for the administration of some governmental agency, where we have reason to believe that no matter how much money we appropriate, it will be expended. In this case, if perchance the circumstances are such that it is impossible to release the restrictions on building material, of course, it will be impossible for the R. E. A. to extend their lines to the extent of requiring these funds, and it will be utterly impossible for anybody to expend it, because we are not making appropriations here for administration of a bureau or department. We are making this appropriation to provide funds to loan to farm cooperatives for the construction of their own lines. The money is to be returned. As a matter of fact, a large part of these cooperatives have repaid to the Government today more money than is due the Government at

this time. Many R. E. A. cooperatives are paid up even in advance of contractual obligations. This Nation has not made any better loans unless it be the Jones-Bankhead loans, which fall in exactly the same class of loan, by making it possible for farmers to remain on the farms and produce during the times when we need production.

The committee members state that they are in favor of the R. E. A.; that they desire to provide it with all the money that is needed. Their criticism of the motion by the gentleman from Mississippi is, as I understand it, simply that they feel that perhaps the full $30,000,000 will not be needed. They would, therefore, limit the ability of the R. E. A. to make loans to this amount. If perchance circumstances were such that these loans were needed, it would be impossible under the committee proposal to make them. The development of the Nation would be retarded and the Congress would be called upon to take further action which the committee says they would then favor. No money would be saved, but delay and confusion would result. On the other hand, if the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi prevails, the money will be available, there will be no delay; there will be no necessity for further congressional action. If material is available, the development of our rural electrification program will go on without interruption. But if the material is not available, there will be no confusion, no loss to anyone, and not one cent of additional expense to the Government. Why should we not follow the course that gives us the assurance of orderly development without any unnecessary expenditure of funds?

Certainly everyone who ever even visited on a farm knows that it is desirable to have rural electrification in every rural home. Of course, we find that those who deal in farm property consider it a great advantage to have electricity available and that they are able to increase the selling price of property that enjoys this advantage.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, who has done so much to aid the cause of rural electrification throughout this Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the leaders in this movement was down here from New York the other day and said that the milk situation in New York State was becoming serious because of the lack of electrical facilities on the farms. The War Production Board lately has authorized the completion of 72 of those projects which had been stopped. There is not one of those projects in my district and not likely one in my State. As a rule, they are out in the Middle West, and some of them in New England. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $30,000,000 after hearing the R. E. A. If this money is not spent for that purpose, every dollar of it will be retained in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. POAGE. The $30,000,000 cannot cost this Government anything. If you make a $30,000,000 instead of a $20,000,000 appropriation and we do not have an opportunity to use it, it does not cost the Government a penny. It is not like money that is appropriated to a department for administrative expenses where it be spent regardless of whether there is any need for it or not. It cannot even be loaned unless there is an opportunity to expand rural power facilities to rural people. Nobody is going to expand it, and nobody ever can unless the rural cooperatives need it in the form of loans.

In my country the power companies charged $1,000 to $2,000 to put in a connection before we had R. E. A., and then made you pay an exorbitant rate for the current. Then they said that rural business was not profitable, and not until we were able to create R. E. A. cooperatives were we able to even interest the private power companies in rural business. Even then we could get no quantity rate from the private power companies until we were able to threaten them with the construction of a public generating plant. We could never have built that had there not been R. E. A. funds available. As it was, we did not have to build the plant to get the first reduction. The fact that the power companies knew that we had the opportunity to get the funds and make good on our threat made it unnecessary to use the funds. When we were able to offer even more serious competition in the form of cheaper hydroelectric power, we were able to secure still further reductions from the private-power companies. Three years ago all of the local R. E. A.'s in my part of Texas were paying the Texas Power & Light Co. at least 1½ cents or 15 mills per kilowatt-hour for the power which they delivered to their subscribers. As soon as the R. E. A. began to negotiate with the local cooperatives in central Texas with the view of financing a loan to enable 13 of these cooperatives to purchase and use the power generated at the Morris Sheppard Dam, the private utilities began to come down in their rates. By the time we actually organized a transmission cooperative and were able to provide real competition, the Texas Power & Light Co. reduced its charges to its R. E. A. customers by approximately 60 percent, all within a period of about 6 months. It is true that they said that this reduction was granted because of their ability to effect savings in the cost of generation and transmission of power, but they sold these R. E. A. cooperatives power that was generated at the same plant and transmitted over the same line that produced and transmitted the power for the cities of Waco and Temple. Yet the patrons of the private power company in these cities received during that period of time not one iota of reduction.

The power companies have never been able to explain and never will be able to explain how they were able to reduce generating and transmission costs on that portion of their power that was to be used by the rural cooperatives, but could not effect any savings in the cost of generating or transmitting the power that was being used in the adjoining cities. Of course, the truth of the matter is that the power company was not threatened with any kind of competition in the cities. It, therefore, granted no reduction in rates. Whereas, on the other hand, the availability of funds in the hands of the R. E. A. that might be borrowed by the local cooperatives enabled these local cooperatives to threaten and to make good on their threat to transmit cheap hydroelectric power to the rural customers that they served. At this moment, there are thousands of rural families throughout Texas who are paying less than half what they would be paying for the same power had it not been for the threat of competition on which the R. E. A. enabled them to make good. There never has been, and I doubt if there ever will be, any regulatory body that will be one-half so effective in controlling power rates as competition. This House can, this afternoon, implement the R. E. A. so that it can make good when it threatens competition, and in that way reduce the cost of power to multiplied thousands of farm families throughout the United States, and you can do all this without spending any additional money. All we need is authority to make additional loans if circumstances require them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, the feature of R. E. A. that I am most interested in is its extension to places where electricity never has been and would never otherwise go except by the R. E. A. program. But the R. E. A. has brought to the people in the hills and valleys its greatest convenience since the hills and valleys have been occupied as homes. The Kentucky people in the rural areas are proud of this convenience and to have it as a reality instead of a wish or dream as it seemed to be only a short time ago. It may not have been profitable for any one power company to go into these areas on that small scale, but it is not a loss to the Federal Government to loan that money to those people who have repaid the regular annual installments on the loan. I thoroughly dislike this to be even spoken of in the same category as if it was a Government expense or gift. It is a loan on a sound basis that is being repaid. This is one of the soundest investments ever made in comparison with other loans. These farms are being clamored for that have this electricity. You have raised the price of those farms. A man who comes from a farm that has had rural electrification is not content to go back into the dark any more. He wants to get on a rural electric line over there in the other county if he moves.

It does not matter about change of ownership; it does not matter about the life of the man who is there; it does not matter about the tenants that come to the land. It is all a part of the home and whoever owns it, it remains a part of the home and the debt will be paid.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman an additional half minute.

Mr. CREAL. With reference to taking up the allotment, we passed a bill the other day providing that the Federal road funds would not go back to the General Treasury and not one single State in this Union had used all of the Federal money that had been allotted; so let us pass this amendment, and if it is not used by reason of shortage of material, then it will not be spent.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 5 minutes to conclude the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that most of the discussion thus far has not touched the real issue which is here involved. Perhaps we ought to have enough background, therefore, to see what the real issue is.

When this bill was reported to the House the subcommittee and the full appropriations committee recommended $20,000,000 for R. E. A. loans. The bill then went to the Senate, and they increased the amount to $30,000,000.

That is the issue before us, and the gentleman from Mississippi offers a preferential motion to recede from the House position and concur in the Senate position, namely, to provide $30,000,000 instead of the $20,000,000 as provided by the House.

The House conferees took the position that $20,000,000 is enough, and there are some reasons for it. I believe the Members of the House are unanimously for the R. E. A.; I believe we all realize that it has done a great job for the country, but that is not the issue.

The issue is whether under existing circumstances it can use $30,000,000. Our answer to that is no, and the reason for it is that there is a lack of critical materials that are necessary to construction of new lines.

We had 7 days of hearings early this year attended by R. E. A. officials, officials of R. E. A. cooperatives, officials from the War Production Board, and other agencies of Government relative to the availability of copper for these lines. The W. P. B. kept insisting they could not make any additional allocations of copper to R. E. A. cooperatives for R. E. A. lines, because it could not be spared from the war effort.

Assuming that they had the extra money and they do go ahead with nothing to prevent it, then what will happen? They may install inferior materials in the lines, which will have to be torn out later.

The fact of the matter is that one of the Senators from a Western State, who was a member of the conference committee, gave us his estimation after investigating as to how satisfactory some of these materials were as compared with copper lines of the right size and gage, and he said the experience was not satisfactory at all.

Now should the R. E. A. go ahead, under those circumstances, and install steel wire, inferior aluminum wire, and at some later time make it necessary to tear out that investment and replace it with copper at an additional cost to the cooperator? That certainly does not look like good business, and so that is one of the reasons why the committee recommends $20,000,000 instead of $30,000,000.

On the basis of the official W. P. B. report to our subcommittee, we had a full explanation that there is a shortage of copper and critical materials, and it is our best judgment that the amount of money recommended by the Senate cannot be spent and if that is the case why should it be carried in the bill?

There is another reason. This $30,000,000 is broken down pretty much as follows: They want $5,000,000 to service lines established to war industries; $10,000,000 for the acquisition of existing electrical lines, and $15,000,000 for new construction if they can get the material. And that raises a question that was raised only a while ago by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] as to whether or not some of these funds are being used to acquire plants that have been ordered sold by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The answer is "Yes."

I read from an exhibit of the R. E. A. dated March 25, which has this to say:

> A Minnesota cooperative will acquire 280 miles of lines and generative facilities while allocation for a second Ohio system will finance acquisition of property ordered sold by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

That appeared in one of the releases that was gotten out in March.

I do not quarrel about that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me conclude just this statement.

I do not quarrel about that; they have a right to acquire lines and the Securities and Exchange Commission has a perfect right to order the sale, under the Public Utility Holding Act. Nobody quarrels about that, but there is this fact to be kept in mind: The Comptroller General has ruled—and you will find the ruling in the hearings—that R. E. A. cannot acquire an existing facility unless it is intended to serve new unserved rural customers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question is: Does R. E. A. propose to acquire existing facilities that do not immediately serve unserved rural customers? I think the answer may be "yes." In their release of June 7 they say, among other things:

> To acquire existing properties that will facilitate electrification of additional farms in the post-war period.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that is true certainly they can wait until that time, and it is not at all imperative that this money be furnished in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is a small community, we will say, where the power company owns a small plant that it has to sell, it wants to sell it, and the R. E. A. wants to buy it. Why? Because by buying it it can electrify the farms around it. I have had many, many of those cases called to my attention and some of them in my own district. Under those conditions the Comptroller General has ruled the cooperatives can buy them, and they are buying them. That is what is happening in the cases referred to in Minnesota and in Ohio; and they are electrifying the farms around those communities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give the Comptroller's exact language.

Mr. RANKIN. I know what it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He says:

> If the acquisition is incidental to serving unserved rural customers.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if there is any acquisition for any other purpose, it is not going to be allowed by the Comptroller General.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, unless there are farms around it, unless it is in a farming section with farms to be served that are not being served now, then the cooperative cannot acquire it. They could not make the sale to the co-op, but you will not find one out of a thousand of those little systems that does not have a large farming community around it that has not been served at all, and this is the only way that they can get it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no evidence that this additional $10,000,000 is necessary, and I hope the preferential motion will be voted down.

Mr. RANKIN. It was recommended by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 70, noes 106.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 193, answered "present" 1, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—168

Abernethy	Bishop	Cooley
Allen, La.	Brooks	Cooper
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ga.	Courtney
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bryson	Cox
Andresen, August H.	Bulwinkle	Creal
Angell	Burdick	Crosser
Barrett	Camp	Cullen
Beckworth	Carlson, Kans.	Cunningham
Bennett, Mich.	Chapman	Curley
Bennett, Mo.	Chiperfield	D'Alesandro
	Coffee	Davis
	Cole, Mo.	Day
	Colmer	Dilweg

Dingell	Johnson, Ind.	Outland
Domengeaux	Johnson,	Pace
Doughton	J. Leroy	Patman
Drewry	Johnson,	Patton
Elliott	Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.
Ellsworth	Johnson,	Peterson, Ga.
Elmer	Lyndon B.	Phillips
Fay	Johnson, Okla.	Pittenger
Feighan	Kee	Poage
Fernandez	Keefe	Price
Fisher	Kefauver	Priest
Flannagan	Kerr	Randolph
Fogarty	Kirwan	Rankin
Folger	Klein	Richards
Forand	Landis	Rockwell
Fulbright	Lanham	Russell
Fulmer	Larcade	Sauthoff
Furlong	Lea	Schwabe
Gearhart	Lemke	Sikes
Gibson	Lewis, Ohio	Simpson, Ill.
Gilchrist	McCord	Smith, Va.
Gossett	McCowen	Smith, Wis.
Granger	McGehee	Spence
Grant, Ala.	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Gregory	McMillan	Steagall
Hagen	McMurray	Stefan
Harless, Ariz.	Mahon	Stevenson
Harris, Ark.	Maloney	Stewart
Hays	Manasco	Stockman
Heidinger	Mansfield,	Sullivan
Hendricks	Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Hill	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Hobbs	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Hoch	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Hoeven	Morrison, La.	Weaver
Holifield	Morrison, N. C.	Welch
Holmes, Wash.	Mott	Whelchel, Ga.
Horan	Murdock	White
Howell	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Izac	Norman	Wickersham
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson
Johnson,	O'Connor	Winstead
Anton J.	O'Hara	Worley
Johnson,	O'Konski	Wright
Calvin D.	O'Toole	Zimmerman

NAYS—193

Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Martin, Iowa.
Arends	Gathings	Martin, Mass.
Arnold	Gavin	Mason
Auchincloss	Gerlach	May
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Merritt
Bates, Ky.	Gillette	Merrow
Bell	Goodwin	Michener
Bender	Gordon	Miller, Conn.
Blackney	Gore	Miller, Mo.
Bland	Gorski	Miller, Pa.
Bloom	Graham	Mills
Bolton	Grant, Ind.	Monkiewicz
Bonner	Griffiths	Mruk
Boren	Gross	Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Gwynne	Norrell
Brown, Ohio	Hale	Norton
Buffett	Hall,	O'Brien, Ill.
Burch, Va.	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Hall,	Ploeser
Burgin	Leonard W.	Plumley
Busbey	Halleck	Powers
Butler	Hancock	Pracht
Canfield	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Cannon, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Ramspeck
Carson, Ohio	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Carter	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Case	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Celler	Hoffman	Rizley
Chenoweth	Hope	Robertson
Church	Jeffrey	Robinson, Utah.
Clark	Jenkins	Robsion, Ky.
Clason	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Clevenger	Jensen	Rogers, Calif.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ward	Rogers, Mass.
Compton	Jones	Rohrbough
Cravens	Jonkman	Rolph
Crawford	Kean	Rowan
Curtis	Kelley	Rowe
Dawson	Keogh	Sabath
Delaney	Kilday	Sasscer
Dewey	Kinzer	Scanlon
Dickstein	Kleberg	Schiffler
Dirksen	Knutson	Schuetz
Disney	Kunkel	Scott
Dondero	LaFollette	Shafer
Durham	Lambertson	Sheppard
Dworshak	LeCompte	Short
Eaton	LeFevre	Slaughter
Ellis	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Ellison, Md.	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Engel	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Fellows	McGregor	Springer
Fenton	McLean	Stanley
Fish	McWilliams	Stearns, N. H.
Gale	Maas	Sumner, Ill.
Gallagher	Madden	Sundstrom
Taber	Troutman	Wigglesworth
Talbot	Vorys, Ohio	Willey
Talle	Wadsworth	Winter
Tarver	Ward	Wolcott
Taylor	Weichel, Ohio	Wolfenden, Pa.
Thomas, N. J.	Weiss	Wolverton, N. J.
Tibbott	Wene	Woodruff, Mich.
Towe	West	Woodrum, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Beall

NOT VOTING—69

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andrews	Green	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	O'Neal
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Barry	Hartley	Poulson
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Ramey
Boykin	Heffernan	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Brehm	Jarman	Sadowski
Buckley	Judd	Satterfield
Byrne	Kearney	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Capozzoli	Kilburn	Snyder
Cochran	King	Sparkman
Costello	Lane	Sumners, Tex.
Culkin	Lynch	Tolan
Dies	McCormack	Treadway
Ditter	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Douglas	Monroney	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	Mundt	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Murphy	Walter
Ford	Newsome	Wasielewski
Gavagan	Nichols	Wheat

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr Sparkman with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr Ramey.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr McCormack with Mr. Beall.

Mr Heffernan with Mr Culkin.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Paulson.

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

Mr. COLE of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LUTHER A JOHNSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

DEFICIENCY BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944 — CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 123: Page 89, line 17, strike out "$22,258,000" and insert "$32,258,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 123.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 124: On Page 91, line 5, after "Administration", insert the following: "*Provided*, That hereafter the requirement (12 U. S. C. 952) that Federal land banks and joint stock land banks shall be examined at least twice each year is hereby modified so that such examinations need be made only once each year: *Provided further*, That hereafter the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for the fiscal year 1944 and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30, 1944, said Administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year 1944 to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during the fiscal year 1944 of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. There is no controversy about this, Mr. Speaker. The language was in the bill when it was before the House committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, amendment numbered 125 is connected with amendments numbered 126 and 127 and should not be disposed of until after action is taken on those amendments. I ask unanimous consent that amend-

ment numbered 125 be passed for the present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that amendments numbered 126 and 127 involve the subject matter of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments numbered 126 and 127.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 126: Page 95, line 17, insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, $29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation', shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

Amendment No. 127: On page 99, line 7, insert the following:

"FARM TENANCY

"To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, $1,326,070.

"Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 126 and 127 with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation, projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such

work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made out of such funds except loans which have first been offered and refused by other leading agencies (including the Emergency Crop and Feed Division of the Farm Credit Administration, the production credit associations, and private lending agencies) customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation', shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 127 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"FARM TENANCY

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, $1,326,070.

"Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of two times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the House is now presented with a vote on two amendments. I am interested in amendment No. 126. Will there be a chance to vote on that amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asked and secured unanimous consent that amendments 126 and 127 be considered together, and he has made a motion with respect to both of them. Therefore, the Chair holds that the question is not divisible.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal offered in compromise of this entire issue relating to the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration for loans and rural rehabilitation, for grants, and for the farm tenant land-purchase program.

This is not a proposal which meets with the entire approval of any member of the House committee of conference. It is probably not a proposal which meets with the entire approval of any one of the Senate conferees. There are members of both the House and Senate committees of conference who, if they could follow their wishes, would provide considerably more money for the activities heretofore carried on by the Farm Security Administration than is contemplated in this compromise amendment. There are other members who, if their judgment should be followed, would not want to provide any funds at all. There are other middle-of-the-road members of the two committees of conference who would like to have more reasonable provision for the continuance of these activities without going to the limit advocated by the greatest enthusiasts for the work of the F. S. A. and without restricting its operations as severely as would be done by some of those who are most critical of what has been done under its jurisdiction.

Therefore, this is essentially a compromise proposition. As I understand, it has the approval for the purposes of compromise of all of the members of the House committee of conference. We have reason to apprehend that if it is agreed to by the House it will be accepted by the Senate and this pending issue will be settled for the time being, at least. So I hope that in the discussion regarding this proposed compromise we may not seek to open up too much old questions of difference between us as to what the Farm Security Administration has been doing, the abuses or alleged abuses of administrative discretion which it has been accused of manifesting, and of practices which it has been carrying on which have been subjected to severe criticism, in which criticism I have myself participated on many occasions. I hope that in the interest of the swift conclusion of this matter as far as this fiscal year is concerned we may be able to agree on the language of the compromise amendment.

In that connection, I wish to point out that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture headed by the very able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has been conducting hearings in an investigation of the activities of the Farm Security Administration, and I am advised will soon bring to the House for consideration a legislative bill which will deal with this whole subject matter. So the proposal we offer here is in the nature of a stop-gap settlement of the matter pending the opportunity by Congress to enact legislation which in its

judgment will deal with it in a satisfactory way.

In the Senate amendment $97,500,000 was proposed for loans for rural rehabilitation. In this amendment $60,000,000 is proposed, a decrease below the Senate figures in that item of $37,500,000.

In the Senate amendment $29,607,000 was proposed for administrative and supervisory expenses, and in the language of the House compromise that figure is reduced to $20,000,000.

In the bill which the committee reported to the House some time in April we provided for the amount of the budget estimate for farm-tenant land-purchase loans, $30,000,000, with one-million-three-hundred-thousand-odd dollars for administrative expenses in connection with that program. That provision, because of its providing for loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which are not authorized by law, was stricken on a point of order. Senate amendment No. 127 reinserts substantially the language proposed by the House subcommittee with the same amount of appropriation and of authorization for loans as contained in the House subcommittee language and as approved by the Budget, so that there does not appear to be any substantial difference between the two bodies with reference to the farm-tenant land-purchase loans except that in the House language and in bills for prior fiscal years we have carried the provision that no loan shall be made to a tenant for the purchase of a farm of more than the average value of farms of 30 acres or more in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is being purchased. This provision was omitted from the language of Senate amendment No. 127, and in the language of this compromise amendment it has been reinserted.

We have provided in this compromise amendment—and this is a very important provision—that these appropriations shall be made to the Secretary of Agriculture through the War Food Administration. We do not mention the Farm Security Administration in the language of the compromise amendment at all. We place the responsibility on the War Food Administrator for the administration of this program, and that Administrator at this time, as you know, is Mr. Chester Davis.

I want to say frankly that I feel that some of the abuses which have crept into the administration of the Farm Security Administration have been occasioned by the lack of the exercise of good judgment on the part of its supervisory personnel. I do not wish at this time to discuss what I consider those abuses to have been. I have discussed them fully on prior occasions in the House, but as I indicated a while ago, I hope it may be possible for the House to agree to this compromise amendment without entering into a detailed discussion of all of the things that all of us or many of us think have been wrong with the Farm Security Administration, with the administration of its affairs, and of all those things which many of us think have been good as carried on under the direction of the F. S. A.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the procedure am I to understand that the House will be denied an opportunity to vote on the issue of the farm tenancy appropriation, that that will not be segregated from the appropriation for Farm Security Administration?

Mr. TARVER. Conceiving that there would be no objection to it, I asked unanimous consent that the two amendments might be considered together and unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there any language in the amendment that will provide that the farm tenancy shall be handled by the War Food Administration, or is the language that contained in the existing law that this shall be handled by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. TARVER. The language is that it shall be handled through the War Food Administration, "to enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the appropriations of title I of the Jones-Bankhead Act."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And as to loans and grants, will they be handled through the War Food Administration?

Mr. TARVER. In the same way, exactly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I asked that question under paragraph 4, which provides for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rehabilitation matters under the War Food Administrator, and I assume from the gentleman's statement that that same supervision will apply to the other.

Mr. TARVER. The language has been carefully prepared with the idea of placing responsibility for the expenditure of these funds under the War Food Administration, and reference to the Farm Security Agency has been eliminated from the appropriation language. The Farm Security Administration is, of course, a part of the War Food Administration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And is the War Food Administrator directed to dispose of the administration of community projects as rapidly as possible?

Mr. TARVER. Not only have we directed the War Food Administrator to proceed with the disposition or liquidation of all of these projects as expeditiously as possible, but we have hedged about the expenditure of these funds by several restrictions intended to prevent the abuses which have existed in the administration of the affairs of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And I am correct in assuming that this amendment is to be handled by the War Food Administration rather than by the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Illinois begins, may I ask him a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. KLEBERG. What disposition is made in this compromise amendment of the appropriation allocated to the erection and maintenance of migratory labor camps?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will let me get to that, please, as I discuss the whole amendment. This whole matter can be easily explained. First, let me say that we are considering two items together. The first one is the so-called rural rehabilitation loans and services item by the Farm Security Administration, and the second is farm-tenant loans, under title I of the Bankhead-Jones act. Those are amendments 126 and 127.

Let us go back to the Budget. When this bill came to us it had the following items in it. The Budget asked for 97.5 millions for so-called rural rehabilitation loans; $36,600,000 for so-called debt adjustment and other services, and $30,000,000 for farm-tenant loans. When the subcommittee finished with the bill we reported in this fashion. We cut the so-called rural-rehabilitation loans from 97.5 millions to 40 millions, and left the tenancy loans at 30 millions. We reduced the so-called services and farm-debt adjustment from $36,600,000 to $12,000,000, assigning $8,000,000 of that amount to the Extension Service. When we brought the bill on the floor, points of order were made and the net result was that since most of these expenditures had never been authorized by law, everything went out of the bill except an amount of $500,000, with which to liquidate farm tenancy. When the bill went to the Senate they wrote all of these provisions back into the bill. They are legislative provisions, but the Senate can do that under their rules.

What the Senate did was this: They restored the Budget amount of $97,500,000 for rural rehabilitation loans. They took $7,000,000 off of the so-called adjustment service and reported about $29,600,000. They left the farm tenancy loan item at $30,000,000, exactly as we had reported it to the House. The bill as it passed the House contained no provision for the continuance of farm-security functions, since they were deleted on a point of order. The Senate restored this entire item with modifications. We now

suggest a compromise. We are providing $60,000,000 for rural rehabilitation loans. That is $37,500,000 less than the Budget recommended and the same amount less than is carried in the Senate bill. Secondly, we took the so-called service debt adjustment item, $29,600,000, as reported by the Senate and reduced it about $9,500,000, and brought it down to $20,000,000.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just briefly.

Mr. OUTLAND. What was the amount allowed for that particular provision during the current fiscal year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Thirty-six million dollars. The Budget recommended $36,600,000.

Mr. OUTLAND. What was the amount used during the past year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the figures in mind.

Mr. OUTLAND. The figure was $42,800,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That includes an unexpended balance from the year before.

Mr. OUTLAND. But we are making a cut of over 50 percent, are we not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say a little less than 50 percent.

So, going back a moment, we are reducing these rehabilitation loans from $97,500,000 to $60,000,000. We are leaving the tenancy loans at $30,000,000. We are reducing the security and field services from a net figure of about $29,600,000 to $20,000,000.

When we brought the bill to the House we also made this provision: We transferred this whole operation to the Farm Credit Administration. The Senate demurred at the idea, and I think we will be able to agree with them to transfer it instead to the War Food Administration, under Chester Davis. In fact that suggestion is carried in the Senate bill.

There is a provision here for the liquidation of the so-called resettlement projects. There is another provision that one of these loans cannot be made unless credit is not obtainable elsewhere. There is another amendment to the effect that where the applicant, for instance, wants to secure a loan under this type of operation he must first offer his application to some other lending agency, either in the Farm Credit Administration, including the Emergency Crop and Feed Administration, of the Farm Credit Administration, or the production credit associations, or a private lending agency. But if he cannot get a loan at a rate that is comparable to the rates hereunder, as obtain in the area in which the applicant makes request for a loan, then, of course, this money will be available for that purpose. That provision is designed to bring about a utilization of existing types of credit before loans under this proposal shall be available. If such credit is not available, this type of loan can be had.

In addition to that, we have written some additional restrictions into this so-called substitute. In the first place, none of the money shall be used for a land-purchasing or land-leasing program. That has been one of the abuses of the Farm Security Administration and considerable testimony has been adduced on that point. Secondly, none of the money shall be used for collective farming projects. Third, none of the loans can be used for a loan for cooperative farming, so that they cannot set up a large communal or collective enterprise. In fact, the House subcommittee has for several years inserted a restriction on the use of funds for collective farming.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not just now.

Next, none of these moneys can be used for the organization, promotion, or management of a homestead association. The reason for that provision is this: We ordered Farm Security Administration to liquidate Rex Tugwell's old resettlement projects. Instead of that, it appears that in some instances they have organized the so-called homestead associations of Farm Security clients and would transfer the property to that kind of an association. The money cannot be used for cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers. That was still another of the abuses that was not only represented to our committee but was determined by the investigators for the Appropriations Committee, and I am quite sure has been made very plain indeed to the Cooley subcommittee, which is now investigating all of the Farm Security Administration activities. Notwithstanding the clear intent of Congress with respect to communal projects and projects of like nature, the F. S. A. appears to have employed various devices to circumvent that intent so it becomes necessary to write safeguarding provisions in the act itself.

Next, no loan can be made to an individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

Next, there is a provision that no loan could be made to a cooperative association; and, finally, no loan can be made for the payment of dues or for the purchase of a share of stock interest in a cooperative association. The reason for that is this: They have been using this money for that purpose, and thereby they often secure themselves a membership in some kind of an organization, and undertake to build up an organization through the use of public funds, contrary to the intent of Congress. It was our contention that public funds that are gotten out of the Federal Treasury or out of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds should not be used for that kind of a purpose.

Finally, there is this general provision, that the funds that may be obtained hereunder cannot be used for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary for the production of agricultural commodities.

If this is a war food program, then let us tie it down to production, where it should be. That is why the residual clause has been included. It has been repeatedly averred that in addition to the rehabilitation feature, this program deals with food production. In that event, it should be so interpreted.

Now, on farm tenancy, we also transferred that to the War Food Administration. In addition thereto we made one slight change over and above the Senate language, which you will find on page 100, with respect to the concentration of these loans in particular counties or particular parishes. We have been informed that there has been quite an abuse, in the matter of concentrating loans in particular areas, counties, or parishes, so there is a restriction in line 6 on page 100 to the effect that not in excess of two times the amount of money that is available under allocation to any county or parish can actually be expended or allocated in that county.

So, summarizing it, we have reduced the so-called rehabilitation loans from $97,500,000, as provided by the Senate, to $60,000,000.

We have reduced services and debt-adjustment service from $29,600,000, as provided by the Senate, to $20,000,000.

Additional provisos have been included to limit the use of funds where credit is obtainable elsewhere and to meet the efforts which have been made toward communal and collective enterprises.

Finally, on farm tenancy, we left it precisely where it was when the bill was recommended to the House by the subcommittee and the full committee, namely, $30,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman whether, if the farmer, whether or not he is a farm security borrower, who wanted to join a farm-marketing cooperative already in existence, a going concern, with the language in this bill, would be prevented from paying dues to such a cooperative?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language goes only to the method of obtaining it, under this bill. A loan application must show amounts requested and the particular purpose to which all funds are to be devoted. If such an item appeared in a loan schedule it would have to be deleted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think there is the real difficulty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter that must be determined administratively.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman does not believe that he should be so stopped from doing that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe that public funds should be used for such purposes unless we are ready to embrace the idea that public funds should be used to finance all manner of such enterprises.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Do you think he should be prevented from doing it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is, insofar as funds carried in this bill are concerned. I think so; but manifestly I do not care what kind of an association he joins. Funds for cooperative ventures are available through the Farm Credit Administration. This is a program for individual farmers and should not be beclouded by ventures in cooperative and collective operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is a fair statement, from the gentleman's analysis of the amendment, that all the gentleman's motion undertakes to say is that whereas the Farm Security Administration has heretofore promoted collective and community farming, that the proposal now would undertake to provide for individual farming and promote individual units?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am of the opinion that the language and restrictions that we have written into this substitute proposal will accomplish that purpose and are designed for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have this further question: As the gentleman stated in connection with the loans under grants to rural rehabilitants, they are not to be made to colonies, to these collective agencies; and there is also contained, I believe, a provision in the amendment that would prevent these collective purchases of large bodies of land to provide for communities under the Tenant Purchase Act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman answer the question I ask concerning what provision, if any, is made for the disposition of these materials?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. And what is going to happen to them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No funds were requested for the operation or maintenance of migrant camps and none are provided. Under the terms of the farm labor supply bill enacted recently, such camps can be transferred to other agencies of government for such in connection with that program or may be transferred to States.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The loans that the Farm Security previously made are now proposed to be made to the farmer. Is that right?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Under what authority today can they go into sections like southern Maryland and pick out 700 or 800 families, fishermen and crabbers, with their land, and rehabilitate those people?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have always gone on the theory that they had no such authority, but they arrogated such authority to themselves, and that will come, insofar as the English language can cover it, under this proviso to prevent that kind of colonization.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. They did it in Maryland.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before concluding, let me point out that by the very language of the act under which Farm Security has operated, it was designed as a program to aid needy farmers. It says nothing about colonizing farmers. It says nothing about controlling farmers. It says nothing about collective farm schemes. It says nothing about financing cooperatives. It says nothing about vast land purchases for communal farming. It emphasizes aid to needy farmers. Let it, then, be administered in the spirit and intent in which it was devised—to aid individual farmers in the best traditions of an independent agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a letter that I have just received from Mr. Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, in answer to an inquiry which I made concerning his attitude with regard to the liquidation of resettlement projects which have been administered by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. Davis' letter follows:

JUNE 17, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: Mr. C. B. Baldwin has advised me that you would like a statement of my position concerning the liquidation of the resettlement projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration.

It is my view that the units in these projects should be sold to families eligible for rehabilitation assistance as rapidly as is consistent with the financial interests of the Government and with protecting the low-income farm families for whom they are developed. To that end, I have instructed the Farm Security Administration to speed up the process of disposition so that all units will be disposed of as soon as possible. I am advised by Mr. C. B. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, that he plans for the Government to hold title to not more than 1,500 units by June 30, 1944, with respect to which sales have not been possible for some good reason involving either the protection of the Government's financial investment in the unit or the interest of the low-income family resident on it. It is my hope that considerably fewer than 1,500 units will remain in Government ownership on that date, and that all of them will be disposed of during the fiscal year 1945.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

I understand further that Mr. R. W. Hudgens, in the Department of Agriculture, has been assigned to the special job of liquidating these resettlement projects.

That includes, of course, all of the collective-farming projects and the other projects which have brought this program into disrepute. Let me say further that we have been assured that in the future in administering the rehabilitation program a new policy will be inaugurated; in other words, in the past they have not used local committees of farmers in determining the need and eligibility of applicants for rehabilitation loans, but in the future committees of local farmers will be used in the rehabilitation program just as they have been used in the tenant purchase program in the past.

I want to congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], upon the very thoughtful consideration he has given to this very worthwhile program. I personally feel that the administrative allowance of $20,000,000 is insufficient. The fact remains that this agency of the Government has been administering loans and property which is valued at approximately $1,000,000,000, but it is hoped, of course, that this $20,000,000 may be sufficient. I believe we all know that a drastic operation is needed to be performed upon certain programs which were being administered by the Farm Security Administration. We have every reason to believe the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture now investigating the Farm Security Administration will be able to suggest some legislation to the House which will form a legislative basis for the rural rehabilitation program and the tenant purchase program in the future.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should just like to point out in connection with administrative expense that that money has got to go to the servicing of the loans made as well as the money contained in this bill, and I cannot see how it is going to be adequate.

Mr. COOLEY. And the loans heretofore made, added to the property which they now possess, total approximately $1,000,000,000. I do not believe we need fuss about that at the moment, because if the money proves to be insufficient, I am certain Congress will provide the necessary funds.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is the general understanding of both conference committees that there will not be any appropriation next year unless there is legislation from the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that I know the members of that special committee are earnestly trying to discover the real facts with regard to the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I ask my colleague from North Carolina if he does not believe that at present prices of farm commodities there will be less need for such loans during the coming fiscal year?

Mr. COOLEY. I assume the gentleman is correct, but I likewise assume that loans will not be made unless they are actually needed.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. According to the testimony that has come to our committee, some of the projects which have brought objection to Farm Security have

been changed, particularly the manner in which some loans have been made.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that in many cases they have made excessive loans, but looking at the over-all picture I still believe that had the Secretary of Agriculture administered the rural rehabilitation loans and the tenant purchase loans through the Corporation which Congress itself created, to wit, the Farmers' Home Corporation, that the program would today be very popular, but instead of doing that he mixed it up with a lot of these very unpopular and un-American activities, such as collective farming and other things that have brought it into disrepute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to reinforce what the gentleman from Kansas said about this stopgap. This does not mean that this activity can steadily grow. It remains for the gentleman's subcommittee which is investigating this matter to bring in a bill which will deal with the matter.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand that to be the situation. I understand further that it is the purpose of this committee to recommend basic legislation for the future program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that amendment numbered 125 be now reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report amendment numbered 125.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 125: On page 95, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 16, inclusive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede in its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 128: On page 101, strike out lines 13 to 25 inclusive, and on page 102, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 128 with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or approves, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the provisions of food production financing bulletins F–1 or F–2, issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loans Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the applicant represents in writing and it is administratively determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the production of the crops or livestock specified in the application is not available to him from sources other than the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from other sources only on such terms and conditions that he could not use the other credit available to the extent necessary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or livestock specified in his application and (b) the person authorized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity of the crops or livestock specified in the application would be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance under the provisions of Section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins F–1 and F–2 made or approved on the conditions specified in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within 1 year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated as a region in which the making of such loans or advances is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such region: *Provided*, That none of the limitations provided for by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance made or approved before the date this act becomes effective, or to the disbursement either before or after such date of any part of the proceeds of any loan or advance theretofore made or to any loan or advance made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing the completion of production undertaken before such date or for the purpose of protecting or preserving the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of any loan or advance made or approved before such date."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there is a typographical error in the first portion of the motion just reported. Where the language is used "in lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment" the language should be "in lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this substitute language has been agreed to unanimously by the House and Senate conferees. Unless some one desires to discuss the matter, I ask for a vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a minute or two?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the item that deals with the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation. We were at some pains to work this out, so that everybody would be happy. The people most affected, of course, would be the fruit interests out West. This language is so drawn that they can continue to avail themselves of that credit, but it is designed, of course, to stop abuses such as were disclosed when we took testimony on this item.

It is quite agreeable to the Senate conferees, and to the House conferees, and to those Members of the House who are particularly interested in the item, with whom I conferred. I think this has come to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and those from the fruit area.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. This will permit loans to be made in the flooded areas and in other areas in which there is particular stress, and where the local banking interests cannot take care of the situation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know about the flooded areas. I believe we dealt with that in another amendment.

Mr. HOPE. It will take care of any situation that cannot be met by the local agencies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will it take care of areas that have been hit by crop infestation or insect infestation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a credit item which is administered by the Farm Credit Administration. What we tried to do was to continue the credit in those areas where this particular type of credit has heretofore been used and is deemed to be indispensable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 129: Page 102, line 4, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is merely the correction of a section number. There are several of these amendments relating to the correction of section numbers, namely, amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133. I ask unanimous consent that all of these amendments be reported and that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 130: Page 102, line 12, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Amendment No. 131: Page 102, line 22, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Amendment No. 132: Page 103, line 14, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Amendment No. 133: Page 104, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 134: Page 105, line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or any other provision of law, any owner, lessee, tenant, or operator of any farm land on which a substantial part of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or by insect infestation in 1943 so that abandonment or replanting of such crop is necessary, may market without penalty the actual production of cotton from any acreage planted on such farm land and the planting in 1943 of any acreage in excess of the farm cotton acreage allotment on such farm land shall not cause the producer to suffer any deduction or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support: *Provided*, That the acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment in 1943 shall not constitute past acreage or past production of cotton in determining the farm, county, or State acreage allotment for any subsequent year."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to make an announcement to the Members of the House. The War Department has advised me that the trip to New York on Friday next has been postponed, the War Department finding it necessary to postpone the trip at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this amendment contains the same provisions as were passed by this House recently in the Monroney bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments which are still in disagreement and ask for a conference with the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that conferees be appointed on behalf of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, SHEPPARD, WENE, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on the Canadian gas-rationing system as presented by the Automobile Club of Rochester.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 60 and 61.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendments Nos. 5, 60, and 61, to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 5: The original House bill carries provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943. To this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocations to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make exemptions for the Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services but left the Senate language applicable to all other Federal agencies. The Senate accepted the House modification of the Senate language but added a further exception for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement omits the original House amendment relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration, and also omits all other proposed substitute language of the Senate and House and leaves the continuation of the fund in the form originally reported to the House by the committee on Appropriations. The House provision relating to the Planning Board and Farm Security is covered in other measures. The independent offices appropriation bill, 1944, contains provision prohibiting the funds for that Board in that bill from being supplemented from any other source and similar provision with respect to Farm Security is contemplated in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, 1944, now pending.

Nos. 60 and 61, relating to Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett: The Senate recedes from its amendment striking out the section in the House bill prohibiting the use of Federal funds for continuation of their employment in the Federal service.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, just a word by way of preface relative to the status of the supply bills for the session.

The Committee on Appropriations reported to the House today the second deficiency appropriation bill, the last of the appropriation bills, we trust, for the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The appropriation bills are now in comparatively favorable position. Four have gone to the President—the civil functions, independent offices, Navy, and legislative appropriation bills.

Five are in conference—Treasury; State, Justice, and Commerce; Interior; District of Columbia; and Agriculture. All these should be disposed of and forwarded to the White House by the close of the week.

The passage of the second deficiency tomorrow will leave the remaining four bills, the second deficiency, military, Labor-Federal Security and war agencies, in the Senate committee.

The Fourth of July falls this year on Sunday—a week from next Sunday. That leaves a week and a half in which

to secure final action. And as a large part of the preliminary work has already been done on these bills, it is not wholly without the realm of possibility that, so far as the appropriations for the session are concerned, we should be ready for a recess by Independence Day. It offers a very happy method of celebrating that auspicious occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the pending report is of more than passing interest due to the fact that the urgent deficiency appropriation bill carries funds to meet pay rolls of every agency of the Government with the exception of the Army and Navy and the dead line is June 30.

The differences between the two Houses were confined to two items, one imposing limitations on the President's expenditures from his emergency fund, and the other denying funds for payment of salaries of three employees charged with affiliation with subversive organizations.

As to the first, it will be recalled that the bill, as reported to the House, carried a provision making available the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund. An amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] prohibiting allocations from the fund to the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration, was adopted when the bill reached the floor. The Senate struck out this provision and substituted restrictions of a general character. In conference both Houses agreed to withdraw all limitations on expenditures or allocations from the President's fund, leaving the provision relating to the fund as first reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations.

I may say that the agreement on the part of the House managers, to recede from disagreement with the Senate amendment striking out the denial of allocations for the National Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration from the President's funds, was due to the fact that subsequent legislation has obviated the necessity for the provision.

The independent offices appropriation bill prohibited allocations to the National Planning Board from any source other than the appropriation for that purpose in that bill. The amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill adopted on the floor this afternoon carries a similar provision prohibiting the allocation of funds to the Farm Security Administration from any source other than that provided in the agricultural appropriation bill, rendering superfluous the language eliminated from the House bill by Senate amendment 5.

On the second point of difference between the two Houses, the provision denying funds for salaries of the three employees charged with subversive affiliations, the Senate receded from its disagreement and the three employees, Goodwin B. Watson, Wm. E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett are denied salaries from any appropriation hitherto made or hereafter to be made.

Mr. Speaker, the report is a unanimous report and is approved by all House managers on both sides of the aisle and also, I am informed, by managers on the part of the Senate. I trust it will likewise meet with the approval of all Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further inquiries on the conference report, I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee, such time as he may require.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment related to the restrictions on the President's funds. We eliminated that because the first item that the House put on is taken care of in the independent offices appropriation bill and the second item in the agricultural appropriation bill. The only restrictions left on the President's funds are those originally put on when the fund was created. The conference report also keeps in the bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], keeping three men off the pay roll. I think the conference report should be adopted. It is signed by all of the conferees on both sides, and at both ends of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFEGUARDS TO RADIO COMMUNICATIONS, UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States, to make the following change in Senate engrossed amendment No. 1, viz: In the language inserted by said amendment, before the word "until", insert "period"; so that the phrase inserted will read; "period until July 1, 1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Arthur Krock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement with reference to the shortage of iron and steel in this war program, and of the conduct of the War Production Board in turning down applications to them by smaller industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Time magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter on the subject of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IRVING SWANSON, READING CLERK

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to cooperate with the Speaker to the extent of recognizing the very valuable service which has been rendered this House, all alone, by the reading clerk, Irving Swanson, throughout this tedious day.

As a long time legislative clerk, I realize perhaps more fully than some others might the obligations and duties which devolve upon our friend Swanson, and perhaps therefore am more disposed to sympathize with him than some others might be. He has done a very fine job and he is to be commended. We should all cooperate in these days when he is doing this job alone, to make it as easy for him as we possibly can.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, as on several previous occasions, the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]—and I note he is on the floor before me—took occasion to lament the fact that I had called attention to various shortcomings on the part of the administration. The gentleman suggested that inasmuch as we were at war it would be better if we would not point out any of the soft spots, to put it leniently, that possibly might exist in the administration's activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman wants to quote the gentleman from Massachusetts correctly, does he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If possible, if the gentleman does not change his mind and his words too rapidly.

Mr. McCORMACK. The machine-gun chatter of my friend is impossible to compete with. My remarks today were with reference to the gentleman's remarks on the unfortunate situation in Detroit. I have never taken the position that constructive criticism was not in order. I have repeatedly stated that I welcomed it, and that constructive criticism always brought about beneficial results.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that. The only difficulty grows out of the fact that sometimes it appears to him there is no such thing as constructive criticism. That any criticism of the New Deal is wrong. The situation is different when Republicans are criticized as, for example, when a Member of the majority [Mr. CELLER of New York] last night called attention to the statements of Governor Dewey of New York—and that speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] sounded as though it had been written by that expert smear artist, Charlie Michelson—apparently Governor Dewey could not possibly say anything that was constructive if he criticized the New Deal. Now the point which I make is this, that as long as it is permissible for Members of the majority party in both Houses, in and out of Congress, to criticize publicly and to publish their views in the newspapers, I know of no reason why another citizen, who, on occasion, pays taxes and who has been elected to represent a congressional district, the Fourth of Michigan, should not venture to express a little criticism if he has a remedy.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I have always, without exception, whenever I have criticized, introduced a bill which I thought, in my misguided way, might tend to eradicate a wrong. For example, with reference to the strike situation. Sometime ago I introduced a bill which was an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, which provided that when a man went on strike in an essential defense industry he should within 10 days find a job in another essential defense industry, and that failing in that effort to find a job, he should then be inducted, regardless of age or physical condition, into the armed forces as a private, receiving a private's compensation, and that this Government of ours, this New Deal government of ours, anxious for social reforms, anxious that no one should be unemployed, should be without a job, should then assign him to a job at the Government pay given the inducted man. When boys quit, when men quit and cannot find work in an essential war industry, as, for example, in the mines, or they cannot find a job in a factory or they cannot find work on a farm, then the officer in charge of that military district should find that man a job either in mine, factory, or on a farm, or if they preferred, send them over to Africa, or down to the South Sea Islands, and let them take over the job of one of the boys down there, who, I am sure, would be willing to return and accept the job that was left vacant here at home by the striker.

This morning's discussion was brought up by the fact that some on the majority side saw fit to point the finger of reproach toward Michigan, toward the city of Detroit, where this disgraceful riot occurred, where those men met death because of the rioting. My reply was that if Michigan had been left alone in days gone by there would have been none of that rioting in our fair State.

That was the burden of my argument, and I am going to continue every time I have the privilege, if I can get to the floor again—I am going to continue to assert that if Michigan is left alone, if the New Deal will keep its fingers out of Michigan, if they will quit trying to intermingle the races in Michigan and pay some attention to the protests that are made, Michigan will take care of herself, and she will demonstrate to the world that our people are loyal, patriotic, and will do their part—and more—toward the defeat of our enemies.

It is a strange thing indeed that from the floor, publicly, come these statements, in support of the New Deal, but as you walk through the halls and meet the Members of the majority side, you get another and an utterly different viewpoint. Many a Democrat is sick at heart because of the New Deal.

So far as I am concerned there is nothing off the record, and if anyone wishes to disagree with me on the floor that is his privilege. I welcome it. But when you take me to task, just remember there are usually two sides to every argument.

But I repeat again, let Michigan alone and she will take care of her own troubles. If the Federal Government will let Michigan alone the State authorities, under the present Republican administration, with a Governor who served in the last war and who lost a leg in that world war, Michigan, under Governor Kelly, will get along all right; will lead the way in all war and good citizenship activities.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON, for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of a bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and a bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building. Washington, D. C.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

515. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations of $21,126,195 for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 241); to the

Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

516. A letter from E. C. Miller, comptroller, Near East Relief, transmitting a report for the year ending December 31, 1942, of the various activities of the Near East Relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3030. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2618. A bill to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2988. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize blackouts in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2828. A bill to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 3029. A bill to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2184. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 254. An act for the relief of Edward Gillam; without amendment (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury, or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Lillian Woodward; without amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2824. A bill for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps; with amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3031. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to provide an increase in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3032 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the expenses of the offices of recorder of deeds and register of wills of the District of Columbia, approved April 24, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3040. A bill amending the Social Security Act to provide for the reimbursement of municipalities and other governmental units for expenses incurred in connection with the burial of insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Tressie Spring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARSON of Ohio:

H. R. 3035. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adeline F. Lowry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of the Bunge North-American Grain Corporation, the Corporation Argentina de Productories de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3037. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Esther A. Karr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1703. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. William Gilbertson and other residents of Thief River Falls, Minn., supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1704. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Ada M. Blanvelt and 62 citizens of Pearl River, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1705. Also, petition of Naomi Morse and 20 citizens of Gridley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1706. Also, petition of 38 members of the Trinity Methodist Church of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1707. Also, petition of C. J. Tolf and 18 citizens of Iron River, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1708. Also, petition of Mrs. George Saufferer and 129 citizens of Faribault, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or trans-

portation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1709. Also, petition of A. E. Hoffpauir and 26 citizens of Clearwater, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. Also, petition of 46 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of Trinity Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1711. Also, petition of Helen E. Robinson and 20 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1712. Also, petition of H. A. Rhoades and 31 citizens of Millersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1713. Also, petition of Mrs. Maston T. Carlisle and 14 citizens of Hartsville, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1714. Also, petition of Carrie Switzer and 29 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary

1715. Also, petition of Cora E. Davidson and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1716. Also, petition of Anna Davis and 38 citizens of Colton, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1717. Also, petition of Bessie Tucker and 42 citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. Also, petition of Cora Brunemeier and 19 citizens of Placentia, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1719. Also, petition of Mrs. C. F. Abbott and 40 citizens of Espy Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1720. Also, petition of Rev. W. W. Glenn and 34 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1721. Also, petition of Rev. H. E. Rogers and 24 citizens of Easley, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1722. Also, petition of Dwight N. Seward and 37 citizens of Nyssa, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. Also, petition of Eva Musgrove and 153 citizens of Hutsonville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1724. Also, petition of Mrs. T. R. Booker and 36 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1725. Also, petition of Mrs. Audrey E. Milligan and 21 citizens of Pinckneyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1726. Also, petition of May Attvell and 101 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1727. Also, petition of Mary A. Rhodabach and 47 citizens of Newark, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1728. Also, petition of Lourain Parker and 19 citizens of Webster Groves, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1729. Also, petition of Elizabeth Rice and 256 citizens of Springfield, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1730. Also, petition of H. W. Anderson and 113 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1731. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1732. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. C. H. Snyder of Grand Rapids, Mich., and 920 other residents of the Fifth District of Michigan, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1733. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of the Federation of Crippled and Disabled, Inc., requesting that the week of September 5 to 11, 1943, be set aside and proclaimed as Manpower Rehabilitation Week and that during said period a special effort be made to disseminate information throughout the land, acknowledging the important contribution those persons of our country who are disabled are making to the united war effort and advising those citizens who are partially disabled and not yet engaged in the war effort of their great potential abilities to aid their country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1734. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Charles Wilkinsen and 28 other citizens of Shelton, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great companion of our souls, grant unto us, O Lord, the spirit of understanding, of discernment, and of fair dealing. As we give our minds and hearts to the Nation's need save us from our prejudices, from half truths, and from all attitudes colored by the clamor of the few. May we have eyes to see and to seek the highest good for the whole Commonwealth, whose faithful servants we would be. May we take heed of all judgments of men and gather patiently whatever truth they hold, but teach us still to test them by the words and the spirit of that One whose white and winning life judges us all. If men speak well of us may we not be puffed up; if they slight us may we not be cast down, remembering the words of the Master who bade us rejoice when men speak evil against us and to tremble when all men speak well, that we may have evidence that we are still soldiers of God.

In these dark days of the world's agony let not any shadow of discouragement, of defeatism, or of cynicism oppress our spirits, lest our gloom should darken the light by which others have to live and walk. In these days of crisis and alarm help us to play the man and so help others to face with good cheer and courage whatever tomorrow may bring. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 23, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that pursuant to the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, accepting an invitation to have four Members each of the Senate and House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943, the Speaker had appointed on behalf of the House of Representatives Mr. BLOOM, chairman, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS of Ohio.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. GORE, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also anounced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 86, 93, 94, 100, 118, 124, 125, and 134 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 12, 14, 19, 84, 126, 127, and 128, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 107, and concurred therein with amendments; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 12, 14, 19, 84, 107, 126, 127, and 128 that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bankhead	Brewster
Andrews	Bilbo	Bridges
Ball	Bone	Brooks
Buck	Kilgore	Robertson
Burton	La Follette	Scrugham
Butler	Langer	Shipstead
Byrd	Lodge	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Caraway	McClellan	Taft
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Maloney	Tobey
Davis	Maybank	Truman
Downey	Mead	Tunnell
Eastland	Millikin	Tydings
Ferguson	Moore	Vandenberg
George	Murdock	Van Nuys
Gerry	Murray	Wagner
Green	Nye	Wallgren
Guffey	O'Daniel	Walsh
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hatch	Overton	Wherry
Hawkes	Pepper	White
Hayden	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hill	Reed	Willis
Holman	Revercomb	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION—PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL REGISTER (S. Doc. No. 73)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 71)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of $17,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROVISION RELATING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 72)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to an appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR FLOOD CONTROL—DAM AND RESERVOIR ON MOSQUITO CREEK, OHIO (S. DOC. NO. 74)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations of the War Department for flood control, designed to make available unobligated balances of such appropriations for the construction of a dam and reservoir on Mosquito Creek, Ohio, authorized as a part of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin in the Flood Control Acts of June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Vilas and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

A petition signed by 426 citizens of the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 569) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 682) to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE—REPAIR OF RURAL RADIOS AND TELEPHONES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I present House Joint Resolution No. 24 passed by the Illinois General Assembly and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, under the rule. This resolution calls attention to difficulties in obtaining repairs for radios and telephones and memorializes the Congress to "foster the change of such priorities and restrictions insofar as they relate to batteries and other necessary material in order to keep such rural radios and telephones in an operative condition."

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 24

Whereas telephones and radios in rural and farm communities are not only a great convenience, and timesaver, but are absolutely necessary in securing information relating to farm work, markets, and community affairs related to the war effort; and

Whereas the restrictions and priorities placed on the various materials necessary to keep these utilities in repair by the Federal Government have resulted not only in a great inconvenience but an actual loss in valuable time, thereby retarding the war effort and food production: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge and memorialize the Congress of the United States to foster the change of such priorities and restrictions insofar as they relate to batteries and other necessary material in order to keep such rural radios and telephones in an operative condition; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, and the War Priorities Board, at Washington, D. C.

COMPETITION BETWEEN COUNTRY BANKS AND GOVERNMENT LOANING AGENCIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from Mr. L. C. Rasmussen, of Colon, Nebr., which has to do with the competition between country banks and Government loaning agencies.

There being no objection, the letter was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLON, NEBR., *May 17, 1943.*

Mr. KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: From newspaper reports it appears that a conflict is taking place between country banks and Government loaning agencies.

My personal experience may be of some help to you in this controversy. In 1932 I was the owner of 160 acres of land, with a $15,000 mortgage, and due to low farm prices and several years of drought I lost my land by foreclosure.

Also, in 1932, I owed to a local bank $5,400 on my personal property, and due to low prices for grain and livestock the bank was asked by the bank examiner to charge my note out, which they did rather than sell me out. The bank officers were very cooperative and lenient and permitted me to keep on farming and pay my notes in an orderly manner, and as a result of such treatment I have reduced my debt to the bank to $620, which will all be paid when I sell my hogs, leaving me with personal property worth $8,000 free of debt.

I think it would be too bad if country banks were forced out of business because of Government loaning agencies. I think there is too much regulation of banks, on one hand, and too much competition, on the other. We cannot get along without our local country banks, and I hope something can be done about it.

Yours truly,

L. C. RASMUSSEN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; without amendment (Rept. No. 337).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 1397. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 338);

H. R. 2047. A bill to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden; without amendment (Rept. No. 339); and

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 340).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 878. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 341).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 23, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 262. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Ry.;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;*

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417);

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; and

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1265. A bill for the relief of Sherman W. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1266. A bill to transfer to the Petroleum Administration for War the powers and functions of the Office of Price Administration with respect to petroleum and petroleum

products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1267. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1268. A bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide priorities with respect to farm machinery and equipment to farmers in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend limitations on production in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the amendment proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2935, the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"Any funds available to the United States Public Health Service for the treatment of patients may be used, upon the request of State and local health authorities, to provide for the hospitalization, treatment, and subsistence in hospital facilities operated by the United States Public Health Service of Selective Service registrants infected with venereal disease, and for the transportation of such Selective Service registrants between their homes and such facilities when necessary."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 237, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RELATIVE TO TAX ACT OF 1943

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 30, which was read, as follows:

Resolved etc., That there be printed 53,000 additional copies of House Document numbered 237, "Questions and Answers containing an analysis relative to Public Law No. 68, 'An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes' ", approved June 9, 1943; of which 45,000 shall be for the use of the House document room, 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 2,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted for a moment. What is the matter before the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a House concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of a House document relating to the current tax-payment act.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

DESTRUCTION OF FOOD IN TRANSIT

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have recently received a number of communications from various sections of my State, calling attention to the fact that even in these times of food scarcity and food emergency, a considerable amount of perishable food is being destroyed in transit, long before it can reach the civilian markets for which it is destined.

There is no more valuable commodity in our possession at the present time than food, and storm warnings of impending food shortages have already been raised by competent authorities and officials. In view of the extensive food requirements and demands which the food production resources of America will be called upon to meet—food for our armed forces, food for our allies, food for the starving peoples of Europe and Asia, and food for our own civilian population—a determined effort should be made to insure that every ounce of food produced finds its way to the ultimate consumer in a firm and palatable state. Every ounce of food that is wasted or lost, no matter from what cause, will only serve to undermine our war effort to a comparative extent.

I have before me a brief article from the Pittsburgh Press of June 16, 1943, which calls attention to the fact that more than 10,000 bushels of potatoes destined for the Pittsburgh market spoiled in transit, thus depriving many hundreds of citizens of sorely needed food.

Mr. President, I ask that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I sincerely trust that effective measures will be taken to insure the fullest possible use of all the food which we produce, especially during the heavy harvest season which lies ahead.

There being no objection, the article was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SORT OF A ROTTEN DEAL—10,000 BUSHELS OF SPUDS SPOIL IN SHIPMENT HERE—HIGH RATE OF SPOILAGE IN POTATOES FROM SOUTH RESULTS FROM LACK OF ICED CARS

Ten thousand bushels of potatoes—enough to provide every man, woman, and child in Pittsburgh with at least four spuds for dinner tonight—have rotted in transit during the past week before reaching Pittsburgh.

The terrific spoilage, produce men here reported today, is due to a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation prohibiting use of ice in railroad cars to refrigerate potatoes coming in from the South.

The ruling was attributed to a shortage of ice resulting from heavy demands for food refrigeration among Army camps in the South. The Interstate Commerce Commission and Office of Defense Transportation since have relented, permitting 5,000 pounds of ice per car—half the normal amount—but all cars arriving from the South at the terminal still lack refrigeration.

Produce men here said at least 600,000 pounds of potatoes have decayed in transit in the past week and that the spoilage rate in railroad cars arriving from the South ranges from 2 to 90 percent.

So heavy has been the spoilage that yesterday a wholesaler abandoned a carload of 500 bushels of potatoes, valued at $1,449, to the railroad to cover transportation costs.

The railroad then sold the 30,000 pounds for $155 to peddlers willing to cut open individual sacks and salvage the few good spuds.

In another instance, a produce man sold part of his shipment at 45 cents a sack, although the ceiling price is $4.83.

Spoilage has occurred in all shipments from Florida and South Carolina, produce men said. Potatoes from California, however, have been arriving in "splendid shape," wholesalers said, because railroad cars from the far West are iced twice on the cross-country run.

CONSERVATION OF PAPER

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, yesterday I received a copy of a letter which was written by one of my constituents to the Office of War Information, in reply to a circular letter which he received from that office advising him what to write and what not to write to his son in the armed forces.

I could discuss this matter in considerable detail, but since my constituent has covered the situation rather fully, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *June 19, 1943.*

To the DIRECTOR,
Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just received from your Pittsburgh, Pa., office, over the name of Harry Kodinsky, a letter "in the interest of military morale," suggesting what I say and what I refrain from saying to my son in the armed service.

Since my taxes help pay the expenses, I wish to protest against extravagances such as this letter, which I assume is being mailed broadcast over the Nation from your various offices.

To begin with, since our Government claims there is a paper shortage, it would be in the interest of conservation to refrain from such unnecessary letters; second, it is on legal size paper, while it could have gone on a smaller sheet. Again it is unnecessary to make the included suggestions for people of good sense write—or refrain from writing, as the case may be—the proper things. If they do not have good sense, a letter such as your office communication would be useless.

Among other things, it is suggested that correspondents do not tell men in the service "about the things you are deprived of." Why not? My son, for instance, is much interested in what goes on here at home. Is your request based on the theory that, if I tell my son that I am deprived of something so that he and his fellow soldiers may have it, he may say, "Well, we are not getting it. What becomes of it?" I, myself, often ask that particular question. For instance, why my fa-

vorite magazines and newspapers must conserve paper while offices at Washington throw it away in useless letters and publications.

And lastly, but not of least importance, may I ask—if you have so many workers that they can waste time on such useless letters, why not discontinue useless letters and put some of the "workers" in the Army to help my son in the South Pacific and my friend's son in Alaska, or put them in essential war industries so that I won't have to pay more taxes to keep them.

Cut out some of these useless expenditures and put the money into ammunition, which we civilians are supposed to provide by saving our toothpaste tubes, our bits of drippings, and our hard-earned tax dollars.

Yours very truly,

H. W. CORRELL.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that my colleagues will avail themselves of the opportunity of reading the letter, so that they may come to appreciate the ends to which the various governmental bureaus are going in attempting to regulate and regiment the lives of the American people.

WAR MOBILIZATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "War Mobilization" delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STUDENTS AND THE TIMES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Phi Beta Kappa installation address entitled "Students and the Times" delivered by him at the University of Florida on February 18, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR RELATIONSHIPS—TIME MAGAZINE COMMENT ON SPEECH BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from Time magazine for June 28, 1943, commenting upon a speech by Senator LODGE on the subject of the United States participation in the post-war world, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—ARTICLE BY A. D. EMMART

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The National Gallery—War Boom in a Museum," by A. D. Emmart, published in the Baltimore Evening Sun for June 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF SPORTS IN THE WAR EFFORT—ARTICLE BY GRANTLAND RICE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the importance of sports in the war effort published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, June 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, before the word "Corporation", it is proposed to insert "Commodity Credit."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very happy to participate this morning in the debate upon a very important policy, perhaps the most important single policy now under consideration by the Congress, that is to say the use of subsidies in connection with the Price Control Act. I shall not at any length undertake to engage in a discussion of the differences between various policies. That subject was very well covered in the debate of yesterday. I wish to express my appreciation of the very frank handling of the question by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I agree with many of the conclusions arrived at by the Senator from Ohio, especially the conclusion which he stated more than once, that in his opinion the present use of the subsidy policy in connection with food prices is illegal. That is my own opinion. I think there is no authority anywhere for the use of subsidies in the way the Price Administrator, under direction of the President, is now using them. Such use of subsidies is clearly without sanction of law. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which is before the Senate, would legalize the present method.

The Senator from Ohio stated yesterday that he thought there was no foundation in the law as it stands for the use of these subsidies, but he has written into his amendment a definite legalizing of the use of subsidies, not to increase production—which is already provided for—but to prevent increases in prices. This is the first time any language has been presented touching this subject. No language which legalizes or permits such use of money has been incorporated by Congress into law since the emergency arose.

Mr. President, I am opposed to such procedure. Therefore I shall oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, and probably oppose the bill should the amendment be included in it. I desire to discuss the reason for my position. I think it is entirely proper, legal, and justifiable to use inducements to increase production. One may call them subsidies if he wishes, for that is what they are. After all in this period of high prices, with the fear of spiraling prices, which we all entertain more or less and which has been so freely expressed, particularly by the administrative authorities responsible for this policy, the best way to control an increase in price or a threatened increase in price, is by greater production. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is not deflationary, it is inflationary. In other words, when we subsidize consumption we do not increase production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment is not inflationary. The administration of the amendment may be either inflationary or deflationary. The discretion is left with the administrator under the amendment. The amendment itself does not prescribe any particular method of subsidy. Many subsidies may be deflationary. Others, as I have pointed out, may be inflationary.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Ohio did not misunderstand my statement. The amendment he has offered would permit the use of subsidies to prevent increase in prices, and, I repeat, a decrease in prices does not increase production nor the volume of the commodity being bought.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means that a decrease in prices does not increase production.

Mr. REED. Yes. I may remind the Senator from Ohio that his amendment permits the use of subsidies to prevent increased prices, and preventing an increase in prices does not necessarily increase production. The way we are increasing the national debt, issuing more bonds, requiring the banks to take more bonds—and, as I recall the figures, the banks already have about 70 percent of their assets tied up in Government securities—is in itself, Mr. President, the greatest inflationary factor in the whole situation. The policy permitted by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would increase the national debt, which in itself is the most inflationary factor present in the whole situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is very clear that that is not necessarily true. Let us take the copper subsidy by which, it is true, the national debt is increased, we will say, $10,000,000, by reason of the necessity for borrowing the money with which to pay the subsidy, but we may thus save $50,000,000 in connection with the material the Government buys, thereby decreasing the national debt by $40,000,000. If by subsidizing one unit we enable the consumer to buy four units at a lower price, I think such a policy is distinctively deflationary, and not inflationary. As I admitted yesterday, it is only when we have a subsidy all across the board of all of a certain kind of thing the consumer is buying, that in my opinion it becomes inflationary. I agree with the Senator as to the general effect of that kind of subsidy.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio and I are not in any very great difference. Possibly I did not make my position clear. The Senator's amendment permits the use of subsidies to prevent an increase in price. When it comes to copper or other critical materials, if the Government is the only customer, as it is today the only customer, I agree with the position taken by the Senator.

I have never quarreled with the subsidy theory as to the use of copper. I have never quarreled with the subsidy theory when it is used on a basis of that kind. I do quarrel most violently with the theory that we can control inflation

by any method permitted under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I think such methods are inflationary, not deflationary.

Mr. President, the president of the National Grange, Mr. Albert Goss, wrote a letter to President Roosevelt on June 22. On this subject Mr. Goss is one of the clearest thinkers in the whole United States, and particularly among farm organization leaders.

I desire to read at this time a few paragraphs from Mr. Goss' letter. Mr. Goss said, in dealing with the point to which I am particularly referring:

If we are to prevent inflation we must remove the cause instead of treating the symptoms. There are two chief causes of inflation: The first is the pressure of excess income on an insufficient supply of consumer goods, and the second is the loss of confidence in the Government's ability to pay its obligations in dollars having the same purchasing power as the dollar it borrowed.

Mr. Goss goes on to say:

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

* * * * *

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high-cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production.

I shall not take time to read further from the letter, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1943.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the winning of the war and the establishment of a sound and enduring peace depend so largely upon an adequate food supply, any policy that restricts or stifles production should not be tolerated. The situation with which we are confronted calls for the maximum production of foodstuffs.

It is also our duty to do all in our power to halt the drift toward inflation. If we are to prevent inflation we must remove the cause instead of treating the symptoms. There are two chief causes of inflation. The first is the pressure of excess income on an insufficient supply of consumer goods, and the second is the loss of confidence in the Government's ability to pay its obligations in dollars having the same purchasing power as the dollar it borrowed.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

On the basis of today's prices, we have an annual income of approximately $40,000,000,000 in excess of the consumer goods available. Assuming that half this sum will go into savings, we still have the serious problem of an excess income of some $20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a billion and a half to two billion dollars per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high-production-cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised which is effective enough to reach only these high-cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high-cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low-cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high-cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production. On the other hand, when used in connection with subsidies, it increases the gap at the other end because the Government has to borrow the money paid in subsidies and most of this is borrowed from banks. This increases our national spendable income. The subsidy therefore defeats itself. The present plan attempts the impossible by putting economic law into reverse. Higher prices encourage production and discourage consumption. The subsidy program encourages consumption, and to the extent that the subsidies fail to reach the producers they discourage production.

After everything reasonable has been done to increase production, including a compensatory price, if the supply will not meet the demand, the next step is to reduce the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways. First, by increased taxes and increased savings, or both. Second, by rationing. Where goods are scarce, rationing should be applied so that the supply will be divided equitably. Commodities can be rationed to produce a surplus which can be used to hold prices at reasonable levels without the use of ceilings; although ceilings to prevent profiteering may be necessary in some instances. Ceilings should be used for no other purpose.

If we do not take practical steps to close our fast-increasing inflationary gap, plain economics will do it for us, as has always occurred in the past. More and more goods will flow through black markets at higher prices, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar until it comes into balance with the supply. That is inflation.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on Government outgo, how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any government can endure, and that is that the people must support the government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the Government to support the people, cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound; butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late thirties. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply.

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food prices at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest on earth.

In England they have practically closed the inflationary gap, largely by taxation. Three years ago there were 7,000 people with a net income in excess of $25,000 after paying taxes. Last year this group was reduced to 80. At the other end of the line, England has sales taxes ranging from 12 to 72 percent of the retail price.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1 we exported to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately $730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus, England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from America, which are under complete control. She does not include such home-grown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should also be noted that England is having a serious time with black markets. She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison, plus $20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties, prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that black markets are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

We therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps, but rather that our course should be based upon the sound economics necessary to maintain a maximum food supply, for we have no one but ourselves to look to for aid.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
ALBERT S. GOSS, *Master.*

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the last year or more the highest authority in this land, the President of the United States, has been discussing this question. I sat in this Chamber on Labor Day of last year and heard read a message from the President which was so prejudicial to the great farming population of this country that it shocked me. I do not recall another instance when any President of the United States so definitely prejudiced the case of so large a segment of his constituency as did President Roosevelt in his Labor Day message. I took

the floor on the 22d of September of last year and said then what I shall repeat now. Between last September and today, on numerous occasions I have challenged the correctness, almost the good faith, of the policies which were described and which have been followed. The President in his Labor Day speech held up the farmer of this country as a profiteer, described the great injustice which increasing food prices and farm commodity prices might do the country, and asked for authority to control them. We passed the bill. I helped prepare it; I hope I was fairly useful. In connection with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] we offered an amendment which made possible the final passage of the bill. Immediately, the policy which was inaugurated and which has been followed up to this time, was not and has not been at all in accord with what any of us believed would be done or should be done or with what was authorized to be done under the law Congress passed. I have said that before. I say it again.

Mr. President, the President always has laid stress upon the interest of the wage earner, the industrial worker. The interest of the wage worker is important. It is entitled to consideration. I shall come to a discussion of that point. In that discussion I desire to deal with the position of the wage earners in this whole matter, not, I may say and I think I should say, loosely, as has been done by those around the President, and sometimes by the President himself, but realistically and fairly.

Always, or nearly always, when we come to talk of prices and policies we talk about 1939. The war did break out in Europe in 1939. Therefore, an effort has been made to compare all conditions which have occurred since 1939, either with conditions in that year itself or with conditions in the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive. I, myself, have done that for the purpose of this discussion.

Mr. President, I have had placed on the desks of Senators copies of a very simple chart on the basis of which I shall talk. I ask my colleagues to examine it.

I have no quarrel with good wages. The higher the wages which can be paid fairly and reasonably, the better. All I am complaining about is the constant reiteration by the President and his advisers that the industrial wage earner or, more frankly, perhaps, organized labor, is being prejudiced for the farmer's benefit.

So, Mr. President, I asked the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is one of the very reliable statistical agencies of the Government, to prepare figures showing the wage situation beginning with January 1, 1939, and to carry them through to the date nearest today that it could. It compiled the wages by hours, the wages per worker, the increase in the cost of living, and the ratio between those elements. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics used as a basis the figures which always are available in the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. Let me say, Mr. President, that, having had contact with the various statistical agencies, it seems to me there are two agencies in Washington in which all of us, I think, and certainly I, myself, have confidence. They are the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

If I have no confidence in the "snake doctors" who pass as economists in the O. P. A., it is their fault, not mine. I am willing to give credence to their opinions and product when they reach the same basis of accuracy as have the bureaus which I have mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average earnings per employed worker and per hour in manufacturing, and urban living costs, United States, 1939–43

[Index numbers 1935–39=100]

Year and month	Factory pay roll per employed worker [1]	Average hourly earnings of factory workers [2]	Urban cost of living [3]	Real earnings	
				Per worker	Per hour
1939					
January	101.5	105.7	99.7	101.8	106.0
February	102.7	105.6	99.3	103.4	106.3
March	103.7	105.7	99.1	104.6	106.7
April	101.3	105.4	99.0	102.3	106.5
May	101.8	105.7	98.9	102.9	106.9
June	103.4	105.6	98.6	104.9	107.1
July	100.7	104.7	99.1	101.6	105.7
August	103.8	104.4	98.7	105.2	105.8
September	103.7	105.1	100.6	103.1	104.5
October	108.8	106.2	100.4	108.4	105.8
November	108.5	107.4	100.2	108.3	107.2
December	110.6	109.1	99.6	111.0	109.5
1940					
January	107.7	109.6	99.7	108.0	109.9
February	107.3	109.4	100.2	107.1	109.2
March	108.5	109.9	99.8	108.7	110.1
April	107.5	109.7	100.0	107.5	109.7
May	108.2	110.4	100.2	108.0	110.2
June	109.5	110.8	100.5	109.0	110.2
July	107.9	110.1	100.3	107.6	109.8
August	111.4	110.4	100.0	111.4	110.4
September	113.6	110.9	100.4	113.1	110.5
October	115.4	111.3	100.2	115.2	111.1
November	114.7	112.3	100.1	114.6	112.2
December	119.2	113.1	100.7	118.4	112.3
1941					
January	118.4	114.3	100.8	117.5	113.4
February	122.0	114.6	100.8	121.0	113.7
March	124.0	115.3	101.2	122.5	113.9
April	124.6	117.4	102.2	121.9	114.9
May	130.9	120.6	102.9	127.2	117.2
June	134.8	122.5	104.6	128.9	117.1
July	132.5	123.0	105.3	125.8	116.8
August	134.8	123.1	106.2	126.9	115.9
September	136.6	125.1	108.1	126.4	115.7
October	140.0	127.3	109.4	128.0	116.4
November	139.3	129.3	110.2	126.4	117.3
December	144.3	131.0	110.5	130.6	118.6
1942					
January	149.8	134.0	112.0	133.8	119.6
February	152.7	134.3	112.9	135.2	119.0
March	155.6	135.7	114.3	136.1	118.7
April	158.0	137.5	115.1	137.3	119.5
May	161.2	139.7	116.0	139.0	120.4
June	163.2	141.4	116.4	140.2	121.5
July	165.0	143.2	117.0	141.0	122.4
August	169.3	145.6	117.5	144.1	123.9
September	171.2	149.2	117.8	145.3	126.7
October	176.0	149.4	119.0	147.9	125.5
November	180.8	151.4	119.8	150.9	126.4
December	182.6	151.7	120.4	151.7	126.0
1943					
January	184.0	153.7	120.7	152.4	127.3
February	186.7	154.6	121.0	154.3	127.8
March	189.9	156.3	122.8	154.6	127.3
April	192.9	157.9	124.1	155.4	127.2

[1] The index of factory pay rolls divided by that of factory employment.

[2] Based on cents per hour data reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[3] Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

Mr. REED. Using the average wage per hour per worker from 1935 to 1939 as a base, the table starts with January 1, 1939. Using the average wages per hour for the 5 years, the wages received in January 1939 were 105 percent of the average. The factory pay roll per employed worker was 101 percent of that average, and the cost of living was 99 percent. Those are the three factors of greatest importance. If this table be followed through, it will be seen that by April 1942 wages per hour have increased 57.9 percent over the average in the 5 years from 1935 to 1939; the pay roll per employed worker has increased 92.9 percent; the hourly wage went up 57 percent. Because of longer hours, overtime pay after 40 hours, and double pay on Saturdays and Sundays, the weekly wage per employed worker went up 92.9 percent.

Let us see how much the cost of living increased. That is shown on the same table, starting with January 1939. At that time the cost of living was 99.7 percent of the average cost of living in the 5-year period ending with 1939. By April of this year the cost of living had increased 24.1 percent over the 5-year average.

Mr. President, beginning in January 1939, there has not been a week or a month when the wages of workers employed in factories and mills have not increased more than the cost of living. In this period the hourly wage has increased 57.9 percent, the weekly wage has increased 92.9 percent, and the cost of living has increased 24.1 percent.

Why all this worry about a class of people whose economic position, beginning in 1939, has been benefited more than that of any other class of people in the country? I challenge the good faith of men in public life, clothed with great authority, and charged with great responsibility, who continually put out to the country their doctrines and policies under false pretenses. If the investment bankers should use the same tactics in describing the securities they have to sell as the various Government agencies use in selling the country upon the validity of their policies, the Attorney General would put them all in jail. I do not think there is any more morality in a responsible officer of the Government of the United States attempting to deceive the people than there is in an investment banker doing the same thing. I am opposed to such practices on the part of both. So far as I am concerned, the investment banker can go to jail if he misrepresents, and so far as I am concerned, the people can turn the other men out of office, which I am pretty sure they will do.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have some statistics from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics giving hourly earnings of factory workers, weekly wages per factory worker, cost of living, retail cost of foods, and prices received by farmers for the years 1910 to 1914, and also during the period from 1914 to March 1943. I think the

figures are in greater detail than the figures presented by the Senator from Kansas. Later I shall ask unanimous consent that these statistics, prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to compare the position of the farmer with that of the wage worker. Much has been said to prejudice the position of the farmer. We who live out in the great open spaces, under wide horizons, know the difficulty we have in reaching the people of the East. The metropolitan newspapers, vociferous on many things, have little except condemnation of the farmer and the so-called farm bloc in this body and in the other branch of Congress, because we have tried to tell a truthful story of the actual situation.

I am a newspaperman. I appreciate the difficulty we have in getting our story into the metropolitan press. I do not know that I can blame the eastern newspapers very much. I have said this before, and I say it again: The man most responsible for prejudicing the farmer's position with the people of the United States is the President of the United States. He has constantly unfairly stated the situation of the farmer, particularly in his Labor Day message of last year. He has done so much to prejudice the position of the farmer that I am not surprised that the eastern newspapers take their lead from the President and not from us.

Mr. President, there is one thing in which the East ought to be interested. I shall touch on it today. In a few days I shall deal with it extensively and in detail. I refer to the volume of food production. The present policies have demoralized—temporarily, at least—livestock production and livestock markets in the West, and have destroyed the peace of mind of livestock producers to the extent that hundreds of important livestock producers in my own State have written or telegraphed me that when they can feed out and sell their present livestock they intend to quit. I am quite sure that the people of New York, New England, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey will then be interested, because I am sure that those areas cannot produce enough food—especially livestock and meat—for themselves.

I wish to read a telegram which I received this morning from a conference of the farm bureaus of 12 Midwestern States. It is dated yesterday, and addressed to me:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 23, 1943.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of Midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: "The subsidy and price roll-back on foods proposed by the administration is a subterfuge for increasing wages and other consumer incomes already at inflationary levels. It will be expensive to administer, benefits will be small in proportion to total cost, it will continue the already existing ruinous confusion, it contributes to rather than controls inflation, it will decrease rather than increase both agricultural and industrial production, it will impose further regimentation of production and distribution, and will aggravate our post-war price and income problem. For these and other equally important reasons this conference of Midwest farm bureaus, representing 12 States and 300,000 members, respectfully petitions our Federal administrative authorities to cease their effort to inflict this program upon us. We call upon our Congress to enact legislation which will prevent any general continuance or revival of this ill-advised experiment. Copies of this resolution shall be sent each Senator and Congressman from these Midwest States and also to all proper Federal administrative authorities."

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

Mr. President, I went to the Department of Agriculture and asked the gentlemen in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics upon whom I rely so greatly for information to help me obtain in definite and concrete form information which I could lay before the Senate, information which would be of vital importance to any man who seeks to understand the economic situation of the farmer at the present time and 25 years ago, his relation to the wage earner during those years, and the present situation as it points to the future. So I ask for a moment of the time of the Senate in order to distribute copies of the table to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 1.—*Specified commodities: Production, price, farm value, United States, average 1910–14, 1935–39, and ratio of averages*

Item	Unit	Average 1910-14			Average 1935-39			Ratios 1935-39 to 1910-14		
		Production (1)	Price (2)	Farm value (3)	Production (4)	Price (5)	Farm value (6)	Production (7)	Price (8)	Farm value (9)
Group 1:			*Dollars*	*Mil. dol.*		*Dollars*	*Mil. dol.*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Wheat	Million bushels	724	0.884	633	759	0.833	610	105	94	96
2. Corn, all	Million bushels	2,614	.642	1,634	2,316	.656	1,436	89	102	88
3. Oats	Million bushels	1,090	.399	423	1,045	.325	312	96	81	74
4. Barley	Million bushels	164	.619	97	239	.506	109	146	82	112
5. Rye	Million bushels	36	.720	26	45	.541	23	125	75	88
6. Rice, rough	Million bushels	24	.813	20	50	.727	36	208	89	180
7. Grain sorghums	Million bushels	[1]	1.21	[1]	87	1.08	94	----------	89	----------
8. Flaxseed	Million bushels	17	1.69	27	11	1.71	17	65	101	63
9. Cotton	Million bales	14	.124	766	13	.1004	640	93	81	84
10. Hay, all	Million tons	77	11.87	894	84	8.33	694	109	70	78
11. Total, group 1	----------	----------	----------	4,520	----------	----------	3,971	----------	----------	[2] 86
Group 2:										
12. Hogs	Million pounds	11,989	7.27	881	12,998	8.38	1,066	108	115	121
13. Cattle and calves	Million pounds	16,451	[3] 5.42	934	17,927	[3] 6.56	1,195	109	[3] 121	128
14. Sheep and lambs	Million pounds	1,898	[4] 5.88	110	2,423	[4] 7.79	169	128	[4] 132	154
15. Butterfat [5]	Million pounds	[1]	.263	151	1,208	.291	346	----------	111	229
16. Milk, wholesale [6]	Million pounds	[1]	1.60	212	40,270	1.81	727	----------	113	343
17. Chickens, live weight	Million pounds	1,990	.114	231	2,459	.149	375	124	131	162
18. Eggs, farm	Million dozen	2,350	.215	461	3,038	.217	623	129	101	135
19. Potatoes	Million bushels	350	.697	229	356	.753	255	102	108	111
20. Total, group 2	----------	----------	----------	3,209	----------	----------	4,756	----------	----------	148
21. Grand total	----------	----------	----------	7,729	----------	----------	8,727	----------	----------	113

[1] Not available.
[2] Grain sorghums omitted in computing ratio.
[3] Average for beef cattle only; 1910-14 average for veal calves, $6.75; 1935-39 average, $7.80; ratio, 116.
[4] Average for lambs only; 1910-14 average for sheep, $4.53; 1935-39 average, $3.93; ratio, 87.
[5] Sold as cream to plants, dealers, etc.
[6] Sold at wholesale to plants, dealers, etc.

SEC. 2.—*Earnings and incomes in agriculture and industry, United States averages, 1910–14 and 1935–39*

Item	Unit	1910–14	1935–39	Ratio 1935–39 to 1910–14
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
				Percent
1. Average hourly earnings of factory workers	Cents [1]	21.2	60.8	287
2. Average number of hours worked by factory workers per week	Hours [1]	51.9	37.5	72
3. Average weekly earnings of factory workers	Dollars [2]	10.65	21.26	200
4. Average annual wage income per industrial worker	Dollars	583	1,149	197
5. Average net farm income from agriculture	Million dollars	4,321	[3] 4,900	113
6. Average net income per person engaged in agriculture	Dollars	365	511	140
7. Average nonfarm income	Million dollars	29,625	59,878	202
8. Farmers' equity in farm property	Million dollars	39,604	32,890	83
9. Ratio prices received by farmers to prices paid by farmers, interest and taxes	Percent	100	82	82

[1] Average hours worked and/or hourly earnings are computed from figures reported by establishments reporting manhour statistics for the period 1935–39. Estimates for 1910–14 are as nearly comparable with 1935–39 as can be computed from available data.
[2] Average weekly earnings are based on reports from all cooperating establishments, some of which do not furnish manhour information.
[3] Excluding Government payments.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Data for factory workers based on reports of Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SEC. 3.—*Quantities of specified foods that may be purchased by factory workers with 1 week's earnings, 1913–14, 1936–39, and 1942*

Food	1913–14	1935–39	1942	1935–39 as percent of 1913–14	1942 as percent of—	
					1913–14	1935–39
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Bread, white	178	256	406	144	228	159
2. Flour, white	315	472	666	150	211	141
3. Butter	29	58	75	200	259	129
4. Round steak	47	59	81	126	172	137
5. Pork chops	50	63	85	126	170	135
6. Potatoes	595	850	1,038	143	174	122

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

Except as otherwise stated, all information shown on this table was obtained from reports and records of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. Selection, arrangement, and adaptation was made by Senator CLYDE M. REED.

Mr. REED. I am very happy to see the Vice President in the chair. He is thoroughly familiar with these matters. A few moments ago I went to the desk and laid before him a copy of this large table. Knowing his deep sympathy with and wide understanding of the farmer's problems, I am sure he will follow this subject with some interest, and, I hope, perhaps with a trifle of profit.

I hope my fellow Members of the Senate will follow me in this discussion, which I shall make as brief as I can. This is a matter of urgent importance.

When we resort to statistical information of this nature we must necessarily have a starting point. The starting point has always been the condition of agriculture and the farmer in the 5 years before the beginning of World War No. 1. This table shows the condition of the farmer through that 5-year period. Because the present administration insists upon the use of 1939 and the 5 years from 1935 through 1939 as the basis for its comparisons between the farmer and the wage worker, that information, also, is shown.

The chart is divided into three sections. I invite the attention of Senators to the top item in section 1. The first line gives the figures for wheat. During the 5 years from 1910 through 1914 there was an average yearly production of 724,000,000 bushels of wheat. For that wheat the farmer received an average price per bushel of 88 cents and a fraction. His total average realization from his wheat crop during that 5-year period was $633,000,000.

In the second period the farmer produced an average 759,000,000 bushels of wheat, and he received an average price of 83 cents and a fraction. His average realization was $610,000,000. For more wheat he received less money.

While I am on that point, allow me to invite attention to two items which appear in the table. One of them will be found in section 2, line 1. During the period to which I have referred the average earnings per hour of factory workers increased 187 percent. The nearest approach which can be made to a comparison between a wage earner and a farmer is in the wages per hour received by the wage earner and the prices per unit received by the farmer. That is not an exact and ideal comparison, but it is the best which can be made.

In 25 years—30 years if we start in 1910 and continue to 1939—the situation of the wheat farmer did not improve at all, but the hourly wage of the worker increased to a point where it was 287 percent of the original rate. For all wheat produced in the second 5-year period, ending in 1939, the wheat farmer received 96 percent as much money for his grain as he received in the 5-year period starting in 1910.

Let us take the cotton farmer. I have made the same comparison with respect to the cotton farmer, which will be found in line 9 of the top section of the table. In the first 5-year period, from 1910 through 1914, the cotton farmer raised on the average 14,000,000 bales of cotton. He received an average of 12.4 cents a pound during the 5-year period. For his cotton crop as a whole he realized an average of $766,000,000 in the first 5-year period.

In the second 5-year period, from 1935 to 1939, the cotton farmer raised an average of 13,000,000 bales of cotton. For his crop he received 10 cents a pound. His average realization for those 5 years was $640,000,000 as against $766,000,000 for the first 5-year period. The cotton farmer in that second period got only 84 percent of as many dollars as he actually got in the first period, 25 years previously. In that time the average hourly wage of industrial workers went up 197 percent.

Mr. President, at this point, allow me to invite attention to another item.

In section 2, line 8, is shown the farmer's equity in his property. In the first 5-year period the farmer had an equity in his property—real estate, machinery, and livestock—of $39,604,000,000. In the second 5-year period the average, covering the same type of property, was $32,890,000,000.

In other words, the farmer of the United States had fed the country for 25 years; he had furnished all the food, grain or otherwise, which was exported,

and for the privilege of doing so, he paid out of his capital $7,000,000,000.

Now let me come to the second section of this tabulation. Back in the first period, from 1910 to 1914, the industrial worker—this is on line 2 of the second section of the tabulation—worked an average of 51.9 hours a week. When the second 5-year period rolled around the industrial worker was working 37½ hours a week.

Now let us take the average weekly earnings. The average industrial worker's hours had been decreased from the first 5-year period from 51.9 hours a week to 37.5 hours a week, a decrease of 28 percent; but his weekly earnings rose from $10.65 a week to $21.26 a week, an increase of exactly 100 percent.

I do not think that is too much money for the industrial worker; I am willing that he should get more; but what I object to, Mr. President, what I protest against, what I resent, is the constant stream of misrepresentation as between the farmer and the industrial worker that comes from the White House and from nearly all the men who surround the President. I do not resent the fact that there has been an improvement in the wages of the industrial workers. I am glad of that improvement; I wish it could be greater; but I do object to misrepresentation, whether it be done by the President of the United States, by his advisers, or by investment bankers or public utilities in selling their goods on the one hand and their policies on the other.

Now I should like to have Senators refer to the bottom of the large sheet, section 3, where we come to the question of what the worker can buy with his wages. This table also was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; I do not know whether they have ever made publication of it, but I know there is nothing secret about it at all. It shows some rather interesting facts.

Let us consider a week's wages and what they will buy. Back in the period 1913–14 a week's wages of a factory worker would buy 178 pounds of bread made out of white flour. By 1935–39 a week's wages would buy 256 pounds of bread. From 1939 to 1942 the condition of the wage worker improved more than during any other period in history; it improved more than the condition of any other class of people in this country. Following this illustration through, a week's wages of a factory worker, which could buy only 178 pounds of bread in 1913–14 and 256 pounds in 1935 to 1939, would buy 406 pounds of bread in 1942.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. What seems to be done now is to roll back and cheapen the farmer's products and increase the wages of the worker.

Mr. REED. This is an effort indirectly to subsidize a further increase in industrial wages at the expense of the taxpayer; that is all it is. I hope I have answered the Senator from South Carolina. There are other illustrations to which I shall refer. Let us take butter, to which I shall refer again a little later. The figures with regard to butter are found on line 3 at the bottom of section 3. Back in 1913 to 1914 a week's wages would buy 29 pounds of butter; by 1935 to 1939 they would buy 58 pounds of butter. We have heard much said, in press releases and statements, including statements from the White House, about the need to keep production going and therefore the necessity to humor industrial workers organized into great unions. I approve of labor organizations, but it is said we have got to do something to keep the industrial workers satisfied, and so we are asked to pass this bill to legalize what was heretofore illegal. Let us see what happened to the industrial worker so far as butter is concerned in this period when his dire condition is being pointed out. In the period 1935–39 wage workers could buy 58 pounds of butter for a week's wages; in 1942 they could buy 75 pounds. All the remainder of the comparisons in that section show about the same result. It is for that class of people that we are being asked to do this thing which I think is wrong in principle, which will be inflationary if it is carried out, and which ought not to be done.

There is a class of people, Mr. President, that are being pinched in these days, and that is people with fixed incomes, such as white-collar workers, school teachers, and people living upon pensions and annuities. They constitute a class of people that ought to be helped, and if the proposal before the Senate was designed to help that class of people, I should look on it with a kindly eye. Instead of using the taxpayers' money indirectly to increase industrial wages, which is the purpose sought to be accomplished here, I would be willing to use the taxpayers' money, if some way could be found to do it, as I think it could, to help the people whose incomes have not been increased at all through this period of increasing prices of commodities and increasing living costs. Those are the people for whom my heart bleeds, and any workable proposition which may be brought before the Senate to reach that class of people shall have my sympathetic attention.

Now let me go back to butter for a moment, and let me examine the application of subsidies to butter and to the probable effect, as an illustration, of the result that might follow the extension of such a subsidy to other foodstuffs. In the first place, let us consider the effect upon production. Undoubtedly the administration of this subsidy will tend to reduce the amount of butter which the wage earners who are to be protected will find available in the market.

Since the subsidy of 5 cents a pound is to be paid only to creameries making more than 1,000 pounds of butter a month, a considerable part of the butter now produced will be subject to a reduction of 5 cents without any offsetting return.

The census of 1940 showed 2,930,000 farmers churning butter for home use and for market. The farm production in that year, 1940, amounted to 430,000,000 pounds. That is almost one-fifth of the total butter production of the country, and not a pound of that can get any of this subsidy.

What is going to happen? The farm production in 1940, amounting to 430,000,000 pounds, will have only one place to go. In order to dispose of what he cannot eat the natural place for the farmer to go is the black market. I do not like to use that term, yet here is a plan which will drive one-fifth of the butter made in this country, by force of circumstances, into the black market.

What we want is more butter production. The butter subsidy program is going to cost about $100,000,000, and why do we not take $100,000,000, if we are to use it as a subsidy, and subsidize the producer, help him get more feed, better cows, and produce an increase. We are struggling to increase our production of milk, and we are following a policy here which will decrease the production of the principal milk product, which is butter.

A reduction in the amount available in the market will produce a greater struggle for what is left.

If we take 430,000,000 pounds away from a round figure of 2,000,000,000, we are going to have 1,570,000,000 pounds left. So, instead of making more butter available, we will make less available.

Mr. President, I have lived in the farming section of the country and among farmers and livestock producers all my life. Back in 1920, following the great increase in prices, especially of cattle, during the war period, the Federal Reserve Bank took the floor of loans out from under the cattle producers, and there was a precipitous drop. Every important cattle producer in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas went broke. There was no other place for them to go. Their prices decreased, and their loans were called.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has spoken so earnestly and so eloquently on this floor, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], will agree that the state of mind of the large stock producer has not been so seriously disturbed since 1920 as it is now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just received a message this morning from Fremont, Nebr., where a group of cattle feeders of 29 counties of Nebraska, which is about one-fourth of the counties of the State, and 30 counties in west Iowa, are meeting tonight to consider what they can do about the demoralized cattle market. The already narrow margin has become so narrow that the cattle feeders cannot operate, and because of this subsidy question, the centralized markets have become so confused that the feeders are in a dilemma. They do not know what to do, whether to put in replacement cattle or not. They do not know which way to turn.

I thought this news might be added information for the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is making such a wonderful plea this morning in the interest of the producers. I appreciate very

much his remarks, and desire to add this contribution.

Mr. REED. I am very happy to have the contribution from the Senator from Nebraska, and I thank him. He has done his part in this struggle.

This morning I, too, received a letter, from my very good friend, "Bill" Miller, who is sanitary livestock commissioner in Kansas, and a spokesman for the livestock producers of Kansas. The letter is so intimate in its personal allusions that I shall not read it all, but I thought this one sentence might interest Senators. He writes me:

Senator, the President and Byrnes are certainly raising hell in the meat and livestock situation.

I think that fairly well epitomizes the sentiment of all the livestock growers, the President and "Jim" Byrnes are certainly raising hell, out in the livestock country, with even the announcement of their policy. The letter continued:

I know of any number of our feeders that are simply not going to feed cattle due to the uncertainty of grain and protein concentrates and the inability to buy at any price.

As a matter of fact, they cannot get corn, they cannot get protein feeds. The conditions already are disturbing enough and difficult enough, and now announcements have come along in the last few days which have broken the market price.

Mr. President, suppose you were a farmer and had a hundred steers, or a thousand steers, or five thousand steers, as some have. I think the Senator from South Dakota cited a case a few days ago of one who had about a thousand steers. And suppose this announcement had broken the price $12 a head, and the livestock producer was immediately faced with a loss of $12,000 on his cattle, which were ready for market. When we come down to the essence of this matter, the consumers cannot eat subsidies, and the subsidy program, intended to further increase the income of industrial workers, will disturb production.

Of course, I know the industrial workers comprise the largest segment of political support left to the President on the home front. I do not desire to inject any partisan tinge into this debate, but that is the truth. All these policies are made, not with a view of aiding the consumer in general, not with a view of protecting this class which needs protection, the people with fixed incomes, but all the policies are made, conceived, and carried out for the purpose of increasing the incomes of that class which has already had the largest actual, relative increase among all the classes of our people.

Lest I may be thought to be perhaps overstating, I wish to refer to a publication edited by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who I think publishes one of the finest journals of opinion in the country. I refer to the Progressive.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for that "plug."

Mr. REED. If I am advertising the Senator's publication, I am doing it sincerely and earnestly. I receive the publication at the place where I live, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin knows I read it.

I wish to refer to a statement from the Progressive, of which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is the editor and publisher and owner—and I hope it supplements his senatorial income.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator need not worry on that score. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I read from the Progressive of June 21, 1943:

Although the administration sought to create the impression that its only labor difficulties were with Lewis and the United Mine Workers, it has been clear enough for some time that all of organized labor is becoming resentful of the run-around it has received in Washington. Last week, for instance, mild-mannered William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, predicted a "spontaneous revolt" of wage earners unless living costs are cut.

Mr. President, that is what I have been talking about. That is why I have gone to all this trouble to show the relation of the wage earner to living costs. No one can examine the charts I have presented, and which will appear in the RECORD, which contains official and reliable figures, without knowing that the wage earner has been amply protected, better protected than any other class of people in the country, and yet Mr. Green is quoted in the newspaper published by the Senator from Wisconsin as predicting a "spontaneous revolt" of wage earners unless living costs are cut.

I continue to read from the Progressive:

Calling for a slash in living costs or an increase in wages beyond the Little Steel formula, Green declared that "the workers of the Nation feel that their Government has gone back on its promise to extend them equality of treatment in the cost of living control."

Let me go back, Mr. President, to the first table which I offered for the RECORD, and which will be published in the RECORD. Between January 1, 1939, at which time wages had already doubled through the 25 years preceding, and the immediate period of which Mr. Green complains, that is, between January 1, 1939, and April 1943, hourly wages had increased 57.9 percent, weekly wages had increased 92.9 percent, and the cost of living had increased 24 percent. Yet Mr. Green threatens us with a "spontaneous revolt" unless wages are further increased, or living costs—and he means the prices paid to the farmer—are reduced.

Mr. President, I have about concluded my remarks. I wish to make my position clear. My sympathy goes to the white-collar worker, to the man with a fixed income, who always gets the worst of it in a situation of this kind. I wish there were some way to help him. I think some way might be found if the high authority of government would give this problem some attention from that angle, which it never has done, and which it shows no inclination of doing.

Secondly, I have no quarrel with respect to good wages. I want workers to receive good wages. But I do not want them to receive good wages, and then, through their undue influence with the national administration, having already been preferred above any other class, to come forward with the backing of the administration and threaten a spontaneous revolt unless their already favorable situation is improved at the farmer's expense.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 3.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in opposition to the committee amendment which would authorize the expenditure of $500,000,000 to carry out the roll-back of prices on meat, butter, and coffee, or such other roll-back programs as might be carried out within that amount of expenditure.

Three main reasons are advanced for the adoption of this amendment:

One, that it will result in a saving to the consumer.

Two, that it will prevent inflation.

Three, that it will carry out the announced program of the Chief Executive.

I believe that the adoption of this form of subsidy, which many of the best legal minds in the Senate believe to be an illegal procedure, will be but the beginning of a general program of subsidy which in the long run will not decrease but will increase the cost to the consumer by adding constantly heavy burdens of taxation. I believe that it will not prevent, but will hasten and contribute to inflation. However, the larger, and immediately important problem, is that of production, price control, and distribution of our vital "food for victory."

Every member of the Senate committee who heard the voluminous testimony given during the investigation of the manpower problem is fully aware of the tragic neglect and almost criminal bungling of our food-production program.

The shortage of machinery, the lack of fertilizer, and the excessive draining of men from the farms by both the armed forces and industrial plants by reason of the high wages paid by them, prove conclusively that we will surely fall short of last year's production even if we were to have the most favorable weather conditions.

The extremely late planting season and the destructive effects of floods in the Midwest are certain to have added disastrous effects on our production.

The failure to allow price and wage increases to canners has materially reduced the possibility of saving large portions of our already reduced production of many foods.

The control of the price of corn threatens to close many corn-products factories, which will definitely hinder not only many of our war industries and essential food-products industries, but threatens to force its skilled workers to find employment in other industries and then prevent them from making their highest contribution to our already unprecedented war task.

The dairy herds and poultry flocks are both going to suffer by reason of lack of properly prepared foods because of inability to secure corn, and thousands of hogs and other essential brood animals will be sent to market because of lack of feed.

This will further materially reduce the supply of milk, butter, eggs, cheese, meats, and fats for human consumption, as well as many essential elements so vitally necessary to our industrial war effort.

Now comes the further deterring and distressing program of costly and confusing systems of roll-back subsidies which were never authorized by law.

Confusion on the home front will soon be a more deadly weapon against our American war effort than enemy submarines and airplanes.

The brilliance of our American design and construction engineers plus the daring and courage of our fighting young American men are fast overcoming the weapons and fighting ability of our enemies abroad, while we have wandered farther into the wilderness of confusion on the home front.

Our people in the Midwest are distressed over this constant confusion caused by conflicting directives, orders, questionnaires, releases, and statements coming out of the overlapping bureaus and commissions in Washington. They are disturbed by the conflicting stories of further curtailing their use of gasoline, the conflicting stories concerning the drafting of fathers, the changing controls of the use of manpower, materials, and awarding of war contracts, and now the changing rules concerning the prices of food.

If we were to enact into law the measure now before us we would merely confound existing confusion. When Chester Davis was called back to Washington to assume the role of Food Administrator, many of us felt that a sound and sane program was in the making. Instead, it turned out to be just another makeshift gesture. A capable man was given grave responsibility without adequate authority. It is my firm conviction that unless he is quickly given genuine authority over prices, production, and distribution of food we will lose the beneficial effect of the confidence he commanded in the commercial, financial, and farming population of our country.

The testimony before our committee investigating manpower showed that at no time was food production, through responsible representation, ever given a seat at the table where the strategy, plans, and policies of our gigantic war effort were considered and decided.

When Chester Davis was called in at a critically late hour to tackle the tremendous job of food administration, he was not even then made a member of our War Mobilization Board.

The time has come for Congress, in full possession of these facts, to fulfill its responsibility as the elected representatives of the people and to say "No" to any more half measures, and to insist that full authority be granted to a responsible man to establish an intelligent program of producing, preserving, pricing, and distributing food.

The farmers who produce and the organizations which process our food supply have all made known their dissatisfaction with and their protest against the ruinous confusion and the cost of the proposed additional bureaucratic control over food production, prices, and distribution. To enact a measure providing for such control is merely to fly in the face of those sincere, patriotic American citizens who ask only that we give them a clear program under which they may make their full contribution in producing the principal product needed for the American war effort—food. Further delays are dangerous, for food is the No. 1 essential weapon for victory, and certainly is by far the most effective weapon in establishing and preserving a permanent peace.

The daily stories of the gallantry of the services and sufferings of our young men and women overseas should no longer be a smoke screen to shield inadequate plans and inefficiencies on the vital home front. The warnings against the approaching food shortage and the protest against the confusion that will cause it have been stated time and again. The hour for action has come. We, the Congress, have a definite responsibility to demand that adequate authority be given to the Food Administrator under the vast powers given to the Chief Executive, or we should set up that authority now by further legislative action.

The time for procrastination, evasion, indecision, and makeshift half measures is past. Therefore, we should say "No" to these particular forms of subsidies in order to prevent their hindering rather than helping the production and processing of our already inadequate supply of food.

If we do not stop taking half-step measures farther into the wilderness of confusion, we shall add greatly to the difficulties entailed in defeating our enemies abroad, and the starving people we will liberate will find that we have come with an empty cupboard.

If the general roll-back subsidy program is adopted, very little of the money provided under it will cause a reduction of prices to consumers; but, as heretofore proven in the case of both butter and beef, the result will be a reduction of prices to the producers; and a large portion of the money will be absorbed in the creation of further bureaucratic control and bungling.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	Wilson
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is in the form of a subsidy to pay commitments which have been incurred by the executive department of the Government. The legality of the commitments upon which the bill is based has been denied by the distinguished Senator and attorney from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He said yesterday that he did not believe that there was any foundation for the proposed subsidy in any legislation upon the statute books, or words to that effect, if I do not quote him exactly. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a similar statement. I understand that that is his view. Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on what law the proposed legislation was based; and with all due respect to the distinguished Senator, I could not find satisfaction in his explanation.

The legality of the proposed subsidy legislation is based upon the strange opinion of the Attorney General that the packer is a producer. The purpose of the bill is said to be to take care of the producer. This subsidy, if enacted into law, will therefore be paid to the packer of meat, who has already bought hogs and cattle at prices below the ceiling. We know that when the Executive edict with respect to the subsidy program was announced, the prices of cattle and hogs dropped on the market as much as a dollar or more a hundred pounds.

The proposed subsidy would be paid to the packer of meat, who has already bought hogs and cattle at prices below the ceiling; but apparently the farmer has no recourse. The executive department has, under this policy, made commitments without the consent of Congress, and now asks Congress to make good this commitment by check written on a bank with no funds. The question for Congress to decide is, Shall the Congress make good this claim based on the strange legal imagination that the packer is the producer and can collect if this bill is passed, but that the farmer, who has sold his hogs and cattle, has no recourse? He has already taken his loss. The bill, if passed, should specify that the claim for loss should be paid to the original producer. The processors have already protected their losses by reduced prices to the farmer, who is the original producer.

The bill is, in effect, in the form of a claim for damages. If any funds are to be expended, they ought to be paid to those who have sustained the loss. It is my opinion that the Congress has already made good too many post-dated checks. The practice of the executive department in making commitments of expenditures without the sanction of Congress is a subversive activity for the Executive to control the purse, a power vested in Congress. This is not only a post-dated check but is, in fact, also a blank check, to be signed by Congress and filled out for such amount as the executive agencies may find need to meet such commitments as they may assume.

When the executive department has a policy which involves expenditures, it should come to Congress for permission to incur commitments of such nature as may occur to them. The sooner the Congress takes action to enforce that policy and its authority over the purse the sooner we shall have less confusion and greater satisfaction with the administration of the war effort and our national economy and life.

This bill is, in effect, a claim for damages suffered by the producer of beef, pork, and butter as a result of the roll-back policy of the O. P. A., and unless the funds from this post-dated check issued without authority of Congress are paid to the original producer who has sustained the loss, the bill should not be passed at all. I do not see how, under this program, such funds can now at this late date be paid to the farmer, because he has already taken his loss. Therefore, I cannot support the Taft amendment or the bill in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, dealing with hourly and weekly earnings of factory workers, cost of living, retail cost of foods, and prices received by farmers, to which I referred when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] was speaking, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of wages, cost of living, food costs, and farm prices, 1910 to date

[1910–14=100]

Year	Hourly earnings factory workers	Weekly wages per factory worker	Cost of living	Retail cost of foods	Prices received by farmers
1910–14	100	100	100	100	100
1914	105	103	104	106	101
1915	108	107	105	104	98
1916	123	121	113	117	118
1917	147	143	133	151	175
1918	193	183	156	173	202
1919	226	207	179	193	213
1920	273	247	207	213	211
1921	239	208	185	166	125
1922	219	202	173	155	132
1923	246	224	177	160	142
1924	257	225	177	158	143
1925	257	229	182	171	156
1926	259	231	183	177	145
1927	261	232	180	171	139
1928	265	234	178	169	149
1929	268	235	178	171	146
1930	261	218	173	163	126
1931	244	196	158	134	87
1932	216	159	141	112	65
1933	215	154	134	109	70
1934	256	170	139	121	90
1935	264	183	142	130	108
1936	267	196	144	131	114
1937	300	213	149	136	121
1938	302	195	146	126	95
1939	304	208	144	123	92
1940	318	222	145	125	98
1941	351	264	152	136	122
1942	410	331	169	160	157
March 1943	449	365	178	177	182

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

	March 1943 compared with May 1942	March 1943 compared with 1919	March 1943 compared with 1939	March 1943 compared with 1926
Average hourly earnings	[1] 12	[1] 99	[1] 47.7	[1] 73.4
Average weekly earnings	[1] 16	[1] 76	[1] 75.5	[1] 58
Cost of living	[1] 5.9	[2] .005	[1] 23.5	[2] 2.7
Retail cost of food	[1] 12.7	[2] 8	[1] 43.8	[2] 2.7
Farm prices	[1] 19	[2] 14.5	[1] 97	[1] 25

[1] Percent more. [2] Percent less.

THE PRESIDENT'S WORK OR FIGHT STATEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the President made a public announcement favoring the work or fight principle and amendment of the Selective Service and Training Act to raise the age limit for noncombat military service from 45 to 65 years.

He said:

I shall make that request of the Congress so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government or taken possession of by the Government, the machinery will be available for prompt action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Virginia understand that in the case of any plant which had any difficulty, the proposal to which he has referred would authorize the President to draft all the workmen in the plant, and compel them to work whether they wanted to or not?

Mr. BYRD. I will say, Mr. President, that I have quoted the language of the President of the United States, and the Senator from Texas can interpret it as well as I can.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point I make is that it seems to me the Senator is correct in the assumption that if the President's plan should be adopted by the Congress, any plant which he might desire to take over, could be taken over by him and he could draft into the armed service every man in the plant, and if the men refused to work they would be guilty of desertion and subject to the penalties for desertion, whatever they may be. That seems to me to be a much more drastic and rigid remedy than anything proposed in the labor relations bill which passed the House and the Senate by such overwhelming majorities, and which approximately 90 percent of the people of the United States are demanding to be approved and made a law.

Mr. BYRD. On March 1, Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 802, which provides for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to give control over all registrants from 18 to 65 and which, with some modifications, is in substance what the President now proposes.

Had this proposed legislation promptly been enacted, the situation which now confronts us with respect to the lack of available governmental machinery to require those who are now striking in the coal mines to go back to work would not exist.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is there anything in the legislation proposed by the Senator from Virginia, which he is now discussing, which would conflict in any degree with the bill which now awaits the President's signature?

Mr. BYRD. Not at all. I shall come to that point in a moment.

Shortly after the introduction of my proposed legislation, the different agencies of the Government indicated their disapproval of the work-or-fight principle, which is now proposed by the President of the United States and embodied in the Byrd bill. On April 8, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, wrote to the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee indicating his disapproval of Senate bill 802. On April 3, Mr. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, indicated his disapproval. On May 5, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, indicated his disapproval. On May 11, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, indicated his disapproval.

Now that the President of the United States will recommend to Congress the work-or-fight principle and the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act for the purpose of extending the age limit for induction into the armed service from 45 to 65, I assume those

officials—W. P. B. Chairman Nelson, War Manpower Commissioner McNutt, the Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of War—will withdraw their opposition to the work-or-fight principle embodied in Senate bill 802 introduced by me.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has introduced proposed legislation along the same general lines.

In view of the announcement of the President of the United States, I am requesting the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] promptly to call a meeting of his committee for the purpose of considering Senate bill 802, introduced by me on March 1, at which time I will present certain amendments, but will retain the work-or-fight principle so that those from 18 to 65 who refuse to work behind the lines in order to supply the boys on the fighting front will be subject to the same control by the Government as those who are inducted into the armed service.

I congratulate the President on his recommendation to Congress that those who have already registered from 18 to 65 for the purpose of rendering the most effective service during the war emergency should come under the control of the Selective Service and Training Act, and give to the authorities the right to require them to work in defense industries, or be inducted into the armed service.

The very least we can do in performing our duty to those who are facing the enemy on many foreign battlefields is to compel those at home to do what may be necessary to produce the implements of war so that these American men may effectively do their part on the foreign front.

Mr. President, we have temporized with this situation long enough. Our domestic front is in the most chaotic condition that this country has ever witnessed. Unless firm measures soon are taken we may lose this war on the home front and certainly the war will be lengthened and many American boys will pay the supreme penalty because of our failure to do what we should do at home in a total war effort which can come only from total sacrifice.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that I sincerely hope the proposal just made by the President of the United States to work or fight is not made as a substitute for the Connally-Smith bill, but that it will be considered only as a measure to implement that legislation.

I believe, Mr. President, that a veto of the Connally-Smith bill would have disastrous consequences on public morale. This legislation, after months of debate and conflict, was finally enacted by both Houses of Congress. It provides strong measures to meet the labor crisis that now confronts us. Implemented by further legislation on the work-or-fight principle, our country can be assured that for the duration of the war there can be no further interruption in the production of those supplies essential for our victory.

I have no means, of course, of knowing what the President proposes to do. In the next few hours he must make his decision. It will be a momentous decision in the history of America. If he vetoes the Connally-Smith bill, millions of Americans will believe that a trade has been made with John L. Lewis—that in return for Lewis permitting the mines to operate an agreement was made that the strike legislation would be vetoed. I do not presume to say whether or not such a belief will be warranted by the actual facts, but I do say that beyond question many millions of our citizens will believe that such was the case.

We should recognize that John Lewis has made the working of the mines conditional on his own terms, namely, that he will continue to work the mines only so long as the Government operates them, and when the Government ceases to operate the mines, he has emphasized, the agreement to continue to work until October is immediately rescinded.

We cannot permit any one man in America to offer terms to the United States Government in time of war in the operation of a vital industry essential to our war production.

Let the President sign the Connally-Smith bill and then implement this bill by work-or-fight legislation, as he has now proposed, and for the duration we can feel assured that no further labor troubles will occur.

I regret, Mr. President, that such strong measures are necessary, but in view of the open defiance to governmental authority by John Lewis, there is no alternative, as I see it. Our labor policies have been weak and vacillating. To delay firm action longer will be to invite certain disaster on the home front.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator referred to a postponement until October 31, conditioned on Government operation. Conceding that the passage of the strike bill had some influence in making Lewis go back to work, or rather, not in making him go back to work but making other people go back to work, what will happen in October when he renews the strike without the strike bill or anything else? What is to hinder him from breaking out again in October? I want to emphasize the necessity both of the strike bill, and then if the Senator can get his legislation through, which probably he will have a hard time doing, well and good.

Mr. BYRD. I realize the Senator from Virginia cannot do it alone, but I thought, with the influence of the President of the United States back of the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia there might be a chance.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to say that it in nowise removes the necessity and desirability of approval of the bill I introduced in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I tried to make as clear as I could in my statement that it is very important and vital that the Connally-Smith bill be signed, and that it be made a law.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as we know, there are conference reports on appropriation bills now pending for action; the Appropriations Committee will meet this afternoon on the Federal Security and Labor appropriation bill; there are also to be considered the huge War Department appropriation bill, and an appropriation bill for war agencies, and another deficiency bill to come along. These bills must become law by next Wednesday evening. So it is greatly to be desired that the Senate make disposition of the pending bill as soon as we reasonably can. In view of the circumstances, I ask, Mr. President, that during the consideration of the pending bill, no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes on any amendment, on any motion, or on the bill itself, and that no Senator shall speak more than once on any motion, on any amendment, or on the bill itself.

Mr. McNARY. That, as I understand, would give each Senator a total of 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Any Senator could speak 15 minutes on any amendment, and 15 minutes on the bill, which would give a total of 30 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is the most important measure that has come before the Senate, at least this year, and, perhaps, the most important measure that has ever been presented to the Senate. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Objection is heard.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I took time of the Senate to speak about the food situation in the State of Wisconsin. I had particular reference at that time to the situation concerning the pea crop. This morning I received a long-distance telephone call, the gist of which is:

> After a cold, wet spring, hot weather has come, and the crop is coming on very fast. It has brought us a bumper crop of peas. If labor is not obtained, will lose between 20 and 25 percent of the food.

Mr. President, I spoke yesterday of the fact that in north Africa and Tunisia, in order to save the food crop of Tunisia American brains there went into action, utilized the armed forces and the gasoline, trucks, and machinery of the Army. In my section—the Middle West—there are great Army camps. I want men of the armed forces used to save the crops.

Mr. President, listen to this quotation from the telephone conversation:

> The United States Employment Service has been doing all it can, but there is no manpower available. It is not their fault.

That means that in that section there have been sucked off the farms and put into plants producing war supplies the men who should now be harvesting the peas and working in the pea canneries.

It means that the men from the cities and villages who were available last year are in war production plants receiving big pay. Something must be done at once. The only available man supply is in the Army camps.

Mr. President, listen to this part of the telephone message which I had my secretary transcribe:

They are sending some soldiers out of Truax Field for a day at a time. They have to be back in camp at 7 o'clock. We pay them for 10 or 12 hours, but they work actually only about 8 hours. It is better than nothing.

The telephone message continues:

Soldiers should be made available with their own living quarters, as most of the places—

Meaning the villages and the cities—

can't house them.

Let us stop and view the situation. When I talked yesterday to one of the military men he said, "Do you think, Senator, that the villages or cities where canning factories are located could arrange to take care of the 50 men you want there?" I said, "I do not know. I do not know how they can."

Suppose the Army was to pursue such a course in Tunisia—ask for quarters. The Army have their own kitchens, and their own tents. We are talking now about preserving or losing from 20 to 25 percent of the pea crop. The Army, located in groups in camps such as Camp Grant, Camp McCoy, and others, say, "Won't you please provide housing, and we will send our boys out by truck, but we must have those boys back in the evening. They cannot stay out when it gets dark." That is the sum and substance of what is said which shows an absolute lack of comprehension of the situation.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. Twenty-five percent of the pea crop will be wasted unless we can get men into the fields. Ordinarily I do not use language such as I am now employing; ordinarily I try to be calm, but if we do not get that crop in—and I am not talking on behalf of the canneries, I am talking on behalf of the boys in the armed services, I am talking on behalf of the people of this country who have to eat—if the authorities do not learn the lesson in regard to peas, they will not learn it in regard to corn, or tomatoes, or spinach, or any of the other crops. If you please, they will not learn the lesson which our own folks in Tunisia taught when it was necessary to save the wheat crop there.

Listen to this telephone message, which came over the wire just half an hour ago:

Situation particularly critical in Dodge and Columbia Counties, Jefferson, and Fond du Lac.

Yesterday in Columbus 27 vineries should have been running and only 9 were.

Two-thirds of those vineries were out of action, and Senators know what that means. Twenty-seven in one town, Columbus, should have been running, when only nine were. Yet the officials of this Government, who have the over-all picture in their hands, will not see to it that orders are issued to make men available to preserve the food.

The telephone message continues:

The crop in the northern part of the State will be coming end of next week.

That means at La Crosse, Eau Claire, and my own town of Chippewa Falls. In that area the situation is very critical. The telephone message continues:

We were up to Camp McCoy the day before yesterday talking to the commanding officer. He told us his field troops were under field orders and not available. He is going to make some 200 to 500 limited-service men available on 3-day passes. We hope they will get down tonight. However, we still need 500 men in that particular area.

The gentleman who was talking, Mr. Verhulst, secretary of the canneries' association of the State, said:

We are not holding the United States Employment Service responsible—there simply isn't the manpower here.

Meaning that in the villages and cities and on the farms there is not the manpower, but in the camps there is the manpower available to save the food of this country for our armed forces and ourselves. Yet there are not the brains available to get the crops out—release the manpower to save the food for the Nation.

The telephone message continues:

Have been told troops from Fort Meade have been called to harvest crop in Maryland.

Thank God there are some brains somewhere in this country. I hope this news is true. I sincerely hope it is true, and I sincerely hope that whoever is responsible for the exercise of a little brain power in this picture will get credit, I hope, too, that, as in the East, the good work will permeate the whole lump, meaning the whole country, so that as the harvest comes on in the various sections of the Nation, the manpower will be made available.

The important thing now is to get boys out of the camps during the harvest and into the canneries. As I suggested yesterday, the primary problem in our country now is to preserve the food first. Everything else should be secondary. I could take the time to tell the Senate how many millions of men we have in training, and I could tell also how many it is estimated will eventually go overseas. Then I could tell how much of a reservoir would be left in this country to sit around and march around and train around. Of course, the brass hats cannot see the need of preserving the food. They have gotten into a rut and cannot see what is necessary. If the boys do not get the food, later on they will not be in shape to train or fight.

We heard remarks this morning by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in relation to the signing of the strike bill. Is there any difference between men stopping work and thus preventing the production necessary to provide the arms with which our soldiers are to fight, and the lack of brains on the part of those who should have brains to see to it that the food is preserved? One is as bad as the other. In one case there is absolute inaction on the part of men who should be active in production. In the other case there is mental blindness on the part of men who should be active in seeing that the food is harvested, placed in cans, and preserved for the Nation.

I sincerely hope that somewhere someone will be found who will send the word out to the proper officials in the camps in Wisconsin and elsewhere, "First things first. Get the men out to preserve these crops."

I say, Mr. President, that if we lose 25 percent of this food crop, everyone of us will suffer this year.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association dealing with the matter of subsidies and the price roll-back. I particularly wish to state that the North Dakota Stockmen's Association is the leading livestock association in the State of North Dakota, and it speaks with authority in regard to stock raising. Mr. Arndt, the secretary, is thoroughly familiar with the problem.

Mr. GEORGE. Are the members of this association favorable to the price roll-back or against it?

Mr. LANGER. Let me read the letter and the Senator can judge for himself:

NORTH DAKOTA STOCKMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minot, N. Dak., June 21, 1943.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The other day I wrote to you expressing not only my personal opinion but the opinion of this association on the subsidy and price roll-back program. I thought you might be interested in just how this subsidy program is affecting the cattle market, and I am enclosing a sheet from the Markets magazine of Thursday, June 17. It would seem to me that in view of the fact that we are supposed to try to encourage production all that we possibly can, this is just about the silliest thing that was ever attempted and the final result must be apparent to everyone.

As far as I am concerned, I believe that if this program is followed out, there will be a genuine crisis in the livestock industry. With all of the uncertainties and confusions in the market, I do not see how we can expect feeders to take cattle out to the feed lots for the additional gain that we need so badly when it is almost self-evident that they are going to lose money. Feed costs are rising every day and feed is becoming scarcer day by day also. Labor costs are all out of sight and just how anyone is going to be able to stay in this business of producing food under circumstances of this kind is something that I cannot answer.

I do not see how anyone representing an agricultural State would even consider supporting a proposition of this kind, and if the administration is permitted to go through with it, we are headed for a lot of trouble.

Further I think that the time has come when we should stop trying to appease labor at the expense of agriculture.

Yours very truly,

L. E. ARNDT, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article published in Markets of Thursday, June 17, 1943, referred to by Mr. Arndt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACKERS FAIL TO REDUCE CATTLE PRICES; SALESMEN REFUSE BIDS OF 75 CENTS TO $1 OFF

(By Federal-State Market News Service)

The sharply lower opening session in the cattle division at South St. Paul was apparently a part of a Nation-wide campaign to reduce live cattle costs in anticipation of a roll-back in meat prices.

Monday's session was by far the slowest of the current season. Sellers being taken by surprise, were hardly prepared for the sharply lower bids, and as a result the entire market was somewhat confused.

Steers and yearlings were bid largely 50 cents and more lower, while on other classes, bids ranged 50 cents to $1 lower. The selling side, however, put up a strong resistance, refusing in some instances to show consignments, and taking a few steers off the market.

The net result was a 25 cents to 50 cents lower market on steers while cows and bulls were unevenly 25 cents to 75 cents lower. The producing faction would not be stampeded, however, and subsequent sessions saw a sharp reduction in salable supplies.

Thus with supplies already running below normal, any further decreases could have only one result, namely a tendency for prices to move upward again toward levels prevailing late last week. At midweek fed steers, yearlings, and heifers were weak to mostly 25 cents lower.

The top for fed steers for the week was $16 paid for a package of choice 1,358-pound fed steers, and there were other lots of strictly good and choice in a range of $15.50 to $15.75. It was largely a $13.75 to $15 market on the rank and file medium and good grades on Wednesday, with numerous lots of medium grade lightweight steers having sold down to $13.25 earlier in the week.

Good and choice yearling heifers sold up to $14.50 on Monday but subsequently there was little available above the good grade. The bulk medium and good heifers changed hands from $13 to $14.25, with a few common dairy-breds downward to $11.25.

Cows recovered around 25 cents of earlier losses, selling at midweek generally 25 cents to 50 cents lower, in a very uneven trade. The practical limit for good beef cows was $13 compared with $13.50 late last week while cutters stopped at $10 compared with instances up to $10.75 last Friday.

Canners were not so severely hit and while odd head had to go below $7.50, the bulk sold above $7.75.

Only odd head good beef bulls realized $12.75 on Monday, but by Tuesday this price was paid quite freely and on Wednesday there was a fair showing at $13. Unlike late last week, however, there were no bulls quoted up to $13.25 making the average loss figure about 25 cents.

Medium and good sausage offerings sold late in a bulk spread of $10.25 to $12.50.

Vealers lost 50 cents as their part of the lower trend, but in this class, there were no violent price losses or recoveries, rather a gradual lower trend.

Good and choice vealers went at $13 to $15, with odd head going to shippers up to $15.50. Common and medium kinds centered around $9.50 to $12.50, with light culls here and there down to $7.

Mr. LANGER. I have before me another letter which may interest the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The letter is addressed to me, under date of June 20, 1943, and is from a group of farmers and livestock producers residing in the vicinity of Mohall, N. Dak. I believe it is one of the most important letters dealing with this problem I have received. It is as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Due to the concern of a large number of livestock producers in the vicinity of Mohall over the declining prices of hogs and cattle and the constantly rising price of feed grains, which has been very prevalent in recent weeks, a group of livestock growers gathered last evening at the office of Theo. Clifford and, after considerable discussion, a decision was made to call you by long-distance telephone.

After our fine discussion with you regarding the program, it was decided to call a meeting this morning at 11 a. m., at which time a large number of farmers were present representing both large and small growers of livestock. I am sure that you personally know many of these men: Frank Sandberg, living west of Mohall; Palmer Asheim, east of Mohall; Lawrence Johansen, our local creamery operator at Mohall; Theo. P. Clifford, attorney and farmer; Harry Lohse, farmer and livestock raiser—

I may add that for a long time he was State chairman of the A. A. A.—

Roy Hoke and a considerable number of others.

We have gone about gathering some information which I believe will throw considerable light on the situation as we see it at this time. Constantly during the summer of 1942, and well into the winter of 1943, every effort was being made upon the part of representatives of the Department of Agriculture encouraging livestock producers and grain farmers to grow everything they could possibly grow because of the urgent war needs.

Today we find ourselves confronted with an estimate by the Renville County agent, Mr. Al Strong, to the effect that we have at least a 30 percent increase in hogs, a very marked increase in the number of milk cows, as well as other cattle and a vast amount of sheep and lambs. However, for the past 10 days, because of the increase in barley prices, we find a virtual stampede of immature spring pigs and unfinished packing sows coming to our local market with this explanation by the farmers: That, with 81-cent barley here at Mohall as of June 19, it is impossible for them to see where they can afford to feed this high-price feed and market their hogs at the price of $12.40 per hundredweight, which is the local livestock market. We find this condition existing together with the terrific handicap our farmers are working under because of the shortage of available farm labor and inexperienced farm help, as well as a complete lack of equipment.

With these thoughts in mind, the above mentioned group took it upon themselves to make rapid telephone surveys, and we are submitting this information to you. The amount of barley that has been shipped out of this locality is as follows:

1. Mohall—

A town of about 2,000 population—

has shipped out 6 cars of barley the past 10 days.

2. Tolley—

A town of about 1,000 population—

a rough estimate of 42,000 bushels in recent months.

3. Glenburn—

A town of about 1,000 population—

some 4,000 bushels of barley as well as 4,000 bushels of oats.

When elevator men here were asked why the shipping out of this feed grain, the answer from everyone has been that they can ill afford to hold this grain with the uncertainty of prices, while at the same time everyone was well aware that much of this feed will be needed here locally at a later date.

Furthermore, we find that Commodity Credit has asked for and is accepting the liquidations of 1942 and prior wheat loans to the extent that the Hurley Farmers Elevator at Loraine, managed by H. A. Gates, will be moving 80,000 bushels of wheat as fast as available cars can be obtained. Other elevators in Renville and West Bottineau Counties report the same situation. That brings us to a cleaning out, so to speak, of wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, as well as barley and oats moving because of attractive prices to the local terminals, and an immediate liquidation of the barley and oats because of fear of Office of Price Administration ceiling prices.

It would appear that in the event something should happen to our crops, of having the ridiculous situation of first shipping out such grains as might be needed to feed this livestock—and then, perhaps, following it with a great number of unfinished livestock.

I am sure, Senator, that you are well aware that we here in the western part of North Dakota are never quite sure of a crop until the same is in the bin.

We also took a hurried survey at random, by telephone, of 15 representative farmers, and we are submitting their feed situation and the number of hogs on their farms:

Mr. O. P. Witteman, west of Mohall—170 pigs, 30 sows. Has 800 bushels of barley on hand. Expected to buy local feed in the event that he did not raise sufficient feed himself. Witteman informs us that he has made inquiry to purchase feed within the past week and has been unable to locate feed from any of his neighbors.

Asheim and Johansen, operating south of Mohall—70 sows, 30 feeder pigs, and 400 spring pigs. As of this morning they have 300 bushels of barley on hand.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, that would be only enough to feed these animals for about a week.

William Witteman, east of Mohall—150 pigs, 20 sows. He figures he has 2 weeks' feed on hand.

Charles Adams, the writer, of Lansford territory, has 100 hogs, 70 ready for market, 10 sows, and 160 spring pigs. Have about 4,000 bushels of feed on hand, and after making this survey this morning, feel that I am much more fortunate than many of my neighbors.

Joe Fisher, southeast of Mohall, has 36 sows, 230 pigs, and 200 bushels of barley on hand. Was planning on buying feed barley, perhaps wheat, but because of this decline in hog prices and upward trend of feed grains, is seriously contemplating discontinuing this project.

John Gates, west of Loraine, has 26 sows, 230 pigs, 200 bushels of barley on hand. Had hoped to be able to avail himself of local supplies of barley and wheat.

This man has just about 10 days' supply of feed.

George Capranos, north of Mohall, one of our larger operators—last year raised about 400 hogs, and has been constantly liquidating until at this date he has 35 sows, 75 pigs, and 300 bushels of feed on hand. He is seriously considering disposing of the balance of the pigs and sows at whatever price he can get because of the uncertainty of market conditions.

L. H. Oberholtzer, of Grano territory, has 44 sows, 170 spring pigs, and 1,000 bushels of feed on hand. Expected to get grain locally until 1943 feeds were available. Reports corn crop making very unfavorable progress and is quite disturbed over this entire situation.

We have had too much rain in this part of the State, and the prospects for corn crops are not good. Of course, if we have considerable good weather from now on, the crops will come through. Out there, as the Senator from Georgia perhaps knows, most of us raise corn which matures early.

Albert Mace, of northeast of Mohall, about halfway between Antler and Mohall. Mr. Mace is one of the smaller operators—has 7 sows, 45 pigs, and 150 bushels of feed on hand. Was attempting to market these hogs Saturday evening because he feels, with feed prices as they are, he is better off without his hogs.

John Asheim, northeast of Mohall, has 60 sows and feeder hogs and 130 spring pigs. Reports that he has plenty of feed and will continue to operate.

Senator W. J. Trout, of Sherwood territory, has 30 sows, 200 spring pigs. Plenty of feed on hand, but very much disappointed with price situation and seriously thinks of selling all but a few hogs for home consumption.

John Mace, west of Mohall, has 12 sows, 100 spring pigs, and 100 bushels of feed on hand. He is undecided what to do, but believes he will market sows as soon as pigs are weaned, admitting they will go to market in unsatisfactory condition.

Frank Sandberg, west of Mohall, sold 75 spring pigs and will be selling his sows this week. He is keeping 1 hog to butcher. Will sell the feed rather than feed it to hogs.

Roy Hoke, of Greene territory, has eight sows which will be marketed immediately. He has sold all of his spring pigs. He feels that ratio between pigs and grain prices makes it impossible for him to grow them out; also confronted with labor problems.

Peder Rice, east of Mohall, has 30 sows, 150 pigs. Mr. Rice reports he has plenty of feed.

I trust this will give you a picture of our local situation.

Mr. President, let me say that, in my judgment, the situation described in the letter is typical of conditions in all the western section of North Dakota. The community the writer of the letter describes is an average community.

The letter continues:

We also made a brief survey of the estimates of the possibility of having matured corn. Peter Asheim reports his corn is just coming up. He says it may make for fodder, but does not look to have any ripe corn—

Let me add, for the information of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, that usually by the Fourth of July the corn in North Dakota is at least 2 feet above the ground.

The letter continues:

Al Strong, county agent, reports that corn prospects are decidedly poor and that only about 50 percent of the 1942 corn acreage has been planted this spring;

Let me add that the same situation exists in eastern Montana. Conditions in both sections are identical.

I read further from the letter:

Frank Sandberg feels corn crop prospects very poor and looks for no ripe corn; the writer's corn prospects are very poor due to several contributing factors—poor seed, cold spring, and some seed which is not adapted to our territory; Theo. P. Clifford feels that we do not have a chance for ripe corn;

Let me say that Mr. Clifford is a man of about 45 years of age who was born in North Dakota and is an expert, as things go out there.

The letter continues:

Lawrence Johansen cut his corn acreage in half and expects no corn to reach maturity; Ed Bred, local elevator manager here states that too much southern corn has been planted, and says we can expect but little corn here this year.

This briefly, is a survey of our corn situation here, and I will admit it does not look bright. Our spring has been decidedly wet and backward; even snow storms in June.

In June, they had 5 inches of snow at Minot, N. Dak., and in western Montana.

I read further from the letter:

None of these conditions being conducive to a corn year.

Referring again to a paragraph in the early part of my letter, one can readily see that with our barley in October 1942 at 35 cents—

I, myself, sold some at that time at about that price—

and live hogs marketing at $13.75 to $14 a hundredweight, it was a comparatively easy matter to sell increased production of hogs and livestock by our local agricultural representatives, but when we find ourselves today with barley at 81 cents and hogs at less than $12.50 a hundredweight, there is a keen disappointment on the part of the people who have learned to look to the Department of Agriculture representatives as their advisers and have been accepting their advice and suggestions that it was contributing to the war effort.

I trust that this lengthy letter may help you in your splendid efforts for our people here in western North Dakota, and please feel free to call upon myself or any one of the group which was here at these meetings for any assistance that you may feel we can offer.

Respectfully yours,

CHAS. F. ADAMS,
Chairman, Lansford, N. Dak.

So, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that the situation in western North Dakota is the very worst it has been at any time since the drought. As the Senator knows, we had 8 or 9 years of drought. We had fairly good crops in 1937, a poor crop in 1938, and splendid crops in 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942. However, with the corn acreage cut down, the result will be that hundreds of thousands of cattle, hogs, and sheep that we had there last year simply will not be there this year. That is the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 3, on page 2, line 19, after the date "June 30", to strike out "1947, or the end of the second year following the first day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, whichever is the later" and insert "1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 5, after line 15, to add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes", approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and myself, I offer the amendment which has been printed and lies on the desk, as a substitute for the committee amendment on page 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be to the amendment stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment beginning on line 16, on page 5, and continuing to line 12, on page 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity or commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof in the market place, the higher of, the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, or the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator and which maximum price shall conform in all other respects to the provisions of section 3 of such act, as amended; nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or

controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes only if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Mr. WILLIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	Wilson
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the nature of a substitute for section 5 of the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment because the bill as written, with the amendment proposed by the committee, does not seem to meet the needs of the present situation, and seems definitely unsuited to promoting agricultural production.

At the outset I wish to have it understood that I have no opposition to legitimate and necessary subsidies. I am opposed to illegal subsidies, and those which are very obviously proposed or applied for purposes other than increasing production.

My amendment has the endorsement of virtually all the farm organizations of the country. I should like to read two or three such endorsements.

The first is from the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, dated June 23, 1943.

NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1943.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: It is my understanding that you plan to introduce an amendment to S. 1108, a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has no specific policy pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation as such, but its membership has been favorable, generally, to the purpose for which this organization was established. The Council does have official policies covering some of the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The tendency recently for Commodity Credit Corporation to use a large part of its funds for subsidy payments is, in our opinion, unsound. The Council is opposed to the "use of subsidies in place of fair prices in the market place." Therefore, we wish you to know that the amendment which we understand you will offer to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill has our full support.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which represents some 4,600 individually incorporated associations of agricultural producers, which, in turn, have approximately 2,300,000 farmer memberships, considers the question of subsidies vital to our national war effort, and urges that the Senate take specific action prohibiting the general use of subsidies throughout our wartime economy.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—Similar letter has been mailed to Senator GUY M. GILLETTE.

A similar letter has been sent to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The next endorsement is from the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, dated June 24, 1943, and reads as follows:

JUNE 24, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATORS: Representing this federation and on behalf of dairy farmers generally, I am writing to thank both of you for introducing your substitute amendment to section 5 of S. 1108. This amendment, among other things, is designed to free dairy farmers from the onerous subsidies which have been forced upon them in connection with cheese, butter, and fluid milk in certain great milksheds.

We oppose subsidies as a compensation for roll-backs of maximum prices, as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices, or as a means of maintaining maximum prices.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. They do not appear to object in any way to the subsidy which they have received through the sale of feed wheat at very considerably less than its value. That was a direct subsidy to dairy producers.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there are a good many subsidies proposed——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has excepted that particular subsidy from his prohibition of subsidies. Apparently dairy producers do not object to being subsidized themselves. What they object to is any subsidy to the consumer.

Mr. AIKEN. Subsidies as an incentive to necessary production are not generally objected to.

The letter continues:

Such devices do not relieve the people of their food costs. They actually increase the food costs by adding the carrying charges to bond issues which some day must be paid if the public credit is to be maintained.

We hope that the Senate will pass your substitute and defeat the amendment offered by Senator TAFT and reported by the committee yesterday. The Taft amendment is unwanted by agriculture and our people resent this effort to fasten on us an unhealthy, undesirable subsidy just because this would be a face-saving action to cover up the mistakes of the New Dealers within the administration.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

I will say also that the American Farm Bureau Federation has expressed its support in full of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and myself. The National Grange is fully behind the amendment. The Livestock Breeders' Association, as well as many others from whom I do not have endorsements in writing, also endorse the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure that the Senator from Vermont and I have the same objectives in mind. However, I must confess that the amendment which the Senator has offered is so complicated that I, myself, cannot understand it. It seems to me, therefore, that it might be very well subject to construction by the O. P. A., such as occurred with reference to section 2 (e) of the original Stabilization Act, which seemed to me to be very clear. I believe that if we are to do something about this situation we ought to do it very definitely and clearly, and prevent a situation which may become involved. I have conferred with several Members of the Senate who very frankly stated that they were unable to understand what the Senator's amendment meant, as I, myself, was unable to understand it. It is an amendment of two pages in one sentence. I frankly do not know exactly what the Senator's amendment means. It seems to me that the Senator could very well improve the mind of the Senate by explaining his amendment, rather than telling us who are in favor of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not reached that point as yet. I shall explain it to the best of my ability. I have had the amendment examined by the most capable attorneys with whom I am acquainted, in order to insure that the amendment states what I intended it to mean.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a page from the June 23 issue of the Nebraska Union Farmer. So far as I know, the Farmers Union as a national organization has taken no official position on the subject of roll-backs and subsidies. However, the Nebraska group is very definitely opposing it. In the June

23 issue of the Nebraska Union Farmer there appears an editorial the title of which is "Food Subsidy Fantastic." I do not wish to read the editorial, as it would take some time, and I do not desire to delay the proceedings of the Senate any more than necessary. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Paying part of the national grocery bill out of the Federal Treasury, which is the effect of reducing prices of food products to consumers and making up the difference with subsidies supposedly to go to producers, is about as fantastic a policy as could be imagined.

The ostensible purpose of the subsidy program is to hold down prices of food to consumers. But large numbers of consumers already have buying power, in terms of money tokens, far in excess of the foods available for purchase. This subsidy policy will leave more tokens in their pockets. By the very means used to prevent higher prices to consumers, therefore, will come greater pressure for higher prices.

Price control has been inaugurated by the Government to prevent inflation. Inflation is the result of an excess of money tokens in relation to the supply of goods available for purchase. Without changing the supply of goods, the subsidy policy leaves more tokens in the pockets of purchasers. This means that the subsidy policy is inflationary and directly opposed to what is being attempted by the fixing of price ceilings.

Even if the subsidy program should not result in greater inflation, it will not in the long run help the people whom it is supposed to help. What the people as a whole save on their grocery bills they will have to pay in increased taxes to replenish the Treasury. Because these taxes are added to prices, and ultimately fall upon consumers, with profit margins added, the very people supposed to be protected by the price reductions and subsidies, the poorer people, will have to pay the major part of the taxes to supply the subsidies.

A more complicated method of attempting to hold down prices to consumers could hardly be devised. As we understand it, the subsidies are to be paid to processors. An army of checkers will be required to determine the payments to be made. The plan is full of opportunities for inequalities and favoritism. It can be used to build some businesses and destroy others. The subsidies are supposed to be reflected to farmers in prices for their products. But can the enforcement make this certain?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now come to the amendment itself:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity or commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof in the market place, the higher of, the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, or the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator and which maximum price shall conform in all other respects to the provisions of section 3 of such act, as amended.

Mr. President, in the act of October 2, 1942, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, section 3 provides two standards with respect to the establishment of maximum price ceilings on agricultural commodities and commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities. The language of the proposed amendment which I have just read adds a third standard—namely, the support price announced for any such commodity by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator. Hereafter, under this language, a price ceiling on such commodities could not be established below the higher of the support price or the price standards specified in section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942. The objective of this language is to discourage a roll-back in an established price ceiling, and then subsidizing the amount of the roll-back in the case of a commodity upon which a support price is announced.

Both butter and meat are apt examples. A support price of 46 cents a pound for 92-score Chicago base butter was announced in November 1942. A support price for hogs of $13.75 likewise was announced on April 10, 1943. Under the roll-back program both these support prices are above the present price ceilings, and the Government is either subsidizing or intending to subsidize the difference.

Speaking plainly, the purpose of adding the third standard is to prevent the Department of Agriculture from promising the farmers a certain price, and then the O. P. A. cutting that price out from under when the produce is ready to be sold.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Frankly, I do not understand the statement of the Senator at all. I cannot see what the roll-back has to do with the support price. The support price is a price which the Government announces it will pay for a certain product.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Government then comes along and rolls back the retail price, and pays the processor a subsidy, so it makes good on the support price. The farmer receives the support price. Everyone receives the support price. I cannot see what it has to do with the question of roll-back.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio is wrong about that. The Agricultural Department announces a support price or guaranty which the farmers shall receive for butter, eggs, chickens, or whatever the article happens to be. The announcement is made, and the farmer goes ahead and borrows money and spends it in producing a larger crop. Then, when the crop is ready for market, the O. P. A. comes in, being a member of the same branch of the Government, and says, "We will put the ceiling of a certain percentage," 10 percent, let us say, below what the Department of Agriculture had promised the farmers in the beginning. In effect, that means the Government does not keep its promise to the farmers, and this amendment is designed to put an end to that kind of procedure.

Mr. TAFT. I have heard of no such case. I do not think any such case exists. I challenge the Senator to cite any such case, and I challenge him to produce any case where the support price has been announced in which the farmer has not received the support price, or the Government has not maintained the promise which it has made. If it is necessary to say that the United States Government shall keep its promise, I shall be glad to do so, but I, at least, have had no complaint from any agricultural producer in my State that a promise of that kind has not been kept—and I have received complaints about everything in the world, with most of which I agree. Frankly, if what the Senator has said were true, I cannot see how the first sentence of the Senator's amendment could have the slightest effect on the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Before I conclude my explanation, I hope the Senator from Ohio will realize that the Department of Agriculture has promised farmers a certain price, and then the O. P. A. has cut that price out from under them.

However, I want to proceed to the next part of the amendment, which reads:

Nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I should prefer, Mr. President, to finish my explanation, during the course of which, perhaps, I shall have answered some of the questions which some of my colleagues might ask if I yielded as I go along.

The purpose of the provision I read before the interruption is to prohibit the payment of subsidies or similar payments, whatever they might be called, on agricultural commodities or commodities processed therefrom.

The language permitting the payment of such subsidies which have accrued is simply to protect producers against loss due to a roll-back. In other words,

the 5 cents a pound subsidy on butter which went into effect June 1, 1943, can, under this language, be paid to the effective date of this amendment, but thereafter such subsidy payments are prohibited. This, Mr. President, I would consider to be really the payment of damages which the Government has already inflicted upon butter producers and meat producers.

Cogent examples of subsidy manipulations prohibited by this amendment are the existing Cheddar cheese and butter subsidies. On the former a subsidy in the amount of 3¾ cents per pound is being paid. O. P. A. established a maximum ceiling price of 23¼ cents per pound, Plymouth, Wis., base, and instead of increasing this ceiling, the following arrangement was evolved: The Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation contracts with the cheese factory to buy the cheese at the price of 27 cents a pound and then turns around and sells it back to the cheese factory at 23¼ cents a pound, which is the ceiling. It thus underwrites the production of cheese with a 3¾ cents' subsidy payment which it pays to the cheese factory, and the factory in turn pays to the producer of milk. This is commonly referred to as the purchase-and-resale-at-a-loss type of subsidy.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the production of cheese has dropped 23 percent since this subsidy was put into effect. That is the testimony which has been given to us by the representatives of the Department of Agriculture. The subsidy did not increase the production of cheese, but decreased it by 23 percent.

Now, as to butter. Using 92-score Chicago as the illustration, O. P. A. recently rolled back the maximum price ceiling from 46 cents to 41 cents a pound—46 cents, incidentally, was the support price announced by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1942—and then arranged with the R. F. C. through its subsidiary, the Defense Supplies Corporation, to pay the creamery a 5-cent-a-pound subsidy ostensibly to be turned over to the producer of butterfat in order that his price return might remain the same and the producers' position thus be status quo ante the roll-back.

Both types of subsidy would be included in the prohibitions of the proposed amendment.

The only escape clause contained in the proposal is that which requires a Government agency, if it is disposed to inaugurate a subsidy program, to request the Congress for authority and funds to carry out such a program. Appropriate language appears near the conclusion to that end.

The next part of the proposed amendment reads:

> Except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes only if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

The foregoing language makes provision (1) excepting from the prohibition, commodities which presently are subject to a form of subsidy program, but only for the duration of the present crop season. In other words, the proposed amendment would permit the Government to keep its agreements made with the farmers who were offered special inducements to produce more flax, sugar, hemp, peanut oil, soybeans, and several other crops of which we simply had to have a tremendous increase and in the growing of which the farmer would incur unusual costs or unusual hazards. The amendment which I am proposing would not prevent the Government carrying out those agreements; in fact, those agreements are specifically authorized by law because they are subsidies which are offered for the purpose of increasing production.

A further exception from the prohibition of a more permanent character is the present subsidy program on domestic vegetable oils and fats. Everyone knows we must offer incentives to get oils and fats produced in this country to take the place of the 2,250,000,000 pounds which we formerly imported from the East Indies and other quarters of the world. Neither of these exceptions applies to subsidy programs on milk and livestock and the products thereof, which have recently been announced over the protest of all agricultural America. In other words, while subsidy payments which have accrued with respect to milk and livestock products must be paid until the effective date of the amendment, thereafter the subsidy programs on these products terminate. This does not apply to fresh vegetables, vegetables for canning—corn, tomatoes, peas, beans, potatoes, and sugar. Existing subsidy programs continue through the current crop season.

I say again that this amendment does not interfere in any way with legitimate subsidies which have been offered by the Government in the form of incentive payments or to support prices or otherwise which were very definitely authorized by the Congress but the amendment does terminate the very questionable, and I hold, illegal, subsidies offered on butter and livestock and the products thereof.

Then, toward the end of the proposed amendment this proviso is found:

> *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

This merely means that where the purchase price in a contract with a Government agency is the subject matter of litigation or negotiation, and it is finally determined what the purchase price shall be, the proposed amendment shall not be construed to prohibit the payment of that finally determined purchase price. For example, under O. P. A. Procedural Regulation No. 6, cases are pending before the Emergency Court of Appeals with respect to the purchase prices of certain products. The court, on final decision, may award an adjusted purchase price, in which event, the proposal should not be subject to a possible construction that such adjusted purchase price cannot be paid.

The proviso means nothing more than the foregoing, and should in no event be construed as authorizing a purchase and resale at a loss transaction, or any other character of subsidy, for it in no sense comprehends such payment.

This final clause was inserted at the request of small meat packers, who felt that they had been obliged to supply the Government with meat at less than cost. In fact, they produced figures which showed quite conclusively that in some instances they had been obliged to furnish the Government meat at less than cost, and they are hoping to have that price adjusted. I doubt if the last clause is necessary in the bill, but I realize also that whatever is passed in the Senate will undoubtedly go to conference, and if it turns out to be unnecessary, will be deleted in conference.

Mr. President, I was interested in what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated about an hour ago to the effect that this is the most important matter on which the Senate has been called to vote this year, if not the most important matter on which it has ever been called upon to vote. The executive department of our Government is attempting to force upon the Nation a program leading inevitably to disaster. The roll-back and subsidy program is not even an experiment. It is based upon false premises, and its evil effects are a foregone conclusion.

Its promoters claim that it will help the poor. That is camouflage—the facts do not substantiate the claim. Its promoters claim the program will not harm the farmer. The farmer knows this claim to be utterly false, and he will not be fooled by it, and is not fooled by it as is evidenced by the communications which I think every Member of the Senate is receiving from the farmers back home.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from Ohio asked for an instance wherein the Government had promised one price through one agency, and had then, through another agency, cut the price out from under those to whom it had made the promise. I desire to call his attention to the following.

On November 20, 1942, Secretary Wickard stated:

> By agreement with Office of Price Administration prices will be supported at not less than 46 cents per pound for 92 score butter, Chicago base.

The Secretary of Agriculture further promised that this price for butter would be maintained through June 30, 1944. It should be expected that when an official, a Cabinet officer of the greatest nation on earth, clothed with authority to make a promise of this nature, does so, the promise would be kept.

Last month the Administration announced that the price of butter was to be reduced 5 cents a pound. This announcement came only 6 months after it had given a guaranty of price to all farmers of America. The executive branch further announced that a subsidy of 5 cents a pound would be paid to processors to offset the reduction in price.

On May 22 the Office of War Information, through its weasel-wording expert, issued a statement which purported to quote the guaranty of November 30, but which inserted the term "equivalent," so that it read "equivalent to 46 cents," in place of simply "46 cents." The Secretary of Agriculture made no promise to pay the farmers of the United States the equivalent of 46 cents for butter. He promised to pay them simply 46 cents.

Now let us see if all the farmers of America would get the subsidy, even assuming that the corrupted wording of the Office of War Information could be accepted, and the subsidy included as a part of the price.

It was announced that this subsidy would be paid to processors manufacturing 1,000 pounds or moré of butter a month. No provision was made, and no provision has as yet been made, to pay such subsidy to the small farmers of the United States, who sell butter to the local stores or direct to the consumers, and I know how much the 2 or 3 pounds of butter a week the farmer's wife sells to one of her neighbors means to her. Secretary Wickard's promise of last November was not made to farmers or processors who processed 1,000 pounds of butter a month or more; it was made to all the farmers of the United States.

Administration spokesmen have also promised that the price of livestock to the farmers would not be reduced because of any roll-back in market prices. They promised them a subsidy to make up any loss. Yet they propose to pay the subsidy only to those who process 4,000 pounds or more of meat a month.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] yesterday was concerned as to whether the bill might result in a reduced production of food, although I take it that he intended to support the committee bill. If he were present I should like to say to him that the bill probably will do harm to a larger percentage of farmers of Connecticut than of almost any other State in the Union, because a larger percentage of the farmers of Connecticut sell direct to the consumer, and they do not make a thousand pounds of butter a month, or dress 4,000 pounds of meat a month.

Again, through this action of two agencies of the executive branch of our Government, the small farmer who sells small quantities of meat to his neighbors or local market men is penalized for the crime of being small. Granting that some American farmers who broke even or made a profit last year would receive a subsidy which would offset the reduction in price, the fact remains that the low-income group of American farmers will feel the crushing and devastating weight of Government domination.

Who will benefit from the subsidy program insisted upon by the executive branch? The loud cries of the pseudo champions of the underprivileged would indicate that the poor would benefit. What are the facts as to this contention?

The Office of Price Administration has directed that the retail price of the best porterhouse steaks be reduced from 66 cents to 55 cents, or 11 cents a pound. Short ribs are reduced from 25 cents to 22, or 3 cents a pound. Choice T-bone steak is reduced 11 cents a pound. Soup bones are reduced nothing at all. Choice lamb chops are reduced 5 cents a pound. Mutton shanks are reduced 1 cent a pound.

The reduction in price per pound to the high-income consumer averages at least three times the reduction to the low-income consumer. If the executive branch really wants to help the underprivileged—and its statisticians tell us that there is a larger percentage of the underprivileged, low-income group living on farms than any other class of Americans—if the executive branch really means that it wants to help the underprivileged, as it has been preaching in the last 10 years, it will make foodstuffs available at still lower prices to the poor people, and let the millionaire pay full prices for food he buys. I venture to say that if the roll-back and subsidy program on meats, and butter, and coffee, is permitted to continue, 90 percent of its benefits wil be derived by those who are amply able to pay full prices, and most of the loss will fall upon the farmers who are least able to bear it. The effect of the White House plan will be to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment would cancel the so-called roll-back subsidies which are now being paid?

Mr. AIKEN. That is the intention.

Mr. BYRD. On what date would they be canceled?

Mr. AIKEN. Just so soon as the bill becomes law.

Mr. BYRD. To what does the language beginning at the end of line 9 on page 2 of the Senator's amendment refer?—

nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof.

Mr. AIKEN. That means that subsidies which have been authorized by Congress may continue in effect. So far as I know, the only illegal subsidies authorized by the executive branch are in the present roll-back program on meats and butter and, I suppose, coffee.

Mr. BYRD. The administration contends that the subsidy is legal, not illegal. I was wondering if the Senator's amendment was specific enough to cancel the roll-back subsidies which are now being paid.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is. As I previously said, I have had the language gone over by competent attorneys.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator point out exactly the language which would accomplish that purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. The language begins in line 9, on page 2, and is as follows:

Nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered—

I think that language covers the point the Senator has in mind; it certainly is intended to cover the present roll-back.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am almost through with what I wish to say, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I simply wish to ask the Senator if in his amendment provision is made for something which has already happened. When the roll-back was announced, the price of hogs and cattle immediately dropped. The packers did not pay the so-called prevailing or ceiling prices, as was promised. Butter also went down—was it 5 or 6 cents a pound?

Mr. AIKEN. Five cents a pound.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Five cents. The subsidy should go to the man who produces butter or hogs or cattle. Does the Senator think his amendment makes provision for the subsidy money reaching back to the original producer? The bill seems to be based on the theory that the packer is a producer. He is a processor, not a producer. Commitments have been made with respect to subsidy. Subsidy payments should go to those who have sustained the loss. How can the producer recover the loss he sustained as a result of the reduced price which came about by reason of the roll-back?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the original producer should receive the full amount of loss sustained by him. If my amendment shall be enacted into law, it will at least prevent the producer taking any loss in the future.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When the announcement of the roll-back was made, the processor cut his prices accordingly, so evidently he has sustained no loss by reason of the roll-back. It may be that other transactions have occurred with the Government whereby the packer has sustained some loss. But I do not see how the packer sustained any loss by reason of the roll-back, because when the roll-back was announced he immediately reduced the price he paid on cattle and hogs which were shipped to him. If the farm producers who have sustained loss are not to receive any subsidies, then what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. There is provision in my amendment for paying the damages which the Government has inflicted upon

the farmers up to date through the butter and meat roll-back and subsidy program. However, I do not know that I could guarantee that the farmers would receive every cent of that loss. I think it cannot be gainsaid that they have lost millions of dollars up to now, and if they receive anything through this provision in my amendment so much the better. I do not know that the payment would get back to them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have letters from creameries and farmers in which they state that when the roll-back was announced and put into effect they sold butter at a loss of 5 or 6 cents a pound. I am told that if at that time they had made out certificates setting forth that they had sold their butter at a loss, they could recover; but they must have filed a certificate at that time for a claim in order to recover loss.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that is true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the farmers did not know that they should make such certificates, and if they did not make them, they have no recourse in obtaining any redress. Was a certificate of that kind also provided for on the part of those who sold hogs and cattle? I did not hear anything about that.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not seen the regulations in regard to cattle. I have the regulation with regard to butter production payments, Regulation No. 2 of the Defense Supplies Corporation. I must admit that I have not read it all. I know a provision is contained in it that if any processor fails to comply in any way with any Government regulations which may be promulgated by any clerk in any of the Government agencies he shall receive no subsidy money to turn back to the producers who supply him. That is a wholly unfair regulation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment I will say that the bill is not one to pay for damages to the farmer, the producer. Unless some method has already been provided to see that this money will go to the original producer, and not to the processor, who evidently has sustained no loss, what is the use of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. My amendment authorizes the payment of damages to the producers for the reduction in prices paid to them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; if the producer can show how much he had sold, and at what price he sold it, and how much he has lost.

Mr. AIKEN. I presume that regulations or rules will have to be worked out by the departments. I do not know of any way to make them follow the intent of Congress. We are trying as best we can under my amendment to make them do it. I know the producers are not going to get anything for the loss they have recently sustained if my amendment is not adopted, and they do stand some chance of getting some recompense if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not want to interrupt the very able Senator's interesting discussion, but I hope before he takes his seat he will point out specifically the differences between the amendment offered by him and the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I think it would be very enlightening and very helpful, I know it would be to me, to have pointed out distinctly and specifically the differences in effect between the two amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be very glad to do that if I can have a little time to read the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. The first time I saw his amendment was when I came into the Senate Chamber at 11 o'clock this morning. I must be frank and say that I have not had time to study the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Misssouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that on Monday I introduced the measure as a separate bill. I had previously given notice in the newspapers that I would introduce it.

If the Senator will permit me to say a word further, the difference between the Senator's amendment and my amendment is this: I have read the Senator's amendment and my amendment several times, and I still do not know what the Senator's amendment means.

My amendment proceeds on the very old-fashioned, obsolete idea that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. My amendment simply would repeal the authority under which the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. are claiming to operate in granting subsidies. I do not think that section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act gives them any such authority; but they are claiming that section as their authority. They are proceeding on that theory.

The committee amendment proceeds on the theory that because the Office of Price Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have proceeded illegally, Congress is now under some sort of moral obligation to express approbation of the action of the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. to make it legal and to establish it as a principle.

My amendment proceeds on the principle of recognizing the rights of people who in good faith have dealt with the Government in the proceedings had up to date, but of repealing the authority under which the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. claim to operate—a proceeding very closely analogous to cutting off the dog's tail right behind the ears. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I want it thoroughly understood that I am not including the provision for any purpose of legalizing the actions of the O. P. A. and the other executive agencies of government, but for the purpose of recompensing the farmers for the damages inflicted upon them by the acts of the executive agencies.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator has referred to his amendment as it relates to legal subsidies and illegal subsidies. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment by inserting, on page 2, in line 11, after the word "have" the word "legally"? The language would then read:

> Other than those which have legally accrued prior to the effective date hereof.

I simply offer that suggestion as a possible means of clarifying the Senator's amendment and making it more easily understood.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I should not want to give the Senator from Texas an answer to his suggestion. I should like to use the few minutes I have remaining in order to conclude what I had prepared to say. Then I shall be perfectly willing to discuss the matter with the Senator from Texas.

As I said when I was diverted in order to answer questions by Senators, the effect of the White House plan will be to make the poor poorer and the rich richer. If carried to its ultimate conclusion, half the farmers of America will be so reduced in circumstances that they will be forced to call on Government agencies for help. Theoretically, that would make them easier to control. If the subsidy program goes through, the upper half of the farmers will be required to market their products through large processing concerns. Theoretically, they, too, would be easier to control.

These acts of our Government tend to create monopolies. Theoretically, a few monopolies could easily be taken over and controlled. Only the willfully blind can fail to see the tendency toward centralized control of the resources of America. If such a development comes to pass free institutions will disappear. We must not let that happen. According to statements appearing in the press, it seems that the President has announced his intention of forcing through the roll-back and subsidy program, regardless of the intent and determination of Congress. That makes the question now before the Senate not one of roll-back and subsidy, but one of maintaining our form of government. If the Congress permits any agency of government, no matter how high, to defy its acts and intentions the Congress will have failed to serve those who have elected its Members from their respective States.

Mr. President, today we are fighting here for the life of our Government, just as much as the men of our Air Corps are fighting over Europe or the men in the fox holes in the South Seas are fighting against the Japanese. If we are to take our place in history as true servants of the American people we will fight for our people now—not at some time in the future, not next year, not next month, not even next week, but today.

If we do not do that we might as well permanently adjourn the Congress, for then we would see a collapse of agriculture and hunger stalking through our cities. There would be a collapse of labor and industry as well. We should see an increase of strikes and rioting, chaotic conditions, and martial law. We can prevent those evils from coming to pass if

we will. If the Congress is ever going to have courage, the time to have it is now.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not quite understand the provision beginning on page 3, line 1:

> Except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity—

And so forth. What is the purpose of that provision? Is the purpose to continue the program a whole year before it is stopped?

Mr. AIKEN. No; that provision means that the incentive payments for crops such as sugarbeets, flax, peanuts, hemp, and soybeans—those are the crops which readily come to my mind—which were promised last spring, under authorization of the Congress, will be made—that those agreements will be kept—but that for the next year the Department will have to come to Congress for authorization and appropriation of funds for the new program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That provision undertakes to deal with subsidies other than those which we are now considering in the pending bill, as I understand, does it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is done in order that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The proposal is to permit a continuance of the subsidies that may now be used, or are now being used, to increase production; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; those which heretofore have been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not understand all the Senator said regarding his amendment to the bill. What does he propose to do with respect to the presently proposed roll-back and subsidy program? Would the effect of the Senator's amendment be to stop completely the program immediately at the time when the bill is enacted?

Mr. AIKEN. To stop the general roll-back and subsidy program on which the executive department has announced it was embarking, and which has already been applied to butter and meats, but to pay for the damage which has already been caused to our farmers through the inauguration of the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What machinery does the Senator's amendment propose to set up for paying that damage? How is that matter to be handled?

Mr. AIKEN. The same machinery that we now have.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the damages would be paid for in the same way that the roll-back is paid; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. As I have said, there is a question in my mind whether the farmers will receive all of it. I think they will receive some of it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The reason I am interested in the Senator's amendment is that I do not want to cast my vote in favor of an amendment if it will mean that I have placed my sanction on or given my approval to a roll-back subsidy program.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the amendment would do that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the philosophy of such a procedure is sound. I say to the Senator and to all other Members of the Senate that I believe that if we pass a bill authorizing and sanctioning the roll-back and subsidy program, we shall be starting a $25,000,000,000 mistake which we shall have to charge to future generations. We can never justify such a program. It is unwarranted; and once we start on it with the sanction and approval of Congress, there is no end to where it may go. It seems to me we are simply proposing to employ this means to cover up mistakes made in the present control program, and in doing so we shall be making a colossal blunder that will ultimately increase the national debt another $25,000,000,000, and possibly more, before we can stop it.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa and myself does not give sanction to any roll-back subsidy program. In fact, it prohibits it. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It would immediately result in an increase of 5 cents in the price of butter and an increase in the price of meat, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. It would result in restoring the prices which existed 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. TAFT. However, so far as the actual result is concerned, when this bill is passed—which may be a week or two from now—the result will be an increase in the price of butter to every consumer in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. And an increase in the price of meat to every consumer in the United States. I do not say that that should not be done, but I think it should be recognized that that would be the effect of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. If every consumer in the United States should buy all the butter he is permitted to buy under the rationing regulations, it would cost him 65 cents a year more to live. However, there is every indication that he will not be permitted much longer to buy 13 pounds of butter a year. Butter will become too scarce. If the subsidy and roll-back program goes into effect, it will cut out a good share of the 100,000,000 pounds of butter a year which is sold direct from the little farmer to the consumer, and we shall have a more serious reduction in the production of butter than we otherwise would have.

Mr. TAFT. I recognize the force of the Senator's argument that we should increase the price of butter and meat. I merely wished to bring out the fact that that is what his amendment would do. It would increase the price of butter and meat to every consumer in the United States. If we are prepared to take the responsibility for doing that, we ought to take it; but we ought to recognize what we are doing.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, I recognize that; and I also recognize the fact that half the people of the United States hardly taste butter from one end of the year to the other. Those people are not going to be affected, whether the price of butter goes up or down.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. While the price of butter may be increased 5 cents a pound, and the prices of meat and other things may be increased in proportion, and while the cost may be brought back to what it was before it was rolled back, the result will also be a further curtailment of production. What America needs today is production. We have the price. There is more purchasing power than ever before in the country. We are trying to find ways to raise taxes in order to get some of that money away from the people. We are squabbling about not having money enough to buy food, and talking about Government subsidies. We are going in the wrong direction with the proposed legislation if we intend to secure increased production, which is what America needs. We will not help the present food situation by this method. Instead we will destroy incentive and thus reduce production of agricultural commodities to a lower level and produce a greater scarcity of food.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I made a vow to myself that I would not make a speech during the present session of Congress. I do not intend to make one now.

Every Senator knows exactly what the roll-back means. All this talk is useless. Every Senator knows what the subsidy means, and who will be benefited by it. Every Senator knows who will ultimately pay it. The taxpayer will ultimately pay it.

All this confusion is merely a method of getting by with what certain persons intend to do. We do not seem to have sense enough to judge what is being done.

As for me, I think the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], which cuts the dog's tail off just behind his ears, is about the best one I have seen. If we do not believe in rolling back prices, let us stop the roll-back. On whom would prices be rolled back? There is not a Senator who does not know on whom the roll-back would fall and who would be the beneficiaries.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has given us certain figures. I presume they are approximately correct. Wages have increased approximately 110 or 115 percent, while the cost of living has gone up only about 24 percent.

Is it statesmanship or common sense to say to those who are receiving high wages, "you cannot pay 46 cents a pound for butter. We will roll back the price on the farmer and give it to you for 41 cents, and the Government will pay the difference of 5 cents?"

It is no use for us to spend all this time and energy. Every Senator knows what the roll-back means, and on whom

it will be rolled back. Every Senator knows whom the subsidy will reach. Every Senator knows who ultimately will pay the millions of dollars which subsidies will cost. It seems to me that it is up to us to decide whether or not we are to enter upon a program of subsidy payments.

There is not a Senator who does not know that once we grant subsidies to one man, or one class of producers, we must grant them to others. Eventually we shall be subsidizing barbers, chicken raisers, and every one but Senators. Of course, Senators are plutocrats. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have sat here and listened to the devious arguments to "carry my point and, if possible, obtain votes for myself on election day." That is the purpose of much of the argument which we have heard. "Whom can I persuade to vote for me? The American people can go hang so long as I can find some man who will say, 'He was smart enough to do something for me.'"

Not long ago we had the beautiful spectacle of 78 Senators voting for the passage of a bill. Then the whip was cracked, the veto came, and, figuratively speaking, every one of the 78 Senators got under his desk. Not I! Oh no. That was a beautiful spectacle which the Senate of the United States provided for the American people. We marched up the hill 78 strong, and dashed down the hill 100 percent scared to death. [Laughter.] That was the situation.

Mr. President, I do not wish to preach to the Senate. God knows, I need some preaching-to myself; but this issue is plain. What does the term "roll-back" mean? When we propose to pay a subsidy, to whom do we propose to pay it? We propose to roll back and crush the fellow who cannot get out of the way; but we say to the man who has been selling butter for 46 cents, "You can sell it for 41 cents, and we will give you 5 cents." Does anyone expect that man to reach down into his pocket to pay any part of the subsidy to the producers of milk and cream? When that happens, hawks will stop catching chickens, and foxes will quit catching rabbits.

We do not act as though we had sense enough to buy a ticket to Washington. I know we have not money enough. Merciful God! Have we reached the point where we must consume days discussing a matter which everybody thoroughly understands, and with respect to which every Senator knows exactly how he will vote? There has not been a speech which has changed one-tenth of 1 percent of a vote.

We know what the roll-back means. We know what the subsidy means; and we know that whatever it costs, the cost will be rolled back on the taxpayer. There is no burden on the taxpayer now [laughter]—only a matter of $150,000,000,000. That is chicken feed. I understand that a bill providing additional appropriations of $70,000,000,000 is on the way.

I believe that it is our duty to make up our minds whether or not we are going to roll back prices on those who cannot help themselves, and add to the already swollen returns of those who, according to the figures which have been exhibited to us, have enjoyed increases in income 76 percent greater than in the case of the man who produces the food.

Mr. President, I hold no brief for the farmer; but if I felt toward the farmer as do some whose speeches I have heard, I would stay out of restaurants. I would eat what I myself produce. I would not eat the produce of the despised devils, the greedy farmers, who have been characterized as millionaires.

Mr. President, let us decide this question as it should be decided. Every Senator who votes for subsidies under the pending Bankhead bill—the $500,000,000 and the $175,000,000—will vote to crucify the man who cannot help himself. If a man forges my name upon a note I do not feel that I should say, "He forged it; but I will pay it." Every one of the subsidies under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act is a forgery pure and simple; and we are called upon to legislate to vindicate the forger.

We are told, "The law has already been construed." Yes, it has been construed. We are now asked to ratify that construction. I will not vote for it; and no Senator who sees the situation as I see it—I started to say no Senator who sees it from the standpoint of common sense—will vote for it. We are asked to say, "Under the circumstances we will appropriate $675,000,000 to make good forged notes."

Mr. President, I want a yea-and-nay vote on this bill. I want every Senator to be put on record as to whether or not he will vote to pile the cost of this proposal upon the backs of the taxpayer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Six hundred million dollars is a small matter.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; $600,000,000 is not much.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is only about half a billion dollars.

Mr. SMITH. We cannot talk except in terms of billions. We have gone away beyond millions. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I have sat here I have become so outraged that I have nearly lost confidence in my fellow Senators. There is no use in going into the question of whether the roll-back is tweedledee or tweedledum. Senators know what it is. The right word was selected—"roll-back." Where are we rolling it back? On whom are we rolling it back? It is said that we will pay out subsidies; we will cut off the farmer's pay, but we will make it good to the darlings who are organized, and that when election day arrives they will cast their votes for us.

Mr. President, I think some of us are very much confused in our mental processes. From some of the speeches I have heard, I have thought that if the speaker should have a real bright idea he would die of apoplexy. We are being asked to do nothing but take the advice of someone else. Some men have come to us and talked about what they were going to do. After conferring with others they have said, "I have changed my mind," when they had no mind to change.

Mr. President, I have sat here and examined certain amendments. There are loopholes in some of them large enough to drive an elephant through. I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has stated the situation correctly. If we do not believe in subsidies, let us stop them. I am told, "You will get some subsidies for your farm." God knows, I am about to lose it. I shall have to borrow money to pay my taxes. Many men who are advocating subsidies belong to the class of window-sill farmers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What kind of farmers?

Mr. SMITH. Window-sill farmers. They have boxes on their windows in their city homes. I do not blame them. I try to take care of my people who do not work in the fields. I think it would be of great benefit to the country at large if every Senator could be forced to perform 12 months' work in producing an average crop, and then live for the next year on what he could make. There would be a different attitude in the Senate.

I do not care to discuss the proposals in the bill, or any of the amendments. All I wish to do is to vote for something which will end subsidies right now. If a house were on fire I would not ask, What sort of an engine are you going to get? I would throw a bucket of water on the fire as soon as I could.

It is up to us, as sensible men representing a great constituency, to say that this horrible iniquity shall not be placed upon the people. The people are trusting us. We have degenerated. Congress is now nothing but an appropriations committee. We sit down and listen to our master's voice. The first thing we know, there will be no money left in the country. I think that is what some are driving at. During the reconstruction days in the South we were fighting against 40 acres and a mule. We are almost in that situation now.

Mr. President, I hope that we can reach a vote on this bill, and have the subject disposed of. Senators who want the roll-back can vote for it. Those who want the subsidy can vote for the roll-back and the subsidy, with a clear understanding of just what the roll-back means, and what the subsidy means. I do not wish to discuss refinements with regard to agreements which have already been negotiated, or paying the note to which our names are forged and saying, "Please don't do it again."

My friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has offered an amendment. His intentions are good, but he seems to have "a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." As Paul said of the Israelites, in his Epistle to the Romans:

> For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

There is but one thing to do with this bill. If we are honest with ourselves we will stop the subsidy business wherever it manifests itself. If we can put enough obstacles in the way to stop the roll-back, we should do so.

I have said that I hoped we had established a precedent for roll-backs, and that in 1944 we could roll back the whole

thing and start from scratch. Roll back every man who is in favor of this foolishness. Roll him out of existence. "Roll-back" may be a very good term. I hope to God that in 1944 there will be a roll-back.

In conclusion, Mr. President, all I wish to say to my colleagues is that if they are opposed to subsidies let them say so. If they are against the roll-back, let them say so by their votes. If they believe that the principle is wrong, let them have "guts" enough to say so and vote accordingly.

When I go out into the corridor Senators whisper to me and say "I think you are right" and then enter the Chamber and vote the other way. The people of the country look upon the United States Senate with a great deal more respect than we deserve.

I am sorry that I have felt it to be my duty to make this statement. Senators have said, "Certain subsidies are all right." Josh Billings said that he lived to be 45 years old before he found a good place for a boil. Some one asked, "Where is it, Josh?" He replied, "On the other man." That is what influences most voters. "Get a fine place to put the boil of bureaucracy, but don't put it on me."

I hope we shall soon have a vote. It does not make any difference when Senators say "We think certain subsidies are all right." We know what the issue is. We have been discussing this matter for a day and a half, I hope that every Senator who has committed himself will be like the man in the old Mother Goose rhyme:

There was a man in our town, and he was wondrous wise;
He jumped into a bramble bush, and scratched out both his eyes.
But when he found his eyes were out, with all his might and main
He jumped into another bush and scratched them in again.

I hope that every Senator will vote according to the power God gave him to know the difference between right and wrong. You know a subsidy is not right and you know that the roll-back is an engine of hell; you know it. Now, if you want to vote for it, vote for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the Aiken amendment. I cannot see that a principle, as suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, is involved. There is no principle against subsidy in the Congress of the United States. For years we have been voting subsidies to the cotton growers and to the wheat growers and to corn growers.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean to imply, then, because there has been a subsidy to the cotton growers, that I am for subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator thinks so, he has another guess coming.

Mr. TAFT. I am saying that no great principle is involved in the question of whether or not we pay subsidies.

Mr. SMITH. It was a wrong principle in the beginning, and it is wrong now. If you will let the market alone, and the law of supply and demand apply, you will be better off, and so will I.

Mr. TAFT. I say there is no principle involved in the question of subsidies. I am as much against subsidies, I presume, as is any other Member of the Congress, as a matter of principle, but we must recognize the fact that gradually we have adopted a subsidy program, and it has gone on and on. It has even been increased since the war. Only last week we voted a $50,000,000 subsidy for school lunches, if you please, although 80 percent of the children subsidized were perfectly able to pay for their lunches. We have paid subsidies to nearly every group in the population of this country. The question we now face, and the question the Banking and Currency Committee faces, is how are we going to hold that program within reasonable check? The conclusion I came to was that the way to check it was to put an over-all financial limitation, and to try to make the provision so all-inclusive that the financial limitation could not be avoided in any way.

With due respect to the Senator from Missouri, and the Senator from Vermont, I do not think their amendments would prevent the continuation of what, in effect, is a subsidy program. I do not see in the Aiken amendment anything which would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation tomorrow announcing that it would buy the entire butter output of the United States and would then, during the year, sell it gradually to the people at a lower price.

My amendment would prohibit such a procedure. It says that no purchase shall be made with the intention of selling at a lower price the article purchased. The Price Control Act provided subsidies only as an incidental. The main power it gives is to buy commodities or crops which may be offered. I think it would be unfortunate if that were done, but we have seen the B. E. W. buy foreign crops, and there is an indication that the Government officials would like, if they could, to buy entire crops, put the Government into business, and then sell them at a loss.

There is nothing in the Aiken amendment or even in the Clark amendment which would take away powers which the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation now have to buy crops and pay subsidies at one price and proceed with the deliberate intention of selling them, from time to time, to the public at a lower price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Was not the committee aware that the R. F. C. had plenty of money for this program when they proposed the amendment to give the R. F. C. $500,000,000 more?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, it was so aware; in fact the R. F. C. had $7,000,000,000. The proposed committee amendment is a limitation on the power of the R. F. C.; it proposes a reduction from $7,000,000,000 to $500,000,000. It is an attempt to say, "Here is a subsidy program which we do not think we ought to stop now; but we propose to limit it." I admit that the question whether the last roll-backs which have been ordered should be prohibited is a question which is open, which can be discussed, but when it comes to the method of dealing with this question, it seems to me there must be a financial limitation.

Mr. AIKEN. On May 25, Mr. Jesse Jones appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, known as the food committee, and in the course of his testimony, speaking of the roll-back and subsidy program, this colloquy took place:

Senator BUSHFIELD. From what fund does the money come to pay the roll-back on these three articles?

Secretary JONES. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation general fund.

Senator BUSHFIELD. It doesn't need any earmarking for that purpose?

Secretary JONES. Not in the law; no.

Senator AIKEN. Do you have plenty of money for that purpose?

Secretary JONES. We have enough money for a time. We will have to come for more money later. We will not have to come for more money to the extent of $450,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You have that on hand?

Secretary JONES. We have got enough credit-borrowing authority to meet all of our requirements for some months, but we will come back when we find that we are going to get out of funds.

In other words, he said the R. F. C. had $450,000,000 for the roll-back on meat and butter and coffee, and yet he comes before the Committee on Banking and Currency and gets them to grant $500,000,000 more.

Mr. TAFT. It is not a question of granting any more.

Mr. AIKEN. I was reading from the testimony.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the R. F. C. are requesting, through the Committee on Banking and Currency, authorization to borrow $5,000,000,000 more when, as a matter of fact, Mr. Jones knows that he will never be called upon to meet a large number of the commitments he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Then does the Senator think he did not have the money when he made that statement to the committee?

Mr. TAFT. I have no doubt it was all committed, but Mr. Jones knows that all the commitments are not going to be fulfilled, and therefore he is perfectly free to grant $450,000,000. On the same theory he could have granted $5,000,000,000 if he had been asked to do so, or told to do so by the President.

My effort in this amendment is to try to limit subsidies by amount. The moment we begin to limit it by the kind of subsidies paid, we get into tremendous difficulty, because there are various kinds of subsidies. There are direct and indirect subsidies. The method I suggest simply to buy a crop and then sell it at a lower price and take the loss involved, cannot be legally called a subsidy at all; it is not legally a subsidy; it is simply a method of doing the same kind of thing that is done through a subsidy. When

the Senator from Vermont comes to offer his amendment he begins to make exceptions to prohibition against subsidies. For instance, take the exception, which reads—

> Except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply * * * to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

Mr. President, under that authority I could go out and subsidize all the butter in the United States, if I wished to do so. The Senator admits that in the case of domestic vegetable oil the subsidy principle should be applied.

We come, then, to the question of feeding wheat. The sale of feed wheat at corn parity prices less than the value of wheat is a direct subsidy to the dairy producer, and the Senator does not think that is a good subsidy. The moment we begin to try to say that one kind of subsidy is a good subsidy, and another kind a bad subsidy, we fall into all kinds of difficulties, and we will find there are many good subsidies we have not authorized, and we may find bad subsidies we have not limited.

I do not know whether those who have actually taken the loss on the butter and the meat, the processors, will receive any compensation at all. It rather looks to me as if the effect of the amendment would be to cut them out, because it is said at the bottom of page 2:

> Unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943.

So it looks as if the people who have taken a loss on meats and taken a loss on butter, with the Government's promise that they were to be reimbursed by subsidy, are out. I do not know that that is the interpretation or the intention of the Senator, but as I read the amendment, that would be its effect.

I am not sure whether or not the Senator's amendment affects sugar. In the case of sugar, we have a very distinct case of subsidy, a Government-authorized and supported subsidy. Payments are made to a limited number of producers, and I think it is a justified subsidy, because it has the effect, since we do not have to make the payments to the Cubans and the other foreign growers of sugar, of getting a larger net reduction for the consumer in the United States than we have to pay to the farmers in subsidies. So it is a good subsidy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A moment ago the Senator spoke of the Government's promise to pay these people. In what was that promise contained? Certainly it was not in any act of Congress to which the Senator or anyone else can refer. I think the Senator agreed with me yesterday afternoon that section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act did not authorize it.

Mr. TAFT. That is my opinion, but the people have been told by the Attorney General it did, and they have been forced, by main force, to sell their products at a reduced price, and I think it is hardly just to ask them to take the loss.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How was the Government's agreement conveyed to the people? According to the explanation made here a few days ago by the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on information from the O. P. A., the so-called agreement consisted of Mr. Jesse Jones and Mr. Prentiss Brown giving out a newspaper release, and then they proceeded, in the worst and most disgraceful botch that has ever taken place in any governmental function, to order a roll-back, without any provision for protecting the rights of the producer, the processer, or anyone else. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he thinks this newspaper release constituted a guaranty on the part of the United States Government, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I am not going to answer the Senator. I agree largely with what he says.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know the Senator is not going to answer. He is too smart to answer.

Mr. TAFT. A man who had a large stock of butter was told by the Government, "You have to sell this butter at 5 cents less, and we will reimburse you the difference." If he inquires, "Is it legal?", they respond, "Yes, the Attorney General says it is perfectly all right," and he goes ahead and suffers the loss. I should like to see him reimbursed, and I think most other Senators would.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as my amendment is concerned, I provide for protecting the rights of the people who deal in good faith with the Government. But I am sure the Senator does not mean to stand on this floor and say that the Government of the United States can be put under any sort of obligation by a newspaper release, either by Jesse Jones and Prentiss M. Brown separately, or by a joint release by Jesse Jones and Prentiss M. Brown. I am sure the Senator from Ohio would not like to establish the principle that an obligation is incurred by the Government through two officials proceeding, entirely outside of authority of law, by a newspaper release, to establish indefinite contractual relations with everybody in the country.

Mr. TAFT. I agree; but the Senator will recall that when some of the packers took that point of view in Chicago, and said, "We do not know that this is going to be paid, perhaps it is not legal, and therefore we will have to pay less for livestock," they were highly criticized in this body for not taking the Government's assurance of payment of a subsidy. They were highly criticized because they offered the producers less money, in view of the uncertainty of the subsidy, and the possible illegality of the subsidy.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The able Senator from Ohio is well informed about what we have done in this country since the birth of the Republic. This debate on the morality of subsidies will certainly add an interesting chapter to American history. If the walls of this Capitol could talk, they could tell a wonderful story.

When the Republic was born, among the first official acts was one to establish the largest subsidy of all; that is, to establish the tariff system, which I believe was Alexander Hamilton's "baby." Then we went on through the whole gamut of subsidies, some of which have been discussed here since I became a Member of this body.

There were the parity-payment subsidies and the air-mail subsidies. We subsidized agricultural colleges by giving them public lands. The second-class mailing privilege is indubitably a subsidy. There is a silver subsidy. We canceled the war debts, a sizable subsidy in itself. We have a lend-lease program, which is a form of subsidy. We built a great many war plants at the expense of the taxpayers, and we shall probably turn them over to private operators later, which will be another subsidy, running into billions of dollars. We subsidized the beet-sugar industry through a statute now on the books.

I am not making an argument on the merits of the bill; I am merely pointing out that the subsidy principle is and has been firmly engrained in our economy and our political life, and this might be an appropriate time for us to examine this principle of subsidy, and determine whether or not we will let American business institutions stand on their own bottoms, and get rid of the practice of nurturing them by various methods which we have regarded as perfectly moral and economically justifiable, whether we will abandon the subsidy principle. We hear a lot of murmuring about one small aspect of it, and it may be that it is in such form that it should be indicted.

I am reminded that there were land grants to railroads. I recall one railroad to which land was granted, and I think it was Dr. Benjamin Andrews who, I believe, was the chancelor of the University of Nebraska a great many years ago, when most of the Members of the Senate were much younger, who wrote a book about the value of the grants to the railroads. I think he stated that one railroad had sold some of the land given it for more dollars than the road had cost.

Congress would be a mighty alchemist if it could turn back the hand of time and unwrite all those things. But I am sufficiently concerned to wonder now whether Congress is going to abolish the principle of subsidies. If so, I should be very much interested, and I should like to participate actively in the discussion of the principle itself.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. With regard to all the subsidies which the Senator from Washington has mentioned, with the exception of one which I can think of, namely, the cancelation of the debts of foreign governments, I think that no commitments were made in connection with those subsidies until Congress had voted the authority.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Aiken amendment attempts to prohibit subsidies, but subsidies only, as I have said. I do not think it is all-inclusive enough to prohibit the kind of thing which can be done to carry out the same effect.

As to the particular matter we have been discussing, it is quite limited. The provision is:

(2) As a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established.

That means that if farm prices go up they must be passed on to the consumer. One cannot attempt to devise any means whatever of trying to subsidize this high-cost producer or that high-cost producer, which will make the cost to the consumer less than it would otherwise be. The language of the amendment would prohibit any subsidy of that kind. I think there might be such a subsidy which would be very helpful in enforcing price control.

No subsidy or other payments shall be made—

(3) To maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency.

I do not quite understand why that provision is contained in clause (3) when almost the same provision appears above covering all Government funds, or attempting to do so. I do not quite understand the distinction between clause (2) and clause (3).

Mr. President, it is my opinion that if we are to provide a subsidy we should place on it an over-all financial limitation. In preparing my amendment I tried to make it as all-inclusive as it could be. If we think $500,000,000 is too much, let us cut it down to $100,000,000. Let us decide on the total figure we desire to spend on subsidies in connection with the war program. If it is desired by the Senate that there shall be no roll-back, let the Senate vote to include that feature in the provision. But it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont is not effective in preventing what may well be in effect a subsidy.

In the second place, if we begin to try to make exceptions of this subsidy and that subsidy, the result may be to prohibit some of the existing subsidies, such as the subsidy on sugar and others, the result of which has not been carefully considered.

Mr. President, I feel that if we are going to do this job we ought to do it by working on the committee amendment rather than by adopting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that the Senator from Vermont has offered a substitute for the committee amendment, beginning on line 16, page 5, and extending through line 12, page 6. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make the further parliamentary inquiry as to whether a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment would be in order and would take precedence over the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XVIII, in the case of a motion to strike out and insert, a motion to amend the part to be stricken out has precedence. So the amendment would be in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the committee amendment beginning in line 16 on page 5, down to and including line 12 on page 6, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That on and after the date of enactment of this act no authority shall be exercised by the Price Administrator, the Federal Loan Administrator, or any other governmental agency or corporation with respect to the making of any subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and any authority contained in such section with respect to the making of subsidy payments is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BONE. I merely seek information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I understand the purpose of the Senator from Missouri is to say in legal effect that whatever pledges have been made to date in good faith will be carried out.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

I suggest——

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I prefer to suggest the absence of a quorum before I begin an explanation of my amendment, but I can state to the Senator very briefly that the purpose of my amendment is to negative the claim of the Loan Administrator and the Office of Price Administration that section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act gives them authority for the roll-back policy they have been pursuing.

I do not think that section 2 (e) under any fair construction could possibly be considered as giving the Loan Administrator that authority. But since that is the claim under which they are proceeding, I propose as an original proposition to strike out that authority completely. Then if we want to provide authority for a production subsidy, which is what Congress intended in the first place, we can do so.

Mr. BONE. The Senator's position is that whatever is accomplished in the way of subsidies in the future shall be specifically authorized by an act of Congress?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is it entirely.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	Wilson
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to modify or correct the amendment which I offered a moment ago. I send the modification or correction to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 16, it is proposed to strike out all of lines 16 through 25, and on page 6, to strike out all from line 1 through the word "purpose" in line 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That on and after the date of enactment of this act no authority shall be exercised by the Price Administrator, the Federal Loan Administrator, or any other governmental agency or corporation with respect to the making of any subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and any authority contained in such section with respect to the making of subsidy payments is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who

has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the only difference between that amendment and the amendment I originally proposed——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I do not quite understand where the Senator proposes to have his amendment inserted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I offer the amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment, to strike out all the committee amendment except the last sentence, and insert the language I have proposed. I would leave only the last sentence of the committee amendment, in order to comply with the rule by making my amendment a perfecting amendment rather than a substitute. I say frankly that the whole purpose is to obtain a vote on the perfecting amendment before a vote on the substitute is had. The perfecting amendment is such that the last sentence of the committee amendment is perfectly meaningless when taken in connection with my own amendment, but I am adopting that form of the amendment for the purpose of complying with the rule.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment is to the committee amendment in the bill, and is in the nature of a perfecting amendment; is that correct?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct?

Mr. McNARY. Therefore it has precedence over the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, a perfecting amendment has precedence over a substitute.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate very long about the matter, because I think all Members of the Senate are thoroughly familiar with the issues involved. It is my belief that we have before us today one of the most important issues which has confronted the Congress and the people of the United States in the lifetime of any of us. I believe that today we are considering a question which involves the last stand of private enterprise in the United States of America. I believe we are considering today a proposition by which, if the advocates of subsidies for agricultural commodities prevail—and, of course, agricultural commodities include processed agricultural commodities—we shall, to all intents and purposes, have reduced the farmers of the United States, the agricultural producers of the United States, to a state of peonage. When once we have established that principle, when once we have established the principle of control of agricultural production in this country by subsidy, we shall have established the whole theory of Government control of agriculture; and when we have done that, Mr. President, there is no reason why every small business, every large business, every barber, every blacksmith, and everyone else in the United States should not be controlled in the same way.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am hopeful that the Senator will discuss this question before he concludes——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will give me an opportunity to discuss it, I probably shall be glad to.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question I have in mind is this: What effect, if any, would the Senator's amendment, if agreed to, have on the present subsidies paid to copper, lead, and zinc producers?

I do not know under what authority those subsidies are paid; but in reading the Senator's amendment, I should say it strikes rather comprehensively and directly at all subsidies. I am wondering whether the copper, lead, and zinc subsidies would in any way be affected?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that the subsidies to which the Senator has referred are direct subsidies authorized by other laws than section 2 (e) of the Price Stabilization Act. The only objective of the amendment is to repeal section 2 (e) of the Price Stabilization Act; and I say to the Senator from Utah that, so far as I am concerned, I think section 2 (e), for the purposes intended by the Congress when that section was enacted, was entirely justifiable, and should be continued.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator will first permit me to conclude my statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the fact that section 2 (e) of the Price Stabilization Act has been taken as an excuse, although I do not think it is a justifiable excuse, and as a fictitious authorization of law for the whole roll-back program, it seems to me to be necessary to repeal the whole of section 2 (e), and then to reenact a section authorizing a subsidy for production, as was originally intended by the Congress in the enactment of the Price Stabilization Act.

Now, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. May we have the assurance of the Senator from Missouri that it is not his intention or purpose in any way to affect the subsidies which now are being paid under the copper, lead, and zinc subsidy programs?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator may certainly have such assurance. I may say, furthermore, Mr. President, that so far as I am concerned, I have tried very meticulously to preserve the rights of persons who have dealt in good faith with the Government, even under the roll-back theory, even though I do not believe any governmental agency had any authority to initiate such a policy. I do not think any individual citizen should be penalized for a misunderstanding of the authority of governmental agencies; and, therefore, I have undertaken in my amendment to protect persons who have dealt in good faith with the Government under what I conceive to be an illegal proceeding on the part of the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri several questions in connection with the provisions of his amendment. Suppose a creamery operator had signed an agreement with the Federal Government providing for the payment of subsidies for a period of 1 year. Would not the amendment carry out the roll-back of butter until next June?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that any such situation exists. I understand that no agreements have been signed, that the matter has been entirely a question of newspaper releases and of general orders issued from Washington, and that few, if any, individual contracts have been signed. If any have been signed, I think a man who has dealt in good faith with the Government of the United States, even though he may be mistaken in his conception of the authority and responsibility of the governmental agencies, should be protected. I make that answer to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure but that the Butter Production Payments Regulation No. 2 of the Defense Supplies Corporation should be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can have printed in the RECORD anything for which he chooses to make such a request.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 2 reads:

SEC. 2. Persons eligible to apply for payments: Any person who manufactures 1,000 pounds or more of butter in any one establishment in any calendar month may file an application for payment on account of such butter manufactured during a calendar month after May 1943.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the difference between the Senator's amendment and mine is that the Senator's amendment is a long, involved one which, so far as I know, no Member of the Senate except himself is able to understand; whereas, my amendment is a very brief, direct, specific repealer of the authority to enter into any such agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose a thousand creamery operators have already signed the agreement with the Government, and a thousand have not signed it. Under the Senator's amendment would not the 1,000 who have signed it be entitled to collect 5 cents a pound until 1944, and would not the others be denied the subsidy?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that any such state of facts exists. I am not willing to deal with a matter of this importance on the basis of speculation that perhaps a thousand operators have entered into such contracts. I do not think the Senator can produce evidence of one instance of anyone having signed such a contract.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not producing evidence. I am asking a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will answer the Senator as frankly as I can. I believe that those who have in good faith entered into agreements with the Government, even though they may be mistaken as to the legal authority of any governmental agency to contract with them or to issue such orders, should be protected. That is what my amendment would do.

Mr. AIKEN. Would we not then have a two-price butter program for a year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Possibly that is the explanation of the very complex amendment which the Senator has introduced, and which no one has yet been able to understand.

Mr. AIKEN. Another question which I wish to ask is, How long should producers be guaranteed the subsidy which they have agreed in good faith to accept from the Government? For example, take the small copper mines which have started in business in order to produce copper for 17 cents a pound. Under the Senator's amendment, how long would they be permitted to receive 17 cents a pound?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment is perfectly clear in that respect. Anyone who has in good faith entered into an agreement with the Government should be protected. I did not insert any time limitation, because, so far as I know, no such contracts have been entered into. However, anyone who has changed his position in good faith, on the basis of a governmental representation, should be protected. I do not think any intelligent argument can be made against such a position.

Mr. AIKEN. I should say that a goodly proportion of the creamery operators have entered into such an agreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator has any figures to produce on that question, he may change my mind; but the Senator is simply indulging in speculation. I am interested in stopping what I consider to be a very vicious tendency, for which I believe there is no authority of law whatever. I think it ought to be stopped. I think the Congress is against it, and I have adopted a very simple method of stopping it.

The Senator has offered an amendment so complex that, as I say, I have not been able to find a single Senator, aside from the Senator from Vermont himself, who professes to have the slightest idea what the amendment means. The Senator has said that he has the opinion of some very distinguished lawyers. I do not profess to be a distinguished lawyer. For many years I made my living practicing law. However, I do claim to be an extremely practical lawyer. Perhaps I am not a distinguished lawyer within the meaning of the term used by the Senator from Vermont; but I will say very frankly that I cannot understand what the amendment of the Senator from Vermont means, and I have not found anyone else who understands it.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I might not disapprove of his amendment if I could understand it. I wish to be sure that I am not voting to give a subsidy of 5 cents a pound on butter to half the creameries, and absolutely deny it to the other half, if half of them have entered into agreements and the other half have not. It seems to me that is just what the Senator's amendment would do.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. There is nothing in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri which would affect the small copper companies of which the Senator from Vermont speaks. They would not be affected in the slightest degree.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think so either. I am mainly interested in the creameries.

Mr. WHEELER. With respect to the creameries, I do not think they have entered into a program for a definite length of time. I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri could be construed in any other way than as stopping subsidies to the producers of butter who produce more than a thousand pounds.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think unquestionably the effect of the amendment would be to entitle producers to the payment of accrued subsidies up to the effective date of the act, and nothing more.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think there is any question about that, as a matter of law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think possibly the Senator is unduly emphasizing the point that contracts have not been signed between individuals and the Government, which bind either the individuals or the Government. It is my understanding that all such Government programs are put into operation by releases on the part of the Government agency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator mean newspaper releases?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. That is the method of circulating offers to the public. It is my understanding that there are no formal contracts between the Government and processors or producers, whether they be farmers or factories. Plans or proposals offered to the public by any agency of the Government, acting with authority, of course, are almost never put into operation in the form of written contracts. The offer goes out through releases scattered all over the country. That was the method used in the case of the sustaining price on hogs. The Government announced a sustaining price of 13¾ cents a pound on hogs, but it did not expect any hog producer or processor to sign an agreement. The information went out in the usual way, the way it always goes out, so far as I know; and the acceptance of the offer is impliedly made by compliance with the Government's offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to quarrel with the Senator from Alabama about the details of the mechanics of the procedure. The fact of the matter is that the O. P. A. and the R. F. C., or the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the creature of the R. F. C., have exceeded their authority. They have taken a section of the Stabilization Act, section 2 (e), adopted by the Congress for the perfectly definite purpose of encouraging production in certain commodities with respect to which increased production can only be brought about at a loss to the producer, and extended it as an excuse for the roll-back procedure.

I have not heard it denied on this floor that that is beyond their authority. I do not understand that Jesse Jones himself, for whom I have great regard and considerable affection, when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee, claimed that the Commodity Credit Corporation had any authority under the law to finance the roll-back procedure. I understand that Jesse Jones said he was ordered by someone else to do it. When he was asked who ordered him to do it, he said, "Jimmy Byrnes." Who ordered Jimmy to do it, I do not know; but I do not understand that anyone has yet maintained, as a legal proposition, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has any authority to finance any such operation as this.

The other day several Senators raised the question as to where the O. P. A. got its authority to carry out such a program. Finally, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] went to the telephone, and when he returned he stated, on the authority of someone by the name of Ellington, or Elphenstone, or Bullington, or some such name—the Senator from Alabama did not even know the man—that the Commodity Credit Corporation was relying on section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act.

I very well remember the debate in connection with section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act. I remember that the then Senator from Michigan, now the Administrator of O. P. A., stood on this floor and explained, time after time, that the provisions of section 2 (e) as to subsidies were not in any event intended to be an authority for price control, but were merely intended, in certain very specific instances, to encourage production when production could not otherwise be increased except at a loss.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that if the construction now sought to be put upon section 2 (e) had been announced on this floor when the bill was under consideration, neither section 2 (e) nor the bill itself would have received a dozen votes in this body.

It seems to me that the adoption of my amendment is the only way in which to handle the situation, inasmuch as in the meantime what is called an opinion of the Attorney General has been obtained. Of course, everyone knows that the Attorney General did not write the opinion; and, of course, anyone who has any sense whatever knows that any Government department which desires to do so may obtain from the Department of Justice an opinion authorizing any perverted or twisted construction of any statute which it may want.

My dear friend, the Senator from Alabama, rose on the floor of the Senate and quoted an opinion of the Department of Justice. I have the very highest regard, as does every one else in the Chamber who knows the Senator, for the legal ability and legal opinions of the Senator from Alabama. Everyone knows that the Senator from Alabama is a great lawyer. If the Senator from Alabama were to rise in this Chamber and say, "I, myself, have made a study of this subject; I have arrived at a definite decision; I have written an opinion on this subject which I wish to have printed in the RECORD," I would have the greatest respect for his opinion. There is no Senator for whose opinion we would have greater respect than that of the Senator from Alabama.

However, the Senator says the Department of Justice has given an opinion on this question. Mr. President, I have read the opinion of the Department of Justice. It is about 2 inches long.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that the opinion to which I have referred is approximately three or four pages long.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama in a moment. In effect, the opinion of the Department of Justice amounts to about the following: "Boys, you can do anything you want to do." [Laughter.]

Now I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in the first place, I say to my good friend the Senator from Missouri that I am grateful to him for his generous appraisal of me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I have said has come from the heart.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know it has. The Senator knows I have the highest regard for him; and I could not have that feeling toward him if I did not know that he had the same feeling toward me.

Mr. President, the situation is this: Of course, I have made no study of the opinion to which the Senator from Missouri has referred. No Member of the Senate has time to examine into collaterally involved legal questions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that. All I am endeavoring to say is that if the opinion were that of the Senator from Alabama, I should have great respect for it. However, if the opinion is a routine, mail-order opinion of some clerk in the Department of Justice, I do not have the slightest respect on earth for it, and I do not believe any other Senator has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The statement of the distinguished Senator that the opinion is only about 2 inches in length discloses that the Senator has not read it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, yes; I have read it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The opinion is some two or three pages in length. I got tired reading it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Most of it is simply a quotation of the law itself. The pertinent part of the decision is no longer than my forefinger.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The conclusion in the opinion may not have been longer than that, but the opinion which was recited was much longer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator is speaking of the statement of fact as being the opinion, I agree with him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I refer to the citations of statutes and rulings, as well. What is generally called an opinion of course usually involves not only the final conclusion but a general restatement of the law, backed up and justified insofar as possible by a statement of any other authority or of any reasoning on the subject which the writer of the opinion may have to offer. However, if the Senator will again examine the opinion, I believe he will conclude, regardless of whether he agrees with the conclusion, that the opinion certainly is a well-considered one, not a hurried memorandum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not agree with the Senator, but I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I say to the Senator that, regardless of whether he agrees with the conclusion, the opinion is not a hurried memorandum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say that there is nothing to the opinion except a conclusion.

Inasmuch as the Senator is on his feet, let me ask him whether he contends that when section 2 (e) or any other section of the Stabilization Act was before this body, there ever was made on this floor any suggestion or claim, except by way of negation, which would authorize any such procedure as the roll-back and subsidy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not think there was.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was it not specifically denied by the Senator in charge of the bill, as well as every other member of the Committee on Banking and Currency who had anything to do with the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not have any recollection that the subject was discussed in any way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have a very definite recollection. I do not have the RECORD before me, but I have a very definite recollection that the Senate never intended to adopt any subsidy authorization at all, except when it was explained and asserted and promised that it was only to be a production subsidy, not a price-control subsidy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot agree with the Senator about that. I think section 2 (e), the section the Senator is trying to have repealed, demonstrates that his conclusion is not well sustained.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator from Alabama contend that section 2 (e), which my amendment seeks to repeal, does anything except to authorize a strict production subsidy?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not. However, I say that when a roll-back is contemplated, if it goes back to the producer it will reduce production, and that the stopping of it by a subsidy at the plant of the manufacturer will tend to sustain production and to prevent a decrease in production.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course the Senator and I are in complete disagreement about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator asked me for my views, and I have attempted to state them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all right. I am glad to have had the Senator express them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the purpose for which I rose was to bring to the Senator's attention, and to the attention of other Members of the Senate, his criticism of reliance by Government officials upon opinions of the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I will repeat everything I have said concerning that subject.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, that would be implication.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say that I will repeat everything I have said. I do not want the Senator from Alabama to think that I am backing up on this proposition. I should like to repeat what I have said, to emphasize it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The point I make is that the Attorney General is a man whose appointment was confirmed by the Senate. I hold no brief for him. However, I know of no reason which would lead me to believe that he has no official, legal responsibility, and is not a man of high standing in his profession.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to introduce as exhibit A the idiotic opinion we have been discussing on this very matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It may be a matter of opinion; but I have discussed it and I want to introduce it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think the opinion is an idiotic one, at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think so.

However, the point I make is that the Senator from Missouri stands here in his position as a Member of the United States Senate, as do we all when we are on the floor of the Senate. I think the interest of orderly government, and the maintenance of respect for our Government, as well as the obedience and compliance with the laws of our Government, require that, generally speaking, unless there is some reason to the contrary, we accept the opinions of officials of the Government duly appointed and confirmed to perform the duties assigned to them under the constitutional provision relating to principal officers of the executive departments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, that is precisely what I propose to do by my amendment. I did not bring in the amendment, I did not bring in any proposition, saying the opinion of the Attorney General is idiotic, which I believe it to be. I did not say the Attorney General is deliberately encouraging violation of the law, which I believe to be the case. I merely said that, since the Attorney General has put an erroneous construction upon the law, as intended by Congress, since the Attorney General has seized upon section 2 (e) as author-

ity for a construction which Congress never had the slightest idea of authorizing, we will simply repeal section 2 (e). That is no reflection on the Attorney General.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the statement of the Senator from Missouri is unfortunate, and I should think so if our positions were reversed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is entirely correct in saying that I believe the Attorney General's opinion is idiotic. I will give the Attorney General credit by saying that I do not believe he ever wrote the opinion. Undoubtedly, some law clerk in the Department of Justice wrote it. I will absolve the Attorney General from personal responsibility for the opinion. I think the construction which he has placed upon the law is a deliberate flouting of the will of Congress; but I do not say so in my amendment. I merely propose to repeal the section 2 (e).

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the body of the RECORD immediately after my discussion with the Senator from Missouri of the Attorney General's opinion, a copy of the opinion as it appears in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on pages 211 and 212

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The opinion is as follows:

OCTOBER 27, 1942.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In answer to the questions raised by your letter of October 20, 1942, it is my opinion that (1) the authority conferred by section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 upon corporations created under section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act does include authority to make subsidy payments for the type of services described in section 302 (c) of the former act when these services are rendered with respect to materials defined by the President as strategic or critical, and that (2) persons, corporations, partnerships, and other business organizations rendering these services are producers within the meaning of the phrase in section 302 (c) which authorizes Reconstruction Finance Corporation corporations to make subsidy payments to domestic producers.

Subsidy payments to domestic producers of commodities are authorized by section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 when it is determined that unless they are paid, the maximum necessary production is not or may not be obtained during the ensuing year. The amounts of the subsidies and the manner and terms and conditions upon which they are paid, section 2 (e) provides, shall be such as are determined to be necessary to obtain the necessary maximum production. When critical or strategic materials are involved, all the determinations to which I have referred are to be made by the Secretary of Commerce (in whom the functions of the Federal Loan Administrator named in sec. 2 (e) are now vested) with the approval of the President and the subsidy payments are to be made by corporations created under section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. When critical or strategic materials are not involved the Price Administrator is authorized to make the determinations and the subsidy payments. The relevant portions of section 2 (e), which I have thus summarized, read as follows:

"Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any commodity which has heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, such determinations shall be made by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and notwithstanding any other provision of this act or of any existing law, such commodity may be bought or sold or stored or used, and such subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof may be paid, only by corporations created or organized pursuant to such section 5 (d) * * *."

Those who render services of the types here in question with respect to critical or strategic materials are, in both an economic and a legal sense, producers. That the Congress intended that they should be so regarded for the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act is shown by section 302 (c) thereof, which reads in part:

"The term 'commodity' * * * includes services rendered otherwise than as an employee in connection with the processing, distribution, storage, installation, repair, or negotiation of purchases or sales of a commodity, or in connection with the operation of any service establishment for the servicing of a commodity."

My conclusion that the authority to pay subsidies conferred by section 2 (e) upon the Secretary of Commerce and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation corporations relates not only to those who, in the narrowest sense, "produce" a strategic or critical material but also to those whose services of the types referred to complete the "production" thereof (in the wide sense in which sec. 302 (c) shows that the word should be understood in this connection) is fortified by the fact that it is, in many cases, difficult if not impossible to distinguish "production," in the narrow sense of the word, from processing and other services of the kinds referred to in section 302 (c). In the case of "petroleum products" is the oil-well operator the only "producer" or is the refiner also a "producer" or perhaps the sole "producer"? The Congress, I think, wisely made it unnecessary that this question, and many others like it, be answered.

Another consideration confirms my interpretation of section 2 (e). That section, in connection with section 302 (c), clearly authorizes the payment of subsidies to persons who have "produced" a "commodity" by furnishing services of the type here involved. The statute cannot, where a strategic or critical material is involved, reasonably be construed to mean that the function of determining the need for subsidies is divided between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator.

Your letter states that—

"Already Defense Supplies Corporation, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, has, with the approval of the President, agreed to pay excess costs of transporting sugar to deficit areas, bituminous coal to New York State and New England, petroleum and petroleum products to the eastern seaboard, and Chilean nitrates to the United States. The purpose in each case is to permit the uninterrupted delivery of the particular strategic and critical material to the areas affected under maximum prices established by the Price Administrator despite increased transportation costs resulting from enemy attacks upon American and Allied shipping. Such subsidy payments are to be paid directly to persons engaged in the performance of any service in connection with particular commodities, or, in order to facilitate administration of the program, to persons absorbing abnormal increases in the cost of any such commodity."

I am informed that in each of these instances the determinations required by section 2 (e) have been made. It is my opinion that these subsidy payments are authorized by law. That, in order to facilitate administration, the payments have sometimes been made not directly to the persons rendering the services being subsidized but to persons absorbing abnormal increases in cost, is, I think, legally immaterial so long as the payments are reflected to the persons you are authorized by law to subsidize. The Congress could hardly have intended to forbid those charged with administering the law to adopt such a method of paying the subsidies. Section 2 (e) specifically authorizes you to pay subsidies "in such manner" as you determine to be necessary to achieve the necessary maximum production.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. TAFT and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I read the Senator's amendment it appears to me that it would abolish all subsidies on the transportation of oil, the transportation of coal to New England, and the transportation of gasoline to the east coast. I should think that is a subject which we ought to consider rather seriously before taking the action which is proposed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I believe in striking out section 3 completely, and then restoring under very specific limitations such subsidies as have actually been put into effect under section 2 (e) which we think should be restored.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator the way to do that is to adopt the committee amendment, and amend it, if that be desired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I think the committee amendment is so absolutely vicious that it would be impossible to make any improvement in it.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. The committee amendment——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Senators must speak one at a time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that the committee amendment proceeds on the theory that since something has been done which is absolutely illegal, according to the statement of the Senator from Ohio himself

on yesterday, we have to recognize that action and should now establish it as a legal principle, with a very slight limitation, which, of course, can be wiped out by the governmental lobby any time it may wish to do so.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator refers only to section (c) of the committee amendment. The committee amendment proposes the procedure the Senator advocates. It abolishes subsidies except for those authorized in (a) and (b). If the Senator does not like (c) which gives the R. F. C. money to do this, he can strike out (c), but the Senator's amendment simply abolishes all subsidies on the transportation of gasoline and all subsidies on the transportation of coal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is precisely what the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is intended to do.

Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, recurring to the question of the subsidies on copper, lead and zinc, let me say that I checked the matter with the counsel of the Metals Reserve Company of the R. F. C., who informed me that if subsection (e) of section 2 should be repealed it would destroy their subsidy programs as to copper, lead, and zinc, because that program is predicated on that section.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, I am in favor of repealing the subsidy on copper, lead, and zinc and restoring it by appropriate legislation. I am in favor of stopping the very ruinous policy which is now being pursued by the Government through the R. F. C. and the O. P. A. of expanding a subsidy which was intended to be a subsidy for production and to use it as authority for general price control subsidies, no matter what the cost may be. I would be in favor of granting authority for a subsidy for production in accordance with the announced intention of section 2 (e) when it was before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have talked with Mr. Henderson, of the R. F. C., who tells me that if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri should prevail the subsidy on strategic metals would be completely wiped out; that subsidies which have been paid on the transportation of oil and coal to New England and other sections would be completely wiped out, and that the war effort would be very drastically interfered with.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have great respect for Charlie Henderson; I am very fond of him. Of course, I know Charlie Henderson's interest in the mining business, and I do not wish to reflect on him in any way; but I say that it is not necessary for us to maintain on the statute books a section which can be perverted as section 2 (e) has been and is being perverted, in order to protect the subsidies which are properly being granted and have been properly granted to strategic minerals and to other necessary elements in order to increase production.

The Senator from Alabama yesterday, so far as agricultural commodities are concerned—and certainly there has never been a more expert special pleader in Congress since I have been a Member of it than the Senator from Alabama, and I have great respect for his ability in that regard—was able to mention only about two commodities. One was soybeans. I ask him what the other was.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mentioned three at least—soybeans, peanuts, and flaxseed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; soybeans, peanuts, and flaxseed, the desirability of protecting which by subsidies no one can controvert, because they are commodities which might otherwise be produced at a loss and which are essential; but because those three agricultural commodities require a production subsidy it is now seriously proposed that we must leave upon the statute books a section, asserted by some law clerk in the Department of Justice, which view is adopted by the Attorney General of the United States, to authorize a general roll-back subsidy and price control. I say, Mr. President, it does not make sense.

As I said a while ago, and as I now repeat, I am one of those old-fashioned people who believe in the old, but apparently discarded, maxim that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. I think, if the Congress of the United States is opposed, as I believe an overwhelming majority of it is, to wiping out private enterprise, and is opposed to Government control of agriculture, Government control of mines, and Government control of small business, that the way to reach that objective is directly by striking out the alleged authority under which the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. are proceeding.

Mr. President, I have talked to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; I am certain that he and I are driving at the same objective; but I have studied his amendment, and restudied it, and restudied it, and restudied it, to the very best of the ability God has given me to read anything—and I think I understand the English language pretty well—and I am very frank to say that I do not understand what the amendment of the Senator from Vermont would do. A dozen Senators today have asked me what would be the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, and I have not been able to tell them. I listened attentively to the Senator from Vermont himself and he has not been able to tell me. Therefore, it seems to me that to reach the objective of stopping the subsidies, if that is what we want to do, leaving the possibility for private enterprise in this country on the farm and in other places to survive, the thing to do is to strike out section 2 (e), and then reenact in separate legislation a carefully guarded subsidy for production, which was the only justification for the inclusion of section 2 (e) in the law in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand it will hardly be possible to get a vote on the pending bill this afternoon, and there are two conference reports involving appropriations which I should like to have taken up and disposed of, if possible, so the appropriation bills may finally be passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is my opinion, after some survey, that the Senate could not reach a vote on the final passage of the pending bill today. We probably could dispose of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Missouri. I thought we were about ready for a vote on that amendment. I think it is our duty to give way to conference reports on appropriation bills, because of the very early date when, under our fiscal policy, it will be necessary to reenact present appropriations if the bills should fail. I am perfectly willing to give way.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is possible to get a vote on the amendment, it will be all right with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know whether any other Senator desires to speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would invalidate all subsidies on the transportation of gasoline and oil to the Atlantic coast, it would entirely upset the price structure of gasoline and oil, it would abolish subsidies on coal to New England, and it would therefore increase the cost of all New England manufacture. It would abolish the subsidies on copper and on many other metals.

It seems to me the method pursued by the Senator, regardless of the question of principle, is the wrong one to follow. I insist that the way the committee has gone about the matter is the right way, that is, first to say that there shall be no subsidies except certain ones which are listed, and then to list them.

We listed the transportation subsidy, then we listed the metal subsidy, and then we listed a money limitation to the R. F. C. If the Senate does not want that money provision regarding the R. F. C., the way to handle it is to strike out subsection (c). It is not best merely to abolish all subsidies, which have become a basic feature in the use of coal and oil and gas and metal in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think the amendment should be defeated. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to see if we cannot reach an agreement for a limitation of time on the bill. However, at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, I withhold the request.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the merits of the amendment, except to say that insofar as accomplishing what the Senator from Missouri and other Senators have in mind is concerned, my judgment is that if we adopt the amendment it will effectively carry out the purpose.

The bill will have to pass the House, and it will pass the House, but in a pretty stringent form, according to available information. So that if the amendment shall be agreed to, it certainly will, in finishing its course through the House, take care of those subsidies which are purely production subsidies. The transportation subsidies, and the subsidies on strategic minerals and metals, can be cared for. Perhaps it would be better if such a provision were written into the amendment, but so far as I am concerned, I merely wish to say that I am ready to vote for the amendment. I know those matters will be cared for.

So far as any of the benefit payments which go to agriculture or agricultural products under other acts are concerned, they are not even affected by the amendment. The amendment relates only to section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment shall be agreed to, will it in any way affect the subsidy paid on sugar beets?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all. It does not affect any agricultural benefit payments at all. It is related solely to the acts which are done under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was about to say to the Senator that I concur entirely in the statement he has made. I shall vote for the Clark amendment, assuming that when the matter gets to conference it will be straightened out, so that the suggestions which the Senator has made will be taken care of, and I have not the slightest doubt they will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri in the nature of a perfecting amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Missouri to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator to withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	Wilson
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by the statement made a moment ago by the Senator from Ohio that the adoption of the pending amendment would endanger the economic system of the country so far as it is now dependent upon subsidies for the distribution of oil and other materials, and so far as the war production plan is concerned by the payment of subsidies for the mining of copper and other minerals.

I am not at all satisfied that we can idly dismiss these matters by the statement that they can be taken care of somewhere else, in conference, or perhaps in the House. If these matters are to be taken care of, they should be taken care of here, it seems to me.

One part of the provision which is to be stricken out by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Missouri reads as follows:

Provided, That in the case of any commodity which has heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, such determinations shall be made by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any existing law, such commodity may be bought or sold, or stored or used, and such subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof may be paid, only by corporations created or organized pursuant to such section 5d.

Section 5d was written into the law for the express purpose of enabling the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to stimulate the production of materials highly necessary in the prosecution of the war. Before I can make up my mind as to how to vote upon this matter I wish to be sure what the effect of the proposed action will be upon that provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will offer an amendment to my amendment providing in terms what he has just read from the law, I shall be glad to accept it. My amendment is not in any degree or to any extent whatever intended to interfere with the present provisions as to transportation or as to production of strategic materials. My amendment is entirely directed to the end of stopping the infamous usurpation of authority in the way of roll-back or subsidies on agricultural commodities. It is not intended in any way, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, to apply to the production of strategic materials. If the Senator will offer such an amendment, I will, so far as I am concerned, be very glad indeed to accept it, because my amendment was not directed at such a situation as he has presented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that statement by the Senator from Missouri. It tends, I think, to clarify the situation materially. I want the Senate to understand, however, as we all know, that many Members of this body have come from committee meetings to the Chamber at this moment in response to the quorum call. The Committee on Appropriations has been meeting morning and afternoon. There is a meeting in progress now at which I should be present, and at which I want to be present. It is almost impossible to write offhand such an amendment as the Senator says he would be quite willing to receive, but I should be very glad to undertake to write it and present it later. Certainly if we are going to have the vote immediately that cannot be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing for the vote to be postponed temporarily. I was not pressing for a vote. I had expressed myself in favor of my amendment, and at the conclusion of my remarks no Senator seemed to desire to pursue the matter further. So far as I am concerned I am not pressing for a vote at this time.

I should like to say further to the Senator in connection with what he has said, that I realize that many Senators are busy in committee. I have done everything I possibly could to familiarize the Senate with the provisions of my amendment. I introduced it first in the form of a separate bill, and then I offered it at this time as an amendment to the committee amendment to the bill. I have done everything I possibly could to familiarize Senators with the purposes of my amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Connecticut has repeatedly asked me to yield, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] wants to file a report from the Appropriations Committee. I yield to the Senator from Nevada for that purpose first, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 342) thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITTINGTON, and Mr. WOLCOTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I attempted to get the floor in my own right at the time the Senator from Wyoming obtained the floor. When I entered the Chamber I came from a very important meeting of the Appropriations Committee. We were completing work on the bill just reported from that committee by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

I am greatly concerned about the pending amendment. I am very fearful of its consequences. It would probably hit the section of the country whence I come more than any other section. Last year, after very careful deliberation, the Senate agreed that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should provide subsidies in connection with the transportation of coal and oil. I should have discussed this matter earlier had I been present, and, as I said a moment ago, I attempted to obtain the floor as soon as I came to the Chamber, in order to point out that if the amendment, as presently drawn, should prevail, it would not only wipe out transportation subsidies affecting coal and oil, but would place many industries at a time when they are contributing so much to the war program, at a terrific disadvantage compared with industries in other localities.

The Senate almost in its entirety has long since agreed with respect to those particular subsidies. I share the feeling of the Senator from Wyoming, to whom I am grateful for having yielded to me, that it is next to impossible hurriedly to draft an amendment which might provide the protection so sorely needed. Unless time shall be given to prepare such an amendment, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri may be rejected, because its consequences, if it should be adopted, would be very serious and harmful to the war program.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I promised I would yield to the Senator from Oregon, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. McNARY. I do not ask to obtain the floor. I wish only to offer a suggestion. I see the difficulties under which the able Senator from Wyoming, and the able Senator from Connecticut, and others are laboring. I also realize that two conference reports are about to be presented. I wish to suggest to my distinguished friend across the aisle, the acting majority leader, that we now postpone further consideration of the pending bill, and proceed to consider the conference reports, after which I propose that when the Senate takes a recess it meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m. Does that meet with the Senator's approval?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think that would be a very happy solution.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that will be done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is anxious to proceed to consideration of two conference reports. While I have the floor let me say that the Senate must consider these two conference reports, and also must dispose of the pending bill, as well as dispose of the appropriation bill which has just been reported by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] making appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Administration. We may have other measures from the Appropriations Committee to consider. As matters now stand I wish to say that it is entirely possible, perhaps I should say probable, that we will have a Saturday session.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MALONEY. It is about certain, is it not?

Mr. HILL. I should say, as matters now stand, it is quite certain we shall be obliged to have a Saturday session.

Mr. GEORGE. I offer, and ask to have printed and lie on the table, an amendment to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], to add at the end thereof the following language:

Provided further, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay (a) to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency, and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

Mr. President, I should like to say that the language in this amendment is taken bodily from the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to take care of the two particular features of the bill to which the Senator from Wyoming and others have referred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say that, so far as I am concerned, the proposed amendment is entirely agreeable to me. I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who are interested in the matter, discuss the proposal, but I assume the matter can go over until tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that my proposed amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment presented by the Senator from Georgia will be printed and will lie on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment numbered 26: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment and amendment thereto insert the following:

"SEC. 204. The Joint Committee on Investigation of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is hereby directed to make a study of the problem of penalty mail in all of the departments and branches of the Government, with a view to eliminating unnecessary volume and reducing costs, and shall report its findings and recommendations by bill or otherwise to Congress not later than the first day

of the next regular session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The departments and agencies of government shall furnish such information and detail such personnel as may be requested by the Committee to assist in its investigation."

And the House agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
PAT MCCARRAN,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask what the report is?

Mr. McKELLAR. A report from the conference committee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. There are only two items still in difference between the two Houses.

Mr. McNARY. Is the report final?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a final report. It is a report on the last two amendments remaining in difference.

Mr. President, let me explain to the Senate that two amendments in the bill have been widely controversial, holding up its final passage for 2 or 3 months or more. The first amendment is one relative to silver. Senators will recall it. The House inserted as an amendment to the appropriations bill a provision concerning silver and the uses of silver. The passage the other day of the bill of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] satisfied the House, so far as the silver amendment was concerned, and after the bill of the Senator from Rhode Island was passed the House receded from its position on the amendment. That is the report as to that matter.

The other amendment is in reference to use of the mails. The House inserted a provision, as I recall, that after January 1, all the departments and agencies of the Government should no longer use the mails free. After many conferences, private, public, secret, and of every other kind, we finally agreed that the question of use of the mails should be referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the committee known as the Byrd committee. I think that course is satisfactory to everyone.

The report was signed by all the conferees, and I think it is a very happy solution of the two matters. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be considered and agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Tennessee whether the conference report is the one which deals with the inhibition against the employment of the three persons to whom reference has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; Mr. President, it is not. I say to the Senator that I shall present that conference report in a few moments, but it has not as yet been reached.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the report is agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 60 and 61.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum before a vote is taken on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to withhold suggesting the absence of a quorum until I have an opportunity to answer the question of the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The conference report is the one to which the Senator from California has referred.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to make some remarks relative to the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the matter seems to me a very important one. Therefore, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand that the Senate conferees have receded from the position which was taken by the Senate by a unanimous vote, a vote of 69 to 0. It seems to me that the matter should be carefully considered by the Senate. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Green	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	Wilson
Gurney	Radcliffe	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the reason that the Senate voted unanimously in favor of its amendment as to the three so-called subversives, I have concluded to do something I do not often do, to read from a written document which I have prepared:

Mr. President, after weeks of conferences your committee has agreed with the House committee on the two items of difference that have held up the conference so long. The House has adopted the report, and it is here for the Senate's consideration at this time. The two items of difference are: First, the limitations on the appropriation for the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert M. Lovett. The Senate is entirely familiar with the question. The House voted about 5 to 1 in favor of sustaining their view of the matter, and it was brought back to the Senate; and the Senate voted unanimously, something that is rarely ever done, in favor of the Senate's view. But after a number of other conferences and side talks of all kinds, we reached the conclusion that there would be no bill—that is, no urgent deficiency bill—unless the Senate yielded on this question. There is about $143,000,000, a large part of it in salaries, that ought to be paid, and we did not feel it was right to disregard all the men against whom nothing has been raised and deprive them of salaries because of the three in question.

Mr. President, the question of these three men charged with holding views subversive to the Government, and as to which men the House by amendment had directed that no part of the appropriation be paid to them, has given us the greatest trouble. It has frequently been up before, and always arouses the greatest trouble. The House passed it by a

vote of 318 to 62—more than 5 to 1—and the Senate struck out the amendment. After the House had voted, the provision was brought back to the Senate and the Senate upheld it unanimously, as before stated.

Mr. President, the Senate conferees have vigorously and earnestly maintained the position taken by the Senate, that the provision of the House bill prohibiting the use of funds appropriated thereunder to pay the three named individuals is indefensible as a matter of procedure. They also maintained that the facts as to the belief in revolutionary principles were not brought before either the House or the conference in a proper way.

The House provision excluding these three men from public employment, or, rather, providing that no salary shall be paid them, which is the same as exclusion, had no evidence except the report of the Kerr committee appointed in the House. The Kerr committee held secret sessions, and the testimony and findings have never been published. All the evidence taken by the Senate conferees was taken in the open before the committee, and all of it was favorable to the three men.

Under the decision in the Myers case the President has the right to discharge Government employees, but there is no provision in the Constitution which allows Congress to discharge them. Of course, the Congress does not discharge them, but it deprives them of their salaries, which means the same thing. The majority of our committee do not believe that under the Constitution Congress has the right to get rid of employees in that way, even after full hearings. We argued this question time and again with the House Members, but to no avail.

The urgent deficiency bill includes many appropriations essential to the prosecution of the war and to the proper conduct of the Government. The House conferees have refused to agree to any urgent deficiency bill which does not include this provision, but some members of our committee think it is unconstitutional. However that may be, in order to get a bill we had to agree to this provision of the House bill. The Senate conferees have most reluctantly felt obliged to yield to this unjust provision in order to get the appropriation bill out of Congress and enacted into law.

This matter has come up a number of times recently, as we all know. After all, this may be the best way to get it settled. It is very earnestly hoped that the Government will continue to employ these men for a while anyway, so that they may bring suit for their salaries and thus raise the question. The question ought to be settled. It ought not to be constantly recurring. Personally, I am not in favor of anyone who has subversive views about our Government working for the Government; but even so, I think that in a case of this kind he ought to have a fair show. I am sure that the men involved in this case will get a fair show in the courts of the Nation.

That is the only possible way the question can be settled. It is the only possible way the passage of this bill can be brought about; and, while it is a matter of regret that this course must be pursued, if we are to enact this bill to pay employees of the Government and provide for many enterprises connected with the war, it is necessary for us to yield.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in yielding I have simply concluded to bring this question to the Senate and let the Senate vote on it as it will. That is the only course the conferees can pursue. I wish to say perfectly frankly that in my judgment if we were to reject the conference report there would be no bill. The other matter can be settled, and I believe it can be settled fairly and honestly by the courts. I hope the Senate will take the same view of it that the Senate conferees have taken.

I wish to make an explanation as to the other item. That item involves the President's private fund. The House provided that no part of this fund should be used for the Farm Security Administration or the National Resources Planning Board. The Senate inserted a more general amendment. After innumerable conferences and talks on this matter, inasmuch as the House had taken care of the two items which it favored in other bills, it was finally agreed to strike out all limitations on the President's use of the fund. I think this was very wise. In time of war such a limitation might be misconstrued as lack of confidence in the President. In addition the President makes a report of his use of the fund. We have examined that report, and in the main there could be no exception to his use of the money.

Mr. President, those are the facts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask the Senator a question in connection with the very frank statement which he has made. He said he did not approve of this system of ousting Government employees, and that the withholding of a man's salary amounted to his discharge. Does not the Senator believe that in truth and fact, under our theory of government, the procedure proposed by the House provision amounts substantially to a bill of attainder against these men, something which is forbidden by the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe it goes that far.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it does.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard the Senator express his view on that subject. He may be correct and I may be mistaken.

The two Houses of Congress have absolute authority over the purse, and the finances of the Nation. They appropriate all money, or they should appropriate all money. In these later days we are not appropriating it all. However, we are appropriating a very large part of it.

I doubt if the proposed procedure is equivalent to a bill of attainder. It is the exertion of a power by the Congress to say what money shall be expended and what shall not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was not that very practice condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States—a real Supreme Court of the United States—in the Myers case?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be remembered that in the Myers case, to which I have referred, a somewhat different question was raised. As I recall that case, the opinion was written by Mr. Chief Justice Taft. In my judgment, it was one of the strongest opinions ever written by that great judge. It was a review of an issue of many years ago. The facts in that case were these:

President Wilson discharged a postmaster in Oregon. I have forgotten the name of the town, but he discharged the postmaster there, and the postmaster sued the Government for his salary for the term for which he had been appointed. The Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Chief Justice Taft delivering the opinion, held that the President had the right to discharge him without asking the Senate. It was argued by lawyers in that case that, the Senate having confirmed Mr. Myers to that position, he could not be discharged unless the Senate should agree to his discharge. Mr. Taft, after reviewing all the authorities, held that it could be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator if it was not also held in that case that a man was entitled to his day in court, and was entitled to a proper hearing?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was not that same proposition enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Humphrey case?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. That is one of the reasons which led me, as one member of the committee—I do not know how the other members of the committee felt about it—but as one member of the committee I felt we would not be doing these three gentlemen any great injustice because they could obtain their remedy in court. It is very trying on them, of course, but they made this record about which so much has been said in the House and in the newspapers of the country. I do not pass upon the facts. I do not know enough about the facts to pass upon them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator well knows, without justification a man may be sent to a concentration camp, and it may be said that that is all right, and that he may sue out a writ of habeas corpus and possibly be released from the camp.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true, but we are not law-enforcing officers and we did not bring about this situation. It is merely a question of whether this bill will be enacted into law at this session of Congress. When the bill appropriates $143,000,000 for the salaries of literally hundreds and maybe thousands of employees and for various enterprises the cost of which should properly be paid under the bill, in my judgment we did right in making the report which we did to the Senate, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not exactly understand the Senator's observation that these men could have their remedy in court.

Mr. McKELLAR. They could have their remedy in court.

Mr. OVERTON. What remedy would they have against a legislative decree that they shall not receive any compensation whatsoever, and be driven out of their office, when the Congress has no evidence at all to support any charge against them? How can a question of that nature be brought before a court? The court will not say, "We will give them relief because the Congress of the United States acted without evidence and without any charge having been made against them."

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; no.

Mr. OVERTON. My objection was that there was no charge or evidence before our committee, or before the subcommittee of the House, whatsoever, affecting the loyalty of these men. There was no evidence whatever which indicated they were disloyal to the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have stated what are the facts; that the House acted upon a report of one of its committees, and that the Senate acted upon the evidence which was before it, and there was interminable bickering.

Mr. OVERTON. The report to which the Senator has referred was not even laid before the committee in the way of evidence.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a secret report made to the House, and the House could have acted upon it if it had wanted to do so.

However, that is not the question before the Senate. The courts are open to these men. They have a right to go into court and sue for their salaries. If the court holds that they are entitled to their salaries upon the showing which they make, that, in my judgment, would give them the proper recourse, and it is the only way in which the matter can be settled.

I am sure Senators would not want to deprive hundreds of employees—I shall have to ascertain whether there are more than several hundred; I imagine there are several hundred or a thousand or more—of their salaries when there is not the slightest complaint against the employees whatsoever. Everyone admits they are entitled to their salaries. As I have said, I am sure Senators would not want to deprive those persons of their salaries merely because of three men who are charged with subversive views in reference to our Government. I simply cannot imagine that we should delay the enactment of the bill on account of those three men.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In addition to the change made in the bill by the conferees which is now under discussion, I understand that the amendment to the bill as adopted by the Senate with respect to the use of emergency funds by the President has also been changed and, in fact, deleted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Both the House and Senate amendments on that subject were deleted from the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, does that mean that if Congress fails to appropriate money for a certain activity the President may resort to his emergency fund for money to carry on the activity?

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that all the purposes to which the House amendments and probably those of the Senate were directed have been taken care of in other bills. The remedy has been provided in other bills. For instance, the National Resources Planning Board has been abolished and, of course, the President could not allocate funds to that Board. The Farm Security Administration bill has been passed, and in that measure there is a provision that the President may not use any of his emergency fund to give to that agency, and probably the same situation prevails in the other cases. I do not think the Senator need fear that the President will use that fund for any such purpose as the Senator has in mind.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Without the thought of fear, does the President at the present time, without the restriction, have the power to use his emergency fund to augment or add to any appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe so. He is prohibited from doing so in other bills which are before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But in the pending measure we placed a prohibition against the use of the fund for the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but that prohibition was stricken out in conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I submit that that prohibition should remain in the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unless some other Senator wishes to ask a question, I will yield the floor.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, because some public posts are provided for by the Constitution, there must of necessity remain a question in the mind of every lawyer as to how far the Congress may go in decreeing by legislation that no part of an appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of a certain public official. I am referring now perhaps to a Member of the Senate. Suppose, for example, we should decree that no part of an appropriation should be used to pay the salary of Senator X. That might be challenged on constitutional grounds. The same thing might be done with respect to the Supreme Court because we might not like some of its decisions. But let us assume the case of an inferior Federal court not ordained by Congress. The office could be abolished at any time, and therefore we would be abolishing all functions accompanying the particular office. However, suppose there were some particularly flagrant and obnoxious decision of a judge of a Federal court, one which outraged all standards of common decency, and was a reproach to the office itself and we should decide instead of impeaching the judge—disliking very cordially his decision—to provide in a budget for the maintenance of the lower Federal courts that no part of the appropriation should be used in the payment of the salary of Judge X in a certain United States district court. On that basis, and having no testimony concerning the case other than our knowledge of it through a reading of the press reports if we should vote to take such action, does the Senator believe we would be justified?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether we would be justified. I do not think the House was justified in taking this particular course about these three men, but the House is adamant on the subject, and when it is not possible to agree, we must do the best we can, and we have made the best report of which we are capable.

I voted, as did every other Member of the Senate who was present, to strike this provision from the bill, and it was stricken from it so far as the Senate was concerned, but when we got to conference, the several times we were in conference—and we were in conference a great number of times—we discussed this matter nearly every day for a month. I think that if the Senator would ask Members of the House whether there was a chance on earth of getting the bill passed with that provision eliminated, he would find there was not a chance. I hope the Senator will not imagine more cases. We have enough actual cases now.

Mr. BONE. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not suggest that there is any impropriety in the Senate being as firm as the House. This is what amounts to a bill of attainder, which was one of the most odious forms of the old English law practices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BONE. What presents itself in this picture is the possibility of impeachment by a new method. This provision should engross every lawyer in the Congress, because this is a way of impeaching some one by an indirect method. We do not have to go through the formality of the House filing charges. We are sitting as a jury, without having heard of the evidence.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me to answer his question, I will say that the one advantage we have is that we have courts to settle all questions of a legal nature between citizens and governmental bodies, and all other bodies in our country. We have courts, in which we all have confidence. I know I have, and I am sure all of us have. The only comfort the Senate gets out of the adoption of this report is that the matter will go to the courts and be settled for all time, for us, as well as for everybody else.

Mr. BONE. If I may intrude again, I understand what the Senator has stated, but we are sitting here as a jury and as a court, and we are deciding a case without any evidence before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is not in that shape at all.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suppose that if there are any people on earth who know anything about ex post

facto laws and bills of attainder it is our English friends. It is a common parliamentary practice to move the reduction of a salary of an officer of the British Government, and if the motion carries, it is tantamount either to his removal or to an expression of lack of confidence. It is true we have to keep in mind the parliamentary system, and that the British have the parliamentary system, but it is one of the common practices in the British Parliament to move the reduction of a salary of an officer of the government. Therefore, it strikes me that we are going very far afield when we imagine that there is any question of ex post facto law here, or bill of attainder.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the way it appealed to the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt that we have merely a legislative situation. I think this is not a desirable way of disposing of men who are holding public office, but sometimes it is the only way to dispose of them. Sometimes it is quite impossible to get rid of them in any other way.

I do not know any of these three gentlemen, and they may be entitled to hold their offices, but it seems to me that it comes right down to this, it is precisely like disagreement over a provision in any other bill. If the House will not yield, and if our conferees have done all they can do, and they report it is useless to try to continue the conference longer, then it is a question of the good faith of our own conferees, and I should be disposed to accept their verdict in the matter, although I think it is not the proper way to proceed in cases of this kind.

As to the question of going into the courts, it may not be precisely the same in the Federal jurisdiction, but I think in State jurisdiction it is very well established, and, so far as I know, there has been no very well considered case to the contrary, that if an office be a constitutional one, it is not possible merely by illegally discharging a man to deprive him of his salary. If it is purely a legislative office, the legislature may repeal the act creating the office, or it may withhold the money. I think there is no reasonable doubt on that point.

This leads me to say that I do not think the men involved in this case would have very much chance in any court. But here is a provision in an appropriation bill, and if the Senate conferees say that they cannot induce the House to recede, so far as I am concerned, I should be disposed to go along with our conferees.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator yield merely for one observation?

Mr. DOWNEY. I have been waiting for about 30 minutes to get the floor, while the floor has been parceled out to various speakers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from Colorado, who wanted to ask a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that we are not confronted with a bill of attainder, technically speaking, but to me the matter is of the spirit of a bill of attainder. It holds within it the possibility of trial without being confronted by witnesses. It holds within it the possibility of trial in absentia. It has every obnoxious feature in it that has condemned bills of attainder.

Mr. President, I regret very much that for these reasons, and because this to me smells of ancient tombs in which liberty has been buried, I shall have to vote against the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield in connection with what the Senator from Colorado has said?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should simply like to suggest that in the remarks I made a while ago I did not mean that this was technically a bill of attainder, but in effect it is a bill of attainder.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It does not have to be technically a bill of attainder. It is in the spirit of a bill of attainder.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, while I recognize the critical situation with respect to the funds carried in this bill, and realize that the conferees were prompted by this urgency to work out a compromise with the House, I feel that the basic principle involved in the so-called Kerr amendment is so important that the Senate should not yield from its unanimous 69–0 vote of a few weeks ago.

There was at that time no doubt in our minds as to the impropriety, and, in fact, the unconstitutionality of a procedure whereby the Congress is asked to legislate three individuals out of Government jobs as subversive without any of the essential forms of a fair and judicial hearing, so dear to us as Americans, a statement of charges, representation by counsel, and open presentation of evidence pro and con.

It has previously been stated upon this floor—and I concur completely with the statement—that adequate legal provisions already exist by means of which persons who are genuinely subversive—that is, who attempt by violent means to overthrow our Government or give aid to our enemies—may be not merely dismissed from their Government positions, but prosecuted in criminal actions. No such charges have been made against these three men, and none of the evidence that has come to the attention of the Senate has tended to imply such charges; nor has the House itself made any claim to such charges as a basis for its decision.

I am, however, most deeply concerned by the detrimental effect which the passage of this rider will have upon our country's understanding of the nature of the war, and hence upon our progress toward speedy victory. It appears that these men are under attack primarily because of their membership in certain organizations which in the opinion of some people were communist "front," but which by a great many people are considered to be antifascist in character, since the programs of these organizations covered such issues as boycotting Japan, or sending aid to China. By branding such persons as subversive, we will cause great confusion among our people by failing to distinguish between those who help our allies and those who help our enemies. This is doubly serious at a time when we must strain every nerve to launch and support a decisive military offensive.

The Supreme Court has recently held that an admitted member of the Communist Party is not, by virtue solely of his membership, thereby deemed to be committed to violent overthrow of our Government. How much more truly this can be said of men who are not charged with being Communists, and of whom it can be said that at most they belonged to organizations with a few Communist members.

Mr. President, I am in agreement with those Senators who have expressed the opinion that the pending measure is essentially a bill of attainder; that its passage would tend to the destruction of our sacred and fundamental traditions of justice and civil rights. Nor can I condone its evil because of the hope that our courts might at some remote time undo the wrong this measure would admittedly do.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest and respect, as I always do, to the conclusions reached by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. In the matter before us they have both expressed themselves with even import. They said that they do not believe that this is the way to handle the matter, by removing officials from the Government pay roll by denying appropriations. The Senate certainly felt that way when the matter came before it for debate and approval, and we voted unanimously, 69 to 0, not to go along with the House. These men are entitled to a square deal, at least as I understand a square deal, by allowing them to be tried on the charges made against them in the open rather than to proceed by this back-door method of denying an appropriation to pay Government employees, with the purpose of discharging them from the Government service.

Mr. President, I listened with interest and thrilled to the remarks made by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], whose words, whose ideas, and whose expressions were worthy of the best traditions of the Senate. I congratulate him on that historic utterance, for that it will be in years to come, and will be often quoted.

I say tonight in this Senate Chamber, at this late hour, that the Senate of the United States, this branch of the Congress, should not allow the other branch of Congress or any individual to say to us in effect "Come across, or else there will be no appropriation bill." I am not one who would bow down to such an ultimatum. My message to my colleagues is for us to stand our ground, to keep faith with our traditions and civil rights. Vote down the conference report, and ask for a further conference with the House, and I am confident that a new report on the appropriation measure will

be made. We need not be concerned as to that. Stand by our traditions and by the previous decision unanimously made by this body, when we voted on the question, and our action will be to our credit and one in which we may well have a just and honorable pride in the years to come.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to express my appreciation of and admiration for the statement made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] because it was in the best tradition of the law. Every man who has practiced law has been taught to feel a reverence for law, for the freedom and the liberty for which American law is supposed to stand, and to pay reverence at its shrine.

My attention was attracted a moment ago to a citation in the Cyclopedic Law Dictionary which it will take me but a moment to read. It defines a bill of attainder as—

> A special act of the legislature pronouncing judgment of treason or felony on one who has not been tried in the courts, and passing sentence of death and attainder upon him. If the act inflicts a less punishment than death, it is called a "bill of pains and penalties."

On the strength of that citation this type of legislation cannot in any wise partake of the nature of a bill of attainder.

The Supreme Court of the United States has had something to say about this type of legislation. It said:

> A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties.

Let me say parenthetically that that is in line with the citation I have just read from the Cyclopedic Law Dictionary.

I continue to quote from the Supreme Court:

> As the term "bill of attainder" is used in the Federal Constitution, it includes both bills of attainder particularly, and bills of pains and penalties.

Citing *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356), *Drehman* v. *Stifle* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.) 595, 601, 19 L. Ed. 508); *Pierce* v. *Carskadon* (83 U. S. (18 Wall.) 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276).

If the measure before us is considered to be a bill of "pains and penalties," and that is exactly what it is, because it inflicts pains and penalties on these men, it is a form of punishment, and according to the decisions of the Supreme Court itself it is, as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, in spirit and effect, a bill of attainder.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the fate of the three men involved in this measure, while of great importance to them individually, in my opinion shrinks into insignificance when we contemplate the action which it is proposed that the Senate shall take. With men dying in the uniform of the United States on battlefields all over the world, and on the seven seas, it seems to me that the action which this body takes in upholding the traditions of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and justice is of vital importance.

All too frequently, it seems to me, there is a growing tendency on the part of groups in this country to feel that because they are in disagreement with another group, or with other individuals, they can with impunity to themselves violate fundamental rights without weakening them. I say that a study of the painful processes behind the sacrifices in blood and treasure whereby these fundamental rights were obtained, will convince any man that it is only by upholding them, by protecting those with whom we disagree, that we can preserve these rights for ourselves and for posterity. For the Senate of the United States to acquiesce in the act of dismissing these men from office, without a scintilla of evidence in its possession to justify such procedure, would be a repudiation of the entire spirit of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. It is mere legalistic hairsplitting to try to find any reason or justification for any such action.

I say, Mr. President, although I am not a lawyer, that I have grave doubt that these men, who do not occupy constitutional offices, would ever have any opportunity to test this issue in the courts. But even if they should have, Mr. President, what a pusillanimous position the Senate would take if it attempted now to justify a law which it acknowledged by a vote of 69 to 0 would perpetrate a wrong, and to justify a reversal of its position on the ground that Members of the Senate hope and pray that the victims will have their day in court, and that the courts of the United States will ultimately wipe out and rectify the wrong which the Senate had committed, and which it acknowledged to be a wrong.

I say, Mr. President, that such action is beneath the dignity and the traditions of the Senate. I say, furthermore, with all due respect to the other body of the Congress, that we have as much right to stand on this principle as it has to insist upon its action. If my information is correct, there was but one formal meeting of the conference committee after the Senate had voted overwhelmingly to stand by its amendment.

On the face of this record, Mr. President, I say I think it would be a blot upon the escutcheon of the Senate of the United States if it were to accept the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is with very great reluctance that I ever oppose the adoption of a conference report, and that is particularly true when a conference report is presented by such a distinguished Senator as the Senator from Tennessee. However, it seems to me that a very important question of principle is involved in this question. Let me say at the outset that, so far as I am concerned, certainly I hold no brief for any of the three men whose discharge and disqualification are sought to be accomplished by the House provision. The only thing I personally know in favor of any of the three men is that I understand that Dr. Lovett had a son who gallantly lost his life as a member of the Second Division at the Battle of Belleau Wood. It is very difficult for me to believe that any man who lost a son in the Second Division has been engaged in subversive activities.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, if the McKellar bill had been on the statute books, and if those three men had required confirmation by the Senate, the chances are entirely in favor of the proposition that I would not have voted in favor of the confirmation of any of them, and in my opinion the chances are entirely in favor of the proposition that none of them would have been confirmed by the Senate. But that is not the question now before us. The question is whether we, as one of the two great legislative bodies making up the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, are justified in proceeding by star chamber machinations to pass what in truth and in effect, regardless of whether it is technically true, is a bill of attainder condemning those three men for all time to come, without giving any of them an opportunity to be heard.

I say there is no possible justification under any theory of Anglo-Saxon law or under any theory of Anglo-Saxon justice which possibly could warrant such a procedure. If we review the whole parliamentary history of England prior to the Revolution, and the whole parliamentary history of the United States since the Revolution, and review the Wilkes case, the Matthew Lyon case, and the many great parliamentary debates on the subject, not one precedent will be found to hold that such a procedure as that which has been adopted by the House of Representatives in this case, and is now being acquiesced in by the Senate conferees, can possibly be justified under any theory of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

Mr. President, on my way to the Senate the other day, after having called at one of the departments, I happened to buy a noon newspaper. In it I read with amazement the statement that one Member of the House of Representatives, Representative TABER, of New York, had announced that unless the Senate would yield on this proposition of star-chamber proceedings, he, one Member of the House of Representatives, meant to see that a great deficiency bill, carrying necessary appropriations, the very arterial blood for the support of a multitude of Government institutions, would necessarily fail. I did not believe that Representative TABER had taken such a position as that. I did not believe if Representative TABER had taken such a position, the House of Representatives could possibly back him up in it. It is an infamous proposition that a great supply bill of the Government, a necessary supply bill of the Government, must fail unless a coordinate body of the legislative branch, which has voted 69 to 0 against such star-chamber proceedings, is overawed and compelled to yield.

I showed the newspaper statement to several other Senators. I remember that I showed it to the Senator from Wisconsin. We all agreed that the newspaper statement must be based on a misapprehension or a misstatement of the position which possibly could be taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, there is no Senator for whom I have a greater affection and respect than I do for the Senator from Tennessee; but now we find that our own conferees come before us and tell us that they are compelled to do an absolutely infamous thing—and the statement of the Senator from Tennessee certainly indicates that he and the other Senate conferees regard it as an infamous thing—because the other House has put a gun to our heads and has said that if we do not do it certain necessary supplies will not be voted. So far as I am concerned, when the Senate has voted 69 to nothing, and when the conferees have met, it seems to me it should have been the House conferees who should have taken the matter back for separate action.

So far as I am concerned, much as I should regret to see the bill fail of passage, I should prefer to see it fail rather than to have it pass, necessary as it is, containing an infamous departure from every principle of Anglo-Saxon justice.

I should like to predict further, Mr. President, that if the Senate votes down the conference report, the House will not take the responsibility of allowing a $150,000,000 deficiency bill to fail because of its insistence upon doing something which every Member of the House knows in his heart is wrong.

I think the Senate should maintain its own self-respect, and should vote down the conference report and should send it back to the House, and should give the House an opportunity to catch its breath and take sober second thought on the proposition of whether it wishes to take the responsibility of defeating a very necessary deficiency appropriation bill, solely for the purpose of trying to enforce its will in the matter of such an outrageous proposition as this.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I merely desire to say that I really know very little as to the merits of the three men concerned; but, based on the findings of the Kerr committee, I make the following assertion, and I should be glad to have any Senator rise in his place and deny what I say as to the disqualification of the three men, if he feels justified in doing so. No Member of the House—not even any member of the Appropriations Committee of the House who was not a member of the Kerr committee—had any information whatever. I assert, Mr. President, that no Member of the Senate has any information which would justify him in voting either for or against a practical bill of attainder against these men. If any Senator has any information that he thinks the Senate ought to have, which would enable the Senate to vote intelligently on such a question as this, I should like to have him rise in my time and give the information.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. That is the thing which disturbs me. I formerly served in the House of Representatives, and I am proud of my service there. The distinguished Senator from Missouri was parliamentarian of the House for many years, when his great and distinguished father was Speaker of the House. As I understand, all the testimony on which this action is predicated was in secret. It was not divulged.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Perhaps, for all we know, these men ought to be tried for treason. If so, they should be tried for treason; but no Member of the Senate knows anything about the facts. If any Senator knows any facts, he should be willing to stand in his place and tell his colleagues the facts, to justify them in voting one way or the other on this question.

Mr. HILL. The House is asking the Senate to take action in the matter when the House does not have information, and makes no effort to give the Senate the information upon which the action is based. It disturbs me that the House should want the Senate to act when the House denies all information to its own Members and to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We are asked blindly to follow the findings of a House committee, after star chamber proceedings, without knowing anything whatever. The proposed action would be practically a bill of attainder. It would be a disqualification. It would be nearly the same thing as convicting the men of treason. They would be disqualified from holding office. I invite any Member of this body to rise, in my time, and say that he knows anything about the case.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator from Missouri if he can distinguish what has been done in this case from a case in which Congress decides that it does not need the services of an executive employee and simply fails to provide compensation for him?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator is talking about abolishing offices, I am very much in favor of abolishing many offices.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the question which I wished to ask the able Senator. This procedure is in the nature of an impeachment of these parties for cause.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This procedure is in its very essence penal. It is almost equivalent to a conviction for treason, so far as that can result from the action of Congress upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Based upon hearsay, and with only allegations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We do not even know what the hearsay is. Does the Senator from Florida know what went on before the Kerr committee? Does any other Member of the Senate know what went on before the Kerr committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence and the report were before the conference committee, and we all heard it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am surprised to hear the Senator from Tennessee make that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Copies of the hearings have certainly never been generally available either to Members of the House or Members of the Senate. I have been told that Members of the House Committee on Appropriations, when they asked for copies of the proceedings of the Kerr committee, were refused copies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about that; but I know that the House Committee on Appropriations furnished the Senate conferees the evidence and the report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator think that before the Senate should recede, the whole Senate ought to be furnished a bill of particulars, showing the grounds on which these men are being subjected to contumely and scorn? Does not the Senator think that the men should be given an opportunity to answer in public the charges made against them charges affecting their quality as decent American citizens?

Mr. McKELLAR. All three men were brought before the so-called Kerr committee on the House. They made full statements; and it was upon their admissions that the House acted. The evidence and the reports were before the conferees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If even the Chief Justice of the United States, or any other dignitary or public official were impeached, he would be entitled to present himself before his judges, who, in the case of the Chief Justice, would be the Senate. He would be entitled to be represented by counsel. He would be entitled to have his case tried before the men who would vote as his judges. In this case these men have not had any opportunity to appear before us.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. From the statement made by the able Senator from Tennessee, it strikes me that there has been another star-chamber proceeding. He has stated that the evidence was presented to the conferees representing the House and the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Senator from Louisiana any evidence which would enable him to vote intelligently?

Mr. OVERTON. Absolutely not, and I was a member of the subcommittee which passed on this question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Louisiana has made a statement——

Mr. OVERTON. I have not made a statement. I was just about to make a statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has made the statement that the conferees were engaged in a star-chamber proceeding.

Mr. OVERTON. I am assuming——

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to say that the evidence purported to be the evidence before a committee of the House. The report purported to be a report from that committee. That was open to any Senator. It was open to any Member of the House, so far as I know. I understand that the evidence was taken in secret. I have heard that, and I so stated in my statement today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's statement is the first statement which I have ever heard to the effect that the whole record was not secret. I made the statement that it was secret, and that I could not obtain a copy of it when the bill was before the Senate in the first instance. I have never heard any contradiction of that statement until the Senator's present statement that the evidence was presented to the conferees.

Mr. McKELLAR. I made that statement earlier.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I would not convict a dog in a hole-in-the-corner or star-chamber proceeding in which the accused did not have an opportunity to be heard. Senators who are called upon to vote on the question have no information upon which to form an intelligent opinion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If my recollection serves me correctly, the RECORD will show that when the bill was originally under consideration in the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee stated that the Senate Committee on Appropriations had been unable to obtain the testimony before the Kerr committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I was told by two members of the Appropriations Committee in the House who were not members of the Kerr committee that the full Appropriations Committee in the House could not obtain the record of the Kerr committee, and did not know what facts the Kerr committee was acting upon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my understanding that that testimony has never been printed, and that it has never been made available to the House. All that was ever made available to the House was excerpts from the testimony, read by members of the committee at the time the provision was under consideration on the floor of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was an entirely ex parte proceeding.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, as everyone knows, the reading of excerpts, as the Senator says, is entirely ex parte.

I am further informed that at this time Members of the House are not able to secure access to the testimony upon which the Kerr committee report recommending the dismissal of these men was based.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in conclusion I merely desire to say that the only argument which has been advanced, or which can be advanced, for the adoption of the conference report is that unless we yield to this infamous requirement on the part of the House of Representatives, a great and very necessary appropriation bill will fail. I am in favor of voting down the conference report and sending it back to conference, with notice to the conferees that the Senate will not agree to any such hole-in-the-corner, star-chamber proceedings. I dare say, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives, in its sober second judgment, will not take the responsibility for causing the delay or failure of a great appropriation bill for the sake of such a provision as this.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Senate but for a short time.

I do not know about the testimony in this case, I have not read it, but I cannot remain silent in the presence of the arguments made here which seem to conclude that the Congress cannot discharge three men in one of the departments of the Government, not in the exercise of the appointing power, but in the exercise of its appropriating power. Congress can declare war. Congress can appropriate money. However, according to the philosophy of some Senators, Congress cannot refuse an appropriation to three little clerks in a Government department. It is a great lawmaking body, is it not?

The appropriating power is the very heart of the parliamentary power. We do not have to give reasons for refusing appropriations. We do not have to say to everyone whom we cut off the pay roll, or to whom we deny appropriations, "You have to have a trial." There is nothing here in the way of star chamber proceedings, as I see it. I have no feeling about the situation, but I cannot allow to go unchallenged the suggestion that what we propose to do would be in violation of parliamentary traditions.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I know the Senator does not intend to say, and I want to have the RECORD clearly show that he does not intend to say, when he speaks of "three little clerks" downtown, that they should be accorded different treatment than that accorded members of the Cabinet.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, the Cabinet is a different thing. Members of the Cabinet are confirmed by the Senate and legalized under the constitutional process.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me make myself clear. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know nothing about these men. My viewpoint with regard to the matter is purely impersonal. I am discussing the powers and functions of the Congress. The individuals do not mean a thing to me.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know them, either. I fully agree with the Senator in his statement that the Senate has the power to do what he is suggesting, but it is by might and power that the Congress does it.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has been intimated that if we should do it we would be violating many legislative traditions. Every Congress passes bills containing limitations. They carry language which says, in effect, "*Provided*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used for certain purposes." Every time we eliminate an activity we are denying some man a job, firing someone from the pay roll, without trial or without any proof, and without anything except the legislative will, and whenever the legislative will is hampered we are violating parliamentary traditions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator in regard to the application of the Constitution to this question. I wish to say not only that, but this body, as well as the other House, in the last year or two adopted provisions exactly like the one under discussion, denying a salary to another employee of the Government. That was done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senate agreed to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate agreed to it. We are not about to do a thing which has not heretofore been done.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I merely wish to say that I do not think this matter can be treated lightly. I do not say that for the purpose of being dramatic, because I do not like that kind of procedure or that kind of language, particularly in the Senate. However, if there is any justification for all the trials through which we are now passing, and all the trouble in which the world now is, it is in the matter of the protection of civil liberty, and what we are now considering is a fine example of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Connecticut does not regard what I am saying as in the light which he has indicated.

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, no; I do not want the Senator from Texas to misunderstand me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am confident that my distinguished and able friend from Texas, of whom I am so fond, as he knows, does not intend to leave the impression with the Senate or with the country that the action of Congress, in its wisdom cutting off a whole activity or abolishing a number of offices as such, is in any degree whatever analogous or equivalent to saying to a certain man—TOM CONNALLY, BENNETT CLARK, BILL LANGER, JOHN BANKHEAD, or anyone else—that he is unworthy to hold a position of trust and confidence under the Government.

The Senator certainly does not mean to say that abolishing a whole activity

or abolishing a particular office, simply describing the office itself, is in any degree whatever analogous to saying by name that a man is not fit to hold an office.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, every individual case has its facets and faces, which make it dissimilar from every other case.

The main consideration is that the three men have jobs and will lose them, and that is what they are "kicking" about. As I understand, there is nothing in the language of the appropriation bill which would reflect on the men. It merely provides that no part of that money shall be expended for the payment of the salary of so and so, and so and so, and so and so.

Mr. President, I do not care to burden the Senate any further, but it seems to me that, so far as our exercise of power is concerned, it is unquestioned. Whether the Senate wishes to exercise the power is another thing. The House seems to have very firm convictions as to these particular individuals.

I remember that a number of years ago the Congress of the United States created a position on one of the boards downtown and inserted some such provision as this: "No one shall be appointed to this position unless he shall have served so many years in Congress, and unless he shall have been a judge in a court in a State for so many years." There was only one man in the United States who could be appointed to the job, and he was a former Congressman. He was chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was James Hay.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. That was an appointment. The Congress was then exercising its legislative power, and invading the Executive field and making it necessary for the President to appoint one particular individual if he appointed any one at all.

Mr. President, I am not minimizing the importance of these individuals; they may be tremendous fellows, but they are not Cabinet members; their appointments are not confirmed by the Senate.

What is a job in one of the departments? The head of the department can employ anyone he pleases, unless he is prohibited from doing so by law, but he cannot pay him. There are two parts to a job. One is the appointment, and the other is receiving the salary. One can get an appointment from the head of the department, but he cannot receive a thin dime unless the Congress says that he can have it. So, after all, it is a joint undertaking, and for anyone to say that whenever the head of a department appoints a man he is bound to continue his job whether the Congress is willing to appropriate a dollar for the job or not, is to give all the power to the executive department, and take away from the Senate and the House the fundamental right of the Congress to hold the purse strings. Whenever we relax control of the purse strings, parliamentary government will be tremendously weakened, it will be debilitated, it will be put on crutches. At the present time in some respects it is very near to being on crutches; it will be on crutches good and proper when we give up our power to control the disbursements, to control the administrative expenses.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Assuming all the Senator says to be correct——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to hear that; it is all I could expect. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERTON. Assuming all the Senator says to be correct, and that the argument he is making is perfectly sound in law and reason, upon what ground is he going to condemn these three men, or upon what evidence?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not condemning them. I do not know anything about them.

Mr. OVERTON. Or upon what evidence would the Senator withhold their salaries and say to them, "Never again can you be employed by the Federal Government"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the bill say that?

Mr. OVERTON. In effect it says so. Upon what ground shall we say that no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay for the services of so-and-so and so-and-so? Upon what ground?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me answer the Senator. But first I wish to thank the Senator, because he is a great lawyer and a fine Senator, although he did use a cryptic sort of word—"assuming the soundness of the Senator's argument." I would rather he had said, "granted" instead of "assume." But I thank him nevertheless.

The Senator wants to know upon what ground we act. I do not want the RECORD to show that everyone in the Senate is agreed that we are a lot of old, debilitated men who could not get out of our seats, and have no legislative power, that the departments have it all, and that when they appoint a fellow, the only way to get him off the roll is to give him an annuity in the form of retirement.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I merely desire to know what evidence the Senator has upon which he is going to base a conclusion that this is a wise provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall give the Senator the reason. First, there are two legislative branches, under the Constitution. We are not both of them. Conference committees have to accommodate their views and agree on something. So, if the House is adamant, is the Senate going to make itself ridiculous by saying, "It is terrible for the House to say that it will defeat this bill because of three men in the department, but we will go it one better, and we will defeat it, too, if we do not get them." That is the attitude we are in.

Mr. OVERTON. Have we not as much right to be firm as the House has?

Mr. CONNALLY. We have just as much right as the House has. We can sit down, if we desire, and say, "No, we will never agree to this conference report." How many million dollars are involved in it?

Mr. McKELLAR. About one hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. CONNALLY. A very modest sum. We may say that we do not mind paralyzing other departments, we do not mind cutting off activities which will consume a great many million dollars, but we will stand at Armageddon if these three men are not retained.

The House conducted an investigation, through one of its committees. I do not know what they developed, but they must have developed something. We must respect the House. I do not mean that we have to bow to every one of their wishes, but we have to assume, if we are to practice the legislative comity which should exist between two coordinate branches of the legislature, if they had a committee and the committee investigated and made a report, that there was some ground for their action.

I understand the House committee had these three men before them, they cross-examined them, they questioned them, and we cannot merely say to the House, "You are a lot of boobs, you are a lot of saps. We will not pay any attention to what you did."

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator spoke of those who would be injured by our failure to adopt this report. We passed a measure not long ago allowing many employees of the Government, practically all of them, overtime pay. Thousands of employees have been granted overtime by the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, with the approval of the President. The pending bill carries funds for those overtime payments. They have not been made. It seemed to those of us who were on the Committee on Appropriations, when we found it was a question of getting the bill through with the funds for the overtime payments to these innumerable employees, that they should be paid, rather than have the bill fail. They are innocent bystanders. We thought it was better to have them paid rather than hold them up. The other three could have their day in court. We are not convicting them of anything, we are not passing upon their innocence or their guilt in any way. All we are doing is getting a bill at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. A word further and I shall be through. Certain Senators speak about the language of the bill branding these men, putting obloquy all over them, and vituperation, contumely, and many other big words of a similar character. What does the bill provide?

> No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of—

Naming the three men. I do not see that that involves any great shame. It

merely provides that the Congress will not appropriate for their salaries.

As I have said, I have no personal interest in this matter, I do not know any of the men. Let me read the names of the conferees of the Senate who acted on this matter, who heard the evidence, who read the report of the House committee. There were the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. They say we should approve the conference report. They heard the evidence, and I am willing to accept their statement. I am willing to accept what these gentlemen found, as members of the conference.

I think that in some cases, though not in every one, we must respect the views of the House, and without knowing a thing about this matter I could not remain silent with Senators expressing the view that the proposed action was a violation of fundamentals, a violation of the Constitution, was in violation of tradition, and that it was out of the range of parliamentary law to refuse to appropriate for any particular purpose without a trial, and all that. We do not have to try anyone. The head of the department could call these men in tomorrow and say, "I am sorry, but your services are discontinued." What could they do about it? They could not do anything but get their hats and walk out. But if the Senate and the House say it, it is a great crime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, since the pending conference report has been called up for consideration, the discussion has revolved entirely around the rights of three employees of the Government, whether or not they have been wronged or are to be wronged. That question has been discussed with a great deal of zeal and eloquence, but I submit there is another question which affects the integrity of the Congress, and I believe the welfare of the country, much more than the question which has been discussed at great length here this afternoon.

When the deficiency bill was before the Senate it contained a heading, and it passed with that heading "Emergency fund for the President," and I wish to take a moment or two to read the provision. It is as follows:

> The appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented by the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for objects of a confidential nature is hereby increased by $25,000,000.

Mr. President, that was in the bill which came to the Senate originally from the House of Representatives, with a proviso attached to the provision.

After discussion the Senate added the following provisos to that section:

> *Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department.

Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate have surrendered that provision. It placed a limitation on the power of the President to use his emergency fund to finance any agency for which the Congress had refused to make an appropriation. That safeguard placed upon the powers of the Congress has been deleted in conference.

We have heard discussed by able Senators the question of our powers of regulation over the affairs of these three men. I say to the Senate that this provision means much more to the integrity and the safeguarding of the powers of the Congress than simply the question of its powers over three employees or three officeholders in the Government.

Mr. President, this limitation upon the use of funds in the hands of the President to defeat the will of Congress, if you please, where no appropriation has been made, or where it has been refused, should again be placed in the measure and should become a part of it. If the Congress is to function under the powers given it by our form of government, if Congress is really to be the body to appropriate money, this limitation should remain in the measure. By continuing such a limitation we protect ourselves against the use, by the President, of the emergency fund to defeat the will of Congress.

For the reasons I have stated I hope that the conference report will not be agreed to, and that a further conference with the House will be requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire what subject matter is before the Senate for action?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REED. Is it the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. REED. And a vote of "yea" is a vote to agree to the report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised if present, would vote "nay," and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained in a meeting of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness in his family. He has a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bankhead	Hayden	McKellar
Bilbo	Holman	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Connally	McCarran	Stewart
George	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McFarland	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Guffey	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Kilgore	Robertson
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McNary	Tobey
Capper	Maloney	Tunnell
Caraway	Maybank	Vandenberg
Chandler	Mead	Wagner
Chavez	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	
Green	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—27

Austin	Eastland	Smith
Bailey	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Gillette	Truman
Barkley	Glass	Tydings
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Van Nuys
Bushfield	Lucas	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Walsh
Danaher	Reynolds	White
Davis	Russell	Wilson

So the conference report was rejected.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 342, Senate bill 1242. This is an emergency measure, otherwise I should not ask for its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1242) to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the Department of the Interior has requested the passage of the bill. Its purpose is to authorize funds necessary to enable the Office of Fishery Coordination to carry out its functions and activities under Executive Order No. 9204, dated July 21, 1942. The estimate submitted for the administration of the Office of Fishery Coordination during the fiscal year 1944, is in the amount of $290,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1242) to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for salaries and expenses of the Office of Fishery Coordination established by Executive Order No. 9204, dated July 21, 1942 (7 F. R. 5657), pursuant to the authority vested in the President by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), to enable said Office to carry out its functions and activities under said order, and to carry out the functions and activities delegated to said Office by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the authority delegated to him under Food Directive No. 2, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 8, 1943 (8 F. R. 1777), as amended: *Provided*, That this act shall terminate on July 1, 1945, or such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to, will the Senator explain the purpose of the measure?

Mr. BILBO. Yes, Mr. President. On July 21, 1942, by Executive Order No. 9204, there was established an Office of Fishery Coordination for the purpose of carrying out the functions and activities delegated to it by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to authority delegated to him under Food Directive No. 2, issued on February 8, 1943, by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It was necessary that machinery be set up in order to provide for carrying out the program of increasing the canning of fish to be used by our soldiers and to be used otherwise in the war effort. The program is Nation-wide, involving the canning of the sardines of the Northwest, the sardines of Maine, the shrimp of the Gulf of Mexico, and the products of the fisheries in Alaskan waters. It is necessary that the bill be passed in order to provide authorization for an appropriation to be used in carrying out the orders of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture relative to the coordination agency, the Office of Fishery Coordination. For that work a very small appropriation will be required. The bill provides merely an authorization. The Senate will still have another opportunity to pass on the matter, if it does not like it, when the necessary appropriation is requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 2, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ON MEASURES RELATING TO VITAL RECORDS AND VITAL STATISTICS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 24, 1943.

SIR: In a letter dated July 27, 1942, I indicated that I would ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a comprehensive study of organizations and problems in the field of vital records. The Director has reported to me on this subject and I am transmitting his report to you herewith. I am transmitting another copy of the report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In view of the relevance of this report to the subject matter of various bills which are now before the Congress, I would suggest that the report and appendixes I-VIII might appropriately be printed as a public document.

Respectfully,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Ethel G. Womble, to be postmaster at Goldston, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 25, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Denmark, now assigned as Acting Chief of the Division of European Affairs in the Department of State, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxembourg now established in Canada.

William C. Burdett, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the United States

Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Joseph G. Pasternack, July 1, 1943.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1943.
Llewellyn L. Ashburn, July 1, 1943.
Leland J. Hanchett, July 1, 1943.
Thomas B. McKneely, July 1, 1943.
William G. Workman, July 1, 1943.
Victor H. Vogel, June 15, 1943.
Robert H. Flinn, July 1, 1943.
Robert K. Maddock, July 1, 1943.
Roy E. Butler, July 1, 1943.
Robert H. Onstott, July 1, 1943.
John L. Wilson, July 1, 1943.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1943.
Leslie McC. Smith, July 1, 1943.
Alfred B. Geyer, July 1, 1943.
Oliver C. Williams, July 1, 1943.
Austin V. Deibert, July 1, 1943.
Richard C. Arnold, July 1, 1943.
Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1943.
Marion K. King, July 1, 1943.
Thurman H. Rose, June 1, 1943.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

William A. Miller, July 1, 1943.
Robert L. Smith, July 1, 1943.
Joe M. Chisholm, July 1, 1943.
Kenneth M. Endicott, July 1, 1943.
Malcolm J. Ford, July 1, 1943.
James W. Hawkins, July 1, 1943.
Glen E. Ogden, April 22, 1943.
Rudolph F. Sievers, July 1, 1943.
Samuel S. Spicer, July 1, 1943.
William H. Stimson, July 1, 1943.
William B. Wiley, July 1, 1943.
Clarence L. Hebert, July 1, 1943.
James A. Finger, July 1, 1943.
George E. Parkhurst, July 1, 1943.
John F. Oesterle, June 1, 1943.
Frederick K. Albrecht, July 1, 1943.
Edwin N. Hesbacher, July 1, 1943.
William S. Baum, July 1, 1943.
Arnold B. Kurlander, July 1, 1943.
William F. Powell, July 15, 1943.
David B. Wilson, July 1, 1943.
Ralph W. Pagel, July 1, 1943.
Leslie W. Knott, July 1, 1943.
Evert A. Swensson, July 1, 1943.
Robert J. Anderson, July 1, 1943.
Jesse D. Harris, July 1, 1943.
Frederick H. Hull, June 26, 1943.
Raymond S. Roy, July 1, 1943.
James L. Southworth, June 1, 1943.
William G. Budington, July 1, 1943.
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano, June 15, 1943.
Stanley E. Krumbiegel, July 1, 1943.
Donald W. McNaughton, July 1, 1943.
James B. Donaldson, July 1, 1943.
James A. Smith, October 2, 1942.
Milton W. Gwinner, July 1, 1943.
Vernon W. Foster, August 15, 1943.
George F. Eilinger, June 1, 1943.
Verne C. Waite, July 1, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER

Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Dawson Olmstead, Chief Signal Officer, to be retired June 30, 1943.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, WITH RANK FROM OCTOBER 5, 1942

First Lt. Dawson Hope Mullen, Jr.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Maj. Frederic J. Hughes, Jr.
Maj. Vince Moseley
Capt. Adolph Benedict Schneider, Jr.
Capt. Freeman Irby Stephens
Capt. Bertram Allen Weeks

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. Albert Rhoades Buckelew

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, VETERINARY CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Maj. Alpheus Heise Seeley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mary D. Briggs, Los Angeles.

MINNESOTA

Louis F. Masonick, Browerville.
Russell A. Quist, Fairfax.
Sam Doherty, Le Sueur.
George V. Anderson, New York Mills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the holy name of Him who is at the right hand of the Father, we pray; we praise Him that our eyes are open to the wide reaches of His impartial love. On this summer day we are wooed by the marvelous voices and hushed by the tender spell as we behold the ever new miracle of nature. Bewilderment overtakes us as we look across this world; the pitiless struggle goes on. Blessed Lord, we pray that the lower impulses of men may know of the mastery of Thy teaching and that they may forswear avarice, violence, and intolerance and be brought into the kingdom of sacrifice and peace.

In Thy name there is no higher gift than one's self and the stronger we are the more we owe to the lowest and least. Teach us Thy rule, dear Saviour; the poorer one is the more we are needed, and the further away from the state of happiness the greater our obligation. We then who are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves. O God, we need not search the heavens for Thy guidance or the horizon for Thy presence. We would unveil the cross and behold infinite love struggling with the dying expression for the salvation of the world. O may men know the touch of the Master and see the light in His eyes and take their place in the midst of a doubtful and a perverse world. In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1943:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

On June 22, 1943:

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Doctor and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Saint Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. REED, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BURTON as members on the part of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943, pursuant to the provisions of Senate concurrent resolution 14.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

2409) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This is a bill recommended by the Post Office Department, approved by the Budget, and unanimously reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Under present law a substitute carrier may serve for 10, 15, or 20 years and remain in the same status with the same pay. This bill gives him the right, after he has served 2,448 hours to be promoted to the hourly pay of the lowest grade of regular clerk.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I introduced a bill some time ago to make these substitute rural mail carriers eligible for promotion to the position of carrier. Of all people in the Postal Service who deserve more consideration, in my opinion, they are the substitute rural carriers. They never get to carry the mail as a rule except when it is raining or when the weather is so cold or so hot that the regular carrier wants to get off, or when he is off on vacation or he or some of his folks are sick. I wish the gentleman would bring out a bill to make the substitute carriers eligible for promotion and transfer to the position of carrier when the carrier dies, resigns, or retires.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The gentleman says he has introduced a bill to that effect?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. And would like to have a hearing on it?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly would.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. I will see that the gentleman has a hearing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This, in the meantime, comes a little nearer doing justice by them.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That substitute postal employees, after 2,448 hours of actual and satisfactory service as such substitute, including service as a special-delivery messenger, shall be paid for services actually performed at the rate of the annual salary received by regular employees of the first grade, the hourly rate to be computed by dividing the annual salary of such regular employees by the number 2,448; and thereafter the rate of pay of such substitute employees shall be increased to the annual rate of the next higher grade of such regular employees, computed in the same manner, upon the completion of each additional period of 2,448 hours of actual and satisfactory service, until they shall have attained the rate for the highest successive rate of regular pay or shall have received appointment to a regular position: *Provided*, That there shall be not more than one increase in the rate of pay of such employees within a 12 months' period: *Provided further*, That the increases in the rate of pay provided herein shall become effective at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 2,448 hours of required service.

SEC. 2. Upon appointment to a regular position in the Postal Service an employee shall receive credit for actual service performed as a substitute, including time served as a special-delivery messenger on the basis of 1 year for each unit of 2,448 hours, and shall be promoted to the grade to which such employee would have progressed had his original appointment been to grade 1. Any fractional part of a year's service as a substitute shall be included with regular service in determining eligibility for promotion to a higher grade, following appointment to a regular position.

SEC. 3. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such service as has been rendered during continuous active service and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment: *Provided, however*, That in the case of those who have been separated, or shall hereafter be separated from the Postal Service for military duty, the periods of terms of service immediately preceding induction into the military service, as well as the time engaged in military service, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service upon the basis of 2,448 hours for each year of such service.

SEC. 4. The amounts of the increases in the rates of pay provided in this act shall be regarded as part of the earned basic compensation for the purpose of computing the increase of 15 percent of earned basic compensation authorized by the act approved April 9, 1943, entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "service" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That in the adjustment of the increases in the rates of pay provided herein credit shall be given for past continuous service and the hourly rate of compensation adjusted accordingly."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from James E. Thorp, chairman, committee on livestock and dairies of the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2798), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. ROBINSON of Utah, WHITTINGTON, and WOLCOTT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the Worcester Telegram of Sunday, June 20, 1943, entitled, "Market Basket Too Vital for a Political Football."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HEIDINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an advertisement from the St. Louis Star Times and in the other a resolution of the Missouri Bankers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN MEAT SITUATION

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Vinson has before him a proposition proposed by the various interests in the meat industry which contemplates the elimination of all price ceilings, with the exception of the retail level on all meat except pork, the 10-percent roll-back to be effective without subsidy at the retail level—other levels in the production of processing of meat to be free.

It is hopeful that this would immediately free the meat industry in such fashion as to start packing houses in full production. This suspends all of the O. P. A. rulings which have been the cause of price squeezes and black-market operations. It is considered by the industry, retail, wholesale, and slaughterer, and producers that there is sufficient margin under the retail ceiling. This becomes the responsibility of everyone in the meat industry, from the growers to retailers, to work together to prevent the danger of crowding the retail ceiling.

I think the plan is worthy of immediate trial, and much more preferable than the ill-advised and impetuous ruling of the 10-percent subsidy roll-back on meat prices which has recently been put into effect at the processors' level.

THE ROLL-BACK AND SUBSIDY SCHEME

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested in the following wire from Harry B. Coffee, long an able Member of this House. It reads as follows:

Have yet to find first livestock producer favorable to price roll-back subsidy program. Hope Congress prohibits this misuse of public funds and authorizes Office of Price Administration to adjust meat prices upward to cover cost of production. Otherwise production will be curtailed and more meat diverted through black-market channels.

UNION STOCKYARDS CO.,
HARRY B. COFFEE, *President*.

The roll-back and subsidy scheme is just the same vicious rebate racket used in the 90's by Standard Oil and many great railroads to destroy their competitors. As Mr. Coffee points out, the farmers of America have seen through this rebate trick, which would eventually destroy free enterprise. The rural uprising against subsidies will not be ignored by thoughtful officials. Hunger cannot find nourishment in Executive orders.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1643) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment numbered 26: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment and amendment thereto insert the following:

"SEC. 204. The Joint Committee on Investigation of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is hereby directed to make a study of the problem of penalty mail in all of the departments and branches of the government, with a view to eliminating unnecessary volume and reducing costs, and shall report its findings and recommendations by bill or otherwise to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The departments and agencies of government shall furnish such information and detail such personnel as may be requested by the Committee to assist in its investigation"; and the House agree to the same.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
PAT MCCARRAN,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Strikes from the bill the limitation, proposed by the House, prohibiting the use of any of the funds appropriated for carrying into effect the Silver Purchase Act.

Amendment No. 26: Strikes from the bill the limitation, proposed by the House, prohibiting the use of any of the funds appropriated for the handling of penalty mail and the section, proposed by the Senate, requiring a study of the use of the mails by Government agencies to be conducted by the Postmaster General and the Director of the Budget and provides for a study of the use of the mails by Government agencies by the Joint Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of all members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some correspondence between the Navy Department and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and after other special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD OF VITAL RECORDS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 242)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

JUNE 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: In a letter dated July 27, 1942, I indicated that I would ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a comprehensive study of organizations and problems in the field of vital records. The Director has reported to me on this subject and I am transmitting his report to you herewith. I am transmitting another copy of the report to the President of the Senate. In view of the relevance of this report to the subject matter of various bills which are now before the Congress, I would suggest that the report and appendixes I–VIII might appropriately be printed as a public document.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I wonder if the gentleman from New York and I cannot agree on an hour of general debate.

Mr. TABER. I have requests for 95 minutes at this time, and I do not see how I can pare them down too much. I think we ought to have 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3030, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state at the beginning of this statement, but not as a part of it, a few things which you should know concerning my viewpoint and attitude insofar as they affect my utterances today.

I take the floor before you, I assure you, without feeling any animosity toward a single fellow citizen of our country. I have no ax to grind and the only special interest which I attempt to serve to the limit of my meager capacity is the best interest of my countrymen and our allies in the prosecution of this war which today engulfs us, and at the same time looking toward the future with the same interest in mind.

In this inimitable period of stress I do not find it in me to be actuated by any partisan motive whatsoever.

Members of each and every political party are to be found in the armed services on the many fronts where Americans are to be found defending our national right to live the American way.

It is my unwavering and deep conviction, based upon much study and devoted consideration, that paramount in our efforts in these tragic days is the preservation of the public confidence in its entirety of the people of these United States. This public confidence if strong and secure is the mightiest agent in the support of the war effort of our country. Yes, and the war effort of our allies.

Confusion is the enemy of both confidence and attainment; it should be abated as thoroughly and promptly as possible. Uncertainty as to what to do today and as to what we may expect tomorrow breeds confusion.

Vacillation is the inevitable result of the impact of these agencies of the devil, and cohorts and aides of our enemies.

Fear is another of these, and greed still another. And when this array aided and abetted by intolerant and untempered thought, reaction and speech combine, they but add to the formidable array which opposes a successful or approximate conclusion of this world's troubles.

These are days, fellow Members, and I speak to you with all the earnestness and emphasis which I can muster, when a prudent jealousy concerning our future and our rights as free men should be ever exercised; and so, without hate or other vicious inclination toward any person or group living or dead among those who defend man's right to be free and enjoy the rewards of justifiable labor, I bring to your consideration some facts and thoughts upon which, in my earnest opinion, much depends as to our successes today and in the tomorrows to come.

We have now before the Congress some vital legislative matters concerning which I desire to address myself in the exercise of the most emphatic expression of which I am capable.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a pessimist nor am I chargeable with being willing at any time to sell the United States short.

The history of our country is replete with victories over gloom and despair in troubled times and we will emerge again as from those dark days in the past with that incomparable flag which is your and our background, still unwavering over a free people in the greatest and most blessed land of all.

I desire for the moment to discuss some problems we have before us to legalize the program of so-called roll-back and subsidies and some related matters. If this program recently put into effect under a directive by our Chief Executive is carried on through, it is my opinion that it will be the result of extra-legal action on the part of the Office of Price Administration. In my interpretation of the Price Control Act, may I state at the outset the law clearly provides that any proposals affecting prices on agricultural commodities considered as food must first be submitted to the Department of Agriculture as the law reads and today to the National Food Administration which by directive has taken over that task which at the beginning of the price control was administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am reliably informed that the National Food Administrator was not advised of the roll-back subsidy proposal until after the Office of Price Administration had already put the program into effect by proclamation. If this is true there is no question but that this action was extra-legal and in complete disregard of the law of the land as enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call your attention to some things that are going on which, if we do not do something about them, will not only lead to bad results but add to the confusion and bring to naught possibly our major fight on the home front, which has to do with the production of food. I want to give you some examples.

Not so long ago, the senior Senator from Texas, Senator CONNALLY, and I called on Price Administrator Brown about some matters involving the poultry industry. In my district are five or six counties which comprise the third largest poultry center in the United States producing broilers and fryers. The price fixed for those broilers was 25.67 cents per pound. The actual cost involved in the production of over 24,000,000 pounds of edible broiler meat, chicken meat, figuring a broiler at 2 pounds to the chicken, ranges from 31.5 cents to 40 cents a pound, established by affidavits and checked over by auditors at my request looking into the business of several of the poultrymen affected.

We went from the Office of Price Administration to the War Food Administration to inquire concerning the fixation of this price level and the vicious differentials which accompanied it; nothing came of this. Despite the fact that the poultry produced in this center was entirely consumed within the State of Texas by Government camps engaged in the war effort and by industries engaged in the war effort, as well as civilians, one of the producers handling over 125,000 chicks a year went out of business. He went to work at a shipyard started in at $12 a day Some in high places think that he did a good job because he could make more money at that than he could if he had stayed in the poultry business.

This producer, who the year before produced 125,000 chicks and 250,000 pounds of edible meat, is now boarded up and out of business. What happened to him happened not to one or two more but to a high percentage of the men engaged in the professional business of raising baby chicks.

Now let us look at some other facts. There is no factual evidence showing that in the last World War or in the present World War the price of livestock, if left uncontrolled, would rise sufficiently to become a dangerous or inflationary force. At the present time this fact is best illustrated by the price of hogs, which has remained at between 14 and 16 cents most of the time, whereas in the last war the price of hogs reached 24 cents.

The only evidence of an extremely high price of livestock is to be found in the black market. The black market is patently the outgrowth of Government regulation, inaugurated in November 1942, at which time all killers not under B. A. I. inspection were placed on a quota of 70 percent of their 1941 kill.

At about the same time that this quota system was inaugurated the wholesale price ceiling was put into effect. This was under regulation 169. Before this was placed in effect there had been no visible evidence whatsoever of an over-the-counter shortage in beef. The housewives in every community in this land could go into a butcher shop or a grocery store and fill their needs.

The drafting of men into the armed services patently does not add to the population of the United States, certainly not with a war going forward.

If you will review the facts contained in a brief inventory of the actual livestock situation in this country, you will be interested in noting that at the time of the 1929 crash there were approximately 68,000,000 head of cattle in this country.

This was a healthy cattle population up to that time. While this cattle population was heavy, the increase of human population in the country made this cattle population fairly low when analyzed on a per capita basis, but everyone knows that it was sufficient to meet all and over the then civilian needs. We had no wartime needs then. In 1934 this cattle population had jumped to something in excess of 65,000,000 head, and on the floor of this House in a debate with a beloved friend of ours who happened at that time to be the leader on the Republican side of the aisle, the Honorable Bertrand Snell. I handled the passage of a $200,000,000 appropriation bill, devoted to bringing the demand and the supply insofar as cattle were concerned, into a workable balance.

Under that appropriation which was passed in this House without objection, 8,000,000 cattle were slaughtered. Those of you gentlemen who were here at that time will recall this. The Department of Agriculture in recent estimates, estimates that up to January 1, 1944, the population of cattle in this country will have reached 82,500,000 head, and that estimate is low, and I am going to tell you why. A brief analysis of what we had on hand in 1941, and what we had on hand in 1942 will show that in those 12 months the cattle population of this Nation increased in excess of 3,000,000 head, and it is my honest conviction that today, there are 82,000,000 head and upward in the feed lots and on the ranges and on the farms of these United States.

Let us look at the facts, and I have some of them here for you. All of this is in the name of avoiding inflation. In 1941 the national income based on figures from authentic sources of information stood at $95,600,000,000, in round numbers. That is the 1941 national income. The 1942 national income was $119,800,000,000. In 1943, up to date, based on present conditions, the national income is estimated to be in excess of $138,000,000,000, and if prices continue on the present scale, and wages go on as they are, the estimate shows that that will be in excess of $140,000,000,000. All right. People in these civilized days do not attempt to eat livestock, but they buy raw meat, and cook it.

Reducing the killing of cattle down to 70 percent level of the 1941 kill, when the income nationally stood at $95,600,000,000 and expecting 70 percent of that kill to satisfy not only the civilian demands, upon which their kill was based, and which that kill supplied in 1941, because not until the tragic date December 7, did this Nation go to war—in the minds of reasonable men, how could we fail to have a beef shortage with an income approaching a peak of $140,000,000,000 this year, and expecting the purchasing power of that surplus income to be satisfied with 70 percent of what we consumed under peacetime conditions in 1941, added to the 35 percent reduction of supplies once going to civilians taken over by the Army and lend-lease? Then, today, that 35 percent has been increased to 45 percent, and if it continues, what happens? The 35 percent I refer to is 35 percent of the total kill in the United States taken by the Armed Services and lend-lease.

In servicing the needs of the war and the lend-lease program, every pound of beef purchased by those two agencies was purchased from killers—and the word "killers" means butchers and packers and slaughterers of all kinds—lend-lease and Army needs were satisfied solely through purchases from killers that were under the Bureau of Animal Industry inspection, that is, Federal inspection of beef. These killers, under B. A. I. inspection, were the major packers. And those demands took every bit of the beef killed in those killers' plants, and those killers no longer serviced the civilian needs, and that left the local independent killer confronted with the problem, that while he at his best had never killed over 35 percent of the kill of the Nation, was now required on 70 percent of the 1941 kill, to meet the civilian needs of a population which in the past 20 years has risen 25 percent. And during which time in the entire food picture there has not been a single year when the United States market supplied its own food needs. We have been on a constantly increasing import basis of food during these 20 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I ask the gentleman to please let me go on and present the picture to you, and bring a recommendation, because it has been said that no recommendations have come from the United States Congress, and I propose to give you one, which is not based on the development of untested ideologies which come from the school of economics of Harvard or Princeton or Columbia, or any one of the major schools of economics, but which comes from a long-time effort applied to the production of livestock and food commodities in this country. I was not a synthetic farmer or a synthetic ranchman when I came to this Congress. Believe it or not, there is not a single job performed on a ranch which produced everything in the way of livestock that was produced in that area which produced everything agricultural that was produced in that area from citrus fruit on down through cotton and all kinds of grain that I did not know how to do myself. I have harvested crops. I have slaughtered cattle myself. I have gone with them to the slaughter pen as a shipper, and I have done every single thing done with cattle from the pasture to the slaughterhouse. So I learned it at least in the school of experience.

What I am proposing here is to remember the figures I have just given you and take into consideration some facts that come after those figures. They say this roll-back and subsidy proposal is for the purpose of curbing inflation. Let us see.

We will take $140,000,000,000 for the purpose of making it easily understood, as the national income of 1943. Of that amount in Federal taxes under the 1941 figure of income and taxes there was paid in $9,600,000,000 in taxes. In 1942 $17,400,000,000. In 1943 it is expected to pick up by way of taxes $24,552,000,000—let us say $25,000,000,000. Take that from $140,000,000,000 and what does it leave? One hundred and fifteen billion dollars. In purchasable consumer goods the best estimates from every statistical department we have in this country indicate that the supply represented in cash is from $80,000,000,000 to $83,000,000,000. Let us take the higher figure, because it makes the picture easier. Say $85,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods available. Subtract $85,000,000,000 from $115,000,000,000 and what do you have left? Then after going through that let us realize that savings to meet margins and protective devices indulged in by American industry, agriculture, and otherwise, to meet the ravages of depreciation, replacement of equipment, increasing fluctuating prices, and costs of maintaining an operation such as that which occurs on a great cattle ranch or on a small cattle farm. Say you take off that amount 20 percent, down to 16 percent of what is left.

The very best figures available out of this jumble, figured out carefully, would indicate that at the maximum, without reference to money taken out of circulation for bond sales, and so forth, there

remains as a dangerous sword of Damocles to create inflation the utterly insignificant sum of between 15 and 16 billion dollars. With costs going as they are and expenses mounting, how ridiculous it seems to me to continue a program of shortage in the midst of actual plenty as applied, for instance, to the cattle industry, which I am using as an illustration. You Members know the canning picture. I have given you a brief description of what happened on poultry, where, by ill-advised regulation, vacillation, and failure to attempt a solution the American way, but on the other hand attempting to follow out and prove some formula which came from what might be termed higher education, the people have been put out of business as far as poultry is concerned, small packers and butchers closed up and canneries going out of business everywhere. I think education that is too high is education that does not permit those who indulge in its practice to get down to Mother Earth long enough to have it said truthfully of them that they have at least had their feet on the ground. There are in actual round numbers approximately fifteen and one-half million head of surplus cattle on the ranges and farms of this Nation. Indulging for a moment the vivid and accurate recollection of what was done under this same administration in 1934 to bring the law of supply and demand into action—that can be done by a wise government and a wise people and a beneficent Providence. Without the latter of course the other two cannot deliver the goods. But suppose you remember the $200,000,000 that was spent and the slaughtering of 800,000 cattle, principally culls to improve the herds of the Nation and bring supply and demand into balance.

Suppose you do pay the salaries of a few extra meat inspectors to give B. A. I. inspection a wider spread over the kill and suppose you throw away the ridiculous figure of 70 percent of the 1941 kill, in cowboy parlance I would want to know where in, and I would not use the word "Jehoshaphat", that theory came from, when we need beef. I doubt if there is a single man anywhere connected with this plan who ever thought of the ridiculous and tragic position presented by a great country, shouldered with responsibility the equal of which has never been fixed on a people, when food, the sustaining element upon which our success will finally depend, is pulled down to the level where both the Army and the civilian services find themselves confronted with a synthetic shortage, created by ill-advised regulation. It was not in the law, but yet here it is. We will have an actual surplus by January 1, 1944, if this keeps up, of from 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 head. This surplus will grow and destroy the cattle industry if it still exists when peace comes. If half of this surplus were slaughtered it would supply normal beef requirements for one year to 200,000,000 persons including the population of the United States and 74,000,000 others. Think of that. You could thus reduce by one-half the surplus on the ranges and feed lots at a time when we are short of feed and when we are losing extra poundage because we are shipping warmed up cattle, if you please, from the feed lots and are not allowing the cattle to have their full complement of gain and full conversion of the corn and grain of this Nation into its utmost realization of cash value and beef.

Now, let me make my recommendation. I want to boil it down to just a few flat statements. If the price is fixed at the point of retail, in reason—not based on any 70 percent of the 1941 kill, which has no possible relationship to what we deal with today—if the price is fixed there and efforts are made to stimulate the slaughter of 6,000,000 head of cattle extra, to take up the gaping holes in refrigerators and boxes of all kinds over this land, you will immediately, because of the supply meeting the demand of the surplus cash, insofar as the prices of livestock are concerned, including hogs, solve your problem. That is the only control that is necessary to hold your price level at a point where it affects the consumer at a legitimate price. The principle of balancing income and expendable money and consumer supplies is the only time-tested cure for inflation of the kind that threatens our country. Also we must rescind that silly quota provision which permits those who slaughter to kill only 70 percent of their 1941 kill.

We should analyze the needs of the armed services to a reasonably fixed figure. Ration civilians to a quantity commensurate with their needs and lend-lease would take the rest. This plan while only outlined will meet the exigencies of our present situation fairly and sanely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KLEBERG. May I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. There is one thing I want to say in the 5 minutes, if I may do so, and that is to conclude with some thoughts that I think have occasioned some of the errors that we have committed.

I was interested to check up on the fact with reference to our great ally, England. We have had advanced here before us, and certainly before members of the House Committee on Agriculture to which I belong, some statements concerning the amazing success of Britain in closing the inflationary gap. Let me call attention to the food situation. In England today those who have the credentials can get 23 cents worth of meat per week. These are the figures, so far as the civilian population is concerned. Only 7 percent of the people in Britain are producers, farmers.

Of course, Britain, as an industrial nation, with its population divided up in that manner, with its heavy industrial activities, wants to hold its food prices to a minimum. She only produces 60 percent of her food. She has neither the land resources nor the farm labor to do much more than this. Ninety-three percent of the population, therefore, certainly could well afford to subsidize the 7 percent. But when you take one-fourth of a country's population, as we have it, you have an entirely different picture.

Forty percent of the entire food supply of England in the last 2 years has been mostly imported from the United States of America. One and a half billion dollars worth of food were supplied under lend-lease, which food Britain sold to her people and paid a subsidy of $730,000,000. She could well afford to spend a little money, half, or about half of the cash represented by the lend-lease food supplies in the payment of subsidies over there to meet the inflationary gap.

What is the situation with reference to consumer goods in Britain? Under lend-lease operations and the situation there from the standpoint of studies which have been made of things which may cause inflation, and the facts as they exist in Britain and what she has used to close the inflationary gap, and some of the conclusions we have reached are these: She does not have to impose a tax on her people to pay subsidies. But today with the earning power of American taxpayers, taxed as they are to the highest degree in the history of this country, with their earning power restricted, with the original source of wealth being decimated by restrictions, how in God's name should they put the restrictions on, which have been put on, in this effort to meet the problem?

I ask you, as sensible men and women, I plead with you to consider this whole problem of simple arithmetic, natural laws, and untested theory which is presented by this silly expression of fear of inflation, on the one hand, and the utterly inconsistent remedy offered until it has increased the inflationary problem to a degree never before realized in our Nation.

As was illustrated in the case of the Ohio wheat farmer whose case was brought finally before the Supreme Court on a question of some payments of overproduction fines. He argued that the law had been passed after he had planted his wheat crop. Therefore his property was being taken without due process of law. The Supreme Court held that it is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

Mr. Chairman, I leave the rest with you. That is an illustration and gives you a picture, one which I am more fearful of than anything else.

Finally let me sum up the situation.

We are told we are in grave danger of inflation. This because of great surplus or excess income over available consumer goods.

Using the plan our Government now has in effect including subsidy and rollback on beef prices—what do we have?

Approximately a $140,000,000,000 income and approximately $85,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods.

What do we do about it and what are the facts? We reduce the available supply of consumer goods, in the case of beef, to 70 percent—in the case of civilian needs—of the average supply used in 1941. In this year our income was $95,600,000,000. Why? On what theory?

In 1941 we paid $9,600,000,000 in taxes. In 1943 we will pay $24,552,000,000.

After taxes, $85,000,000,000 in purchases, and marginal savings we have a sum of about $16,000,000,000 left without considering what we will spend for bonds.

In the midst of plenty we force a shortage when we should increase consumer goods.

We now propose to continue to roll back prices and provide funds to subsidize some few losers while we permit the rights of freemen in property and free enterprise to be endangered in the future by both famine and Government control and regulation of their property and business.

All of this with no improvement in sight of the food supply situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first I want to make an observation inspired by the address given by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. We of the West know that we have the highest population of cattle in the history of this country. I have been informed that the big packing plants of the country are filled with beef, yet we have this anomolous situation, notwithstanding that condition, we are unable, even when we have the necessary points for meat, to get meat in our retail stores right here in the city of Washington and that is true to a great extent throughout the country.

The question is, what is wrong? We have the beef; we have the transportation facilities, not only by rail but by trucks, but we cannot get beef because the retail stores cannot get it.

Yesterday morning I had the experience of applying to three different retail stores here in Washington just to find out if that fact prevailed, and it does prevail. Notwithstanding that we have more beef than the civilian population can use, more than needed to supply the Army requirements and to meet the lend-lease requirements. What is wrong? I have been informed that packers ship direct to the large restaurants throughout the country and sell their beef directly to these restaurants who in turn are not controlled at all in prices and can mark up any price they see fit on their menus for their cuts of beef.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana a question as to this kill of this 70 percent. Is that for domestic consumption 30 percent, or whatever percentage is needed for the Army, or is it a kill of only 70 percent? I understood the gentleman from Texas to imply that they could kill only 70 percent. Would the gentleman from Montana explain that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot explain that because I am not familiar with the figures given by the gentleman from Texas, but from the over-all picture the cut, if there is one, is not understandable with the country full of beef cattle.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. TABER. When they limit the amount of cattle that can be slaughtered to 70 percent of last year and a great lot of that goes to the Army; is not that the answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not necessarily; but if they do limit the kill to 70 percent it is nonsensical.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman know whether it is merely 70 percent of last year, or is it not 30 percent reserved for the Army and lend-lease and 70 percent to the civilian population?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the figures furnished by the gentleman from Texas are correct, that there is a limitation of 70 percent of the kill of last year that would not account for present conditions, because there was a big surplus left after the kill of 1942.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman will find that some of the small packers are not even on a 70-percent arrangement. The Lincoln Packing Co., at Lincoln, Nebr., is operating on only 23 percent of its 1942 basis, and out of this it is 50–50, the Government gets one animal for every animal that goes to the civilian trade.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have heard this—I do not know whether it is true or not; I hope it is not—I have heard that the big packers have devised some sort of squeeze play to put the little packer out of business. The price-control program is putting the little man out of business generally throughout the country, and now it seems the same thing is about to happen to the little packers. It is happening to our retail stores. Small retail meat stores in the West and throughout the country are gradually closing up because they cannot get the beef to sell to the people, although there is a tremendous surplus of it in the United States today.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to talk about a matter that applies principally to Montana.

Mr. Chairman, taken all in all, I think that one of the most ill advised and prohibitively costly proposals to come out of Washington in many a moon was the one that was recently attempted in western Montana in connection with a Federal proposal to obtain additional water in Montana for hydroelectric development in another State. For sheer breathtaking audacity I do not think the proposal can be equaled. It is inconceivable to me that such an utterly destructive and wanton disregard of property, scenic beauty, and States' rights should be conceived of at any time much less in the middle of a very serious war when every bit of foodstuff raised and energy exerted toward the furtherance of the war effort is of paramount importance.

In fact I do not think such a bold attempt to strip Montana of one of its greatest natural resources would ever have been made if those responsible for this proposed deal had not thought that in the hurry and confusion of war their plan would be a fait accompli before anyone could protest. But in that assumption they erred.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of Montana and Montanans that once again that old vigilante spirit, which manifested itself about three-quarters of a century ago to assure the first settlers of that day their right to a peaceful and law-abiding existence, that that spirit still prevails. The perpetrators of this folly overlooked the fact that these people who would be ousted from their homes and farms, were such a proposal followed out, are the sons and daughters of those hardy pioneers who went into that section of Montana when it was nothing but a timbered wilderness filled with then hostile Indians and lawless bandits, there to carve out and develop homes for themselves and their posterity. Those pioneers had to face and overcome tremendous adverse odds and it took a great courage and determination to build for the future, to uproot the trees and bushes, to till the soil, and to build homes for their loved ones and those who would come after them. That those noble men and women who spent a life of hardship and toil in order to leave a better place for their loved ones to live in, that they and the sacrifices they made have not been forgotten was attested to admirably in the spontaneous and determined way in which their descendants, and others, who realize and appreciate the beauty, grandeur, and productiveness of this valley that would be destroyed, have rallied to the call to defend that valley as they know it today.

Specifically, I have been referring to the recent attempt made on the part of Federal authorities to raise the level of Flathead Lake 17 feet with all its ensuing and devastating consequences.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It might be well to point out that this attempt on the part of the Federal authorities was not only to raise the level of the lake 17 feet by 1945 but eventually to 37 feet. This would result in the inundating of several of our large towns, the loss of 50,000 acres of good agricultural land, the decline of a large lumber industry, and a destruction that would be of no benefit whatsoever to the State of Montana. Furthermore, this proposal, if allowed to go through, would affect 25,000 people directly and 50,000 people—one-tenth of the population of my State—indirectly. The most beautiful scenic area in the United States would be desecrated as a result. It might be well to add further that there was no one in the State of Montana in favor of this proposal and that as far as the Montana congressional delegation in

both the House and the Senate are concerned we are 100 percent with the people of the State in this respect. This solidarity on our part is an indication of how strongly we in Montana feel about this proposed infringement of our rights.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman because everything he has said is true.

Apparently it was of little consequence to those responsible for that idea that hundreds and hundreds of homes would be destroyed; that the beautiful city of Kalispell would be isolated if not inundated; that some 50,000 acres of the most fertile farm land in America would be inundated; that lumber mills and millions of feet of valuable timber would be forever and irreplaceably lost; that the scenic wonderfulness of Flathead Lake, a great national asset and beauty spot, would be seriously marred; and that the cost to the State of Montana in property loss, resources lost, highway replacement costs, plus the cost of litigation involved would be tremendous and staggering to the imagination. And all for what purpose? As I have said, and now say again, simply to take from the State of Montana one of its greatest natural assets for the benefit of another State.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the Flathead Indians would also stand to suffer greatly by such a transaction, and I think all will agree that the Indian has been treated shabbily enough in the past without this further thrusting of the Indian down the economic scale. What is known as the Kerr Dam was constructed on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The Montana Power Co. pays a royalty to the Indians of $175,000 per annum for the use of the Indian property. Should the Government take this dam the Indians would be deprived of this royalty unless compensation was secured from the Congress of the United States, and in view of past experience in getting appropriations for Indians I would say that it would be a man's job to secure this compensation.

Every excuse was put forth in justification of this proposal except the real reason back of the desire to get the use of this Montana water. The people of Montana were told that the use of this extra water diverted into Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams would save tons and tons of structural steel. No mention, however, was made on their part as to the resulting loss of 25,000 tons of vitally needed foodstuff produced annually in this section. Nor has any mention been made of the fact that thousands of dollars' worth of property damage would be sustained by Kalispell people who, because of the wording of the law, undoubtedly would be in a position where their property was worthless, as a consequence of the raising of the lake level, but at the same time find themselves unable to collect any damages because their property was not taken or actually damaged. Nor do I think we should overlook the fact that no less than 70,000,000 board feet of lumber is produced annually in this section, which production gives employment to about 750 persons and that pay rolls, and so forth, totaled almost $3,000,000 in 1942.

It looks very much to me like the real and only reason for this attempted rape of one of Montana's resources is that Bonneville and Coulee now find that they need more water to operate on. However, I cannot see where Montana should be forced to be the means of supplying most of the Pacific Northwest with power. That problem should have been taken into consideration when these dams were being constructed. The people of the northwest section cannot understand why the Bonneville Power Administration and the Army engineers, instead of endeavoring to make a storage reservoir out of Flathead Lake, did not look to Fort Peck. A world of power could be developed at Fort Peck if power generators were secured for the latter place. The development of additional power at Fort Peck could be had at very little cost. We of Montana cannot understand why, if additional power is needed in the Northwest, Fort Peck is being overlooked.

The attempt to raise Flathead Lake is clearly an attempted violation of the sovereignty of the great State of Montana and we are all proud of the manner in which our Montana people resisted such an unheard of effort to invade and destroy the rights and property of the people of Montana.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of expressing my satisfaction at the reporting of the Fulbright resolution. In the campaigns which led to my election to this body, I uniformly stressed the point that the aim of this country was the recovery of national security, which we had had for a short time following the year 1918, and had negligently lost for lack of any active or precise foreign policy—indeed of any foreign policy at all—in the succeeding years. I did everything possible to emphasize to the electorate my conviction that the attainment of national security meant, first, the defeat of the Axis Powers and, second, the perfection of international arrangements which would insure the continuance of our national security. This country would be secure if there were a just and lasting peace. It would not be secure if there were an unjust or ephemeral peace; any unjust peace would probably prove ephemeral, and any war of any consequence would certainly involve the United States.

I acclaim the Fulbright resolution as a succinct statement of a policy indispensable for the integrity of American institutions and the safety of our children, not merely from the steadily increasing horrors of total war, but from something worse—the overthrow of this Republic by enemy powers which, without suitable preparations, both in policy and armament, we cannot resist.

For generations there have been people in this country who believed that a foreign policy was a sort of immoral lace frill on the sober flannel petticoat of domestic virtue. This is a tempting view but not a sound one. Last Monday we appropriated over $75,000,000,000—more than half our national income—because we threw away our alliance with the European democracies in 1919 and created nothing in its place—not an army, not an air force, not a fleet. Indeed we even scrapped the ships that might have saved the Philippines, just as in complete thoughtlessness we suffered Japan to take possession of the island bases which made the Philippines indefensible.

In acclaiming the Fulbright resolution, let me emphasize the things which, in my opinion, it does not mean:

It does not mean an international W. P. A. or an international N. Y. A. On the contrary it looks to the abolition of future O. P. A.'s It does not mean a conspiracy of the starry-eyed who yearn with Wallace to elevate the wages of the tin miners of Bolivia and the living standards of banana growers of Nicaragua. Still less is it a scheme to override our immigration and naturalization laws with new and hazardous forms of world citizenship. It is not a project to subordinate the interests of the United States to any nation or group of nations. On the contrary it is merely a commitment to study with other friendly interests the most appropriate and safest insurance policies against the recurrence of the disasters which now have our sons dying on more battle fronts than can readily be counted.

There is no cause to fear that the passage of this resolution can diminish the part which our soldiers of today can take in the conduct of our affairs tomorrow. They must be given a voice on the best ways of securing the American sovereignty and freedom for which they have already fought. But I do think that we of our generation should tell them out of our experience that America's security does not consist in ignoring the dangers that beset it.

And let me say that I think no harm can result from considering this very human question in this body which is never more than 2 years from the heart of the people, instead of leaving it as a mystery so deep that only more august minds can hope to comprehend it. In fact I make bold to say that we should be better off if all international arrangements could be left to a simple majority of both Houses instead of being controlled as at present by a minority in one.

I hope the Fulbright resolution will be adopted in this House by a sweeping vote. It springs from a real instinct for national prudence and not from what Edmund Burke called the false and reptile prudence which seeks to avoid national hazards by disregarding their existence.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] concerning the vast supply of cattle in this country. The New York Times of yesterday morning called

attention to the vast cattle surplus that is piling up as the meat famine, particularly in New York City, increases. The subheading reads:

If half the excess were slaughtered it would supply 200,000,000 persons with beef for 1 year the rangemen say.

What is happening to all this beef? We cannot get it here in the eastern industrial area. The consumers in my district and the industrial cities are hungering for beef; we are starving in the midst of plenty.

The gentleman from Texas says that all he wants by way of solution of the problem is to put a ceiling price upon retail beef and leave beef prices in the hands of the packers and the cattle growers uncontrolled. He wants the law of supply and demand to operate. The experience of every belligerent country is to the effect that you cannot control inflation and cannot prevent the spiral of inflation unless you control all along the line wages, rents, prices of commodities, prices of services, and prices of everything that go into the usual standard of living. No halfway measure can succeed. The law of supply and demand is out the window.

If you, for example, control only the retailer, then the packers under no control could raise their prices at will to the retailer and the retailer could not do any business because he has a ceiling beyond which he cannot go. He could be the subject of a squeeze of the packer. The cattle grower could likewise charge anything he wished to the packer or he could hold back the carcasses of beef at will, as he is doing now. The packer, in turn, would be at the mercy of the rancher.

This same article in the New York Times, which is in part an explanation of what is happening to this vast quantity of beef, states as follows:

The spokesman for the Ranchmen's Association emphasized what he thought was the black market and said he thought "black market" was a misnomer for the thousands of small slaughterers and customers who are determined not to be deprived of beef artificially by Office of Price Administration regulations.

Throughout the West an increasing number of individuals are buying and storing in freezers whole carcasses of beef, and these people are not comparable with the members of the old prohibition bootleg trade. They are patriotic, but they are determined that they shall not go hungry.

I take exception to that statement and I am inclined to the belief that since they are indulging in a bootleg market contrary to the law of the land and the regulations promulgated thereunder, they are not patriotic. When they do not live up to these regulations they should be punished. This hoarding of vast quantities of beef to get higher prices for reasons best known to their own selfish interests, which interests are contrary to the interests of the consumers throughout the length and breadth of the land, is something to be deprecated and I emphasize the thought that these ranchmen who are holding back all this cattle are doing the country a grievous wrong.

The livestock producers want the free law of supply and demand to operate. The Livestock and Meat Council so indicated. And they practically say, "Unless it does operate we will hold back." That is like pointing a gun at the administration, to vary the simile. It is a strike against the consumers.

Just see what happened in the Revolutionary War with reference to the operation of the law of supply and demand. Note what Washington said with reference thereto during the Revolutionary War when he wrote John Jay as follows:

A wagon load of money will scarcely purchase a wagon load of provision.

The Commander in Chief was gravely concerned that the American cause would be lost not in battle but from the high cost of living and the high cost of supplies for his army. Why? Because of the operation of the ordinary laws of supply and demand. The packers of those days and the moneyed interests of those days, if I may put it that way, in New York and in the East, were demanding that the law of supply and demand operate.

What did Washington say concerning price raising and price fixing? He said:

That which is usual and customary in such cases is to fix the prices of the several articles; bearing a proportion to what is the ordinary rate, and if persons will not comply the great law of self-preservation must authorize us to compel them.

Meaning that the law of self-preservation comes ahead of the economic law of supply and demand and "We must," said Washington, in effect, "compel people to disregard the law of supply and demand in emergency in the interest of the law of self-preservation." I commend these admonitions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] and to all ranchmen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. According to newspaper reports we are told that it is contemplated importing Argentine beef into this country regardless of the sanitary laws. Does a policy of that kind make sense when we have more beef on the hoof and in the packing plants than we have ever had in the history of the country and no place to go with it? In other words, we cannot get it even though we have the points.

Mr. CELLER. It does not make sense if we have this vast store of cattle and we cannot get it to the hungry mouths that need it, particularly of the industrial workers who need the proteins and vitamins contained in the meat. If we cannot get it, we must be pregmatic. We will be compelled to import Argentine beef. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that some Argentine beef is not subject to the foot and mouth disease; for instance, that which is grown in Patagonia is not. We can import it corned and we can get it in cans where it is not subject to that disease.

The law of supply and demand does not operate in England as the result of artificial restrictions. In England they have been eminently successful in controlling prices and in making wages meet prices. The gentleman from Texas says that England is not an agricultural nation. Of course, it is not. It is an industrial nation importing most of its food, but we cannot blind ourselves to the experience of England with its roll-back, with its subsidy, and so forth. In a way we can pattern after England. Canada is not an industrial nation. It is an agricultural nation and has been eminently successful in doing that which we have been trying to do and what the O. P. A. is trying to do in getting carcasses of meat to the city populations. Canada has held back prices of rationing, enforcement, ceilings, roll-back, and subsidies. It has "held the line." We must hold the line by doing the same. If we do not hold the line, wages again will lag and will not enable the wage earner to maintain decent living for himself and loved ones. He will demand and get higher wages. Higher wages—higher prices. Then higher wages again. Higher and higher rises the spiral of inflation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to correct a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I realize that my good friend does not know very much about price-fixing or prices except what his consumers have to pay. He said awhile ago that the great trouble at this time is that farmers will not sell their hogs and cattle, although farmers have plenty of hogs and cattle. It is true in certain areas we have an increased production of hogs and cattle. The trouble is that right recently since O. P. A. has been talking about rolling back the price on meat, hogs and cattle have gone down about 2 to 3 cents a pound, and packers are not buying and therefore farmers cannot sell; or if they do it is at reduced price. Do you think the farmers would go running all over each other under these circumstances to force the sale of their hogs and cattle when they are going down every day?

Farmers operate as individuals. They have not any say-so as to what price they are to receive for their products. They are as helpless as consumers. There is no definite price fixed to the farmer's products by the O. P. A. like they have fixed for everybody else. The farmer has to take whatever is offered. The packers are absolutely refusing to buy, and if so it is at a reduced price. Farmers are willing and anxious to sell, but they do not want to sell with prices rolling back on them. Feeding hogs after they become top hogs is an extra expense to farmers. I am selling hogs from my farm now at 13½ cents that some weeks ago sold for 15 cents. In the meantime my tenants are short of meat but O. P. A. will not permit me to kill and sell my own hogs to these tenants.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that there are hundreds of farmers who have spent a half century or a quarter of a century feeding and producing beef who cannot longer stay in business because of the conditions that exist today?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am getting letters and telegrams daily stating, "I am being forced to sell out—I am reducing my production of hogs and poultry because I cannot get any feed." One of the best producers and one of the most intelligent farmers in my district, Mr. Moss, of Cameron, S. C., who has been a producer of purebred hogs, wrote me the other day, "I wanted to increase the production of hogs, but I am forced to reduce."

It is not the farmer's fault. If the O. P. A. had started out its operation on a sound, common-sense, practical basis, that is, from the farmer, the bottom up, with proper differentials with processor and all handlers, including the retailer, then everyone could have operated on a fair and normal business basis. No; they fixed the price of meat to the packer and retailers, and hogs and cattle kept going up. Now they want to roll back prices and pay packers a subsidy and the packers are pushing the prices of hogs and cattle down.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman. It may be that the packers are endeavoring to prevent the farmers getting a proper price. I want the farmers not to sell at a loss. If a roll-back is necessary for the consumers to get food at a proper price and to make up for that loss the farmer should get some sort of a subsidy; I am willing to do that. Let us get together and work something out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. If you are going to roll back prices and pay packers a subsidy, believing you will help consumers, then the farmer's prices should be fixed, so the packer cannot roll back the price on the farmer. May I say to the gentleman that I do not believe there is a Member on the floor of this House any more interested than I am in wage earners and the consumers of this country. Many people in my part of the country live in poverty and raise their children in ignorance because of the type of wages they have been paid and because of unfair prices they receive for their farm products. Before we passed labor legislation, for instance, the textile workers in South Carolina received only about 10 to 12 cents an hour, and they and their families went around in rags. Not a single boy or girl able to go to college, yet on these factory lists we have many boys and girls that would be able to make a name for themselves if they only had a chance. But the trouble is that a great many Representatives of the city districts like my good friend representing consumers and labor do not know the many problems of the farmers. If there is any two groups that should get together it is farmers and wage earners. The farmer, like labor and the consumer, in selling and buying farm products has no power whatever in demanding or fixing fair prices. The packer fixes his price and then fixes the farmer's prices so as to pay all expenses connected with his business, including his taxes and a fixed profit. Then this product passes through many middlemen, all able to fix their prices with many additions between the farmer and the consumer. Naturally the consumer has to take it or leave it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman would have control all the way along the line?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely, from the bottom up and I would weed out many of these useless middlemen who operate as parasites on farmers and consumers.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman and I agree.

Mr. FULMER. You cannot do it from the top down. As previously stated, when they put a ceiling price on meat some time ago, hogs went up. You have to start at the bottom with proper differentials and if I had my way about it, I would definitely fix all prices, including labor, on a fair basis for the duration and quit so much foolish experimenting. I begged them to do it, and they would not do it.

Mr. CELLER. We are in absolute accord on that.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. In the final analysis, just who is responsible for the conditions that exist now?

Mr. FULMER. Under the present situation, perhaps you cannot hold any one person or any one agency responsible, for we have a half dozen agencies running all around over the lot with no one with any definite power. When you check on O. P. A. you are referred to someone else. When you talk to Chester Davis, he will tell you, "I have not any power," and finally you are referred to Mr. Vinson, and he will tell you "We are working on it."

My committee reported a bill today to place sufficient power in the hands of the Food Administrator, that which he thought he had when he was appointed, in connection with production, distribution, rationing, and price fixing.

Let us cut out red tape, lost motion, and confusion before we wake up too late with too little.

Mr. BISHOP. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on an item of $8,000,000 for airports did not arrive in time for the committee to incorporate it in this deficiency bill. It would have enabled 28 communities in the United States to complete their airports which were started by the W. P. A.

Originally, the Work Projects Administration had 267 airports. When the W. P. A. ceased functioning, 103 of these airports were completed; 65 have been specified by the Army and the Navy as being of military necessity and will be completed by funds otherwise provided for; 71 of these airports are now being operated by the Army. However, there are 28 airports which are not completed and a huge investment of not only the Federal Government, but the State governments and local municipalities, is wasting away. In this category is the air port at Beatrice, Nebr.; also the one at Fremont, Nebr. The other 26 airports are scattered over the States of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, these communities have completed their part of the contract that they made with the United States Government to build an airport and thus advance aviation, aid in the pilot-training program, and improve the national defense. As the matter now stands, the Federal Government is a defaulter in its arrangement with these several communities in regard to their airports. Most of these airports are far along on the way to completion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a letter received from Mr. W. W. Cook, secretary of the airport board of Beatrice, Nebr., bearing date of January 12, 1943, which is as follows:

BEATRICE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT BOARD,
Beatrice, Nebr., January 12, 1943.

Mr. CARL CURTIS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to give you some information regarding our local Work Projects Administration airport project. As Work Projects Administration stops February 1, we have been notified that the work on our airport will cease as of that date.

The airport is a municipal airport, the land being owned by the city. It is located 2 miles north of this city on paved highway U. S. No. 77. Last April the citizens of this city voted by a majority of 2 to 1, $60,000 for the purchase of the land and to pay the sponsors' contribution for a class 3 airport. The cost of the land was approximately $45,000 for 395 acres.

The city entered into a contract with Work Projects Administration for the development of this tract of land as a class 3 airport. The amount of money necessary for the city to spend, according to their contract with Work Projects Administration, was about $80,000. This included the purchase of the land, the sponsors' contribution, and the engineering fee. The city has cooperated with the Work Projects Administration 100 percent. We have furnished everything that we have been asked to. We have even gone further than our contract agreement. When Work Projects Administration labor became scarce, the city furnished high-school boys to drive trucks. The city paid these boys as, of course, they could not be paid by Work Projects Administration. We have fur-

nished lumber, sand, and other materials, the cost being paid by the city. All of these things being over and above the amounts called for in the contract.

At the present time the field is in much worse condition than if the improvement project had never been started. There was grading done and ditches dug which have not been filled. Before Work Projects Administration started there was 160 acres of this tract that was a usable airport. The field, in the condition it is now, leaves us very little of even the original 160 acres that we may use.

The drain tile is being put in place at the present time, the city having agreed to furnish and pay for the necessary labor. This also is over and above the contract agreement. Work Projects Administration awarded a contract to the Robert Construction Co., of Lincoln, for grading and moving of dirt. The amount of this contract was approximately $101,000. The Robert Construction Co. have moved a great deal of equipment and machinery to Beatrice. They have done very little work. Of course, if their contract is terminated, there will be a large amount of money due them as liquidating damages for which the Government will get nothing in return. They, of course, are rightfully entitled to the liquidating damages as they have been to considerable expense.

We have trained approximately 50 students here in Beatrice under the Civil Aeronautics Authority War Training Service. The majority of these people are now either in the Army or the Navy. We are still training these students, although it is quite difficult with our limited runway.

I am enclosing photostatic copies of some letters received from the Store Kraft Manufacturing Co., of this city. They are large subcontractors under the Cessna Co. As you can see from the letters, they need the airport continually. As a matter of fact, Cessna many times have flown parts and supplies into the Store Kraft Co., and if they had not been able to do this, it would have greatly delayed the program of the Store Kraft Co. in their vital war business.

I am also enclosing information compiled by our engineers showing the summary of the work planned, the work accomplished, and the work yet to be done. This was all approved by the Work Projects Administration.

We are calling upon you to help us in any way that you can to get some other agency to take over and complete this work. We need it very badly. The city has at the present time spent in the neighborhood of $70,000, fulfilling their part of the contract. It does not seem fair to us that the city, having spent their part of the money, that the Government should not complete this project.

Anything that you can do for us will be greatly appreciated. If there is any additional information that we may furnish you, please let us know.

Yours truly,

W. W. COOK,
Secretary, Airport Board.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the weeks and months since the termination of the W. P. A., I have been endeavoring to get some action that would bring about the completion of this important airport at Beatrice. Many contacts and conversations have been had with officials in the C. A. A. and the Army and Navy. Up until now, the Army and Navy have not seen fit to take over this airport or aid in its completion. It is my belief that the C. A. A. wants this airport completed and that their request is now before the Bureau of the Budget.

The city of Beatrice has done everything that they could do. In fact, their expenditures at the present time apparently exceed the amount mentioned in the above-quoted letter of Mr. Cook.

On June 14, Mr. M. S. Hevelone, an attorney at Beatrice, advised me by telegram, "Beatrice fulfilled its part of original contract with W. P. A., including furnishing land, all engineering, and other items, totaling over $80,000. W. P. A. agreed to complete port in three phases but did not complete phase one. Airport in worse condition now than before. Besides, Government defaulted on contract. Beatrice has three industrial plants devoted to war production. One plant working under subcontract with Cessna Aircraft of Wichita. Beatrice port in incompleted condition not usable by men flying here on war work."

State Senator Ladd Hubka of Beatrice has been very active in promoting the Beatrice airport. He, too, advises that the city of Beatrice has done everything required of them and more, and urges that the Federal Government complete its agreement.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of economy and fair dealing on the part of the Federal Government with these 28 communities having unfinished airports started by the W. P. A., I urge that this Congress, at an early date, take the necessary steps to bring about their completion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we are presenting this morning the last of the annual appropriation bills. The pending bill, the second deficiency appropriation bill, closes the appropriation program for the session. We are at last able to approximate in general terms the total amount carried by the annual supply bills for this session of Congress. Of course, it is impossible yet to say definitely just what the amount is, as a number of the bills are still subject to change in the Senate and in conference, but, under the present status, the annual supply bills and the supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills aggregate approximately $111,000,000,000 for the first session of the Congress. An approximate estimate of the permanent appropriations, special and general accounts, not including trust funds, for 1944 is $4,000,000,000. So we reach a grand total at this time, under the present status of the supply bills, of $115,000,000,000 for the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

This is the largest amount of money ever appropriated by the American Congress, with one exception. The second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress appropriated a total of $147,000,000,000. We are falling short of that amount this session by some $32,000,000,000.

And that is as it should be. There is an encouraging note in the fact that the appropriations for this session make it the second largest appropriating session in the history of the Nation. There is reason to believe that it indicates we are over the hump, that the biggest job of getting our production geared to war needs is done, and that we have now reached the point where we have practically completed capital investments. All major factories are built; all major plants are in operation; all patterns, jigs, and dies have been supplied; our personnel has been mobilized and organized. From now on we need production, replacement, and maintenance, as far as we can see now; and from now on, the trend should be to keep producing to the limit. There is heartening evidence in this decrease in appropriations for this session under the appropriations for the last session—that we have passed the turning point in the war. It is an encouraging and optimistic augury. At last we are definitely headed toward ultimate victory. We are winning the war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope everything the gentleman has said will prove to be true. If the gentleman has not read it, I should like to have him read in the current issue of Life a description of the Battle of Attu. It will give him a vivid idea of what this country is up against before we lick the Japs, which we have to do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am very glad to have the gentleman call attention to that phase of the situation. I trust no one will get the impression that victory is either near or easy. While this is an encouraging omen, it does not mean that the war is over or that any material part of the incalculable price has been paid. Anyone who took note of the very informative address made by General Marshall this week, must realize that there are long days of hard and strenuous battle ahead, and that it is to be battles in which we must expect to suffer frequent reverses and severe losses; but we can begin to take heart in the knowledge that the processes of preparation for war are now secure.

We are just beginning to realize, just beginning to catch a glimmer of light on how close we came to tragic and irretrievable defeat. We are beginning to realize that if the enemy full-panoplied, full-armored, ready to the last buckle, had been able to throw his mechanized might against us as against France before our plants were built, our troops equipped, our personnel mobilized, that, regardless of our resources, regardless of the dauntless spirit of the American people, we could not have protected our shores or defended our centers of production.

We are now in a position through the capital expenditures of the last Congress and this where we can be assured we are as well or better armed, as well or better equipped, our armed forces as well trained and disciplined or better trained and disciplined as any force which the enemy can bring against us. From now on our job will be to keep our present plans and factories in production. As a matter of fact, it has been developed in our hearings that we are producing so effectively that we can now turn some small part of our energies and facilities

to civilian needs and divert some of our war plants to the production of materials for civilian consumption. That is one of a number of encouraging conclusions reflected in the substantial reduction in the amount of the total appropriations for this session under the peak appropriations of the last session.

It must be understood, of course, that all appropriations here tabulated, either for the last session or this session, are not devoted to war purposes. In the last session, and in this session, about six or seven billion dollars have been devoted to the maintenance of the ordinary functions of government, including interest on the public debt, which for next year amounts to something like $3,000,000,000; but outside of the six or seven billion dollars in the last session and this session the entire appropriation of $147,000,000,000 for the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and $115,000,000,000 for the first session of the Seventy-eighth has been for war.

The second deficiency appropriation bill contains comparatively few items and comparatively small amounts to take care of the ordinary odds and ends of deficiencies that ordinarily appear at the end of a session. We have here appropriations for the Postal Service, the bulk of which is for the pay of personnel, for clerks, for postmasters, and for Star Route Service, and the deficiency is occasioned by the tremendous increase in the volume of mail and to mail carried free for those in the armed forces.

Under the Federal Works Agency we have an appropriation of $7,000,000 to carry on a work-relief program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from July 1 to November 30, 1943, under the act of June 22, 1943, legislation which came unanimously from the Committee on Insular Affairs. This $7,000,000 is a reduction of $1,000,000 from the $8,000,000 recommended by the Budget in respect to this legislation to provide a stop-gap to take care of unemployment and destitution conditions in the islands, much of which is due to war conditions, and the disappearance of commerce occasioned by our war activities.

Under the Treasury Department we provide $2,700,000 for payment to Panama and the Export-Import Bank on account of Panama's share of the cost of constructing the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway. When this road was projected the original cost was to be $4,000,000, of which the United States was to pay one and a half million and Panama would pay two and a half million dollars. Panama borrowed her share from the Export-Import Bank at 4 percent interest. The work was to be done by Panama under advice of the United States engineers; but with the coming of the war, and the imminent necessity of prompt defense of the Canal and the locks in Panama and other installations, we took over, with the consent of Panama, the building of the road, changed the specifications, and agreed, for other important considerations, to assume her part of the cost of the road. We here provide for a refund of the part of the amount of the loan which Panama has paid, principal and interest, and to pay the bank the remainder due from Panama on the two and a half million dollars in the original loan.

Under the Civil Service Commission we provide for the Board of Legal Examiners, with which the House is familiar, and for the liquidation of the National Resources Planning Board.

The bill as presented to the House carries a total recommendation of $36,245,360.60, a reduction from the amount of the Budget estimates of $2,255,500, as large a retrenchment as we felt the program could afford.

It is to be regretted that time could not have been afforded for inclusion in this bill of an appropriation to take care of distress conditions occasioned by floods in the Missouri, Mississippi, and Ohio Valleys. Conditions in these sections are so severe that 3 weeks after the first inundation, the Army engineers have not yet been able to make an accurate estimate of the damage or of steps to be taken for alleviation of flood conditions in these devastated valleys. The loss has been very heavy and will be greater unless early assistance can be given to rehabilitate farm facilities and to start production before it is too late to take advantage of the season.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. On the Missouri River flood situation we have no funds for a survey based on the damage done this year, have we?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill carries no provision of any kind. There has been no time to secure estimates.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman understand that there is a new section to the new road bill passed in the Senate yesterday providing for some construction of damage done to bridges and roads in the recent flood? Will we get that bill here before we recess?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is to be hoped that some such provision will be provided before the recess. It is the most distressing flood we have had in the Middle West in a generation, and the crest of the flood had not reached the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi at last report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the statement made by my good friend—and he is a good friend—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to the effect that the total appropriations at the last session of the Congress aggregated $147,000,000,000, and that the appropriations for the present session of this Congress had aggregated $115,000,000,000, making a total appropriation for the two sessions of $262,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

On May 27 I placed in the RECORD a statement giving the latest available records on the assessed valuation of each of the 48 States of the Union. That record shows that the total assessed valuation of the 48 States of the Union is $150,000,000,000. I fail to find anything that is very encouraging in the picture. We have passed appropriations for $262,000,000,000 in two sessions of the Congress, and this session is not over yet. That amount is almost twice the assessed valuation of every piece of property, real and personal, tangible and intangible, in the 48 States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

WHAT IS AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, recently there has been unanimously reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution, which I hope will be unanimously passed when it reaches this floor. I read that resolution:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Since this resolution was reported a number of people, including to my astonishment one or two Senators, have spoken as though the foreign affairs of this country were not the business of this House. I can imagine no conception of foreign affairs which betrays such a complete lack of understanding of what foreign affairs are all about. To talk as though this House had no concern with foreign affairs, is to talk as though foreign affairs were some sort of esoteric parlor game, some pukka-sahib sport, a sort of private political monopoly which has no vital relation to the vital interests of the people. Is this House, then, to raise the most staggering taxes in all history, for a $300,000,000,000 war, and to have nothing to say about what we win when we win that war?

Such indeed seems to be the attitude of a few people in high offices who have always sought jealously to maintain a monopoly of foreign affairs. They have cozened and propagandized the people into thinking that foreign affairs is a delicate abracadabra which the people had better leave to their betters. This is also the doctrine of those who preach a century in which there will be 129,999,000 common men but only 1, or perhaps 2, very, very uncommon men who will do all the thinking about everything foreign for you and for me.

Mr. Chairman, I know, and every Member of this House knows that the future foreign policy of the United States is a matter of profound concern to all the people. To be sure the people are confused about it now. They have been deliberately confused by those who have claimed a monopoly of wisdom in this field. The catastrophe of this war is the very measure of their wisdom. This, the people have begun at last to realize. So, while the people do not yet know what they intend their future foreign policy to be, they do intend to be the architects of it. If, in spite of their

desire to do so, the American people are denied the chance to determine their own foreign policy, there will have been committed the greatest crime that was ever committed in this Nation against government by the people.

It is in response to the demands of the people that their representatives in every branch of government contribute to this task of shaping America's foreign policy by every available means that the Fulbright resolution has been brought before us. Wisely, I believe, it has been determined to postpone the vote until after every one of us shall have had an opportunity to consult again with our people who have sent us here. When we return here, I have no doubt that we shall pass this resolution unanimously.

But though this step is all, perhaps, that we can wisely take at this time, it is only a first step toward an American foreign policy. For actually the Fulbright resolution is only the expression of a national sentiment. And there is a world of difference between sentiment and policy.

My argument is that, even at this late date, America has no foreign policy; that we must shape ourselves a policy soon; and that without a foreign policy we in this House can do nothing in the future with intelligence or success. Without some idea of the shape of American foreign policy, our attempts here to deal with the problems of finance, labor, agriculture, currency, social security, lend-lease, demobilization, rehabilitation of stricken countries, feeding of starving nations, and disarmament can hardly be more brilliant than the attempts of blindfolded children to pin the tail on the donkey.

To show how we may go about getting a foreign policy, may I with your kind permission propose a base point in a true American foreign policy? But let me say one thing, first: I do not care what foreign policy all the American people finally determine—provided they determine it on the basis of the facts. For I know this—and each of you knows it—that after all the argument is done, a policy which stems out of the true character and vital interests of the American people is not going to differ very much from what I want or from what each of you wants, on either side of this aisle.

How then do we proceed from vague verbalisms to concrete decisions? How do we proceed from sentiment to policy?

At the risk of sounding schoolmarmish, let me press the distinction between the sentiments of a nation and its policies, by defining the word "policy" itself. Here the ordinary Webster's Collegiate Dictionary will do. There policy is defined as "procedure based primarily on temporal or material interest, rather than on higher principles; hence worldly wisdom in the conduct of a nation's affairs."

This, Mr. Chairman, is the specific sense in which I use the word "policy." This is also the sense in which it has been used for hundreds of years by statesmen and diplomats whenever they have spoken of any nation's domestic or foreign policy. By historic use, as well as by dictionary definition, the philosophy, the ethics, the morals, the principles, the sentiments of a nation are not the same thing as its policies. Indeed, policy, which is procedure, based on temporal or material interests, in short, procedure based on self-interest, may be at total variance with the accepted principles, or spiritual concepts of a nation. Or it may be in accord. Benjamin Franklin made clear for all time the nice distinction between principle and policy, as well as the great importance of harmonizing them happily, when he said, "Honesty is the best policy."

Policy is, to put it another way, the pursuit of national or international ends by a choice of national means. A wise and honest nation will always demand that the international ends it seeks should be open and aboveboard, just and honorable, and so also should be the means to these ends. That is what Woodrow Wilson meant when he said, "Open covenants, openly arrived at." Secret means, used to achieve secret ends, midwifed by secretive diplomacy are not the ways of a democracy. These are the ways of totalitarian and Fascist powers. These are the ways of dictatorship. And when they are practiced or embraced by democratic statesmen, they are the ways that lead a democracy to its own doom.

Now the effort during the past 40 years of millions of Americans in high places and low to avoid having any foreign policy at all has come to be known in our day as "isolation."

Your extreme isolationist of yesterday was a citizen who believed that his country could develop peacefully and prosperously with nothing but a domestic policy, regardless of the foreign policies of other nations.

At this point let me say, every American realizes that we do have a procedure and do practice a foreign policy toward Canada and Mexico and the Central and South American countries. In short, he has long recognized and accepted the need of stating his material interests in the Western Hemisphere, and pursuing them there intelligently and vigorously. But in the past 40 years the average American had come to feel, for some strange reason, that our thinking about Europe and Asia could stop at the water's edge. And he has twice been doomed to ugly surprises. He is doomed for uglier and even more tragic ones, if he has failed to learn the lesson of two World Wars. I do not think he has failed to learn it. I believe there are few isolationists, by my definition, left in this Nation.

Now it has been noted, I believe, that I am no proponent of "globaloney." But it has not been generously noted that I am equally a bitter enemy of "globlindness", and a stanch friend of "globalliances."

I know, as most of my colleagues do, that the policy of no-policy toward Europe and Asia ignores one hard and woeful fact. All the other nations—European and Asiatic—do have foreign policies. They do assiduously and tirelessly pursue their international ends by the choice of national means. What the isolationists had failed to realize is that all these other foreign nations—both our friends and our enemies, put the United States' foreign policy—which is paradoxically to have none at all—at the very top of their agenda. For example, for a hideous example, the whole foreign policy of the Germans and Japs and the Axis Powers was carefully built and secretly pursued in the justified belief that America would not take the trouble carefully to inspect ultimate Axis aims, and would therefore never realize in time the nature of Axis designs on America. In short, during the past 40 years, our lack of any alert and positive foreign policy toward them allowed them safely to pursue their own toward us. Thus, we see an ugly paradox; our lack of a foreign policy not only became an irritant, a worry, a heartache to our natural allies, forcing them into appeasements and uncertain alliances, but it became a comfort and an encouragement and a very real aid to our natural enemies.

Mr. Chairman, twice in our lifetime America's lack of a foreign policy has discouraged our friends, encouraged our enemies, weakened the forces of peace, fanned the flames of war, and plunged the world into catastrophe.

So isolation has twice proven to be a disastrous attitude for America. But what, you ask, of intervention? If isolation is the lack of an American foreign policy, is what has come to be called intervention the presence of an American foreign policy?

The answer again is an unequivocal No. Intervention, as it also has been twice practiced in our lifetime, is no more of an American foreign policy than isolation. Intervention, both under Woodrow Wilson and under Franklin Roosevelt, was simply the adoption in extremis of another nation's foreign policy. Twice before this isolationist nation, belatedly seeing that its many moral and material commitments abroad and on the high seas were menaced, and its shores therefore ultimately endangered, has been plunged into a world war, prepared neither with war aims nor peace goals, and barely prepared with sufficient arms to defeat those of its enemies.

Neither the avowed interventionists nor the avowed isolationists can conceal the appalling fact of their own paucity of ideas about American international aims. For neither interventionists nor isolationists had any clear pre-war international American policy.

I believe that an American interventionist who adopts lock, stock, and barrel another nation's foreign policy when the threat of war is fully revealed is no more to be admired as an American patriot than the isolationist who denied the need of any policy when the threat of war was not visible. The interventionist is just a renegade isolationist, the isolationist an unconverted interventionist. Neither has honestly thought through his own country's true interests.

Now, let us, since the question of isolation came first, take the so-called foreign policy of the President. Until 1937

Franklin Roosevelt was the world's outstanding isolationist. For years he was famed for his blithe indifference to the oneness of the world in every chancelry in Europe and Asia. His public approval, for example, of Munich is a matter of public record. This administration's isolation from Europe and Asia until, and even after, that very day is a fact that no historian disputes. Hitler and Mussolini thrived and waxed strong in those balmy days of the isolationist New Deal. In those days, too, Hirohito, slowly encompassing the conquest of China, bought the scrap and steel from us with which to beat our only potential ally in the Far East to her knees. And even then Hirohito was planning the conquest of American possessions in the Pacific. Until 1931 America had had a coherent, if not a vigorous, far eastern policy. From then on, under New Deal statesmanship, that policy was allowed to deteriorate slowly but inexorably; a fact that was memorialized by our piled dead at Pearl Harbor.

But after Munich the evil tidings out of Europe and Asia began to swamp the State Department. No President fit for office could any longer ignore them. Slowly, reluctantly, hesitantly, Franklin Roosevelt abandoned his isolation. Little by little, cautiously, compromising always uninformed public opinion with his own bitter State Department information, Roosevelt, the world's outstanding isolationist, became Roosevelt, the world's outstanding interventionist. Which is to say, insensibly he began to adopt another nation's foreign policy. He adopted that of our greatest and nearest and most friendly neighbor—Great Britain. Fortunately, he adopted something, and better late than never. Though, may I point out here, even that policy was never forthrightly adopted by him, but rather thrust upon him at long last by Pearl Harbor and the German declaration of war upon America.

Now, right away you ask, Was Mr. Roosevelt's acceptance of British foreign policy a good thing or a bad thing for the U. S. A.? I want to be quite clear about this. The acceptance of any coherent, functioning foreign policy, long contrived to preserve the material welfare of millions, no, hundreds of millions of people, above all, the acceptance of the foreign policy of a powerful and friendly and kindred nation is far, far better than having none of your own. And Mr. Roosevelt had no foreign policy for America before Pearl Harbor—and he has no foreign policy for America now.

But as we all know, for many divers reasons, many Americans who were against Roosevelt's domestic policy were entirely willing to follow him in so-called American foreign policy. Those who did so for the best reasons were the thoughtful, unselfish, patriotic Americans who wanted above all things for America to be physically safe, not only today, but tomorrow. They knew, in short, their geography. They knew that for purely geographic, utterly materialistic reasons, lacking a foreign policy of our own, the foreign policy of Great Britain was the policy of all those in the world best calculated to preserve America from direct attack. They were the people who also knew that the Monroe Doctrine itself would never have been tenable without the existence of a strong and friendly British Navy. They knew that for time out of mind, the British, who kept the seas open and policed, had coincidentally kept them open for American trade, American defense, American ideas. They knew and saw what people do not yet see clearly enough—though there is nothing whatsoever to keep them from looking at the map—that the British Empire is America's natural buffer state.

As France has stood between England and Germany for centuries, as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans have stood between Russia and Germany, so there, my colleagues, on the globe stands the far-flung British Empire between the United States and all its real or potential enemies, in Europe and to some extent in Asia.

We have been attacked by the Germans and the Japs. Where are the great masses of our American troops gathered or fighting? Not on American soil. In Australia, the British Isles, the Near East. We have had to borrow everywhere Empire soil to get at our enemies. Even in the Far East, now that the Philippines are gone, to aid our Chinese allies we must pass for thousands upon thousands of miles through commonwealth land to India. Conversely, if our enemies today or tomorrow want to get at us, they too must always borrow British soil, or first subdue all or parts of the British Empire.

To repeat, with the exception of Japan, there is not one country in this whole world—again I am omitting South America, for obvious reasons—which could get at the United States of America, or at which the United States of America could get without passing over or through some part of the Empire and commonwealth. America's geographical armor, its eternal physical shield are colonial parts or commonwealth components of the Empire and its many Gibraltars. Even Japan had first to dispose of British strongholds in the southwest Pacific in order to secure her lines of attack on our loosely held outposts in the Pacific.

Let us say that mighty Russia might be our next enemy, which I do not for a second believe. Attacking from the polar cap, even Russia would have to pass through, or over, Canada to get at us. Attacking out of Siberia past Japan, striking at Alaska, Russia would still have to go through Canada to reach American heartland. Therefore, Mr. Roosevelt was right, so far as the question of sheer self-defense of the United States of America went, in the early stages of the war to embrace Empire policy and strategy. He saw, as any child who consults his maps can, that if the Empire were to be destroyed America must eventually become physically vulnerable to a score of nations. For yesterday, today, tomorrow this country must always deal with immutable geography. We have the neighbors we have. And this must always make our foreign relations to the British Empire of paramount importance to the United States of America.

Therefore, it is, I think, obvious beyond dispute that the base line of our search for an American foreign policy must be our relations with the British Empire. I believe that the American foundation stone of an American foreign policy ought to be a military alliance, or nonaggression pact, with Great Britain and the self-governing members of the Commonwealth. The high-minded, sincere internationalists, or the deliberate makers of political confusion may talk all they want about world organizations, regional federations, leagues of nations, and other mechanisms of collective security. I submit that in this epoch of history, collective security is meaningless without the firm and clearly established military, as well as economic and spiritual, collaboration of the United States and the British Commonwealth.

Today and tomorrow the question is not paramountly the peace of Europe but of the world. In the world scene, any scheme, however noble in concept, to maintain peace will in the last analysis be no better than the character and clarity of the relationships between the United States and the British Commonwealth.

I speak, at this point, not of a foreign policy, but of the search for a foreign policy, and I say that this search must be enormously speeded up. It is for the people of America to determine their future foreign policy. In foreign affairs, as in domestic, politics is the art of the possible. The American people have a right to know what is possible in foreign affairs and what is not. It is the business of the executive branch of this Government to serve the people. In foreign affairs, as in all else, it is for the President of the United States to be the servant of the people, not their master, and certainly not their Delphic oracle. Let us then call upon the executive branch to serve us and all the people by ascertaining without further delay the broad limits at least within which a permanent alliance with the British Commonwealth may be obtained.

There are, I believe, no insuperable difficulties in the way of an Anglo-American alliance. But no doubt there are difficulties. Some of these difficulties certainly exist in the sphere of our world-wide material, commercial and economic interests, such as currency, aviation, shipping, communications, oil, and so forth. All such questions need not be settled at once, though they certainly should be explored at once. The question to be determined today is whether we and the British are willing to work out these problems in a generous spirit of give and take. Senator LODGE has ably pointed out that all of our allies are definitely pursuing, in their policies, their own material and temporal interests. I do not for 1 minute object to Great Britain pursuing her own interests with vigor and selfishness, so long as she is threatened, and the world is threatened by the possibility of recurrent American isolation. So long as the Government of the United States is not prepared to get down to brass tacks—so long as high officials of this Government continue to make windy words and sentiments and vague principles such as the

"four freedoms," a substitute for the hard but patriotic business of statesmanship, Great Britain cannot do otherwise. Nor can the rest of the United Nations. But if our Government would ever get down to brass tacks, and help to give the American people a clear conception of what are the vital interests and needs of the United States so that we could all agree to our foreign policy—then surely the British Government would, for the first time, be willing and glad to deal with us on the basis of a high regard for our material interests and our spiritual aims of world freedom. I cannot conceive that any government of His Majesty would want to jeopardize the security of the commonwealth or the peace of the world by undue opposition to American interests and ideals. His Majesty's Government would, I am certain, wholeheartedly welcome a Government of the United States which would be able to make plain in sensible, common-sense fashion the continuing and vital interests of the American Nation, in Asia and Europe. Benjamin Franklin might well have said: "Fair play is the best Anglo-American policy."

I have said that policy must be sharply differentiated from principle. Policy cannot always achieve, indeed policy can never wholly achieve the perfect fulfillment of principle. At the same time, when there is too big a gap between policy and high principle, we are plunged into an abyss of moral confusion—the very kind of confusion from which America now so deeply suffers. For instance, either in the vacuum of an American foreign policy, or even with an American foreign policy, the "four freedoms" for the whole world are impossible of application. But implemented by a clear Anglo-American accord, the application of them to many parts of the world, where they do not yet exist, becomes infinitely more possible. In fact in these circumstances we may even be able to achieve the "four freedoms" for the United States of America.

For my part, I believe that the greatest of our principles does not separate us from the British Commonwealth, but rather binds us together: namely, our mutual faith in government by the people, for the people, and of the people, and our determination to maintain it for ourselves, whatever else happens.

The people of the British Commonwealth are utterly devoted to this principle. In the course of two centuries, however, they have acquired the tremendous problem of the application of this principle of self-government to vast areas of the Empire where self-government is not fact nor even, in some cases, an active theory. Today many British leaders tell us they are determined to apply the principle of self-government everywhere in the Empire as rapidly as possible. Certainly the United States ought not to be a party, directly or indirectly, to any unjustifiable delay in the expansion of political freedom for all peoples. But an Anglo-American alliance would, I believe, give great impetus to the expansion of world political freedom.

Finally, we cannot enter into a basic alliance with the British Empire if to do so would provoke the reasonable enmity of or suspicion of other peoples, such as the Russians and the Chinese, with whom, as with the rest of the United Nations, we are also determined to establish enduring relations of fruitful cooperation.

Let me now summarize my argument: In the long and tragic absence of any American foreign policy, vis-à-vis Europe and Asia, Mr. Roosevelt did the "second best thing" when he adopted that of Mr. Churchill. But second best it was, and is, and will be.

Until America finds and proclaims a vigorous policy of its own, our isolationist Presidents, in times of stress and war, will always be faced with either the disastrous choice of letting the British Empire go under at the hands of its aggressors—and our potential enemies—or of becoming interventionists and jumping in at the last desperate moment on Britain's side—and in that scramble of accepting, in a vacuum of all else, Britain's foreign policy, her ways and means of waging war, and her ways and means of shaping the post-war world. For we shall never, never, in material things, or spiritual ideas, be prepared for anything else.

How shall peace finally be brought to the world? By what—to use the words of the Fulbright resolution—"appropriate machinery"? Well, first, by using the machinery of our minds. Let us here in this House make it clear that it will be no longer an advantage to statesmen who wish to remain in power to make America's foreign policy seem exclusive, mysterious, and complicated. The Greeks invented the painless trick of the maze to drive ordinary men insane. It is the trick of politicians in high places today to raise a terrible dust of words about police forces, leagues of nations, world federations and so on, and then to complain that people do not see. It is a trick of these politicians to egg on every man to call his neighbor who is trying desperately to think things through from any American point of view, either an isolationist or imperialist, a warmonger or a pacifist. Let us put an end to this nonsense by proclaiming the simple obvious fact:

What is most wanted in America today are statesmen and legislators who can formulate a clear, honest, all-American foreign policy for the United States of America in Europe and in Asia. I predict that any such clearly announced American policy will at no point come into harsh conflict with the best interests of China, Russia, Great Britain, or any of the United Nations. Once we see this clearly, each of the great nations will give a little and all the nations will gain more. Only in this way will we be able to work out our destinies peacefully at home and abroad.

One more point and I am done: A foreign policy never should be and never can be at odds spiritually or economically with a domestic policy. The same spirit and philosophy that informs one will inevitably inform the other. Laissez-faire tycoonery, economic isolation and reaction at home before 1932 bred the same sort of disastrous American foreign policy abroad. Today "W. P. A.-ism," "poppa-fixism," "mama-do-good-ism" will breed the same kind of American policy abroad—and with inevitably the same results on the foreign scene that it has had on the domestic scene.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, Where are today's Jeffersons and Franklins and Adamses? Where are today's Monroes and Washingtons? Where are the men who believed in helping those who help themselves? In equal opportunities for all men and all nations? In vigilance being the eternal price of liberty? In America creating its own destiny? Where are the men, such as those I have named, who had both a policy for America and an American policy for other nations, and who put them squarely and honestly and without apology before the people and the world? Where? Where? Well, when they come—and come they will, perhaps on the very floor of this House—they will bring order out of our national and international chaos. They will set an honorable and yet realistic American foreign policy before us, and to that policy we will pledge our words, our honor, and our arms; and having done so, our words will never haunt us, our honor will remain unsullied, and our swords will stay bright in their scabbards—bright and unused.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Out where I live we have a port. For 5 or 6 years before December 1941, out of that port went hundreds of thousands of tons of scrap steel; and the same thing out of San Francisco. It went to Japan, and at the very same time we were shipping those thousands of tons of steel we were befriending, or supposed to be befriending, China. What kind of a policy was that?

Mrs. LUCE. That is the isolationist policy of Mr. Roosevelt which I am presently going to describe.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a distinct recollection of the campaign of 1940 when some of us were charged with some of the things the lady is now announcing. Is it not true that even the President of the United States then announced that the boys of this Nation would never fight on foreign soil?

Mrs. LUCE. That is perfectly true and I thank the gentleman for making the point.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Please let me finish. It is quite true, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] says, that in the last election the President out-did Mr. Willkie in telling the people of the United States that their boys would never be put on troop ships and sent overseas. What safeguarded his political position for him at that time was that the insiders all knew he was talking with his tongue in his cheek. Now, it is one thing for a private citizen to talk with his tongue in his cheek, but

it is quite another thing for the President of the United States to talk with his tongue in his cheek, of the whole American people. Mr. Roosevelt was in reality an interventionist talking like an isolationist.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the President himself became the leading isolationist when he espoused and put through the so-called neutrality bill of 1935 and 1937?

Mrs. LUCE. That is perfectly true, and I thank you for making that point, too.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentlewoman will read the New York Times the day after the Munich conference she will find in that paper a statement giving Franklin D. Roosevelt equal credit with Britain and France for having established the peace of the world by enforcing or participating in the Munich conference.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for making still another point in my argument that Mr. Roosevelt has been the world's greatest isolationist in his time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The statement which the lady made that the President inspired neutrality legislation is not in accordance with the facts. Neutrality legislation was not looked upon with favor by the President and the Secretary of State, as I happen to know. That was an act of Congress.

Mrs. LUCE. The President of the United States for 10 years had this House in the hollow of his hand. There was seldom any piece of legislation he wanted that he could not get here. If he did not at the time inform the people of the United States what an insane policy the Neutrality Act was, then it was because he did not choose then to upset the overwhelming political balance of power which he had in this House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the lady that familiar as I am with the facts, the statement that the President of the United States or the Secretary of State inspired neutrality legislation, is not supported by the facts. I speak as one who led the fight for neutrality legislation, and I was wrong and I have apologized since to Secretary Hull for differing with him upon that very issue.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman is a typical example, as the President himself is, of an isolationist, which is to say he was an unconverted interventionist. Conversely, an interventionist is nothing but a renegade isolationist. What America wants are men who have a positive foreign policy for the United States, who will see clearly enough ahead so that they cannot possibly make a mistake about a thing as serious to the United States as the passage of the neutrality act.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the lady that if I am guilty of that name, whatever it is, the Members on your side of the aisle voted just as numerously and in just as large proportion for neutrality legislation as those on this side of the aisle.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman misunderstands my words completely if he thinks I am supporting either interventionists or isolationists. I say that neither is good for America. Neither has a foreign policy for the United States.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was very much interested in what the gentlewoman had to say about the period 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Does the gentle lady believe that any one person, no matter how popular or with what authority in this country could have sold the American people the idea we must intervene to protect China or any other country?

Mrs. LUCE. I believe great leaders can sell the people anything. I believe that great leaders have in times gone by sold the American people great new forceful ideas; I believe Thomas Jefferson was such a leader; Washington was such a leader; Abraham Lincoln was such a leader. We have had them in history before. And when we have again men like Monroe and Jefferson, men who have both a foreign and domestic policy for the United States of America, and when that day comes people will fall completely unified behind such a leader.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not true that the present administration has no foreign policy to sell to the people?

Mrs. LUCE. Precisely; you have made the very point my whole argument is based on. This administration never has had a clear foreign policy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentlewoman have any hope that the President will announce any foreign policy until about 2 weeks or so before the election in November of 1944?

Mrs. LUCE. It is to the interest of those in political power today to keep a monopoly on foreign affairs. The Greeks invented the maze, a very painless way of driving a sane man insane. It is therefore certain that this administration will not reveal its foreign policy, if any, before election, but will rather, induce the American people to lose itself in a maze of terms like collective security, world federations, regional federations, and so on, so that the people will become so confused that they will believe no one but the President can show them the way to go home.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The distinguished gentlewoman has frequently referred to isolationists and interventionists. I think those terms are largely inspired terms. I do not think there was such a person in the United States as an isolationist so far as war was concerned.

Mrs. LUCE. Peace, sir, is not a policy; peace is an expression of hope.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Pardon me just a minute, may I continue?

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman asking a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. I now propound a question: If a man believes in trade and friendliness and neighborliness with foreign nations but if he did not want to participate in war would the gentlewoman call such a person an isolationist?

Mrs. LUCE. Certainly not. I did not want to get into this war; the gentleman from Montana did not want to get into this war; even Franklin Roosevelt did not want to get into this war. If that was isolationism, then we were all isolationists and, so long as we hate war, will continue to be.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentlewoman will permit me to continue with just one further observation: In the campaign of 1936 the President of the United States made this statement: "We are not isolationists; none of us are except insofar as war is concerned." Would you call him an isolationist at that time?

Mrs. LUCE. The man who sent the message of congratulation to Chamberlain at Munich was an isolationist—by my definition he had no American foreign policy. The man who said that America could stay out of this war and that he would keep this country out of this war in the face of the information that was piled up in his own State Department—I refer you to Mr. Hull's own white paper on the subject of the inevitability of war with Japan—was an isolationist; he had no positive American foreign policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I remember with much interest the statement of the distinguished gentlewoman when she made her first speech on the floor of the House to the effect that Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt could not agree on a foreign policy until they knew what was in the mind of Joseph Stalin.

Mrs. LUCE. I should think they should no longer be in doubt.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Has the gentlewoman any reason to believe now that they knew what was in the mind of Joseph Stalin, or if she knew what was on his mind which makes her think that they can now enter upon a foreign policy?

Mrs. LUCE. It was and is of the utmost importance that Mr. Roosevelt should have sought and should continue to seek what is in the mind of Mr. Stalin. I believe without any reasonable doubt he knows now what is in Stalin's mind. From here out he can proceed to act in the formulation of a policy toward Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentlewoman to say a few moments ago

that Thomas Jefferson had a sound, definite foreign policy; is that correct?

Mrs. LUCE. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Jefferson expressed that policy in his first inaugural address in these words:

> Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Is that what the gentlewoman alludes to?

Mrs. LUCE. That is quite correct. I do not wish any entangling alliances with any foreign country that are not alliances based on the physical security of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. I am a Jeffersonian Democrat and, of course, I agree with his views as expressed in that historic address.

Mrs. LUCE. The British Navy is the one thing that made Jeffersonian internationalism, and later the Monroe Doctrine, possible.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am trying to reconcile the gentlewoman's statement with reference to a military alliance with her answer to the gentleman from Mississippi when she said——

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman consider that our relations with South America are entangling alliances? That our relations with Canada is an entangling alliance? Is that the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am trying to find out the type of alliance the gentlewoman desires with Great Britain.

Mrs. LUCE. I would encourage the exploration of a nonaggression pact with Britain, which is our natural buffer state. Look, please, at the map; and remember at the same time this is an air world we are living in, and that in future we shall need to surround ourselves with as wide a margin of physical protection as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], who always comes prepared with beautiful and devastating phrases based largely upon her own views and frequently unsupported by logic or facts, has just entertained the House with one of her clever addresses. Unfortunately, I did not know that she was to address us upon this occasion on the subject of our foreign policy and only came in the Chamber while she was in the midst of her address. I can only secure 5 minutes of time, but I do want to consume that 5 minutes, if I may, in correcting, if I can, some of the unjust criticisms and some of the illogical statements based upon conclusions which are not justified by the record.

It is easy for one who has not been a Member of the House until this session and who has never voted upon any measures coming up in the House during the past 10 years, like the distinguished gentlewoman, to be free to criticize all votes because she has no record to commend or to condemn. Had she been a Member of the House for the past 12 years, during that critical period through which we have been passing and had served upon the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House and had seen these various transactions unfold themselves, she would not have made some of the statements which she made here today.

I think she was rather unfair and manifested a spirit of extreme partisanship when she leveled her criticisms at the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his great Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. It is easy to criticize; it is difficult to construct. The question of a foreign policy is not a static thing, just as the domestic policy is not static. Domestic legislation and domestic policies depend upon conditions existing in a country at the time, and our foreign policy just as naturally rests upon conditions that confront us abroad. None of these great leaders of the past of whom she has spoken ever had an inflexible domestic or inflexible foreign policy. The foreign policy has always had to depend upon the conditions existing throughout the world at the time.

I resent the charge or the implication that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull are responsible for this war. On the contrary, they have both done everything within their power to prevent it and I dare say that the historians of the years to come will not point, as the lady did today, the finger of guilt to them as being responsible for this great global war.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. For a question. What has the lady on her mind?

Mrs. LUCE. I wish to know if the gentleman misunderstood me? Does he think that I blamed one man for the isolationism of the whole country? I do not think I blamed the President alone. The almost unanimous attitude of Americans for 40 years has been isolationist.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The lady does not blame the President alone then?

Mrs. LUCE. Definitely not.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I wonder if the gentle lady is aware of the fact that only 27 Members of her own party voted for the lend-lease bill?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that reminder and I was going to say something in that connection, which brings to my mind this: She condemned the neutrality legislation as being responsible for the war, but I call her attention to the fact that when we voted to repeal that neutrality legislation, when that became necessary by reason of conditions abroad it was the Members on her own side of the aisle who tried to defeat it and we had to depend on this side for the votes to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman again misunderstand me? Does he think I was defending Republican isolationism? Because, if he does, I want to correct him. I am against and was against both the isolationists and interventionists—neither of which had a foreign policy—on both sides of this aisle.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The lady not having been here, we do not know how she would have voted. It is very easy for her to criticize now the votes of others who were here when we voted upon many measures affecting our foreign policy.

Talking about isolationism, when did isolationism begin? It was back in 1920 after that great leader of ours, Woodrow Wilson, left the White House, and Harding and the Republican regime came into power. Aye, it began even before that, when the Republicans in the Senate, aided by a few isolationist Democrats, turned down Wilson's request that we become members of the League of Nations and the World Court, and I doubt very much today whether the world would be at war if this country had not turned its back on Wilson's leadership and his plan to preserve world peace. I want to remind the gentlewoman that in my opinion one of the reasons responsible for this war and which helped to produce it was the disarmament conference under the Harding administration when the other countries of the earth scrapped their blueprints and we scrapped our ships and found ourselves without a Navy sufficiently large to make the Axis Powers respect us. That was not caused by Franklin D. Roosevelt or Cordell Hull.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. To be accurate, historically accurate, what does the gentleman have to say about this last World War having been started by the peace of Versailles? That was framed by President Wilson. There is where it started.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I have no such delusion, I do not think that this war started by the Treaty of Versailles. That is the reason Hitler gives, but I do not accept his alibi as the cause of this war.

I want to talk a little about this neutrality legislation because I do know something about the history of that legislation. I was chairman of the subcommittee that framed the first bill upon that subject and I know the attitude of Secretary Hull and I think I know the attitude of President Roosevelt with reference to it. It was not recommended

by the President to the Congress or submitted to the Congress by him. The Congress, and not the President, initiated it and passed it without any nod from the White House. I do know that Secretary Hull was against it, and there was considerable doubt at the time whether or not the bill would be signed by the President after we passed it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think I had better not yield to anybody now. I wanted to talk a little more about this neutrality legislation, because that has been injected into the debate. Inadvertently I said campaign instead of debate, and my friends on the Republican side, by their laughter and applause, indicate that they recognize the speech just made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut as being a part of a political campaign, and it was evidently made for that purpose.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. At the gentlewoman's insistence.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman, for the remainder of his time describe quite clearly and simply what he thinks the foreign policy of the President of the United States is?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not going to be diverted by the lady's telling me what to talk about. I am going to choose my own subject, and talk in my own time. On some other occasion when my time is not consumed in answering a speech of the gentlewoman, I will be glad to discuss at length the foreign policy of this administration.

What I was starting to say was that the neutrality legislation was conceived as being legislation which was designed to keep us out of war and keep other countries from going to war. That was the whole inspiration on which it was based.

As I said a moment ago, I was one of those who so believed and supported it. I believed that we should set an example for the rest of the world by refusing to sell arms so that they might follow our example and we might thereby encourage peace and prevent war. But I am convinced now, and I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] who was here a moment ago, and who led the fight against the neutrality legislation, that he was right and I was wrong. It is not a popular thing to admit that you are wrong, but in the light of subsequent history I want to say that that legislation, in my judgment encouraged rather than discouraged the Axis Powers in bringing on the war in which we are now engaged. They interpreted it as a license from us—that they could rob, murder, and pillage, and attack the rest of the world and we would do nothing about it. And that after they destroyed the rest of the world they could then destroy us. Republicans and Democrats both voted for it. It was enacted by Congress not at the instigation of the President or his Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I know the gentleman has an intimate knowledge of the neutrality legislation. The gentleman will recall that in the fall of 1939, after war had started, we were called into special session to change our neutrality law.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I remember the Vorys amendment, too.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The arms embargo repeal was involved. Let me remind the gentleman what the President's attitude was on September 21, 1939. In his message he said:

> The step I recommend is to put this country back on the solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman can put it in the RECORD. I am not going to take all my time letting the gentleman read the RECORD. I decline to yield further.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He said he was for neutrality.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. By traditional neutrality, the President meant the kind that we had before we passed the neutrality law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the gentleman recalls the vote on the Republican side on the repeal of the arms embargo when we came back in September 1939 for a vote on that issue.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; I remember it. I was in there fighting for its repeal and a large majority of the Republicans voted against the repeal of the arms embargo, as they did against all bills to modify or repeal any part of the neutrality law. Many Democrats and many Republicans may have made a mistake in enacting the neutrality law back in 1935, but many more Republicans made a greater mistake when they voted against its modification or repeal when the storm clouds were breaking over Europe. While it was a mistake to pass the neutrality law in 1935, if we had repealed it or modified it before the European war began, it would have done much to have averted the present global war. Those who prevented its repeal or modification before the war began erred far more grievously than those who originally enacted it.

On June 30, 1939, 2 months to a day before Germany invaded Poland, the House voted on the repeal of the arms embargo of the neutrality law and failed to repeal it because an overwhelming majority of the Republicans voted against its repeal.

The President felt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull felt that if we could repeal that arms embargo before the war started in Europe it would be notice to Adolf Hitler and to the Axis Powers that these countries who were attacked could secure arms from us, and Congress was urged by the President so to do.

We had that session here which I well remember. Unfortunately—I say unfortunately, I think tragically unfortunately—we failed to repeal the arms embargo in June 1939, and on September 1 Hitler invaded Poland and the World War began. I have always felt that if the Congress of the United States had at that historic session on June 30 repealed the arms embargo it would have given notice to Adolf Hitler and to his cohorts that we were not going to hold ourselves aloof, and that countries that were attacked could come here and get munitions with which to defend themselves, and Hitler might not have invaded Poland, and the present war would have been averted. The special session of Congress, after the invasion of Poland, did repeal the arms embargo, but it was too late to prevent the beginning of hostilities in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I say in the light of history, in the light of what has happened in the last 10 years, in the light of the history of our country and its relations with other countries, no one familiar with the facts and with the events as they have happened can criticize the President of the United States as not having done all that he could to keep us out of war and to help win it after we were attacked.

I do not believe in all of the domestic policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and have not supported all of his domestic policies with my vote, and on his domestic policies I think he has made mistakes; but I say to you, and this is what I have said many times elsewhere, that on foreign policies throughout this crisis, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have been right 100 percent, and the verdict of history will so record.

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, in a well-prepared address and in her usual suave manner, opened the 1944 Presidential campaign with a somewhat related rear attack upon the President of the United States. She found considerable criticism with his foreign policy, or his lack of foreign policy.

But somehow or other the leading newspapers of this Nation—many of which opposed the President on the domestic front—supported his foreign policy. Our distinguished colleague from New York, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, a Republican, but an outstanding American, has been one of the greatest supporters of the President's foreign policy. Certainly President Franklin Delano Roosevelt pledged to all Americans that he would make every effort to keep America out of war. As early as 1938, the President warned America of totalitarian dangers. In 1939 he again warned us of the danger of Germany and Japan. He was called a war monger and an interventionist by Republicans and by some of the press of the Nation. Reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will clearly establish to the satisfaction of the gentlewoman from Connecticut who favored and who opposed preparedness. Apparently in 1939 the gentlewoman

from Connecticut must have been in China or somewhere on one of her many international sojourns—unaware of the solid isolationism of her own Republican Party.

Let us look at the record of both major parties since Congress sensed the danger of impeding war. Let us see how the Democrats and the Republicans voted to prepare America:

June 30, 1939: House Joint Resolution 306, Neutrality Act of 1939, passed the House 201 to 187. One hundred and seventy-five Republicans opposed this measure.

September 7, 1940: House Resolution 10132, a bill to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service—selective service—passed the House 263 to 149. One hundred and thirty Republicans opposed this measure.

February 8, 1941: House Resolution 1776, a bill to further promote the defense of the United States—Lease-Lend—passed the House 260 to 165. On this measure, considered the most important of our entire foreign policy, 137 Republicans voted in opposition.

October 17, 1941: House Joint Resolution 237, a joint resolution to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act by permitting arming of merchant ships, passed the House 259 to 138. One hundred and twenty-eight members of the Republican Party opposed this measure.

November 13, 1941: House Joint Resolution 237, a joint resolution to repeal the Neutrality Act of 1939, passed 212 to 194. One hundred and seventy-six Republicans opposed this important measure less than a month before Pearl Harbor.

In view of this conclusive record of Republican isolationism, the very partisan address by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, opening the 1944 Presidential campaign, sounds like some more "globaloney."

Let me remind the charming lady from Connecticut that when she "aired" her first "supremacy of the air" address, she stated then that we—Great Britain and the United States—should not formulate or embark on any foreign policy until we knew what was on Joe Stalin's mind, and in that premise she was absolutely correct. Let's move slowly on any new foreign policy. Let us try to make it as flexible as possible, depending on the day-by-day turn of world events.

The gentlewoman's endorsement of the Fulbright resolution to which I heartily subscribe was the sole bright spot of an otherwise ill-timed address.

For 4 years, I was the quarterback of the football team of my university and real generalship demanding instant decisions necessitated by the game's circumstances meant the difference between victory and defeat. It is easy to find fault with the plays called or strategy used by the quarterback the day after or the following Monday morning by the sideline all-American. In my opinion, the gentlewoman's criticism of the President's foreign policy sounded like "Monday morning quarterbacking."

The gentlewoman from Connecticut would certainly be making a greater contribution to the war effort if she and the Republican Party which she represents, would rally behind one of the greatest leaders of all time comparable to Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson; yes, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of all Americans—Republicans as well as Democrats.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] will feel indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] because he has confirmed her thesis that the President has no foreign policy, the gentleman from Texas having stated that the foreign policy of this country during the last 8 or 10 years had to change as conditions changed. I take it that the policy of opportunism as enunciated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] is still the foreign policy of this Government, changeable, variable, turning with each wind of public opinion, and that we still have no foreign policy. The symbol of such a policy should be represented, not by the American eagle, but by a weathervane. I am glad, as I say, that the gentleman from Texas confirms the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some comment with reference to an item which is carried in the bill on page 7, and which has to do with Puerto Rico, and after all of this discussion on international affairs, perhaps we can go back to one of the milk bottles that is on our own doorstep, from a continental standpoint. On page 7 of the bill we have an item of $7,000,000 which the committee has recommended that we provide, with which to carry on the Federal Works Administration program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, during the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending with November 30, 1943.

A committee from this House, under a resolution of instructions passed by the House, has just returned from Puerto Rico, and that committee will in due course file, for the benefit of the House Members and the interested public, a committee report. Of course, I shall not at this time attempt to give a report for the committee, but my only purpose in coming before you at this moment is to discuss rather briefly and in a preliminary manner, this item of $7,000,000 and the course that this Congress may have to follow on this particular part of our relief program, as related to those two areas, beginning next December 1, because this appropriation expires as of November 30, 1943. You gentlemen may wonder how the $7,000,000 got into the bill. The Puerto Ricans asked for $50,000,000, $25,000,000 to be spent during the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1 next, and $25,000,000 to be spent during the following fiscal year. That request came before the Insular Affairs Committee of the House at about the time we were prepared to go to Puerto Rico for this investigation, and it was the judgment of the committee that the $50,000,000 should not be provided before the investigation was made. So there came to that committee a recommendation for $8,000,000, to be used during the coming 5 months, and to prevent the destruction, we will say, of the Public Works Administration in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I understand there was a division in the Committee on Appropriations with respect to whether this $7,000,000 should be left in the bill, so I want to give a few thoughts on the whole program.

Puerto Rico has about 1,800,000 people who came under our control after the Spanish-American War. The Virgin Islands are some 1 or 2 hours travel distance from Puerto Rico by air. We purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1917 as a matter of national defense. In those 3 islands there are about 26,000 or 27,000 people. On 1 island there are 12,000 or 13,000 people, on another about 700, and on another about 13,000. It is my frank, blunt opinion that our program as related to the Virgin Islands has operated to turn the entire economy of those islands into a ball of wax. When I say we, I mean the Congress and the administration. How that is to be "unballed" and put back into order I do not know. The Virgin Islands are included in this bill, and in this $7,000,000 item. I make that observation because unfortunately the amount that is to go to the Virgin Islands is not segregated, and in my opinion the Virgin Islands is in a different world to that of Puerto Rico, from the standpoint of nature, from the standpoint of production, and from the standpoint of present economic conditions. Puerto Rico has a budget which is divided into three general heads—what is called the general fund, and the special funds, and the trust funds. The total revenue that will flow in under all of these funds during the coming fiscal year will perhaps approximate $70,000,000 or maybe $75,000,000. There is a population as I say of about 1,800,000 people. This side of Puerto Rico, and largely under our jurisdiction, is the country of Haiti, with about 4,000,000, with a budget which will probably run $5,500,000, during the coming fiscal year, maybe $6,000,000. Note the comparison there—4,000,000 people with a $6,000,000 budget, and 1,800,000 people with a $75,000,000 to $80,000,000 budget. What are doing to Puerto Rico when we supplement budgets like that with $7,000,000 for 5 months or $25,000,000 for a year, or with an average, say, of about $30,000,000 for the past 10 years?

What have we done to the Puerto Rican people? After I have read the investigating committee report I will have something to say about that. Do we wish to give the Puerto Rican people this $7,000,000, and through this debate indicate to them that at the end of this 5-month period they may not receive any more from us while present conditions continue; or do we wish to leave

the record in such shape as to lead the Puerto Rican people to believe that when this $7,000,000 is exhausted and the 5 months have expired they will receive another $18,000,000 to carry them through the remaining part of the fiscal year and which, added to this $7,000,000, will give them the $25,000,000 they asked for before the committee went to Puerto Rico?

Those are basic questions with which we should deal and about which we may wish to say something in this debate in the final disposition of this $7,000,000.

At the present time, as the Appropriations Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Military Affairs Committee particularly know, the Federal Government is releasing into Puerto Rico an enormous flow of dollars. Do you want to make your appropriations for public works after the Army and Navy cease to turn these many million dollars loose, or do you wish to supplement this fantastic budget with the Federal expenditures by the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, and, in addition, give appropriations such as this bill carries? That is something for us to think about.

Here is another thing that enters into this proposition: As many of you no doubt know, the distillery industry in this country has ceased to manufacture intoxicating liquors. That means to say that insofar as boats are made available the West Indies—Cuba, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Santo Domingo—and some of the other countries down there will have access to the intoxicating-liquor market in this country up to their capacity to produce. Puerto Rico is in an unusually favorable position to produce rum and ship it to this country. The boys who like rum tell me it is a pretty good product. As the rum flows out of Puerto Rico it creates an export tax. For the month of May, I was informed this tax exceeded $2,000,000. Mr. Tugwell estimated it would probably be $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, and the largest rum manufacturer down there, who produces a product under the name of Bicardi, told the committee that with favorable shipping he thought it might reach $25,000,000 a year. That is a very unusual and a very peculiar position in which Puerto Rico finds herself at this particular moment from a revenue standpoint. Do we want to go further and supplement the income of Puerto Rico with appropriations of this nature, with Puerto Rico benefiting by the heavy flow of export taxes on rum? There is something else we must think about and that is the increased income from new taxes.

You have down there four or five basic crops—sugarcane, coffee, tobacco, coconuts, and rice. Every man who is attempting to farm in Puerto Rico is competing with the Federal Government through the W. P. A., the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps, and these other agencies, in an effort to obtain labor to carry on his agricultural operations. That is something for us to think about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The official report shows there are 250,000 unemployed employables in Puerto Rico today; that of those 250,000 the W. P. A. is at this time employing 41,000, and this appropriation will permit the continued employment of that number. So, even subtracting the 41,000 provided for by the amount in this bill, there are still 209,000 unemployed employables in the island who are available for employment by any farmer who wants farm labor.

It was further shown that W. P. A. refuses to employ anyone who can get a job anywhere else. If any man is offered a job, and refuses to take it, they promptly fire him from W. P. A. employment. The W. P. A. officials took up the matter with the industries and asked them how many men of those on W. P. A. rolls they could use. They told them they could use 100—100 out of 41,000. So, I am puzzled by the gentleman's statement that the employment of these 41,000 is drawing labor from private industry, when there are 209,000 who cannot get any kind of a job at all and, in addition, W. P. A. offers the entire 41,000 on its rolls to local industry when needed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not going to dispute what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just said, but I call attention to the fact that he is now speaking about the official report which has been given to him. In other words, these figures he is giving are not his figures, as I understand him.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they are not my figures. They are official figures compiled on the basis of a local census. I wondered if they agreed with the gentleman's figures. Did the gentleman get any figures down there which indicated that the official figures were incorrect or inaccurate? If so, will he let us have that evidence?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our report, practically all of which was taken in the form of sworn testimony, will not squarely support the report which was given to our committee before we went down there and which undoubtedly has been given to the Committee on Appropriations. Conditions have radically changed with the improved shipping situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman say there is no unemployment on the islands? And what does he say to the statement that W. P. A. asked local industry to estimate how many men they could use, and they said they could use 100 men—100 out of 250,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not say there is no unemployment there. I would say there is unemployment there, and I will make the further statement that as long as we pour these millions of dollars into this island there will be more unemployment, because the Federal dollars which come in siphon people down from the hills into the cities and reduce them to a life in as nasty and degraded a slum area as you are likely to find anywhere, with tuberculosis, gonorrhea, and syphilis and all that goes along with it. They come down there from the hills and squat and live as best they can.

And knowing they can get a few relief dollars, why, certainly, many refuse to stay up in the hills and work, and this drift that I refer to runs all through the operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, we can rely on the record. The record will show, and there are other members of the committee here who were down there with me and who are on the floor now, who can give you the facts about this situation. We went into the facts, and the record will show that men are taken away from sugar and coffee plantations for public-works projects. I went out into the country just to ascertain for myself, and I found that at a 1,500-foot elevation there were about 340 acres of land, with 28 coffee plantation houses on it. I talked to a man there and asked him why men were not working on it, and he said they are working down in the valley on a works project; working on public roads that you came over awhile ago. I saw them at work but I did not know what specific project they were working on or what farm they were from.

You can go down there now and study the sugarcane operation and you will find sugarcane is left in the field uncut, and at the end of next month, July 1943, that will be true, and it is left there because the Work Projects went in there and absorbed the sugarcane workers, took them away from the particular fields.

There is no question about that. I made it my business to go out and visit on some of the farms and plantations throughout the country to see them with my own eyes, so I do not have to take any official record.

Of course, we have got the testimony from the farmers; their testimony is in the record, and the record will speak for itself.

That does not mean to say that the farms will absorb all these people, but here is the fundamental point I am raising, which I fear we are about to overlook. Do we at this time, with reference to this $7,000,000, wish to further a plan of putting more revenue into the Puerto Rican hands and thus encourage additional waste and graft and extravagance and experimentation, or do we at this time, by serving warning that we will leave the $7,000,000 in the bill, but that, beginning in December next, we are going to insist that they use some of their own funds. In other words, we will leave the $7,000,000 in the bill, but when the committee has completed its report and when we come back here next fall, we will have to revamp the whole program, or, because of the few remarks that we are making here today, give them a warning in questioning this proposal, that we are looking into a new policy with reference to Puerto Rico which we have never had in mind prior to today.

I am worried more about the domestic situation; there are others who can wor-

ry about international affairs, but I am for protecting the United States and its Territories, organized or unorganized, first, last, and all the time, and take care of the balance of the world thereafter if we feel able to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman—and I am asking purely for information. I have the highest regard for the gentleman. He has just returned from the island, and we want to get all the facts we can. I would like to ask him two questions. He mentioned graft just now. Does he charge the W. P. A. down there with graft?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I charge that in this whole operation, without any hesitation whatsoever, that in the administration of these amounts, the Congress, through the support that goes to Puerto Rico and to the insular government in Puerto Rico in connection with this whole problem, is a party to the graft that runs through the entire operation financed by Federal and insular funds for all activities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Just a second. May I ask if the gentleman will elaborate, in the extension of his remarks, and explain in what specific manner he says graft exists. That is a serious charge and should be itemized. We cannot lightly charge General Fleming's administration of graft without being able to prove it. It is the gentleman's public duty to tell what graft he found, if any.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; we will let the committee report cover that, along with the testimony presented.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman to enlarge on it? He surely has not made so grave an indictment without being able to prove it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let the official record and report speak for itself. I am willing to stand on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But as the gentleman knows it does not speak for itself. It does not charge graft, but the gentleman does. If the gentleman will not answer that question, may I ask this one: Is the gentleman in favor of the appropriation of the $7,000,000 or does he oppose it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. At the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; at this time in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in favor of it on this condition: That if this debate serves warning on Puerto Rico that from here on we are going to expect them to take funds from their own treasury; yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he favors the appropriation of the $7,000,000 as provided by the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If they are going to take warning from this that we are going to expect them to help support themselves as a part of their own domestic economy, I am willing to let it go through, but otherwise not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is what I wanted to know—if the gentleman, after visiting the island, is willing to support the $7,000,000 until the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which he is a member, has presented its report on permanent legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am bringing this up for discussion at this time to get the House thinking on the whole subject.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman really believe in his own heart that any substantial good can be given to Puerto Rico with this money as long as the political philosophy of the present administration down there, meaning Tugwell's philosophy if you please, persists? In his own heart does he believe it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not going to make a political discussion out of this matter. What I am dealing with here is how far do we propose to subsidize the Puerto Rican treasury in addition to the great military expenditures we are now making, along with the enormous flow of income which is coming into the insular treasury by reason of these situations to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD following the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Michigan, for whom I have the greatest respect. It has been my honor and pleasure to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs which recently went to Puerto Rico to investigate conditions there and I want to take this opportunity to thank every member of that subcommittee for the splendid cooperation they gave in every manner. I think if there has ever been a committee that worked without any partisan feeling it has been this committee. We did not know whether we were Republicans or Democrats; we went down there and tried to do our duty as Members of this House to get all of the pertinent information as to what was going on there in order that we might come back and in due time make a report and give Congress the real facts so that this Congress might exercise its judgment as to what is the best legislation to pass with reference to Puerto Rico and its effect upon the United States as well as Puerto Rico. I wish I had a longer period of time in which to outline the situation.

With reference to the $7,000,000 item which is before us today I think we ought to leave that in the bill as it is; I think we ought to pass that item, and I will tell you why: There has been some question as to whether or not funds were improperly used or whether there was graft exercised in their use. I think the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who just spoke will agree with me that there was no evidence of any graft so far as the W. P. A. officials were concerned. I think sincerely that Members on both sides of this subcommittee had the feeling that of all the agencies, W. P. A., as represented by General Fleming, has done a good job there.

On the question as to the necessity for its continuance beyond this 5-month period I will in turn agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I was against giving them $50,000,000 before we went down there, and upon returning I am still of the same opinion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Are we not sticking our neck out to give them $7,000,000 at this time when they have such a large island revenue, from $75,000,000 to $80,000,000—a revenue higher per capita than that of any State in the United States?

Mr. BELL. On the surface that would appear to be so, but if one studies and analyzes the situation one will find that the revenues for the months to come have been allocated to certain plants and projects. W. P. A. down there is finishing up certain projects which are necessary to the war effort, some of them very necessary.

Mr. TABER. But they are more important in that they take help away from the farmers and take help from the private employer, destroying the economy of the island.

Mr. BELL. I am inclined to believe that the continuation of this program in its limited form for another 5 months is a matter of winding it up down there in an orderly manner and will not interfere with the economy of the island. I feel just as the gentleman does that we do not want to spend any money down there that is going to interfere with private industry. I am just as much opposed to that as the gentleman is, but I do feel that with respect to these projects which have been started we as a Congress ought to permit them to be finished in an orderly manner and that is what this $7,000,000 appropriation is for, to conclude the thing in an orderly manner and to wind up an agency which has been doing that work down there.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that the Insular Legislature in Puerto Rico at its last session passed one of the stiffest tax bills in the history of the island?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the food crisis is so real, so serious, that we of the Congress must act and act promptly. We face an inevitable food shortage

due mainly to the mishandling of our food program. There simply will not be enough food for our men in uniform, our allies, the people whom we may rescue from Nazi rule, and our own people at home.

It is too late to increase food production for this year. The administration has failed to heed the repeated warning of an impending food shortage. Before we entered this war representatives of agriculture appealed to the President to regard food as important as planes, ships, and guns, and to encourage maximum food production. Not only was nothing done to give us more food but the policies adopted restricted and discouraged production and brought about the present alarming situation. Forcing down prices by regulation discourages production and depresses the morale among producers. When the supply of any product is decreased by low-price ceilings, prices are forced up by the law of supply and demand, creating unlimited black markets.

The attempt to roll back butter prices under a subsidy has brought about the sale of so much butter to Government agencies that cold-storage warehouses are packed to overflowing, so the supply of butter for the public has been distinctly cut by the roll-back method.

Today, when there is a shortage on meat, four small packing plants in my congressional district are closed because they cannot operate under the O. P. A. price-ceiling regulation. Feeders cannot get corn for their cattle. Poultry raisers cannot get feed for their baby chicks. Proteins are difficult to procure. Bakeries are crying for corn sirup, corn products, and starch. Policies now being followed have brought about the slaughtering of milk cows that cannot be replaced in 3 years, and a milk famine is predicted in our larger cities this coming winter.

Our food supply must not be manipulated by politicians for the purpose of winning votes. Food production and distribution should be placed in the control of one competent individual whose sole purpose will be to give the American people more food at fair prices. He must know food production and distributing problems, and must be a practical man free from the restrictions and interference of New Deal theorists, and he must be blanketed with all-out authority to do the job. The manipulations of our impractical bureaucrats, who know nothing about our food problem, are making the situation worse. We need an immediate house cleaning to bring order out of chaos.

The people are looking to Congress to deal with this food problem vigorously and immediately. Food is a basic war weapon. The effective solution of the food problem will have an important bearing upon the outcome of the war and upon the health and morale of the people of this country. The hour is growing late, and we have no time to lose.

H. J. Haskell has written a book entitled "The New Deal in Old Rome." Facts are recorded in history back in the year 301. Late in the third century, the anarchy was ended by an able soldier and administrator; Diocletian, with army backing, became the dictator, reorganized the government, and stabilized the currency on what he believed was a sound basis. Unfortunately, like some modern rulers facing a similiar problem, he overvalued his new monetary unit. Prices promptly responded with a violent rise. Diocletian recognized the suffering that resulted, but naturally did not understand the cause. In 301, he issued his famous edict setting maximum prices and wages. The act had the death penalty for evasion. It read like modern orders.

The civil service had so expanded that a contemporary wrote, with disgusted exaggeration, that half the men in the nation were on the government pay roll. There were plenty of inspectors, but this early attempt at price fixing failed. It is recorded that businessmen closed their shops, that many articles of commerce disappeared, and that food riots resulted.

A few years later, we read the obituary of the act. For merest trifles blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse until the law was repealed from mere necessity.

This, history records as of the year 301. It could be 1943.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in the debate on this bill on the question of subsidies and also about the probable amount of meat we have in the United States which is available for our civilian population, our armed forces, and for lend-lease. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in his lengthy and very interesting address indicates that we have sufficient meat on hand. Others who have spoken on the subject also indicate that we have plenty of meat. I wish to enter the debate from a different viewpoint and on behalf of the farmers who feed cattle, farmers who for half a century have been in the livestock-feeding business, farmers and producers who have furnished to us millions upon millions of pounds of beef and pork. I wish to differ from those who have spoken so often on the subject of supply. From what they have said, it would seem there is nothing to the meat problem except transportation and distribution. Of course, that has much to do with our farm problem. Let me give you the other side of the picture. Let me tell you the side of the farmer who feeds cattle and finishes them for the market. There is a tremendous expense for feed and care of these cattle before they are finished. The price these feeders get for this finished meat today is too low to allow them to stay in business. Under present conditions they cannot get even the cost of production. They are operating at a loss. The spread must be wider so far as finished beef is concerned. This subsidy and roll-back program is affecting these great producers to such an extent that I fear many of them are being forced to quit business.

Recently I called attention of this House to the case of one feeder in my district. This farmer has been in the feeding business for 25 years. He has always had around 1,000 head of cattle on feed in his yards. Today he probably has not one critter in the yards. He just cannot operate under present conditions. He just has to quit. On yesterday I presented to the House the resolution of 700 feeders and producers who met at Fremont, Nebr., indicating that they cannot operate nor can they continue in the feeding business any longer unless help comes to them at once. I presented to you a telegram from 97 feeders in Cedar County, one of the 24 counties in my district, who say they, too, fear a deep decrease in meat production unless some stabilized program is adopted at once. I have presented to you the reports from many other feeders in my district who have the same thing to tell you. They, too, are pleading for some immediate help. They do not fear any overproduction of meat. They have a different story to tell about meat supplies as compared to the stories told here about the tremendous stocks of available meat. These feeders are patriotic. They know that food is needed to win this war and they are anxious to produce it. They cannot do it under the roll-back and subsidy program. They want a stabilized program which will permit them to stay in business. Otherwise you are going to allow the destruction of a great meat-producing business upon which we must depend for badly needed food. These great producers who always take great chances in this business want to continue to furnish food.

I call your attention to the fact that the House Agriculture Committee has passed out a bill which will help the situation. It is known as the Fulmer bill. This legislation should pass before we recess here because it will help the farmers and producers of meat. It will help these feeders who are threatened with destruction. Also we will have on tomorrow the Wolcott amendment to H. R. 2869 which would eliminate this subsidy and roll-back program. I believe this measure, too, would help the producers of meat. I urge quick consideration of these measures because they represent the only pieces of legislation we now have and which will answer the demands of the producers who are so much concerned over the new price and food programs which have been inaugurated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all our name calling in connection with the discussion of world affairs I am wondering where our statesmen were when Mussolini was boiling the Ethiopians in oil and I wonder who furnished Mussolini the oil to burn the Ethiopians in? There was not too much protest from anybody about that procedure. One's hindsight is so much better than one's foresight.

In regard to this meat situation it does not do you or I or anyone else any particular good to get up here day after day

and continually repeat criticism of the O. P. A., without a constructive suggestion to offer. Most everyone is familiar with the facts and the causes of this meat shortage. The question is, Is there anything we can do about it? What are we going to do about it?

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Agricultural Committee, has a bill which has passed through that committee, a bill that in his opinion—and a large majority of the committee members think the same way—will help correct this situation as far as meat is concerned. I want to say that there are absolutely no politics in it. If anyone wants to make politics out of it, they will have to accept the responsibility. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has lived up to his responsibility. He has the bill out of the committee and it is now up to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee can now assume their responsibility, and so can the other individuals and bodies whose approval is needed to translate this legislation into law.

I maintain there is no use to continually blame the O. P. A. and then do nothing to correct the situation in a legislative way. The Fulmer bill is an attempt to take the confusion out of food production and place the responsibility in the hands of one man and one food agency. The Fulmer bill is a constructive approach to the war food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that if we continue this W. P. A. proposition down in Puerto Rico it means the absolute and complete destruction of all private employment in those islands. I have listened to statements by different members of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs who went down there. I am satisfied that those people in charge of the government of that island are out to wreck the economy of that island and unless we stand up here and limit the operations of the W. P. A. down there so that they cannot continue to break down private employment, it is gone and there is no hope for its recovery.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Speaking about the policy of government down there, let me read from this: American Economic Review, volume XXII, No. 1, supplement March 1932, papers and proceedings of the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Economic Association. Beginning on page 75 there is an article under the heading, The principle of planning and the institute of laissez faire, by R. G. Tugwell, Columbia University. On page 89 he states:

> The next series of changes will have to do with industry itself. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. That is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis. It is literally meant.

Then on page 86, in the footnote, he states:

> When industry is governed and government is industry, the dual conflict deepest in our modern institutions will be abated.

That was Dr. Tugwell's philosophy, apparently as stated by him at that time.

Mr. TABER. That is just the situation that he is trying to create in Puerto Rico. He is now spending $2,000,000 of the money out of their own treasury to build a glass factory. The entire outfit is run without any efficiency or economy of business stability and I do not believe that I am going to neglect my duty here on the floor to offer an amendment to clear up that situation in order to try to make them do the things that they ought to do.

I have not the time to go into details. I have here in my hand an example of the way they perform. The Food Administration, as I understand it, sent down there from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 worth of food in the last year. How have they treated it? I have here in my hand the report indicating that the Food Administration has sent down there a great lot of red kidney beans and white beans that are now rationed by our Government, through the Office of Price Administration, and that they have allowed them to spoil rather than distribute them to the people. If there is trouble, it is the trouble of incompetent and improper administration, it is not the trouble of not having enough money. If we continue this W. P. A. in Puerto Rico, we are placing a curse upon the people of Puerto Rico from which it will take generations to recover. I hope the House will not be a party to this degenerate performance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including an additional $5,000 for employment of expert examiners, and actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, $81,600: *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be contingent upon the enactment into law of the bill (H. R. 1025) entitled "An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a Board of Legal Examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is an appropriation not authorized by law. There is absolutely no legislation authorizing this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding, Civil Service Commission: For an additional amount for printing and binding, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, $5,000: *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be contingent upon the enactment into law of the bill (H. R. 1025) entitled "An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a Board of Legal Examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands", approved June —, 1943, during the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending November 30, 1943, $7,000,000, of which not to exceed $350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the items of expenditure specified in section 14 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943: *Provided*, That employees of the Work Projects Administration in active duty status on June 30, 1943, may, in the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator, be transferred to and paid from this appropriation without the necessity of further appointment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 7, line 11, after "June", insert "22."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 7, line 6, strike out "Puerto Rico."

On page 7, in line 12, strike out "$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

On page 7, line 13, strike out "$350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in favor of the amendment. However, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] advises me that he has an appointment shortly and he would like to precede me, so I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to precede me in speaking on this amendment, and I reserve my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York in his remarks a little while ago seemed to have the feeling that if we pass this bill carrying the $7,000,000 it might have

a tendency to set aside the traditional way of life in Puerto Rico and the capitalistic system and all that sort of thing.

I think every Member of the House who knows me knows there is no Member of the House who is more firm than I in his belief in our traditional form of government. I believe in the capitalistic system that our forefathers left to us. As far as I am given strength of mind and body, as long as I am a Member of this body I am going to fight and contend for those sacred things our forefathers gave us when they gave us the Constitution of the United States and our present form of government.

On the other hand, in regard to this particular item, I believe that in furtherance of an orderly manner of closing up the W. P. A. down there we ought to go ahead and pass this $7,000,000 item. I have a feeling that it is the orderly way to do it. There are certain projects there which have to do with our national defense that ought to be finished up.

My distinguished colleague from Michigan said something about graft down there. I know he did not intend to imply there was any graft in the management of the W. P. A. down there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. BELL. I knew that was the gentleman's opinion, but I merely wanted to clear it up for the body, because the W. P. A. down there, I think, has been handled in a fine manner.

As I said a moment ago, I believe that what we ought to do is to continue this limited program until they have an opportunity to wind it up. I think 5 months is a short time in which to do that. I think the President of the United States acted very wisely when by Executive order he ordered the closing up of W. P. A. all over the United States. I rejoice that he did it. I think he left the W. P. A. open in Puerto Rico because of the fact that he felt there was a special condition down there. It is one of our military outposts. There are certain things that ought to be done. So I am leaving it to you gentlemen to go ahead and pass this $7,000,000 item.

I want to serve warning that when this item is passed, it is the last item I expect to vote for for W. P. A. down in Puerto Rico. I think that when this thing is closed up the W. P. A. should be closed up down there the same as it is here.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is clear now that this is the last item under W. P. A.?

Mr. BELL. I am speaking for myself. I am not speaking for anybody else.

Mr. CHURCH. I mean, the gentleman understands that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are the only places we are still attempting to vote W. P. A. money for?

Mr. BELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is acquainted with the graft and the theft, not under General Fleming in this particular case, no, but in the administration hertofore of W. P. A. Is not the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. BELL. I do not care to get into a general discussion of W. P. A. in the United States, because that is a closed issue, but I will say that W. P. A. as operated under General Fleming I think has been operated honestly and carefully down there, because I have been down there and I have found no evidence to the contrary. I know General Fleming to be an able executive. I think he is thoroughly, beyond any question, an honorable man. I know his work down there is above reproach.

Mr. CHURCH. And does not the gentleman feel that it approaches reckless theft of the taxpayers' money to appropriate this $7,000,000.

Mr. BELL. No; I would not say that at all. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot be a party to permitting an appropriation for the continuance of the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico. Here is the story. They have now in sight a tax revenue of $75,000,000 to $80,000,000 a year. That is more per capita than the State of New York, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Illinois, the State of Texas, or the State of Massachusetts or any other State in the United States. Why is it that with that enormous revenue they are unable to meet their own demands? The mismanagement down there of their affairs has been such, as the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CRAWFORD, has told you, that men who were supposed to be working on a farm left their jobs and went down into the W. P. A. employment in place after place and farm after farm. I say to you that unless you want to destroy completely the entire economic set-up of these islands, and of that island, it is absolutely necessary that we discontinue the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico. I leave funds in here for the operation of the Virgin Islands, perhaps leaving too much. There is nothing in the evidence to show how much it was for one and how much for the other.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why did the committee leave $350,000 as administrative expense of the $7,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Because the Public Works Administration asked for $8,000,000 for the job. They asked for $400,000 out of this for administrative expenses. The committee made a cut of $1,000,000, and they cut the administrative expenses a like percentage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it is 5 percent?

Mr. TABER. Five percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have not had access to the figures given to the Committee on Appropriations, but it seems to me that that is awfully high.

Mr. TABER. It is altogether too high. It is ridiculous, like the whole thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of what has been said on the floor, I certainly feel that should be reduced anywhere from $100,000 to $200,000, without hurting the program at all.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand I think this whole Puerto Rican W. P. A. proposition should be eliminated, and that is what I ask the House to do, to save six and a half million dollars.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in part when he refers to the present government that we have been having in Puerto Rico in the last 2 years under Dr. Tugwell. Really the Puerto Ricans have been suffering from a most tyrannical and rotten government under the direction of Dr. Tugwell. Under Governor Tugwell democracy is a shallow word. He has also been taking Puerto Rico as a guinea pig for his crackpot experiments, that are regimenting and ruining agriculture, industry, and commerce, and are a scare for private enterprise. I have been opposing and protesting against Dr. Tugwell for 2 long years, speaking on behalf of the majority of the Puerto Ricans, who do not want Dr. Tugwell there, and speaking on behalf of agriculture, commerce, industry, and labor in Puerto Rico who are opposing Governor Tugwell and requesting his removal.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman really believe that there is any real hope for a successful program for Puerto Rico as long as Dr. Tugwell or his philosophy prevails in the government of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. No; I do not have any hope as long as Dr. Tugwell is Governor of Puerto Rico, and I hope that soon Puerto Rico will be rid of Tugwell. To put Tugwell out would be democratic and fair to the Puerto Rican people. They do not want him there.

Mr. CHURCH. I read awhile ago some of the philosophy of Dr. Tugwell. Here is some more of it, if you will pardon me. In the Battle for Democracy, by Rexford G. Tugwell, professor of economics, Columbia University, published in 1935 by the Columbia University Press, he stated on page 19:

> This will perhaps explain what President Roosevelt meant when he spoke of this new system of relationship as governmental partnership with industry. The phrase is precise. The Government, however, is the senior and controlling partner.

These statements of Dr. Tugwell indicate his philosophy. Its effect is to destroy private industry and to destroy jobs for these people. He is now putting Government more and more in charge of industry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think the gentleman's attention should be called to the fact that Dr. Tugwell has absolutely

nothing to do with this proposition. This is a matter exclusively under the jurisdiction and administration of General Fleming.

Mr. TABER. But he has to do with the operation of the revenue.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I say this appropriation has nothing to do with the administration of Dr. Tugwell. So I oppose the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The authorization for this appropriation is already a law, and was approved unanimously a few days ago by the Senate and the House.

The present situation in Puerto Rico is very critical. A committee of Members of this House that recently went down there to investigate conditions can tell you how difficult are our economic problems. While here in the mainland there is labor shortage, in Puerto Rico more than one-half of our workers are unemployed. We have more than 3,000 workers unemployed. We have no war industries at all. Agriculture and industry are practically wrecked, mostly due to lack of transportation. The shipping shortage, due to the war situation, has been very acute. Shortage in shipping has been the cause for shutting down industries and for reduction in planting and harvesting our agricultural crops, producing great widespread unemployment.

The tax collections in Puerto Rico, mentioned before, are mostly for certain trust funds, which by law are tied for other purposes. The insular government of Puerto Rico has appropriated some amounts to help the unemployed through relief and public works, but it is not enough, because of lack of sufficient funds.

May I state also that a great part of the appropriation provided in the bill, as was stated by W. P. A. officials at the hearings, is to be devoted for works for malaria control and other health and sanitation purposes in districts close to the naval and military establishments in Puerto Rico, to protect the health of the naval and Army troops in Puerto Rico during the war.

I think that the people of Puerto Rico, under present circumstances, are entitled to this aid. In normal times, under other circumstances, I would not ask for such aid. The United States have certain moral responsibility with the people of Puerto Rico, with about 2,000,000 loyal American citizens, which they hardly can evade.

I hope that the amendment is rejected.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURLEY. Is it true that the $7,000,000 is earmarked for health and sanitary measures of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. It was so stated by the officials of the W. P. A. who testified at the hearings.

Mr. CURLEY. And in the gentleman's judgment it cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr. PAGÁN. Yes.

Mr. CURLEY. And it is admitted by everyone that large sums of money are necessary for the protection and preservation of the health of the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. PAGÁN. And also for the health protection of the naval and military troops stationed now in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CURLEY. So that Dr. Tugwell would have nothing to do with the expenditure?

Mr. PAGÁN. Absolutely not. If Dr. Tugwell were to have anything to do with it I would be the first to oppose it.

Mr. CURLEY. So that irrespective of the views of Dr. Tugwell, the gentleman is in agreement with the committee that this appropriation is absolutely vital and necessary to the people of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. I agree with the gentleman, it is absolutely vital and necessary.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Neither the Navy nor the War Department have asked for this appropriation of funds to be used to help any of their projects in Puerto Rico, under the W. P. A. or the P. W. A. Is that not right? They have adequate funds to carry out their own projects?

Mr. PAGÁN. I answer the gentleman that in the hearings before the Senate committee, when a similar bill was discussed, the officials of the W. P. A. testified that a great amount of this money was being spent on works for health and sanitation purposes, in districts close to the Army and Navy Establishments in Puerto Rico which were absolutely necessary to protect the health of the troops stationed in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CHURCH. I understand that the representatives of P. W. A., carrying out these W. P. A. projects, have represented that they can use some of it in the localities; yes. But the Navy and the War Departments have adequate funds to carry out every project that they have down there, and they do not want the W. P. A. leaf-raking around these projects. I am anxious to help Puerto Ricans help themselves.

Mr. PAGÁN. The Navy and War Departments do not oppose this appropriation, they favor it.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. For the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois, 65 percent of the projects have been approved by the Army or the Navy. With all deference to his leaf-raking program, he is all off color on this. Sixty-five percent have been approved by the Army or the Navy as assisting in the war effort.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to page 61 of the hearings, where Mr. Field, testifying in behalf of this appropriation, said:

> Then we have a malarial control project which the Army wants us to expand. Malaria has broken out in a virulent form and the Army is back of that project. Ten percent of the soldiers down there have malaria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at some limitation on time for debate on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the use of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think we should clarify the issues here a little.

I had the privilege of going to Puerto Rico with the committee. While I do not have time to go into the problems that exist there at this time, I wish to call attention to a few facts as I saw them.

In the first place, the Insular Affairs Committee of the House reported an authorization for $8,000,000 to be expended by W. P. A. during the next 5 months. This was reported out unanimously and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is a member of that committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman voted against it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am not yielding. If there is any question about my statement, read the report of the committee. The gentleman is a member of that committee and we reported that bill from the Insular Affairs Committee of the House unanimously.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman voted against it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I decline to yield. I am a member of that committee. The bill went to the Senate. The Senate reported $8,000,000 for this purpose, unanimously, on the theory that a committee was going down there to make a report on the conditions on the island, and then some decision would be made as to what should be done in the future with this island. Your committee has been down there. They appeared before you today. The chairman of the committee urges you to pass this appropriation of $7,000,000, which is a cut of $1,000,000 by the Committee on Appropriations. The ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], came before you and urged you to pass it. I went down there with the committee and I want to tell you people in this House that in my opinion there could be no greater piece of injustice or inhumanity against some of our citizens than the denial of this amount that is asked here at this time. It would

be outrageous. It would be inhuman. It would be unjust. These people have some rights. They are our citizens.

Here is what they are doing with the money. At the present time they are building roads, with practically all of this money. If that is cut off you would have some of the roads that are the most important roads on the island in such shape that they cannot be used, and there is no money to proceed with them.

The money that is spoken of here in the treasury of the insular government is almost entirely tied up in various funds—trust funds and otherwise. There is no money they can get for this particular use. Not only that, but I myself talked with a number of people on this question—men who are opposed to Mr. Tugwell. He is no problem here. I do not see why he should be dragged into this argument. Many of these laws were passed before he became Governor. It is an interesting thing that a great many of these measures that are called socialistic were passed by unanimous consent of the Legislature of Puerto Rico. The whole island wanted these measures. It is not a matter that concerns Tugwell. Tugwell only has veto power. In my opinion, while I do not have any great brief for Rex Tugwell, I think he is doing a fine job at the present time. I want to tell this House there has been some mention of graft and corruption and such things, but there is not one scintilla of evidence in all the evidence taken before this committee that indicates any graft or any corruption at all. That will be shown by your committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon the Member from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] stated in substance, if I understood her correctly, that she did not agree with any of the dunderheads on either side of the aisle.

Now, in view of the fact that a book was published last fall, around about election time, which gave a list of the dunderheads, so-called, I would be glad to have the Member put her list of the Members of Congress she considers dunderheads in to see how the two lists compare with each other. I have never regarded any of my colleagues on either side as either dumbheads, dunderheads, or dumbbells.

With reference to this matter of Puerto Rico: The President issued a statement yesterday in connection with the coal strike and down in the last paragraph in one of the papers I find this language:

> As the Selective Service Act does not authorize the induction of men above 45 years into the armed services, I intend to request the Congress to raise the age limit for noncombatant military service to 65 years. I shall make that request of the Congress so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government—

Note, "owned by the Government"—

> the machinery will be available for prompt action.

Being ignorant of the establishments, plants, and mines which are owned by the Government, as distinguished from those which are operated, I am asking the chairman of the committee how many, if any, establishments owned by the Government we have in Puerto Rico or any other of the Territories covered by this bill or the appropriations in this bill.

Will the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee answer that question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many establishments, plants, or mines does the Government own that would receive a portion of the funds carried by this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain what he means by his inquiry? Does he mean Army and Navy Establishments?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the President said in this statement that he wants authority to draft all men up to 65 years of age, so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government, the machinery will be available for prompt action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if he will explain to me what if any reference his inquiry has to the appropriation of the $7,000,000?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that this $7,000,000 is to go to Puerto Rico or some of the different Territories, and my inquiry is, Does the statement of the President apply to any work that is being carried on in such Territories?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean Naval or Army Establishment? It has nothing at all to do with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; you do not understand my inquiry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It has nothing at all to do with it and I do not see the connection between the gentleman's inquiry and the item under discussion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The connection is that the President wants to put men in the Army and to use them in plants and establishments owned by the Government if the need arises.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The President made no statement about Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President refers to plants owned by the Government and he did not limit it to plants, establishments, or mines in the continental United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield, if the gentleman can answer the inquiry.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As an illustration, let us take the cement plant just outside of San Juan, which was financed through funds appropriated from the Federal Treasury approved by this House, through the so-called Puerto Rican Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which funds were used for the purpose of building the plant. Now I would ask the gentleman, with his legal knowledge, does he construe that to be a plant owned by the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally, I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am trying to learn the answer to this for one thing: Does the Government own the rum plant in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal Government through its agency owns the rum plant; the Federal Government through its agency owns the cement plant, but I do not know whether the President meant plants thus owned through Government corporations would come under the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the question I am asking; that is what I would like to know specifically. Just what did the President mean; just what did he include when he said plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government. Did he mean that the Government considers itself the owner as distinguished from the operator of the mines? And did he mean that he expects the Government to own mines, plants, and establishments in the near future?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUDLOW. I should have hoped that every Member of the House might have had an opportunity to read the hearings on this matter before being called upon to vote. The situation in Puerto Rico is very bad indeed, and, while I know it is true that we have been very generous to Puerto Rico, the fact remains that we have been generous to people all around the world. We are giving food at the present time to an untold number of people in Africa and in other parts of the globe. These people down in Puerto Rico are our people; they are citizens of the United States, and they are under the American flag. The war has brought about some very serious economic repercussions in Puerto Rico; there is no doubt about that; it has multiplied their woes enormously.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that instead of the war it is the Tugwell administration that has wrecked their economy?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the Tugwell administration has had a good deal to do with it, yes; but I do not think we ought to dwell upon the Tugwell administration in seeking to appraise the economic situation in Puerto Rico; we should look at the humane features of this proposition and try to do something for our own citizens who are loyal members of the American Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As to the Tugwell situation, he did not go into office until 1942 and this island was in a worse condition prior to that time than it has been since.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think Tugwell and Tugwellism have done considerable injury to the political system of Puerto Rico, but I cannot imagine he has had anything to do with bringing about these very serious economic conditions which we are trying to cope with here in this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The fact of the matter is that Puerto Rico's economy during the 45 years the island has been in our possession has never amounted to much due to the fact it has been subjected to our high tariff walls, our shipping monopoly, and whenever Puerto Rico attempted to develop an industry of its own, because of our shipping monopoly and our high tariff walls, we have gone down there and dumped goods to wipe out any industry in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I have not time to do anything but sketchily review the evidence here. If, however, you will read General Fleming's testimony he says the unemployment situation is very bad in Puerto Rico and the submarine menace has been bad, very bad, and the entire situation is very distressing.

The gentleman from Illinois raised the question as to whether the Army and the Navy is interested in any projects down there. I should like to call his attention to page 61 of the hearings where Mr. George H. Field, the Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Works Agency, testified. He said:

> We have a malarial-control project which the Army wants us to expand.

He testifies further that they have more cases of malaria in Puerto Rico in a year than in the whole continental United States. He testifies further that in June 10 percent of all the soldiers down in Puerto Rico were afflicted with malaria. There are some things we can do and should do for humanity's sake to help the people of Puerto Rico. One thing we can do, and one thing we have been doing, is to keep 160,000 little children from suffering the pangs of hunger. Surely that is something worthwhile.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the only place that Governor Tugwell has in this argument is that of a "red herring" to be dragged across the trail. The argument here is: Are you interested in the feeding of 160,000 children? Or will you abandon them to hunger? Are you interested in seeing what you can do to prevent further tuberculosis? Or do you just want to walk out on your duty? This is the real argument. It is easy enough to drag a "red herring" around here, but it is quite another thing to face the picture.

Fourteen thousand of these Americans down there are in the armed forces of our country today. Perhaps if they had had better food there would be more of them physically fit to serve in the armed forces. Look at the hearings, page 61, and find the answer to questions raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]:

> Sixty-five percent of the people working on our projects are on projects certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as being important for their purposes; and that includes not only road work but other types of construction work.

There are unemployed 250,000 people who are asking for food—asking us for food. We live in a country that has recognized the conditions of the world. Our lend-lease program proves that. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would walk out on the very people——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Not now.

Mr. TABER. But the gentleman referred to me.

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield until I have finished my statement.

If you want to follow the gentleman from New York you will walk out on some of our own under-the-American-flag citizens, while we talk about helping the people of the world. Two hundred and fifty thousand of those people are unemployed. Forty-one thousand only are on W. P. A. The difference is in excess of 209,000. These are the facts—not a Tugwell "red herring" drawn across the trail.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman was present, if I remember correctly, when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] spoke.

Mr. RABAUT. I was; and I complimented him on his remarks.

Mr. TABER. And the gentleman from Mississippi indicated that there was no substantial unemployment there.

Mr. RABAUT. Did what?

Mr. TABER. Indicated that there was no substantial unemployment there.

Mr. RABAUT. As I remember his testimony he said there was unemployment. A person can take one or two sentences here and there and get a distorted view—but his general testimony before the committee was that this assistance should be given.

I quote from the testimony of my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] from page 101 of the hearings on the bill:

> A subcommittee of the House Committee on Insular Affairs was sent to Puerto Rico to make an investigation and report back their recommendations to the Congress for the future handling of the affairs of Puerto Rico.
>
> The placing of a limitation of 5 months in this bill is a stopgap which would allow sufficient time for this subcommittee to make its investigation and report to the Congress.
>
> It developed in our hearings that there is quite a large number of unemployed in Puerto Rico.

Moreover, the original amount was $8,000,000, approved by the Senate, which this committee reduced to $7,000,000.

It is a stopgap appropriation. It runs for 5 months and it amounts to $1,400,000 a month. Two hundred and fifty thousand people are asking for food, and they are Americans.

What is this House thinking about? That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard here this afternoon statements on this legislation that causes us to reminisce and reflect back over the last few years, because all of us have watched this relief program grow. We have again been told by inference that unless we make appropriations and do certain things blood would run in the gutters and the people would kick in the windows of the shops and that people would starve.

I can remember the experience back in my own State of Illinois. I can remember investigations which we made into relief conditions and at one particular place we found 1,250 families on relief and upon investigation we found that 431 of them had employment. We found that the percentage of fraud ran from 30 to 60 percent of all those who were receiving assistance, and this was true in every section we checked. We found that our State was becoming a mecca for those who wanted to obtain something for nothing. We found that as soon as we spread out this bounty there were those who came from all over the Nation to get it, and I know you will find the same condition to exist wherever public relief is passed out. It has happened in Puerto Rico, according to this testimony.

We have been told that the people from the hill country of Puerto Rico come down and take employment on W. P. A. because they can probably earn more than working upon the farms of their particular community. We are told that politics has no effect on its administration and I hope it does not, and we are told that Tugwell has nothing to do with it, and I wish to commend him if such is the case, because if that is true he is the first Governor in the history of the Nation that I know of who has not dabbled at some time or other in W. P. A. We have seen it work; we know what has happened. I am informed by a member of the committee, and if I am wrong I should like to be corrected, that there has been some $16,000,000 appropriated by Puerto Rico for the relief of its indigent, yet they ask for this $7,000,000.

To stop the influx of transients into my State I helped to enact into law a 3-year residence law which requires a residence of 3 years in order to obtain relief. We also made it mandatory for a man upon relief, if he was physically able, to work and earn the amount of his budget, and as soon as that went into effect the relief rolls went down very substantially.

I believe sincerely that if this appropriation is removed you will find those

who are now receiving the relief will return to the farms and places where they were formerly employed or where they earned their own livelihood by cultivating the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I desire to restrict my argument at this time to the question of need, and I use as my authority one whose integrity is beyond the realm of impeachment, one who is respected and accepted as an excellent administrator. I refer to Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, who is the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. He said as far back as April 26 that "the unemployment crisis in Puerto Rico is more severe than it was in continental United States at the depth of the depression." He also said that "about half of the population is in great need." He stated further that "complete economic collapse has been prevented only by assistance from the Federal Government."

According to the chairman of another investigating committee, Senator CHAVEZ, "unemployment is increasing" and "local industries are practically at a standstill."

It has been estimated that there are unemployed in Puerto Rico, at various periods, between 225,000 and 325,000 people, affecting 165,000 families. These are facts and no amount of hocus-pocus can conceal them. Yet we are urged to eliminate this $7,000,000 appropriation, a mere pittance for the relief of a good and honest people who are the victims of the worst evils of colonialism.

Let me point out to you, gentlemen, that the Latin-American people of South and Central America have a strong feeling of kinship toward the people on the island of Puerto Rico who are also Latin Americans. There are 100,000,000 Latin Americans who are watching the United States, following closely the manner in which we treat the people of Puerto Rico, the people who live on what we call the Gibraltar of the Caribbean, which guards the entrance to the Western Hemisphere. Despite this vital factor in this war you seek to deny the people of Puerto Rico $7,000,000 to relieve their unemployment in a slight degree, and you do so by heaping insults upon them, and by misinformation, and misrepresentation of the facts.

Now let me for a moment deal with the question of ownership, the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan. He wanted to know about ownership in Puerto Rico. Let me give you some figures. Fifty percent of the sugar land is absentee-owned by four big United States corporations. I will give you their names: The Fajardo Sugar Co., the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., the Eastern Puerto Rico Associates, and the Centrale Aguirre Co. Another 26 percent is also in the hands of absentee owners. The American centrales control 41 mills. The sugar industry comprises 40 percent of farm acreage, 56 percent of the value of all farm lands and buildings, and 60 percent of the exports. It employs 50 percent of the agricultural workers. Is the present plight of Puerto Rico's agriculture the fault of the people of Puerto Rico?

Why is there unemployment in Puerto Rico? Because first of all we have never permitted Puerto Rico to develop an industry of its own. In Puerto Rico, had they ever attempted to develop any kind of an industry, it would soon have been destroyed by those who now exploit the people of Puerto Rico.

For the past 45 years Puerto Rico, under the complete control of the United States, has been prevented from developing its own industry. High tariff walls have excluded the island from other world markets. This fact and the coastwise-shipping laws which forced Puerto Rico to do its commerce under ships flying the American flag at exorbitant rates, have made the island almost wholly dependent on the United States for its food and essential supplies and for the marketing of its cash products. Puerto Rico has been our colonial possession from which we have drained a rich abundance of raw material but have not permitted to develop an island industry which would guarantee the well-being of her people. Under such a system of colonial exploitation Puerto Rico has not and cannot ever hope to develop a sound national economy which will guarantee the Puerto Rican people employment, good health, and decent standards of living. That is why the problem of immediate political independence and self-determination for Puerto Rico is a matter of such basic importance. There can be no hope of effective industrialization of Puerto Rico without Puerto Rican independence.

Let the investigators also tell you that Puerto Rico has a one-crop economy, sugar, a diabetic economy. Because of this large ownership of land concentrated in the four corporations I have just mentioned it has been impossible for the Government and the people of Puerto Rico to take farm land and use it for a subsistence-crop program, use it to raise a few things with which to feed their families.

I have often wondered whose ideas have been voiced when I have heard arguments against Puerto Rico similar to those expressed on the floor of the House today. I have wondered if these arguments have not been the ideas of the sugar trust which has little if any regard for the well-being of the Puerto Rican people.

I am not suggesting the destruction of the sugar industry. I am suggesting the simple formula of diversified agriculture, a subsistence crop program, use of marginal and other unused land, to develop an adequate food supply for the Puerto Rican people. The sugar trust with its monopoly of land has prevented this rational approach to the problem.

Instead for Puerto Rico and her people it has been sugar, low wages, and exploitation. Then you stand up here and base your argument against appropriating $7,000,000 for the relief of these people on the ground that these people are diseased, they are lazy, they want to get away from the farms to seek W. P. A. wages. It is nonsense, sheer nonsense, and you use it to alibi a system of colonialism which shames the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Commissioner from Puerto Rico if it is not a fact that the insular government has appropriated some $16,000,000 for relief during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. PAGÁN. I do not think that is the correct figure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the gentleman think it is?

Mr. PAGÁN. They have appropriated all possible amounts to help the unemployment there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know whether or not they are preparing to spend any of those amounts they have appropriated, or have they spent any of them?

Mr. PAGÁN. They have spent some.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How much?

Mr. PAGÁN. I cannot tell the gentleman the exact amount, but I know they have spent nearly $3,000,000; but that is not a sufficient amount to take care of 300,000 families.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that, but what I want to get into the record, if the gentleman will give us the figures, is how much they appropriated. I think the gentleman will find it is exactly $16,000,000.

Second, how much of the $16,000,000 have they spent, when do they expect to spend it, and are they going to hold it up to 1944 and use our Federal Treasury funds in the meantime? I suggest that the gentleman look into that for his own protection, if for no other reason.

Now may I ask the Commissioner this. I think the Commissioner knows what I am talking about. Does the gentleman want the record to show that this $7,000,000 carried in this bill is to be spent for sanitary and health purposes? If I understood correctly, the gentleman from Massachusetts asked the gentleman that question. Does he want the record to show that?

Mr. PAGÁN. A great portion of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the gentleman mean by "a great portion"? We want to keep the record straight.

Mr. PAGÁN. The portion stated by the officials of the W. P. A. in the hearings. They stated that 65 percent of this fund was to be spent for works for malaria control, on sanitation, and on other health purposes, especially in districts close to the Navy and Army bases established in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he wants the record to show that 65 percent of this $7,000,000 is to be used for health and sanitation purposes.

Mr. PAGÁN. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We will watch and see how it is spent, then, because that is not my understanding at all. I think the gentleman from Michigan, a mem-

ber of the committee, stated that 65 percent of the projects had been approved by the military authorities. Is that not correct?

Mr. RABAUT. I corrected by statement when I took the floor. I said that 65 percent of the people working on the projects are on projects certified by either the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That certainly does not say it is for health and sanitary purposes. That is the point I am getting at. In other words, if you would build a big military road from San Juan to Mayaguez—I am not objecting to the road, now I am trying to get our thinking straight on this, because you are not going to settle this problem this afternoon. So I say that if the $7,000,000 is largely spent for military roads then it will not go for health and sanitary purposes. If we had a list of the projects which have been approved we would know roughly for what the money is to be used, but without the list, we are largely guessing about the matter.

You are not going to stop this program with $7,000,000. You are going to have this problem for the next 25 to 50 years. I stand on that statement, because we have done some very extraordinary things down there, that will perhaps have to be undone. For instance, take the question of people starving to death. Here is Haiti, for instance, under our supervision for some 15 or 20 years. We still dominate the picture almost 100 percent. Do you know what the cash income of the Haitians was? About $4 a year, just $4 a year. Is there any starvation there? Not at all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You will find the Haitian works, he produces food, gets along. Take the December 12, 1942, issue of the Foreign Commerce Weekly. I was reading it this morning. See what they have to say about how 95 percent of the Haitians are getting along and how well they are and how they take care of themselves, although I think the last boat to land in Haiti was some months ago. In a country in the Tropics, you can generally feed yourselves if you want to do it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On what?

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the things that nature provides, just as we do in the temperate and arctic zones. Did not the Eskimos get along before the Public Works Administration began to operate?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On what?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Bananas, breadfruit, mangoes, sugarcane, tropical nuts, various root foods which grow in abundance, plants, and many other highly important foods to say nothing about rice and fish, plus other items obtained with cash income. There is a shortage of proteins, of course. The gentleman is making fun of sugar.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Do you eat sugarcane?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That question indicates how coddled the gentleman is. If he understood the Tropics he would know how valuable the sugar content of the cane is to the native and how much he uses it. Sugarcane will give about $300 in dollar income from an acre of good cane. Do you know what these so-called substitute food products, which the gentleman from New York would have grown, probably as much as $15 per acre—more likely less. And then what would be the buying power of the people? Apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] would do away with the sugar industry, and have everybody now engaged by that industry starve to death on the same basis he claims some of the other people who are not engaged in and by the sugar industry are starving. I ask the gentleman just why he thinks God Almighty placed sugarcane in the Tropics and sugar beets in the colder zones?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this item came to the Committee on Appropriations at the end of a long process of executive and legislative collaboration.

The House Committee on Insular Affairs, which exercises jurisdiction over the legislation involved, after some considerable deliberation, passed a resolution on May 24, 1943, as follows:

Resolved by the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, That pending a study of conditions in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, recently authorized by the House, and in view of emergent conditions there;

It is the sense of the committee that the Federal Works Administrator should be authorized to continue a work-relief program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for a period of several months from July 1, 1943, and, in accordance with the purposes of the Emergency Relief Act, fiscal year 1943. In the opinion of the committee, this emergency authorization should not exceed 5 months, nor the funds $8,000,000. The chairman is authorized to communicate this resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

This resolution was passed unanimously, and was subscribed to by all members both majority and minority, of the Committee on Insular Affairs. They then held hearings and eventually formulated a bill which was brought into the House as House Joint Resolution 128, authorizing an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The joint resolution was referred to the Union Calendar, and passed the House May 27, 1943.

I quote briefly from the report, House Report No. 506:

Economic conditions in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are critical. This has resulted in widespread unemployment. While in the United States there is a shortage of manpower and a great demand for workers, conditions in the islands of the Caribbean, as a result of the lack of shipping to bring in raw materials for manufacture and to ship out finished products and agricultural commodities, have produced the opposite result.

* * * * *

The Senate committee found that the work program provided by the Work Projects Administration in Puerto Rico has prevented widespread suffering and general collapse of economy. It is the plan of the President, with whom the committee is in agreement, to close up the Work Projects Administration throughout the United States and the insular possessions by June 30 next. The Work Projects Administration is now employing on the islands of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands about 41,000 people on a large number of projects. Of these, 40,000 are employed in Puerto Rico. The cost for this employment is at the rate of $1,600,000 a month.

The committee is unanimous in the view that some arrangement must be made to prevent the discharge of this great group of people on June 30. The committee does not propose the continuation of the Work Projects Administration as such, but in lieu thereof, recommend to the House the passage of House Joint Resolution No. 128 which would authorize the Federal Works Administrator to provide work for employment of needy persons on useful public projects for a period not to exceed 5 months from July 1 next, according to the provisions and purposes of the Emergency Relief Act for the fiscal year 1943 insofar as they are applicable to such employment.

This legislation is admittedly a stop-gap arrangement pending the time when the committee can bring to the House its considered judgment after making actual observations of the conditions on the islands and after completing the studies of the various proposals that have been made to alleviate them.

This House joint resolution was not only reported by the committee unanimously, but it passed the House unanimously, was unanimously approved by the Senate committee and unanimously agreed to in the Senate. The item then went to the Budget, and was transmitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the House and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. At no stage of that long process is there any record of criticism or objection.

My friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], a member of the committee which considered the legislation, occupies a rather anomalous position. He agreed to this recommendation by his committee. He approved the preliminary resolution. He voted for the bill. In company with other members of the Committee on Insular Affairs he accompanied the delegation to the islands and personally participated in the inspection and viewed the situation at first hand. And with all this familiarity with the proposition and an intimate personal knowledge of conditions as he found them on the islands, when I inquired of him at the close of his speech just now as to whether he favors the appropriation of the $7,000,000—although in cooperation with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who offered this amendment, he has tried in every way to throw cold water on the proposition—he says we ought to appropriate the full $7,000,000. That is the gentleman's position. That is his final conclusion. And that is the opinion of every member of the official delegation which visited the islands and has just returned within the last week. They saw the unemployed. They saw men at work who otherwise would have been without employment. They inspected the public works in process of construction. They saw them feeding 160,000

hungry children and having just returned from that enlightening experience, they recommend, without exception, that the money carried by the bill be appropriated to take care of the situation until permanent legislation can be enacted.

This bipartisan delegation from the Committee on Insular Affairs, after a minute inspection of the islands, were unable to find anything to criticize in General Fleming's administration. No one questions his integrity and ability and the success of his work as W. P. A. administrator in the islands. When I inquired of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] just now if there was any implication of inefficiency or maladministration, whether there was any evidence of graft in connection with the work, he replied unequivocally, if somewhat reluctantly, that there was not. He gave the W. P. A. a clean bill of health. He did not submit a single objection to or criticism of the manner in which this money is being expended or the integrity with which it is being administered.

Mr. Chairman, no higher tribute could be paid to General Fleming and his staff, and no more convincing justification could be submitted for the approval of this appropriation and the rejection of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 36, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to strike out the last word under the head of "Department of Commerce." I ask unanimous consent to return to that part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but we have agreed to finish this bill promptly this afternoon, and I shall have to object to returning.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, provision is made in this bill for some funds for the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the Department of Commerce. I desire to discuss a matter in that connection in which I believe a large number of the Members of the House and Senate are interested. Since 1935 the W. P. A. has engaged in an extensive program of airport construction throughout the United States. The construction activities of W. P. A. have now terminated. When the order for termination was given engineers of the C. A. A., together with those of W. P. A., conducted joint surveys of the projects still in operation. This survey disclosed that 28 airports in the country remained in a state of partial completion due to the withdrawal of W. P. A. funds.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the subject under discussion by the gentleman does not relate to the provision of the bill which we are now considering.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, 267 airport projects were approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority to be completed under the W. P. A. formula by contribution of W. P. A. funds to be met by local municipal funds to complete those ports. Of those 267 airport projects so approved, when the W. P. A. ceased functioning, there were 28 ports located in various States where local communities had expended, in connection with W. P. A., a total sum in excess of $8,400,000.

Herewith is a complete list of these airports:

California: Merced.
Colorado: Pueblo.
Connecticut: Danbury.
Georgia: Atlanta.
Idaho: Idaho Falls.
Indiana: Bloomington.
Iowa: Iowa City, Des Moines.
Kansas: Pittsburg.
Maine: Dexter, Eastport.
Michigan: Menominee.
Minnesota: Eveleth, Hibbing, International Falls.
New Mexico: Eaton.
North Carolina: Wilson, Burlington, Rockingham.
North Dakota: Valley City.
Texas: Henderson.
West Virginia: Clarksburg, Wheeling.
Wisconsin: Eau Claire, Siren, Oshkosh.
Nebraska: Fremont, Beatrice.

Many of these communities have borrowed money through bond issues and have raised money and bought the land to make the sponsor's contribution for the completion of these airports. They did so with the distinct understanding that the Federal Government would maintain its proportionate share under the W. P. A. formula to enable those ports to be completed. Now we find, with the folding up of W. P. A., these 28 airports, some of them from 50 to 90 percent completed, upon which the sum of $8,400,000 has been spent by the local and Federal Government; 3 of them are located in my State. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY], who sought to take me off the floor and prevent me from bringing this matter to the Congress, that the people of Wisconsin and the people of all the States I have mentioned are extremely interested in seeing the Congress take action to complete these ports. Now, I say that unless we are able to direct the Federal Government to expend the money necessary to meet its obligation, those ports are going to disintegrate and become useless, and each day that they remain in their present state the $8,400,000 investment we have already made in those ports will be depreciated.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to ask the gentleman a question. I am as interested in airports as anybody in this House, but how can we distinguish with regard to the airport program? With the cessation of W. P. A., we stopped the school lunches, we stopped building schools, we stopped building hospitals, and we stopped building roads. Everything else fell in the same category as airports.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I think the attitude of Congress has been reflected in other legislation which clearly shows that the Congress intends to have the Federal Government keep faith with the municipalities so that projects that were started under W. P. A. and were partially completed, and which were started with the distinct understanding with the local communities that they would be completed, should be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am somewhat familiar with the situation that the gentleman describes. There is one of those airports at Bloomington, Ind. I am in complete agreement with the contention of the able gentleman from Wisconsin that those half-finished and rapidly deteriorating airport projects should be completed. That is just common sense. I would like to offer this as a contribution to the gentleman's discussion: I understand that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has prepared a proposed estimate and submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget for an appropriation of $8,000,000 to complete those 28 airports.

Mr. KEEFE. I was just coming to that.

Mr. LUDLOW. I understand the Bureau of the Budget is to present the matter to the joint Army and Navy Board and get its opinion as to the military

necessity of those airports, and those that are approved as being essential in the military interests will be recommended for appropriation by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentlemen there are two sources from which funds are available for the building of airports. One is the fund that we appropriated to the Department of Commerce, which is approximately $200,000,000. Those funds are subject to the jurisdiction of the Army and the Navy Board. There must be a finding of the Army and the Navy in order to secure money from that fund to complete the airport projects, that those projects are essential and necessary in the interest of national defense.

Now, it so happens that these 28 airports have not received the approval of the Army and Navy that they are of military necessity, and yet the municipalities that are involved went on the assumption, being misled by the Federal Government through the W. P. A. and through governmental agencies, that if they would go ahead and bond themselves and procure land, go ahead and meet the sponsor's contribution, that these airports would be constructed.

It seems to me that it is utterly and completely breaking faith on the part of the Government of the United States if we do not take steps here in this Congress to see that funds are provided to complete these ports under the program which was originally started by the W. P. A.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Supplementing what the gentleman says, I took this matter up today with Mr. Wayne Coy, the Acting Director of the Budget, and he stated these 28 projects will be resubmitted to the Board to determine their essentiality in the military interest and those which are approved will be favorably considered by the Budget in the hope that in the next deficiency bill funds may be approved to carry the program out.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that at the time the airport program was started, the question was asked as to whether or not strictly military necessity was of paramount importance, and these municipalities were led to spend their money in the purchase and building of these airports at a time when it was necessarily considered that they must be of military necessity in order that the Federal Government would make a contribution to complete them.

Now we are faced with a situation where the Army and Navy declines specifically to approve these ports as a military necessity. The Bureau of the Budget will not approve a request of the Civil Aeronautics Authority which is now pending before them, without Army and Navy approval, and these communities will be sitting there "holding the bag," with airfields on their hands. The Government must keep faith with the municipalities, when it asked them to go ahead and spend their money on these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I went into this matter with my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] in connection with an airport in New Mexico, and in our particular case the airport was started with the understanding it would have military necessity, and it was channeled through the regular sources and Colonel Harlow said that he thought that it should be done, and I am glad the gentleman is bringing the matter up.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that we had a meeting in my office this morning. Many Congressmen from these various States are interested in these projects, and there was a unanimity of agreement among the Members present that we should make every effort possible to place an amendment in this deficiency bill if the rules would permit it in order to secure immediate approval of the estimate that has been submitted by the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Bureau of the Budget. This is a matter that should demand the immediate attention of the House, and I am at this time calling it to your attention and expect to call it to the attention of the other body in order that we may get this appropriation through and get some action on it before this House recesses. Unless we do, the matter will go over again, and perhaps to the next year. We must protect and finish these airports we have started.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the matter under discussion should be of interest to every Member of this House who took an interest in the original construction of these airports.

W. P. A. began with an original program of approximately 1,019 of these airport sites. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State and Commerce is very sympathetic to what is involved in this particular item of debate. We could not include it in the regular bill for Commerce due to lack of our Budget request. Now, let me give you a brief explanation of this program because eventually it is going to have something to do with an over-all program involving about 3,500 airports in every State in the Union and every congressional district when hostilities cease. When the President of the United States sent a letter to Major General Fleming liquidating W. P. A. he had this to say:

> State or local projects should be closed out by completing useful units of such projects or by arranging for the sponsors to carry on the work.

The President wanted to complete these useful projects. Certainly airports 50 to 90 percent completed, with over 8 millions invested, could be considered useful units. Now, what is the picture? When W. P. A. liquidated it had completed 103 out of 267 airports. Of the rest the Army and Navy took over 71 and is now completing them, or we think they will complete them. A resurvey was made of the other airports. There were 93. The Army and the Navy and the C. A. A. Board made a resurvey and picked 65 for completion because of military necessity, and the money for their completion will come to you in a few days in the form of a conference report reappropriating $99,000,000 earmarked for these W. P. A. projects. That left 28 which are from 50 to 90 percent completed and which projects we are now discussing. The United States Treasury is interested in these 28 uncompleted airports because over $8,400,000 of Federal money, State money, and county money is invested in them. Every day those airports lie idle a great loss of invested capital is incurred through wind erosion, and so forth. We are losing a large Federal, State, and municipal investment. It is only a matter of economy that the work be finished. It will take $8,000,000 to complete them. The Civilian Aviation Administration, knowing of this great investment, knowing the value of these airports to national defense, would like to have them completed. So the C. A. A. went to the Budget. They told the Budget they needed $8,000,000 to complete these airports because the airports were needed. The President has said to complete useful units or make arrangements with the sponsors to complete them. The C. A. A. has carried out its part by the request to the Budget.

We met this morning. Many of us have been working on this matter a long time. We decided to take the floor to inform Congress of the probable loss of this big investment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, has a break-down of what it will cost to complete each one of these airports. Those of you interested should get those figures. You will be surprised at the amount of money that your State, your city, and your Government has invested in airports 50 to 90 percent completed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. There is one airport near the city of Vesta, Nebr., where a W. P. A. project was constructed, an airport covering 130 acres where they were training 50 flyers for the Government. W. P. A. said we ought to enlarge it. They did so by taking in areas surrounding the field with the result that the new one is not completed and the old one cannot be used.

Mr. STEFAN. That is right and it will cost $450,000 to complete it. There is one airport in my district, Fremont, which will cost about $25,000 to complete. It is 90 percent complete yet it has been abandoned representing a great outlay of city and Government funds. I want that investment saved and this valuable and badly needed airport completed.

Because of parliamentary procedure we are stymied, we cannot offer an amendment to include this important item. We may get help in the Senate.

We are pleading with the Budget Bureau to allow and approve immediately this C. A. A. request for $8,000,000 to complete and save this investment in order that we may include it in this bill when it gets over to the Senate. We want these airports authorized before we go home or before we recess.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said and to point out that the airport I mentioned at Raton, N. Mex., is 91 percent completed.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. It will only cost $75,000 to complete that airport. The gentleman has worked hard for its completion.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. May I say on the gentleman's behalf that there is not a man in the House who is more diligent and who has taken more interest in this matter than he has. There are three of these airports that the people of my State have spent thousands and thousands, yes, millions of dollars, as I understand it, to build or, rather, they have given land that is worth that. These are magnificent, prosperous towns near the great Army activities of my State. Yet they will leave this out, and they cannot be completed.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has helped and worked hard for aviation generally.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says. I do not know whether there are any of these in my State or not. Nevertheless, I feel that there is a great future for aviation, and I think it would be a permanent investment for the country. Unless there would be some Member object or raise a point of order, the amendment could be offered. From what I can judge, it is the unanimous sentiment of the House, if no point of order is raised.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we could pass it if no point of order were raised.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no doubt about the amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Our committee wants to proceed in an orderly manner. I am sure a point of order would be raised. I want to thank the gentleman, however, for his contribution. We want to save this investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, we all should, if we all do not, feel grateful to both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. STEFAN] for calling this important matter to the attention of the House. I feel that the Government does have a moral obligation to carry out a solemn contract and if we fail to complete these airports that have already been started and many of which are nearly completed, we would not only be guilty of a breach of faith but we would suffer a severe economic loss. I never did believe much in W. P. A. but when one undertakes even a bad thing he should see it through. "Blessed is he who sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not."

I happen to have an airport down at Joplin, Mo., that is practically complete. All that it lacks is $14,000 to $16,000 worth of lighting facilities. The people in that community have cooperated with the Federal Government and both have spent over $500,000 for building that airport, which is located in one of the third largest defense areas in the United States. The field is complete, the hangar built, the runways constructed, and yet we cannot use it.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I do not want the gentleman to embarrass me. I do want to tell the gentleman that this Joplin airport is between Fort Leonard Wood and Camp Crowder, in Missouri. It is just across the line from the Jawhawk ordnance plant and from the shell-loading plant over in Kansas. It is about halfway between Kansas City and Fort Joe Robinson, at Little Rock, and Camp Chaffee at Fort Smith, in Arkansas. It is about halfway between St. Louis and Oklahoma City, in one of the most strategic areas in the United States. We have lead and zinc mines and several powder plants in this area. This airport could be easily extended. Yet, because the W. P. B. or the Army or the Navy or some other agency overlapping C. A. A. has been negligent, envious, or jealous, we are denied these $14,000 worth of lighting equipment in order to utilize that field that is already complete. What a waste of public funds. Yet I know the acute shortage of critical materials.

Recently a bomber that cost $350,000 crashed near that field, killing all the crew and, of course, the bomber was lost, too. It is all right for the Congress to appropriate funds to complete these fields, but unless we can jar some sense into the heads of some administrative agencies down at the other end of the Avenue in order to get the equipment to utilize these airports, the money will have been spent in vain.

Mr. Chairman, it is shocking to know that we already have lost more men in air service training than we have lost in combat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for 2 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the last speaker that there was no contractual obligation on the part of W. P. A. in its relation to the States. In this, my answer to him, I desire to quote my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has always referred to this Federal assistance as a hand-out.

Under the W. P. A. the Federal Government was to pay about 75 percent of the cost. I want to be very clear about the matter. There was a requirement in W. P. A. to complete Federal projects, and if the completion of an airport is requested now as necessary to the war effort by either the Army or the Navy, it will be completed. However, other projects not necessary to the war effort upon which great contributions have come from the Federal Government may be completed by their sponsors. As far as these airports are concerned, I am as strong for the construction of airports as anyone present, and I wish at this time to commend in a special manner the devotion in this regard of my personal friend and colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for the airport program.

But it certainly comes as a surprise to hear W. P. A. praised in this House; it certainly comes as a great surprise to now hear that W. P. A. really has done some good in so many parts of the country; that W. P. A. has been accountable for some airports; that W. P. A. was accountable for schools, libraries, courthouses, roads, lunches for children, and a thousand other things. Formerly we heard much talk about boondoggling and everything else, but today, at last, W. P. A. comes into its own and is praised on the floor of Congress. I am happy that this day has come, for at last recognition is made of the generous gifts of the Federal Government to the States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 26, after line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 303. Appropriations contained in this act may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President for advances made therefrom to meet obligations for purposes for which the funds are provided in this act and for which purposes such appropriations are contained herein."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a precautionary amendment offered by direction of the committee. We trust it will not be necessary. We hope and expect this bill will be passed in ample time to antedate the close of the fiscal year, but in the event through some misfortune it should be delayed beyond the first of the fiscal year, this will make it possible for reimbursement to be made of funds advanced to take care of the items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 303. This act may be cited as the "Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 26, line 7, strike out "303" and insert "304."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in his remarks of yesterday, appearing on page 6343 of the RECORD, made the statement that certain contracts had been entered into by the Office of War Information in violation of law. Also that it was incorporated by a group of people most of whom are on the preferred list of the Dies committee.

The original contract with Short Wave Research was entered into by the Office of Coordinator of Information, headed by Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan. General Donovan is one of the most eminent men in the Government service today. He has a long record of public service. He served with credit and distinction in the first World War. He was the nominee of his party for Governor of New York against Governor Lehman.

While he needs no defense, I am glad to be able to certify that this contract was not in violation of law and that he did not recruit for carrying out the contract men from the preferred list of the Dies committee. I think it is only due to General Donovan that this statement be made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just want to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that I stated that those who incorporated the Short Wave Research, Inc., were a group of people who were on the preferred list of the Dies committee. I did not say that those whom they recruited were on that list. I made no comment of that kind.

I still say that the contract was illegal. It is perfectly clear, I think, that it is illegal. It is now under investigation by the Comptroller General.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It could hardly be under investigation when it was discontinued some time ago.

By way of historical review, Mr. Chairman, I shall read the following statement:

The Office of War Information, Overseas Branch, inherited on its establishment in June 1942 a contract which had been entered into on April 25, 1942, between Short Wave Research, Inc., a private corporation, and the Foreign Information Service of the Office of Coordinator of Information, headed by Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan. After the Office of War Information was given the foreign information service formerly in the Office of the Coordinator of Information, the Office of War Information renegotiated this contract with Short Wave Research in July 1942, and that contract was continued until terminated by the Office of War Information on March 7, 1943. During the period of the contracts with Short Wave Research by the Office of the Coordinator of Information and the Office of War Information, beginning in April 1942 and ending in March 1943, $545,009.79 was paid to Short Wave Research, Inc., for foreign-language services required in overseas propaganda. This sum was entirely from authorized and vouchered funds.

The arrangement was entered into originally for reasons of economy, of which the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission were cognizant. At that time, the Foreign Information Service of the Office of Coordinator of Information was preparing programs in many languages, but did not broadcast in any single language sufficient hours each day to warrant hiring full-time linguistic personnel. Short Wave Research, Inc., maintained a pool of available personnel with linguistic or literary skills needed in overseas propaganda. Under the contract, the Foreign Information Service could call for such services as it needed, for given hours each day or week, and payment for these services was made to Short Wave Research, Inc. All payments were for writing, translating, or radio broadcasting services actually rendered.

When the Office of War Information submitted its first budget to Congress in September 1942, a sum was included for these services and the item was clearly set forth and explained in the book of justification.

By January 1943, programming by the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information had increased in volume to such an extent that it became preferable for the Office of War Information to place all linguistic and literary personnel directly on its pay roll. This change was completed and therefore the contract was terminated by the Office of War Information on March 7, 1943.

Payments made under contracts with Short Wave Research

Payments made by the Office of Coordinator of Information, April to June 1942, before transfer of the foreign information service to the Office of War Information	$226,855
Payments made by the Office of War Information from July to October 1942	178,120
Payments made by the Office of War Information from November 1942 to March 1943	140,033

There was a saving here. Originally, instead of using personnel whose entire time could not be employed, they used the pool supported by this service to give the service only when service was needed. At other times there was no charge upon the Government. All payments were for writing, translating, or radio broadcasting services actually rendered. When the service was built up to a basis of continuous employment, the contract was discontinued.

If there had been such maladministration, such malfeasance, and misuse of funds as are indicated by the gentleman, it would have been brought out at that time, and certainly opportunity was offered for criticism at that time.

So there is no basis on which an investigation could be predicated. I am sure if any investigation is being made, General Donovan can more than maintain the right he had to make the original contract. And, of course, O. W. I. had a similar right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The statement that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just read is incorrect in several respects. In the first place, Mr. Davis became the head of the O. W. I. some time before we went away from here in the early summer of 1942. For almost a year he has operated under this contract with the Short Wave Research, Inc., and this set-up was designed to hire people for the Government without their having to go through the Civil Service Commission or be classified by the Civil Service Commission. The O. W. I. was given opportunity to enter into contracts without reference to the provisions of section 3709 of the code, but that applies only to supplies and materials. It does not apply to personal services, because the statute was designed to keep people on the Federal pay roll so that they could be checked upon, and the Civil Service Commission could properly classify them. I do not feel that any statement that I have made in criticism of O. W. I. in this connection is in the least out of the way, or in the least incorrect, and I think that I will stand right square upon what I said. I did not say that the majority of the employees were upon the preferred list of the Dies committee. I said the incorporators were on that list. The gentleman seeks to make General Donovan the goat. The man I criticized was Elmer Davis, and the criticism was well founded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, originally this work was under the Coordinator of Information, General Donovan, and he, in this capacity, negotiated the contract, and the fact that the contract was not illegal is shown by the fact that expenditures under it have regularly passed through the General Accounting Office and been properly vouchered and approved. Later the Office of War Information was created, and this work was transferred, that is,

the Foreign Information Service was transferred from the Office of the Coordinator to the O. W. I. under Mr. Davis, and the O. W. I. renegotiated a contract with Short Wave Research in July 1942, and in March 1943 discontinued this contract.

The record cannot be construed as a reflection on General Donovan, who has had a distinguished public career, and who has represented and is representing both his country and his party in a most praiseworthy manner. The evidence is that his accounts were vouchered by the proper authority and O. W. I. continued a contract and followed a practice inaugurated by the Coordinator's office.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2536), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BARDEN, Mr. HART, Mr. LESINSKI, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. CHENOWETH.

EXCESS PROFITS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN PRODUCTION BONUS PAYMENTS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2888), relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this involves the question of excess profits on the production of zinc in the lead and zinc mining areas of Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas. Last year we attempted to correct an apparent inconsistency involved in the payment of bonuses for the work of low-grade zinc deposits, and then charged the producer excess profits. By oversight the matter of the working of so-called tailing piles was overlooked and the anomalous condition still prevails as far as that is concerned.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is no objection from the Members on the minority side.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have examined this bill thoroughly. It is a meritorious bill and ought to be passed in the interest of the prosecution of the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 735 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Nontaxable bonus income: The term 'nontaxable bonus income' means the amount of the income derived from bonus payments made by any agency of the United States Government on account of the production in excess of a specified quota of:

"(1) A mineral product or timber, the exhaustion of which gives rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m), but such amount shall not exceed the net income (computed with the allowance for depletion) attributable to the output in excess of such quota; or

"(2) A mineral product extracted or recovered from mine tailings by a corporation which owns no economic interest in the mineral property from which the ore containing such tailings was mined: *Provided*, That the exhaustion of such mineral product would give rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) if such corporation had an economic interest in such mineral property, but such amount shall not exceed the net income attributable to the output in excess of such quota."

SEC. 2. Section 711 (a) (1) (I) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(I) Nontaxable income of certain industries: In the case of a producer of minerals, or a producer of logs or lumber from a timber block, as defined in section 735, there shall be excluded nontaxable income from exempt excess output of mines and timber blocks and nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735. In respect of nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735 (c), a corporation described in section 735 (c) (2) shall be deemed a producer of minerals for the purposes of this subparagraph."

SEC. 3. Section 711 (a) (2) (K) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(K) Nontaxable income of certain industries: In the case of a producer of minerals, or a producer of logs or lumber from a timber block, as defined in section 735, there shall be excluded nontaxable income from exempt excess output of mines and timber blocks and nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735. In respect of nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735 (c), a corporation described in section 735 (c) (2) shall be deemed a producer of minerals for the purposes of this subparagraph."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "mined", strike out "*Provided*, That the exhaustion of such mineral product would give rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) if such corporation had an economic interest in such mineral property."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment merely strikes out some surplusage that was overlooked.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, if I may, of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if he can tell us when the bill S. 35 is likely to be reported from his committee? It involves a question of silver which the War Production Board and others who are interested in the war effort think should be passed quite speedily.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It has been referred to a subcommittee. I do not know just when they will be ready to report. I will check up and give the gen-

tleman that information in the next day or so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would do that, because I understand it is a question of days before there will be no silver for use in the war effort.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is an emergency as far as silver currency is concerned, is it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; it is silver that is used in the war effort. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] understands the urgency of it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has spoken to me about it and it has been referred to a subcommittee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill originated in another branch of the Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] called it to my attention frequently.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He may have a bill of like nature, but the one I am referring to was passed in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. All bills relating to that subject, of course, will go before the subcommittee, and I will try to inform the gentleman in a day or two just when it will be reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill is S. 35, introduced by Senator GREEN, and it has passed the Senate.

It is a bill that is connected up with the elimination of the Celler amendment in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, and there seems to be no objection to it. I know that if it is possible to get the bill considered before we recess there is no objection to the committee giving it early consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will agree with me that it has been represented as being quite urgent for the war effort and should be taken up very quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, there is no question about that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter I have written to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have just received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee this afternoon and to include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, entitled "What Our People Want of the Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FROM PEARL HARBOR TO TOMORROW

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I realize only too well that none of us can spare one-tenth of the time he needs to read one-hundredth of the wonderful printed material which flows across our desks in a continuous flood tide.

However, once in a while I do get a chance to read some item or booklet with care and thought and when I discover a good one I want to share it with others; especially you, my colleagues, whom I know face my own problem of sorting and selecting what to read. I am happy to recommend without reservation a booklet I have just read entitled, "From Pearl Harbor to Tomorrow." It is a most wonderful day-by-day account of the first 15 months of our war. Not only is the whole publication of great interest to all of us who saw the hand of destiny at work in the dark days before the war but the booklet is well indexed, and is, therefore, invaluable for reference purposes.

James Bell is the author of this work and one of his readers who was very much impressed with the book brought me two copies and asked that I place them where they would be accessible to other Members of Congress. This I am happy to do and you will find a copy in each of the cloak rooms.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 40 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House of Representatives in considering an appropriation bill deprived the Office of War Information of the funds necessary to conduct its Domestic Branch. This action if concurred in by the Senate, which is presently considering the bill, will result in the complete elimination of this agency without the provision of any substitute. Indeed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] who introduced the amendment to eliminate this appropriation stated that there is no necessity for the work now being performed by this office and that the war effort would proceed more expeditiously if no similar office existed.

I do not wish to talk of the spirit of pique and legislative resentment in which the House took this action. We know that Friday was a field day for the critics and enemies of the administration. I will not even say that some of this resentment is not understandable and that a small portion of it is not justifiable but I do however think that we should calmly and in a proper deliberative mood consider now the results of the action we have taken and whether or not we have performed a service or a disservice to our country.

The following day Elmer Davis, the Director of the Office of War Information, announced that should the House provision be finally enacted into law he would have no alternative save to resign. This morning the Washington Post condemned the action of the House and pointed out the impossibility of servicing the American public with the proper news and information about the war and about the domestic front unless some office existed which could collate and assemble such information from the various agencies of the Government and also from the news sources on our battlefronts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman is doing this afternoon. In my judgment, if Mr. Elmer Davis should discontinue the work he has been doing for this Government in connection with the Office of War Information it would be a serious loss to our war effort.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman feels that way because I believe Mr. Davis is doing a very valuable work,

work we cannot afford to dispense with at the present time.

I will discuss in some detail the valuable and necessary service now being rendered by the Office of War Information.

I might state at the outset that much of this information was obtained from the Office of War Information itself and that any Member is free to challenge its accuracy.

The controlling principle of O. W. I. on the domestic front is this: "This is a people's war, and to win it they should know as much about it as they can. We will tell the people the truth and nothing but the truth. Only information of value to the enemy will be withheld."

If the domestic branch of the Nation's war information organization is abolished, will the people of this country have a clear and accurate picture of our war activities, policies, aims, successes, and failures? Will they remain, as they are now, the best-informed people in the world?

PRESS

Before O. W. I. was established a year ago, the public had lost confidence in the accuracy of military news. Newspapers were carrying the charge that the Navy was withholding news of the complete destruction of our Pacific Fleet. Another charge was that bad news was withheld until good news could be balanced with it. The people at war, ill-informed, were deeply shaken.

The O. W. I. has fought within all councils of Government for the prompt, complete, and accurate reporting of all military news. Only information valuable to the enemy is withheld. Today the American people know they are accurately informed as speedily as possible.

A year ago the press of the country was bitterly attacking the Government for conflicting statements by various Federal officials on rubber, oil, production, prices, manpower, and so on. Conflicting statements led to Nation-wide public confusion. Newspapers in all sections charged that no one could be sure that he had obtained the truth.

Today not all, but most, conflicting statements have disappeared, due to the coordinating work of O. W. I. The public knows where we stand on the battle fronts, in production, in conservation, in financing, in price control, and in all other major war undertakings.

A year ago newspaper correspondents had to work with 33 separate Federal agencies to obtain war news. Today 54 correspondents get most of their stuff from the O. W. I. central news desk.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views. Right now is no time to dispense with the domestic branch of O. W. I. It is the only organization that has a well coordinated, well planned campaign to educate the people on the dangers of inflation. That campaign is to start soon, yet Congress will be in the position of not only failing to levy taxes to siphon off sufficient excess purchasing power to prevent inflation, but also to have crippled the O. P. A., the only agency that is charged with the duty of keeping down prices. We must not dispose of the only agency which is trying to carry on a campaign to prevent inflation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. So it is especially bad at this particular time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his observation because I know this organization is going to be quite valuable also in our domestic front, although I spoke of the dissemination of foreign news. I agree with the gentleman that inflation is probably a greater danger at present than it has been at any time since we have been in the war.

RADIO

The radio industry—networks, affiliated stations, and independent stations—are devoting about $100,000,000 in radio time to war information. The industry's desire is to help keep people accurately informed and to stress those campaigns—such as bond sales, salvage, food conservation, and so forth—which will help promote the war on the home front.

The industry depends upon O. W. I. to bring the facts together in proportion and perspective. Without O. W. I., the industry would have to work separately with 33 Federal agencies, each of which would be interested in only 1 phase of the war, and each of which would contend with the industry that its program deserved first attention on the air. The result would be chaotic. The truth is that a $900,000 annual cost by O. W. I. enables the radio industry to do an effective $100,000,000 war job.

ADVERTISING

The advertising industry has converted its output to war, also. About $100,000,000 in newspaper and magazine space carries vitally helpful information on black markets, food conservation, point rationing, and so on. The advertising council obtains its basic data from O. W. I. If O. W. I. were discontinued, 33 separate departments would attempt to work directly with the advertising industry; their competitive demands would most likely cause the industry to give up in disgust.

MOTION PICTURES

The motion-picture industry is making, at its own cost, 26 special war pictures a year for use in the bulk of American movie houses. O. W. I. makes 26 also. Hence, there is 1 picture a week, on an important war topic, in the movie theaters each week. The industry favors the present cooperative arrangement. It knows that O. W. I., having sifted the needs of all agencies, is supplying it with basic facts on those war problems which can best be tackled by motion pictures. If there were no domestic branch of O. W. I., the industry would be besieged separately by W. P. B., O. P. A., O. D. T., Treasury, War Department, Navy Department, Agriculture, and other agencies. The industry would have to pick and choose, with no assurance that it was making its maximum contribution to public understanding.

POSTERS

The retail stores of the country placed their display windows at the disposal of O. W. I. One poster each week deals with a current war campaign, such as security of information, Navy recruitment, black markets, food conservation, bond sales, and so forth.

MAGAZINES, BOOKS, AND FREE LANCE WRITERS

O. W. I. does not write articles for magazines and books. But editors, publishers, and writers are constantly asking "What problems need to be explained?" O. W. I. keeps them informed and they in turn, at their own expense, do the job.

THE FIELD

Each Federal war agency has field offices. Many cities have 4 or 5 such offices and a few have as many as 15. At these field locations, 1 O. W. I. office does the information job for all. If each did its own, the cost would more than double.

ENEMY PROPAGANDA

Every American citizen may obtain enemy propaganda by radio or by reading Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo dispatches in his newspaper. O. W. I. is the only agency in America that is regularly exposing the lies and fallacies of what the enemy is saying to us.

SAVING THE GOVERNMENT MONEY

The Domestic Branch of O. W. I. costs less than $9,000,000 a year. But its services enable the free communication media of America—press, radio, advertising, motion pictures, magazines—to do an effective job and this private effort, on war subjects alone, costs several hundred million dollars a year.

If O. W. I. is abolished, the information costs of every Federal war agency will rise. Indeed, the Federal cost will easily double, and the result, to the American people and to our free communication media, will not be half as good as it is now.

Why is it then in the face of the importance of this Office in the conduct of the war that its operation should have aroused so much resentment among the Members of the House that they would vote to discontinue its appropriation?

Several distinct criticisms have been leveled at the conduct of this Office and I will speak of each of them briefly. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] stated in a moving address that this Office had stirred up racial feeling in the South and that in consequence it was a detriment to the war effort in that section of the country. Having an appreciation of the delicate nature of this question, particularly at the present time when we read of the hideous occurrences recently in Detroit, I am constrained to sympathize with the gentleman's position. Certainly at this time no action should be taken, no word should be spoken which would aline Americans against each other on racial issues and I would not countenance any such activity. I sincerely believe, however, that there has been no intentional attempt to cause racial disunity on the part of the responsible heads of this organization. I believe that if any Member holds a different opinion and thinks that the Office

of War Information is fermenting racial discontent, Mr. Davis would give his complaints sympathetic consideration and eliminate any action which could be reasonably criticized as having this effect in time of war. I wish to comment at this point what the Director of this office himself has to say about the racial question and its connection with the operation of his Office.

Some Members of Congress have suggested that the Office of War Information intruded into racial relationships by the publication of a pamphlet, Negroes in the War.

This pamphlet was written specifically to point out the stake that 13,000,000 American Negroes have in the war, and to help counteract Japanese propaganda designed to foment racial discord in this country.

Obviously the responsibilities of O. W. I. to convey information about the war to the people of this country include the responsibility of providing information of particular interest to minority groups. The Negro minority is the largest racial minority in the country and has a special interest in the part that the Negroes are playing in the war effort. The purpose of the pamphlet was to indicate the advances made by the Negro people under American democracy in contrast to what would be in store for them in event our enemies should win; to point out the contributions being made by Negro citizens in professional, industrial, and military fields, and in general to foster among Negroes a feeling that they, as well as white Americans, are fighting this war. There was nothing inflammatory in the pamphlet. It was written by a well-known Negro writer and edited with extreme care by competent members of the O. W. I. staff who are thoroughly familiar with the Negro problem.

Negroes in the War is largely photographic, giving the pictures of Negro leaders and showing what contributions they were making to wartime America. The pamphlet was distributed largely to Negro religious, social, and fraternal organizations.

The most prevalent criticism, however, is that frequently heard from the Republican Members of the House. They accuse the Office of War Information of playing Democratic politics and specifically of promoting the fourth term of President Roosevelt.

If their criticisms be well taken and if this office is using its prestige and favored position to play partisan politics, I would of course agree with these gentlemen that such conduct is highly reprehensive and should be stopped immediately. I am a Democrat and a fairly consistent supporter of the administration. I am not so partisan, however, that I would deny to the Republican Members the right to protect their legitimate political interests nor do I think that a governmental office, particularly in wartime, should promote disunity by engaging in partisan politics.

Again, however, I would suggest that this charge also is entirely unfounded and largely prompted by the too tender political sensibilities of the members of the Republican Party. There was one booklet issued by O. W. I. which portrayed and somewhat idealized the life and accomplishments of the President. This book was, however, not circulated in this country and no one charged that it was. It was sent to our foreign front for propaganda purposes, not among our own people, but among our allies and our enemies. I think that this booklet and its circulation can be defended. Whether we like it or not, the President symbolizes America to most foreign countries and I might say that his personal popularity among our allies and sympathizers does much to promote the popularity of our cause. I will agree, however, with Mr. Davis who himself has stated that in an effort to lean over backward to avoid the slightest semblance of politics that there should be no future dissemination of similar literature. Mr. Davis has this to say about political activity in his organization:

> The Office of War Information has neither the inclination, the talent, nor the experience to engage in political propaganda.

The Director, moreover, has instructed the staff to take every precaution against issuing material which might in any way be construed as having a political intent. In a staff order binding on all personnel the Director stated:

> It is the duty of all staff members to continue so to conduct themselves that there shall never be any basis for such criticisms, in the judgment of fair and intelligent observers. Office of War Information can no more be concerned with politics than can the Army or Navy. Our sole function is to contribute to the winning of the war.

The Director of the Domestic Branch and many members of the staff are Republican. No consideration whatever is or has been given to personal political affiliations, however, beyond the regular check to determine possible Communist or Fascist connections.

By and large the personnel of O. W. I. Domestic Branch are professional people—newspapermen, script writers, photographers, artists, motion-picture technicians, and advertising men. They are not political partisans. They are concerned only with how they can present the facts.

The information programs conducted by O. W. I. in general involve no political issues whatever—the why and how of food rationing, fuel rationing, airplane production, and similar matters quite outside the field of political controversy.

In a recent speech in Boston Mr. Davis criticized the perspective of some of the Washington correspondents. He has been subjected to attack both on the floor and in the press for his remarks. I have often thought myself that many news writers and commentators fail to keep before the people the picture of the great accomplishments which this country has performed in its conduct of the war and that they have confined their observations largely to the inevitable disagreements among the various branches of the Government and between the two major parties and also among those in administrative offices, many of whom are nonpolitical and are drawn from business life. Whether or not my opinion is correct is beside the point. This is a matter of extreme unimportance and not even the most severe critic of Elmer Davis would state that a veteran newsman like himself had any thought whatever either in his remarks in Boston or at any other time to in any way shackle the free press of America.

Finally, I wish to speak of an address made on the floor of the House last Thursday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], the burden of which was that the Office of War Information was playing Communist politics largely because it has not adopted as the policy of its office the contentions of the Polish Government in exile as to the various matters which it has in dispute with the Soviet Government.

This last attack has caused me some concern because the gentleman has always been an outstanding liberal and a supporter of the President, in addition to being a personal friend of my own. In the course of his address the gentleman has, undoubtedly in good faith, but unjustly, attacked the character and patriotism of several of the staff of this office. He moreover has adopted a position concerning our foreign policy and our relations with Russia which I consider unfortunate and one which would, if given any public support, endanger our friendly relations with that country at the time of our common battle with the enemy.

The gentleman's strictures upon the personnel of the Office of War Information do not extend to Mr. Elmer Davis, the Director, except insofar as he states that Mr. Davis has been a failure as an Administrator. I share the gentleman's praise of the high accomplishments of Mr. Davis as a correspondent and news analyst. I know that he has taken his present position with the sole motive of rendering service to his country and at a considerable financial sacrifice. I disagree with the gentleman, however, in his statement that Mr. Davis has managed his office badly and also with his statement that he has surrounded himself by incompetents and Communist sympathizers. I am personally acquainted with only one member of the staff of this office who has been criticized by the gentleman, but my acquaintance with him and my knowledge of the falsity of the accusations against him give me good reason to doubt the accuracy of his remarks about the others.

He has seen fit to attack the character and attainments of Alan Cranston, who heads the Foreign Language Division of the Domestic Branch of this office. Mr. Cranston is an experienced newsman, having been for years a foreign correspondent in Italy and London for the International News Service. I can testify from my acquaintance with him that he is capable and patriotic and also that he personally detests any trend toward communism in this country. Instead of playing down the contribution to the war rendered by the exiled governments and the people in their occupied countries, the group headed by

Mr. Cranston has continuously emphasized the sufferings and the bravery of these people who have done so much to help us with the war. I have several exhibits which I will be glad to show the gentleman, showing news releases to the foreign language newspapers in this country which emphasize the value of what is being done by the governments and people of occupied Europe. As to the insinuation of any connection on the part of Mr. Cranston with the so-called Tresca affair, which incidentally was an unexplained homicide down in New York, I shall not comment except to say that any mention of his name relative to this occurrence is absurd.

Mr. Gordon, who is criticized as ignorant of the duties of his position, as inexperienced and as communistic-minded, and whom I do not know, is, I am told, a journalist of 8 years' experience, a college graduate, a fine American, and a linguist who is conversant with several languages.

As to Mr. Hudes, whom the gentleman states was a Communist, I was told myself by Mr. Davis that he had no knowledge of any communistic connections on the part of this man nor any reason to believe him so disposed. If the gentleman is of the opinion that Mr. Hudes is guilty of subversive activities, I would suggest that he refer his name to the Kerr committee.

I am concerned also with the gentleman's complaint that the Office of War Information has not promulgated propaganda criticizing the Russian Government in the so-called Katyn massacre and in the Ehrlich and Alter case. I am convinced, and I am sure that the House will agree with me, that if the Office of War Information or the Department of State had taken the position suggested by the gentleman it would have been a serious affront to our ally, the Soviet Government, which might have been of sufficient gravity to have caused the severance of our relations with them. These are matters of such extreme delicacy that I do not think that any high Government official can risk becoming involved in them. Every responsible American writer considers the Katyn massacre story as unadulterated Nazi propaganda. As to the Ehrlich and Alter case, none of us knows all the facts, and, more than this, it so intimately involves the sovereignty of the Russian Nation that to me at least its discussion upon the floor of the United States Congress seems improper and dangerous.

The gentleman is passionately interested in a free Poland and I can sympathize with his desires. With my great friendship with those of Polish antecedents, any peace settlement which would not insure the ancient and Christian nation of Poland its proper recognition would be to me a tragic failure, but I do not propose for this reason to make public statements unfriendly to the Russian Nation on matters which should be discussed, if at all, through our proper diplomatic channels. We need friendship with Russia to beat Germany, we need friendship with Russia to beat Japan, and we need friendship with Russia to maintain a world peace.

Let it not be thought in my making these statements that I in any way condone communism at home. American Communists are in my opinion disloyal to this country in which they live, because their ultimate allegiance is not to America but to Russia and the Third International. I think they are potentially dangerous because although at present the party line demands that they cooperate with our war effort, they will surely sabotage our interests if they change the party line. My feelings in this matter and my sympathy with the future of Poland will not permit me, however, to endanger our friendship with Russia which I think we must maintain for the safety of our Nation and of the world.

So, therefore, I do not condemn the Office of War Information for its position as to foreign affairs but rather I heartily commend it for its devotion to the national interest.

I sincerely trust that whatever matters the gentlemen of the House might sincerely have in disagreement with this important Government office, they will attempt to adjust them amicably and that if we get an opportunity in the House to modify our action taken last Friday that we should reconsider the vote which we have cast to destroy a valuable public function without providing any substitute for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WASTE IN GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently spent 10 days in my district in Georgia in daily contact and association with my constituents who form a part, and to me a very important part, of the populace of this Commonwealth known and loved by us as the United States of America. I have always been convinced that the essence of a representative form of government was a close association of a representative with his people and a first-hand knowledge of their problems, their hardships, their emotions, and reactions to the various national issues. I am more convinced than ever that any Representative in Congress to give the best representation to his people should at least have regular periodical association with his people.

I want to say to this body, and through this medium, to every taxpayer of this Government, that I saw and learned facts first-hand that were appalling, amazing, and distressing while I was in my district.

I am bringing these facts to this floor with the hope that the people who toil to furnish the money to run this Government may be awakened sufficiently that they will correct the disgraceful and shameful waste that is being committed by those in operation of the Government. I have often remarked, and I believe, that 40 percent of every dollar that is appropriated to the various departments here in Washington for their operation is wasted. This, of course, I must admit is an opinion based upon my observation since I have been in Congress, but I believe sincerely after conservative reflection that if an efficiency expert were to investigate the operation of the various departments of government that his findings would sustain my opinion above expressed. However, this is a question that at least could be considered debatable.

On the contrary, I found while on my trip away from Washington that the War Department in entering on great tracts of land and clearing same for air bases, in disregard to every intelligent impulse, and as I consider as an insult to every taxpayer of the United States, cut down hundreds upon hundreds of acres of sawmill and pulpwood timber and hired men to cut it, pile it and burn it, in the face of a great need through the country and in the war effort of sawmill timber and pulpwood, and further in the face of the highest tax assessments that have ever been levied against the people of this country. I have no way of computing accurately the actual value in timber destroyed willfully by fire, but on one air base it would certainly run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. I cannot see how any man can destroy tangible property in the face of the hardships that the citizens of this country are having by necessity to go through at this time. Just why the War Department would commit and have committed these fiendish acts of destruction in the face of a $71,000,000,000 appropriation is inexplainable. This, of course, is a small item as compared to what has been destroyed throughout the United States by similar conduct by this Department. My colleagues from the four corners of this country have told me of similar instances. I have further been told by reliable parties that they do not hesitate to push chimneys down to large buildings of good lumber and fire them when farmers who are trying to produce for the war effort are standing by trying to purchase such lumber for badly needed repairs on their farms. I have further learned from reliable sources of this same Department piling up lumber that is left over from construction work in amounts sufficient to build several large dwellings and burning it when farmers who actually need it are asking for it; and from similar sources I have learned of near whole kegs of nails being thrown away in the face of farmers being denied sufficient nails to operate their farms.

Another fact that is rather significant is that not willfully, but as a direct result of carelessness, the Department has burned up toward $100,000 worth of timber in Clinch County, Ga., belonging to three or four individuals in that county. I have been endeavoring over a period of several months to get the War Department to do something about fire protection for the property adjoining a bombing-practice range, and have been given the usual line of promises without any action until thousands upon thousands of acres of timber land have burned to ruin, destroying the life accumulation of the individual citizens, the direct result of gross negligence, for the payment of which damage the Government is unquestionably bound by every moral law.

I was humiliated and disgusted over other acts being committed by this Government that are unthinkable in the face of the manpower shortage existing today. I heard of many similar instances, but especially one where a turpentine operator and farmer who was cutting badly needed lumber with a small sawmill, and very properly was working a son about 15 years of age whose school was in vacation. One of these wage and hour field representatives, or whatever he may be designated, appeared on the scene and became very much alarmed over this young man performing this work, and not knowing he was a son of the operator, propounded to him many silly questions. The man who was delaying the work of these people was of draft age and by all means should be in the service of his country fighting for the freedom Americans have learned to love instead of puttering about trying to take from the American citizens the privilege to work and earn an honest living. In other words, they are continually puttering about the premises and agitating the employees of sawmills, turpentine processors, and other citizens who are trying to make an honest living and furnish means to others to make an honest living, and in every instance entering where there is peace and harmony and general satisfaction to go away leaving discord, dissatisfaction, and a frustrated and unproductive business.

If there has ever been a time in the life of our Nation when the taxpayers of this Nation should wake up and rout from its pay rolls parasites and demand a complete stamping out of disgraceful and criminal waste of their property and money it has now been reached. I represent a people who expect to work for a living, who always have worked for their living, and who accept as a privilege the right to work for a living, and who love their flag and the Nation it represents and are free and willing taxpayers, but a people who were born and reared in an atmosphere of honesty and sincerity, and who expect from their Government the same degree of consideration, honesty in purpose, and action that they are willing to give their Government.

I realize that there is no more waste in my district than in any other district of the United States, but I am calling upon the War Department and the Secretary of War to see that this criminal waste is stopped, and I am calling on the American people who are now being taxed to the bone and who may expect to be taxed a great deal heavier if this waste is not stopped, to demand that it be stopped.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. We are all going to have a chance to get out and see what is going on in the country in the next few weeks if we adjourn around July 3. I think the gentleman has made quite a fine statement here and we should all take it to heart.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman. It helped me to go down there and see the fruits of our labor, to see what fruit the tree is bringing forth.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I wonder if the gentleman's inquiry regarding the waste of lumber has extended to the purchase of unnecessary quantities of lumber and timber by the War Department for the construction of large camp projects. I have been told by men in my State, who are familiar with the situation, that in some instances timber is lying idle now as a result of purchases of huge quantities that were not needed. I wonder if the gentleman can throw any light on that question.

Mr. GIBSON. I cannot. I was down there for a special purpose. I heard a great deal about such waste but I cannot verify it. What I am bringing to your attention are these things which I saw with my own eyes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PLUMLEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. FITZPATRICK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 25, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Friday, June 25, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands in executive session at 10 a. m. Friday, June 25, 1943, for the purpose of considering S. 364, H. R. 647, H. R. 2801, and various other bills. At 10:45 a. m. the committee will resume open hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1. Hon. Norman Littell will be the witness.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

517. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

518. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the sixth bimonthly report dated June 11, 1943, on the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation from April 10 to June 11, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization; without amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3018. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; with amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2837. A bill to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emma Hall, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 3041. A bill to suspend the immigration of aliens into the United States during the war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3042. A bill to amend section 105 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the family allowance of servicemen having wives and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3044. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3045 (by request). A bill to promote the welfare of persons discharged for disability from the military and naval forces during World War No. 2 by establishment in the Treasury of the emergency loan fund, Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to provide priorities with respect to farm machinery and equipment to farmers in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend limitations on production in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution appealing to every citizen to support our gallant airmen, soldiers, and sailors with racial cooperation at home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of Hershell Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 3047. A bill granting a pension to Irene M. Estes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3048. A bill granting an increase of pension to Josephine Morris Rowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joe J. Svejkovsky; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1735. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Mary Albanese, requesting the passage of legislation against the return of the Japanese to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1736. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of 125 citizens of Zanesville, Ohio, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1737. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from F. E. Giltner, president, Massac County Farm Bureau; one from Ernie Harper, of Belknap, Ill.; and also one from William Maedeker, of Rosebud, Ill., earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1738. Also, communication from the Farm Bureau of Richland County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1739. Also, communications from Fred Kotter and C. P. Fletcher, of Karnak; Allen Rottmann, Walter E. Dyer, Charles L. Adkins, Carl Baccus, and Frittz Kruger, of Metropolis; and S. A. Lynn, of Brookport, all representative farmers of Massac County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world filled with the clamor of those whose trust is in violence and with the boasting of those who reckon not with the ultimate supremacy of forces unseen and eternal, we come seeking fortitude and stability as we rest our souls in those final and vital things stronger than the noise of the world. Confront us, we beseech Thee, with a vision of Thy majesty that we may be stripped of pride and made humble and penitent.

Save us from being victims of the apparent and the transient. Give us the steadying confidence that behind the unchartered riot of today there hides a power whose invisible energy is the real master of the field. May we keep that faith even when the obtrusive circumstances of the hour shriek against that creed. And so in dark and dangerous days may we still be able to utter our glad and grateful confidence:

Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident: The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 24, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Burton
Andrews	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Bankhead	Brooks	Capper
Bilbo	Buck	Caraway
Chavez	McCarran	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Shipstead
Connally	McFarland	Smith
Davis	McKellar	Stewart
Downey	McNary	Taft
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
George	Millikin	Tobey
Gerry	Moore	Truman
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Gurney	Nye	Vandenberg
Hatch	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Wallgren
Hill	Pepper	Walsh
Holman	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	White
La Follette	Reynolds	Wiley
Langer	Robertson	Willis
Lodge	Russell	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, as a subcommittee of one, to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR WAR DEPARTMENT—IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS (S. DOC. NO. 76)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, for the War Department, for the improvement of existing river and harbor works, to remain available until expended, amounting to $7,095,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE FOR FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 77)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $12,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT IN A SPECIAL CASE (S. DOC. NO. 78)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by a district court in a special case, requiring an appropriation of $19,864.80, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 79)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and requiring an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $486,486.20 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (UNDER THE NAVY DEPARTMENT) (S. Doc. No. 80)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by the district courts requiring an appropriation of $6,688.72 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIM FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION, ETC., INCIDENT TO OPERATION OF A COAST GUARD VESSEL (S. Doc. No. 81)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of $142.70 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION, ETC., INCIDENT TO OPERATION OF NAVAL VESSELS (S. Doc. No. 82)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $8,977.32, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS TO PAY CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 83)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $6,154.95, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require appropriations fo their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AS COVERED BY CERTIFICATES OF SETTLEMENT (S. Doc. No. 84)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of claims amounting to $117,251.89, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of law, and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, Mrs. Grace Cunningham, of Seattle, Wash., has sent to me a petition signed by 28 residents of the city of Seattle praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, a bill dealing with the liquor question. I understand the bill is before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I assume that the proper disposition of the petition is to have it referred to that committee, and I ask that that be done, and also that the petition be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached.

The petition is as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917, the Congress of the United States included legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, even though liquor was then forbidden in any military unit; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act the Congress of 1940 called the young men of the present time to train for defense of our Nation if need be, and there now exists for these young defenders no defense from the activities of what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," namely the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and since beer is now sold in the camps by Government authority, and since commercialized prostitution in camp areas threatens health, morals, and efficiency of service; Now therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of Seattle, State of Washington, do respectfully petition you to vote for S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1943 the protection their fathers had in 1917.

MRS. ROSALIE ANDERSON.
WALLACE W. ANDERSON.
MYRA G. KENNEDY.
GRACE CUNNINGHAM
(And sundry other citizens of Seattle, Wash.).

AMENDMENT OF NATURALIZATION LAWS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Joseph Vacanti, president of the Order Sons of Italy in America, of the State of Nebraska, in which he states that the executive committee of that organization has studied House bills 1291 and 1941, pertaining to the amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940 and to the naturalization of certain persons, not citizens, whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States, and that his organization is favorable to the passage of the bills.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,
Omaha, Nebr., June 21, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The executive committee of the Order Sons of Italy in America of the State of Nebraska has carefully examined both H. R. 1291 and 1941, the first of which pertains to the amendment to the Nationality Act of 1940, and the other to the permitting of the naturalization of certain persons, not citizens, whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

We have examined these with care, as stated, because of the fact that there are many of our members throughout the State of Nebraska, and throughout the United States, who because of inability to speak or write the English language have been unable to pass the requirements of the immigration and naturalization laws so that they have been unable to receive the certificates of naturalization. These laws would cause them to become eligible for they have shown their loyalty by the reason that their sons and daughters are serving in the armed forces of the United States of America.

The executive committee is in full accord that such bills be passed, and in this manner is making its intention known to its constituents. It would be to the best interests of the Nation as a whole if such bills became law, and it is the desire of the executive committee that as representative of the State of Nebraska you vote for the passage of such bills, if in your mind you would be satisfied that their passage will not be inimical to the peace and welfare of the Nation.

Yours respectfully,
JOSEPH VACANTI, *President.*

THE SUBSIDY AND ROLL-BACK PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask consent to present a statement by the executive board of the Sioux City Milk Producers' Cooperative Association and also a resolution adopted at the fifteenth annual convention of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association, held at Omaha, Nebr., relating to subsidies and roll-backs, which I request may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were received and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 1943.

We urge you to put forth every effort to stem the tide of subsidies and get back to normal everyday business thinking. Let the crackpot economists and professors try their nefarious experiments in a more propitious time and not while we are fighting the greatest war in history.

We hope every Congressman in both Houses will keep their vested power given them by the people of this country insofar as is possible in these serious times and stop such unwarranted experiments as subsidies.

The farmer merely wants to be left alone. Given the labor and equipment with God willing, without the hindrance of the devil and his helpers, he will yet feed the world.

Again urging your opposition to subsidies, we remain,

Yours sincerely,
SIOUX CITY MILK PRODUCERS' COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
ALEC CHICOINE,
FRED KAMM,
J. L. STEVENSON,
E. R. PIKE,
H. BLIEL,
Executive Board.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NEBRASKA GRAIN AND FEED DEALERS ASSOCIATION, HELD AT OMAHA, NEBR., JUNE 6 AND 7

Whereas the Office of Price Administration is about to institute a subsidy program rolling back the cost to consumers of meats, butter, and other food, the Nebraska Grain Dealers Association is unalterably opposed to any program of subsidizing consumers because such a program will have a tendency to curtail food production and increase black markets.

This program will bring about more Federal regulations of all private industries and will require another army of employees to administer when those employees are needed directly in the war effort. We consider the paying of a subsidy to consumers as illegal and not provided for under present law. The same consumer supposed to be helped under this proposal will ultimately have to pay his own bill through taxes. Private industry is already taxed to the breaking point by Government rules and regulations. Our efficiency and our ability to produce are already impaired by Government rules and regulations. We feel that we could perform a better service with less Government interference.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 841. A bill for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 343);

S. 1049. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California*; with an amendment (Rept. No. 344);

H. R. 1081. A bill for the relief of Frank Borah; without amendment (Rept. No. 345); and

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Jennie Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 346).

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. ELLENDER), from the Committee on Claims:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 347);

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 348);

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson; without amendment (Rept. No. 349);

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Robert N. Bickert; without amendment (Rept. No. 350); and

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of John Rhoden; without amendment (Rept. No. 351).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Eddie Percle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 352);

H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts; without amendment (Rept. No. 353);

H. R. 1557. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam; without amendment (Rept. No. 354);

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld; without amendment (Rept. No. 358), and

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; with an amendment (Rept. No. 355).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1101. A bill to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 356).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2996. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 357).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry assistant surgeons and passed assistant surgeons for promotion in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Francis L. McNamee, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director at $8,000 per annum in the Philadelphia regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STTES—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. LANGER, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted minority views on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which were ordered to be printed (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 291).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1269. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1270. A bill making a grant to William G. Holman to be used in conducting experimentation with respect to blue mold; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1271. A bill to extend gratuitously policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Insurance Corporation for 1 year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943, with respect to the payment of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act without regard to income and resources arising from agricultural labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL—EXERCISES AT UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, jointly with the Virginia Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, announces that a speech which will be delivered by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on July 4 in honor of Thomas Jefferson will be broadcast from the University of Virginia over the blue network, starting at 4:30 p. m. A Nationwide hook-up will be used.

Following the speech of the Senator from Kentucky from the university, a wreath will be placed on the grave of Thomas Jefferson at nearby Monticello.

The program will be conducted by Edward Boykin, executive secretary of the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission. Gov. Colgate W. Darden, of Virginia, will introduce the Senator from Kentucky.

The entire membership of the Virginia Jefferson Bicentennial Commission will be on hand to join in these exercises as will perhaps certain descendants of Thomas Jefferson. It is expected that the largest gathering of citizens of the community in years will attend inasmuch as 1943 is the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, while July Fourth is the one hundred and seventeenth anniversary of his death.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a tribute to Thomas Jefferson prepared by the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THOMAS JEFFERSON—APRIL 13, 1743–JULY 4, 1826—A TRIBUTE

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We, the people of the United States of America, heirs of the incomparable struggle carried on by you and your compatriots for the liberation of the human mind and for the rights of man, humbly pay this tribute of affirmation in the hope that your ringing statement of beliefs will give courage and faith and tolerance to those who now fight the unending fight against the ancient forces of tyranny and cynicism and intolerance.

ON THE RIGHTS OF MAN

We affirm with you our belief in these self-evident truths: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." (From the Declaration of Independence.)

ON EDUCATION

We affirm with you our belief "That the most effectual means of preventing [tyranny] would be to illuminate, as far as practical, the minds of the people at large and more especially to give them knowledge of those facts, which history exhibiteth, that, possessed thereby of the experience of other ages and countries, they may be enabled to know ambition under all its shapes, and prompt to exert their natural powers to defeat all its purposes * * * whence it becomes expedient for promoting the public happiness that those persons, whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue, should be rendered by liberal education worthy to receive, and able to guard the sacred deposit

of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens, and that they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth, or other accidental condition or circumstance." (A bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge, 1779.)

ON A FREE PRESS

We affirm with you a belief in the need of a free press for a free people: "The only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted, when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary to keep the waters pure. We are all, for example, in agitation even in our peaceful country. For in peace as well as in war, the mind must be kept in motion." (To Lafayette, 1823.)

ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

We affirm with you our belief that "Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested His supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraints; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocricy and meanness. * * * That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical * * * that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions any more than our opinions in physics on geometry * * * that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction * * * and, finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument, and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them." (From the Virginia bill for establishing religious freedom, 1779.)

ON THE STRENGTH OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT

We affirm with you a profound belief in the strength of republican government founded on democratic principles: "I know indeed that some honest men have feared that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us full and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may, by possibility, want enough to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law; would meet invasions of public order, as his own personal concern." (Inaugural Address, 1801.)

ON FAITH IN THE PEOPLE

We affirm with you our belief in the capacity of the people: "Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositories. And to render them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This indeed is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary. An amendment of our Constitution must here come in aid of the public education. The influence over government must be shared among all the people. If every individual which composes their mass participates of the ultimate authority, the Government will be safe; because the corrupting the whole mass will exceed any private resources of wealth; and public ones cannot be provided but by levies on the people. The way to have a good and safe government is not to trust it all to one, but to divide it among the many, distributing to every one exactly the functions he is competent to." (Notes on Virginia.)

ON TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT

We affirm, in the face of unparalleled examples, our agreement with your abhorrence of government by tyranny: "To have an idea of the curse of existence under [governments of force], they must be seen. It is a government of wolves over sheep." (Letter to James Madison, 1787.)

ON THE BILL OF RIGHTS

We affirm with you the belief "That a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inferences." (Letters to James Madison, 1787.)

ON FIGHTING FOR LIBERTY

We affirm with you our determination to carry on to our last breath today's fight for freedom: "We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficent Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die free men rather than to live slaves." (Declaration of the Causes of Taking up Arms, July 6, 1775.)

We honor you the more for cherishing and defending these democratic ideals because you did so without the advantages and strength that we possess. In your day our Republic was young and experimental: today it is the most powerful Nation in the world, the impregnable fortress of democracy, made great and powerful because of the principles and institutions which you cherished. You had only a faith in the people and in their future: we have the advantage of basing our similar faith on the proofs that shine forth from a century and a half of unparalleled achievement. You confronted the skeptics of your day with belief in the common sense of the people: we confront the cynics and disbelievers of our day with proof that you were right.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to the committee amendment inserting section 5, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered, I assume that, under the rules, I am not permitted to accept a modification of my amendment without obtaining unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Therefore I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the amendment which I have proposed be modified by the inclusion of the amendment with respect to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on yesterday gave notice. The Senator's proposed amendment is published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have objection, but I should like to have the amendment restated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am looking for the amendment, I will say to the Senator from Oregon. The amendment has been printed.

Mr. GEORGE. My amendment, proposed as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, has been printed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The proposed modification of the Senator from Georgia is in the language of the committee amendment itself. That statement is correct, is it not, I will ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is in the language of the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay (a) to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

So that, as modified, Mr. Clark's amendment would read:

That on and after the date of enactment of this act no authority shall be exercised by the Price Administrator, the Federal Loan Administrator, or any other governmental agency or corporation with respect to the making of any subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and any authority contained in such section with respect to the making of subsidy payments is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made: *Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay (a) to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the

high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment by the inclusion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the language of the George amendment is taken from the committee amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I favor the amendment. I think it is a very happy suggestion. But I am wondering if it is broad enough to comprehend the suggestion made by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] last evening just prior to the time the Senate took a recess. Has anyone conferred with the Senator from Wyoming on that subject?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not had the opportunity to do so, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I am not making any qualification along that line, but I am simply curious to know if the proposal of the Senator from Missouri will meet the thought which was expressed by the Senator from Wyoming last evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I have taken the matter up with some of the attorneys who are interested in preserving the subsidies for metals and strategic materials, but as yet I have not received a report. I hope we can wait a few minutes before taking action on the amendment until we receive the report and ascertain whether the George amendment covers the whole matter in a comprehensive and adequate manner. We will have that information in a very few minutes. If there is some way of holding up the matter a little while I hope it may be done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay consideration of this measure. I realize the necessity for going through with the bill as fast as we can, intelligently, of course, and that is a matter which is wholly up to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no desire to press for immediate action on this matter until Senators who are interested in the modification of the amendment have an opportunity to be heard. I made my request simply because my amendment was the pending business before the Senate, and I had to make it then or not make it at all.

Mr. McNARY. Let me suggest, in the interest of expedition, that we accept the proposed amendment offered by the able Senator from Missouri, as he desires to modify it, and then if our action is not satisfactory to the Senator from Wyoming he can ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That would be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would be entirely satisfactory to me also.

Mr. McNARY. I am willing to act on the suggestion that the amendment be agreed to and that a reconsideration of the vote be had if it is found to be not satisfactory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that, so far as I am concerned, if it shall be found that the amendment is not satisfactory, I shall have no objection to a reconsideration of the vote by which it was agreed to. But, for the purpose of getting the matter before the Senate, I renew my request for unanimous consent that I be permitted to modify my amendment by the inclusion of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is modified by inclusion in it of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to object?

Mr. PEPPER. No, I have no objection. If I correctly understand the present parliamentary situation, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri has been modified by inclusion of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. May I ask the Senator from Missouri if he will be kind enough in a succinct way to state what the effect of the amendment, as modified, now is?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Florida the effect of the amendment as modified at the present time is that it repeals section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act, which is the authority relied on by the Commodity Credit Corporation and by the O. P. A. to make subsidy payments on food.

The amendment preserves the intention of Congress already expressed to authorize transportation subsidies for certain very critical materials, such as petroleum, in certain areas of the United States, and also preserves the subsidies as to critical minerals of various kinds, and as to certain other commodities, which it has been intended all the time by Congress, if necessary, to have produced at a loss, and for the Government to take up the slack of any loss that might be incurred.

Mr. PEPPER. So, if I correctly understand the able Senator, the amendment as modified presents clearly the issue as to whether we are to allow authority or funds for the making of subsidies for food production.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely correct. The amendment as presently modified is intended to express the view which Congress entertained when it passed the Stabilization Act, namely, that it was authorizing subsidies for production, certain subsidies for transportation, certain subsidies for strategic materials, but was not authorizing subsidies as a price-control measure.

Mr. PEPPER. Nor subsidies to aid in food production?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, no; it is not my intention, so far as I am concerned, to prohibit bona fide production subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I do not concede that the Senator's amendment as modified has that effect. I think it prohibits every sort of subsidy except for strategic minerals and transportation.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the issue I want to have made clear. We now have before us the Clark amendment which would repeal the authority referred to in the Emergency Price Control Act.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. We have the George amendment included in the Clark amendment, which would authorize subsidies only in specific cases, namely, of increased cost of transportation resulting from the war emergency of products such as petroleum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Florida that the effect of my amendment is to wipe out section 2 (e) in the broadest possible terms, with the exception of the specific limitations placed in the amendment by the George amendment. I will say further to the Senator from Florida that, so far as I am concerned, at a proper time I would be glad to vote for any proposition to include bona fide production subsidies, but it seems to me, in view of the flagrant, notorious manner in which section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act has been distorted by certain authorities, that the thing to do is to wipe out that section, and then restore, if Congress so desires, bona fide production subsidies. I will say very frankly to the Senator that in the present status of the Clark amendment, as modified by the George amendment, it does wipe out authority for all subsidies except those specifically enumerated in the George amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in view of my understanding that the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] proposes to discuss this question, I do not desire to address myself to it at the present time, but I do wish to have the privilege of addressing myself to it before the issue is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not clearly hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. PEPPER. I say that, in view of the information I have received that the able Senator from Alabama proposes to address himself to this subject, I shall not address myself to it at this time, but I desire to address myself to it before the matter shall be concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I intend to make some remarks about the matter, but I do not know how many more speeches are to be made. I do not desire to demand the floor at this time, if other Senators are prepared to speak, for the simple reason that I think I have the right, as a proponent, to close the debate. I do not know that there is any rule to that effect, but I believe it would follow

parliamentary practice. I do not intend at the moment to speak, if some other Senator desires to address the Senate, but I intend to do so before final action is taken.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask of the Senator from Missouri, regarding his proposed amendment, a question with reference to that portion of his amendment on page 2, line 2, beginning with the word "Provided," and concluding in the eleventh line. Would not that provision ratify and legalize the promises which have been made by the administration to pay subsidies on the roll-back on butter, beef, and coffee?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator's statement may be correct to a certain extent, but only to the extent to which people have in good faith dealt with the Government and changed their position. It seems to me that such people are entitled to be protected. The average man who produces butter or any other farm commodity is not a lawyer, and in time of war he should not be charged with the responsibility of dealing at his peril with the Government of the United States.

Therefore, I have provided by the amendment that people who have dealt in good faith with the Government of the United States shall be protected. I do not think we can do any less. There has been dispute between various governmental agencies, including the Attorney General of the United States, there has been dispute on the floor of the Senate among Senators who are good lawyers, as to exactly what the provisions of the old law authorize.

I am very clear in my own opinion about it, but I do not think that in good conscience we should pass an act which would prejudice and penalize people who in good faith have dealt with the Government of the United States in time of war. I, personally, should never be willing to do such a thing.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator from Missouri. As I read clause (b) of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia, it seems to me it would permit the subsidization of crops or animal products necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or for any of the United Nations, but would not permit the subsidization of crops or animal products for food purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is my understanding. I should be glad if the Senator would address his inquiry to the Senator from Georgia, the author of the amendment. The Senator has accurately stated my opinion of the amendment and what I had in mind when I asked to be permitted to amend my amendment by the inclusion of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. However, I should be glad to have the Senator address his question to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if, by the second part of his amendment, he means that crops or animal products may be subsidized or bought and sold at a loss for the purpose of the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war, but not for food purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly—to be bought and sold for the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the amendment it would be possible to subsidize crops for the purposes of manufacturing alcohol or glycerine or sugars or corn or other materials used in the manufacture of aluminum or steel; would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. For the Government?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; for the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. In the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the amendment goes a little too far; but, realizing the seriousness of the situation and the necessity for doing something about it, and also realizing that the matter will finally have to be worked out by Congress, I expect to support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to one circumstance which seems to me to make the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri very defective in respect to serving the purposes the Senator intends to have it serve unless in some way he adds a prohibition against buying and selling. All the amendment would do would be to take out that part of section 2 (e) which deals with subsidies.

Section 2 (e) reads as follows:

> (e) Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof—

That is very broad language, Mr. President—

> or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers.

All that would be repealed by the amendment would be the provision for the making of subsidy payments to domestic producers; so it would be perfectly possible for the administrator to go on buying and selling through the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Furthermore, entirely apart from the Price-Control Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation has power to buy and sell commodities, and it has bought and sold commodities at a loss before this time. Not only that, but by the pending bill we shall be giving it a billion dollars more with which it could continue to buy and sell commodities, farm commodities, if you please. I should not have the slightest difficulty, after the passage of the bill including the Clark amendment, if I wished to do so, and if I ran the Commodity Credit Corporation, to do just exactly, in effect, what now is being done, and to spend a billion dollars in doing it, instead of spending the limited amount which is provided in the committee amendment.

I see nothing in the world to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from announcing that it is going to buy all the butter in the country at whatever the price may be—50 cents, let us say—and later dole it out at 45 cents, from time to time, to various people—carrying out exactly the same procedure, except the latter procedure would put the Government more into business than it ever would have been if it simply paid a subsidy to producers.

The same thing is true with respect to meat. As to coffee, today, the Board of Economic Warfare is buying the whole coffee crop of Brazil, under what authority I do not know. Some one of the subsidiary corporations—I think it is the Commodity Credit Corporation—is taking over all the buying of coffee in Brazil. So if it be desired to accomplish the same effect at equal cost to the Government, it can be done under the Clark amendment, so far as I can see. We would not really avoid the problem of having subsidy payments.

The committee amendment provides that none of the corporations shall purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss.

I admit that even that provision would be somewhat difficult to enforce; because it would not prevent one of the corporations from buying the commodities and finding out later that it had to sell them at a loss. However, at least it could not deliberately adopt a program of selling at a loss.

So in that respect I think the committee amendment is much stronger than the other.

When we begin to distinguish, as we are now doing, between production subsidies and other subsidies, I find it impossible to draw a reasonable line of demarcation between what kind of subsidies can be paid and what kind of subsidies cannot be paid. It seems to me that the thing to do is to impose a limitation on all subsidies. If the Senate does not want to approve the roll-back provision which would cost $450,000,000, I think the best way to proceed would be to cut the $500,000,000 to $100,000,000 or to $50,000,000, and leave the R. F. C. with some money with which to carry out the purpose, or else cut out the R. F. C. altogether, and leave the Commodity Credit Corporation with $175,000,000 for those total purposes.

So, it seems to me that, while we could show our sentiment by adopting the Clark amendment against subsidies, in name, I do not really think we would accomplish as much as we would if we

adopted the committee amendment. A year from now I think we shall find that if the Government has a policy of buying and selling, it will cost the Government more than a policy of having a limited amount of direct subsidies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can say to the Senator from Ohio that so far as my own view is concerned, it is perfectly consistent, because I intend to vote for the amendment which I have offered, which I think is a very valuable restriction, and I intend to vote against the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from Missouri. Is he satisfied that the language of his amendment, as modified, would not restrict the sale of Government wheat on the terms specifically authorized by an act of Congress?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I do not think it would. That certainly was not the intention. It is certainly not my intention to change that policy of the Government. Although, as the Senator knows, I was opposed to the adoption of the policy originally, I certainly have no intention of changing it by indirection in this manner.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it seems that the foremost reason given by the proponents of the committee amendment is that we should provide the funds to pay for commitments already made, for which there is no legal authorization. The department has said in a press release to the packers, "Buy these cattle"; and to the wholesalers, "Roll back the prices, and we will pay." So it is now contended that the department has made commitments, and that is the main reason why we are asked to support some kind of a subsidy or provide money to pay for the commitments which have been made without authorization.

The question asked by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] was timely. He asked the Senator from Missouri whether the amendment which he proposed would provide for such a program. The Senator from Missouri said that it would. I should like to say, with reference to the question asked by the Senator from Texas, that I do not believe any commitments have been made to be paid for, even though we do provide a subsidy. I say that on the basis of facts which I have received from my own State of Nebraska. I received them from Omaha even as late as last night.

When the roll-back order was issued, the roll-back was directed to the wholesalers of meat. The theory was that they would go into the market and pay the then prevailing prices to the producers; that the subsidy would make up the difference. But the packer did not do that. That is what caused the demoralization of the markets. That is what brings up the question which is before us. Neither the packer nor the wholesaler made any commitments, because they did not rely upon the order of the United States Government. They did not rely on the press reports. They bought cattle for less than the prevailing prices. So I doubt very much whether any commitment has been made, for which payment is required. If we should provide the subsidy, where would it go? If we should provide money for the wholesalers, what assurance have we that it would get back to the producer? In a telegram from the president of the Union Stock Yards, of Omaha, Nebr., he informs me that only one wholesaler rolled back prices. They did not put any confidence in the press reports.

The proponents of the measure before us say that we have made commitments, and therefore we should somehow guarantee this postdated check and provide the wherewithal. That is the big argument advanced to the Senate to vote some kind of a subsidy—either $250,000,000 or $500,000,000—in order to make good departmental unauthorized commitments. I will go as far as anyone else in order to make good any legal contract which the United States has already entered into, if it can be shown that the department has made a contractual commitment, and that in equity we ought to pay for authorized commitments already made. That provision is included in the Clark amendment, which I intend to support. But I think that argument is weak. There is no showing that any commitment has been made.

What would the bill do? Even as amended by the Taft amendment, it provides that we shall pay a subsidy of $250,000,000 or $500,000,000 to do what? The point is that the bill would establish a subsidy, on the wrong premises. After the eloquent address by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Foresty [Mr. SMITH], Senators should certainly know what the bill involves. The proposed subsidy would not go to the producer. It would go to the consumer. It would be a bonus to the consumer. It would not be a subsidy to the producer. There is no authority under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act for the payment of such a subsidy.

We talk about the opinion of the Attorney General. I highly respect the opinion of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He has stated that in his opinion this is not a legal subsidy. I respect the opinion of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who also stated that such a subsidy is not legal. I respect also the statement made by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Aside from the legal question, the Senator from Georgia stated that it was his understanding, when the subsidy question was before a previous Congress for consideration, that this subsidy was a subsidy to be paid the producer for increased agricultural production, and that it is a violation of the spirit of the act to pay to the consumer a roll-back under the guise of paying the producer a subsidy.

Let me say, once and for all, that the proposed subsidy would not go back to the producer. The only proper interpretation of the Price Control Act is that the subsidy provided for in section 2 (e) is a subsidy to the producer. That is the spirit of the act. The proposed subsidy would go only to the wholesaler of meat. It would not reach beyond the wholesaler. It would not reach the Nebraska farmer who is feeding cattle, and who needs a profit in order to encourage the production of beef. The subsidy would stop with the packer. It would then be rolled back to the consumer.

The proposed subsidy is not a subsidy to pay the producer anything. It is a bonus to the consumer. What good would it do the consumer? If we should put $2,000,000,000 into the hands of the buying public, the inflationary effect would be much more than the 10-percent roll-back.

We have heard some wonderful speeches in the Senate during the last 5½ months. I respect those who have made them. One of the outstanding speeches, which I shall remember all my life, was the speech of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. He said that we must hold the line. But we will not be holding the line if we vote subsidies of $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000. We shall be creating inflation. Such a program would be one way of going in the back door to increase the purchasing power of the public, or to increase wages.

The worst part of it is that we are doing it as a subterfuge. We are asked to give a bonus to a group under the theory of paying a subsidy to the producers of meat. We are not giving a subsidy to the producers. We are giving a roll-back to the consumer, which will cause inflation, and break the line. It will not hold the line.

The producer does not want this subsidy. I feel that this question is of vital importance to the Senate. It certainly is to me. The proposed subsidy would extend only to meat, butter, and coffee. Although we have many consumers in Nebraska, Nebraska is entirely an agricultural State. We are dependent upon agriculture. I should like to see the producer make a legitimate profit on what he produces on the profit-motive basis.

If the producers in Nebraska were in favor of the proposed subsidy, they would tell us so. What do they say? Last Tuesday I read telegram after telegram from producers in my section of the country who said that they did not want a subsidy. I read a statement from the president of the Livestock Producers' Association—the cattlemen of America. He said, "We do not want a subsidy." I read a statement from representatives of the Chicago meat industry, to the effect that farmers and cattle feeders do not want a subsidy. Last Friday I inserted in the RECORD a resolution from a gathering in Fremont, Nebr., of representatives of more than 24 counties. They drafted a resolution memorializing Congress to the effect that the cattle industry in Nebraska did not want a subsidy. I have in my possession perhaps 100 messages from cattlemen, not only in Nebraska, but in other parts of the country, stating how they feel about the subsidy.

This morning I received a message from the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association signed by E. G. Hayward, president. I will read it for the RECORD.

It consists of only three paragraphs and it sums up in a nutshell the feeling of the producer relative to a subsidy, and that is the subject with which we are dealing. We are asked to legislate a subsidy for the producer which goes to the consumer. The term "subsidy" is a misnomer. We are asked to give a bonus to the consumer, but under the interpretation of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act which has been expressed by those who are interested in the roll-back legislation, they find it is not a subsidy to the producer.

The producers do not want a subsidy. To show how they feel about it, I now read the letter from the president of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association:

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: As our organization considers the administration subsidy and price-roll-back program in the meat-packing industry a problem of first importance to our livestock-production business, we are writing you at this time to express our views on this critical subject. In order that we may qualify our association to speak on this matter, you will be interested to know that our membership includes more than 2,300 New Mexico cattle breeders and producers, who own more than 90 percent of all cattle in this major beef-producing State.

We are unalterably opposed to the administration's plant to roll back prices on meats by means of subsidy payments to the meat-packing industry, and we have appealed to the Office of Price Administration and the President to accept and try our national livestock and meat-packing industry program to solve our wartime meat problems before throwing our industry on a subsidy basis. Our program was developed by major meat packers and representatives of 96 breeder and producer organizations; by businessmen with practical knowledge and years of experience in the meat industry. We assure you that the producers and processors of meat all along the line are entirely in accord with this feeling, and their judgment should probably be considered more accurate than that of some officials in the Office of Price Administration with perhaps less experience in this field.

It is difficult to believe that a subsidy plan as outlined by the Office of Price Administration could be put into effect at a cost of less than $3,000,000,000 annually to the taxpayers of our Nation, and at present $3,000,000,000 in inflated currency. Although the subsidy program in our industry might at first appear to be a means of effective price control on the part of the administration, it appears to us who are familiar with Government subsidy programs a complete admission on the part of the Office of Price Administration that it is unable to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments. There is little doubt but that this subsidy program will eventually put the administration in control of the meat-packing industry and thus in control of the livestock industry of our Nation, a condition which is unhealthy to our people and discouraging to production of livestock.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration, we remain,

Very truly yours,
NEW MEXICO CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
E. G. HAYWARD, *President.*

The letter is signed by E. G. Hayward, president of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association.

I do not wish to clutter up the RECORD, but I have hundreds of communications from cattle growers and feeders and from those who are interested in the packing business — the processors — indicating that they are absolutely opposed to this subsidy.

If we are to increase the production of beef, how is it to be done? It must be done by getting the subsidy clear back to the grower, and to the cattle feeder. It can not be done by the method proposed, but it can be done by removing the present restrictions, including the ceiling price on corn. Corn then will seek its own level. It will flow out to the various segments of the industry and to the feeder, and it does. The ratio of corn and labor to the production of beef and hogs will adjust itself. The result will be less inflationary than any price ceiling, or any subsidy which may be paid.

What we want to do is to put the cattle feeder in Nebraska on a profit-motive basis and not on a subsidized program.

Another thing which would increase the production of beef would be the orderly coordination of the Food Administrator with the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. I believe the time has come when we should have an administrator who can handle that particular job. We need to eliminate the present contradictory program between the Secretary of Agriculture and those within his organization, such as Mr. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. On the one hand we have the Agriculture Department seeking to increase agricultural production. It pays subsidies and imposes restrictions.

The Senate should be advised that we do not have total agricultural production in this country. We do not have total production on the acres in the western section of the country, where we should have total production. We are still limited in production. If we do not grow certain war crops we are restricted, and do not achieve the maximum crop production which we should have.

This situation should have been looked into at least a year ago. Immediately after Pearl Harbor all restrictions should have been taken off agriculture. Last year there should have been no restrictions on the growing of any agricultural crop. There should be none now. If the restrictions were taken off, if the ceiling were removed from corn, and cattle feeders were given a chance to make a decent profit, they would produce beef, and we would not now be facing a meat famine.

What does the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation say? A few days ago Mr. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said that we have too many cattle in this country. We have 38,000,000 beef cattle. We have a total of 78,000,000 cattle, but 38,000,000 of them are beef cattle. Mr. Hutson said that during the past 15 months the number of cattle has been increased by 2,000,000. What else did he say? He said that we have 125,000,000 hogs, 25,000,000 too many.

So on one hand we pay a subsidy. We even put into effect the R. A. C. C., a Government lending agency to make nonrecourse loans to cattlemen, without restriction, in order to increase the production of cattle.

On the other hand, we have the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Hutson, on the other side of the fence, saying that we have too little corn. What was Mr. Hutson's remedy? Senators who were present know what the suggestion was. He said, "We must narrow the feeding profit to the cattlemen and the hogmen so we can drive in the surplus on the market without feeding them corn." If we ever needed a coordinator to harmonize two programs like that, we need that administrator now. On one side we increase the production of livestock, and on the other side we decrease it because we cannot feed the animals. Such a program will not only drive the cattle into the market but will drive the cattle feeder out of business.

In 2 or 3 months we shall wake up in Washington and find no meat. There was no meat in South Omaha Saturday of last week. Yet, in a country where we have 2,000,000 more cattle than we ever had, and 200,000,000 bushels of corn more than the average June turn-over, it is a pity we cannot get the two together now as we face a meat famine. The program must be harmonized. It should be in the hands of one man. The ceiling on corn should be lifted. We should provide corn for industry. We need it now. We should provide corn, not only for the cattle feeder but also the poultry feeder. Let it seek its own level, and in the final analysis it will not be so inflationary as a subsidy program paid for crop restrictions.

It is said that we have made commitments, and that our word must be made good. The R. A. C. C. was told last January that it did not have authority to loan money except for emergencies, and yet it loaned $77,000,000. The plea before the committee was: "We have already loaned it, and we want you to ratify our acts." Under the guise of a subsidy we propose to pay a roll-back to the consumer. We support an amendment partly cutting it off, but we propose to continue to pay a subsidy of $250,000,000 or $500,000,000 for illegal acts which never were authorized. It is like coming in through the back door. The people of the country do not like it. If we are to pay the consumer a bonus, let us pay it; if we are to pay the producer to produce beef, let us pay the producer to produce beef; but let us not tell the producer that we are going to increase his price, or pay the packer a subsidy, and then turn around and give that subsidy to the consumer as a bonus—as a roll-back. It is not right, and every Member of the Senate knows it is not right. No one could express it more eloquently than it was expressed yesterday by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

I desire to make the record clear. I do not believe in subsidies as they are proposed here. I shall support the Clark amendment which now includes

the George amendment, and I hope that every Senator from the Corn Belt and every other Senator who sees the light will support that amendment. Let us face the issue squarely; let us place subsidies where they belong; let us keep to the spirit of the act; let us see to it that if the cattle feeders and the cattle growers are to increase the beef supply under a subsidy it shall be paid to them, instead of paying a roll-back under the guise of a subsidy to the cattle feeder.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to know whether the Senator objects only to the roll-back feature, or whether if a subsidy were granted to the processor to increase the production, for instance, of soybeans, in order to hold the price where it is, and yet increase the price to the producer, he would favor that kind of a subsidy under certain circumstances where it seemed to be desirable? Or is the Senator's objection to all subsidies? My difficulty in this latter situation is to know what kind of subsidies are good subsidies and what kind are bad subsidies. If the Senate wants to prohibit roll-back subsidies, we can say so, but I should like to know whether the Senator objects to the other kind of subsidy or simply to the roll-back subsidy.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the senior Senator from Ohio that any subsidy that has been authorized by the Congress by any act of Congress should be paid, I should feel under obligation to pay it, and whether I believed in it or not would not make any difference insofar as this legislation is concerned. I would be in favor of paying any legal obligation we have made; and I would go further than that. If anyone, who, because of equity or of a commitment had made an advance to the consumer or anybody else, I would feel that we ought to pay it; but the senior Senator from Ohio knows as well as I do how I feel about subsidies; he has heard me deliver more than one speech on this subject. If they are to aid the war effort, if they are to increase the production of critical materials, I would go along with anybody in the war emergency; but, generally speaking, I am against subsidies. I am against them because I think they regiment people; I think they destroy freedom of enterprise; I think they destroy economic freedom. I am against subsidies generally.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator be against subsidies to the producer in order that the price might be held to the consumer where it is, rather than to let it go up. Assuming that it is necessary to increase the price to the producer the question is, Are we going to authorize it by subsidy or are we going to say to the Price Administrator you must increase the price to the consumer?

Mr. WHERRY. If we are to pass this legislation, as I interpret the spirit of section (e), the subsidy should be paid to the packer so that he can pass it on to the producer; otherwise it is an illegal use of the subsidy. What we are considering is this legislation; we are talking about this bill, not about a different bill.

Mr. TAFT. We are talking about the Clark amendment. The Clark amendment prohibits the other kind of subsidy, but the Clark amendment attempts to say—I do not think it quite accomplishes the purpose—that if it is considered necessary to increase the price to the producer the price to the consumer must be increased. That is a perfectly logical theory. I was trying to find out whether the Senator was for it or against it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am for the Clark amendment because, as the Senator from Missouri said yesterday, I think it cuts out the authority under section 2 (e) to the Department of Agriculture, or whoever operates the subsidy. I believe in the George amendment because I am willing to go along with any payment of subsidies that has been authorized by a former Congress and I am willing to pay any subsidy that the Senate feels necessary in order to obtain critical materials to help out in the war emergency. I think possibly the machinery might be improved, and I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio—and there is no man in the Senate whose judgment I respect more highly—that I believe his proposal cutting off this machinery is the best that has been presented, except I do not agree with him about paying $250,000,000, which puts our sanction and approval on an illegal subsidy. That is the only disagreement I have with the Senator from Ohio, and with his wisdom he has the ability to write an amendment to this bill or offer a measure which would cut it off, and permit only the payment of a legal subsidy and to provide to pay, if there is redress, in cases where funds which have been used under a commitment which should not have been made, then I would support it 100 percent. I think the Clark amendment comes more nearly doing what I want done.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. That is exactly what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I take the floor to reiterate my opposition to price subsidies; that is, subsidies for the purpose of lowering or holding down prices. As I have previously stated on the floor of the Senate, I can see the justification of subsidies for the purpose of obtaining maximum production of critical materials or of foodstuffs or feeds. Payment of subsidies to marginal producers can be justified in the emergency.

But that is not the proposition the Senate is asked today to legalize, and for which to provide funds. What is asked in the Bankhead amendment to the pending legislation, as I read it, is congressional approval of the roll-back and subsidy program that already promises to cause grave injury to the livestock and dairy industry. In addition to the injury to these industries, I can see a strong probability that, instead of increasing production, this program is more like'y to decrease production.

As a measure to halt inflation, it seems to me that a program which calls for adding ultimately several billion dollars a year to spending power—and to the national debt—while at the same time reducing prices on already scarce commodities, is bound in the long run to add to the inflationary forces, not to take from the strength of such forces.

I am perfectly aware that there are in effect both direct and indirect subsidies as a means of promoting the war effort. These include construction and conversion of plants, payment of increased transportation costs, and support prices for farm products.

But I want to point out that the purpose of all these subsidies is to bring about increased production for the war effort, or to compensate for increased transportation costs.

I say the proposal to subsidize consumption of certain food products departs radically and dangerously from the principle involved in production and even in distribution subsidies.

I repeat, the subsidies here proposed are not designed, nor are they expected, to increase food production. The effect will be to transfer to the Public Treasury a part of the consumer's cost of living. Briefly, it proposes to charge a part of the cost of the food civilians eat to future generations to pay. Our men in the armed forces who return to civilian life will be required to help pay for the food civilians consume while they are risking their lives in this global war.

Mr. President, my information is that factory pay rolls in the United States practically have doubled in the past 4 years. Bank deposits, I am informed by the Department of Commerce, are in excess of $100,000,000,000.

Currency in circulation is approximately $15,000,000,000, or three times what it was only a few years ago. The national income, payments to individuals, this year is expected to reach $145,000,000,000, nearly twice what it was 5 years ago. The number of able-bodied unemployed is at a minimum.

I ask you, Mr. President, if we cannot pay for the food we eat today, under these conditions, what hope is there for us to be able to pay for what we eat after the war is over?

Even in the face of these conditions, I might be able to justify food price subsidies—with borrowed money—if they were advanced on the basis that these subsidies would (1) provide more foodstuffs, or (2) would enable consumers in need to obtain such foods. I have heard no such claims made for this roll-back and food price subsidy program.

The experience so far has been that its effect has been to reduce prices farmers receive for meat and dairy products. With production costs where they are, that is going to mean decreased production and less food for consumers, less food for our armed forces, less food for our Allies. It strikes me this is a pretty high price to pay for reducing the consumer's butter bill 65 cents a year, and his meat bill two dollars a year. Especially if it results in his being able to buy less meat and less butter.

Last night I received a telegram signed by Will J. Miller, himself a stockman and farmer, secretary of the Kansas Livestock

Association, and by James G. Tomson, president of the association. The telegram stated:

Kansas livestock producers are unalterably opposed to price roll-backs and subsidy payments on agricultural products and urge support of amendments to Commodity Credit Extension Act to prohibit same. Letter follows.

This afternoon I received the letter referred to, and wish to read from it, as follows:

I am writing you at this time because I feel our only salvation is in your (Congress's) hands. We must look to Congress for a fair deal in connection with meat production for our wartime needs.

Office of Price Administration and kindred minds are apparently doing everything possible to increase confusion and discourage production. Market reports in recent days indicate they are doing a pretty good job of it.

Senator, this program is certainly raising hell on meat and livestock situation.

There is no question in my mind it is intended to put our civilian population on a cereal diet. Feel that our feed situation this year will be critical, due to flood and weather conditions. The livestock people do not know where to turn, and the confusion in their minds is increased from day to day due to uncertainties coming out of Washington.

I know of any number of feeders that are simply not going to feed cattle, due to the uncertainty of grains and protein concentrates and inability to buy at any price.

This roll-back of prices—and the roll-back reached the farmer, but the subsidy did not—is making the situation worse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, a press release, resolutions adopted by the National Livestock and Meat Board at its recent session in Chicago, and a letter to the President from Albert S. Goss, president of the National Grange, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.—At its annual meeting just concluded at Chicago, the National Livestock and Meat Board climaxed the 2-day session with the unanimous adoption of a resolution calling upon the War Food Administration and the newly formed War Meat Board to avoid taking any action in planning the food program for the future which might further injure the livestock industry and at the same time seriously impair the war effort.

The resolution referred specifically 'to an attempt being made by certain interests, apparently with the sanction of Government officials, to bring about drastic changes in the American diet which provide for further reduction of meat allowances for civilians to a much greater extent than warranted by existing conditions. Such a reduction, it is pointed out by the resolution, can seriously damage the health of the Nation.

The Board, which represents all branches of the livestock and meat industry, calls attention to the fact that the livestock interests of the country are putting forth every effort to produce the tremendous supplies of meat needed by our armed forces, our civilian population, and our fighting Allies and that these efforts so vital in helping to win the war must not be curtailed.

The resolution adopted by the Board read as follows:

"Whereas the livestock industry has responded to the urgent request of Federal authorities and has greatly expanded both livestock and meat production; and

"Whereas, apparently with the approval of Government officials, proposals are now being made calling for a drastic change in our national diet, further reducing the allowance of meat to civilians much greater than is warranted by existing conditions; and

"Whereas, according to recognized nutritional standards, a further reduction in meat consumption can seriously impair the health of the Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the directors of the National Live Stock and Meat Board, in annual meeting assembled at Chicago, June 18, 1943, urgently request the War Food Administration and the newly formed War Meat Board to give the most careful consideration to all the facts in shaping the food program for the coming months and to avoid taking unwarranted action which might further injure the livestock industry—which is putting forth every effort to supply the meat so necessary for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our fighting allies—and seriously impair the war effort."

The present officers of the board were reelected to serve for the ensuing year. They are: Chairman H. W. Farr, of Greeley, Colo., who represents the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association on the board; Vice Chairman J. W. Rath, of Waterloo, Iowa, a representative of the American Meat Institute; Treasurer W. H. Tomhave, of Chicago, representative of the National Society of Record Associations; Secretary-General Manager R. C. Pollock, of Chicago.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 22, 1943.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the winning of the war and the establishment of a sound and enduring peace depends so largely upon an adequate food supply, any policy that restricts or stifles production should not be tolerated. The situation with which we are confronted calls for the maximum production of foodstuffs.

It is also our duty to do all in our power to halt the drift toward inflation. If we are to prevent inflation we must remove the cause instead of treating the symptoms. There are two chief causes of inflation. The first is the pressure of excess income on an insufficient supply of consumer goods, and the second is the loss of confidence in the Government's ability to pay its obligations in dollars having the same purchasing power as the dollar it borrowed.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

On the basis of today's prices, we have an annual income of approximately $40,000,000,000 in excess of the consumer goods available. Assuming that half this sum will go into savings, we still have the serious problem of an excess income of some $20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high production cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised which is effective enough to reach only these high cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production. On the other hand, when used in connection with subsidies, it increases the gap at the other end because the Government has to borrow the money paid in subsidies and most of this is borrowed from banks. This increases our national spendable income. The subsidy therefore defeats itself. The present plan attempts the impossible by putting economic law into reverse. Higher prices encourage production and discourage consumption. The subsidy program encourages consumption, and to the extent that the subsidies fail to reach the producers they discourage production.

After everything reasonable has been done to increase production, including a compensatory price, if the supply will not meet the demand, the next step is to reduce the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways. First, by increased taxes and increased savings, or both. Second, by rationing. Where goods are scarce, rationing should be applied so that the supply will be divided equitably. Commodities can be rationed to produce a surplus which can be used to hold prices at reasonable levels without the use of ceilings; although ceilings to prevent profiteering may be necessary in some instances. Ceilings should be used for no other purpose.

If we do not take practical steps to close our fast-increasing inflationary gap, plain economics will do it for us, as has always occurred in the past. More and more goods will flow through black markets at higher prices, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar until it comes into balance with the supply. That is inflation.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on Government outgo, how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any Government can endure, and that is that the people must support the Government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the Government to support the people cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound; butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late thirties. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply.

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings

and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food prices at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest on earth.

In England they have practically closed the inflationary gap, largely by taxation. Three years ago there were 7,000 people with a net income in excess of $25,000 after paying taxes. Last year this group was reduced to 80. At the other end of the line, England has sales taxes ranging from 12 to 72 percent of the retail price.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1, we exported to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately $730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus, England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from America, which are under complete control. She does not include such home-grown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should also be noted that England is having a serious time with black markets. She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison, plus $20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties, prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that black markets are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

We therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps, but rather that our course should be based upon the sound economics necessary to maintain a maximum food supply, for we have no one but ourselves to look to for aid.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
ALBERT S. GOSS, *Master.*

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks at this point a letter from Mr. C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange; a letter from C. T. Lindgren, cashier of the Farmers State Bank of Canton, Kans., and an accompanying newspaper clipping; and some of the many telegrams and letters received by me protesting against the roll-back and subsidy program.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE GRANGE,
Topeka, Kans., June 23, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: There is no question in my mind but that the Grange membership and practically all other actual farmers of Kansas are opposed to the roll-back and food-subsidy program. I base this conclusion on the result of hundreds of personal contacts and scores of letters, as well as replies from questionnaires sent out from my office.

More than 270 questionnaires were recently sent to masters of subordinate Granges in Kansas. One of the questions dealt with the subsidy and, without exception, every reply has been opposed to it. There are various reasons, among which the following are the most frequent:

"It is unfair to agriculture as the benefits go to others."

"It is impossible of equitable administration."

"If ceiling prices are fixed as a means of preventing inflation they should never be set at a figure lower than the one attained through natural causes prior to the time of fixing it."

"There is no justification for subsidizing the consumer (even if it could be made effective) at a time when the smallest percent of his earnings are required for food."

"It discourages production of needed food."

The whole Office of Price Administration set-up is bogging down and unless changed will prove a major disaster. Fumblings have already frozen the normal flow of corn to feeders who do not produce it, causing heavy losses and threatening liquidation of half-fed animals. This will prove costly to many and hasten the national food shortage that now seems inevitable.

I sincerely trust that something constructive will soon be submitted in lieu of the destructive influences now at work. Farmers and other businessmen alike are fed up on so much 1944 politics being injected into every activity emanating from Washington. If this information is helpful, use it any way you desire.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

C. C. COGSWELL.

THE FARMERS STATE BANK,
Canton, Kans., June 22, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I enclose herewith clipping from Wichita Eagle as of last night. This explains some of the conditions here and market slumps. Pigs that formerly sold at $12 at local sales now bring about $6.

I believe that the subsidy on meat, etc., will discourage many farmers in trying to raise more meat and poultry.

If they lose money and with no help to do their work they will drop the items that lose money as fast as possible. Our local meat market man informs me that meat salesmen from packing houses are trying to push lard on the market as they have a large supply but owing to high ration points he cannot sell what he has on hand.

I do not think our Kansas farmers will strike and hope they do not. However, I believe they are entitled to cost and a little besides. Farm wages are $100 per month, board and room. Many working in cantonments get as high as $300 per month, work less hours with nothing invested.

Our wheat around here is one of the poorest crops in many years. Much froze out and hessian fly, etc., takes its toll. No danger of the farmer being too prosperous on present set-up.

Respectfully,

C. T. LINDGREN.

[From the Wichita Eagle of June 21, 1943]

FEAR IS FELT MEAT SUPPLY TO DROP HERE

Wichita's meat supply is taking a downward plunge and unless the Government can make adjustments, housewives will be faced with more meatless days.

Four Wichita packing plants have either completely ceased operations in the beef market or cut down at least 50 percent. The Dunn-Ostertag Co. butchered 3 head of cattle last week instead of the usual 100.

Joseph Dunn, vice president and secretary of the company, said that if the plant continued killing it would be at a great loss, and that the company is uncertain about the Government plan of subsidy.

The Sunflower Packing Co. killed 11 head of cattle the first week in May, and 6 the second week, at a loss of $20 a head, said Fred Lochmann, president. Since then no beef has been killed, and the killing of pork has been cut down because of the lard situation. The public will not buy lard because the points are so high, and unless the Government can adjust this to relieve the Sunflower Packing Co., Mr. Lochmann asserted, the plant's surplus of lard will have to be given point-free to a desiccating company. Mr. Lochmann has queried the Government which was worse: letting the public have it point-free or the desiccating company? Washington is investigating, said Mr. Lochmann, but added that unless the lard situation were cleared up immediately, the company will have to discontinue the slaughter of hogs. As it is, the company killed 33 hogs last week instead of the usual 200.

H. F. Brown, of the Excel Packing Co., stated his plant has had to cut down from 40 to 45 percent owing to the Government price cut on beef.

Another local packing company has killed only 7 beef in the last week, instead of their usual 150 because it has lost from $2 to $15 a head over what was paid for the cattle. This company attributed the situation to Office of Price Administration regulations.

The increasingly critical meat situation in Wichita is representative of the suspension of operations farther east. Approximately 14 packing houses in Ohio have ceased slaughter. A slump of beef on the hoof has been reported in the same packing districts.

Cudahy has not been affected yet by the Office of Price Administration regulations, and the Government subsidy plan, said J. A. Preston of the Cudahy Packing Co. "We are wondering if this will cause the shipper and raiser to hold back a little in shipping the cattle, but the reason our shipments are light now is because this is an in-between season. They are always light at this time of year. This year, however, they are a little lighter."

About the suspension of slaughter operations, Mr. Preston said that the Cudahy company is faced with the same losses as the other Wichita plants, but that the Cudahy company must fill its Government contracts, irrespective of loss. Cudahy will buy anything that comes into the market, asserted Mr. Preston.

The Fred W. Dold Packing Co. is also listed as a major packing company in this area.

MARION, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly disfavor subsidy program which will roll back agricultural prices.

MARION COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
ALPHONSO KLENDA, *President.*

GARDEN CITY, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Four hundred members of Finney County Farm Bureau urge your continued opposition to subsidies rolling back agriculture prices.

FINNEY COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
G. B. MAYO, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Need your best efforts to stop roll-back subsidies. They are killing farm prices and will hurt producers and consumers too.

W. A. RAYMOND,
Garden City, Kans.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
Roll-back on farm prices having bad effect. Please do all you can to stop this plan.
KANSAS FARM BUREAU WOMEN,
Mrs. GEORGE HOLLEMBEAK,
Chairman.

GIRARD, KANS., *June 25, 1943.*
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers opposed to subsidy roll-back which will break agricultural price structures and will place agriculture at a further disadvantage. We urge you to use your utmost influence in opposition to program.
CRAWFORD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
E. J. MOREY, *President.*

STOCKTON, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers of this county believe subsidies rolling back prices will only serve to break agricultural prices structure unless stopped immediately. Many farmers contemplate reducing or liquidating livestock operations unless situation is improved. I urge you to oppose this measure.
ROOKS COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
ORIA VROVER, *President.*

GIRARD, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers and businessmen are opposed to subsidy roll-back and urge your opposition.
H. H. VANHOOZER.

SHARON SPRINGS, KANS., *June 25, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
The farmers of Wallace County are opposed to subsidies.
R. B. RIGOR,
President, Wallace County Farm Bureau.

GIRARD, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
Girard Chamber of Commerce, because of the almost universal opposition by its members and the farmers of this trade district to subsidies in any form, requests that you use every means at your disposal to defeat any legislation legalizing such payments.
ROY JACOBSON, *President.*

OSWEGO, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: In the interest of agriculture, I will appreciate any effort you see fit to make to stop price roll-back and subsidy payments. All we farmers want is a fair price, and subsidy payment will be unnecessary. The consuming public never was more able to pay a fair price for food, and I see no reason why future generations should be taxed so we can have cheap food now. Let's give the next generation a chance. Further price cuts will mean less food.
WM. A. CHRISTY,
President, Labette County Farm Bureau.

GYPSUM, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers are against price roll-back program.
GLEA GILLUM,
President, Saline County Farmers Bureau.

FAIRBURY, NEBR., *June 21, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.
DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We Nebraska farmers don't want subsidies or parity payments. We want a square deal with labor and industrials. We want to raise what our land is fitted for and we have the machinery to handle.
We can't raise paying crops of flax. Our land is too full of weed seeds. We can't raise peanuts; nor can we raise soybeans—usually too dry and too many rabbits to eat them when they are green—but we can raise wheat, oats, corn—sometimes—alfalfa, sweet clover, hogs, cattle, sheep for wool and mutton. We use sweet clover for rotation. We can successfully raise brome grass, alfalfa for hay and pasture.
Yours,
CHARLES M. TURNER.

MCPHERSON, KANS., *June 14, 1943.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from Kansas.
DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We hear considerable about a roll-back in prices and a subsidy plan. I am against any such a plan I hope you will work against such a plan and vote against it. It savors a lot of politics. My farms market cattle and hogs each year. I can see no reason for hogs being cheaper now than a year ago with the cost of production being 25 to 30 percent higher.
Yours with thanks.
J. J. YODER.

THE LIGHT GRAIN & MILLING CO.,
Liberal, Kans., June 18, 1943.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: This letter is being written to tell you that we are definitely opposed to the food-subsidy plan which is now before Congress.
We cannot help but feel that subsidy payments are just as inflationary as wage increases; that the taxpayer will bear the entire burden for the appeasement of a few radical labor leaders that seem to be running our Government. Proponents of the food-subsidy plan point to the success in England and Canada of subsidy in keeping living costs down, but we understand that labor costs are also definitely controlled. If prices of everything, including wages, were frozen, then we could see the possible necessity of subsidizing a few out-of-line commodities, but when it comes to leaving wages and a few pressure-group commodities open and then attempt to compensate the producer for a roll-back in price to appease the labor leaders, it is high time people of this country took some action and place men in charge of our Government that are forthright and have nerve enough to deal with such situations.
We know that you will take the proper action in dealing with this matter and hope that there is sufficient strength to defeat it.
Yours truly,
THE LIGHT GRAIN & MILLING CO.,
W. E. BUSH, *Sales Department.*

THE J. C. LYSLE MILLING CO.,
Leavenworth, Kans., June 21, 1943.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I take it for granted that you are opposed to the administration plan for subsidies on agricultural products.
The milling industry has gone on record as vigorously opposing the proposed administration subsidy program.
I, personally, am opposed to this subsidy plan—
1. Because it is an evasive, almost dishonest attempt to side-step the labor issue.
2. Because it represents huge, nonessential additions to the tax burden, at a time when taxes are intolerably high.
3. Because the subsidy plan, as proposed by the administration leaders, will not prevent inflation, but, on the contrary, will immeasurably increase the hazard of inflation and have a disastrous effect upon the economic structure of this country for years to come.
Yours very truly,
JAMES C. LYSLE, *President.*

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that so far in the discussion of subsidies and roll-backs of prices two facts have been overlooked. One is that inflation is a real danger on the home front today, probably the most serious danger. The estimate is that last year there was $25,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power in this country. After individuals had paid all their taxes, had made all their individual purchases of bonds, and had paid their living expenses, they had $25,000,000,000 left over to spend. In my opinion, it is that inflationary gap which has pressed steadily upward on prices, and so long as it is there—and this year it will be even larger—any "hold the line" program will be impossible until something is done about it.

It is estimated the excess purchasing power this year may reach $35,000,000,000. If the Government continues to permit purchasing power to accumulate during another year or two of the war, so that it will be from $75,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 at the end of the war, and by subsidies or other means we attempt to hold price increases to a slow pace, that extra purchasing power of from $75,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 turned loose in our economy at the end of the war will create chaos. It is almost certain to bring about a runaway inflation, and make any sound, sensible post-war program for America almost impossible.

So far as I can see, neither the administration nor Congress is proposing any realistic program to take care of that excess purchasing power. Whether it is done through a retail sales tax, stiffer individual income tax rates, or compulsory savings, or a combination of all three, I am convinced—and I have sat through the consideration of all these bills in the Committee on Banking and Currency—that until the job of sopping up all this extra purchasing power is done, any measures to hold the line on prices and wages are doomed to failure.

Today we face this situation: The executive branch has told the country that it proposes to hold the line, and prevent a wage-price spiral upward, by the use of subsidies, a roll-back of prices, and a hold-the-line program. In common with most of the other Members of this body, I do not think it will work so long as from twenty-five to thirty-five billion dollars of excess purchasing power remain in the hands of the people, and nothing is done about sopping it up.

There is no proposal from the administration, and no proposal in Congress, to do anything about that problem. We are merely saying to the country that we do not believe the administration has the right answer, but we ourselves have not any answer.

Mr. President, I am not ready or willing to sit here and vote against subsidies, unsound as I think they are in substance—I do not think we can oppose them in principle, because Congress has voted subsidies for many purposes—I am not prepared to sit here and tell the country that we think the administration program to hold the line on inflation is unsound and will not work, when we have not any program of our own.

I am supporting the Bankhead-Taft committee proposal. That would allow the administration $500,000,000 for subsidies to finance roll-backs on meat and butter, and to hold the line under the present program. Congress will return next fall, and we will then see how the program has worked, and I am hopeful that if the subsidy program proves that it cannot do the job, then either the Congress or the administration will propose a tax and compulsory savings program which will do the job. But I am very much afraid that if we deny the administration authority to try their answer to inflation, and propose none of our own, the country will be doomed to see prices and wages chase each other upward, and finally end in a real inflation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. In discussing the subject of subsidies yesterday I said that I had on more than one occasion asked the O. P. A. authorities if they would submit to the Committee on Banking and Currency the program of subsidies they intend to apply if the pending bill is approved. I was informed late yesterday afternoon, and again this morning, that they were working on an explanation of the plan which they will submit, and I hope to have it before the conclusion of this debate.

I have, however, received from the O. P. A. authorities, by way of Mr. Richard B. Gilbert, who is economic adviser to Prentiss Brown, a lengthy statement entitled "The Essential Role of Subsidies in the Stabilization Program." This paper sets forth the arguments of the O. P. A. in favor of the entire program. I fear Senators will not have a chance to read it before the conclusion of the debate, but I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD, as I have the feeling that, regardless of what we do today, the subject of subsidies will be before the Senate again. I am hopeful, of course, that the committee bill will pass, but if it fails of passage, it is certain that this subject will confront us time and again. I think these arguments should be made available for the RECORD, for use in the future, and for the benefit of all those who are concerned with this all-important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF SUBSIDIES IN THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

THE STABILIZATION CRISIS

The present crisis on the economic front shows that the stabilization program urgently requires reinforcement. Such reinforcement must consist not only of the more vigorous use of the major controls which constitute that program; it must include the use of subsidies as a new major technique. In this connection it should be borne in mind that the national program for economic stabilization as it now stands has developed stage by stage. New elements and new techniques have been added as the growing pressures of war have altered the basic circumstances with which it has had to deal.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Beginning in June 1940 with what was virtually a "price watching" program, it has expanded as the pressures have grown. Price watching became price control. Price control, originally selective in nature, was made general a little over a year ago. Farm prices have been made more fully subject to control. The fiscal program, embracing taxes, savings, and credit control, has been harnessed to the requirements of economic stability. Rationing of consumer goods has been introduced and expanded to insure equitable distribution. Control of incomes has been imposed, both to relieve the pressure of labor costs upon prices and to slow down the increase of income.

Thus, from a small beginning, appropriate to the minor dimensions of the problem in 1940, the policy has developed into a broad, many-sided program geared to the tremendous strains and pressures of an all-out war economy. This gearing, however, is not yet complete. That fact is clearly indicated by the present crisis, in which, while wage stabilization has been made effective, the cost of living has continued to rise until the stabilization of wages, and with it the entire program, is jeopardized. To make the program effective, it must be strengthened and it must include full use of subsidies along the lines which the British and the Canadians have found so effective.

WAGES AND THE COST OF LIVING

The wage and cost-of-living elements of the stabilization policy are very closely linked, perhaps more closely than any others in the integrated program. Not only have wages and the cost of living exerted pressure each on the other in every inflationary period known to history, but in the national program this linkage has been expressly recognized and wage stabilization has been accepted on the basis of the declared policy to stabilize the cost of living. Under the Little Steel wage stabilization program, wage rate increases have been limited to 15 percent above January 1941 levels.

The cost of living, however, has risen 25 percent above the level of January 1941. Even since September 15, 1942, the date named by the Congress as the bench mark of wage and price stabilization, it has risen 7 percent. Maintenance of wage stabilization requires that the cost of living be reduced to the September 1942 level and stabilized there.

UNACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE ROLL-BACK

There is no alternative to rolling the cost of living back into line with wages. To take the other course and to adjust wages upward to match the rise in living costs would set the inflationary spiral in operation and make certain that a new crisis would arise every few months. A roll-back of the cost of living is therefore an inescapable move in the stabilization program. Such a roll-back, however, cannot be permitted to interfere with production. That, too, is a wholly unacceptable alternative, one that could not possibly be tolerated.

Why subsidies must be used

A problem of reconciling adequate production on the one hand and stable prices on the other arises in those cases where the price that would cover all production costs exceeds the level at which prices to consumers are to be stabilized. The producer must be assured this return and yet the consumer must not be required to pay more.

These are two distinct problems. The apparent conflict between them, however, is easily reconciled and the solution to both is obvious as soon as one recognizes that the price paid by the consumer need not be the sole source of return to the producer. What the producer gets from the ultimate consumer in the form of a market price can be supplemented, in those few cases where it is necessary, by payments from the Government. These payments permit him to receive an adequate return while the price to the final user is firmly held.

The need for supplementing these returns arises not only in cases where price ceilings must be reduced but also in cases where the cost of producing marginal output necessary for the war exceeds the ceiling price and where costs will increase.

Certain costs are bound to increase, regardless of our ability to stabilize raw-material prices and wage rates. New and more expensive raw materials may have to be substituted for those customarily used; less efficient facilities and less efficient labor may have to be utilized; foreign suppliers may raise their prices; the hazards of ocean shipping, traffic congestion, or break-downs may raise transportation costs. A variety of such dislocations is inevitable in wartime.

In many cases earnings are sufficient to permit these cost increases to be absorbed. In many other cases they may be met by compensating economies of production. There will nevertheless be cases where returns must be supplemented. If prices were to be increased in such cases, stabilization could not be achieved.

It has become obvious to all that when we increase one price we make necessary other increases, we create new pressures throughout the economy, and we thereby make it impossible to achieve the goal of stability. This is, of course, a basic reason for supplementing producers' returns by using subsidies instead of raising prices. Less frequently appreciated is the fact that effective price control requires that a price, once fixed, should remain stable. If a price regulation has to be frequently amended or replaced by new regulations, it becomes complex and irritating to business. At the same time it becomes ineffective and unenforceable because the changes make it difficult or impossible for the consumer to know what the ceiling is. Thus both simplicity and effectiveness of price control require that price increases be avoided.

Savings made possible by the use of subsidies

There is widespread appreciation, both in Britain and in Canada, that the subsidy program, by making possible the stabilization both of living costs and of the wage bill, is saving the country far more than it is costing its treasury. The principles involved may be illustrated if we turn to the program now

scheduled to go into effect in the United States and compare the cost of the subsidies with the costs that would result under the alternative wage and price adjustments.

Even when we take the narrow view and ignore the immeasurable damage that inflation could do to war production, war morale, and post-war adjustment, considering only the narrow financial results of using subsidies to help prevent inflation, we find that subsidies are an enormously profitable investment as compared to the alternative. They save the Government and consumers far more than they cost. In fact, even if we ignore the saving to consumers, they save the Government alone far more than they cost.

DIRECT SAVINGS

The subsidies are to be used to prevent price increases, or in the case of meat, butter, and coffee, to permit price reductions. The price increases that will be avoided or the price reductions that will be directly secured by their use far exceed the amount of the subsidies. In the case of meat, butter, and coffee, the subsidies will cost from three hundred to four hundred and fifty million dollars. The direct saving to household consumers alone is equal to $470,000,000. This saving reflects the lower margins which prevail in wholesaling and retailing when prices are low. Because of the practice of the distributive trades, whereby major costs move in the same direction as prices, any price reduction at the producer or processor level must result in a greater reduction at the retail level.

INDIRECT SAVINGS

This source of saving, substantial though it is, is the least important source of saving from subsidies. Far more important is the saving to the Government and to consumers that results from the avoidance of the wage increases that would occur if subsidies were not employed and from the avoidance of the price increases that such wage rises would make necessary. For we are faced today by a specific situation in which the alternative to subsidies is a break-down of the Little Steel wage stabilization formula, and a series of wage and price increases that would cost the Government many times the amount of the subsidy.

These savings can be estimated in dollars and cents. The meat, butter, and coffee program provides a clear example. This program will reduce the cost-of-living index by more than 1 percent. It is conservative to assume that without this reduction wages and salaries would have to increase by four-fifths of this percentage. Some groups would probably be able to get a wage adjustment equal in percentage to the price increase that has occurred since September 15, the base date of the Stabilization Act. Others would be able to get much less. The figure of 0.8 percent wage adjustment for every 1 percent price change is a reasonable average. The reduction of the cost-of-living index amounting to 1.1 percent will, on this estimate, forestall a wage increase averaging about 0.9 percent. Since wages and salaries will equal over $100,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1944, the increase in the wage and salary bill that would occur without the meat, butter, and coffee price reductions would be over $900,000,000.

What effect would this have upon prices? The most conservative assumption that it is reasonable to make is that the value of output would go up on the average by no more than the increase of wages and salaries. In some cases, to be sure, profit margins are today so wide that an increase of wages could be absorbed out of these profits without an increase in prices. Where profits are already low, however—and this may be true for essential firms even if not for an entire industry—a wage increase would put pressure on prices for the industry as a whole. In still other cases prices are determined upon the basis of cost plus a percentage. This is true, for example, in distribution, for reasons already referred to. It is also true under many Government contracts where prices are based upon cost plus a percentage. Taking all these factors together, it is clear that the smallest increase to be expected in the value of a product as a result of a wage increase would be an increase equal in dollars and cents to that of the wage and salary cost.

This is not the end of the matter, however. The price increase that would result from the initial wage adjustment would raise the cost of living, and this, in turn, would require further wage adjustments.

TOTAL SAVINGS OF $4 TO $12 FOR EVERY DOLLAR SPENT

At the end of two wage and price adjustments, prices would have risen by $1,300,000,000. The Federal Government alone will purchase about 55 percent of the gross national product and would presumably have to pay a roughly similar proportion of any price increase. The saving on Government expenditures through the avoidance of price increases that the Government would otherwise have to pay is therefore about $720,000,000. The saving to consumers from the avoidance of these price increases is $550,000,000.[1] When the direct saving to consumers from the price reduction on meat, butter, and coffee is added to this, the total saving to consumers amounts to $1,020,000,000. Thus, the total saving on expenditures for Government and consumers together amounts to $1,470,000,000, since the cost of this program will be between $300,000,000 and $450,000,000 a year. The ratio of saving to cost is roughly between 4 and 6 to 1.

If we make the somewhat less conservative, but perhaps more realistic, assumption that a rise in wages will bring about an equal percentage increase in prices, the saving is still greater. On the basis of this assumption, savings on Government expenditures alone are estimated at almost $1,750,000,000. Savings to consumers from the avoidance of price increases are $1,300,000,000, and when the direct savings resulting from the price reduction is added, the total savings to consumers amounts to about $1,770,000,000. This is a total of over $3,500,000,000 on Government and consumer expenditures together. The cost of subsidy needed to obtain this result being at most $450,000,000, and possibly as low as $300,000,000, the ratio of saving to cost on this assumption is therefore no less than 7½ to 1 and may run 12 to 1.

DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

This cost estimate, it must be noted, reflects payments to all parts of the industry. Across-the-board payments are not typical of subsidy programs and the ratio of saving to cost will ordinarily run substantially higher than has been estimated for the meat, butter, and coffee program. Ordinarily subsidies may be limited to only part of an industry because of the market variation in costs among firms in the industry. Under such circumstances, earnings may be satisfactory for the industry as a whole, while for some firms, or for additional production by otherwise low-cost firms, costs may be above the ceiling price. In such cases, subsidy payments, while necessary to cover these costs, may be limited solely to the high-cost production.

[1] The balance of the $1,300,000,000 saving would accrue on purchases of the now negligible amount of private new capital formation.

The most striking example of subsidies to marginal producers is the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc which has been operating since February 1942. In the case of copper, for example, the use of a subsidy saves the Government at least $28 for every dollar it spent.

If the high-cost copper had been obtained in 1942 by permitting the price of all copper to rise from the ceiling level of 12 cents to the price of 17 cents that is necessary to cover high-cost production, the Government would have paid an additional $280,000,000 in 1942. To avoid this the Government paid 17 cents only for the high-cost copper and sold it to manufacturers of war goods for 12 cents. It thus took a loss on the high-cost copper of 5 cents a pound. This loss is the subsidy. Since virtually all copper mined goes into war goods bought by the Government, the subsidy makes it possible for the Government to avoid paying the 5-cent premium on the overwhelming bulk of the output and thus saves considerable expense in the purchase of war goods. In 1942 it cost the Government about $10,000,000 to save the $280,000,000 that it would have had to pay in additional direct costs of the copper component of war materials. Moreover, since the increase would undoubtedly have been pyramided in the price of the finished war goods, the saving is undoubtedly much greater than the indicated 28 to 1. That is a saving with a vengeance.

Method of granting subsidies

Several possible mechanisms are available for making these payments. One is a direct payment of the subsidy to producers, or distributors, depending upon where the pressure on returns is being felt, or, in case prices for the industry are realined generally, where the subsidy can be most efficiently administered. This commonly is at the processor level.

A second method is for the Government to purchase the entire output of the product to be subsidized and to sell it back to the industry or to consumers at a lower price than was paid. The loss resulting from sale at the lower price constitutes the subsidy. By this means the Government can pay a price to the producer high enough to insure that he will get adequate returns, while at the same time the product can be made available to processors and distributors and thereby to consumers at a lower price than would be possible without the subsidy.

This method, like the first, is used extensively in Canada and Great Britain. In Canada, the Commodities Price Stabilization Corporation, especially created for the purpose, conducts these purchases and sales. This method has also been used in the United States to some extent. The Commodity Credit Corporation purchases crude vegetable oils, for example, from refineries and sells it back to them at one-half cent per pound less, thus permitting these fats and oils to be processed and sold at stable prices, while maintaining the Department of Agriculture's support price so that production of the vegetables may be increased.

The third method of subsidy, which in fact is only a variation of the second, is for the Government to purchase, not the entire output, but that portion of the output of a commodity which is produced at a cost higher than the price ceiling permits and to sell it to the industry at the ceiling price. This method has been used with extraordinary savings to the Government in premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc, already cited above.

A fourth method of subsidization is the provision of a service by the Government at a loss. This method is used only in connection with the provision of services that have mounted in price directly because of

war conditions. For example, the War Shipping Administration, in order to stabilize the cost of war risk insurance to shippers, insures commodities at stable rates and absorbs any excess of claims paid over premiums. Commercial insurance rates have skyrocketed because of submarine activities. Without the Government's program for providing insurance at stable rates, the continued importation of goods at stable prices would have been impossible.

Analysis of objections to subsidies

The program to expand the use of subsidies into one of the key techniques for stabilizing the cost of living has given rise to a host of objections. Most of the objections to the use of subsidies ignore the alternative to their use and are without foundation. Let us consider each of these objections in turn, remembering as we do so that the alternative to the use of subsidies is a rise in the cost of living and resumption of the upward spiral of prices and wages.

OBJECTION NO. 1. SUBSIDIES (LOWER PRICES) ARE THEREFORE INFLATIONARY

This objection takes various forms. In its most confused form the argument is that subsidies to hold down or reduce prices leave people with more money to spend upon other commodities, and that they are therefore inflationary.

Now, of course, to say that lower prices are more inflationary than higher prices is to say that down is up. Probably what people have in mind when they make this argument is that if we were to let prices go up without letting incomes go up—a virtually impossible task—the price increase would prevent or discourage people from buying, and that if we hold prices down we shall have to restrict their purchasing by other means.

But this necessity exists in any case. That is just why we have rationing. We do not propose to restrict purchases of necessities to consumers through letting prices rise. To do that would be to distribute the supplies to the people who have the longest purses. It is precisely to avoid such an inequitable distribution of scarce necessities that we have price control and rationing in the first place.

In any case, this argument completely overlocks the fact that if prices were permitted to rise, wages and other incomes would have to be adjusted to the increased cost of living. Moreover, the rise in parity prices would require an increase of ceilings on farm prices and thus would result in an increase of farm income. The increase of incomes resulting from these adjustments would give consumers far greater purchasing power than would be absorbed by the higher prices themselves. These adjustments, therefore, magnify the consequences of a price rise. On the other hand, even an across-the-board subsidy avoids this inflationary result, and a subsidy that is limited to high-cost production reduces still further the relatively small increase of income resulting under any subsidy program. Thus, the premise of this argument, that subsidies release more purchasing power for expenditures upon other commodities than would a price increase, with all its indirect effects, is simply not correct.

OBJECTION NO. 2. SUBSIDIES INCREASE WAR EXPENDITURES, THUS FEED INFLATION

Another reason is advanced for supposing subsidies to be inflationary. They involve an additional expense to the Treasury at a time when war expenditures are rising to previously unheard-of levels. Since it is recognized that the increase of war expenditures is the underlying cause of the inflationary danger, does it not follow that a further increase, such as is involved in the payment of subsidies, aggravates that danger? Here again the answer is clear so long as the alternative to subsidies is borne in mind.

A rise in prices would involve an increase in Government and private expenditures far greater than the increase which the subsidy expenditure involves. In fact, the increase in Government expenditures alone that a price increase would cause is far greater than that involved in the payment of subsidies. This follows from the fact that the Government is now the major buyer of goods in the American economy. It has been noted above that in the fiscal year 1944 the Government will probably purchase at least 55 percent of the gross national product. Its expenditures will be over $100,000,000,000. A 1-percent increase in the prices Government must pay would cost it more than $1,000,000,000. The subsidies required to forestall such an increase fall far short of such a sum. Thus, even when one looks only at the effect on the Public Treasury, the cost of subsidies is much less than the cost of rising prices. Contrasted with the alternative, subsidies not only constitute a definite economy, but they also involve a smaller injection of purchasing power, and, therefore, are not inflationary.

OBJECTION NO. 3. SUBSIDIES ONLY CONCEAL PRICE RISES

Another objection sometimes made is that the use of subsidies does not prevent price increases; it merely conceals them. The basis of this argument is the claim that the subsidies involve taxes which are as great as the price increase that is avoided. For example, it is said that the use of a subsidy to avoid an increase in the price of butter from 45 to 50 cents a pound merely means that the public pays 45 cents for butter and 5 cents in taxation instead of paying 50 cents for butter, and that the public is no better off.

Here again the argument ignores the indirect effect of a price rise upon wages and upon prices generally. It cannot be stressed too greatly or too frequently that, whether the cost of subsidies is financed by taxation or by borrowing, the increase in the tax load or in the public debt is far less when subsidies are used than when prices are permitted to rise.

Furthermore, the argument that the public is no better off because what it saves in prices it pays in taxes ignores completely the very great difference in the impact of a price increase and the impact of additional taxes among income groups. Under our democratic system of progressive taxation, additional tax revenues are raised predominantly in accordance with ability to pay. A price increase, on the other hand, takes equal amounts from every purchaser regardless of his income and thus takes a higher percentage of low than of high incomes.

The fact that inflation does bear so heavily and so unfairly on low-income groups is a major reason for imposing price control in the first place. To say now that it does not matter to the consumer whether price increases are prevented or not is to deny completely this basis for price control. Where the argument is not grounded in ignorance or naïveté, it can only be a back-door attack on the anti-inflation program.

OBJECTION NO. 4. CONSUMERS CAN AFFORD HIGHER PRICES

A somewhat similar fallacy underlies the point, frequently made, that price increases are not objectionable because consumers have such high incomes that they can afford to pay higher prices. Figures are then cited to show that total income of consumers has risen by more than the cost of consumers goods and that consumers are consequently spending a smaller proportion of their incomes than ever before. Here again the use of total figures conceals one of the major problems that price control is designed to meet.

The increase of total consumer income reflects extremely large increases in the incomes of some consumers and, at the same time, very small increases or no increase at all in the incomes of other consumers. The annual earnings of large groups of the population have not risen by nearly enough to compensate for the rise in the cost of living and in many cases have not risen at all. Between January 1941, the base date for wage stabilization, and March 1943, weekly earnings in all nonagricultural establishments rose 32.5 percent. When corrected for the rise in the cost of living during the same period, this percentage is drastically lowered to 8.8. Within nonagricultural establishments as a whole, real earnings have risen 29 percent in manufacturing and 27 percent in mining. In trade, in government, and in finance and service, on the other hand, real weekly earnings have actually declined by from 3 to 10 percent.

People dependent upon fixed incomes are invariably squeezed in a period of rising prices. The contraction in the value of their incomes far exceeds the squeezes that are the subject of much vociferous complaint. The victims of the cost of living squeeze are not organized into well-financed associations to assert their claims, but they are nevertheless an important fraction of our population. Over 3,300,000 of our citizens are employed by State and local governments as policemen, firemen, school teachers, etc. They and their families depend for a living upon virtually fixed salaries. Over 2,500,000 more are in the service of their National Government on the same basis. Recipients of public assistance, numbering 3,000,000, and 860,000 veterans who served their country honorably in past wars likewise depend in varying degrees upon fixed incomes which have already depreciated and will depreciate more if prices are permitted to rise further. The people of this country own 120,000,000 life insurance policies and over 14,000,000 savings bank deposits. Their work and morale are vital to the successful operation of the economy.

The front behind the battle front would suffer if we failed to carry out our obligations under the stabilization program. Moreover, the families of our fighting men are, in whole or in part, dependent on fixed allotments while their breadwinners are away. If for no other reason, for the sake of these men at the front, the welfare of their families must be protected. These people do not have great organizations to speak for them. They expect and demand protection from their Government. The fact that the incomes of so many consumers remain the same in money amount while the cost of living rises for all is the very characteristic of inflation that causes inequitable distribution and indiscriminate hardship. The rise of total consumer income is irrelevant.

Moreover, the fact that total consumer income has increased more than the value of consumers' goods is itself largely a reflection of inflationary forces, although it also reflects our success in controlling prices. Expenditures on consumers' goods have been held down because the physical quantity of consumers' goods has been curtailed and price rises have been restrained, while the increase in incomes reflects increasing production and employment on war goods, and inflationary increases in wage rates, profits, and farm prices.

The increase of consumer income in excess of the rise in the value of consumers' goods and services is a general characteristic of inflationary periods. If incomes did not rise faster there would be no upward pull upon prices—there would be no inflation. The disproportionate growth of consumer income is, in other words, a reflection of the very thing that causes the inflationary pressure. To raise prices on the theory that the high level of consumer income justifies an increase would inevitably result in further increases of profits, farm incomes, and wages, and therefore of consumer incomes. The increase of consumer incomes would, on this theory, justify still

further price increases. This in turn would force further increases in consumer incomes, and so on, indefinitely. Thus, if this argument were to be translated into practice it would result in continuously rising prices.

OBJECTION NO. 5. COSTLY SUBSIDIES—TINY SAVINGS

Another related fallacy is involved in the objection that the saving to the public from the avoidance of particular price increases would be only a few dollars per person and that the prevention of this increase in prices through a subsidy program is not worth the effort it involves. This argument has all the characteristics that appear in arguments against price control. Not only is it wrong as to the facts, but it is designed to lull the public into forgetting that inflation must be fought every step of the way.

It is wrong as to the facts because it takes into account only the initial price increase that the subsidy avoids, while completely ignoring the forces that cause one price increase to give rise to others and thus to generate that spiral of inflation, the danger of which is generally recognized.

Second, the argument that any given price increase is insignificant is the siren song that all price-controlling authorities have to resist. No single price increase taken by itself will upset the economy, say applicants for a higher price. It is true that a particular price increase is insignificant, but the enormous sum total of consumers' goods itself consists of a large number of just such separately "small" components and it is precisely with the multitude of such individually minor pressures that the price-controlling authorities must cope. Such small increases, each one directly affecting only a tiny fraction of the total volume of goods, are, when taken together, just the stuff of which inflation is made.

Furthermore, again the point comes to the fore, these "small" increases are not small to those at the lowest levels of income, whose need for protection against the burden of inflation is greatest. The use of an average figure to indicate what a price increase would mean to consumers disregards completely the fact that sums which are relatively small to people in the middle and higher income brackets are substantial to those less fortunately situated.

OBJECTION NO. 6. IF SUBSIDIES ARE USED NOW, WON'T PRICES FALL WHEN THEY ARE WITHDRAWN AFTER THE WAR?

The answer to this question is a flat "No." Subsidies are proposed as a part of the price-control program. They will be withdrawn only when the danger of inflation has disappeared, a time when retail price ceilings can also be removed. Thus there will be no squeeze when the subsidy is withdrawn.

Not only is there no reason whatever to suppose that the withdrawal of subsidies will cause a decline in prices to producers, but there is good reason to suppose that a subsidy program makes a decline far less likely to occur. If we permit an inflation to develop, a sharp post-war fall in agricultural prices is virtually inevitable. Since the price-stabilization program cannot work without the subsidy program, a sharp rise and a sharp fall of prices is far more likely to occur without such a program than with one.

Moreover, when the war ends producers will not have to work under forced draft, as at present. Cultivation will not have to be so intensive and costs will be lower, so that even if prices to producers do decline somewhat, producers' net incomes need not fall. So far as any drastic fall is concerned, the Government has already guaranteed to support prices of a substantial list of major agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war.

OBJECTION NO. 7. SUBSIDIES ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR ENFORCEMENT

Beyond these objections, which fail to take into account the basic nature of inflation, are certain other points which are valid and which require consideration. The first is that there is no use in preventing price ceilings from being raised if they are only disregarded and that under such circumstances it would be better, in fact, to permit the ceilings to rise so that the illegal margin between selling prices and actual prices is decreased and money taken out of the hands of violators of the law. This is not an argument against subsidies; it is an argument in favor of enforcement. The Government does not propose and never will propose the use of subsidies as a substitute for enforcement. On the contrary, it proposes to push enforcement harder than ever, and it is taking effective steps to do so.

The Office of Price Administration is simplifying its controls by replacing the diverse ceilings that existed under the General Maximum Price Regulation and other regulations by dollars-and-cents price ceilings, which are as uniform as customary trade practices and cost differentials permit. This program has gone far and it is being pushed further. It will permit consumers to know what price ceilings are and will make it possible for them to recognize violations where they exist. This program constitutes a major advance in the enforcement of price concontrol. In addition, the Price Administrator has requested appropriations to permit the employment of 1,800 more enforcing agents. Finally, the subsidy program itself will contribute to the enforcement of price ceilings by enabling the Office of Price Administration to check up on conformity with its regulations simultaneously with the administration of the subsidy program.

OBJECTION NO. 8. SUBSIDIES ARE SUBJECT TO ABUSE

It is also argued that a subsidy program is subject to abuse. That possibility does exist. It exists with any Government program and it must be guarded against. The Government recognizes that a subsidy policy must be hedged about with safeguards. A great deal of thought has been given to this problem, and standards have been developed for the application of this policy.

The existence of this problem, however, should not inhibit us from taking necessary action. Standards to protect the Public Treasury and to make certain that no vested interests grow up are no more necessary in connection with the subsidy program than they are in connection with many other programs which governments all over the world are not prosecuting. They have been developed in connection with procurement programs; they can and will be developed in connection with the subsidy program. The question is simply whether we will face the danger of one potential evil or whether, fearing it, we will subject ourselves to a certain and greater evil.

We do not refuse to fight the war merely because the procurement of munitions opens the door to abuse. On the contrary, we face that problem and surmount it in order to accomplish the greater purpose. We shall do the same in connection with the subsidy program. What is at stake in this program is the success of our fight against inflation, and at stake in that fight, in turn, is the successful prosecution of the war and of the peace.

Foreign experience

No other major belligerent has accepted either the alternative of rising prices or that of strangled production. All have insured full production within the framework of stable prices. They have done this by using subsidies to insulate the cost of living from rising production costs. It is the wise and effective use of subsidies that has enabled both the British and the Canadians to reconcile the imperative of economic stability with the imperative of war production.

The miraculous production achievements of the British are widely known. It is not so well known that for over 2 years the cost of living in Britain has been held to virtually absolute stability and the cost of foods has even been reduced. Evidence of the effectiveness of British stabilization is found in the fact that, whereas between the outbreak of war and May 1941, the cost of living rose 29 percent, between the later month and April 1943, it actually fell 1 percent. During this period, moreover, the retail price of foods in Britain, which had risen 25 percent above pre-war levels, was reduced 3.7 percent.

Similarly in Canada: Cost of living stabilization was made national policy in December 1941, and subsidies were used from the outset in effectuating that policy. The cost of living had risen 15 percent at that time. In the year and a half that followed, down to May 1943, the net increase in the cost of living was only 2 percent. Several successive roll-backs, made possible by subsidies, accomplished this, and in June 1943 a new roll-back was scheduled to reduce or eliminate even this slight rise.

The relation between the effectiveness of the British and the Canadian stabilization and the use of subsidies is indicated by the extent to which prices entering the cost of living index are subject to subsidy. In Britain 92 percent of the food component of the cost of living index is affected by subsidy. This means that 55 percent of the total cost of living index is effected by food subsidies alone. In Canada, 68 percent of all foods and 21 percent of the cost of living are subject to subsidy.

In both countries, the stabilization of the cost of living has been closely linked in policy with stabilization of wages. In Canada both wages and prices were brought under control simultaneously, whereas in Britain no such across-the-board policy has been found necessary. In both, however, wage rates have exhibited much greater stability since the cost of living has been stabilized. Under the Canadian scheme of control, wage rates are formally linked to the cost-of-living index and a cost-of-living bonus is payable to offset increases in the official index. A similar result is obtained in Britain due to the fact that one-third of the wage contracts there formally incorporate cost-of-living adjustment provisions, while wage bargaining as a whole reflects the same basic consideration.

The experience of Great Britain and Canada is a striking demonstration of the effectiveness of subsidies as part of an integrated system of price control. Subsidies work—they enable a country to hew to the line on a tough stabilization policy and at the same time to get production to the limit of its capacity.

The present crisis

The same circumstances that forced other belligerents to use this instrument now face us. The urgency of the immediate use of subsidies cannot be too greatly stressed. We cannot stand still. Unless the cost of living is rolled back to September levels, it must rise. There is no possibility of stabilizing it at its present levels because, unless it is rolled back, it must force the abandonment of the present wage-stabilization formula. The upward adjustment of wages will be a signal for enactment of the Bankhead and Pace bills, which will boost

farm prices substantially. Prices generally, under these twin pressures, will shoot upward and the cost of living will rise well above its present level. The consequences that would follow hardly need elaboration. We would be caught up once more in the inflationary spiral and under pressures which would push us along at a catastrophic pace. That we must avoid by prompt action, action which will make up for the ground lost since last September, action which will include the full appropriate use of subsidies. Only in this way can we emerge successfully from the present crisis and insure that it shall be the last on the economic front.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, following the statement already placed in the RECORD, in an attempt to make the record complete I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the Secretary of Commerce on May 25, 1943, which shows to what extent subsidies are now being used.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JESSE H. JONES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOD OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1943

The President on May 2 stated that Government will continue to take all necessary measures to eliminate all unjustified and avoidable price increases. He further stated that measures will be taken to roll back the price of meats.

In carrying out this policy, the Price Administrator announced that he would reduce not only the price of meats, but the price of butter and coffee approximately 10 percent to the consumer.

The only way to accomplish this without forcing a reduction in prices to the hog, cattle, and sheep raisers, and the dairy industry, was through subsidy payments to the processors.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authority under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act to buy and sell or to subsidize those materials that are designated by the President as critical and strategic. The materials that are to be subsidized under the immediate program have been so designated.

The Price Administrator has requested the subsidy payments. The Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization has issued a directive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make the payments, and the President has approved the directive to the extent of $450,000,000.

Subsidies in one form or another have been a matter of administration policy since 1940, first in the defense program and later in the war effort.

Due to submarine warfare we are paying excess transportation charges and, in some instances, excess cost on petroleum products.

We are paying excess transportation costs on coal to New York and New England.

We paid transportation costs in distributing sugar throughout the country up to December 16, 1942. This included sugar from Cuba and moving beet sugar from the West to the New England area. Since then, Commodity Credit Corporation has handled sugar.

We pay abnormal transportation costs and losses on the purchase of nitrates and fibers from Latin America, and on various metals, minerals, and rubber from Latin America and elsewhere abroad.

In addition to the foregoing, we are paying premiums on excess domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc.

We are causing the production of various and sundry metals in this country through buying them at a high price and selling them at ceiling prices.

In addition to copper, lead, and zinc, these include arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chrome, cobalt, fluorspar, graphite, iron ore, kyanite, magnesium, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, rutile, spodumene, talc, tantalum, tin, tungsten, and vanadium.

These materials come from one or more of the following States: Pennsylvania, Utah, Texas, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Idaho, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Vermont, Michigan, Arizona, Missouri, Alabama, New Jersey, Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and New York.

We are buying and selling scrap metals and scrap rubber at substantial losses, as well as used tires.

We are buying binder twine in Mexico and selling it at a loss.

We are paying excess costs of production to a few wood pulp producers in New England to keep them from closing down.

All of these things are being done with the approval of the President, and at the request of war policy agencies such as the State Department, War Production Board and its predecessors, War Department, Navy Department, Petroleum Administration for War, Rubber Director, Board of Economic Warfare, Office of Price Administration, and now the Director of Economic Stabilization.

A meeting was held Saturday, May 22, 1943, attended by the Director of Economic Stabilization, representatives of Office of Price Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation, Food Administrator Chester Davis, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials, at which it was determined to consult with representatives of the industries involved, to determine the most practical methods of carrying out the subsidy order on meat, butter, and coffee.

Those meetings are scheduled for Thursday and Friday of this week.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut, who has just spoken. I did not get the point of his remarks. Perhaps what he said has made it perfectly plain. Apparently the Senator inserted something in the RECORD dealing with the general subject of subsidies.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the report which was proposed to be made to the Price Stabilizer, Mr. Justice Byrnes, by a board appointed about the time he took over the position of Price Stabilizer?

Mr. MALONEY. It is not. It is simply the argument of the O. P. A. in favor of subsidies.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say that, as perhaps the Senator from Connecticut knows, that a board of the kind to which I refer was appointed at the time Mr. Justice Byrnes assumed the position of Price Stabilizer. The Board was made up of a very prominent group of Government officials, and it is assumed that its report has been ready for some time. No one, however, has been able to get hold of the contents of the report. I think it would be highly beneficial if that report were made available to Senators at this time. When the subsidy plan is once unleashed it will be very hard to stop it. I think already in Government circles the subsidy idea has gained such prominence that it constitutes a real threat to a sound Federal fiscal policy. I hope the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators on the majority side of the aisle will do what they can to bring to light the report which was made by the Special Survey Board for the benefit of Mr. Justice Byrnes when he took over the position of Price Stabilizer. It would be well to have that report placed in the RECORD along with the report which the Senator from Connecticut has just inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not have a copy of the report to which the Senator from Nebraska refers. Has the Senator a copy of it?

Mr. BUTLER. I have tried to obtain a copy, but have not been able to do so. I thought perhaps the Senator from Connecticut might be able to obtain a copy.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sure that, if the able Senator from Nebraska has not been able to obtain one, I would have difficulty in doing so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate gave unanimous consent to acceptance by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] of the amendment proposed to his amendment by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It was understood at the time that that amendment was not entirely satisfactory to some of the mining interests, and it was indicated that there would be no objection to a reconsideration of the Senate's action.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish it understood that in view of the statements made at the time that a motion to reconsider would be in order, I did not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] stated that there would be no objection on his part, and I took it for granted that all Senators who heard his statement concurred in what he said. Otherwise, I should have objected to inclusion of the George amendment in the Clark amendment.

I desire to offer a perfecting amendment to the George amendment, which meets objections the mining industry has to the George amendment. I send to the desk my perfecting amendment to the George amendment, and ask that it be stated. I ask that the clerk read the George amendment, which is very short, together with the insertions I have placed in it, and the language I propose to add at the end thereof. The matter will be in a more intelligible form then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to borrow money and (a) to pay to shippers of commodities and others the increased cost of transportation resulting from the war emergency and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided further*, That in any case in which a com-

modity is domestically produced, the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the foregoing proviso shall be exercised with respect to the importations of such commodity only to the extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the George amendment which has already been accepted to the Clark amendment, be perfected in accordance with the language read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I think this is an extremely important amendment, and that, except for a small group of Senators, no one has had an opportunity to examine it closely. The amendment may be a very worthy one. However, I think it should be examined carefully. So important an amendment should not be adopted simply after a reading of it at the desk. So I will ask the Senator from Colorado to let the amendment lie over for a little while until we shall have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it embodies a provision which is in the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is already in the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the need of again placing that language in the law if it is already in the law? I am not opposed to what the Senator is trying to do, if I correctly understand his purpose. I would at all times support what he has in mind to do, but I think in a matter of this sort Senators other than those who have already had an opportunity to examine the amendment closely should be given an opportunity to examine it for themselves. If the language is already contained in the law I do not know why the Senator proposes to insert it again in the law, unless the language referred to has been repealed, and it is the Senator's desire to reinsert it. If the language is now in the law, I should like to examine the law itself to see its effect. I think that is a reasonable request, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, so far as concerns the modification which the Senator from Colorado proposes to make in the amendment which I offered, which is literally in the language of the Senator's own amendment——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GEORGE. It is purely technical. It does not change it at all. The effect is not at all changed. The addition at the end of the amendment is of a provision which now is contained in subsection (e) of section 2 of the Price Control Act which the Clark amendment would repeal. The Senator from Colorado is merely seeking to restore that part of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the Senator from Ohio examined the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think I have read all of it. I have seen one part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me ask what amendment the Senator is offering?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A perfecting amendment to the George amendment which was accepted by unanimous vote a few minutes ago with the understanding that it might be reconsidered and perfected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment, that it is an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator has requested unanimous consent to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has requested unanimous consent to offer the amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alabama that the language in my amendment appears in an amendment which I submitted yesterday, and which lies on the table, and which was on the table at the time when the George amendment was agreed to. The provision covered by my amendment is in the present law. My amendment would merely reinstate it for fear that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] might repeal that particular provision of section 2 (e).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me raise a technical question relative to the amendment. The amendment would insert the words "through its subsidiary corporations", so that the language would read:

Provided further, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to borrow money and pay (a) to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency, and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation never borrows money through a subsidiary corporation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but it buys metals through the Metals Reserve Company; and Mr. Goodloe thought that language was necessary, and it was inserted.

Mr. TAFT. But the Metals Reserve Company does not borrow money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No one contends that it borrows money or provides for the borrowing of any money.

Mr. TAFT. But the language reads:

Provided further, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to borrow money and pay (a) to shippers of commodities—

And so forth. In other words, the point I am attempting to make to the Senator is that the place at which he proposes to have the language inserted is not the proper place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I favor no particular point for the insertion of the language. If the Senator can find a better place in the amendment to insert the language, I shall be perfectly satisfied to have that done, and I am sure everyone else concerned will be.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act before me; but I notice that the amendment provides that subsidies may be provided for—

Any commodity which has heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the Senator reading, Mr. President?

Mr. AIKEN. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the pending amendment at all. I merely offered the language as a perfecting amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. The part of my amendment which the Senator has just read is not being considered at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator from Colorado was discussing all the amendment, and I was going to ask him if there is any limitation on what the President may define as a strategic or critical material.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Strategic and critical materials are very well defined. The expression is commonly used, and I do not think any difficulty would arise along that line.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it the thought of the Senator from Colorado that the acceptance of his proposed perfecting amendment would only preserve the law as it now exists, and would make certain that it would not be changed or repealed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is exactly the point—merely to preserve the law as it is, and to escape any dangers which might possibly result from annuling or wiping out certain provisions of section 2 (e) of the present law for the protection of the mining industry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should merely like to say that, of course, I have no right to accept a modification of my own amendment, by reason of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered by the Senate on my amendment. If I still had control of my amendment, and if it were possible for me to accept the modification suggested by the Senator from Colorado, I should be very glad, indeed, to do so.

I hope that statement satisfies Senators who are concerned about the matter

of strategic minerals—a subject with which there never was any intention whatever on my part to deal in my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to place some of the language in another part of the George amendment, if agreed to, I am certain would improve the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio, that the proposed language be inserted in line 3, after the word "and", rather than after the word "Corporation", be accepted as a part of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado for unanimous consent to incorporate in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, certain proposed language?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Not being an attorney, I simply want to be rather certain that I understand what the Senator's object is. His proviso would continue the provisions of the present law with reference to strategic materials, I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct—strategic minerals.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the point. Does the amendment refer to strategic minerals, or does it refer to strategic materials, which might also include agricultural commodities? Personally, I should be glad to have it include the words "strategic materials."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First, let me say that the particular language I have proposed does not pertain at all to the point mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska. That point is covered by the original George amendment which has already been accepted by unanimous consent.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wanted to explain to the Senator from Nebraska that the language does cover strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government. It is true that strategic and critical materials would be defined by the President, as they have been defined in connection with the roll-back, to include foodstuffs; but only cases in which the foodstuffs were necessary for the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war would be covered. So, although some timber products or some other agricultural products might be covered by that language, it would not apply to any general subsidy of agricultural products.

Mr. BUTLER. However, the byproducts of the corn-milling industry—starch, for instance—are really essential to the manufacture of certain mechanical implements of war.

Mr. TAFT. If I may say a further word, the reason for permitting the extension is that if the material is to be used entirely by the United States Government it is clearly obvious that the Government would recover by means of the lower price of the goods any subsidy it might pay. So there would be no loss to the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the language proposed by the Senator from Colorado is incorporated in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as modified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before I take my seat, I send to the desk a letter and an enclosure received today by me from the Honorable Jesse Jones, and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter and enclosure will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 25, 1943.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: I enclose copy of a statement I made before the subcommittee on food of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Tuesday, May 25.

Under authority of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, and by direction of the then Director of Economic Stabilization, Justice James F. Byrnes, and with the approval of the President, definite commitments to the extent of $450,000,000 have been made for the payment of subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee.

Entirely aside from differences of opinion as to the advisability or the effectiveness of such subsidies, I feel that these commitments, already made under authority of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, should be carried out.

Further, by using the amount of money provided under the Bankhead-Taft amendment and within the limitations of that amendment, we can determine the value of subsidy payments to insure maximum production of certain essential foods without either reducing the price to the producer or permitting price increases to the consumer.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

The President on May 2 stated that Government will continue to take all necessary measures to eliminate all unjustified and avoidable price increases. He further stated that measures will be taken to roll back the price of meats.

In carrying out this policy, the Price Administrator announced that he would reduce not only the price of meats, but the price of butter and coffee approximately 10 percent to the consumer.

The only way to accomplish this without forcing a reduction in prices to the hog, cattle, and sheep raisers, and the dairy industry, was through subsidy payments to the processors.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authority under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act to buy and sell or to subsidize those materials that are designated by the President as critical and strategic. The materials that are to be subsidized under the immediate program have been so designated.

The Price Administrator has requested the subsidy payments. The Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization has issued a directive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make the payments, and the President has approved the directive to the extent of $450,000,000.

Subsidies in one form or another have been a matter of administration policy since 1940, first in the Defense program and later in the war effort.

Due to submarine warfare we are paying excess transportation charges and, in some instances, excess cost on petroleum products.

We are paying excess transportation costs on coal to New York and New England.

We paid transportation costs in distributing sugar throughout the country up to December 16, 1942. This included sugar from Cuba and moving beet sugar from the West to the New England area. Since then, Commodity Credit Corporation has handled sugar.

We pay abnormal transportation costs and losses on the purchase of nitrates and fibers from Latin America, and on various metals, minerals, and rubber from Latin America and elsewhere abroad.

In addition to the foregoing, we are paying premiums on excess domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc.

We are causing the production of various and sundry metals in this country through buying them at a high price and selling them at ceiling prices.

In addition to copper, lead, and zinc, these include: arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chrome, cobalt, fluorspar, graphite, iron ore, kyanite, magnesium, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, rutile, spodumene, talc, tantalum, tin, tungsten, and vanadium.

These materials come from one or more of the following States: Pennsylvania, Utah, Texas, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Idaho, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Vermont, Michigan, Arizona, Missouri, Alabama, New Jersey, Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and New York.

We are buying and selling scrap metals and scrap rubber at substantial losses, as well as used tires.

We are buying binder twine in Mexico and selling it at a loss.

We are paying excess costs of production to a few wood-pulp producers in New England to keep them from closing down.

All of these things are being done with the approval of the President, and at the request of war policy agencies, such as State Department, War Production Board and its predecessors, War Department, Navy Department, Petroleum Administrator for War, Rubber Director, Board of Economic Warfare, Office of Price Administration, and now the Director of Economic Stabilization.

A meeting was held Saturday, May 22, 1943, attended by the Director of Economic Stabilization, representatives of Office of Price Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation, Food Administrator Chester Davis, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials, at which it was determined to consult with representatives of the industries involved, to determine the most practical methods of carrying out the subsidy order on meat, butter, and coffee.

Those meetings are scheduled for Thursday and Friday of this week.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I received one of the circular letters from Secretary Jones. It was addressed to me at the Senate Office Building, but it was not sent to me at the Senate Office Building. It was not even folded. It was placed on my desk as a circular letter while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. I happen to know that other Senators have received such letters. The Senator from Vermont

[Mr. AIKEN] received one. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has just disclosed that he received one.

Mr. President, I say that that is an exhibition of indecent lobbying by the Secretary of Commerce in behalf of an illegal practice in which he has indulged, in plain contravention of the law, and which he now desires to have legalized by the so-called Taft-Bankhead amendment. I say that the Secretary of Commerce sat out in the lobby yesterday afternoon, conferring with Senators as they passed by, to try to raise some doubt in the mind of someone—any doubt in the mind of anyone—as to the wisdom of the course which the Senate was about to pursue in outlawing these subsidy practices.

Mr. President, I say that I think this is an indecent practice. I think it is a practice forbidden by law. In all truth and candor, I think it is a practice for which Secretary Jones could be fairly impeached by the House of Representatives; and if he were impeached I would vote to convict him, in view of the plain facts about his trying to proselyte Members of the Senate in behalf of a certain amendment now pending before this body.

Mr. Jones' statement that there have been definite commitments by the Government to the extent of $450,000,000 is not true. I say further that Secretary Jones knew that it was not true when he wrote this circular letter. The only commitment whatever which has been made has been in the form of a newspaper release by Mr. Jones and by Mr. Prentiss Brown, stating that they intended to do a certain thing about subsidies. They do not now seriously contend that they had any legal authority to commit the Government. In the debate in this Chamber I think it has been generally acknowledged that they had no such authority.

This letter has been placed on the desks of certain Senators, I do not know how many. I know of three Senators on whose desks it has been placed. What Mr. Jones is now trying to do is to convey the impression to Senators that under some sort of authority of law he has made commitments which would be sensibly diminished in amount by the so-called Taft-Bankhead amendment. That is not true. Mr. Jones has simply taken the figures of the coffee, meat, and butter industries, and on the basis of a newspaper release which he had no right to give out in the first place, and which he knew was a violation of law when he did it, is trying to make it appear, in order to defeat a limitation on his own authority, that he has already committed the Government, in violation of the law, to the extent of $450,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Missouri makes some pretty vigorous charges against Mr. Jones.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I make some very vigorous charges against him. I intended to make vigorous charges against him. I say that this is an indecent attempt at lobbying on a question now before the Senate; and Mr. Jones knew it when he did it.

Mr. CONNALLY. When I asked the question, I did not intend to call for reinforcement or strengthening of what the Senator had already said.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The longer the Senator continues, the stronger my statements will probably become.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says that Mr. Jones had no authority to do it. I do not know, but my understanding has been that he did it as the result of a directive from higher authority. I do not know what a "directive" is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that Jesse ever claimed that he had the legal authority to do it. I understand that what Jesse said was that he did it because Jimmie Byrnes told him to do it; but in the circular letter which was placed on my desk while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, Jesse claims that by direction of Jimmie Byrnes, and with the approval of the President, he has made definite commitments to the extent of $450,000,000. Where did Jesse get the authority, either by the direction of Jimmie Byrnes, or with the approval of the President, to make any such commitment of $450,000,000? I say that this is an indecent piece of lobbying, and that Jesse Jones is able enough, and a fine enough man, so that he ought to be ashamed of himself for what he has been doing.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If it was the purpose of Mr. Jones——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator received one of these letters, did he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I received one. It was not folded when I received it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mine is not folded yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the sanctity about folding a letter? Is the basis of the grave charge against Mr. Jones that he did not fold the letter?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if I still have the floor, I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the letter was signed, but it was not folded. Of course, if that is the basis of the grave charge against Mr. Jones, I will have to take my seat, because I understand it was not folded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if I did not know my distinguished friend from Texas so well, and if I were not so certain that he is fully cognizant of all the proprieties in the matter, I might take the trouble to explain; but the Senator from Texas knows very well indeed that when a letter is addressed to a Senator at the Senate Office Building, and some one sneaks into the Senate Chamber during his absence and places it and similar letters on the desk of various Senators, that is intended as a lobbying, propagandizing proposition, and not as a bona fide letter addressed to individual Senators. I am certain that the Senator from Texas will agree with that very simple statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not allergic to information, from whatever source he may receive it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator certainly ought to be allergic to misinformation, such as is contained in this letter, in the form of deliberate misstatements of facts. Mr. Jones must know that they are deliberate misstatements of fact.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If it was the intention of Mr. Jones to raise a doubt in the mind of any Member of the Senate, he has succeeded in my case. He has raised a question as to whether the letter which has been sent to some of us may not be intended as a loophole or escape for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the event of the adoption of the Clark amendment. The language of the proviso in the Clark amendment is as follows:

> *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be trying to convey to us the impression that the $400,000,000 has been promised by agreement with American farmers, so that he will not be affected by that part of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understand the feeling of the Senator from Vermont with respect to the effort of Director Jones—and I speak of him now as Director Jones, of the R. F. C., rather than as Secretary of Commerce—to prejudice the situation in the Senate by a false allegation as to his commitments.

If I had received this letter from Mr. Jones before I offered my amendment, or while I still had control of it, I would have omitted the proviso. In other words, I would not give Jesse Jones any claim of authority to continue to violate the law, as he is admittedly violating the law now. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the proviso reads:

> That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith—

When?—

> in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments.

Mr. President, it is not contended on the part of "noble Jesse" or even "dear Prentiss" that they issued any order or regulation.

Mr. AIKEN. The butter regulation was issued.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What they issued was a newspaper release.

Mr. AIKEN. No; there was a regulation issued and signed on the 7th of June 1943, by the Defense Supplies Corportion, by George A. Hill, Jr., executive vice president.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was not advised of that, I will say frankly.

Mr. AIKEN. I indicated a while ago that I would probably support the Clark amendment. However, if the Clark amendment would in any way freeze the roll-back and subsidy program, I would not feel that I could vote for it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator that if I believed that this amendment authorized the roll-back subsidy proposal, I myself would not vote for the amendment. I am frank to say that, in view of Mr. Jones' letter, if I still had control of my amendment, I would strike out the proviso. Since the yeas and nays have been ordered upon my amendment, I would not be at liberty to accept an amendment to it, but if I were at liberty to do so I would vote for an amendment to strike out the proviso.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in my hand the regulation issued with regard to the roll-back in the price of butter. It is dated the 7th of June 1943. I have no doubt that similar regulations have been issued with relation to livestock and its products, and dated prior to the 15th of June. I imagine such regulations have been issued, although they have not yet come to the notice of the public or of the growers. Therefore, I certainly do not want to have any avenue of escape to freeze in bad subsidies any more than I should want to freeze out good subsidies.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand the Senator, the meaning of the proviso is simply that payments may be made to anyone who has already suffered——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who has dealt in good faith; in other words, who has changed his position in reliance upon representations made to him by the Government. In the letter to which reference has been made, Mr. Jones has merely taken the gross figures as to those industries, and has tried to use them as a form of propaganda in favor of the so-called Taft-Bankhead amendment. As I have said, I consider it to be an entirely indecent form of lobbying.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, it would not authorize payments in the future to anyone for roll-backs, but if roll-backs were authorized prior to the time the measure is passed, then the payments might be made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is entirely correct. The only purpose of the proviso in my amendment is to prevent any suggestion being made that we were changing the legal position of anyone who had dealt in good faith with the Government. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. WHEELER. The only thing that bothered me was that in view of the statement of Mr. Jesse Jones it seemed to me he might try to contend that because of a rule or regulation the officials had a right to continue the roll-back. But that is not the intention or purpose behind the Senator's amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator that in view of Mr. Jones' letter he would probably try to contend anything. However, it certainly is not the purpose of my amendment to legalize anything which was hitherto illegal, but merely to save the legal rights of anyone who in good faith had been dealing with the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. And put a stop to the roll-back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And put a stop to illegal practices.

Mr. WHEELER. And to the roll-back. I agree with the Senator that under section 2 (e) no right exists to pay any processor a roll-back. In their wildest imagination I do not know how any officials could construe that section to mean what they have contended it does mean.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not believe that any lawyer who had given it careful study and consideration would say that the act could be used as an authorization to give a roll-back and a subsidy to the packers of the country, or to any other processor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri of course has a right to his own opinion with reference to the action of Mr. Jesse Jones, but I wish to take strong exception to his use of the term "indecent lobbying." I sharply disagree with the opinion of the Senator from Missouri. I not only believe that Mr. Jones, as head of the R. F. C., was well within his rights in communicating with any Senator or Senators, but I think that if he had information which he thought the Members of the Senate should have which would perhaps throw light on the subject now before the Senate, and had not sent the information to the Senate, he would have failed in his obligations and would have been derelict in his duty.

If there is any man at the other end of the avenue who has tried at all times to cooperate with and be sympathetic toward Congress and to understand the problems facing Congress, as well as the problems facing the individual Members of Congress, and who has always tried to work with Congress, it is Jesse Jones. He frequently comes to the Senate. He comes to the Capitol, and appears before committees of Congress more than any other Cabinet member. I really believe that he comes here more than do all the other Cabinet members combined. Why? Because of his desire at all times to work with Congress, and to furnish it with any information which he may have which may be helpful to Congress, and in order that he may at all times know the will and the intent of Congress, and try insofar as he can to carry out the will and the intent of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with everything which the Senator has said with reference to the Secretary of Commerce. Certainly, in my opinion, any Cabinet member, as the Senator has stated, who has information pertaining to a legislative question pending here, should furnish it to the Senate. The only criticism I have—and I am not sure that I am justified in it without checking with my office—is that I did not receive such a letter. I have talked to two or three other Senators who have said they did not receive such a letter.

Mr. WAGNER. I did not either.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I, myself, did not receive one. Perhaps it would have been better if Mr. Jones had sent one to all Senators. But be that as it may, he certainly should not be criticized because he sent to some Senator information which he thought the Senate should have. On the other hand, I think he should be commended for sending the letter which he sent.

Mr. MURDOCK. If a Cabinet officer has any information to which the Senate is entitled, then certainly every Senator is entitled to the same information. If a Cabinet officer is furnishing information, I think it should have general distribution throughout the entire membership of the Senate, and not be furnished merely to two or three or a half a dozen Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I put in the RECORD the letter to which reference has been made. I had the clerk read the letter, and I will state how I happened to receive it. Yesterday I called up Mr. Jesse Jones, former Senator Charles Henderson, and Mr. Goodloe, and asked them some questions with reference to the Clark amendment. I asked them to make a study of it and determine to what extent, if any, it would affect the payment of subsidies for strategic minerals. At my request they made a study of the amendment, and also at my request they assisted me in working out something which I hoped would be satisfactory to, and a protection of, the mining industry in the West. So the letter which was read by the clerk at my request came to me pursuant to the request which I have explained,

Mr. HILL. The Senator certainly took no exception to the manner in which the letter came.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said he did not request a letter, and I presume the reason he got a letter was because Mr. Jesse Jones wrote to me at my request and thought that as a matter of

courtesy he should send a letter to some of the other Senators who were concerned with this particular amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, well, Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield; I do not wish to interrupt his thought——

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Everybody saw Jesse Jones sitting there on the couch yesterday afternoon, all afternoon, actively buttonholing Senators as they came along and raising various kinds of objections to the policy proposed in the Senate at that time of repudiating the roll-back. There is no secret about that. Jesse is a large man; anybody can see him with the naked eye; it is not necessary to put on glasses to recognize him as you pass by. So, as I saw him out there buttonholing Senators, whispering in their ears, I knew exactly what Jesse was doing. I have seen Jesse operating frequently upon his side of various controversial propositions; but I saw him yesterday when he came here, and I know what he was doing when he sent this letter.

Mr. HILL. I am delighted at one thing, and that is that the Senator from Missouri says that Mr. Jesse Jones is a large man. I think Mr. Jones is a large man in many ways, and I hope that is what the Senator had in mind when he used the adjective "large." Mr. Jones was here yesterday and had lunch in Colonel Halsey's office. There was a luncheon there to which Mr. Jones and other gentlemen were invited. Most of those who were there had nothing whatever to do with this bill, so far as I know; had no interest in the bill and certainly there was nothing said about the bill.

Mr. Jones, as I have said, often comes to the Senate, no doubt to talk to Members of the Senate, as he has a right to do. He had a right to come here; he has a right to come on the floor of the Senate if he wants to do so; he has a right to go to the offices of Members of the Senate and talk to them there. Instead of condemning Jesse Jones for talking to Members, and for giving them what information he may have, and giving them his viewpoint, I want to say that I wish there were more men in the Government with the spirit and with the purpose of Jesse Jones who would come to the Congress more often and make themselves, their views, and their information available to the Congress, and that they would sit down and counsel and consult with Members of Congress, as Jesse Jones has done ever since he has been in the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to say that I am supporting the Clark amendment, that Mr. Jesse Jones knows that I am, and that he furnished me the information that I asked him to furnish, knowing that I was supporting the Clark amendment and knowing that he could not influence me in any way about it. He tried to give me some information, but I am still supporting the Clark amendment. I was interested in seeing the Clark amendment fully protect the mining industry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to say to the Senator that I agree with what he has had to say in regard to Jesse Jones, even though I did not receive one of the letters and did not get in on the lunch.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate the Senator joining in.

Mr. President, in these times we hear much said about bureaus and bureaucrats, and the basis of the complaint against them is largely that the bureaucrats, the heads of departments and agencies at the other end of the Avenue, do not show proper consideration to Congress; that they do not advise and consult with the Congress; that they have too great a disposition to put their own constructions on legislation enacted by the Congress rather than the constructions and interpretations of the Congress itself.

I wish to repeat what I said in the beginning, that I sharply disagree with and I challenge the statement of the Senator from Missouri about Jesse Jones' "indecent lobbying." I think he ought to be commended for his attitude toward Congress, for his cooperation, and for the way at all times he seeks to give Congress full information, to carry out the will and intent of the Congress, and to work in full accord and in mutual helpfulness with the Congress.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think perhaps the letter which Mr. Jesse Jones has sent to Senators is very timely because, as it seems to me, it has caused discussion and debate which may throw some light on the true meaning of the provision in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri about which I spoke earlier today. That provision, which is on page 2, reads as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made.

The author of the amendment, the Senator from Missouri, has explained that that provision is intended to protect the individuals and corporations who have acted in good faith and are entitled to some subsidy payments under the directives or orders issued by the executive department. There is a question in the minds of some Senators as to whether or not the present law permits subsidy payments to be made, but it appears to me—and I think the author of the amendment recognizes the fact—that this provision will legalize or authorize the payment of roll-back subsidies whether they are legal under existing law or not, provided those who claim subsidy payments acted in good faith.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Senator has erroneously stated the effect of the proviso in the amendment. The proviso does not authorize any payments for anything. It simply provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to affect in any way any claim anyone might have. In other words, the amendment does not give anybody a right of action against the Government; it does not assure anybody of any authority to collect against the Government; it merely does not take away any right anyone might be able to assert in court.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for that contribution, but, at the same time, there are some people who believe that the promises of subsidy payments which have been made to meat packers and creameries were not authorized by law. Therefore, I think it is well that we understand whether or not this provision does legalize such promises or authorize such payments.

The statement was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska that some of the meat packers, at least, had notified him that they do not consider that any promises or authorizations have been made.

Mr. Jones now comes along with his letter, and clarifies the atmosphere by admitting and stating that the commitments have been made for this roll-back subsidy to the extent of $450,000,000. If the Secretary of Commerce makes an admission that those commitments have been made, I do not believe we will have much difficulty in finding firms, corporations, and individuals engaged in business who will readily admit that they are entitled to those subsidies, and that under the provisions of the law they have entered into contracts with Mr. Jones, or the O. P. A., or the R. F. C., or some other Federal agency, which entitle them to the payment of these subsidies. Therefore there is reason for some folks to believe that even if the present laws do not authorize such subsidies this provision might validate commitments Mr. Jones says have already been made.

I merely wanted to point this out because we are getting ready to vote on this very important question, and some of the Members of the Senate do not want to go on record as approving subsidies in the form of roll-backs to the processors to reduce the retail prices of butter, meat, and coffee. But in voting for the Clark amendment, as modified, they may be voting for that kind of subsidies to the extent commitments have already been made, but not to the extent of commitments which may be made hereafter.

Mr. President, it appears to me that we are discussing a subject which is very strange indeed. The whole matter of subsidies on these roll-backs is very strange.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there can be any question about the intention

of the author of the amendment, since his explanation. I doubt that we should question it, because then it may be said that there is a question in the minds of some Senators. I think we should take the position that, in adopting this proviso, Congress is not affording any justification, under the language adopted, for those interested so as to construe it as meaning that they can continue these roll-backs, and the payment of subsidies on food products for that purpose. I think we should take that stand, and there should be no question about the question of the subsidy.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the Senator's statement is absolutely correct, that the Clark amendment would prohibit the continuation of any commitments for subsidies on this rollback. But is it the opinion of the Senator from Montana that the provision which I have just read will permit the payment of subsidies on rollbacks which may be claimed or may have already been made, or as to which there have been commitments, according to the letter of Mr. Jones?

Mr. WHEELER. I think that where the administration has already made a rollback, and people have suffered as a result of it, to the extent one has suffered as a result of the rollback and has taken a loss, in good conscience we should pay the subsidy to such person for this interim period, but to that extent only.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator would presume that this provision would authorize the payment of those subsidies which have been promised in good faith on the rollback program, to the extent of $450,000,000?

Mr. WHEELER. Not at all.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As specified by Mr. Jones, providing good faith contracts can be produced?

Mr. WHEELER. No, because that much money has not been paid. Mr. Jones simply states in the letter, as I understand, that he has made commitments to pay that amount in the future, that he has not paid it, but that he has made commitments to pay it in the future, providing the rollback takes effect. That is my understanding of the letter.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator would presume this would authorize the payment of everything for which he has made commitments?

Mr. WHEELER. Not at all. The amendment would only permit the payment of a subsidy where the rollback had already been made, and only up to the date when the bill shall be enacted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Clark amendment provides that the subsidy shall be paid for the period of time for which the agreement has been made.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not so understand.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and I offered requires that the roll-backs must cease whenever the bill is passed.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not so understand the situation, and I asked a specific question along that line of the author of the amendment just a few moments ago, and he said his intention was as I have stated it, that that is all he intends.

When the farm bill was before us, and some Senators questioned it, because of its uncertainty, it was felt that their opinion was probably correct, and the suggestions made by the opponents of the bill were followed, because of the controversy on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the language is quite plain, that any commitments which have been signed prior to the date of the enactment of the pending measure must be carried out, regardless of how long they are to run.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not so read the language.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The latter part of the provision, beginning in line 8, page 2, reads as follows:

> And to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interest of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well, "heretofore made".

Mr. O'DANIEL. It continues "or entered into such subsidy payments may be made."

The Secretary of Commerce claims the commitments heretofore made amount to $450,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. He has made commitments to that amount.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is a transaction, in my opinion, if he has made a commitment.

Mr. WHEELER. He has made a commitment to pay them in the event the roll-backs are put into effect. If we stop the roll-backs, certainly he cannot go on paying the money.

Mr. AIKEN. The question in my mind is whether this language in the Clark amendment does not authorize the roll-back, if it has already been committed for.

Mr. WHEELER. If there is to be question about it, we should eliminate it entirely. What I was trying to do was to get the Members of the Senate, instead of quibbling over it, to say that in our opinion this means only that they could pay money where a person had actually made a roll-back, and only from the time he made the roll-back order, or commitment, up to the time of the passage of the bill. If that were the sentiment of the Senate, that would have to be followed, and the courts would follow the views and opinions of the Senate. But if there is disagreement as to the meaning among Senators, expressed on the floor, it is left open so that anyone can say, "Well, there was a disagreement as to the meaning of it, and we will adopt this meaning, because there was this disagreement."

Mr. O'DANIEL. There seems to be much disagreement as to the exact meaning of the proposed Clark amendment. My understanding, after listening to all the arguments, is that if this provision authorizes and legalizes the payment of subsidies on the roll-back program to any extent whatever, it would authorize those payments to the extent of the commitments which Mr. Jones claims have already been made, that is, $450,000,000. I may be wrong, but that is my understanding of the authorization provided in the provision on page 2, beginning in line 2. Possibly Mr. Jones sent the letter in order to make it definite that there are outstanding commitments to that amount, and that this authorizes payments to the extent of $450,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator's fear is justified, because it seems to me the amendment affects only the rights and interest of a person who has acted in good faith and in reliance upon the regulations. No one can be so acting in good faith and in reliance, except as to the things he has done before the passage of the bill. I do not see how it could extend beyond a month's obligations. I do not think the Senator's fear is justified that it would authorize the payment of the whole $450,000,000.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There is no doubt in my mind that the commitment made by Jesse Jones was made in good faith, and that he considers it to be a just and honest commitment.

Mr. TAFT. But no person has been able to act in any way upon it so as to give him any claim to a whole year's subsidy. He may be entitled to a subsidy for the moment, for a few weeks or so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should say that if any firms or individuals are honestly able to make the statement that in good faith they had carried out transactions based on commitments made by Mr. Jones, and they are able to show combined losses to the extent of $450,000,000, this provision would authorize the payment of $450,000,000 to them, because good faith would be shown on the part of both parties to the contract.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I believe the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio would furnish the solution to the question the Senator from Texas is discussing, that with respect to commitments entered into in good faith claims may be presented to the Claims Committee, which could investigate the claims and report on them. Let us cut out any such provision from the measure now.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina is a correct one. If any commitments have been made in good faith, even though the provision for roll-back subsidy may be eliminated from the proposed amendment, such cases can be carried to the courts of the land, and proper adjudication on the cases had in the courts, and the claims satisfied there.

Mr. President, I wish to say something else with respect to the whole subject of roll-back and subsidies. It seems to be a strange subject that we are discussing here in the Senate of the United States. To me it seems strange that there should be a meat shortage all over the country, when we have so large a surplus of cattle in the United States at the present time. I thought it might be well to call the Senate's attention to statements made by two men who perhaps are as familiar with the cattle and meat situa-

tion as any two other individuals in the United States. One of them is Mr. Joe G. Montague, who is the legislative counsel for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association. That association has a large membership. Its members are entirely familiar with the cattle situation in the United States. The other gentleman to whom I shall refer is Mr. Bob Kleberg, one of the owners of the King Ranch, the largest cattle ranch in the United States, I presume. The statements made by these two gentlemen are quoted in the New York Herald-Tribune of June 23. I wish to take time to read the article, because I think it is very enlightening. It is as follows:

TEXANS REPORT HERDS OF BEEF TIED TO RANGES BY OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION CURBS

There is more than enough beef roaming the prairies to meet the Nation's requirements, but Government restrictions have kept producers and processors from getting it "off the hoof and onto the hook," two leading Texas representatives of the cattle industry said here yesterday.

If the Government would lift restrictions on quotas and abandon the subsidy plan, the industry could be restored to normal, in the opinion of Joe G. Montague, of Fort Worth, counsel for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, and Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., president and manager of the world-famous King Ranch, at Kingsville, Tex., and a director of the association. They discussed the problem in an interview at the Hotel Ambassador, Park Avenue and Fifty-first Street.

"From Government estimates," Mr. Montague said: "we know we will have, by January 1, 1944, a surplus of 15,400,000 head of cattle. This represents a surplus in poundage of 7,700,000,000 pounds. If we slaughtered one-half, or 3,850,000,000 of the surplus, we would produce out of this one-half of the surplus enough to feed 74,000,000 people in addition to supplying our armed forces and our civilian population with their normal supply of beef, and these additional people would be supplied as bountifully as are our own fighters and civilians.

"Thus we can, without hurting ourselves, actually supply normal quantities of beef for over 200,000,000 people—Americans, plus 74,000,000. In fact, the use of this surplus would be a genuine service since it would relieve our ranges and our feed lots of a severe strain on their resources."

Mr. Montague said that all elements of the packing industry at a joint meeting in Chicago on April 2 and 3 formulated a plan to solve the wartime meat problems.

"The plan is simple," he continued. "It calls for recognition of the fundamental law of supply and demand. The supply is known, or at least easily determinable, by observation of the slaughter records. The demand has three factors—the armed forces' needs, the civilian needs, and the lend-lease requirements. All other factors must yield to the proper necessity to meet the reasonable requirements of the armed forces.

"The civilian needs are controlled by rationing, with the point value being fixed but not invariable. The lend-lease demands would be very flexible, being coordinated with the actual slaughtering. Any surplus slaughtering, that is, any surplus above requirements for the armed forces and lend-lease, would be absorbed by adjustment of civilian ration points."

This plan, said Mr. Montague, was endorsed by Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration; Chester Davis, Director of the War Food Administration; and Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States, and it was announced that the plan would be put into effect.

"Following the endorsement of the plan by these officials," Mr. Montague said, "the Government has attempted to put it into operation. The Meat Board has been set up, operating in Chicago, with all essential details of the plan adopted, but, unfortunately and in spite of opposition from the entire industry and from the Office of Food Administration, the roll-back and subsidy plan has been hung on the neck of the plan and it is seriously feared that such an impediment may cause the failure of the entire plan. Certainly it can and will do no good, and only added confusion will result."

Mr. Montague and Mr. Kleberg agreed that the saving to the consumer under the subsidy program would be "microscopic" and added that the program would add increased millions of dollars in taxes on the consumers.

PUTS BLAME ON THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

"The anomalous situation of a large surplus of cattle for the consuming public did not exist before the efforts of the Office of Price Administration to control the industry," Mr. Montague asserted.

He added that the cattle industry is a sensitive one and that its confidence in the Government's efforts has been shaken.

"Production has certainly more than met expectations," he said. "It is in the control of the demand that the horrible mistake has been made. A great many more cattle should be coming to the market than are arriving. The reason for this is that the producers are literally so confused they do not know what to do."

Mr. Montague charged that "not one" representative of the cattle industry has been called in by the Government for consultation in outlining the meat program.

Mr. Kleberg said that everything the Government has done to regulate meat production has been restrictive.

"It has done nothing to aid production or distribution," he said. He added that prior to interference by the Office of Price Administration, there had been no beef problem in this country.

"If America is to have muscle and brawn," said Mr. Kleberg, "it must have beef." Lack of beef, he believes, is bad for the Nation's morale.

Looking to the future, Mr. Kleberg commented that if the currently overstocked cattle ranges should suffer a drought, or a postwar depression, the Nation's cattlemen will be ruined, with a consequent economic blow to the entire Nation.

Mr. Montague has compiled figures for his association showing that the Nation's livestock has increased from 59,000,000 head in 1929 to an estimated 82,500,000 head by January 1944. In 1934, when the cattle population had reached 74,000,000 head, he pointed out, the Government stepped in and through purchase and subsidy had 8,000,000 head killed.

To prevent a similar necessity, said Mr. Montague, the present excess numbers should be reduced during the next few years, so that at the end of the war emergency the ranges and farms will not be overstocked.

Mr. Kleberg commented that the meat shortage among consumers is as severe in the center of the great Southwest producing centers as it is in the East.

Mr. President, it appears to me that it would be wise to pay some attention to the statements of men who know something about the cattle business and the meat business. I have just read to the Senate some statements made by two such men. Now we are faced with the situation of having the meat markets short of meat. People are unable to buy the meat they need; yet we have a large surplus of live cattle. In addition, we are short of protein feeds and feed of all kinds. Yet, by rulings of the O. P. A. in setting up market quotas so that the cattle cannot be sold when they are ready for the market, those cattle are forced to be kept in the feed lots or on the range eating up feed needed for other purposes, and adding nothing to the weight or value of the cattle, because they were already finished when they were originally ready to go to the market. So we have, on the one hand, a beef shortage in this Nation, and on the other hand a surplus of cattle that are eating up the needed feed. According to the gentleman to whom I have referred, the whole situation has been caused by the rulings of the O. P. A.

Last night I was interested in listening to the radio program, March of Time, in which Mr. Montague took part. He restated the figures I have just mentioned, and stated other figures, to show how ridiculous is the situation in which the United States finds itself—our people starving for meat in the midst of an overabundance of cattle. In concluding, he called attention to the fact that on the cattle ranges in Texas and the West there used to be a certain kind of weed which, when eaten by cattle, caused them to become "loco," so that they ran around in circles, did not know what they were doing, and lost control of themselves. We called that weed the loco weed. At present that weed is almost extinct, if not entirely extinct, in Texas, but Mr. Montague expressed the opinion that possibly the weed had been transplanted and was now blooming in great profusion here on the banks of the Potomac. If so, possibly some of our Washington czars and bureaucrats may have eaten some of this loco weed, thus causing such tremendous confusion in the various governmental bureaus and agencies, more particularly in the O. P. A., which is setting up rules causing confusion throughout the entire United States and depriving the people of a sufficient amount of one of their best foods, meat, when there is an enormous surplus of cattle on the ranges in Texas and the West.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems very strange that this dignified body of intelligent persons, the Senate of the United States, should be discussing and debating roll-back subsidies as a solution to our meat and food problem, when all we would have to do to solve the whole food problem would be to abolish the O. P. A., and perhaps some other Washington czars and bureaucrats who are doing so much to retard production and completely disorganize distribution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BARDEN, Mr. HART, Mr. LESINSKI, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives further insisting upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate still further insist on its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill; agree to the further conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I desire to speak for only a minute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to read to the Senate a telegram I received yesterday after I had concluded my remarks. It is from several of the leaders of farm organizations, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator GEORGE F. AIKEN,
Washington, D. C.

We have examined the Taft amendment to S. 1108. We do not favor this amendment and respectfully urge its defeat. We have also examined the Gillette-Aiken substitute and respectfully urge its passage.

Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, National Grange; John Brandt, president, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation; Charles W. Holman, secretary National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation; Ezra T. Benzon, executive secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; P. O. Wilson, cochairman, Livestock and Meat Council; Byron Wilson, chairman, legislative committee, National Wool Growers Association; Clark Brody, executive secretary, Michigan Farm Bureau; Earl Smith, president, Illinois Agricultural Association; F. E. Mollin, secretary, American National Livestock Association.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to speak on the question which is before the Senate. I quite agree with what the Senator from Georgia said upon the floor or in private conversation the other day, that this problem is by all odds the most important one before the Senate, before the Congress, and before the country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Brooks	Langer	Stewart
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Caraway	McNary	Truman
Chavez	Maloney	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Davis	Millikin	Van Nuys
Downey	Moore	Wagner
Eastland	Murdock	Wallgren
Ellender	Murray	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Green	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Pepper	Willis
Gurney	Radcliffe	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BILL IMPORTANT ON HOME FRONT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the issue which is presented by the various amendments which have been reported from the Banking and Currency Committee or which have been offered by various Senators——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A quorum call has just been made.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is there a quorum present?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Senators have answered to their names and then left the Chamber to attend committee meetings. It is only appropriate that I should say that the Members of the Appropriations Committee, for example, are now holding subcommittee meetings, conference meetings, and hearings, and are marking up various bills which are to be passed by the 30th of June. I was myself participating in the conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill all morning, and was unable to be in the Chamber when the discussion began today. I can understand the absence of Senators from the Chamber. Their absence only emphasizes the importance of the subject matter of this bill and of the various amendments, which involve the whole capacity of America to wage this war upon the home front.

In the Appropriations Committee, which was considering the War Depart-

ment bill day before yesterday, we heard the testimony of General Arnold, the head of the Air Force. Members of that committee were naturally asking him about the feats and the sufferings of the young men who constitute the Air Force, and who are carrying on the war over the Axis countries. I think it may be appropriate to recite here one story which he told.

Senators will remember that American Flying Fortresses made an attack upon the German base at Kiel, and that 24 American bombers failed to return from that engagement. Every Flying Fortress had a crew of 9 members, and each Flying Fortress, without regard to the armament or the radio installation, cost the people of this country more than $385,000. Twenty-four of them, with their crews of 9 men each, failed to return to their base. Fortunately the failure of a plane to return to its base does not necessarily mean the loss of the lives of all the crew. It was in answer to questions with respect to that feature that General Arnold told the incident which I am about to repeat.

One of those planes was seen to be hit, and its engines were seen to catch on fire. It was falling, out of control, and seven of the crew of nine jumped with their parachutes, and were gradually coming down to earth. General Arnold stated that so far as the Germans are concerned, we know that fliers who jump by parachute are in no danger of being shot from the air, although the Japanese do shoot airmen who bail out. However, two of the crew did not bail out. They were gunners, one of them in the tail of the ship and the other in the nose. They stayed in the ship, sinking as it was to destruction in flames, and operated their guns all the way down.

Their companions in other planes who saw that those men were giving their lives when they might have jumped, destroyed in that action no less than seven German fighters.

UNITY DEMANDS WE FORGET GROUP INTERESTS

Mr. President, with those stories coming to us from the millions of boys who are waging this war, here on the home front we find labor wondering about how much it is going to receive, we find farmers wondering how much they are going to receive, and we find businessmen begging the Congress to change the law so that they will receive more. In all the confusion upon the home front there is this lack of understanding of the terrible crisis in which this Nation and democracy are involved.

Ah, Mr. President, it seems to me that the time has come for us to forget our group interests, whatever they may be, and to think of those boys who are giving their lives to save the fundamentals of freedom and of democracy. Let us stop thinking about what someone is taking away from us, and let us make a constructive effort to achieve unity upon the home front.

PEOPLE KNOW WAR MUST BE WON

Mr. President, I know that the people of America are ready for that unity. It would not be possible for the citizens of America to respond as they have responded to the appeal to buy bonds; it would not be possible for the tax bills to be received with such apparent acquiescence in every community and in every State, if the people of America did not understand that there is a war to be fought, and war to be won.

I sympathize completely with everything which has been said on behalf of agriculture, I sympathize with the position of labor, I sympathize with the position of businessmen because I know that in 90 percent of all these cases the hearts and minds of all our citizens, whether they belong to labor, capital, or the farmer, are sound. What we lack is a comprehensive, all-embracing leadership, and a willingness to cooperate one with another here in the Government.

RESENTS EFFORTS TO BYPASS CONGRESS

I understand completely, and I have expressed myself over and over again, the dissatisfaction which Members of Congress feel because of the fact that the executive arm of the Government has on numerous occasions indicated its intention to bypass the Congress, to disregard Congress, to act without regard to the letter of the law, and to explain away some of the expansions and extensions of power which have been made. That is all true, Mr. President, but, on the other hand, knowing as I do the personnel of most of the executive agencies, I realize that 90 percent of the people in the bureaus want to do the right thing.

I have charged, and I do not withdraw the charge, that there have been men in the executive bureaus, such as the O. P. A., and the W. P. B., who have deliberately wanted to change our form of government, and who sought to use the war powers to bring about that objective. I know that there have been persons in various bureaus who have believed that the time has come when little business can be liquidated, when individual enterprise can be liquidated, and all those things accomplished. But this I know, as far as the O. P. A. is concerned, when our former colleague, Mr. Prentiss Brown, assumed his duties as the Administrator of that agency, he began immediately a good-faith effort so to administer it that it would be in accord and in harmony with the law and with the will of Congress. He has shown a disposition to cooperate with Congress and to discover from Congress the legislative intent. In this very matter he has come before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has cooperated with the members of the committee in an effort to work out a satisfactory solution of the problems involved. I do not believe that the solution which has been brought upon the floor is a satisfactory one, but I wish to recognize the essential ability and good faith of former Senator Brown, and those who are following his directions in the O. P. A.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for the broad-minded and constructive manner in which he has approached this problem. It would have been easy for one in his position to have laid aside the serious issue and to have thought in terms purely of partisan politics. It would have been easy for him to have denounced the whole subsidy program as though it were a thing to which we had never given our consent, as some have done. I wish to compliment the Senator from Ohio on the statesmanlike attitude which he has assumed.

Likewise, I may say as much for the Senator from Alabama who, I know, has been laboring in an effort to work out a solution of this matter.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], whose amendment is now the pending business, has been actuated by the noble motive of restoring the power of Congress, the elected representatives of the people, in this great crisis. I am for all of them.

BILL FAILS TO SOLVE PROBLEM

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the suggestions which have been made here do not go to the heart of the problem. If we pass the pending bill with any of the amendments which have been proposed we shall still have failed to solve the problem which is presented to us. It is not sufficient to say there shall be no subsidies, and then, when we find that that broad declaration rules out subsidies for which we have asked, vote to make modifications so as to preserve the subsidies which we want, while denouncing the subsidies which we do not want. Now, Mr. President, I desire to assert certain principles which I think ought to be contained in this bill and which, if they are not contained in the bill, will prevent a constructive solution of the tremendous problem which confronts us.

MUST MAINTAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

The first principle to be laid down is that we must maintain agricultural production. We cannot afford to permit the production of agricultural commodities to be impeded, to be delayed, or to be suppressed; but the fact remains, Mr. President, that under the policies which we have been following up to this time obstacles have been raised to agricultural production. If this condition is not corrected the country will be unable to do the job it has assumed to do in the production of food not only for our armed forces and for our civilian population but for lend-lease and now, under Governor Lehman, for the relief of the stricken people of Axis-occupied countries.

How absurd it has been, Mr. President, for us for more than a year to have followed a policy which overlooked all these objectives and which was concerned only with the purpose of keeping down the cost of living so far as foodstuffs are concerned for the consumer at the home table. It is only necessary to point out that the consumers at home have supported the black market. If they have sufficient money to support the black market then certainly they have sufficient money to support agricultural production upon a basis which will make it possible to produce what the Nation needs if it is to deliver on the commitments it has made to civilization.

I read in the newspapers that Members of Congress are now thinking of

forming a consumers' bloc, which will be devoted to keeping down the cost of foodstuffs, no matter what may happen to the quantity of food the Nation needs to have in order to distribute it. We cannot permit ourselves to be driven into positions because the consuming masses in the large cities do not understand the problem; nor should we be driven to adopt any policy because telegrams pour in here from agricultural regions asking us to do this or that.

A few days ago, before the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] had even been presented at the desk of the Senate, telegrams from various areas were already on their way to my office asking me to support the Aiken-Gillette amendment, in fact, telling me I must support it. I knew that the authors of those telegrams had not the remotest knowledge of what was in that amendment. Not only did they not know, but Members of the Senate, Members of the other House, and even members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, struggling with this problem, did not know what it was. Yet we received these telegrams.

The same thing is true with respect to labor. Communications were received by members of this body with respect to the so-called Connally bill, demanding this or demanding that, from persons who we knew did not understand the first thing about the contents of that measure.

Obviously, if we are to legislate under the whip of pressure groups, we shall not be exercising the constitutional power and responsibility which belong to us and which we ought to exercise under the oath which we took when we became Members of this body.

So I say the first principle is agricultural production. Let us do what may be necessary to maintain it. If we are to do that—and certainly everybody will agree that it must be done—then, obviously, the second principle which I wish to emphasize comes into play, and that is that there shall be no roll-back upon the producer of agricultural products, for it is the roll-back or the fear of the roll-back that destroys the capacity of the farmer and the rancher to produce.

It is perfectly appropriate to point out here that in January 1942, almost a year and a half ago, when the emergency price control bill was under consideration on the floor of the Senate the Members of the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, approved an amendment the purpose of which was to tie agricultural wages and industrial wages together so that agriculture and industry could move together. The Senate felt that it was a wise thing to do, but the amendment was thrown out in conference. Everything else that was in controversy between the two Houses was yielded save only that; everything else was yielded so that that amendment might be defeated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. When the able Senator says there should be no roll-back upon the producer, does the able Senator mean that the producer shall not have the sale price substantially depleted so that he will get less than he should get for what he produces, or does he mean that the roll-back should not be applied to the producer and a subsidy given to the producer to compensate for the roll-back, so that the roll-back would simply be a part of the technique of keeping down the excessive prices of commodities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My purpose—and I am going to offer language which I think will carry out the principles I am laying down—is to make a reassertion of the legislative judgment of Congress and the President that the prices for agricultural products should be those as defined in the act of October 2, 1942, and that if it be necessary to pay subsidies to maintain those prices in order to maintain production, subsidies shall be paid, but under the supervision and after the approval of Congress in the ordinary exercise of its legislative functions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. What does the able Senator mean by under the scrutiny of Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said in the normal process of legislative action.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what we are engaged upon now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. This is a difficult problem, a very complex one, and when I have finished stating the principles upon which I have acted, then I shall be glad to read to him the language which I think will carry out those principles and which I think will be quite satisfactory to the Senator from Florida. If he will bear with me, I think at that time I shall be able to satisfy him.

MUST NOT DESTROY PRODUCER

Mr. President, we must so administer these prices that there shall not be a roll-back on the producer which will destroy his capacity to produce. I do not complain at the policy which the Congress has already adopted of making war against inflation by keeping prices down; I approve that. What I am pointing out is that from that day in January 1942 when the Emergency Price Control Act was approved, without the amendment tying farm wages and industrial wages together, there was a constant depletion of farm labor and other labor as a direct result, and a constant increase in the cost of living. Congress had given the Office of Price Administration practically every power it sought, but in spite of that grant, the cost of living continued to rise, because officials in the O. P. A. were confronted with the conundrum of how they could reduce prices without killing production.

Mr. PEPPER. If the able Senator will yield for one other question, I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am always glad to be interrupted.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator does not mean to say that the O. P. A. had to go to Congress almost begging on its knees to give it the power of subsidy, and the funds, ever since the price-control law has been before the Congress, does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no, but I will say to the Senator that when the O. P. A. sent its request here for the power to subsidize, it asked for that power in a manner which was certain to bypass the Congress, in a manner which would have transferred the power of the purse from the elected representatives of the people to appointees who were selected without regard to the will of Congress, without regard to the confirmatory power of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator envision the possibility that the Congress can determine, in the legislative process to which we are accustomed, what should be the amount of subsidy paid to all the various individual producers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly, in the manner in which it is attempted to be done in the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. He asks for a lump sum, and he asks the approval of Congress, and that amendment undertakes to approve it.

I would say that that is an example which should be followed, and that it is perfectly possible for the executive branch of the Government, through the Bureau of the Budget, to send to the Congress in the ordinary way an estimate and a break-down of the expenditures needed for this purpose, and then Congress can approve it, and if it is done, then it will be the action of the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, instead, as it is now, and as it has been, and as it was proposed in the bill which the O. P. A. asked last February or March, of the arbitrary decision of appointive executive officers.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator then merely means that there will be an overall limit placed by the Congress upon the amount available for such subsidies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator were a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he would know that every bill which comes from that committee contains, as to a thousand or two or three thousand items, a lump-sum appropriation for such and such purposes, and in the Budget there is a specific table setting forth the persons to be employed, the salaries they are to be paid, the amount for telephones, the amount for telegraph, the amount for clerks, the amount for every item of expenditure. That can be done.

Mr. PEPPER. But if the cost of production can change from time to time due to change in the cost of labor or to change in the cost of ingredients which enter into the cost of production, obviously the executive agency will have to have authority to graduate the amount of the subsidy according to circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not deny that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all I meant to suggest to the able Senator, that essentially it is inescapable that the discretion about the awarding of the subsidy, and the amount of it in the particular case, would have to rest in the executive agency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Again I say to the Senator that I am now merely discussing the fundamental principle. The Senator inquires about the details. I shall come to the details presently. But I should like to make clear what in my mind at least appears to be the important aspect of this problem. I think that if we once get those aspects clear in our minds, we shall be able to apply a solution.

The first principle is the stimulation of agricultural production.

The second is a determination that there shall not be a roll-back upon the producer, because obviously unless we preserve the producers from such a roll-back, he cannot produce, and we shall not have the food necessary to supply the tremendous needs we have assumed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In my opinion, the Senator is rendering a public service by addressing the Senate in the way he is addressing it. Under the pending bill we have this problem: A roll-back was invoked. I think it is now generally conceded before the Senate that it was done illegally and without any basis of law. Immediately when that roll-back was put into effect the prices of cattle and hogs coming into the packing houses dropped. It was said that the packers refused to pay the prevailing prices because the roll-back had reduced the prices to the consumers.

In the pending bill there is a provision for the payment of a subsidy to the processor. The legal basis of the bill is, as I understand the Attorney General's opinion, the fact that the packer is a producer, though he has always been regarded as a processor.

If the bill should be enacted, there could be no loss sustained by the packer because he protected himself by paying a lower price in order to escape a loss. The question is, If the bill shall be enacted—and I am addressing this question to the Senator from Wyoming because he has always shown a very profound understanding of the agricultural producer and has always been strong in his defense——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for that observation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the bill shall be enacted and money shall be provided for a subsidy, how can the roll-back reach the producer of cattle and hogs who lost on the market after the roll-back was invoked?

PRESENT SUBSIDY PROGRAM INEFFICIENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my opinion, the present subsidy program is utterly and completely inefficient. It will not do the job it was intended to, and it will inevitably result in a roll-back upon the producer. Therefore, I desire to see that system ended, and I wish to substitute for it a system which will prevent a roll-back, but which at the same time will make it possible for the packer, the little packer particularly, to operate without loss.

Under the system which has been promulgated, I have not the slightest doubt that we shall not only suffer a reduction of production, as already indicated by the declining receipts from feeders, and so forth, but we shall also suffer a loss of processed meats because packers will be compelled to close their doors. The subsidy program to packers announced by the O. P. A. does not attempt to deal with the second problem at all. It was designed to deal with the first. It was the intention of the O. P. A., so expressed to me, that the subsidy of 2 cents a pound on the carcasses in the hands of the packers would leave them with sufficient money to continue to pay the prices the producers were receiving. But that was not the result. It was the difference between theory and reality. We must deal with realities. But when we deal with them I think we should recognize that most of the theorists, with the exception of those who were deliberately trying to change our form of government, were acting in good faith.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator at this time have the intention of introducing a bill or of submitting an amendment the effect of which will be more equitable to the producer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I have an amendment which I will discuss presently. I wish to lay the ground for it, and I am propounding the principles upon which I am acting.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I did not know that the Senator intended to submit an amendment. I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me at any time.

We have our two first principles, maintenance of agricultural production and no roll-back upon the producer. Why do we say "no roll-back upon the producer"? Because we know that there is no other agency or person or group upon whom the producer can roll back. When the producer or rancher or the farmer does not obtain for his commodities a price which covers the cost of production there is only one recourse for him, and that is to go out of business, and the producers have been going out of business at such a rate as to threaten the production of agricultural commodities necessary to win the war.

WOULD CONTROL RETAIL PRICES

Mr. President, the third principle is that the price in the market place for foods and other agricultural commodities should be sufficient to enable the producer to produce them without a roll-back and without suffering a loss. But when it is necessary in the war against inflation to reduce prices so as to prevent spiraling, then the subsidy may properly come into play, provided it is paid in the manner laid down in the original act. That act, the Emergency Price Control Act, recognized that if the retail ceilings were kept at a low level rising costs would make it impossible for the producer, without a subsidy, to meet those levels. It can be handled in such a way if we reannounce the determination of principle which we made in the act of October 2, 1942, to maintain the proper price for the producer by the normal operation of the market, unless it becomes essential to act otherwise. Is that sound? Is that a difficult thing to do?

SHOULD RETAIN AUTHORITIES

Mr. President, let it be remembered that on most agricultural products there has been no attempt as yet to pay a subsidy. It may not be necessary. But we should not destroy the legal authority which was granted by Congress in January 1942 and approved again in October 1942. We should not destroy the principle, but we should keep the payment of subsidies in strict control by asserting the power of Congress to supervise all authorizations and expenditures for such purposes so that we may know that the standards are reasonable and proper and meet the needs of the great community we represent.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. It seems to me I have heard the expression "roll-back" used in perhaps different senses since this debate has been proceeding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am quite sure that those using that term have not always had the same meaning in mind. I should be glad to have the Senator's idea of what a "roll-back" means.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The word first came into current use when it was intended to describe the continuous passing on from retailer to wholesaler to distributor to producer of a reduction of price at the retail level. That is a roll-back, because, as the word itself indicates, it rolls back through all the various lines until it reaches the producer, and he must absorb it.

AGRICULTURE CANNOT ABSORB MORE REDUCTION

If we do not have sense enough to realize that the agricultural community, which has been at the lowest level of any community in our whole country, cannot absorb this continued reduction, then we do not have sufficient sense to deal with the problem. The roll-back on the producer must be stopped if we expect the producer to continue to produce.

The other definition has come into use since the O. P. A. announced its 10 percent cut on retail ceilings of meat and butter and coffee. I think that O. P. A. or some of its spokesmen intended that roll-back to be a limited roll-back; but, unfortunately, realities turned it into a complete roll-back. There is only one roll-back, and that is the one which begins with the O. P. A. on the retailer's shelves and goes all the way back to the producer who provides the commodities which we need for food.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, as I understand, if the $450,000,000 or $500,000,000 referred to in the Taft-Bankhead amendment could reach the persons from whom the roll-back is actually taken, it would constitute compensation or partial compensation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it did, but, of course, that is not the program of O. P. A. That represents a change of policy from the policy which was announced by the Congress when it passed the original act.

Mr. TUNNELL. Which was that production should be increased.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; that the subsidy payments should go to producers. Let me read that law to the Senate. I read from section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, the act of January 20, 1942, which has already been the subject of much discussion here.

Whenever the Administrator—

That is, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. Observe the power which we gave:

Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

"PROCESSOR" AND "PRODUCER"

When that language was written into the law it was the belief that the words "domestic producers" meant, with respect to agricultural products, the farmer and the rancher at the beginning of the economic line. There has been an opinion rendered by men who are acting in the capacity of attorneys that a subsidy to a processor is a subsidy to a producer. Whatever may be the technical result of that interpretation, I say it was an interpretation intended to justify the withholding of a necessary subsidy to a producer, and the payment of it to a processor; and certainly, Mr. President, we have had sufficient experience in this country to know that when subsidies or grants of any kind or benefits of any kind are paid to those at the top of the economic scale, they have a tough time trickling through to the people at the bottom.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has already partially answered the question which arose in my mind. As I recall the terms of that act—for which I did not vote, by the way—it specifically limited the power of the Administrator of the O. P. A. to the granting of subsidies to producers, not processors.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That certainly was the intent, I think, so far as this is concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I listened with great interest to the exposition of the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming, and I considered the Senator's proposition. I follow it one step further, and ask this question: Does the Senator think that if the position now claimed by the O. P. A. as to the extent of the authority granted by section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act had been frankly avowed on this floor—that is to say, that the authority must be used in granting subsidies to processors, instead of producers—it would have been possible that the provision would have secured as many as 20 votes in the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no doubt that it would not have been passed; and I say to the Senator as a proof of the correctness of that statement—and what I now say also deals with the question asked by the Senator from Delaware—that when the Committee on Banking and Currency a year ago reported a bill similar to this one, undertaking to authorize the R. F. C. to borrow $5,000,000,000 and to spend it for subsidies, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency by this body. I am still happy that it was my motion to recomit which resulted in having the bill sent back. I made the motion because the bill, if passed, would have permitted the bypassing of the elected representatives of the people.

When I say that, I am not concerned that I, as an individual Senator, should be consulted; I am not concerned that the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator should be consulted; but I am concerned that the people of America who sent us here shall be certain that these things shall be done in the open forum, where all may see, and not be done behind some black curtain in an executive bureau, where only those who are taking the action, and who sometimes have a sinister objective, know what is being done.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator did not say "Senatorial" objective. [Laughter.]

I desire to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TUNNELL. I gather from the Senator's reading of the powers of the O. P. A. Administrator that rather wide latitude was left to him to determine the manner in which the money was to be used.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was. The reason for that was that, in the belief of the Congress, the O. P. A. would come back to Congress and would say, "These are the subsidies we want to pay, and this is the money we want to expend. Now give us the fiscal authority." Of course, that is what they did; but it was done in such broad language that the Senate rebelled, and the bill went back.

Again, the amendment which has been proposed by the Committee on Banking and Currency to the bill which is on the calendar is also couched in broad language which would permit the use of the money which is sought to be authorized by it, for any of the purposes which have been condemned. The roll-back could be extended from meat to every other agricultural product, under the terms and within the limitation of that amendment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, am I to understand that since the powers were to be exercised in such manner as the Administrator might determine, the Senator disagrees with the manner which has been determined?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; absolutely. I think the decision with respect to the subsidy program as to meat, butter, and coffee was a mistaken policy, an ineffective policy, and one which cannot possibly result in anything but disaster so far as butter and meat are concerned.

Mr. TUNNELL. But the law itself permitted the Administrator to perform that function in such manner as he should determine, as I understood the language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that it was the opinion of Congress when that law was passed that the Administrator would come back to Congress for the specific fiscal authority, and would lay down his program. He did so; that is, he came to Congress and asked for $5,000,000,000; but he did not spell out the program, and because he did not spell it out Congress said "No."

The program concerning which the Senator is interrogating me was not announced under the language which I have read, but under the language of the succeeding paragraph, which was for an utterly different purpose. Let me read it to the Senator:

Provided, That in the case of any commodity which has heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, such determinations shall be made by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and, notwithstanding any other provision of this act or of any existing law, such commodity may be bought or sold, or stored or used, and such subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof may be paid—

And so forth. The Senator will recall that Congress had passed, and the President had signed, a bill dealing with strategic and critical materials.

There never was any thought that such materials were anything but minerals and materials of that character. There never was the slightest imagination in the mind of anyone that that was intended to cover agricultural commodities, because section 3 of the bill dealt with agricultural commodities. This is another illustration of the devious method which has been followed time after time in the executive bureaus, of extending the power of the bureaus by interpretation of the law, trusting that the Congress, because of the great emergency, would permit the extension to go unrebuked and uncorrected.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. If I may ask one further question, I will not pursue the matter further.

Does the Senator believe that under the power which was given, and which seemed to be so broad as to leave to the Administrator the determination as to how the money should be spent, a possible shortage is being or was being prevented?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid I did not catch the import of the question.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand from the Senator's reading of the act, whenever the Administrator should determine that there might be a shortage of food or of materials, he might make the expenditures in such manner as he should determine. I am trying to find out if the Senator thinks that those expenditures were being made in such a manner as to make less likely a shortage.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The expenditures were not being made. The first example we have had of the payment of a subsidy for food commodities is in the program recently announced for meat, butter, and coffee. That method is not working, and in my judgment will not work, but will result only in disaster. It will obstruct and restrict rather than expand the production which we need.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think I undertstand the Senator's view.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator is always so enlightening that it is a pleasure for me to ask him questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's statement will be a very pleasant thing for me to read in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. WAGNER. I mean it. I do not know that the Senator has covered the point which is troubling me. Let me give a specific case. Take New York City as an example. I think approximately three-fourths of the people there who work for a living are not employed in defense plants. Their wages have not been increased. They comprise a large and stable class. Many of them are teachers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are like Members of Congress in that they have not had any increase in pay.

Mr. WAGNER. Probably not. The cost of living has risen; it has increased about 21 percent since 1939, and it continues to increase. By the end of the year it will probably have increased by an additional 12 percent. Those people will be in great difficulty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

Mr. WAGNER. How are we going to help them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We ought to prevent inflation.

Mr. WAGNER. How are we going to help those people?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We will help them by the subsidy system when it is necessary.

Mr. WAGNER. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not propose to do away with subsidies. I ask only that they be exercised in the full view of Congress, so that Congress may know what is being done.

Mr. WAGNER. In the particular instance which I have cited, the effects are already being felt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The program which has been announced would destroy the supply for the Senator's constituents in New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Why?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because production would be cut off. We cannot expect a dairyman to operate at a loss. We cannot expect a farmer or a rancher to operate at a loss. Under the program which has been announced by the O. P. A., although there has been a 10-percent decrease in retail prices, the subsidy which was intended to take up that decrease will go to the packer, and will not be reflected back to the producer. A producer who is operating at a loss will go out of business, and there will be no meat. The mayor of New York is quoted in the New York newspapers as complaining about the lack of meat. The story is the same in every large city. Two or three days ago the Washington News carried a headline describing this program. I do not know that I can quote the exact words, but they were to this effect: "Retail prices of meat reduced—if you can find the meat."

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, the black market has been a very difficult problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. I will show the Senator how the black market can be controlled, and how prices can be kept down for the benefit of consumers, and how my constituents can be enabled to continue to supply the foodstuffs which are necessary not only for New York City, but for the Army and Navy, for lease-lend, and for Governor Lehman in his efforts abroad.

Mr. WAGNER. When I spoke of New York I was using it merely as an illustration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand. I meant no reflection.

SUBSIDIES WOULD GO TO PRODUCERS

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator says that there should be subsidies. To whom is the subsidy to go?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the producer, the last link in the economic chain. When he receives the cost of production, every one else in the chain can operate on that basis, and the whole economic system can work properly. Instead of beginning at the tail end and saying, "These are the retail prices, and every other element in the economic system must accommodate itself to these prices," I say turn the mechanism around and begin at the other end. Decide what prices are necessary to obtain the production which we need, and then let the other elements accommodate themselves. If the retail price ceiling is not sufficient to maintain those prices, then, and only then, and only with the consent of Congress, resort to a subsidy.

Have I made myself clear to the Senator?

Mr. WAGNER. Except for one point. The Senator says "Only with the consent of Congress." We cannot wait in every instance to see what the situation is, can we?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; under the system which I shall announce in a moment.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well. I wish to hear what the Senator from Wyoming has to propose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I have announced the various principles, with the possible exception of two.

A principle which must be maintained is that we shall continue to wage war on inflation, because if we permit inflation to come, then labor, the consumer, the producer, the business man, the school teacher, the Senator, the Representative, the newspaper man, and the radio commentator will all suffer, and the Government itself will suffer in the prices it must pay. We must recognize the necessity of preventing inflation, and we must so manage our legislation and our requests for our own groups that such legislation and requests will not endanger the ultimate objective of preventing inflation.

Finally, Mr. President—and this, I think, is the most important principle of all except that of continuing to preserve agricultural production—the responsibility and authority for handling the agricultural program, including the payment of any subsidies that should be paid, should be exercised by the War Food Administrator, and by no one else. It is absurd to believe that we can entrust the encouragement of agricultural production to an office the primary responsibility of which is to keep down the cost of living; because in every questionable case an agency of that kind will resolve the doubt against the producer. That is not only true with respect to agriculture, Mr. President; it is true with respect to oil. At this moment we have an illustration of that in this Government. The Office of Price Administration is holding down the price of gasoline so that consumers who have A cards will not have to pay more than 16 or 17 cents a gallon—although they cannot obtain enough gasoline to fill a thimble—and because the price of gasoline is kept down, the ability of the oil producers of America to produce the oil which is needed for the Flying Fortresses is being curtailed.

When Secretary Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, demands that he be allowed more petroleum in order to provide fuel for the flights our air forces are making in the Pacific, in Africa, and over Europe, and demands that the price paid to the producer be increased so that he can obtain the oil, the answer he receives from the O. P. A. is that to do so would increase the burden on the consumers and would increase the cost of living.

Mr. President, how useless it is to talk about the cost of living in connection with the vital commodities which are necessary to maintain bare living itself, to preserve the Government, and to win the war.

We are confusing important notions. I believe in fighting inflation, but we must yield on that point whenever it is necessary to do so in order to obtain the commodities we need for the great, fundamental objective of the Nation. If it is impossible in certain instances to do that, then we must resort to subsidies.

Take the case of oil. We resorted to a subsidy when it became necessary to pay the cost of transportation to the railroad companies.

Mr. WAGNER. And also to the coal industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No Member of the Senate proposes now to do away with that subsidy. If we are willing to say, as we do say, that a subsidy to the oil industry is necessary—or to the coal industry, as the Senator from New York suggests—and that we are going to maintain those subsidies because we need those commodities, then who is going to say that under no circumstances shall we permit a subsidy to be paid in order to produce the food we need?

This is a realistic question. It is not merely one of theoretical objectives.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. Does the Senator mean to say that the producers of oil have received a subsidy? The subsidy is a transportation subsidy. The oil producers have no subsidy, and never have received one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I recognize the correctness of the position taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senator will realize that I am not speaking from notes.

Mr. GUFFEY. I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am speaking on the question as it arises here. I initiated the discussion by referring specifically to the cost of transportation, but we are paying subsidies for transportation. We are paying subsidies for numerous other items. We carefully provide in the committee amendment that nothing in the war against subsidies shall be so interpreted as to stop soil-conservation payments.

The amendment of the distinguished Senators from Vermont and Iowa has been so drafted as to preserve certain subsidies which now necessarily are going to agriculture.

In this great crisis confronting the Nation we have recognized that the use of a subsidy may be a necessity to prevent disaster, and, so far as that is concerned, I am willing to go along; but, Mr. President, we cannot avoid the complete wreckage of our food program if we continue to deprive the War Food Administrator of the power and authority to obtain the food which is needed.

So I say let us take the power over food away from the R. F. C. and away from the O. P. A., and let us put it where it belongs—in the hands of a man who understands agriculture and its problems.

Mr. President, I remember so well the profound feeling of relief which was indicated among Members of this body when the announcement was made that Chester Davis was to be the War Food Administrator. All criticism disappeared. All suspicion disappeared. On every hand Members of the Senate were saying, "Now, at last, we shall have a Food Administrator who understands his job, who understands the farmer, and the task of producing agricultural commodities. Now this problem will probably be on the way to solution." But, as it is working out, Mr. Davis does not have the power which is essential to enable him to do the job.

We gave the Rubber Administrator full power to perform the task assigned to him; and when he came into conflict with the War Department and the War Production Board he prevailed because it was the will of Congress and the will of the Executive that synthetic rubber should be provided without any guesses or qualifications.

Mr. President, I say to you that if we are to solve the problem of agriculture and of feeding the Army, the Navy, and the civilian population, there is only one way to do it. That is to take the responsibility out of the hands of the agency which is concerned only with keeping prices down, and to put it into the hands of the agency which knows something about farmers and about agriculture. Mr. President, I say that without the slightest thought of criticism of the O. P. A. under the direction of former Senator Prentiss Brown. Again, I wish to say that I regard him as an able, energetic, patriotic man, who, in good faith, is trying his best to do an impossible job.

In the Senate and in the other House tempers have become short and suspicions have been aroused. We are in great danger of legislating in anger, and slashing out to destroy an obvious injustice; and in so destroying such injustice we may bring down upon our heads a disaster greater than the disaster or the evil we are trying to cure.

So, Mr. President, we must approach this problem not as angry persons intent upon demonstrating our ability to stop the machine from working; we must act as intelligent legislators for the purpose of maintaining production, of preventing inflation, and of enabling an official or an agency with an understanding of agriculture to carry on that work.

Mr. President, how is it to be done? It will not be done by the amendment proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee, and, in my judgment, it will not be done by the amendment drawn by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], although I recognize how diligently they have worked upon that measure.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

I have here a draft which I have prepared and submitted to every thoughtful person whom I could reach in various agencies, and I have yet to find anyone who says that there is any economic defect in it. In order that it may be clear in the RECORD for those who are to read the RECORD tomorrow, and because I have not introduced it, and, therefore, it is not printed in the form of an amendment, I send it to the desk and ask that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

"The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the authority conferred by this subsection with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities, and the making of subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only by or under the direction of the War Food Administrator and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food in the quantities specified by the President to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, and for war relief purposes: *Provided further,* That no such subsidy payments shall be made unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements of section 3 of the act approved October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.): *Provided further,* That the amount of such subsidy payments shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the Congress: *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the payment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of this act."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Referring to the second proviso of the Senator's amendment, which reads:

Provided further, That the amount of such subsidy payments shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the Congress.

Is it the Senator's intention to limit the Congress of the United States appropriating money for this purpose or any other purpose to the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no, and if the language were susceptible to that interpretation, I would change it immediately. I mean to have the Bureau of the Budget act in its legal capacity only as a recommending agency.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe that under the present law every item of appropriation before it comes to Congress is first submitted to the Budget Bureau?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, why would it not be better to delete reference to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget? I fully favor the scrutiny of the Bureau of the Budget as to all appropriations, but I think it is exceedingly dangerous, Mr. President, to write into law language which, even by implication, could be construed as a limitation on the power of Congress unless it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may be quite right about that.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to see that language deleted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that my purpose in putting this language in was to provide the machinery by which the President, acting through the Bureau of the Budget, could make his recommendations to Congress. It might be better to have the recommendation come directly from the President himself, and, if I should offer this amendment, I should certainly consider making a modification.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the Senator will consider that point carefully.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I crave the indulgence of the Senator from Wyoming. There is on the desk a matter of the highest privilege that ought to receive the immediate attention of the Senate. I am wondering if the Senator from Wyoming would defer his remarks until after we dispose of the matter in question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order that I may yield the floor to the Senator for the matter of the very highest privilege, I shall now ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a modification of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] for the Committee on Banking and Currency in order that this whole discussion and the proposals I make may appear at one place in the RECORD, and, later on, I shall be glad to resume the discussion, if that be necessary.

MODIFIED BANKHEAD AMENDMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, proposed modified amendment referred to by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed in the RECORD.

The proposed modified amendment is as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

(a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow and use such sums as may be necessary to liquidate all subsidy payments which have accrued prior to July 1, 1943, under the terms of the so-called roll-back program.

(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000 and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss in order to obtain the necessary production of such commodities in cases where the average price received by producers of such commodities in the market place meets the requirements of section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.). All commitments heretofore made by the Commodity Credit Corporation for such or similar purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitment herein authorized shall be entered into hereafter with any producer, processor, or distributor that cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(e) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers, or the sale of feed wheat, as authorized by existing law.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 75)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the President's message be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am wondering if he will not let me suggest the absence of a quorum so that all Senators may be here to listen to the message?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Millikin
Andrews	Green	Moore
Ball	Guffey	Murdock
Bankhead	Gurney	Murray
Bilbo	Hatch	Nye
Bone	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Overton
Brooks	Holman	Pepper
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Butler	Kilgore	Reed
Byrd	La Follette	Revercomb
Capper	Langer	Reynolds
Caraway	Lodge	Robertson
Chavez	McCarran	Russell
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Scrugham
Connally	McFarland	Shipstead
Davis	McKellar	Smith
Downey	McNary	Stewart
Eastland	Maloney	Taft
Ferguson	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
George	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	Wherry
Tobey	Van Nuys	White
Truman	Wagner	Wiley
Tunnell	Walsh	Willis
Tydings	Wheeler	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 796, the so-called war labor disputes bill.

It is not a simple bill, for it covers many subjects. I approve many of the sections; but other sections tend to obscure the issues or to write into war legislation certain extraneous matter which appears to be discriminatory. In the form submitted to me the accomplishment of this avowed purpose—the prevention of strikes in wartime—could well be made more difficult instead of more effective.

Let there be no misunderstanding of the reasons which prompt me to veto this bill at this time.

I am unalterably opposed to strikes in wartime. I do not hesitate to use the powers of government to prevent them.

It is clearly the will of the American people that for the duration of the war all labor disputes be settled by orderly procedures established by law. It is the will of the American people that no war work be interrupted by strike or lock-out.

American labor as well as American business gave their "No strike, no lock-out" pledge after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

That pledge has been well kept except in the case of the leaders of the United Mine Workers. For the entire year of 1942, the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. The American people should realize that fact—that ninety-nine and ninety-five one-hundredths percent of the work went forward without strikes, and that only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the work was delayed by strikes. That record has never before been equaled in this country. It is as good or better than the record of any of our allies in wartime.

But laws are often necessary to make a very small minority of people live up to the standards the great majority of people follow. Recently there has been interruption of work in the coal industry, even after it was taken over by the Government. I understand and sympathize with the general purpose of the war disputes bill to make such interruptions clearly unlawful.

The first seven sections of the bill are directed to this objective.

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "War Labor Disputes Act."

Section 2 relates to definitions.

Section 3 gives statutory authority to the President to seize war facilities—a power already exercised on several occasions under Executive order or proclamation.

Sections 4 and 5 of the bill provide for maintaining existing terms and

conditions of employment except as directed by the War Labor Board.

Section 6 makes it a criminal offense to instigate, direct, or aid a strike in a Government-operated plant or mine.

This would make possible the arrest of a few leaders who would give bond for their appearance at trial. It would assure punishment for those found guilty, and might also have some deterrent effect. But it would not assure continuance of war production in the most critical emergencies.

Section 7 gives the National War Labor Board statutory authority and defines its powers.

Broadly speaking, these sections incorporate into statute the existing machinery for settling labor disputes. The penalties provided by the act do not detract from the moral sanctions of labor's no-strike pledge.

If the bill were limited to these seven sections I would sign it.

But the bill contains other provisions which have no place in legislation to prevent strikes in wartime and which in fact would foment slow-downs and strikes.

I doubt whether the public generally are familiar with these provisions. I doubt whether the Congress had the opportunity fully to appraise the effects of these provisions upon war production.

Section 8 requires the representative of employees of a war contractor to give notice of a labor dispute which threatens seriously to interrupt war production to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board in order to give the employees the opportunity to express themselves by secret ballot whether they will permit such interruption of war production.

It would force a labor leader who is trying to prevent a strike in accordance with his no-strike pledge, to give the notice which would cause the taking of a strike ballot and might actually precipitate a strike.

In wartime we cannot sanction strikes with or without notice.

Section 8 further makes it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after the giving of the notice take a secret ballot among the employees in the "plants, mines, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units," as the case may be on the question of whether they will stop work. This requirement would open the whole controversy over "bargaining units," a fruitful source of controversy and of bitter jurisdictional strife.

Section 8 ignores completely labor's "no strike" pledge and provides in effect for strike notices and strike ballots. Far from discouraging strikes these provisions would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations.

The 30 days allowed before the strike vote is taken under Government auspices might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period. The thought and energies of the workers would be diverted from war production to vote-getting.

The heads of our military, naval, and production agencies have testified that these provisions are likely to be subversive of the very purpose of the bill—uninterrupted production.

Section 9 of the bill prohibits, for the period of the war, political contributions by labor organizations. This provision obviously has no relevancy to a bill prohibiting strikes during the war in plants operated by the Government or to a "War Labor Disputes Act." If there be merit in the prohibition, it should not be confined to wartime, and careful consideration should be given to the appropriateness of extending the prohibition to other nonprofit organizations.

There should be no misunderstanding—I intend to use the powers of government to prevent the interruption of war production by strikes. I shall approve legislation that will truly strengthen the hands of government in dealing with such strikes, and will prevent the defiance of the National War Labor Board's decisions.

I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.

This direct approach is necessary to insure the continuity of war work. The only alternative would be to extend the principle of selective service and make it universal in character.

I recognize that this bill has an entirely praiseworthy purpose to insure full war production. But I am convinced that section 8 will produce strikes in vital war plants which otherwise would not occur. Therefore, I could not properly discharge the duties of my office if I were to approve S. 796.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1943.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be printed.

The Senate proceeded, as the Constitution requires, to reconsider the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lockouts, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am sorely disappointed. The Senate is sorely disappointed. The House, I am sure, is sorely disappointed. The people of the United States in overwhelming majority are sorely disappointed. Every soldier and sailor on the seas and on the land and in the air is sorely disappointed. The sections of the bill about which the President complains were contained in the bill as it passed the House. They are not vital provisions in the bill. They are merely incidentals. The President has the right under the Constitution to veto a bill, and the Senate has a right to pass a bill over the President's veto. I hope the Senate will exercise its high constitutional privilege.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as one of the conferees who worked in trying to bring about an adjustment between the House and the Senate on this all-important legislation, I wish to join the Senator from Texas in hoping that the Senate will override the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, under the Constitution, the vote must be taken by the yeas and nays. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. Is a vote "yea" a vote in favor of overriding the President's veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. A vote "yea" is a vote to pass the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. STEWART. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to make a motion that the Senate override the President's veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is not necessary. The question arises automatically under the Constitution.

Mr. STEWART. The question comes before the Senate automatically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. OVERTON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is unavoidably detained because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who, if present, would vote "yea," is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who, if present, would vote "yea," are paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BURTON], who, if present, would vote "yea," are paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The following Senators would vote "yea" if present:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent as a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Andrews	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Lodge	Stewart
Brooks	McClellan	Taft
Buck	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Maloney	Tobey
Capper	Maybank	Tydings
Caraway	Millikin	Vandenberg
Chavez	Moore	Van Nuys
Connally	O'Daniel	Wherry
Eastland	O'Mahoney	White
Ferguson	Overton	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gurney	Reed	

NAYS—25

Ball	La Follette	Shipstead
Bone	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Truman
Davis	McFarland	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Green	Murdock	Walsh
Guffey	Murray	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Nye	
Kilgore	Scrugham	

NOT VOTING—15

Austin	Bushfield	Gillette
Bailey	Chandler	Glass
Barbour	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Barkley	Danaher	Lucas
Burton	Ellender	Wallgren

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question, more than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Day before yesterday and earlier today I advised the Senate that I had requested the Office of Price Administration to furnish me and, through me, the Senate a statement of the standards which that agency had planned to use in carrying into effect the so-called subsidy program. There has just been delivered to me a letter, addressed to me, from Price Administrator Prentiss Brown which sets forth the standards to which I have referred. I think the letter is of great importance, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I should like to outline to you my ideas as to the policies that should govern the use of subsidies in carrying out the general economic stabilization program. I have attempted to relate them not only to the requirements of the price stabilization program, but to our entire wartime economic policy. At the same time, the standards laid down are designed to safeguard the subsidy program from abuse.

I. THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIES IN THE WARTIME ECONOMIC PROGRAM

A. The function of subsidies

It is an essential part of our wartime policy both to stabilize prices and to obtain necessary production and distribution of commodities essential to the war and to the civilian population. In some cases the returns that are required in order to obtain necessary production and distribution are higher than can be obtained solely in the form of prices that are consistent with the price stabilization program. The purpose of the subsidy program is to provide a means of supplementing these prices so that necessary production and distribution can be obtained while, at the same time, the program of stabilizing prices and preventing the development of an inflationary spiral is carried out.

The need for supplementing these returns arises in cases where the cost of producing marginal output exceeds the ceiling price, and it also arises in cases where costs will increase or where price ceilings must be reduced.

Certain costs will increase, regardless of our ability to stabilize raw material prices and wage rates, because of such factors as the need for substituting new raw materials for those customarily used, the utilization of less efficient facilities and less efficient labor, increases in the prices charged by foreign suppliers, and increases of transportation costs resulting from the hazards of ocean shipping, rerouting of traffic, congestion, or other factors resulting from inevitable wartime dislocations. Beyond these cost increases are those which must result from commitments the Government has made with respect to parity in the area of agricultural prices and the elimination of substandards and gross inequities in the area of wages.

In addition to these cost increases, the Government has made a commitment to stabilize the cost of living as of September 15, 1942. Although the Little Steel Formula for wage stabilization has been accepted on the basis of this commitment, the Government has not yet made good on it; the cost of living has risen by more than 6 percent and the cost of food by more than 12 percent above the level at which Congress ordered prices to be stabilized. The execution of this mandate therefore requires price reductions and vigorous action to prevent increases. These reductions, like cost increases, will have the effect of diminishing the returns earned by producers or distributors unless they are offset in some way.

In general, earnings are sufficiently generous to permit absorption of these cost increases or price reductions without the use of subsidies, so far as entire industries are concerned. Profits before taxes for all corporations amounted to almost $20,000,000,000 in 1942 as compared to about $14,500,000,000 in 1941 and an annual average of only $4,500,000,000 in the years 1936–39. Net income of proprietors in nonagricultural fields amounted to $10,400,000,000 in 1942, as compared to $9,300,000,000 in 1941 and only $6,600,000,000, on the average, during 1936–39. Similarly, the net income of farm operators was $10,200,000,000 in 1942, contrasted with $6,700,000,000 in 1941 and an average of only $4,700,000,000 a year during 1936–39. Thus in all these fields there is considerable ability to absorb cost increases or price reductions without the use of subsidies.

There will be cases, however, in which earnings will have to be supplemented if necessary production and distribution are to be obtained. This will be true of the marginal output of many commodities both with respect to the output of high-cost firms and the high-cost portion of the output of firms which are making a profit on most of their production. It may also be true where returns on a particular commodity are insufficient, even though the earnings of the industry from other operations are favorable.

Even in these cases it may be possible to offset higher costs or reduced prices by other means. There will nevertheless remain a number of cases in which returns must be supplemented by the Government. In these cases the use of subsidies is essential to the execution of the Government's wartime program.

B. Relation of subsidies to other elements of the price stabilization program

While it is clear that subsidies have an important role to play in the price stabilization program, it is equally clear that they are a supplement to, and not a substitute for other parts of the program. These other controls must be tightened if the program is to be carried out.

First, controls exercised over demand and supply factors by other parts of the Government must be pushed more vigorously. This means more taxation and saving. It also means more effective control of manpower, production and allocation of supplies, so that labor, materials and productive facilities are used where they are needed. Those in charge of production usually take it for granted all too readily that higher prices will solve their problems. Now that the use of price is ruled out by the "hold the line" order, the danger exists that they will want to use subsidies in the same indiscriminate manner. It must be realized that main reliance in the guidance of production must be placed on direct action with respect to production, allocation, and manpower.

Second, where prices are controlled only at some stages of processing or distribution, measures should be taken to see that they are controlled at all stages. Although a rise in prices at the uncontrolled stages

could be offset by subsidies, failure to control these prices might make it difficult to limit the amount of subsidy required.

Third, better enforcement of price ceilings is required. This means simpler ceilings and more vigorous policing, which in turn means cooperation from other Government agencies and adequate funds for an enforcement staff. If existing ceilings are not made effective, no purpose is served by using a subsidy to hold them down or reduce them. To do so would be to put Government money in the pockets of violators.

II. CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH SUBSIDIES ARE NOT TO BE GRANTED

In the light of the purpose of subsidies, it is possible to lay down credit conditions which must be met before their use in particular cases is justified. These conditions are designed to insure that subsidies are not used where the objectives can be accomplished by more desirable means and, further, to insure that when subsidies are used their purpose will in fact be accomplished.

A. Subsidies should not be granted in connection with commodities that are not important to war production or to the cost of living

This requirement hardly needs explanation. A rise in the price of commodities that are unimportant either to war production or to the cost of living will not bring about the break-down of the price-stabilizing program.

B. The subsidy must be required to obtain necessary production and distribution at prices consistent with the stabilization program

1. This implies that all feasible steps to reduce costs shall have been taken before a subsidy program is put into operation. To the extent that such steps have not been taken, a subsidy cannot be regarded as necessary. Where action to reduce cost has been initiated but not completed, it may be desirable to make it clear that the subsidy is temporary, pending the completion of cost reductions, and that its subsequent reduction or elimination is contemplated.

Among the steps that may be taken to effect such cost reductions are elimination of wastes and extravagances, ordinary economies of management, standardization of products, and simplification of products and services. These measures are necessary not only to reduce the money costs of doing business, but also to obtain maximum use of resources for war. If subsidies permitted the continuance of wasteful and inefficient production, whether in the war or civilian sphere, they would impede the war effort. It cannot be emphasized too strongly, however, that the Office of Price Administration has only limited power to promote cost-reduction programs. The fulfillment of this condition requires that other Government agencies put into effect positive programs, and that these programs be coordinated to achieve the purpose. This, in turn, requires full backing from the Office of War Mobilization.

2. The requirement that the subsidy must be necessary precludes the use of industry-wide subsidies to compensate for cost increases or price reductions when firms producing 75 percent of the output are covering direct costs of production by a sufficient margin and, in addition, are earning over-all profits sufficient to permit absorbing the cost increases or price reductions without subsidies. This means, for one thing, that an industry-wide subsidy should not be paid if, without it, a price increase would not be granted under the standards prescribed by the applicable statutes and Executive orders. It also means that an industry-wide subsidy should not be paid in connection with a price reduction if the price reduction can be effected without it under the standards prescribed by the applicable statutes and Executive orders. Where a subsidy is used in connection with a price reduction, it should leave the revenues of an industry no lower than they would have been if the price reduction had been limited to the amount permissible without subsidy.

In cases where a subsidy may not be paid to an industry as a whole under these criteria, a subsidy may nevertheless be necessary for the marginal output which is needed to obtain essential supplies. In such cases, subsidies should be paid only on specified portions of the output, and only on condition that such output has actually been produced.

3. A third corollary is that the possibility of price adjustments at earlier or later stages of production or distribution must be explored before subsidies are used. When a cost increase cannot be absorbed at the stage where it occurs, it may be possible either to lower prices at earlier stages without reducing returns below minimum levels or to raise prices at the current or later stages without raising prices to the ultimate consumer.

4. Before a subsidy is used, the possibilities of Government purchase and sale and of differential price ceilings to private buyers should be explored. By purchasing at prices adjusted to the needs of different producers and selling at a uniform price, corresponding roughly to the average of prices it paid, the Government can sometimes permit producers who need a higher price to get it without significantly raising the general level of prices for the product. By using differential price ceilings on sales to private buyers, also, a price increase may sometimes be permitted those who need a higher price to get it without having significant price-raising effects.

5. Where direct costs of producing or distributing one commodity exceed the price but over-all profits of an industry are high, it may be possible to avoid the use of subsidies by raising the price of the one commodity and reducing prices on one or more of its other products, thus preserving general price stability while permitting direct costs to be covered.

6. Necessary production of commodities is sometimes impeded by the competition of less essential commodities for land, labor, or supplies. In such cases production of the more essential commodity can sometimes be increased by reducing the price of the less essential product, thereby discouraging its production and releasing the resources. This possibility should be explored before subsidies are used.

C. Subsidies should not be paid in connection with any commodity the retail price of which is not at the same time controlled

As I have pointed out above, if the price to the ultimate consumer cannot be effectively controlled, the subsidy is wasted so far as the consuming public is concerned. It should be noted, however, that subsidies themselves can, in some cases, be used to make ceilings more effective and to simplify them. For example, they may make it possible to compensate for differences of cost between different sellers and thereby to shift retail ceilings from a mark-up basis to a uniform dollar and cents basis, or to maintain such uniform dollar and cents ceilings where they already exist. Since the latter ceilings are by far the most effective, this is one of the best uses to which a subsidy can be put. In view of the possibility of securing greater effectiveness of ceilings through use of the subsidy device itself, the condition that the retail price must be effectively controlled should not be interpreted to mean that effective control must exist prior to the initiation of a subsidy program, but merely that it must exist during the operation of a subsidy program.

It is also desirable that prices in earlier stages of production and distribution be effectively controlled, either by ceilings or by other means. Since such control is not always feasible, however, and since lack of it will not necessarily make subsidy programs undesirable, this condition should be regarded as desirable, but not absolutely necessary.

D. Subsidies should not be used unless there is a direct net saving from their use

Subsidies should not be used in any case where the cost of the subsidy, including administrative costs, exceeds the price increase avoided or the price reduction effected by the use of the subsidy. Where a subsidy applied to one of several commodities will have the same effect on the cost of living it should be applied to the commodity where the direct saving per dollar of subsidy cost is greatest. Although the direct savings are less important than the indirect benefits of avoiding subsequent price and wage increases, the absence of any direct saving makes the benefit from use of a subsidy more difficult a measure. There are so many cases in which a subsidy can achieve measurable gains that a program so confined can still accomplish its purpose.

E. Subsidies should not be used where the cost of administering them would exceed one-quarter of 1 percent of the price increase avoided or the price reduction affected

This limitation should be imposed to reassure those who are concerned lest the cost of administering the program be enormous. This limitation has been expressed in terms of the amount of saving rather than the amount of the subsidy because the latter appears to be a less logical basis for determining whether the subsidy is worth its cost. In most cases the cost of administration would be increased by efforts to limit rigorously the amounts paid, thus raising from both sides the ratio of administrative cost to amount of payment. Such efforts should not be discouraged.

F. Subsidies should in general not be granted in compensation for such increases of unit overhead costs as reflect merely curtailment in the volume of operations

The preservation of firms whose output has been curtailed is an important problem, both from a social and economic point of view. But it is a problem distinct from that of maintaining price stability while obtaining necessary production, and it should be dealt with apart from a subsidy program designed to maintain wartime economic stabilization. Where direct costs are being covered, production and distribution will ordinarily continue over the short run, even though all accounting costs may not be covered. In general, no subsidy under this program is required in such cases.

There are, of course, exceptions to this generalization. For example, owners of small firms may shift into other, more profitable occupations. If their trade can be turned over to other firms, such transfers will make for the best wartime use of resources. On the other hand, where failure to grant a subsidy will impede the production or distribution of an important commodity, an exception may be made to this rule.

It should be understood, of course, that the rule itself does not preclude the use of a subsidy in connection with a commodity solely because its output may have been curtailed, but merely precludes subsidization of that part of the cost increase that results from the curtailment. Cost increases due to other causes may be subsidized.

G. The aggregate amount of subsidies that do not involve direct saving on Government purchases should be limited to $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944

I think it highly desirable that we announce such a limitation on the program we contemplate in order to make it clear that the proposed program does not open the way to potentially unlimited subsidy expenditures. In addition, such a limitation would

be of great assistance to us in resisting pressures to extend subsidies where their use is not warranted.

This restriction should obviously not apply, however, to subsidies that will involve direct net savings to the Government as a buyer.

III. CHOICE OF METHOD FOR SUBSIDIZATION

A. Technique

While subsidization is usually thought of as involving direct payments by the Treasury, this is only one of several methods by which subsidies may be paid. In addition to direct payments, the Government may purchase the entire output of a commodity at a price that gives the desired return to the industry and sell back at lower prices, either to the same firms from which it bought or to firms at the next stage of production or distribution. The trading loss, equal to the excess of purchase price over sale price, is a subsidy. This method is used by the Commodity Credit Corporation. A third method, really only a variation of the second, is for the Government to purchase only a part instead of all of the output and sell it at a loss. This procedure is used in the case of the premium-price plan for nonferrous metals. The Metals Reserve Co. buys the high-cost portion of copper, lead, and zinc production at prices higher than the ceiling and sells it at the ceiling price. A fourth method is the provision of a service at a loss. This technique is used by the War Shipping Administration when it provides war-risk insurance and other services at premiums which aggregate less than the total claims paid.

The technique to be used in any particular case should depend upon the nature of the commodity, its market structure, and other aspects of the organization of the industry. It is neither possible nor desirable to lay down any rigid rules as to the best procedure, since the choice will depend upon a variety of factors that cannot always be foreseen.

Some important considerations may be mentioned, however. Purchase and sale by the Government permits the supply and its allocation to be effectively controlled. Where the geographical distribution of the supply or its distribution between uses, including stockpiles, needs to be better controlled, this is an important advantage of the purchase and sale technique. The method of purchase and sale, moreover, by substituting a single buyer, the Government, for a large number of private buyers, permits the price at the stage of subsidization to be controlled. It may be desirable to have control take this form. For example, in the case of certain imports, supplies are controlled by foreign monopolies. A rise in the import price cannot be effectively resisted by many private importers who are competing with each other, but it can be resisted by a Government agency which does all the importing. On the other hand, where such considerations are absent, the method of purchase and sale should not be used.

At present, the choice of technique is greatly influenced by restrictions on the powers of the various Government agencies. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, has taken the position that it is powerless to make direct grants, but can only buy and sell. While the substantive difference between these two procedures is sometimes virtually nil, it seems to me that the law should permit the administrators of the program to use whichever technique is appropriate, rather than force them to make the choice on the basis of restrictions imposed before the program was contemplated.

B. Stage at which subsidy should be paid

1. In addition to choosing the technique to be used, the Government must also decide at what stage of production or distribution the subsidy is to be paid. In this connection it should be understood that a subsidy need not be paid at the stage where a cost increase originally occurs. It should be paid at the level where it can be most efficiently administered, having regard both to the cost and the effectiveness of administration.

2. An additional consideration is the amount of direct saving that can be obtained for a given subsidy expenditure. Insofar as price ceilings are determined upon the basis of percentage margins, this saving will be greater the earlier the stage at which the subsidy is paid.

I have no doubt whatever that a subsidy program of the type outlined above is essential to the stabilization program. I am convinced that the standards set forth in this letter provide adequate safeguards against unwise use of the program.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN.
Administrator.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Connecticut has concluded.

Mr. MALONEY. I have concluded. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me take a moment to submit for the RECORD a table and a letter. The table was suppiled by Mr. C. M. Elkinton, price executive of the Office of Price Administration. It is a list of wartime subsidies and appears on page 54 of the committee report on the pending bill. I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wartime subsidies

[Taken from Business Week, May 22, 1943]

Commodity	Type of subsidy	Supervisory agency	Estimated annual rate of subsidy
Various imports	Absorption of certain payments on war-risk insurance.	War Shipping Administration.	$63,000,000
Sugar	Payments to refiners to cover increased transportation costs and losses resulting from reduction in weight through transshipment.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	30,000,000
Soybean, cottonseed, and peanut oils.	Payment to refineries (1½ cent per pound) to absorb rising prices at the far level.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	17,000,000
Copper, lead, and zinc.	Incentive payments to create production in marginal mines (production beyond established quotas carries a premium of 5 cents per pound for copper and 2¾ cents for lead and zinc).	Metals Reserve Company	25,100,000
Henequin	Absorption of higher costs in transportation, insurance, etc.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	5,900,000
Petroleum and petroleum products.	Payments for increased transportation costs, rail hauls, insurance, etc.	do War Shipping Administration.	268,000,000 150,000,000
Imported metals	Absorption of (1) higher shipping costs and (2) increase in foreign sellers' prices.	Metals Reserve Company	30,000,000
Copper scrap	Absorption of costs in connection with conversion of excess manufacturers' inventories into electrolytic copper.	Copper Recovery Corporation.	(1)
Nicotine sulfate	Payments to manufacturers to compensate for rises in price at the farm level	Agricultural Marketing Administration.	1,750,000
Alcohol	Absorption by the Government of higher grain and molasses prices, freight charges, and war-risk insurance.	Commodity Credit Corporation and Defense Supplies Corporation.	(1)
Bituminous coal	Double subsidy consisting of (1) absorption of additional costs on water-borne coal to New England, and (2) direct payments for rail transportation.	War Shipping Administration. Defense Supplies Corporation.	15,000,000 40,000,000
Imported oil-bearing seeds.	To keep down pressure on Office of Price Administration ceilings, imported oil-bearing seeds are purchased by the Government and put into trade channels at a loss.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	800,000
Coffee	Payments, direct or indirect, to cut transportation outlays and absorb higher insurance premiums.	do War Shipping Administration.	7,000,000 14,000,000
Chilean nitrate	Absorption by the Government of increases in foreign sellers' prices and of increased transportation and insurance costs.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	6,000,000
Cheddar	Payments to processors to enable them to purchase milk for additional cheese production.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	30,000,000
Canning crops	Payments to processors to get bigger supplies of tomatoes, peas, sweet corn, and snap beans from farmers.	do	10,000,000

[1] No estimate.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I also have a statement from Mr. Jesse Jones to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], setting out a list of the items on which subsidies are now being paid by the Government. The statement appears at pages 13 and 14 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy and sell, or to subsidize, those materials which are designated by the President as critical and strategic.

Subsidies in one form or another have been a matter of administration policy since 1940, first in the defense program and later in the war effort.

Due to submarine warfare Defense Supplies Corporation is paying excess transportation charges, and in some instances excess cost, on petroleum products. The estimated net cost of this operation for 1943 is from ninety-five to one hundred million dollars, probably from forty to fifty million dollars for 1944.

For the same reason the Corporation is paying excess transportation costs on coal to New York and New England. The estimated cost of this program for the year is $25,000,000.

Defense Supplies Corporation paid transportation costs in distributing sugar throughout the country up to December 16, 1942. This included sugar from Cuba and the cost of moving beet sugar from the West to the New England area. Since then Commodity Credit Corporation has handled sugar.

Disbursements have been approximately $23,000,000.

All Chilean nitrate of soda imported from July 1, 1942, to June 1, 1943, is for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation. Sale of this nitrate of soda within the Office of Price Administration price ceilings will result in an estimated loss of $7,000,000, of which about one-half is due to transportation costs.

Because of the critical shortage of fibers for rope and binder twine which was brought about principally because of the loss of the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies, Defense Supplies Corporation is purchasing fibers in Mexico, the West Indies, and East Africa. This fiber is landed in the United States wherever possible and the high costs of the fiber and the high rail transportation costs to destination will result in an estimated loss of approximately $5,000,000 for 1943.

The purchase and resale of idle tires will result in a loss to Defense Supplies Corporation estimated at $20,000,000.

Formerly this country obtained its supply of jewel bearings almost entirely from Switzerland. In order to induce American manufacturers to produce them, Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to purchase the output of American manufacturers at a price which entails a very substantial loss. It is estimated this loss will approximate $7,500,000 a year.

In order to obtain the necessary production of aluminum rivets which are used principally in airplane manufacture, it was necessary to have them produced by high-cost manufacturers who were not normally in the business. Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to subsidize the production of these rivets, at an estimated loss of $5,000,000 for a year.

This applies also to aluminum rod and bars, on which the estimated loss is $1,000,000.

Defense Supplies Corporation has agreed to pay the excess cost of purchasing petroleum coke at inland locations, transporting it to the west coast and processing it into calcined coke. This is done to avoid interference with the maximum production of 100-octane gasoline and Navy fuel oil on the west coast. The estimated loss is $2,500,000.

Metals Reserve Company has been paying premiums on certain excess domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc since February 1, 1942. At the present rate of premiums and production this will cost approximately $53,000,000 a year, but due to efforts to further stimulate production, this cost may be increased to as much as $80,000,000 annually by the end of 1943.

Metals Reserve Company is purchasing and selling idle and excess inventories of raw materials and partly and fully fabricated materials frozen in the hands of the holders; it is also purchasing scrap metals where the cost, including preparation, handling, refining, freight, etc., will entail substantial losses. It is estimated that in 1943 these losses will aggregate $27,000,000.

Metals Reserve Company is encouraging the production of various and sundry metals in this country through buying them at a high price and selling them at ceiling prices.

In addition to copper, lead, and zinc, these include arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chrome, cobalt, fluorspar, graphite, iron ore, kyanite, magnesium, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, rutile, spodumene, talc, tantalum, tin, tungsten, and vanadium. The loss on these items probably will be about $25,000,000.

These materials come from one or more of the following States: Pennsylvania, Utah, Texas, Arkansas, Alaska, California, Idaho, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Vermont, Michigan, Arizona, Missouri, Alabama, New Jersey, Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and New York.

Metals Reserve Company is paying abnormal transportation costs and losses on the purchase of various metals and minerals from Latin America and elsewhere abroad. The estimated loss on these for 1943 is about $25,000,000.

In the manufacture of synthetic rubber, the purchase of natural rubber from foreign countries, the purchase of scrap rubber for reclaim purposes, and the development of new sources of rubber, the cost is problematical. These activities are carried on by Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Company.

In the case of meat and butter, the Price Administrator announced a reduction of approximately 10 percent to the consumer on these items. Obviously if this reduction were rolled back to the cattle and hog raiser and the price of cattle and hogs were reduced accordingly, the supply of meat would be retarded at a time when the maximum supply is most needed.

For this reason the Director of Economic Stabilization directed that I arrange with an agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pay subsidies on meat and butter to assure maximum production. The President approved the payment of these subsidies up to $450,000,000.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries act as service agencies in the war program. When the President, the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Rubber Director, and the Director of Economic Stabilization establishes the need for plant facilities, materials, services, or supplies for which no other provision is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through one of the above-named subsidiaries, when requested to do so by the appropriate war agency, and with my approval, undertakes to provide them. In this way it serves those responsible for war production and war policies. Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor I make policies.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I desire to apologize to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for the facetious way in which I referred to his amendment to the pending bill. I did not mean to leave the impression that I was opposed to his amendment. I think his amendment would be a vast improvement over what we now have or over the pending measure. In my opinion, the Senator is one of the best Americans in this body, and I desire to take this opportunity to apologize to him for the manner in which I referred to his amendment. I did not know the Senator was present. I wanted to say some complimentary things while he was here because I was afraid he might read them and think I had not meant them. Mr. President, of all the Members of the Senate, the Senator from Vermont is the last one I would choose to offend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the message from the President was received, I had sent to the desk a suggested amendment in which I had attempted to meet the various principles set forth by me with respect to the proper solution of our problem of agricultural production. I should like now to take a few moments more to analyze that suggestion.

WOULD TRANSFER POWER TO FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

The proposal which I have sent to the desk and which I had read undertakes to meet the problem by transferring from the Office of Price Administration to the Office of the War Food Administrator all powers with respect to the payment of subsidies for food products. The object of that, as I stated, is perfectly simple. The power to pay subsidies to increase agricultural production should be vested in an official who understands agricultural production and who is charged with the duty of maintaining it, rather than in the hands of an official whose duty is to keep prices down, and who, strive as he may, will naturally tend to keep them down, even at the expense of securing necessary production.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that point, will he yield to me so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it not logical to carry the Senator's theory still further, and to concentrate the total food control in the Food Administration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it might be very logical, but I do not think it is practical. I have endeavored to draft phraseology which would preserve the objective of the Executive with respect to the war against inflation, and at the same time preserve the objective of everyone which is to be certain that the necessary agricultural production is assured. I think nothing would be gained by adopting a provision which would meet a veto. I am endeavoring to work out, if I can, a constructive solution for a problem which everyone recognizes to be of great seriousness.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What puzzles me is that the Senator emphasizes the fact that Mr. Davis, rather than Mr. Brown, should have this power; but what assurance have we that Mr. Davis will be War Food Administrator by the time the bill is passed? There are rumors that he already is dissatisfied because he is not given full power, and is about to resign. How do we know that Mr. Brown may not be War Food Administrator by the time the bill is passed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. We do not know who will be War Food Administrator. I hope that Mr. Davis will remain in the position to which he was called. Like all other Members of the Senate with whom I have talked, I have the highest confidence in him; but if he goes out of office for any reason, I feel confident that there will be appointed in his place a War Food Administrator who understands agriculture. In the light of the discussion which is taking place, or the statements which I am making, I am confident that a War Food Administrator would not be selected from the Office of Price Administration. That would be a defeat of the clear purpose of my proposal.

I was about to say that my amendment has another advantage, in that it reaches the problem with which we are concerned without touching the other problems respecting production of war minerals. It does not deal with strategic or critical materials. It does not de-

prive the R. F. C. of any power over minerals. It deals solely with food.

Mr. President, I am addressing myself to the Chair as well as to Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is very glad to be addressed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize the Vice President as an eminent expert in agriculture; and I am quite sure that his influence, if exerted on this problem, would be most beneficial to agriculture.

My amendment would avoid all the difficulties which have arisen in connection with each of the amendments which has been proposed, because it would eliminate all questions of copper, oil, lead, zinc, or any of the other metals for which bonuses and subsidies are being paid.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is one other difficulty which I have with the Senator's amendment. It is my impression that if Mr. Brown, the Price Administrator, and Mr. Jones were asked their real opinions, they would not be in favor of the roll-back-subsidy program; but they were committed to it by the President of the United States, when he answered John L. Lewis and announced that he was going to roll back prices. I cannot see what assurance the Senator can give us that the War Food Administrator would not accept the direction of the President of the United States on that question, just as the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce have done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, and read the wording of the amendment, I think he will find that at least an attempt has been made to meet that precise problem.

The War Food Administrator being made the administrator of food subsidies, the next step is to determine what foods shall be produced. So the amendment provides that he shall administer these powers in such manner as to obtain the maximum necessary production of food in the quantities specified by the President, to assure (1) an adequate supply of food for the armed forces; (2) an adequate supply for essential civilian needs; (3) an adequate supply for carrying out the policy of lend-lease; (4) an adequate supply for war-relief purposes.

That places upon the President the responsibility of determining the amount of food necessary. I assume that he would act through the War Food Administrator; and I assume that without any question the estimated quantities would be such as would be designed to carry out the already announced policy of the President with respect to those various matters. We cannot think of carrying out the President's policy of war relief, to which he has assigned Governor Lehman, unless he is willing to see that the necessary quantity of food is produced. We cannot think that he would fail to do everything possible to produce the necessary quantity to enable him to carry out the lease-lend policy, which is his policy. We cannot believe that he would hesitate to encourage the production of whatever food may be necessary to meet essential civilian needs. Above all, there can be no doubt that his purpose would be to see that there was food enough for the armed forces.

Then there is the proviso that—

> No subsidy payment shall be made unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements of section 3 of the act approved October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.).

In that act, Mr. President, the Congress came to an agreement with the President as to the returns which the producers of agricultural commodities should receive. This provision is so drafted that it would be possible to have the normal operation of the market support the prices which the producers ought to have.

The next proviso is in the nature of a limitation:

> *Provided further,* That the amount of such subsidy payments shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the Congress.

The purpose of that provision was clearly to provide an avenue for the President to make his estimates and have them submitted to Congress and approved by the Congress. This would put an end to the by-passing of the legislative branch of the Government. The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has suggested that the reference to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget might result in giving the Director a power which he does not now have over Congress. Recognizing the validity of that criticism, I am willing to change it from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the President; and if I offer the amendment I shall make that change.

Finally, there is the concluding provision:

> *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the payment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The purpose of that provision is to recognize the good faith of the Office of Price Administration in the action it has already taken, and to guarantee the payment of subsidies which the O. P. A. and the R. F. C. have pledged. We should not repudiate their action, but we ought to bring it to an end.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has Congress authorized the R. F. C. and the O. P. A. to enter into contracts embodying the principle of the subsidy for food?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. What provision of the law does the Senator use in support of his affirmative answer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator mind reading it, if it is not too long?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. If he will do so, I shall be able to follow his argument a little more closely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 2 (e) reads as follows:

> Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the proivisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof—

And so forth. Under my amendment I transfer that power to the War Food Administrator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not interested in who exerts it, but I wish to follow the Senator's reasoning. As I listened to the reading of his amendment I gained the impression—perhaps not accurately—that the Senator's amendment applies to food subsidies only to the extent of commitments already made. Am I in error in that impression?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the Senator is in error about that. The amendment looks to the future.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would put Congress in more direct alinement with the subsidy principle than does the present law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. It would preserve the supervisory authority of the Congress, as it should be preserved.

The Senator will recall that last year the Committee on Banking and Currency reported a bill authorizing the R. F. C. to borrow $5,000,000,000 for subsidy purposes. The bill was rejected by the Senate and sent back to the committee because it provided for no congressional guide. The congressional guide is provided for in this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been absent from the Chamber much of the time during the past 3 or 4 days. I have been attending meetings of the Committee on Appropriations, both morning and afternoon, and I have missed a great deal of the debate. I do not wish to go back over a matter which has been covered, but would it put the Senator to great inconvenience if he should enumerate the dates, the character of the commodities, and the amounts of subsidies which have already been authorized under the provision which the Senator has just read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The subsidies authorized were not under that provision. They were under another provision which follows immediately to the one which I just read. That is the provision which was written in by Congress for the purpose of enabling the R. F. C. to pay subsidies to producers of strategic and critical materials. The only reason that provision has been utilized for food is the declaration by the President that coffee,

meat, and butter are strategic and critical materials.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator give me the date and the amounts of subsidies promised by the agency authorized to make subsidy payments so that I may ascertain in more detail what the situation is at the present time? The Senator has made some study of the subject and is familiar with it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator all the figures for which he has asked. I do not have the totals in mind. They appear in the RECORD, however. About the 1st or 2d of June the program with respect to butter, meat, and coffee was announced. With respect to meat, the measure of the subsidy was 2 cents a pound to the packers, on the carcass. Of course, the aggregate amount would depend on the number of pounds sold.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to divert the Senator from his argument. If I am doing so, he can so indicate, and I will desist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the Senator is not diverting me. I made the principal part of my argument while the Senator was in attendance at the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator further if the three subsidies for food to which he made reference are of recent crigin? Did the Administrator put them into effect the 1st of June this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was about that time.

Mr. TYDINGS. According to the announcement of the subsidy authority, how long were the subsidies to run? They were to start in June. Was there a time limit?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So far as I know, there was no time limit. That is the policy which was announced.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can see what I am leading to. If a Senator should desire to vote against the principle of subsidy without repudiating contracts which the Congress has authorized the subsidy authority to make, he would have to know what the commitments were in order to cast an intelligent vote on the question at issue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the principal points for which I was contending before the Senator entered the Chamber was that the principle of the payment of subsidies has been recognized by Congress over and over again.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been recognized specifically and also in general terms in many instances.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that to be true, particularly as to critical materials, in which category foods have now been included.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So, in my judgment, the rejection now in toto of the subsidy principle would upset our entire economy, and it should not be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that a good case can be made for critical materials, but I am wondering if as good a case could be made for butter, meat, and coffee, assuming that no time limit were set upon the subsidy program as it relates to those three commodities.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My purpose is to put an end to that program and, if it shall be necessary, to authorize the War Food Administrator to initiate a new program. However, I think it can be administered in such way as to reduce the amount of subsidies. Everyone who has familiarized himself with the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the work of the Department of Agriculture knows that those two agencies have been most careful in the exercise of the subsidy program. I think no one challenges the ability, the efficiency, and the high-mindedness of the men who have been doing the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Our problem here is to find a way of having all the agencies work together.

Mr. President, with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I wish briefly to say that in my opinion it is open to the criticism that if adopted it would upset our whole economy. It was initiated, if I correctly understand the Senator, because he felt, as I did, that the food problem has been mishandled, and that the power of paying subsidies in this manner should be ended. But in seeking to accomplish that result, he offered an amendment which would end all other subsidies, and seriously cripple the war effort. Therefore, the amendment was amended on the floor of the Senate. However, I believe that the changes which have been made in it are not such as will cure the defect in the amendment.

In my opinion the amendment offered on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency is also defective because it would not stop the roll-back. It would not control the payment of subsidies. Moreover, it would amend the law which Congress enacted providing that subsidies should be paid to producers. For that reason, in my judgment it should not be adopted in its present form.

Mr. President, I have already sent to the desk a proposed amendment which has been read and which will appear in the RECORD. It would alter the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama in the following respects: On page 2, line 7, it would strike out the word "is" and insert in lieu the words "and the Commodity Credit Corporation are"; so that subsection (a) would read:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

Subparagraph (b) is allowed to remain as it is. That is the paragraph which authorizes the R. F. C. to borrow money and pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials.

Then I propose to strike out all of subsections (c), (d), and (e), and to substitute new language. The reason I strike out (c) and (d) is that they were made interchangeable, and they do not prevent the roll-back. Subsection (c) authorizes the R. F. C. to borrow $500,000,000 in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of or to purchase commodities to prevent price increases.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000 and to pay subsidies or purchase commodities, but subsection (e) then authorizes the transfer of these funds back and forth, so that the amendment, in these three paragraphs amounts to an authorization of $675,000,000 to be used in the way which has already been criticized and which should be abandoned.

That is overcome by inserting in place of the three paragraphs which I have just analyzed this language:

> (c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow and use such sums as may be necessary to liquidate all subsidy payments which have accrued prior to July 1, 1943, under the terms of the so-called roll-back program.

That provision stops the roll-back, and it stops it at the end of this month, and in connection with the other language it provides an agricultural commodity program in the hands of the War Food Administrator.

Then the next paragraph reads:

> (d) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000 and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss in order to obtain the necessary production of such commodities in cases where the average price received by producers of such commodities in the market place meets the requirements of section 3 of the Act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.). All commitments heretofore made by the Commodity Credit Corporation for such or similar purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitment herein authorized shall be entered into hereafter with any producer, processor or distributor that cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

Subsection (e) of the committee amendment goes out, and subsection (f) of the amendment becomes subsection (e).

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I understand the proposed amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, under it if subsidies are paid they are to be paid for the purpose of increasing production and payment shall go to the producer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; the one who is to do the increasing.

Mr. O'DANIEL. In the present situation it is claimed by those in the cattle business that already there is a large surplus of cattle and no shortage, yet, through marketing quotas set up by O. P. A., a shortage is created in the meat market. Would the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming reach that situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my amendment would not, and no amendment that is pending here would. The only way that defect can be corrected is to set

aside the quota, and as to that I agree with the Senator, but it is not relevant to the debate here. That is another problem which ought to be met.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is certainly related to the subject in some manner, because we are discussing the shortage of meat, whereas there is no shortage of cattle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that; it is directly related to it; but the bill before us deals solely with the question of prices and subsidies for production. I agree with the Senator that the population of cattle is so great that if the quota restrictions were removed livestock would flow to the markets and the supply could be properly distributed; but that is another question, and the situation referred to by the Senator from Texas cannot be cured by this bill.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have taken so much time, but so many questions were asked me as I was proceeding that it was unavoidable; and of course I welcomed the questions.

I desire now to enter in the RECORD a letter which I received under date of June 7 from the Acting Administrator of O. P. A., in which he announced that the program which has been adopted by the O. P. A. with respect to meat was not intended to bring about a roll-back upon the producer. I insert this in the RECORD for the purpose of showing the good faith of O. P. A. I do not question their good faith, I do not question their intent. I say only that the program did not work as it was intended to work, and it has brought about a reduction of price such that the producers of meat animals cannot sell at the resulting figure and meet their costs, and therefore the roll-back should be discontinued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: A reduction of meat price ceilings at the retail and wholesale levels of approximately 10 percent was announced by this Office on June 5. This measure was taken as part of a program designed to meet the requirements of Executive Order No. 9328, known as the hold-the-line order, issued by President Roosevelt on April 8.

Meat was included in the price reduction program primarily because it constitutes the most important single item in our food budget, and because the ceiling prices on meat are spelled out in dollars and cents for each cut thus making an effective price reduction possible.

It is well known that a 10-percent reduction in meat prices would sharply reduce the amount of money reflected back to the livestock market with a corresponding decline in livestock prices. It was in full recognition of this fact that the decision was made to make subsidy payments equal to the reduction in meat prices. For example, the ceiling price on carcass beef will be reduced 2 cents a pound and the Government will pay the slaughterer 2 cents a pound on all beef slaughtered. The meat packer will thus receive the same amount of money for his meat as he did prior to the price reduction. In other words the packer will go into the livestock market with as much money as he did prior to this program and the producer will be protected from the retail and wholesale price reduction.

Provision has been made in the subsidy program for the protection of meat inventories. While the subsidy is effective for meat slaughtered beginning June 7, the packer's ceiling prices will not be reduced until June 14 for fresh and frozen meat and June 28 for cured and processed meats. This staggering of dates for the price reductions will enable those who have inventories of meat to sell them at the higher prices which now prevail.

This carefully developed plan is designed to be an important part of the national economic stabilization program, and great care has been exercised to assure that no part of the meat industry will be adversely affected by its operation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURKE,
Acting Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as modified, as a perfecting amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator. I thought we were ready for a vote, and I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have no objection to that. I wish to speak for a few minutes on the question before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I shall not insist, if the Senator desires to speak. I merely wanted a quroum, because I thought we were about to vote.

Mr. TUNNELL. Perhaps it would be better to wait until after I have spoken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have been much disturbed about the whole subject of subsidies. Since childhood I have been opposed to the principle of subsidies. Since I have been taking any interest in politics I have been talking against subsidies. I talked about the protective tariff when I believed that the tariff was used as a subsidy, for the purpose of building up immense and swollen fortunes for which no compensation was given. I remember opposing the idea of a payment of 2 cents a pound on sugar, as I recall the figure, a sugar bounty, which was a subsidy. I have always been opposed to the idea of giving something to a business which should be operated on a purely business basis.

I have been much interested in the statements which have been made by those representing the cattle interests in the West. I was interested in the statement of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in particular, when he said that the cattle growers were running on too small a margin of profit. To my mind, that is a valid and strong argument, because, after all, the profit motive is the inducement, the incentive, which causes people to transact business and to do business, and without that incentive business will not be done.

Perhaps not being acquainted with that particular business, I have been somewhat confused by the various statements which have been made. For instance, we have been told that there is a shortage of beef in prospect, and the next minute we are told that there are more cattle in the country than ever before. We are told that there is going to be a shortage of hog meat, and then we are told that there are 125,000,000 hogs in the country, more than ever before. We are told that those who produce cattle and hogs will not send them to market, and then we are told that there are unsold animals in the market. I do not know; I suppose there are explanations of all those things. But the statements which have been made have been very confusing to me.

Leaving that matter for a few moments, I was much disappointed this morning to hear the Secretary of Commerce attacked because he had dared to send to some of the Senators a statement as to what had been done. We were told on the floor of the Senate that the Secretary sat in a room adjoining this Chamber and whispered to those who went by, attempting to induce them to vote in a particular way.

Mr. President, I am somewhat disappointed in this, because I feel that I have been slighted. I passed the Secretary yesterday in the adjoining room, I met him, and he shook hands with me, but he did not whisper in my ear, he did not tell me that he wanted me to vote for anything or against anything. I have just been wondering whether the charge made on the floor of the Senate was as baseless as to other Senators as it was in my own case. If the Secretary is going to whisper into the ears of others, I myself should like to know what he is whispering about; I think he slighted me.

It seems that in the particular situation we are considering we all agree that conditions are different from what they were prior to the war. I noticed in this morning's Washington Post an article headed "Brown appeals for subsidies. Says he cannot control prices without them."

This article refers to the man upon whom the duty is thrown of controlling prices, and he says he cannot control them without subsidies. Of course, with my tendency of mind against subsidies, such a suggestion is disturbing, and again I go back to the thought that, after all, we are at war, and there is very great difference between what is now required or what is now justified and what is justified under ordinary conditions. Without reading the whole reference to Price Administrator Brown, I should like to have this article, found on page 3 of the Washington Post of this morning, printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN APPEALS FOR SUBSIDIES; SAYS HE CANNOT CONTROL PRICES WITHOUT THEM

Price Administrator Prentiss Brown last night declared he cannot administer price control without the use of subsidies, and said the cut in Office of Price Administration appropriation imposed by the House last

week will—if agreed to by the Senate—cripple the Nation's hold-the-line program into uselessness.

When the price-control laws were passed, he asserted in a radio speech directed to the general public, it was apparent the program would require "the use of Government funds."

Subsidies, the Office of Price Administration chief declared, provide the cheapest method of securing production and are necessary "not only to roll back the cost of living to the level to which we are committed, but to hold it there."

The President and the War Labor Board, Brown said, have courageously prevented a serious break on the wage front and it is now more than ever necessary "that we hold on the price front."

"When Congress takes its recess in July," the Administrator declared, "it will find the people behind price control. Pressure groups are strong in the Capital and they often blind Congressmen to what the average citizen is thinking," he contended.

"Only when a Member can talk with those he knows have no pet cause to plead, can he get the real low-down on American thinking. I am glad for this reason that Congress is going home," he said.

"All ground lost on the cost-of-living front since September 15 must be retaken," he declared, "for the alternative of raising wages to match the rise cannot be considered."

"The roll-back subsidy program on meat and butter will save the consumer between $2 and $3 and the Government at least $2 for every dollar paid out in subsidies," he said, terming the program the "soundest kind of finance."

"On this program," he said, "the Office of Price Administration was faced with two alternatives. Other than the subsidy, prices on meat could have been reduced at the farm level. Since the Price Control Act specifies farm prices must not be placed lower than parity, the lower ceiling at agricultural levels was impossible."

If retail prices were to be stabilized at last September 15 levels and "a fair and equitable margin maintained for the various processors and middlemen," as stipulated by law, Brown declared, "the subsidy was the only way out."

He reiterated his promise to extend community dollar and cents ceilings to all market basket foods, and urged Americans to arouse themselves to the dangers of inflation "before it is too late."

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, to my mind Price Administrator Brown is one of the ablest men I ever met in this Chamber. I am satisfied that he is not making this statement without some reason. I am satisfied that he believes the statement he makes that he cannot control prices without subsidies.

It has been preached to us by newspapers, by columnists, and in speeches all over this Nation, that it is absolutely necessary to control prices. We have a Price Administrator. He is appointed for the purpose of controlling prices. He is supposed to have studied this question, and I think each of us will admit that he is a person who is capable of studying and arriving at a correct conclusion.

As I understand the situation, and as I gather it this afternoon from hearing the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] discuss this matter, the problem is as to what is to become of the roll-back.

Mr. President, it seems to me that according to the law which was read by the Senator from Wyoming, very wide latitude is given to the Price Administrator. He is permitted to use his own judgment in the handling of this question, and I am not one of those who believe that either Secretary Jones or Price Administrator Brown is willingly and knowingly violating either the law or the Constitution of the United States.

If I were to undertake to find out what is the law with reference to a Federal matter, I do not know that I could get an opinion from any source in which I would have greater confidence than the office of the Department of Justice, or the Attorney General. I do not know why it should be thought that that office would give out false information or information not justified by the language of the law itself, and after listening to the reading of the law in question, I believe that the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States was worth pretty nearly as much as the judgment of some of the others of us, with less experience, and less opportunity to study the particular law.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that perhaps the statement that we all agree, or that it is admitted, that the officials referred to are violating the law, is putting it pretty strongly. Here is at least one Senator who does not make such an admission, and I do not think the statement is justified. I believe that the Attorney General is justified in the position he took, and I believe so more firmly since hearing the speech of the Senator from Wyoming this afternoon.

There is now before the Senate a problem which affects the whole American people. I noticed that the Senator from Nebraska stated that the growers of cattle were not the ones who would get the subsidy. The Senator from Nebraska said the processors would not receive the subsidy, but that the users of the product, the consumers, would receive it. If the consumers are to receive this subsidy money it will be quite widely distributed, and therefore in an attempt to hold the line by means of subsidy payments the damage which some contend will result therefrom will not be so great. If the consumer receives the subsidy money I think that is a pretty good alternative.

Mr. President, we are trying to do something by way of holding the line, as the expression is, but what will be the result if we do not succeed in holding the line? As I view the situation, after having listened to various arguments, if the bill is passed with the amendment of the Senator from Vermont in it, or if it contains any amendment which would interfere with what former Senator Brown says is necessary for him to do, and thus result in preventing him from controlling prices, it will mean a rise in cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the statement made by Price Administrator Brown presents a sufficient reason why I, for one, can afford to do something which I am constitutionally opposed to doing. I have been opposed to doing what is now proposed to be done throughout political life, because I think it represents a Republican principle, which is that some persons should be given something for nothing. The Republican Party has fattened on that principle. I was delightfully surprised when I found that a Republican Senator from Ohio had taken a position in favor of controlling prices. I congratulate him on taking that position.

The statement was made by the Senator from Nebraska that the producer is not going to get the subsidy money, but the consumer is. That is not the theory of the Republican Party in this Nation. The theory upon which it has acted is that the manufacturer, but not the consumer, should receive benefits through the Government. If the consumer is now to be given an opportunity to benefit by the provisions of this measure, then I feel justified in voting for it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the so-called Taft-Bankhead amendment provides the best method among the different methods left to our choice. These two Senators have given us a means by which we can limit the amount of liability placed on the Nation in doing something which has always seemed to us Democrats to be wrong. It limits the amount which can be thus expended, and yet it gives an opportunity in wartime to hold down the cost of living. I think that is very important. Perhaps I have not been so thoroughly convinced of the danger of inflation as some other persons seem to be, and yet I believe that inflation is a real danger. I think we have before us the possibility of a rise in cost of living, which would make it necessary again to raise wages. That would present a dangerous situation. Such a procedure would be a dangerous one. It is because of that danger, as I understand, that Price Administrator Brown insists that the measure be passed without crippling amendments; that otherwise he cannot hold down prices.

Let us see what will result if we refuse to do what is said to be necessary to be done by those who have studied the question, and who have made the matter of price administration their exclusive work during this period. Many men are studying the question of price control. If we refuse to do what is contended to be so absolutely necessary at this time, who assumes responsibility for the results? I myself do not propose to assume responsibility for them. Price Administrator Brown has my entire confidence. I think he has an almost impossible task to perform, and I believe that what he is now asking for can be utilized by him for the benefit of the American people.

Under those conditions, I think we should ask who will assume responsibility for failure resulting from our refusal to act? If general inflation results from our failure now to act, if as Price Administrator Brown says he cannot hold the line, if hardship shall come to millions of people as the result of our failure to act, will we then take the responsibility upon ourselves? Will we be honest about the situation, and say to Mr. Brown and to the administration, "Yes; you had a plan, and had we followed it we would not be in the condition in which we now find ourselves?" Or will we try to sidestep the responsi-

bility and say, "The plan would not have worked anyway?"

I ask Senators who oppose the subsidy plan what plan they have to offer in its place? What is the plan of those who refuse to accede to the demand of Price Administrator Brown? I have not heard presented any intelligent plan which would be likely to stop inflation. I have not heard any plan presented which would stop the rise in living costs. I have not heard of any proposal for action which would cause a cessation of the hardship falling upon the people of this country whose incomes have not been raised, and there are many millions of them.

Mr. President, the responsibility is one which the Senate and the House of Representatives must assume. The situation, as outlined by Price Administrator Brown, is such that if the Senate and the House accede to his wishes, and give him an opportunity to try out the plan which he thinks is the only available plan, should it fail, we shall have done our part. Unless some intelligent plan is put into execution, and the American people suffer because we fail to provide a remedy, then the blame is frankly and plainly upon those of us who refuse to accede to the demand and request of those in position to know what is necessary.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, Undoubtedly responsibility for future rises in the cost of living will be laid without basis of reason at the door of those of us who refuse to grant to the Executive the alleged power to control such rises through the use of subsidies. Were I motivated by the desire to embarrass the Administration in its conduct of the war on the home front, I would vote to legalize and extend the practice already illegally indulged in, because eventually that remedy for controlling prices will fail, and full responsibility for that failure would then be laid at the door of the Executive.

I say the subsidy plan will fail because I am firmly convinced that in no such way can the Executive control the certain rise in the cost of living. The strains on price ceilings will become greater and greater as the supply of wanted goods diminishes and the huge volume of spending power is increased by the growing abnormality of our war effort. To hold levels rigid will only result in the increasing scarcity and final disappearance of the things we need for the conduct of the war and for the requirements of the civilian economy during the war, as well as for a stake for negotiations at the peace table.

Therefore, it is my duty to oppose the use of subsidies for the over-all control of prices. If we approve the proposed plan, we shall later be flooded by demands for appropriations to extend the practice, until disaster overtakes us. I shall not oppose the use of subsidies for the purpose of increasing the supply of critical materials for which abnormal conditions create an abnormal demand. I shall accede to the policy of using subsidies to equalize transportation costs of gasoline and fuel which have been distorted by the war.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may be interested to know that witnesses who were proponents of the roll-back and subsidy plan who came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry told us that the subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee were only a beginning, and that they proposed to continue along that line until all the necessities of life and all the things we require and provide are brought under the plan. So $2,000,000,000, or whatever the figure may be, would be only the initial amount requested. No one knows how many billions of dollars would be needed before the plan would be wholly put into effect.

So when we vote on this measure, I think we should bear in mind that what is proposed is merely the beginning of a plan intended to blanket the whole United States and everything that everyone buys.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. I intend to dwell on that point a little later.

My opposition is leveled at the pernicious practice of using roll-backs at the consumer market place without any provision or even any claim that the benefits of such practice will reach the production point which is necessary in order to reduce costs through having ample supplies.

I am, therefore, opposed to the use of subsidies as a roll-back or a bonus to the consumer, as practiced by the administration and as condoned and expanded in the committee amendment now pending before the Senate, because—

First. The practice is based on false premises. The facts do not support the contention of the proponents of the use of subsidies. Under the so-called roll-back of meat and butter, already put in force by the Government through subsidies to the processors, and a proposed roll-back on coffee, the average consumer would save less than 8 cents a week. Not more than 6 cents a week would be saved on meat, about 1¼ cents on butter, and about one-half cent a week on coffee. With butter and meat shortages threatening to grow worse, and with the constant decrease of consumption, the saving would be around 5 cents a week for each consumer. I contend that is not an important factor in the rising cost of living. The present high cost of living is due to the prices on commodities which ordinarily are counted as desirable but not as necessary food items. For instance, in a market in Washington yesterday, celery was quoted at 30 cents a stalk. A year or two ago it sold at 10 cents a stalk. Sweetcorn was quoted at $1.20 a dozen ears, as against 25 cents a dozen 2 years ago. Huckleberries were quoted at $1.20 a quart, while 25 cents a quart was formerly a fair price. Raspberries were quoted at $1.60 a quart. I could scarcely believe that was so. Strawberries were quoted at 60 cents a quart, although in my own community 2 years ago they could have been purchased for 8 cents a quart, if you picked them yourself. A great many other articles of living which are commonly found on the ordinary family table were quoted at prices two to five times pre-war rates. All those articles figure in the index of the cost of living, and I contend the effort to control by subsidy has not even laid the dust of high costs. I greatly fear what would happen if the effort to control prices by this process should be expanded to its full requirements.

In the second place, the process is too costly. While 8 cents a week would nominally be saved to the individual consumer, eventually there would be a net increase of cost to each person of 18 cents, under the roll-back program for the three items, when the cost of administration, taxes, and all service charges are applied. The total cost of subsidies already proposed by the O. P. A. is estimated at $500,000,000. That amount could be obtained only by the sale of Government bonds, probably to be paid off in about 50 years, at a fair guess, if added to our present indebtedness. At the annual interest rate of 2.9 percent, that would boost the cost to one billion two hundred and twenty-five million, or about 18 cents a week for a year, to each person in the United States, for the privilege of saving between 5 and 6 cents at the present time.

Yet, while proposing to save the people money by charging them from 233 percent to 366 percent more money than they could thus save, the O. P. A. has the naive effrontery to refer to this scheme as the only way to prevent inflation and relieve the excessive cost of living from the necks of the low-salaried white-collar class.

In the third place, under the experience we have already had with subsidies, the plan will promote food shortages. Take for example, the present situation in regard to corn and meat. The roll-back of the retail price of meat has been accompanied—but not accomplished—by a subsidy to the processors of meat. We have now existing the very curious situation of a frozen corn market due to the fact the O. F. A. is trying to maintain a ceiling price for corn of approximately $1 a bushel on the markets, and to maintain through support a $13.75 price on hogs. It does not take an exceptionally bright farmer to figure out that with hogs at $13.75, he can get approximately $1.35 a bushel for corn converted into the meat. Yet the O. P. A. insists on maintaining the lower legal ceiling on corn and a subsidized ceiling on hogs; and consequently the farmer is holding his corn to convert it into hogs, and our plants processing corn for other needed articles are facing shut-downs. If this plan is persisted in, we shall be deprived of critical feed and war materials.

The policy of cheap feed and higher hog prices was intended to be a temporary expedient to encourage the increased production of hogs. The measures of inflation control have frozen those incentives into our economy. The situation may be compared to an automobile. The accelerator of the car was pushed down to gain momentum rapidly, but now has been tied down, through the use of price-control measures, notably the price ceiling on corn. The car

is now exceeding safe speed limits, and there are sharp curves ahead.

It is elementary that so long as these price disparities or economic maladjustments continue, hog production will continue to increase until it has absorbed all available feed supplies. Not only does hog production have the advantage of paying the higher price for corn, but it has a priority on the available supplies because of the location of the hogs on the farms where the corn is raised.

The hog is now eating us into something approaching a national disaster, and its effects will be widespread throughout our economy.

In the fourth place, I am opposed to the extension of this subsidy program because it is un-American. It places in the hands of men who have never been elected by the people and who are not responsible to the people the distribution of vast sums of money upon their own judgment and upon their own discretion, without any yardstick of policy set up by the Congress. I need not emphasize the danger of this practice or to what point it would lead in favoritism—personal and political—or of the unfair competition to businesses not allowed a subsidy, and the complete control which Government would exercise over businesses accepting the subsidy. These dangers are so obvious that they stand out as a part of a plan to regiment completely the large businesses of the country, while the small fellow is waved aside with the bland statement that his sacrifice is just one of the casualties of the war.

In the fifth place, I oppose these subsidies because there is a better way to combat the problem of rising living costs, and that is to increase production so that the supply of needed materials will rise to the point that their availability will bring down the price. To accomplish results we must have an over-all control vested in one single authority with the power granted to him, first of all, to control and stimulate production, and then to coordinate the distribution and direct the prices that shall be charged at the consumer point. Only in this way can we end the confusion that exists in our hydraheaded effort to manage our food problem. It will remove uncertainty from the minds of the producer, the processor, and the distributor. This direction must have the power to cut the red tape of excessive Government regulations and provide the producer, not only with the manpower and machinery, but with the spirit that is necessary to get complete cooperation. The spirit with which our Government approaches this problem will have a vital effect upon production.

This week I received two letters which are very illuminating. One letter complained about a suit which had been brought in my State against a farmer for having overplanted his wheat allotment in 1941. He had raised 350½ bushels of wheat above his quota, and the penalty which the Government is seeking to recover in the suit recently filed is $168.59. The farmer was not informed in the regulations and had no definite notice of a penalty for overproduction. He did not realize that such a thing could happen in a free country. He could not obtain a card for the sale of his wheat, and it remained a drug in his bins. Illness came into the family, which required a physician and hospitalization. He found a physician who was willing to furnish the necessary services and accept wheat as pay for his services. Now the Government is bringing suit against this farmer, in this year of our need, for $168.59, and trying to force him to pay a penalty for growing wheat in this time of our trouble.

Burdensome, costly, and exasperating regulations lower the production of our country. Are the initials "U. S." to stand for "Uncle Sam" or "Uncle Shylock"?

On the same day I received another letter from a very capable farm woman in my own county. She was writing to ask me the price of a house which I own in the neighborhood in which I live. She had made a success of farming, but she had decided to give it up because of the lack of cooperation of Government agencies. She said:

> This year I wanted to raise 1,000 turkeys on my farm. I bought the equipment and I ordered the young turkeys, and then I found that I had to get a man to help raise the turkeys. I located, in a county quite a distance from my home, a schoolteacher who had the necessary qualifications of strength and intelligence to go into this difficult effort of raising turkeys.
>
> He was married and had two children. The agricultural war board of my county recommended his deferment for the essential duty, but when I applied to the draft board of his county to get him deferred to help raise the turkeys, the draft board refused to grant deferment because he could not qualify as a skilled agricultural worker. Nevertheless, he had all the necessary qualifications to raise turkeys successfully, and supply the country with much-needed food. Unable to locate other help, I locked up my equipment, canceled my order for the turkeys, and now wish to move to town.

Thus our food supply is curtailed by a neglect of the spirit for the letter of Government regulations.

In 1942 we planted 22,013,000 fewer acres of corn than we did in 1932. Probably less will be produced in 1943 on account of the weather. In 1942 we planted 13,748,000 fewer acres of wheat than we planted 10 years ago. This reduction of our production capacity is the result of the planned system of farm management.

That is what I mean, Mr. President, when I say that we shall have to have better cooperation and a better spirit on the part of our Government if we are to get the production necessary to bring down the cost of food. If we vote for subsidies we shall give consent to the program of confusion, injustice, and abortive production. Instead of the subsidy program, let us have something constructive, and set up a program of over-all control which will forestall food shortages over the country. Only in this way can we enable America to take her proper place at the peace table and be prepared to use a bountiful supply of food to smooth the irritations between nations. If we do not do so, when we sit at the peace table we may be saying, in a pleading voice, "Please pass the biscuits."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate for only a few minutes, to discuss one phase of the problem before us which has not been elaborated upon during the discussion which has occurred in connection with Senate bill 1108.

A number of amendments have been proposed to the bill, which was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Each amendment has merit. I am sincerely hopeful that as a result of the consideration of the several amendments we may finally arrive at one which will be practicable and will accomplish the purpose for which we are all so hopeful.

I was present at the meeting in Nebraska a week ago last night, when between 700 and 800 farmers who had been engaged in feeding livestock—principally hogs and cattle—were in session to consider their plight. It is a little difficult for one who is not familiar with the problems which those people must face to realize that the situation is really serious. I can speak from personal experience. Frankly, the income, based on prices obtained for livestock today, will not meet the outgo in the production of livestock. I think that is stated in terms simple enough for anyone to understand that the situation is acute.

The farmers do not want to see extremely high prices. I doubt if they want any absolute guarantee of profit, but I think they, like other fair-minded persons, would appreciate the opportunity of having an opportunity at least to come out even, or perhaps with some profit.

I believe that the use of subsidies in a limited way is sound and meritorious, if they are used to increase the production of strategic or critical materials, without permitting a general increase in the prices of the commodities in question.

Thus, if a given quantity of copper can be produced at, let us say, 12½ cents a pound, and if an additional amount is necessary to carry on the war program, and if this additional amount can be produced at a higher cost, the use of a subsidy is justified in order to bring about the added production while at the same time holding the general price level at, let us say, 12½ cents. That is one of the first points on which I think we should agree.

Second. The use of subsidies in a limited way can be justified where some region of the Nation, through no fault of its own, is put in a disadvantageous position as a result of the military activities of the enemy. Thus, if the submarine menace absolutely stops the flow of petroleum products from producing areas in the Gulf States to consuming areas on the Atlantic seaboard, and if this in turn forces a more expensive transportation program, the Government may be justified in paying the differential for a limited period of time until consumers can shift from fuel oil to coal or at least adjust themselves to the circumstances.

Third. There are other illustrations which might be cited in which subsidies or their equivalent could be used to advantage by the Government in order to

maintain reasonable justice, and at the same time promote the successful prosecution of the war. I shall not attempt to enumerate them, but think that some leeway should be left to the administration in solving emergency situations as they arise.

Fourth. The use of widespread subsidies either (a) to promote general or Nation-wide expansion of production, or (b) in the form of roll-back payments to distributors and/or processors to reduce prices to consumers—or even to prevent prices from advancing—would be definitely inflationary, and if generally applied, would completely destroy all control of prices, wages, national income, national debt, and so forth. There is at the present time, and it is admitted by all, a tremendous inflationary gap resulting on the one hand from curtailed production of goods available for consumers, and on the other hand, from the increase in number of workers, the increase in hours per week, and the increase in wage rates and extra payments for overtime. Because of this inflationary gap, consumers are tempted to go outside the regular market and avoid the general price structure, which in turn means the widespread development of the so-called black market. But by lowering ceiling prices through the use of roll-back subsidies, consumers are left with even larger purchasing power, and while on the one side producers refuse to sell through the regular market, on the other side consumers are encouraged to buy through the black market. Thus the whole price structure is gradually destroyed.

Furthermore, the payment of subsidies actually increases the inflationary gap since it increases the purchasing power of consumers while discouraging any increase in the production of goods.

Still further, this policy is inflationary because it means that the Government, with the use of printed money—Government loans negotiated through financial institutions—is increasing the national debt, increasing the national income, and, in general, increasing the inflationary gap.

Indeed, the roll-back use of subsidies is nothing more nor less than the application of the principle of sales taxes in reverse. To avoid inflation, the Government should at this time impose a widespread sales tax of at least 10 percent, with proper exemptions, or require an equivalent investment in nonnegotiable Government securities with low interest rates. Either of these two methods would reduce the inflationary gap. A third method would be to prohibit the payment of time-and-a-half or double wage rates except for employment exceeding 50 hours or 60 hours per week. However, this approach, while reducing cost of production, and the income of workers, and, therefore, the inflationary gap, might tend to discourage production, and the war effort. For that reason, it seems definitely better to absorb a large part of the inflationary gap by a sales tax, or through enforced lending to the Government. These methods are the reverse of the roll-back subsidy program. As indicated before, the payment of subsidies in the form of roll-back payments to hold down or reduce prices is nothing more nor less than the sales tax in reverse, and is inflationary in character.

It is argued by some that Great Britain has used the roll-back subsidy program successfully and thus has prevented runaway inflation. This is, I think, absolutely not true. Weekly earnings in the United States have increased more than 65 percent since 1938–39. In Great Britain weekly earnings have increased less than half of this rate, or not more than 32.5 percent. Thus, there has been created no great inflationary gap.

Furthermore, under our lend-lease program we have furnished the British Government foodstuffs and other materials valued at several hundred million dollars annually. This in turn allows the British Government to sell to the distributors on a fixed price basis in harmony with wages and other income, thus avoiding inflation. In turn, the British Government is able to use the money received from the sale of these goods to subsidize imports from other sources than the United States and dominions, thus holding the prices of the other commodities down in harmony with the price ceilings. We in the United States have an entirely different situation. We are on the giving or lending end instead of on the receiving or borrowing end, and have permitted wage earnings and other items to increase the inflationary gap to such a point that now every effort should be made to close that gap by taxes and/or Government loans rather than further increase the gap by roll-back subsidies.

We cannot follow a fiscal program without limiting to some extent the subsidy program to which we would give official recognition if we were to agree to the provisions of Senate bill 1108. I for one am very anxious that the Senate take ample time and give serious consideration to the solution of this problem. I believe that, more than anything else, it reflects on our domestic conditions and will, if a solution is not found, cause us great distress as a nation.

I was impressed by the remark made yesterday by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he objected to a limitation being placed upon the debate. I myself shall not take much of the time of the Senate in a discussion of this question, but I hope sincerely that each and every Senator will realize the seriousness of the problem, and vote to preserve the American form of government instead of going into reverse and endeavoring to give away what little may be left in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Burton
Andrews	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Bankhead	Brooks	Capper
Bilbo	Buck	Caraway
Chavez	McClellan	Shipstead
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Smith
Connally	McKellar	Stewart
Davis	McNary	Taft
Downey	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Eastland	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
George	Millikin	Tobey
Gerry	Moore	Truman
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Gurney	Nye	Vandenberg
Hatch	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Wallgren
Hill	Pepper	Walsh
Holman	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	White
La Follette	Reynolds	Wiley
Langer	Robertson	Willis
Lodge	Russell	Wilson
McCarran	Scrugham	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I assume that the debate on the Clark amendment and the general debate on the whole subject under discussion is now about at an end and that the Senate will soon proceed to a vote.

I realize that there is very little chance of changing the opinions and votes of many Senators. I think most Senators have made up their minds, and I am quite certain that nothing I could say would add very much to what has already been said, and I feel that I should make at least a brief statement before the vote is taken.

I think there has been more loose thinking on the subject of subsidies than on any subject that ever came under my attention. I have heard Members of the Senate say that they were opposed to all subsidies. I have heard pointed out by Senators that every Member of the Senate has been voting for subsidies, and we all know that yesterday the Senate by unanimous consent, and apparently with great satisfaction to representatives from two sections of this country, agreed to ratify, approve, and continue subsidy payments.

I shall not repeat the list, but we have heard pointed out a long list of subsidies which have been adopted by the Congress, from pioneer days down to this time, including, as I have stated, the action taken on two sections of the pending bill.

When it developed on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the Clark amendment, if agreed to, would terminate the subsidies under which western mining operations are being conducted, and when it also developed that the Clark amendment would terminate the transportation subsidies under which coal and oil are being carried to cold and remote sections of the country, a disturbance occurred among Senators from the West and the Northeast because it became apparent that subsidies—subsidies so generally condemned—were to be eliminated by the Clark amendment.

Mr. President, I submit that we cannot take a broad, general position in opposition to subsidies. Such action would be inconsistent with the record of practically every Member of the Senate. I know that most Members on the opposite side of the Chamber are now in

favor of the Clark amendment and opposed to subsidies, but I wish to point out to Members of the Senate on this side of the chamber that the party represented by the Members on the other side has always stood for the protective tariff, which is nothing but a subsidy representing the difference between the cost of production in foreign countries and the cost of production at home. The protective tariff is of course a subsidy, an aid, a benefit, a help to the manufacturing industries. Is it consistent to support a protective tariff and then to say, "I do not like subsidies. I am opposed to subsidies?" That is not, in my judgment, a consistent position to take, because no one who understands the English language can successfully deny that the protected industry which receives benefits under the tariff by which it may increase its prices over the level of the prices which would be in effect if it were not for the tariff, receives a subsidy.

Mr. President, yesterday I received a bill which had been introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It came to me as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In that bill the Senator proposes that food stamps be issued to low-income persons in order to equalize for them in some degree the high prices with which they are now confronted as a result of the war. I do not know how the junior Senator from Massachusetts stands with respect to the pending bill. I regret to note that he is not now present in the chamber. If the Clark amendment is adopted the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be condemned by those who are in favor of the Clark amendment, for who can deny that food stamps given to low-income persons, or even turned over to them at a cost lower than prices of food, is a subsidy granted to such persons?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator certainly does not mean to contend that anything is condemned in terms in my amendment, or that it would do anything except repeal the authority contained in section 2 (e) of the Stabilization Act. I have been given to understand in the cloakrooms and about the Chamber today that the Senator from Alabama has been saying that my amendment would invalidate parity payments and soil-conservation payments and various other types of subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not mentioned one of them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will certainly admit—and I mention this in view of the last statement by him—that my amendment is simply directed to the repeat of a fake authority claimed by the O. P. A. under section 2 (e) of the National Stabilization Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I stated today to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] that the Clark amendment would not repeal the authority for soil conservation payments. Since that subject has been raised, I wish to say that the Clark amendment would not prevent parity payments, or repeal the authority for such payments. Parity payments represent a pure unadulterated subsidy, yet I contend that the Senator's amendment would not prevent Congress from specifically authorizing parity payments, and such payments come about by means of specific appropriations made each year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, he will admit that my amendment, with the inclusion of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which are now included in the so-called Clark amendment—the Senator will admit that the amendment in its present form is simply a restatement of the intention of Congress as nearly every Member of this body understood the act when the National Stabilization Act was passed. It is not intended to interfere with anything else whatever.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator cannot put those words in my mouth.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator wishes to deny that statement I shall be very glad to have him do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me make my argument, please. I do not mind having the Senator interrupt me, but I do not wish to be engaged in that sort of controversy at this late hour. Since the subject has been raised, let us see what the effect of the Senator's amendment would be. He states his view of the effect of his amendment. I do not agree with his statement with respect to its effect. Let us see what it would do. It would repeal subsection (e) of section 2 of the Price Control Act. The inclusion of the George amendment in the Clark amendment results in making an exception of subsidies for minerals, that is for the mining program, whatever it may be, broadly speaking, and also the subsidy with respect to the transportation program, broadly speaking. The inclusion of the George amendment results in excepting those two subsidies. It restores those subsidies. I agreed to the inclusion in the Clark amendment of the George amendment, because a similar provision was contained in the committee amendment. The George amendment is in effect a ratification of subsidies for those two programs, one in the West and one in the Northeast.

Except for those two programs the Clark repealer eliminates section 2 (e) from the law and there is nothing else in the law dealing with the O. P. A., and I am fairly familiar with it, which authorizes the payment of subsidies for any purpose. Therefore I submit to the calm reasoning of Senators who are really interested in knowing what is being done, that all other forms of subsidies authorized in the O. P. A. law would be repealed and eliminated by the Clark amendment.

What authorizations would the Senator's amendment repeal? I hope to submit what I am saying to the cool judgment of Members of the Senate who some day must look back upon their record on this tremendously important issue. First, the Administrator of the O. P. A. is authorized by means of subsidies to buy or sell or store or use such commodities as he deems necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

There is the authority under which the Administrator may buy commodities and sell, even at a loss. There is the authority under which sustained production prices are guaranteed in order to increase production. There is the only authorization in the O. P. A. law for such subsidies to increase agricultural production.

That is the first. The second is:

> Or otherwise to supply the demand therefor.

Store them up, buy them, hold them for distribution in times of emergency, times of great need for food, if such action is thought best in the public interest. There is the authority.

Third—and listen to this, Mr. President:

> Or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

By agreeing to the Clark amendment, the Senate would be repealing those provisions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield. I do not want to misrepresent the meaning of the Senator's amendment; the Senator knows I do not want to do that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and I certainly do not wish to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument. The Senator certainly does not claim, however, that such an order as the one issued by Mr. Elkinton as to meat production was for the purpose of increasing production; does he?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator knows he is trying to sidetrack me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I am not attempting to sidetrack the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not discussing the subject to which the Senator has just referred. I am discussing the legal effect of agreeing to the Clark amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I am attempting to discuss. If the Senator does not want to reply to my question, of course, he does not have to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am endeavoring to direct the attention of the Members of the Senate to this question, and to appeal to their best judgment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield to the great senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the Senator's position to be that, so far as the Price Control Act is concerned, the language under consideration would eliminate the authority which the Senator from Alabama has enumerated. However, the Senator from Alabama does not mean to tell the Senate, does

he, that there is no other authority under other valid acts for Government corporations to go into the market and buy, and hold, and so forth?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I have confined my remarks to the O. P. A. law, as I know the great mind of the Senator from Georgia noted.

Mr. GEORGE. I did note it, but I did not want the Senate to gain the impression that there were not already other agencies which could buy the same things which could be bought by the O. P. A.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The authority of the other agencies is not so broad, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad it is not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So the elimination of the authority of the O. P. A. would restrict the legal authority to use the funds of the corporation for the purpose of securing adequate and necessary production.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Congress were to establish a policy disapproving of buying and selling for such purposes by the O. P. A., another administrative agency might be deterred, and properly so, from indulging in such buying and selling; might it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think so.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator in the development of his thought——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am always glad to have the Senator from Georgia interrupt me.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator from Alabama knows, and the Senator from Florida should know, that there is no opposition here to the payment of subsidies to increase production, to bring about greater production. What we are fighting against is a system which disrupts production, throws out of balance all our price adjustments, and in the long run results in less and less production.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly, I yield; I am always glad to yield to my good friend the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator very much; I have the same feeling toward him. I desire to ask him a question, and to make an observation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to answer a question. I hope the Senator's observation will not be very long, because I am anxious to have the Senate vote on the amendment.

Mr. REED. I hold in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, January 27, 1942. On page 703, at about the middle of the second column, Mr. Brown, then a Member of this body, now the Price Administrator, made the following reply to the Senator from Wyoming:

> Mr. BROWN. That is what I was about to do. In the first place, no power can be exercised under subsection (e) for any purpose other than to increase production or increase the supply.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not taking issue with the Senator on that point; but what I am saying is that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would repeal the right of the Price Administrator to use the money in the form of a subsidy to increase production.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I will yield when the Senator from Kansas has concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I do not want to take the Senator from Kansas off his feet.

Mr. REED. I desired to ask the Senator from Alabama a further question. I think the Senator from Alabama in his statement unduly narrows the authority under the Clark amendment, as compared with the authority under his own amendment.

Now let me ask the Senator from Alabama what would happen when the O. P. A. spent the $500,000,000 which the Senator's amendment would provide? Let me call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the language:

> (c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow not to exceed $500,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to July 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss—

This is the point about which I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama:

> All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

I want to ask the Senator from Alabama if his own amendment would not deprive the O. P. A. of any authority to do anything of that kind after the $500,000,000 had been spent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. REED. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri would hardly go any further than that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes; the Senator's amendment would cut off the program, and would end all programs which have been entered into. This is the essential difference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for yielding to me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the meantime, my amendment would provide an opportunity to conduct an experiment such as that which Canada has conducted or that which Great Britain has conducted, but would require the O. P. A. to come back to Congress if it desired to follow a procedure of that sort.

Since the Senator has stated that the subsidy has done no good, let me say that it has not done any good in this country because it has not had time to do it.

I hold in my hand a chart which was submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is a chart of the retail food prices in Great Britain, in Canada, and in the United States. It shows that in the United Kingdom, since 1939, there has been a 20 percent incerase in food prices. In Canada there has been a 27 percent or 28 percent increase. In the United States there has been a 45 percent increase. Those figures show the difference in the control of prices in the three countries. In Canada 62 percent of all agricultural commodities are under a subsidy program.

Mr. President, what are we doing when we repeal the authorization in the price-control act? The word "subsidy" is used in section 2 (e) of the act. We tried to use it to increase necessary production. What does "subsidy" mean? That is a question which we often hear. I find the following synonyms for "subsidy": "Aid; allowance; bonus; bounty; gift; grant; indemnity; pension; premium; reward; support; subvention; tribute." They are all synonyms of the word "subsidy," which is used as a broad expression to cover every form of aid.

Under this amendment, so far as the O. P. A. law is concerned, all subsidies—whatever the word "subsidy comprehends—except subsidies in the transportation of oil and coal, and subsidies to the mining interests of the West, would be terminated. Those two exceptions have been made. I think I know the reason why, but I will not state it. Those two forms of subsidy have been approved, and all others are condemned.

Mr. President, I shall consume very little more time, because I have been here long enough to know a situation when I see it. What would be the result of repealing all subsidies except those granted for the transportation of fuel to the North and Northeast, and those granted to miners in the West, which are two worthy causes? Who would be helped and who would be hurt? Why are we all so disturbed over the question?

Why are we not more selective in the matter of our support of subsidies than we have been in the past? We have not condemned them all in the past. As every Senator knows, each Member has voted for whatever subsidies appealed to the interest with which he was concerned. We have voted for subsidies to help our own sections of the country, or to help some interest which had a peculiar local appeal. Practically all of us have voted for such subsidies. I do not say that we all did. There are always some exceptions; but heretofore we have not condemned subsidies in the form of parity appropriations, or soil conservation payments, or the food-stamp program, which became so popular.

Subsidies for numerous other worthy causes have been presented to the Senate, and in the main we have voted for them, not because they were subsidies but because we believed in the particular activities concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that we have voted out the stamp plan?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. I said that we voted it in.

Mr. AIKEN. We voted it in.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was a subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. It worked.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in favor of it.

Mr. AIKEN. We should have it today, so that we could subsidize the poor people without subsidizing millionaires.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the Senator. I have always supported it. However, Senators have spoken with great eloquence and oratorical power in denunciation of all sorts of subsidies as a wrong principle of government. I respect a man who holds that view. Some of my best friends are of that persuasion. I do not condemn any Senator for it; but I do not like to have him become too loud about it, when he has been voting regularly for subsidies which appeal to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I wish to say that I believe that the stamp plan is a proper method for applying subsidies, because the subsidy is applied only to those who need it, and not to those who do not need it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct. I hope the principle to which the Senator has referred will not be condemned, because I favor it.

Mr. President, who would be injured? Certainly not the farmer. This is not a program in which farm prices are involved. The bill would neither increase nor decrease farm prices through the subsidy. As I have frequently stated, this is a consumers' bill, in an effort to adjust prices which the Price Control Administration believes have become maladjusted—prices of the essentials of life, such as meat and butter, fats and oils, which the Administration believes have become maladjusted. I have not gone into the question, so I do not know; but the Administration believes that such prices have become maladjusted. I know that the prices of such commodities have continually risen, and that they are above the level of other commodity prices to such an extent that they have attracted the attention of the people.

This effort is frankly confined to meat, butter, and coffee, and nothing else. The Administration admitted that it had made a mistake in not stopping those prices at the point to which it now proposes to roll them back. The Administration frankly stated that there was a division of opinion within the circles which control those activities. There was great pressure from producers to allow prices to rise, and they were permitted to rise. Now it is sought to put them back to the point where they should have stopped in the first place, so far as the consumer is concerned. Ample protection has been provided to the producers of livestock and to dairymen. It is sought to obtain some benefit for consumers by reducing the prices of essential foods. At the same time the Administration is saying, "We will not roll back prices to the growers of cattle or the producers of butter." How can we give to the poor people of the country the benefit of more reasonable prices for food commodities without rolling back the prices?

No one denies that the O. P. A. have the power to roll back prices without the payment of any subsidy. Without the payment of any subsidy they can fix prices. At present they can order a complete reduction in the prices of these three commodities all the way back to the producer, and including the producer. To avoid any disturbance of the financial situation and the income of the producers of these commodities, and so as not to discourage production, it has been said that there is but one way in which it can be done. If we give the benefit of lower prices on these commodities to the people of this country, to the consumers, and do not take that reduction out of the producers, there is but one way by which to accomplish the desired result, that is, by paying the man in the middle, whose cost is such that he cannot stand the reduction in the price, a bonus in order to protect the producers as well as the consumers.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. When the Administration officials say that they will not pay any subsidy to one processing less than 1,000 pounds of butter or 4,000 pounds of meat a month, how can anyone say that that roll-back is not being turned back onto the farmer, or the group of farmers which is least able to stand it, namely, those who produce less than 1,000 pounds of butter or 4,000 pounds of meat a month?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know the facts, but they are minor when compared to the whole problem.

If the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] shall be defeated, it is my intention to offer the following amendment to the section providing the $500,000,000 authorization:

Provided, That no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the owners of livestock on account of or as a result of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the owners of livestock.

Those in authority have already put that regulation into effect. They were slow in getting it out. It naturally resulted in confusion in the markets because they did not have the money ready, and they did not have the regulations out in time. The program was ill-advised and poorly managed. But now they have made the regulations available—I have a copy of them on my desk—which provide that none of this subsidy shall be taken from the producers. However, I have provided for that in the amendment. I have the power to add it to my amendment, and will do so if I have the opportunity. So there can be no question about the roll-back on the farmer. Let us eliminate that idea, and make certain of it by a provision in this bill if we ever have an opportunity to do so.

There is only one question left, Senators, and that is whether you are opposed to a roll-back even when it does not cost the producer anything. That is all there is left.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator guarantee that he can write a bill which will return to the small farmers a subsidy on meat and butter even though they make but 10 pounds of butter a week, or sell only 300 pounds of meat a year? The Government agencies have confessed their inability to work out the mechanics for doing that, and if we fail to do so we shall be committing a terrible injustice to half our farmers, who are guilty only of the crime of being poor and small.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot guarantee any legal work to the satisfaction of the Senator from Vermont. I am talking about broad, general principles, and trying to make the situation clear to the Members of the Senate, notwithstanding the clouds of dust which have been kicked up, and the storms which have blown against this administration, against the O. P. A., against the President, and against Jesse Jones. I shall not go into those matters. I am not considering them. The Senate knows that I use my own judgment on all the issues which are presented here.

I want to make it clear, Mr. President, to the Members of the Senate, that if they vote for the Clark amendment they will not be voting for any protection to the farmers. They will not be doing any injury to anybody unless it be to the taxpayer. My good friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], told the truth about it when he said that the only person injured in this whole situation—and he is firmly opposed to what is being done—is the taxpayer. That is true. The bonus comes out of the taxpayers.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to take up any time in argument, but if the cost of living to industrial workers should be reduced by 10 percent it would be equivalent to an increase in their wages of 10 percent. At present the trouble with the farmer is the wide disparity between his capacity to employ labor to carry on his operations, and the capacity of other groups to employ labor to carry on their operations. I do not understand why it is, when we are doing better in this country than we have ever previously done, that we cannot pay for what we eat as we go along. Instead, we want to sell Victory bonds next year to pay for the food we ought to be paying for this year so as to allow the farmer to receive a fair price for his products.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have very much sympathy with what the Senator has said. I have made an argument along the same line, that the wages of industrial workers are entirely out of line with those of the farmers.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement from Dr. Townsend, which came to me yesterday unsolicited. No man in this country is better known as a

friend of the poor old people. I wish to read the statement, which is as follows:

If such groups as organized labor and the farm organizations can envision betterment from a roll-back of food prices, and subsidies to producers, the people I represent, I am sure you must agree, are much more in need of reduced prices.

Most groups of our citizens have experienced increases in income to somewhat balance off price rises, but among the older citizens of America the war boom has brought greater poverty and even starvation.

My organization has tried by every conventional means to impress upon the proper authorities in this Congress that old-age assistance payments, by which some three and a half million people must live, is not sufficient to allow these folks to exist.

Without any searching investigation of my statement, the very figures definitely prove that I am not overstating the case. Look at them. The average old-age assistance payment is $21.83, and I quote that figure from the Seventh Annual Report of the Social Security Board, page 80. This is only a 3-percent increase over payments during the previous fiscal year.

Yet, gentlemen, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, on April 8, this year, sent me data showing that food costs have increased 42.9 percent since August 15, 1939, and 36.6 percent since February 15, 1941. The cost of clothing has increased 25.5 percent during the same period of time.

Thus, you can see that these people on old-age assistance have actually had their income reduced more than 25 percent already, and prices are still going higher.

Before this price climb started, these folks were living at a below subsistence level. Now, I assert, the older citizens of the country are practically starving. Malnutrition is rampant, sickness is widespread, and adequate housing these days is practically nonexistent.

You, gentlemen, of course, cannot deal directly with the problem of increasing pensions or correcting the present old-age-assistance situation, but I am sure you are interested in the plight of this segment of the population for whom my organization is fighting.

You can help us by pushing the prices of food back toward the normal point. We are strongly in favor of any help you can give to those of our citizens on fixed incomes. They are helping, each in his own way, to win the war, but the so-called war boom has reacted against them rather than for them.

As individual Members of the Senate, you can also help us by giving some consideration to the plight of these people who are the mothers and fathers and the grandparents of the soldiers in training or overseas.

I am one of the advocates of the old phrase "charity begins at home." We are rightfully doing our share in feeding our allies in this war, but I believe we should give consideration to the morale of our own people first. When we have people suffering from lack of proper food in the United States, it is hollow mockery to talk of freedom from want for the entire world. Let's keep our own from starvation, and give our allies everything we can beyond that point.

In conclusion, let me quote from a letter I have just received from Mr. Gus Bixby, of Shell Lake, Wis., which expresses a lot in a few words. He says:

"I have worked hard all my 63 years and helped to carve two good farms out of the Wisconsin wilderness, one of 165 acres and the other of 120 acres. The land was covered with brush and timber when I went to work on it, and now it is producing food and paying taxes. I am about through, however, as I am crippled quite badly from rheumatism. * * * There has been no war boom for the old and poor. It is really worse now than before the war. Is there a chance for a decent pension bill being passed at this session of Congress?"

That letter, gentleman, is only one of thousands I receive each year, all of them in about the same vein. These people were the builders of the America we love. They were toilers who carved out the foundation of this great Nation. They deserve more consideration than they have received, and any action you may take here to roll back prices will help them a great deal.

In conclusion, I may say that there are many millions of people in this country whose income is not increased in the slightest, not only the aged, not only the pensioners, but all in the social security organizations are in that situation, school teachers, widows, firemen, policemen, countless groups of large numbers, clerks in stores, stenographers, workers in offices. Wherever we find the plain, everyday, white-collar workers, we find them not only with taxes to pay in increased amounts but without increases in their incomes, such as industrial workers are receiving, and they are bowed down with additional burdens and loads which the Government has imposed on them. Therefore, if we can give them something, if we can give something to one who does not need it, even, and does not want, if we can give that group a reasonable reduction in the cost of the food they are obliged to eat in order to maintain their lives, I submit that we should go as far as we can in order to do it.

If I thought the pending bill would injure in the slightest degree the farmers, or any group of them, if I thought it had any tendency to reduce their income or change their financial status in any way, I would not give it my support under any circumstances. I feel sure that I have abundantly manifested, on this floor and in the committee rooms, my loyalty and my devotion to agriculture and agrarian groups in the United States. But this hullabaloo about hurting the farmer, when his income is not reduced a penny, and cannot be—and I propose to make it certain that it cannot be—does not disturb me, even though some of my best friends in the farm group are opposed to the program. I do not agree with them, and I am obliged to follow the dictates of my own judgment and conscience, but I am clear that there is nothing in the bill injuriously to affect in the slightest degree, in the slightest way the welfare of the farmers of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, and passed by the Senate on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

PROHIBITION OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. HATCH introduced a bill (S. 1272) to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have asked consent to introduce the bill which I have sent to the desk in keeping with previous declarations made by me, when I stated that if a bill such as that which is the subject of the message which has just come from the House, which was passed over the President's veto, should become law, I would introduce a bill putting employer groups upon exactly the same basis on which labor organizations were placed by that measure.

I should say that in previous statements I mentioned the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Since then I have been advised that both these organizations are corporations, and come under the present law prohibiting campaign contributions by corporations.

Mr. HAWKES subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the bill

which has been introduced by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I told the Senator from New Mexico a few days ago that I firmly believed that the same application should be made to chambers of commerce, business organizations, and trade associations throughout the United States that we are making to labor organizations. I think it would be for the good of decent politics throughout the United States if we could stop all organizations which are collectors of vast funds from making political contributions. In fact, I am one who believes that a certain political contribution which was made a few years ago has led to much of the confusion we have been discussing in the last few weeks in connection with the Connally-Smith bill.

I want the Senate to know that I believe that unless and until all groups in our American life are willing to accept the same regulations and the same responsibilities, we will never reach a point where we have statesmanship in this Nation, and clean, decent politics. I know the Senator from New Mexico is very much interested in clean politics.

HOUSE BILL ORDERED TO LIE ON THE TABLE

The bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it may be that we will not reach a vote on the pending matter tonight, and I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by the Honorable Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, which bears directly upon the question of subsidies. I commend it to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR PRICES—NOT SUBSIDIES—WILL INCREASE PRODUCTION

In 1940 according to the Government census there were 29,000,000 people on the farms of the United States.

There were approximately five people on an average on each farm, constituting about 6,000,000 families.

These 6,000,000 families also contained many old people, invalids, babies, and, of course, the farm housewife, whose time is largely consumed with family cares.

If we assume that in 1940 each farm family averaged two full-time field hands we will be making a very liberal estimate.

If 6,000,000 families had 2 farm hands to each family there would have been 12,000,000 farm hands in the United States in 1940.

Since 1940 several million of these farm hands have joined the fighting forces of our country. A great many more have gone to accept employment in war factories and other high-paying industrial jobs.

It would be a very conservative estimate to say that 4,000,000 out of the 12,000,000 farm hands in 1940 are no longer on the farm. This leaves only 8,000,000 farmers to produce crops for the Nation.

ONE SOLDIER FOR EACH FARMER

With 8,000,000 farmers and 8,000,000 men in our armed forces it is apparent that every hand in the field has 1 fighting man dependent upon him for food and other agricultural supplies.

SEVENTEEN PEOPLE DEPEND ON EACH FARMER

The population of the United States today is in excess of 136,000,000 people.

With only 8,000,000 farm hands it follows that each farm hand must provide for 17 people of the United States to say nothing of our allies in other countries.

There are 17 people in this country who cannot eat if one farmer fails to make a crop.

RED TAPE, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

When this farmer starts out to make a crop he cannot buy his seed and fertilizer except under rules and regulations governing the distribution of fertilizer and some seeds.

He cannot plan or plant his crop except in accordance with rules and allotments of the Triple A.

The farmer cannot obtain equipment for producing a crop until he obtains certificate from the war board. After he secures certificate he may be unable to find the equipment he requires.

When he is ready to market a crop the Office of Defense Transportation has many rules and regulations with which he must comply before he can haul his crop to market.

After he hauls his crop to market he comes in conflict with the Office of Price Administration. Very often it is necessary for him to go to the Office of Price Administration to find out how much money he can accept for his crop without being a criminal.

Many times it is necessary for the farmer to sell to a trucker in order to have any market at all. The trucker is likewise under many rules, regulations, and taxes. The trucker finds himself continually on a hot spot because of countless rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, the United States Department of Agriculture and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Whichever way the farmer turns and whichever way the trucker turns he faces more rules and regulations.

What has been said with regard to rules and regulations on farmers and truckers apply with equal force to merchants and dealers who handle farm produce.

FAIR PRICES—NOT SUBSIDIES—WILL ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

As I traveled over the State last week visiting many of the best farm sections in the State and other sections of Georgia to inspect the State farmers markets, I found the farmers had planted every field possible.

They were short handed, labor was scarce and practically unobtainable, but these patriotic farmers just worked a little harder. They were out of bed before daylight and didn't come in from the fields until it was too dark to see how to plow.

Driving by night I found many fields of grain being cut by the light of headlights on combines. Long as the days are, they were not long enough to get the grain cut and too few combines were available so they were cutting the grain at night.

They were not counting the hours. The only thing that mattered to them was that our country was at war and they were supplying the ammunition for our fighters overseas. They were helping to feed those at home and those overseas.

Their boys who generally helped them harvest the grain and till the fields were in Africa, New Guinea, India, and in many other places where their country needed them.

They thought of these boys as they worked, thought how their boys fought at times 24 hours of the day and night and they wiped the sweat off their brow and doggedly kept at their tasks.

All that the farmer wants is a fair price for what he produces so he can continue to produce adequate crops for his country. What the country needs basically is production and more production. The payment of subsidies to processors or others will not encourage or help the farmer to get maximum production.

The payment of subsidies means higher taxes, more Government employees, higher prices in the end to consumers, lower prices to the farmers, and less production.

Fair prices to farmers means increased production, more business for businessmen, lower prices to consumers, more food and clothes for the people in this country, and above all, adequate supplies of food and clothing for our boys overseas.

Put General Farmer in command of agriculture, remove all restrictions, give him a fair price and let's win the war.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was very much gratified in listening to the very able address by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], because everyone knows that there is not a Member of Congress whose record of support of farm legislation, and whose efforts to improve the lot of the farmer, is better than that of the Senator from Alabama.

We have all been the recipients of protests against any form of subsidy for agricultural commodities, due to the belief, apparently, on the part of the producers of such commodities, and especially foodstuffs, that they should be allowed to get more for what they produced, and that somehow it would be inimical to their interests if they were to get their return, which is the cost of production plus profit, from a subsidy.

I was glad to have the able Senator from Alabama point out that he, as the leader of what is called the farm group of the Senate, and generally the spokesman for that group, was in favor of defeating the Clark amendment, which, as modified, is now before the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not speak for the farm group in that matter.

Mr. PEPPER. I said generally.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The farm group is opposed to it.

Mr. PEPPER. I am always willing, insofar as my votes on questions affecting agriculture are concerned, to follow the lead of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, and I am willing to do that in this case.

I consider the vote the Senate is about to take one of the most important it will take for some time or has taken in the recent past. We have to do one of three things, it seems to me, relative to the present situation. Either we must break the line on prices and let prices begin an

inflationary spiral or we must deny to producers a fair return, let alone a margin of profit, or we must make possible some form of aid in the form of a subsidy. I have not heard anyone successfully deny that position.

It is all right for one to have one's opinion as to the best way to meet the problem, and I commend the integrity and the intellectual honesty of those who say, "We are not in favor of curbing farm prices." They might even say they do not think they are high enough at present. They might say, as the able Senator from Georgia said a few minutes ago, that the workers ought to be able to pay for the food they eat out of the wages they make.

Mr. President, there is a bit of fallacy which creeps into that position, of which we are sometimes not aware. Those receiving the high wages do not constitute all the consumers of this country. As a matter of fact, there are relatively few of the total number of employed persons who are benefiting from high wages in the way that the war workers in the airplane factories and the shipyards are benefiting.

In September of last year I had in my possession figures which I believe to be accurate when a kindred subject was before Congress. At that time I discovered that in the manufacturing industries, which employ 11,000,000 workers, there had been an increase in wages; in fact, the real average weekly earnings increased 29.8 percent. But, Mr. President, that represented only 11,000,000 workers. Their gross increase was 52.7 percent. If that were true of all workers, then I would be agreeable to seeing agricultural prices go up relatively, or even slightly in excess of a comparable increase in wages. But that is only a part of the picture, for in another group, in the transportation and public-utilities field, the gross weekly earnings increased only 19 percent, and the real average weekly earnings increased only 1.1 percent since 1939. The average hourly earnings increased only 12.9 percent, and the real hourly earnings decreased 4.1 percent.

Mr. President, it is not only the war worker in the shipyard or in the airplane factory who must buy foodstuffs. The group of workers engaged in transportation and public-utility employment must be fed as well, and it has lost instead of gained in the matter of wages.

In trades and related establishments, including shop girls and clerks and storekeepers and others in similar categories, the weekly earnings increased 11.1 percent, and the real average weekly earnings declined 5.6 percent. In other words, in that classification the wages have been reduced a little more than 1½ percent. There has been no increase for that group since 1939.

What about the Government workers? I am not only talking about the Federal employee who receives his 10 or 15 percent increase, but I am talking about those who work for the city or the county or the State. Their salaries and wages have been cut since 1939. Their average hourly earnings increased 4.3 percent, but their real average hourly earnings decreased 11.5 percent. From August 1939 to the summer of 1942 their wages and their salaries therefore diminished.

Mr. President, there is another group which is entitled to our consideration, and that is the group composed of seven and a half million persons who make less than 40 cents an hour, one-half of whose total income goes to the purchase of food. They, too, have to pay the increase in the cost of foodstuffs.

So what we often forget, and what the farmers often forget, is that when the ceiling price on foodstuffs is increased the increase is not alone being paid by the shipyard worker, or the airplane worker, or the other worker who is in the relatively small group which has received the large wage increase, in many instances disproportionately high, but the increase in food costs has to be paid by every man, woman, and child in the Nation who is a consumer. That is the reason, Mr. President, why we cannot raise prices for foodstuffs the way all of us would like to raise them.

It may be said, "Very well, does that mean you are not in favor of the farmer receiving a fair price for what he produces, a fair return upon his investment, a fair return for his labor"? Not at all. Nor does it mean that the farmer's income should be limited to what the consumers of the Nation as a whole can afford to pay. That is not a necessary limitation upon the farmer's income. It is not a limitation in England. I imagine most Senators have read the very able articles written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, for whom I have high regard. He pointed out that early in the war the authorities in Great Britain resolved that they would not limit the farmer and the producer to what the consumer was able to pay in wartime. What did they do? They resorted to a form of subsidy to the producer to give him a sufficient return in the first place, and an adequate incentive in the second place.

I wish to see adequate food for the people of this country and for our armed forces abroad as well as at home; I desire that we shall use food as a weapon against the enemy; but we can be assured of an adequate supply of foodstuffs only by giving to the farmer and to the producer not only a fair return, but a sufficient incentive to encourage the venture of food production.

Mr. President, I am not willing to go into all the homes where there have not been wage increases, and say to those who live in them, "You must use the larger part of your gross income to buy milk for your child in order that the farmer may receive a fair return."

A delegation of dairymen from my State have for several days been in conference with my colleague and me. They have been pleading and begging the Government to give a larger return for milk both to the producer and the distributor. One cannot listen to what those men say without being convinced that their cause is just. They tell us that feed costs have increased. They speak about the increase in the cost of labor.

They say farmers are selling their herds, that their herds are being killed for beef, and that they must receive help or they cannot continue to produce milk for the people of Florida. What are we going to say to them? They want 8 cents a gallon increase in the price of milk; 2 cents a quarter. That means that every baby's milk will cost its mother, its father, or its guardian more money. If all the milk went to the shipyards in Jacksonville and Tampa and Panama City, if it went to the manufacturing workers who receive high wages, I would give the requested increase to the dairymen in a minute, or perhaps an increase of more than 8 cents a gallon. But when the granting of such an increase means that 1,800,000 people must pay more for milk, we face a very serious problem. Yet I do not want to send those men home with no succor whatever.

The chairman of the State war board sent a telegram saying that the dairy industry must receive more money or it cannot remain in business. How can one ignore such a statement by so responsible an officer?

What I said to those men was, "Gentlemen, I am convinced that we must provide some form of subsidy for you in order that you may obtain an adequate return." One of them said, "You know that the payment of subsidy is not an American principle." But, Mr. President, we are engaged in a war, and that has brought about an emergency, and we are doing many other things we do not like to do. We are confronted by the problem as to which of three courses we shall follow, and we cannot ignore it. Either we are going to break the line on ceiling prices for foodstuffs, and wreck the whole Government effort to keep down the spiral of inflation, or we are going to deny to our producers not only a profit but a fair return on their money, or we must lend them some sort of succor or support by means of some kind of Government aid or assistance. I do not know how those questions can be avoided. The question is, Which one of the three is the least objectionable?

I say very readily that I sympathize with the struggle the President has in trying to handle the difficult labor situation. We will not be sitting up there in the White House, as he will be, with his responsibilities in the days and in the nights when conditions will be growing worse. I can even envision a lonely man, another Lincoln, sitting in the White House and wondering with troubled heart and praying for guidance and assistance as he tries to lead, not only his nation, but the world through the ordeal we are facing. But he must handle that problem. We will make it more difficult for him if, when we vote, we prohibit the Office of Price Administration from using the weapon and method of subsidy to handle price control in the United States during the war. For the workers are going to demand more, and the President has that problem on his hands; and it will be aggravated and accentuated if we prohibit the use of subsidies.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me we might as well directly face the issue. Do we want to use the power of the Government by way of subsidy in order to guarantee to the producers an adequate return, and give them an incentive to produce food?

What would be obtained by adopting the Clark amendment as modified? All we would do would be to divest the Government of the subsidy instrument. We would not assure the farmers a price increase. The dairy farmers would not have any assurance that they would get a price increase. The poultry industry, which is making a similar claim, would get no such assurance, either. All we would do would be to tie the hands of the Government, without ourselves taking the responsibility for inflation.

If Congress wants to pass a resolution saying, "We do not believe in holding the line; we desire to see prices rise; we will not let you use the instrument of subsidy as a control"; very well. Then the Office of Price Administration might as well go out of business, and might as well say it had been destroyed by its creator, the Congress. If that is desired to be done, well and good. We have the right to do it; we have the power to do it. However, Mr. President, we are not children. We know the inevitable effect of our acts, or we should know it; and we are held responsible for our acts. If we deny to the O. P. A. the power to use the subsidy as one of the weapons in fighting inflation, it will lose the battle, or our producers will lose a part of their economic hides.

So, depending upon how we vote, we will take the responsibility in one way or the other. If we reject the Clark amendment as modified, what will be the situation? The situation then will be that we can consider the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama, speaking for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or we can consider the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who proposes to use a subsidy in another way, or we can consider ideas and suggestions which other Senators may offer.

Personally, I do not favor paying a subsidy to the processor. The farmers believe that they will never get the benefit of a subsidy if its payment is confined to processors alone.

After the Clark amendment is rejected, if it shall be rejected, and when we have a chance to determine what is the best kind of subsidy and the best method of subsidy, I shall vote for that form which will give the subsidy to the producer, personally. I am in favor of doing that. The producer is the man who is getting the assistance under the existing soil-conservation laws. Under the parity payments, the check is given not to the processor but to the man who complies, or to the farmer whose income has not been up to parity.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he would vote for canceling the regulations already issued by the Defense Supplies Corporation which prohibit the payment of subsidies to anyone who processes less than 1,000 pounds of butter or dresses less than 4,000 pounds of meat a month?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly do say so, and I hope the Senator will join me in voting to do that.

Mr. AIKEN. I certainly shall. Such assistance should be given to the persons in the lower half of the economic scale. However, no such arrangement has been made so far; and the agencies confessed to us that they do not see how mechanics could be set up to provide assistance for all the small producers. But that must be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I realize it is difficult to get the assistance to the small producers. Perhaps that is one of the reasons which led the O. P. A. to deal with the large producers. But, again, that is a detail of administration.

If we can can give the farmer rural free delivery, soil-conservation payments and parity payments, if we can send allotments to the families of every soldier and sailor that becomes eligible—a number which must total millions—if we can have income-tax returns and victory-tax deductions, if we have a sufficient governmental bookkeeping system to do all those things and many more, I am sure we can work out some administrative machinery which will insure the providing of adequate assistance to the producer by his Government. I commend the Senator from Vermont, for pointing out the necessity for doing that.

Mr. President, I am saying that the power should be placed in the hands of the Government, so that assistance will not be denied to the producers. I am asking the Senate not to adopt the Clark amendment which would completely tie our hands, would condemn the present system of price controls to inevitable failure and destruction, and would throw the whole price administration system into immediate chaos, if our action were joined in by our sister body, the House of Representatives.

If we give the O. P. A. the authority to pay subsidies, it will not go about looking for people who want subsidies. It simply will have that power in its bag—a power it may employ when needed, and when other methods are not available. For instance, consideration might be given to raising the price of milk 1 or 2 cents a gallon. The Office of Price Administration might give the producers a subsidy of 2 cents a gallon and a price increase of 2 cents a gallon, if it thought they were entitled to a total increase of 4 cents. In that way we would simply put another weapon into the hands of the Government in this dangerous warfare against inflation.

If we adopt the Clark amendment we deny to the Government any such power. So, Mr. President, there is nothing un-American about giving such power to the Government. There is nothing inconsistent with our past actions. There is nothing about such a course which would be inharmonious with what we have been doing. There is nothing which would be outside the virtue and the reward of past experience. Such action would not be dissimilar to what the British have been doing, according to our information.

Therefore, I cannot see why there is so much objection and concern on the part of some Members of the Senate at the thought that the power might be continued in the hands of the Government.

I will say in fairness to the O. P. A. that this is not the first time it has asked for help of this sort. I know Congress has been reluctant to grant it. At the same time we are voting to do a great many things we are reluctant to do. I believe that if the Clark amendment is rejected the able Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and other Senators interested in the subject can work out the form of subsidy which is most reasonable and proper, and which will more definitely assure that the subsidy will be received by the persons who are entitled to receive it. However, we cannot go on expecting the O. P. A. to hold the line and expecting producers to get a fair return, and not place in the hands of the Government the power to accomplish those desirable objectives. That power the Clark amendment would take away.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the Government will not be deprived of that essential weapon in this most dangerous war against inflation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wonder if we can obtain an agreement as to a time to vote on the Clark amendment. I do not wish the Senate to take action at this time, because the Senator from Missouri is temporarily absent from the Chamber. I wonder if it would be possible to agree, if the Senate should take a recess at this time until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, that at not later than 12 o'clock we will vote on the pending amendment, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, with the time equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment. I understand that the Senator from Missouri will return to the Chamber in a moment.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have always been opposed to subsidies, but in the present situation three things confront us as Members of Congress. The first is the problem of winning the war. The second is the problem of securing a just and lasting peace. The third is the problem of preventing inflation. For that reason I have changed my position, and will vote for the proposed subsidy. I believe it should be adopted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri entered the Chamber.

Mr. GUFFEY. Before proceeding further, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a question. If the Clark amendment should be adopted, what substitute have they to offer for the subsidy program? What program has either of them to offer in this situation? I have been working on the problem for some time with packers and food processors. I wonder if either Senator has any program to offer. I was asked by two or three heads of departments to offer a program. I am frank to say that I have none. I have talked with several distinguished and intelligent leaders of the Senate. They have no program to offer.

For that reason I am willing to consider the subsidy program.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will tell me what he is willing to consider, I shall be glad to listen to his argument. The Senator said he would be glad to consider something.

Mr. GUFFEY. I will vote with the Senator if he has a program.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am interested in what the Senator has to offer.

Mr. GUFFEY. I have no program to offer. I have been thinking about the problem for some time. I have nothing better to offer than a subsidy. I wish to know if the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Georgia has anything to offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator in favor of a subsidy?

Mr. GUFFEY. I am now; I was not before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator is in favor of subsidies, that presents a very definite issue.

I believe that an alternate program might be worked out. I am frank to say to the Senator that I do not have such a program at my fingertips at the moment. I think there might be some such system as the Government taking over commodities. Instead of putting a ceiling on agricultural prices, the Government might fix prices on agricultural products and agree to take all agricultural commodities at fixed prices. I am perfectly frank to say that the plan has not been worked out in detail, and I am not prepared to present it.

However, I am very certain that the proposal for subsidies, if adopted, means the end of private enterprise in this country, either as to agriculture or anything else. Therefore, I am against it. It seems to me that the question on which we are to vote in connection with my amendment is the question whether we are going to end private enterprise, so far as agriculture is concerned. If the Senator from Pennsylvania is in favor of ending private enterprise, and allowing Jesse Jones, Prentiss Brown, or anyone else to operate on the subsidy basis without any authority of law, as they now admit they are proceeding, the Senator from Pennsylvania ought to vote against my amendment. If the Senator has a contrary view, as I have, then he should vote for my amendment.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am interested in preventing inflation. I think that is as important as winning the war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am as much interested in preventing inflation as the Senator from Pennsylvania can possibly be. No later than last October, when the stabilization bill was before the Senate for consideration, I offered a substitute for the bill which would have absolutely stopped inflation.

Mr. GUFFEY. Was it voted upon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; it was voted upon, and the Senator from Pennsylvania voted against it.

Mr. GUFFEY. I have forgotten what it was. What was the nature of the substitute?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's memory is very short. It was a very simple proposal. Instead of leaving it to the War Labor Board, on one side, and Mr. Leon Henderson on the other side, to pull against each other, I would simply have frozen wages and prices at the highest point reached between January 1 and September 15, 1942. That is the point to which the President, through Mr. Justice Byrnes, has been trying to beat back to through his recent stabilization order.

The Senator from Pennsylvania voted against my substitute. There were only about 20 votes in favor of it, but at that time the Senator from Pennsylvania was not so much interested in stopping inflation as he apparently now is.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am interested now.

Mr. CLARK of Misouri. I, too, am very much interested. Let me say to the Senator that I have been very much interested from the very beginning. When the price-fixing bill came before the Senate, I knew that it would not be effective unless it should provide for over-all control. At that time I talked with Mr. Leon Henderson, and he entirely agreed with me. He entirely agreed with the views which had been previously expressed by Mr. Bernard Baruch, who was probably the ablest authority in the country at that time—and still is—on the subject of inflation.

Mr. GUFFEY. I agree with the Senator in that statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Henderson said that he agreed 1,000 percent with me, but that he was under obligation to carry out the policies which might be approved by the "Big Four." At that time the "Big Four" were the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader in the Senate, and the majority leader in the House. Mr. Henderson stated that he entirely agreed with the over-all control theory expressed by Mr. Baruch, but that he was not a free agent in the matter. I advocated that very principle on the floor of the Senate. However, I did not receive any support from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. I will not deny that the Senator did not receive support from me. Perhaps I was mistaken then. When I make a mistake I am willing to admit it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to welcome the Senator from Pennsylvania as a very belated recruit.

Mr. GUFFEY. In opposition to inflation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very happy to welcome the Senator from Pennsylvania as a very late recruit in the fight against inflation.

PROPOSED REPAIRS TO THE SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have been a Member of this body for 8 years. During that time I have learned one thing. What is everybody's business is nobody's business. Now that we are about to take a vacation for a month or two, I think it is time, when we have such a large attendance, to discuss the acoustical properties of the Senate Chamber.

For 8 years I occupied a seat in the rear row on this side of the Chamber. For the first 5 years I could hear everything. I could even hear everything the mild-mannered and soft-spoken minority leader, Mr. MCNARY, said on the other side of the Chamber.

Later the air circulation system in the Chamber was changed to increase the volume of air for cooling purposes. That very noticeably changed the acoustical properties of the Chamber. I moved my seat nearer to the front, hoping that that would enable me to hear better. It did not. I became worried about my hearing, and went to the best experts in Baltimore for a consultation. I consulted the leading aurists there, and found that my hearing had not changed over a period of years.

Then the steel work was erected overhead. Again the acoustic conditions of the Chamber were perceptibly changed.

About a year ago the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] presented a report of a special committee which recommended a program for improving the acoustic properties of the Senate Chamber. I should like to have that report produced again. I do not know whether the Senator has it here now. The work recommended to be done would cost some money, and it would take some time, but I think it should be done during the coming vacation. That would be a good time to do it. I shall ask the senior Senator from Florida to present the report again, at his first opportunity. If the repairs were made in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report, I am sure we would be able to hear what was being said in the Senate Chamber, and would not have constantly to call for order. If the acoustical properties of the Chamber were improved we would have better order in the galleries. I believe the plan to which I refer would produce the desired result. About 5 years ago I offered two such plans but the Senate was not interested. The execution of one plan would have cost approximately $25,000; of the other, approximately $30,000. Either would have improved conditions to some extent. The plans I offered were submitted before the steel work was erected to support the ceiling of the Chamber.

I hope the senior Senator from Florida will again present the report of the special committee, because I think it is important that the acoustic properties of the Senate Chamber be improved.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that it be agreed that

a vote shall be taken on the amendment I have offered, and all amendments thereto, at not later than the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. I will include in my unanimous-consent request a request that the time be divided equally, one half to be controlled by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the remaining half to be controlled by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the Untied States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

POSTMASTER—ETHEL G. WOMBLE

Mr. HILL. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of a postmaster on the executive calendar be considered and confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the nomination will be considered as in executive session.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ethel G. Womble to be postmaster at Goldston, N. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Saturday, June 26, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph T. Votava, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska. Mr. Votava is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.

Horace Frierson, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee. Mr. Frierson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 4, 1943.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

George E. Proudfit, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska. Mr. Proudfit is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 26, 1943.

Reuben Gosnell, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina. Mr. Gosnell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 2, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virginia V. Tucker, Helena, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William B. Mims, Phenix City, Ala., in place of J. F. Freeman, Sr., deceased.

ARKANSAS

Don H. Stalls, Turrell, Ark., in place of D. H. Stalls. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

CALIFORNIA

Victor F. Vieira, Esparto, Calif., in place of B. L. Rogers, retired.

FLORIDA

Hilary T. Stewart, Fort Walton, Fla., in place of S. F. Pryor, retired.

GEORGIA

Richard B. Sims, Canton, Ga., in place of A. V. Jones, Sr., resigned.

IOWA

Lillian R. Carson, Essex, Iowa, in place of J. O. Bussard, transferred.

Catherine H. Wiggerman, Maurice, Iowa, in place of J. E. Mieras, retired.

MAINE

Harold Wayne Allen, Columbia Falls, Maine, in place of W. H. Allen, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Dorothy M. Armstrong, Hull, Mass., in place of M. P. Murphy, removed.

MICHIGAN

John S. Dunsford, Marlette, Mich., in place of F. J. Erwin, resigned.

MINNESOTA

James M. McGuire, Rush City, Minn., in place of Henry Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

Hall W. Wilson, Natchez, Miss., in place of William Bullock, deceased.

MISSOURI

Wade D. Moody, Pattonsburg, Mo., in place of H. F. Nalle, transferred.

NEBRASKA

William Stuart Campell, Waterloo, Nebr., in place of W. S. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW YORK

Don J. Herrington, Cato, N. Y., in place of G. C. Gumaer, retired.

Dorothy G. Mooney, Cicero, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Howard G. McGee, Copake, N. Y., in place of H. G. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

W. Franklin Moore, Freeville, N. Y., in place of George S. Hart, deceased.

Alice C. Lewis, Gilboa, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clarence M. Krum, Grahamsville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arley V. Joslyn, Grand Gorge, N. Y., in place of J. E. Moore, removed.

Jennie Young, Howes Cave, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Williard C. Schadt, Jeffersonville, N. Y., in place of F. W. Schadt, deceased.

Francis E. Hughes, La Fargeville, N. Y., in place of L. W. Snell, transferred.

Iva B. Locke, La Fayette, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William J. Holbert, Morrisville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Holbert. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1942.

Roy Blanchard, Oneida, N. Y., in place of Roy Blanchard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Julia W. Gurnett, Watkins Glen, N. Y., in place of J. W. Gurnett, resigned.

Donald R. Widrick, Whitesboro, N. Y., in place of C. H. Widrick, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

William T. Wakefield, Mott, N. Dak., in place of W. T. Wakefield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Emma P. Snyder, Leesport, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Cleona Fritz, Noxen, Pa., in place of L. R. Hackling, transferred.

PUERTO RICO

Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Leonidos M. Lopez, Camuy, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Fred Coates, Provo, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Regie H. Ray, Ducktown, Tenn., in place of P. A. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

LeRoy J. Eldredge, Hixson, Tenn., in place of L. J. Eldredge. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Edward C. Oslin, Boydton, Va., in place of E. L. Toone, retired.

Elsie P. Jones, Urbanna, Va., in place of C. C. Chowning, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Gordon, Bramwell, W. Va., in place of M. R. Walker, retired.

Harry C. Louden, Fairmont, W. Va., in place of A. G. Hartin, deceased.

Paul D. Young, Omar, W. Va., in place of A. C. Smith, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTER

NORTH CAROLINA

Ethel G. Womble, Goldston.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we would honor the heroism and endurance which the brave attain and which the bravest will not despise; these are worthy to be sought. We pray for something higher, sweeter, and more precious; it is the secret of a happy child at the side of his indulgent father. Our Lord and Master had this unbroken companionship with His Father amid the vicissitudes and storms of His earthly mission. We do not pray to see the future which is folded from our sight, but for that rest in the word of our Saviour: "Your Father knoweth." O equip us with this divine relation and its exalted privilege.

Almighty God, we pray for men, godly men, men of conviction and understand-

ing, unyielding in all the dictates of honor. O put them in the sanctuary, in the street, in the neighborhoods, in the home, and in the entanglements of business and they will defy the world. We pray for those robust patriots, who by their daily lives, write a commentary on the Constitution, on the ideal of the true American life, and blessed Lord, they will make the world believe. Let them arise and go forth in righteousness of rectitude and integrity and with that peace which Thou dost regulate and with that joy which is the reflection of heaven. Bless us this day with that quietude and poise which cometh from the heart of a merciful God. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 237, Questions and Answers, containing an analysis relative to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1242. An act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, and 7, and from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for six months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the 'Women's Army Corps'. The total number of women enlisted or appointed in the Women's Army Corps shall not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women of excellent character in good physical health, who are enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213), and who are on the date of such enlistment citizens of the United States between the ages of twenty and fifty years."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The commanding officer of such corps shall be a colonel and such officers of lower rank shall be appointed as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That physicians and nurses shall not be enlisted in this corps: *And provided further*, That commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps shall exercise command only over women of the Women's Army Corps and other members of the Army of the United States specifically placed under their command."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
ELEERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The Senate bill provided for the establishment in the Army of the United States for the period until the cessation of hostilities in the present war and for 6 months thereafter, or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation might prescribe, or until January 1, 1945, whichever might be earlier, a component to be known as the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. The House amendment designated the corps as the Women's Army Corps and established it for the duration of the war plus 6 months or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation might designate. The House amendment further provided that the number of women in the corps should not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President and in no event should exceed 150,000. The conference agreement adopts the House amendment except as to the limit of 150,000 upon the number of women who may be in the corps.

Amendment No. 2: The Senate bill provided that the enlisted personnel of the corps should consist of women enlisted in the Army of the United States under the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended. The House amendment made similar provision with respect to the enlisted personnel of the corps and provided further that the women should be of excellent character, in good physical health, and at the time of enlistment citizens of the United States between the ages of 20 and 45 years. The conference agreement adopts the House amendment except that the maximum age at time of enlistment is raised from 45 to 50 years.

Amendment No. 3: The House amendment inserted new matter providing that the commanding officer of the corps should be a colonel, that the corps should have such officers of lower rank as the Secretary of War might prescribe, that physicians and nurses should not be enlisted in the corps, and that the military authority of officers of the corps should be exercised over women of the corps only and should be limited to administration of the corps. The conference agreement adopts the House amendment except with respect to the limitation upon military authority of the officers of the corps. As to that, the conference agreement provides that commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the corps shall exercise command only over women of the corps and other members of the Army of the United States who are specifically placed under their command.

Amendment No. 4: The Senate bill provided that officers of the corps and their dependents and benficiaries should have all of the rights, privileges, and benefits which are accorded in like cases to other officers appointed under the joint resolution of September 22, 1941, and to their dependents and beneficiaries. The House amendment has the effect of providing that the rights, privileges, and benefits shall be the same except where otherwise expressly provided. The conference agreement adopts the House amendment.

Amendment No. 5: Section 4 of the Senate bill specifically authorized the Secretary of War to prescribe additional regulations applicable to the corps and provided that the corps and the Army Nurse Corps should be the only women's organizations in the Army of the United States. The House amendment

eliminated section 4. The conference agreement adopts the House amendment.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7: These amendments merely renumbered sections and were made necessary by the adoption of amendment No. 5. The conference agreement adopts the House amendments.

Amendment No. 8: The House amendment added a new section to the bill providing that the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 should not be applicable to dependents of women enlisted under the bill and further providing that women commissioned or enlisted under the bill should receive only the subsistence and rental allowances payable to male commissioned officers and enlisted men, without dependents. The House recedes from this amendment.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TABER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial on the food crisis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement from the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco in favor of repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article from the Atlanta Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes today. I do not desire to use this time, but instead ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Daily Ardmorite, of Ardmore, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein excerpts from an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRICE ROLL-BACKS AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to roll back prices and reduce the cost of living and then vote a subsidy on the backs of the American taxpayers is just one way of deceiving the people of this country. Living costs will be more, not less. Bonds must be sold, money borrowed, interest paid, and administration costs added. How long must we of this generation ask the future generations to pay for the undeserved ease of our day? It means shifting our obligation to the backs of the soldiers now fighting our battles when they return. If the people of this country, when wage scales and the national income are the highest in the history of the Nation, are unable to pay for butter, coffee, meat, and for food at decent prices to the producer, when will they be able to pay for it?

This morning I received a telegram from two farmers' organizations in my district, the Oxford Cooperative Elevator Co. and the Oakland County Farm Bureau, both saying this:

> Farmers and farm leaders are emphatically opposed to any roll-back in farm prices. So much unfavorable publicity from Washington. Absence of guaranty of stabilized profitable returns to agriculture when labor and industry are taken care of is interfering with crop production. Office of Price Administration regimentation is resented.
>
> FRED G. BEARDSLEY,
> *President, Farm Bureau, Oakland County.*
> RAY E. ALLEN,
> *Secretary, Oxford Cooperative Elevator Co.*

Give the farmer a decent price for his products in the market place and there will be no necessity for subsidies. He is opposed to accepting a Government dole and forever forcing him to remain an object of charity.

Subsidy will discourage the production of food. Let the income of those who till the soil be brought in line with national income.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial entitled "Subsidy Is All Wrong," written by Mr. J. C. Morrison, of Morris, Minn., one of the leading editors of the Northwest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two short newspaper articles commending the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 270, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2869, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report

the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, and shall take 5 minutes myself.

This rule makes in order H. R. 2869, providing for the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation for an additional 2 years. It increases the amount heretofore authorized by $500,000,000. From the evidence before the Rules Committee there is no objection to the bill, and to the continuance of the Corporation, because all seem to appreciate the tremendous work which has been done and the good that has been accomplished for agriculture by this Corporation and for the country in general.

There is some objection to section 6, which contains certain restrictions that have been placed on the Corporation. That section reads as follows:

SEC. 6. In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies to maintain maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities, no maximum price shall be established or maintained under any law for any such commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, in the market place, the support price therefor announced by the Secretary, or below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended, except that nothing in the foregoing provisions shall be construed to prevent the selling of wheat for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn nor to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort. Agreements made by the Commodity Credit Corporation prior to the enactment of this act shall not be affected by this section until 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

I do not know whether the committee has acted wisely, but it is up to the House to pass on that section.

There is also some disagreement I think on section 7, which reads as follows:

SEC. 7. Such modifications shall be made in maximum prices established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (Public Law No. 421, 77th Cong.), and an act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation and for other purposes, approved October 2, 1942 (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.), for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as the War Food Administrator determines are necessary to secure an adequate production of such commodity for war purposes.

The disagreement was with respect to the interpretation of the word "modification" bearing on maximum prices; that is, that there should be other verbiage used to make it clearer. This is a minor clarification that will and can be perfected in the House.

The bill I know is favored by both the majority and the minority, and I feel there should not be a great deal of trouble and time taken in passing it.

In that connection I wish to state, however, that I understand the Commodity Credit Corporation has acquired tremendous quantities of corn, cotton and other articles, which are still in the warehouses, and I feel that these commodities, without affecting the market, should be released, or the loans called. I am informed that my friends, the corn farmers, refuse to sell, because they can get more for their corn now in the black market. Many farmers need the corn to feed the hogs, and it is bringing, as they claim, about $1.40 a bushel. I think it is manifestly unfair that the corn farmers, who have been aided and assisted by this Administration and by this Congress and the Congresses that have gone before, should now, when there is a shortage of corn, go to the extent of refusing to sell the corn they now hold.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 2 additional minutes. Mr. Speaker, I come from a corn State, and I think that all of the friends among the corn farmers should inform them that they are not making any friends here by being unfair, unjust, and unreasonable, in withholding the corn from the market.

I believe if the loans were called by the Corporation, a great deal of this corn would be released and conditions relieved. Of course, I think if you would restrict the price of hogs and cattle, this corn would not bring $1.40 in the black market. Furthermore, the O. P. A. has raised prices on meat, but has refused to put a price on cattle and hogs, and there a mistake has been made.

I think it is not too late now to take action and that a ceiling price should be placed on cattle and hogs. Cattle and hogs that were selling in 1932 at 3 cents a pound are now selling for 15, 16, and 17 cents a pound—500 percent higher than they were selling for then, and perhaps 150 percent higher than in 1939. So I feel something should be done in the interest of the consumer and in the interest of those who have not received increases in their salaries and wages and whose cost of living has gone up all the way from 50 to 100 percent. These people cannot stand it much longer, and difficulties are liable to ensue unless these matters are adjusted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the farmers' friend from the cornfields of Chicago, feels called upon to so severely castigate all American farmers by accusing them of unethical, unpatriotic, and illegal conduct in causing, making, and maintaining a black market for meats.

He entirely overlooks the fact that the administration has called upon the farmers to produce more meat, especially cattle and hogs. He also overlooks the fact, or perchance may not be familiar with the fact, that the farmers' corn, fed to the livestock, produces the meat food that the farmers have been urged to supply. The great mass of farmers do nothing to create or support a black market. All the farmer wants is a fair price in the market place, and what, Mr. Chairman, is so wrong about that?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, you would not ask the farmers to produce meat at a loss in order that your consumers in Chicago may buy more cheaply. Surely, you would not expect the farmers to place their corn on the market at a less price than it cost them to produce, and at a less price than they could receive by selling that same corn in meat at the same market.

The implication of the chairman's remarks is that the food producers should subsidize the chairman's consumer constituents in Chicago. Well, of course, while most labor in war industry is today receiving unheard-of compensation and is abundantly able to pay for its food at a much higher price, yet we are all mindful of the school teachers, the clerks, and the white-collar employees who have had no increase in wages but who must buy their food in the same market with the high-salaried war worker.

There is a problem here that is very difficult to solve and some method must be found to adjust these inequalities. It will not help any, however, to shout "wolf" at the farmer and accuse him of maintaining a black market at the expense of those who must buy food. We are all human. The consumer would like to buy as cheaply as possible and, by the same token, the farmer would like to get as high a price as possible. In wartimes, each group must make concessions, and in doing so must not charge bad faith or misconduct on the part of the other.

My respect and affection for my chairman are such that I want to believe that his remarks were inadvertently made, and that when he thinks it over he will soften up a little in his condemnation of the great class of food producers to whom our country and, in fact, the world at large, owe so much today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I am sorry, but all time has been promised. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who by common consent is

always authorized to speak for the farmers of the country on matters affecting their industry.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss only one phase of the legislation which is embodied in this bill. I refer particularly to section 6 relating to subsidy payments. I have in mind especially the subsidy payments which have been lately put into effect on meat and butter, the so-called roll-back subsidies. The argument that is made by those who are advocating subsidies of that type is that they are necessary in order to absorb the increased cost of living, particularly the increased cost of food. The proponents of those subsidies say in effect that we stabilized wages last September, but we did not stabilize prices. As a matter of fact, we did not stabilize either of them. Prices have gone up some and wages have gone up some since last September.

I placed in the RECORD day before yesterday some figures compiled by the Library of Congress, showing the increase in wages, both hourly and weekly wages, since last September 15, and also the increases in the cost of living. I think if we are going to adopt the theory that we are to roll prices back to September 15, then in all fairness, if we are going to deal with the question of inflation, we must also roll wages back to the same date. Unless we do we are increasing the inflationary gap and bringing the perils of inflation nearer and nearer.

I do not want to go into that question any further at this time. I do invite your attention to these figures which you will find in the RECORD for Wednesday. They show that wages on the average have increased as rapidly as the cost of living since last September.

I want to consume the remainder of my time in discussing some figures which are contained in a publication by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, entitled "The Marketing and Transportation Situation." I call attention particularly to the figures contained in this document which compare that portion of the consumer's income spent for food at the present time and at different periods in the past. I am going to get permission to put in the RECORD the table to which I am referring at this time.

I call attention particularly to the fact that at the present time, that is, for March 1943—these are the latest figures available—American consumers spent 21 percent of their income for food. That is the smallest percentage of income with the exception of 2 or 3 months last year and at the beginning of this year, that we have ever spent in this country for food. In January and February of this year and during 2 or 3 months last year, the percentage dropped down to 20 percent. I am told on reliable authority that in England, which we are asked to adopt as a model as far as subsidies are concerned, the consumers spend 60 percent of their income for food.

Let me also call attention to this fact, that the 22 percent of the consumer's income which now goes for food includes recent increase in the standard of living, because if we will take, as shown in this table, the quantity of food which the average consumer purchased during the period from 1935 to 1939, if he bought that same quantity and quality of food today he would be expending only 16 percent of his present income. So that he has improved his standard of living during the period from 1939 to the present time because he is now spending 22 percent of his income for food.

Let me call your attention also to comparative figures as to income and expenditures for food between September 1942, which is the date to which we are going to roll prices back if we adopt the theory of the proponents of that policy, and March 1943. The total average income in this country in September 1942 was $883. That was the per capita income. In March 1943 it was at the rate of $1,012 annually, or $129 more. The per capita cost of food in September 1942 was $178. In March 1943 it was $208, an increase of only $30, whereas wages and salaries have increased $129 during that same period of time.

In view of that situation it seems to me that any argument that we should roll back prices of food products to September 1942 or any earlier date does not stand up for a minute. If we have any idea of preventing inflation certainly we do not want to adopt any program which, by its very nature, can only be inflationary, because it adds to the purchasing power of the consumer by reducing the price he pays, while in no way reducing the income which he receives, and which has been constantly increasing since the war period began.

I do not want to say that I am opposed to all types of subsidies. There are some which I think are helping in bringing about an increased production. There are some of them which have been put into effect in order to aid the war effort in the production of strategic materials, but there is a clear distinction between those subsidies which have been put into effect in order to bring about increased production and those which are simply a roll-back of prices on the theory that prices have advanced more rapidly than wages. I think if we will keep that distinction in mind there should be no difficulty in determining what types of subsidy will assist and contribute to the war effort and what types will fail to make that contribution, but bring about inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. If prices have advanced more rapidly than wages—and I do not agree with the gentleman's figures—would he then be in favor of the roll-back or reduction without subsidies?

Mr. HOPE. No; I would not, because I do not think we can increase our standard of living in time of war. All this idea that you have to roll back prices, if they get a little ahead of wages, is based on the theory that we can increase our standard of living at a time when two-thirds of our national energy is devoted to carrying on the war, instead of producing for consumption. Under these circumstances a lowering of our living standards is inevitable. We can put off the evil day but we cannot prevent it. You cannot do it.

Mr. BARRY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that two Sundays ago in the New York Times appeared a chart which was put out by the Labor Department which indicated that since January 1941 food prices have increased 40 percent and wages have only increased half of that, or a differential of 20 percent.

Mr. HOPE. Food prices are only a part of the cost of living; these figures also considered everything coming under the cost of living. As shown by the figures already quoted, only 21 percent of consumer income goes for food. A large increase in food prices might mean only a small increase in the total cost of living. Attached herewith is the table referred to from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics publication, the marketing and transportation situation:

TABLE 1.—*Food cost and expenditures compared with total and disposable income per person, United States average, specified periods*

Year and month	Total income [1]	Disposable income [1]	Total expenditures for consumers goods and services [1]	Food expenditures				Cost to consumer of fixed quantities of foods representing average annual consumption per person, 1935–39			
				Actual [1]	As percentage of—			Actual [2]	As percentage of [3]—		
					Total income	Disposable income	Total expenditures for goods and services		Total income	Disposable income	Total expenditures for goods and services
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1913	340							95	28		
1914	333							100	30		
1915	393							101	26		
1916	477							115	24		
1917	471							147	31		
1918	542							166	31		
1919	579							192	33		
1920	628							201	32		
1921	506							142	28		
1922	531							138	26		
1923	599							144	24		
1924	610							143	23		
1925	645							155	24		
1926	659							155	24		
1927	655							150	23		
1928	664							150	23		
1929	679	655	583	156	23	24	27	149	22	23	26
1930	595	574	527	143	24	25	27	139	23	24	26
1931	500	480	437	120	24	25	27	112	22	23	26
1932	380	366	345	94	25	26	27	92	24	25	27
1933	368	354	341	91	25	26	27	93	25	26	27
1934	418	403	377	100	24	25	27	105	25	26	28
1935	460	442	410	105	23	24	26	116	25	26	28
1936	531	508	461	113	21	22	25	115	22	23	25
1937	561	536	485	119	21	22	25	119	21	22	25
1938	509	484	451	113	22	23	25	108	21	22	24
1939	541	517	471	114	21	22	24	106	20	21	23
1935–39 average	520	497	456	113	22	23	25	113	22	23	25
1940	579	554	497	121	21	22	24	107	18	19	22
1941	692	662	560	140	20	21	25	121	17	18	22
1942	857	807	612	176	21	22	29	144	17	18	24
	Annual rates by months, seasonally adjusted										
1942:											
January	778	744	617	168	22	23	27	134	17	18	22
February	786	751	591	160	20	21	27	136	17	18	23
March	795	759	554	162	20	21	29	138	17	18	25
April	815	778	591	165	20	21	28	139	17	18	24
May	825	785	639	171	21	22	27	140	17	18	22
June	844	802	589	169	20	21	29	142	17	18	24
July	859	813	615	179	21	22	29	143	17	18	23
August	875	824	631	182	21	22	29	145	17	18	23
September	883	828	610	178	20	21	29	145	16	18	24
October	905	845	652	196	22	23	30	149	16	18	23
November	937	870	628	184	20	21	29	151	16	17	24
December	958	887	631	193	20	22	31	153	16	17	24
1943:											
January	971	895	659	195	20	22	30	155	16	17	24
February	992	911	688	202	20	22	29	157	16	17	23
March	1,012	915	629	208	21	23	33	162	16	18	26

[1] Calculated from data prepared in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Total income is national income payments to individual per capita of United States population, including all armed forces. This average is approximately equal to income per capita of civilian population, differing by less than 1 percent in 1942. Disposable income is total income less direct personal taxes. Total expenditures for goods and services are averaged over United States population excluding armed forces abroad. Actual food expenditure is total amount spent for foods (excluding alcoholic liquors) in retail stores, eating places, and elsewhere, plus allowance for value of home-produced foods, per capita of United States civilian population. This expenditure reflects changes in quantities and types of foods purchased and in payments for preparation, service, and entertainment at eating places in addition to changes in food prices.

[2] Cost to consumers of quantities of foods representing average annual consumption per person during 1935–39 is calculated by taking as a 1935–39 base the actual food expenditure for that period ($113) and applying to this base cost the changes in a United States average consumers' food price index. The latter index is a weighted average of indexes representing (1) retail food prices in 51 cities (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics); (2) retail food prices in other cities and towns; and (3) prices received by producers applied to foods consumed on farms where produced. This series reflects the part of changes in food cost due solely to changes in food prices.

[3] These percentages show what share of consumers' income would be required to purchase identical quantities of the same foods (1935–39 average consumption) at prices prevailing during each year and month.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

THE WOLCOTT AMENDMENT

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the roll-back and subsidy program which has been announced by the administration is a fraud on the American people. It is proposed to save each individual consumer in the United States 5 cents a pound on butter, and since each person is allowed 12 pounds of butter a year, that saving will be 60 cents a year per individual, or not enough to pay for a ticket to a movie in downtown Washington.

It is proposed to save the consumers 3 cents per pound on meat or 6 cents a week, about $3 a year. And, in addition, it is proposed to save 3 cents a pound on coffee; you are allowed 12 pounds of coffee a year, with a saving of about 36 cents. In other words, a total saving of $3.92 per individual.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Would the gentleman tell us what it would cost to administer this subsidy program per individual?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is estimated that the total subsidy will be $450,000,000; it will cost at least another $50,000,000 to administer; that will be a total of $500,000,000. The Government must sell bonds in order to raise the money to pay the subsidy, and if we assume that these War Savings bonds draw 2.9 percent interest, and we further assume that they will run for 50 years, if you calculate your interest on those

bonds for that 50-year period, you have a total of $725,000,000 in interest, plus $500,000,000 subsidy at the end of the 50 years. In other words, you have got to pay $1,225,000,000, which will be $9.15 for each individual who saves $3.92 in the year 1943 on his grocery bill.

Furthermore, I doubt very much if 10 percent of the membership of this House will be living at the time the bonds are paid, which means that our children and our grandchildren will be called upon to pay the $9.15 of the grocery bill so that you and I could save $3.92 in 1943.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has told us how little the benefit will be to each individual, but if the bill is put into effect, and continues in effect, with the present roll-back plan, does not the gentleman understand it is the purpose of these proposers of this subsidy plan to expand it greatly so that the total cost might be as much as $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 a year?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If it should be expanded, as has been suggested, they will need about $2,000,000,000 for subsidy, and assuming they get the $2,000,000,000 for subsidies they will save each individual $12 in the year 1943, or any 12-month period, and when the bonds are paid off 50 years from now each individual who saved $12 in the year 1943 will be called upon to pay back $36 in interest and principal to liquidate the bonds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, would it not be correct to say that the roll-back will be upon our grandchildren?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about it. As I said before, very few of the people now living will be alive when these bonds are to be paid.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It will also fall upon the soldiers, on the boys who are fighting to preserve this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right; it will fall upon the soldiers and our children, and their children will be called upon to pay for the folly of 1943.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I would like to, but I only have a few minutes.

I went to a country school, and I learned my arithmetic the same as most of you in the old-fashioned manner. I learned that 2 and 2 make 4, and 3 and 3 make 6, but last night when I heard Prentiss Brown make a radio speech I was amazed to hear advanced a new theory in the higher realms of calculation. Mr. Brown stated, and I quote:

> The roll-back subsidy program on meat and butter will save consumers between two and three dollars for every dollar paid, and the Government at least will save two dollars. This program will pay off in hard dollars and cents at the rate of 4 or 5 to 1.

And he says that on some of the things the "saving will be higher. This is sound Government finance."

That is what Mr. Brown says, and that is the end of the quotation.

No doubt Mr. Brown got this fanciful, complicated scheme of higher mathematics from the same men who figured out that an obligation does not make any difference; it does not make any difference how big our national debt is if we owe it to ourselves. So, I assume that is following the same philosophy, and also the philosophy of those who are spending the taxpayers' money, who consider that it is sound Government finance to subsidize and pay a part of your grocery bill on borrowed money, to be finally paid by future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Wolcott amendment because I am convinced that the roll-back and subsidy scheme is a mistake and a fraud against the American people. This amendment, if adopted, will materially help to stop inflation which now threatens our country. The enactment of the amendment will not increase the cost of living, if officials administer and enforce the law according to the intent of Congress.

The roll-back and subsidy scheme has brought a food crisis in our country, encouraged black-market operations, and is rapidly breaking down our system for the distribution of food. Food stores, processors, and distributors are being forced out of business because they cannot get supplies. All at a time when we possess the largest supplies of beef cattle, hogs, and milk products in the history of our country. The situation is particularly serious in the processing and distribution of meat. The O. P. A. refuses to recognize that an error has been made in the handling of meat and dairy products. Unless prompt action is taken to remedy the situation, it will be difficult for the men in the armed forces to secure meat, to say nothing about a supply for lend-lease and civilian requirements. I am convinced that the adoption of the Wolcott amendment and the Fulmer bill to coordinate all food administration under one head, will go far to correct the present difficulties.

It will take men of experience to straighten out the meat problem and undo the damage already done in the distribution of this vital food. It appears that the administration does not desire to utilize the services of men who have spent a lifetime in the business of processing and distribution of meat and other foods. The administration prefers inexperienced men to shape and administer the Nation's food policies.

Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding meat processors of the country is a constituent of mine. He is Mr. Jay C. Hormel, of Austin, Minn. He has spent a lifetime in the meat business and knows what he is talking about. I asked Mr. Hormel to appear before the House Committee on Agriculture this morning to propose a plan for the solution of our difficulties in the distribution of meat. Several members of our committee have asked me to place Mr. Hormel's splendid and practical suggestion in the RECORD for other Members of Congress and the country to read. I believe it a good and simple plan which should be put into operation, and under leave granted me I am including Mr. Hormel's suggestion as a part of my remarks:

A WORKABLE PLAN TO SOLVE THE MEAT DISTRIBUTION PROBLEM

(By Mr. Jay C. Hormel, of Austin, Minn.)

I think the American public would be shocked if people knew how bad the meat situation really is.

It is time they are shocked. The situation is worse than we have been told.

For example, the headline in the Chicago Tribune on Friday, June 18, read: "More Pork For Civilians! Army Will Get Larger Share of Beef Store." That is not the truth.

It is not true that the civilian population is going to get more pork. The production of pork meat now is at a seasonal peak and yet, even today, the Government is not getting as much pork as it wants. A worse truth is that in spite of the scarcity of beef on the domestic market, our armed forces are short of beef they need to eat. The way the meat situation is being handled, the Army will not get a larger share than it is getting now

At the same time, there is a right way to handle this meat situation to give the Army what it needs, to give lend-lease all we can spare them, and to distribute the civilian supply fairly.

A statement entitled "A Program for Solving Wartime Meat Problems" has been issued by the Livestock and Meat Council, which consists of 99 national, regional, and State associations and organizations of the livestock and meat industry. This statement tells what will work and what won't work.

Its principles have been accepted by the Government. The War Meat Board was established for the purpose of carrying out that meat management program.

It was written by committees consisting of nearly three hundred people fairly representing all phases of the meat and livestock industry.

The only trouble with the plan today is that it is not being use..

For example. The Army surely is short of beef. Surely something must be done about it.

What does the meat management plan say to do?

It says to ask the civilian population to use less beef. How do you ask them? By increasing the point value of beef. And, at the same time, explaining why point values are raised.

Then what happens? You and I respect our ration coupons because we know the reason for them. Because of the increased point value, we cut down on the amount of beef we use. That leaves more beef in the hands of the packers. If you and I don't buy it, they look at the only other customer they have, which is the Army. In that way the Army quickly and surely gets its beef. That would be the right way to do it.

But now lets see what actually has happened during the last 2 weeks. The Government called together a group of beef men. They said, in effect, "This is an emergency. The Army is short of beef. What emergency steps can we take?" At that point the Government people and the industry people forgot about their meat management plan and undertook a make-shift. They quickly calculated what portion of the beef the Army needed. Then they issued orders to the packers simply taking that amount of beef.

That sounds like direct action. They knew what they wanted, so they reached right out to get it. But they didn't get it. The reason is they went at it the wrong way. They

didn't follow the meat management plan. In the first place, they didn't tell you and me what they were trying to do. So you and I, the consumer, couldn't help them a bit.

Even if they had told us what they were trying to do, they didn't tell us how we could help. We still had our ration tickets which said any time we felt like spending 12 points for a pound of round steak, all we had to do was hunt up the butcher who had the round steak.

Now, the Government can use only Government-inspected beef. That is the law. So, this "take" order, or "set-aside" order as it is known officially, applied only to Government-inspected packers. If you happened to be trading with a retailer who handled Government-inspected meats, the chances are he was out of round steak the day you came in, because the Government already had taken 45 percent of the packer's supply. That forced the retailer to look for some other packer for his beef. That made a new customer for that other packer. If that other packer bought one extra bullock to take care of that new customer, there was one less live bullock to be offered for sale. If there were one less live animal for sale, that meant the Government-inspected houses slaughtered one less. It wasn't your fault, because nobody had told you that 45 percent of that round steak you bought was supposed to go to the Army.

It seems clear enough that the way to get meat for the Army is to get you and me not to buy the meat which the Army needs. That seems simple enough.

That is a basic part of the meat management plan. Of course, that is not all there is to it. Altogether, the meat management plan has four jobs to do.

1. Supply all the meat which the armed forces need.

2. Supply the full amount of meat allowed for lease-lend.

3. Take the meat to the ration tickets, so that after you have been told how many tickets you can spend and what the point prices are, you can spend your tickets as you want to.

4. Maintain the meat price levels which administration policy determines.

The plan is simple—let supply and demand do all these jobs.

Fortunately, the use of supply and demand to do these jobs is simple, also.

If we weren't interested in price levels, the meat management plan simply would be to let natural forces work as they always have worked. The prices on things we wanted most would go sky high and when the price on that round steak got too high to suit us, you and I would decide not to buy and the Army would get all it needed.

We have a new name for high prices. We call it inflation. We decided we didn't want inflation, so we set out to control prices. We still have to stick to supply and demand, so this time we use ration tickets to control the demand.

If you have 16 points a week and you are buying more than your share of round steak at 12 points, the way to handle the situation is to make round steak 14 points or 16 points or 32 points or whatever is necessary so you and I leave enough round steak for the Army.

In the same way, we use the ration point values to get enough of all meat for our fighting forces and for lease-lend.

That leaves the problem of seeing to it that you and I can get all the round steak we want each day, whether it be the little bit we want at 32 points a pound or whether it be the larger amount we want at 16 points or at 14 points or at whatever minimum point value still permits the Army to get what it needs.

When they tell us what the point value is, we should be able to get what we want no matter where we live. Now, it is obvious the War Meat Board never will be able to direct the flow of meat each day in such a way as to distribute the round steak equitably all over the country. On the other hand, we long have had a device which always has worked. If the price is higher in one place than it is in another, somebody always find it out and finds a way to take the meat to the place where he can get the best price for it.

Of course, we don't want inflation. So, the question is, how are we going to put a higher price on meat in order to get it to your butcher shop or to your town? Well, if we don't want high prices, the answer is to make the price lower in the towns that already have their share.

Fortunately, this is an easy thing to do. The point values have been set so that 130,000,000 of us have left plenty of round steak on the market—all, in fact, that the Army can use. You and I won't try to buy that round steak away from the Army, because of our points. That leaves the Government as the only possible bidder for all that extra meat.

Now, if the Government bids at ceiling prices, a great many communities will be short of meat because the easy thing for a lot of packers to do will be to offer all their meat to the Government. It takes a week to collect the figures showing how many head of livestock have been slaughtered, so as one packer after another offers his meat to the Government, the War Meat Board would have no possible way of knowing whether this was meat which should have come to your town to supply your ration tickets. On the other hand, if the War Meat Board should buy this extra meat at just a little bit less than ceiling prices, the packer would find it more profitable to sell to your retailer who would pay the full price.

In this way we see the meat management plan can work only when two things have happened. The first thing is that point values must be set in such a way that there is plenty of meat for the Government to buy. The second is that the Government must buy that meat at a price which is low enough so that it always is profitable to someone to sell it to you instead, so long as you have the points with which to buy.

Now, just as the meat management plan demands that the Government's buying prices be just a little below ceiling prices in order to get fair distribution of the civilian supply of meat, so the government can use its buying prices to control the price of meat to the civilian trade.

For example, if the ceiling price for a certain class of meat is 40 cents and if the Government's price on that same meat should be 36 cents, a packer, before selling to the Government at 36 cents, would try to find a retailer whose customers had enough coupons so that retailer would buy his meat at the 40-cent price. However, it is certain that some other packer would discover that same dealer and rather than sell at the Government price of 36 cents would offer that dealer the same meat at 39 cents. Someone else, still wanting that dealer's business, would offer at 38 cents and so on until finally the price that dealer would pay would be based on the fact that the Government's 36-cent-buying price was his only competition. In this way, the War Meat Board absolutely can set the meat price levels which administration policy may determine.

If we get away from the wartime meat plan, the Army goes short of meat, part of the civilian population goes short of meat, black markets thrive, and actual prices break through our ceilings.

The consumer pays too much while the producers hold indignation meetings and legitimate small packers are forced out of business.

On the other hand, the meat management plan does all the things we want it to do.

If we use the rationing system and use it properly, we control the amount of meat which is available to you and to me and to the Government. If we let price competition handle our distribution, we will get the meat to our coupons.

By using the Government buying price to set the price level, we will control inflation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a table prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if in all the agricultural programs we have had in recent years anything has been of so much practical benefit to agriculture as the activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Having had some opportunity of observing its operations my conclusion is that it is a fine agency filling a very particular need and that it has been well managed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed for a little without interruption. I shall be pleased to yield later.

Mr. Speaker, I remember that in 1939 when the British Government found it had only a limited amount of dollar exchange available in this country but having at that time a considerable stock of tobacco on hand and needing munitions very much worse than it did tobacco it was obliged to withdraw from the tobacco market. Ordinarily British interests take something like 50 percent of the tobacco produced in America. The result of their withdrawal was that when the tobacco producers got ready to go to market they found the markets closed in their face. To meet this situation the Commodity Credit Corporation stepped into that picture and worked out a plan that enabled not only the reopening of the markets but gave the producers of that year's crop about the usual price they had been accustomed to.

In that year, 1939, tobacco paid taxes into the Federal Treasury of almost $700,000,000. The next year the tobacco tax exceeded $700,000,000. It now bids fair for this year to run much in excess of $800,000,000. It might be said, of course, that the Government could have gotten that tax anyway, but it certainly would have been inequitable if not poor business for the Government to put in its pockets those enormous sums of money while the producers of the commodity from which it came would trek to the bankruptcy courts of the country. I say this because the record of the hearings on this bill show that its total loan and purchase transactions have amounted to $63,000,000,000 and its total loss up to date amounts to only $144,000,000.

The amount of the tobacco tax paid in 1 year is over five times the total loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation since it was organized.

I think it was organized first for the purpose of dealing with curing surpluses of farm commodities and for the purpose of trying to get those surpluses to markets that were not glutted and into the hands of people who needed them. Its functions from now on out I think should and will be to induce the production in balanced quantity of the food and fiber that is absolutely necessary for conducting this war. It might be said if you took the lid off and just let agriculture go, let the prices go up, there would be ample production; but there might easily be produced a great surplus of one commodity and a scarcity of some other essential commodity. By its incentive payments and by putting a flooring under the price of certain essential agricultural commodities this corporation cannot only insure the production but the balanced production of those things which are so essential in this hour.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe Congress ought just yet to foreclose itself on this question of subsidies, and I do not see how that properly comes into the picture in connection with this legislation. It is true that upon its whole operations this Corporation has lost $144,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. On some commodities the Corporation has made money.

Mr. CLARK. I was just fixing to say that. My reason for holding that the money involved here is not in the nature of a subsidy is that the corporation has made money on certain transactions and made a profit on others. In the tobacco transaction to which I have referred, they will lose no money, nor on the enormous amount of cotton they now hold. On some of these transactions they make a profit while on others they may sustain a little loss; but that is a business venture, and where there is a possibility of a profit or a loss one cannot properly classify that as a subsidy. Furthermore, the imperative necessity of getting the production of food and fiber on a balanced program is a function of government that cannot be properly classified as falling within the realm of a subsidy. I do not understand the language of this bill to permit or prohibit the payment of subsidies. I hope the committee at the proper time will clear up the language of section 6 which, to my mind at least, at this time has nothing in it except to prohibit the fixing of prices on agricultural commodities or those commodities manufactured largely from agricultural commodities—to fix a price on it below the support price determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. I cannot see where that involves any question of subsidy.

As I said a moment ago we would not know exactly what we are going to have to do to procure for this Nation all the food it is going to need and I am not at all prepared myself to now foreclose the question of subsidies. I do not think that any of these bills we are passing ought to foreclose the House on that subject, but that we ought to deal with the necessity or not for a subsidy as the picture becomes clear and we can see just exactly what we are called upon to do.

I now yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a statement to the effect that the Commodity Credit Corporation has been operated satisfactorily and properly up to the present time. I should like to know upon what he bases that statement? There has never been made an audit of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. CLARK. My statement was based upon my observation of its operations in my section, that it had done a good job. Certainly the hearings on this bill which I have examined indicate that there has been an annual audit, and this bill itself provides for the continuation of an annual audit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is an audit of the revenue and administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. CLARK. I think the gentleman will have a different idea if he looks into the matter.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The Commodity Credit Corporation has loaned on a certain amount of cotton in the last 10 years. They have made a profit on the cotton sold of $50,000,000. Now, they have 3,200,000 bales of cotton and it has a book value of $30 per bale on the cotton they now have and to which they have title.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Some contracts have already been made this year, have they not, for incentive payments to farmers to produce certain crops that are necessary?

Mr. CLARK. That is my understanding.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is there danger of the prohibitive language in this bill interfering with those contracts already made?

Mr. CLARK. I do not so understand. I understand the prohibitive language in the bill to mean that O. P. A., for instance, would be prohibited from fixing a price on agricultural commodities below the supporting price fixed therefor by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition as far as I know to the pending rule. This merely makes in order a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, and revise the basis of the anual appraisal of its assets. I do not know of any opposition to continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There will probably be a very bitter fight, however, on the question of subsidies and the roll-back of prices on coffee, butter, and meat. If that is the case, this bill may become one of the most important bills that has come before the Congress at this session. The Congress should meet this issue fairly, openly, and squarely and say whether it is in favor of subsidies or whether it is against them. It ought to be put up squarely to the Congress because in the last analysis the Congress alone has the duty to legislate. If the Representatives of the people want subsidies, if they want political hand-outs, if they want favoritism, special privileges, and benefits, that is their business to say so, but these roll-backs or subsidy prices have been inaugurated by the O. P. A. in defiance of the Congress and against the wishes of the Congress, and not one penny of the subsidies goes to the farmers or helps to increase production.

Today when we consider this bill, I hope we will meet the issue fairly and not by subterfuge and that we will have a clear-cut vote on the question whether the Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, want to continue the policy of subsidy inaugurated by the O. P. A. upon the initiation of President Roosevelt, who, in the last analysis, is alone responsible for the collapse and failure of the farm program. Once the camel gets his mouth, nose, and ears, and part of its head under the tent to the extent of $175,000,000, it is only the beginning, and it will ultimately mean two or three billion dollars a year if we are to start a program of subsidy and roll-back prices on farm commodities. This is only the start. The time to stop it is right now in this bill, and that is why I am asking the Members of the House to consider it openly, fairly, and squarely and not evade the issue. Let us kill this subsidy before it destroys the farm industry, wrecks the American farmers, and ruins our national economy.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman speaks of the necessity of avoiding subterfuge. I would like to point out to him that in Webster's Dictionary there is no such economic term as "roll-back" but there is an economic term in there known as "rebate." That is what this scheme is. It is a rebate scheme that the American people drove out of American business in the nineties. It should properly be characterized now as a rebate.

Mr. FISH. Rebate is one definition, fraud is another, political hand-out is another. But this is the time to stop these roll-backs by a vote of Congress, a roll-back vote of Congress to stop the whole program of subsidies before it is forced on us by the brain trusters and bungling bureaucrats.

Now, you will hear some of these Democrats, good Americans, and claiming to

be Jeffersonian Democrats who for 100 years have fought subsidies in all forms, shapes, and manner, say that they are in favor of this particular kind of subsidy.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does the gentleman not think it important in this prohibitive legislation against subsidies to insert a definition of subsidy? I am opposed to some subsidies and the gentleman defined one, but some I do not think are subsidies. Is it not important to legislate intelligently and to insert a definition of subsidy in here?

Mr. FISH. I have no objection to a fair definition of subsidy, whether it is a hand-out or regimentation or political bribery. It does not make any difference. All I am saying is that this is a subsidy, and this is the time for the Congress, in a fair, open manner, to meet that issue and vote whether it is for or against a subsidy. Of course, there must be exceptions. We have got to make certain exceptions for the war effort, such as transportation of oil and the mining of strategic war materials. Everybody will agree to that. But the fundamental proposition of roll-backs and subsidies on farm commodities is vicious and unworkable and smells as bad by whatever name it is called and every farm organization is against it.

Let us face the issue. The city Members are for it. We do not blame the city Members for being for it. They represent their districts; I represent my district; but, on the other hand, we are not fooling each other. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] knows it is a subsidy; he is an honest and able Member, and is willing to say so.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Is it not true this word "roll-back," which is something new in my vocabulary, simply means a reduction of the price level of certain commodities?

Mr. FISH. By paying a subsidy to the packers or wholesalers out of the United States Treasury but none to the farmers.

Mr. BARRY. We gave the O. P. A. the power to do that.

Mr. FISH. The O. P. A. assumed that power. This amounts to a reduction of 10 percent on meat to be paid for by the taxpayers to the packers and processors. It is nothing but a subsidy.

Mr. BARRY. It has no connection with a subsidy. If the Administrator finds that the cost of living has risen, he has a right to reduce those prices without paying a subsidy at all, and that should be done.

Mr. FISH. But he does pay a subsidy; that is what he is doing now, without the authority of Congress. He is paying a 10-percent subsidy to the packers.

Mr. BARRY. Would the gentleman be in favor of reducing prices, rolling them back, or whatever you want to say, if they are out of proportion, without a subsidy?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. I believe Mr. Baruch was right that we should have set maximum prices on all commodities.

Mr. BARRY. Food prices have risen 40 percent since January 1941.

Mr. FISH. When you start giving subsidies on farm products, there is no end to it.

Mr. BARRY. Forget the subsidy.

Mr. FISH. I cannot forget it. It is a fact. That is what is being done. The gentleman is talking about something academic and theoretical, that might happen if there were no subsidies.

Mr. BARRY. It is not theoretical.

Mr. FISH. I might agree with the gentleman if there were no subsidies, but there are subsidies, and that is what we are objecting to.

Mr. BARRY. Food prices have risen 40 percent since January 1941.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BARRY. Yes.

Mr. FISH. If we put a drastic provision in this bill—there is already one in it, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will submit an even more severe one—which I hope will be adopted by the votes of the Members of Congress—which does away with subsidies; will the gentleman support it?

Mr. BARRY. If I face the choice of inflation or subsidies, I will vote for subsidies.

Mr. FISH. Then the gentleman is for subsidies, which is his right. I am opposed to all subsidies, Government hand-outs, and political bribes, all the way through.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why all the excitement now? This administration has been buying votes one way or another ever since its inception.

Mr. FISH. The administration now wants to do it on a much larger scale.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know how that is possible.

Mr. FISH. The existing roll-backs require $175,000,000. That is only a start and would probably involve two or three billion dollars in subsidies within the next couple of years. The fourth-termers will need more money to buy votes next year than was needed a few years ago. That is why I say this is one of the most important issues before Congress because of the huge sums of money that would be inevitably asked for subsidies and political hand-outs.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Referring to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] as to whether we should prefer subsidies or inflation, is it not true that as far as the roll-back type of subsidy is concerned it is inflationary and contributes to inflation?

Mr. FISH. Yes. It does not help the farmers one iota. It does not help them increase production. It does not give them any more money, and the money for the subsidy to the packers comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, which also further burdens the farmers. If we are going to have subsidies without the express wish, or rather, in defiance of the Congress, we will have sunk to the level of the Reichstag. It is time we met this issue squarely and voted our convictions and put an end to government by bureaucrats and subsidies.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will always yield to my distinguished and good friend. I know we do not agree on this issue, but I am perfectly willing to have him express his views.

Mr. BARRY. Between organized labor on one side and the farmer on the other is the great middle class of America, the white-collar class, whose income has not increased. They are being squeezed right in the middle. This subsidy plan by keeping the prices down will help that great mass of people, the majority group.

Mr. FISH. I know what the gentleman means. The gentleman is representing his district and doing it ably, conscientiously, and honestly. He represents the consumers in his district. For the balance of my time let me represent the constituents in my district, one of the largest dairy districts in the United States, if not the largest. Delaware County, recently added on to my new district, is the largest dairy county in America. My district is also a large poultry district. Some of my farmers have lived on those farms since the Revolutionary War, most of them, long before the New Deal and the alphabetical system came into power which has all but wrecked and ruined them. The shortage or lack of corn because of the vicious New Deal regimentation is disastrous to my farmers and ruining them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this subsidy matter. I deeply appreciate the attitude of those who represent the consumers on this matter because they really believe it is going to help the consumers and that it is not going to hurt the farmers. However, if they knew more about price fixing and the various middlemen operating between the farmers and the consumers, they would want to put their finger on the real sore spot.

Since we have been talking about paying processors a subsidy to bring about production down on the farm and to help consumers, what has happened? Processors have held up buying except at lower prices. Hogs and cattle have gone down from 2 to 3 cents. The farmer has no way of telling the packer, "My price is 14 or 15 cents." He says to the buyer of hogs, "What will you give me for my hogs or my cattle?" You can pay the subsidy, but that does not mean that the farmer

is going to get what we call parity, because they can still roll it back, and you are going to find out that it will not help the consumer; and if so, it will amount to very little per family.

Why do you not do the same thing for farmers that you are doing for industry? The industry gets the subsidy. When you want the industry to manufacture guns, tanks, and airplanes, you tell him to go ahead, buy material, and pay whatever is necessary to get it, employ all the employees it can, and have them hanging around, it may be, paying them any kind of wages. You just as well tell him, "Make the amount as high as you can and we will guarantee you a profit on all of it." You should visit some of these plus-profit jobs and look around and see all the waste. Find out about the advertising, all of which is added in with a profit.

Let us just take this thing from a common-sense viewpoint. Suppose we have a race out there, and you want a certain young fellow to win. Would you go and pay the manager of the racer to steam up the fellow who is going to make the race? No; you would call the man that you want to win aside and say, "John, if you will win this race, I will give you $100," and that boy is going to step in and win. You have given him an inducement, an incentive. Packers do not produce hogs or cattle. They could take the subsidy and still roll the price back on the farmers. What a joke.

I am against subsidies in any instance; if you will give the farmer that to which he is entitled, you do not have to even give him a subsidy. Let us start at the bottom with proper differentials on up through the packer and others, including retailers, and give each group that to which it is entitled. Then if some of these parasites operating between the farmer and the consumer are sapping the lifeblood out of the consumer, let us get rid of them. There are plenty of them operating between farmers and consumers. Under the procedure now, all of these middlemen are taken care of by O. P. A., every one of them fixing their price with a profit, and that is the problem confronting consumers. Yes, this is the consumer's serious problem, and there is nothing you can do about it unless we streamline our marketing and distribution system and weed them out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to a man who knows a little of the history of subsidies to listen to gentlemen on the Republican side this morning. I remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and all gentlemen on the Republican side in advocating and supporting high tariff legislation always favored subsidies for shipping corporations, or for the mail service, and for all other small corporations that have been making millions out of their business, and that they all voted for them, but now when they believe there might be a little subsidy given to the poor farmer—I mean the small farmer——

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No—out of which the consumer may to some extent be benefited; especially that consumer whose wages have not been increased hardly at all in the last 10 years, who is still working for meager wages or salaries, whose cost of living has been increased from 100 to 110 percent and in some instances 200 percent, my colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] and others oppose it. That would be taking money out of the Treasury. Personally I think we should help the little fellow who needs our help as against those who do not need it.

Lest I forget, my really good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] tried to place me in a position where I was opposed to producing all the needed pork or beef. On the contrary, I am for greater production. I think the farmers should be persuaded or urged to dispose of the corn which they are holding and hoarding for a still higher price, so that it can be fed to cattle and hogs in order that we may produce more meat to supply our Army as well as the civilian population. Of course the gentleman must have misunderstood me when he charged that I was trying to restrict production.

Then there was something said about the "black market."

The gentleman from Michigan has asked me whether I would withdraw my remarks as to the black market. I wish I could, but due to the many resolutions and information I have received, the facts are that the farmers selling outside of the regulations for a much higher price by a quiet arrangement with the livestock farmers dispose of their corn for feed purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in addition to this information as to the black market, I have received several resolutions from the cattle, hog, and livestock feeders from several States, who assert that unless the roll-back order is rescinded they will immediately stop shipping their cattle and hogs to the market. Of course, that is very patriotic, extremely so, on their part, and I presume some of you gentlemen feel that it is patriotic. I do not. I think these organizations should not control the action of the Congress, because on its face their conduct shows a selfish and avaricious aim on their part in trying to force the Government to do or not do certain things, and trying to stop the Government from placing a ceiling on cattle and hogs. I feel that this should have been done from the very beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point several telegrams and excerpts from letters which I have received from these selfish groups. Copies of these communications have been sent to the President, they are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 23, 1943.*

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: The subsidy and price roll-back on foods proposed by the administration is a subterfuge for increasing wages and other consumer incomes already at inflationary levels. It will be expensive to administer, benefits will be small in proportion to total cost, it will continue the already existing ruinous confusion, it contributes to rather than controls inflation, it will decrease rather than increase both agricultural and industrial production, it will impose further regimentation of production and distribution, and will aggravate our post-war price and income problem. For these and other equally important reasons this conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus, representing 12 States and 300,000 members, respectfully petitions our Federal administrative authorities to cease their effort to inflict this program upon us. We call upon our Congress to enact legislation which will prevent any general continuance or revival of this ill-advised experiment. Copies of this resolution shall be sent each Senator and Congressman from these Midwest States and also to all proper Federal administrative authorities.

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

JUNE 19, 1943.

DEAR SIR: For your information, the following wire was sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, June 18, 1943:

"The following resolution was passed in Fremont, Nebr., June 17, 1943, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers and feeders, representing many thousands more: 'In order to guarantee an adequate supply of pork, beef, and lamb for (1) armed forces, (2) the civilian population, and (3) lend-lease, that they demand that James Byrnes, Director of Office of War Mobilization, rescind his order, which is effective Monday, June 14, 1943, rolling back wholesale prices and ordering subsidies to be paid on beef, pork, and lamb and if it is not immediately rescinded the producers and feeders of the Corn Belt States will request all feeders and producers to withhold the marketing of slaughter animals effective Monday, June 28, pending compliance with their demand and further, that the feeders of the Corn Belt States demand that the reflected price on meat animals be sufficient to cover cost of production.'

"During the last week, because of the break in prices of live animals marketed, the producers and feeders have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The request to withhold the marketing of slaughter livestock would be made to save the producers from these losses during this period of uncertainties. Further, the Corn Belt producers and feeders of livestock stated in a resolution, 'We, the livestock feeders and producers from 28 counties in Nebraska and 9 in Iowa, oppose the roll-back and subsidy program on meat, butter, and coffee as un-American, inflationary, and discriminatory.' The livestock producers and feeders of the country at the request of the proper authorities in charge, and at your personal request, have increased the production and marketing of livestock to the highest levels in the history of this country. The decision to keep slaughter livestock off the market would not mean a strike in production, because the production of meat tonnage would continue on animals now in feed lots. Many feed-lot operators, however, already have been discouraged from buying additional livestock and have ceased making replacement purchases with the result that thousands of feed lots already are empty or are rapidly being emptied. In this they are influenced not only by price roll-backs recently announced, but also by the fear of further price reductions by the same method in the future.

"The apparent lack of understanding on the part of people in Washington as to the seriousness of the food situation and their unwillingness to request and accept the counsel and advice of people with knowledge

and practical suggestions for solution gives them no choice but to take drastic action and insist that this whole problem have your personal, immediate attention.

"HARRY GARDNER,
"Oakland, Iowa.
"HERMAN DINKLAGE,
"Wisner, Nebr.
"Resolution Committee."
HARRY GARDNER,
HERMAN DINKLAGE.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 22, 1943.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The members of the National Live Stock Exchange most respectfully urge your strong support of amendment to Steagall bill, H. R. 2869, Commodity Credit Corporation. This amendment prohibits the use of Government funds for payment of subsidies and roll-back of price. Your assistance will be appreciated.

JOHN SANDERS,
President, The National Live Stock Exchange.

I do not want to criticize the administration, but even this great administration, that always has the interest of the masses at heart, makes mistakes when they listen to some of the Republicans who happen to be in important positions, and I hope this influence, if any, that has been exerted, will be eliminated. If we expect to have reasonable prices on meat we must necessarily place a ceiling on cattle and hogs, fully appreciating that it is manifestly unfair to place a ceiling on meats without at the same time placing one on livestock. Not that I am interested in the packers. In fact, I shall, if time permits, explain more thoroughly my position as to the packing industry. They are not losing money, but they are trying to make the country believe they are being ruined. These, however, are the facts:

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering one part of this home-front crisis—that part which has to do with national economic stabilization—control of cost of living. Avoidance of inflation is absolutely imperative if the home front is to be a strong foundation for the battle front. Up to now prices have not been controlled effectively but have been soaring through rising price ceilings and lack of enforcement. An attack is under way by the representatives of special interests—the great trade associations, the great retail-wholesale associations, the great meat-packing associations, and great real-estate associations—all designed to gain special profit at the cost of wrecking the national stabilization program. This offensive against the war effort at home has created a major crisis for the Nation. It is a fine thing that the Congressional Committee for the Protection of Consumers has been organized to make a vigorous fight on this issue. I am glad to be a part of it.

MEAT PROFITEERING IS SAMPLE OF TOTAL PICTURE

On Wednesday the Washington Post carried a story, as have other parts of the press, in which they refer to "the continued strike against O. P. A. price policy by major beef slaughterers of the country," which was leading to a crisis in the meat supply of the Nation for war workers, for the Army, and for citizens generally. This strike is just as reprehensible as the coal-miners' strike and has just as serious potentialities for the war effort. It is a clear attempt on the part of the large meat packers to force the Government to adjust its price policies to suit their desires for maximum profits.

While meat packers claim hardship, the facts are that they have profited at enormous rates from their meat sales during the wartime. Specifically, official Government analysis of profits of 17 leading meat packers shows that profits in 1942 increased 460 percent over the average profits for the pre-war period of 1936–39. Under these circumstances can they scream "hardship"? Even after taxes the increase in profits was almost 300 percent for these 17 leading meat packers, which includes Armour, Cudahy, Hornel, Swift, Wilson, and so forth. It is an attempt to maintain these profit levels that the meat packers organized their great lobbies to fight vigorous price-control policies on the part of the Government. It is the obligation of the agencies administering this program and of the Congress to see to it that they do not succeed in this sabotage of the Nation's war effort.

These large packers, because of their size, have been able to take advantage of the small packers, squeeze them out of business, and increase their own monopoly power in the industry. This must stop. The Government must control the pricing process and the distribution of meat from beginning to end. It is imperative that prices be put on livestock to avoid the inevitable squeeze between uncontrolled livestock prices and controlled retail prices. The use of the subsidy program to roll back these prices is clearly the only means of reducing the cost to the consumer of this vital part of their food budget.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Just to state to the gentleman that he is now giving some good information to the House, because when you fix the price of meat without fixing the price of hogs or cattle, then the price of hogs or cattle can go anywhere, to a point where the packer cannot afford to buy them, but if you start at the bottom and fix the price on the raw material with proper differentials, then you will never need to change the differential unless wages go up or down.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and yield now to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is it the gentleman's opinion or impression that the farmers are in favor of these subsidies?

Mr. SABATH. From my observation I think the farmers will not refuse them, because so far they have been glad to get anything that they have been able to get. In fact, they have been receiving more than they asked for from this Congress, and still do not appreciate it. That is what I cannot understand—when we have done so much for the farmer by which they are now getting two or three or four hundred percent more for their products than they did under a Republican administration, yet they still seem to refuse or fail to recognize the benefit accruing to them and the good that has been done for them by the Democrats.

Mr. FISH. Oh, the farmers will not get 1 penny of this subsidy. It will go to the packers. Not 1 dime of it goes to the farmers.

Mr. SABATH. I am not interested or in favor of any subsidy to the packers unless where it be actually necessary to equalize conditions to bring about a reduction in the cost of living. I am interested in the little fellow. That has been my aim, and it is because the little fellow needs protection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I know that the gentleman is sincere in his statement in regard to the little farmer, but at the beginning of the session today I read to the House two telegrams from two small farmers' associations in my district, and they are all against this idea and theory of a subsidy, and in the telegrams they said that they resented it.

Mr. SABATH. I am not entirely wedded to a subsidy, as I stated, with the exception of where it might reduce an unjustifiable high cost of living. I am speaking on the roll-back of prices. I think the prices of commodities should be reduced because they were permitted, due to your unfortunate delay and interference with the O. P. A., and the prices have not been fixed as they should have been fixed. Prices are too high, and the cost of living is too great. It should be reduced not only by 10 percent, but by 25 percent, because the 21,000,000 of white-collared people and wage earners in this country, as I said before, cannot live and pay the prices today on the wages that they are now receiving

It is amazing that the Commodity Credit Corporation, having rendered such great and beneficial service to agriculture, having raised farm prices, that now the same Republican gentlemen are endeavoring to restrict the activities of that Corporation because it might find it necessary to limit profits and thereby to some extent reduce the cost of living.

This morning and this afternoon a meeting was held by many sincere and well-meaning Members of Congress, which I regret I was unable to attend, due to my being obliged to remain on the floor. This conference is being held because the whole war effort is being jeopardized by the attack on the home front being made by a combination of Axis sympathizers, profiteers, business-as-usual followers, and a few misleaders of labor, such as John L. Lewis. This disruptive activity has led to such disastrous actions as the recent race riots in Detroit, Mich., Beaumont, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif., which threaten the effectice unity of the Nation to win the war. "Business as usual" has resulted in a serious condition in our war-production program, as was indicated by Under Secretary of War Patterson, who last week reported to the Nation that production was 5½ percent behind schedule and that this would inevitably result in the needless loss of American lives on the battle

front. It is also evident from the report of the Kilgore committee of the Senate, which points out the very serious shortcomings on the home front.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

URGENCY DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgency deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, further disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5 and further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 60 and 61, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the other body when this came up there was a prolonged discussion about the right of a legislative body to take people off the rolls. Just so that the House and the country may know what the other body thought of the right to do this sort of thing, I desire to read a paragraph from S. 575, which passed the Senate on June 14. The paragraph is as follows:

Page 2, line 9: "No person shall hold any such office or position after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office or position who was not so appointed"—

That is, with confirmation by the Senate—

"may continue to hold such office or position until his successor is appointed or qualified, or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if nomination for the appointment to such office or position has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943."

The Senate passed that bill which threw everyone off the rolls who had not been confirmed by the Senate and who received a salary of over $4,500 a year, on the 14th of June by a vote of 42 to 29—just exactly the same proposition that the House presented in H. R. 2714.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a report and statement on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Public Lands may be permitted to sit today during the general debate on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, July 2, 1943, after the legislative program of the day and any other special orders, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (Rept. No. 602) to accompany House Resolution 262, authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to make an investigation of the plans for the improvement of the Columbia River, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make an investigation of the plans for the improvement of the Columbia River and its tributaries for utilization of its waters for reclamation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power generation, and the cost and effect of proposed water storage in Lake Pend Oreille in the State of Idaho.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2869), to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2869, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], is recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 1½ hours.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill involves matters that have been before the House in one way or another for quite some time. I assume that Members of the House understand the issues that will arise in the discussion of the legislation and that Members know already how they stand on these issues. So, for the present, I am going to undertake to explain the provisions of the bill briefly.

Section 1 of the bill provides for a change in the manner of accounting which the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make annually. Heretofore the calculation has been for the appraisal of commodities on hand, including not more than 1 year carrying charges on the assets of the corporation or the average market price of the assets for a period of 12 months. Under the present bill the calculation would bring the accounting down to date, so that the appraisal of assets would be for the average market price during the last 30 days' period of the fiscal year, or the cost of the assets whichever is lower.

The Corporation desires that change because it is their view that such an accounting would present to the Congress and to the country a more accurate disclosure of their assets and liabilities and that it would complete their transactions down to the end of the fiscal year. There is no objection on the part of members of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to that provision of the bill.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the borrowing capacity of the Corporation in the amount of $500,000,000. I have here an extended statement, prepared by the Corporation, showing their liabilities and assets along with the estimates which they have made of the requirements for carrying out their program for the next fiscal year.

The officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation submitted a proposal for an increase of a billion dollars, but the Committee on Banking and Currency felt that we should hold down the authorization, as far as might be safely done, and we think that we can be reasonably assured that the work of the Corporation, as it will be curtailed under the provisions of the bill before us, will not be endangered in any way by reducing the amount from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000.

Section 3 of the bill provides for the extension of the life of the Corporation.

Under existing law the life of the Corporation would terminate at the end of the present fiscal year. The bill provides for an extension for a period of 2 years from the end of this fiscal year. There are certain responsibilities imposed upon the Corporation that will run for years longer, but it was thought that we might very well, for the moment, limit its life to an additional 2 years. That is section 3 of the bill. There was no omission in the committee on this provision.

Section 4 of the bill is not controversial. It would make the Federal Reserve banks fiscal agents of the Corporation.

Section 5 of the bill would amend the Federal Reserve Act so far as it places a limitation upon loans that may be made by Federal Reserve banks to executives of the banks, insofar as those loans are secured by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, is a Government corporation with provisions to secure the maintenance of its capital of $100,000,000 and with its obligations specifically guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States.

Section 6 of the bill deals with the much-discussed subject of subsidies. There will be an amendment proposed in the nature of a substitute for this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

This provision of the bill, as reported by the committee, would prevent the payment of subsidies to maintain prices for agricultural commodities or commodities processed in substantial part from agricultural commodities, below a price as high as the support price established by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or below the standards embodied in the Price Control Act, with the exception that wheat may be sold for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, and with the exception that adjustments may be made to bring about or maintain necessary relationship in the price of oils and fats required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

There is also a provision which makes this limitation effective after 60 days following the approval of the act as to agreements made by the Corporation prior to the approval of this act.

I think there is some confusion with respect to what necessarily are subsidies as involved in the activities of the Corporation.

It will be remembered that the Commodity Credit Corporation was established for the purpose of protecting the orderly marketing of products. Under those operations there was no handout to farmers. There was no subsidy in the true sense of the word. It was a business operation and I do not think anybody denies that it accomplished wonderful good, not alone for the farmers of the Nation, but in support of the entire national economy. Right here I wish to say that the management of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been commendable. Their business seems to have been conducted with remarkable success, and I think the country is fortunate in the manner in which this agency of the Government has been administered.

Legislation was enacted which required the Corporation to support farm prices on commodities which were not included in the original act, as basic commodities. There have been some losses on those operations.

As to the lending activities of the Corporation, they have operated at a substantial profit. The accounts, brought down to date and counting commodities at their market value would show more than $150,000,0000 profit on those operations.

I do not see how anybody can contend for a moment that those operations stand in the category of subsidies such as the case where, under the Price Control Act a price is fixed below the standard required in the act and then the Treasury required to make up the difference by handing somebody cash. There is a vast difference between the practice of supporting prices by the Corporation and taking money out of the Treasury to pay a citizen's grocery bill or to hand to a processor or a manufacturer to enable him to make a profit.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Will not the gentleman concede that the only difference between parity payments to the farmer, soil conservation payments to the farmer, and roll-back on consumer prices is that in the one case it helps the farmers and in the other case it helps the consumer?

Mr. STEAGALL. I suggest to the gentleman that he might more wisely direct his solicitude to the production of the food the consumers of the country are going to need to sustain their lives rather than quibble over such matters as indicated by the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it not clear that if we adopt this bill it will increase the food and fiber production of this country?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know that the people of this country are in danger of going hungry, but the best advices we can get from all sources indicate that there is a possibility of a serious food shortage in the United States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will this help the situation?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what it is intended to do and what we hope it will do.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One further question if the gentleman will permit. I understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] to say that we have a loss on the corporation's operations at this time of about $144,000,000. Am I correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But I understood the distinguished chairman of the committee to state that we have a profit of $150,000,000. How are these two statements to be reconciled?

Mr. STEAGALL. What I said was that under the lending powers of the corporation their accounts at this time would show a profit of more than $150,000,000 calculating their accounts, which is provided for by existing law by counting their commodities at market value. That was the statement I made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In referring to subsidies and their vicious effect on prices and production, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to the House the vicious subsidies, if any, that have been indulged in by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. STEAGALL. The Commodity Credit Corporation down to this time has not engaged in any considerable service of that kind, and the losses are not enormous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. In connection with subsidies, is it not a fact that the principal subsidy we have in this country is as old as the country itself? That is the tariff.

Mr. STEAGALL. There have been subsidies in numerous instances. That has been referred to here. But there is not any subsidy in undertaking to protect the farmers of the country in the orderly marketing of their products, and that is what the Commodity Credit Corporation was established for. We have passed laws for the protection of labor; we have recognized the obligation of government to see that those engaged in the manufacture of the essentials of war make a profit. We pulled the bridle off the O. P. A. Act so far as organized labor was concerned. Wages were allowed to soar. Meantime, there was specific authorization for the control of prices of farm commodities. Everybody understands that the way to get production is to pay fair prices. Laborers on the farms have been attracted by higher wages elsewhere, paralyzing the production of necessary food and other products—everybody understands that. Certainly no man can make any serious pretense of opposing inflation if he proposes to have the Government borrow money and incur an increase in the bonded debt of the Nation in order to pay the grocery bills for people whose salaries and wages are at levels never known before in the history of the country.

One other provision of the bill I wish to discuss briefly. We have conferred upon the Food Administrator, by this bill, the authority to increase price ceilings or maximum prices established by

the O. P. A. Administrator, if found necessary by the Food Administrator, to increase production essential to the conduct of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I think that covers briefly the provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this bill seems to be highly controversial. It is made controversial by the attempt of some to interpret existing law differently than what some of us believed to have been the original intent of Congress. Although the bill is controversial in at least one respect it is a subject which I think with a little explanation can be readily understood. In order to understand it we have got to approach it from a little broader viewpoint than some of us have had in the past few weeks. We have been seemingly hopelessly enmeshed in a labyrinth of conflicting thought in respect to subsidies, and inasmuch as the most controversial feature of this bill has to do with the subject of subsidies I intend to devote most of my time to that subject.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point before he gets further in the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the issue in this bill revolve around section 6 whether or not the increased cost of processing farm commodities should be passed on to the ultimate consumer or whether a portion of it should be borne by the Government?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is correct in that observation.

We have on several occasions authorized subsidies to encourage the production of food and strategic and critical materials which have been essential to the war effort, still are and will continue to be essential to bring this war to a victorious conclusion. So we have had to be very careful to distinguish between the subsidies which would promote the production of food and essential critical materials and this other entirely new philosophy of subsidies which contemplates that the Federal Government obligate itself to pay at least a part of the grocery bill for all of the people of the Nation without regard to a person's ability to pay his own grocery bill.

In this connection, and in order to crystallize the issue as to whether the American people today might not be in a better position to pay their food bill than ever before in the history of this country, I want to read one sentence from the last report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture in which, in summarizing their findings, it is said:

> The total cost to consumers of fixed quantities of food making up a typical consumer's food basket was smaller in relation to average consumer income in recent months than at any other time on record.

That is not amazing because we know that consumer purchasing power has been increasing by leaps and bounds. What do we do when we subsidize for the purpose of providing that the Government shall pay the grocery bill of the Nation? I have already differentiated between the two classes of subsidies. In order to prevent inflation because of this ever increasing purchasing power, which is a constant and increasing threat to inflation, it is found desirable to siphon off a large part of this purchasing power. When the tax bill was before the House we were warned that if we did not adopt that tax bill and perhaps more drastic tax bills in the future the national income would constitute such a pressure against the inflation ceiling that within a very few months we would break through and inflation could not be controlled.

The only way that we can siphon off this purchasing power so that there will not continue to be this constant threat to inflation is, first, by taxation, and, second, by the sale of bonds to individuals who will hold those bonds. If we subsidize the consuming public out of the Federal Treasury we increase the pressure which results in inflation proportionately as we raise the money to pay for the subsidy. The only way we can raise the money to pay for the subsidy is by bonding or, as I said, paying taxes, raising taxes, but we have got to raise this money immediately by bonding.

We sell our bonds. We sell those bonds wherever we find a market for them and if the market for those bonds was wholly or largely in private investment there would not be too much danger of inflation; but, unfortunately, the public is not responding to our bond programs to the point where there is much encouragement that we can stop inflation by siphoning off purchasing power through the sale of bonds. In the last drive which was a tremendous success, the goal was $15,000,000,000 of bonds to be sold. We actually sold $18,000,000,000 in bonds.

We sold $3,000,000,000 in bonds more than our goal. But the program called for the sale of something over $5,000,000,000 of bonds to private individuals, and in that respect the drive was a lamentable failure because private individuals bought less than $3,000,000,000 worth. So, although we went over three billion beyond our goal, we sold only $3,000,000,000 to private individuals. The rest of the bonds were sold to commercial banks, investment syndicates, to insurance companies, corporations, and so forth.

Now, the bonds which are bought up by commercial banks constitute the primary danger of inflation and the commercial banks are increasingly becoming more important than any other element in the sale of bonds for the reason that from now on it is expected that the commercial banks will have to take much larger amounts of these Government issues. What do the commercial banks do with these bonds? They put them up as collateral security for the issuance of currency, they take that currency and buy more bonds, they take those bonds and use them as collateral for more currency to the point where the volume of circulating media has increased from about $5,000,000,000 to over $16,000,000,000 in the last few years. Let us not fool ourselves at all. So long as the commercial banks can convert Government holdings into cash, we are going to have cash enough to prosecute the war.

Mr. Eccles, appearing before our committee, said that the amount of currency which could be issued on the basis of existing gold and bond holdings was so large that he would not even hazard a guess on any limitation. I put the question to him: Would you think that on the basis of present bond holdings and gold holdings the banks could issue $500,000,000,000 in currency? He said, "Oh, yes; at least that." Of course, that constitutes inflation. Every time we increase the facilities for the depreciating of our currency we contribute to inflation.

Is there an individual in the United States today who wants his boy and his girl—and whether that boy or girl is in the armed forces or not is not too material—I repeat, is there a man or a woman in the United States today who wants to obligate his son or his daughter to pay this month's grocery bill for him? When you subsidize the grocery bill of the Nation such as is contemplated, such as will be done unless we pass remedial legislation, you are passing on to posterity the grocery bill which you should pay today out of the largest national income that this Nation has ever had.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot at the moment. I anticipate what the gentleman is going to say, and I hope he will cover the subject. I trust I can yield to him later on.

Mr. Chairman, as I read section 6 of the bill I do not think as it is now written it stops the payment of subsidies to the consuming public. Before I get into that I want to say just a word in respect to the position in which labor finds itself in this subsidy program.

Starting next July 1 every man and woman who has a pay check or pay envelope is going to have deducted from that pay check or that pay envelope up to 20 percent of his income. That is based upon present commitments and the present Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

It has been suggested that to stabilize the prices to the ultimate consumer we increase the national debt by not less than $2,000,000,000. This means that if it is carried through—I am now referring to the statements made by Mr. Green before the Senate committee, not the statements made in the hearings—$2,000,000,000 is the initial amount. Next year it might

be $5,000,000,000 if prices are allowed to continue to go up. It might be $10,000,000,000.

When organized labor, or all labor, anybody that works for a living who gets a pay envelope or a pay check, has 21 percent of his income deducted from his salary instead of 20 percent, is he not going to come to us and say, "Well, was not that a nice thing that you fellows did. You paid subsidies out of the Federal Treasury. You made me think that I was paying less for my food than I would otherwise, and all you did was turn around and take what I would have paid my corner groceryman last month, and you took it out of my salary and paid it into the Treasury which in turn paid it to the corner groceryman." That is what he is going to say to you. And when that is done, you are going to have a terrible time explaining to him that in addition to taking this dollar more out of his pay envelope and giving it to the Treasury to give to the corner groceryman he has had added to the national debt represented by subsidies 4 percent per year, because the carrying charge on our national debt and the carrying charge on this money which must be raised to pay these subsidies is just one little small fraction of 1 cent less than 4 cents per dollar a year. If you can look into the future 25 years, then the subsidies will increase by 100 percent the cost to the ultimate consumer instead of his paying it out of his pocket today when he can afford to pay it.

The point, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. At a time when we can afford to do it, when we are telling the people of this Nation that this generation should pay its proportionate share of this war, yes, more than its proportionate share for carrying on this war—and upon that premise we have predicated our tax proposals—we deny it, and we pass on to posterity, even to the third and fourth generation, a grocery bill which you can better afford to pay today than could any of your forefathers.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman tell me how the great unorganized middle class of America, excluding the farmers, whose income has not increased at all except possibly 2 or 3 percent, can pay their food bill, which has increased since January of 1941, 40 percent? Where have they got the surplus money about which the gentleman is talking?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman's figures and the figures of the Bureau of Economics of the Department of Agriculture are not the same. I think I will accept the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is an official report and the only one which I think comes from an official source, rather than the statement that the food bill of the Nation has gone up 40 percent.

Mr. BARRY. How high has it gone?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It might have gone up 40 percent in relation to income of 5 years ago, but based upon national income today, which is 40 percent, yes, 50 percent higher, because the national income was only $90,000,000,000 4 years ago and today it is $145,000,000,000, it has not gone up that much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate in answer to the gentleman that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says that the total cost to the consumer of fixed quantities of foods making up a typical consumer's food basket was smaller in relation to the average consumer income in recent months than in any other time on record.

Mr. BARRY. I am asking the gentleman where the middle class got its purchasing power about which he is talking. They do not have it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The total purchasing power has gone up.

Mr. BARRY. Not for the middle class, but for the farmers and the laborers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He has to pay the taxes just the same, does he not?

Mr. BARRY. Certainly he does.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right; why should the middle class pay your food bill, your grocery bill, or the grocery bill of the man who is getting $2 an hour when he used to work for 50 cents an hour?

Mr. BARRY. Everybody pays taxes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In respect to the amendment which I propose to offer, I might say at the outset that the amendment preserves all subsidies, incentive payments, support prices, and everything else which we have provided for in any law. It does prevent the payment of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government for the reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices that have been or may hereafter be ordered. It does prevent their being used as a substitute for or in lieu of an increase in maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, and it does prevent the use of subsidies to maintain any maximum prices already or hereafter established. In substance, it prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from paying your grocery bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. On the point the gentleman just mentioned, would the gentleman's amendment in any way disturb the set-up which has been in operation for some time which encourages the production of strategic minerals essential to the war effort?

Mr. WOLCOTT. None whatsoever. We have been very, very careful to preserve the subsidy provisions in the Price Control Act in respect to the subsidies on critical and strategic materials and even on food for the purpose of maintaining maximum production for the war effort.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the bill in its present form handicap the normal operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not in the least.

Mr. COOLEY. What I have in mind is that the Commodity Credit Corporation was built upon the basis of buying and selling at a loss. I think it has rendered a very valuable service. Will the normal operations of the past be handicapped in any way by this proposal?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the operations continue as they have in the past to encourage the maximum production of foodstuffs, it will not interfere with them at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I ask the gentleman as to the effect of his amendment upon the commitments that have been made for the production and processing of canned vegetables? The gentleman knows that the Department of Agriculture increased the price the processor had to pay the farmer for peas, corn, and a couple of other vegetables.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I provide in the amendment that they may use these moneys to take care of these commitments which have accrued prior to the effective date of the act. The word "accrued" means "come into existence as an enforceable claim," and any claim which has been established and can be enforced on express commitments is an accrued claim and may be paid, but after the effective date of the act I presume prices will have to go up to absorb those differentials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

TARIFF FIRST SUBSIDY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I am opposed to subsidies. There are exceptions to almost all rules. Subsidies, however, are as old as the Government itself. I believe that it is a true statement of fact that the first general bill to pass the Congress of the United States more than 150 years ago was a protective tariff bill, which was a subsidy. We have had a subsidy ever since. The most enormous subsidy is the protective tariff. We have subsidized the merchant marine, and we have subsidized the Post Office Department, and practically every retirement fund in our Government is subsidized directly or indirectly by the United States Government. We have all approved subsidies in one form or another. It is very interesting to try to lay down a pattern by rule that will say, "Now, I favor certain types of subsidies,

but there are other types of subsidies that I am against." The distinguished and able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has endeavored to lay down a rule to the effect that he is in favor of subsidies that are essentially in the war effort, but he is strictly opposed to subsidies that are not essential to the war effort. If you will take the gentleman's amendment and read it carefully, you will discover that he does not confine it to that. The object in bringing this out is to show that we are not always consistent. We cannot expect to be consistent always, because circumstances alter cases, and conditions and facts that enter into these things cause us to change our minds, or deviate from any rule we endeavor to establish.

The gentleman refers to a subsidy in aid of the war effort. I hope the gentleman will listen to this. The petroleum subsidy which saved the people of New England $140,000,000 last winter—and I am glad that they were saved that much money—is that in aid of the war effort? Certainly not. Of course, the oil that went to the Atlantic seaboard, which went overseas to the war, was in aid of the war effort, and, according to the gentleman's standards the subsidy would be justified, but with the oil that went to thousands and hundreds of thousands of homes in New England, to homes where he says the people are better able to pay than ever before in the history of the country, that was not in the war effort, and he says why not let them pay the bill. That is not exactly in the war effort.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman where it is in the war interest.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; I said in the war effort.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that the Government has taken over boats and thus made it necessary to transport a lot of coal and oil under a higher cost of transportation, and the Government is paying the difference.

Mr. PATMAN. The Government is paying it, but it does not come within the gentleman's definition. He says in aid of the war effort, but these people are able to pay this increased price according to his statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If it were not for the war effort the expense would not be there.

Mr. PATMAN. What about sugar, and what about all those others items, and what about coal? Coal was not sent through pipe lines.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the same thing applies. Coal came by barge, because of the lower cost of transportation, and now it has to be transported by rail. It costs several dollars more a ton.

Mr. PATMAN. Forty million dollars was saved on coal which was transported by the railroads, and under the same conditions as before the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Except much of it went by water before and now it goes by rail. I want to bring these things to the attention of the gentleman so he will have his facts correct.

Mr. PATMAN. I am really interested in the gentleman's attempted definition of a subsidy. If that amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is a clarifying amendment, I just cannot understand any amendment. I wish the gentleman would read it, and if he can understand it, I wish he would give me his understanding of it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would make it clear that this Congress has never had an opportunity to vote on either the oil or the coal subsidy, that the oil subsidy was brought before our committee in a bill, and there was live opposition to it, in the committee, and the bill was withdrawn, and the subsidy was paid, without any action by Congress, by the R. F. C. I have never had a chance to vote on an oil or a coal subsidy.

Mr. PATMAN. And the gentlewoman has never heard of a single kick about it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Oh, yes; I kicked about it.

Mr. PATMAN. From the Members on the gentlewoman's side.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman ought to remember that I kicked about it and objected to paying the oil bills of people on Park Avenue, though I did not object to paying them over on the East Side.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not surprised at the gentlewoman's statement. She is usually consistent. What about milk and the milk subsidy? Is that in aid of the war effort, subsidizing milk in Boston and New York City? Where does the gentleman find that in aid of the war effort? There is no attempt to stop that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did the Congress pass upon subsidies for milk, or did some bureaucrat pass upon that?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it is a bureaucrat if it is wrong or against the gentleman's wishes, but it is all right if it meets with his approval. The same authority that put the coal subsidy into effect put the milk subsidy into effect, and under existing law they have the power to do it. That is under a law that this Congress passed.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I mentioned one that the Congress did approve. The lend-lease program is a subsidy.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is a subsidy. But if we try to distinguish between subsidies we will have a very difficult time doing it. I see in this, in some subsidies, help to the farmer. All of us agree that some subsidies are good. Since we agree that some subsidies are good, such as on copper and different metals, cheese, milk, coal, and different things like that, and we approve them, we agree that there are some things where a subsidy is in the interest of the people. Since we know that and we agree to it, why should we hamstring the executive department and say "You cannot, under any circumstances or conditions, use a subsidy in the case of agriculture"? Why is agriculture to be picked out as the only segment of our population where there will be no deviation from the rule, regardless of the facts and circumstances or conditions? Just think that over.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Are not soil conservation and parity payments subsidies?

Mr. PATMAN. Soil conservation is not, because they work for that. Parity payments are no more a subsidy than putting a floor under labor. It is in the same category exactly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that in the days of the depression and prior thereto corn and wheat and other products were subsidized?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I would not figure 8-cent corn under Mr. Hoover during the depression a subsidy; or 4-cent cotton.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It was exactly because of that condition the Congress went along with a subsidy.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think it is a little farfetched. When people work on a farm for 5 or 10 cents an hour, and even at the prices they are getting now they do not make 25 cents an hour, for the hardest kind of stooping and bending work that anyone can possibly do, under adverse weather conditions, day and night and at all other times.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me. I have always been in favor of measures guaranteeing the farmer a decent living. I have always voted in this House to help them get it.

TAX BILL A REPUBLICAN BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Let me talk to you about something that is more serious about this clarifying amendment, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will give his attention to this. Much has been said by our good friends on the Republican side—and I do not say this in a partisan sense—that they could do much better running this war and running our domestic Government if they just had charge of it. There is one bill that passed the Congress a while back that is a Republican bill—strictly, solely and purely a Republican bill. That was the tax bill. The Republicans wrote that bill. They are entitled to the credit, and I am willing to give them credit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that is not a correct statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Why, it could not have passed without your support.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The compromise which passed came from a

distinguished Senator, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, in placing the monkey around on different backs, I am sure the gentleman would like to put it on somebody else's back, but the fact remains that the gentleman boasted he got his amendment, substantially his amendment, written into the law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No. The gentleman never boasts.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not mean it in any offensive sense at all.

WITHHOLDING TAX ON POOR NECESSARY TO PAY FORGIVENESS TO WAR MILLIONAIRES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knew that our amendment was rejected by this House on three occasions. There was the one part of the tax bill which the people will object to rather strenuously is the proposal by the Treasury Department, which was supported by the Democrats, and that is the withholding part of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. You had to have the withholding tax to pay what you were forgiving the war millionaires. We forgave, under that bill, the millionaires seven or eight billion dollars, and you had to put this 20 percent withholding tax on in order to pay that. So on July 1, when that tax bill goes into effect, it can be pointed to as an example of legislative clarity on the part of our Republican friends. I am perfectly willing for them to have it.

INFLATION

Now, I want to talk to you about something that is more serious than subsidies, and that is inflation. Inflation is something that we often talk about but do not do much about. In 1930 and 1932 and along in there, a few of us were attempting to pay the veterans of World War No. 1 $2,000,000,000 in new money. We were told that that would absolutely ruin the country. It would take a carload of greenbacks to buy even a package of cigarettes if we passed any such bill as that. Remember, that was in the depths of the depression when we had less than $5,000,000,000 in circulation, and there was hunger everywhere. Yet $2,000,000,000 would ruin the country. Here we have $17,500,000,000 in circulation today, in the pockets and tills of the people, and we have over $100,000,000,000 in circulation generally, yet we are seemingly not alarmed or disturbed about inflation. I cannot understand it. But may I invite your attention to the fact that if something is not done, and done soon, we are going to face the most serious inflation that any country on earth ever faced.

The kind of inflation that will probably take a wheelbarrow load of printing-press money to buy just a common, ordinary-sized loaf of bread. It can happen here. It has happened in other countries.

HOW TO STOP INFLATION

Now, how are we going to stop inflation? We must give the Executive the power to stop it. Subsidy, he says, is one way to hold down inflation. That is what we are told. We admit subsidies in some cases are good. So why say that subsidies are not good in the case of agricultural commodities?

Let us leave it to the Executive and he can pick out certain cases where a subsidy is good in the public interest; let him pick the one; give him the right to change subsidies so he can handle it.

But let me tell you where Congress is to blame. All of us right here are to blame for this. The only effective way you can stop inflation is to syphon off purchasing power so that the people will not have the money to be in competition with one another to buy the limited supply of goods that will be available.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish my statement and then I will yield.

That is one of the ways it can be done. That is one method; Canada used it, and that is the reason they can point with pride to the fact that they only have a dozen or two in Canada, and in England only 100 or 200 people enforcing price control, whereas here we have several thousand people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. May I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. But the difference is that in England and in Canada price control is easy because they have taken so much more money away from the people that they do not have the competition for their goods. Now, with reference to the action of Congress in 1942 and 1943 on taxes: Will you listen to this astounding, startling statement, that the people in Canada and the individual income taxpayers in England will pay 300 percent more taxes for these two years than will be paid by the taxpayers in the United States, and yet we talk about doing something to stop inflation. We are not as a Congress doing anything to stop inflation. Not only are we not siphoning off the taxes that would make price control easier, but when the O. P. A. bill comes up here—the only agency that has been established with arbitrary powers to fix prices, when under the law of supply and demand they would get out of hand, and there comes a time when we must use arbitrary power—when the O. P. A. law was here for amendment we crippled it, and we hurt it, rendered it just as useless as we could by cutting a substantial amount of its appropriation.

So, we are not only doing nothing to stop inflation in an effective way, but the only agency that we have established with the duty of holding down prices we take advantage of at every opportunity to cripple and harm when it wants to hold down prices.

Not only that, when the O. W. I. bill came up here the other day—and I do not agree with everything the domestic division of the O. W. I. has done, of course, but generally they are charged with the duty of giving the people of America the facts concerning this war. This Congress and the people, before it was established, did not have the facts. We had one Cabinet officer saying one thing and another Cabinet officer saying another, but the O. W. I. must coordinate these different statements, must gather the news and must act as a news-giving agency, and give to the people of the United States the truth. The O. W. I. is charged with the duty of warning the people what the dangers of inflation are. They have one of the finest methods ever heard of; it is well planned, over the radio, newspapers, and through different means of communication.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman intend to yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment.

Yet, when the appropriation came up here we passed an amendment to absolutely destroy, put out of business, the domestic provision of the O. W. I. and yet we say we are against inflation. The record of this Congress will show that we have taken advantage of every opportunity to cripple the agencies set up for the purpose of curbing inflation in addition to failing to pass tax laws that would siphon off excess purchasing power.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Does the gentleman feel that the paying of a subsidy will add more money to the already enlarged public purse, and would that aid or retard inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, of course, if you look at it in the narrower way—the answer could be no, but I cannot agree that there is nothing else to it.

I do not know, but there are a lot of things subsidies will work on and some things it will not work on. The point I am making is that when we do not know, and since we cannot change the law quickly, because it takes time to change laws, let us leave it to the Executive, since he can, by a flick of the pen, if you please, make the change and if he makes a mistake it can be changed quickly.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I agree heartily with the point the gentleman has made, that no serious effort has been put forth to curb inflation. Does not the gentleman think that if we roll back prices without rolling back purchasing power and wages we are simply going to widen the inflationary gap instead of contracting it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the issue is: Hold the line; that is the object and aim. I may say to the gentleman that the total aggregate of all wages and services for last year was about $100,000,000,000. Now, if we increase prices here and there, if we permit an increase in wages and salaries, which we will have to, of only 10 percent that means $10,000,000,000 extra. Compare that with $500,000,000 paid in subsidies; and, as the gentleman from

Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] often points out, the cost of the war appropriated or authorized to date has been $220,000,000,000. Ten percent of that would be $22,000,000,000. Compare that with $2,000,000,000 paid in subsidies to prevent that increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt about it, there is a battle royal on; there is a war between the administration and the Congress, and it may be a serious war. It is difficult for some of us at times to know exactly the cause of a war. I read recently of a man who said he was perfectly satisfied with the Trojan War because he knew what it was about: It was about a woman. I wish this were as clear as that, but it is not. This is a case where the farmers want adjustment by higher prices and the administration wants prices adjusted by subsidies for the benefit of the consumer. It is a clear case where the administration has violated the Price Control Act as passed by the Congress.

I have read with patience the entire debate in the other body the past 2 days. It really took a good deal of patience to do it. One whole afternoon was taken up by practically two Members of the body. They were very thorough. Interesting, indeed, were their conclusions: One Senator claimed that the act had been violated by the roll-back plan. There was no doubt about it in his mind, but as the President had consulted his Attorney General, and, as the Attorney General had given him a favorable interpretation of the law, he had obtained his objective by proper channels. So the Senator asked: "What can we do about it? We must carry out the commitments already made." The Wolcott amendment contains the word "accrued." Accrued, in the minds of many, includes promises made. These promises may cover an entire year of subsidy payments. What do we know about that feature of the price-control bill, "strategic materials"? Seemingly, meat and butter were suddenly thought to be strategic for carrying on the war effort, so under that surprising decision the R. F. C. was called upon to pay subsidies to lower the price to the consumer some 10 percent.

Where did the R. F. C. get that instruction? Through the Economic Stabilizer appointed by the President. I want to show you how they are kicking us around with our own feet, so to speak. They appoint Jimmy Byrnes, Marvin Jones, and Fred Vinson, great friends of ours whom we so highly respect, to tell their old friends what the administration says we should do. Great shrewdness has been shown in those appointments. Will they be persuasive with us to the degree expected?

What has brought all this trouble about? Let us further examine into this. Unquestionably, it has been brought about by the President's war with John L. Lewis. It is not about a woman, it is about John L. Lewis. It seems that John L. Lewis could have no argument if the hold-the-line order was successful. That was why the order was issued. Having issued it, he must stand by it. Also, today you and I are impatiently awaiting word as to the signing of the antistrike bill. Evidently the President hesitates, lest Lewis have something more to complain about; and if he can hold the line on prices, no matter about the method, even though against the direct action of Congress, what does it matter as long as John L. Lewis can be deprived of an argument for higher wages?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering if the gentleman had some special knowledge which led him to say that he was awaiting the signing of the bill? For some of us have felt that more likely we were awaiting the veto of the bill. Does the gentleman have any special knowledge?

Mr. GIFFORD. I suppose I expressed the hope, the hope that is in my heart; and, of course, that hope is not that he will veto that bill because I know the roar of anger that will go up over this Nation if he should veto the bill, if you want to put it that way. Is the gentleman hoping he will veto the bill?

Mr. CASE. No; I am not hoping he will veto the bill, but we have waited quite awhile; we have hoped that he would sign it, but hope deferred 10 days sometimes maketh the heart sick.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, he seems to have tried to put off acting on the bill until the coal strike was adjusted. Our country is having to suffer much because of the antagonism between those two very determined men. I made the comment that Jimmy Byrnes, Marvin Jones, and our friend Vinson now hold the line for the administration. Why were those people selected? They were selected, of course, because it was thought they could deal with us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. In just a moment.

We cannot hear of a decision given by our friend the Economic Stabilizer without hearing the sound of his master's feet after him.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The object of the hold-the-line order, as I understand it, is to hold down both prices and wages. Does the gentleman favor that or disapprove of it?

Mr. GIFFORD. As you have stated just a moment ago, every rule has its exception. The gentleman knows that this hold-the-line order was given that John L. Lewis would not be able to claim that the cost of living had gone up. Official statistics show that wages have increased 40 percent and the cost of living 24 percent during the last 2 years. I am one of those responsible and must now look at the result of our handiwork in reporting the O. P. A. Act. I helped set it up. Sometimes I feel ashamed of my handiwork. Many men of little or no talent have been appointed to carry its provisions out. I have read that if men were assigned according to their talents during these days the cows would be much better tended. Because of inefficiency and foolish regulations, I have had much trouble to justify this agency of the Government.

A Member of the other body, in spite of the fact he claims roll-back subsidies to be illegal, is offering an amendment on the floor of that body to grant $500,000,000 for the R. F. C. and $175,000,000 for the C. C. C. to carry on because of the commitments possibly already made. I hope I am making this point clear that if the butter and meat subsidies keep up for a year they will, of course, need that money. But, have they committed themselves for a year? Undoubtedly not. Neither does his amendment specify those particular items. Next month they might stop these particular subsidies, they then might have nearly the whole $500,000,000 to use for some other payments they may want to try out where there was at that particular moment a feeling on the part of the public that they were being afflicted with too high a price. It is desired to make the consumer appreciate the bounty of his Government and to love this administration.

Probably there will arise a difficult situation. When this bill goes to conference, no matter what it contains, it is coming back to us from conference and then we must decide whether it will be $500,000,000 plus $175,000,000 or whether it will be the Wolcott amendment which will probably be placed in the bill today in place of section 6. Consumer subsidies once embarked upon would soon run into billions of dollars. Beware of the first step on that road.

The farmers need a little higher price for their milk. I want them to have perhaps 1 cent more a quart for their product. I thought when we set up the Office of Price Administration that when they found it necessary to protect our supply of milk they would raise the price a little and hold it on that point. That would have but little effect on the cost of living.

During the last war the cost of living went up 100 percent. Under present conditions of price control and rationing our cost of living will not go up over 10 percent a year. It will have to go up 10 percent a year for 5 years before the cost of living would go up 50 percent, yet they are bringing in the bogey of inflation when these little and necessary adjustments need to be made. But the "hold the line order" must be invoked lest John L. Lewis have cause to complain of higher prices. Lewis is a great general, his troops follow him and he must be defeated.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman from Massachusetts has given us the facts with regard to the difference in the increase in the cost of living during the First World War and this war. Will the gentleman now give us the difference in the cost of labor in those days and today? In that way we can get some idea whether or not the laboring man is

in as favorable a position now as he was at that other time.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have not those figures. Has the gentleman those facts?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I do not. I will be very happy if he will do so.

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot imagine that the labor costs increased as fast during the last war as during this one.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I understand they have not.

Mr. GIFFORD. When I look at the civil-service records and see $6 a day and $9 a day for doing very ordinary work, when I see our restaurants, our laundries denuded of help because of such high prices paid, as my memory serves me, that did not happen to such a degree during the last World War. But the point I wanted to make was the matter of inflation being brought in when slight changes in price schedules are contemplated.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe it was the gentleman's contention a few minutes ago that because the cost of living went up 1 percent a month, and I think it is closer to 1½ percent, it would only go up 12 percent a year. Does not the gentleman agree that if you have an increase in the cost of living followed by an increase in wages the spiral of inflation increases at a far more accelerated rapidity and there might be as much as 50 percent a year if some efforts were not made to control it?

Mr. GIFFORD. No. The present method of holding down prices on the whole has worked. We have generally held to the prices of last March 15. May I again say to the gentleman from Texas I hope that rule will stand many exceptions. I have one lone individual in mind who had to have 10 percent added to his price in September because his costs went up. It was from October until the following April before that one individual, hiring no help, could be allowed that 10 cents to continue his small business. Of course, they finally granted his request, but it took months and months to get an answer. That is what we have been up against, the inefficiency, the inability of obtaining decisions, and so few in authority to really act. That is what has made our people hate the O. P. A. the way they do. How different the attitude of the public if this Price Control Act had been wisely and efficiently administered. Today we must protect the act from the whims of the administration itself.

We have surely held down the cost of living, except perhaps, as to some agricultural products which are now being considered in this bill. We are legislating today only relating to those products. Clothing and other articles may still have to be rationed, and the rationing system has apparently worked pretty well.

In fact our fortune seems to have been that we have held too many prices so low that we now realize that we may have stifled the incentive to produce and lack of production is far worse than paying slightly higher prices.

When we try to roll back prices, we do not help the farmer, but rather the consumer. Rationing must follow any scarcity of products and we are fast learning that it is something to be avoided if possible.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. The gentleman interrupts my line of thought, but perhaps it is well for him to do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sorry.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; I think the gentleman may help me. He always does.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. When the gentleman considers the 20 percent withholding tax——

Mr. GIFFORD. It is not 20 percent if you have a half a dozen kiddies and have a lot of exemptions.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman realizes that the average salary or wage of the consuming public is about $2,500 a year. With a withholding tax of 20 percent and with prices going up, just what is going to happen to the average American family unless we have a roll-back of prices?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman knows perfectly well they have to pay that tax sometime. If they do not withhold it now they pay it later. What difference does it make? Why give me that argument? Taxes have to be paid later.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Granting that to be true, it does not change the situation.

Mr. GIFFORD. He has to save the money to pay his taxes next year, whether he pays it now or not. The average family can pay these prices now, rather than be taxed more to make food largesses granted at this time.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Has it occurred to the gentleman that it does matter whether this job is done in one way or the other? If we indulge in more subsidies we must certainly have more of a bureaucracy with which to administer the same.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; a tremendous number of employees to be added.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It adds tremendously to the cost of doing the very thing that every one of us wants done.

Mr. GIFFORD. We should go at this like the man intending to build a house. "He sitteth down and counteth the cost lest he will no be able to finish it." I have not the exact biblical quotation. But that is the text I thought to take. We begin the subsidy business with what has already accrued or has been committed, start with $500,000,000, plus the $175,000,000, as may be suggested to us by the other body, and when that is spent what are you then going to do? Our people will get into the habit of taking largesses from the Government. Can we stop then better or easier than we can stop now? Soon it would be $2,000,000,000. It may be $4,000,000,000. There would soon be no end to this expense or to this questionable method.

This hour is the time when we must decide. How much has already accrued? To how much have we been committed? Beyond these amounts we should not go according to the Wolcott amendment. Do not let us surrender, as they seem apparently to do in another body, and grant a whole year of extension of this unwarranted roll-back expense on our Government. Let us count the cost in the beginning. Let us ask ourselves, "Will it encourage the farmer to produce more?" The answer is, "It encourages him to produce less, if anything." At this time we must act to induce him to produce more. If there is to be any subsidy paid, pay it to the farmer, as we really set out to do. We must eat even at higher prices. The O. P. A. was set up to grant reasonable prices and hold the line there. Why did they let some of the agricultural prices get out of hand and go way up above parity? It would seem that they are to blame for that. It may now be too late to try to roll them back. The farmer must receive his necessary price or he will not produce, and why roll back if proper prices prevail?

What has been the effect of the roll-back already? Why, it has been calamitous. The packers have closed their doors, black markets are everywhere. Why continue it? It has proven itself already as being absolutely inefficient.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman it has been calamitous already. The next question is, What good will it produce? If I understand the purpose back of the roll-back, it is to make lower prices for the consumer. My question is, Are not all of our people consumers and are they not all now taxpayers? Therefore, is it not just a question of robbing Peter to pay Paul?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. It has been pointed out that we can pay our grocery bill now, if ever. If there are 10 percent who are unable to pay, let us go back to the stamp system, as was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and let those people have the benefit by using that system. That would not be an unsafe sort of subsidy. But why subsidize me for my food when I am able to pay for it? As to those people who cannot, sometimes an individual must suffer when largely the whole people are benefitted. We understand that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Referring again to the packers, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] remarked that he did not care so much about the big packers, he was sorry that anything happened to the little packers, and that subsidies would help the little packers. The fact is that it is the little packers that are falling out all over the country and going out of business due to the roll-back because, while the big packers have lost,

they say, something like $30,000,000 on their inventories, they have glue, they have soap, and they have other by-products from which they can make money. But this roll-back has turned any number of small packers out of business.

Mr. GIFFORD. Let me remind the gentlewoman of something. They talk for the little packer and for the little man. They have acted the last few years for the big man, since the war came on. You realize that. They act like a certain rich widow we have read about: "She cries with one eye and laughs with the other."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I made a short talk on this bill on Tuesday, thinking at that time that the bill would be up on Wednesday. I undertook in that address to give the achievements and the history of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think I proved conclusively that it is desirable and necessary to extend the life of the Corporation for 2 years. Unless we extend it as provided in this bill, the life of the Corporation will expire on June 30 this year.

There is a provision in this bill to increase the borrowing capacity in the amount of $500,000,000.

Section 6 of the bill is controversial. That deals with subsidies. Regardless of whether section 6 is adopted as written or amended, I hope the Members of the House will vote for the bill so as to extend the life of the Corporation, and perhaps the objectionable features will be ironed out in conference. It certainly would be unfortunate not to extend the life of this agency.

In addition to what I said the other day I wish to state that this agency was organized to stabilize prices of basic agricultural commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice. Someone has intimated that this agency has not done so well. I wish to call your attention to the fact that this agency has made a profit of $50,000,000 on cotton which it had title to and sold in the last 10 years. The C. C. C. now has title to 3,200,000 bales of cotton, it has loans on 3,000,000 bales, and it has a profit now, at the present price of cotton, of $30 per bale on the 3,200,000 bales, so that if the Corporation were liquidated as of today, the entire profit on the stock now on hand would be approximately $96,000,000. On corn this agency has lost $42,000,000 up to the 30th of April, this year.

It has very little corn now, only about 10,000,000 bushels. On wheat it now has title to 300,000,000 bushels. The losses on wheat amount to $52,000,000. The loss on tobacco is about $2,000,000. Therefore, you see that the losses on corn, wheat, and tobacco are less than the profit we have on the 3,200,000 bales of cotton to which the C. C. C. now has title, and that is in addition to the $50,000,000 profit received on cotton it had title to and sold. The losses on wheat and corn are due to sales out of normal use and converted for feed purposes and for alcohol. I do not know of any other agency that has accomplished for the producer of agricultural commodities anything like what has been performed by this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Section 6 is controversial on account of subsidies. I doubt the wisdom of stopping subsidies that go direct to the farmer in order to produce necessary food to win this war. I doubt the wisdom of any subsidy known as a roll-back subsidy which does not go to the farmer. In order to have all of the production that is necessary to feed civilians and to feed the Army we ought to encourage the farmer. I think roll-back subsidy as a policy is not desirable as it does not help the farmer to produce more and to some extent is inflationary. I am afraid the tendency of roll-back subsidy would be to discourage production.

In the early stages of the operations of the Corporation the price of cotton was very low. I was kidded many times by friends from the North and a few from the West on the committee that we were carrying cotton at a loss of something over $200,000,000 for a year or two, and the remarks on the floor of the House in criticism of the policy of the Corporation were that we were helping the cotton farmers too much. In those years there was no loss on corn and wheat but as cotton does not deteriorate, and corn, wheat, and other commodities do, the Corporation was able to hold cotton. The price went up and the Corporation sustained no loss, and now many of the Members who opposed my fight for loans on cotton agree that I was right and the loan on cotton has saved practically all criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Representatives from the large cities should not object to subsidies being paid the cotton farmers. I still think the cotton farmer should have the profit, or some of the profit, made by the Corporation on the cotton it sold for a profit. At the same time I realize if it had not been for the C. C. C. holding cotton off the market the farmers would have suffered great loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, when, due to war conditions, it becomes necessary for the Government to disarrange and reconstruct the transportation facilities of our economy, to divide up the continent of the United States into sales areas and allocate in those areas to individual processors who have historically sold in other districts, we set in operation new economic forces that have to be dealt with directly or indirectly. So with respect to that, I can understand why someone advocates and someone supports the idea of having the Federal Government assume certain transportation charges. Again, when on account of war, strategic and critical materials are being produced in less quantities than the war effort calls for, and where all of the planned economy is operating with which we are now dealing, I can also understand how the Federal Government may at times come in and indicate to some particular producer who can increase his products, that the Government will pay above the market price, said market price being fixed by the Government agencies, provided that production is increased. Still again, when consumers' goods, both durable and nondurable, are disappearing from the market, due to the dollar flow which is increasing tremendously, the stream widening all of the time, and also to decreased production, and there is a disposition on the part of many and for economic reasons, to want to decrease the buying power, I cannot understand why people who claim to be intelligent will advocate a subsidy and the so-called roll-back theory and have the Federal Treasury actually pay a large percentage of the grocery bill of those who are receiving the benefits of the increased dollar flow, incident to war financing.

It seems to me that this House today will have to deal with that fundamental question. Furthermore, it is my firm belief that the introduction of subsidies into our economy on the plan that is recommended by the Chief Executive and the Administrator of O. P. A. is the most direct attempt to destroy our economy as it has developed over the last 150 years, that has yet been made. As a primary producer of foodstuffs, as one who is interested in manufacturing and processing of steel products as well as foodstuffs, as one who tries to be interested in transportation, I think that when we fully adopt the subsidy program, we serve notice on the economy of this country that it must cease to function as it has heretofore. On one lot of cattle which I have my manager says the market price has dropped $5,000 since we started the discussion on this roll-back price proposition. That is something the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] was talking about the other day. This subsidy program certainly will not induce me to increase production, but it does create in me a fear that there will be no chance whatsoever for my economy to survive because, through the application of subsidies, you destroy my market. That is what you do exactly. Now, if you want the most beautiful illustration on earth of some of this stuff, you analyze carefully the operations of F. D. A. in the little country of Puerto Rico and see what happened, where all the food is subsidized. You do not have to wait 20 years to see this thing in process. Go look at what has happened in the last 6 months. Do you want your importers, wholesale jobbers, wholesale merchants, and retail people to remain in business in this country? Do you want that kind of a distributing system for your people? Do you want your farmers and tradesmen to have a market in which to trade their goods and their wares and convert their effort in the

form of goods paid back to them in dollars with which they can go and trade with others?

If you want those things to continue, you had better not support this subsidy program. I am not discussing the inflationary aspects of it. I am talking about what it does to the markets of this country. If you have no market for beef cattle, you do not produce beef cattle. If you do not have any free market over which you can trade in stocks and bonds, you do not own stocks and bonds. If you have no cotton market, you do not grow cotton. The destruction of the market destroys the economic lifeblood of the people.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. What would you do? Let the law of supply and demand operate as against the law of self-preservation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I would not let the law of supply and demand operate. It is silly to talk about that with the planned economy that is now in operation. If you are going to let it do that, you have to go back to the bottom and erase all of this planned economic interference.

Mr. CELLER. But could you have a roll-back without subsidies?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why do you want the roll-back? Tell me why you want a roll-back.

Mr. CELLER. Because the workingman with a limited purse——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Which workingman?

Mr. CELLER. The workingman in my district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What kind of work does he do?

Mr. CELLER. He does all kinds of work.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If he participates in the war effort he is getting war wages and he can afford to pay these prices.

Mr. CELLER. The average wage scale in my district is $40 a week.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know what the average wage scale is. I am asking what is the man doing you are talking about? If you cannot answer that question, you cannot intelligently discuss the other question.

Mr. CELLER. He works in the navy yard, in defense and nondefense industries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then if working in war industry he is getting the pay and nobody knows that better than the gentleman from New York. The idea of the gentleman from New York asking the people of this country to subsidize the grocery bill of a man who works in a navy yard at today's wages! That is too silly to discuss.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think it is fair to say it is silly, because I would not characterize the gentleman's argument that way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You can characterize it any way you want to, because I know what wages are being paid on Army and Navy construction jobs and in those industries where armament, munitions, machine guns, and tanks, and planes are being built. The beginning wage rate in my town for war workers is around 89 cents an hour. I have about 26,000 organized workers in my area, and I am not going to stand here and advocate that the people of this country subsidize their grocery bills. Let them pay their own grocery bills out of the wages that the United States Treasury is paying them for the war work they perform.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not this talk of a roll-back a fraud on the very people that they are professing to undertake to help?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no question about that in my mind.

Mr. JENNINGS. You cannot get something for nothing in this world, and ultimately we pay for all we get.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We certainly do.

Mr. JENNINGS. They want to give it to them with their right hand and take it away with the left hand in taxes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you will look at the hearings you will find where I stated that the only real reason I can possibly figure out in connection with this particular roll-back program is to fix it so that whoever wants to do it can stand before his constituency in 1944 and say, "Now listen, boys, I had the subsidy put into operation so you would not have to pay so much for your grocery bill. You had better vote for me."

I do not have to campaign on that kind of stuff because I do not have to have a seat in this House, and if I have got to have that kind of palaver to elect me, my people can get somebody else to represent them on this floor, and they know what I mean by that. Let us pay our own grocery bills directly instead of through the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] 10 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a pretty difficult thing to come to the floor and argue the question of subsidy in a few minutes' time, to go into this matter to which I have given a considerable amount of study, to realize that I am going against the expressed wishes of many people in my district, because I come from a farming district. Yet I do not believe that I would be serving to the best of my ability and judgment if I stood here and through an oversimplification of the problem, oppose judicial and carefully spent subsidies.

I think if I could express in a few words my opinion, after study of this matter, I would put it in the words of Chester Davis, the War Food Administrator, when he appeared before our committee. I do not think any of us would accuse Mr. Davis of being a long-haired theorist. In fact, the Agricultural Committee has asked that he be put in charge of all farm programs, price and production, in the war effort.

Mr. Davis on page 23 of the hearings before our committee, said:

CHESTER DAVIS' STATEMENT

I said yesterday and I want to repeat now I think it is extremely dangerous to outlaw under a legislative label such as "subsidies" or "incentive payments" or anything of the sort, some devices that may be tremendously important in the case of some particular commodities at some particular time if we are going to get the production which after all is the most important thing we face in this country as I see it, and that is to get the production of agricultural commodities.

Now may I go further, because I also agree with his statement:

On the other hand I believe that a general reliance on a program of broad subsidies as a chief implement to prevent inflation is a dangerous delusion, partly for the reason the Congressman pointed out, and that for inflationary control in this country we have to have a broad and coordinated program that involves a great deal more than direct price-control orders or subsidies.

Now, in looking at the markets that we have, it is not a simple question such as if a man is guilty or not guilty; it is not a question of black or white, but we are dealing with a most tremendous system and as complex a thing as the world has ever seen, our far-flung price structures, the most extensive and diversified price structure that perhaps includes the greatest number of items of any nation in the world.

FINE BALANCE NECESSARY

I like to compare it with a finely tuned, elaborate harp: It is influenced by the weather, it is influenced by vibrations in the distance, and you men who understand the markets of this Nation know that a rumor of trouble in Texas, that a new kind of bug in Kansas, or bacteria infecting a herd of cattle in Montana will upset and have repercussions throughout the 48 States on our markets. And yet we propose by oversimplifying this question of subsidy to play on this finely attuned harp with a crowbar.

This is a most difficult problem; we have to decide, to draw the line where to use subsidies for the maximum benefits for the things that we are trying to accomplish. One is to get the production that this country needs for its war effort, and the other to hold prices down so that the Nation's cost of this food will not cause new adjustments and thereby force new higher wage costs to the Nation.

As I say, if we could simplify it down I believe everyone in this body would say that they are for good subsidies and they are against bad subsidies. I know that many are fearful of a misuse of subsidies. But Congress will be on the job, its committees investigating and watching the use of these moneys to see that they are placed where they will be beneficial to the war effort. I do not think we should adopt a lazy-man attitude and say, that simply because the problem is a difficult one, that it is not worth the effort to try to solve it.

We are talking here a lot about roll-back subsidies. Unfortunately, that is not a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

CORPORATION RECORD GOOD

The roll-back subsidy is the thing that they are trying to do through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is being discussed over in the Senate. I asked the chairman of our committee if he could name any time or any instance where the Commodity Credit Corporation had violated good judgment or good, sound business sense in its subsidy operations, and he could not point out a single instance where that had occurred.

There are several amendments proposed to draw rigid lines against any kind of subsidies with the exception of wheat for feed and for the oil and fats program. Both of those were two of the largest subsidy operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and Congress agreed it was a good subsidy operation. I am inclined to believe that as we go through the most difficult food years this country will ever face, that we will have other problems that must be met by judicious application of sound business practice and, perhaps, even the use of subsidies to get production, and we have got to exercise judgment on what effect this device will have on the whole problem of inflationary control and, ultimately, the cost to the consumer.

The problem that faces us is not as simple as some of the proponents of the Wolcott amendment would have us believe. To them it seems to be simply the question of whether the Government will pay subsidies to the producers to lower the cost-of-living index.

I am familiar with the Price Control Act, and I think I know what the provisions in it mean. I am convinced that there is no assurance from any source that prices will not be rolled back to lower the cost of living.

I know that the administrators of Government inflation program downtown have given their words that they are going to roll back prices to 1942, September, levels. They can do it under the Price Control Act that the Members of Congress passed. Then who is to blame? Congress fixed those floors in the Price Control Act, yet the price has gone up above those floors. The O. P. A. let many go up because we needed to get increased production. Now, if these prices are to be rolled back, they can be rolled back under the law without subsidies to the farmers, and the farmer take that jolt. You can save him by not forbidding completely all forms of these subsidy payments that will act as a shock absorber against the roll-back.

I am just stating this because it is a fact; it will be true under section 6 of the bill as it is now written, and it will be true under the Wolcott amendment that will be introduced. I think it is a thing that the Members from the farm districts who have farmers looking to them to see a little bit farther than their noses, for they are going to ask you many questions if this roll-back occurs. Let us look at one other factor that is rather important in this subsidy program.

In the R. F. C. bill, which is not before us, it is proposed to subsidize meats, cheese, butter, and milk, I believe. It happens that more than half of all these commodities are being taken by the armed forces. Let us not overlook the fact that since the Army is taking half that the cost either way goes to the Government on that half of the country's production. It comes out of Uncle Sam's pocket whether you subsidize at the bottom, or whether you let the price go up at the top. So on half of our production, the ultimate cost to the Army is identically the same. In some cases, it is possible that if these subsidies such as are applied by the Commodity Credit Corporation are applied at the base line, at the production line as they apply it, then, perhaps, it saves the Army, the Navy, or lease-lend a little bit because the normal mark-ups of the processors are not reflected upon a higher initial cost.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot yield; my time is too limited.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But the gentleman would like to have his facts accurate, would he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will let another committee member answer that ultimately; I am trying to talk against time.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely would like to have him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In starting on this proposition ask yourself one question, and if you can be satisfied that an increase in the cost of these basic living items can be made without disturbing the Little Steel formula and without continuing the cycle of rising wages, then you should definitely and positively be against any kind of subsidy program no matter how judiciously it is applied. But if you are fearful, as I am fearful, that if we let prices rise we must break the Little Steel formula, then I think you had better begin to consider how this can be done through application of properly used subsidies carefully restricted and used at the proper place where the war effort will be helped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman is a member of the committee and heard the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma who just preceded him. In all the time that we had hearings on the price-control bill, either in 1942 or the year before, did the gentleman ever once hear any witness from the O. P. A. say they intended either to let prices get out of line or to roll them back if they did let them get out of line?

Mr. KEAN. Certainly not.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, though, that under the law as the Congress passed it they can roll prices back and that we have absolutely no recourse?

Mr. KEAN. It is possible.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In other words, they just found a loophole in the law and used it in a way that was not contemplated by Congress.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I expect to pay my respects to the roll-back program under the 5-minute rule but while we consider this legislation for continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it is well that we pause to take stock of the activities of the many Government corporations. There are approximately 50 of them.

The Constitution provides that control of expenditures rests in Congress, but these corporations leave a gap in our control which is wide open.

Many have been set up under section 5-d of the R. F. C. Act, which provides that corporations may be created having the power, under subsection (a) "to produce, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials as defined by the President"—and he has declared about everything strategic and critical—and having the power, under subsection (g) "to take such other action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator may deem necessary to expedite the national defense program."

In other words to do anything, limited only by the provision that it must be concerned with the national defense—and what action today is not concerned with the national defense?

These corporations are organized under various State charters and the powers granted them are very broad.

Some of the provisions of the certificate of incorporation of this Commodity Credit Corporation read as follows:

Under subsection (b) it has the authority—

to purchase or otherwise acquire, to hold, or otherwise to deal in, to sell or otherwise dispose of any and all agricultural and/or other commodities, and/or products thereof.

It may, under subsection (d)—

engage in any activity in connection with or involving the production, carrying, shipping, storing, exporting, warehousing, handling, preparing, manufacturing, processing, and marketing of agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof.

It may, under subsection (i)—

enter into, make, perform, and carry out contracts of every kind and description for any lawful purpose without limit as to amount, with any person, firm, association, corporation, municipality, country, State, body politic, territory or government or colony or dependency thereof.

As shown on page 187 of the hearings, I asked Mr. Shields, general counsel of the Corporation:

Is not your charter so broad that you can do practically anything?

Mr. Shields' reply was:

In 1935 when Mr. Jesse Jones appeared before this committee to have the life of the Corporation extended, he said that under the charter this Corporation had the authority to commit murder.

Our committee found that, utilizing these broad powers, the Corporation has entered into activities which not only are contrary to the intent of Congress, but that it was also doing things which none of us had any idea it was doing.

Of course we had some knowledge of their subsidy program; but we found, in addition, they were incurring losses through purchases for the Lend-Lease Administration; and we found also that they were making purchases and taking losses—I quote Mr. Hutson:

> To support the economies of our neighbors to the South—to assist in the stabilization of the economy of Brazil—to purchase cotton under the good-neighbor policy and support the economy of friendly countries.

Now all of these undertakings may be advisable, but if they are to be done, they should be carried out under the direction of Congress by agencies created for these purposes, and the taxpayers' money should not be spent for such things by this agency, which was created merely to help American farmers, solely under Executive directive.

These charters are so broad that officials of the corporation feel they can do almost anything even though it is contrary to the will of Congress, unless Congress specifically provides, in this or some other bill, that they shall not do so. How can we foresee everything that they might do, during the next 2 years, in accordance with the broad provisions of their charter? Into what new fields will we find they may have entered when next they come before us?

Just the other day we read in the press that the Defense Plants Corporation—a corporation formed under section 5–d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act for the purpose of aiding industry in building plants essential to the war effort—is going to be used to roll back meat prices.

I suppose the reason that this Corporation is being used is that it is in funds; though you may remember it was only last December that Mr. Jones came before the Congress and stated that he was entirely out of funds and would have to have $5,000,000,000 immediately to carry out the legitimate functions of the R. F. C.

He did not get the money owing to the adjournment of Congress; and strangely enough since then he has made no further request for the funds which he stated at that time he so urgently needed.

Where he is getting the money now is a mystery. Feeling that, as a member of the committee which is responsible for the authority granted to the R. F. C., I should know what was going on, over 2 weeks ago, on June 10, I addressed a letter to Mr. Jones asking if he could inform me where he was getting the money which he seems to have in abundance now, in spite of his protestations of last autumn. As yet I have not had the courtesy of a reply.

It seems to be easier for him to get the money than to explain where he is getting it; or does it embarrass him to tell Congress where it is coming from?

Through these corporations which it has fathered, the R. F. C. has become a great octopus through which the will of the people, all unknown to them, may be thwarted.

Under authority granted by the War Powers Act, the President has given directives to the Board of Economic Warfare and other agencies to direct expenditures of money of these corporations, even over the protests of those who are in charge of their operations.

As you may read on page 192 of these hearings, the general counsel agreed with me that, under present law, the Board of Economic Warfare could order the Commodity Credit Corporation to use all of its funds for the B. E. W.'s purposes at their direction.

One of the reasons that section 8 was incorporated in this bill was to prevent such action.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that these corporations are dangerous. If we are to have a government in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution, if Congress is to control spending, these corporations must be curbed and long-term planning should provide for their liquidation; or if they are to remain in existence their present charters should be surrendered and Congress should specifically provide what they can and cannot do.

This problem is one to which we should give the most serious consideration.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT.]

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the debate on this bill I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] whether or not the issue before the House today is not, "Who is going to bear the extra living cost due to the increasing cost of food commodities?" It is whether or not this cost should be passed on to the ultimate consumer or whether the Government should not bear a certain portion of the cost. The gentleman stated that that in essence was the issue.

This, of course, brings up the question of subsidy and roll-back. Those words are possibly bandied about and not too well understood. We have had an average increase in the cost of living of about 1½ percent a month during the last few months. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] suggested that if this figure were multiplied by 12 it would give some fair indication as to how much living costs would increase in the next year. I do not believe that any person who has studied the inflation in other countries will agree with this. If there is an increase in living costs and if there is a consequent demand for higher wages, and then a demand for higher prices, and for higher wages again, the rate at which the inflationary spiral will ascend will accelerate astronomically. In other words, instead of a 12 percent increase in living costs during a year's time you may have a 50 or 100 percent increase, then after it gets beyond control the rate of increase is so rapid it would be impossible for any of us to measure it.

Several of the members of the committee besides myself do not think that we should completely tie the hands of the Executive or of any of the administrative departments in sweeping and all-inclusive language against the use of subsidies. We do not think on the other hand that the use of subsidies is a good over-all method for the control of inflation. We were all unanimous on that. We think, however, that the next 6 months or year will give us the answer as to whether we are going to have inflation or we are going to check inflation.

I will give you a few reasons why I say that. Organized labor has, with one glaring exception, been willing to abide by the Little Steel formula. The Little Steel formula was based on an estimate that there had been an approximate increase in living cost of somewhere around 15 percent from the time of Pearl Harbor until September 1942. So the War Labor Board ordered that any group of employees, any union group that had obtained a 15 percent increase in wages during that period of time was barred from obtaining any further increase in wages, and any group of wage earners who had not obtained a 15 percent increase could obtain an additional increase up to the 15 percent. Since September 1942 the cost of living has gone up about 1½ percent per month. If this formula provided a fair solution, if the leaders of organized labor and the working people of this country, who were patriotic, were willing to abide by this formula which after all is a check on inflation, and if by means of it they have succeeded in stabilizing reasonably the increase in wages, then obviously they are entitled to an increase in wages since September 1942, which is commensurate with the increase in living cost during that period of time. The reasoning is stronger, of course, in the case of people who do not belong to a union, people working for salaries, the so-called white-collared class, who have had no increase in their compensation at all or none commensurate with the increase in the cost of living.

How are you going to arrive at an equitable ratio between income and cost of living? You can do it in one of two ways. Some Members say, "Let the consumer pay the added cost of the production of agricultural products." If you will let the cost rise and rise, and remember if you pursue this course that the peak in living costs will never be reached. It is a steadily rising increase at the present time about 1½ percent a month. Or by skillful use of subsidies you can cushion these demands at the present time. You can say, "We do not want wage earners to ask for more wages now because if they ask for more wages everybody else will want more wages, the farmer will want more income, and so on ad infinitum. Let us stabilize wages and costs for a period of about 6 months or a year and we will have the inflation problem beaten. But if the increased cost of living must be borne by the wage earner,

demands for higher wages which will be irresistible will break down the Little Steel formula.

I attended a meeting this morning at which I listened to an address by Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., who is trying his best to cooperate with the war program of the President and trying his best to cooperate with the anti-inflation program. He stated at this meeting that unless prices are rolled back so that the price of food to the workers is fairly commensurate with their wages, which have been frozen since September 15, 1942, they will be forced to demand a higher rate of wages.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not contend, does he, that the income of organized workers has not increased since last September? There have been substantial increases in the income of the organized workers or of all workers since last September.

Mr. WRIGHT. Not generally, I would say, unless you have a case where they have not had the 15-percent increase or unless you have a case where a man has been placed in a higher position.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, the 48-hour week has gone into effect in a good many industries and there has been an increase in average hourly wages because of the overtime in some cases. In other cases there have been wage increases.

Mr. WRIGHT. In some cases there have, but in answer to the gentleman, may I state this? It is idle to state in this House that the average annual income of the worker has increased by so many percent, 100 percent or so, unless you pick out your various salary and wage groups and find out how it affects each income bracket. I mentioned the white-collar class a moment ago. This group is not getting any increase to speak of at all, and there are many people in the unskilled groups in organized labor who are not getting any appreciable increases in wages. Admittedly there are some high wages paid.

Mr. HOPE. But from the standpoint of inflation, if there has been an increase in the national income through wages and salaries since September 1942, and we now roll back prices to that date without rolling back this increase in income, we are increasing the inflationary gap, are we not?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is a certain amount of reason to the gentleman's position, but on the other hand if they had not adopted time and a half for overtime with the 48-hour week you would have a reduction in the income of very many workers, so it was felt best to give a few of them an increase so that you would not reduce the income of the rest of them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am informed by the Labor Department that the average wage scale for all workers in all manufacturing industries, war and nonwar, is $41 a week. As against that, prices of food, clothing, and medicine have advanced since August 1939, 54.4 percent.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think those figures are approximately correct.

Mr. CELLER. Therefore, they are being squeezed between what they receive and what they have to pay for.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. As I read section 6, I understand that no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation can be used for subsidies or roll-backs. Is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. Not only can no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation be used but no funds of any Government agency. This provision would forbid the roll-back program, which has now been advertised to the country and on which the people are depending, out of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEISS. I fully subscribe to the gentleman's statement. May I say that the arguments advanced in the House this afternoon were the same as advanced in the British Parliament against subsidies. Today British public opinion universally acclaims the present British Price Control Act with the wise administration of subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe the British have handled the situation very well. I do not know whether or not the same employment of over-all subsidies for all commodities would be effective here. I do not believe it would, but I think the weapon should be afforded to the Government agencies in extreme situations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer two amendments to this Commodity Credit Corporation bill, one to strike out the $500,000,000 and the other to provide for the auditing of this agency.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Before the gentleman starts his argument, may I make this comment on the discussion which was going on just before the gentleman took the floor. It seems to me that the fundamental fallacy in a great deal of the discussion about the relative advance of wages and the cost of living since a date in 1939 is that it overlooks the fact that the base period at which they start was at a time when there was not a proper relationship between commodity prices and wages, that wages had advanced then far beyond prices of farm commodities. A second fallacy is that we did place a ceiling upon farm prices before a ceiling was placed upon wages; consequently, during a period when wages were free to advance commodity prices were not free to advance.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In commenting on the gentleman's statement I simply say that I think the New Deal has definitely decided to liquidate the farmer. I am against that and think it would be better to liquidate the New Deal.

No justification at all was shown for the request of $500,000,000 additional borrowing power before our committee. When the discussion finally ended on this $500,000,000, it took the form of, "We had better put it in, anyhow." So there is no reason at all why we should vote for this $500,000,000, and there is no reason why we should ask that the operations of this agency should not be placed under audit the same as other agencies of the Government. Of course, there are a lot of New Deal agencies that are not subject to audit. A good many of the 30-odd lending agencies are not subject to audit.

I am wondering why it would not be a good plan to put in a little amendment in the bill which would provide for abolishing the cost of living altogether. If you can abolish a part of the cost of living by subsidies, why can you not abolish all of it? Why can you not do that?

It is said here on the floor that our posterity will have to pay for this cost. There is another cost involved in the subsidy program for which this generation will pay. We are going to pay for it in regimentation, in being bossed around by the bureaucrats. We are going to pay for it with Gestapo tactics.

We are not going to escape the cost of a program of this kind. A few moments ago, one of the Members who spoke on the floor said the matter of regulating prices is a complicated process. To be sure, it is complicated, and nothing proves it any more than the state of affairs which prevails in this House at the present time. When the New Deal started out to control and regulate prices, as it did as soon as it came into power, it entered into a domain that meant trouble for this country.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not now. Leaving out of consideration whether there is or is not involved in new dealism a deliberately concealed plan to destroy the American form of government and substitute for it a collectivist state, it is unquestionably true that the main thing that characterizes new dealism is subsidization with taxpayers' money of certain groups at the expense of other groups.

Indeed, the very heart and soul of new dealism is the exaction of funds from one group of citizens and handing them over to another group of citizens. One trouble with this scheme is that the receiving groups never get as much as was extracted from the giving groups. The difference goes to the administrators of the scheme, and, except for this one little element in the New Deal, there probably would not be any New Deal.

Mr. Chairman, examine the thirty-odd New Deal lending agencies—the Thomas inflation amendment, the joint resolu-

tion of June 5, 1933, the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the Silver Purchase acts, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation acts, and so forth, and see if it will not be found that the principal effect of the operations of each of these acts is the transference of property from one arbitrarily designated class to another arbitrarily designated class. Was not this the stated purpose of some of the main New Deal programs? Did not Senator Thomas boldly state that the gold devaluation clause would have the effect of redistributing $200,000,000 worth of the Nation's property?

Look at the New Deal laws pertaining to agriculture. Excepting that part of this program which has to do with restricting crop production and the regimenting of farmers, there is little else that these acts accomplish but what ultimately amounts to the paying of subsidies.

All agriculture support prices, parity payments, as well as soil conservation payments, resolve themselves ultimately into Federal subsidies. This is no fault of the farmers. The fact is the farmers never asked for any benefit payments and never wanted any. They always wanted their prices made in the market, not at Washington. The only reason they took any payments was because the New Deal failed to provide the conditions which would have permitted them to receive a fair and honest price in the market, and because they had to pay a part of the payments themselves in taxes. In the end, it amounts to the farmers having been forced by the politicians and bureaucrats to take the payments.

The real rationale of New Deal philosophism is the promise to give everybody something for nothing. As long as the New Deal could resort to deficit financing, charging its failures and the effect of its nostrums to future generations, things went along pretty well. But it does seem that the New Deal has now just about reached the end stage of its utopian promises. If I understand the avowed purpose of the so-called roll-back program it is to somehow make it possible for the consumers of the Nation to get a part of their living for nothing. Indeed, it appears to me there is something about this price roll-back plan which holds out a sort of hazy, potential promise of abolishing the cost of living altogether. If you can eliminate a part of this cost of living with subsidies, why not eliminate all of it with subsidies?

The New Deal never had but one cure for every political affliction it thought existed and for a lot that didn't exist—namely, deficit financing.

Similia similibus curantur—like cures like—so said the old physician Hahnemann. So taking its cue from this misquoted old doctor, the New Deal seeks to cure inflation with inflation.

Every dollar raised for the payment of these subsidies will be Government printed money which is the real inflation that is causing undue rise in prices in this country.

In seeking to cure inflation with subsidies, the funds for which must be raised by printing press money, we see the ultimate ratio of new dealism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it might help us to give some thought to what we can do best for our country through legislative enactment, and what can best be done through the executive or administrative branch of the Government for the people. It seems to me as a new man around here for a few weeks, that I have discovered too much pressure from the executive branch of the Government, trying to tell the legislative branch what to do, and I think we have been a little bit too busy trying to see to it that the executive branch of the Government does things as we think they ought to be done. I think each is independent, but when discharging its duties our division of powers should be respected.

Now we talk about subsidies, and our definitions of them and whether we are opposed to them or not. Why, as a regular diet, we are opposed to all these things we are having to do, in order to prosecute this war successfully. I am opposed to price fixing, but we know very well that if we do not do it, we would be in chaos and demoralization directly. There are many things we have to do in order to move wisely and orderly to the victory ahead of us in this war.

Now, what is a subsidy? We usually think of it as a gift to a particular group at the expense of all the people, for their private enrichment. There is not any suggestion of such a subsidy here. We are going to give this subsidy to those who distribute to the people a staple food. It will go to everybody alike, and when we pay it we will pay it by a just and uniform tax, designed to touch every class alike.

I think we have been doing very well. While I hate to disturb the happiness that some people seem to enjoy in drawing pictures of woe and destruction and all that, it reminds me of the old fellow I heard of who met an old friend and he asked him how his wife was. "Well," he said, "she has been enjoying bad health for several months, but right recently she has been complaining of being a good deal better than she was."

Now we are harvesting the crop. We have come up to now in triumph over all our difficulties to a degree that is amazing and difficult to understand. Now we are gathering the oats. We are gathering the barley. We are gathering the wheat. Corn is just ahead of us, but the other cereal grains that we are gathering will do much to weaken the pressure of our corn. We are doing very well. Now we have under consideration whether we will tie the executive or administrative branch of the Government in a statute, foreseeing in our greater wisdom all the twists and turns that may take place in the future. I submit that the heads of these great departments in patriotism, in wisdom, and in experience are our peers, and that in the very nature of this business they can do a much more successful job if we give them the resources and let them understand that we want to keep prices down; not only to prevent inflation, but to prevent the poor people of this country from starving to death on account of high prices which they cannot pay.

The great abundance of money in the country does not reach everybody. It is in the hands of a few groups. Millions of our people are making no more than they were making before this war started, and they are bearing all of its difficulties. We are forgetting them in our zeal to smite some group somewhere that is making a little more money than they ought to have. Oh, you cannot argue against success, as old Bob Burdette said. As such things go, we have succeeded up to now. We have helped feed our allies. We have kept our people and our country healthy and well fed. Today we have more foodstuffs than ever before in the history of this land; and under a leadership that has made mistakes—and God knows I get as mad with them as my friend DIRKSEN ever dared to get—but on the whole they are winning in this fight, and I urge all those who hear me not to become partisan or factional. This benefit, if it is a benefit, will go to all the people of the land. It goes to no special group. It will be paid back by all the people in the land.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I would like to, but I have been trying to make a speech on this subject ever since I have been here and I have been able to get but a few minutes to do it and my time has almost expired now.

Yes; you say we have got to stop inflation. Inflation is a Hydra-headed monster. We have to fight it in many ways. But up to this time, while not completely successful, I dare say in all the history of the world, greater success in our fight against inflation was never made anywhere. The battle goes well. If we can keep keep partisanship out of this business—one of my friends when I was speaking the other day threw a political rock at me and I threw two back at him, and I have been ashamed of it ever since. This is no time for party. This is no time for class feeling. This is no time for sectional feeling. We must win this war. The armies that are carrying our flag to victory are not made up of party people. They do not know anything about that. They are not made up of city people. They are not made up of country people. They are made up of every class. Let us legislate and let the executive officers execute our will, expressed in broad statute, with resources behind those statutes to put them into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, judging from expressions of sentiment received by Members of Congress from all

sections of the Nation, the American people generally are opposed to further extension of subsidies by the Federal Government as a means to roll back prices.

As a Member of Congress, representing the Twenty-first Illinois District, which is one of the best farm areas in the United States, I am firm in my opinion that there is no substitute for a fair price to the farmer in the market place, and, consequently, I am opposed to subsidies in any form.

Subsidies will cause heavier expenditure of public funds, and, therefore, in the final analysis will not only increase the tax burden of the farmers, themselves, but will contribute to the inflation spiral, thereby defeating their own purpose. At the same time, subsidies will offer another excuse for the extension of more bureaucratic controls over the economic life of our country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Midwest farm bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at a conference in Chicago on June 23, adopted a resolution which charged the subsidy and roll-back on foods proposed by the administration as a "subterfuge for increasing wages and other consumer incomes already at inflationary levels."

Continuing, the resolution said:

It—

The subsidy program—

will be expensive to administer, benefits will be small in proportion to total cost, it will continue the already existing ruinous confusion, it contributes to rather than controls inflation, it will decrease rather than increase both agricultural and industrial production, it will impose further regimentation of production and distribution, and will aggravate our post-war price and income problem.

For these and other equally important reasons, this conference of Midwest farm bureaus, representing 12 States and 300,000 members, respectfully petitions our Federal administrative authorities to cease their effort to inflict this program upon us. We call upon our Congress to enact legislation which will prevent any general continuance or revival of this ill-advised experiment.

In the past few days, I have been the recipient of numerous telegrams, letters, and long-distance telephone calls from businessmen, farmers, and taxpayers urging me to oppose the subsidy program. I would like to quote several of them.

Mr. Joseph E. Boyd, of Taylorville, Ill., as chairman of the Christian County War Board, telegraphed me as follows:

Farmers in this territory oppose roll-back in food prices to supply cheap food when workers are receiving wages sufficient to pay fair prices. Strongly urge you to oppose any legislation to roll back prices on farm products. Drop in cattle and hog prices at all markets is very discouraging to producers of livestock at a time encouragement is needed most.

The First Trust and Savings Bank, of Taylorville, Ill., telegraphed me as follows:

It is our information that you are opposing the administration program to roll back food prices by the subsidy method. We are experiencing the competition of Government subsidized credit agencies originally designed for an emergency now expanding and soliciting good credit risks at a time when all banking institutions have an excess of idle funds. It is our observation that once a subsidy bureau is established it is seldom abolished. We commend you on your opposition to this subsidy.

Mr. D. L. Clarke, Springfield, Ill., president of the Sangamon County Farm Bureau, wires as follows:

Urge your active opposition to roll back of food and agricultural products sponsored by administration and labor leaders. We believe burden will fall on farmers and taxpayers and, probably more important, that it will seriously interfere with food production program. Also believe there is no stopping place on the subsidy program once started.

Mr. Claude W. Mitchell, Springfield, Ill., secretary of the American Berkshire Association and editor of the Berkshire News, wired as follows:

The sentiments we have received from our members and readers in Illinois indicate they are unalterably opposed to subsidies. We believe their reactions accurately reflect the sentiments of all those connected with agriculture in this State. Therefore, we appeal to you to stand by your guns and vote for the Wolcott amendment. Please convey these sentiments to your colleagues. This is a fundamental fight.

In addition, I have received many more telegrams, which in essence state as follows:

Urge you oppose food price roll back and subsidy program.

Meat subsidies will curtail the production of livestock to a great extent.

Urge your strong opposition to roll back of food prices.

Be sure and oppose food price roll-back program.

We believe roll-back and subsidy program will injure livestock production and the whole Nation. We are depending on you to protect the livestock producers' interest at this critical time.

The roll-back price bill and subsidies on farm products would mean higher taxes on everyone. Urge you oppose.

Urge your opposition to roll back of food and agricultural prices being pushed by administration.

Urge you oppose farm price roll-back program and subsidy program which we believe will seriously affect food-production program.

The roll-back bill and subsidies on farm products would add untold millions to the taxpayer's burden. If our laboring class can't pay their way now, God pity us if we should ever have a depression and subsidy to pay on top of it. I urge you to oppose these measures.

Government programs relative food price roll back and corn opposed by all agricultural people here. Urge your active opposition to administration-sponsored programs.

This resolution and these telegrams sum up accurately and effectively the attitude of the great Farm Belt of the Middle West with reference to the subsidy program. I would, however, like to add one additional thought, and that is that the cost of administering a subsidy program as suggested would run at least $50,000,000 a year. This would mean, of course, additional auditing and bookkeeping, to say nothing of the inevitable increase in pay-rollers in bureaus in Washington and in the field offices.

The American people have learned enough lessons from their dealings with the Office of Price Administration and other Federal bureaus to want to avoid any further involvement in red tape. I appreciate the position they have taken and I recognize their desire to protect and maintain the American system of free enterprise, in which I heartily concur.

Among those individuals in the Twenty-first Illinois Congressional District and vicinity who have expressed opposition to the subsidy and roll-back program have been:

Mr. Alvin Marten, Alexander, Ill.; Mr. S. J. Snell, Auburn, Ill.; Mr. F. E. Morris and Mr. Robert Garvey, both of Buffalo, Ill.; Mr. J. H. Schumacher, Beardstown, Ill.; Mr. H. Melville Schultz, Mr. Gilbert H. Kasten, Mr. Steve Marko, Mr. Harvey Bloome, Mr. John Kaburick, Mr. G. O. Morehead, Mr. Cecil Denby, Mr. Henry Lehmann, Mr. A. G. Schoeneman, Mr. J. S. Hounsley, Mr. W. C. Wohlert, Mr. William Thomas, Mr. Otto Harms, Mr. Arthur Stadler, and Mr. Joe Kaburick, all of Carlinville, Ill.; Mr. John P. Stout, Mr. J. C. Quisenberry, Mr. John Woodside, and Mr. George Theilen, all of Chatham, Ill.; Mr. Floyd Lewis, Curran, Ill.; Mr. H. C. Irwin, Mr. Frank Reller, and Mr. Gerald M. Waters, all of Edinburg, Ill.; Mr. A. N. Carpenter, Franklin, Ill.; Mr. T. H. Lloyd and Mr. Elmer H. Kessinger, both of Girard, Ill.; Mr. Eugene Pfeifer, Kenney, Ill.; Mr. H. E. Pickrell, Lanesville, Ill.; Mr. Sam Sparks, Jr., Lincoln, Ill.; Mr. Fred Kloppe, Loami, Ill.; Mr. Evan Taylor and Mr. W. M. Goff, both of New Berlin, Ill.

Mr. Meade McWilliams, Pawnee, Ill.; Mr. J. Kennedy Kincaid and Mr. C. C. Stier, both of Petersburg, Ill.; Mr. Scott Irwin, Mr. T. D. Irwin, Mr. Emery Purvines, Mr. William B. Miles, Mr. H. H. Muncey, Mr. Walter Nottingham, and Mr. Kenneth Stringfield, all of Pleasant Plains, Ill.; Mr. A. R. Booth, Mr. George Gunnett, Mr. J. Ward Hopwood, Mr. Alfred Odiorne, and Mr. Carl F. Ostermeier, all of Springfield, Ill.; Mr. B. H. Wageholf, Mr. J. A. Donner, Mr. Carl Reincke, and Mr. Maurice Parrett, all of Taylorville, Ill.; Mr. George M. Miller, Virden, Ill.; Mr. Elmer Reichert, Virginia, Ill.; Mr. R. C. Downing, Waverly, Ill.; and Mr. John T. Cooper and Mr. Milton E. Jones, both of Williamsville, Ill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

OLD-AGE SECURITY—FREEDOM FROM WANT AND HAUNTING FEAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing wages, roll-backs, subsidies, and the cost of living, and before we take a recess we should also consider an increased allowance to our old folks so they may keep body and soul together. Mr. Chairman, I am sure no one will question the need for the Congress to recess during these hot summer weeks. As shown by the weather records, Washington this summer has experienced the hottest June since these records were kept. While congressional offices and the House and Senate Chambers are air-conditioned, the contrast between these air-conditioned buildings and the rest of Washington during this extreme summer heat not only is a severe handicap

to the orderly transaction of business here in the Capital, but slows down materially the efficient work of the Congress.

For almost 4 years there has been no opportunity for an extended cessation of congressional work so that Members might return to their districts, not only for a needed rest but also to acquaint themselves with the problems of their respective districts and confer with their constituency upon the momentous problems which are facing us during this critical time. However, Mr. Chairman, while I feel the need of returning to my district for all of these reasons, not having had an opportunity to be home but for a few weeks during the last 2 years, I feel that it is more important to clear the legislative calendar before a recess is had so that all important legislation which in any way will help in the prosecution and the winning of the war will be disposed of. We must also provide for the reconvening of the Congress immediately if necessity requires.

We should before recessing make some provision for increased allowances to our elderly citizens under the old-age security or pension program. We should at least before recessing make temporary provision for our elderly citizens by increasing their monthly allowances to cover increased living costs under war conditions until the Congress enacts a permanent old-age security program giving to our elderly people participating therein sufficient monthly remuneration to permit them to live in decency and health. It would be a mistake, Mr. Chairman, for Congress to recess before providing for these much-needed increases as a war emergency.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently reported that city workers now pay 21.1 percent more for cost of living than they did in January of 1941. Food prices show the sharpest rise, averaging 46 percent above those of 1941. The cost of various services required for living, especially medical care and other personal services, show the next highest increase. The millions of elderly men and women who are on fixed monthly pension incomes are required to meet these high costs of living from their meager allowances which have not been increased. The seventh annual report of the Social Security Board shows the average old-age assistance to be $21.83 a month. These payments have remained stationary, with the exception of small increases in certain States, throughout the war period, notwithstanding the increased cost of living.

I attended a conference recently of a number of House Members where we discussed the pros and cons for giving early consideration to all pension legislation. We took this subject up personally with every member of the Ways and Means Committee urging them to grant a hearing on all pension legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Ways and Means Committee will accede to our request and appoint a subcommittee to hold hearings on old-age security and pension legislation pending in the Congress. This will be a recognition of the necessity of a thorough study and investigation of old-age security and pensions and the enactment of legislation which will deal adequately with our elderly people and which will provide a sufficient income so that these old folks may maintain themselves in decency and health during the few remaining years of their lives.

Mr. Chairman, in seeking a solution of the old-age pension problem there are two objectives: First, providing adequately for the aged; and, secondly, maintaining our national economy unimpaired. In approaching this problem it is essential to consider the number of persons falling within the age limits of 60 years and over. I call attention to the following table giving this data:

Means of support of persons 60 years of age and over, 1941

	Number	Percentage distribution
Total number of persons in the United States	13,900,000	100.0
A. Self-dependent	6,264,000	45.1
By reason of:		
1. Current earnings	2,700,000	
2. Savings, real estate, or securities	2,325,000	
3. Federal, State, and municipal pensions or insurance payments	708,000	
4. Industrial and other private pensions	142,000	
5. Insurance annuities	364,000	
6. Other resources	25,000	
B. Dependent	7,636,000	54.9
1. Supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies	2,986,000	21.5
2. Dependent on children, other relatives (including spouse in some instances), and friends (wholly or almost wholly)	4,650,000	33.4

Source: Marjorie Shearon, data submitted at hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the Old-Age Pension System; U. S. Senate, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941, p. 215, revised as of Nov. 30, 1941, to include data from 1940 Census.

According to this compilation, while there are 13,900,000 persons in the United States 60 years of age and over, there are 7,636,000, or 54.9 percent, who are supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies, or are dependent on children or other relatives and friends wholly for their support. Furthermore, there is a considerable group of approximately a million persons classified as self-dependents who derive their support in whole or in part from pensions of various sorts. It follows from an examination of these and other statistics showing the means of support of persons 60 years of age or over, that the major portion of the group are now being supported by society or relatives or friends.

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, in her studies, concludes that of all persons 60 years of age and over, four-fifths get less than a minimum for decency and health.

Dr. Shearon is an outstanding social-science analyst with extensive experience in the United States Public Health Service. She was formerly on the staff of the Social Security Board and prepared the economic brief for the defense of the Social Security Act in 1937. Her experience qualifies her to speak with authority on this subject. In considering this problem the marital status of the persons involved is desirable. The following table gives this information:

Estimated marital status of persons 60 and over, Jan. 1, 1940

Marital status	Total	Male	Female
Total	13,200,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
Unmarried	5,900,000	2,100,000	3,800,000
Married	7,300,000	4,500,000	2,800,000
Spouse under 60	2,100,000	1,900,000	200,000
Spouse over 60	5,200,000	2,600,000	2,600,000

Source: Estimate by Robert J. Myers, of the Social Security Board, memo dated Feb. 14, 1939.

MONTHLY MINIMUM FOR DECENCY AND HEALTH

What is the amount required for a minimum for decency and health of the persons falling within the provisions of the proposed law? It has been determined by a number of investigators considering this subject that a minimum requirement for a couple over 60 years of age is $85 per month. This is the amount arrived at by Dr. Shearon in her analysis of the problem, as shown by the following table, and I understand is the minimum requirement given by the National Resources Planning Board in its release Family Expenditures in the United States, table 66, of June 1941:

Monthly minimum for decency and health, for a couple over 60

Food	$30
Shelter	35
Clothing	6
Transportation	5
Medical care	3
Miscellaneous	6
Total per month	85

Source: Dr. Marjorie Shearon, social science analyst, National Resources Planning Board, Family Expenditures in the U. S. (table 66), June 1941.

It should be noted that these minimum requirements are based on pre-war conditions, which should now be substantially increased to meet war increases.

It is of interest to note in this connection that the recent Gallup poll on old-age pensions shows that the American public in response to the question, "What do you think is the smallest income per month that a couple over 60 years of age needs for a decent living in your community?" answered, $73. This is arrived at by averaging the answers throughout the United States. The South obviously was considerably lower, namely, $59. The West Central States gave a similar sum as the South. The West and the New England and East Central States gave the higher sums of $74 and $78. The following shows the results of the poll by geographical sections:

West	$78
West Central	59
East Central	74
East	78
South	59

This poll shows that 91 percent favor Government old-age pensions and the majority approved lowering the age to qualify to 60 years.

The American Institute of Public Opinion released the following survey, showing that 4 out of every 10 families in the United States lack sufficient purchasing power to provide proper food:

The fact that nearly one-half of all young men called up by the draft are rejected or deferred from full military service because of physical defects raises the question of just how fit the American people are. Shocked by the high ratio of physical defects among draft registrants, President Roosevelt has said that national health is one of the most pressing domestic problems facing the country today.

Since medical authorities trace a definite relationship between diet and physical fitness, the institute has conducted a survey among American families to determine how many believe their health suffers for lack of money to buy healthful foods. The results reveal three disturbing facts:

1. Throughout the Nation as a whole, approximately 4 out of every 10 families, or a total of about 12,000,000 families—say the health of their families is suffering because of insufficient money for proper food.

2. That situation shows virtually no improvement over a year ago, despite the increase in national income. In a similar survey in December 1940, 40 percent of all families reported lack of money for food necessary for the highest health standards, while today the proportion is 39 percent.

3. The situation in the lower-income levels of the population—families earning less than $25 to $30 a week—is particularly acute. Of all families below that level, 57 percent are conscious of diet deficiencies impairing their health.

The following question was put to a carefully selected sample of adults throughout the Nation:

"Would the health of your family be better if you had more money to spend on food?"

	Today	Year ago
Health would be better—percent	39	40
Health would be no better—do	61	60

The results in the income groups under $25 to $30 a week are as follows:

	Percent
Health would be better	57
Health would be no better	43

The Institute survey asked next:

"If you had more money, what foods would you spend it on?"

Following is the list of foods which those families who say their health suffers from lack of money would buy if they had more money:

	National	Families earning below $25 to $30 a week
	Percent	Percent
Meat, with beef mentioned first	45	46
Vegetables, with small number mentioning potatoes	33	34
Dairy products, with ⅓ mentioning milk and the rest eggs	33	34
Fruits	30	30
Bread cereals	5	5
Sugar-content foods	2	2
Miscellaneous	22	22
Didn't know	8	7

Some persons named more than 1 item, hence the total is more than 100 percent.

These startling facts were all based on pre-war conditions.

A study made of the income of the United States during 1935 and 1936 by the Government discloses these startling facts with reference to our national consuming power and the deplorable economic condition of our people; 4,000,000 families, or 14 percent, had an average income of $312 a year; 8,000,000, or 27.5 percent, had an average income of $758; and 7,000,000 families, or 23 percent, had an income of $1,224. Two-thirds of our families had an average income of only $826 a year, or $69 a month, for an entire family. This survey was made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Home Economics, with the collaboration of the National Resources Committee, covering incomes in the United States during 1935–36. These disclosures show not only a lack of purchasing power but underconsumption so critical as to threaten the health and welfare of a large portion of our population. The American family is still the keystone of American democracy when the war ends. If the American way is to endure we must preserve at all costs the economic and social security and independence of the American family. If it falls, the whole structure falls. This study further shows that in the lowest income families 14 percent received only 6 percent of the food, and 42 percent of the families received only 26 percent of the food. The low-income group spent approximately a dollar a week per person for food—about 5 cents a meal—whereas the families receiving $100 a month spent more than twice as much, or $2.18 per person a week for food.

If families in the age groups participating in industry are unable properly to provide food for their own families they cannot be expected to furnish maintenance for their elders who are denied the opportunity to receive any income. If these workers are in such a plight, what may we expect the condition of the unemployed over 60 years of age to be?

AMERICA'S GOAL HAS BEEN MAXIMUM OF PRODUCTION WITH MINIMUM OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Chairman, we in America are proud of our achievements in the development of our productive enterprise and the processes perfected under mass machine production which enable us to produce the essentials necessary for the maintenance of our people on a scale of living never obtained by any other organized society. By the development of technological processes and mass machine production we not only are able to provide for the needs of all of our people, but we can do so and are doing so with the utilization of only a portion of our population who are able and willing to work in productive activities. It is reported that production in 1939 approximately equaled that of 1929, but 1,000,000 less workers were employed in industry. The United Mine Workers of America recently reported that within a 5-year period 25,000 men and women were released from the steel industry alone, due to improved methods and labor-saving devices requiring less employees, and that much larger numbers would thereafter be released by the adoption of improved labor-saving machinery. I am informed that 19 men in the automobile industry are now making the same number of blocks that were made by 250 men 10 years ago.

Recently I inspected the Grand Coulee reclamation and hydroelectric power project in the State of Washington. This is the greatest man-made structure ever conceived and built. When completed it will be three times the size of the Egyptian pyramids which 360,000 slaves took 20 years to build. The immense concrete dam constructed across the Columbia River, the second largest river in the United States, is now completed. It will provide 1,980,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy and water for reclaiming 1,200,000 acres of land. The sand and gravel going into the dam is taken from the hills several miles distant by huge electric shovels. The material is removed by mechanical belt conveyors to the sizing and washing plants, and from there to the storage bins. One man in the control tower by means of mechanical devices transfers the sand, four sizes of gravel cement, and water to the mixing bins which are weighed automatically in correct proportions to form the concrete pursuant to Federal specifications. The concrete mixture is then carried by machines to the dam where huge cranes mechanically dump it into the structure. Through the perfected machines and mechanical devices used in this process, one man is able to do the work which without the machines would require 500 or more laborers. This is a typical example of what is taking place throughout industrial America today.

As a result of our ingenuity and accomplishments in adapting scientific processes and power machinery for mass production, our workers have not only been able to produce a much greater volume and variety of goods than heretofore to provide food, clothing, and shelter, as well as a higher standard of living for our people, but in the process we have eliminated a large segment of our population from participation in the processes. As a result, and due to other contributing factors, from 1929 to the beginning of our national defense program, some 10,000,000 or more of our workers were unable to find employment in productive enterprise, and even now with the increased demand for manpower in war production, we still have unemployed workers. These calculations in the main do not take into consideration that larger group of unemployed who are 60 years of age or over, most of whom are denied the right to participate in productive enterprise. It is interesting to note that the United States census for 1890 shows that at that time 75 percent of all our people over 65 years of age were gainfully employed. At the present time, as I have already pointed out, 80 percent of our citizens 60 years of age or over are unable to obtain the minimum for decency and health.

The science of production has submerged the science of distribution. The very achievement of our goal, maximum of production with minimum of employment, has undermined our economy by reason of our failure to provide that dis-

tribution shall keep pace with production. Production has filled our stores, our granaries, our warehouses with foods, clothing, and other necessities of life, but in so doing has robbed the customers of the power to purchase. As a result, before the war we have had the spectacle of our Government buying up huge quantities of the necessities of life or paying the farmers and producers to destroy them, or not to produce them, at the same time millions of our people lacked food and clothing to maintain a bare minimum of decency and health.

I call attention to an observation of the United States Supreme Court in a decision written by the late Mr. Justice Cardozo—*Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 619–641)—which sheds much light upon this distressing problem confronting us:

Spreading from State to State, unemployment is an ill not particular but general, which may be checked, if Congress so determines, by the resources of the Nation. If this can have been doubtful until now, our ruling today in the case of the Stewart Machine Co., supra, has set the doubt at rest. But the ill is all one, or at least not greatly different, whether men are thrown out of work because there is no longer work to do or because the disabilities of age make them incapable of doing it. Rescue becomes necessary irrespective of the cause. The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when journey's end is near.

Congress did not improvise a judgment when it found that the award of old-age benefits would be conducive to the general welfare. The President's Committee of Economic Security made an investigation and report, aided by a research staff of Government officers and employees, and by an Advisory Council and seven other advisory groups. Extensive hearings followed before the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance. A great mass of evidence was brought together supporting the policy which finds expression in the act. Among the relevant facts are these: The number of persons in the United States 65 years of age or over is increasing proportionately as well as absolutely. What is even more important the number of such persons unable to take care of themselves is growing at a threatening pace. More and more our population is becoming urban and industrial instead of rural and agricultural. The evidence is impressive that among industrial workers the younger men and women are preferred over the older. In times of retrenchment the older are commonly the first to go, and even if retained, their wages are likely to be lowered. The plight of men and women at so low an age as 40 is hard, almost hopeless, when they are driven to seek for reemployment. Statistics are in the brief. A few illustrations will be chosen from many there collected. In 1930, out of 224 American factories investigated, 71, or almost one-third, had fixed maximum hiring age limits: in 4 plants the limit was under 40; in 41 it was under 46. In the other 153 plants there were no fixed limits, but in practice few were hired if they were over 50 years of age. With the loss of savings inevitable in periods of idleness, the fate of workers over 65, when thrown out of work, is little less than desperate. A recent study of the Social Security Board informs us that "one-fifth of the aged in the United States were receiving old-age assistance, emergency relief, institutional care, employment under the works program, or some other form of aid from public or private funds; two-fifths to one-half were dependent on friends or relatives, one-eighth had some income from earnings; and possibly one-sixth had some savings or property. Approximately 3 out of 4 persons 65 or over were probably dependent wholly or partially on others for support." We summarize in the margin the results of other studies by State and National commissions. They point the same way.

The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least, had a basis for that belief. States and local governments are often lacking in the resources that are necessary to finance an adequate program of security for the aged. This is brought out with a wealth of illustration in recent studies of the problem. Apart from the failure of resources, State and local governments are at times reluctant to increase so heavily the burden of taxation to be borne by their residents for fear of placing themselves in a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighbors or competitors. We have seen this in our study of the problem of unemployment compensation (*Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis, supra*). A system of old-age pensions has special dangers of its own, if put in force in one State and rejected in another. The existence of such a system is a bait to the needy and dependent elsewhere, encouraging them to migrate and seek a haven of repose. Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize, in the United States today, through the use of the physical sciences and mechanical arts, the major part of the goods and services consumed are provided by scientific processes and power machinery. Our workers are able to produce a much greater volume and variety of goods than heretofore to provide food, clothing, and shelter, as well as a higher standard of life to our people. Our productive capacity per man has multiplied manyfold. In supplanting handicrafts by scientific processes and mechanical devices a maladjustment has taken place in manpower or labor, resulting in unemployment and loss in purchasing power. Before the war the loss of purchasing power in the workers displaced threw the industrial machine out of balance. To retain this balance, purchasing power must be retained in the post-war period. Fewer workers being required in productive enterprise to supply our wants, it follows a portion of the body of workers must be retired.

If any group must be retired to save our industrial structure and the profit system as well as our economy, it follows those citizens 60 years of age and over, four-fifths of whom are without means to maintain themselves in decency and health, should be retired. Their past services entitle them to such recognition. Our industrial system which is responsible for their plight should be charged with the responsibility to provide the purchasing power to meet their needs.

ELDER CITIZENS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that it is inopportune now to adopt and put into effect a program providing for adequate care for our elder citizens when we are engaged in a world-wide war. I concede that no new program should be adopted which will limit or curtail our productive activities in carrying forward our war efforts unless absolutely necessary. We will win a hollow victory if in the winning we deprive four-fifths of our 14,000,000 senior citizens of the means to maintain themselves in decency and health. However, at the outset, I feel that the premise that this program will not fit in with our war efforts is untenable. The contention has been made that with the demand for manpower in war production many of our citizens falling within the 60 years and over age group will be absorbed in industrial employment. It is true that preliminary studies already made disclose that some of the men between 60 and 65 who are skilled workmen who had been released prior to the national defense program owing to the demands for skilled workmen, have been put to work. This reemployment, however, is so small as compared with the total number of approximately 14,000,000 of the age under consideration, that such relief is of minor importance in finding a solution for the whole problem. Furthermore, it is obvious that the peak of such employment of these older men has now been reached, as the number available of such skilled workmen has already been exhausted. As the younger workers acquire the necessary skill the older men will be relieved.

We should note also that the reemployment of these elder citizens is limited to a few definitely defined areas contiguous to centers of defense production and therefore affords no relief to the great stretches of our territory reaching from coast to coast where no defense activity is in progress.

On the other hand, the relief granted through a sound old-age annuity program will be fairly uniformly distributed throughout all areas of the United States in proportion to population. It follows that the major portion of these citizens 60 years of age or over will continue to remain unemployed and without a minimum income for decency and health and will continue to be an obligation resting upon our national economy, regardless of where the burden may be placed. If a plan is to be adopted whereby this burden resting upon our society is to be provided for by Federal enactment, providing minimums of support to all older citizens regardless of State lines, financed in full by the Federal Government, we are in a better position under our national war economy to initiate it now than we have been since 1929.

Our national income will be this year one hundred and forty billions due to our war efforts. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has, on several occasions, informed Congress through its committees that it is desirable to capture through taxation or otherwise a larger portion of this increased national income in order to prevent inflation. If that is true, it seems reasonable to assume that a Federal tax such as proposed in the Townsend program, or some comparable tax formula, will meet the problem suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time inaugurate a long overdue program providing decent care for those of our citizens who have been discarded by industry. This indeed is a most opportune time to initiate this program. Furthermore, at a time when we are bending every effort to free the entire world of want and suffering and

are pouring out billions of American dollars to the four corners of the earth for that purpose, we must not completely ignore the 14,000,000 of our own elder citizens who under our economy are denied the right to work when able to do so and are in dire need, while we are passing out these billions to the unfortunate peoples beyond the Americas. Let us not overlook the folks at home, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed. I have voted for these expenditures but I still believe that charity begins at home. However, the obligation that we owe to these elder citizens is not charity. It is a social dividend which they have earned through the years, by their sacrifices and work in building this America as we have it now to enjoy, and in preserving our American way of life.

These facts demonstrate that Federal legislation as proposed, providing a minimum for decency and health for our citizens over 60 years of age, does fit into our war program. The great majority of our senior citizens will neither profit directly nor indirectly from this program. Only a negligible number have been reemployed. On the contrary, they will lose through the present increased cost of living. The benefits of defense spending seem to be largely localized in less than half of all the States. In contrast the proportion of about one-tenth of the population who would receive a pension is very constant throughout the Nation. The production demanded by our senior citizens will be mostly food, shelter, clothing, medical care.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and protect our own democracy from disintegration and collapse, we must find a solution for our unemployment problems as well as providing a decent living for those of our citizens who under our economy are unable to be provided with remunerative employment in our system of production. The severest indictment that has been lodged against us is that while we are the richest and most favored Nation on earth and while we have developed the greatest and most effective productive enterprise the world has ever known for providing the necessities of life—more than sufficient for all—we have failed miserably to provide a method by which the fruits of our industry may be shared equitably by all groups of our people.

While it is true that the social-security program was an approach to this problem, it has completely failed to bring about a solution. Instead of preventing inflation, it has only added thereto. It has sucked out of industry huge blocks of purchasing power and frozen it in idleness, and has used the funds contributed for relief in meeting the ordinary obligations of the Government. It is now clearly demonstrated that these taxes, while ostensibly being a tax upon the wages of these annuitants and their employers, are in practice passed on to the general public as an additional charge entering into the cost of the goods produced. It follows that this tax burden in the main rests upon the general public, but the general public does not have an opportunity to share in the annuities paid therefrom. It is restricted to the few favored individuals coming within the protection of the Social Security Act. Furthermore, the larger the income of the annuitant through the years the larger his monthly payment, notwithstanding the fact that with the larger income annuitants are in less need than those receiving smaller incomes. It reverses the needs test. Under it the less the need the greater the annuity.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks, I present for consideration the following brief summary of a report of the voluntary nonpartisan committee of the House on social security, old-age pensions, and unemployment.

National recovery in the United States is entirely dependent upon an adequate and sustained purchasing power in the hands of the American people. If business and industry are to be assured of opportunity for the steady production of goods, with reasonable profits, and if labor is to be assured stable and sufficient employment, with living wages, purchasing power must keep pace with production. Economic stability depends today almost entirely upon the expansion of demand. With adequate purchasing power available, demand for commodities and services will come naturally, and this demand will force increased production and in turn stabilize employment and make more work available.

Annually about 15 to 20 percent of currently received income is neither spent nor invested, but is saved. This means that this amount is taken out of circulation, reducing the volume of active purchasing power and causing more unemployment. The main question is, How, under the circumstances, are we going to consume all we can produce? Part of our people can produce enough for all of the people. It is necessary that some group be enabled to consume without taking part in production. There are a considerable number of persons in the country who, through no fault of their own, cannot take part in production. In this age it is almost impossible for a man to get a job after he reaches the age of 60. This group over 60 years of age, who have toiled the longest, should not be deprived of taking part in the consumption of goods. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible.

We owe a duty to our old folks and we can perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system on a pay-as-you-go basis, drawing upon some of the idle savings as means of financing it. This plan would take care of all groups that are American citizens over the age of 60. They would be paid by the Federal Government an amount determined by prorating the tax revenue derived from the special taxes levied for this purpose. The revenue will be derived from a broad general tax plus taxes which will operate to reduce the volume of idle savings and make more funds available for active consumer buying power.

Probably the central reason for unemployment today is failure of consumer buying power to keep pace with the production of goods and services. If we are to have a full employment, it is necessary for production of goods to be continuously balanced by an equivalent flow of consumer demand.

Certain facts in recent experience have important bearing on this question. These facts are as follows:

First. Production tends to increase faster than employment.

Second. Under modern scientific methods of production, part of the people are able to produce enough for all the people.

Third. If, however, all the people do not consume their reasonable share of national production, inventories increase, production must be reduced, and even those currently employed will be in danger of losing their jobs.

Fourth. In the closing months of 1939, the Federal Reserve index of industrial production stood at the highest figure on record and in the whole year 1939 the production of goods and services equaled that of 1929. This, however, was accomplished with the employment of 1,000,000 less people than were employed in 1929. It was inevitable under these circumstances for inventories to increase and for production itself to be curtailed so that today the index of production is once again falling.

Fifth. Various methods have been employed to try to keep consumer demand in line with production. Between 1922 and 1929 the consumers of the country had contracted a debt of between $9,000,000,000 and $11,000,000,000 for purchases which they had made on the installment plan. That is, they had attempted to purchase goods in an amount of $9,000,000,000 in excess of their incomes. This could not go on and it was one of the causes of the crash of 1929. It would have come much sooner had it not been for people buying goods beyond their incomes. They tried to stretch consumer demand to equal production. It could not be done.

Sixth. We find that persons 60 years of age and older, once they have become unemployed, find it almost impossible to get back to work again. There are various factors which cause this, among them those connected with industrial insurance and retirement systems. It is a fact, however, which must be taken practically into account.

Seventh. In various ways an attempt has been made to bring about better adjustment between production and consumer demand by enabling certain groups to consume even though they do not take part in production. Relief, retirement systems for Government employees, and certain categories of social security are examples of this.

If it is necessary for some group in society to be enabled to consume its share of national production without contributing to that production, then obviously this group should be those people who have worked the longest and contributed most in the past to our national wealth and to the building up of our very efficient productive machine. This evidently indicates an old-age annuity system.

It is agreed by most economists that the central cause of unemployment today is that too large a proportion of our na-

tional income is saved and set aside in idle pools of money which are neither spent nor promptly invested by their owners. This would indicate the importance not only of stimulating investment but accomplishing a transfer of a portion of the funds now held out of use in surplus savings into the stream of active consumer buying power. The best way to do this is by a system of taxation on the one hand, and the payment of old-age annuities on the other. In our opinion, such a measure would contribute as much to a restoration of confidence as anything that could be done. For all these reasons we believe there should be a national system of pensions established in this country for those people who have passed the age where they can reasonably be expected to secure employment in industry. The particular features of such an old-age annuity system, we believe, should be as follows:

First. It should be a pay-as-you-go system. That is to say, all money collected in taxes for the purpose of providing such pensions should be promptly disbursed to those eligible to receive it.

In the fiscal year 1940 both the unemployment insurance system and the old-age annuity system took money out of circulation at a net rate of $50,000,000 a month. That is, over the whole year those two programs collected in tax $1,200,000,000 more than they paid out in benefits.

Furthermore, those population groups, such as farmers, farm laborers, domestic servants, and others who do not participate in any way in the benefits from either the unemployment insurance or old-age annuity systems, must constantly pay a portion of the pay-roll taxes—indirectly through higher prices—to make possible the payments to the special groups which are covered. Therefore, our next point is:

Second. Pensions should be paid to all American citizens over 60 years of age who are retired from industry.

Third. There should be no difference in the amount of payments made by the Federal Government to people in different States. The States may, of course, supplement Federal payments as they see fit, but the basic pension system should be a straight Federal system supported by Federal taxes and with payments made directly by the Federal Government.

Fourth. The revenue for such a system should be derived first from broad general taxes whereby practically everyone in the population will pay at least a small amount to support this national system of old-age security. Another portion of the revenue should come from such taxes as will operate to reduce the volume of hoarded funds and to accomplish the necessary shift out of those holdings into active consuming buying power. The gross income tax is an example of the first kind of tax, whereas, income taxes, inheritance, estate, and gift taxes are examples of the second kind.

Fifth. The size of the pension should be determined by prorating the tax revenue derived from the special taxes levied for this purpose among all those eligible to receive the pension. But the policy should be to fix the tax rates at such a point as to yield to each pension recipient his proportionate share of the national income.

Such a system as we have outlined would avoid the complicated system of bookkeeping now required both on the part of the individual employers and on the part of the Social Security Board itself. It would make possible elimination of the pay-roll taxes and of the attempt to maintain individual records on upward of 40,000,000 workers. It would make possible the inclusion of all occupational groups of citizens, and it would bring to an end the serious deflationary influence of the current attempt to accumulate reserve funds.

Mr. Chairman, as stated in my opening remarks, it is imperative that the Congress take action immediately to provide temporary relief for our old people by increasing their monthly allowances, as a war emergency matter, owing to the increased cost of living expenses which they must meet out of their meager monthly income from pensions. This increase should be provided for before we recess. My remarks, however, on a permanent social security or old-age program, have reference to a permanent long-range program based on pre-war conditions and fitted into our economy in the post-war period.

We cannot overlook the fact that when the war ends some 10 million servicemen will be released from combat service and will be seeking civil employment and, in addition, there will be 20 million or more turned out of war industries who will have to be absorbed by civil employment in our industrial enterprises. We should not add to this immense problem that will face us by having the 10 million or more elderly citizens still seeking employment and a sufficient monthly income to maintain them in decency and health.

Mr. Chairman, I plead that this important pension program be taken up by the Congress at an early date and solved, in order to save our old folks from want and starvation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, most of the discussion thus far has been devoted to the wisdom or unwisdom, the necessity or lack of necessity for subsidies. I presume no single argument on this subject, for and against, will be unstated after the debate is over. But in my considered judgment there is a far more fundamental issue before this Congress today, and I presume upon a few observations upon that fundamental issue. That is the executive versus the legislative. It is just a part of the pattern that we have seen coming for some time.

It is going to plague us from here on out, and I am frankly disturbed.

It is a question of whether the President is above the law or whether he is amenable to the law. If there is no authority for the action that has been taken thus far by the officials of the Office of Price Administration, directed by the President of the United States in rolling back prices by means of subsidies, then we are in the very unhappy and in the very anomalous position of trying to place a restriction upon the Chief Executive and his administrators when there is no authority now under existing law for what they have done. That is the unhappy and paradoxical situation; that really is the point I am drawing attention to, and if it were left to me entirely I would not validate the action that has been taken thus far. If there is no authority for subsidies in the first instance, I would not validate them now if it could be done by my vote. What is happening is that we are simply storing up for the one evil day that lies ahead, a determination of the responsibilities resting on the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government, a question that is going forward year after year.

The very fact that in the last 10 years there have been 3,600 Executive orders as against the 4,500 public laws passed by the Congress is some indication of the power that has been arrogated to the executive branch of the Government at the expense of the legislative branch.

It is a part of a design that has recurred in the history of the Republic. When Alexander Hamilton had in mind some idea that he wanted to get over, he wrote with that facile pen of his that there must be a strong Executive. When Woodrow Wilson was still in the scholastic cloisters, 50 or more years ago, he was writing about the necessity of a strong Executive; and then pursued that ideology, when he was in the White House.

Theodore Roosevelt tried it on the country when the Panama Canal was still under construction, and again there was conflict between Congress and the President.

And today we have this same identic design that recurs in pattern of this representative democracy, and there is a fateful day ahead before we finally determine whether or not the ancient and durable separation of power in government is going to be maintained, whether the integrity of the lawmaking branch will be preserved, and whether the President will carefully follow the law.

I was interested in the observation of my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON], because he started out on that thought. I am interested in preserving the coordinated government with its separate branches, each one with its organic powers, and if that is not done, then a good many of our sacrifices will have doubtless been in vain. What shall it profit us to gain freedom for the world and lose constitutional government at home?

This is tragic business, and what I have in mind is that here the fundamental issue is again presented today of the Executive versus the legislative branch, with the Chief Executive assuming an authority that does not exist, and then compromising the position of the Congress. That is the thing that is happening today in this very question

of subsidy. It is growing, day after day, week after week, and month after month, and we must deal with it sooner or later.

I am interested in another thing. I am wondering as we pursue this subsidy route now whether we are seeing far enough down the avenue of time to see the difficult position we are going to be in later. It is so easy to put on a subsidy, but do not forget that some day we will be confronted with the problem of taking it off, and then what? We will meet consumer resistance to taking it off; we will meet farmer resistance if we tinker with prices; we will meet labor resistance if we undertake to alter wages and it is going to be a difficult thing to remedy and to undo the work that may be done this fell day by the Congress of the United States if we embark upon a subsidy plan.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for just a moment, and then I will yield.

I am interested for this reason: It will be a part of the whole collective pattern; it will be a part of the socializing pattern, and when we get going pretty well on that road, what will be our condition, what will be our capacity for dealing with the big problems of the Nation and the world when the war is over?

We made great promises to the world, but do we have the capacity to carry out those promises? It is a matter of great importance. It is so easy to talk about the "four freedoms," and to talk about elevating the conditions of 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 peoples throughout the world, but do the 130,000,000 people have the capacity? They might. They might if the very integrity of the Republic is maintained, and it can be done only by a great and a militant people that still live under the banner of free enterprise, for only out of that kind of government would you get the faith, would you get the vigor, would you get the power, would you get the leadership to do the job that we have assumed for the world. A collective ideology cannot do it; a collective philosophy cannot do it, and I am wondering whether we do not, by the route now proposed, destroy our own capacity to meet post-war problems when finally that responsibility devolves upon this Republic.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Would not this so-called subsidy we are now immediately dealing with naturally fall when price control falls?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My good friend, it will fall only when the authors and finishers of the subsidy philosophy fall. Mr. Henderson said to the Banking and Currency Committee that in his judgment there would be price control after the war is over. Mr. Tugwell said that the philosophies existing before 1932 were just as archaic as the ox cart and the windmill.

Dr. Hansen who advises the Federal Reserve Board and the Bureau of the Budget says that Congress will surrender its powers over taxation and appropriation and only indicate in broad lines the direction that the Chief Executive shall pursue and leave to him the rest of the chore. Adolf Berle has expressed a like kind of philosophy, and they, my good friend and brother in the faith, are giving point to the administrative philosophy of government today. So I say to you that it will fall only if they let it fall; but, thank God, there will be another day for the people to speak and there may be a possibility of taking them out of office and saving the country before it is too late.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentry to whom he refers we will attend to in our party before the gentleman even gets a chance to do it, and what we leave of them we are sure he will take care of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope that will be the case, but there has been this rising tide of the new ideology that has been moving faster and faster in all the days that I have been privileged by my constituency to be a part of this honorable body, and sometimes I have despaired we will ever undo the damage which has been done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. Akin to what the gentleman has stated, which disturbs me and it must disturb the gentleman, is the reasoning of Mr. Ickes and others in taking over the coal mines, the industry of the country, under the impact of the war. Is not that a further step towards socialization and corporate government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true. I thank my friend. You see, there is something more to it than meets the eye. We are dealing here ostensibly with subsidies, but fundamentally we are dealing with this greater problem of the executive encroachment upon the legislative branch of Government, and the very hope of this country reposes in this branch of Congress today.

Consider how many times Congress has in one way and another spoken upon the question of incentive and subsidy payments and yet at this very moment, notwithstanding the action of the Congress, such subsidies are in effect. Where is the authority for such action, and if no authority exists, by what virtue was such a program initiated? Can it be that in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President deems himself Commander in Chief of the civilian population and the civilian economy as well?

If the President can assume such powers, without authority of law, what shall we say of the future? He may find himself at variance with the people and with the Congress on matters of international concern, and will he then undertake to ignore the clear intent of the people's representatives and pursue his own course?

If we continue to move forward into that field of governmental philosophy where governmental power is ultimate and supreme and transcends the rights of the citizen as a free individual, speaking through his legislative representatives, what shall we say of our usefulness in the days ahead in dealing with world problems? A nation wedded to the collective idea in which the individual is but an atom, and where incentive and initiative are impaired, would find it difficult indeed to assume leadership for the world. Freedom, free enterprise, initiative, integrity, constitutional government must be maintained if we are to exercise maximum usefulness in the days to come and it cannot be done if by subtle means or by bold action on the part of the Executive powers are assumed which are not authorized by the lawmaking branch.

Such is the matter before us today, and that is why we are confronted with a problem far more fundamental than the mere problem of subsidies.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee listening to the hearings on this bill, I just want to take a minute or two to express my views about subsidies, and why I feel some restrictive amendments should be placed in this act to curb the use of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If you will turn to the hearings at page 23 you will find the statement of Mr. Chester Davis. He said something in his opening statement which, to my mind, defeats every argument he advanced in support of his request for subsidies. I read the following from his statement:

> Let me throw a few figures at you. Most of you are familiar with them. The best estimates I am able to obtain indicate that the total of consumer income in the United States in 1943, that is the sum of payments to individuals, will aggregate about $140,000,000,000. The forecast for individual taxes is about $16,000,000,000. leaving disposable income in the hands of the consumers of about $124,000,000,000. At the existing price level, with the supply of goods that we have on hand, about $82,000,000,000 is about all we can expend for consumer goods without having a substantial rise in prices. And that leaves, and on any estimate of this sort you have got to be willing to take a billion dollars or so here or there because after all, they are estimates; that leaves about $42,000,000,000 which you might say is available for savings. And under savings I would include insurance payments, normal payments, and reduction of debts and what people are now investing in Government bonds.
>
> Saying that that type of savings is $25,000,000,000, that leaves $17,000,000,000 knocking loose in the economy, much of it in the possession of people who want to spend it. Many of them never had so much money to spend before in their lives. That creates an inflationary condition. That makes direct price controls very difficult to handle. It seems to me the answer to that is the answer that should have been taken a long while ago, that is by stiffer taxation and withholding at the source and a much broader program of investment on the part of the people who have this money in Government securities than we have ever had in this country. That would lay a kind of foundation against which we could brace ourselves with price controls and operating programs.

Mr. Davis in asking the committee to give him another $1,000,000,000, to be

used in subsidy payments, admitted in his opening statement that the same public that in his mind had $17,000,000,000 which should be taken away from it, should be given this extra $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000. In support of his argument, he said we should borrow, or tax the people further, to give them another $2,000,000,000 too much money to spend. This, to my mind, is no argument why we should allot funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation for subsidy payments.

Brought out in the committee, and discussed very thoroughly, was the question of how much money this subsidy would save each person. They said on the facts before the committee it could not save the average person in America over $10 a year, or approximately that. Do you mean to tell me that anybody in authority will try to convince the American people that a $10 subsidy to each individual in the United States will stop the cost of living from going beyond the limit where it would be called inflationary? To my mind we are not only fooling ourselves, but we are trying to fool the American people into believing we are giving them something that we are not. It is very easy for us here in Congress to go home and tell our constituents that we are giving them something; that today we have voted in Congress to give them something; that is easy to do. I have in my district two of the largest industrial plants in the United States, the Glenn L. Martin Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. Over half my district is in Baltimore city. I can easily go to my people and tell them that I voted this afternoon to give them a subsidy, but I think this is no time, of all times, for men in public life to try and curry favor with their constituents by offering them some incentive.

The Treasury of our country and the financial stability of our country is of more importance to me than to go back home and tell my constituents that I am trying to tax the people of the United States to give them a hand-out; and that is what this subsidy will mean, because it is a subsidy to the consumer and not the producer. Mr. Chairman, we, especially we in public life from the Executive down, in this war Congress, as never before, should stand up and tell the American people the facts and not try to perpetuate ourselves in public office upon some unsound program that will catch the unthinking person and possibly get votes by doing so. If there ever was a time in America when men should stand on principle and try to lead their constituents and be honest and truthful with them about the actual conditions and facts of our Government, it is today, because we not only are struggling for the survival of our democracy, but what we do here in the next year or two is going to go a long way in molding the policy of our Government for the next generation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we are facing a most unusual situation in the country today.

We are witnessing a shortage of meat all over the country and at a time when we have a larger surplus of beef and hogs than at any other time in the history of our country. In facing such a situation one naturally asks why a shortage of beef and pork in the case of such a surplus? The answer is not too simple but in making a careful analysis one cannot help but come to conclusion that the price-fixing regulations under the administration which has caused confusion, doubt, and apprehension as to the future has caused the producers and the packers of meat to become panicky. They lack confidence in the administration. There is too much confusion.

It is most unusual, Mr. Chairman, that the individuals in the administration who have charge of the regulations relative to food, and this includes price-fixing, rationing, and distribution, are not in accord with each other. There is no definite policy, no coordination of effort, but misunderstanding and bickering which have led to further confusion.

It is most unfortunate that many of the men dealing with policy-forming positions have had so little actual experience in the fields which they are trying to regulate.

The O. P. A. set up some advisory committees to consult with the leaders of industry but I want to point out to this House and the country that although these advisory committees who understand the problems of food production have been consulted their advice has not been followed. Take the cattle industry including the producers and the packers. They have protested long, hard, and in earnest that the roll-back of prices and the subsidy program being considered was not workable. They have protested vigorously against the directives and the program. Have they had any results? Apparently not. It is hard to understand why some of the economic theorists and the impractical planners have not taken the advice and the considered judgment of the men on the firing line who are dealing intimately, closely, and with great understanding with the problems in the production of meat. Is there anyone in this House, particularly on the majority side, who can answer that question? I would like to pose this question to the majority leader. Why has it been that the O. P. A. has not listened to the considered judgment of the livestock producers and the packers as it relates to meat? This is also true of the butter producers and the men dealing in the sale of coffee.

On June 1, 1943, I placed in the RECORD the following:

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fourth District of Nebraska are wrought up over this latest scheme of price control proposed by theoretically minded economists in the Office of Price Administration known as the roll-back of prices by means of subsidy payments. Here are some of the expressions found in the mail that is coming into my office:

"We believe that production will be further curtailed and black markets increased. Government bureaus must listen to common sense if they are to ward off starvation."

"Proposed subsidy programs will mean only further Government control, will increase black markets tremendously, will add materially to already much-confused conditions, will tend to reduce production, and cost of operation will be exorbitant and extravagant."

Stockmen wire:

Subsidies are wrong in principle and roll-back will be incentive to bootleg meat and decreased production. Let's win the war and quit messing things up.

These messages show that practical people understand just what the subsidy scheme implies and how it will fail in practice. In the first place, if it does reduce the price of meat and butter at the retail store, the housewife who buys it will pay in taxes not only the subsidy but the cost of the huge organization that will be set up to administer the program. In this day, when everybody is going to pay taxes to the limit, there can be no shifting to someone else. Today there is a black market in food because the consumer has the money and is willing to pay a higher price in order to get the food. By reducing the official price of food with a subsidy the O. P. A. is not going to be able to destroy the black market nor is it going to be able to reduce the actual price that people will pay for food, if they get any at all.

These theoretical schemes, hatched in the brains of impractical economists, which disregard our whole established plan of production and distribution, serve only to disturb and upset those who are having a hard enough job of producing our food. These schemes only serve to discourage the producers and inevitably reduce the amount of food produced. What I say about this is borne out in the following statement I received from 145 members of the Dawson County, Nebr., Feeders' Association this morning:

Government meddling has already taken half the cattle out of our feed lots, and we know that the proposed subsidy program will further discourage cattle and hog feeders in this territory.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, What good will it do to reduce prices if the scheme employed reduces the production of food itself?

These people are appealing to their Representative in Congress for aid against these schemes. The bureaus that hatch them will not listen to them. We are the elected representatives of the people. They look to us for help against the "planners" who have taken this land of plenty almost to the point of where it is a land of scarcity. It is high time, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress serve notice in a way that will be understood that it is opposed to these schemes of totalitarian economy.

I wrote a letter to Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, and Prentiss Brown, Director of the O. P. A., in which I stated in part:

It is the considered judgment of the livestock producers and packers that a roll-back program, as it will affect livestock and meat, is very unwise. Such a move will add to the

already existing confusion, which means red tape and rationing the livestock and meat industry, which have heretofore had an unequal record of patriotic cooperation in our national war effort. It will in the end not only create chaos but encourage black markets and decrease the production of meat.

This was on June 1. The prediction made at that time, I am sorry to say, has come true, black markets are flourishing, confusion is rampant. I further stated:

The entire food subsidy idea will cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars The citizen has more money to spend than ever before and giving of subsidies to him will add more millions of dollars to an already swollen and unmanaged purse.

I further stated:

That the giving of subsidies is an unwise economic experiment designed to fool the people. It is un-American and unnecessary. Such a move will be an additional form of inflation. It is entirely devoid of any merits. It will be impossible to distribute subsidies with any degree of equity among all the producers and handlers of food.

I further stated:

That subsidies will act as a creeping, grasping narcotic which in the end will lull industry to sleep and eventually paralyze and stifle free enterprise.

I said in the same letter:

I presume the next move of your group, if Congress refuses subsidies and I am sure they will, will be to pass the roll-back to the farmer.

That is what is happening, gentlemen; the roll-back on the price of meat has already been given to the farmers, and now the administration proposes an additional subsidy to the packer.

I asked Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Brown for an answer which the public and my people would understand, but to date I have received no answer.

I am rather proud of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that I was one of the first men in this Congress to protest the giving of subsidies. For on May 10, page 4150, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called the attention of this House and protested the statement of Price Administrator Prentiss Brown, in his radio talk, when he made his first announcement that "the paying of subsidies would save the housewife some money because the Government would pay the difference."

Mr. Chairman, subsidies for foods are a political juggernaut. When once started it never turns back. The paying of subsidies for all food prices would add billions of dollars in taxes to our national debt. The administrative costs would be tremendous. It would add thousands to the Government pay rolls. The administration is not fooling the people. They know eventually they must pay the bill.

It is the desire of every man in this Congress to do those things and take those actions that will help win this war. The production of food is most important. Men cannot fight on empty stomachs nor can the people at home wax fat on directives from the administration. There is no question now since the program of subsidies was announced by Mr. Brown on May 9 that it has resulted in a scarcity of food, particularly meat. Many packing houses have closed their doors. The only ones operating, and they on a restricted basis, are the large packing houses who are supplying meat to the armed forces.

It seems that this Congress should recognize that when an act of the administration is hindering the prosecution of this war that the act should be immediately corrected.

Leaders of agriculture have appealed to the administration for more than a year, pointing out the necessity of food, the need of machinery, a more liberal policy in keeping experienced farm hands at home, and then a price for their produce which would give them a fair profit. The administration has been blind and refused to listen to the leaders who saw the tornado and crisis in food approaching.

The President has said that anyone that had a better "'ole" should come forth with the plan. Mr. Chairman, I am bold and yet humble in suggesting a plan which will produce and give additional food, not only to the armed forces and the world, but the folks at home. My conclusion comes from being a farm owner for a quarter of a century and living in a farming community and studying their problems.

Let me suggest that prices as they relate to meat should be flexible. Let us establish a floor under beef and a ceiling over that beef. There should be a wide-enough difference in this floor and ceiling, from 4 to 6 cents at least in order that the individual producing meat might have a price incentive for producing better beef. The individual who produces poor meat will get a lower price. The law of supply and demand will be in operation. The individual's incentive will be given freedom of action. The packer or the buyer of livestock will be able to use his judgment as to what an animal is worth. It is folly to attempt to put the American food producer into a physical, mental, ritualistic price fixing, regimented, goose-stepping program. It cannot be done.

Then, Mr. Chairman, a most careful study should be made as to the distribution of food. There are now entirely too many profits between the producer and the consumer. It may be likely that flexible prices should be established for the consumers. In other words the consumer who wants a good corn-fed steak will pay a higher price. The cheap meat of course will bring a lower price. Such a method will help produce meat. What I am saying about meat applies to other foods. We must not strangle freedom of action and enterprise. We must not destroy the incentive of the individual on the home front. With such a program in operation and with an understanding that there will not be a constant tinkering and meddling with our economic machinery we may be assured that food will be produced and will reach the consumer.

I would urge that the study of distribution and the profits to the middleman be given immediate consideration.

I feel further, Mr. Chairman, that there should be no attempt to ration the luxuries of life. If John Jones has a thousand dollars to spend on a fur coat, let him spend it, but if Joe Doakes needs a pair of overalls and work shirt he should be able to buy it at a controlled price.

It is absolutely necessary that this Congress do everything possible to control inflation. The methods, however, adopted by the administration in the subsidy program aid inflation. The roll-back prices give additional money to the individual to spend. Ruinous inflation would be a tragedy to American industry and the people in our country. Inflation has been knocking at our door and gradually gaining an entrance over a period of several months. It will come in like a tornado, leaving a devastating wreckage behind unless Congress and the administration recognize some of the fundamental problems involved and take the necessary steps to control inflation.

Many harsh words have been said and can be said concerning the administration and the methods they have followed, but what does it gain? Congress should have something constructive to offer. It is so easy to criticize. It is hard to offer constructive criticism. We sometimes wait until we are over the ground, for hindsight seems better than foresight. The plan that I have suggested, however, of a ceiling and a floor with flexible prices not only for meat but for other products should have serious consideration. The study of middleman profits and distribution needs the glaring light of investigation. The control of labor prices is essential.

Seldom has a plan offered by the administration been shown so quickly that it would not work. I urge the Congress, both sides of this House, through the proper committees to establish those controls and procedures which will help save the food industry of America, save us from ruinous inflation, which in turn will help win this war and bring our boys back home, where they may live under a lasting and honorable peace.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the payment of subsidies to support a roll-back on retail prices of meat and other foods will not, in my judgment, contribute to the winning of the war or contribute to the best interests of the people of this country. It appears there has been a considerable amount of confusion as to the reason for the payment of subsidies in an attempt to reduce the price of certain rationed foods, especially meat. I do not believe there is serious objection on the part of Congress or the people to paying subsidies for the purpose of increasing the supply of certain strategic materials required for the war effort. That field is limited and includes a comparatively few items. For a considerable period of time subsidies were paid the farmers in order to help sustain their incomes and also to induce them to cut down their production. Now we have a different situation. We are embarking on a program, that of paying subsidies not to increase production but simply to hold down or reduce retail prices on certain rationed foods. Let it be understood that these

payments are not to go to farmers to increase production but to packers and processors to make up the difference in the roll-back of retail food prices. Just for a moment, let us see how much it will really help the consumer. A roll-back of 10 percent in the price of meat will reduce the cost of meat to the average consumer not more than $3 per year, or 25 cents per month, but it does not guarantee that the consumer will get meat. It simply means that if meat is available under a rationing program, he will save 25 cents per month on meat. Mr. Chairman, the funds to provide for these subsidies must come from the Federal Treasury. Since there is no money on hand for this purpose, they must come from increased taxes or increased sale of bonds. In other words, you are going to ask the boys who are now fighting our battles and helping to save this country from our enemies to assist us in paying our food bills when they get back. Either they or our children or our grandchildren will be expected to pay the terrific debt that is being placed on future generations. It is, of course, necessary to increase the debt required for the prosecution of the war but I just do not believe it is right to use Treasury funds to pay food bills of the present generation unless it can be shown that the farmer or the producer is making huge profits on account of this war. If there are some excess profits, this is not the way to attack the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the farmer and the producer should be given a fair chance to produce all the meat and other foods he can. He should receive a fair and reasonable profit for his labor. The amount he receives should be based on the price he is required to pay for the things he buys and he ought to be encouraged to produce every bit of food he can. Let the processor have whatever is reasonable to put the food in the hands of the retailer, and permit the retailer to be given a fair and reasonable profit. If prices must be fixed let it be on the retail price of food, and place it on the basis I have just described. Mr. Chairman, we must do everything we possibly can to encourage an increased production of food and give less attention to rules and regulations. Shortage of food is the thing that causes more difficulty than the price itself. In other words, not much good will be done in an attempt to solve the problem of food prices if we find ourselves with a dire shortage of food.

Mr. Chairman, I do not share the views of certain Members of this House who hold the payment of subsidies for roll-back of rationed foods will help prevent inflation. In my judgment it will work in the opposite direction. Such policy will tend to create inflationary conditions. I am not in favor of skyrocketing prices or inflationary conditions, but I do not believe this is the proper method of tackling the problem.

Mr. Chairman, to embark on such policy is very important. If funds from the Federal Treasury are to be used to hold or adjust prices on these commodities, then why not apply the same policy on other consumer goods? Why not roll back prices on farm machinery and equipment that has increased so much during the past few years? If we once get good and started down the road in paying subsidies to hold the line on prices, I am concerned as to where and when it will end.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize again that I am concerned about the shortage of food supply that this country may face in the rather near future. Not that the American people will be in want. But with the demand for the armed forces and for our own consumption as well as that of our allies in this war, every possible effort must be made, and every encouragement be given for increased production of food of all kinds. Food is a most essential material in the prosecution of this war as well as for the winning of the peace.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect increased production by curbs and regulations, red tape and uncertainties, and gadgets of all kinds that tend to hamstring the farmers of this Nation. The farmer will not receive the subsidy payments under this program. He is not asking for them. All he wants is a fair price for his products on the basis of the price he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the President has just vetoed the Smith-Connally bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, but I am not surprised.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I am not an economist, I do not even think I am an economist, so you need not expect a very enlightening statement on my part. I feel, however, that in the general disposition toward legislation we were too fearful that there could be nobody found outside the Halls of our Congress who were competent or capable of doing anything much at all right. That has not appealed to me as a very safe course for us to take.

As one of a few who signed not a minority report, but who submitted a minority view, I subscribe to the position that we have confidence in Chester Davis. I do not know what his politics are and I do not care anything about them, but I think he must be a man competent and certainly inclined to perform a good work for this Government and for the people. We cannot stick too closely to our pet feelings about the Government and go back and talk about this provision and the other as though we were not in an emergency or in a war. Maybe if we did not have an unusual situation and maybe if we did not expect it to continue for a time, we might debate with much profit perhaps about each one of these economic questions and then say that we spell this out and you do it this way, but do not do it any other way. The objection to the sweeping language used, and I understand that a substitute will be offered that is more restrictive in its language, with respect to section 6 of this bill is that it is all-inclusive.

We do not want to hand out subsidies to anybody, but right now as we debate this bill there are independent producers, there are independent distributors, there are independent packers who are caught in a bind and it does not seem to be possible to do anything except to provide a small subsidy in order to let them live and distribute their products to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term "$2,650,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "$3,150,000,000;".

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 2, line 10, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I stated previously this afternoon that I intended to offer an amendment to strike out the increased borrowing authorization of $500,000,000 in this bill. No justification at all was shown before our committee for this increased borrowing power for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I cannot exactly say what the mind of the committee was, but it seemed to me there was a general understanding that the provisions of the bill against the use of subsidies and the roll-back program would prevail. Therefore, there is no need, if there are not going to be any subsidies, for this increased authorization.

I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation still has approximately $400,000,000 or $450,000,000 in reserve. This being the case, it seems to me that if the Commodity Credit Corporation gets to a place where it really needs any more funds it can come back to the committee and ask for them.

It seems to be one of the easiest things for these agencies to come to the committees and ask for an authorization for more money to spend. I think we should watch these items a little more closely. Being utterly opposed to this roll-back-and-subsidy program, anyway, I want to see this $500,000,000 eliminated.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Can the gentleman advise me, based upon the hearings before his committee, how much money would be required for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make necessary loans this fall on crops harvested in the fall?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No justification for any amount was made. That was understood by the committee.

Mr. MILLS. Would the $450,000,000 now available to the Commodity Credit Corporation be sufficient?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not think that point was brought out before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to place a few figures in the RECORD in support of this amendment.

On page 242 of the hearings you will see where I asked Mr. Hutson how much money the Corporation was borrowing at this time last year and how much money they are borrowing now. What I was trying to find out was exactly how much money they had spent during the past year for there seemed to be a good deal of confusion as to that in our committee.

The figures given me show that they spent approximately $500,000,000 during last year. Out of that, on the same page, they testified that they spent $207,000,000 on foreign purchases, which we have prohibited under section 8 of this bill, and that they had spent $25,000,000 under the subsidy program. Deducting these two items totaling $232,000,000 from the $500,000,000 they have spent shows that they might need for this year approximately $270,000,000; but they have on hand today $465,000,000. Therefore, I think the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is pretty sound, and that if this bill passes with its restrictions they will not need any further money. Also owing to higher prices of farm commodities the Corporation should not be asked this year to lend so much money as they have in the past to protect farm prices. It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio should be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have had only brief opportunity, of course, to examine the figures that have been submitted by the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it occurs to me that this extra $500,000,000 that is in issue in this amendment is, at least to the extent of 50 percent of that amount, unnecessary for the normal operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The exact amount will be about $232,000,000, as I understand, so there would be a little cushion of about one-half of that amount. That, of course, in addition to whatever profits the Commodity Credit Corporation may have made or whatever unexpended balances are available to them, could then be used for their operations in the year to come. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. KEAN. Yes. They have $465,000,000 on hand at present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize the importance of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the general agricultural scheme and in dealing with farm commodities. We made provision for this agency in the agriculture appropriation bill. We do insert some limitations, but we have always recognized the necessity for this kind of a trading operation when you have a very uncertain condition in the country.

My best judgment is that probably the Smith amendment that is now pending ought not to be adopted so as to hamstring the operations of the Corporation. It does not involve the subsidy money, as I understand this particular money. Of course, it will be taken care of if the subsidy restriction is adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. It is true, of course, that if this borrowing authority is not needed it will not be utilized by the Corporation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true. Where you have a rather extensive authorization that deals not only with operations within our own country but operations abroad, as, for instance, in the case of Peruvian copper or Peruvian long-staple cotton, Brazilian cotton, Brazilian coffee, and a good many other items, I doubt the wisdom of holding them so close that you might very conceivably obstruct and hamstring their operations.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We cut them half a billion. This is one of the most important agencies for getting food, because under the Steagall amendment that was adopted and reamended they can support anywhere, at least above 90 percent of parity. They have gotten beans, snap beans, and all sorts of vegetables and strategic kinds of commodities like corn and that sort of thing that otherwise they could not have gotten without this money. It seems to me this is one place where you can put the money and get results.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. It is, after all, only a borrowing authority for the purposes of operational funds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I am not misinformed, the Commodity Credit Corporation will undoubtedly be requested subsequently to make vast purchases for lease-lend. All of these funds go into their general operations, do they not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not see how we can make any mistake by letting them have this additional half billion dollars.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not involve so many dollars. It just involves borrowing to the limit so that they will be on the safe side.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, originally officials of the Corporation asked for $1,000,000,000, but the committee, anticipating a curtailment of the services they will be required to render next year, and that possibly this bill will take away some of the demands upon the Corporation, reduced it to the amount carried in the bill, $500,000,000. If the officials of the Corporation find that they cannot operate with that amount, and undoubtedly the demands during the next year are liable to run well ahead of what they have been, it will not be difficult to obtain legislation to increase the amount. But if this bill is amended, as it probably will be, it will limit the services to be rendered by the Corporation, so that it will not matter if it is more than they need, it could only be used for the purposes authorized.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this one thing. They gave us figures on their losses, and it appears in the hearings they are expected to be about $70,000,000 from the period of their operations before the Board started. In making a little table of it for my own use it occurred to me that if they held their commodities just a bit longer and had not put them on the market in order to provide these commodities for use for war purposes, their loss would have been erased, and perhaps there would have been a profit instead. They started taking their loss, that is, the cotton loss, in 1936. That cotton could just as well have been held until today, and it would have been a profit. So I think it is just as well to keep in mind for the future, because the same kind of a situation is likely to occur after this war as during the depression, and this is the kind of a corporation with the idea of holding surpluses over from one year when there is a surplus, to another year, when there is not so as to keep a stability not only on the agricultural program, but a stability of the whole program, through stabilizing all agricultural products, and you can do it without loss. I mention that not only because there is not very much danger in voting against the amendment, but also to draw attention to the fact for future purposes, that this is something that might very well be a permanent agency, which would help to alleviate the depressions from the high peak of prosperity, from which we have suffered so much in the past in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 2, strike out lines 14 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (Public, No. 1, 74th Cong.; 49 Stat. 4), is amended (a) by striking out 'June 30, 1943' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945', (b) by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 7', and (c) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office (in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions) and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem ad-

visable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1945, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purposes of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'"

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should have the support of every Member of this House. It simply provides for an annual audit of the books and transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If anyone can give any reason why this agency should not be subjected to an annual audit, I should like to have him rise in his place and state his reason therefor.

I do not know anything about the transactions of this agency, but here is an agency which has at its command more than $3,000,000,000. That is a lot of money, and I think it is of interest to the people who furnish that money to know precisely what is being done with it. They ought to know, and I think they want to know. A number of agencies have been established in the last 10 or 12 years which are not subject to audit. I might say that this agency has been audited, so far as its administration is concerned, but not with regard to its operations and transactions, and until we have such an audit we do not know what the actual condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation is. I do not think it is necessary to go into this any further. I believe, as I said a moment ago, that every Member of this House ought to vote for this amendment. I might say that originally this bill had a provision requiring an audit of the books and transactions of the agency. It was taken out of the bill, and I thought at the time it was deleted that it would be put back in another form, but it was not. That is one reason that I have offered this amendment, and I hope it will receive full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were ayes 70 and noes 82.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] against subsidies. I feel that if this Administration were truly interested in stopping inflation and paying the cost of this war as we go along we would have had a sales tax within a few days after we declared war. The subsidy is a sales tax in reverse. It is another attempt to panhandle our way to victory. Its effect on the production of food is most disastrous.

I would like to read to you a letter that came to my office this morning from a young farmer in my district.

I fed 4 carloads of steers this past season and landed on last week's market when the Government and the packers were at loggerheads over roll-back prices. Before roll-backs were considered prices were hardly high enough to permit a feeder to break even. I borrowed the money to carry on this supposedly necessary job and now find that I have a mortgage on my cattle that were clear before I started.

Since September 1942, the cost of producing meat has advanced at least 40 percent and there is absolutely no way to roll-back this cost. Most certainly Government edict won't roll it back.

One man and I look after the stock, do the farming, and put up the hay on this small ranch which carries the usual Federal land bank loan. We were of the opinion that it was necessary work and we hoped to be able to produce 100,000 pounds of meat ready for the consumer. I feel that my business was sacrificed to enhance the position of Mr. Roosevelt in his fight with Lewis.

I feel that to continue the production of meat under the present set-up is to flirt with bankruptcy. This has little or no appeal to me. I have a further suspicion that the Government through the Office of Price Administration is planning on forcing a liquidation of livestock through the simple method of causing losses. I feel this strongly enough so that my business which was on a sound producing basis is in for drastic curtailment. Young sows which normally should raise a crop of fall pigs will be marketed. There will be no fall pigs on this place for the first time in years. Our cows and heifers are in the balance and probably will be mostly sold. So far as feeding cattle is concerned that is out the window. Incidentally I increased the weight of the cattle I fed 30,000 pounds, besides improving the quality. I didn't get paid for it. I feel so strongly that a liquidation at a loss is just around the corner that I am attempting to get my house in order. It means a feast today, a famine tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to guarantee or secure."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss SUMNER of Illinois: Page 2, line 22, after the phrase "SEC. 5", strike out the word "Section" and insert the word "Subsection"; page 2, line 22, after the word "this", strike out the word "section" and insert the word "subsection"; page 2, line 24, after the word "to", insert the phrase "take over or purchase."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois. It meets the judgment and approval of the officials of the Federal Reserve System. It is simply a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we are at a critical hour in the history of this world conflict. Our armies in the field are winning glorious victories. Today in the minds of many American citizens, we are about to lose an important battle on the home front. The time and circumstances are not appropriate to go into much detail about that. But the Chief Executive, for reasons undoubtedly sufficient in his own mind, has sent back to the Congress without approval, the Smith-Connally bill. The other body, at the other end of the Capitol, has passed the bill over the Presidential veto. The clerk of the Senate is at the portals of the House of Representatives with a message from the Senate. It is time now for action in this body, not tomorrow, not Monday, but today.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will pardon me just a minute.

Every man is entitled to his own individual opinion, and he must take his

own responsibility. The President can take his. He is amply qualified to do it. I want to take mine. I do not want to put it off. I want to say to the people that I represent, and I want to send a message to the boys in the fox holes and on the battle fronts that those of us here at home are going to do our part. I hope very much it will be the pleasure of this House to take immediate action upon this important matter, and not let it simmer here and work into a festering sore. We should unhesitatingly pass this bill over the veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to speak out of order; is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] asks unanimous consent to speak out of order, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] reserves the right to object. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that ordinarily the veto message of the President is not open to discussion.

We have before this Committee a very important bill. I have a certain responsibility to this Committee to preserve consideration of this bill. I do not intend to allow the consideration of this Commodity Credit Corporation bill to be turned into a forum for the consideration of the President's veto message.

I will not object to the gentleman from Kentucky speaking out of order, but I shall object to anyone else speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I do not think it is proper or fitting as Americans to permit the House to become worked up against labor by a lot of this antilabor talk on the President's message, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Committee rose informally, and the Speaker assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. FRAZIER, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 796) entitled "An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate of the United States, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senate having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate still further insists upon its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

(The Committee resumed its sitting.)

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will resolve our tempers, return to our customary good judgment, and particularly to adhere to that for which our forefathers fought, that it is the right of men to be independent and to enjoy their liberties. That includes the right to vote as we please and to exercise our own judgment. Just as soon as this Committee rises I expect to move the previous question——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. McGRANERY Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order. The gentleman from Kentucky will proceed in order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, so far as the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania know, I may have meant that I would move the previous question on the bill under consideration. But I will move the previous question, and I shall expect the House of Representatives to meet its responsibility as I shall meet mine, fearlessly and in the interest of the men in the fox-holes of Bataan and Guadalcanal and Kiska and Attu where this message of the President has struck like a 4-ton block buster. I raise no question as to the good faith of the President, but "to err is human and to forgive is divine" and I gladly concede his right to veto the Connally-Smith bill, but I have a right to and do most seriously question the wisdom of his act. No law, however severe, hurts anyone who does not violate or disobey it. The rank and file of labor are sound at heart and patriotic in purpose, but some labor leaders, as stated in the President's message, have for selfish reasons knowingly obstructed production of vital war materials and thus tied the hands of our fighting forces in our greatest hour of peril and at a time when thousands of our boys in uniform face death in many parts of the world. I hope this House will stand man to man for the safety of our Republic and vote to override the veto.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the debate on this bill will proceed in order and be brief, and when the bill is out of the way the veto message will be brought up for action.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: Page 2, line 24, after the word "secure", strike out all of section 6.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is to strike out section 6. As I understand it, section 6 has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN, The gentleman is correct; the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, section 6:

"SEC. 6. In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies to maintain maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities, no maximum price shall be established or maintained under any law for any such commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, in the market place the support price therefor announced by the Secretary, or below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended, except that nothing in the foregoing provisions shall be construed to prevent the selling of wheat for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn nor to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort. Agreements made by the Commodity Credit Corporation prior to the enactment of this act shall not be affected by this section until 60 days after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 3, strike out all of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies. No subsidies or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or to any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or commodities processed in whole or in substantial

part from agricultural commodities either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices that have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under Congressional authorization by, or in custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in the foregoing provisions shall be construed to prevent the selling of wheat for feeding purposes, if sold at not less than the parity price of corn nor to prevent such adjustments in the maximum or support prices on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed as may be necessary to bring about or to maintain adequate production for the war effort; nor shall any maximum price for any such commodity be established or maintained for any such agricultural commodity including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, in the market place a price below the support price therefor nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in Section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan just read is adopted, then will it be possible to offer an amendment to strike out the entire section 6?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

Mr. BARRY. The only way to get an opportunity to strike out section 6 is to defeat this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has had careful and thorough study by the gentleman from Michigan, and myself. We have worked on the amendment jointly for several days, and we have consulted various people who have been interested in it. It has been before the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration, but was not adopted by the committee as a committee amendment. It was not acted on by the committee. Speaking for myself, personally, I wish to say that I favor the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Unless the gentleman from Michigan desires time, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 195, noes 48.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. STEAGALL and Mr. KELLEY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 179, noes 52.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 42, noes 130.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Line 4, after the word "hereof", insert "including the commitments heretofore made for the production and processing of canned vegetables for the crop season for the year 1943."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 125, noes 95.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: After the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOLCOTT, insert the following: "Agreements made by the Commodity Credit Corporation prior to the enactment of this act shall not be affected by this section until 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHRIST: Amend the pending Wolcott amendment by inserting after the words "parity price of corn" the words "at the time and in the area of the sale."

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. Such modifications shall be made in maximum prices established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (Public Law No. 421, 77th Cong.), and an act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation and for other purposes, approved October 2, 1942 (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.), for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as the War Food Administrator determines are necessary to secure an adequate production of such commodity for war purposes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL: On page 4, line 1, strike out "modifications" and insert the word "increases."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 10, after the word "commodity", strike out the comma and insert "including milk and livestock and the products thereof."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, never in my short service in the House, save on one other occasion, and that was the day on which war was declared against our enemies, have I seen this House so tense and so excited. We have very serious and grave matters confronting us today upon which we must exercise our judgment as legislators. I am interested, as is everybody else, in being faithful to the men of this Nation who are fighting on the far seas and over in north Africa. I do not think we are going to help those men by doing anything ill-considered or by doing anything which is going to interfere with the almost miraculous production which we have had in this country. My plea is that the Members of this House today use the same reason and good judgment which I have seen them exercise so often, and that they be not stampeded by any emotional appeal on the important matters on which we have to vote.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. BARRY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this bill do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE and Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 190, noes 29.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 270, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Wolcott amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The question is on the amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 225, noes 32.

So the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 3, strike out all of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies, no subsidies or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or to any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices that have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in the foregoing provisions shall be construed to prevent the selling of wheat for feeding purposes, if sold at not less than the parity price of corn nor to prevent such adjustments in the maximum or support prices on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed as may be necessary to bring about or to maintain adequate production for the war effort; nor shall any maximum price for any such commodity be established or maintained for any such agricultural commodity including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, in the market place a price below the support price therefor for a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. DINGELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Is this the amendment that has to do with the elimination of the payment of any subsidies?

The SPEAKER. This is the Wolcott amendment as amended.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to have an explanation of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not presumed to know the language of the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF WAR—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read the message from the President of the United States.

(For message from the President of the United States, see proceedings of the Senate of this day.)

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be entered at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. Under the Constitution this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 244, nays 108, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—244

Abernethy	Goodwin	Monroney
Allen, La.	Gore	Mott
Andersen, H. Carl	Gossett	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	Newsome
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Nichols
Andrews	Gregory	Norrell
Arends	Griffiths	O'Hara
Arnold	Gross	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Gwynne	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Hale	Patman
Barrett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patton
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Ploeser
Bland	Hare	Poage
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Poulson
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Price
Boykin	Harris, Ark.	Priest
Brehm	Harris, Va.	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hays	Randolph
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Rankin
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bryson	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Richards
Burch, Va.	Hobbs	Rizley
Burgin	Hoeven	Robertson
Camp	Hoffman	Rockwell
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson, Kans.	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Carson, Ohio	Hope	Rohrbough
Case	Horan	Rowe
Chapman	Howell	Russell
Chenoweth	Jeffrey	Satterfield
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Schwabe
Church	Jennings	Shafer
Clark	Jensen	Short
Clason	Johnson, Anton J.	Sikes
Clevenger	Johnson, J. Leroy	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Luther A.	Slaughter
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, Ohio
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Johnson, Ward	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Jones	Sparkman
Cox	Jonkman	Springer
Cravens	Judd	Stanley
Crawford	Kean	Starnes, Ala.
Creal	Keefe	Steagall
Cunningham	Kefauver	Stearns, N. H.
Curtis	Kerr	Stefan
Davis	Kilday	Stewart
Dewey	Kinzer	Stockman
Dies	Kleberg	Sumner, Ill.
Dirksen	Knutson	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	Lambertson	Taber
Domengeaux	Lanham	Talbot
Dondero	Lea	Talle
Doughton	LeCompte	Tarver
Drewry	LeFevre	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	McCord	Tibbott
Dworshak	McCowen	Vincent, Ky.
Eaton	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	McGregor	Vursell
Ellis	McMillan	Ward
Ellsworth	McWilliams	Wasielewski
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Weaver
Fellows	Mahon	Welchel, Ohio
Fernandez	Maloney	West
Fish	Manasco	Whelchel, Ga.
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fulmer	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Gale	Mason	Wigglesworth
Gathings	May	Willey
Gearhart	Merrow	Wilson
Gerlach	Michener	Winstead
Gibson	Miller, Nebr.	Winter
Gifford	Mills	Wolcott
Gilchrist		Woodruff, Mich.
Gillette		Woodrum, Va.
Gillie		Worley
		Zimmerman

NAYS—108

Angell	Bradley, Pa.	Crosser
Barry	Burdick	Cullen
Bates, Ky.	Busbey	Curley
Bender	Butler	D'Alesandro
Bennett, Mich.	Canfield	Dawson
Bishop	Carter	Day
Blackney	Celler	Dickstein
Bloom	Coffee	Dilweg
Bolton	Cole, Mo.	Dingell

Ellison, Md.	Lynch	Robsion, Ky.
Engel	McCormack	Rogers, Calif.
Feighan	McGranery	Rolph
Fenton	McMurray	Rowan
Flannagan	Madden	Sabath
Fogarty	Mansfield, Mont.	Sadowski
Folger	Marcantonio	Sasscer
Furlong	Miller, Conn.	Sauthoff
Gordon	Miller, Pa.	Scanlon
Gorski	Monkiewicz	Schiffler
Granger	Morrison, N. C.	Schuetz
Green	Mruk	Smith, Maine
Hagen	Myers	Smith, W. Va.
Hart	Norman	Snyder
Hoch	Norton	Somers, N. Y.
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Spence
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Stevenson
Jackson	O'Connor	Sullivan
Kee	O'Neal	Troutman
Kelley	O'Toole	Voorhis, Calif.
Klein	Outland	Weiss
Kunkel	Pittenger	Welch
LaFollette	Powers	Wene
Lane	Rabaut	White
Lemke	Ramey	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lesinski	Reed, Ill.	Wright
Lewis, Ohio	Robinson, Utah	
Ludlow		

NOT VOTING—79

Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hartley	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barden	Hébert	O'Leary
Bates, Mass.	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Beall	Heidinger	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Phillips
Buckley	Jarman	Plumley
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Pracht
Byrne	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Scott
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cochran	Keogh	Sheridan
Compton	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	King	Sundstrom
Culkin	Kirwan	Taylor
Delaney	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Larcade	Thomason
Douglas	Luce	Tolan
Eberharter	McKenzie	Towe
Elmer	McLean	Treadway
Fay	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Forand	Miller, Mo.	Wadsworth
Ford	Morrison, La.	Walter
Gallagher	Mundt	Wheat
Gamble	Murphy	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavagan		

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Treadway and Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey and Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Sundstrom and Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Costello and Mr. Thomason for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Phillips and Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Towe and Mr. Hartley for, with Mrs. Luce against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia and Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey against.

Mr. Jarman and Mr. McKenzie for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Gamble and Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Pracht against.

Mr. Compton and Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Ditter and Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana and Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. King with Mr. Miller of Missouri.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I notice that my name is mentioned as being paired for the bill. I am present, and I voted "aye", to override the veto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded as voting "aye."

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. But the Clerk read my name as being paired.

The SPEAKER. Pairing is a private agreement.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Senate will be notified of the result of the vote.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. SABATH, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 271), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions passed by the Business and Professional Women's Club of Raleigh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement upon the bill H. R. 2397, the State Department, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, relative to rationing of gasoline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech I recently delivered in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Times and an address delivered by the Honorable Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, formally placing on sale the stamp commemorating Poland's resistance to the Axis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DIRKSEN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF ALASKA GAME LAW

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 332), to revise the Alaska game law, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 15, line 24, strike out "game fish."
Page 16, line 3, strike out "game fish."
Page 16, line 9, strike out "game fish."
Page 24, line 18, after "game", insert "or fur."
Page 24, line 22, after "hunt", insert "or trap."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I understand this is simply to let the Indians catch a few fish and dispose of them?

Mr. GREEN. That is the purpose of it. It pertains to privileges in that connection for members of the armed forces.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what we may expect next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing definite on the program. District of Columbia business will be in order on Monday. I understand there are several bills that are not controversial. At least, that is the information I have received. There is the bill, S. 832, to regulate the sale of horse meat. There is also H. R. 2184, H. R. 2618, H. R. 2828, and H. R. 2988, which is a bill to amend the blackout law and provides for the allocation of $25,000 for the activities of civilian defense.

There will be a conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. During the rest of the week conference reports will be taken up if they are presented. If the bill extending the Guffey Coal Act is reported out, that will be taken up.

I know of no other legislation now, but I will advise the gentleman and keep the House advised during the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POULSON was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole and to include therein certain tables and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CONNALLY-SMITH LABOR BILL, S. 796

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, after passage of the Connally-Smith labor bill, S. 796, I released on June 16 a news letter discussing this bill and including certain editorials. I include as a part of my remarks this news letter, together with a letter written to Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, by various Government officials discussing the bill, and also the veto message of the President, dated June 25, 1943:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN HOMER D. ANGELL

THE CONNALLY-SMITH LABOR BILL, S. 796

"There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime." This bill was a temporary measure for the duration of war only, and its purported objectives were to stop strikes in wartime, help settle labor disputes, and keep war production going ahead full speed. Its real purpose was to chastise John L. Lewis. Everyone agrees with these objectives. No one has a right to strike against the Government. Coolidge was right when he said: "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime." All of us want to do everything within our power to speed up production and assist in the prosecution of the war and to eliminate everything that will interfere with the war program. Those of us who voted against this bill did so because in our judgment it would not accomplish these objectives, and instead of helping it would hinder the war effort. This bill, however, instead of outlawing strikes against the Government gives statutory recognition to the right of workers to strike against their Government. Instead of preventing such strikes it will tend to foster them and impede war production.

The language of the bill in section 8, which instructs the National Labor Relations Board to take secret ballots among employees who were threatening to strike "on the question whether they will permit any such interruption of war production," implies legalization of strikes in war plants if they are approved by a majority of the workers. This is directly opposed to the agreement between labor and the Government that there shall be no such strikes during the war. This bill does recognize the right of labor to strike against the Government in wartime, which is unsound.

The War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Production Board, National Labor Relations Board, the four public members of the National War Labor Board, and the Labor Department, being the Federal agencies charged with the duty of maintaining orderly industrial relations and keeping war production to full efficiency, on May 15, 1943, advised the Congress that, in their judgment, this bill would imperil the effectiveness of the existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes. They pointed out that while recognizing the gravity of the coal-mining situation, this bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. They further called attention to the fact that while there have been a number of strikes since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history. They further state: "The bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. * * * It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated."

These departments objecting to the passage of the bill are the key war agencies of the Government having in charge the prosecution of the war on the home front and bringing victory to our cause. It would seem to be good judgment to heed their advice and follow their recommendations. They opposed the passage of the bill because it would disrupt labor relations, impede war production, and do infinitely more harm than good.

There is attached hereto a full copy of the letter from these war agencies addressed to Representative ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

In a recent radio address James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, said:

"When you condemn the few who strike do not forget that the great mass of the workers, and with rare exceptions, the leaders of organized labor, are doing as much as any of us, and more than many of us, to see that there is no interruption of war production.

"Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes. The striker in war industry is almost as rare as the slacker in the Army."

Mr. Byrnes further pointed out that we have built 100,000 planes and bombers; we have doubled the American Navy; we are building more than 1,000,000 tons of shipping

a month; we have produced 2,225,000 machine guns and 44,830,000 bombs, and 100,000 aircraft guns. In a single year we built more than 1,000 oceangoing cargo ships and 100 oceangoing tankers. In fact, our workmen, man for man, are producing faster than Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Japan, or any other country.

There are 40,000,000 men and women working in industry in this country helping to win the war. We must not in a moment of anger by reason of a few irresponsible labor leaders engaging in strikes pass crippling legislation indicting all labor and tending to disrupt peaceful labor relations and interfere with the outstanding production job labor and management have accomplished in their contribution toward winning the war.

This bill was conceived in anger, written on the floor of the House, and is a hodgepodge of inconsistencies. David Lawrence in his column June 14, discussing the bill, said:

"It is really a wishy-washy affair and is of no permanent value whatever as a constructive policy in handling of labor disputes. What the bill, which was considerably weakened in conference as compared to the measure sponsored by Representative SMITH and passed by the House, really does is to express an axiom. It says that the Government has the right to protect work done for the Government in plants seized by the Government.

"At no time until recently was that principle ever challenged. It has never been supposed that there was any need for a law saying that when the Government seized a plant and hoisted the Stars and Stripes over it, anybody who interferred with the authority of that flag could be put on trial and jailed if convicted."

The Wall Street Journal in its issue of June 11 said editorially:

"The indignation is righteous. The dissatisfaction is well-founded. But the antistrike bill in its present form includes provisions that seem ill-adapted to correct the mistakes in labor policy that have accumulated in recent years. If both House and Senate pass it, President Roosevelt can find several good pegs on which to hang a veto message, and the progress that might have been made will probably be lost. * * *

"Now, however, as critics of the bill have said, such provisions make it appear as though Congress is setting up a system to make strikes legal in industries which are now generally understood to be covered by the broad no-strike promises of national labor leaders. Of course, during the prescribed waiting period the Government could seize the property, but that only proves the major point set forth above—namely, that enforcement really depends on Government operation. There are labor groups at this time which would be well content to use strike threats or almost anything else to extend the scope of Government ownership and operation of private industry. Such a law would play right into their hands."

The New York Times, on June 7, 1943, characterized the bill as follows:

"The antistrike bill passed by the House on Friday was largely written on the floor. This is the worst possible method of legislating. Yet the administration's failure to supply leadership for rational labor legislation and its blanket opposition to any sort of rational corrective have invited the sort of haphazard bills now in conference.

"These bills are unsatisfactory in several ways. They do not outlaw a strike in wartime unless the plant in which it occurs has been seized by the Government. This, at best, introduces an unnecessary and irrelevant stop. A union that strikes against a decision of the War Labor Board is striking against Government authority, whether or not the plant in which it works has been seized by the Government. To seize a war plant, moreover, regardless of whether the management or the union is at fault, confuses the issue. Experience shows, in fact, that striking unions often welcome this procedure and actually try to force it."

Those of us who voted against this bill have been accused of doing so for political reasons. It would seem one seeking political favor would have voted for the bill and with the crowd on the popular side. The only criterion should be what is best for the war effort. We followed the recommendation of the war agencies who said that to adopt this bill would be unwise and would imperil peaceful labor relations and impede war production.

MAY 15, 1943.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to express certain views with respect to the amended version of S. 796, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense, which was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs to the House on May 11, 1943.

The War Department, the Navy Department, the United States Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, being the agencies primarily responsible for the production and procurement of war materials, are unanimous in their judgment that some sections in the bill as presently drawn would tend to interfere with such production and procurement by stimulating industrial unrest. The Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and the four public members of the National War Labor Board, these being the Federal agencies primarily concerned with the maintenance of orderly industrial relations, concur in this view and believe that the bill, as it stands, would impair the effectiveness of the existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes.

The committee bill proposes drastic and far-reaching changes in the over-all machinery and principles established by statute, Executive order, and mutual agreement, for dealing with labor relations in the war period. According to the committee report, these changes are imperative because of the emergency which may arise from the current dispute in the coal industry. But the bill in its terms is not limited to that industry and therefore must be appraised with respect to its impact upon the whole field of industrial production.

While recognizing the gravity of the coal mining situation, and without attempting to suggest here what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation, we note that, since the Government has taken possession of the coal mines, only a few sections of the bill have any bearing upon that particular dispute. The bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. It is accordingly felt that in evaluating the bill our judgment should not be obscured by the exception presented by the coal mining situation to an otherwise unprecedented record of industrial peace since Pearl Harbor. Although a number of strikes have occurred since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history.

The bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties. At the same time it impliedly recognizes the propriety of strikes after a 30-day notice and a secret ballot. In both these respects the bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. This agreement, which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial relations structure, has been supplemented in a number of industries by written agreements outlawing strikes and lock-outs for the period of the war. This nationally accepted arrangement, whereby strikes and lock-outs have been outlawed by voluntary action, has proven by experience so satisfactory that a change in the arrangement should be approached with greatest caution. It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated.

The absence of any comment in this letter on other features of the bill does not necessarily imply approval of those features. The shortage of time has prevented the preparation and submission of any joint detailed analysis. Some of the undersigned agencies will, however, submit additional comment on the sections of the bill bearing on problems respecting which they have special knowledge and experience.

Sincerely,

JNO. J. MCCLOY, War Department;
FRANK KNOX, Navy Department;
FRANCES PERKINS, Labor Department;
D. M. NELSON, War Production Board;
E. S. LAND, United States Maritime Commission;
H. A. MILLIS, National Labor Relations Board;
WILLIAM H. DAVIS, GEORGE W. TAYLOR, WAYNE L. MORSE, FRANK P. GRAHAM, the four public members of the National War Labor Board.

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 796, the so-called War Labor Disputes bill.

It is not a simple bill, for it covers many subjects. I approve many of the sections; but other sections tend to obscure the issues or to write into war legislation certain extraneous matter which appears to be discriminatory. In the form submitted to me, the accomplishment of its avowed purpose—the prevention of strikes in wartime—could well be made more difficult instead of more effective.

Let there be no misunderstanding of the reasons which prompt me to veto this bill at this time.

I am unalterably opposed to strikes in wartime. I do not hesitate to use the powers of Government to prevent them.

It is clearly the will of the American people that for the duration of the war all labor disputes be settled by orderly procedures established by law. It is the will of the American people that no war work be interrupted by strike or lock-out.

American labor as well as American business gave their "no strike, no lock-out" pledge after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

That pledge has been well kept except in the case of the leaders of the United Mine Workers. For the entire year of 1942 the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. The American people should realize that fact—that 99.95 percent of the work went forward without strikes, and that only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the work was delayed by strikes. That record has never before been equalled in this country. It is as good or better than the record of any of our allies in wartime.

But laws are often necessary to make a very small minority of people live up to the standards that the great majority of people follow. Recently there has been interruption of work in the coal industry, even after it was taken over by the Government. I understand and sympathize with the general purpose of the war-disputes bill to make such interruptions clearly unlawful.

The first seven sections of the bill are directed to this objective.

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the War Labor Disputes Act.

Section 2 relates to definitions.

Section 3 gives statutory authority to the President to seize war facilities—a power already exercised on several occasions under Executive order or proclamation.

Sections 4 and 5 of the bill provide for maintaining existing terms and conditions of employment except as directed by the War Labor Board.

Section 6 makes it a criminal offense to instigate, direct, or aid a strike in a Government-operated plant or mine.

This would make possible the arrest of a few leaders who would give bond for their appearance at trial. It would assure punishment for those found guilty, and might also have some deterrent effect. But it would not assure continuance of war production in the most critical emergencies.

Section 7 gives the National War Labor Board statutory authority and defines its powers.

Broadly speaking, these sections incorporate into statute the existing machinery for settling labor disputes. The penalties provided by the act do not detract from the moral sanctions of labor's no-strike pledge.

If the bill were limited to these seven sections I would sign it.

But the bill contains other provisions which have no place in legislation to prevent strikes in wartime and which in fact would foment slow-downs and strikes.

I doubt whether the public generally is familiar with these provisions. I doubt whether the Congress had the opportunity fully to appraise the effects of these provisions upon war production.

Section 8 requires the representative of employees of a war contractor to give notice of a labor dispute which threatens seriously to interrupt war production to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board in order to give the employees the opportunity to express themselves by secret ballot whether they will permit such interruption of war production.

It would force a labor leader who is trying to prevent a strike in accordance with his no-strike pledge to give the notice which would cause the taking of a strike ballot and might actually precipitate a strike.

In wartime we cannot sanction strikes with or without notice.

Section 8 further makes it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after the giving of the notice take a secret ballot among the employees in the "plants, mines, facilities, bargaining unit or bargaining units," as the case may be, on the question of whether they will stop work. This requirement would open the whole controversy over bargaining units—a fruitful source of controversy and of bitter jurisdictional strife.

Section 8 ignores completely labor's no-strike pledge and provides in effect for strike notices and strike ballots. Far from discouraging strikes, these provisions would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations.

The 30 days allowed before the strike vote is taken under Government auspices might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period. The thought and energies of the workers would be diverted from war production to vote getting.

The heads of our military, naval, and production agencies have testified that these provisions are likely to be subversive of the very purpose of the bill—uninterrupted production.

Section 9 of the bill prohibits for the period of the war political contributions by labor organizations. This provision obviously has no relevancy to a bill prohibiting strikes during the war in plants operated by the Government or to a "War Labor Disputes Act." If there be merit in the prohibition, it should not be confined to wartime, and careful consideration should be given to the appropriateness of extending the prohibition to other nonprofit organizations.

There should be no misunderstanding—I intend to use the powers of Government to prevent the interruption of war production by strikes. I shall approve legislation that will truly strengthen the hands of Government in dealing with such strikes, and will prevent the defiance of the National War Labor Board's decisions.

I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.

This direct approach is necessary to insure the continuity of war work. The only alternative would be to extend the principle of selective service and make it universal in character.

I recognize that this bill has an entirely praiseworthy purpose to insure full war production. But I am convinced that section 8 will produce strikes in vital war plants which otherwise would not occur. Therefore, I could not properly discharge the duties of my office if I were to approve S. 796.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1943.*

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GAMBLE (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK), on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMASON (at the request of Mr. MAHON), for June 25, on account of official business with the War Department.

To Mr. BLOOM, for 5 days, on account of official Government business.

To Mr. VORYS of Ohio, for 5 days, on account of official Government business.

To Mr. BATES of Kentucky, for Saturday and Monday, on account of business.

To Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), from June 25 to June 28, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for 3 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. EATON), for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 1 day, on account of illness.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. POWERS), from June 25 to July 1, on account of illness.

To Mr. SUNDSTROM (at the request of Mr. KEAN), for June 25 and 26, on account of official business.

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), beginning June 25 until July 3, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1242. An act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Monday, June 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Saturday, June 26, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262 Resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to make an investigation of the plans for improvement of the Columbia River; with amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 82. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 271. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2975, a bill to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1388. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2922. A bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3050. A bill providing for the promotion of certain substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 3054. A bill to amend the Expediting Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to cause an investigation and report to be made with respect to the existing petroleum situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Donato Forlin and Analia Gisella Forlin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3052. A bill to correct the naval record of Carlo Solone; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3053. A bill for the relief of the Realty Bond & Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1740. By Mr. JACKSON: Petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1741. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Oregon, asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1742. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of McConnelsville, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1743. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Monroe County, urging passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1744. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cumberland, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1745. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from B. D. Gates, C. M. Hine, and Frank Durfee, all of Harrisburg, and Charley Lockwood, of Galatia, all representative farmers of Saline County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods as being unfair to the farmer and additional expense to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1746. Also, communication from the Clay County Farm Bureau, of Clay County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1747. Also, communication from J. King Eaton, president, Sanitary Milk Producers, opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1748. Also, communications from M. M. Land, Walter L. Clark, Ulla D. Given, and W. L. Miller, all representative farmers of White County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods as being unfair to the farmers of the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1749. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of R. T. Kiersey of Franklin, Tex., favoring House bills 1119 and 1167; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1750. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1751. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Frank DeLashmutt and 59 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1752. Also, petition of 82 residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we would be valiant in a day when the hearts of many turn to water in them. As we here seek a solution for the Nation's tangled problems, may we not be found unwilling to pay the price of better things. Teach us the vanity and futility of a quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged. We mourn the misunderstandings and suspicions, the alienations, the strife between class and class, which weaken the Nation's strength and sap our vitality when in this age on ages telling we must be strong, for our own sakes and for the sake of the world's tomorrow. As we remember those of our own fellow countrymen who in far places are ready to lay down their lives for the preservation of our heritage of freedom, save us from lowering the shield of national solidarity just as the air is filled with the poison arrows of determined foes.

O Thou, in whose Holy Name our Nation was baptized at its birth, enable us to find that one highway along which we may march together to the promised land. Grant that we may be found among the shining company of prophets and forerunners who, amid the encircling gloom, have sought the mind and the will of God and who have known the time of his visitation and restoration and with faith and hope and love have prepared the way of the Lord. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate to attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday when the vote was being taken on the reconsideration of Senate bill 796, the so-called Connally bill, following the veto message by the President, the Senator from Illinois was on the train returning to Washington. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE NEAR EAST RELIEF

A letter from the Comptroller of the Near East Relief, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Near East Relief for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, the Navy (3), Interior (2), and Agriculture; Federal Security Agency, United States Maritime Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Civil Service Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RACIAL DISORDERS IN DETROIT—RESOLUTION OF THE TUTWILER (MISS.) LIONS CLUB

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Tutwiler (Miss.) Lions Club deploring the maltreatment and slaughter of Negroes in the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Lions International, and all local Lions Clubs promote peace, harmony, and the Nation's safety; and

Whereas the Tutwiler Lions Club is located in the heart of the Delta section of the deep South, where there are 8 or 10 Negroes to 1 white person; and

Whereas Delta planters and businessmen of this section are vitally concerned about the Negroes to the extent that they see to the matter of providing shelter, food, clothing, doctors, hospitalization, adequate schools, churches, and his general welfare; and

Whereas the Negroes of this section are well cared for, contented on the farms, rearing their families, and making money; and

Whereas we in this section have always lived with the Negroes and have in most cases found them to be faithful laborers and coworkers, with mutual understanding between the two races; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that there are serious racial clashes in industrial centers, and most particularly just recently in the city of Detroit, Mich., where over 25 Negroes were killed and the injured runs up into the hundreds. This condition, we believe, was brought about to a great extent by reason of persons or organizations making unwarranted inducements to colored labor from the deep South and agricultural sections to get them to the northern centers where the Negroes are neither liked nor understood; and

Whereas we desire good treatment, peace, harmony, and understanding of the Negro wherever he goes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we condemn such a program of enticing labor away from sections where they belong, are understood, and liked; and

We do not sanction, but rather deplore, the misunderstandings and maltreatment of the Negro race by the white people of the North, such as occurred in the city above mentioned; and

If the Negro cannot be understood in the North, we can employ him in the South where he is understood and well liked; and

That we send a copy of this resolution to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hon. James E. Eastland, Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, Hon. Jamie L. Whitten, the Commercial Appeal, the Jackson Daily News, the Press Scimitar, the Clarion Ledger, and the mayor of Detroit, Mich.

TUTWILER LIONS CLUB,
F. O. MARTIN, *Chairman.*
W. F. FLAUTT,
J. F. ALMOND,
Resolution Committee.

RESOLUTION OF CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION—CONTROL OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution of statement issued by the conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation recently held in Chicago and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I am in hearty accord with the appeal made by this conference that the Honorable Chester C. Davis be given control over production and distribution of food including pricing and rationing policies. I think the record made by Mr. Davis in the position he now holds meets with the approval of the agricultural interests of all sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent to present the telegram embodying a statement or resolution of the conference and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 1943.

To United States Senators and Representatives from the Midwest States, Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: Immediate and positive action is required to meet the critical food problem in this country. In order to avert disaster on the food front, it is our considered opinion that all necessary authority over the food problem must be centered in one individual. A clear-cut, understandable,

and effective food policy in this country now is an indispensable factor, without which the war cannot be won. We therefore urgently recommend that all control over production and distribution of food, including pricing and rationing policies, be given our capable and courageous Food Administrator, Chester C. Davis. Continuation of the present muddled food policy will jeopardize the food supply and will incur the just condemnation, not only of farmers, but of all patriotic Americans.

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

CONSERVATION AND PARITY PAYMENTS TO FARMERS—TELEGRAM FROM M. W. THATCHER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, in regard to a controversial item in the agricultural appropriation bill. I hope the Senate conferees will insist on the retention of the Senate language relating to the use of the $400,000,000 conservation payments and also providing for parity payments on 1943–44 crops. I think the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is standing for the best interests of the producers of the country, especially the wheat growers, and I hope the Senate will stand by the group which makes this appeal. I request that the telegram be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives represents more than 1,500 interior cooperative elevator associations, with a membership in excess of 350,000 wheat producers. It is composed of 10 regional cooperative grain marketing organizations extending from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Pacific Northwest to Indiana. We have not often asked the Congress of the United States to consider our views. When it comes to wheat marketing and wheat prices, however, we feel that our experience and opinions may be of value to Congress. We are advised that the House of Representatives, in dealing with the current bill for agricultural appropriations, has rejected by voice vote the position taken by the United States Senate relative to soil conservation and agricultural conservation program payments. The House, while supporting $400,000,000 for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—which retains the $100,000,000 increase inserted by the Senate, as compared with the original House bill for $300,000,000—has restricted payments to be made out of the $400,000,000 to soil-building and water-conservation practices, thus eliminating the agricultural conservation program payments. As matters now stand, on the wheat crop produced for 1942–43 marketing agricultural conservation program payments were made last fall at 9⅞ cents per bushel. Parity payments will be made on the crop marketed in 1942–43. But as to the wheat now growing, which will be marketed in 1943–44, the wheat producer this time is only eligible for 85 percent of parity through a loan program, and by way of comment, with the price of wheat on most cash markets now under the 85-percent loan price, it appears highly ridiculous for the Office of Price Administration to be considering ceilings on wheat at this time. The wheat farmers are not threatening a general walk-out. The House has failed to authorize parity payments, and has eliminated agricultural conservation program payments in 1944. This means that for the 1943–44 marketing of wheat the wheat farmer will receive only the support of an 85-percent loan. He has no assurance of any parity payments. Based on the House vote there will be no agricultural conservation program payments. As a matter of information to wheat Senators, wheat farmers during this current marketing year past received loans at 85 percent of parity, agricultural conservation program payments of 9⅞ cents per bushel, which were made last fall, and such parity payments as you may provide by appropriations in the current bill. Wheat is the only basic commodity now below parity. Many people high in the Department of Agriculture apparently have come to the ridiculous conclusion that 85-percent of parity is all that wheat farmers should have, although relatively the cost of producing corn is much less than the cost of producing wheat in relation to parity prices. Rightfully we expect the wheat Senators to make a fight to enable wheat producers to collect full parity price. We also expect the statesmanship of the Senators who are not from the wheat States to accord treatment to wheat producers which would give them a price and income comparable to cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. The position of the United States Senate in all fairness to wheat producers would be that the Senate would not concur in the House language as regards the use of $400,000,000 by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration next year which earmarks soil-conservation funds only for "soil-building and water-conservation practices." Such a restriction excludes proper price consideration and income to the wheat producers. Specifically the Senate, by debate and by language in the appropriations bill now under consideration, must make certain that the wheat farmers will not only receive the benefit of an 85-percent loan, but that agricultural conservation program payments may be made out of the $400,000,000, and that the balance to bring wheat prices to parity shall be supported by authorization for appropriations to continue parity payments next year. The regional cooperative grain-marketing organizations which are members of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives maintain headquarters at the following marketing places: Indianapolis, Ind.; Amarillo, Tex.; Enid, Okla.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Kansas City, Mo.; Omaha, Nebr.; Denver, Colo.; Ogden, Utah; Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; Great Falls, Mont.; the twin ports of Duluth and Superior at the head of the Great Lakes; and the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Repeating we seldom raise our voice on matters before Congress, but we do speak out of long-time experience in the field of the production and distribution and sale of grain and feed products, and we feel strongly the responsibility of representing more wheat producers than all general farm organizations combined. We are pressing to secure approximately 23 cents a bushel for the wheat producer, who is now producing more than ever without time and one-half for overtime and double time for Sundays. We do not ask for more than parity. This is what the 1938 Farm Act calls for. The wheat farmers have a right to expect parity. Because of their confidence in the good faith of Congress in enacting the 1938 Farm Act, Congress should either sustain this faith or rewrite this fundamental farm legislation to state whatever it determines ought to be a fair price.

Respectfully yours,

M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 250. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. Res. 161. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid highways, including allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 25, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1273. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court for the district of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of residents of St. Georges, Del.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1274. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1275. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1276. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1277. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3030, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, after line 23, to insert the following:

"WAR DEPARTMENT—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, to be available until expended, $7,095,000."

VIEWS OF SENATOR VANDENBERG ON SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have received numerous letters from Michigan regarding the Smith-Connally bill, which, under the pressure of time, I have been unable to answer, but I presented my view of the situation in a letter to one of my labor union friends in Michigan, which is sufficiently typical so that I should like very much to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, if I may have unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. ———: I greatly appreciate the open-minded spirit in which you have written me about the so-called Connally-Smith bill. I am indebted to you for your friendly candor; let me be equally frank in my reply.

In my humble opinion, the rank and file of organized labor has often been misled regarding this so-called antilabor bill. The bill has just one purpose, namely, to prevent interruptions in the production of war goods necessary to sustain our sons at the fighting front. Whatever may be the political consequences (to which you refer) of supporting such an objective, let the chips fall where they may. What happens to me politically is of no moment to me or to the country, but what happens to our fighting sons is of vital concern to us all.

Organized labor made a magnificent no-strike pledge after Pearl Harbor. A vast majority of organized labor has faithfully kept this pledge—to its everlasting credit. Unfortunately, however, there have been, and still are, serious crippling exceptions to this rule. The so-called antistrike bill will not affect adversely any labor union which keeps this pledge. It will affect only those who break this pledge. I confess that it seems to me those who keep their pledge should be the very first to welcome any efforts by the Government to prevent a small minority from breaking their pledge. It is no reflection on the former that we find it necessary to discipline the latter. Only a small percentage of our people ever break any of our laws, but they do not object—on the contrary, they are the chief supporters—when laws are passed to control crime. We need no laws at all to protect the great law-abiding majority. It is in their defense that they insist upon laws to curb lawbreaking minorities. In my view, the great labor-union majority will immensely benefit when the law assists in protecting it against these small minorities which, however unjustifiedly, threaten the repute of all organized labor.

This bill, by its own terms, expires when the war is over. It is exclusively a war measure. With great care and specific reference, it protects every collateral right of labor under the Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Act, etc. It particularly protects every individual member of a union. The President himself has said that he objects seriously only to section 8, which, in the final analysis, guarantees to each individual member of a union the right to vote whether his plant shall be struck or not. It seems to me that is the very essence of democracy.

In my opinion, this bill is necessary to the war effort—and, if I may say so, to the long-range welfare of labor itself. In my view, it is necessary to the earliest possible victory with the least possible casualties. Frankly, I shall always put that objective ahead of all others, and I am certain that I do not offend labor's great rank and file when I do.

An unauthorized strike in Texas last week cost an oil production sufficient to carry 1,000 bombers into Germany. I do not believe that the great rank and file of labor has any remote sympathy with that sort of a contribution to the Axis. I certainly do not believe that the prevention of such a tragedy has any adverse effect upon the rights of labor unions in the United States—quite the contrary. Yes; this is an exception to the rule. The general labor record and the mass labor attitude is magnificent. But, in my humble opinion, that is all the more reason why labor itself should welcome any reasonable proposals devoted exclusively to the prevention of exceptions to the rule.

In many particulars this bill is far from satisfactory to me. But its assets—to the public welfare, to victory in this war, and to labor's own enlightened self-interest—far outweigh its liabilities, as I view it. The bill has been sustained by overwhelming majorities in both House and Senate—including the votes of many whom labor would readily identify as among its best friends. I submit that labor would do well to ponder this significant fact. In any event, if I have lost the labor vote on this account, as you suggest, I am at least at peace with my own conscience and with my sense of loyalty to our fighting sons.

I have wanted to make this complete statement to you so that you may know that I have been moved by a profound conviction in making this difficult decision.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Cordially and faithfully yours,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

AMERICAN NATIONALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of American Nationalism, delivered by him on June 25, 1943, and the introductory remarks of the station announcer, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS D. BRANDEIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in tribute to the late Louis D. Brandeis, delivered by Senator LUCAS before the Memorial Association of Chicago, on June 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD OF NEBRASKA AT GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold of Nebraska at the Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio, June 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSPORTATION OF TROOPS, ETC.—ADDRESS BY COL. K. W. THOM

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Col. K. W. Thom, of the Port Transportation Division, New York Port of Embarkation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. REILLY, PRESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John A. Reilly, president of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the association, on June 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPENING OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT IN WEST VIRGINIA—ARTICLE BY ROGER WILLIAM RIIS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Roger William Riis, entitled "Rubber—It's Coming at Last," published in the Reader's Digest for July 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS—LETTER FROM WILLIAM J. GOODWIN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by William J. Goodwin, of New York City, regarding international investments, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOUR FREEDOMS FLAG—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Four Freedoms Flag," by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of June 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. LEWIS AND CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Lewis and Congress," by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of Thursday, June 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to perfect the committee amendment, inserting section 5, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Chair calls attention to the unanimous-consent order providing for a vote on the amendment as modified at not later than 1 o'clock today, and for a division of the intervening time between the proponents and opponents, to be controlled respectively by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not prepared to speak at this time. I may want only 2 or 3 minutes, but I have to wait for material to come from my office. If the Senate is ready for a vote on the Clark amendment, let us proceed to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I am ready for a vote.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Butler
Andrews	Brewster	Byrd
Ball	Bridges	Capper
Bankhead	Brooks	Caraway
Bilbo	Buck	Chavez

Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Russell
Downey	McFarland	Scrugham
Eastland	McKellar	Shipstead
Ferguson	McNary	Smith
George	Maloney	Stewart
Gerry	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Moore	Tobey
Hatch	Murdock	Truman
Hawkes	Murray	Tunnell
Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Wagner
Kilgore	Pepper	Walsh
La Follette	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Langer	Reed	Wherry
Lodge	Revercomb	White
Lucas	Reynolds	Willis
McCarran	Robertson	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for only a moment or two.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator going to address the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For about 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like about 3 minutes after the Senator shall have concluded his remarks.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from J. C. Mohler, secretary of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Topeka, Kans., in which he takes a strong stand against the subsidy and roll-back program. I regard Mr. Mohler as one of the best authorities in the West on agricultural matters. I ask that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Topeka, June 23, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Perhaps there could be no more effective way to destroy democracy than to follow through the scheme of roll-back and subsidy, as inevitably it would lead to complete subjugation of the people.

The husbandmen with whom I have discussed this subject are vigorously opposed to Government subsidies as a solution of their problems, and I suspect their views pretty well reflect farm sentiment generally.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion on this floor to question the accuracy of a statement contained in letters written by the Loan Administrator, Mr. Jesse Jones, to the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Georgia, and myself, and possibly to other Senators. I took exception to the accuracy of the statement in Mr. Jones' letter that definite commitments to the extent of $450,000,000 had been made for the payment of subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee. I did not believe that statement to be true.

Since yesterday, through the courtesy of Representative CURTIS of Nebraska, I have been furnished with a letter written by Mr. Jones just 2 days before the letter to which I have referred. The letter to Representative CURTIS completely demonstrates the inaccuracy of the letter read in the Senate Chamber yesterday, because in the letter to Representative CURTIS Mr. Jones adopted the same figure $450,000,000, and set that down, not as a commitment on the part of the Government which the Government would be bound to pay, but as the estimated cost of the whole program for a year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Jones has been very much less than frank in his dealings with the Congress; because it would have been just as accurate and just as fair if Mr. Jones had sent here a letter in which he said that the Government had definite commitments of $4,500,000,000, the estimated cost of the program for the next 10 years, as it would be to say that the Government was committed to the extent of $450,000,000, because that was the estimated cost for 1 year; for, as a matter of fact, Mr. Jones and everyone else knows that if the Congress should see fit to adopt the pending amendment, the Government would not be obligated to the extent of the stated cost for the next year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the President's directive putting the program into execution carried the figure $450,000,000 as the amount estimated for the cost of carrying out the program for 1 year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct; that amount was the estimated cost of the program for 1 year. If Congress stops the program, the Government is not obligated to the expenditure of $450,000,000.

Mr. HILL. That may be true; but I am sure that Mr. Jones in using the word "commitment" had in mind that, so far as he was concerned or so far as those who were responsible for carrying out the program were concerned, in using the figure $450,000,000, which was the amount for the program for a year's time, certainly so far as they were concerned, in giving out the press releases and other statements, they had a commitment for a year's time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if Congress stops the execution of the program, of course, the Government is not committed to that expenditure. What Mr. Jones was trying to convey in the letter which was laid on my desk and on the desk of the Senator from Georgia and on the desk of the Senator from Vermont and on the desk of the Senator from Colorado was that the program would cost $450,000,000 even if the Clark amendment were agreed to; and he was trying to fight the Clark amendment in that way.

Mr. HILL. Of course, everyone knows the program would not cost $450,000,000 if the Clark amendment were agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The purport of the letter is as I have stated.

Mr. HILL. But if the program were carried out under the President's program, as launched, it would cost $450,000,000; and the President in the program set out $450,000,000 as the cost for a year's duration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the program were carried out for 10 years, it would cost $4,500,000,000; but that does not represent a commitment which the Government is required to pay.

I yield now to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on any of the amendments, I should like to summarize what would be the result of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and myself.

The amendment would provide a third and a new price standard for maximum price ceilings on agricultural commodities, raw or processed, namely, the support price announced for an agricultural commodity by the Department of Agriculture.

The amendment, if agreed to, would eliminate immediately upon enactment the roll-back and subsidy program on butter and meats and the purchase-and-sale-at-loss program on cheddar cheese. We all know that 50 percent of the butter and cheese is now required to be set aside for the use of the United States Government, anyway.

The amendment, if agreed to, would make good the Government's promise to pay subsidies on butter and meat for the period from June 1, 1943, until the amendment became law.

The amendment would permit the continuation of incentive payments or subsidies to producers for the current crop season only on, first, the canning crops, such as tomatoes, corn, peas, beans, and possibly others; second, the specialty crops, such as dried peas and beans; and, third, on potatoes, hemp, sugar, and possibly other crops.

The amendment would permit the continuation of the Government's price support program on domestic vegetable oils and fats. It would permit the continuation of the Government's existing program on the sale of wheat for feed purposes. It would permit the inauguration of a subsidy program for the purpose of increasing production or for any other purpose upon first securing the approval of Congress. It would require orderly legislative procedure in procuring and expending public funds, in lieu of a blank check.

There are some things which the amendment would not do. It would not increase prices to consumers; it would restore the prices of butter and meat to the prices which prevailed 1 week ago. The amendment would not prohibit subsidy programs, but would only require prior congressional approval.

The amendment would not prohibit the payment of subsidies to secure strategic and critical materials, such as copper, lead, and zinc.

The amendment would not prohibit the payment of subsidies for increased costs of transportation. It would not prohibit carrying out to conclusion the

presently committed legitimate subsidies for the purpose of increasing the necessary production of war-essential food products; and it would not deprive the O. P. A. of any legitimate powers which have already been delegated by Congress to that agency for the control of prices.

Mr. President, I wish to say further that yesterday the House by an almost unanimous vote—not a sufficient number of Members of the House raised their hands to obtain a record vote on the question—adopted an amendment virtually the same as the amendment I have offered on behalf of the Senator from Iowa and myself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator speaking in the time of the Senator from Missouri or the time of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I yield a part of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I desire to speak in the time of the Senator from Alabama. I shall say only a few words.

In view of the fact that the House in acting on this proposed legislation has agreed to an amendment which is substantially the same as the one proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa, the adoption now of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri would effectively close the door to any solution of the food problem, as I see it, in the conference. Since the Clark amendment would positively forbid the use of subsidies with respect to food, the result would be that there would be the roll-back upon the producer of food. We desire to avoid that.

All representatives of agricultural States realize how important it is that the producer of agricultural commodities shall be able to obtain the cost of production from the returns which he receives. If he cannot obtain the cost of production from the returns which come when ceilings have been fixed upon retail prices, he will be in a quite impossible position. But the will of the country is clearly supporting the war against inflation. Public opinion will support the control of retail prices. The inevitable result, therefore, of our closing the door entirely to the use of subsidies would be that the roll-back would go all the way down to the farmer, and we should thus have achieved the very thing we seek to avoid.

It is not necessary for me to add another word about the uncertainties which would be created by the Clark amendment with respect to mineral development in the West and elsewhere.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Clark amendment should be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to the committee amendment, inserting section 5. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted on page 5, line 16, and extending down to and including the word "purpose" in line 10, on page 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

That on and after the date of enactment of this act no authority shall be exercised by the Price Administrator, the Federal Loan Administrator, or any other governmental agency or corporation with respect to the making of any subsidy payments under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and any authority contained in such section with respect to the making of subsidy payments is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the rights or interests of any person who has acted in good faith in reliance upon any regulation or order issued prior to the date of enactment of this act with respect to such subsidy payments under the authority of such section 2 (e), and to the extent necessary to protect the rights or interests of any such person in connection with transactions heretofore made or entered into such subsidy payments may be made: *Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and, through its subsidiary corporations, (a) to pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency and (b) to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided further*, That in any case in which a commodity is domestically produced, the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the foregoing proviso shall be exercised with respect to the importations of such commodity only to the extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Assocation at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are unavoidably absent. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is unavoidably detained on departmental business.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Gurney	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McClellan	Tobey
Butler	McKellar	Tydings
Byrd	McNary	Van Nuys
Capper	Millikin	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	White
George	Reynolds	Willis
Gerry	Robertson	Wilson

NAYS—37

Andrews	La Follette	Overton
Ball	Langer	Pepper
Bankhead	Lodge	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Lucas	Russell
Bone	McCarran	Scrugham
Caraway	McFarland	Stewart
Chavez	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Maybank	Truman
Green	Mead	Tunnell
Guffey	Murdock	Vandenberg
Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Hill	O'Daniel	
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—20

Austin	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bailey	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Barbour	Danaher	Revercomb
Barkley	Davis	Taft
Burton	Ellender	Wallgren
Bushfield	Gillette	Wiley
Chandler	Glass	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has been in session practically every morning and afternoon this week, and I have been attending its sessions. Therefore, what I shall say on the vote which has just been had will be for the purpose merely of making my position plain, and I shall speak for only a moment.

I am opposed to subsidies; hence I voted for the Clark amendment. However, I do not feel that that vote barring subsidies from price fixing should be construed as putting the stamp of approval upon the present ratio existing between prices and wages.

Yesterday, when Mr. Brown of the O. P. A. appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, he stated that he had full authority to fix all prices on the farm or off the farm so as to create a fair relationship between prices and wages. I expect that to be done without any subsidies of any kind or description. That was why we supported the O. P. A. law in the first place, and there is no reason why it cannot be done now. What is needed is not more legislation or more money, but more "guts" in order to give squareness to the situation on both sides of the equation.

I believe that the farmer is entitled to no more than a fair price; and if prices for meat or anything else are higher than the fair price for such commodities they ought to be cut back without any subsidy. We cannot justify the payment of an agricultural subsidy any more than we can justify the payment of a wage subsidy. We ought to stay out of the subsidy business and go into this situation fairly and squarely. Give the farmer his comparable relative relationship on the price side of the equation and labor the same relationship on the other side of the equation. I do not intend to take the responsibility, either directly or indirectly, for any variation from that program.

Insofar as the law is concerned, technically a case can be made out for giving authority for the imposition of subsidies. But when we voted for the law subsidies were conceived to be useful only for critical material which could be produced only at an economic loss. That is not the situation for which subsidies are proposed to be used in the instant case. There is no evidence that these commodities are being produced at an economic loss, and therefore the subsidy principle has no justification. I wish to see the O. P. A. roll back any price which the farmer is receiving which is more than his rightful price, just as I expect it to hold the line on the wage situation. The working man is entitled to translate on a fair basis his earnings into food, clothing, and shelter. In my opinion that has not been done. He is entitled to have it done, and if the prices of certain agricultural commodities are too high, I expect the O. P. A. to adjust them so that they will be fair to the farmer and to the working man, just as I expect wages to be fixed at a level where they will be fair to the farmer as well as to the working man. That is the reason I cannot support this measure. I have asked for a few minutes to make my position known, so that there may be no misinterpretation of it. I do not intend to take the responsibility for failure in the price structure or wage structure when all the authority to deal with both has already been given copiously by the Congress.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield if I have not given up the floor.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator is in favor of inflation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that is like a baby crying for milk. Of course, I am not in favor of inflation.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, that is the effect of the entire argument which the Senator has made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute. So long as the Senator has raised the question, let us see who is in favor of inflation. Let us consider the statement which I made. What did I say? I said that prices should be held down in relation to wages, which are being held down. I will ask the Senator if he is in favor of that.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator may go ahead and state his position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator a question.

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes; I am in favor of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. Why does the Senator want to keep prices up by using the inflationary powers of the Government to keep them higher than they ought to be?

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator's point is not proved.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that the Senator is in favor of inflation. He does not know it, because he has not thought about it enough, but his own words condemn him to that side of the argument.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not agree with the Senator's statement. He is in favor of inflation, and his entire statement proves that he is in favor of inflation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the question now pending before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the so-called Aiken substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it be in order for me now to offer an amendment in the form of a new section to the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order to offer an amendment at the end of the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said a new section of the bill, an amendment to the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently I have not made myself clear. The committee has offered certain amendments. I desire to offer an amendment which would not deal with any of the amendments which have been offered, but would be a new section of the bill. Would that be in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would now not be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have discovered a typographical error in the printed copy of the so-called Clark amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to correct the error. On page 2, line 13 of the amendment, I ask to strike out "(a)" and in line 14, after the comma, to insert "(a)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. What is the request which has been made by the able Senator from Colorado?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has asked unanimous consent that a typographical error in the Clark amendment be corrected.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question now recurs on the so-called Aiken substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the so-called Aiken substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment offered by Mr. AIKEN for himself and Mr. GILLETTE, to the committee amendment as amended is as follows:

On page 5, lines 16 through 25, and on page 6, lines 1 through 12, strike all of same and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity or commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof in the market place, the higher of, the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, or the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or

the War Food Administrator and which maximum price shall conform in all other respects to the provisions of section 3 of such act, as amended; nor shall any subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes only if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term 'person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term 'person' as used herein."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the vote now being taken is on the Aiken substitute for the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a substitute for the committee amendment as amended by the Clark amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that a vote in the affirmative on the Aiken amendment will be a vote to supplant the action on the Clark amendment just taken by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as a subcommittee to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is unavoidably detained on departmental business.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Bone	Capper
Andrews	Brewster	Caraway
Ball	Bridges	Chavez
Bankhead	Brooks	Downey
Bilbo	Butler	Eastland
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Murdock	Tobey
Hill	Nye	Truman
Holman	Overton	Tunnell
La Follette	Pepper	Vandenberg
Langer	Radcliffe	Wagner
Lucas	Russell	White
McCarran	Scrugham	Willis
McNary	Shipstead	
Maloney	Smith	

NAYS—29

Buck	McClellan	Robertson
Byrd	McFarland	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Millikin	Tydings
Gerry	Moore	Van Nuys
Gurney	Murray	Walsh
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Kilgore	Reed	Wilson
Lodge	Reynolds	

NOT VOTING—21

Austin	Clark, Idaho	Glass
Bailey	Connally	Hatch
Barbour	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.
Barkley	Davis	Revercomb
Burton	Ellender	Taft
Bushfield	George	Wallgren
Chandler	Gillette	Wiley

So Mr. AIKEN'S amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it be in order now to offer a substitute for the committee amendment as amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that case, I offer an amendment as a new section to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first question is on the committee amendment as amended. When that has been acted upon, the Senator's amendment will be in order.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this subsection with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities and the making of subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only by or under the direction of the War Food Administrator and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food in the quantities specified by the President to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, and for war relief purposes: *Provided further*, That no such subsidy payments shall be made unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements of section 3 of the act approved Octo-

ber 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That the amount of such subsidy payments shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount recommended by the President and approved by the Congress: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the payment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment was thoroughly explained yesterday, and I do not desire to take the time of the Senate today to repeat any part of what was said then. The pending measure, in its present form, is in such shape that the conferees will have quite a task to work out a finally acceptable bill, and I hope that the amendment will be agreed to so that it may go to conference.

Mr. HILL. Will not the Senator briefly summarize his amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it would be well to do that, because some Senators are now in the Chamber who were not present yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of the amendment is to transfer from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to the War Food Administrator all the functions which, under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, were vested in the Administrator of O. P. A. so far as food is concerned. It is therefore the first and only recognition of the desirability of having a Food Administrator which has been presented to the Senate for approval in the consideration of the pending bill.

The amendment authorizes the President to make recommendations to the War Food Administrator with respect to the maximum amount of food necessary to carry on the war effort, to determine how much food is necessary for the armed forces, for essential civilian needs, for the purposes of lend-lease, and for the purposes of war relief.

Representatives of the executive arm of the Government, in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere, are doing everything in their power to outline a program for furnishing food to the occupied nations after the war shall have ended and when such nations have been recovered from the Axis. Programs are developing for sending food to our allies. It is recognized, for example, that Russia is in as great need of food as of guns. The amendment recognizes that important aspect of our war effort.

The amendment then contains a provision prohibiting the use of any subsidy payments for food "unless the average price received by producers in the market place for such commodities meets the requirements" set forth by Congress, and the Executive, when the Executive approved it, in the act of October 2, 1942. It provides for recommendations by the President and approval by the Congress, so that it preserves the power of Congress to approve all such payments.

Finally, it contains a provision that nothing in the act shall be construed to prevent the payment, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency, of subsidies which have accrued prior to the date of the approval of the act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that the Senator uses the term "War Food Administrator." Has this office been created by the Congress at any time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it was created by Executive order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Could it not be annulled by another Executive order?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It could be, of course, but this would be a statutory recognition which I think would have the effect of preventing such annulment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think I am very much in favor of the Senator's amendment, but I am a little disturbed by the situation of confusion which might develop. As I recall, in the basic law creating the O. P. A. we set up a dual food control, part of it under O. P. A. and part of it under the Department of Agriculture. Why does the Senator use the War Food Administrator instead of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Congress yesterday passed, over the veto of the President, the Connally bill. That bill contained the only statutory recognition, to date, of the War Labor Board. The War Labor Board, like the War Food Administrator, was established by Executive order, but when the Connally bill became law, as it did yesterday, recognizing the War Labor Board, in my opinion it fixed that Board, gave it a legal status and legal authority, and it could not thereafter be done away with by mere Executive order.

With respect to the War Food Administrator, the condition is exactly the same. I misunderstood the Senator's inquiry when he first stated it. I thought he was referring to the individual holding the position, but I feel that if the amendment shall be agreed to, it will be a statutory recognition of the office which cannot be changed except by statutory enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, I think a very bad practice was established in the Connally-Smith bill, so-called. In my opinion, Congress is making a very great mistake in recognizing agencies set up by Executive order instead of creating them by legislative enactment, and I do not see why it is necessary in this case to refer to the War Food Administrator when we might just as well refer to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My reason for doing so was to bring about coordination of the steps which have already been taken by the Executive with the step I am urging the Congress to take. I think the Senator's doubt can be settled, and I modify my amendment by adding in line 2, page 2, after the word "Administrator," the words "hereby created", so that it will read, "exercised only by or under the direction of the War Food Administrator, hereby created."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's amendment as printed was an amendment of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. Since the amendment was offered, and since it has been printed, the Senate has agreed to the Aiken amendment. I should like to have the Senator summarize for the Senate what will be the effect of his amendment if agreed to now, in view of the action of the Senate in adopting the Aiken amendment. I should like to have him relate his amendment to the Aiken amendment, if he will.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this introduces a complication which in my opinion can only be settled by the conferees. The amendment gives the conferees the opportunity to work out a constructive bill. It does not modify the Aiken amendment, because it is not offered as a substitute for the Aiken amendment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator feels that it would leave the door open for the conferees?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I definitely feel it would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the amendment as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the conferees will now have considerable latitude when they confer on the provisions of the bill, and I think it is only fair to the country and to the executive departments of the Government that the Congress unequivocally declare its attitude on the question of subsidies. If the Congress is not in favor of subsidies, if some effective plan of subsidies is not to be worked out, let us say so, and abandon the idea, and then put it right in the lap of the administrative agencies to do the things that Congress has required by its action.

If Congress wishes to take the responsibility for disturbing the whole present equilibrium in wages and prices, Congress has that right, Congress has that power; but let Congress take the responsibility before the country for doing it.

If I were in former Senator Prentiss Brown's place, I would consider the vote which the Senate has already cast as a vote against subsidies. He has already had the vote of the House. If I were in his place, I would not employ any subsidies, but I would follow along with the inevitable consequences of the policy the Congress has declared, let the consequences be what they may.

Mr. President, I am not saying which is the wiser course. I am saying only that the Congress seems to have spoken on the subject, and the administrative

agencies of the Government might as well recognize that that is the will of the Congress and of the country. If I were in their place I would not dally with the hope that there is going to be any other authority or funds conferred upon them to alter the course which they will have to follow in consequence of the congressional action.

I think that in view of the action of the House and the vote of the Senate, there is no use for us to entertain any delusion about this matter, in the hope that the conferees will be able to work out anything which will preserve the subsidy principle. The sooner we get down to bedrock in this matter and decide what we really want to do, the sooner will we make some substantial progress in the solution of the situation which is now confronting the country, because it is my personal belief that the whole thing is about to crack up. The sooner we discover whether it is or not the sooner we will find it possible to make some substantial progress toward the winning of the war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, during the discussion of the bill, much has been said about inflation. I want the RECORD to show that I do not think the bill contains any remedy for inflation. I shall vote for it because in the administration of the law as affecting the price of food, an evil has arisen which, I think, requires a remedy. I also desire to state that there has been much fluctuation in administration to add to the general confusion, which is bad for the whole psychology of the country, the morale of the country, and also for the war effort.

Mr. President, the cost of living must be hitched to the price paid to the original producer of the raw material. The price paid to the producer of the raw material must be sufficiently high to insure production. When we get it high enough to insure production, then we can fix the cost of living on that basis. Had we followed that course it is my opinion that we would have avoided all the confusion and change which have brought about a situation which inspired a letter to me from a farmer in Minnesota in which he said "There is so much bum thinking in Washington that we do not know where we are going to land." He further said, "Things are out of joint, and we do not seem to be able to get them back in joint." He also said, "There is too much back and forth, and forth and back, and so we go from nothing to nothing."

Mr. President, it is my opinion that if the bill which was passed by the Congress at the request of the President on last Labor Day had not been vetoed, we would have had something to which we could anchor with some definiteness the price of farm products. And if we could anchor the price of farm products we could have a basis upon which to calculate the cost of living with equity all down the line.

Mr. President, this is not a complete statement of my position. At a more appropriate time I shall expect to address the Senate somewhat in extenso on the subject. But I do not want the bill to be passed without making my position clear that the problem of inflation has still not been met, and it is not going to be met by the passage of this bill. As I previously said, I shall vote for it, in order to deal with an evil which has arisen by the assumption on the part of the executive departments that they have authority to do things which has not been granted to them by Congress, and the passage of this measure will compel them to come back to Congress for permission to do what they think they ought to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I assume the amendments to the bill have all been disposed of. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2869.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the House bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now move to amend the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause, and substituting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2869) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). Without objection, Senate bill 1108 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2869, the one which was just passed, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, be printed with the Senate amendment, so that we may have the bill showing the amendment as the Senate passed it a short time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2935 making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a brief explanation as set forth in the report may assist in the consideration of the bill. The bill makes appropriations for the Labor Department of the Government and for Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1943–44. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was $1,086,059,499. The amount of the increase by the Senate committee is $52,963,311. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate and now before the Senate is $1,139,022,810.

The amount of the appropriation for the current year, that is, the amount of the appropriation made in 1942 for the current year 1942–43, was $1,200,656,023.

The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1944, that is, the amount coming from the Bureau of the Budget, was $1,249,031,110. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1944 in the amount of $110,008,300, and is under the appropriation for 1943, that is to say, it is less than the appropriation on which those agencies are now working, in the sum of $61,633,213.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the bill be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", at the top of page 4, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Working Conditions Service, Division of Labor Standards (national defense): For salaries and expenses necessary to provide for the extension of advisory service to labor and management in national defense industries in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, proper working conditions, and amicable industrial relations, including items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding; and reimbursement to employees at not to exceed 3 cents per mile for expenses of official travel performed in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 7, line 24, after the word "Act", to strike out "$200,000", and insert "$253,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maternal and Child Welfare", on page 8, line 9, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$378,000"; and in the same line, after the item just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminates between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, after the name "Children's Bureau", to strike out "$4,000,000", and insert "$4,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration", on page 16, line 5, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,323,580."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$94,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Howard University", on page 18, line 25, after the word "funds", to strike out "$591,240" and insert "$597,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education", on page 20, line 21, after the word "students", to strike out "whose technical or professional education can be completed in 1 year" and insert "who received loans during the fiscal year 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I find I have some difficulty in keeping up with the alacrity of the very able clerk of the Senate. On page 20, in line 21, as I understand, certain of the language has been deleted and new language has been inserted. I could not understand in a moment the reason therefor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand what page and line the Senator mentioned.

Mr. McNARY. Page 20, line 21. I assumed the chairman of the committee could keep up with the reading of the amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I did. But the amendment has already been agreed to, so I am required to go back.

On page 20, line 21, the committee struck out the words "whose technical or professional education can be completed in 1 year", and inserted "who received loans during the fiscal year 1943." That was done for the purpose of limiting the whole program so that it would come to an end with the expiration of the year 1944, because those who receive the loans in 1944 will receive them for only a limited period. In that respect the desire of the committee was definitely to put an end to the program. We made the loan provision in the 1942 appropriation act. Only a part of the amount which we appropriated has been used. There is a carry-over, and we sought to have that carry-over, and that alone, utilized, so that those who receive the benefit from it and who are carrying on may continue their program; but the whole program will come to an end in 1943.

Mr. McNARY. Was that the unanimous view of the members of the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was the view of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator whether this bill touches expenditures under the so-called Lanham Act in connection with the Federal Works Agency?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 8, after the name "Commissioner of Education", to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That said unexpended balance shall be available for not more than 2,000 students and that this program shall end June 30, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Vocational education", on page 25, line 13, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal Security Administrator" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, why was this change made?

Mr. McCARRAN. The change was made simply to do away with confusion, so that the head of the War Manpower Commission shall be the head of these various agencies, rather than calling him by a different name.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It is only a change in the language identifying the person. It is not a change in the person at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 25, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

Training for nurses (national defense): For the cost, including subsistence, including cash allowances to trainees as provided by Public No. —— (H. R. 2664, 78th Cong.), of refresher, student nurses, and postgraduate nursing courses, including courses in midwifery, provided by public agencies operating public educational facilities and by hospitals and nursing schools in accordance with plans submitted by them and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, at hospitals with recognized schools of nursing, and, where necessary, in the case of postgraduate courses at other institutions, for approved persons who have been licensed to practice as registered nurses under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, $3,500,000, payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by said Surgeon General to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency, nursing school, or hospital to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Salaries and expenses (national defense): For all general administrative expenses necessary to enable the Public Health Service to carry out the foregoing program of nursing courses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $50,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at this point I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the item in the bill on pages 31 and 32, because it is a new item, and I think the Senate should have its attention drawn to it on account of the amount involved. The amount is $45,000,000 for the training of nurses.

On the 15th of June there was approved by the Executive a bill which passed both Houses of Congress, providing for an extensive program for the training of nurses during the war period. This provision sets the authorizing act in motion and appropriates $45,000,000 for the program. It will train 57,000 nurses. It will train 33,000 second-year nurses, 18,000 third-year nurses, and 6,000 first-year nurses. Young women who are now in training in the various

hospitals and nurse-training institutions in the United States, and who signify their willingness to give their efforts to the Government when called upon by the Government, will be taken into the program. Their subsistence, tuition, books, uniforms, housing, and the like, will be paid for out of this money; 33,000 of them are now in the second year of training, 18,000 in the third year of training, and 6,000 in the first year of training. We questioned the Public Health Service very closely as to what institutions, if any, would be favored in carrying out this program. It seems to me that the Senate should be interested in the matter. Hence I have called for a pause at this time so that questions may be asked. Let me say that every institution, whether it be a so-called sectarian institution, such as a religious institution, which conducts hospitals, or a public institution such as a county-sustained institution, which has a recognized training program for nurses, will receive money from this appropriation for the training of nurses.

In addition to the items of sustenance which I have enumerated, which the nurses in training will receive, they will receive a stipend of $15 a month. The cost of their subsistence, tuition, and the like is estimated at $45 a month for each nurse.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The language proposed to be deleted from the bill as it came over from the House had a similar purpose, and carried an appropriation of $3,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. The $3,500,000 is included in the $45,000,000. The item as it came over from the House provided an appropriation of $3,500,000. An estimate came from the Bureau of the Budget, through the Public Health Service, to the Senate committee, and the entire presentation was made in the first instance before the Senate committee. The question was not presented to the House.

Mr. McNARY. That answers the question which I was about to propound to the Senator. I was wondering why the Senate took action on such a large increase without some similar attitude, so far as the record shows, on the part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer is that the authorizing act was approved on the 15th of June. Immediately after the approval of the act, the matter was presented to the Bureau of the Budget, and the estimate for the new program, based upon the new law, which had just been approved, came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the first instance.

Mr. McNARY. Is there now a similar program—perhaps greatly diminished—covering the same objectives?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am unable to answer definitely, but from my present knowledge I should say no.

Mr. McNARY. Then, this is wholly a new venture.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a new venture, provided for by a new law, approved on the 15th of June

Mr. McNARY. That was too late to have the estimate presented to the House committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was too late to be presented to the Bureau of the Budget, and too late to be presented to the House committee. It was presented to the Bureau of the Budget after the authorizing act was approved, and the estimate was presented to the Senate committee after that.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee have hearings?

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee had quite full hearings.

Mr. McNARY. Was there any objection to the amendment on the part of members of the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The question was gone into quite at length. The project was looked upon with much interest by members of the committee. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave considerable attention to it. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was present during all the hearings. I will not say that the project was looked upon with skepticism, but it was considered with great interest, and it was felt that the program deserved our approbation.

Mr. McNARY. Are the nurses to be used primarily in connection with the war effort?

Mr. McCARRAN. Entirely so. They must sign an agreement placing their services at the direction of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is important to bear in mind that, in the first place, this appropriation is in pursuance of an act of Congress which is now on the statute books. In the second place, the nurses are to be trained in existing institutions. There is no question of the Government setting up its own schools.

The purpose of this provision is to increase the annual supply of new nurses. The number has risen somewhat in the past 3 or 4 years, but it is desired further to increase it. The training of nurses is in competition with the WAVES, the WAAC's, and a great many other organizations which are making an appeal to young women of that background and type.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does this supplement or invade the nursing training which has heretofore proceeded under the auspices of the Red Cross?

Mr. LODGE. So far as the Red Cross gives hospital training, it would merely supplement it. I believe I am correct in that statement. The purpose of the proposal is not only to encourage the training of new nurses but to insure that when a candidate is qualified and becomes a nurse the Government will have a call on her services.

Mr. McCARRAN. The first call.

Mr. LODGE. The first call. The Government is in a competitive situation insofar as these young women are concerned, and unless some provision of this nature is made the Government will not have first call on their services, and they may decide not to become nurses at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point upon which I wish to be enlightened is whether or not the thorough and splendid nurse training which has been so ably developed under Red Cross auspices is in any degree herein being transferred from the Red Cross to the Government.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think so at all. I do not think there is any possibility of that occurring.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing in the amendment or in the appropriation bill now pending which contemplates anything of that kind.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I was not able to hear distinctly all that the Senator said; but if my understanding is correct, the committee was motivated first by an obligation to implement a direction of the Congress itself in legislation which was very recently enacted. I think we felt a very definite obligation to meet the requirements of that legislation, assuming that in so doing we were carrying out the intention of the Congress very recently expressed. Then we felt—and this was urged upon us—that this provision was necessary in order to increase speedily the supply of nurses which might be available to our own military forces.

Mr. McCARRAN. The necessity for more nurses was presented to the committee and is now being presented to the Congress. The vehicle by which the Corps of Nurses will be created was approved by the Congress and by the President. This provision is merely to afford the money to carry out the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 31 after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 6, to insert:

Training for nurses (national defense): For carrying out the purposes of the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74, 78th Cong.), $45,000,000, of which not to exceed $650,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including printing and binding; personal services in the District of Columbia; maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; advertising in newspapers, magazines, and periodicals without regard to the act of March 4, 1921 (42 U. S. C. 33); and items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation for miscellaneous and contingent expenses for the Public Health Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 42, line 20, after the words "to the", to strike out "Superintendent upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual

cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned" and insert "hospital monthly the actual cost of the care and maintenance of such patients, and bills rendered therefor by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, shall be subject to audit by the auditor of the District of Columbia semiannually, or in the case of any department or establishment concerned other than the District of Columbia, by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming to make a statement concerning the amendment which has just been read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. President, this amendment was offered in the full committee as a result of some facts which were developed in the hearings upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Last year in the other House it became known that by reason of the method heretofore followed with respect to the payment to St. Elizabeths Hospital of the charges for the care of patients sent from the District of Columbia, there were several instances of payments being made for a long period of time after the patient had died. The language which is stricken out denies the District of Columbia an opportunity to make any examination of the charges before the payments are made. The purpose of the amendment is merely to provide that the auditor of the District of Columbia, in the case of the District of Columbia, or the General Accounting Office, in the case of any other Government department or agency which sends its patients to St. Elizabeths Hospital, shall have the opportunity of examining the accounts before they are paid. Under the present system the superintendent makes his demands, submits his bills, and they must be paid. Later on adjustments are made.

The records so far established clearly show that under this system adjustments were not always properly made. Otherwise, it would not be possible for the District to have paid for the care of persons long since dead.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator tell me if there are any other cases of District of Columbia officials being given authority over a Federal institution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say there are. The Senator knows this amendment was offered in the full committee. I said then, as I now say, that the matter is of such importance to the District of Columbia that it ought to go to conference, and, in conference, a proper solution can be worked out. If the amendment is so drastic that it would do any injustice to the hospital, I would, of course, have no objection to its alteration.

Mr. LODGE. That arrangement is very satisfactory to me. It will mean that we shall have a chance to look into the matter more thoroughly. However, as applying to the subject under discussion, I should like to have a letter from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1943.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I take the liberty of inviting your attention to an amendment which has been proposed by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to H. R. 2935, the Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944.

The language on page 41 commencing on line 15 and providing that the District of Columbia shall pay to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital either in advance or at the end of each month all or part of the estimated or actual cost of maintenance of District of Columbia patients has existed in the appropriation bill for many years. It was approved this year by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and by vote of the House itself. The amendment strikes out the language after the word "the" in line 15 of page 41 through the word "concerned" in line 1 on page 42 and substitutes the following: "to the hospital monthly the actual cost of the care and maintenance of such patients, and bills rendered therefor by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital shall be subject to audit by the auditor of the District of Columbia semiannually, or in the case of any department or establishment concerned other than the District of Columbia by the General Accounting Office."

For the current fiscal year St. Elizabeths Hospital will expend approximately $4,950,000, of which approximately $3,200,000 is made up from reimbursements by the District of Columbia. The charges made to the District do not include at all the expense of capital outlay, but are merely for the actual cost of maintenance, including repairs. The District thus is better off financially than would be the case if it operated its own mental hospital, at least if it operated it on the same standard as here. For the latter half of each year the hospital is dependent almost entirely upon the payments from the District of Columbia to meet its necessary expenses, including pay roll and supplies. If bills for supplies cannot be met promptly discounts are often lost with resulting financial damage to the Government, and I am sure that you are familiar with the sort of publicity that would ensue if by reason of an act of Congress pay rolls could not be met promptly. The proposed amendment wipes out the provision for any advance payment and provides that the cost of care and maintenance must be figured in advance and that only the actual cost shall be paid for. As a matter of fact, at the present time if the District overpays the hospital reimbursements are made after the propriety of such reimbursements is shown by audit. The actual cost from month to month fluctuates and usually cannot be figured until at least a month or more has elapsed. If a bill were then sent to the District it might be held up for an indefinite period in the office of the Auditor of the District for Columbia for preaudit before it is paid. This would put a Federal institution at the mercy of the District authorities, a situation which is governmentally quite unsound. There would be no saving to the government of the District of Columbia ultimately but great inconvenience would be caused to the Federal Government and an additional force of bookkeepers would probably be necessary to figure the actual cost called for in the amendment. The amendment does nothing new as far as auditing by the General Accounting Office is concerned. All accounts of the Government are subject to auditing by the General Accounting Office and all accounts paid by other agencies to this hospital are audited by the General Accounting Office.

The amendment, to my mind, is an unfortunate one and I should appreciate any assistance which you can give in seeing to it that the action of your own subcommittee is sustained on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
WINFRED OVERHOLSER, M. D.,
Superintendent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 42, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 46, line 5, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$34,000,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment the figure $37,328,502.

Mr. President, this is the item which provides the moneys necessary to pay the expenses in connection with Federal-State unemployment compensation administration. It is money which is utilized by the States to administer payments for unemployment compensation. The figure which I have offered is the Budget recommendation. I may say that this figure was arrived at after a most careful check made by the Social Security Board of the budgets made up by the various State agencies which enforce, carry out, and administer the unemployment-compensation provisions in the respective States. Before the estimate was submitted to the Congress it was cut by the Bureau of the Budget below the amount estimated by the various States. As Senators will observe, the House cut the figure to $30,000,000. Apparently they made the assumption that because benefit payments have declined substantially during the period of tremendously increased employment throughout the country, the administrative services of the States could stand such a drastic cut. I have been advised by those who represent the various State agencies that they believe this cut will impair the efficiency of the administration of this important activity in the various States. While it is true that the payments made because of unemployment have declined, certain other activities and labors made necessary by the act upon the part of various State agencies have increased as a result of increased employment. In other words, two phases of their activity have declined because of increased employment and decreased unemployment, but, on the other hand, because of increased industrial activity two phases of their activities have increased.

Mr. President, there has been no evidence presented before either of the committees which, in my opinion, would justify either the drastic cut made by the House or the cut proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. A

careful analysis of Mr. Altmeyer's testimony, in my humble opinion, justifies the Budget estimate for this amount.

Mr. President, I desire to be entirely frank about this matter. I am concerned that there be no drastic cut made which will impair the efficiency of the various State agencies that are administering this section of the Social Security Act. As many Senators know, in fact, I think as all Senators know, the Social Security Administrator and the Board have recommended the complete federalization of the Unemployment Compensation System. I personally am opposed to that, and I am apprehensive that if Congress erroneously cuts too drastically into the appropriations available to the various State agencies for the administration of the act, and, as a result of that cut, their efficiency declines, and their personnel is dissipated and disintegrated, it will be used as an additional argument for the federalization of the Unemployment Compensation System. For that reason, I urge upon my colleagues that they support the Budget estimate at least for the purpose of letting the matter go to conference, because already the House has cut $7,328,502 from the appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the House cut the Budget estimate from $37,000,000 to $30,000,000. The hearings indicated that the House might possibly have looked upon it erroneously. The committee of the Senate thought that $34,000,000 would be sufficient to carry on, but, in order that we may make no mistake in the matter, I shall accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and take the matter to conference.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before yielding to the Senator from Maine, may I say that I appreciate very much the considerate attitude of the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who has this matter in charge. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was going to express my concurrence with what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has just said. It is true that the House cut this appropriation to $30,000,000; it is true that the Senate committee feels a driving obligation to exercise every possible economy; but I have so much doubt as to whether we exercised wisdom in this particular instance that I hope the matter will go to conference at the figures suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin and be further examined there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it so happens that I was one of those on the committee who felt that the Budget estimate should be restored. Initially it seemed to me that, with the falling off in unemployment, the work of the Unemployment Compensation authorities would be less; but I was convinced, after the figures had been presented to me by Mr. Altmeyer, showing the various paper work operations which the Unemployment Compensation authorities maintain, that, while the amount of work has decreased in some categories, it has increased in other categories. For instance, in the field of unemployment benefits, paid to unemployed individuals, the work has decreased, but in the field of registering new employees and in making the necessary records of new businesses which have come into existence the work has increased. So it seemed to me that the Budget estimate was proper, and I voted accordingly in the committee. I am hopeful that a disposition of this question may be made along that line.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator's statement. I wish to state one further fact, because I hope the conferees will consider this matter very carefully in conference. I do not wish to leave the impression that the States have not already drastically cut their personnel. They have done so voluntarily. They have likewise lost personnel to the armed services and to higher salaried positions in other agencies and departments. I wish to point out that in my own State of Wisconsin, for example, there has been a 32-percent reduction in the personnel since January 1, 1940, until the present time. They hardly have a sufficient number of investigators of claims for unemployment compensation to ascertain whether the claims are valid or not.

I thank the Senators all for their very great assistance in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is agreed to, and, without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator", on page 53, after line 17, to strike out:

None of the moneys appropriated by this act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 57, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,415,000" and insert "$1,715,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 14, after the figures "$600,000", to strike out:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 58 the Senate Appropriations Committee has eliminated a provision which was inserted in the bill by the House. I should like to offer, as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read, to come in on line 14, page 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 58, line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor, copy of which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment is aimed to stabilize labor differences during this critical wartime period. At the beginning of 1941 the Government wanted to stabilize the shipbuilding industry because of the experiences of World War No. 1. Inasmuch as the American Federation of Labor had been well established in the Pacific coast yards for years, the Pacific coast was considered the best place to attempt stabilization first.

The American Federation of Labor, through its metal-trades division, undertook the job. Mr. John Frey, who was president of that organization, with all the Government officials concerned, went out there, and, after several weeks, a master agreement was worked out. It was signed by every shipbuilder on the western coast, with the exception of two small repair yards in southern California, which had working relations with the C. I. O.

The Government was a definite party to several provisions of this agreement governing wages, and so forth. It accepted the entire agreement, including the A. F. of L. closed shop, as the vehicle to bring about stabilization. Everyone knew about this agreement. Sidney Hillman, then Codirector of the O. P. M., publicly applauded it. The agreement was subsequently applied to the Atlantic coast, where the C. I. O. was recognized as the entrenched labor organization, subsequently to the Gulf and Great Lakes zones.

For more than 2 years 400,000 men on the Pacific coast have been working under that agreement; 90 percent of this coast's production has been carried out under it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. The stabilization agreement has not been applied to the Atlantic coast or the Gulf coast. It is applied only on the Pacific coast.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not also true that this agreement does not apply to wages or to hours?

Mr. BRIDGES. It merely applies to the agreement in existence at the time, worked out between the A. F. of L. and

other labor groups and the management, in the Pacific coast yards.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment proposes, in effect, a statute of limitations—on what? On jurisdictional disputes? On wages? On hours? On working conditions? Or on everything? On some industries, or all industries?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the situation will be clarified by understanding that the stabilization agreement on the west coast was worked out as the Senator from New Hampshire has indicated. It was subsequently incorporated into agreements between the various industries, shipyards, and others affected. The only additional stipulation that was not in the stabilization agreement was the closed-shop provision, which was forced by the Government upon the Bethlehem Steel Corporation on that coast after very serious difficulty. Mr. Kaiser cooperated completely with the suggestion of the Government that there be the closed shop, although it was not put into the stabilization agreement. As a result, this practice has gone on ever since. This amendment merely says that the agreements entered into in that fashion shall not now be reopened.

Mr. LODGE. Agreements regarding all topics?

Mr. BREWSTER. I repeat, the stabilization agreement covered wages, hours, and all working conditions. That was incorporated in the contract, the only additional clause being the provision as to the closed shop.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I have a high regard for Mr. Frey. I think he is really a statesmanlike man, and I admire his courage and frankness. I wanted to say that before I went any further. But I am somewhat mystified by the import of the proposal. We are asked to impose a 3-month limitation regarding action on complaint cases, and, as nearly as I can gather, such complaint cases do not involve the jurisdictional question. They can cover the whole field of hours and working conditions.

Let us take the case of the maritime union, with a man at sea on a ship. I am advised that it is in the record that it is a physical impossibility to obtain action on cases of that kind within 3 months, and if we enacted legislation of the kind proposed, we would in effect be putting in a freeze. Perhaps we want to put in a freeze, but if we do, let us go at it with open eyes, and understand exactly what we are doing, and the full implications of it.

My confusion in regard to this proposal is a good illustration of why matters of this kind should go to legislative committees, and not appropriation committees. I wish the Senator from Maine would comment on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be clear that the complaint to which the amendment refers will be filed by the labor organization. It is not necessary for a man at sea to file the complaint. It will be filed by his representatives who are on shore, if they feel that in any instance unfair labor practices have been entered into, or if they feel that the agreement is not properly representative of the majority of the workers on the ship or in the plant.

Mr. LODGE. But the maritime workers certainly have a right to have a voice in the decision whether a complaint is to be filed or not.

Mr. BREWSTER. This proposal proceeds on the assumption that the labor organizations are the parties moving. I think it is very rarely the case that individuals file. It is almost always their representatives.

Let us assume, in the case the Senator mentions, that there are two organizations concerned, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. If for any reason the representatives of the C. I. O. are not satisfied with the A. F. of L. agreement which has been entered into in any case, all that is needed is to file a complaint, which will completely protect the rights of every member of their organization. Accordingly, I do not see any reason why the amendment of the statute in the manner indicated would adversely affect any individuals concerned.

Mr. LODGE. If the language is aimed at a special situation in the Kaiser shipyards, why is it so broad as to cover all kinds of situations, really not desired to be covered?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire made it entirely clear in his initial statement that the amendment is designed to stabilize labor relations. As a matter of fact, complaints have been filed or are pending in several other similar instances of considerable antiquity. This merely means that unless some stabilization policy shall be adopted, we shall throw the entire field of labor relations into chaos, because a complaint may be filed in every case, and immediately there follows what we found occurring in the Kaiser yards. The men spend an unfortunate amount of their time discussing whether they would join one organization or the other. Mr. Kaiser testified before us repeatedly that it was a very serious impediment to the war effort.

Mr. LODGE. That is what the Senator is trying to reach?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. A jurisdictional dispute? I am sure some arrangement can be made for that. But it seems to me we would be doing many other things which in some ways would be of much more importance.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know it has been suggested by my colleague from Maine that more happy language might be adopted. I hope this may go to conference. There careful consideration may be given to the phraseology; perhaps an amendment may be formulated which would be better than the language suggested.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to confirm what my colleague from Maine has said. One of the reasons which led me to approve the action of the committee was my utter inability to understand the impact and the import of the language of the House provision. I was completely confused about it, and am still confused about it, and I had hoped that if the matter went to conference, something could be evolved which at least my poor understanding would comprehend.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment I have offered differs from the provision of the House, so that it would automatically go to conference.

Mr. TRUMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. In the condition in which the committee amendment now is, it will go to conference, and any change the Senator from New Hampshire might want may then be considered by the conferees. If the Senator's amendment shall be adopted, I am very sure it will not go to conference, and it is most dangerous to legislate in this manner in an appropriation bill.

I listened to my able colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is on the special committee with me, and he stated the facts as they are, but I do not believe we should repeal the National Labor Relations Act through an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate, without any consideration of the committees of the House and the Senate having to do with labor matters. That is exactly what this amendment would do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in the stabilization of labor conditions?

Mr. TRUMAN. Of course I do, and we have been fighting for that right along, but this is not the way to get it.

Mr. BRIDGES. How would the Senator get it?

Mr. TRUMAN. As I have said, if the matter is allowed to go to conference and to be worked out there, we can get stabilization in a manner which will be entirely satisfactory to all concerned. I have very great admiration for Mr. Frey, I think he is one of the statesmen of labor, but I think he is somewhat peeved at the situation as it has developed on the west coast, I think the amendment is the result of that peeve, and I do not think it should be put through as an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate, without serious consideration. Like the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], I cannot see any result from this language but confusion, and I think that is exactly what it will create if it shall be agreed to. I hope the Senator will not push his amendment, because the matter is already in shape to go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want any action taken by the Senate which would indicate that we are merely casting aside this amendment, and are not in favor of stabilization of labor conditions.

Mr. TRUMAN. Everyone is in favor of that.

Mr. BRIDGES. The National Labor Relations Board, in opening up these contracts at this time, are directly starting labor struggles during a very critical war period, doing injustice not only to labor, but to the Nation as a whole. This should be stopped.

Mr. TRUMAN. No one is quarreling with the Senator on that point.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator's view that the Senate should not permit the impression to be created, by its nonaction on this amendment, that it is opposed to stabilization. I think the Senator is correct in that respect.

I believe all Members of the Senate are in favor of stabilizing this condition. Speaking as one Member of the Senate, and as one who will be a conferee on the bill, I wish to say that I will deal with the subject in that spirit.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only point on which I cannot agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is with respect to what would go to conference. I do not understand why there would not be equal scope of action whether we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire or the committee amendment. In either event, as I understand, the conferees will have complete latitude with respect to what formula they will finally adopt.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, as I understand, the argument which is made by the Senator from Missouri is not that the matter would be in conference whichever of the two amendments is adopted?

Mr. TRUMAN. If the committee amendment is adopted, the whole thing will go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. And if my amendment were adopted, it would also go to conference, and all phases of the question would be discussed.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; that is not the case.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from New Hampshire is in error in that respect, because the Senator has adopted in his amendment the very language of the House amendment which the Senate struck out, except about three additional words.

Mr. BRIDGES. There are considerably more than three words.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will read to the Senate the House language proposed to be stricken by the Senate committee amendment. I wish the Senator from Vermont would compare his amendment with this language. This is the House language:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

The Senator added one or two, or perhaps three words thereafter, as I understand from hearing the amendment read at the desk.

Mr. BRIDGES. My amendment is as follows:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am somewhat in error. The Senator has changed the language from the House language.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not hear the last part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say I am in error. There is a change in the Senator's amendment from the language of the House.

Mr. LODGE. In each case, either way, the whole thing would be in conference and open to action.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the language remains as it now is, the entire subject matter and question will go to conference and there be worked out.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to be understood with respect to the matter. I think the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, which he just read, is word for word the House language proposed to be stricken out by the Senate committee amendment, and there would be no way to consider that in conference for the purpose of rewriting it.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator from Missouri is incorrect in that statement.

Mr. TRUMAN. Is the Senator attempting to repeal the National Labor Relations Act?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it is not word for word the same as the language of the House bill. My amendment differs from it considerably. If the Senator has a copy of the House language, I will read my amendment, and he can check the differences.

My amendment is:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been filed with the Labor Department for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by a labor organization.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to point out that this change, though only of a few words, is very important, and is a change which I would have made in connection with this amendment, because it definitely and specifically states that the agreement must be filed with the National Labor Relations Board or the Government agency——

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it says the Labor Department.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is different.

Mr. HAWKES. But it makes it incumbent upon the organization to see that the agreement is filed there. I personally believe the Government should not hold these agreements open for months and months, and hold them as a club over the head of any labor organization, no matter which side it is on. I am very strongly in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that the object of the committee is to work out a comprehensive provision if it can be worked out. If we adopt language such as is offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, I fear that our hands will be tied and that we cannot work out a comprehensive provision. The Senate committee has identically the same idea that the Senator from New Hampshire has in many respects, but we do not in an appropriation bill propose to amend or alter or nullify a legislative act which has been passed by Congress and which has received Executive approval.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand the Senator from Nevada correctly, then, that he is in complete sympathy with the objective of stabilizing labor relations at this critical period?

Mr. McCARRAN. Absolutely. The entire committee is.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that any appropriate language designed to prevent the reopening of, let us say, somewhat aged contracts, would be in accord with the Senator's views?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, that is my view, because I think labor relations should be stabilized all over the country. A master agreement which was entered into on the Pacific coast constituted a stabilization for a considerable time. It has worked out very satisfactorily, and has been generally commended. It does not apply in other sections of the country. It does not apply to the east coast, and it does not apply to the Gulf coast. All members of the committee are in favor of stabilizing labor conditions, and if we could do so without destroying the Wagner Labor Relations Act, we would. At the same time, we do not want to destroy an act which has been passed by Congress after long debate and consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator's statement of the case is exactly what the proponents of this amendment have had in mind. The situation on the west coast is not only very serious, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] agreed with me in pointing out, but I understand that a similar reopening of contracts on the Gulf coast and on the Atlantic coast is also imminent, and that nothing could be more disastrous at this time than to have such a situation develop.

Mr. McCARRAN. That was testified to before the Senate committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a member of the committee which considered this amendment, I think it is probable, as the chairman has brought out, that by adopting the amendment in the committee it was not assumed that the wording was perhaps so all-encompassing as to do as much justice and fairness as was possible, and at the same time accomplish the desired result. However, the committee was not in a position to refine the wording at that time, but in adopting this principle it was assumed that when the matter went to conference—and it will be in conference—it could be considered more fully and any imperfections in it would then

be eradicted, and the principle of the amendment adopted.

I likewise should like to use this opportunity to say that I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, in referring to the support given to the amendment, inadvertently and unintentionally said that only a certain portion of the American Federation of Labor favored it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not say that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, I did not say that at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I am now advised that Mr. Green and other members of the American Federation of Labor do favor the principle of this amendment, but they all concede that it may have to be reworded to accomplish the desired result. Since that had not been brought out I felt obligated to bring it out.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I may have misunderstood the Senator who is in charge of the bill.. I understood him to say he did not think this matter was one which should be handled on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I said, or at least I intended to say, that I did not think an appropriation bill was the proper place in which to set aside the force and effect of a legislative act.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator think that in conference a satisfactory amendment could be worked out which would not do that, and yet at the same time would achieve a remedy for the situation?

Mr. McCARRAN. My wish will be the father of my thought, and I express my thought, and say I hope so. That is all I can say. But if the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire should prevail, I am confident it would tie the hands of the conferees.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Nevada will agree, I am sure, that the mere enactment of a statute of limitations would not be considered as vitiating the act.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; and that is just what we do not want to accomplish. We want to provide limitations which will be wholesome for the welfare of the country in this unhappy hour, but we do not want to vitiate the act.

Mr. BREWSTER. But if such an amendment were agreed to, it would not be possible for labor strife to continue.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my thought.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the American Federation of Labor was divided on the question. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. At the meeting of the Appropriations Committee, some members stated this amendment was supported by some officials of the American Federation of Labor, but did not have the support of Mr. Green, the president of the A. F. of L., and the general support of the American Federation of Labor. I believe these members were mistaken, and did not convey the correct information.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; the statement was made that it did not have the approval of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. That was exactly my understanding, that it did not have the approval of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor, that the executive committee had not approved it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood, as did the Senator from Maryland, that it had not only the support of the metal trades division headed by Mr. Frey, and including some 14 or 15 divisions, or national unions, but also the approval of Mr. Green and the American Federation of Labor; and when he speaks in favor of it he speaks on behalf of the whole American Federation of Labor. This measure has the support of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I did not so understand. I understood it had the support of the executive council.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am referring to Mr. Green, now; and I assume that when Mr. Green speaks he speaks for the American Federation of Labor as a whole inasmuch as he is president of the federation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order to clarify that particular phase of the question, let me read the record as made by Mr. Frey before our committee:

Mr. WHITE. Am I to understand that the American Federation of Labor approves this House amendment?

Mr. FREY. Yes. Before the amendment came in, Mr. Green authorized me to say that he was in full support of it and that it met with the policy of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a clear answer.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the statement of the chairman of the committee, and not to force at this time the amendment I have offered, with the understanding that the problem of stabilization of conditions in labor relations will be considered, and that we shall have some settlement along that line.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator has used language with which I would not want to go along. I would not go that far. So far as the stabilization of labor conditions in the country at the present time is concerned, I think I speak for the entire committee when I say that we are in favor of doing anything and everything reasonable to stabilize conditions. But we cannot say to the Senator, and I will not say to him, that we will go so far in dealing with the subject as to set aside an existing statute. I would not be so unfair to the Senator as to say that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, would the Senator say that the establishment of some statute of limitations certainly would not vitiate the act?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it can be worked out. I have answered the Senator from Maine that I think it can be worked out along the lines the Senator has just suggested.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. The procedure suggested is agreeable to me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are on the subject of the War Manpower Commission, there is one statement which I should like to make for the information of the Senate regarding the work the War Manpower Commission has done toward solving the manpower problem insofar as labor shortages and labor surpluses in war industries are concerned. We have before us, in the form of a bill known as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, a measure which would provide for a compulsory draft of manpower. So far as I am concerned, I should not want to see legislation of that type enacted, except as an absolutely last resort. I should hope to see in this country a condition in which the labor surplus and its exact location and identity were so well known that it would be possible to make a voluntary appeal to the men to move into areas where there was a labor shortage. Of course, for the performance of that function we look to the War Manpower Commission; and the hearing before the Appropriations Committee on the pending bill gave us an opportunity to obtain the pertinent data. Part of the data is found at page 375 of the Senate hearings, and part of it was sent to me after the hearings had been printed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the data be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—CLEARANCE PROCEDURES

(The following letter and statements were filed for the record:)

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1943.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Attached is the information you requested at the hearing last night in connection with our clearance procedures. Because of the space of time available for the preparation of this material it is necessarily rather sketchy in character.

I trust that if there is anything further that you would like to be provided with on this subject you will not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT L. NICKERSON,
Director, Bureau of Placement.

OPERATION OF INTERAREA RECRUITMENT PROCEDURE

In many areas it is impossible to recruit a sufficient number of workers for employers in the area because of critical labor shortages. When such a situation develops, the local United States Employment Service follows what is known as interarea recruitment procedure.

This procedure involves recruitment of workers in areas of supply for employers who are located in areas of critical labor shortages. Before interarea recruitment will be attempted, certain conditions must be met.

These include that full utilization is made of all local labor, including the employer's present working force; that the need for workers is hindering, or in the near future will hinder, the war effort; that the number of persons requested by the employer represents his minimum needs; that the employer will follow a positive recruitment itinerary arranged by the United States Employment Service, or will delegate hiring authority to the United States Employment Service; that the employer will advance transportation for the worker in all cases where this is considered necessary to successful recruitment; and that there is housing available for the worker upon his arrival on the job.

Interarea recruitment is first tried in areas of supply within the employer's State and then, if necessary, within the War Manpower Commission region. If it is impossible to secure the needed workers within the region, a copy of the employer's order is sent to the Washington headquarters with a request that recruitment be extended to other regions.

The attached table entitled "Interarea Recruitment Results, April 1943" shows by States the number of workers recruited during April by the United States Employment Service for employers outside the area in which the recruitment was conducted. This includes interarea recruitment within each State, between States within each region, and between regions. April is the most recent month for which this data are available. Separate data are not available for April on interregional recruitment but it is estimated that of the 65,449 workers recruited on interarea recruitment, approximately 10,000 were recruited on interregional recruitment.

On May 1 a reporting procedure was established for results of interregional recruitment. The table entitled "Interregional Recruitment Results" shows by regions the number of workers recruited from May 1 to June 5 by the United States Employment Service for employers located outside the region in which the recruitment was conducted.

Attached also is a copy of a memorandum which was sent to all regional manpower directors concerning the introduction of revised program for interregional recruitment:

Interregional recruitment results, May 1 to June 5, 1943

	Number of workers recruited
Region I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island	------
Region II: New York	5,156
Region III: Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	1,375
Region IV: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and District of Columbia	3,875
Region V: Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky	------
Region VI: [1] Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana	343
Region VII: Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida	2,432
Region VIII: Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska	3,155
Region IX: Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma	1,687
Region X: [1] Texas, New Mexico, and Louisiana	244
Region XI: Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah	502
Region XII: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, and Arizona	------
Total	18,769

[1] May 1–27, 1943, only.

Interarea recruitment results, April 1943

	Number of workers recruited
Region I:	
Connecticut	879
Maine	960
Massachusetts	331
New Hampshire	91
Rhode Island	10
Vermont	95
Region II: New York	9,232
Region III:	
Delaware	23
New Jersey	1,626
Pennsylvania	4,594
Region IV:	
District of Columbia	258
Maryland	489
North Carolina	1,879
Virginia	1,131
West Virginia	1,561
Region V:	
Kentucky	2,745
Michigan	712
Ohio	1,738
Region VI:	
Illinois	1,513
Indiana	186
Wisconsin	1,396
Region VII:	
Alabama	1,067
Florida	708
Georgia	1,477
Mississippi	1,196
South Carolina	676
Tennessee	1,740
Region VIII:	
Iowa	1,200
Minnesota	1,446
Nebraska	539
North Dakota	31
South Dakota	296
Region IX:	
Arkansas	781
Kansas	520
Missouri	2,070
Oklahoma	904
Region X:	
Louisiana	1,786
New Mexico	1,091
Texas	4,265
Region XI:	
Colorado	1,776
Idaho	320
Montana	204
Utah	512
Wyoming	83
Region XII:	
Arizona	68
California	7,609
Nevada	216
Oregon	596
Washington	823
Total	65,449

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1943.

To: All regional manpower directors.
From: Lawrence A. Appley, executive director.
Subject: Introduction of revised program for interregional recruitment.

At the conference of regional directors on April 30 it was agreed that a revised program for the interregional recruitment of workers should be adopted. This revision was recognized as necessary to the end that there might be developed a truly national approach to meeting over-all manpower problems.

Enclosed is the proposed pattern for interregional recruitment which was presented to the conference of regional directors. Specifically, the revised program for interregional recruitment provides for the following:

1. A careful review of all orders emanating from the various regions to insure that each of the 10 standards prescribed in United States Employment Service Headquarters Bulletin No. 4 have been met.

2. Each 30 days an exhaustive review of all available labor supply and demand data will be made. Based on a balancing of shortages and surpluses, by areas, within each region, quotas will be assigned to those regions showing net surpluses upon which net shortage regions may draw.

3. Monthly patterns will be issued which will indicate the quotas assigned to each surplus region and the orders to be directed from shortage regions against such quotas.

4. Each region whose clearance orders are authorized to be directed against the quotas of surplus regions will be expected to negotiate directly concerning arrangements for positive recruitment itineraries, controlled advertising, etc.

5. Reports will be required at frequent intervals which will reflect progress made in recruitment on specific orders. A simple reporting system will be devised and initiated in the immediate future.

There is also enclosed the interregional recruitment pattern which has been developed for the month of May. It has been necessary to supplement available labor market information by estimates of labor supply in certain unclassified areas. For this reason the pattern for the month of May is not as complete, nor perhaps as accurate, as will be subsequent monthly patterns. Arrangements will have been made prior to June 1 for more comprehensive coverage and for more exhaustive analyses than have been possible in the limited time available for the preparation of May figures.

The pattern for May will be supplemented as early in the month as possible by telegraphic instructions to direct additional orders against the unallocated portions of regional quotas reflected by the pattern for May. The incompleteness of the current pattern is due to the cancelations of all existing clearance orders, as of May 3, except those revalidated by regional office certification that they meet each of the 10 conditions precedent to clearance outlined in United States Employment Service Headquarters Bulletin No. 4, dated April 20, 1943. As such orders are certified, or as new orders are developed, appropriate advice to the regional offices involved will be issued.

It will be noted that civil-service requirements for west coast shipyards and for Pearl Harbor are included among the orders for which recruitment is to be conducted. It is to be understood that these orders for the navy yards are to be given priority in each region to which they are directed.

It will be highly important that the headquarters office keep currently informed of recruitment progress made within each region upon each order directed against its quota. This will be accomplished by the simple reporting system which has been mentioned above, and the purpose of such information is twofold:

1. It will permit adjustments of demand figures on a current basis and will be an integral factor in arriving at new recruitment patterns each month.

2. It will indicate localities where recruitment is not progressing satisfactorily or where progress in exceeding expectations. In either case headquarters attention and action will be indicated in order to maintain a proper balance of the national program.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of giving vigorous and immediate effect to this new approach to interregional recruitment. It has been prescribed in fairly broad, general terms and leaves much detail to be worked out by each regional director and his staff. Headquarters counsel and assistance will be given as needed or requested, and any points requiring clarification or alteration should be brought to my attention without delay.

I am personally confident of the practicability of this revised approach to interregional recruitment, based upon quotas assigned to regions and areas of relative surplus; I am equally certain of the necessity for so approaching the national responsibility of the War Manpower Commission. I earnestly enlist the active and continued cooperation of each regional director in carrying out his share of this over-all manpower job, which is Nation-wide in scope and transcendent of purely regional, State, area, or local considerations or provincialisms. I know that I may rely upon each of you to accomplish your apportioned segment of this vital responsibility.

For the executive director:

ALBERT L. NICKERSON,
Director, Bureau of Placement.

PROPOSED PATTERN FOR INTERREGIONAL RECRUITMENT

Recent developments enlarging the responsibilities of the War Manpower Commission for the transfer of workers between areas have resulted in an unprecedented volume of orders which cannot be filled except through interregional recruitment. Even after the cancelation of all existing clearance orders, except those meeting the standards prescribed in Headquarters Bulletin No. 4, there will remain an actual need represented by orders in hand for almost a half million workers. Further anticipated needs not presently supported by actual orders will more than double the volume of recruitment for the next 12 months. Current orders include demands for important shipbuilding establishments, aircraft plants, naval repair bases, major military installations, and construction work of strategic importance in Canada. The War Manpower Commission has the definite responsibility for meeting these demands and taking whatever action is necessary, no matter how drastic, for the complete fulfillment of this responsibility.

In the present state of the labor market the currently available unemployed labor supply has been largely exhausted. In most areas no great number of able-bodied men can be recruited from this group. Every region has areas where critical shortages have occurred or are imminent, as well as areas where more intensive recruitment would yield additional manpower. It is necessary to draw on the areas of supply to meet the needs of the shortage areas within regions and between regions. To accomplish this each region must undertake to meet its shortages within the region as far as possible and to provide its share of manpower from areas of supply to meet deficits in other regions faced with over-all shortage. This added responsibility for meeting out-of-region needs must be approached just as vigorously as though the demand to be met were a purely local one It is just as important to meet these labor requirements as it is for local selective service boards to meet their military induction quotas.

In order to distribute equitably the responsibility for these special recruitment efforts, a plan has been developed which attempts to place the greatest burden on areas of relative labor surplus. To this end, net labor shortages and surpluses are being established for all important labor-market areas. These calculations are based on labor-market reports prepared and transmitted to Washington by regional and area personnel. To the information on labor-market areas for which analyses are available will be added shortage or surplus estimates for the unanalyzed portions of each region. A national pattern will thus be set up which will indicate the relationship between our national labor requirements and resources.

From these estimates a balance of shortages and surpluses in various areas within each region will be derived. Some regions will clearly face an over-all labor shortage. Others will contain the labor reserves on which the shortage regions must draw.

These labor surpluses will be calculated on the assumption of active demand for male workers and will rely on the maximum utilization of potential reserves of women. Thus it may eventually be necessary to conduct special recruitment campaigns for women and to withdraw men from less essential activities in areas where purely local needs would not require such efforts. In some cases it may even be necessary to withdraw qualified men from essential activities if replacements from within the community are available.

The shortage regions will be allowed to recruit in other regions up to but not exceeding the number of workers equivalent to the net shortage. This limit will require intensive recruitment campaigns within the region to insure the full utilization of all of the region's labor resources. Otherwise the region's labor requirements will not be met, since clearance recruitment must be definitely limited.

The balance of shortages and surpluses will permit the establishment of quotas for the withdrawal of workers from surplus regions. At the present time only a fraction of the over-all national estimated shortage is actually in hand in terms of order. Moreover, the immediate requirements for the next month will place a relatively light burden on each surplus area. However, the establishment of gross quotas will permit adequate advance planning by regional and area directors against the requirements to be met later this year.

Each 30 days current demand and supply data will be reviewed and the ensuing month's program for interregional recruitment issued from Washington. This pattern will advise shortage regions where clearance recruitment may be conducted and will advise other regions of the quota which they will be expected to furnish.

This monthly pattern will be carefully developed, and when received in each region is to be considered as a positive instruction from the executive director to each region involved. It will be expected that, at least up to the quota established, each region will actively cooperate in the recruitment of workers for shortage regions. Positive recruitment itineraries will be developed and controlled advertising will be utilized to whatever extent is necessary.

The program outlined above is believed to represent the only basis upon which the national responsibility of War Manpower Commission can be completely discharged. The complete acceptance of this national approach is important to the war program, and the cooperation of each regional director is indispensable.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: During the discussion at the meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Monday afternoon, you asked Mr. Haber for some information concerning the procedure employed in securing the transfer of workers from one community to another, and such information as we have dealing with the number of such transfers which have taken place.

You will recall that we indicated that a great bulk of the transfers which occur is voluntary and is in response to information made available by the War Manpower Commission and employers indicating the demand for workers in particular areas. A substantial quantity of transfers also takes place as a result of the direct stimulation by the local United States Employment Service offices of the War Manpower Commission. You will be interested in reviewing the attached memorandum which outlines some of the problems involved in transfers, and presents some statistical material indicating the activities of the Employment Service in this connection. You will note that on page 3, very substantial numbers of "clearance placements" were made during 1942.

I am sure that either Mr. Appley or Mr. Haber will be glad to discuss this matter further with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—TRANSFER OF WORKERS

With the virtual disappearance of unemployment in almost all areas, we have become dependent principally on three sources of manpower to meet the expanding demands of the armed forces and war industries:

1. Young people, coming of working age;
2. Women entering the labor market;
3. Transfer of workers employed in industries not essential to the support of the war.

The direction of young people into war-supporting activities presents few problems. Many of the young men enter the armed forces soon after they become 18. The remainder, being relatively mobile, are drawn into essential work early, attracted by the many opportunities for inexperienced workers in war industries.

Similarly, the reserves of women have been mobilized in great numbers where they have been needed. The number of women workers increased from 22 percent of all nonagricultural employment at the beginning of the war to 34 percent early this year. During 1942, the Employment Service made 2,250,000 placements of women.

Early in the war program, employed workers also were drawn in great numbers to the expanding war industries. As a matter of fact, it would have been impossible to meet the mushrooming schedules of aircraft, shipbuilding, explosives, construction, and other war industries, without the transfer of large numbers of workers from less essential activities. During 1941 and 1942 the most mobile workers flocked to war employment, with the result that those who remained by the end of 1942 were the less mobile, who had personal reasons for not wishing to transfer. As a consequence, the recruitment of workers for transfer has become increasingly difficult and expensive in time and effort, and at the same time increasingly necessary.

In critical labor-shortage areas, where work opportunities were abundant, strenuous appeals have been made by the War Manpower Commission, through the Employment Service, to stimulate transfer of workers from less essential activities. Active recruitment, including public appeals through radio and press, have been used to bring applicants to the employment offices. Negotiations have been carried on with employers to persuade them to release workers needed in war industry. All of these measures, appealing to the traditional mobility of American workers, were fruitful for many months; but toward the end of 1942 there was evidence that the volume of transfers was slackening. When plants were forced to shut down, because of lack of materials, their workers were registered and offered opportunity for direct transfer to plants that were expanding. Employment-stabilization programs, designed to reduce turn-over in the essential activities, have been used also to facilitate movement of labor from the less essential.

The most direct evidence grew out of the experience of the Employment Service with the national occupational inventory of the

Selective Service System. As part of its campaign to recruit workers to meet local shortages, the Employment Service reviewed 39,400,000 occupational questionnaires returned to Selective Service boards by all men between the ages of 18 and 65. Men with needed skills whose records showed that they were not working at their full skills in essential industries were called to the employment offices and offered war jobs. At least 1,000,000 such men were interviewed between March and October 1942. The results were not encouraging: in a sample of 52 employment offices, only 30 percent of the men who were offered jobs were willing to be referred, and only about 1 in 6 was placed. The chief reason given for refusing to apply for war jobs was fear that seniority pension rights, or other formal or informal recognition of tenure would be jeopardized. Differences in wages were secondary. Inadequate housing or transportation to the job was a frequent cause for refusal.

This inertia has increasingly characterized the workers remaining in less essential activities in critical shortage areas. As a result, such areas have had to rely on potential reserves of women and, for work which women cannot do, on recruitment of men in areas of labor surplus. Orders for able-bodied men which cannot be filled locally (for example, in the shipyards of Norfolk or Seattle) are circulated in other areas where male labor is available.

As a result of the labor demand and supply analysis, the areas of labor surplus in each State and region are identified, and care is taken not to recruit in areas where local labor is needed for agriculture, lumber, mining, and war production. By these means, recruitment quotas are determined and orders are prorated.

To facilitate recruitment, arrangements are made to have a representative of the employer at the scene, in order that applicants may be referred directly and hired on the spot. Applicants are preinterviewed by the Employment Service, to avoid referring outside the community men needed locally for essential work.

Inertia is a barrier to interarea recruitment also. Many men are reluctant to leave their home communities—and frequently, their families—to take jobs sight unseen. In many cases, housing and other community facilities in the area of employment may be overtaxed, if not entirely lacking. The cost of transportation to the place of employment may be greater than the worker can or will bear. As a result, many possible sources must be canvassed to find relatively few who will accept the jobs and who are acceptable.

To discourage indiscriminate migration, the Employment Service carefully controls the interarea recruitment carried on through its facilities. No such recruitment is permitted unless local resources have been fully utilized; unless the employer has reduced his hiring specifications to a minimum; until provision has been made to transport the workers to the work site and to house them when they have arrived.

During 1942 more than 600,000 such clearance placements were made by the Employment Service. Workers from Maine and Vermont were placed in the machine shops of Connecticut and the shipyards of Massachusetts. Workers were moved from the depressed areas of northeast Pennsylvania to the war industries of Philadelphia and New Jersey; from the Virginias and the Carolinas to Baltimore and Norfolk; from Alabama and Mississippi to the shipyards in Mobile and Pascagoula; and from all over the West to the aircraft and shipbuilding centers of the Pacific coast.

Typical of the interarea recruitment for leading employers are:

	Workers
Richmond Shipbuilding Co. (Kaiser) Richmond, Calif. (6 months)	20,000
Oregon Shipbuilding Co. (Kaiser), Portland, Oreg. (6 months)	30,000
Alcan Highway contractors (12 months)	18,000
Dravo Corporation, Wilmington, Del. (12 months)	10,000
Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif. (6 months)	16,000
Aluminum Co. of America (west coast reduction plants) (6 months)	5,000
Clinton Engineering, Clinton, Tenn. (week of June 7–12)	1,000

Altogether, approximately 10,000 workers were placed by transfer between regions in May alone, and four to five times as many by transfer between areas within the regions.

Because of the increasing difficulty of recruitment and transfer, greater and greater emphasis is being placed by the War Manpower Commission on programs designed to stabilize employment and effect more efficient utilization of labor in essential industries. In a period of labor surplus, recruitment and transfer met most of the labor needs of war production. Now it is necessary not only to transfer workers from industries and areas where they can be spared, but also still further to reduce turn-over, improve training, lengthen hours, and otherwise increase the ability and productivity of the workers recruited and placed.

Mr. LODGE. I believe Senators upon reading the data will be surprised at how little has been accomplished. In my judgment, the showing has not been an impressive one. I received the impression that the War Manpower Commission, through its statistical agencies, has simply sought to follow the migration of labor and to see where it is going, but that the Commission has not really made a serious, earnest, well-considered attempt to induce the man who is living in an area where there is a labor surplus to go into an area where he is really needed. However, Senators can judge that for themselves. I simply wanted to direct attention to the fact that for the first time, I believe, in the hearings and in the document I am inserting for the RECORD the facts relative to what has been done for the treatment of our labor surplus are available to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator's opinion of the work done by the Employment Service.

Mr. LODGE. I was one of those who voted to restore the Budget estimate for the Employment Service. I did so because it is the only hope we have, if the war continues and if our present economic situation continues, of avoiding compulsory manpower legislation. If we do not have an employment service that knows where people are, and has the information classified by occupation and by vocation, we cannot hope to make a voluntary system work, and we shall be driven that much closer to a compulsory system. I will say to the Senator that for that reason I supported the Budget estimate for the Employment Service.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to say that I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Massachusetts in his position regarding the Employment Service. Let me say that, so far as the Southeast is concerned, we are in an excellent condition.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how good a job the Employment Service is doing, but I merely know the job is one which must be done and which cannot be done too well.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator's position, as he has expressed it; and I hope every consideration will be given.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, while we are talking about the confusion in the labor situation in the country I desire to say that we shall continue to have labor confusion, and the Manpower Commission and the Department of Labor will not be able to prevent it, so long as confusion exists regarding the number of men who will be taken into the Army and so long as conflicting statements are issued from time to time.

A few days ago I called attention to the confusion which exists in some of the departments, particularly with reference to the armed services. I now invite attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Star of June 24. It reads as follows:

CONFUSING STATISTICS CLOUD ARMED SERVICES' NEED OF MANPOWER—MCNUTT SAYS 1,900,000, BUT FIGURE IS HIGHER THAN OFFICERS ADMIT

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Revised estimates on the number of men required to meet the demands of the armed forces this year appeared likely today in the light of still unexplained conflicting statistics from the War Department, Selective Service, and War Manpower Chief McNutt.

Out of enough statistics to daze even the House appropriations subcommittees, which had to listen to them, confusion appeared to center on two principal points:

How big is the Army now?

How many men do we still need, or, how many fathers will have to be drafted this year?

SERVICES SIMPLY ASK

Actually the Army and Navy do the asking and Selective Service supplies on demand, but Mr. McNutt is supposed to have a running account of armed forces needs to budget his manpower.

And, to judge from the hearings on War Manpower Commission and Army supply bills, the manpower budget is going to stand revising.

Mr. McNutt told a House appropriations subcommittee that 1,900,000 persons would have to be inducted between July and December. Elsewhere in the same statement on the same day he knocked off 200,000.

About the same time another appropriations subcommittee was informed by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, and Army finance officers that the Army needed about 700,000 men between July and December. The congressional limit on the number of WAAC's made it necessary to do some revising and the Army finally settled on about 900,000.

We have a difference between the testimony of General Somervell and that of Mr. McNutt. First, there is a difference of 1,200,000, which Mr. McNutt revised to 1,700,000. Then a statement was

made by General Somervell, showing a difference of 700,000, which was later revised to 900,000.

The article continues:

CAN'T RECONCILE FIGURES

Earlier Navy testimony indicated the naval forces were counting on about 400,000 men to the end of this year.

Of course, there is always the question of replacements, but even manpower statisticians admit that what Mr. McNutt figured for replacements wouldn't account for the difference between what the armed forces said they wanted and what Mr. McNutt planned to give them.

Mr. McNutt estimated the armed forces would have a strength of 9,200,000 by July. However, a manpower official said the estimates prepared for Mr. McNutt did not include all the Army and Navy groups not in uniform and not receiving pay.

Then there was Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey's testimony. He said 7,800,000 men registered with selective service had enlisted or been inducted by April 30. His figures did not include those in the Regular Army when the Selective Service Act was passed, nor the National Guard men, nor the youths who enlisted before they had to register nor "some other individuals—how many I do not know."

No businessman can estimate how many of his employees are to be taken, or what is to be done about the manpower question. No man knows whether he will be taken into the Army tomorrow or next day. I have not been able to figure it out, and I do not believe anyone else can do so.

Continuing with the article:

SEVEN MILLION IN JANUARY

There were indications that the armed forces were nearer their contemplated goals than Mr. McNutt knew.

President Roosevelt told Congress early in January that the armed forces totaled 7,000,000 persons. From the first of this year selective service was called on to procure 4,300,000 men. The men were to go in at the rate of 400,000 men a month.

If that time schedule has been followed, selective service has added 2,400,000 men to the strength at the start of the year, not including enlistments of youths, men over 38, and women.

The Army told Congress it would have more than 7,200,000 men and women by the end of June. All the figures to reach that total were exact except for the enlisted male strength—a round figure of 6,500,000.

FIGURES NOT STANDARD

Manpower officials said Mr. McNutt's figures were compiled "some time ago" and there had been "some lag in information from the Army."

Several officials suggested that some of the estimates included women and others did not. Some included officers and others did not. Some included youths and specialists signed up for the Army, but still out of uniform, and others did not.

The story concludes:

How big is the Army and when will fathers be drafted? Ask General Somervell. Or General Hershey. Or Mr. McNutt.

I invite attention to a statement which appeared in the Evening Star of June 24, 1943:

LAUNDRIES CHARGE UNITED STATES AGENCIES WORK AT CROSS PURPOSES

Declaring that laundries and dry-cleaning establishments throughout the Nation virtually have broken down under the strain of insufficient manpower, officials of the two industries said today that they would ask Director Byrnes of the Office of War Mobilization, to appoint a special committee to coordinate the activities of several Government agencies in their relations with the laundry and dry-cleaning industries.

Representatives of six national organizations, who yesterday asked assistance of Director McNutt of the War Manpower Commission, indicated that some of the agencies were working at cross-purposes, in connection with their hard-pressed industries. They cited instances.

When laundries can't return a man's shirt within a reasonable time, he has to buy more. Housewives have had to increase their linen supplies. Infrequent washing, due to the slowness of laundry service, causes disintegration of material.

On the one hand, the officials contended, the War Production Board is trying to maintain its textile supply, while on the other hand, the Office of Defense Transportation is interested only in cutting down deliveries.

Again, on the one hand, the War Manpower Commission wants to help the laundries hold their labor, while on the other hand, the War Labor Board has been reluctant to grant the wage increases which would keep laundry workers on their jobs.

Edwin Wesley, of Washington, speaking for the American Institute of Laundering, said flatly that "the laundry service has broken down here."

Some plants are on a 10-day or 2-week schedule, and dry-cleaning plants here have been advertising that they could not take any dry-cleaning for a week or two at a time.

The industries' officials are hoping that Mr. Byrnes will appoint a coordinating committee, taking in the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Production Board, and the Office of Civilian Requirements.

The officials said they had been given assurances by the War Manpower Commission that all appropriate steps would be taken to recruit part-time workers, and use handicapped persons to prevent a break-down of the industry.

George Soukup, of Lincoln, Nebr., president of the National Association of Dyers and Cleaners, told reporters that today dry-cleaning plants in critical areas are forced to turn away as much work as they can accept. At one point, he said, his own plant had 7,000 dresses waiting to be cleaned, and 3 girls to do it.

In Washington, it was reported, there were at one time 3,500 mothers on the waiting list for diaper service.

Then we have Mr. Eric Johnston, who blames labor, the Government, pressure groups, and the people themselves. I read an article from the New York Times of June 25, 1943:

JOHNSTON DEPICTS THE HOME FRONT PERIL—HE BLAMES LABOR, GOVERNMENT, PRESSURE GROUPS, AND PEOPLE THEMSELVES FOR CRISIS

WASHINGTON, June 24.—Eric A. Johnston, a representative of management on the Economic Stabilization Board and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, gave a sharp warning to the American public tonight, declaring that "our country is confronted by a crisis that daily grows more menacing, and of a nature so serious that its dangers cannot be overemphasized."

Mr. Johnston, who attended a meeting of the Stabilization Board earlier in the day, had never before made a speech in which he criticized labor, government, pressure groups generally, and even the people.

With his rapid rise to an influential position in Washington largely due to his reputation as a conciliator in striving to bring labor and management and government together in a program of wartime unity, his speech tonight over facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System expressed his loss of patience with causes which had brought crisis on the home front.

"The only good news the Axis is getting," he declared, "is the bad news from the United States home front. As our bombers shatter factories in the Ruhr, the headlines in Berlin proclaim a strike in Pennsylvania or Alabama, a conflict among high officials in Washington, or a riot in Detroit."

DECLARES VICTORY IS DELAYED

He said that "Washington is not winning the battle on the economic front," and that "confusion and inefficiency in Washington serve to delay the day of victory."

"Washington dilly-dallies, argues about the jurisdiction of Federal war agencies, plays politics, experiments with social measures, acts with indecision or not at all," he asserted.

"The threat of inflation hangs like the sword of Damocles over the Nation's head, the food shortage continues to get worse, we have failed to formulate a tax program adequate to help meet the astronomical costs of war and forestall inflation, a chaotic price policy provides fertile soil for growth of untold black markets," he declared, adding:

"The problem of manpower is still a mess."

He lashed out at pressure groups for engaging in "a civil economic brawl with the battle lines drawn on the home front instead of on the war front."

"Too much play for power among powerful men, lack of coordination and cohesion of effort, is causing Washington to spray its shots and miss the mark when the target should be high 16-inch artillery," he asserted.

He reminded labor that "strikes are on the increase despite labor's no-strike pledge—voluntarily given."

ASSAILS EVASION OF RATIONING

For the people generally he remarked:

"It is considered smart by too many people to evade rationing, to patronize black markets, and to violate other rules which must be promulgated in wartime."

He even deplored a lack of what he called adequate production, declaring that "our output of arms must be greatly increased in the next 6 months if we are to make up for the deficiency and adequately provide our fighting forces and those of our allies with the weapons essential to victory."

Calling for greater effort from all, Mr. Johnston said that those in business could manage better, those in labor could work even harder, those on farms could produce more, those in government, in executive and legislative branches could guide all their decisions "by one indelible rule—the war comes first."

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary and treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. He states:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am writing you to express my personal appreciation and congratulations on your splendid radio address which you delivered Friday, March 5.

I had about given up hope that any responsible Government official would have the courage and understanding to tell the people of this great country the facts concerning the war manpower problem and to explain the fallacy of attempting to build up an Army out of proportion.

During the past year I have served on several committees appointed for the purpose of discussing those subjects with General

Hershey, Mr. McNutt, and others, and it has been very disappointing to find there is such a lack of understanding with regard to the realities that confront the Nation in connection with many features that were covered in your radio address.

For example: the railroad industry has been robbed of manpower that will be sorely needed before the end of this year because General Hershey and others in authority seem to have failed to recognize that transportation is one of the greatest factors in promoting a necessary and successful war effort.

During the last war, the transportation problem was, as you know, simple compared to this one because we, in the railroad industry, were fighting what might be called a one ocean war. Today a large percentage of the products of war industries must be moved from the Middle East and eastern territory to the west coast.

Aside from these features, it seems to me we are in danger of losing the greatest and most important thing in America, and that is home life. It is discouraging, to say the least, that all we receive from the heads of departments in Washington is a bewildering medley of sounds over the air that result in confusion.

At the present time there is a tremendous hue and cry about absenteeism which is apparently going to be used by some racketteers to again promote prohibition. But not one word is said about the tremendous loss of time through accidents that could have been avoided.

I also received a letter from Mr. Tom Cashin, of the Railway Switchmen's Association, in which he said:

I am pleased that you have introduced a bill which, in my judgment, should receive support. As far as I am personally concerned it will be supported, although at the present time I am not in a position to speak for our Association (the Railway Labor Executives' Association), but I believe they will support your bill. I have written you at some length on this matter, expressing my personal feelings and indicating that so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to help you in any manner I can.

Again I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the conflicting statements regarding the draft, which have added greatly to the confusion of the registrants.

I have before me a statement recently issued by Charles P. Taft, Assistant Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, from which I read:

February 12: Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, said most draftees within the next two or three months will be chosen from fathers, "because there'll be no one else left to induct."

February 14: General Hershey and Manpower Director McNutt told the Nation nearly all able-bodied men of military age would be in the service by the end of 1942 except a small minority in essential jobs.

February 15: Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee said the committee would favor the Kilday bill to put married men with dependents at the bottom of the draft list.

February 16: Representative KILDAY (Democrat) of Texas, author of the Kilday bill, accused the Manpower Commission of "using the Selective Service as a weapon for the enforcement of administrative decrees."

February 21: The Bellamy Committee, in report to the President, urged tightening of deferments for Government employees and limiting such deferments to not more than 6 months.

February 24: President Roosevelt said an Executive order was in preparation to release able-bodied men from Government service for the armed forces. The House Military Affairs Committee ordered a special subcommittee to investigate draft deferments of Government employees and employees in plants under Government supervision.

February 27: General Hershey was disclosed to have told a Senate subcommittee he had grave doubts requirements of the armed forces could be met without drafting men over 38.

March 1: Secretary of War Stimson endorsed provisions of the Austin-Wadsworth bill to draft men and women for farms and war factories in a letter to Chairman REYNOLDS, of Senate Military Affairs Committee. Early passage predicted at Capitol for Bankhead bill granting blanket deferment to farm workers.

March 1: William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, opposed any unreasonable plan to strip industry of skilled workers to build up an excessively large Army.

March 3: Informed Government officials said drafting of fathers would begin about May 1.

March 8: All men over 38 ordered reclassified from IV–H (deferred for age) and returned to classifications on the same basis as younger men.

Recently a statement appeared in the press to the effect that fathers would not be called before October 1. Another statement announced that they might not be called before January 1, if at all.

So I say that the confusion continues to exist. Therefore, we should not wonder that there is confusion with reference to the subject of manpower. What married man between the ages of 18 and 38 will leave his home and seek employment when he does not know whether he will be called into the armed service? What unmarried man will arrange to buy a business or settle down if he does not know what his draft status is to be? If necessary, the married men of the country are perfectly willing to serve. A few days ago Chairman MAY, of the House Committee on Military Affairs, made a statement that at no time had any Army official appearing before his committee said that the Government needed more than from 7,000,000 to 7,500,000 men. I have read the reports of hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. If Senators will read them they will see that they contain nothing but confusion. One statement will be to the effect that our armed forces will need not more than 7,000,000 men, while another statement will be to the effect that 8,000,000 men will be needed. Statements have been issued by Secretary of War Stimson, Chief of Staff Marshall, and General McNarney, and when we are through reading the statements of each of these men there is nothing but confusion.

I have repeatedly stated that, in view of the confusion existing throughout the country, the Congress of the United States should take a hand and say to the fathers of the country who have children, "You are not going to be called or sent overseas in the next year." Congress should definitely and positively tell them that they will not be taken, and it should pass a law to that effect. Congress should say to them, "If the time comes when the situation changes, and we find we can use you, then we will call you."

Mr. President, I have a large number of letters which have come to me with reference to this subject. I shall not place all of them in the RECORD, and I shall not read all of them. However, here is one from New York. It states:

May I add my voice to your movement to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of all single men up to age 45. The disrupting of families by the taking of fathers, when there are available healthy bachelors is an outrage and against the best interests of the home—that last fortress of a democracy.

I read from a letter received from Omaha, Nebr.:

I read in last evening's World-Herald of this city that you are drawing up a bill which included taking all able-bodied Army men from desk jobs. I think this is the most commendable bill I know of. I have long been noticing this situation. At first I definitely thought that this was a job for the military to decide alone, but now I feel it is high time for Congress to take a hand.

Here in Omaha—

The writer then refers to something occurring in Omaha.

I will now read from a letter, which I have received from New Orleans:

It is a sad situation in life when children do not have a father for their guidance. The mother, then, has to go out and earn a living, leaving her small children to shift for themselves, the best way they can, while she is away at work. This has a tendency to destroy the American home.

I read from a letter written by an officer of the Navy, in which he says:

I went through World War No. 1 and returned home and raised a family of five boys. My oldest son was killed in action on board the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor. The next oldest son is somewhere out there in the hellhole. Now that I am back in the service, I am trying to give everything that I have to win. I left an elective position to get back into the service. I am past the draft age.

He goes on to state that he feels that married men with children should not be drafted.

I think that the authorities in Washington owe it to the business interests of the country, to the fathers of the country, and to the people generally to make a definite statement, which may be relied upon, as to how large an Army it is intended to have, and stick to it, and then also issue a definite statement as to whether or not fathers are to be drafted in August or October or January 1. In view of the fact that we have had no assurances of that kind, I have been hopeful that the Committee on Military Affairs would report the bill which I introduced in order that we might pass upon the question on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 58 is agreed to.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] had to say in reference to Army matters and the drafting of fathers or the drafting of youngsters before

the drafting of fathers or after the drafting of fathers, and the remarks which he made likewise in regard to the size of the Army, all of which I found interesting, as I find everything the Senator says to be very interesting. I desire to make a few observations, briefly, in regard to that matter, particularly in view of the fact that the subject thus brought to the attention of this body is of great interest to the American people.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I am of the humble opinion that, as the Senator knows, it is very difficult for the Army leaders to decide exactly the number of men they want or will need now or in the future, which is entirely due to the fact, I dare say, that our Army leaders do not know what they will be called upon to demand of the American people in reference to contributions in the form of manpower. That is attributable, of course, to the chaotic condition existing throughout the world today. As a matter of fact, we have so much misunderstanding even on the home front that Americans do not know whether they are coming or going or whether they are going in a circle, and I rather imagine that Army leaders and the great military spirits of the world today find themselves in the same fix, because they do not know really what is going to take place. Even at this hour, the American people are confused; and it cannot be otherwise.

Our military leaders cannot tell the American people what they have in mind. Many people feel that, this year, with forces numbering millions of men, we should invade the continent of Europe in order to bring about the earliest possible victory. Of course, I am not only agreeable to an early victory, but I hope that, in some way or other, we may bring it about. Nevertheless, unless we are now prepared to bring about an early victory at the very minimum cost of American manpower, I am not inclined to recommend an invasion until such time as our military leaders are ready for it. That interests itself in the size of the Army.

Another factor in regard to the size of the Army is that we must have a tremendously large Army because, unfortunately and sadly and shamefully, in this country we are called upon to make utilization of several hundred thousand uniformed men exclusively for the purpose of guarding our own installations within the confines of the continental United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell the Senate how many men there are in the armed forces at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know the exact number, but it is approximately 7,500,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Can the Senator tell the Senate how many men we can possibly transport abroad in view of shipping difficulties?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, as the Senator knows, the number is limited. I do not know that I ever had the information as to the number of men we could send abroad. As a matter of fact, I am rather inclined to think that if we had such information it would not be well to provide the public with it, because of the fact that it might be of some advantage to the enemy.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts have been testified to and have been published.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not think the exact number that can be sent abroad has been testified to or published. It is a question how many we could supply with food and munitions on foreign fields.

Mr. WHEELER. Statements of the number have been made on the floor of the Senate, over the radio, and published generally throughout the country, and I was wondering if those in charge had changed their opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the figure has not been changed for a long time. The figures have been placed on a chart in the Marble Room, and they have not been changed at all. The total number that can be shipped to December 31, 1943, is 2,700,000 and the total to the end of 1944 is 4,700,000. It is a matter that cannot very well be changed from day to day. It is arrived at by the total tonnage which is available to supply the men abroad, and the total supplies which have been ordered. That is a matter which must be arranged a long time in advance, and it cannot be changed from month to month.

Mr. WHEELER. Can the Senator tell me how many men are in the Army at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are somewhat over 7,000,000 men now in the Army at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. So that if we do not take another man into the Army, by the end of 1944, if we should send 4,700,000 men abroad, there would still be left in the United States at the end of 1944 an Army of 2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. If we should not take any more men into the Army than we have up to this moment we would still have left in the Army in the United States in excess of 2,000,000 men.

Mr. WHEELER. There would still be over 2,000,000 members of the Army in the United States at the end of 1944. So I say that if 2,000,000 men of the Army will be left in the United States at the end of 1944, what excuse is there for taking more men into the Army, and what is the excuse for breaking up American homes and taking fathers away from their children, and sending the children out on the streets?

Bills have been introduced increasing the allowances to be paid to the wives and families of soldiers, but even if we give them a $15 increase or whatever is being asked, that is not going to settle the problem. If the father is to be taken away from the home the wife will be compelled to go to work for a living, and the children will be driven into the streets or put into institutions. When that happens, as was pointed out a few days ago by Mr. Hoover, and as has been pointed out to me in letters from various public officials who have written from various sections of the country, it contributes to the increase of crime among children. It seems to me that steps should be taken to prevent such a condition.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I did not rise particularly to enter into an argument with the Senator. I merely wished to give him information upon the matter about which he was speaking.

Yesterday the Committee on Military Affairs were provided an opportunity to go to the city of New York to extend greetings to some of the wounded from the north African war zone. I wanted to go and see the hospital ship which was to arrive and visit some of the boys in the hospitals, but, after all, I am rather glad I did not go, because I would not like to go through the painful experience of seeing the maimed and the wounded and the blind soldiers.

Mr. President, it was concerning that matter that I rose to make a remark. As I look around the galleries of the Senate, I see men in uniform, I see several who have been through foreign service, and some who have been wounded. What I am thinking about today is not whether we are to win the war, for there can be no doubt that we are going to win the war. If we desire, we can bring about an unconditional surrender. We have the power with which to do it. As to whether or not our Allies are going to insist upon an unconditional surrender, or whether there will be some sort of negotiation before long, I do not know. Many people are commenting upon the fact that there has not been much activity between the Chinese troops and the Japanese troops lately. Others comment on the fact that there has not recently been much gunpowder wasted on the Russian front between the Germans and the Russians.

What I am interested in is the care of these 11,200,000 men and women of the Army and Navy after the war shall have ended. I am interested in cutting down expenses, as is the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other Members of the Senate, for that I do not want to give away everything we have in this country and have nothing left for the heroes of World War No. 2 when they return to our shores.

What I am exercised about more than anything else is how under heaven we are to be able to take care of the veterans of this war when the war shall have ended. In passing, I make this observation, that I noticed in the columns of the press of yesterday that up to the present time the American forces have experienced casualties numbering about 80,000 or 90,000 men, having lost 18,000 men in the north African campaign. During our entire participation in World War No. 1 52,000 of our soldiers were killed and 250,000 were wounded. If there is to be an invasion of Europe this year and next, and if and when we retake the territory which the Japanese have taken,

as we will, we will have as a result of this war hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of men killed in actual battle, and there will be millions of wounded. What I am interested in is conserving all that we can in this country in order to utilize it in taking care of the veterans of World War No. 2.

In speaking of that, I wish to remind the Members of the Senate that just before we entered this war, in December 1941, 25 years after the close of World War No. 1, we did not have enough beds in our hospitals to take care of the veterans of that war, which closed 25 years ago.

When the boys from this war come back they are going to ask for a bonus. They are going to deserve a bonus, and I am going to vote for such a bonus.

Mr. President, when our boys return armless and legless and blind, their usefulness in life destroyed, they are going to deserve attention, and insofar as I am concerned, I shall vote all the money necessary, if we still have it, for the care and protection of those men who have gone forth at this time; for the second time in a generation, to save the world. What I am interested in is saving enough money here and cutting down expenses so as to take care of the boys who come back, for we will need billions upon billions of dollars, because we will have to care for and hospitalize millions of boys who will be wounded or stricken with tropical diseases in the several portions of the world where we have men in uniform today. Furthermore, we are going to have to pension the men and pay pensions for 50 years to come.

Mr. President, my purpose in rising was to say this much in the interest of the men of World War No. 2.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator advise what the total cost of civilian operations of the Federal Government is at the present moment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I cannot.

Mr. BONE. Can any Senator here advise us what the total amount involved for civil operations may be? The Senator from North Carolina was speaking of saving some money, and in contrast with whatever savings might be achieved, I wondered what percentage of possible war costs those savings might represent. That involves a very practical question. If we save $500,000,000 a year, or $100,000,000 a year, it would be a drop in the bucket compared to war operations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Such economy would represent hardly a drop in the bucket, so far as total appropriations are concerned.

Mr. BONE. I am trying to think it out in very practical terms. A $71,000,000,000 bill is about to come before the Senate, and I imagine that because of the grim necessities wrapped up in that appropriation, there will not be much debate about it. The debates here are over saving a little here and there in the civil operations of the Government, which are, as the able Senator points out, but a mere drop in the bucket.

Mr. McCARRAN. May we proceed with the bill, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board", on page 60, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out the colon and the following: *"Provided,* That not more than $2,500 shall be paid during the fiscal year 1944 to any person for services as referee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Railroad Retirement Board", on page 60, line 25, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,706,769" and insert "$2,030,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the word "another", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$490,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I must leave the Senate Chamber in a few moments to attend a committee meeting. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in charge of the bill, if at this time I may offer an amendment on page 62, in line 25, to increase the amount from $9,994,800 to $12,177,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$9,994,800" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12,177,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to state the reason why the amendment is offered. The Senate has added a considerable amount of money to the bill. The item in question is for general administration. In all we have added approximately $60,000,000 to the bill. I know it is more than $50,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. $52,900,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House reduced the amount asked for in this item on the theory that it had cut off a number of items in the bill and had otherwise reduced the amount carried in it, and therefore it reduced this particular item along with others. In the Senate we have added an additional item for administration. In view of the evidence before the committee that the purpose of increasing this item for general administration was in order to deal more directly with the States themselves, I hope the Senator from Nevada will accept the amendment and permit it to go to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter was brought before the subcommittee as well as the full committee. It was voted on in the full committee. The amendment, as now offered, failed of adoption in the committee. Matters have been brought to my attention since the hearings before the committee which make me feel it might be worth while to take the item to conference. I am willing to take it to conference, and see what can be done with it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Both in the subcommittee and the full committee I voted against the proposed increase, but since that time I have obtained further information on the subject, and I believe the Senator from Tennessee is correct, and that the item should be taken to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the amount proposed in the Senator's amendment conforms exactly to the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is the amount the Bureau of the Budget estimated. There was a difference of opinion in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and by a tie vote the amendment was defeated in the full committee.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Missouri has said, additional information establishes that the amount provided by the Senator's amendment is necessary if we are to carry out the functions provided for in other items.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the Senate be advised what the additional information is to which the Senator from Alabama has referred?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I stated it a moment ago. As the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee, knows, the House cut down various items in the bill. Some of them were cut very drastically. This is one of the items the House cut very drastically. It is an administration item. The House reduced the item a little over $6,000,000 under the Budget recommendation, and below what the House committee had agreed to, as I understand. The Senate has added about $52,000,000 to the bill. Of course, the additional administration made necessary by reason of the additional appropriation must be provided for. All I am asking is that the matter be taken to conference. The Senator in charge of the bill has said that he is willing to take it to conference and work it out there. The Senator from Massachusetts will be a member of the conference, and, of course, can be helpful in working it out.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that there were some items to which the committee did not agree, and to which I would not agree in conference if they were brought up again. But the amount requested in addition to what the committee allowed, it seems to me, might well go to conference under the Senator's amendment. For that reason I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have great faith in the statements made by the Senator from Nevada, and, of course, also in statements by the Senator from Tennessee, and I found myself in harmony with them I think on almost all the questions which came before the subcommittee. I believe the record will

show that I have been fair and nonpartisan, and have tried to consider all these matters on their merits. I voted to increase the amount for the apprentice training service, for the administration of unemployment compensation, and for the employment service, and I was under the impression that when we made those increases we were increasing the amount of personnel, and that such personnel would administer the work for which we made the appropriations. I am not at all clear as to why it is necessary to appropriate any more under this general heading. I feel that the War Manpower Commission so far has not made a broad, general record which justifies this increase. We have provided all that was asked for the employment service, for unemployment compensation, for the apprentice training service. Those are specific services in which I happen to believe. But I have seen nothing which leads me to believe that the increase now proposed is justified.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may add that in my time of service in the Senate I have never served on a committee with a Member who has taken hold with such zest and zeal and ability as has the young Senator from Massachusetts in the Appropriations Committee. The manner in which he deals with subjects which come before him has won for him the approval of every member of the committee, and I commend him heartily for the interest he has taken. What he has said up to this point is entirely true.

In taking this item to conference I do not commit myself to press for its adoption, but I do think it might be taken to conference and a further study made of it there. Since the committee passed on this bill it has been stated to me by Mr. McNutt—and I want to be frank about it—that if we retained the cut in the bill, it would result in seriously impeding the progress of his program. With that in mind, I wish to make a further study of the matter, and that is why I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on page 62, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that will necessitate a change in the item for printing and binding in line 23, and the item for travel expenses in line 24. I have two amendments dealing with those two items. All three items can be taken to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will accept those amendments, and the matters can be worked out in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 23, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$160,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$193,400."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it would be ungracious for me not to express my appreciation for what the Senator from Nevada has said about me, and without in any way desiring to appear as though I were paying a perfunctory compliment, I should like to say that it is not hard for a member of the subcommittee to make his best efforts when the committee is well presided over and its business is conducted in so orderly and efficient a manner as it is by the Senator from Nevada. I appreciate what he has said about me. But I still say we have not had presented to us a single fact to show why this is necessary; and I am still opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not offer the other amendment. The two amendments would simply go along in the same way if the full amount is appropriated. But as the one amendment has been rejected, I shall not offer the other one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management—Apprentice Training Service," on page 63, line 6, after "(not to exceed $100,000)", to strike out "$465,500" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after "(not to exceed $161,000)", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Employment Office facilities and services", on page 64, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,980,000" and insert "$2,275,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 2, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$45,500,000" and insert "$50,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I offer, and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, before the amendment is read, let me say that a number of Senators are interested in the amendment, and before it is read I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and yield to me?

Mr. TRUMAN. Very well.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada if he will tell me what was the purpose of the committee in striking out a certain portion of the provision beginning on page 8? Let me say that I have consulted with a number of Senators who were instrumental in having that action taken, and they gave me their impression, which is opposite to the one I obtain from reading the provision. It seems to me that the provision which was in the bill was designed to prevent the use of any money of the Federal Government to propagandize for a medical policy in the separate States. Senators on the committee with whom I talked thought that provision was stricken out for the opposite reason.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the provision was inserted in the House and was stricken out by the Senate committee because as it came from the House it would mean that certain cults and practitioners of certain schools of medicine should not be the recipients of public moneys in obstetrical cases. In other words, there are what is known as chiropractors and osteopaths and similar groups who seek to operate and to practice under the Federal money and to receive the benefits of the Federal moneys who are not permitted by State laws to practice in obstetrical cases. It is the view of the Public Health Service that only those who are permitted to practice in obstetrics should receive the benefits of the public money. In other words, they want to limit the practice of obstetrics under the public authority and public aid to those who are qualified in obstetrics.

Some States in the Union permit chiropractors, osteopaths, and others to practice obstetrics; but those States also screen out, as I choose to use the term, those who do not graduate from schools where obstetrics is taught. Those in chiropractic work and osteopathic work who graduate from schools and who receive the full course in obstetrics may, under some State laws, practice obstetrics. In other States they may not practice obstetrics.

The object of the Senate committee in striking out the provision was to provide that only those who are qualified obstetricians shall be the recipients of the public money.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I may intrude further upon the time of the distinguished Senator, let me say that at the present time in California there is such a great shortage of doctors of every kind that many sick people find it difficult to secure medical attention and sometimes women are dying in childbirth because they are not able to have the services of any kind of a physician.

Under those conditions we are utilizing every kind of medical talent, and I think we must continue to do so.

I may be entirely mistaken, but I believe the provision which was in the bill as it came from the House was meant to provide that none of the money appropriated under the bill could be used by any medical association to propagandize persons in the effort to change the rule of a State as to what should be its policy. Having talked with several Senators who voted on the matter in the committee, and having heard them express the opinion that what I have just stated was exactly what they wanted to accomplish, that they did not want the Federal Government to interfere in the

set-up of the States, it does seem to me that the provision and the matter should have further consideration in conference; and I shall deeply appreciate it if the provision is reviewed.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are dealing with a committee amendment, and of course it will go to conference and will be reviewed in conference.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then I express the hope that it will be reviewed in the light of the interpretation which it seems to me should be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is not trying to cast any doubt on the legislative history of the amendment as it goes to conference; because I do not want any doubt cast which would justify the Senate conferees in receding from the amendment. The amendment would justify the use of the money to provide care for the wives of men who are serving in the armed forces of the United States and are fighting on the battlefields all over the world. So far as I am concerned, I want their wives to have as good medical care at the time of childbirth as there is to be had in the United States, and I do not want the Children's Bureau to be put in such a position that it could not bar incompetents from professing to take care of women at the time of childbirth. I want the RECORD to show that the Senate and the Members of the Senate committee knew what they were doing, not that they did not know what they were doing.

The committee was advised that various agencies now practice, or may practice, obstetrics. Those agencies include midwives, as well as some cults which attempt to practice obstetrics. The object of the Senate amendment is that those who receive the benefit of this money, which is public money, shall be of the very highest class so far as obstetrical practice is concerned, as recognized by the group of physicians in the United States who are obstetricians. This does not attempt to prevent, nor would it prevent, the practice of obstetrics by anyone who could get a case in obstetrics. We do not go into that field at all. We are dealing with public money, and we say that it shall be paid only to those whom we judge to be best fitted to carry on the work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am sorry to have evoked so much heat from the Senator from Wisconsin. What I am contending for, and what I shall continue to contend for, is that in the State of California, under all the conditions existing there, we are certainly capable of judging the qualifications reasonably to be required of any physician who practices in childbirth cases. This rule, as apparently interpreted by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Nevada, would allow some bureau in Washington to say to the State of California, "We cannot agree with the rules of medical practice set up by your legislature and your medical boards. We are going to impose some other rules upon you, and say that none of this money may be used unless your standards are acceptable to us."

Perhaps my interpretation of what the distinguished Senators said is erroneous, and perhaps my understanding of this language is erroneous. I do not desire to prolong the controversy. This is not the proper time. I was not present when the amendment was under consideration, or I should have discussed the question then. In view of all the circumstances, I hope that the question may be reviewed.

While it may very well be that in various States of the Union a certain medical standard may be upheld, our standards may be very different from those in other States. In California, weekly, hundreds of people are dying without any medical care at all.

Recently I was in one of the defense centers in the State of California. I knew a man who lay dying in agony for 24 hours. He died, without a single physician in that community to come to his aid. I may say, incidentally, that in that same community there is one of the finest military hospitals in the world. At that very time one-third of the beds were unoccupied, and a large number of trained nurses and physicians were doing nothing. They would have been glad to offer succor to the dying man, but under military rules they were not allowed to do so.

We are in extremis in the State of California; we are desperate. Our workmen cannot have their teeth properly attended to. Frequently our women are giving birth to children under most unhappy conditions. All I am attempting to say is that I think it would be most unfortunate if the provision in this bill were used by any medical association to attempt, through a bureau in Washington, to impose upon any State a different medical standard than that which the people of the State and the legislature of the State want.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that it is furthest from the minds of members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to say which is the best of any groups of practitioners of medicine. However, we are dealing with public money. Congress has the right to say how public money shall be expended, and if the Congress wishes to say that it shall be expended for those who are equipped to practice along certain approved lines, that is the business of Congress. That is what the Congress is seeking to do by this amendment. It does not seek to pass on the qualifications of osteopaths or chiropractors. They may be qualified, and they may practice obstetrics. We pass on the qualifications of no one. We simply say how public money shall be expended, and that is all.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. I offered an amendment, and was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum before the amendment is stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hill	Reed
Ball	Holman	Revercomb
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Van Nuys
George	Murdock	Wagner
Gerry	Murray	Walsh
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	O'Mahoney	White
Hatch	Overton	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. TRUMAN to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after line 20, on page 65, down to and including line 13, on page 66, and insert the following:

"PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, $35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed $918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

"PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, $4,000,000, together with not to exceed $1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

"PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not

to exceed $250,000 for travel expenses, $2,750,000.

"PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, $50,000.

"PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal year 1944 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

"PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

"PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however,* That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

"PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

"PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"'I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God.'

"Par. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgement of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

"PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

"PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

"PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

"PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

"PAR. 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however,* That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

"PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further,* That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of $86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for such purposes.

"PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

"PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment or cremation (not to exceed a total of $100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided,* That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

"PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a

claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

"PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

"PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

"PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of $300.

"PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

"PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the able junior Senator from Missouri is quite long. It will involve considerable discussion. The appropriation bill for the military activities of the Government has been reported to the Senate, and it should be considered at once.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri be printed, and that after I shall have offered one more amendment to the pending bill, House bill 2935, that it go over until Monday, so that the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation bill for the military establishment, may discuss the bill this afternoon.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to agreeing to the suggestion which has been made by the able senior Senator from Nevada, providing the Department of Labor appropriation bill will be the pending order of business when the Senate convenes on Monday.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would include that in my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not favorable to taking up the Military Establishment appropriation bill for final vote until Monday. The hearings have not been printed. The proposed appropriation is for $72,000,000,000. I should not want to attempt to pass the bill this late in the afternoon. I should have no objection to taking up the bill this afternoon if it will go over until Monday for final vote. I thought we could pass the Department of Labor appropriation bill today.

Mr. McCARRAN. The discussion on the matters involved in the Truman amendment will consume considerable time of the Senate. I believe the amendment should be printed so that the Senators may know what they are discussing and what they will vote upon. The amendment is a vital one. It is what is known as the N. Y. A. amendment. It would set aside the amendment of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and would provide for the appropriation of approximately $46,000,000.

Mr. TRUMAN. The amount would be approximately $47,000,000. The college part of the program was increased at the suggestion of several Senators by more than $4,000,000, so that instead of being $43,000,000, the appropriation would be $47,800,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. In excess of $47,800,000. This is the N. Y. A. controversy all over again on the floor of the Senate. I know that a number of Senators, including some who are not present at this time, will want to be heard on the amendment. For that reason, I suggest that the entire matter go over, and that the amendment be printed so that Senators who wish to discuss it may have it before them and will know what they are voting upon when they vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McNARY. I should have no objection to that arrangement if it were coupled with the understanding that not until Monday will we vote finally on the very large bill providing for appropriations of approximately $72,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment. I am willing to consider the bill and discuss it, but I want the final vote on the bill to go over until Monday, so that in the meantime we may have an opportunity to read the hearings, which as yet have not been printed, and to study the measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the appropriation bill for the military establishment is taken up for consideration today we will be able to make such progress as we can on the bill; and, if objection is made to the taking of a vote, I believe that no Member would insist upon having the vote on the bill taken today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to make the objection now, and have it understood. I do not want to have any contingency about it, such as that we might not vote today. I want it clearly understood that we will not vote today.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion. Several Senators are very anxious to make a record on the N. Y. A. amendment. I can see nothing to be gained by preventing those Senators from having their say on the amendment this afternoon, if they want to speak on it, and then we can postpone the vote on both bills until Monday. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon is entirely proper.

Mr. HILL. That is what I was going to suggest. I think the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is, of course, most anxious to have the appropriation bills disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe we would be justified in laying aside the pending bill at 3 o'clock in the afternoon without at least putting some of the debate behind us. Would there be an objection to allowing Senators who may wish to speak on the N. Y. A. to do so this afternoon, so that some of the debate may be behind us?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my only object is that all Senators, those who are absent from the floor and those who are present, may have a full opportunity to know what the amendment is. The amendment has only just been presented. I think it should be printed and should be in the hands of every Senator before he votes on it. It involves $47,000,000. That is not so very much, but it is something, just the same.

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to say to the able Senator from Nevada that the bill he is suggesting that we vote on has to do with $71,000,000,000 and not $40,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It not only involves $47,000,000, but also involves overturning the action of the House of Representatives and the action of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

Mr. TRUMAN. There is no reason why we should not discuss it first this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma how many amendments there are to the War Department appropriation bill? Does the Senator have any idea as to how long the consideration of that bill might take?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me make a very brief statement, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for that purpose?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The House Committee on Appropriations received from the War Department estimates which totaled some $59,000,000,000 of new money and requests for some twelve and a half billion dollars reappropriation of funds which were unallocated, making a total request of some $71,500,000,000.

The House committee held extensive hearings, embracing some 600 pages of testimony. The bill was considered in the House and on a yea-and-nay vote was passed unanimously, no Member of the House voting against it, although a large majority of the Members of the House were present.

The bill came to the Senate on Tuesday. Anticipating the arrival of the bill, the Senate Committee on Appropriations commenced hearings Tuesday morning, before the bill actually reached the committee. We had asked the War Department to submit recommendations for changes, pursuant to the policy of the committee, according to which when a bill comes to the Senate the chairman of the committee requests the department having to do with the bill to submit recommendations for eliminations or for additions or changes. The Secretary of War replied that he had no suggestions to make; that he recommended that the bill be passed in the form it was passed by the House of Representatives. No doubt the recommendations were based upon the desire that the bill should pass before the 30th day of this month. Under our policy the fiscal year ends on the 30th day of June, and if this bill is not passed and signed by that date, on July 1 there will be no money for some phases of the War Department's activities.

The Senate committee held hearings forenoon and afternoon during this week, commencing Tuesday morning and closing last night. It is true the hearings have not been completely printed. They will be printed, of course, by Monday.

As I have said, there were no requests for changes made by the Secretary of War, but in the subcommittee we considered changes suggested by Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and by some officials of the War Department, who made the suggestions in their individual capacity. As the result, the subcommittee recommends only four changes in the bill. I can outline the changes very briefly. They all involve limitations on the expenditure of funds.

The first amendment has to do with the renegotiation of contracts made by the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation. Under the existing law, as I understand, War Department contracts are subject to renegotiation, Navy Department contracts are subject to renegotation, Maritime Commission contracts are likewise subject to renegotiation; but contracts made with the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation are not subject to renegotiation. The House committee placed an amendment in the bill by way of limitation providing that contracts made by the Defense Plant Corporation and by the Defense Supplies Corporation should be subject to renegotiation the same as in the case of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission. Because our committee did not have time to go into the subject, because we thought that it was a matter for the legislative committee to consider, the committee voted to eliminate that provision from the bill. We did not have time to go into the matter. We could come to no satisfactory conclusion regarding it, and we thought it was in the bill unnecessarily. So the subcommittee and the main committee recommended that this limitation be removed from the bill and be handled by the regular legislative committee. That is amendment No. 1.

Amendment numbered 2 provides that no part of the funds appropriated shall be used in any way to supervise conscientious-objector camps. The evidence shows that there is a great number of such camps throughout the country, which are provided and maintained by church organizations. The Selective Service Administration has assigned Army officers to supervise such camps. These officers have a very small staff, and if the limitation should remain in the bill the funds appropriated could not be used to pay the salaries of these officers, and a few employees, to supervise these conscientious-objector camps.

We thought it only reasonable that the War Department should have some supervision over these camps. We, therefore, struck out the limitation which would prevent the payment of any salaries or the assignment of any Army officers to this class of work. That is limitation No. 2.

Limitation No. 3: The War Department has employed and assigned a number of painters and artists to go abroad and depict on paper and on canvas outstanding war scenes. That is pursuant to a policy which has been followed for a long time, although perhaps authorization for it cannot be found in the law. We all have in mind many famous paintings of war scenes and war incidents. An artist painted the picture of Custer's Last Stand; an artist painted the picture of the Battle of Gettysburg; and in the Rotunda of the Capitol there are some very famous war pictures painted in the days of the Revolution. The War Department thought it advisable to have this class of work done. It thought it advisable to select outstanding artists and painters, commission them in the Army, let them wear the uniform and become a part of the Army, and send them abroad to do this class of work. This bill provides that none of the funds appropriated may be used to pay the salaries of such painters and artists.

The objections to this activity came about because of an incident wherein some of the painters were ordered to paint the portraits of generals. That is perhaps a questionable public activity. Had it not been for that, I think this issue would not have arisen; but, anyway, this bill provides that painters and artists engaged in this activity may not be paid. They are now in various parts of the world, some in the Aleutian Islands, some in northern Africa, some in the South Sea Islands, and some in other places.

It occurred to the committee that in any event it would be necessary to appropriate money to return these men to the United States, if their services were discontinued, and, inasmuch as again there is involved a question of policy and the Appropriations Committee is not primarily a policy-making committee, we thought that limitation was not proper on this bill. So the committee recommends that the limitation whereby no part of the funds appropriated by the bill may be used to pay the expenses and salaries of these painters and artists be eliminated. That is No. 3.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the able and distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, but the measure which he is discussing is probably not going to be reached this afternoon. I have the floor, and have an amendment pending to the bill under consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I may make one more point all four of the limitations will be covered. It will take but a moment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The fourth limitation provides that no part of the funds appropriated in the bill shall be used to pay the expenses of training medical students for more than 2 years. Under that provision the War Department could train medical students at existing colleges except for 2 years, which means the 2 last years of their college training. So that premedical students and first- and second-year medical students could not be trained with money appropriated by this bill. Inasmuch as this would disarrange the programs of the medical schools of the country, and as it is another matter for a legislative committee of Congress, we thought that limitation should not remain in the bill.

Those are the only four suggestions the committee makes for amendments.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his request?

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the suggestion made by the acting leader, I withdraw the request for a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri to yield to me so that I may offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield for that purpose, provided no controversy ensues.

Mr. McCARRAN. If controversy arises, I shall withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, line 25, after the figures, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the

President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that provision is a part of the law at the present time. I am merely offering it as an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the amendment which has been offered by me to the pending appropriation bill. It is the same amendment which was presented by the subcommittee of the House of Representatives to the full committee and which was voted down in the full committee, except that the college appropriation is increased from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000, at the suggestion of several Senators.

The amendment calls for the appropriation of $48,800,000 to continue the National Youth program. Thirty-five million dollars of that is to be used along with reappropriation of some $5,000,000, under the same set-up now in existence, for the training of men for war industries, and for the customary college courses. The high-school course and the course which interferes with the national program have been eliminated.

Much testimony was taken before the House committee and before the Senate committee. I think nearly every Senator is familiar more or less with the workings of the National Youth organization in his own State. It is doing work which, in my opinion, is absolutely essential to the war program.

I have numerous letters and telegrams from such men as Andrew Jackson Higgins, of New Orleans, and Henry Kaiser, on the west coast, and several others of the great production managers in the war effort, that the National Youth Administration is of indispensable value to them.

Those who are familiar with its workings in their own States I think will find that a good job has been done in the training of the young men, and I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, California knows well the immense contribution that N. Y. A. has made to the war industries of our great State. Had it not been that thousands of workers, including many N. Y. A. trainees, had come to California at the outset of the war, we would never have been able to produce the vast amount of war material it has been our privilege to contribute to the winning of the war. Oftentimes overlooked, but a point of vital importance for the present and for the future, is the fact that the vast migration of labor made necessary by war brings with it very grave social problems, and if N. Y. A. had done no more than to provide the safeguards it has provided for the youth it has transferred, that one fact alone should cause us to place our stamp of approval upon it.

California is not alone in having a youth problem today—every State and every large city has that problem, and it is becoming graver. As more and more workers, and in particular youthful workers, migrate in order that the needs of war industry shall be served, we may be thankful indeed that we have an agency in existence which can help to keep the evils that are inherent in the situation from getting out of hand. There is no thoughtful person in the country who can do otherwise than view with alarm the growing tide of youthful delinquency. What does this portend for the future, and if, as it is now proposed, we throw N. Y. A. out the window, what agency have we that can take its place as a stabilizing force for youth? Perhaps we can destroy N. Y. A. and think we save fifty million, but if in doing it we harm the war effort, as I think it would be harmed if N. Y. A. were destroyed or disrupted, and if all youth were left on their own in this hectic war period, I am inclined to believe that we shall find the saving was entirely illusory.

True economy consists not only in preventing waste, but in wisely using money in the present, and it is my unshakable conviction that true economy warrants us in spending this money on behalf of the Nation and its youth.

In connection with the foregoing, I should like to introduce for the RECORD a letter from the citizens committee for Latin-American youth. It is of particular interest because this letter was written as far back as January 13 of this year. It bears eloquent testimony to the stabilizing influence which N. Y. A. has exercised. I think Senators will agree with me that young men and young women who are willing to undergo training in hard and dirty work, as N. Y. A. youth do, are not likely candidates for street brawls. Let me read the letter:

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR
LATIN-AMERICAN YOUTH,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 13, 1943.

Mr. AUBREY WILLIAMS,
National Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The citizens' committee for Latin-American youth was appointed by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County to plan a constructive approach to the problems of our Latin-American group in this community, following a visit to Los Angeles made by Mr. Cranston of the Office of War Information.

This committee has taken note of the outstanding program of shop training that the National Youth Administration has provided to the young people of California without regard to race, creed, or color. A large group of young Americans of Mexican descent have taken advantage of the programs offered and are now contributing to the war effort by serving in our local defense industries.

At its meeting of January 4, 1943, the committee unanimously commended the National Youth Administration program as demonstrated in California and ordered its secretary to express its appreciation to you as National Administrator.

May I take this opportunity of saying that I personally concur with the sentiments expressed by the committee.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN J. KEATING,
Secretary.

There is no man in this Chamber who can view with equanimity the rising tide of youthful delinquency, and I say that if N. Y. A. were making no contribution to the war effort whatever, but were rendering the Nation this one service alone during the present times, we would be fully justified in making the appropriation requested.

However, important as this aspect of N. Y. A. activities is, it is a byproduct at the present moment of a much greater product—and that product is the skilled workers whom the N. Y. A. places at the disposal of war industry. The great State it is my honor to represent is favored in many ways, and in this particular hour of the Nation's crisis it is particularly proud that it is able, through its war industries, to make so vast a contribution to the war effort. And to this war effort N. Y. A. youth have made a large contribution. In the 10 months to April 1 of this year over 6,100 youth were given training, a large part of which was concerned with those skills that are indispensable in the building of planes and of ships. As in other sections of the country, N. Y. A. youth in California learn to produce by producing, and in this fiscal year, to May 21, 199,366 pieces and articles were produced, principally for the benefit of the various armed forces.

The firms who have employed these youth read like the blue book of war industry—Douglas Aircraft, Lockheed Aircraft, North American, Vultee, Kaiser Shipyards, Bethlehem Steel, California Shipbuilding, and others too numerous to mention.

The approval of N. Y. A. voiced by the Kaiser Shipyards is well known. That approval is typical of the attitude of industry generally.

Judged solely by its contribution to the war effort, I am glad to give my approval to this agency. I hope the Senate will not destroy it.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is on the desk of the clerk a conference report and the papers on the agricultural appropriation bill. I should like to have the report taken up at this time, if it is agreeable, in order that the bill may go back to conference early next week. There are a number of items which have not as yet been settled.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 53, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 101, 102, 108, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 23, 24, 50, 54, 68, 77, 89, 90, 95, 96, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,498,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,898,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $9,100 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$658,843"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,127,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,481,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,826,649"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$149,595"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,787,876"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$282,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$223,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,767,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$257,128"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$822,829"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$472,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$169,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$416,131"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,978,537"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$940,280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,531,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

"To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 563b), (not to exceed $496,011) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $101,357; in all, not to exceed $746,168, of which not to exceed $44,110 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,678,065"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 147, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity

substantially deteriorated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquires or supplying of information to individual farmers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,675,136"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,069,391"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum of $1,278,649 where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$177,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$364,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2481, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
June 23, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 86, 93, 94, 100, 118, 124, 125, and 134 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$14,198,950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$14,857,793."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the said amendment insert: "$24,623,443: *Provided*, That the appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *Provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out all after "individuals," down to and including "amended" in line 12 and insert "including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 11 of the matter inserted by the said Senate engrossed amendment strike out [, expansion,]; and

In line 17 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "consumption" insert "but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 per centum of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made out of such funds except loans which have first been offered and refused by other lending agencies (including the Emergency Crop and Feed Division of the Farm Credit Administration, the Production Credit Associations, and private lending agencies) customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have out-

standing at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this Act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation,' shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"FARM TENANCY

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said Act, $1,326,070.

"Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of two times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who makes or approves or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to make or approve, (1) any loan or advance under the provisions of food production financing bulletins F-1 or F-2, issued by the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loans Branch, as heretofore or hereafter amended, unless (a) the applicant represents in writing and it is administratively determined that credit sufficient in amount to finance the production of the crops or livestock specified in the application is not available to him from sources other than the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation or is available from other sources only on such terms and conditions that he could not use the other credit available to the extent necessary to produce the entire quantity of such crops or livestock specified in his application and (b) the person authorized to approve the loan or advance on behalf of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation finds that a greater quantity of the crops or livestock specified in the application would be likely to be produced if the loan or advance is made than would be produced otherwise, or (2) any loan or advance under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended (other than loans or advances under bulletins F-1 and F-2 made or approved on the conditions specified in this section) except (a) in regions in which loans or advances had been made under said section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 within one year prior to December 1, 1942, or (b) in any region which the Secretary of Agriculture shall have designated as a region in which the making of such loans or advances is necessary in order to finance the production of crops or livestock that otherwise would not be produced in such region: *Provided*, That none of the limitations provided for by this section shall apply with respect to any loan or advance made or approved before the date this Act becomes effective, or to the disbursement either before or after such date of any part of the proceeds of any loan or advance theretofore made or to any loan or advance made or approved at any time for the purpose of financing the completion of production undertaken before such date or for the purpose of protecting or preserving the security for or assisting in the collection or liquidation of any loan or advance made or approved before such date."

That the House insist upon its amendments to Senate amendments numbered 12, 14, 19, 84, 107, 126, 127, and 128; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that amendment No. 128 deals with the R. A. C. C.?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has to do with the R. A. C. C.; yes.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 84, 107, and 128. Amendment No. 128 is the one to which the Senator from Nebraska has just referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to amendment numbered 128, I wish to say that when the measure was before the Senate the item in question was debated fully on the floor, and a vote was taken relative to the question of restoring the language of the House in section 2, page 95, of the bill. Considerable debate was had with respect to the Senate amendment which deleted that language. In view of the fact that during the debate on this subject, considerable discussion was had concerning the question of whether the proposed amendment should go to conference, and there accomplish the purpose of the original provisions, and in view of the form in which it has been returned from the conference, I wish to make a few comments.

During the debate suggestion was made that the R. A. C. C. be continued in operation without the extension features now operated by the Department of Agriculture. There were certain suggestions that an attempt be made to correct the situation, if the extension features were not to be continued, and the R. A. C. C. restricted to the position it occupied as originally intended by the act. As the amended section No. 128 comes back from conference, the proposed revision has not been made. I feel that the provision is broader now than it was before it went to conference.

The first part of the amendment provides that the applicant shall represent in writing and it shall be administratively determined by the chairman of the county war board, whether the applicant is eligible for a loan. That is all the applicant has to do now in order to obtain funds from the R. A. C. C. Let us say that a farmer comes in to make application for a loan. The chairman of the triple A board is in 75 cases out of 100 the chairman of the county war board. All the applicant has to do is to

state in writing that he cannot borrow the money elsewhere. The chairman then administratively determines that the applicant cannot borrow the money elsewhere and makes the loan to him. There is no restriction placed on making the loan. It is a nonrecourse loan.

The second part of the amendment goes beyond the purposes of the act entirely. The act establishing the R. A. C. C. provided that it should deal with drought situations. It was an act providing for an emergency. As the amendment comes back from conference it provides that money can be loaned to anyone; it does not make any difference who the applicant is, what his credit is. The loans can be extended to cattlemen, to anyone to whom the chairman of the local war board desires to make the loan without any restriction. This is now being done on a wholesale basis, so that the R. A. C. C. will become so firmly entrenched that it cannot be terminated. I am receiving hundreds of letters from all over the country telling of loans being made to applicants without any restriction whatever. We are simply setting up another Government lending agency in direct competition with 19 other Government lending agencies, and with 15,000 private lending agencies.

Much is said about holding the line and about spiraling inflation. We have debated these subjects for nearly 2 weeks in the Senate. Yet here an organization is set up which, without any restriction at all to loan money, can pyramid loans up to $500,000,000 under the new provisions of the act.

In view of the fact that after due deliberation and debate with respect to section 2 of the bill, and that the bill and the conferees did not adopt the Senate amendment, went to conference, and now has come back to us in its present unsatisfactory form. I shall not further oppose the conference report, because in reality the issue was settled last week by vote of the Senate. I do wish to say to the Members of the Senate, however, that later on in the session I expect to bring up for consideration proposed legislation, which contains provisions to terminate this type of agency outright. In connection with the agricultural appropriation bill I attempted to do what should have been done in other cases, that is to cut off the agency entirely, but I agreed that it be continued with certain restrictions, for the period of 1 year. The conference committee has not seen fit to carry out that proposal. Its action is a broadening of the provisions of the act itself. So I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I cannot accept this provision of the conferees' report, but shall not make objection further at this time. I think the Senator from Georgia has done everything he agreed to do to accomplish what I wanted done in the way of restricting the provisions of the act, but I feel now that the only way to accomplish what I wish done, is not make a further attempt to restrict the R. A. C. C. by legislation in an appropriation bill, but to proceed in the alternative and deal with the question in direct legislation affecting it, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his kindness and what he has done. The conference committee has broadened the act, instead of restricting it, and the adoption of the conferees' amendment would now authorize the R. A. C. C. to make loans which heretofore were illegally made. I cannot accept the report but will immediately ask for consideration of Senate bill 914 and by direct legislation ask the Senate to terminate R. A. C. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the amendment with respect to the Farm Security Administration contained in the portion of the report now under consideration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Security Administration amendment is not contained in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 126, and 127, and that the Senate further insist on the Senate amendments. I might say to the Senator from Virginia that this motion embraces the Senate amendment relating to the Farm Security Administration. The effect of the motion would be to carry this matter back to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move, Mr. President, that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, and 123, agree to a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thought that if it were agreeable, we might now temporarily lay aside the pending bill, and take up the War Department appropriation bill, and make as much progress as possible on it, with the understanding that we would not reach a final vote on it today, and that when the Senate meets on Monday, the bill now pending will automatically come up as the pending business. In other words, I suggest that the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending bill, and take up the War Department appropriation bill; that on Monday the bill now pending shall be the pending business, and that this afternoon we simply make as much progress as possible in the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill. I make the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have it distinctly understood, Mr. President, that when the Senate meets on Monday, House bill 2935 will be the pending business.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator that is the understanding. If under a unanimous-consent agreement we temporarily lay aside the pending bill, the Senator from Nevada, or any other Senator, can at any time demand the regular order, and automatically the pending bill will be brought back before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. McNARY. With that perfect, precise understanding, that the pending bill would go over until Monday, and that then any Senator could consider any amendment which has been written into the bill today, I shou'd be very glad to agree to the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator request that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military Activities—Expediting Production", on page 3, line 12, after the name "President", to strike out the colon and following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That section 403 (a) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public, 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, is further amended to include the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, and to provide that the term 'Department' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively, and, in the case of such corporations, that the term 'Secretary' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as a vote will not be had on the bill today, I ask permission at this point to submit a statement giving a rather broad interpretation of the bill and its several provisions, and to have the statement printed in the RECORD. I do not think it is worth while to take the time of the Senate to read the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Military Appropriation Act for 1944, which your committee now presents for consideration, provides for the largest single appropriation in history, by this or any other Government. This bill, as passed unanimously by the House of Representatives and as recommended to the Senate by your committee, contemplates total obligations during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, of approximately $71,500,000,000, consisting of $59,000,000,000 to be newly appropriated and a carry-over of $12,500,000,000 from the fiscal year 1943.

Previous military budget programs have been directed largely to the construction of our defenses, the building of a powerful wartime Army, and the production of weapons of war sufficient to permit us and our allies at least to hold our own with the enemy, which had the advantage of such a substantial head start on us. Those previous budgets, even including the current 1943 budget, might well be called "Defensive Budgets," even though Guadalcanal, Tunisia, Attu, and other scenes of our battle successes, including the almost world-wide aerial combat of the Army Air Forces, strongly attest to the fact that the funds appropriated for 1943 have not been devoted exclusively to defense.

But let no one, certainly not the Axis Powers, make any mistake about this budget for 1944. This budget is for the purpose of maintaining a powerful American Army aggressively on the offensive against our enemies on the far-flung battlefields throughout the world; and also to assist the armies of our allies in pressing forward toward the complete and utter defeat of the Axis Powers, which is our common goal. I do not believe we can give it a more descriptive name than that suggested by the Deputy Chief of Staff, General McNarney, who calls it The Decisive Budget.

HIGH LIGHTS OF PROPOSED BUDGET

I will outline for you briefly what it is intended to accomplish with the money which you are now asked to appropriate. The very fact that we are in a position to undertake this program will indicate how well we have accomplished our previous objectives, but I will also include a few illustrative examples of our accomplishments thus far, of which I feel we can all be justly proud.

ARMY AIR FORCES

The largest single item, representing one-third of the entire budget, is $23,700,000,000 for the Army Air Forces. By far the greater part of this amount, or twenty billion, six hundred million is for the procurement of airplanes, including spare engines and other spare parts. These funds will provide for the procurement of 100,000 additional airplanes, including 38,000 fighters, 36,000 bombers, and 21,000 transports and trainers, and will permit us to maintain 273 fighting groups.

Not long ago we might have doubted our ability to achieve such an ambitious program; but it does not seem too ambitious when we realize that we have produced 60,000 airplanes in the past 12 months, making a total of more than 100,000 since we began our war production program. Actually, this program is stepping up the pace, for now that we are on the offensive we must have a higher proportion of bigger airplanes—heavy bombers and long-distance fighters—in place of the defensive fighters and light bombers of our earlier programs. In fact, the average weight of planes produced this year will be nearly double the average weight of those produced as recently as January 1942. During the calendar year 1943, 911,000,000 pounds of air frames will be produced, and this will be stepped up to over 1,400,000,000 pounds of air frames during the calendar year 1944, or approximately 5 times the production during the calendar year 1942.

Over $2,700,000,000 of the $23,700,000,000 for the Army Air Forces is for operating expenses. Two hundred and thirty-one million is included to provide for the training of the personnel to man and maintain our vast air armada. The program for 1944 contemplates an output of 302,000 officer and enlisted technicians and 110,000 pilots, navigators, and bombardiers. Also, the college-training program calls for a continuously operated 5-month course, contemplating the matriculation of 14,000 cadets each month.

Although relatively small, it is worthy of mention that $99,000,000 is included for research and development which has been so effective in keeping our aircraft not only abreast but ahead of the enemy's in performance in all theaters of operation and under all conditions.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

The second largest portion of this Budget is for the Ordnance Department, which is responsible for the production and maintenance of the Army's weapons and ammunition. Approximately $15,000,000,000, or 21 percent of the Budget, is for this purpose. More than half of this amount, or nearly $8,100,000,000, is for ammunition, ranging from small-arms ammunition to 4-ton block busters.

Most of the remainder, or approximately six and three-tenths billions, is for the procurement of ordnance matériel, ranging from the M 1 Garand rifle to the M 4 tank, not to mention certain secret weapons which have already given a good account of themselves and others which will give the enemy many unpleasant surprises. Included in this $6,300,000,000 for ordnance matériel is over two billions for the procurement and maintenance of all automotive equipment, which function was transferred to the Ordnance Department from the Quartermaster Corps during the past year.

Among the other Ordnance projects, requiring relatively smaller amounts but nonethe-less very important, is $81,000,000 for research and development so that we can continue to provide our boys with more powerful ammunition and new weapons superior to any with which they are challenged by the enemy. Nearly $10,000,000 is included for training of Ordnance soldiers, over one hundred and forty-eight millions for preservation of Ordnance matériel, and $494,000,000 for current operating expense, including Ordnance activities in the theaters of operation.

If anyone, and particularly Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, have any doubt as to the ability of the Ordnance Department to accomplish such an ambitious program, a few illustrative statistics as to what has already been accomplished should dispel such doubts. Since Pearl Harbor, Army Ordnance has produced 1,000,000 machine guns and 14,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition, to mention only 2 representative items. Last month alone, we produced 3 times as many pieces of artillery as in the whole of World War No. 1.

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

To continue with this summary of what the Army intends to accomplish with this $71,500,000,000, the third largest amount is $12,800,000,000 for Finance Service, Army, which represents 17 percent of the entire budget. The great bulk of this amount is for "Pay for the Army," for which $11,500,000,000 is requested.

This money will provide pay for an Army of more than 8,200,000 officers and enlisted personnel, which strength is to be attained by December 31, 1943. Have no doubt that this strength can and will be reached on schedule, considering how we have already built up our Army since September 1939, when Great Britain and France declared war on Germany. At that time we had fewer than 200,000 officers and enlisted men, plus 200,000 in the National Guard. When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, our Army strength was only about 1,600,000. Even last year at this time the Army stood at approximately 3,000,000, only partially trained and equipped. Yet, today we have an over-all strength of 7,000,000, including the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, properly trained and equipped.

The only other relatively large item under Finance Service, Army, is $720,000,000 for "Travel of the Army," which the House of Representatives reduced 10 percent from the $800,000,000 originally requested.

SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORTATION

It is going to cost $2,500,000,000 to feed our 1944 Army. The delivered ration cost for next year is estimated at 72 cents per man per day, a small increase over this year. Clothing and equipage will account for another $2,400,000,000, to maintain our troops wherever located and to furnish appropriate battle dress for practically every climate.

Over $1,500,000,000 is required by the Army Transportation Corps to transport our troops and supplies both within the United States and all over the world. During the first year of this war, the Transportation Corps transported two and one-half times as many troops and six times the volume of supplies as in the first year of World War No. 1. This record is even more significant when it is considered that the average round trip today is 15,000 miles as compared with 6,000 miles in the First World War. Yet the volume must be trebled in 1944; hence the need for one billion five hundred million for transportation. In all, seven billion five hundred million are provided for supplies and transportation.

SIGNAL CORPS AND CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Signal Corps will obligate five billion six hundred million to provide our Army with the finest communications equipment possible. Approximately 80 percent of this amount will be spent for the procurement of radar and radio equipment. The Army Air Forces alone will use $3,700,000,000 worth of this signal equipment.

The Corps of Engineers requires four billion, of which one billion six hundred million is for construction. However, only $500,000,000 is for construction in the United States, as the vast Army construction program in the United States, involving more

than 10,000 projects at a total cost of more than $9,000,000,000 is already 92 percent in process or completed. The construction program included 4,500 posts, camps, and stations, 900 airfields, hospitals with total capacity of 700,000 beds, and internment camps for over 300,000 prisoners of war.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

The $1,100,000,000 budgeted for the Chemical Warfare Service will enable our Army to return with large dividends any gas attacks which the Axis Powers launch. About half of its output is for bombs for the Army Air Forces.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

The approximately $600,000,000 for the medical and hospital department will enable that service to continue to maintain the remarkably high health record and low casualty rate which it has maintained thus far during this war, both at home and on the far-flung battle fronts.

CONCLUSION

Of the remaining $1,700,000,000, $1,200,000,000 will be used to expedite production by constructing a few new facilities, by converting certain existing facilities to changed requirements, and by providing necessary machine tools where needed. The remainder of the appropriation will be used for several small but important activities, such as the United States Military Academy and the service schools.

I trust that the data I have given you are sufficient to indicate what we intend to accomplish with the money in this appropriation. The objectives can and will be accomplished. A fine job has been done by the Army with the support it has received from the Congress, from industry, and from the people. The one ultimate accomplishment for which we all strive is the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army", on page 8, line 5, after the word "accounts", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for obligation or expenditure or for any expense whatsoever, directly or indirectly, for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (except as may be incident to induction into the Army of the United States), including compensation of military and civilian personnel, transportation on any kind of conveyance belonging to or operated by or at the expense of the War Department, and instruction, education, or training of any kind."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps—supplies and transportation," on page 15, line 21, after the figures "$30,556,162", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the figures "$262,965,473", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That appropriations in this act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within 2 years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency appropriations bill, which was temporarily laid aside, so that the bill will automatically be before the Senate when the Senate convenes on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis L. McNamee, of Pennsylvania, to be Regional Manpower Director, at $8,000 per annum, at the Philadelphia regional office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE — NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably two nominations for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman D. Cann, of Atlanta, Ga., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say a word or two in explanation. In the last tax bill a provision was inserted creating assistants to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in lieu of a deputy to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Both the appointments are of men already in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They have been there for a number of years and both are in actual service. We changed the law by abolishing the Office of Deputy Commissioner and simply creating positions of assistants to the Commissioner. Mr. Cann, whose nomination has just been read, is at this time serving as the deputy commissioner. In the consideration of the tax bill by the committee the statement was made that he would be appointed as one of the assistants.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue advises me that he is most anxious to have the nominations confirmed at the earliest possible moment, so that he may make certain necessary arrangements personal to himself, as the Commissioner, with respect to recent legislation passed and with respect to his own duties.

Therefore, he asked that the matter be brought before the Senate at the earliest possible time. Since the appointments are those of men who already are in the service, performing substantially the same duties, and who, if the nominations are confirmed, will merely serve under a new title, a mere change of name, I should like to have immediate consideration of the nominations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, while the nominations have not reached the calendar, in view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold N. Graves, of Jacksonville, Ill., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 155.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, just a moment, please. I think a measure similar to the one referred to was agreed to sometime ago. I think it later was reconsidered on motion of the able senior Senator from Montana. It provided for the appointment of a committee by the Vice President. I believe it now is desired to have the committee appointed by the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 155), which was read.

Mr. WHEELER. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out "a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate" and insert "the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants; (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses; (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards; (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation; and (5) whether plans for future development of Government hydroelectric plants provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes, p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 28, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Francis T. Spellman, June 30, 1942.
Charles D. Leffler, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Alan R. McCracken, January 1, 1942.
George L. Menoqal, June 30, 1942.
Burton Davis, June 30, 1942.
Robert M. Morris, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Rufus L. Taylor, May 1, 1941.
Roger M. Keithly, January 1, 1942.
Harry A. Barnard, Jr., May 19, 1942.
Charles M. Holcombe, June 30, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Eli B. Roth	William G. Kornahrens
Robert C. Barnes	Charles Holovak
Clarence W. Becker	David G. Bryce

The following passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Arthur W. Eaton, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Stephen E. Flynn, June 30, 1942.

The following assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Howell E. Wiggins	Robert O. Canada, Jr.
Robert B. Greenman	Vernon E. Martens
William F. Queen	

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon James H. Connelly to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Edward V. Barth to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from the 9th day of June 1943, to conform with the change in name effected prior to graduation from the Naval Academy:

Richard J. Kroth
Jonathan J. Crowder

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Franklin M. Haines, Jr.
William F. Babcock

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Chester J. Kurzawa to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 6th day of June 1940:

Louis N. Saunders, Jr.
Robert R. Wooding

Ensign John F. Tynan, SC-V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of November 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman D. Cann	Harold N. Graves

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Francis L. McNamee, of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

Joseph G. Pasternack	Robert H. Onstott
Waldemar J. A. Wickman	John L. Wilson
	George G. Van Dyke
Llewellyn L. Ashburn	Leslie McC. Smith
Leland J. Hanchett	Alfred B. Geyer
Thomas B. McKneely	Oliver C. Williams
William G. Workman	Austin V. Delbert
Victor H. Vogel	Richard C. Arnold
Robert H. Flinn	Donald W. Patrick
Robert K. Maddock	Marion K. King
Roy E. Butler	Thurman H. Rose

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

William A. Miller	David B. Wilson
Robert L. Smith	Ralph W. Pagel
Joe M. Chisolm	Leslie W. Knott
Kenneth M. Endicott	Evert A. Swensson
Malcolm J. Ford	Robert J. Anderson
James W. Hawkins	Jesse D. Harris
Glen E. Ogden	Frederick H. Hull
Rudolph F. Sievers	Raymond S. Roy
Samuel S. Spicer	James L. Southworth
William H. Stimson	William G. Budington
William B. Wiley	Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Clarence L. Hebert	Stanley E. Krumbiegel
James A. Finger	Donald W. McNaughton
George E. Parkhurst	
John F. Oesterle	James B. Donaldson
Frederick K. Albrecht	James A. Smith
Edwin N. Hesbacher	Milton W. Gwinner
William S. Baum	Vernon W. Foster
Arnold B. Kurlander	George F. Ellinger
William F. Powell	Verne C. Waite

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. Troubled by the record of remembered yesterdays when, under the pressure of these momentous times, we fell short of our best, we are beckoned to better things by the assurance of the angel of the dawn, "Each night I burn the records of the day; each sunrise

every soul is born again." And while there comes to us a solemn realization that we cannot cancel a line of the books that are closed, we are grateful for a new week and a new day, because they are Thy gifts, bringing new vigor, new hopes, new opportunities to be strong and kind, patient and understanding, faithful and true.

Help us to command this new day, meeting its joys with praise, its difficulties with fortitude, its doubts with fidelity. Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil; help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. So make us faithful ministers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Saturday, June 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RETURN OF SENATOR BARKLEY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in a purely personal way I want to give myself the privilege of expressing a welcome back to the Senate to the distinguished majority leader, who rejoins us this morning in full health and vigor. He has been ably represented in his absence by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who, however, I am sure will join in my expression of happiness that the old master himself has returned.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wholeheartedly join the distinguished Senator from Michigan in that sentiment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator mind striking out the word "old"? [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the word "old" disappears of its own weakness in the physical presence of the Senator in his new youth.

I have wanted to say for some time that for many critical years the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has served his thankless task in this body with as fine a spirit, as broad a tolerance, and as tireless a devotion as could possibly be brought to his difficult assignment. It is no cinch to ride herd on Democrats. [Laughter.] I have often regretted that such talent could not be enlisted in a worthier cause, but I have never failed to appreciate his fine public service at the hottest spot in the Capitol, and I would not have wanted this morning to pass without this expression of welcome upon his return.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I express just a word of appreciation of the very cordial greeting accorded me by the Senator from Michigan, and also other Senators who have privately expressed their welcome?

I might say that I did not want to go away in the first place, but since I did go, and the Senate, with some few exceptions, acted so wisely in my absence as it did, I began to fear that Senators had gotten along so well without me they would not want me to return at all. But I have had a very delightful rest. I have boiled out all impurities, preserving only the pure silver, whatever that may be. I have deliberately worn off a quarter of a hundred pounds, which I hope I may keep off in spite of the bean soup which is served in the Senate restaurant.

I am glad to be back, and I hope that within a week all my colleagues may take a longer recess than I have been able to have in the last month.

I want also to thank the Senator from Alabama for the very splendid way in which he has carried on the work to which I am assigned, and to express my appreciation of the skill and ability with which he has done it, and also for the cooperation which has been given to him by Members of the Senate on both sides.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who was appointed as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on House bill 2869, dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be unable to act, and has tendered his resignation in order that the Chair may appoint a successor. I request that his resignation be accepted and that the Chair appoint his successor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resignation of the Senator from New Hampshire is accepted, and in his place the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] as conferee on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

CLAIM ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE—TRAVEL PAY AND ALLOWANCE, VOLUNTEERS, WAR WITH SPAIN IN THE PHILIPPINES (S. Doc. No. 85)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation amounting to $115.68, for payment of a claim allowed by the General Accounting Office under a certificate of settlement (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, requesting that no action be taken on House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246, affecting air commerce, or similar proposed legislation until the present war is over and peace is established; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 47

"Joint resolution requesting the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin to investigate Office of Price Administration Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 relating to cheese

"Whereas on December 24, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued and promulgated Maximum Price Regulation No. 289, the effect of which has been:

"1. The establishment of maximum prices for the various sizes of cheese produced without consideration for the increased cost of producing the smaller styles of cheese;

"2. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese on a moisture-content basis which permits the sale of cheese with low moisture content only to the Government or for processing;

"3. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese delivered outside of Wisconsin on a basis of the maximum prices for such cheese sold in Wisconsin 'plus freight from Plymouth';

"4. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese on a moisture-content basis without consideration of the trade practice of reading moisture tests in 'tenths' and adjusting the same to the nearest point or half-point; and

"Whereas all efforts of the state department of agriculture and the several cheesemakers' associations of the State, immediately recognizing in such order the difficulties and inequalities confronting those engaged in the cheese industry in Wisconsin, sought the revision of the order to the end that cheese makers in Wisconsin would not be penalized because of location, that manufacturers of the smaller sizes of cheese would be able to receive prices fairly based on cost of production, that low-moisture cheese might be sold for aging, and that there would be less interference with the attempts of the industry to increase production; and

"Whereas the Office of Price Administration did establish and promulgate Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 without consultation with either the persons engaged in the cheese industry or the State department of agriculture in Wisconsin, the State which produces more than 50 percent of the cheese manufactured in the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the United States Senators and the Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin and from other surplus-cheese-producing States, be requested to investigate the origin and supporting data of Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 issued by the Office of Price Administration, and to investigate further the possibility of the revision of such order for the protection of the cheese industry in Wisconsin; and that they report their findings to the Wisconsin Legislature; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the two Senators and each Representative in Congress from Wisconsin."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1134. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941; with amendments (Rept. No. 360).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 45. A bill to further amend section 3 of Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases; with amendments (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 1130. A bill to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph T. Votava, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska;

Horace Frierson, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee;

George E. Proudfit, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska; and

Reuben Gosnell, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James B. M. McNally, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Mathias F. Correa, resigned.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as chief signal officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Dawson Olmstead, chief signal officer, to be retired June 30, 1943;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Several citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—EXPENSES OF H. C. LOWRY IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 162), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding $381.33, for the payments of expenses incurred by H. C. Lowry in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of North Dakota now occupied by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; and

S. 1280. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. BAILEY):

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian; and

S. 1282. A bill for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 1283, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1284. A bill to provide for increased benefits to certain persons entitled to benefits under the act of August 16, 1941, as amended, or the act of December 2, 1942; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the subject matter of bills and joint resolutions and the manner of revising or amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION—WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill is a counterpart of the so-called Fulmer bill, introduced in the House of Representatives, to provide for centralized responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1283) to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL AND A RESOLUTION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 9, one of the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was erroneously referred to the Military Affairs Committee. I refer to the bill (S. 1215) to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War. S. 1215 proposes to amend Public Law 743 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

That law was based upon S. 134 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, a bill which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. I request unanimous consent, therefore, that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of S. 1215 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of a resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, favoring removal of the statute of limitations as to claims for emergency officers' retirement benefits—heretofore presented by Mr. LANGER—and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. LODGE. Several weeks ago I introduced a bill (S. 1131) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act.

From the study I have been able to give to the subject and the testimony given by officials of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, I am convinced that the bill can be materially improved. I therefore propose an amendment by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting material which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LODGE to the bill (S. 1131) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201), is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words 'of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades.'

"SEC. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words 'except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof.'

"SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class B–1 dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B–1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support.'

"SEC. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words 'class B' in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words 'or class B–1.'

"SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance, consisting of the reduction in, or charge to, the pay of the enlisted man and the Government's contribution, payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man, shall be—

"'To class A dependent or dependents:	
"'A wife but no child	$50
"'A wife and one child	68
"'(With an additional $11 for each additional child. The total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children.)	
"'A child but no wife	42
"'(With an additional $11 for each additional child. The total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children.)	
"'A wife divorced	42
"'(In no event more than the amount of alimony decreed and still payable.)	
"'To class B dependent or dependents (where there is no class B–1 dependent):	
"'Where there is no class A dependent	$37
"'(Payable to only one designated dependent.)	
"'Where there is a class A dependent	20
"'(Payable to only one designated dependent.)	
"'To class B–1 dependent or dependents:	
"'One parent but no brother or sister	50
"'Two parents but no brother or sister	68
"'(The total amount payable on account of two parents to be equally divided between them.)	
"'One parent and one brother or sister	68
"'(With an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two.)	
"'Two parents and one brother or sister	79
"'(With an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two.)	
"'A brother or sister but no parent	42
"'(With an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two. The total amount payable on account of two or more brothers and sisters to be equally divided among them.)'	

"SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words 'both class A and class B' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'more than one class of.'

"(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) In any case in which the payment of the monthly family allowances involves two or more dependents, the total amount may be apportioned and paid for the benefit of such dependents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.'

"(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"'(1) to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife or child shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife or child, except that in the case of a wife or child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreeement, and such order, decree, or agreement is silent as to the amount to be paid to such wife or child, no family allowance shall be payable unless application is made by the enlisted man or unless the secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make such application, in which case the full allowance prescribed by this title shall be paid; and except that in the case of an application filed for an allowance for a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or written agreement which fixes the amount to be paid for such child's support at a lesser amount than is provided for such child by this title, the secretary of the department concerned may authorize payment of the allowance in any amount greater than that fixed by such court order, decree, or written agreement, but not in excess of the amount prescribed by this title; or

"'(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.'

"SEC. 7. That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *'Provided'*, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 107 (a). An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after October 1, 1943, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"'Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"'If paid, such initial family allowance shall be in lieu of the regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status.

"'Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"'The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be:

"'(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"'(2) $68, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $11 for each additional child;

"'(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $11 for each additional child;

"'(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother

or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $83 in the aggregate;

"'(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $101 in the aggregate.

"'(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $64 in the aggregate.

"'Payment of the initial family allowance may be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"'(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the period of entitlement to family allowances shall be as hereinbefore prescribed for payment, except that in the case of a change in status of a dependent, the period of entitlement shall cease with the last day of the month in which such change occurs: *Provided further.*'

"SEC. 7a. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after 'SEC. 108,' the subparagraph designation '(a)', and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(b) An enlisted man receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who, being entitled thereto and having made application therefor on or before the date of approval of this act, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance, or elect to receive in lieu thereof, the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, as amended: *Provided*, That an enlisted man's election shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to such allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of $1.25 per day.'

"SEC. 8. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount.'

"SEC. 9. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive, or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.'

"SEC. 10. That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words 'under oath' in the fourth line thereof.

"SEC. 11. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) The terms "man" and "enlisted man" mean any enlisted individual of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act and include members of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include the leader and second leader of the band of the United States Marine Corps, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan Native Guard, or band of the Navy, or the Samoan Reserve Force of the Marine Corps.'"

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and referred as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROLL-BACK OF FOOD PRICES BY SUBSIDY PAYMENTS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, because of the parliamentary situation in respect to the Clark and Aiken amendments to the Commodity Credit bill approved on Saturday, there was no record vote indicating the views of those who, like myself, favored the O. P. A. program to roll back food prices by payment of subsidies. Along with many of my colleagues who took a similar view, I voted for the Aiken amendment as a substitute for the Clark amendment, since from my viewpoint it represented substantially the lesser of two evils. Some sections of the press, however, have mistakenly construed all votes for the Aiken amendment as votes against the O. P. A. roll-back program. I wish, therefore, to reiterate my support of that program, and in this connection to have printed as part of my remarks the text of a radio speech which I delivered last Friday evening over the Atlantic network.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, in weighing any vital issue on the home front, I have always before me the picture and the example of brave American boys fighting our battles overseas. Every day brings a new list of casualties, dead and wounded, in your home town and mine. Every day brings new reports of incredible bravery and sacrifice.

There is no question in my mind that we will produce the food and the weapons needed by our fighting men to win a crushing victory against the Axis. We are doubly fortunate that in winning the victory, our land will not be ravaged by invading armies, nor our cities torn by falling bombs. The only question—the continuing doubt—is whether we can go through this war without the economic chaos of price inflation—inflation that would wreck the hopes of a decent livelihood for our boys when they come home again.

The Office of Price Administration has done a very effective job in controlling the prices of materials like steel and copper, essential to war production; in holding residential rents to pre-war levels; in maintaining the prices of articles like sugar and gasoline in common use by the average family. This is a far better record than was accomplished in the last war. But the line has not been held on many other items, especially the price of food; so that the cost of living as a whole has risen more than 25 percent since the war began.

The weekly wages of war workers have also increased, but it is not often realized that only one out of three wage earners in the country is employed in war activity. The rising cost of living is a growing hardship to at least a majority of those who work for wages or salaries, as well as the millions who live on fixed incomes from investment, pensions, or Government allowances to the families of servicemen. This growing injustice is especially acute in sections of the country like New York City, which have not shared in the general rise of war activity.

As a means of restoring a fair balance, the responsible Federal officials, acting under powers conferred by law, have taken three important steps which I heartily support:

First, they are announcing dollar-and-cents price ceilings on many retail articles—ceilings which the merchant and the customer can understand, apply, and help to enforce.

The second major step is to seek an appropriation adequate enough to fight and stamp out the black markets which threaten honest business, the consuming public, and the whole wartime food program. If we allowed all food prices to rise to the level in the black markets, the price ceiling would be the sky. I can assure you that a strong fight will be made in the Senate to restore the full Office of Price Administration budget, which means so much to the family budget in millions of American homes.

A third major step by Federal agencies was to pay reasonable subsidies in order to roll back the prices of butter and meat, without hurting the processor or the farmer. Both Great Britain and Canada have used subsidies in their very successful programs to stabilize the cost of living. And the fact is we have been using subsidies right along to stabilize many prices, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies. Consumers, manufacturers, and farmers on the east coast would be in a very bad way if we allowed the law of supply and demand to take its course on items like gasoline, coal, sugar, animal feeds, or certain vegetables for canning. These prices are being stabilized by subsidies, not by mystic powers exercised by some czar down here in Washington. With all the brave talk in Congress against subsidies, no one has proposed to wipe out all subsidies. The Senate will vote tomorrow whether to prohibit only the limited subsidies supporting the recent roll-back. If this prohibition should become law, every housewife will immediately know the difference; the price of butter will go up again by 5 cents a pound and meat prices will rise 10 percent.

The three-way program I have outlined will roll back the cost of living to the level of September 15, 1942, the level which Congress itself established last year in the Stabilization Act. What is the alternative? If this reasonable program is rejected, or crippled by final congressional action, there will be demands for increased wages, followed by demands for still higher prices—and the spiral of inflation will be in full swing. This is our gravest danger on the home front today.

Even when wages and prices are stabilized, we have to face the bigger job of mopping up surplus purchasing power. That can be done only by a coordinated drive on many fronts, to discourage spending, increase savings, and increased taxes. The one way it cannot be done is by letting prices go uncontrolled. I repeat, that is the way to economic ruin.

When we probe deeply into the causes that undermined many democracies abroad during the last decade, we see that economic collapse was brought about by the violent clash of group interests, each concerned with its own demands, regardless of the general good in time of crisis. Our crying need today is for economic stability to back up our fighting men. Let us be guided by their example—for unity, for teamwork, and for victory.

THREATENED SHORTAGE OF BEEF

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] presented for inclusion in the RECORD a statement in connection with a meeting which was held recently at Fremont, Nebr., of about 800 livestock men and livestock feeders.

Since then I have received from the same group a statement which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The critical emergency confronting the livestock producing and feeding industry has grown rapidly more acute day by day, threatening not only the continued existence of the industry, but also the Nation's supply of its No. 1 wartime food—meat.

Due to continued failure of the Office of Price Administration, and other Government bureaus, administrations and officials, to work out a price structure which will cover cost of production of beef, the Nation faces an increasing beef shortage, despite the fact that total cattle numbers are the greatest on record.

Instead of protecting the consuming public, the Nation, and our allies by insuring an adequate supply of meat, the policies adopted to date have resulted in scarcity that threatens an actual Nation-wide meat famine in the very near future. Moreover, they are rapidly forcing the producing interests, on which future supplies depend, to the point of quitting business entirely.

This threatened meat famine is not due to any lack of willingness on the part of producers to continue their functions, but is the result of handicaps that have been placed upon them by regulations issued without knowledge, or at least without consideration, of producers' needs.

In order to rectify this situation and to restore the confidence on the part of producers that is necessary to prevent a collapse of the livestock industry and encourage future production, we, the representatives of 60 livestock producing counties in Iowa and Nebraska, offer the following recommendations:

1. A simple, positive, informed and forthright policy on the part of the Government on the production of beef is at least 12 to 15 months overdue. The present chaotic conditions in the livestock and meat industry result largely from the negative, confused, and indecisive policies followed since Pearl Harbor.

2. The uncertainty in the cattle market, aggravated by the illegal subsidy roll-back program, continues. The light receipts of the past 2 weeks have protected the feeder to some extent. In order to promote stability in the cattle industry and to insure a regular, adequate supply of beef, it is imperative that cattle be carefully marketed as long as this uncertainty continues.

3. The first step toward improved conditions in the livestock industry is the restoration of confidence among producers in the ability of men directing Government agencies affecting the production and distribution of meat and animal products, and in their integrity and loyalty to fundamental American principles and institutions; confidence that they will use their necessarily great powers fairly and honestly and to promote the production and distribution of food in harmony with our war needs and not to secure a stranglehold on the livestock industry. The recent unfortunate proposal to use subsidies has created more confusion and still further lessened confidence in the purposes back of Government control as they affect the livestock industry. We are, unalterably, opposed to the subsidy roll-back program as proposed for the meat industry, but if we must have the roll-back we are still opposed to the subsidy.

4. We recommend that a single agency be charged with the responsibility of directing the national production, distribution, and price policies as they affect food; that the War Meat Board be given full authority to carry out its program; that every possible action be taken by the Government to keep legitimate packing plants operating and to stamp out the illegal slaughtering of livestock and marketing of meat.

5. Government policies should be directed toward the production of meat and animal products in keeping with the most efficient use of our feed resources for the prosecution of the war. A frank statement of the kind and relative amounts of meat and other animal products needed and within our probable productive capacity should be made and the reasons back of the decisions given. It is recognized that some errors may be expected, conditions may change, and modification of the program from time to time may be necessary.

6. It appears probable that our supply of feed grains in relation to our use of them has been overestimated and that it is a physical impossibility to maintain livestock production at present levels. If this is correct, the country should be apprised of the fact fully, frankly, and promptly, and not forced to readjust livestock production under the pressure of artificially manipulated prices. If readjustments in food-production programs are necessary, it should be remembered that present programs are the result of policies initiated and supported by Government agencies, and because of this fact the Government is obligated to protect the interests of producers in connection with livestock now in the process of production.

7. Consequently, changes in policies should be planned and announced far enough in advance that producers who have cooperated with the national war food production program will not be penalized nor those who have refused to cooperate benefited.

For example, the Government has an obligation to support the prices of hogs, including heavy hogs, until the fall of 1944. If feed conditions require the marketing of hogs at lighter than contemplated weights, say 220 pounds, then common honesty requires that swine producers be given the facts; present holders of heavy hogs be given time to market them; and swine producers told that after a certain date the price of hogs above a certain weight will no longer be supported by Government agencies.

If beef-cattle prices prior to the decline caused by the subsidy roll-back program were higher than justified by Office of Price Administration ceilings, the higher prices were possible because of failure of Government regulations to function as planned or anticipated. Cattle feeders who have cattle fed on the basis of actual existing conditions should not be penalized by arbitrary, abrupt reduction in prices. Any reduction by decree in prices paid for cattle should be announced some months in advance of their effective date.

8. If available feed supplies require further modifications in cattle-feeding methods as may very well be the case, then that fact should be made public. Holders of the current crop of cattle should be protected until the cattle are marketed or time given to modify feeding methods on cattle not too far along. The weight of carcass and degree of finish desired should be stated and the price level at which carcass beef of the desired weight and finish will be supported together with ceiling prices should be made known some months in advance of effective date of such prices.

9. If beef must be produced on relatively larger amounts of roughage and relatively smaller amounts of concentrates, this should be announced as a production policy and the State experiment stations, extension services, and cattle feeders called upon to suggest possible production plans adapted to their respective States.

10. If, as seems probable, it is desirable to reduce somewhat the degree of finish of slaughter cattle, we recommend that the Office of Price Administration AA grade of beef be eliminated and the price of A grade increased to the present price of AA grade with corresponding increases for other grades and the price reflected back in the price of slaughter cattle.

11. Government officials and the consuming public should come to understand that it is only through beef cattle that a large part of our agricultural production can be made available for human needs and that governmental policies should encourage the maximum utilization of such production. This is essential if we are to be reasonably well fed.

12. The beef producer should recognize that the primary function of beef cattle is the conversion of roughages and grass to human use and that he can produce a tremendous amount of beef and other products by the proper use of grass and roughages plus a limited amount of concentrates, if the war effort requires it and if Government policies permit it.

Further, that the supply of beef can be increased and the producer kept in better position by closely culling nonproductive and long-age cows, and by the replacement of older animals of poor quality by younger animals of good quality, the use of good sires, extreme care in guarding against disease and the efficient use of feeds.

13. The Government should take the initiative in selling all classes of the American public on the idea that we are now at war; that when we divert a large part of our total production to war, normal living standards can no longer be maintained; that there are many reasons why what we buy, including food, is costing and will cost more; and that the prices of agricultural products were relatively low at the beginning of the war and should be expected to increase more than the prices of other products which were relatively higher in price at the beginning of the war.

14. Our supply of beef during the emergency depends upon the total number of cattle, available feed supplies, and Government policies. The total number of cattle is the largest on record. It is important that Government policies encourage the use of feed supplies available for cattle production to their maximum efficiency and encourage the marketing of cattle. This will insure a maximum supply of meat during the emergency and a reduction in the total number

of cattle in the United States by the end of the emergency.

HERMAN DINKLAGE,
Wisner, Nebr.
PAUL KRUGER,
Fort Calhoun, Nebr.
ALEX LEGGE,
Fremont, Nebr.
PARR YOUNG,
Murray, Nebr.
WAYLAND HOPLEY,
Atlantic, Iowa.
JAY COLBURN,
Harlan, Iowa.
HARRY GARDNER,
Oakland, Iowa.

"THE O. W. I. IS HELPING TO WIN THE WAR"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Office of War Information Is Helping to Win the War," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on June 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE O. W. I.

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Movie Industry Backs the Office of War Information," written by Peter Furst, and published in PM of the issue of June 23, 1943, and an article entitled "A War Service in the Balance," written by Bosley Crowther, and published in Screen, both discussing the proposed reduction of the appropriation for the Office of War Information, which appears in the Appendix.]

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY CHARLES S. RUSSELL AT THE CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL GRADUATION EXERCISES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Charles S. Russell at the Capitol Page School graduation exercises in the New House Office Building on June 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] proposing a substitute for the provision in House bill 2935 beginning in line 21, on page 65, for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, several Senators who are not now on the floor wish to discuss the pending amendment dealing with the National Youth Administration. They are opposed to my views, but I think they should have a chance to be heard. The Senator from Missouri offered the amendment dealing with the National Youth Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I had expected that other Senators would precede me in the discussion of the pending amendment. But I am unwilling that a vote be had without taking the opportunity to give to the amendment my unqualified support. I confess without any hesitation, Mr. President, that my interest in N. Y. A. springs from some knowledge of the character of its work which has been done within my own State. In Maine N. Y. A. has had a dual program. There has been a program for local youths in local plants, and there has been a program carried on at resident centers, so-called. From these local plants and from these resident centers of Maine within less than a year's time there have gone into the industrial life of this Nation more than 1,000 trainees qualified in some branch of craftsmanship. There have gone from a single resident center, located in the home town of my distinguished colleague [Mr. BREWSTER], 1,200 trainees as welders, as machine operators, and as foundry workers of one kind or another. From them all, local plants and resident centers, Maine's branch of the N. Y. A. has contributed to the industrial life of the Nation more than 7,200 trainees, skilled, as I said a moment ago, in some useful work in the field of production.

Mr. President, there have gone from the N. Y. A. training plants of Maine sufficient numbers of aircraft workers to produce, so I am told, 18 attack bombers for every week. From these schools and from these plants there have gone into the navy yard at Portsmouth, N. H., and at Kittery, Maine, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of parts, required in ship construction and in the outfitting of our vessels of war. There has been given this large number of new skilled workers who are making their contribution to the industrial life of the Nation, and in particular to the war production effort.

Mr. President, much the same story comes from all over the country. From some 510 communities, in which are to be found 1,500 plants of the N. Y. A., there were turned out this last year more than 400,000 trained youths. Every 7 or 8 weeks these training centers of the N. Y. A. gave to the country 16,000 welders. They gave 24,000 machinists of one character or another. They gave 11,000 persons, men and women, boys and girls, qualified as aircraft builders or otherwise qualified to contribute to the aircraft program. They turned out more than 6,500 radio operators and radio technicians. Mr. President, every day of the current year there have gone from the plants of the N. Y. A. throughout the country into the active life of America approximately 1,000 trained workers, useful workers, able to make their contribution in the immediate present, and a source of potential usefulness and of production through the long years which lie ahead.

Various objections have been urged to this amendment. It has been said that it is stripping from the centers of the country men and boys needed for our armed forces. The facts do not sustain that contention and objection.

Mr. President, 51 percent of all the trainees at the present time are girls, and 73 percent of all the trainees in all the plants of the N. Y. A. are below the military age of 18 years. The trainees are young men and young women, in large part, below military age; and the program stands as no substantial hindrance to the war effort of the country so far as manpower is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What interests me in respect to the statement the able Senator is making is that it is asserted, at least in my area—and I presume it is a question of fact—that all the training and service done by the N. Y. A. could be with equal adequacy produced under State vocational and educational auspices. What would the Senator's comment be regarding that assertion?

Mr. WHITE. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. First, I should like to refer to the fact that it has been charged that the program is stripping from the farms of America the manpower available there. The facts do not justify such an assertion. Of the 57,000 trainees at this time in the plants of the N. Y. A., only 6,600 of them come from communities of less than 2,500; and at the present time, and for some time past, no youth leaves a rural area to go to the N. Y. A. without having a certificate from the county agent of the county in which he lives that his services are not needed for farm work.

Mr. President, just a brief word further. My distinguished colleague is to answer more fully than I have attempted to do the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. However, let me make merely a passing reference to the Senator's question, because I do not want to avoid it altogether. There are 510 communities in the United States in which the N. Y. A. maintains plants. In 194 of them no comparable facilities at all are furnished by the community. In 243 of them work is carried on by joint arrangement or cooperative efforts between the N. Y. A. and school authorities, with complete satisfaction to both. In only 70 or 75 communities among the 510 in which plants are maintained by the N. Y. A. is there the slightest conflict between local authorities who want to carry on work of a similar character and the N. Y. A. authorities.

I hope what I have just said answers, for the moment, at least, the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan.

The proposed appropriation aggregates approximately $48,000,000. The testimony is that this amount will provide for 73,000 trainees each and every month. If the program is continued during the coming year, there will be added to the industrial resources of the Nation more than 500,000 young skilled trainees.

Mr. President, much is said about economy. I am told—I heard it in the committee, and I assume I will hear it on this floor—that in behalf of economy

we must not make the suggested appropriation. I say that to strike down this agency maintained for the youth of America would not be economy but would be wanton waste of resources. To strike it down would be to throw away in substantial part all the capital expenditure which has been made; to strike it down would cause the dismantling of 1,500 plants throughout the country; it would involve the loss of machines, tools, and implements in these plants; it would cause the dissipation of the organization of personnel which has been built up; and it would deprive the youth of the country of the opportunity which is found in the program.

Mr. President, economy does not consist alone in refraining from spending of money. Economy consists as well in the wise and useful and helpful expenditure of money for beneficent purposes. To me the training of the youth of America makes a great, powerful, irresistible appeal. When mention is made to me of economy at the expense of the youth of America, I have no partnership in the appeal. I am unwilling to place on our young men and young women the dollar mark, and have it said of them that they are receiving advantages denied to others and which cannot be justified. Mr. President, I think with depression of the contrast which the proceedings today in this Chamber may afford. When the pending amendment and the pending bill are disposed of, we shall proceed to consider the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment, and scarcely a dissenting voice will be raised when the vote is taken on that bill appropriating $72,000,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the war. We will pass that bill in behalf of the "freedoms," in behalf of our country and its institutions, in behalf of a better world. Yes, Mr. President; all this is true. But who is to pay for it all? The taxpayers will pay in the years that stretch ahead. But the immediate payment and the sacrificial payment will be made by the youth of America. They are the ones who will pay in sweat, tears, blood, broken bodies, shattered minds, and in death—and yet we will pass that bill without a moment's hesitation. But when there is proposed the expenditure of $47,000,000 or $48,000,000—less than one, one-hundred and fiftieth of what we will vote for war purposes—we are told that that is too much to spend in behalf of the youth of our country.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate in behalf of the appropriation. I want the appropriation made because it will afford to the youth of America opportunity; it will open new vistas of usefulness to them; it will make of them better men and better women. I believe in so doing. It will make for a better America. I hope the amendment will have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very sorry I did not hear all the Senator's address, but I was detained at the Commerce Committee on a matter of importance.

The part of the Senator's address I heard almost leads me to believe that the Senator has the impression that we are destroying the educational system of America. Does the Senator mean to imply that during the past 150 years we have been neglecting the education of our children?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has no right to draw such a conclusion from anything I have said. I did say that this program was an educational opportunity which it is proposed by some to destroy, and I am against its destruction.

Mr. MALONEY. If I may ask the Senator a further question, Does he not understand that vocational opportunities are provided in this country quite apart from the N. Y. A.?

Mr. WHITE. To a certain extent, but I think inadequately. This program is supplementary and complementary, and is all for the good of the country and of the youth of the country.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator agree that young men and women who are anxious to enter industry are able to obtain positions easily without going through the N. Y. A.?

Mr. WHITE. That is speculative. I know that when they go through N. Y. A. they enter industry, and I believe in vastly larger proportion, considering the numbers who take the training, than such workers are contributed by any other source.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know that testimony before another committee indicated that only 50 percent of the N. Y. A.-trained students enter industry?

Mr. WHITE. I have heard that statement made, but the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was that about 700 of every 1,000 entered industry.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know——

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will continue to ask me questions, he may find something I do not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator have any knowledge of the extent to which the N. Y. A. youths are taken from the suburban areas of the country, where they are so badly needed on the farms, and encouraged to go into industry?

Mr. WHITE. A moment ago I said that of the 57,000 trainees now engaged in the work of the N. Y. A., only 6,600 come from communities of less than 2,500 population, and that no youth now gets into this service unless he brings to the N. Y. A. a certificate from the county agent that he is not needed in agricultural work.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator agree that a great many farm youths are leaving the farms, where they are so badly needed, to engage in this program?

Mr. WHITE. In the first place, I do not concede that any substantial number are leaving the farms to engage in this program. I think the testimony before the committee is quite to the contrary.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, do I have the floor now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. STEWART in the chair]. The Chair understands that the Senator from Maine has yielded to his colleague.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very much interested to know that the Senator from Connecticut has raised this question, because hundreds of our Maine youths have gone to Connecticut to labor in the industries of Connecticut in war production, solely as a result of the training which they have received under the N. Y. A. I happen to be quite familiar with the situation. Without such assistance, I am sure that the industries of Connecticut would not have been able to make the remarkable record they have made in the production of war materials.

With respect to the broader question, which was referred to by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], as well as by the Senator from Connecticut, I do not know what the experience of other States has been; but I do know that so far as Maine is concerned—and I am sure that the same situation prevails in many other States—my observation has been that the traditional educational system has not welcomed vocational education. As a former school teacher, and as one who has served for a long time on committees on education, having been active on the committee on education of the Legislature of Maine, I know that formal education has not welcomed working with the hands. I am informed by the Senator from Michigan that in his State vocational education under State auspices has been very successful. That is certainly not true in very many other States.

I was informed by the American Federation of Labor representatives that, while, in general, they have opposed vocational education because of its conflict with the training system in the shops, they had no objection to the old-fashioned vocational education, because it did not result in training boys to do any effective work. To me that was very convincing evidence that a great development in our vocational education was essential. That is why I welcomed the development of the National Youth Administration, and the very practical work which it has carried on, supplementing our formal system. It may very well be that the two things will wisely be merged; but in this emergency, at this critical time, I view with concern the suggestion that this training program should be wiped out. I think my colleague has shown conclusively that there is very little conflict between the two systems, as a result of the National Youth Administration not being active in the areas where ample vocational training is already being provided.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not hear the statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but in my judgment the vocational-training program under State auspices in Connecticut has been most successful. I know that some of the industrialists in my State, which is a most important industrial State, look with favor upon the continuation of the National Youth Administration. It is perfectly natural for anyone engaged in manufacturing to appreciate advanced training on the part of young people. However, the National Youth Administration was started as part of a relief program a long time ago. I think it did good work. I also think the Administration made a great many mistakes, of some of which I should be ashamed; but on the whole, I think it made a substantial contribution to the welfare of young men and women and to the efforts of Government in the depression period.

But now, taking into account the rapidly rising, tremendous national debt, I think we should be exerting every effort—I have been endeavoring to do so for some time—to abolish the so-called relief agencies. A year ago I spoke in the Senate against the National Youth Administration. Two years ago I tried to bring about its abolition. I am hopeful that at this time we may bring this agency—and soon hereafter other relief agencies—to an end, at least for the time being.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall yield in a moment.

I am particularly disturbed now to see Senators from agricultural States, who best understand the serious needs of agriculture and the shortage of labor on American farms, urging the continuation of a program which, day by day, under the encouragement of the National Youth Administration, is taking young men and women from the farms. A great many of them have already gone into the war program as industrial workers. Whether the N. Y. A. is continued or not, more farm youths will engage in industry, prompted partially, I am sure, by patriotism, and prompted partially, I am sure, by the belief that they can make a greater contribution to the war effort in that field than on the farm; but I am equally certain that many of them are encouraged to enter the industrial program of our country because of the high wages paid therein.

Facing the danger of a food shortage, as we are, I do not think the Federal Government should be constantly competing with itself—on the one hand appropriating money to attract young men and women to the farm, and in another part of the Government appropriating money to entice young men and women from the farm.

There are other reasons, Mr. President, why I do not like the program. I am opposed to taking young men and women—boys and girls 16 years of age—away from their homes to engage in a coeducational industrial program under the auspices of the Federal Government. I deplore that part of the program.

Mr. President, because there is so much need for the saving of Federal money, I am hopeful that at this time this program may be brought to an end.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator have the information that in the selection of youths for N. Y. A. training each youth must clear through the United States Employment Service, which must certify that he or she is not an agricultural worker, before he can engage in the N. Y. A. program?

Mr. MALONEY. In reply to the Senator from Florida, I must say that I heard that during the hearings on the bill the other day, and I was considerably surprised to know that that policy had become a part of the plan. But that does not change my opinion. I think we should be exerting every effort toward keeping young men and women on the farms. That is not what the N. Y. A. is doing.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator assume that a farm boy or girl could go to the United States Employment Service and obtain a certificate that he or she is not an agricultural worker, so as to make him or her eligible for N. Y. A. training?

Mr. MALONEY. I assume that is the case.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have anything but the word of the N. Y. A., but they have assured me in writing that that is the condition precedent to a boy or a girl obtaining this type of training.

Mr. MALONEY. I am told that that is the case now; but I do not want to have any part of it. I wish to discourage the National Youth Administration.

Mr. President, I have not seen a copy of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], but I observed in the language of the bill as it was considered in the Appropriations Committee that provision was to be made to raise the age limit of those to receive benefits to 85 years or more. It is proposed that the N. Y. A. shall train elderly men and women who have long since passed the age which would make them eligible to receive a pension under existing law. I do not believe there is a way in which we can prove that the N. Y. A. is not useful, or that it cannot contribute to the war effort. Of course it can. It is the most flexible agency in the Government. It can change its program and change the age limits. I know the views of those who sponsor the amendment. I assume that it is intended to wipe out the age limit and to permit the N. Y. A. to train children from 16 years of age to and including children 85 years of age.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In their second childhood. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not further discuss the proposal at this particular time. I may do so at a later time. I know that many Senators are anxious to speak on the subject. I believe that nearly all Senators have made up their minds how they will vote on the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I heard the distinguished Senator from Connecticut make the observation that the N. Y. A. was started to help needy students.

Mr. MALONEY. Needy youth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Needy youth. Very well. The program now includes the training of young persons who go to work in war plants. The amendment also provides for the continuation of work which they were doing in colleges.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the appropriation bill for the War Department carries a substantial item, running into millions of dollars, for similar purposes?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By which persons will be trained to be doctors, veterinarians, dentists, engineers, and so forth?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct. I am under the impression that that program will include nearly all the students who will henceforth be in college.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make is that the War Department bill carries an item for that purpose.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So there is no particular reason why that item should be included in the appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

Mr. MALONEY. As the very well informed Senator from New Mexico knows, included in this bill and other bills are large appropriations for vocational training outside the National Youth Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he departs from that point?

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator from New Mexico has concluded, I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to raise the question as to whether, in the first place, some of the benefits to students who are needy might not be for girls, who are not eligible for employment under the Army and Navy training programs—I assume generally those in the colleges—and, in the second place, for boys who, because of some physical deficiency or otherwise, are not included in the Army or Navy program.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I assume that no Senator would suggest that any boy or girl should be eligible to receive benefits both from the Army or Navy and the N. Y. A.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Those who would receive benefits under the N. Y. A. program are needy college youths who are not recipients of other Federal aid in acquiring a college education.

Mr. MALONEY. This program was originated at a time when we were disturbed over the fact that many young men and young women were suffering the loss of a college education, or the opportunity of obtaining one, because of a very serious depression which had in many cases wiped out that opportunity. Money was not available to send young men and women to college. Jobs were

not available to enable them to earn money to attend college. The purpose of this program in the beginning was to meet that need. If we vote to continue it now, in a period of plentiful employment, in a period of prosperity—so far as dollars are concerned—I have a feeling that the N. Y. A. will be with us forever. Certainly the original purposes of the N. Y. A. have been taken care of. Certainly the needs which then existed have been met. It is quite beyond me to see the justification for the National Youth Administration so long as the present period of high wages and good prices continues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] wishes to be heard.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, at this time I should like to make a few remarks in favor of the Truman amendment providing an appropriation for the National Youth Administration. In this connection I wish to read some figures showing what it has done in my State. I can only speak of the success of it in my State.

The National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania during the past 12 months has maintained an average of 6,200 trainees daily. Five thousand of these get their training in local shops in 38 different communities. Twelve hundred are being trained at points to which they come from isolated communities, where no training opportunities are available, and are housed in resident centers on a 24-hour-a-day basis.

About 35 percent of these trainees are prepared in machine-shop work. Another 30 percent are being trained in heavy arc welding, and in various types of aircraft welding. The remainder are prepared for war jobs in the radio, electric, motor repair, sheet metal, and power sewing trades.

The enrollment turns over 5 to 6 times a year. Thus, in the past 12 months, some 37,000 young persons have availed themselves of war training offered through this agency. This figure represents 45 percent of the preemployment war-training output of all publicly supported training facilities in the State of Pennsylvania, including the output of the federally subsidized vocational schools. It is noteworthy that one-half of the trainees are women, and that the shops operate 2 or 3 shifts daily.

Almost 40 percent of this training is done in the anthracite coal region of northeastern Pennsylvania. It is a section of the State in which there is the largest labor surplus. It may be stated fairly that before the establishment of the war-training program of the National Youth Administration, the vocational-training opportunities of the young people of that area were so narrow and inadequate that young men were confronted with the almost single choice of entering the mines, while the needs of young women went largely unfilled.

Since 1940 the National Youth Administration has created in that anthracite region, work training facilities capable of training 3,000 persons at any one time. For the past 2 years the agency has controlled the out-migration of young workers in the area through an induction center program which relocated already trained workers in industries of North Jersey and along the lower Delaware River valley. Giant industries, such as the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the Sun Shipbuilding Co., Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co. of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, the Dravo Shipbuilding Corporation of Pittsburgh and Wilmington, the Radio Corporation of America in their plants at Lancaster, Pa., and Camden, N. J., the New York Shipbuilding Co. and the Middletown Airport and other Army and Navy stations have welcomed this controlled influx of already trained young people and have testified repeatedly to the value of the service rendered.

Two hundred and thirty-one National Youth Administration trainees have been employed by the Sun Shipbuilding Co. alone.

Aware of the situation in the anthracite coal region of the State, I have worked unceasingly to bring about the location of important war plants in that area, and I am happy to state, finally with some success. My colleague [Mr. DAVIS] was a member of the committee.

Among the most powerful selling arguments to induce war plants to locate in that general area has been the existence of the splendidly erected, equipped, and staffed shops of the National Youth Administration.

The largest plant to move into that section of recent date is the Murray Corporation of Detroit. While this bomber-wing assembly plant breaks ground for its giant structure, I am pleased to note that the shops of the National Youth Administration have already reached a joint arrangement with the corporation to supply some 4,000 drillers, riveters, and sheet metal operators. This company has selected the trainees from the National Youth Administration instead of all other training sources. Within 2 weeks the National Youth Administration adjusted its floor layout to include equipment provided by the company, and at the present moment, persons are already in training against the needs of that war plant.

The National Youth Administration has demonstrated to my full satisfaction that it is efficiently managed by competent people who are imbued with great enthusiasm for the task in which they are engaged. It is a Federal agency which can stand on its record for prompt, efficient operation and for flexible administration. This year alone, 320 individual machine tools were relocated in my State in conformity with changing training needs and labor supply demands. The War Manpower Commission office of training has testified to the real service which a flexible federally operated training structure can provide during an emergency period. State and community controls necessarily impede the rapid transformation of vocational school services to meet emerging requirements. Were we to interfere with the continuance of this important activity, we should do violence both to an agency which presents us with such a record of accomplishment and to the general program of training as envisaged by the War Manpower Commission.

I cite the fact that industry in my State has sent many recommendations in support of the work which N. Y. A. shops local to its establishments are doing. No war employer has yet written me to recommend the discontinuance or reduction of present N. Y. A. operations. The Congress ordered the National Youth Administration 3 years ago to change from a work relief to a war training agency. None can deny that it has followed that mandate successfully in an incredibly short period. For this accomplishment, the Congress owes its benediction and approval, by the grant of funds necessary to go forward.

I shall now give a few samples of the type of letters industry writes concerning N. Y. A. war production training. The Piper Aircraft Corporation, of Lock Haven, Pa., has written to the shop superintendent in the war production training shop in Johnstown, Pa.:

> Please let me know when you will have some more trainees available, at which time I will get in touch with Mr. Glock and make arrangements for another pooled interview.

The York Corrugating Co., of York, Pa., has written to the manager of its local N. Y. A. shop as follows:

> Over a period of 2 years we have taken into our employment many boys from your sheet metal shop. We found these boys had received good training in sheet-metal work, good basic knowledge of the work, and a good background for anything needed.
>
> These boys have been a great value to us in the execution of our war contracts, especially because of a shortage of skilled mechanics.
>
> In order that industry in York can continue to benefit by this training, we request that the training activities will be extended.

The Manley Manufacturing Division of the American Chain & Cable Co., at York, Pa., has written to the director of the N. Y. A. shop:

As you will recall, the writer has discussed with you a number of times the fact that we are arranging to employ women in our machine shop. * * * The several times I visited your machine shop I was quite favorably impressed with the training that was given these women and with the strict attention they were giving to their work. Our experience with the several young men who were secured from your training school was such that we feel quite sure that the women we may secure from you will be well fitted to begin work in our machine shop.

I will write you again or telephone you along about the 20th, advising you definitely as to just how many women we will need and at what date.

This letter was signed by the plant manager.

The Pioneer Engineering Co., Philadelphia, has written to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The letter, signed by the plant manager, reads:

The National Youth Administration war production training shops in Philadelphia have been supplying us with workers who are trained and experienced in war production work.

We are well satisfied with these workers and we have come to depend a great deal on the National Youth Administration for workers, because National Youth Administration trainees are able to do production work with little or no additional training by us. The curtailment of the National Youth Administration during these wartimes, in our opinion, would seriously handicap us in obtaining trained employees as we need them.

The manager of the Goldberg Co., of Uniontown, Pa., last February wrote as follows concerning the N. Y. A. trainees employed in their plant at Uniontown:

We have been very highly pleased with the graduates of your training program whom we have employed. These boys have averaged a higher degree of skill and ability to learn than any other class of labor that we have been able to secure under the present market. Their training has been very thoroughly rounded, and as a result they are up-graded very rapidly once they come into our shop.

Mr. President, I should like to read a few other letters I found on my desk this morning. First is a letter from Reading, Pa., enclosing a resolution adopted by the city council asking that the National Youth Administration be granted the appropriation requested. The letter reads:

CITY OF READING,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Reading, Pa., June 25, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of city council held Wednesday, June 23, 1943, that body unanimously passed Resolution 114, reciting therein that the Reading center of the National Youth Administration has been established in close proximity to this city on municipally owned land and setting forth further that since its inception this center has trained more than 1,300 young men and women in mechanical trades without in anywise interfering with, or encroaching upon, the field of endeavor of any public or private vocational training school or college.

And that the efficiency of the training bestowed is evidenced by the fact that more than 86 percent of the school students are now successfully engaged in essential war industries; and pointing out that if it were not for the facilities offered by the Reading center of the National Youth Administration most, if not all, of the young men and women in question could not have acquired the technical skills which they are now efficiently using.

The Council of the City of Reading earnestly requests that you use your influence and best efforts to secure an appropriation sufficient to continue the National Youth Administration, especially so the Reading center, which has rendered such splendid and patriotic service, may continue in existence.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DANIEL F. MCKENNA,
City Clerk.

I should also like to read a letter from the principal of the New Salem public schools, as follows:

Someone said to me recently that all of us should write to Washington about stopping National Youth Administration. No doubt, we should write, but not to stop it. May I, through you, talk to every Congressman as one who has been on the firing line of this great youth movement to support the man and the National Youth Administration—the first great constructive plan ever to reach the common people and get results? I know what I am talking about, for I have administered the program in my community since it began and know at first-hand what took place.

There is just one answer to a question in this youth crisis, and that answer is to be found in killing National Youth Administration or in giving it new life. Will Congress abandon youth and let it shift for itself, or will it now give intelligent and trained leadership and direction to youth? We talk about juvenile delinquency being on the increase. No wonder! It is no accident, but direct cause and effect. If every Member of Congress had a delinquent son, we would have a big National Youth Administration. But everyone has a potential one. Do we not believe in prevention? Will we never learn? Will all these boys under 17 just automatically become great or useful citizens? Only today I had occasion to take a boy to the welding school. He was 16. Where else would I have taken him? Incidentally he had been kicked out of school because he could not pass his eighth-grade achievement test. He was branded a failure. The schools will take care of him? Didn't they? That kind of stuff is still going on and bids fair to go on forever. Shall National Youth Administration go on? Will Congress aid and give comfort to an invisible force that can destroy us as a nation from within? That is little short of treason.

Let us be practical and wise. Let us continue National Youth Administration and build into this greatest of all youth movements a new America—one that youth will want to defend.

Cordially yours,

W. O. FORMAN,
Supervising Principal.

The Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity have written a lengthy letter endorsing the program, as follows:

BAPTIST MINISTERS CONFERENCE OF
PHILADELPHIA AND VICINITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 1, 1943.

Senator JOSEPH GUFFEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: The civic committee of the Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and vicinity brought to the attention of the conference in a recent meeting the issue confronting this Congress involving the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

So concerned was the conference, which covers the Delaware River area from Trenton, N. J., to Wilmington, Del., representing some 250 Baptist churches and 150,000 communicants, that a resolution was passed in the regular weekly meeting, March 22, 1943, directing the writer to urge the several Congressmen and Senators from these districts to strongly support legislation for the continuation and extension of the National Youth Administration.

The members of the conference are thoroughly familiar with the work of the National Youth Administration and feel this agency is not only a pathfinder for youth but the preparation for participation in our all-out war effort will lead them to a more useful life during the peace that will follow.

Therefore, at the direction of the Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity, I am asking you to fully support the National Youth Administration when this agency's future is brought before the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. CHARLES D. BURKE,
Secretary.

From J. Jacob Shannon & Co., of Philadelphia, I have a letter which I read, as follows:

J. JACOB SHANNON & CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 25, 1943.

Hon. United States Senator GUFFEY,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR GUFFEY: I have read this morning in the Philadelphia paper an article in regard to the National Youth Administration.

The United States Government should be congratulated for ever starting an organization of this kind.

Two years ago our company was fortunate enough to have in our employ some young men who were developed as mechanics at the National Youth school. However, since the outbreak of the war these men have been called in the Army, and we were, indeed, sorry to lose these good workers.

Congress should arrange to keep the National Youth Administration in existence for many years to come, as it is not only a great help to our youth but greater help to the country.

Very truly yours,

J. JACOB SHANNON & CO.,
M. FECK, *Secretary.*

I have also a letter from Albert Lindsay Rowland, president of the State Teachers College at Shippensburg, Pa. He also endorses the movement, and states:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Shippensburg, Pa., May 11, 1943.

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: As I understand it, there are two measures pending before Congress, each of which is intended to provide assistance to needy college students. Such assistance has heretofore come through the National Youth Administration and has been of inestimable value to many of our young people here who would otherwise have been unable to secure a college education.

I am naturally concerned that at this time, when accelerated programs have in many instances reduced opportunities for summer earning, there shall be no reduction in the amount of money available through the working scholarships that have heretofore been provided through the National Youth Administration.

I am not familiar in detail with either of the pending measures, but trust that any

reasonable provision for the continuance of this aid through Federal sources will have your support.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT LINDSAY ROWLAND,
President.

I have a dozen other letters, which I shall not read, but offer for the RECORD. Running all through these letters it is reiterated that the N. Y. A. conducts the only vocational schools in the State which give colored youths of our State a chance to learn essential trades.

I have, from Lawrence Foster, executive director of the Pennsylvania State Temporary Commission on the Conditions of the Urban Colored Population, some figures as to the different schools, which I will ask to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks, following the letters to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in closing, I should like to submit that any change in the present set-up, in my opinion, is bound to retard the training of war-production workers at a time of the Nation's greatest need of producing implements for the war.

I submit that the National Youth Administration has proven its value as a war agency, and that no jurisdictional dispute should be allowed to interfere with it as a going agency indispensable to the war effort.

The letters referred to in Mr. GUFFEY's remarks are as follows:

EBENEZER A. M. E. CHURCH,
Middletown, Pa., March 30, 1943.

Hon. Senator JOSEPH GUFFEY:

I am informed of a possible discontinuance of the National Youth Administration. Therefore, I am writing you at this time asking for your general support in this matter.

As you know, the National Youth Administration is a Federal training agency for youth geared to meet the training demands of war industries. As such, it has benefited thousands of Negro men and women throughout the length and breadth of the country. Because of the tremendous contribution made by this agency to Negro youth, I am asking you, in the interest of humanity and national unity, to support legislation for the continuance and expansion of the National Youth Administration.

The Negro has benefited largely through this great agency because it has been impartial in its accepting of registrants. It has equipped him and prepared him to qualify and take an active part in any phase of the national defense program, and enables him to meet their demands. In addition, the National Youth Administration student work program throughout the Nation has aided over 59,000 students to remain in school or complete their courses. Over 13 percent of this number were Negro students. If we are to win this war and enjoy post-war order, which will come through the coordinating of our efforts, this great agency, which stands just for these things, must not stop nor slow its speed. So I implore you, as one who can see the needs of this great, united Nation, to give it your consideration and general support.

Sincerely,

REV. J. W. GANTT.

CITY OF CARBONDALE, PA.,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
June 21, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been instructed to forward you a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Council of the City of Carbondale, Pa., held June 21, 1943.

Yours very truly,

MADELINE WALKER,
City Clerk.

Resolved by the Council of the City of Carbondale, That—

Whereas it is proposed by the Government to abolish the National Youth Administration, which agency has been instrumental in preparing youths to qualify for defense work; and

Whereas a great benefit has been derived from this organization;

Therefore it is for the welfare of the City of Carbondale that the National Youth Administration be retained and a copy of this resolution is directed to be forwarded to Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and Congressman JOHN MURPHY, whereby their assistance and cooperation is solicited and requesting them to use their influence in the retention of the organization.

The advisory committee of vocational training for war production workers program for the Chester area has at all times had the fullest cooperation of the National Youth Administration shop at Ninth Street and Ridley Creek, Chester, Pa., and I have been requested as chairman of the committee to urge that this shop be continued in active operation as an aid in the training of the individuals who are to be later employed in the war industries of Delaware County.

A real contribution to the war effort in this area has been made by this training center, and with the rapid induction of men into the armed services necessitating training of additional women and older men, the training facilities in this area are taxed to capacity. It is the considered judgment of the advisory committee that nothing should interfere with the continued operation of this unit of training for war industries.

May I also add that our company's Chester branch has received valuable aid from this training shop, and we trust your committee will make appropriation so that this unit will continue all of its training functions.

R. J. WILLIAMS.

P. S.—The advisory committee referred to on the preceding page is composed of representatives of Sun Shipbuilding, Baldwin, and others.

COMMONWEALTH OF
PENNSYLVANIA,
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
West Chester, Pa., May 18, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GUFFEY: The college student work program of the National Youth Administration has enabled many worthy students to continue their education and therefore prepare themselves for effective service who would otherwise have been unable to secure such advanced training. The proposed changes which would include war training and a 12-month program are greatly needed, and we trust they will be included in the final program.

Some of the reasons why the college work program should be continued and expanded to include the war-training and 12-month features are as follows:

First, without such a program there can be no such thing as equalization of educational opportunities for thousands of capable and worthy youth. We must not forget that such a program does not give youth a college education but merely insures that they will have an opportunity to earn a part of the cost while at the same time continuing their education.

Second, the teacher shortage which is already critical is becoming increasingly so. Our State Department estimates a shortage of 4,000 teachers this September, and a survey by the National Education Association indicates a national shortage of 100,000. Without the National Youth Administration work program many potential teachers will be compelled to drop out of college, and thus add to the seriousness of the shortage.

Third, colleges have set up accelerated programs whereby students will complete their training in much less time, but this requires attending school the year around. However, such is impossible for many students because they have no National Youth Administration work opportunity during the summer and therefore must drop out of school to earn money for the following year. Once started to work many such students fail to return. The 12-month program would correct this deficiency.

Fourth, because of the rising cost of food, colleges have been compelled to raise the dormitory charges and this in turn has been reflected in increased applications and need for National Youth Administration employment.

Fifth, our students come for the most part from homes of low-economic income, a situation which is being further complicated by the greatly increased cost of living, and other economic dislocations resulting from the war.

As president of the State Teachers College at West Chester, Pa., and spokesman for the needs of these students, I wish to bring these facts to your personal attention, and trust you will lend your support to this worthy program.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. SWOPE,
President.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Harrisburg, Pa., March 25, 1943.

Senator JOSEPH GUFFEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the fact that plans are being formulated to discontinue the National Youth Administration project.

As one who has been closely connected with the National Youth Administration I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the great value it has been to the training of our youth. Many of these youth are able to serve the Government and industry today simply because they were trained in National Youth Administration centers. Hundreds are still being trained in defense work and they are better equipped to do their share in winning the war.

It is my opinion that it would be a great mistake to close down a project that has done so much for our youth and is continuing to afford them an opportunity which they would not otherwise have. The National Youth Administration is essential to the war effort and is too valuable a project to scrap at this time. It has made a commendable record of achievement and is worthy of praise rather than condemnation.

Very truly yours,

MARION S. ENGLISH,
Executive Secretary.

BETHEL A. M. E. CHURCH,
Lancaster, Pa., March 27, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senator from
Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has reached my intelligence of the probability of the discontinuance of the

National Youth Administration. Dear sir, for such to happen will mean a calamity to the future hope of the youth of the country, especially in such crucial times.

The National Youth Administration is the instrumentality through which thousands of the youth of the Nation is trained to meet the demand of preparedness, to answer the call of the Nation's industry, in a mechanical way as well as intellectual.

Through the training provided by the National Youth Administration, thousands are now on the assembling lines in such branches as radio, drafting, machine shop, welding, sheet metal, forge, foundry, and industrial sewing and many other defense demands.

In region III, embracing Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, there are more than 15,000 youths, the majority of whom are employed in war plants during the past 7 months. The National Youth Administration students work program has aided approximately 59,000 students to remain in school or complete their courses. How can America, the wealthiest Nation of the world neglect or destroy its own future hope, when other nations in pre-war years and also now have their youths' strength geared to capacity. I have mentioned statistics, I believe are accurate.

Dear sir, I am voicing the sentiment of tens of thousands of loyal Americans, when I ask you to listen to the voice of youth. Youth is speaking, asking for a place for further preparedness in this struggle for justice and liberty, and for better service in the post-war program.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill in his masterly address on March 21, 1943, emphasized the need of individual preparedness, both mechanical and intellectual. I am asking of you when the bill pertaining to the National Youth Administration comes before the Houses of Legislature, please vote for the continuance of the National Youth Administration and the sufficient amount of appropriations to maintain it, and wield your influence among your colleagues to also vote for the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

Please reply to this communication, and I pray that it contain a hope of light for the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

I remain,

Fraternally yours,

REV. E. S. DENNIS.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE
TEMPORARY COMMISSION
ON THE CONDITIONS OF THE
URBAN COLORED POPULATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 27, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: The Commission has examined the program of the National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania with particular reference to the impact upon the training and placement of Negro youth. Region III of the National Youth Administration operation includes the States of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, but the greater portion of its program is in the State of Pennsylvania. Due to the fact that the Negro population of Pennsylvania is larger than that of New Jersey and Delaware, the majority of Negro youth trained on this program are residents of this State. The average enrollment of Negro youth trainees in this tri-State area has been approximately 1,200 with about 900 of this number residents of the State of Pennsylvania. The total assignment of Negro trainees represents approximately 18 percent of the total number enrolled in this area.

A review of placement records of the National Youth Administration shows that 1,795 Negro youth have been placed in war industries for the period July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1943. Examples of the industries in which these youth have been placed are as follows:

Philadelphia Navy Yard	86
Middletown Air Depot	20
Sun Shipbuilding Co	183
Dravo Corporation	13
Mathis Shipyards	10
New York Shipbuilding Co	21

Of particular note is the record of 719 Negro girls employed in the textile trades as power machine operators. This report of placements is significant when it is realized that without this training the greater majority of these youth would not now be employed in their present capacities. The fact that this group has benefited by this preemployment training is an outstanding reason for the continuance of this agency.

The flexibility of National Youth Administration training is demonstrated in its resident-center program which permits the transfer of trainees from communities without training facilities to well-equipped centers located near acute labor-shortage areas.

National Youth Administration training is practical because of its production-training program, fabricating useful items for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other civilian Government agencies. In this region National Youth Administration trainees have produced during the past year for the Army and Navy ordnance a total of 918,324 articles, 86,673 of which were produced in metal shops and 791,744 garments fabricated in the industrial sewing shops. Thirty-nine thousand nine hundred and seven articles were produced in National Youth Administration woodwork shops. In addition to these there were 636,180 articles made for civilian Government agencies. Reports indicate that the articles produced met all specifications.

Added to the services to youth by the National Youth Administration is the student-work program which aids needy students through part-time employment in the schools, to continue or complete their education. Our survey discloses that in secondary schools approximately 3,300 students, of which 10 percent are Negro, are aided in colleges and graduate schools; approximately 2,600 students, of which 3 percent are Negro, benefit by this program.

Estimates of the War Manpower Commission indicate that there is still a great need for skilled and semiskilled workers in war industries. The age limitation for trainees imposed upon the National Youth Administration by your honorable body limits the effectiveness of this agency in realizing its maximum contribution to the training of workers for war industries. The Commission knows that hundreds of persons, particularly women, have applied for this training and have been turned away because of age limitations. This restriction, if lifted for the duration of the war, would insure maximum use of facilities and increase the contribution of this agency to the war effort.

Having examined the work of this agency, its efficiency and flexibility in the training of war workers, the Commission urges that this agency not only be continued but expanded to include trainees of all ages.

Respectfully submitted.

LAURENCE FOSTER,
Executive Director.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in rising to say a few words with reference to the National Youth Administration, I first wish to commend the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] for what he said on that subject.

I should like to ask the attention particularly of the Senators from Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, to a report I have from C. B. Lund, Regional Administrator of region VIII, which I think conclusively answers the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who said a few moments ago that the National Youth movement took boys off the farms. As a matter of fact, this report shows that it has been helping boys on the farms, helping keep them there to assist in the repair of farm machinery. The report is dated June 18, and is as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
St. Paul, Minn., June 18, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Congress of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This report relative to National Youth Administration activities in region VIII is intended to further supplement the information already forwarded to your office. This report gives specific data relative to the work on the medical program of the National Youth Administration.

During the period covered in the report 40,064 youth have been given thorough physical examinations by competent physicians of the communities in which the youth live. Each examination is conducted by a physician and dentist in good standing with the State and American medical associations. The health examination is the basis for health counseling and for referring youth to their own physicians, clinics, or hospitals for remedial treatment. The complete health examination which Congress has authorized gives necessary information to meet the health needs of youth going into defense plants. Local hospitals, welfare boards, and clinics provided the National Youth Administration with X-rays, chest plates, and the services of roentgenologists, and also provided for the treatment of contagious and infectious diseases for these 40,064 youth at no cost to the National Youth Administration.

These health examinations are conducted on a basis meeting all of the State laws within each State where they are given and with the permission of parents and guardians of the youth. The examination includes past medical history, immunity status, examinations of the ears, eyes, nose, throat, lungs, circulatory system, orthopedic impairments, blood serology, and urinalysis. X-rays are given to all youth who show a positive Mantoux test. The average cost of the health examinations for these 40,064 youth has been a little less than $2 per youth. This fee includes the services of a dentist, physician, and nurse.

The expense of the remedial work and follow-up work is borne by the youth through his National Youth Administration wages and/or his parents and/or welfare agencies or municipalities.

Through the cooperation of the various State rehabilitation departments handicapped youth have been examined and trained and placed into defense industries. In the last 6 months alone in 1 State more than 200 presumably unemployable youth of a handicapped classification have been rehabilitated and placed into defense industries.

The attached sample study of 11,000 cases indicated that 11 percent of the youth were of such physical fitness as to be ready for any type of work immediately. Fifty-three percent had health deficiencies which limited their employment in defense plants without

remedial work. Another 29 percent were found to be temporarily or permanently unfit for training or work in any kind of industry on a full-time basis. Seven percent of the youth examined were permanently unfit for any type of work or training. In other words, 89 percent of the sampling of the 11,000 youth in this region, which is made up of the States of Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, were found to be either temporarily or permanently physically deficient for war training before receiving medical attention. Thirty percent of the youth had received remedial and follow-up assistance through their local physicians and had their deficiencies corrected prior to the time they completed their National Youth Administration training.

Attached hereto are three tables which indicate pertinent information on this subject. Should you desire further detailed information we shall be glad to prepare it for you.

Yours sincerely,

C. B. LUND,
Regional Administrator.

Attached to the report are three tables, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Number of health examinations given to National Youth Administration youth by private physicians for period July 1, 1941, through Mar. 31, 1943*

State	Number of youth examined	Male	Female
North Dakota	2,469	1,260	1,209
South Dakota	3,013	1,738	1,275
Nebraska	5,890	3,035	2,855
Iowa	12,344	6,173	6,171
Minnesota	16,348	10,045	6,303
Total	40,064	22,251	17,813

TABLE II.—*Sampling of 11,000 National Youth Administration youth examined showing types of defects*

Type of defect	Number	Percent of number examined
Dental	7,736	70.3
Eyes	3,528	32.0
High blood pressure	608	5.6
Low blood pressure	1,401	12.7
Overweight	478	4.3
Underweight	774	7.0
Heart	379	3.4
Positive Mantoux	1,818	16.5
X-ray	1,128	10.3
Positive Wassermann	95	.8

TABLE III.—*Classification of 11,000 National Youth Administration youth based on health examinations showing fitness for employment or training*

Class	Number in classification	Percent of number examined
I	1,168	10.6
II	5,812	52.8
III	3,131	28.5
IV	720	6.6
V	112	1.0
VI	57	.5
Total	11,000	100.0

Class I and II, fit for any work or training.
Class III and IV, limited work or physical activity.
Class V and VI, unfit for employment, training, or physical activity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 9, 1942, from Robert Byrne, State youth administrator for North Dakota, addressed to me, which shows what became of these young men, some of whom were physically unfit for induction into the Army, and how they are now working in defense industries, particularly on the west coast, at Denver, Colo., and in other localities. I particularly call the Senate's attention to the fact that scores of these young men have been trained to repair farm machinery, and in view of the fact that there is so large a deficiency in farm machinery at the present time, I submit that these young men have done a great job.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 9, 1942.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am sure that you will be interested in the information which we are enclosing relative to the defense-training program of the National Youth Administration.

The bulletin, Industrial Education and the National Youth Administration Training Program, was published by the State normal and industrial school at Ellendale and outlines quite completely the work which is being done by our agency in cooperation with that institution. At the present time 50 young men are enrolled there in the specific 3-month defense-training course. The Remington Arms Co., of Denver, Colo., has agreed to accept all machine-shop trainees who successfully complete their course and are recommended by their instructors.

The National Youth Administration News Bulletin, of the Grand Forks resident center, was published by the University of North Dakota and explains in detail the work of our agency in that institution. At the present time 90 boys are receiving defense training in their shops for jobs in defense industries.

A project at Fargo, which is similar in every respect to the Grand Forks resident project, is now giving defense-work experience to 100 young men.

These projects have successfully trained upward of 400 young men, many of whom have now entered defense industries in various parts of the country. Sixty trainees are now with the Remington Arms Co. in Denver, Colo. Twenty-four from the Grand Forks project alone have now received preference rating with the Naval Reserve. Forty-four have accepted positions with the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. Approximately 12 radio trainees have received positions with the radio merchant marine on Gallups Island, and many others have gone to defense plants in various parts of the country, including the shipyards, Boeing Aircraft Corporation, and the Rock Island Arsenal.

We are also enclosing several pictures, which will be of interest to you, of boys who are receiving training in shops in various parts of the State.

Work is rapidly being completed in Bismarck on a defense shop which will train approximately 150 young men every 3 months in machine-shop, welding, sheet-metal, and auto mechanics. We expect to commence operations at this location the early part of February.

The school men over the State have been most cooperative in assisting our agency to gage the program to meet war needs in an all-out war effort.

All projects which do not qualify as defense projects are rapidly being eliminated. Projects for girls include training in hospital work, so that the girls will be prepared for nonprofessional duties in times of emergency. Food projects have been established to give girls experience in large-quantity cooking. Clerical projects are operated in connection with selective service boards and other governmental units to give young men and women experience so that they will be prepared for jobs in civilian and military defense agencies.

You will be interested to know that information about enlistment is being distributed to all National Youth Administration projects by recruiting officers, and arrangements have been made for these officers to visit these projects for talks not only to the National Youth Administration boys but also to the other youth in the various communities where these projects are located.

The fact that the Bureau of the Budget set aside $28,000,000 of National Youth Administration money in a reserve fund has temporarily handicapped our work. However, with the funds which remain we are doing our part in training young men and women for the defense emergency. We shall remember Pearl Harbor for one of our fine young men who was trained at our Fargo center was killed in action while serving there with the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BYRNE,
State Youth Administrator.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report made by the War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, National Youth Administration, North Dakota, from which I shall read a line or two as follows:

In line with this policy, farm machinery repair courses have been offered, some of which are continuing beyond the school year.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In North Dakota, the National Youth Administration (War Manpower Commission) is operating war production training centers at three locations: Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks. The activities at these shops are geared definitely to the war effort and designed to provide trained workers for defense industries. Training and experience are offered in the fields of arc welding, machine shop, sheet metal, woodwork, and radio. The shops are equipped with standard industrial equipment, and instruction and supervision are provided by skilled tradesmen in each branch of work.

These opportunities are available to out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 to 24 inclusive. Through a special exemption, selected high school seniors have also been privileged to receive training on a part-time basis in addition to their regular high-school subjects. This means that many of these young people will soon be ready to enter war production.

Since July 1, 1942, 2,000 North Dakota young men and women have received war production training in North Dakota National Youth Administration shops. These youth come from every county in the State and each month they are taking their places in the production lines of the Nation's war industries. The majority of youth now enrolled in North Dakota National Youth Administration shops are from cities and villages. It is the policy of the National Youth Administration to encourage farm youth to remain on the farm. In line with this policy, farm machinery repair courses have been offered, some of which are continuing beyond the school year.

The majority of the North Dakota youth who have been employed in war industries are with such firms as Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle-Tacoma Shipyards, Bremerton Navy Yards, Rock Island Arsenal, United Air Lines, and Northwest Air Lines Co. These firms speak well of our youth and praise the training offered by the National Youth Administration. As a group, the youth are very patriotic and proud of the fact that they can participate in winning the war. They do not hesitate to recognize the privilege they have been afforded in receiving such training and experience. Letters are received from these youth from day to day, expressing their appreciation and indicating the satisfaction they feel in the part which they have been permitted to play in the war effort.

During the period of training, after a youth has acquired some degree of skill, he is put on the production line in these shops, as we have orders from the Rock Island Arsenal and other governmental agencies for the production of many items needed as equipment in the Army and Navy Air Force. More than 3,000,000 such items have been produced in the shops in region VIII, of which North Dakota is a part. The estimated market value of these items is far in excess of $3,000,000. The production work is an integral part of the training philosophy of the National Youth Administration program. While in training, the youth produce actual job orders comparable to those found in defense industry.

Aside from the splendid contributions these young people are making toward the winning of the war, there is ample evidence that the National Youth Administration has furnished them the opportunity not only of securing employment, but has also given them the satisfaction of occupying a definite place in the American way of life.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am convinced that the National Youth Administration is making a real contribution to the winning of the war. I therefore intend to support the Truman amendment providing for its continuance.

In the fiscal year now drawing to a close the National Youth Administration has given training to over 400,000 persons. That number, or even one-half that number, of semiskilled workers provided for war industry cannot be discounted. It represents an important and an indispensable contribution toward winning the war. Not less but more of this training is needed to speed the wheels of industry.

The National Youth Administration, responding to the needs of the times, has increased the number of females in training so that at the present approximately one-half of all its trainees are young women—and this proportion continues to increase, as it should and must. That is very important.

Of the males on the program only one-third are of draft age. Some of these certainly will enter the armed services without ever having used their newly acquired skills in war industry but that does not mean this training is lost, for these skills will be of great value to them in their military service.

The remainder of this group of draft age boys are those who do not quite measure up to the physical standards required by the armed forces although they are acceptable to industry and must be so in order to receive N. Y. A. training. With the training they receive they too can make their full contribution to the winning of the war.

Montana youth, as youth throughout the country, have profited by this training. Nearly a thousand of them, in large part from communities and areas where no other training facilities are available, will have received training in this fiscal year alone. As of June 9, 163 Montana youth were preparing themselves under N. Y. A. supervision for war production as welders, sheet-metal workers, radio technicians, machine-shop workers, and as automotive mechanics.

It would require someone of greater temerity than I possess to suggest that such training makes no contribution to the war effort.

We tend to overlook the fact that our manpower problem is one of skills as well as of numbers. N. Y. A., in giving training and work experience to tens of thousands of potential war workers, is helping industry to carry its staggering burden and is rendering an invaluable contribution to the production of the implements of warfare. This is shown by the signed statements of industries engaged in war production.

On April 24, 1943, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. sent the following letter to N. Y. A.:

We wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation and help in sending us girls who have machine shop training at the National Youth Administration to be employed at the supercharger plant.

We find that girls with this experience and training have proven an invaluable aid in the war effort, and sincerely hope you can continue to send us girls in the future.

Then on February 10, 1943, the Studebaker Corporation sent in the following letter:

We would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and thanks for the number of competent young women you have sent to us for employment.

They have, without exception, proved very capable and you deserve to be commended for the splendid training they are receiving at the National Youth Administration center under your careful supervision.

To make it quite clear that these letters do not all bloom in the same month, here is one from the Piper Aircraft Corporation, Lock Haven, Pa., dated December 11, 1942:

Please keep up the good work on welders, as it will be necessary for us to pick up at least 200 welders somewhere before February 1, 1943.

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission has stated clearly and convincingly for the records that all of our training facilities must be utilized fully in the year ahead. It is counting on N. Y. A. to train approximately 600,000 persons. Perhaps before the next fiscal year ends our manpower needs may decline, but let us not be too sure about what tomorrow may bring. It may be we shall need more rather than less trainees than we now suppose. One thing in all of this is clear. We have at our command a going organization in the training field which is skilled and highly efficient. To disrupt that organization—the need for its services was never greater—would, in my judgment, not be wise.

Nor should it be overlooked that N. Y. A. carries on its work economically—and I use the term advisedly. It pays a small wage to youth in training, as under the circumstances is proper; it houses and feeds and transports tens of thousands of them; it trains them in skills which require costly equipment and it does all of this at a total cost of only $66.91 per month per trainee. I say that reflects superior management.

Mr. President, the facts before us show clearly that training must be provided for hundreds of thousands of persons in the fiscal year approaching. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission states that N. Y. A. is indispensable in carrying on this program. My own judgment confirms this conviction. Believing as I do that the N. Y. A. is making a vital contribution to the successful prosecution of the war effort, and doing it economically, I could not in conscience do otherwise than to approve its continuance for another year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to give a few facts to show what the National Youth Administration is doing in my State. The National Youth Administration war production training program in Florida is preparing 1,200 youth regularly in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State and sending them into war industries having critical labor shortages. During the year 2,358 boys and girls in Florida have gone from N. Y. A. shops to the war-production line and there are now in training approximately 1,400 who will be transferred to war industries as rapidly as they complete their training.

Mr. President, it is a matter of common knowledge that machine tools discarded by the Navy and other agencies of no further value were secured by N. Y. A., rebuilt by the youth under competent journeyman supervision and set up in shops for production work. Adjacent to the shop center in Florida, N. Y. A. built or secured resident facilities in order to bring to the shops young people living too far away to travel each day between home and the shop. Now the State has major centers located at Plant City, Pensacola, and Ocala and Miami. The State-wide Negro center in Florida is located at Daytona Beach. At the large resident centers youth are housed in dormitories, furnished food, necessary medical attention, and emergency hospitalization. The youth that obtain training at these resident centers are drawn from small towns and communities in the surrounding areas where vocational training of any kind is not available. If these facilities were withdrawn there is no possible way by which these youth can be trained.

In the selection of youth, each youth must clear through the United States Employment Service, which certifies that he or she is not an agricultural worker.

Mr. President, just before beginning to make these remarks I telephoned Mr. Aubrey Williams, the head of the National Youth Administration, and asked him particularly whether the National

Youth Administration training program was retarding the work on the farms, and Mr. Williams assured me and authorized me to state to the Senate that it was the county agent of every county who certified that the boy or girl who applied for N. Y. A. training was not needed agriculturally in the county, upon which information the United States Employment Service then certified the eligibility of the youth to the National Youth Administration. That program and that procedure have been in effect for 7 months, Mr. Williams assured me a few moments ago.

Senators will recall that the recruiting of labor is in the hands of the county agents, as representatives of the United States Extension Service, by act of Congress. So we have the protection for agriculture that the very agency responsible for the recruiting of agricultural labor must certify that the boy or girl who applies for the training is not needed upon the farms and in the agricultural-commodity producing center of the county in which he or she resides before he or she can become eligible for certification by the United States Employment Service, and then eligible for the training the National Youth Administration gives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot understand why any possible detriment to agriculture will be afforded by the continuation of the training program; and I think those facts should be known and recognized as proper to the consideration of the Truman amendment for the continuation of the National Youth Administration's training program.

The 35 shop units at the 85 Florida locations mentioned will provide 707 work stations in 10 occupations having critical labor shortages, including the metal trades, welding, machine shops, sheet metal, automobile mechanics, forging, aviation mechanics, and electrical occupations. In each of the 10 occupations there are from 1 to 8 shops, and training is provided for approximately 1,200 youths at a time. Nearly half of them are girls, and the proportion of girls is constantly increasing. Each shop is set up on the basis of a production line, and is a unit in which actual work is performed. That makes it possible to train the youths under the conditions under which they will operate when they go into industry.

The training is mainly for work in the war industries; and I will say again that a few moments ago Mr. Williams assured me that every youth engaged in taking the N. Y. A. training, except those at schools and colleges, is engaged in war work or in training for war work. So the training is not incidental training, but is training of men and women and boys and girls to do war work which is essential in character.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. What is the scope of the authority of the N. Y. A. in respect to assistance of boys and girls in schools, under present operations.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the able and humanitarian Senator from Washington has asked that question. The student work program enables students in colleges and schools to continue proper education by the performance of useful work. In my State of Florida the work the students have been able to get by virtue of the N. Y. A. program has made it possible for 1,633 Florida boys and girls to continue their education in 261 Florida institutions during the present fiscal year. The students are enrolled in secondary schools, colleges, and universities, both public and private, which are tax-exempt, non-profit-making institutions. What the student does is to get from the N. Y. A. a job that pays, as I recall, in the case of college students, an average of $11 a month, and in the case of secondary school students, approximately from $4 to $7 a month. All that does is to give a boy or girl a chance to work his or her way through school or college. As a boy who never would have gotten through college if I had not had a chance to work, I know about and I appreciate that kind of a program.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator permit me to intrude again?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONE. Objection has been registered by some educators to the N. Y. A. program under present auspices, and I wondered what valid objection there might be to assisting a youngster who is working his way through school and who is paid for outside work. What basis could there be for that sort of objection?

Mr. PEPPER. I share the doubt suggested in the question of the able Senator as to what could be the basis of an objection to a program of this kind. The only basis I can think of is for someone to place a greater value upon money than upon the training and education of the citizenry of the Nation; and I do not so appraise those two elements.

Mr. BONE. I have not observed that the objections have been thoroughly analyzed by anyone. There seems to be an objection in certain quarters; but if it rests upon the assumption that the program will result in giving outside work to a boy so that he can work his way through college, I do not consider that a very valid objection.

Mr. PEPPER. All I can say is that some persons, unhappily, do not seem to have the same appreciation of the value of an education to the boys and girls of the Nation that the Senator from Washington and I have.

Mr. President, it also will be remembered that the boys and girls receiving N. Y. A. aid are certified by the educational institutions themselves, usually by the deans of students. So they are attested by the school, itself, to be of good character and deserving, and thus they are boys and girls who are worthy of being helped.

In the second place, they do not continue to receive the aid unless, according to the certificate of the institution itself, they do creditable work in the institution.

Mr. BONE. Is there any competitive factor of a nature which would work to the detriment of the school system?

Mr. PEPPER. There must not be; because many educational institutions in my State have requested my support of the continuation of the N. Y. A. program, and among the institutions so requesting my aid are the universities. I have never heard of an educational institution which commented other than favorably upon the continuation of the N. Y. A. college-aid program, and recommended its continuance.

Mr. BONE. Does the situation prevail in the Senator's State which exists in some other States, and I may say it exists in some spots in my State, that very important war plants now find themselves unable to secure trained help? They have sought my assistance, and doubtless they have sought the assistance of every other Member of this body who represents locations where such a condition exists. I am wondering, and probably my good friend the Senator from Florida can tell me, whether the program would lend itself to the instruction of otherwise untrained boys and men who might fill those positions.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to answer the Senator's question by referring to certificates and letters from employers engaged in war work in my State. For instance, I hold in my hand a letter from the vice president of the St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., a company located in Jacksonville, Fla., engaged in constructing Liberty ships for the Maritime Commission. The vice president of the company says:

> During the past few months it has become more evident that industry will necessarily have to employ many young women to fill the ranks depleted through young men being drafted into the armed services.
>
> The National Youth Administration program in this State has been developing very fine trainees. It is my belief that if the age limit of 25 could be raised to 35, it would materially help, and it is with that thought in mind that I am writing you this letter.
>
> ST. JOHNS RIVER SHIPBUILDING CO.,
> KENNETH A. MERRILL, *Vice President.*

I now hold in my hand a copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, by the J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., which also is building Liberty ships for the Maritime Commission, at Panama City, Fla.

The letter reads as follows:

> J. A. JONES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.,
> WAINWRIGHT YARD,
> *Panama City, Fla., April 28, 1943.*
>
> Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
> *Chairman, War Manpower Commission,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: This letter is written in the interest of the Pensacola war production training project, National Youth Administration, Pensacola, Fla., to acquaint you with the benefits received by the Wainwright Shipyard, J. A. Jones Construction Co., Panama City, Fla.
>
> Since the beginning of this fiscal year, the Pensacola project has referred approximately 350 trainees in sheet metal, welding, and machine shop for employment in our shipyard. I do not need to tell you that due to labor shortage these trainees were most welcome and we wish to continue in the future receiving as many trainees as possible from the

Pensacola project. It is the hope of the personnel of our yard that the National Youth Administration training program be allowed to continue throughout the next fiscal year. We expect a sharp decrease in skilled labor to prevail within the very near future which would force us to utilize all the available training programs in this area in order to keep our yard properly staffed.

Very truly yours,

H. V. APPEN,
General Manager.

In another letter to Mr. Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the same company, which employs about 12,000 workers in building Liberty ships, says:

We have secured approximately 350 youths from the National Youth Administration at Pensacola.

Listen to this testimony as to the character of the trainees:

As employees, these young men have proved very helpful to us in our production program, involving the construction of Liberty cargo ships for the United States Maritime Commission, and we earnestly trust that necessary appropriations to carry on this training will continue to be made available.

Very truly yours,

J. A. JONES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.,
WAINWRIGHT YARD.
R. P. MAPELSDEN, *Personnel Manager.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that everything the Senator has said in the statement he has made and read from the letters he has received from his constituents is accepted as being correct. The difficulty with this particular appropriation is that it duplicates the work which is being done under another item in the War Department Appropriation Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean in the colleges and schools?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That activity comes under the provisions of the pending amendment. That is paragraph 2 of the amendment. The objections in my State to this particular item are to paragraph 2, which has nothing to do with the item about which the Senator has been talking. Paragraph 2 is as follows——

Mr. BONE. Where is that provision?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the Truman amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The language is:

To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The objection to that is that that program was started as a result of the depression. It was a very laudable program. At the time everyone was for it. The same thing is true of P. W. A. and W. P. A. Now, as a result of the war, we do not have W. P. A., P. W. A., or the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Civilian Conservation Corps was for the benefit of needy youth. It was a laudable program; but now the universities are devoting their time to training engineers, dentists, veterinarians, and doctors, and the War Department appropriation measure carries a very substantial sum of money for those particular purposes. The Army and Navy, in many instances, are taking over colleges and universities as a whole to do that particular class of work. So it is felt that so long as that program is adequate, at least, some economy should be effected.

The people of my State object to items which are not necessary. They make to me this argument: The administration is continually talking about the danger of inflation. Nevertheless, you are appropriating millions of dollars for activities which are not necessary, and the result will be inflation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank my able friend for raising that question and pointing out the difficulty in his mind.

Before I began to speak on this subject I talked with Mr. Aubrey Williams, the head of the N. Y. A., about this matter. I knew that it was troubling many Senators. This is the explanation which Mr. Williams gives me, and I shall be glad to have any Senator ask questions about it:

Mr. Williams says that every boy or girl receiving N. Y. A. training in school or college is ineligible for the war-training program of the Army or Navy, to which the able Senator refers. He says that they are either girls, and therefore not eligible, or boys who are preparing to be teachers, or to do some other kind of useful work, and who are not physically qualified for the Army or Navy, and therefore are not eligible for the V-12 training program of the Army and the Navy. This is a category of needy boys and girls who are in school or college. They are found to be worthy by the institutions themselves. They are found to be doing creditable work in those institutions, and are certified by the institutions. They are not eligible for any other training program of the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, the Senator feels that the emergency agencies which were created for the purpose of helping the needy during the depression period should be continued. He may be correct. However, in war we are taking youths from college and from the farm. The draft boards are taking youths from every field. I do not feel that it is proper, when there is so much work to be done, to continue an emergency agency such as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The emergency is that American boys and girls who are eligible for college training have not the money to obtain such training unless they are given the opportunity to work their way through school. The fact that there are shipyards in operation, and all kinds of war work going on which they could perform if they were not in school, does not mean that they do not need some kind of employment on the school campus.

I know the humane sentiments in the heart of the able Senator from New Mexico, and I know that he would not intentionally deny to 1,633 boys and girls in my State of Florida who are presently receiving work opportunity through N. Y. A. a chance to work their way through school or college by doing odd jobs on the school campus. All that is involved in this question is an opportunity, in high school, to obtain work which will pay, on the average, from $4 to $7 a month, and in college, work on the campus which will pay, on the average, $11 to $15 a month, so that boys and girls may continue their school or college education. Bear in mind that they are not eligible, either by reason of being girls or by reason of being physically disqualified, for any of the other Federal-aid training programs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Florida feels that I am humane. I am humane. The Senator from New Mexico has been the beneficiary of American institutions, the American way of thinking, and American opportunity. I want every child in America to have an opportunity, but I do not want to kill the incentive of American youth to work out its own salvation. I do not want to say to American youth that from now on it must depend upon the Federal Government for everything. Consider the membership of the United States Senate. A majority of Senators had to come up the hard way. I want to preserve opportunities for American youth. I want American youth to have some incentive. I want the American boy to realize that he must work hard. I want to help him, and I want the country to help him. However, the N. Y. A. was the creature of the Congress, created during the depression, as were the P. W. A. and many other agencies of the Federal Government. I do not think it is right to continue, under the pretext of the war effort, something which was started when people were starving and walking the streets, and when our boys were wandering idly along the highways from here to California. I do not want such an agency to continue during the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me say one word in response——

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not want my distinguished friend from New Mexico to labor under any misapprehension about the war effort of this agency. It is one of the few agencies which have really put forth a war effort which is appreciated by the people who have to train or employ the students. The reason I offered the amendment was because Kaiser, Higgins, the Aluminum Co. of America, the automobile industry in its war effort, and half a dozen others whom I could name need the trainees which are being prepared by the N. Y. A.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the training of boys for the war effort.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not want anyone to labor under the misapprehension that the work of this agency has not been a real war effort.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I merely desire to inquire concerning the work which is done by the particular group which was referred to by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], namely, the group that receives from $4 to $11 a month while they are students in school. Obviously they do not consist of the larger body of trainees for war plants. They are receiving from $4 to $11 a month from the Government for doing some kind of work which the Senator from Florida, as I understood him, has indicated as being work "on the campus." The expression "on the campus" naturally narrows the kind of work which they are to do. I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] provides approximately $5,000,000 for that type of work. What is the work which is done on the campus?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is the usual kind of work which the institutions themselves have provided for students to perform. For example, one job will be work in the laboratory; another will be work in the mess hall; another will be work on the campus grounds in maintaining them in proper condition; another will be some type of work in the machine shops, and other work of that kind on the campus. It consists of all kinds of work on the campus which has been arranged by the institutions in order that students may help themselves through school or college.

Mr. BONE. Of course, there is nothing novel in that arrangement because many students in universities have worked in the office of the registrar or bursar, or performed work around the college property which had to be done. Sometimes it is manual labor, bookkeeping, or accounting work. It is quite customary. I happen to know that, having had one who was very near and dear to me who worked in the office of a university on the accounts which dealt with the payments of the salaries of the professors and work of that nature. However, I wish also to ask the able Senator from Florida what particular skills are taught in the general over-all program of work for trainees for Army plants? What field does the program cover? What type of mechanical arts and operations does it cover?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in a telephone conversation which I had a short time ago with Mr. Williams concerning the kind of training the boys and girls were receiving in the schools, he mentioned such things as chemistry, physics, engineering, and subjects of that nature. He mentioned specifically those three categories of training. He also mentioned preparation for the profession of teaching.

Mr. BONE. Then the program goes beyond the field of manual arts.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to place myself on record in support of the National Youth Administration, and particularly the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I have personal knowledge of the satisfactory work done through this valuable training program. It would be a great mistake to discontinue it at this time.

I have received a number of telegrams and letters urging the enactment of the measure, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED ARTS,
Manhattan, June 18, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: On April 19, I wrote you at some length giving reasons why I think the College Work Program of the National Youth Administration should be continued. I believe that all of the reasons listed in the letter just referred to are equally valid at the present time.

I am familiar with the report recently gotten out under the headings of the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the American Vocational Association. It does not seem to me worth while to prepare a report on the arguments advised in this report, but I should like to make this comment. In my opinion the major reason behind this opposition is that public school administrators are extremely reluctant to release any of their students before they graduate from high school, regardless of whether or not they could be more useful in the present emergency in doing something else. We have, for example, experienced considerable opposition from public school administrators in the widely adopted plan of permitting high school seniors to enroll in the college during this emergency.

When this matter comes up again in the Senate, as I think it likely to, I hope that you will keep these ideas in mind.

Very truly yours,
M. A. DURLAND,
Chairman Kansas College Work Council National Youth Administration.

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Topeka, Kans., June 18, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We would appreciate your support for the continuation of the National Youth Administration. We feel that it is the one Federal Agency that is fitting the youth of America to meet the challenge of service in the future.

We thank you in advance for your interest, not only in this, but for all of your kindnesses in the past.

Sincerely yours,
EZEKIEL RIDLEY,
Assistant U. S. O. Director.

DIOCESAN SCHOOL OFFICE,
Wichita, Kans., June 19, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from Kansas,
United States Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It has been brought to our attention that an effort is being made to do away altogether with the National Youth Administration and that attempts are also being made to allocate National Youth Administration funds directly to institutions instead of to needy students as in the past in case the National Youth Administration program is continued.

May we say that the work of the National Youth Administration here in Wichita has received sincere endorsement of outstanding educational, civic, and industrial leaders with particular reference to the contribution which is being made in training young men and women to take their places in defense production. We should appreciate very much your valued support of legislation which will enable the National Youth Administration to continue its important program.

If funds will continue to be available through the National Youth Administration to enable needy and worthy students to continue their studies on the high-school and college levels, we trust that no change will be made in the manner in which the money is allocated. In the past, funds have been given directly to the students regardless of the school which they were attending. This has made it possible for them to attend not only the public schools but also privately operated high schools and colleges. If the funds are paid directly to the educational institutions it would seem that the private institutions and particularly the church-related colleges would have no share in the aid which is thus given and that none of the students attending these schools would be able to receive help through the agency of the National Youth Administration. May we solicit your support for legislation which will enable the National Youth Administration to continue to give students' aid directly to the students themselves.

Thanking you for your kind consideration in this matter, and with every good wish, we remain

Sincerely yours,
Very Rev. Msgr. LEON A. MCNEILL,
Diocesan Superintendent of Education.

BAKER UNIVERSITY,
Baldwin, Kans., June 19, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am writing you in the interest of the National Youth Administration, which has been carrying on a most worth-while program during the past few years in connection with our colleges. The feature of this program which is especially appreciated by those of us administering the affairs of privately endowed and church colleges is that the funds are paid directly to the students concerned, rather than to the institutions; in other words, the student may go where he wishes, and, if he is eligible, may be considered for employment under the National Youth Administration.

The recent report which went out from the National Education Association is not in keeping with the thing many of us would like to see accomplished. As I understand that report, it is in favor of direct Federal subsidy to institutions. I think the other method is much to be preferred. In addition, I believe that a study of the work which has been done in the colleges through the National Youth Administration appropriations will reveal that it has been a most worth-while venture and that the programs carried on have been commendable.

Here at Baker University we have the athletic stadium and field, and also many repairs to buildings about the campus which, in part, have been helped by the work made available to the students through the National Youth Administration. It is my sincere hope that the necessary appropriations will be forthcoming to make possible the continuance of the work which this agency has been carrying on.

Cordially yours,
NELSON P. HORN,
President.

FRIENDS UNIVERSITY,
Wichita, Kans., June 21, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In these critical days, when we are making every effort to save de-

mocracy, we must not forget the longer view of saving civilization. The great hope of tomorrow rests with an educated citizenry. Therefore, I am urging you to support the National Youth Administration appropriation which will make possible the continuance of college education for a number of ambitious young men and women.

Very sincerely,

W. A. YOUNG,
President.

THE KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Emporia, June 17, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I cannot let the matter go by without registering my protest. I refer to the trend of action which seems to be coming from the committee headed by Senator BYRD. I refer to the effort to eliminate the National Youth Administration, at least that part of the National Youth Administration which is outside of colleges. I do hope that this committee and that Congress as a whole, finally, will see what a tragic thing it would be to refuse, at this time, the support of the National Youth Administration work. Many boys have been saved for a successful life, and for more than a year the National Youth Administration has done splendid work in producing tools and equipment for the defense of our country. I speak for a large number of educators in this State when I say that we are not supporting the fight made on the National Youth Administration by the unauthorized statements of the officials of the National Education Association. I believe that you take the same position we are taking on this matter, but I thought this letter might add to the testimony on the fight against the National Youth Administration.

While I am writing to you about the National Youth Administration work outside of colleges, I should like also to register my support of the bill listed under House Document 173, now being considered by a committee of Congress. It is the bill carrying support for the National Youth Administration for college work. It is no secret that college administrators and teachers all over this country are not joining the National Education Association officials at Washington in their fight against this bill. These officials of the National Education Association are acting entirely on their own and have not consulted their far-flung membership of the National Education Association throughout the Nation. Thanking you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

H. G. LULL,
Head of Department of Education.

JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Junction City, Kans., June 24, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to take a few moments from your busy life to talk with you concerning the wavering National Youth Administration program.

I am acquainted with it from its beginning. I have observed and supervised it at its height and at a time when it was at its low ebb. We cannot measure it in terms of its necessity for any one year. We must evaluate the past, consider the present, and be judicious for the future.

The National Youth Administration has helped innumerable boys and girls, both in the secondary schools and in colleges. It has been a means for many of obtaining the diploma or the degree. From these much constructive leadership has been developed. There might not be the demand now that there was 5 or 6 years ago, but when a boy or girl does need it, the need is very urgent and perhaps would be greater now than before to that specific person. To cut it off now might be dangerous for the future. If the need were ever great in the future were it to be cut off now, the Congress that might rule then might not be friendly to such a program even though the need were great.

I would rather see a curtailment in the future than to have the whole program disintegrated.

To that end I am appealing to you to use your best judgment in the interest of our boys and girls.

Sincerely,

H. D. KARNS,
Principal.

The Honorable Congressman REES:

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of the advisory board of the National Youth Administration of Wichita, celebrating the placing of the one-thousandth graduate of their school in a war factory, it was forcibly brought home to us the contribution this agency was making to the war effort. We were informed that there had been from twenty to twenty-five thousand boys and girls placed from this agency in war work throughout this area alone. The problem of our youth in the post-war period was discussed in a very serious mood, and the group felt that some such agency should continue to function to help the youth of the Nation in the readjustment period, and unanimously passed the following resolution for your consideration:

"Whereas the National Youth Administration has done such an efficient piece of work with our youth during the depression period; and

"Whereas it is making such a wonderful contribution to the present war emergency; and

"Whereas we certainly will face an emergency in youth adjustment after the war: Be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the unanimous opinion of this body that the National Youth Administration should be continued and generously supported by the Congress of the United States."

Rev. L. F. Arend, chairman; H. D. Lester, vice president, Fourth National Bank, Wichita; C. W. Corsaut, manager, U. S. E. S.; M. M. Read, director, Sedgwick County Social Welfare Board; A. L. Ashmore, M. D.; Hugo Wall, University of Wichita; Robt. L. Nesmith, judge of district court; John P. Kieffer, president, Wichita Photo-Engravers Union, No. 73; Rev. Thomas C. Glynn, director of Catholic Youth.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., *June 21, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of National Youth Administration for next fiscal year.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. F. WALKER,
Secretary.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

I believe record of National Youth Administration training of essential war workers warrants continuance of that part of the program.

H. R. MILLER,
State Planning Board.

ABILENE, KANS., *June 22, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge your active support National Youth Administration bill as defense measure, thanks.

Mrs. J. E. JOHNTZ.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 26, 1943.*

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As one of your Topeka friends, I appeal to you to help pass the National Youth Administration bill. It has done a lot of good for our Kansas boys and girls as well as playing a vital part in the war effort. My father who is president of the Topeka Food Dealers Association joins me in asking your support of the National Youth Administration bill.

Very truly yours,

J. BLOOD COATS.
GEO. E. COATS.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 28, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator of Kansas, Washington, D. C.:

I believe the National Youth Administration has been of great value to the youth of this section of the country and particularly Negro youth. I truly hope you will support legislation for its support.

F. L. BARNETT,
L'OVERTURE SCHOOL.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., *June 19, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of National Youth Administration appropriation for next fiscal year.

CITY COMMISSION, ARKANSAS CITY, KANS.,
GEO. W. WYLIE, *Mayor.*

LINDSBORG, KANS, *June 22, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Definite need for appropriation in National Youth Administration bill for college-work program. Conditions justify support on basis of need. I heartily urge your vote for it.

Dr. ERNEST F. PHILBLAD,
Former President, Bethany College.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., *June 20, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We urge support of National Youth Administration appropriation for war training.

GEO. W. WYLIE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Division 462, Brotherhood Locomotive Engineers.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 22, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator of Kansas, United States Senate Office Building:

Pleased to inform you that National Youth Administration at Wichita is meeting with hearty approval of outstanding industries essential to production of bombers and planes. Would appreciate your support to continue this agency so vital to war industries.

BISHOP WINKALMANN.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In response to the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], I wish to state that in my State, for instance, a school is being conducted to teach mechanical drawing to girls to fill positions in laboratories and in the engineering set-up in order to replace the young men who have been drafted into military service.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make an observation in the time of the able Senator from Florida. Whether I was in favor of or opposed to the National Youth Administration in the past, after listening

to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] make his explanation of the amendment, and after having heard him reiterate what he said a few days ago in connection with the men who are producing in this country at the present time the implements of war to defeat the enemy, I would not have any hesitancy in changing my mind.

The Truman committee is one committee of the Senate which has no ax to grind. In my opinion, the committee has the respect of the American people to a greater degree than any other committee which has been appointed in the Senate for a long time. The Senator from Missouri made an honest observation to the Senate and to the country when he proposed the amendment and asked the Senate to continue the N. Y. A. during the present emergency.

Mr. President, we are at the crossroads in this war. Great successes have taken place on the part of the Allied armies in the Pacific, in the Mediterranean, and in Tunisia.

From all reports we will soon open a second front somewhere, and soon we will make an all-out assault upon the unspeakable Japs. If there was ever a time we should do nothing that would curtail the production of implements of war or curtail the training of individuals engaged in making implements of war, it is this particular moment.

During the next 9 months the casualty list of men in the armed forces of this country will be long, and the sufferings and the heartaches of American mothers and fathers and friends will be poignant. The $49,000,000, or whatever the amount may be required to continue the N. Y. A. should be appropriated, because, as the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said this morning, 70 percent of the work which is now being done by these trainees eventually finds its way into war production. Mr. President, that is what I am interested in.

When we went into this war in December 1941, everyone knows that we were totally unprepared; we did not have the manpower and the mechanics and the technically trained men to do the kind of job that was so necessary then, and we are still struggling with a shortage of technical power. We have not reached the peak as yet of our production, but we will more nearly approach it as we employ the type of individual N. Y. A. is training in various schools to engage in the art of producing implements of war.

There is much loose talk about taking boys from the farm for the N. Y. A. They are not taken from the farm, unless, as the Senator from Florida said a moment ago, a certificate that they are unnecessary in the particular area is made by the proper authorities. Certainly that should satisfy any reasonable mind.

Mr. President, this is the same old fight which has been going on over the N. Y. A. for the last few years. In connection with the great emergency which confronts us incident to the war a great many persons cannot see the forest for the trees. Many seem to think that victory is just around the corner; many seem to think that the war is over, and we sit here day after day and quibble and quarrel among ourselves when we should be lashing out in the most vigorous and effective way against the unspeakable Japs, the Nazis, and the Fascists who seek to destroy us all. We must have victory or there will be no chance for us to debate in the United States Senate in the future.

The sum involved is small in comparison with the great problems that are before us. We appropriate $72,000,000,000 without blinking an eye, and yet we have committees consuming weeks trying to find something wrong with the National Youth Administration. Of course, it has made mistakes. It started out as a relief organization, it is true; but it has developed into a real war-effort organization. That is what I am most concerned about. I am just as much interested in economy as is any other Senator; I do not yield to any man in my attempt to protect the taxpayers of America; but, if we do not win the war, we will not have any taxpayers to protect.

I undertake to say that this is a step in the right direction toward winning the war. I am for this amendment, and I think the Senate should adopt it, because I know what the National Youth Administration in my own communities in Illinois has done toward the training of youth who without such training could not contribute anything, except in a limited way, to the war effort. The N. Y. A. has given them education along mechanical lines. It is worth while, I will say to the Senator from Washington, in my opinion. All I am interested in is in knowing that the N. Y. A. is doing something to win the war.

As to the cost of winning the war, we see the cost mount higher and higher, and, of course, every dollar we can save is that much gained, but the question of the cost of the training of individuals who will help in the war effort, who will enter factories and do necessary work, is not to be considered, in my humble opinion. When the Senator from Missouri tells the Senate that men such as Higgins and Kaiser in the shipyards and men in the other great industries who are producing the tools and instruments of war to destroy the enemy say that they want this training work continued, the Senate is listening to big business and not to the wails of some Communist outfit. An effort has been made to pin the Communist label on the N. Y. A. ever since it has been in existence. I am for the amendment; I think the Senate should adopt it and the other House of Congress should adopt it as a war effort, if nothing else.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for the very able and eloquent contribution which he has made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to beg the indulgence of the Senator from Florida for a moment. The difficulty in discussing measures of this type is that those who feel that a vote "yea" should be cast seem to think that they are the only ones who are making any contribution to the war effort.

I have a personal interest in the winning of the war. Names of my kith and kin have been in the casualty lists; my kith and kin are prisoners of the Japs; my kith and kin are at Attu; my kith and kin are in North Africa; my kith and kin are all over the world. I also want to win the war. I want to vote for every part of this bill that has to do with advancing the war effort; but I do not wish to continue an experiment which was undertaken when the people of the country were hungry; not, however, because I do not want to win the war. I do not take my hat off to any Member of this body when it comes to the question of having relatives actually at the front trying to win the war. I am becoming sick and tired of hearing that if a Senator does not vote the way someone else thinks he should vote he is against the war. I am for winning the war, but I am against this bill unless there can be eliminated from it some features which I dislike and which I think are contrary to American institutions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, would the Senator strike out paragraph 2?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think paragraph 2 belongs in the measure.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. We know we are facing a rather contradictory situation when we start argument on this amendment. The amendment seeks to take a going organization and expand its age limit somewhat in order to increase its effort in making preparation for war. We pay the Coca-Cola Co., of Atlanta, Ga., a large fixed fee for operating—what? A shell-loading plant, not a plant to produce a soft drink which they have been manufacturing. Why is that done? Because the Coca-Cola Co. has an existing organization. We pay to various other companies, on the recommendation of our business people, large fixed fees for operating plants. Why? Because they have an existing organization. Yet it is proposed that the Government tear down an existing governmental organization for training, at the same time it is going outside and paying private concerns because they have an organization, and then we are to build up a new organization to provide for the training. Our action seems inconsistent to me.

Mr. BONE. It is probably a fair assumption, I take it, that if a private plant puts in an educational activity it is added to the cost of the contract it has with the Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, it is added to the cost and, not only that, but due to the fact that there is no central government agency reaching this situation, the complaint made to me in the city of Detroit and elsewhere in industrial centers was that trainees went from school to school because there was no central organization governing the private training schools, and nothing was gained from the training in such schools because a man went from Ford to Kaiser and to General Motors and to Fisher Body,

They would leave the school at one plant and go to another because the work was pretty hard and arduous.

Mr. BONE. If a private plant establishes a school for training men and women for work in a plant, is not the cost of that operation in some fashion added to the contract for which the taxpayers have to pay?

Mr. KILGORE. Not only that but trainees are paid the wages of beginning workers during their training period.

Mr. BONE. They are paid as apprentice workers.

Mr. KILGORE. They are paid as apprentice workers.

Mr. BONE. So the cost is added to the contract because in this world it is impossible to get something for nothing.

Mr. KILGORE. A private plant always gets the benefit of the extra cost.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I make an observation about one phase of this subject which I think is very interesting?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I have been advised, and I have every reason to believe the information is correct, that a long time ago Mr. Hitler, who is a very forthright gentleman, undertook to bring about some very drastic changes in the educational system of Germany. Being foresighted, and realizing that he had ahead of him a program of exploitation of Europe, and realizing the part which technology plays in modern warfare—which is a very vital part, perhaps the very heart and soul and essence of modern war being the technology of it—Mr. Hitler set about to strike from the educational courses in German schools all the cultural subjects, leaving only the mechanical arts, those subjects which would make a man an efficient fighting man, with a knowledge of modern machinery, the modern machinery of war, leaving in probably merely enough of the language of Germany to enable a student in school to understand orders and to make himself an individual efficient in carrying out orders. Mr. Hitler was wise in doing that, because if he wanted to carry out his program of conquest, that was the way to build the most efficient soldiers, although of course it was a shocking thing from a cultural standpoint.

I talked to one of the able Members of this body who had been abroad, and who had talked with young German soldiers in the African theater of operations, and he said that these young fellows were very "cocky," if I may lapse into the vernacular. They said to him, I suspect thinking he was a British officer, "We are going to lick you." So my friend, who is a distinguished Member of this body, said, "Why do you think you are going to lick us?" "Well, because we have the know-how. We know how to run tanks, we understand artillery, gunnery, ballistics, mechanical drawing. We understand all those subjects which will make us efficient fighting men. We have cut out the cultural subjects in Germany over the years so as to build a more invincible army for Germany."

Mr. President, that has many shadings, many unhappy shadings, but it is a stern lesson to us of what can be done when a great army of young men are trained almost solely and exclusively in the arts of war, and an understanding of the mechanics of war, which takes in some of the program which is embraced in the National Youth program, I take it.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida if he can tell us what skills are being taught under the N. Y. A. general program, what subjects it covers. Part of it has been referred to by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I think very vital subjects, but in the field of mechanical arts, what are the outstanding subjects?

Mr. PEPPER. A few moments ago I mentioned, I believe, the metal trades, welding, machine-shop work, sheet-metal work, auto mechanics, forging, aviation mechanics, electrical occupations, and subjects of that character.

Mr. BONE. Those, I take it, are all vital to the war effort.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Further information on the subject may be gleaned from a list of some of the employers who have received these trainees in Florida. Among the industries to whom the youths have been sent are the Wainwright Shipbuilding Co., Panama City, Fla.; I believe the Gibbs Dry Docks, Jacksonville, Fla.; Merill Stevens Ship Yards, Dade County Dry Docks, Miami, Fla.; Tampa Shipbuilding Corporation, Tampa, Fla.; Eastern Air Lines, Tampa, Fla.; Pan American Airways, Communications, Inc., Miami; Food Machinery Corporation, Lakeland, Fla. They are engaged in making amphibian tanks for the war effort. In the adjoining States youths have been referred to the Alabama Dry Docks; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation; Chickasaw Shipbuilding; Sun Shipbuilding Corporation, Chester, Pa., and so on.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in response to my able friend from New Mexico, who has expressed his sympathy with section 1 of the amendment, that is to say, the portion which has to do with training war workers, that I think he is under a misapprehension as to the reason for the establishment originally of the N. Y. A. college-aid program. It was not started as a relief measure, as the able Senator surmises. It was not a question of giving relief, in the sense of employment, to college or school boys or girls. If that had been the object, they would have been in W. P. A. It was conceived of originally as a program to aid needy and deserving boys and girls to obtain a chance, by working on the side, to finish their secondary school and college education. It was humane in its conception, but it was broad also in its aim, because it was intended to help build a better, a more educated, and a stronger citizenry for the Nation.

Mr. President, there is nothing new about what is proposed in section 2, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico. The need exists today as it did when the N. Y. A. was initiated. There are the same boys and girls, in counterpart, who are worthy, who wish to go through high school, who wish to go through school and college, and who have not the money with which to do it. They have to work in order to be able to finish their education. All the pending proposal would do would be to give them a chance to do honorable and wholesome work in order to complete their education.

Remember, they are certified by the school or college itself, they perform work designated by the school or college, they have to continue to do creditable work, and to be of good character, according to the certificate of the school or college, or they cannot continue to receive the benefits.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. As the Senator will remember, I think, recently there was a movement on foot among educational institutions, and various other very sympathetic-minded people, to raise a fund to put through our colleges the Japanese youths who are in the internment centers, in lieu of American youth who could not afford to go.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. President, at a time when the colleges and schools of the country are being drained of the youths, when the future of the Nation is being jeopardized by the retardation of the education of these boys and girls, perhaps by the termination of it, in the cases of many of them, if not most, surely the boys and girls who are physically, intellectually, and morally worthy of continuing in school and college are not going to be sent home because they cannot find a job on the side, averaging from $4 to $7 a month in the high schools, and from $11 to $15 a month in the schools and colleges, to help them continue to get an education.

I am sure that the able Senator from New Mexico, if he understands that these boys and girls are not eligible for any other war training program, or any other Federal aid program, and that all the proposal would do would be to give them a chance to earn a pittance on the side so as to enable them to stay in college, will not be the one, out of his magnanimous philosophy, to take those boys and girls away from their opportunity.

As a boy who fired the furnace, as a boy who rolled coal, as a boy who waited on the table, and in that way was able to go to college, Mr. President, I certainly do not want to see any boy or girl denied an opportunity to get through school by doing honorable work, and this opportunity has made it possible for 1,633 boys and girls in my State to stay in school when they otherwise could not have done so.

I know neither the able Senator from New Mexico, nor other Senators, upon reflection, will want to deny to these boys and girls such an opportunity to be more useful and valuable citizens of their country and in their work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, about a year ago the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, held hearings on the National Youth Administration. In those hearings what impressed me most was the large number of industrialists and manufacturers who

were in the business of producing munitions and supplies and equipment for the war effort, who came before the committee asking and urging the committee to continue the N. Y. A. and its work. Many of the industrialists cited illustrations in their own plants indicating how they had been enabled to secure the needed trained workers, how they had turned to N. Y. A., and through N. Y. A. had been supplied the artisans, the mechanics, the trained men it was necessary for them to have to carry on the operation of their plants and to assure the production so necessary for our war effort.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has said, from the very beginning of the war one of our greatest bottlenecks has been that brought about by a lack of properly trained men and women to operate the tools and machines designed to turn out the production necessary for the war.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] inquired concerning the nature of this training, and as to the different types of work carried on by the N. Y. A. He asked, "What are these youths trained to do?" Let me give the Senate at this point a few figures.

The N. Y. A. today is a full-fledged war agency. Its entire purpose is of a character limited entirely to war purposes. It has 1,500 shops located in more than 500 communities. It has 4,300 experienced and competent trainers, teachers who are training welders, machine operators, electrical workers, radio assemblers, ship's carpenters, calkers, foundrymen, forgemen, and so forth, training them at the rate of more than 1,000 each and every day.

In these 1,500 shops there is one of the greatest war-training structures we have in the whole country in all our war effort. For example, there are in use 9,739 machines of various kinds used by industry, on which 16,000 persons are being trained. There are 6,500 arc and gas welding booths, in which at this very moment 11,500 welders are being trained. There are 5,666 aircraft and other sheet-metal training units, which are at this moment training 7,680 persons. There are 3,123 radio training units, training 3,924 persons.

Mr. President, these stations are so located and are being operated in such a way as most effectively and completely to serve the war effort. For example, in the States of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania alone there are 3,454 training units training some 6,444 persons. There are 3,236 training units with 5,386 persons in training in the States of Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In the States of Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio there are 4,327 training units with 6,853 persons in training. In Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin there are 5,689 training units with 8,066 persons receiving training. In the States of Alabama, Florida—the State represented by the distinguished Senator who a few moments ago so eloquently and ably presented the case of N. Y. A.—Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee there are 4,460 training units with 6,337 persons at this very moment receiving training.

To dismantle those N. Y. A. plants, to put an end to the training units, to cut off the persons who are now being trained to go into war plants to produce the munitions and the supplies and the equipment necessary for our armed forces and those of our allies—to put an end to this training, Mr. President, would be to strike a severe blow at our war effort.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter addressed to me by the Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., of Mobile, Ala. For more than a year this company has been engaged in the production of ships. We know that if there be a need confronting us at this hour it is the need for ships and more ships and even more ships, because in the final analysis our war effort must depend in large measure, and does depend in large measure, upon the bridge of ships we can build to transport the supplies and the men so that they can get at the throats of our enemies. The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., which constructs ships for the Government at Mobile, Ala., wrote to me as follows, under date of June 25, 1943, Friday of last week:

> We need your assistance toward passage of an appropriation related to the National Youth Administration.
>
> In these stringent times we are fully aware of the shortage of man and woman power that is vitally needed to prefabricate for final assembly the ships so urgently needed to supply our boys of the armed forces. A knowledge of mechanics can be gained only through association with machines and materials.

Mr. President, it makes no difference how brilliant or how gifted an individual may be, as the Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. says in its letter, the only way the individual can learn to operate the machines designed to fabricate, to weld, to do the things necessary for the building of ships, is by working with the machines. That is exactly what the N. Y. A. training program does. It places individuals at the machines and teaches them how to operate them, so they can go from the machines of the National Youth Administration to the shipbuilding plant and operate the machines in the shipbuilding plant and make their contribution to the building of ships, which are so necessary for the winning of the war.

The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. letter continues:

> We, therefore, are firmly convinced that the preparatory training that these students receive in the National Youth schools is of utmost importance and enables us to accentuate any natural adaptabilities that any individual possesses.
>
> We are not acquainted with the activities of these schools in other localities, but we do know that over 3,000 students from Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Georgia have been placed in this shipyard area with but a very low percentage of individual failure. This, without the preparatory training received in the National Youth Administration, would be a physical impossibility.
>
> The schools located here and in Birmingham have produced thousands of simple and complicated articles for this yard alone which could not be produced here due to lack of facilities and manpower.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that in the N. Y. A. schools not only are the individuals trained to go into the shipyards and into the plants to carry on the work in the shipyards and in the plants, but in these very schools, as is brought out in this letter, the trainees fabricate many simple as well as complicated articles of production, which in turn are sent to shipyards and to other plants to be joined with the production of such plants and shipyards in constructing ships and the other finished products.

The letter continues:

> We are now employing approximately 22,000 people in this yard and could use several thousand more trained personnel if such were available.

The company could use more. It could construct a greater number of ships; it could make a greater contribution to the winning of the war and to the winning of it in the shortest possible time if it could obtain more trained employees. What better way to give them more trained employees than, as has been suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, by keeping the organization of the N. Y. A. a going concern, continuing to develop trained workers and to provide the needed ship workers.

The letter continues:

> In this present emergency our only hope of obtaining additional semi or completely trained personnel is through the medium of the National Youth Administration. It is our urgent desire that these schools, this educational program as a whole, be permitted to continue their good work for the duration of this present emergency.
>
> Our armed forces need supplies; to obtain them we must have ships; to build ships requires trained manpower which the National Youth Administration now supplies.
>
> Your efforts toward the passage of this new appropriation will be greatly appreciated.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ALABAMA DRY DOCK & SHIPBUILDING CO.

Mr. President, I think that company would not hesitate to let me say that it has not always supported the program of the present administration in Washington. I think I can state there have been times when it has found itself in sharp disagreement with many things which have been done in Washington, particularly with those things which it has looked upon as a part of a great social program whic' perhaps was bringing about too many changes and which it thought was moving too rapidly along certain lines. But that company, at Mobile, Ala., is a hard-headed, practical, common-sense concern. It wants to make its best contribution, it wants to turn out the largest possible number of ships. It knows that in order to do that job it must have trained men and trained women, and it knows that one of the best sources—in fact, as the letter states, about the only source now open to it—for trained men and women is the National Youth Administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In listening to the interesting letters the Senator has just read, I noted it was stated that the National Youth Administration is the only facility for training such workers. I should be very happy to have the Senator discuss the question of duplication of effort. I want to ask if there are not other facilities for training men to do the same work.

Mr. HILL. That is undoubtedly true; but I say now to the Senator that, instead of the trouble being a duplication of facilities, the trouble is a lack of facilities. There is not sufficient training going on in the country today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I should like to point out to the Senator a statement contained in the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

To prove that the National Youth Administration is duplicating other bureaus in its functions, it will be necessary to examine the programs of a number of agencies performing similar duties. The War Manpower Commission has published a bulletin revealing that the following groups under its control deal with war training.

Then six programs dealing with the training of the youth of the country, doing, I take it, the same kind of training the National Youth Administration does for the youth of the country, are enumerated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I say, the question is one not of duplication but of not having the training facilities we need. The pity is that today we should find ourselves engaged in a struggle for our very lives and not have all the training facilities which are needed in order to develop the number of trained workers it is necessary to have in order to obtain the production required for the war effort.

Mr. President, I have a number of excerpts from letters from leading business and manufacturing institutions in my State of Alabama and elswhere in my section of the country, all of them emphasizing the need for trained workers, all of them emphasizing the splendid and necessary contribution the N. Y. A. is making toward providing trained workers. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the excerpts, but I ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our needs are for welder trainees, in fact it is our greatest need as far as this company is concerned. We do not need machinists and sheet-metal workers but an increase of welders. These trainees should be 38 years of age or older in the men, and single women 18 to 35. (From Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.)

We are very appreciative of the training that has been given to the young women of this vicinity through the National Youth Training School here in Florence.

In most cases these girls that are trained and turned over to us have not been trained on our special sewing machines, but their basic training has been such that they acquire proficiency ordinarily from three to four times as fast as those we bring in here and try to train on our own equipment. As a general rule we found these girls to be clean, punctual, and industrious.

You can see from the above that we sincerely believe in this Florence project, and since we are operating approximately 95 percent of defense work for our soldiers and sailors they are being of great use in the present emergency of national defense. (From the Gardiner-Warring Co., of Florence, Ala.)

We have received 726 of these youth who have come to us as trained welders, machinists, and sheet-metal workers. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on this fact and express the appreciation of this company for the splendid work the National Youth Administration is doing in the war effort.

I would like to inform you that we have a greater need for welders, electricians, and sheet-metal workers than we do for machinists. I am quite sure that we can use all of the trainees in the first three crafts that you can send us. (From the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, of Mobile, Ala.)

I hope it will be possible to use the four resident units over the entire State of Mississippi to their fullest capacity on this allocated training program for specific wartime production at Higgins Industries.

I am assured that the United States Employment Service and Higgins can recruit sufficient numbers of youth to fill these four units provided you will accept and make room for them.

The organization of the aviation plant of Higgins is now taking place and we expect to use 20,000 women in the construction and assembly of planes. I hope that you will be able to house and train at least 2,000 youths for us by March, which is the time they will be needed. (From Higgins Industries, Inc., of New Orleans, La.)

Truly the National Youth Administration here in Houston in the last year or so has been of material benefit to the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, and I understand likewise to many other industries here. This benefit has come to us through what your organization has done for thousands of men and women in preemployment training. You have given these young people something that has made them valuable to us.

Our employment records show that approximately 75 percent of the 4,000 welders now working for us here have been given preliminary training by the National Youth Administration. The boys that we have hired from the National Youth Administration rolls, on the average, make better employees than welders hired from other sources. This is probably due to the fact that there has been close cooperation between the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation and the National Youth Administration, and also that the majority of your instructors have worked for us and are familiar with our welding requirements, rules, and regulations, since these are taught to National Youth Administration trainees along with their welding training.

Also, since the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation started hiring women welders, you have taken over training of these girls. To date we have hired approximately 160 women, of whom about 80 percent have come from the National Youth Administration and are proving very satisfactory.

I do not believe that any higher recommendation could be given your unit than the figures that I have quoted above. (From the vice president and general manager of the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, of Houston, Tex.)

I am taking the liberty of writing to you in regards to the National Youth Aministration and what it means to my company.

I should like to point out to you how helpful the National Youth Administration has been in assisting my company in the war effort.

Our business is and has been 100 percent defense work and we have grown continuously as production has risen, and we were forced to hire additional help. Trained help is not available; therefore, it has been a great help to find youth with a very good foundation of training in the mechanical field. Your local administration has been supplying us for the past 2 years with boys who have had preliminary training in factory work. We are still depending upon your local administration for additional help. It would be a decided loss if this useful work, which your organization is carrying on, was forced to discontinue.

For these reasons, I should certainly like to see the National Youth Administration continue for the duration. (From the president-owner of the Expert Die & Stamping Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.)

We wish to inform you that we have a number of trainees of the Charles Mill resident center near Mansfield, and find them to be among the better class of our employees both in regard to their skill and working attitudes on the job.

We feel that this program has been a very great asset to the city of Mansfield and wholeheartedly wish to indorse it and encourage its continuation. (From the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Mansfield, Ohio.)

Thirty-two of the National Youth Administration boys who were placed in February have received advancements in pay this month. Twenty-three of the boys who were placed in January have received two advancements in pay since they came with our company. Seven boys who reported for work in December have received three raises since they started to work.

The remaining boys were placed during the latter part of February and the first of March and from what we can learn from the departments in which they are working, they are making out all right. (From the Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.)

This letter is written * * * to acquaint you with the benefits received by the Wainwright Shipyard, J. A. Jones Construction Co., Panama City, Fla.

Since the beginning of this fiscal year the Pensacola project has referred approximately 350 trainees in sheet metal, welding, and machine shop for employment in our shipyard. I do not need to tell you that due to labor shortage these trainees were most welcome and we wish to continue in the future receiving as many trainees as possible from the Pensacola project. It is the hope of the personnel of our yard that the National Youth Administration training program be allowed to continue throughout the next fiscal year. We expect a sharp decrease in skilled labor to prevail within the very near future which would force us to utilize all the available training programs in this area in order to keep our yard properly staffed. (From the J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who for 1 moment would consider taking a step or doing anything which would result in closing down any plant, or cause the closing down of any number of machines which were operating and producing needed war materials and war equipment. In view of the situation which confronts us today and in view of compulsion for all possible war production, no Member of the Senate would consider taking any step which would mean the closing of any plant or the disuse or displacement of machines which

now are turning out such products. Yet, Mr. President, if we strike down the N. Y. A., if we put an end to its program of training much needed men and women workers so as to enable them to go into the plants and operate the machines in them, the effect on war production will be exactly the same as if we had closed a plant or stopped the operation of some of the machines in the plants which now are turning out war products. In view of the situation now confronting our country, in view of the compelling need for war production, in view of the dire necessity for trained men and women to carry on production, I do not think any Member of the Senate can seriously consider a proposal to kill the N. Y. A., to put an end to its work, and to deny to the war effort the trained men and women who are so greatly needed in order to assure war production.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, with respect to my questions addressed to the able Senator from Alabama, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a portion of the report of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, beginning on page 2, under the heading "Duplication of purpose", continuing through page 3, and ending near the top of page 4.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It may be stated unequivocally that the National Youth Administration does in effect duplicate, overlap, or perform functions similar to those of six other Government bureaus as well as conduct training for which the Federal Government is already paying large sums of money to private industry. By reason of this multiple duplication of effort, manpower, equipment, and money, if for no other reason, the National Youth Administration no longer seems to justify the appropriations it receives.

To prove that the National Youth Administration is duplicating other bureaus in its functions, it will be necessary to examine the programs of a number of agencies performing similar duties. The War Manpower Commission has published a bulletin revealing that the following groups under its control deal with war training:

1. Training Within Industry Service advises on over-all on-the-job training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors.

2. Apprentice and Training Service advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs which provide on-the-job training coordinated with the training services supplied by other agencies.

3. Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocation Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education, in cooperation with State and local vocational schools, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade to war production workers.

4. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers, in cooperation with State boards for vocational education and local departments of vocational agriculture, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade in the production of farm commodities and in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment.

5. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training, United States Office of Education, in cooperation with colleges and universities, is specifically assigned to offer training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production supervision to train professional and technical workers for war industries.

6. National Youth Administration is specifically assigned to provide training to unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 25, in skills required in war industries.

7. The United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, make recommendations regarding training needs and on the most effective use of personnel in terms of the prevailing and anticipated labor requirements. The Employment Service will direct industry to the service assigned to give the training assistance needed.

In addition, according to testimony presented before the Joint Committee on Reduction on Nonessential Federal Expenditures by Mr. Aubrey Williams, Executive Director of the National Youth Administration, it is understood that industry itself is being paid in some instances as much as 2 percent on war contracts for the specific purpose of training apprentices or recruits in courses similar to, or supplementary to, those given by the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education. The Government apparently is paying industry to train youths and men for war jobs while it is at the same time carrying on similar training programs in its own organizations.

Specifically the program of the National Youth Administration duplicates that of the Office of Education in its defense training work as well as that of those other Government bureaus and industry itself. This is evident when one compares the functions of he National Youth Administration with those of that Office. The original purpose of the National Youth Administration—to provide work relief for persons no longer in regular attendance at school—has largely been supplanted by the purpose outlined in the provisions of the appropriation act for the National Youth Administration "to provide employment and work training for unemployed young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on resident and nonresident workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor."

Similarly, the United States Office of Education assists the States in organizing and conducting vocational courses of less-than-college graduates through—

(a) Courses supplementary to employment in occupations essential to national defense,

(b) Preemployment courses, and

(c) Refresher courses for workers with some previous occupational experience.

In addition to the foregoing, the Office of Education has within its scope the following:

"To assist the States in the organization and conduct of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction for out-of-school, rural, and nonrural persons; cooperate with the States in determining the necessary equipment and supplies to be purchased from Federal funds. Appropriate Federal funds among the States for such programs. Approve or disapprove proposed expenditures for the purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space for such programs. Administer an appropriation of $5,000,000 to help, by loans, needy college students who can complete in 2 years their study of physics, engineering, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy."

Obviously, then, there is a duplication of purpose in the stated objectives of the two organizations. This duplication becomes alarming when viewed from the standpoint of cost.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss the pending amendment, and to preface my remarks by informing my colleagues that I am in favor of the continuation of the National Youth Administration, and to say to them also that I am a member of the subcommittee which considered this question, and also a member of the full committee which rejected the item.

Mr. President, the subcommittee approved the N. Y. A. appropriation by a very close margin. By an equally close margin the full committee rejected the N. Y. A. appropriation. Because of the closeness of the vote, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, we have reason to believe that there is a chance in the Senate of retaining the item as presented in the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

We feel that it is not a lost cause. We believe that if the amendment shall be properly presented, there is a sufficient number of Senators with open minds to support the continuation of the National Youth Administration program.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should approach this question from the standpoint of economy alone, without going into the relation of the National Youth Administration to the Nation's war effort. I do not believe we should consider the conflict between its training program and the training program of the War Department, or that of any other agency of the Government. I believe we should consider the National Youth Administration's position in the emergency in which the country finds itself today.

First of all, the National Youth Administration is a going organization whose activities spread all over America. It is educating thousands of boys and girls, training them for war industry,

and doing a remarkable job. It is serving the war needs in our industries, and the war needs alone. It is the only agency of which I know, created before there was any anticipation of the present emergency, to fulfill a need in another field, which has fitted appropriately, effectively, and efficiently into the war effort. It is true that for a while the W. P. A. was able to do excellent work in the vicinity of camps, cantonments, and other military establishments. It is likewise a fact that the Civilian Conservation Corps was able to serve the Nation's needs in protecting forests, aqueducts, pipe lines, and other necessary facilities. But here is an agency of the Government which, in my judgment, is vitally important to the war effort. It is 100 percent in the war effort. It is one without which we can hardly get along. It is one which is more vital to the war industries of the country today than it was a month or a year ago.

As industry expands, as the skilled worker of industry is taken in the draft, as we find it necessary to recruit from the youth of the land, as it becomes necessary to employ women and girls into industry, then the National Youth Administration fits in admirably.

Mr. President, industry is expanding rapidly. Millions upon millions more personnel will be necessary in the shops, the factories, and the industries of America. Thousands upon thousands of skilled machine workers, craftsmen, artisans, and mechanics are leaving industry weekly as the result of the Selective Service Act and the needs and requirements of the military for personnel.

Mr. President, from what source are the future workers of industry to come? Will we find an adequate supply? Who will train them for this essential work? To a very remarkable degree, they will be recruited, of course, from the ranks of the female population of the country. Boys in deferred classifications will find employment in the industries of America. All of them will be unskilled. Every one of them will have to be trained. Some of them will not meet the requirements of a formal education. They will live in communities where opportunity for vocational training will not be possible in the schools of their home localities. The National Youth Administration can train many of them. With the mobility of this organization, without the standards which are required in many of the formal educational systems of the country, the National Youth Administration is the agency which can be depended upon to take care of a large group which might otherwise be untrained.

Industry cannot do the training job which will be required as a result of the large turn-over in industry, and, if industry is called upon to do the job, then thousands of machines will be utilized in training projects which ought to be utilized in making ships and tanks and guns and other equipment for war. If men and women are to be trained by an industry, then skilled workers who ought to be busily engaged in making war material will find it necessary to drop their work and instruct the trainees.

We are going to spend approximately $40,000,000 for the National Youth Administration, which is the most economical expenditure for obtaining skilled workers which has yet been devised. But if, in our eagerness and desire for economy, we should save $40,000,000 and abandon the training program, it would cost the Government in excess of $100,000,000 to train them in industry; and remember, Mr. President, whether we pay the bill in this way or in the other way, we still pay the bill.

So we find ourselves facing a very serious crisis. Industry expanding rapidly, requiring millions of additional workers, must seek workers in the ranks of those unaccustomed to labor in the fields of industry. Thousands upon thousands of skilled workers leaving industry every month, if not every week, create a new gap which must be filled. Because of the expansion of industry and also because of the gap which is to be filled as a result of the Selective Service Act, we now need every available agency, every agency at hand, to train boys and girls, men and women, wherever they may be, in order that we may fill the needs and requirements essential to the prosecution of the war.

The mobility of the national youth organization should recommend itself as readily fitted to meet the needs and requirements of this large training program. It is the only mobile training agency we have. It can be moved from one section of the country to another. Whenever a surplus exists in one training area, the National Youth Administration can transfer training work to an area where the need of a training program is imminent. Furthermore, the N. Y. A. can move its activities to an area where trainees can be found, and, after they are trained in an area where they are to be found, and yet where they may not be necessary, they can be sent across State lines and employed in industries far removed from their home area. When a given N. Y. A. school has served its purpose in any one area, it can be transferred to another area, there to continue its work.

In 1943 the N. Y. A. will have moved 25 percent of its entire set-up from one locality or one area to another. So, this mobile training agency is the only one of its kind that fits into the picture in this particular matter.

Mr. President, a question has been raised on the floor of the Senate which left the implication to many of us that the N. Y. A. was interfering with farm production, in that it was taking boys from the farms and placing them in industries. The record indicates that that is not the case. As of March 17, 1943, the N. Y. A. had only 6,000 youths who came from counties in which the largest town or city was under 2,500 in population. This does not indicate that N. Y. A. is taking youth from the farms.

Certainly I believe it will be readily agreed that other training agencies have attracted young men and young women from the rural sections of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In my State a training school is being operated which trains young agricultural workers in the repair and maintenance of equipment and in the use of the most advanced mechanical farming equipment in order to increase the crops.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to have that contribution, and what the Senator says is true in many other States. The N. Y. A. is not taking youths from the farms and placing them in war industries; the N. Y. A. is training youths on the farms to do the mechanical work which is required upon the farm.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I happen to know of one case in which they did exactly what the Senator says they are not doing. I was in South Dakota at a time when there was a great shortage of farm labor. Last summer I stood on the platform of the station, and I talked to the N. Y. A. supervisor who was taking boys right off the farms in the neighborhood and sending them to Seattle to work in shipyards and get further N. Y. A. training in shipyards. There was an N. Y. A. station near Aberdeen which had been taking boys for a couple of weeks, and every one of those boys came off farms in South Dakota when there was no harvest labor available in that district. I talked to the supervisor and he told me that the boys came from there; they were put on the train on which I was traveling, and were to be trained at Seattle to work in a shipyard.

Mr. MEAD. I have no doubt that that was what was told my distinguished colleague from Ohio, but I have some doubt as to what was said to him.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, then I will yield. I say I have some doubt, because, under the law and the regulations, the county agent in every instance must approve the applications of boys who are leaving the farms for N. Y. A. training programs. Of course, if the county agent in any county approves the application of any individual, it would not be the desire of the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from New York that the applicant be denied that opportunity and be frozen in his job. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the difficulty may be reconciled by realizing that a regulation has been put into effect since the episode to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, which I understood was last summer. I think there has been a change in the regulation to avoid the very difficulty of which the Senator from Ohio speaks.

Mr. TAFT. I said that last summer, when in fact it was denied that such a thing was being done, it was being done, for I talked to the N. Y. A. man himself. I have no confidence in a statement that

the N. Y. A. makes now or makes at any other time.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, that is a matter for each individual to determine for himself. I said I did not know but that that was what was told to the distinguished Senator, but I have some doubt about the source of the information.

Mr. President, the record is—and the record, which was made in the House and Senate hearings, speaks for itself—that only 6,000 of this huge army that is being trained came from rural counties the largest town or city of which had a population of under 2,500.

Everyone knows that male youths on the farm who are drafted can be deferred from military service; so if they desire to remain on the farm, they can do so. Everyone knows now, as the Senator from Maine well pointed out, that anyone who leaves the farm must receive the approval of the county agent. How much further we can go I do not know; but if there is any further distance we might go and write it into the bill, I should not object to it.

Mr. President, I am proud of the record as it has been made in my own State. I think a remarkable contribution has been made to the war effort, and many men and women, boys and girls would otherwise be denied the right to follow a skilled trade, would perhaps have been neglected, and would not be working in a defense plant today had it not been for the N. Y. A. program.

Almost 8,000 youths have gone into war industry in my State during the period from July 1, 1942, through February 28, 1943, from N. Y. A. training units. That is at the rate of a thousand a month. In order to serve every corner of the State, there are 21 N. Y. A. work locations, housing 59 work units, in which there are 2,599 war stations.

In my State the shop-training activities include machine, aircraft sheet metal, arc welding, gas welding, aircraft welding, forge, radio, automotive mechanics, aircraft mechanics, aircraft engine mechanics, aircraft woodwork, industrial sewing, mechanical drawing, and other shop activities. In addition, there are clerical-training activities at a few points in my State.

It can be said that the training activities are those in which there are critical labor shortages. The N. Y. A. has geared its training facilities to meet these shortages, and is concentrating all its efforts to meet industry's heavy and continuing manpower demands.

Training is of a practical nature, and gives N. Y. A. trainees not only the fundamentals of a skill but actually work experience in the production of war goods.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with what the Senator is pointing out, not only as to the value of the training program but of its production aspect, in goods alone last year 1 navy yard received more than 1,200,000 different parts to go into naval construction from the National Youth Administration training alone.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. Along the same line, articles produced for the Portsmouth, N. H., Navy Yard, and the Brooklyn, N. Y., Navy Yard, in my own State, which met the rigid requirements of the naval inspection service, were valued at $78,583.50, and consumed 58,210 man-hours.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. As the Senator knows, for the last 30 years I have been very much interested in the training of the youth of the land along vocational lines. The Senator has given a statement as to the number who have been trained in New York during the past 9 months. Could he give me the figures as to the per capita cost of the training of those youths in New York, or the per capita cost of training the young men and women who are being trained in the Nation as a whole?

Mr. MEAD. It is my information, according to the record, that the per capita cost was about $108 for the full training period of 7 weeks. That is as it applies generally throughout the country.

Mr. President, more than a thousand youths from New York State who have had training in N. Y. A. shops have entered the armed services. A large proportion of these youths were reservists in the United States Signal Corps, and the training they received in the N. Y. A. training centers met with the approval of the Army officials.

A few of the firms which use N. Y. A. youths in my State are the General Electric Co., at Schenectady and Syracuse; Consolidated Slipper Co., Malone, N. Y.; American Locomotive Co., Schenectady and Auburn, N. Y.; Chevrolet Co., of Buffalo, my home city; M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., of Buffalo; A. A. Johnson Machine Tool Co., Syracuse; Rome Air Depot, of the United States Army Air Corps, at Rome, N. Y.; Curtiss Wright Aviation, Buffalo, N. Y.; U. S. Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ford Brothers, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Precision Tool and Manufacturing Co., Syracuse; Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.; Burdick & Sons Metal Works, Albany, N. Y.; International Harvester, Auburn, N. Y.; General Motors, Buffalo, N. Y.; Glenn Martin Aircraft, Buffalo, N. Y.; Bell Aircraft, Buffalo, N. Y.; Link Aviation Corporation, Binghamton, N. Y.; Remington Rand, Binghamton, N. Y.; International Business Machines Corporation, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Bausch & Lomb Co., Rochester, N. Y.; General Motors, Delco Division, Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. President, I have before me a number of letters, many of which I shall not read, but to show the type of letters and the character of the corporations writing them, I shall read briefly from one or two.

The first is from the American Locomotive Co., Diesel Engine Division, Auburn, N. Y. It is addressed to the manager of the N. Y. A. Center at Auburn, N. Y. It begins with this paragraph:

> We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the fine work that the National Youth Administration has been doing in the training of girls. * * *
>
> We find that girls who have had the National Youth Administration training are thoroughly conversant with the use of machine tools, blueprints, and micrometers.

The letter is signed by the personnel manager of the American Locomotive Co.

I have another letter from the Ford Instrument Co., of Long Island City, N. Y., which is addressed to Mr. Robert Ausley, National Youth Administration. They make this comment:

> During recent months we have employed several hundred young men as trainees in our machine shop. Some of the most successful of these men have been National Youth Administration trained youth. * * * These men have been quite adaptable to our type of work and their records with us reflect a rather thorough mechanical training. * * *
>
> Our company is engaged exclusively in manufacturing fire-control equipment for ships of our Navy. Our product is vitally necessary to the Nation's armament program and we are in the process of expanding our manufacturing facilities to meet the Government's needs.

I have another letter from the Ford Instrument Co., of Long Island City, N. Y., which I shall not read.

I also have a letter from the Consolidated Slipper Corporation, from which I read the following:

> We have further equipment on the road and as soon as you can give us additional operators we are putting on another shift, and we can use up to 200 additional people on this work.

I read from a letter from the Columbia Aircraft Corporation of Valley Stream, N. Y.:

> This is to advise that we have employed a number of trainees from your school and are pleased to mention that their services are entirely satisfactory.

I read from a letter from the David Bell Co., automatic screw machine products, of Buffalo, N. Y.:

> We wish to thank you, the New York State Employment Office, and the National Youth Administration project for the splendid help you have given us in securing trained help for our machine shop.

I have a similar letter from the Swiss-American Gear Manufacturing Corporation, another complimentary epistle from Robert L. Stedman, general machine work, Oyster Bay, N. Y., also a similar letter of recommendation from the United States Hoffman Machinery Co., of Syracuse, as well as other letters. These recommendations come from what might be termed very conservative institutions, but institutions vitally interested in the success of the training program.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning of my remarks, and I now repeat, that there are a number of training programs. Each is complementing the others' efforts. Each one of them is vital to the success of our war production program; but the N. Y. A. program, with its widespread adaptability, with its

universal mobility, with its possibilities in the way of recruitment of applicants who might otherwise be denied training, reaching out as it does into every area in the country where trainees can be found, and taking those who might not have the qualifications necessary to enter other training programs, this versatile training program which is so well organized, which has contributed so splendidly to the war effort, which costs so little and which does so much, cannot be spared at this time.

Mr. President, as I have previously said, industry is rapidly expanding. Millions of workers will be necessary and they will have to be recruited from the ranks of those who are without any training of this particular type, and they will have to be found in every section of the country. Here we have an agency which can seek such persons and give them the necessary training, and make it possible for our mounting war production to continue to break all records ever established.

Mr. President, I hope and trust that the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri will be adopted so that this program may at least have an opportunity to be discussed by the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate. I hope that a majority of my colleagues in the Senate will vote for the Truman amendment, and afford us another chance to consider the merits of the National Youth Administration's work.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, while the Truman amendment is under discussion there are a few things I should like to say with reference to the attempt to eliminate a governmental agency which, from my own personal observation, has been doing a magnificent job throughout the country. Particularly I wish to speak of my observations in the State of West Virginia with respect to what it has accomplished. From July 1, 1942, to April 1, 1943, as a direct result of the training in West Virginia, 6,523 young West Virginians, most of them girls, took places in industry as trained workers in the plants, both of New England and of the Chesapeake Bay area. Those 6,523 individuals were placed in industry from sections of my State in which there was no war industry. This was a direct result in that one State alone of recruiting that number of semiskilled workers to go into the war plants in question.

As I have stated previously, we have followed the policy throughout, under the guidance of the businessmen brought to Washington to assist the W. P. B. and various other governmental agencies, of dealing exclusively in the war program with established business organizations, and, if necessary, converting a soft-drinks manufacturing organization to a shell-loading organization. We have worked on the basis of converting organizational activities to the war effort. The Truman amendment would continue that process with a governmental organization. Why should we tear down a going, flexible concern which has trained individuals whose activities had definite age limits placed upon it by Congress, for Congress has limited it to persons under 25 years of age? The age ceiling should be raised so the N. Y. A. may train a greatly increased number of persons.

There are two features of the National Youth Administration's war production training program now in force which appeal to me very strongly. First, there is the payment of a subsistence wage—not a training beginner's wage, but a subsistence wage—to the trainees near their homes, so that they may be trained near home for far less money than industry is training them in industry's schools for which the United States of America is paying the bill. There is no incentive for anyone trained in a school of that kind simply to keep on in school. There is an incentive to go on into industry and make higher wages, whereas if trainees are placed on the pay roll as wage earners there is a tendency to go from school to school, as has happened in the Detroit area and in various other areas, as industrialists have informed me. Instead of going into industry they go to some other school and try to seek some other training which may benefit them more. We pay for workers but we get students.

Second. There is the resident center which makes training possible in areas where there is no local training available. I am largely interested in the normal training program of the National Youth Administration because in my State vocational schools are rare. Vocational training is offered in high schools, but due to the educational requirements placed by law on the teachers it is impossible to get practical artisans qualified to teach in such schools and it has been my experience that the training of an artisan is a matter for trained artisans.

In West Virginia 36 percent of all the N. Y. A. youths receiving training are in resident centers, because they come from communities which cannot afford to train them. With the subsistence wage they can be made self-supporting in the resident centers. Through the resident facilities the N. Y. A. is able to train and send youth to areas where the shortage of skilled and semiskilled labor is acute. More than 3,000 youth trained by N. Y. A. in West Virginia during this fiscal year have been transferred to N. Y. A. induction centers located in these critical labor demand areas.

Some of the vital war producing firms which have benefited from this arrangement are the Glenn L. Martin Co., Western Electric Co., Westinghouse Co., Maryland Drydock Co., Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyard, Edgewood Arsenal, Allied Aircraft, American Hammered Piston Ring, Eastern Aircraft Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock, Norfolk Navy Yard, and Norfolk Shipbuilding and Drydock.

The managers of all those plants—and I have interviewed the managers of various ones of them during the past year—have all expressed satisfaction with the training the youth have received from the National Youth Administration.

As a matter of fact, last year so many were sent to the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts that in the Baltimore area and the Norfolk area a complaint was registered against having West Virginia youth go to the New England centers, and request was made that they be held down here.

In addition to the youth trained for war industries by N. Y. A., nearly 700 other trainees have gone into the armed services where their skills are equally essential In recognition of the importance of this training, West Virginia N. Y. A. trainees who were applicants for enlistment—about 700 in number—in the Navy were told by the Navy that they should complete their N. Y. A. courses first.

N. Y. A. training in West Virginia is carried on at seven locations which have approximately 900 work stations. On the average, those work stations are in use about two and one-half 8-hour shifts each working day. One of the stations is used exclusively for the training of women to work in clothing manufacturing establishments. I happened to meet the head of a large shirt manufacturing company which has a large Army contract, and he told me he had made a blanket application for all the N. Y. A. workers he could obtain.

Youth are drawn from all the counties in the State to the training centers where they are given training in the various mechanical fields which are in demand in war industry. Trainees are supervised and instructed by industrially experienced foremen. In other words, the trainees are trained by practical workmen.

N. Y. A. shops are operated on a production basis and the trainees learn their skills in a shop atmosphere. Some of the articles made by N. Y. A. trainees in West Virginia during this fiscal year, at a great saving to the Government, are:

Ten thousand loading pallets for the United States Army. Loading pallets, sometimes called lift boards, are the wooden pallets which are used in loading ships. By their use the loading time for ships in port, when being loaded by the Army, has been reduced 25 percent.

Twenty thousand cooks' and bakers' uniforms for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps.

Ten torpedo adjusting stands for the Navy torpedo station, Alexandria, Va. Those stands are rather delicate, and are difficult to make.

Ten thousand four hundred and ninety-six steel Army cots for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps. I happen to be familiar with that item, because in the last fiscal year the N. Y. A. trainees made over 16,000 such cots for the United States Army. The cots cost the Army $2.58 apiece, as compared to an average cost of $6.85 for the cots when made commercially. In other words, the difference in cost was recaptured by the Army from the money spent for the training of those youths. The time of the youths was employed in making something useful for the Army.

Three hundred and sixteen radio converters for the Civil Air Patrol. Three

thousand two hundred first-aid kits for the State of West Virginia. Ten interoffice communicating system sets for the State. Five hundred and forty cartridge containers for the Philadelphia Ordnance Depot. Two gun mounts for the United States Naval Ordnance Depot, which is right next to the shops.

Fifteen extractor curb caps for the Ordnance Depot, Radford, Va. Six thousand metal fire rakes for the Forestry Service, for use in combating forest fires. There was a scarcity of such implements.

Twelve hundred ship ladders, 100 hulls, for the United States Maritime Commission.

All those items, so far as labor costs went, represented a recapture of funds from the funds paid out for the N. Y. A., because the labor cost nothing. The training was used to produce useful articles.

In reviewing the accomplishments of the National Youth Administration I am deeply impressed with the services it has rendered and is rendering the war effort, from all I have seen and heard, not only in West Virginia but elsewhere in the country. I have talked to Mr. Bedford, who handles four shipyards for Mr. Kaiser and who expresses himself as highly pleased with the trainees he has received. I know the attitude of that organization toward N. Y. A. trainees. I have talked to various other large organizations. Some time ago the Glenn Martin Co. had in its plant over 700 N. Y. A. trainees from the one State of West Virginia.

It is clear to me that our present need for production is so great that it is necessary to get the maximum skill, and we should get it back home where the cost is least and then ship the trainees, after they are semitrained, to plants where their training may be completed.

I was told by the manager of a gun plant in West Virginia which is next door to one of the training schools that it took just one shift for one of the trainees to take over work on any machine tool in the shop. After he came out of school, one shift to familiarize himself with the operation of the particular machine tool qualified him to go ahead as a first-class workman on that tool. In my opinion, training of that kind is something we must have.

Unless the N. Y. A. is retained I believe we will handicap the training program; we will hamper the supply of our future needs; we will make the ancient mistake of tearing down a convertible and flexible organization which can be moved, of dismantling its facilities, and disturbing the personnel, and then will find that we shall simply have to vote more money in appropriations for the Army and the Navy for the operation of training schools in plants, to replace the facilities which have been completing the training much more quickly under this one central agency.

For that reason, if for no other, I favor the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I wish to speak, not on the pending bill, but on a subject which I feel should be called to the attention of the Senate immediately. Last Saturday the Senate passed a bill dealing with the subsidy question. As I understand, under the amendments which were agreed to, some subsidies may be paid to producers and certain subsidies may be paid under commitments which have already been made by the administrative branch of the Government, but subsidies cannot be paid to processers or packers. I have given the subject some independent thought, and I earnestly feel that the position the Senate has taken on that measure is a mistaken one. I express that view with all proper deference to the views of every other Member of the Senate.

We have already set about to peg or fix the wages of the working men of the country. It seems to me quite unfair and quite illogical not to fix, or permit the fixing of, the prices of the necessaries of life, such as foodstuffs. I desire to say that under ordinary circumstances, in usual times, I am fundamentally opposed to price fixing; but these are unusual times, and I recognize the necessity in time of war for fixing the prices of the articles generally used by our people. I am fundamentally opposed to the payment of subsidies in any form, but if a subsidy is necessary in order to carry out logically and with fairness a plan of price-fixing in this country, then we must give way so far as our views upon subsidy are concerned.

If food prices are to be fixed or maintained, if the prices of commodities which the people buy from the stores, and on which they must live, are to be fixed, someone somewhere along the line between production and consumption must take a loss.

The administrative officers in whose hands we have placed the duty of administering prices brought forth a plan with respect to meat. There was to be a roll-back or a fixing of prices as of a certain date. Necessarily, if there was to be a roll-back of prices which the consumer must pay, there would have to be a roll-back of prices all along the line. However, it was felt—and I think with fairness—that we ought not to roll back the price upon the farmer or the stock raiser, because they should have the incentive to produce meats and other foods. Necessarily it followed that somewhere in the middle of the line someone would be paying more for the product than the price which he would receive for it. Somewhere the slack had to be taken up; and with respect to meat it was planned to subsidize the packer to the extent of $2 a hundredweight on beef carcasses so that he would not operate at a loss and consequently have to close his business, for if he closed there would be no meat in the stores for the people.

That was a novel plan. It struck me as such, and no doubt it so impressed others. But after thinking it over, it seems rather logical. Therefore, in order to permit the stock raiser and the farmer to receive the best price obtainable, it was proposed to subsidize the packer, so that he would not lose money and close his packing house, thereby shutting off the market for the sale of livestock and closing the retail markets to the consuming public of America. The Senate refused to adopt this plan. I believe that it should have been given a trial.

I realize that the view which I am expressing today is somewhat different from that which I have expressed in previous discussions; but I hope that I shall always express a change of view when I feel that I am mistaken. With great deference to every other Member of this body, I feel that we have made a mistake. I feel that if in time of war we are to try to stabilize incomes or wages, in all fairness we must stabilize the prices of products which the people who receive the wages must buy.

It is my earnest hope that this body will reconsider this legislation. It is a departure for me to advocate a subsidy for anything. It is a departure for me to advocate fixing prices in this great country of free enterprise, but at the same time I must recognize the great exigency which exists in time of war and that price fixing on the generally used commodities—foodstuffs in particular—must be tried. If to do that requires the accompaniment of a subsidy, then, I repeat, Mr. President, that we must accept the principle of subsidies. It is my earnest hope that this body will reconsider its action on this question before we leave here.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia if I have a proper understanding of the legislation. As I understand, we recognized the principle of subsidies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the principle of subsidies was recognized with respect to the payment of subsidies to producers, but no provision was made for the middleman—the packer, in the case of meat. If we recognize the principle of a subsidy to the producer, but not to the packer or processor, how are we to keep prices stable unless somewhere along the line the slack is taken up? Let me say to the able Senator from Nebraska that it seems to me that what we have done is bound to react unfavorably to the farmer or producer of foodstuffs.

Mr. BUTLER. If I may interrupt the Senator, the talk about a roll-back has already injured the producer of livestock to the extent of the amount of the proposed roll-back. The producer is himself paying a subsidy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just what the roll-back will do unless we have a subsidy. That is the point I am trying to make. Unless we can take up the slack and pay the difference in the middle of the process between production and consumption, the farmer, the food producer, is bound to lose. He ought not to lose, because he ought to continue to have every incentive to produce sufficient, even abundant, foodstuffs for our country.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly. The reason for adopting the subsidy is to use it where necessary to obtain the required amount of production.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then we should not make a price to the consumer which will not allow the processor his margin for processing the farm crops.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we do that, we permit prices to rise, beginning at the bottom. That must not be done, because if that were done we should have no price fixing whatever. In order to keep the price down for the general buying public, it ought to be fixed, pegged, rolled back, or whatever may be proper, and then the slack, if I may use that word, or the difference, should be taken up in the middle—in the case of meat, with the packer. Under this legislation we cannot pay the packer a subsidy. Therefore we stop any plan to keep prices in the retail stores from rising.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Nebraska. I am particularly interested in the advocacy by the Senator from West Virginia of the payment of subsidies to processors. The agencies of the executive department have based their authority to pay subsidies to processors on section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act. I have before me a copy of the act. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia examine it and point out wherein authority is given for the payment of subsidies to processors.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In reply to the Senator, I shall not attempt to point out wherein authority is given to pay subsidies to processors. What I am trying to persuade the Senate to do is to adopt legislation to permit it, so that such a plan can be carried out.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from West Virginia has quite an undertaking on his hands. There certainly is no authority in that law for paying subsidies to processors.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish it were possible, although I recognize that it is probably impossible, for Senators to dissociate themselves from any prejudices which they have had against the past program, administration, or activities of the National Youth Administration, and to think of it now exclusively from the standpoint of the work which it is doing directly related to the training of men and women for effective and efficient employment in our war plants.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument, but will he yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is Aubrey Williams still the head of the National Youth Administration?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is he the same Communist who was head of the N. Y. A. when it started?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a question which, he well knows, is not capable of a "yes" or "no" answer. It is like the famous question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" Answer "yes" or "no."

In the first place, I have known Mr. Aubrey Williams for a great many years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So have I.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He was previously very active in welfare work in my State. If Mr. Williams is a Communist, I do not understand the meaning of the word. I have never heard any expression from Mr. Williams, either public or private, which would justify the statement implied in the question of the Senator from Missouri. After Mr. Williams has been investigated by the F. B. I. in connection with the amendment which is always attached to appropriation bills—the so-called Overton amendment—if Mr. Williams is still being retained in office, and if the Senator's implications are correct, the Senator is casting a reflection not only upon the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration, but also upon the investigative ability of the F. B. I. and the Civil Service Commission.

The Senator's question, I assume, proves that my expression of hope that Senators would consider this program without personal prejudice is not capable of being realized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I dislike to ask the Senator to yield, but the implications of the question of the Senator from Missouri are such that I feel compelled to say a brief word about Mr. Williams.

I have known Mr. Williams for a number of years. I have not always agreed with him; in fact, I have frequently disagreed with him. I disagreed with him quite vigorously on the occasion when he was supposed to have made the statement to certain relief workers in Washington that they knew who their friends were, and statements of that nature. However, I do not like the implication that he is a Communist, because in my contacts and associations with him I have become definitely convinced that Aubrey Williams is an honest, loyal, intelligent, and patriotic American citizen.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, of course I should like to make the same reservations the Senator from New Mexico has made. I have not always agreed with Mr. Williams. On many occasions I have disagreed with him. As to some aspects of the administration of the N. Y. A. program I have disagreed with his policies. But if I ever knew a man who fundamentally believed in the concepts of American government as exemplified in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States and who sincerely desired to aid his fellow men and to assure them a better opportunity in this life, it is Mr. Aubrey Williams. He exemplifies that philosophy.

Mr. President, as has been stated by Senators who have preceded me in the debate, since the N. Y. A. has been taken over by the Federal Security Administration, since the inauguration of the defense program, and more particularly, since our entrance into the war, the N. Y. A. has been greatly streamlined. It has had most of its activities directed to the training of persons who were not trained in skills, thereby enabling them to respond to the inordinate and extraordinary demands of industry for new employees. That has been done, first, because of the enormous expansion in industrial activity; and, second, because of losses which industry has sustained to the armed forces, through the rapid expansion of the Navy, the Army, and the other military services. It is my deliberate view that we need more, not less, training of industrial manpower if the war production effort is to maintain schedule. It is necessary only to recall the recent statement of Under Secretary of War Patterson that, despite the great achievements of management and labor in expanding to meet the prodigious demands of lend-lease and of our own armed forces, we are behind schedule. I believe I am correct in stating that Lieutenant General Somervell, who is in charge of the Services of Supply, has stated that our armed forces will not be fully equipped until some time in 1944.

The War Manpower Commission has estimated that an additional four and a half million persons will have to be employed in essential industries during the coming year. Every Senator who is at all familiar with industrial employment knows that we are scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel. The War Manpower Commission estimates that if allowances are made for the few who still can be obtained from the ranks of the employed, or as the result of a transfer of workers from less essential industries, at least 2,500,000 of the added working force essential to maintain the war production necessary properly to arm and equip our forces will be without any previous shop experience or training.

Mr. President, it is true that we have other means of training those who have not previously been trained. There is one program which provides for their training in industry. We also have the Federal-State aid system for vocational education.

I do not like to be constantly referring to my own State, Mr. President, but I believe that any disinterested person will acknowledge that Wisconsin probably has one of the finest, most efficient, and most widely distributed Federal-State vocational school systems in the United States. In the city of Milwaukee, alone, is located what I have been told is the largest vocational school in the world. It occupies a full city block. That institution, as well as all similar institutions in the State which were built up through the Federal-State vocational aid system, will, of course, continue to contribute trained employees. But after

a careful study of the situation I do not believe that even in my State they will be able to furnish the quickly trained manpower essential to meet the requirements of Wisconsin industrialists so as to enable them to meet their commitments and schedules in war production. I have personally been informed by men of the most conservative type in my State that they believe the striking down of this program would be a great mistake. If men in such responsible positions of industrial management take that position in the shadow—if I may say so—of the great vocational education institution located in the city of Milwaukee as well as in view of the other vocational schools which are located throughout the State of Wisconsin, I ask in all fairness what can be the situation in States which have not built up an adequate Federal-State vocational education system? How is the training to be accomplished of the individuals whose services it is necessary to use if the fighting men in uniform on the battlefields of the world are to receive adequate delivery of equipment with which they may be properly armed in order to have a chance to succeed and to protect themselves in the holocaust of war?

I think it is fair to state that any person who has made a study of the recent activities of the National Youth Administration must admit that it is no longer a relief agency and that it has been to all intents and purposes streamlined and converted to the war effort.

The training which is being given is a result of the closest cooperation and consultation with industry and with the experts of the War Manpower Commission. I may say that, as is essential in order quickly to train persons needed for particular shortages of skills, training is given under the present program only in those skills which are deemed essential to war production. In the fiscal year 1942 there were trained under this program 386,000 persons who are known to have taken work in some skilled phase of war production, and another 300,000 have gone into related phases of war industry. That is a total of 686,000 persons. I say, Mr. President, that in my opinion—and I am not dealing in theory; I am not attempting to salvage any moribund shreds of a New Deal agency—we cannot afford, unless we wish to cripple the already seriously hampered effort of industry to maintain its employment levels, to strike down an agency which has such a record without providing any competent and effective substitute for it. It is perfectly preposterous to endeavor to fall back on the Federal-State aid system, for the reasons I have already pointed out, namely, that even in my own State, which is highly developed industrially, while the industrialists consider that that system is making a valuable contribution, yet it is inadequate and needs to be supplemented by the work of the National Youth Administration. No substitute can be found for it in States which because of the lack of financial ability have been unable to build up a highly developed Federal-State aid vocational education system.

N. Y. A. is now turning out 700 potential war workers every day. Even the majority report of the Byrd committee admits that 500 of them go into war industry. This figure is based upon Mr. Williams' estimate of those who are known actually to have gone into war industry. The estimate of 700 daily, which I have just given, includes others who have been trained in essential skills which are in demand by war industry but for whom the N. Y. A. does not have any specific record as to where they took employment.

I do not wish to overemphasize the fact, but there has been a considerable or at least an appreciable contribution to the war effort as a result of this training program in the manufacture of simple items which have been produced as a result of the training provided by the N. Y. A. They have already been mentioned here, and I shall refer to them only briefly. They produced 311,000 specific items in 1 year's time for the Portsmouth Navy Yard; they have been making large quantities of welded ship ladders for the Maritime Commission ships, and other articles of similar nature. I do not wish to overemphasize it, but I say that even the products which have been fabricated as a result of the training have been put to useful service in the war effort, as mentioned by the Senators from Maine.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the criticism that the National Youth Administration in connection with its wartime training program has been extravagant is not borne out by the facts. Even the majority report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures admits, in so many words, that the National Youth Administration costs cannot be compared accurately with the Office of Education costs, and yet it seems to me that the committee attempts, in the face of this admission, to build itself a case against the N. Y. A. on just such a comparison.

It has been charged that the N. Y. A. has been keeping equipment in idleness. That is based upon a figure of 56,534 work stations, which include 17,000 work stations which N. Y. A. has declared to be surplus and has been put into warehouses for disposition by the Property Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. The implication from the comparison of the number of work stations with the number of trainees is that the work stations are most efficiently used when a greater number of trainees is assigned to them. Actually there is another factor, namely, the time which a trainee spends at a station. That factor must be considered if any fair comparison is to be made. In school it is not uncommon for a trainee to spend only a couple of hours a day at a machine. Under the N. Y. A. type of training through production the trainee spends 8 hours a day at his machine, and it must be obvious that his training in a particular, narrowly defined skill must come much more rapidly and obtain much quicker results than when as a trainee he is given a broad course in vocational education.

The N. Y. A. states that on an average each work station is used approximately 12 hours a day, and in machine shops and welding shops the enrollment figures show each work station is in use from 14 to 16 hours during a day, taking the average for the country.

There is no question that the N. Y. A. officials would like to see an expansion of their program, but, of course, they cannot expand it unless Congress provides more money for that purpose. They estimate that they have the equipment to handle another 50,000 trainees a month, although the present rate is about 30,000.

Mr. President, during the last 11 months this agency has been turning out trained persons at the rate of over a thousand a day. The grand total of those trained and prepared for war production by this agency during the last 11½ months is well in excess of 400,000.

What this means, when broken down into skills, is that each 7 weeks of the past year the National Youth Administration has turned out an average of 16,000 welders, 24,000 machine operators, 11,000 aircraft and sheet-metal workers, 6,500 radio and assembly workers, and numerous other thousands who have acquired some unit skill needed by the war effort.

In the face of this record, which is supported not only by the evidence given by the National Youth Administration itself, but which is supported by evidence given by employers, in view of this service and in view of the thousands who are being added monthly to war production, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can advocate the abolition of the agency which is doing this work.

We are spending billions of dollars to speed up and insure final victory in the war, but although this is an agency making a contribution which industry approves and supports, for some reason there is a determination to abolish it.

I do not see how anyone can contend that opposition to the N. Y. A. is founded on economic reasons, for what possible economies can be realized from the destruction of training which turns out a trained welder or a trained machine operator for $108, which is the cost under the operations of the National Youth Administration?

I know of no better authority upon which to rest the case as to whether or not we should continue this agency than those responsible for war production, that is, the war industries themselves.

Mr. President, it has been charged that there is duplication because of the Federal-State aid system and because of the training-in-industry system. I have made inquiry into this matter, and I find that the National Youth Administration has training facilities in 510 communities throughout the United States. Of the total training facilities, 40 are in communities where there are no other war production training facilities whatever. In about 320 communities, a harmonious and complete working arrangement exists between the schools and the National Youth Administration. These figures are based upon joint statements of the

schools and the National Youth Administration authorities.

This leaves the remainder in which whatever duplication there may be must be judged on the basis of the total need in those localities for manpower, and this can be determined only on the basis of whether or not the needs of industry are being supplied.

Mr. President, I desire to read very briefly from a letter which I have received from a director of one of the vocational educational schools in the State of Wisconsin. Bear in mind, he is the director of a school which has been developed and is being operated under the Federal-State aid vocational system. I have not obtained permission to use the name of the writer of the letter and therefore I shall not use it, but I shall be glad to show the letter to any Senator who may be interested. He says:

DEAR MR. LA FOLLETTE: I understand that the bill carrying an appropriation for the National Youth Administration will reach the floor of the House of Representatives Monday, June 14. Some papers are carrying attacks against the organization, some educators are condemning it, and some organizations are against it.

I want to take this opportunity to give you my reaction to the National Youth Administration program. I have been in contact with the organization since its inception. At first it served as a welfare agency and now it has a definite purpose in training war-production workers. Our vocational school is training workers for war plants and our graduates from Work Projects Administration, United States Employment Service referrals, and National Youth Administration are now working from coast to coast and from the Gulf to the Canadian border in war plants.

We have trained and placed some 500 workers and, I may say, half are National Youth Administration referrals.

In other words, of 500 workers, 250 or more were produced by this N. Y. A. war-training program.

The training program we put on for National Youth does not duplicate our regular program.

Here is a letter from a man in the field who has been for many years at the head of this school. His letter to me is absolutely unsolicited, and I think his testimony should carry weight with Senators whose minds are at all open on this question.

In my mind, there is no conflict between National Youth and the vocational school. I do know that if National Youth is abolished our defense training program will shrink fully 50 percent and that means 50 percent less war-production workers.

Mr. President, I think we are justified, in the face of such statements, in trying to purge our minds of any prejudice against the National Youth Administration in the past or against its past program, and to consider it now in the light of its proven effectiveness as a means of helping to keep war industry functioning and of supplying the armed forces with the implements of war which are necessary to its successful conduct.

I read further:

Here is the situation in this locality. We have a great number of small communities in this area that have no vocational school or vocational courses in their high schools. A boy coming from these schools is a helpless individual, as far as technical skill is concerned, in a war plant. The National Youth Administration has been able to bring these individuals into this city, pay them an amount sufficient for them to exist on while taking training and then place them after training in war production plants.

I'd like to give you the story of ——— ———, the Winnebago Indian boy, from some county west of ———. He heard about the National Youth Administration and had his father write a letter asking for someone to see him, as he desired training. He was found living with his father in a hut, had one pair of socks and one poor pair of rubber high-top shoes, one pair of breeches, a sweater, and a cap. He was brought to ———.

Where this school is located—

and was completely outfitted by the local lodge of Elks, placed in National Youth Administration war training, and now he is working in an airplane factory on the west coast as a direct result of his National Youth Administration training.

Our local vocational school was in no position to help ——— ———. We have one legislative scholarship of $7.50 per month.

Evidently the high school in his vicinity did not attract him What was done for him and what he is now doing can only be credited to the National Youth Administration and the cooperating vocational school.

The writer proceeds:

I feel vocational schools have a big job to do.

Secondary schools, too, have a big job to do and I, personally, feel that unless they make some needed curricular changes, they will be missing the boat just as the academies missed the boat when the high school came into being in the early nineties.

City schools have much to be concerned about the efficient teaching of the fundamental tool subjects.

I honestly feel that too many educators and some educational organizations are too much concerned about the National Youth Administration and its accomplishments when they really ought to be concerned about how good a job they are doing in their respective fields. Some outstanding work by them will go a long way in their making the headlines.

I think you would be amused at some of the arguments and typical propaganda that is being sent out to counteract the National Youth Administration. I'm not afraid of the National Youth Administration absorbing this school and thus losing my position, as some propagandists would like to have me believe.

A study of Wisconsin legislation since the inception of the dual educational system (separate State board of vocational education) will show that some of the same people and some of the same organizations and branches thereof, that are now trying to ax the National Youth Administration have repeatedly attempted to place Wisconsin vocational education under their control. They suffered defeat after defeat and, I believe for the first time this year, there is no bill in our legislature attacking the Wisconsin system.

I hope you will see fit to support an appropriation for National Youth Administration for 1943-44, I am,

Yours respectfully.

The letter is signed by the writer as director of his vocational school, the school of vocational and adult education, and also by the principal of the high school in that community.

Mr. President, let us be fair about the matter. There are two factors in the situation in which the N. Y. A. finds itself despite the splendid record which on the whole it has made in training persons for the war program. The first is that it labors under the prejudice which attached to it because there were those who felt it was the entering wedge for general Federal education, and who opposed it on that ground. There is also some prejudice against the organization by those who are connected with the State-Federal vocational educational system. I think my record will show that no Member of the Congress since I have been here has exceeded me in my zeal to secure adequate support for that system. But, Mr. President, there is no more justification for those who are associated with that system to attempt to tear down the emergency wartime training activities of the N. Y. A. than there would be for them to attempt to destroy some other effective program which is in operation for the purposes of the war, and which is effectively achieving objectives which are essential to a sound functioning of our war program.

I realize, Mr. President, that in all probability every Senator has made up his mind how he intends to vote on this question, but believing as I do that the shortage of trained workers in industry will continue to grow until it becomes even a more serious menace to achieving the production goal essential to providing proper equipment for our armed forces, I could not allow this important matter to be decided without placing upon the record my sincere conviction as to the unfortunate consequences which I think will flow from a strangulation of this program, when at the same time we have no adequate substitute to place in its stead.

Mr. President, I am a member of an important conference committee—or at least I think it is important—and I shall have to be absent from the floor during much of the remaining discussion of this question. I do not want my absence to be taken as any indication of lack of interest in this subject, but I feel that I must attend the conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the National Youth Administration was established in 1935. Up to July 1, 1943, it will have expended $771,414,445. I doubt whether any single expenditure of the Federal Government has yielded smaller definite and concrete returns than has the $771,000,000 which has been expended by the National Youth Administration. The same organization continues, although it is alleged that the program has been changed. It has a personnel of 11,806.

Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, the first suggestion for the abolition or transfer of the National Youth Administration came from a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau. On November 14, 1941, Mr. Morgenthau, appearing before the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, said:

> It would seem that the regular activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration must conflict with the more important defense program and should be eliminated or drastically reduced. It is suggested that all vocational training activities be consolidated in a new Bureau of Defense Training. Any overlapping functions or duplication of work should be eliminated, and one comprehensive program integrated with the defense program could be formulated and administered more economically than appears possible under present conditions.

Three important committees of Congress, after the most careful and serious consideration, have advocated the liquidation and abolition of the N. Y. A. Such a recommendation was made by the House Appropriations Committee after the most exhaustive hearings. The Senate Appropriations Committee also advocated the abolition of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may take a little of the Senator's time, let me say that the Congress of the United States appointed a special committee to investigate these matters. The Senate of the United States appointed the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the chairman of a group which would represent this body. Careful study of the whole subject was made, and now the chairman of that committee is addressing the Senate on a matter which involves millions of dollars. I respectfully say that order should be maintained so that the Senator's analysis of the whole subject may be heard and understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

As I said, both the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, after most careful investigation, have recommended to the Congress the abolition of the N. Y. A.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not had the benefit of reading the report of the committee headed by the able junior Senator from Virginia——

Mr. BYRD. The report is on the Senator's desk, I may say, if he wishes to read it.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not had the benefit of reading the report recommending the abolition of the N. Y. A. Will the Senator give me succinctly the reasons why he makes the recommendation?

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to continue, I will do so, but I will have to do it in my own time and in my own way.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the committee find that the particular training was not done before, but should be done?

Mr. BYRD. I will deal with that if the Senator will listen to me.

Mr. President, the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, a year ago recommended the abolition of the N. Y. A. The committee made that recommendation and a minority report was filed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The committee report was signed by Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, the vice chairman of the committee; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], with a certain reservation; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], Representative CULLEN, Representative TREADWAY, Representative WOODRUM, and Representative TABER.

This year the committee conducted another investigation; and by a report to the same effect, with only the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] dissenting, the committee again recommended that the N. Y. A. be abolished.

I first desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that seven different agencies are attempting to do the work of training within industry. We have, first, the Training Within Industry Service which advises on over-all on-the-job training problems, and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors. That is under the War Manpower Commission. I understand that when the Senator from Nevada addresses the Senate, he will show exactly what are the appropriations for each of the different activities which are included under the bill.

Second, there is the Apprentice and Training Service which advises on overall training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs.

Third, there is the vocational training for war production workers.

Fourth, there is the vocational training for rural war production workers.

Fifth, there is the engineering, science, and management war training, under the United States Office of Education.

Sixth, there is the National Youth Administration.

Seventh, there is the United States Employment Service, which is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, and so forth.

In addition to the activities I have mentioned, the War Department has adopted the policy of permitting organizations which have war contracts to spend as much as 2 percent of the amount of the contracts for the training of workers within the different plants. I am told that such training is the most effective of all, because the training is given within the plant where the worker will later be assigned. The committee of which I am chairman was unable to obtain any definite figure as to that cost; but we were told by representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department that 2 percent which now is being deducted from many contracts, in addition to the appropriations for training which are being made by Congress, will amount to a very substantial sum.

It seems to me that the crux of the whole situation is found in the question: How many war workers in proportion to the total requirements are being trained by the N. Y. A.?

I was astonished to hear a Senator say just a few moments ago that if the N. Y. A. were abolished, one-half of all war-training activities would cease. I want to say that that statement has no justification whatever in fact, as I shall attempt to show to the Senate.

It is rather difficult to find out how many of the persons trained by the N. Y. A. finally get into war industries. Mr. Williams testified before the committee that he had no records to show what percentage of the N. Y. A. trainees finally went into war-production work.

This is the nearest thing I can find to a statement on the subject. I am quoting the language of Mr. Williams himself, from his testimony of May 25, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Williams said:

> Our records show that 350 of the 1,000 youth who leave our projects each day go into war production.

He claims that 1,000 are trained each day, and that 350 go into war production.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me where the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] obtained his figures? Earlier in the day he stated very definitely that 700 out of 1,000 went into the war effort.

Mr. BYRD. I could not say. I am reading to the Senator from Illinois exactly what Mr. Williams said, on page 297 of the House hearings on the N. Y. A. appropriation.

Mr. Williams continued:

> For those concerning whom we have no record, and they are the greater number inasmuch as we are not permitted to expend any funds in placement work, we feel justified in assuming that at least one-fourth of the remainder go into war production, thus making the total 500 a day to go from projects into war production work.

I am willing to accept the statement that a thousand are trained each day,

and even that 700 of them go into war production work. That would be approximately 210,000 a year.

It was testified before the committees that 7,829,000 are needed and are being trained for war production work. So, even taking the larger figure which has been given, a figure which is 200 a day more than Mr. Williams stated in his testimony, the N. Y. A. is training only about 3 percent of those who are being trained in war industry. Assuming 300 days in the year, at the rate of 700 a day, that would be 210,000, which is about 3 percent of the total which it was testified were being trained by the various agencies for purposes of war production. That does not take into account the 2 percent deduction for training, in the war contracts which the Government has with industry.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a few facts which will be found in the report from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which is on the desks of Senators. I should like to have Senators follow the statement as to the number of students in the various States, and the number of work stations which are idle in the various States.

I am reading this information from page 9 of the report. First, there are only 12 States in which the work stations are being used 100 percent. Let us take first the State of Massachusetts. On November 18, 1942, Massachusetts had a total of 3,801 work stations. November 18, 1942, is the latest date for which figures are available from Mr. Williams. On that date there were 901 students. With 3,801 stations, there were 901 students. These are Mr. Williams' figures, which he presented both to the committee of which I am chairman, and to the Appropriations Committee.

In New Hampshire there were 202 work stations and 126 students on that day.

In the great industrial State of New York there were 3,852 stations and 3,093 students. In New York 35 percent of the work stations are now idle.

New Jersey had 1,168 work stations and 639 students. Twenty-eight percent of the equipment in that State is idle.

In North Carolina, with 1,380 work stations, there were 1,879 students, but 22 percent of the equipment was idle.

Coming down to the State of Nevada, represented by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Nevada did not have a single student on November 18, 1942, with 221 work stations.

In the State of Illinois there were 3,580 work stations, with 3,693 students, but with 36 percent of the equipment idle.

In the State of Tennessee 27 percent of the equipment was idle.

In the State of Texas 32 percent of the equipment was idle.

Rhode Island, a great industrial State, had 16 students. One would think that in the State of Rhode Island there would be many who would want to avail themselves of the facilities of the N. Y. A.; but in that State on November 18, 1942—and I understand the situation is about the same today—there were only 16 students.

Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate to read all the figures.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not the Aubrey Williams who is the head of the N. Y. A. the same Aubrey Williams who was formerly Acting Administrator of the W. P. A.?

Mr. BYRD. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is he not the same man who, when he was Acting Administrator of the W. P. A., was engaged in organizing W. P. A. "pensioners" at Government expense, telling them that they were entitled to control the Government, and that they ought to coerce Congress, if necessary, to continue that activity and continue them in employment, whether other employment was available or not?

Mr. BYRD. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think that he is a proper man to be in charge of any technical training program in which the Government might wish to indulge at this time?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was not fit to administer W. P. A. before. As a matter of fact, he was appointed Administrator of the N. Y. A. so as to get him out of the line of fire, because of his maladministration of the W. P. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I notice the table to which the Senator has been referring in the report of the joint committee on pages 8, 9, and 10, and from which the Senator has quoted regarding the number of work stations and the number of students as of November 18, 1942. The grand total is 56,534 stations, and on that date there were only 53,722 students.

Mr. BYRD. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that correct? Were there more work stations than students?

Mr. BYRD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of what does a work station consist? What is meant by a "work station"?

Mr. BYRD. It is possible for a number of students to use the same work station. A work station may be a piece of equipment at which a trainee learns to operate some activity for training as an industrial worker. It is not a separate building. It is a unit within the training center, but it is a fact that there are more work stations than students.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Ordinarily would not one work station accommodate more than one student?

Mr. BYRD. In a great many instances that is true. A great number of them are not in use. If the Senator will read the percentages in the next to the last column he will see the percentage of equipment in each State which is not now in use.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply wanted to clear up what is meant by a work station, and to call attention to the total number of work stations as compared with the number of students.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to what happens when this equipment, which is very valuable for the war effort, is idle. I wish to show what becomes of the machinery and equipment which is not in use. It has been stored over the country. The committee has been unable to ascertain the cost of storage of it, except in one district, and that is Boston. There are 11 regions in the country. In Boston the only storage where figures of cost are available, the cost of personal service was $65,394. The rental costs were $32,112, making a total of $97,506 for the storage of equipment, tools, and other things which should be in use in war industry, and which the N. Y. A. has been unable to use because it has not had enough applicants for training to use it.

This equipment is scattered all over the country. As I have said, there are 11 regions in the country. In this one region it is costing the United States Government $97,000 a year merely to store the equipment and to pay for personal services for looking after it. That is what has happened to equipment which is not being used. The Senate will notice that in Massachusetts, for example, 79 percent of the equipment is not in use; in Delaware 28 percent; and in my own State of Virginia 78 percent.

I wish also to invite attention of the Senate to page 7 of the report of the committee, which shows the personnel of the N. Y. A. It has 11,806 employees to train 53,000 youths. In other words, it takes 1 paid employee to train 4½ trainees. If anything can be more extravagant than that, Mr. President, I do not know what it may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It takes more than the number which the Senator has indicated for the reason that, according to Mr. Williams, only a little more than one in every three goes into industry after the training period has been completed.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. Although Mr. Williams has revised his testimony and he now claims that 700 out of every 1,000 go into industry, in a statement which no doubt the Senator from Tennessee will refer to, Mr. Williams stated at one time that about 1 in 3 trainees went into industry. As a matter of fact, there is no record as to how many go into industry. It may not be over one-half, and it may not be over one-third. When the matter was under consideration before the committee the Senator from Tennessee interrogated Mr. Williams, who admitted that he had no records on the subject, but that he thought approximately 50 percent went into industry, but that the percentage might not be that high.

Mr. President, the traveling expenses of the National Youth Administration were $1,470,000 a year.

The communication expenses of the N. Y. A. were $207,667. Thousands of telegrams have come to Senators within the past week or so. It would be interesting to know to what extent, if any, the telegraph bill of the N. Y. A. has increased in the past 30 days. I have rarely seen such propaganda and pressure as has been put upon Members of Congress with respect to the continuation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. A few days ago, before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Williams very frankly admitted that he was using every method known to him to propagandize the matter with Senators in order to save the National Youth Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to only one other feature. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee will also speak upon this subject. Mr. Williams now wants to pay 40 cents an hour to the trainees during their period of training. In other words, the plan is not only to train them so that they may receive good salaries in defense industries but to pay them 40 cents an hour out of the Federal Treasury while they are undergoing their training.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Following up what the Senator has said, I should like to say that in my State of Delaware girls are being paid $40 a month to learn to be stenographers, and their transportation expenses back and forth to the centers are being paid.

Mr. BYRD. Out of the funds of the N. Y. A.

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. That is what is occurring. I say that if any person desires to obtain a job in the Government at a high salary he should at least be willing to devote the necessary time at his own expense in training for the job, if the Government pays for the training. For the Government to pay a sizable salary while he is being trained is something which I think is unjustified.

Mr. President, we have been told in this debate that the N. Y. A. trainees have furnished a large number of articles of various kinds to navy yards. The number was stated to be 1,000,000, but they are not of any consequence. They are such things as bolts, nuts, and articles of that nature. No material contribution has been made by the N. Y. A. in furnishing to the industries of the country anything in the way of tools or equipment or materials.

A few days ago I was talking with the president of the Newport News, Va., shipyards, Mr. Homer Ferguson, who was possibly named after the distinguished Senator from Michigan, or possibly the Senator was named after Mr. Ferguson. At any rate, Mr. Ferguson is one of the finest men I have ever known. He is doing one of the greatest jobs which any man of this country has done in the way of providing ships for the Government. A short while ago he was very highly complimented by the Truman committee.

Mr. Ferguson told me that the N. Y. A. trainees who came to him were of practically no value whatever. He had to retrain them, and he said that they would be much better off if they came to the navy yard and were trained there for the work which they had to do.

Mr. President, these are briefly the reasons why I am opposed to the continuation of the N. Y. A.

I wish to correct the impression—not by my own words but by the testimony of Mr. Williams himself—that he is training a very large percentage of the war workers of the country. He made the statement that the N. Y. A. was training approximately 500 students a day to go into war industries. Even taking 700 a day, which is the maximum number set by those who are advocating the continuance of the N. Y. A., he would be training only about 3 percent of the new war workers. According to the testimony, 8,000,000 must be trained each year to meet the needs of industry.

There is one other feature to which I wish to invite attention of the Senate. It has been adverted to here once or twice today. The N. Y. A. has solicited farm labor all over the country in order to pay them 40 cents an hour, or whatever the payment may be, which is being made at the training centers. I have a letter from the Washington County, Va., Farm Labor Board. It is not an organization which is set up under the Government. It is a part of the war farm service in the present emergency. The letter reads as follows:

ABINGDON, VA., *May 28, 1943.*

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Washington County (Va.) Farm Labor Board, at its regular meeting, Monday, May 24 asked that I write you as secretary of the board and express our appreciation to you for the stand and fight you are making against the National Youth Administration. Our board and we feel the public in general in this area are bitterly opposed to the National Youth Administration.

Each week from one to two large bus loads of young girls and boys leave Abingdon supposedly for National Youth Administration training centers. Not all of these youth are from this county. Abingdon seems to be the collecting center for three or four counties.

The National Youth Administration workers are scouring the rural as well as the urban communities recruiting these children. Many of these boys and girls are badly needed on the farms. Our board feels that the National Youth Administration is hampering the work we are trying to accomplish—recruiting workers for the farms.

Our board also feels that many of these youths, especially the girls, are too young to leave their homes or the care and protection of their parents. We feel the long time effect on these youths' lives will greatly outweigh any good that may be accomplished by National Youth Administration.

From very reliable reports the National Youth Administration workers have in the past made promises and used methods in recruiting youths that should not be tolerated.

Our board wants to urge you to do all within your power to have the National Youth Administration completely abolished as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

WASHINGTON COUNTY FARM LABOR BOARD,
B. M. ARINGTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, the committee of which I am chairman has received thousands of letters urging the abolition of the N. Y. A. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them. However, I will say that many businessmen in the country are opposed to the N. Y. A. because they think it is of no value because they realize the need of the exercise of every possible governmental economy at the present time, and because they believe that other agencies could do the work much more efficiently.

The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce made a very exhaustive investigation of the situation with respect to the N. Y. A. in New Jersey. It would have no reason to oppose the N. Y. A. if the industrialists of New Jersey desired it, because, of course, the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce represents the businessmen of New Jersey.

I will read a few paragraphs from the press release:

The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce recommended here today that the defense-training program now being carried on by the National Youth Administration be discontinued.

The recommendation was based upon a survey of the National Youth Administration training program in New Jersey, made by the State chamber's department of governmental research, of which Alvin A. Burger is director.

Originally 19 in number, the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been reduced to 5 because of decreases in enrollments. The 5 centers now operating are located in Jersey City, Newark, Trenton, Camden, and Phillipsburg. The National Youth Administration provides for the training of young men and women, between 16 and 24 years of age, in courses designed to equip them to take positions in war-production industries. The courses include machine shop, welding, sheet-metal work, and industrial sewing. Trainees now receive 25 cents an hour, or a maximum of $40 for a 160-hour month.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that so far as I am able to ascertain—the Senator from Tennessee can better state it than I can—there is no authorization whatever for the N. Y. A. to increase its payments to trainees, from about 16 cents an hour, as it was a few months ago, to 40 cents an hour at the present time.

Conclusions reached by the survey as released by the State chamber are as follows:

1. The National Youth Administration defense training program in New Jersey is a weak, ineffective, and costly duplication of the training programs which are much more extensively and competently carried on by New Jersey's public vocational school system and by the training within industry service of the War Manpower Commission.

2. Most of the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been grossly mismanaged, with resulting wastage of manpower, equipment, materials, and public funds. The only existing National Youth Administration training center which is reported to be giving satisfactory service is that located at Camden. In this center, however, the training is actually supervised by the

Camden County vocational school system, although financed by National Youth Administration.

3. Most of the New Jersey National Youth Administration training centers have been manned largely by poorly trained, incompetent supervisory and teaching personnel.

4. In order to build up enrollments in some of its training centers, the National Youth Administration in New Jersey, has engaged in widespread proselyting activities among students in public high and vocational schools.

5. Some records kept by the National Youth Administration, such as those dealing with enrollment, trainee attendance, etc., appear in many instances to be incomplete and inaccurate.

6. The relationship between the National Youth Administration and the public-school systems in this State has deteriorated, thus creating a situation which is harmful to the general war production training program.

7. New Jersey's war industries generally have found the results of the National Youth Administration training program to be unsatisfactory, and they almost unanimously favor its discontinuance.

Mr. President, that is merely one of the many letters the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has received, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them all, because the one read represents the general scope and ideas which have been expressed in the other letters.

I desire to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that certainly I have no animosity and no prejudice in making this recommendation. It came originally, as I have said, from a suggestion made by a member of the President's own Cabinet, Secretary Morgenthau; it was considered carefully by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, composed, among others, of the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the joint committee, by action, recommended the discontinuance and abolition of the N. Y. A. last year. This year, in view of the changed conditions that have occurred due to the war, we thought it was wise and proper by reason of the war situation to go into the matter again. We had long hearings. We had Mr. Williams before us, and, after consideration, the committee again renewed its past recommendation that the National Youth Administration be abolished and be liquidated as proposed by the House bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have been much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has had to say on the question of the National Youth Administration. I should like to put into the RECORD excerpts from the Executive order creating the National Youth Administration.

The National Youth Administration was created by Executive order of the President on June 26, 1935. I quote from the first paragraph of the Executive order:

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935 (Public Res. No. 11, 74th Cong.), I hereby establish the National Youth Administration, to be within the Works Progress Administration, established under Executive Order No. 7034 of May 6, 1935.

It is my understanding that the President has already abolished or is in process of abolishing the W. P. A., and I can see no reason why that does not take with it the National Youth Administration which he, by Executive order, created as a part of the W. P. A.

I read further from the Executive order:

I hereby prescribe the following functions and duties of the National Youth Administration:

To initiate and administer a program of approved projects which shall provide relief, work relief, and employment for persons between the ages of 16 and 25 years who are no longer in regular attendance at a school requiring full time, and who are not regularly engaged in remunerative employment.

Mr. President, I suggest that today no such persons exist.

In the last paragraph of the Executive order dealing with the employment of officers and employees who may be necessary there is this proviso:

Provided, That, insofar as practicable, the persons employed under the authority of this Executive order shall be selected from those receiving relief.

I do not think anything more need to be said, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate for more than a very few moments. I appreciate the fact that there is prejudice on the part of some persons probably in and out of the Senate against the N. Y. A. because it was set up originally as a part of the relief program. It was established, as indicated by the order just read by the Senator from Wyoming, as a part of the relief program; it was intended to be a separate organization for young people who were unemployed and who were, for one reason or another, not attending school, some of whom perhaps were unable to provide the equipment necessary to enable them to attend school. Be that as it may, when the President undertook to liquidate the Work Projects Administration he did not include in his order of liquidation the National Youth Administration.

I realize that the National Youth Administration, in all probability, cannot be retained as a permanent part of our governmental set-up, and probably it should not be. I am one of those who think that the N. Y. A. has done a good job. It may have been needed more at the time of its establishment by the Executive order referred to by the Senator from Wyoming than it was needed later or immediately prior to the initiation of the new program of training for war purposes. Be that as it may, it seems to me, in spite of all the defects and shortcomings of the N. Y. A. through its history from 1935 to now, that, on the whole, it has done a constructive job. It has more to its credit than there is to its discredit; there is more on the credit side of the ledger than there is on the debit side of the ledger, in my judgment, considering its activities from the beginning up until now.

I believe it is doing not only a constructive and desirable work now but that, insofar as it is doing it at all, it is doing an indispensable work. My information is that the Navy Department feels, and has so indicated its feeling, that if the N. Y. A. should be abolished the Navy would be deprived of a training program, which it has no other facilities to undertake, for putting men in shipyards and other institutions which are building ships and other equipment for the Navy. If that be true, and I have no reason to doubt it, it seems to me, that in the midst of this war we cannot weigh altogether the cost of any training program against the needs of the naval branch of our Government. As has been repeatedly said here, it is much better to have things we do not need than to need things we do not have, and if the Navy needs these trainees in order to place them when they have a certain amount of training, even though they might happen to need a little more training, into institutions which are manufacturing naval equipment, it seems to me we cannot quibble over the amount of money involved, if it is an indispensable activity that is needed by the Navy.

It has been suggested that the vocational facilities in the various States can do the same work, and can do it as well, and some contend they can do it better. It has also been contended that N. Y. A. is doing a work that is being duplicated by our public school systems, or which could be taken over and accomplished by our school system. No doubt actuated by that belief, many men and women connected with our schools—and I have talked with many of them in my own State, and in other States—have a feeling that if the N. Y. A. should be abolished, the school systems would obtain the identical funds, or an amount equal to the funds now being used for N. Y. A. training.

I do not so understand the situation. If the N. Y. A. should be liquidated entirely, or the appropriation should be withheld, it would not mean that our public schools would get the amount of money involved in the N. Y. A. appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that were the situation, does not the Senator believe the public schools could very much better handle the matter than the N. Y. A.?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I should not want to utter any sentence which would not to the fullest extent convey my appreciation of our public school system. I think there would be a hiatus between the abolition of the N. Y. A. and the complete integration of the same program in the public schools which might be a disadvantage. That is another thing which it seems to me at least should have some weight in making a comparison. The age at which students are admissible

into the public schools varies in the States, but none of them go beyond 24 years. I think some of them limit free tuition in the public schools to 18 years. Those who are being trained in the N. Y. A. are from 16 to 24 years. So that if we turned the training over to the public school systems the day after the N. Y. A. was abolished by the Congress, there could be a large number of young men and women between the maximum school age and the 24 years, which is now the maximum age for the training of trainees of the N. Y. A., who would have to be deprived of any opportunity for training because they could not go to the public schools for training, and they would not have the advantage of the facilities of the N. Y. A., and therefore they would be denied training. I do not know the proportion of those being trained month by month now between the ages of 18 and 24; I do not have the figures, but there certainly would be quite a large number.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not quite accurate to say that the public schools could take over immediately the same personnel who are being trained, with the same age limits, and train them, because they could not do so without amendment of the school laws of every State, and it would of course be impossible to bring about amendments of the school laws in all the States so as to provide for training of men and women and boys and girls between the school-age limit and 24 years, the age to which they are being trained in the N. Y. A.

It was testified before the committee by Mr. McNutt and Mr. Williams that within the last year they have trained over 400,000 men and women, more than half of them women—by the way, as I recall, the testimony shows 51 percent of them are women. Those individuals are being trained to go into industry as welders, as radio workers, and to perform other technical functions, which must be performed if they are to go into any war plant with an approximate hope of being able to do efficient work.

As I have stated, it has been testified that within the last year they have trained over 400,000. They stated their program contemplated the training of over 600,000 in the next year. The Chairman of the Manpower Commission certainly is in a position to know, if anyone knows, the details of the needs of industry in regard to manpower in this country. If the Chairman of the Manpower Commission does not know, I do not know anyone who would know. He certainly should know; and if it be true that more than 400,000 young men and women have been trained in the last year to go into industry, and if it be true that, according to the testimony, more than 600,000 are needed in the next year for the same purpose, it seems to me we are taking a long chance in jeopardizing this training by even 1 week, by any threat to transfer an organization which is now working every day, in order to set up a new agency, or transfer the training to some other Federal or State agency which is engaged in part in the same kind of training.

These observations have reflected my views in regard to the N. Y. A. I think that in all likelihood the time will come, at the end of the war, perhaps sooner, when the N. Y. A. could be liquidated, and when we could, over a period of months, at least, work out an integration of the training now being given to these men and women so as to transfer it to some other agency, but I do not believe—and I am sincere in making the statement—that the agency should be abolished for another year at least, and because I entertain that belief I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wild-life-refuge purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 27, 45, 57, 58, 59, 68, and 70 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 32, and 72, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 10 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the first line of the said amendment strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 10.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2397, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 28, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$33,940,358" proposed in said amendment insert "$29,400,000"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

After the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert the following:

"The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 9 and 10.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no——

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Tennessee is the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I think what he has to say should be heard by the Members of the Senate, I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator insists, very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I have previously said, I have been so busy trying to get appropriations through the committee in the last 2 or 3 days that I really must unbuckle my mind in order to have an intelligent understanding of the present situation in the Senate. I do not know whether I can do so or not, but will do the best I can.

In 1935, when the N. Y. A. was established as a part of our relief system, it did very excellent work, I have no doubt. I am not complaining of it. But for several years the country has been in an entirely different situation than it was then. At that time hundreds of thousands of boys were roaming the streets with nothing to do. We did what we could do for them by way of sending them to school, by giving them training in vocational schools, by giving them various kinds of work, and I think it was very proper and right to do so. Through the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A., we did what we could for those who could find no work. I have no regret for what we did, nor had I any objections to it; indeed, I not only supported the measures establishing those organizations but did all I could to help them along.

Two or three years ago the situation entirely changed. From being a nation which had millions of persons on relief we became a nation in which everyone who wanted to work could obtain work. Therefore, a little more than 2 years ago as I recall—and I call especial attention of the Senate to this, because of the plea that we carry the National Youth Administration for 1 more year—I introduced a bill to abolish the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A., as well as the W. P. A. The bill providing for the abolition of the N. Y. A. and the W. P. A. failed of passage. The C. C. C., however, was abolished and appropriations for W. P. A. were cut. I do not have the figures before me, but my recollection is that the appropriation for the W. P. A. was cut from nearly $1,000,000,000 to less than one-half that amount; it was cut more than in two. A short time after that the President abolished the W. P. A. Only the N. Y. A. remained. I think it should have been abolished more than a year ago. I think it should have been abolished 2 years ago. We would have gotten along just as well without these three institutions as with them.

Mr. President, I have come in very close contact with these agencies because of the fact that the heads of the agencies have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to obtain appropriations. They are not to be blamed for that. Once an administration or agency is established and takes hold, those in charge of it get into the habit of asking for appropriations. They come not only for appropriations in the amount they have previously received, but they come asking for more. But when there was no longer any necessity or reason for giving relief, I, as a practical everyday individual, having my country's best interest at heart, could not refrain from taking the stand that the time had passed when further provision should be made for these three institutions. I not only sought to keep them from obtaining appropriations, but I openly sought to abolish them by introducing bills to that effect.

Mr. President, as I have previously said, I believe these agencies did well when they were needed. They are no longer needed, and have not been needed for more than 2 years. It is the most difficult thing in the world to get rid of a bureau once it has been created. I will give an illustration of that which appears in the record. Several years ago the agricultural appropriation bill contained an item for a particular Bureau which, I believe, received only about $10,000 a year. I was looking up the Bureau for another reason, and I telephoned to the chief of the Bureau to know if I could obtain his last report. He said, "Senator, I have not had time to prepare a report." I said, "I would just as soon have one for the last year, or the year before that, or the year before that. Send me the last report you have." He said, "We have never yet had time to make a report." I said, "I call your attention to the fact that I have looked up the record, and I find that your Bureau was established in 1868."

At the time when that speech was made, for over 60 years that Bureau had been drawing $8,000 or $10,000 a year for certain individuals in it, but had never had time in the sixty-odd years to make a report. That is the trouble with a bureaucratic system.

So I say it is exceedingly difficult to abolish this agency, although I think nine-tenths of us feel that it ought to be abolished. My good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whom I am glad to see back here in health and vigor and strength, just said he thought that in another year it would be all right to cut it out. Some of our friends made that same argument about it a year ago: "Let it go on for another year, and then it will be all right to end it." I know I was told that I could not abolish both the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. at the same time, and that I had better let one of them go for another year. Another year has passed, and here is Mr. Williams propagandizing the country. I expect all Members of the Senate have received letters from their home States urging them to stand by this organization.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. On the subject the Senator mentioned, I wonder whether he has any information about who pays for the telegrams and telephone calls sent by officials of the N. Y. A. in the field and from other men who work for the organization. I wonder who pays for those messages.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot give the Senator the information; but the inference from Mr. Williams' testimony before the Appropriations Committee is that the Government is paying for those telegrams, of course. We are paying for the very propaganda that is coming to us in the effort to try to have us retain this utterly useless organization.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, let me inform the Senate that I received a telephone message from my

State the day after I voted in executive session as to how I voted. I do not know how the information was obtained, but the persons who sent the message knew.

Mr. McKELLAR. Propagandists are quite careful and quite crafty when it comes to getting the information back home where they think it will do good.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, yield again so that I may ask another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I noticed in the report of the Byrd committee, of which Representative DOUGHTON of North Carolina is also a member and vice chairman, that they listed 11,806 adult civilian employees who administer the program. I think the result is that there is one paid official for about four trainees.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is probably the most expensive bureau that ever was established in the Government at any time since our Government was founded.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the Senator expresses the opinion that the number of civilian employees paid to administer it is a waste and an extravagance; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only a waste and an extravagance, but an indefensible waste and extravagance. Let me tell the Senate that in our busy lives in government we sometimes overlook pregnant facts. The fact is that in every contract the Government makes with industrial organizations the payment of 2 percent of the contract is provided for. For what? For completing the training with which our good friend Mr. Williams plays? No; not at all. It is for the purpose of training. For instance, let us consider a plant in the State of Michigan which has, let us say, a $5,000,000 contract. The Federal Government pays 2 percent of that $5,000,000 contract. For what purpose? For training employees. But it is said that the additional training is all right. Perhaps so, but it is not necessary. I will tell the Senate why. Not an industry in the whole country will accept the training provided by Mr. Williams or the N. Y. A. All Senators know that to be so. Not a single one will accept the training the N. Y. A. gives. The industries proceed to train their employees just the same. They have gotten money from the Government to carry on such training. They train their own employees. They do not accept the training done by Mr. Williams, even if he does all the training he says he does.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In view of the fact that the Senator has mentioned Michigan and the fact that industries in Michigan have large contracts——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me say that we feel we can train the employees, not only in industry, but, as was stated by Mr. George H. Fern, director of the State board of control for vocational education, at Lansing, Mich., in a letter written on the 19th of January of this year:

I consider National Youth Administration training a duplication of effort, and training which could be absorbed by vocational schools. There is no justification for paid work-project experiences at the present time since trainees can be quickly placed at work after intensive training at wages prevailing in war-production industries.

It seems to me that there is no place for the two training programs—one or the other should be discontinued.

Not only can our industries train the workers, but our public schools, our vocational schools, can train them. In Michigan we have adult education, so that we can take care of persons between the ages of 18 and 24. I think the letter of Mr. Fern as it appears in the report should be printed in the RECORD, and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to have it printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to having that done, and I thank the Senator for his interruption.

There being no objection, the letter referred to by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If authorized by Congress, the vocational schools of Michigan could absorb trainees now in National Youth Administration programs without any difficulty and with very little, if any, additional administrative or supervisory expense.

I consider National Youth Administration training a duplication of effort and training which could be absorbed by vocational schools. There is no justification for paid work project experiences at the present time since trainees can be quickly placed at work after intensive training at wages prevailing in war-production industries.

It seems to me that there is no place for the two training programs—one or the other should be discontinued. Naturally I believe that all such training should be carried on through public schools that have had a long-time established program and, therefore, experiences necessary to meet the situation. Furthermore public schools are unbiased in their desire and effort to meet their obligation to serve the youth and adults of the country. The public schools have demonstrated their ability to carry on effective training during this war emergency at a cost which certainly cannot be questioned. The program as operated through the public schools, even though subsidized by Federal funds, is more in line with our democratic practices.

I am frank to admit that since two programs cannot be justified—it makes the cost to the taxpayer high—the programs should stand on their own merit and one or the other should be discontinued.

If the National Youth Administration program is transferred to the public schools, these schools should be given the opportunity to transfer needed equipment for training purposes from the National Youth Administration shops. In many cases the National Youth Administration has had priorities on securing equipment, and thus has always had first choice. Any surplus of equipment could certainly be absorbed by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

National Youth Administration students are only supposed to be enrolled in National Youth Administration projects, which are reimbursed in part through a cooperative plan with the State board for a period not exceeding 3 months. We have cases where trainees will be enrolled in the National Youth Administration, in one resident project; for example, Traverse City, and at the end of 3 months the same trainees will be transferred to Cassidy Lake for an additional period of time. The individuals will also be enrolled twice on National Youth Administration enrollment figures. We have been advised that some trainees in National Youth Administration projects have been enrolled for periods as long as 14 months. (George H. Fern, director, State board of control for vocational education, Lansing, Mich., January 19, 1943.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call attention to the point just discussed by the Senator from Michigan. I do not know whether the Government will enter into $100,000,000,000 worth of contracts this year. It may be entirely within the realm of possibility and reason that we shall enter into $100,000,000,000 worth of contracts this year for war materials and implements of war. Assuming that the Government should do so, it would be paying out $2,000,000,000 for training young men in the war industries of the country. After expending $2,000,000,000 for training in the very best places in the world where men could be trained, in the factories where they will go to work, certainly the idea of our appropriating $47,000,000 for Mr. Williams and his outfit, merely to keep it alive, on the excuse that it is for war training, is without any semblance of reason or excuse.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend mind another interruption?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been trying to justify, if I could, a vote for the training of the poor little people about whom I have heard so much said here. But if the N. Y. A. program is a waste and is utterly futile, here is something I should like to have the Senator explain. I have been reading the reports and hearings. According to the latest reports on work stations and employees, the National Youth Administration had 53,722 trainees, but they have 56,534 work stations. They have more work stations than trainees. I wish the Senator would explain that, if he can.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ordinarily a work station is a place of work for one person.

By the way, I digress here long enough to say that when, several years ago, I introduced a bill to provide for abolishing the N. Y. A., it failed of passage. Such a bill failed last year and has failed of passage this year. I submitted the matter to the Byrd committee, to have it take the proof. The Byrd committee is made up of such men as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the committee; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], Representative DOUGHTON, Representative CULLEN, Representative ALLEN T. TREADWAY, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Representative CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and Representative JOHN TABER. That committee took the proof. They have made a report; and so far as I know, the report was unanimous. I will ask the Senator from Virginia if the report of the committee recommending the abolition of the N. Y. A. was unanimous, or was there objection?

Mr. BYRD. It was unanimous, except for the minority views signed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. McKELLAR. With the exception of the Senator from Wisconsin, the report was unanimous.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think I should say that on the day when the Senator from Wisconsin procured permission to file his minority views, I made the statement for the RECORD that I did not think we should abolish the N. Y. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then there were 12 members of the committee in favor of it and two against it—two of our best Senators. I wish to be perfectly courteous, because I am a great admirer of both Senators, but I differ with them.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. In reply to the statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] there are now 39,281 work stations and 59,055 trainees. The 16,814 work stations, representing the difference between 39,281 and 59,055, which totals I placed in the RECORD awhile ago, are being used in this manner:

Loaned to non-Federal agencies (schools) and subject to recall, 4,675.

Declared as surplus to the Treasury Procurement officer for disposition, 5,184.

Equipment listed on Declaration of Surplus Documents in process of transfer to Treasury Procurement, 1,468.

Equipment transferred to other agencies, 3,260.

Equipment in process of transfer to new work locations, 2,227.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What has happened in this case is that 17,000 work stations have been stored.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just about to read to the Senate what the record shows, and what Mr. Williams, the chief propagandist in this whole matter, said. He is a delightful gentleman, but nevertheless a propagandist for the bureau of which he is the head. This is what Mr. Williams said 2 or 3 days ago when he was examined by the House Committee as to these very stations:

Part of what they take care of is the 17,000 work stations which we have not been able to get rid of, and a part of which is stored in warehouses, where we are paying the rent on them.

In other words, we are proposing to abolish an institution which, in effect, has already abolished itself. Apparently most of the work stations are not only not used for training boys, but they are stored away, and doing no one any good. We are paying rent on them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What is it that is stored away?

Mr. McKELLAR. The work outfits on which the boys are trained.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The tools?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Listen to this:

That has cost us a good deal of money.

It will cost us a good deal of money so long as we continue this activity.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a minute. I think this will answer the Senator's question:

We did everything we could to get rid of them, and we were successful until there was issued an order providing that all disposal of surplus property had to be handled by a central agency, which took the matter out of our hands.

That is the kind of organization which it is proposed to continue for another year. Our distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] thinks it should be continued for another year. It would cost $47,000,000 to continue it for another year, most of it going in high salaries to favored employees, without a single dollar of good being done, in my judgment, in the training of the youth of the country.

As I remember, Mr. Williams claimed that a total of 900,000 had been trained last year.

Senator McKELLAR. Nine hundred thousand last year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those went into industry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have records on 320,000.

That is a little over a third.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were 1,000,000 trained?

Mr. McKELLAR. Nine hundred thousand. The ratio is not quite 3 to 1. Probably half of them are girls. I am in favor of training girls; I am in favor of training men; but what good does it do when no industry will take any of those who are thus trained? This organization is like a fifth wheel to a wagon. We are making a present of $47,000,000 for an absolutely useless project.

The question has been asked, "Why are the trainees put in schools?" It is said that it helps the schools. Confidentially—I am talking as one Senator to another; it will be a long time before my reelection campaign comes up, and I am not bothering about it now—but confidentially, I understand that the schools are all opposed to the program. No wonder. I am willing to have the Government contribute money to the schooling of boys and girls; but it would be so much better to establish a system whereby boys could be trained. It costs probably a thousand dollars apiece to train these boys. There is no telling how much it costs. It costs an enormous sum. It would be cheaper for the Government to contribute one-half the cost of educating the boys, rather than to continue a half-baked, utterly useless, and utterly indefensible bureau of this kind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. How many have been trained in a year? How many students have attended these stations, and how many stations are there? As I understand, the number of students is a little less than one million. How many stations are there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator the figures. He will find them in the report of the Byrd committee, on pages 9 and 10. The total number of work stations last year was 56,534. The number not in use last year was 17,000. Think of it! The Government owns the tools comprising 56,534 work stations. Seventeen thousand work stations are in storage. How can we defend a vote in favor of carrying on a bureau of this kind under the circumstances?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator has stated that after the youths are trained by the N. Y. A. industry will not accept them.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Upon what is that statement based?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is based upon the testimony of witnesses. Mr. Williams himself testified that industry would not take them until it had trained them after they had been trained by the N. Y. A. Industry would not accept the N. Y. A. training.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that be true, then the Government, through the N. Y. A. is paying for the training once; and when the trainees go into industry, through the 2 percent deduction in war contracts, they are trained again with Government money.

Mr. McKELLAR. We train them twice with Government money; and one man is required to train one boy or girl. By the way, it is admitted that not half of them ever go into industry.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I understand there are 11 regions in the country. As the Senator has explained, in those regions about 17,655 stations have been placed in storage. Is it true that in the Boston area alone it cost the Government $97,506 merely to store the stations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read from a letter which was received from Boston. It may not answer the question of the Senator from Kentucky. I shall have to read it and see. I read as follows:

If the history of the National Youth Administration were ever written, I would say that it would be one of the most vicious attacks on the rights of the taxpayers of this Republic that we have ever known. This school has at the present time—

That is the school in Massachusetts—

the most modern up-to-date machine-shop equipment together with the most modern tools. There are instructors there drawing $12 and $15 a day—

We have already paid perhaps a billion and a half or two billion dollars for the purpose of training these boys to go into industry. I continue reading—

who have had during the past month as few as two pupils some days—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Two what?

Mr. McKELLAR. Two pupils, two students. I continue—

and some days those pupils would not come in.

Can you beat it, Senators? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, the figures which the Senator is now reading merely have reference to the teachers absolutely on the job out in the field. However, when we add in Aubrey Williams, all the various assistants, and the gang here in Washington, as well as in the various regional headquarters, it is not unfair to say, is it, even if we were to assume that all the students would actually make the grade—which the Senator has said is not true—that each one would have to carry some big fat bureaucrat like Aubrey Williams on his shoulder every time he went to class in the morning? Is that not true? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Senators, I do not wish to say anything mean about anyone. [Laughter.] I merely wish to give the facts. The letter from which I have been reading is from James N. Muir, superintendent of the Quincy Public Schools, Quincy, Mass., and is dated March 15, 1943. It bears on what the Senator from Missouri has just said. It goes into detail. Listen to this, as showing the attendance for the week of February 8, under the N. Y. A.

	Pupils
Monday, Feb. 8	5
Tuesday, Feb. 9	6
Wednesday, Feb. 10	6
Thursday, Feb. 11	6
Friday, Feb. 12	8

They do not work on Saturday or Sunday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That does not include the overhead in Washington and in the various regional headquarters of the big fat bureaucrats to whom I referred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does it show how many instructors receiving from $12 to $15 a day were present with the six students who are enumerated in the letter?

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter states as follows:

> There are instructors there drawing $12 and $15 a day.

Let me read further:

> This is the best attendance they have had in some time.

Mr. SMITH. This is what?

Mr. McKELLAR. It says:

> This is the best attendance they have had in some time. There are 49 stations.
>
> We have in the city of Quincy a trade school with an enrollment of 254 pupils, which is adjacent to the Quincy High School with an enrollment of 1,600 pupils. In the Quincy Trade School we have regularly from 62 to 72 pupils taking machine-shop practice. We are obliged to go out and get third- and fourth-rate lathes which should be sold for junk, while this up-to-date machinery is standing idle.

Senators, can you beat it? [Laughter.]

I do not see how it is possible for us ever to defend a vote to spend $47,000,000 to carry on such an institution as this. However, I have not finished. I continue to read.

> If we had this machinery we could put it to work for defense purposes. It could be used to advantage. The large Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation is clamoring for machinists.

The letter is signed by James N. Muir.

Senators, I have a dozen letters to which I could call attention. They come from various States. Take the State of Rhode Island, for example. I cannot leave out Rhode Island. I see in the Chamber my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. In a moment I shall yield the floor to him. Rhode Island is one of the important manufacturing States of the Union, as I understand. I have seen more manufacturing plants there per square mile than anywhere else in the country. Do Senators know how many stations are located in the State of Rhode Island? There are 16. They have trained 16 individuals. Aubrey Williams and the N. Y. A. have trained 1r individuals in the great manufacturing State of Rhode Island. Can you beat it? It does not make decent common sense.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I do not know to whom the distinguished Senator from Tennessee referred when he said it does not make decent common sense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was referring to Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I know that the N. Y. A. in Rhode Island has not always made a good record, and that a good many stations there should be abandoned. It may be that at one time, on the day this census was taken, they had only 16 students of this type. However, I received a complaint from the assistant superintendent of the public schools of Providence of a nature similar to the one which the Senator from Tennessee just read.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that it checks.

Mr. GREEN. I took the trouble to check it. I think it would be well if the other communications had been checked in the same way. I should like to read—it seems to me only fair that I should do so—the reply which I received as the result of this complaint.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be perfectly willing to have the Senator do so.

Mr. GREEN. Especially as it brought the matter up to date, the letter having been received by me day before yesterday. It reads as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have read the letter of Mr. Richard D. Allen, assistant superintendent of the Department of Public Schools, of Providence, R. I., which you so kindly forwarded to me. In his letter Mr. Allen, speaking of the student work program, makes the extremely serious charge that upon "orders from Washington" the National Youth Administration "deliberately went out of its way to find people to whom they could give Government subsidies whether they needed them or not."
>
> Because of the malfeasance charged, I had the case investigated with particular care. In view of the facts, which are here set forth, it is difficult for me to understand how any responsible educator claiming to have knowledge of the National Youth Administration would permit himself to make such sweeping accusations.
>
> On June 17, 1942, when it was known that Congress had appropriated $5,000,000 to aid needy college and graduate students in fiscal year 1943, Mr. Aubrey Williams, Administrator of the National Youth Administration, sent an identical letter to each of the presidents of the 1,700 colleges participating in the student work program. A copy of one of these letters follows:
>
> FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
> NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington, D. C., June 17, 1942.*
>
> DR. HENRY MERRITT WRISTON,
> *President, Brown University,*
> *Providence, R. I.*
>
> DEAR DR. WRISTON: The Congress, as you are probably aware, appropriated $5,000,000 to assist needy college and graduate students, through work stipends, to continue their education during the fiscal year of 1942 and 1943. This is approximately one-half of the amount of funds expended for this purpose during the past year.
>
> The limitation of these funds to only those students who, without National Youth Administration assistance, absolutely cannot attend college otherwise, is accentuated.
>
> We have, therefore, the feeling that there is a special need this year for the fullest understanding and cooperation on the part of the college authorities if we are to make an allocation of these funds in complete keeping with the purposes for which they are appropriated.
>
> We are asking that you supply us, on the attached affidavit, the absolute minimum figure, indicating those students who, without these funds, cannot enter or continue in college.
>
> I shall appreciate your consideration of this whole matter, and the return of the enclosed affidavit in duplicate at your earliest convenience.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> AUBREY WILLIAMS,
> *Administrator.*
>
> (A copy of the affidavit mentioned in the letter, which each college president was required to execute, is attached hereto.)
>
> When you consider the foregoing letter and the fact that 1,700 college presidents have executed these affidavits and that only upon the basis of these affidavits are any payments made, it becomes clear that your correspondent impugns the integrity of each and every one of them, including 6 college presidents in his own State.

That is, Rhode Island. I continue reading:

> I am amazed, as I have no doubt you, too, will be, that any educator should place himself in the unenviable position that Mr. Allen has placed himself in with respect to this distinguished body of men by his irresponsible and baseless charge.
>
> Against the National Youth Administration war production training program in Rhode Island, Mr. Allen makes the general charge that it was a "phony from the very beginning." As he claims to have been chairman of the Rhode Island advisory committee of the National Youth Administration at one time, it is a bit odd that he should now condemn it as a "phony from the beginning."
>
> National Youth Administration, now, so Mr. Allen further alleges, "enrolls people unqualified for the kind of work for which they were being trained"; the latter charge despite the fact that hundreds of National Youth Administration trained Rhode Island youth have entered and are now entering such establishments as the Newport Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.; Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.; Franklin Process

Co., Pawtucket & Rheims Shipyard, Providence, R. I., and despite the fact that other companies are requesting National Youth Administration trainees, as the following letter shows:

Here is a letter from the American Ball Bearing Co., of 115 Clifford Street, Providence, R. I. It requests the N. Y. A. to furnish them with additional trainees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator be willing to let the remainder of the letter go into the RECORD?

Mr. GREEN. It is very short, only a paragraph, and I should like to read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. McNutt's letter continues:

In his letter no attempt is made by Mr. Allen to advance an iota of evidence to support any of his allegations. Such generalizations hardly deserve comment, but for your information let me say that in the early months of fiscal year 1943 there were 200 youths in training per month in Rhode Island, with approximately 125 youths a month leaving to enter local war production industries. As trainee supply diminished, the centers not needed were closed and steps were taken to transfer the equipment. Woonsocket, one of the centers, closed in October 1942, was not dismantled because the equipment was driven by overhead-line shafts, which it was better to leave in place until final disposition was determined.

And there are cases to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred which I think are in the same situation. The letter continues:

Fortunately so, for early this year, at the request of the Woonsocket school authorities, this machine shop was reopened to train high-school seniors for war production work. It is the only public training facility in the city. At the present only the Providence and Woonsocket training centers are in operation.

Nowhere in the country has there been a better demonstration of the adaptability of National Youth Administration facilities to changing conditions than in Rhode Island, where training centers have been opened or closed just as rapidly as constantly changing industrial needs and changing trainee supply dictated. Had these training facilities been immobile, this could not have been accomplished and the war effort would have suffered.

At the time when the trainees seemed to me inadequate in number, I myself requested the closing of these stations and facilities at various places, and they were closed, but they were reopened when the demand for workers increased and the manufacturing establishments in Rhode Island called for additional help. It seems to me it is very proper that they should not be closed, but reopened, and that in the meantime the stations should be restored.

May I ask, in that connection, in order to be fair to Mr. Allen, that as a part of my remarks Mr. Allen's letter be printed?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is all right with me. I do not intend to send my speech out, and it does not make any difference if it rather interferes with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Providence, R. I., June 4, 1943.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I understand that the National Youth Administration is asking for an appropriation of approximately $59,000,000, and feel it my duty to state to you my considered opinion in regard to the National Youth Administration program.

I was formerly chairman of the advisory committee for the National Youth Administration in Rhode Island and I have been closely associated with its work since the beginning. Its student-aid program was necessary and urgent as long as it kept within the bounds of actual need, but when the staff deliberately went out of its way on orders from Washington to find people to whom they could give Government subsidies, whether they needed them or not, it lost my support.

The National Youth Administration training program in Rhode Island has been a farce and a phony from the very beginning. It duplicated local facilities and personnel, enrolled people unqualified for the kind of work for which they were being trained, and was in many other ways a fifth wheel.

I respectfully urge that the National Youth Administration in this State be terminated, since it has outlived its usefulness and provides lavish expenditure for services which are inferior to and a duplication of facilities already available in the public schools and under the auspices of the United States Office of Education.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD D. ALLEN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator has said, I wish to state that there are only 16 stations, only 16 people being trained in Rhode Island, which is the smallest number among all the States of the Union, except that represented by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in whose State there are none at all. He did not get any of Mr. Williams' benefits in his State.

Mr. GREEN. I am sorry the Senator paid no attention whatever to my remarks. I do not blame him, because his own are much more interesting, but I recall it was distinctly said that in Rhode Island, in the early months of the fiscal year 1943, there were 200 youth in training.

Mr. McKELLAR. The record does not so show.

Mr. GREEN. No, the record does not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry the record does not show it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to get back to the cold storage proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator does that, I wish to say that I have found another remarkable thing about the rent. There are 11 regions, and the cost of taking care of the material and tools in just 1 region is fixed as follows. Listen to this:

Personal services—

To look after the tools and material—$65,394.

Rental cost, $32,112.

That makes a total of $97,506.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the matter I had in mind. There are 11 regions in the United States, Mr. Valentine, testifying before the House committee, in answer to Mr. ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, said:

Of course, there are 11 regions in the country. However, I would like to say that the Boston region is an average example.

If it is, then we are paying 11 times $97,506 for guards and for the storage of surplus materials.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be in excess of a million dollars.

Mr. CHANDLER. In excess of a million dollars in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. Why not? It will help Mr. Williams; it will help all the gentlemen connected with him in the N. Y. A., and it will help their agents throughout the country. It will help them, because it will give them all salaries, for which they will not have to do much work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was very much intrigued by the outbreak the Senator from Rhode Island just put into the RECORD, evidently from a fellow who was himself profiting to some extent by this program, that is, in the extension of this service. He says in the letter which the Senator from Rhode Island read into the RECORD that Rhode Island is a perfectly typical State, and one of the best examples of the National Youth Administration activity. The Senator from Tennessee has already proven that there are only 16 trainees there. If, according to the Senator from Rhode Island, Rhode Island is one of the best examples of this activity, and they are training only 16, we may assume the same ratio would prevail throughout the country, and when we see that my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, proposes to spend forty-seven-million-and-some-odd thousand dollars——

Mr. TRUMAN. Forty-eight million dollars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Forty-eight million dollars? It has increased since the last time I talked with my colleague by a million dollars. Of course, that is a very small amount in these parlous times, but it has jumped a million dollars since I last talked with my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has jumped up a million dollars since I last talked to my colleague. It is now $48,000,000 for a small handful of trainees on the basis of what the Senator from Rhode Island says is the best example of this program in the whole United States. In other words, if there are 16 pupils seeking the training in Rhode Island, there would probably be 100 in Tennessee, and 200 in Missouri, but even so it would simply be a small handful.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall retain the floor for only a half minute longer.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to give a piece of additional information which, judging from the remarks of the last Senator who spoke, I neglected to give. The correspondent who gave me that letter and that information as the result of having had a special examination made of the charges, was Mr. Paul V. McNutt.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That strengthens my view with respect to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Mr. McNutt is the head of the organization in which this bureau is located, and he wants to keep around him every one of the employees he can. That is what I have been complaining about. It is almost impossible to get rid of a Government agency, once it is established. It is like pulling an eye tooth to diminish any bureau's appropriation. To abolish it is as hard as it is for a camel to gain entrance through the eye of a needle. I know how hard it is, because I worked like smoke to have the C. C. C. abolished last year. I tried to have the N. Y. A. abolished, but was obliged to let that go over for a year. The plea now made is to have the N. Y. A. held over for another year, when it is the most useless thing in the world.

We have the so-called Byrd committee. I have not had time to give as much attention to the work of that committee as I should like to have given. There are on that committee as fine a lot of Members of both Houses as can be found. That committee voted 12 to 2 in favor of abolishing the N. Y. A. In the Appropriations Committee the other day, after one of the most active fights I can recall in that committee—and we have had a great many fights in it—by majority vote the committee turned down the N. Y. A. Two committees have turned it down. The whole country is opposed to continuation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. Williams, it is true, frankly stated that he was using every effort, propaganda and every other kind of effort, to keep this organization from being abolished. Now we have exactly what is being done. Yet some of us are willing to spend $47,000,000 because a nice gentleman wants us to spend it for himself and for those under him. I am not willing to vote to do that. I shall vote against continuation of the N. Y. A. There has really been no need for the organization for 3 years. It has no longer any place in our Government. It never was authorized by law. It was established because it was necessary to put boys in school, or somewhere, to keep them out of mischief. The appropriation made for it was passed purely as a relief appropriation. The organization should not be allowed to continue a minute after the 30th of June, which will be next Wednesday.

Mr. President, I have concluded. I yield the floor, or shall yield to any one who desires to ask any questions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am curious about one aspect of this matter. The program of training under private auspices is not necessarily keyed or anchored to any one contract. That program is a continuing one. In other words, it goes from one contract and merges into the period of another contract. I understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that the private contractors are allowed 2 percent under the private contract training program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BONE. That cannot be charged to any one contract, because the training program is a continuing program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whether it can or not, it is charged to the Government of the United States, which is paying the 2 percent

Mr. BONE. That leads me to inquire—and it has to do with taxation—how the question is handled for purposes of income tax. Are the private companies allowed cost plus a fixed fee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is asking something which is entirely outside my realm of knowledge.

Mr. BONE. I understand that, but the Senator is on a committee which has to do with financing the operations, and I am curious to know what happens to the 2 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that it is taken out of the tax equation. That is a credit to the taxpayer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On this very matter of 2 percent, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I learned a moment ago from my distinguished friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] that the letter which I thought came from an educator in Rhode Island, is actually from Administrator McNutt. I know, of course, that Mr. McNutt has not only asserted but maintained and got away with the principle that he was entitled to assess every employee of the State of Indiana 2 percent. The 2 percent the Senator from Washington is talking about is very suggestive. I should like to know whether Mr. McNutt is to be entitled to assess everyone connected with the National Youth Administration 2 percent for his own political purposes? When the Senator from Washington brings up the subject of 2 percent it is extremely reminiscent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to say that I do not think the same law prevails nationally that prevails locally in the State of Indiana.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will Paul be able to shake down the National Youth Administration employees in the same way he did the State employees in Indiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think he will do that under any circumstances.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to say to the able Senator from Missouri, that if the distinguished Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr. McNutt, will lift the odor of the Two-Percent Club away from Indiana, our citizens will be highly favored.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. My friend the Senator from Missouri raises an interesting question. If the Government pays this 2 percent, is it allowed as an operating overhead in the way of expense; and if such is the case, is the private concern allowed a profit? And if so, how is it figured? I do not know how it is figured, or if it is allowed, but I am curious about it. I hope my brethren will not indulge in badinage about the matter, because, as I recall the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, it represents quite a sizeable sum of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. A good deal of money, yes; more than I or the Senator from Washington possess.

Mr. BONE. If there is a profit paid on it I wonder about that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. On all contracts, 2 percent is allowed. I think the industries use that money for the purpose of training boys. I know they will not take boys trained simply by the N. Y. A. They must undergo the regular training the Government furnishes through the industry.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Tennessee with respect to the 2 percent. It has nothing to do with the campaign funds in Indiana, I am happy to say. Industries which receive contracts for war work, if they need it, are allowed a credit of 2 percent for training. The total money spent for the war effort is the figure on which the Senator based his estimate of $2,000,000,000. I venture to say that there have not been more than two or three hundred million dollars spent for this purpose, and that the better the people are trained who go to work for war industries, the less of the 2 percent it is necessary to spend. That is the reason for this N. Y. A. training program.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not the testimony which was given before the two committees.

Mr. TRUMAN. But those are the facts, I will say to the Senator, and I know them to be the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. They may be the facts.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not want to be placed in the ridiculous position of voting for the amendment solely on the basis of what has been stated by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the N. Y. A. In Florida the National Youth Administration war production training program is regularly preparing 1,200 youths in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State, and is sending them into war industries having critical labor

shortages. In Florida alone, more than 2,300 boys and girls have gone from N. Y. A. shops to war-production lines in the first 10 months of the current fiscal year.

I do not know what the situation is in other States, but in Florida the N. Y. A. has done a most important job from the time when it was instituted. All its program is now devoted to war work. I cannot sit here and see this matter go to a vote on the basis of the ridiculous situation which has been represented in the last few minutes. I have no right at all to dispute what has been stated, but the condition which has been described does not exist in my State.

In order to save time, since I can speak for only a few minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement only two pages long printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION IN FLORIDA

In Florida, the National Youth Administration war production training program is preparing 1,200 youths regularly in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State, and sending them into war industries having critical labor shortages. Over 2,300 boys and girls in Florida alone have gone from National Youth Administration shops to war production lines in the first 10 months of the current fiscal year

In the fall of 1938 and well before general preparation for defense, National Youth Administration began encouraging extensive development of production shops as work projects for youth, anticipating with accuracy the need for new workers trained in the metal and mechanical trades and taking the lead in preparing young women in such trades. At strategic locations in Florida, National Youth Administration construction workers erected adequate shop buildings under a standard pattern for production work.

Machine tools discarded by the Navy and other agencies as of no further value were secured by the National Youth Administration, rebuilt by the youth under competent journeyman supervision, and set up in the shops for production work. Such money as could be set aside in the budget was used to purchase new machine tools at a time when there was no demand for them by industry.

Adjacent to the shop centers in Florida, the National Youth Administration built or secured resident facilities, in order to bring to the shops young people living too far away to travel each day between home and shop. Now, the State has major centers located at Plant City, Pensacola, Miami, and Ocala, with feeder units located at Tallahassee, Jacksonville, and Orlando. The State-wide Negro center in Florida is located at Daytona Beach.

At the large resident work locations, youth are housed in dormitories and furnished food, necessary medical attention, and emergency hospitalization. On their own time and on a voluntary basis, youth assist supervisory employees in the preparation and serving of food, laundering, the maintenance and beautification of buildings and grounds, and the conduct of recreational activities. Youth thus share certain responsibilities for the operation of these centers and help to provide facilities which improve conditions of community living. Sparsely populated areas in Florida make it almost impossible to find sufficient nonagricultural workers in any one section to carry on an economic nonresident training program. The resident facilities make it possible to offer National Youth Administration war production training to all eligible youth in the State.

The 35 shop units at the 8 work locations mentioned above provide 777 work stations in 10 occupations having critical labor shortages, including the metal trades—welding, machine, sheet metal, auto mechanics, forge, aviation mechanics, and related trades. Work experience is also provided in radio, joinery, clerical, and electrical occupations. The use of these work stations for 1 to 3 shifts a day provides for training about 1,200 youth at a time, two-thirds of whom are given subsistence at the resident centers. The average stay at the project is from 8 to 12 weeks.

The youth work in the shops on 8-hour shifts 6 days a week. Nearly half of the youth are girls and the ratio of girls is climbing steadily. Each shop is set up along industrial lines and is a unit where actual production work is performed. This makes it possible to train youth under the same conditions which they will experience when they go into private industry. The work the youth do is production mainly for war agencies, although some production is done for local public sponsors. The orders are: Ocala, 2,051 caps for smoke pipes for United States Army, Camp Blanding, Fla., and 282 steel ship ladders for United States Maritime Commission; Miami, production work for 10 aptitude tests for Army Air Force Technical Training Command, Miami, Fla.; Plant City, 1,200 rail connectors, No. 15, for Maritime Commission, and 1,175 spark arresters for Army Air Force, Boca Raton Field, Boca Raton, Fla.

During the period from July 1, 1942, to May 31, 1943, in Florida, approximately 2,300 youth were trained and placed in jobs in war industries, in other concerns doing work related to the war effort, and in Government service. This means that each work station has trained youth for industry, excluding the present employment of 1,200 youth. It is interesting to note that the projects in Florida have been so successful in gearing their activities to the Nation's war effort that it is now possible for a youth to know the name of the war industry that will employ him on completion of his training. The war industries now depend upon a weekly quota of newly trained workers from these facilities.

On completion of their training in Florida National Youth Administration shops, youth are often transferred to National Youth Administration induction centers, which are located near war industries. Under National Youth Administration's induction center program, youth are given their initial training in a N. Y. A. shop near their home community; then transferred on a voluntary basis to another National Youth Administration center in a labor-shortage area. While youth are undergoing their final 2 weeks of training in the new location, the United States Employment Service finds war jobs for them. The United States Employment Service maintains contacts with war industries and is instrumental in placing youth in industry as soon as their training is completed. Industries in which Florida National Youth Administration trained youth have been placed include Wainwright Shipbuilding Co., Panama City, Fla.; Alabama Dry Docks, Mobile, Ala.; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Chickasaw, Ala.; Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.

Assignment of youth to the respective projects is handled by several workers stationed in the counties served by the projects. They work closely with the United States Employment Service and local citizens, and recruit out-of-school young women and young men not likely to be drafted and who do not have available other means of preparation for war industry employment. Only youth between the ages of 16 and 24 are employed. Extreme caution is taken to avoid affecting adversely the farm labor situation.

Local advisory committees, composed of 131 community leaders and representative citizens, advise with National Youth Administration project officials and help to interpret the program in their vicinities. Many youths are referred to individual projects through local advisory committees.

Health examinations are given National Youth Administration youth through arrangement with private physicians and public health officials. In the first 11 months of this fiscal year, National Youth Administration in Florida gave physical examinations to 3,639 youth, revealing a variety of conditions requiring attention.

The average cost per youth per month for the program in Florida, including management, recruiting, direct shop supervision, food, lodging, and health service, 24-hour supervision at resident centers, shop operations expenses, work clothes, property and transportation, and youth wages, is about $66.

From July 1942 through April 1943 the National Youth Administration war production training projects in Florida produced goods, excluding a large ship-ladder order for the Maritime Commission, for the United States Army, Navy and marines, which saved these organizations the sum of $17,397.07

No picture of National Youth Administration's wartime activities would be complete without mention of the student work program, which enables students to continue properly their education by the performance of useful work. The student work program has enabled 1,633 youth in Florida to continue their education in 261 Florida institutions this fiscal year. The students are enrolled in secondary schools, colleges, and universities, both public and private, tax-exempt, non-profit-making institutions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply want to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, at page 10. In Florida the total number of work stations was 740. Six hundred and fifty-four were in use on October 28, 1942. Eighty-six were not in use.

The percentage of those not in use was 12 percent. The number of youths trained was 983.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me again, let me say in regard to the statement just made by the Senator from Tennessee that a station can be one lathe. Only 35 different shops are being used. As I have just said, a station can be one lathe or one machine.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certain excerpts from letters written by persons in Kentucky appear in the report of the Byrd committee. The excerpts are very short. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point, and I desire to comment for a moment on

one of them. The one to which I refer was written by Harper Gatton, superintendent of the Madisonville city schools, at Madisonville, Ky. Mr. Gatton said:

The National Youth Administration work is a duplicate of effort in this area. Busses are hauling children 35 miles through Madisonville to Providence now for the National Youth Administration course. All of these children could take the same type of courses in our regular school work in Madisonville at much less cost and expense.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me; and if there is no objection, I should like to have the excerpts referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my considered opinion that the National Youth Administration set-up as now maintained is contrary to the best interest of the people of this country.

The training given by the National Youth Administration is a duplicate of the training given in our public schools and consequently is in direct competition with them. The result is that neither program is as efficient as it would be if under a single administrative agency. The public-school system as maintained in our States is the proper place for the control and administration of the National Youth Administration program.

At the present time the National Youth Administration is enticing from the high schools and grade schools boys and girls that by all standards should remain in public schools. These students are taken away from home and housed under conditions that cannot be as satisfactory as home conditions. (V. O. Turner, principal, Maytown Consolidated School, Langley, Ky., January 29, 1943.)

As a result of the present emergency, when our people are having the heaviest tax burden in our history imposed upon them, they are naturally becoming much more concerned about the manner in which this money is spent by their Government. I do not wish to stipulate that our people object to taxes, however steep they may be, so long as the money obtained is used wisely in preserving our American way of living.

The general public sentiment today is becoming more and more critical of the misuse of Federal funds in promotion of such organizations as the now abolished Work Projects Administration and the still-existing National Youth Administration. The prevalent sentiment is that the present National Youth Administration is in direct competition with and a duplication of the efforts of our public and vocational school systems. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that with the equipment and money allotted to the National Youth Administration our public schools would do a far better job than any such organization.

I have personally made a study of the activities of the National Youth Administration by direct contact for the past year. In a recent study, I found 42 percent of the trainees enrolled in one shop to be under 18 years of age and the average grade level of this group to be seven. The only logical assumption we can make is that these boys and girls have been enticed away from the public schools and from under home influence, where they rightfully belong. (Fred A. Martin, coordinator, Prestonburg Shop, Mayo State Vocational School, Prestonburg, Ky., January 31, 1943.)

The National Youth Administration work is a duplicate of effort in this area. Busses are hauling children 35 miles through Madisonville to Providence now for the National Youth Administration course. All of these children could take the same type of courses in our regular school work in Madisonville at much less cost and expense.

I understand that in the United States there are 50,000 National Youth Administration training stations, but not that many trainees. It has been our observation that many of the trainees from the National Youth Administration school at Providence have been turned down by the employers of labor at Evansville because they are not 18 years of age. It has also come to our attention that the training which is given to the trainees in this shop is not particularly helpful to them after they enter industry.

No reason has ever been presented to me why better learning could not be obtained in public schools at less training cost and expense. (Harper Gatton, superintendent, Madisonville city schools, Madisonville, Ky., January 19, 1943.)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes. As the chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge, the matter was presented to the subcommittee, the House having stricken the item from the bill. Hearings extending over a day or more were held. I approached the subject with entire impartiality. I had no prejudice on the subject at all. The records show that my State is entirely out of the picture; in other words, nothing has gone to the State of Nevada as a result of the N. Y. A. activity.

If the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House are duty-bound to attempt to curtail national expenditures, here is one place where the Senate can support its committee by curtailing expenditures. If, on the other hand, we are not bound to curtail expenditures, if we are to spend and spend and spend, and tax and tax and tax, as has been said by certain persons in high places, then of course the Senate can sustain the proposed amendment.

The question has been asked, Is there a duplication of effort? That is what we in Appropriation Committees are looking for all the time; we are constantly endeavoring to find out whether there is duplication of action, by reason of which $2 is expended where $1 might do the work. Let me say in all sincerity that the Byrd report—I am not dealing with a report of my own committee; I am dealing with the report made by the Joint Committee of the Senate and House—shows a duplication of action, as is disclosed on pages 2 and 3 of the report. Let us remember that this agency was set up under the Work Progress Administration. It was set up by Executive order, not by statute. It was set up for a defined and limited purpose. I read now the Executive order and the purpose set out in it, as was detailed by the Senator from Wyoming just a few moments ago:

To initiate and administer a program of approved projects which shall provide relief, work relief, and employment for persons between the ages of 16 and 25 years who are no longer in regular attendance at a school requiring full time and who are not regularly engaged in remunerative employment.

That was the object and purpose of setting up the N. Y. A. in the first instance.

Now it is said that the N. Y. A. has become a war training program, that it is indispensable to the war effort. Mr. President, I can say to you from observation extending over many years, some 10 years of them on the Appropriations Committee, that there is not a single agency which ever comes before the Appropriations Committee that does not justify its items on the ground that it is essential to the war effort and to the prosecution of the war. The Fish and Wildlife Service has spent hours before the Appropriations Committee outlining how it is indispensable to the prosecution of the war. The record will bear out my statement.

As a matter of fact the N. Y. A. is no more essential to the prosecution of the war than is the Fish and Wildlife Service. Why do I say that? Because the very training so much relied upon in the debate for the war effort is being duplicated by agency after agency, with appropriation after appropriation, most of which is in the very bill now under consideration.

Let me read them to you.

First, Training Within Industry Service. That is under this very bill. I read from the list printed in the report:

1. Training Within Industry Service advises on over-all on-the-job training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors.

For the current year, $1,145,000.

2. Apprentice and Training Service advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs which provide on-the-job training coordinated with the training services supplied by other agencies.—$915,501.

That is in this bill.

3. Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocation Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education, in cooperation with State and local vocational schools, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade to war production workers.—$14,301,140.

Do Senators say that there is no duplication? Look at the very bill before us.

4. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers, in cooperation with State boards for vocational education and local departments of vocational agriculture, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade in the production of farm commodities and in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment.—$15,000,000.

Is there no duplication?

5. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training, United States Office of Edu-

cation, in cooperation with colleges and universities, is specifically assigned to offer training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production supervision to train professional and technical workers for war industries.—$30,000,000.

Do Senators say there is no duplication? These programs are in the very bill before us.

6. National Youth Administration is specifically assigned to provide training to unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 25, in skills required in war industries.

7. The United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, make recommendations regarding training needs and on the most effective use of personnel in terms of the prevailing and anticipated labor requirements. The Employment Service will direct industry to the service assigned to give the training assistance needed.—$2,467,670.

The total is $125,103,311. Every item I have read is a duplication of the very activity set out in the N. Y. A. item.

Mr. President, I approach this subject without the least degree of prejudice. I have no prejudice whatever. It does not affect me in the least. I speak before the Senate only to support the will of the Committee on Appropriations, which said that in keeping with the will of the House of Representatives this item should go out of this bill, because somewhere along the line we must curtail just a little, even though it be only $48,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. It is said that the N. Y. A. should be continued for another year. If it goes on for another year, we can rest assured that it will do just as it did this year when we tried to eliminate it, and last year. It will have another excuse for going on with all these training programs, now being paid for by the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. To say that this agency should go on, when it is duplicated six times over, is to say that we will willfully spend this money, regardless of duplication, regardless of whether or not it is being duplicated $6 for $1 all the way down the line.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that besides the $125,103,311 which has been stated by the Senator from Nevada, the War Department bill carries many more millions of dollars for the purpose of training engineers, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, and others?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is absolutely correct. Furthermore, as has been stated here time and again this afternoon, 2 percent is allowed to industry for training. The record before the committee shows that institutions which employ persons who are trained by N. Y. A. insist that they must be trained again before they can be put into industry. So industry demands, and is allowed, 2 percent for training. Where the training actually takes place, as it must take place, 2 percent is allowed, and not otherwise.

So, in addition to the $125,103,311 for a duplication of the services of N. Y. A., there are untold millions of dollars in the 2 percent. Someone has figured it up to be $1,000,000,000. I do not know whether it is or not, but untold and unenumerated millions of dollars are provided for duplication of this very service.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Having this bill in charge, I approach the subject without the least degree of prejudice. The only prejudice I have in the whole matter is that I hope that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate may some time reach a point where we can have the support of the Senate to curtail expenditures, because if we do not do it, God only knows where expenditures will reach. It is time to stop. We cannot stop it all at once. Let us stop it little by little, one item at a time. Last year we put the C. C. C. out of business. I wonder if anyone will say that the C. C. C. did not do a valiant job when it was set up and operating. I do not think any Senator will utter one word of depreciation against the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Then we had the Work Relief Administration. That was an administration which did a splendid work in an hour of great need. Both those agencies went out under protest. First of all, the President did not want the Work Relief Administration to go out of business. Finally he put it out of business by an Executive order. Then he did not want the Civilian Conservation Corps to go out of business, but the Congress put it out of business. Now we are engaged in trying to cut down one more item—only $48,000,000; but $48,000,000 cut down now is $48,000,000 which might be expended for a better purpose.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have listened to what the able Senator has said about the duplication of the program, and his reading from the enumeration of the various services rendering this kind of training, given on pages 2 and 3 of the Byrd Committee report.

I notice that item No. 3 relates to—

Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocational Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education.

I notice that item No. 5 reads:

Engineering, Science and Management War Training, United States Office of Education.

I notice that item No. 7 reads:

The United States Employment Service.

My question is: Is it not a fact that the United States Office of Education and the United States Employment Service, together with the N. Y. A., are all under the general control of the Federal Security Administrator?

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that that is true; in fact, I know it is true.

Mr. PEPPER. May we not assume, unless we attribute inefficiency to the Federal Security Administrator, that he would not allow, within his own agency, a duplication of facilities? I do not know what Mr. McNutt has recommended this year, if anything. I remember that last year, when the question of the abolition of the N. Y. A. was before the Congress, I was present on one occasion when the Federal Security Administrator appeared, and he distinctly informed the committee that there was no duplication, and that he was keeping the several agencies working in different fields. If he is doing his duty, I wonder if the able Senator would not assume that the various agencies are so coordinated that there is no duplication among them?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will answer that question by saying that I take the facts and let the conjectures go. Whether he is doing his duty or not is one thing. The facts speak for themselves. There is a duplication, five or six times over. That is the answer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. A moment ago it was suggested that the War Department and the Navy Department had certain training programs in the universities and colleges. Earlier in the day I stated that I was directly informed this morning by Mr. Aubrey Williams that the N. Y. A. boys and girls who were receiving N. Y. A. aid in school or in college were not eligible for the training given by the War Department or the Navy Department. So if Mr. Williams correctly represented the matter to me, there is certainly no duplication in those programs between the Army and Navy V-12 program and the school and college aid program of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator does not find that activity on the list which I read.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator did not say it was; but it was suggested in the colloquy a few moments ago.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is useless to try to confuse the issue. I have read to the Senate a list of six agencies, every one of which is duplicating the work of the N. Y. A.—$6 spent for $1 of good accomplished, if there was $1 of good accomplished.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In my remarks earlier in the day I read from a statement given me by Mr. Aubrey Williams. In that statement Mr. Williams flatly stated—again I rely on his own integrity—that where the N. Y. A. training program was being carried on there was no other service of the same kind available. For example, he took in, he said, boys and girls

from rural areas and from areas where the other phases of this character of training were not being carried on; so that there was no duplication.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no desire to speak disparagingly of the utterances of Mr. Aubrey Williams. I make the statement with the facts known to Mr. Aubrey Williams, and it is impossible for Mr. Aubrey Williams or anyone else to deny the facts, most of which are in the bill which is now before the Senate. Senators may read it. Senators have already approved the items of appropriation.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude with one further statement. I hope the amendment will not prevail. If it prevails today then we shall have thrown discouragement into the committee in its efforts to curtail day-by-day Government expenditures, so that some day the people of the Nation may say that Congress was trying to save and lighten the burden on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. I had not expected to say anything on this subject, but inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], was under the impression that I had agreed to the report, I think I should make a statement.

I may have been present on the day when the report was under discussion. I heard no testimony this year on the report. When the distinguished Senator from Virginia filed the report, either on that day or the day subsequent, and when the Senator from Wisconsin rose in his place and asked that he be permitted to file minority views, I rose, as the RECORD shows, and stated that I did not agree to so much of the report as asked for the immediate ending of the N. Y. A., and that, while perhaps I would not file minority views, I wished my position to be understood.

I have no desire now to discuss the report except to say that last year, when an effort was made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as he has detailed, to abolish the N. Y. A., a report was submitted by the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures especially directing the Senate's attention to the N. Y. A. program. Prior to that time this program had advanced in cost until it had reached approximately $160,000,000 per annum, as I recall. There was a reduction in the program last year.

At that time I did not join in the report asking for the abandonment of the N. Y. A., but did subjoin to the report a statement agreeing in the main to many of the committee recommendations in the report, and to the findings of fact, but suggesting and urging that certain essential functions of the N. Y. A. be integrated with other services of the Government. That was not done; there was no attempt to do it; and I would be justified in voting now to abolish the N. Y. A. outright, because the authorities, in place of heeding the report of the committee, have deliberately plowed ahead and presented the same issue again this year.

Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. President, I did not join in the report—and I wish to make that clear—for only two substantial reasons: First, I am advised that the N. Y. A. has equipment totaling in value perhaps $75,000,000. As I have said, I have been told that. To abandon the N. Y. A. would be virtually to lose the use of that material, because I know that machinery and equipment will not be transferred to any other vocational training school. I shall explain that statement in a moment.

Also, if this machinery and equipment should be transferred to any other vocational training school, where I think it ought now to be used, there would necessarily be a time lag. I felt that we ought not to abandon the N. Y. A., destroy it now, terminate it at this moment, or at the end of this fiscal year, which is just a day or so ahead of us, with the consequent loss of this machinery, or the loss of the use of a vast investment of the Government in the machinery.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suppose the Senator has been advised that in the bill as it came from the House, and in its present form, there is an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the liquidation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I appreciate that fact. However, there is no effort made in the House bill to transfer this machinery to any other training facility, and there would be a time lag which I am unwilling to believe the country should stand at this time.

Mr. President, I desire to make a further statement. The N. Y. A. in my State has done good work. It has rendered a service to a great many people in the State who needed assistance, and needed the precise service which was rendered. I think that due respect to the findings of the committees a year ago should have led to the integration in other agencies of the functions of the N. Y. A. which should have been preserved. On that point I am perfectly clear.

Mr. President, I happen to have been the author of three of the four vocational educational bills which became law in this country within my lifetime. A bill was introduced by me which put vocational education on a permanent basis, and called for an annual appropriation. The money which has been wasted all the way down from Mr. Hopkins' early administration through the various training programs would have established vocational education in America worthy of this great Nation, yet I regret to say that it early became obvious to me that the money could not go where I thought it should go.

I have never been a great advocate of the Federal Government contributing to our ordinary local educational institutions, but I did strongly favor vocational education, and participation in the program by the Federal Government, because it was a contribution to but one department of an established school system, and that could never be Federally controlled if we adhered to the salutary principle I have stated.

Year after year I have seen appropriated many millions of dollars which, in my humble judgment, should have gone into the vocational training schools in all the institutions of our States, in which case we would long since have had a vocational educational system which would have been of permanent benefit to the Nation. But when we finish with it, we will come face to face with the situation that, beginning 8 or 9 years ago, we can trace a great deal of money which has been used for a semivocational educational purpose, totaling many million dollars, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, yet the vocational educational system has stood still, and at some future day, when the war ends, the whole work must be taken up again if we are really to accomplish any worth-while purpose.

Mr. President, since the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], seemed to have been under the impression that I was present, or that I assented to the report, I wanted to say that I did not agree to the report asking for the immediate dissolution of N. Y. A., principally for the two reasons which I have stated. I have declared all the while that I would vote for a reasonable appropriation to continue the work of the N. Y. A. under existing circumstances.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed I misstated the position of the Senator from Georgia, and I know he will realize my error was entirely inadvertent. As I recall, the Senator from Georgia was present at the meeting when the report was adopted, and, so far as I heard, made no dissent from it. I was not informed that when the Senator from Wisconsin submitted his minority views, on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia stated that he was not in favor of the report of the committee. I hope the Senator will understand that my statement in response to the question of the Senator from Tennessee was entirely inadvertent.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I know it was.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word with regard to the amendment before the vote is taken.

I have received several letters from North Carolina asking that I vote for the continuation of the N. Y. A. I realize that a number of the letters were from people who were directly interested in the continuation of the N. Y. A.; whereas there were letters from parties who were not directly interested.

I realize that the N. Y. A. has done a pretty good work in North Carolina, but, on the other hand, I realize that outside North Carolina the N. Y. A. has been a miserable failure.

I think Mr. Aubrey Williams heads the N. Y. A. under the direction of Mr. Harry Hopkins. I understand that Mr. Hopkins, who directs Mr. Williams, is very anxious that Mr. Williams be continued in office, but I do not feel that I

can conscientiously cast a vote here today for Mr. Hopkins to continue Mr. Williams in office. I do not know how much Mr. Williams receives a year, but I do not feel that I can vote $45,000,000 to continue Mr. Aubrey Williams in office.

Consequently, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am sorry he offered the amendment, because I dislike very much to vote against any amendment he proposes, recognizing that he is chairman of about the finest committee we ever had in Washington since the creation of Congress. But from a sense of patriotic duty I shall have to eliminate all personal considerations at this time, and instead of voting in favor of Mr. TRUMAN, as I should very much like to do, I shall vote against Mr. Hopkins, against Mr. Williams, and in favor of the United States of America. Therefore I shall have to vote against the amendment of the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Aubrey Williams, and a table which shows the number of machines in use and the number of people working on those machines.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
June 28, 1943.

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: Among the charges that Senator BYRD may make is that the National Youth Administration in the early part of the fiscal year had a substantial number of idle, unused work stations. The Byrd report has erroneously charged that the National Youth Administration in January 1943 had some 56,000 work stations, of which approximately 39,000 were in use, leaving, as the Byrd report assumed, a total of 17,000 idle work stations. The facts, nevertheless, are that following a sharp reduction in our appropriation we of necessity had to take out of operation 17,000 work stations, so that by January 8, 1943, equipment representing 16,814 work stations was not in use. However, in accordance with existing requirements regarding disposal of surplus property, the status of this equipment was as follows:

Loaned to non-Federal agencies and subject to recall (schools)	4,675
Declared as surplus to the Treasury Procurement Officer for disposition	5,184
Equipment listed on declaration of surplus documents in process of transfer to Treasury Procurement	1,468
Equipment transferred to other agencies	3,260
Equipment in process of transfer to new work locations	2,227
Total	16,814

There is attached hereto a table as of February 24, 1943, which is about the time that Senator BYRD released his charge. The table shows the number of work stations (a work station consists of a machine or a bench and working space for one individual), in use and the number of trainees based upon a nose count of those actually present in the shop on that date. In this connection it should be noted that an individual trainee is at a work station for 8 hours each day. Of course, the really significant fact is that all of the 39,000 work stations which were retained after the declaration of surplus property are in use and that through their use the National Youth Administration is turning out 60,000 trainees every 60 days, 40,000 to 45,000 of whom go into war-production industry.

Sincerely yours,

AUBREY WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

National Youth Administration: Number of active work stations and number of trainees receiving training, as of Feb. 24, 1943

Region and State	Total number of work stations	Number of youth under active assignment
Grand total	39,281	59,055
Region I (total)	4,584	5,728
Connecticut	280	385
Maine	519	752
Massachusetts	826	931
New Hampshire	102	142
Rhode Island	25	28
Vermont	233	187
New York	2,599	3,303
Region III (total)	3,684	7,799
Delaware	24	63
New Jersey	601	854
Pennsylvania	3,059	6,882
Region IV (total)	3,368	6,228
District of Columbia	169	287
Maryland	390	561
North Carolina	1,080	2,243
Virginia	828	1,235
West Virginia	901	1,902
Region V (total)	4,304	7,774
Kentucky	1,121	2,404
Michigan	1,480	2,492
Ohio	1,703	2,878
Region VI (total)	6,370	8,226
Illinois	2,522	4,425
Indiana	1,105	1,516
Wisconsin	2,743	2,285
Region VII (total)	4,614	6,916
Alabama	882	1,258
Florida	805	1,102
Georgia	1,104	1,919
Mississippi	596	990
South Carolina	357	787
Tennessee	870	860
Region VIII (total)	2,758	3,414
Iowa	1,033	907
Minnesota	1,005	1,438
Nebraska	273	304
North Dakota	164	354
South Dakota	283	411
Region IX (total)	4,748	6,131
Arkansas	717	1,588
Kansas	785	875
Missouri	1,102	1,514
Oklahoma	2,144	2,154
Region X (total)	2,507	4,360
Louisiana	501	1,010
New Mexico	112	192
Texas	1,894	3,158
Region XI (total)	1,273	1,272
Colorado	339	289
Idaho	383	448
Montana	112	134
Utah	263	291
Wyoming	176	110

National Youth Administration: Number of active work stations and number of trainees receiving training, as of Feb. 24, 1943—Continued

Region and State	Total number of work stations	Number of youth under active assignment
Region XII (total)	1,071	1,207
Arizona	86	154
California	564	620
Nevada		
Oregon	190	250
Washington	231	183

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 20, on page 65, down to and including line 13, on page 66, and insert the following:

PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, $35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed $918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, $4,000,000, together with not to exceed $1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not to exceed $250,000 for travel expenses, $2,750,000.

PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, $50,000.

PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal

year 1944 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however,* That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

PAR. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgment of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence

PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

PAR 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however,* That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further,* That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of $86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for such purposes.

PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment, or cremation (not to exceed a total of $100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided,* That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed

guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of $300.

PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Bankhead	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bilbo	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Truman
Davis	McFarland	Van Nuys
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—37

Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bridges	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	McCarran	Smith
Buck	McClellan	Stewart
Butler	McKellar	Taft
Byrd	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Millikin	Vandenberg
Chavez	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gerry	Reed	
Gurney	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—18

Austin	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Bailey	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Tobey
Brewster	Gillette	Tydings
Burton	Glass	Walsh
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley

So Mr. TRUMAN'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of my colleague was agreed to.

Mr. TRUMAN. I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Missouri on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TRUMAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Is a vote "yea" a vote to table the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" is a vote to lay on the table the motion made by the senior Senator from Missouri.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from

Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Barkley	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bilbo	La Follette	Shipstead
Bone	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Davis	McFarland	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Mead	Wagner
Green	Murdock	Wallgren
Guffey	Murray	White
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—37

Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hawkes	Reynolds
Brooks	Holman	Robertson
Buck	McCarran	Smith
Butler	McClellan	Stewart
Byrd	McKellar	Taft
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wherry
Danaher	Nye	Willis
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ferguson	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NOT VOTING—18

Austin	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Bailey	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Tobey
Brewster	Gillette	Tydings
Burton	Glass	Walsh
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley

So Mr. TRUMAN's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. CLARK of Missouri to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Any funds available to the United States Public Health Service for the treatment of patients may be used, upon the request of State and local health authorities, to provide for the hospitalization, treatment, and subsistence in hospital facilities operated by the United States Public Health Service of Selective Service registrants infected with venereal disease, and for the transportation of such Selective Service registrants between their homes and such facilities when necessary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the present time it is estimated that there are, among the 21,000,000 males aged 18 through 37 years, nearly 1,000,000 cases of syphilis. Among the 2,000,000 Negro population in this age group there are 524,000 cases; among the 19,000,000 whites there are 428,000, according to the best estimates available. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an exhibit which shows the basis of the estimates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not definitely known how many men in these age groups have already had blood tests. However, it is believed that as of this date 15,000,000 men have already been tested as a result of the Selective Service mass blood testing program. On this basis, if the results on the first 2,000,000 men tested and on subsequent samples are representative, 750,000 men with evidence of syphilis have been revealed as a result of those examinations.

Present programs as carried out by State and local health departments have placed under treatment about 55 percent of the men revealed by the Selective Service blood tests as being infected. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit B, which bears on the foregoing, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator kindly to suspend until the Senate is in order; because the Senator's discussion should be listened to by the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am doing my best to make myself heard, and I may say that in my humble opinion there is nothing more important, in a minor way, to which the Senate could give its attention than this proposal.

In the past year, alone, the programs to which I have just referred have been stepped up by more than 20 percent.

That is indicated in exhibit C, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is the important point: Prior to October 1942, the Army did not induct registrants with syphilis. Therefore, it was necessary for the civilian health authorities to give each individual with syphilis a minimum recommended schedule of therapy before he could even be considered for military service. Since October 1942, the Army has inducted registrants with uncomplicated syphilis, regardless of treatment, and the rate of such inductions is gradually increasing. But because prior to October 1942, the Army did not induct registrants who, except for the fact that they were shown to have syphilis, were otherwise qualified for military service, a great backlog of syphilitic eligibles for military service has been built up. It is contemplated that eventually a considerable portion of the million males with syphilis will be taken by the Army under this new plan.

Civilian health authorities, however, will still have to supply treatment to those persons who are not eligible for military service because of the late crippling manifestations of syphilis, or because of other defects, dependency, or essentiality, and because of a large number of Negro males who will not be inducted because of racial quotas. Moreover, civilian health authorities and the United States Public Health Service, in order to control the spread of syphilis in civilian communities, are required to provide adequate treatment immediately upon the uncovering of syphilis in the individual.

Therefore, the amendment proposes that in areas where the civilian health authorities are overwhelmed with the numbers of infected registrants needing treatment, the local or State authorities may request the United States Public Health Service to provide treatment for those individuals in hospital facilities already established by the United States Public Health Service or put in operation to meet the need for that type of service. Once more I wish to emphasize the point that the persons who would receive treatment are persons who have been called for selective service, and who, insofar as we know, and generally speaking, have been rejected for the sole reason that they were infected with a curable venereal disease. Legal authorization is required to permit the work to be done. Legal authorization is also required to provide transportation of patients to and from their homes, when necessary. No need is anticipated in the immediate future for additional funds to carry out the provisions of this authorization, since the Hospital Division proposes to operate this program within the limit of already available beds, and additional facilities can be provided from funds appropriated by Congress under the provisions of the Lanham Act.

I desire to emphasize the point that the sole purpose of the amendment is to help the local and State authorities treat the unusually large number of syphilitic cases which have been revealed as a result of the Selective Service mass blood tests, and, by utilization of hospital facilities which are not now being utilized, to make those men ready for induction into the military service. In my opinion, to the extent that we can make these men available for military service, we will to that extent relieve the pressure upon persons who otherwise would have to be inducted. It is fair to assume that those who have thus far been called are largely those in the group of single men, or those without large numbers of dependents.

I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will be willing to let this amendment go to conference. I apologize for having proposed it at this stage of the proceedings. My only defense is that these measures are moving along with such rapidity that it has been almost impossible for me to obtain an opportunity to present the matter through the regular channels.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What sums are available for the treatment of patients? Can the Senator indicate in which appropriations and on what page of the bill such funds are listed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are statutory provisions for the care of persons

who are provided with hospital service, such as those in the Maritime Service, and those treated by the Narcotic Service. The officer in charge of the hospital service informs me that there are certain vacancies in those hospitals which could be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator refer to the $10,510,700 appropriation or pages 34 and 35?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, it is the funds which are available for persons who are entitled to statutory benefits, such as those who are in the Maritime Service, and those who are sent to the narcotic institutions for treatment. The funds will only be used where there are vacancies in existing facilities. I do not know whether the Senator is familiar with the situation, but there have been some very encouraging developments in the rapid treatment of syphilis, and it is hoped that these cases may be given the combination of fever and high arsphenamine dosages which are giving great hope of providing a new and much quicker method of treating syphilis.

Mr. TAFT. What I do not understand is why, if there is any money left over from any of the other appropriations, the appropriations are in that sum. If there is any money left over, it should have been cut off the appropriation. Therefore, it seems to me that if additional facilities are to be created, necessarily additional appropriations will be required.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not my understanding of the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Then the Appropriations Committee has not done its duty. It should have cut down the appropriations for the other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Merely because there is a vacancy of 25 or 30 beds in an institution at a particular time, we could not pare down the appropriation to represent the temporary nonuse of 25 or 30 beds.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am in hearty accord with everything the Senator from Wisconsin says about this item. I should like to be able to further and support it, but the rules of the Appropriations Committee are mandatory. The Senator in charge of the bill must raise the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill when that question presents itself. This is clearly legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I concede that, Mr. President. My only hope was that in view of the manner in which bills are going through the Senate, and the rapidity with which they are being acted upon, the Senator might feel that he could permit this matter to go to conference, where he could give it further study.

Mr. McCARRAN. If there were any latitude in the rule, I would naturally extend it, because I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, but the rule is mandatory, and I must make the point of order. I make the point of order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada makes the point of order, which is sustained.

EXHIBIT A

Estimated prevalence of syphilis among men aged 18–37 in the continental United States, by age and race

(Based on blood test reports of registrants under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, received from November 1940 through August 1941 and in October and November 1942.)

Age group	White			Negro			Total		
	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases
18–20	3,157,405	8.5	26,923	363,364	130.2	47,301	3,520,769	21.1	74,224
21–25	5,060,793	10.9	55,391	543,764	183.9	99,990	5,604,557	27.7	155,381
26–30	4,784,396	22.5	107,415	519,070	289.1	150,078	5,303,466	48.6	257,493
31–37	6,107,592	39.1	238,742	640,514	353.3	226,308	6,748,106	68.9	465,050
Total	19,110,186	22.4	428,471	2,066,712	253.4	523,677	21,176,898	45.0	952,148

EXHIBIT B

Reports of State health departments[1] on the status of registrants found with evidence of syphilis under the Selective Serevice blood-testing program

United States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis, by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis, by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Total	524,400	235,300	289,100	279,300	245,100
Percent	100.0	44.9	55.1	53.3	46.7

States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Alabama	19,700	4,100	15,600	[2] 12,400	7,300
Arizona	1,800	1,400	400	900	900
Arkansas	10,100	2,300	7,800	4,900	5,200
California	25,900	22,300	3,600	10,800	15,100
Colorado	1,700	1,600	100	900	800
Connecticut	2,200	1,500	700	1,100	1,100
Delaware	1,400	500	900	1,100	300
District of Columbia	10,200	1,800	8,400	3,900	6,300
Florida	38,000	9,100	28,900	22,800	15,200
Georgia	[2] 30,000	6,000	24,000	[2] 13,500	16,500
Idaho	300	300		100	200
Illinois	8,000	5,400	2,600	4,800	3,200
Indiana	10,000	7,500	2,500	3,500	6,500
Iowa	5,000	4,700	300	[2] 2,500	2,500
Kansas	4,100	3,000	1,100	900	3,200
Kentucky	10,500	3,700	6,800	6,900	3,600
Louisiana	31,600	7,000	24,600	[2] 15,600	16,000
Maine	1,000	1,000		400	600
Maryland	20,000	6,200	13,800	[2] 10,000	10,000
Massachusetts	2,800	2,400	400	2,000	800

EXHIBIT B

Reports of State health departments[1] on the status of registrants found with evidence of syphilis under the Selective Service blood-testing program—Continued

States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Michigan	11,200	7,500	3,700	3,200	8,000
Minnesota	1,900	1,800	100	600	1,300
Mississippi	25,200	2,900	22,300	20,900	4,300
Missouri	10,600	6,800	3,800	5,500	5,100
Montana	500	500	----------	100	400
Nebraska	1,200	1,000	200	800	400
Nevada	400	400	----------	200	200
New Hampshire	300	300	----------	200	100
New Jersey	10,000	5,500	4,500	[2] 5,000	5,000
New Mexico	3,000	2,800	200	[2] 1,500	1,500
New York	12,000	7,400	4,600	[2] 7,000	5,000
North Carolina	28,000	7,000	21,000	[2] 14,000	14,000
North Dakota	400	400	----------	200	200
Ohio	11,600	8,000	3,600	9,300	2,300
Oklahoma	8,100	5,400	2,700	4,800	3,300
Oregon	1,500	1,500	----------	1,000	500
Pennsylvania	20,000	13,000	7,000	[2] 12,000	8,000
Rhode Island	700	600	100	500	200
South Carolina	13,900	2,800	11,100	8,600	5,300
South Dakota	300	300	----------	100	200
Tennessee	16,700	6,700	10,000	9,900	6,800
Texas	[2] 50,000	24,500	25,500	[2] 26,000	24,000
Utah	200	200	----------	100	100
Vermont	100	100	[3]	[3]	100
Virginia	20,000	5,800	14,200	7,700	12,300
Washington	2,000	1,900	100	800	1,200
West Virginia	8,000	6,200	1,800	[2] 4,000	4,000
Wisconsin	2,000	1,800	200	1,400	600
Wyoming	300	300	----------	100	200
Chicago	11,200	7,500	3,700	7,900	3,300
New York City	18,800	12,600	6,200	7,500	11,300
Total	524,400	235,300	289,100	279,300	245,100

[1] For the period Nov. 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1942. [2] Estimated [3] Less than 50.

EXHIBIT C

Funds budgeted and activities reported for venereal-disease control in States and Territories for the fiscal years 1940–43

	1940	1941		1942		1943[1]		
	Amount or number	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1940–41	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1941–42	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1942–43	Percent increase, 1940–43
I. Funds budgeted for venereal-disease control	$10,645,183.20	$13,153,498.76	23.6	$15,432,508.77	17.3	$18,052,980.00	17.0	69.6
A. Federal	4,656,528.20	6,362,218.76	36.6	8,447,924.25	32.8	10,595,880.00	25.4	127.5
B. State and local	5,988,655.00	6,791,280.00	13.4	6,984,584.52	2.8	7,457,100.00	6.8	24.5
II. Venereal-disease control activities:								
A. Syphilis:								
1. Cases reported to State health departments	487,464	494,813	1.5	489,172	[2] −1.1	590,604	20.7	21.2
2. Admissions to clinic service	288,778	340,615	18.0	343,312	.8	430,302	25.3	49.0
3. Average monthly patient load in clinics	290,982	384,478	32.1	400,198	4.1	445,702	11.4	53.2
4. Treatments administered in clinics	8,313,796	10,661,259	28.2	10,682,137	.2	12,506,784	17.1	50.4
(a) Arsenicals (doses)	3,719,880	4,885,736	----------	4,928,484	----------	5,891,090	19.5	58.4
(b) Heavy metals (doses)	4,593,916	5,775,523	----------	5,753,653	----------	6,615,694	15.0	44.0
5. Arsenical drugs (doses) distributed by State health departments	6,895,837	8,161,491	18.4	8,727,964	6.9	10,813,934	23.9	56.8
6. Serologic tests in laboratories	10,216,978	16,520,591	61.7	20,173,769	22.1	30,895,328	53.1	202.4
B. Gonorrhea:								
1. Cases reported to State health departments	180,383	198,432	10.0	220,432	11.1	282,815	28.3	56.8
2. Admissions to clinic service	66,811	84,418	26.4	104,421	23.7	133,784	28.1	100.2
3. Average monthly patient load in clinics	30,392	26,487	[2] −12.8	25,536	[2] −3.6	33,153	29.8	9.1
4. Treatment visits in clinics	851,694	712,164	[2] −16.4	801,267	12.5	764,315	[2] −4.6	[2] −10.3
5. Sulfalnilamide drugs (tablets) distributed by State health departments	5,179,586	7,218,617	37.3	13,836,985	91.7	23,102,238	67.0	346.0
6. Tests (for detection of gonococcus) in laboratories	1,038,086	1,224,227	17.9	1,369,663	11.9	1,559,408	13.9	44.8
C. General:								
1. Publications distributed by State health departments	3,324,358	4,158,008	25.1	4,342,633	4.4	2,710,299	[2] −37.6	[2] −18.5
2. Clinics treating venereal disease	2,454	3,245	32.2	3,569	10.0	3,704	3.8	50.9

[1] Estimate based on first 6 months of fiscal year. [2] Percent decrease.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that in view of the importance of the decision on the National Youth Administration amendment, and the fact that it was decided by four votes, if there is anything I can do to have the bill go over until tomorrow or next day, until the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] may be present. I think I am justified in doing so. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that it is my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum every time I have the right to do so under the rules, and to make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to submit a conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The conference report will involve a record vote before we conclude.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 97, 122, and 123.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "herein" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "in this act"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,128,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,349,063"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment in the proviso thereof, and after the word "projects" where the same first occurs in such proviso, insert the words "under his supervision."

At the end of the first paragraph of said amendment, following the word "funds" and before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That during the first four months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months."

In the third paragraph of said amendment after the word "elsewhere", and before the comma, insert the following: "at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made."

In the third paragraph of said amendment before the word "Provided" strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out all of the proviso down to and including the word "made."

In the fourth paragraph of said amendment after the word "necessary" insert the following: ", in the discretion of the Administrator."

At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third paragraph of said amendment, in the first proviso thereof, after the word "tenancy" and before the semicolon, insert the following: ", or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or Territory, whichever amount is the larger"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is this report?

Mr. RUSSELL. This is a partial conference report on the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. The conference report which has been submitted is not complete. It deals with many provisions of the bill, but there are a couple of matters still in disagreement. For the information of the Senate, probably I should state that the conference report which has been submitted disposes of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. The items in disagreement relate to the soil-conservation payments and to the program of crop insurance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does the conference report dispose of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate conferees very reluctantly accepted the House provision, with minor amendments as to restrictions on the use of the appropriation.

The Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that when the bill reached the floor of the House a substitute for the Senate amendment was offered, which retained the substance of the Senate amendment and the amount of appropriation of the Senate amendment for the tenant purchase program, but which drastically reduced the appropriation for rural-rehabilitation loans and grants and administration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the net result?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am coming to that. The report carries the same amount of appropriation for the tenant-purchase loans as was contained in the Senate amendment, which was $30,000,000. The appropriation for administrative expenses, $1,326,070, was also agreed to.

There was a change made, in that an appropriation was made to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution rather than to the Secretary of Agriculture, as has been the case heretofore.

In connection with the appropriation for rural-rehabilitation loans, the Senate provision carried an appropriation of $97,500,000. The conferees adopted the House provision of $60,000,000 for such loans.

The Senate amendment appropriated $29,607,573 for administration for the coming year. The House appropriated $20,000,000. The conferees agreed to the $20,000,000, with language which will permit, for the first 4 months of the fiscal year 1944, the expenditure at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months. That language was inserted in the bill because of the fact that at the present time the House Standing Committee on Agriculture has under consideration the whole matter of legislation affecting the Farm Security Administration. We were advised that a bill will be reported at an early date which will clearly define the activities of the Farm Security Administration and its authority, as well as make authorization for appropriations, something that should have been done some time ago.

That is practically the only matter of any importance that is in the conference report now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay action on the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, but in view of my expressed desire that House bill 2935 be not acted upon tonight, I feel it is incumbent upon me to suggest the absence of a quorum preceding the motion of the Senator from Georgia. In other words, Mr. President, I think the vote on the National Youth Administration amendment is close enough to entitle us to have a vote of the full Senate. I propose to exercise every parliamentary right which I can think of to prevent a final vote being had on the bill tonight.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of what has transpired, it seems to me that perhaps time would be saved by allowing the vote on House bill 2935 to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. House bill 2935?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the bill pending before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2935, the unfinished business, go over until the reconvening of the Senate tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Did not the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] move that the conference report be agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are three or four conference reports awaiting action by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have no disposition to interfere with any of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. In addition, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] desires to bring up a bill which will probably not create any opposition. He wishes to have it acted upon by the Senate before an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate. So I think that no time would be lost if the pending bill should go over until tomorrow, and we may gain some time by proceeding on other matters that are ready for disposition.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the present parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has made the unanimous-consent request that the pending bill (H. R. 2935) be postponed until tomorrow. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, certain amendments are still in disagreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask whether the Farm Security Administration was involved in the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered, so that I may make a brief statement. I should like to have the statement come before the agreement on the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that in the present temper of the Senate there is no possibility of upsetting the conference report, but I wish to state for the record that I think the amendments which the conference committee has agreed to are crippling in character. So far as I am personally concerned, I should prefer to see the Farm Security Administration killed and given a decent burial, rather than have it strangulated over a period of time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are certain amendments which are in disagreement at the present time. I desire to have them considered and to have action taken on them.

Mr. President, there are still in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99. Amendments numbered 87, 88, and 92 all relate to the so-called soil-conservation and domestic allotment appropriation. We are in an anomalous position with respect to the appropriation. The Senate by a record vote, as I recall, of approximately 53 to 25, allowed the full amount of the Budget estimate of $400,000,000. The conferees could not agree on the item when they met, and the House sent the amendment back for a second vote. Incidental to the appropriation of $400,000,000 there was in the bill certain language which provided that funds could be expended in the manner provided and for the purposes announced last December by the Secretary of Agriculture. Senators will recall that in the debate on the bill the position of the committee was that this was an obligation to the farmers for payments to be made in accordance with the terms of the announcement on last December 5. When the bill reached the House, the House by a record vote adopted the provision for the full $400,000,000 by a majority of about 11. However, when the language of the bill providing for the expenditure of funds in accordance with the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture was read in the House there were about 20 less votes on the second vote than on the first, and the Senate amendment providing for the expenditure of the funds for which the House had agreed to appropriate was defeated by a slight margin in the House, throwing around the appropriation the restrictions which the House threw about them in the first instance, which would prevent compliance with these contracts. I think the Senate should have a record vote. It is the integral part of the amendment which the Senate approved by a vote of 53 to 25.

The whole point at issue was whether or not the Congress would keep faith with the farmers who had made out their work sheets in December of last year. Both Houses have appropriated the money. The Senate authorized the payments, but the House, by a small vote, did not adopt the Senate amendment authorizing the payments.

Certainly we should not leave the matter in that position. I therefore move that the Senate insist upon its language to complete this whole transaction, as found in amendment numbered 87 of the bill as it passed the Senate. I hope the Senate will give us a record vote on this question. I think perhaps if that is done, the matter might possibly be settled. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. What is the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. That the Senate insist on its amendment with regard to the Senate appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. The $400,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is the language which authorizes the payments. The $400,000,000 has been approved by the House, but the House has not receded from its language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from North Caroline [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Chavez	Hawkes
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Ball	Danaher	Hill
Bankhead	Davis	Holman
Barkley	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	George	Kilgore
Bridges	Gerry	La Follette
Butler	Green	Langer
Capper	Guffey	Lucas
Caraway	Gurney	McCarran
Chandler	Hatch	McClellan

McFarland	Overton	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	Pepper	Truman
McNary	Radcliffe	Tunnell
Maloney	Reed	Vandenberg
Maybank	Revercomb	Van Nuys
Mead	Robertson	Wagner
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Murdock	Scrugham	Wheeler
Murray	Shipstead	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Willis
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson

NAYS—2

Ferguson Lodge

NOT VOTING—25

Austin	Byrd	Reynolds
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Smith
Barbour	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Downey	Tobey
Brewster	Ellender	Tydings
Brooks	Gillette	Walsh
Buck	Glass	Wiley
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	
Bushfield	Moore	

So the Senate insisted on its amendment numbered 87.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 88 and 92. They are amendments dealing with the soil-conservation program. I expect that from the vote the Senate just took it would necessarily follow that the whole item should be left in disagreement, even though the vote just taken is that which controls the expenditure of $400,000,000, which the Senate approved.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell us what the difference is in the language, or what we are voting on?

Mr. RUSSELL. I undertook to explain the amendment, but perhaps due to the lateness of the hour I did not go into as much detail as I should have done.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know what clarification is brought about by the language. What does the Senator want done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was moving that the Senate insist upon its amendments and adhere to the position taken heretofore. I think it might be well to have the clerk report the two amendments, numbered 88 and 92. The amendments have to do with the formulation of the program for 1944. Both the House language and the Senate language limit next year's program to $300,000,000, but there is a difference in the way the program is to be set up under the two provisions. The House language confines the program strictly to a soil- and water-conservation program. In other words, no payment could be made except for building a terrace, planting a tree, or pursuing some other recognized and accepted soil-conservation program.

The Senate amendment likewise limited the appropriation for next year to $300,000,000, which, as Senators know, is a reduction of $200,000,000 below the amount made available for years. The Senate amendment does give the Department of Agriculture discretion in establishing the program for the expenditure of the funds. There is no difference in the amount of the money that can be expended, but the House language ties it strictly to a soil conserving program, whereas the Senate language would give the department some leeway in announcing the program, whereby it might encourage the production of crops of some commodities especially needed, and would not confine the payments to strictly soil conservation practices.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps some of that money might be used for incentive and subsidy payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. It all depends on what are called incentive payments.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking about.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not attempt to describe an incentive payment. One of the motions I shall make in a moment is based on the fact that the House language specifically prohibits any incentive payments. I have never seen any legal definition of an incentive payment to a farmer. In my judgment, a soil-conservation payment is an incentive payment, and if such general language is placed in the bill, it would likely destroy the entire soil-conservation program. One of the amendments I shall move that the Senate insist upon, is an amendment which strikes out the language in the House bill:

> That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

That language was put in on the floor of the House. I do not know what it means. I do not believe any other person could predict with any degree of certainty as to how a court would construe that language, or how the Comptroller General might construe it, because, as I stated a moment ago, any payment that was made to a farmer, whether made in lime, or in nitrates, or in trees, is in the nature of an incentive payment to distribute that lime or to plant those trees. Of course, I do not think there is any question but that the House had in mind trying to prevent the incentive payments which were requested by the President in a special budget estimate asking for $100,000,000 for making what the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget designated as incentive payments. That money is not appropriated in the bill.

I am perfectly willing to accept language, if the House sees fit to offer it, or to agree to it, which would provide that no incentive payments, as defined in the message of the President some time in February, which is House Document 101, shall be made from these funds. If it is proposed to say that no incentive payments should be made, there is grave doubt in my mind, and I think in the Senator's mind, that even a soil-conservation payment could be made, because such payments are all in the nature of incentive payments. I think we should be careful to define what payments we are making.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand correctly that all the Senator from Georgia is asking the Senate to do now is to approve what the Senate has heretofore done?

Mr. RUSSELL. All I am asking is that the Senate insist upon the position the Senate previously took when it voted this language out on the floor of the Senate a few days ago.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senate has already passed on the question, and the Senator from Georgia insists that the language remain just as the Senate adopted it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am asking the Senate that it adhere to its former action taken when this question was before the Senate previously.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The House amendment provides ironclad language, whereas the Senate amendment would leave some discretionary powers as to the possibility of soil conservation, rotation of crops, and such measures as would aid in the war effort?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. What the Senator from Georgia proposes does not specifically create an incentive, but the Department of Agriculture can determine what is conservation under this language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Within the terms of legislation the Congress has enacted, the Department could not bring in any new practice, but it could operate under the existing law. The effect of the House limitation is to repeal all provisions of the act not related directly to soil-conservation practices. We are merely saying that the Secretary may operate under the statute enacted by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is one other amendment, although two are really involved, and that is relating to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Senators will recall that the action of the House on the bill had the effect of repealing the Crop Insurance Act. The House language provided that no part of the appropriation should be used except in connection with the liquidation of outstanding contracts of crop insurance. The House has voted on this proposition a second time since the first conference, and by a record vote has adhered to its former position, which seeks to liquidate and annul the Crop Insurance Act. It is up to the Senate to decide what it wants to do with respect to crop insurance in the future. I have given the facts in the case as best I know them.

This program has been in effect for 4 years as applied to wheat, and 1 year as applied to cotton. During that period there have been losses aggregating approximately $17,000,000 of the capital structure of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. About sixteen and one-quarter million dollars of that loss was incurred with respect to wheat, and something like five or six hundred thousand dollars with respect to cotton.

Though I am not particularly wedded to crop insurance, I think it is entitled to a fair trial. In my opinion, a splendid case was made through days of hearings before the subcommittee that would justify a continuation of this program in an effort to arrive at a basis of operations under which the Government will not suffer any loss, and the farmers will have protection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I was not particularly wedded to this particular policy in the first place, but does not the Senator think that taking it by and large, it is about as beneficial money as the Government has spent in connection with agriculture over a period of years? I believe it is, at least since I have been in the Senate and the Senator from Georgia has been chairman of the great subcommittee dealing with agriculture in the Appropriations Committee. Does not the Senator think that has been a really beneficial appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated when the measure was debated on the floor in the first instance, that in my judgment without crop insurance it would have been necessary to make out of the Treasury relief appropriations which would at least have aggregated the amount of the losses of this Corporation. If a great disaster should ever occur in an agricultural section the Congress will see to it that those farmers do not suffer. If the farmers are aided through insurance the cost will be prorated among farmers all over the country. In my opinion over a long period of years the crop-insurance program will save money to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Georgia that at the present time I have a bill pending in the Appropriations Committee which I intend to offer as an amendment to another bill proposed by the Senator from Illinois and reported from the Committee on Commerce, to make an appropriation of $15,000,000 for direct relief for damage directly suffered this year as the result of floods in the Missouri Valley, the Mississippi Valley, and the Ohio Valley. I think that is an extremely moderate estimate. If that whole amount had been covered into the crop insurance which the Senator is discussing, such a direct appropriation would not be necessary.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in the assumption that over a protracted period of time all the Federal Government does is to pay the overhead of operating the crop insurance programs, and that the cost of the programs is distributed among the owners of the crops insured?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the way we hope to have the program operate. Of course, there have been some capital losses up to now. We hope to get the program operating in the way the Senator from Florida has stated. Of course when we established this corporation we created a capital of $100,000,000. So we anticipated there would be some loss. But I wish to point out that in the hearings before the committee it developed that without exception all the old line companies, all the mutual companies, have experienced losses in the first 4 or 5 years of their operation.

Today we have had the experience of 4 years of operation with wheat and 1 year of operation with cotton. We have changed the system of insurance. For the first 3 years we had a 1-year policy; and, of course, in an area where there had been a great deal of rain and snow and where the season was not unfavorable, the farmer would not insure his crop; but where the prospects were a little gloomy, the farmer would insure his wheat crop. It was interesting how it was possible to spot the crop failures around the country by following the number of insurance policies issued in those sections.

Now a 3-year period has been adopted. Only a 3-year policy is sold. That requires the extension of the risk over 3 years. In my opinion the losses which have been incurred are the principal losses we shall sustain under the program, and in a short time it will be absolutely self-sustaining.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator has said with reference to the benefits of crop insurance. So far as the wheat areas in my State are concerned, where drought and hail have occurred, crop insurance has been exceedingly beneficial. If it had not been for crop insurance, in some years some of the farmers who raised wheat in the drought areas would have had to apply to the Federal Government for direct appropriations to be used for feeding them.

The program has been of great benefit, and all the farmers in my State, without exception, take the position that the program is one upon which they all agree, and they consider it to be most beneficial. I certainly hope provision for it will be retained in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are profiting by experience. The losses have been reduced, and the number of insurers has been increasing. Of course, Snators are aware of the fact that no farmer can put 100-percent insurance on his crop. The amount of insurance is limited to 75 percent of the farmer's crop, is based on his 5-year average, and is under the supervision of the local committees of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I do not think we should abandon the program at the present juncture.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina and then to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I expected to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question which he has now explained. The answer is this: With the 3-year insurance policy program and with the many safeguards the Department of Agriculture, through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, has thrown around crop insurance, crop insurance is good business not only for the farmers, but for all the American people. I only wish that a law providing for such a program had been in effect many years ago; and I certainly hope the present program will be maintained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to add a few very brief remarks to what the Senator from Georgia has said. I do not want to detain the Senate, but I desire to call the Senate's attention to the difference between a crop insurance program and most of the other programs we have been talking about, all of which, except the crop insurance program, are to some extent taking on the nature of a subsidy program or a charity program.

What those of us who have lived with the crop-insurance program for several years are trying to do is to put the farmer on his feet, if we can do so, by means of a system of crop insurance for which the farmer, not the Government, pays. We have had 4 years' experience. That is not sufficient. In my opinion, it will be necessary to carry forward the crop-insurance program on wheat for at least 3 years more before we can acquire sufficient experience in order to determine whether the program should be made permanent. I hope it will be made permanent.

Let me call attention to the fact that for the first 3 years of operation, 165,000 contracts were made with wheat farmers. In the next year, 360,000 contracts were made. In 1943, 371,000 contracts were made with wheat farmers. Today, approximately 25 percent of the entire wheat crop is growing under the crop-insurance program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator what crops are insurable.

Mr. REED. The law passed in 1938 provided for crop insurance on wheat alone. The wheat crop insurance program has been operated in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943. Two years ago, I think, cotton was added. We have had 1 year's experience with cotton.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Government lost every year on the insurance?

Mr. REED. The Government has lost every year on wheat-crop insurance, for reasons which I now shall point out: The original law restricted wheat-crop insurance to a term of 1 year, which was the worst mistake which could have been made. The need for crop insurance applies principally in the Hard Wheat Belt, the areas where both winter wheat and spring wheat are raised, in the States of Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana, and Oklahoma. In my section of the country, when a farmer sows his wheat along about September, in the fall, if he finds the soil thoroughly devoid of moisture, under the 1-year program he insures his crop. If there is ample moisture in the soil the

chances are that the farmer will get a crop, so he does not insure his crop. So, one of the lessons we learned was to make a 3-year term contract.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did it take 5 years to find that out?

Mr. REED. The statute required administration on the basis of a 1-year contract. That was the law as the bill passed this body. But we are learning as we go along as best we can.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask another question. How long does the Senator think it will be until the Government finds out what should be the premium, so that at least it will come out nearly even?

Mr. REED. Let me inform the Senator from Michigan that the premium is determined on the basis of the experience on the particular farm on which the crop is insured. There is no fixed premium. The premium varies with the degree of risk assumed, and properly so.

Another point is that originally in the administration of the crop insurance law the corporation took wheat in payment of the premium. It spent approximately $1,800,000 in paying storage charges on wheat. The corporation has gotten away from that. It now takes a note from the farmer whose crop is insured. The note is payable at harvest time. At harvest time the farmer can pay the note in wheat, if he desires to do so, or in money, if he desires to do that. If the note is paid in wheat, the wheat is immediately cashed on the market, so as to avoid incurring any storage charges.

In other words, in 3 years of experience several important blunders have been discovered.

I desire to say for the wheat crop insurance program—and then I shall conclude—that in the administration of the program the expenses have been kept down to a point lower than the expenses of the large insurance companies themselves. Of the money spent in the first year, a sum equal to 41 percent of the premiums paid was incurred in expenses. The next year, the sum was only 26 percent. In 1941, it was only 21 percent. The large insurance companies incur greater expenses than that.

So, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to make a distinction, to use discrimination, to recognize the fact that the program is no subsidy, no charity. We are not asking for a subsidy or a charity. One of the great risks the farmer always incurs is the risk of a crop failure. If we can work out, as I hope we can, a valid, sound, solvent system of crop insurance, we shall have done the farmer more good than will be done for him by many of the programs which are more in the nature of charity.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell me what provision is made to cover the losses of the 75 percent of the wheat which is not insured?

Mr. REED. Crop insurance will not be made to cover more than 75 percent of the average crop on any particular farm.

The farmer himself carries the risk upon the other 25 percent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the Government may pay losses in wheat or in dollars, at its option?

Mr. REED. I think the losses are paid in dollars. Originally they were paid in wheat. If the premiums were paid in wheat, the losses were paid in wheat. My impression is that the losses may be paid either way.

Mr. DANAHER. It has reached the point where we are now making up a loss of $17,000,000 in capital.

Mr. REED. Seventeen million dollars is the aggregate of 3 years' losses, not 1 year's losses.

Mr. DANAHER. But it is in dollars and not in wheat.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the Senator tell me what percentage of the farmers make use of the insurance?

Mr. REED. There is no way that I can tell exactly. We started with 10 percent of the wheat crop under insurance. We now have 25 percent of the wheat crop under insurance. As I stated awhile ago, the number of contracts with individual farmers started with 165,000. In 1940 it was 360,000; in 1941 it was 317,000; and my impression is that the present number of contracts exceeds 450,000.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is not in the nature of a subsidy, then why do not insurance companies take the business?

Mr. REED. So wise and successful a businessman as the Senator from Nebraska ought not to ask such a foolish question. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent, as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—51

Aiken	Kilgore	Overton
Ball	La Follette	Pepper
Bankhead	Langer	Radcliffe
Barkley	Lucas	Reed
Capper	McCarran	Russell
Caraway	McClellan	Scrugham
Chandler	McFarland	Shipstead
Chavez	McKellar	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Taft
Danaher	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maybank	Tunnell
Green	Mead	Vandenberg
Gurney	Millikin	Wagner
Hatch	Murdock	Wallgren
Hill	Murray	Wheeler
Holman	Nye	White
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Willis

NAYS—10

Bridges	Gerry	Robertson
Butler	Hawkes	Wherry
Byrd	Lodge	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews	Connally	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Smith
Bailey	Downey	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	George	Tobey
Bone	Gillette	Truman
Brewster	Glass	Tydings
Brooks	Guffey	Van Nuys
Buck	Hayden	Walsh
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley
Bushfield	Moore	Wilson
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on the amendments still in

disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, having agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 40, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, and 69; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$95,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,676"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$122,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,840,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$977,107"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$145,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$261,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, and after the comma, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$244,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 25, 27, 32, 45, 57, 58, 59, 68, 70, and 72.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2513, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 28, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 27, 45, 57, 58, 59, 68, and 70 to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Columbia" insert ": *Provided further*, That the appropriations and authority contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *And provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$755,760"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "to continue available until expended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 4, 32, and 72.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The VIC EPRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 650) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932, which were on page 1, line 4, to strike out "an Act" and insert "Acts"; on page 1, line 5, after "1936", to insert "March 24, 1937"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "one year" and insert "two years"; and on page 2, line 5, to strike out "three" and insert "four."

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THADDEUS C. KNIGHT—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 86)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 414, a bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight.

It is the purpose of the bill to authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the said Thaddeus C. Knight, a captain in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the same longevity and rank on both the relative and promotion lists as he would have attained had he not been separated from the service.

In view of the approved findings and sentence of a court of competent jurisdiction in the case of this former officer, I do not feel justified in approving, and thereby establishing an undesirable precedent, special legislator, the effect of which would be to set aside the judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction by legislative action.

I am, however, directing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of officers to

investigate Mr. Knight's entire record and his present qualifications for appointment as an officer and shall take such action with reference to a new appointment as the facts may warrant.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1943.*

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1134, to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941. I have consulted with the majority and minority leaders, and it is satisfactory to them that I make the request.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very sorry that I must object to the present consideration of the bill. I wish to investigate it further. I notice that in one place it makes provision for a loan to the railroads of $100,000,000 without interest. Farmers, as well as merchants, and small businessmen are paying high rates of interest. For that reason I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a certified copy of an agreement, executed by the Governors of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, to extend for 4 years, commencing September 1, 1943, the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas.

The original of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, in accordance with a provision contained therein, has been deposited in the archives of the State Department.

The compact between the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas was first executed in February 1935, and received the consent of the Congress in August 1935. Since that time the compact, with the consent of the Congress, three times has been extended and renewed for 2-year periods, the last extension period expiring September 1, 1943.

The compact designed to promote State legislation relating to the conservation of petroleum and gas also has resulted in an effective collaboration of the oil-producing States which are parties thereto upon oil problems of general import. In view of the worthy purposes of the compact, it is particularly heartening to note that the compact, first ratified by 6 States, has been ratified by 12 of the States.

I suggest that the Congress, by appropriate legislation, sanction this extension agreement as required by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1943.*

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if any other Senator wishes to bring any matter before the Senate at this time I shall yield to him. If not, I now ask for recognition in order to submit a conference report. Half a dozen times this afternoon I asked for recognition, and each time the Vice President looked at me and recognized some other Senator. Therefore, if no Senator desires to bring up any other matter at this time, and if the Vice President will deign to recognize me, I shall be very glad to have him do so in order that I may lay before the Senate a conference report. Am I recognized, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is now recognized, and may always be recognized any time he desires recognition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Vice President. It is a very great condescension on his part.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment Numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, at the proper time I desire to make a point of order against the conference report. I do not necessarily wish to do so tonight if the Senator from Tennessee does not desire to pursue the matter tonight. I shall be glad to have it go over as the unfinished business, and I will make my point of order against the conference report at the earliest opportunity tomorrow. However, if the Senator from Tennessee wishes to continue tonight, I shall be glad to make the point of order now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be recalled that a conference report was made a few days ago and rejected by the Senate. Today it comes in a different form. I believe that every Senator knows what it is. Several hundred thousand employees are without pay, which is being held up by reason of the fact that three employees of the Government are accused of subversive activities.

I believe that every Senator knows something about the subject, and knows how he will vote upon the report. I should like to see the Government employees who are entitled to their salaries receive them. The bill carries an appropriation of approximately $143,000,000 to pay the salaries of employees of the Government. I should like to see the conference report voted upon this afternoon, because we may have to hold several more conferences with regard to the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I desire to make the point of order and argue it at some length, at least so far as the Chair will indulge me. Failing in that, I shall desire to argue the merits of the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to consideration of the report being postponed.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a privileged matter, and will remain the unfinished business, inasmuch as it is before the Senate, and I think we might therefore suspend at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar, so it is not necessary to hold an executive session.

I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943 (reappointment).

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Ellen S. Woodward, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Social Security Board for the term expiring August 13, 1949 (reappointment).

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Charles M. Hay, from the State of Missouri, to be general counsel in the office of the Executive Director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Elmer K. Delp, from the State of New York (previously confirmed for the position of senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum), to be assistant regional chief of training, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Harold E. Mayo, senior chaplain, United States naval air station, Patuxent River, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee for the gift of life. We rejoice that each day brings to us opportunities for service and challenges us to use our talents for the good of our fellow men. In this time of world-wide chaos and war we seek Thy guidance that throughout life we may do Thy will and help mankind. Grant that as a nation and as individuals we may find Thy will and honor Thy name as we live and serve from day to day. Bless those who in places of responsibility and honor represent the sovereign States of this Republic. May they have upon their hearts a sense of destiny and so live and labor that this Nation, under Thee, shall continue as a beacon of inspiration and hope to the freedom-loving peoples of the earth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 25, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 12, 14, 84, 107, and 128 to said bill; that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 126, and 127 to said bill; that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 19, 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126, and 127 to said bill, agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the Act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Civil Service Commission.
6. Federal Power Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. United States Maritime Commission.

EXTENSION OF ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO REQUISITION PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 217) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Kentucky be good enough to tell us briefly the purpose of the bill and the fact that the Secretary of War has requested this extension for 1 year?

Mr. MAY. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that authorized the President to requisition personal property for war purposes. It expires on the 30th day of this month if not extended. The only thing the pending bill (S. 217) does is to extend it for a period of 1 year by striking out the date "June 30, 1943," and inserting the date "June 30, 1944." Otherwise it continues every provision of the original act in effect for that length of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1944," so that it will read as follows: "That whenever the President, during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not later than June 30, 1944, determines that (1) the use of any military or naval equipment, supplies, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or munitions is needed for the defense of the United States; (2) such need is immediate and impending and such as will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply; and (3) all other means of obtaining the use of such property for the defense of the United States upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted, he is authorized to requisition such property for the defense of the United States upon the payment of fair and just compensation for such property to be determined as hereinafter provided, and to dispose of such property in such manner as he may determine is necessary for the defense of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "December 31, 1944," so that it will read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Whenever the President determines that property acquired under this act and retained is no longer needed for the defense of the United States he shall, if the original owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, return such property to the owner; but, in any event, property so acquired and retained shall, if the owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, be returned to the owner not later than December 31, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO INDIAN WAR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 85) to amend the act of March 5, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898 and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and give the estimated cost?

PURPOSES OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the general purposes of the legislation is to liberalize the now-existing benefits payable to veterans and dependents of veterans of the Indian wars. This bill provides the same rates for Indian war veterans as are now being received by Spanish War veterans. The rates as to the widows correspond with those of the widows of Union veterans who served during the War between the States. However, before a widow can receive benefits under the provisions of this act, she must be at least 60 years of age and have lived with the veteran for 10 years or more. It must be borne in mind that before anyone can benefit under this proposed Indian war legislation, the veteran must have served at least 30 days in the zone of or in connection with active Indian hostilities. The authority to determine what constitutes the zone of active Indian hostilities under the provisions of this bill is delegated to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under existing laws this determination is made by the War Department. It is the consensus of opinion of the Indian war veterans and those interested in legislation for them that the War Department has been too rigid in its interpretation of what constitutes a zone of active Indian hostilities. The number who would benefit under the liberalized provisions of this bill both as to veterans and dependents of veterans is negligible.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The total cost of the bill would approximate $671,400 the first year. A break-down by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as to the estimated cost can be found near the close of the Administrator's report on page 6 of the committee report. The average age of the Indian war veterans is 82 years and approximately 1,340 veterans would receive increases at an additional cost of $284,000 for the first year. Section 3 would make eligible approximately 400 widows for pension, and it has been determined by the Veterans' Administration that only about one-half of those entitled would file during the first year, and the cost for this group would be approximately $90,000 for the first year. Under section 3 increases for approximately 2,465 widows are provided at an estimated cost for the first year of approximately $297,400. Summing up this break-down as to cost—and repeating—the total estimated cost for the first year is approximately $671,400.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The amendment on page 3, line 15 of the bill reduces the figures from $150 to $50. This was an error in printing and is fully explained on page 1 of the committee report.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

This bill, as amended, is identical with the Indian war bills of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses—both of which were passed by the House without amendment or dissenting vote. The Seventy-seventh Congress bill, H. R. 1095, was favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions of the United States Senate, but failed to pass the Senate before the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

CONCLUSION

This bill has received the commendation of and has been strongly endorsed by the several Indian war veterans' organizations, as well as individual Indian war veterans and dependents of deceased Indian war veterans throughout the country.

It is the opinion of your committee that this proposed legislation is believed to contain necessary liberalizations and simplification of existing law and is considered, from the standpoint of cost as well as other provisions, to be most conservative.

The Indian war veterans will receive the same rates as the Spanish War veterans and their widows will receive the same rates as the Union veterans of the War between the States.

A break-down as to the present rates for the veterans both under present law and under the provisions of this bill may be found in tables of the Administrator's report on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

This bill under the provisions of section 7, contains a savings clause which prohibits the reduction, discontinuance, or denial of any rights under any law in effect on the date of enactment of this legislation.

Your committee has held extensive hearings on this subject—both in the Seventy-sixth Congress as well as on May 6 of this Congress—and it is the opinion that this proposed legislation is equitable in character and recommend its passage.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish to concur in the statement of my distinguished chairman and to say that after extensive hearings we feel this bill is simply an equalization bill. It was reported by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381; 44 Stat. 1361), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That any person who served 30 days or more, or for the duration of one of the campaigns cited in section 1 of the act of March 4, 1917, even though such campaign was of less than 30 days' duration, in any military organization, whether such person was regularly mustered into the service of the United States or not, but whose service was under the authority or by the approval of the United States or any State or Territory in any Indian war or campaign, or in connection with, or in the zone of, any active Indian hostilities in any of the States or Territories of the United States from January 1, 1817, to December 31, 1898, inclusive, the determination as to what constitutes the zone of active Indian hostilities to be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and who is now or may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character which so incapacitate him for the performance of manual labor as to render him unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may provide, be placed upon the pension roll of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $60 a month and not less than $20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated, these rates to be fixed as follows: $20 a month for one-tenth disability, $25 a month for one-fourth disability, $35 a month for one-half disability, $50 a month for three-fourths disability, and $60 a month for total disability: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be entitled to receive a pension of $30 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 65 years, $60 a month: *Provided further*, That any such person who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of $100 a month: *And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home, and while the Government of the United States contributes toward defraying the expense incurred in providing such inmate with domiciliary care shall be paid more than $150 per month under this act."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381c; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The pension or increased rate of pension herein provided for shall commence from the date of filing application therefor after the date of enactment of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or the date of the inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That as to veterans who hereafter apply for and receive pension under the provisions of this act, increased pension by reason of disability requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person shall be effective as of the date of inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, but not earlier than the date of the original application for pension hereunder."

SEC. 3. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381–381d; 44 Stat. 1361–1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section No. 6 to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The dependent unremarried widow of any person who rendered service as described in section 1 of this act, who is barred from receiving pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to March 3, 1917, but who is otherwise entitled to pension under section 2 of this act, shall be entitled to pension in her own right and to

the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in said section 2: *Provided*, That she has attained the age of 60 years, was married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death, except where there was a separation which was due to or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided further*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this section, then the difference between said amounts shall be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That any widow otherwise entitled to pension under this act who has attained or who shall hereafter attain the age of 70 years shall be entitled to and paid a pension at the rate of $40 per month: *Provided further*, That the widow otherwise entitled under this act who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in an Indian war or campaign shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month. Payment of pension or increase of pension at the rates provided in this section shall commence as provided in section 4 of this act. Pension and increase of pension under this section shall not be paid to the widow who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated."

SEC. 4. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381–381d; 44 Stat. 1361–1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section No. 7 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to discontinue, diminish, or reduce any pension heretofore granted, nor to abridge or deny rights under any law in effect on the date of enactment of this act, nor be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll, as provided by the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein provided for shall be in addition thereto."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381d; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, strike out "$150" and insert "$50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASTE OF WAR FOOD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend what I am about to read to the House to the attention of the distinguished gentleman and learned representative of the butchers of New York [Mr. CELLER]. I want him to read this when he comes in. This appeared on the first page of my home paper, the Corpus Christi Caller, Corpus Christi, Tex., June 23, 1943:

OWNER STEWS AS GOOD STEAKS BURN IN MAZE OF RED TAPE

The steak burned.

And so did the roast, and the liver (without benefit of onions), and the hamburger meat, and the heart.

In fact, the whole cow burned, consumed in red tape.

The cow belonged to Fred Frank who lives at 300 Bartlett Drive here in town and who has a farm out in the country.

The cow sustained a broken back. A veterinarian informed the Frank family that the cow could not recover, that she would have to be killed.

Mrs. Frank—Mr. Frank was out of town at the time—inquired of the County War Board if the meat could be sold. The board representative informed her that she would have to have a butcher's permit and that she could not have one. The representative, Mrs. Frank said, advised her to burn the animal.

That seemed like a terrible waste of meat in these meatless days. Mrs. Frank phoned the representative again and asked if she could give the meat to the employees on the farm. She received an emphatic "no."

The cow was burned.

Regulations of the Agriculture Food Administration permit a person who lives on a farm to butcher a meat animal but forbids a person who owns a farm but who lives in the city to do the same thing, an official of the Federal meat program explained to a Caller reporter. In fact, the regulations prohibit a city dweller who owns a farm to butcher his own animal and put the meat into a cold storage locker for his own use.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to include in the RECORD two resolutions received from the Montana Association of County Commissioners now meeting in Billings, Mont., and the other to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

MEAT SPOILAGE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to see in a Montana paper, Great Falls Tribune, June 24, 1943, under Helena date line, the following statement that—

More than 20,000 tons of fresh beef is threatening to spoil on railroad sidetracks from eastern Montana to Seattle while Federal war agencies do nothing to obtain labor for re-icing refrigerator cars, James D. Graham, president of the Montana Federation of Labor, charged today. Movement of the meat, bound for overseas under lend-lease contracts, has been delayed for several weeks due to a traffic jam between Chicago and Seattle, Graham said, and appealed to the War Manpower Commission and the War Labor Board to take immediate action.

At least 1,000 refrigerator cars loaded with dressed beef are strung out on sidetracks along the Milwaukee Railway from Miles City to Spokane, a distance of 750 miles, awaiting shipping orders, the Montana labor leader declared.

Low-paid re-icers are blamed by the State labor chief for not having any labor to re-ice cars.

He blamed the condition on the War Manpower Commission's refusal to raise railroad maintenance-of-way workers' wages above 50 cents an hour, which caused many of these men to leave their jobs and is making it difficult for railroad companies to replace them, and he added that while a State-wide attempt by the United States Employment Service to recruit men for icing the refrigerator cars was being made it has yielded not one man.

No doubt that condition and many more similar conditions throughout the country is one reason why we here in Washington cannot get any meat. It is one thing if our sacrifices are helping to feed our boys in arms, but it is quite another thing, and our sacrifices become meaningless, if they are to no avail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program in order for the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the article read by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. I hope that the article will assist in inducing the very distinguished gentleman to get behind us who are trying to get the bill recently reported out of the House Committee on Agriculture enacted into law, so that we can get the food distribution program in the hands of a single administrator.

Mr. KLEBERG. That was not a letter. That was an article that appeared in a local paper.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, the people down in my section of the country and in the Southwest generally are not very enthusiastic with two of the recommendations that came out of the recent food conference in Virginia, one that we again plow the land where millions have been expended and to stop wind erosion in reclaiming it from the so-called dust bowl and planting it to peanuts and soybeans and other crops. They also do not seem to be very much in sympathy with the suggestion that comes from the professors over at Cornell and Columbia that there is more nutrition in corn flakes and soybeans than there is in a good juicy beefsteak. It is hard to convince and convert the hardy people of the plains country to this sort of program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a report on the Taylor Grazing Act and to also place in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief poem by a deceased soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks on the antistrike bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke and voted for the antistrike bill when it was up for debate and was a member of the conference committee that rewrote it. Had I been present I would, of course, have voted to override the President's veto, although my live pair accomplished the same result.

At the request of the War Department and by appointment of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I was named to represent that committee at the docking in New York Harbor of our first hospital ship, the *Acadia*, upon its arrival from north Africa. The War Department was represented by the recently appointed Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Norman Kirk, and other high-ranking officials. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs was represented by Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one extension to include a letter by myself and in the other an article by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial that appeared in my local county paper, the Coshocton Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution unanimously adopted by the California congressional delegation on June 14, 1943, with reference to the policies of the Government toward resident Japanese. I also ask unanimous consent to include representations and recommendations of the California State Senate fact-finding committee on Japanese resettlement, also a resolution on the same subject by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Pajaro Valley, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore agreed to, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, following the last special order heretofore entered, that of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a number of communications from Butte, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an Associated Press notice of the strike committee of 500 that the C. I. O. is sending to Washington to query legislators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Harry W. Farr, chairman of the National Live Stock and Meat Board, made at the annual meeting in Chicago, Ill., June 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation at a meeting recently held in Chicago, and further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have recently received from Leo V. Horton, one of the representative businessmen of Mount Vernon, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the American Legion post of Sigourney, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the committee of conference on the urgent deficiency bill has entered into some sort of an arrangement under which the three subversive individuals will be kept on the Federal pay roll until next December 31. If this is true, I submit that

these individuals will not be any redder next December than they are right now. The mental gymnastics that resulted in this arrangement certainly would be interesting to observe, but we should not retreat now in this battle of Washington, and I submit that if any unanimous-consent request is advanced to effectuate the purpose of this arrangement it should be objected to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Aloysius A. Konezal, chief clerk, Lucas County, Ohio, War Price and Rationing Board No. 34, concerning the situation in the rationing board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include an editorial from the World-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some recommendations by livestock producers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an address by General Somervell on Women's Organization in War Work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Ralph Roessler, of Marion, Ind., under date of June 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a companion bill to one introduced by a distinguished gentleman from the other side of this building. It deals with political contributions, and places the same restrictions upon manager groups as it does upon labor groups. I am sure that the Members of this House are willing to support legislation which deals with all groups alike.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in two particulars and include excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the Appendix and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 18, the W. P. B. announced that recommendations have been made to require newspapers to reduce their use of newsprint by another 5 percent on the 1st of July.

There is not a newspaper publisher in the land who would hesitate at taking his pro rata share of any necessary cut, and even more, if he felt that the Government itself was setting a good example.

But such is not the case. Three thousand two hundred Government publicity agents still flood the country with handouts on every conceivable subject under the sun. that end up in newspaper wastebaskets. Most of them serve no useful purpose whatsoever. They only add to the sum total of the country's available supply of waste paper.

In this morning's mail I have a 4-page release accompanied by 10 pictures, size 8 by 10, sent to our newspapers. With the release comes a request that editors using the release send a clip sheet back to the public-relations officer.

The free press of this country has discharged with great credit its responsibility to give the public the news of the day that the public is entitled to hear.

Today, however, they are being choked to death by the flood of Government hand-outs on the one hand, while on the other hand these continued cuts in the supply of newsprint strike out at the jugular vein of our free press.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my desire to go home is just as great as that of any other Member. But the people's business must be taken care of first. We have appropriated upward of $71,000,000,000 for the Army. Then this morning along comes a report in the newspaper telling us that six of these four-motored transport planes are being refitted, one for the use of Secretary Knox and one for Mr. Patterson, and the others for some officers who desire to get around durin : the week ends.

My desire to go home is somewhat lessened by the fact that, when we get there, the folks are going to ask us why we did not stay and do something about the use of Army planes for week-end trips by the playboys in the President's Cabinet and for week-end trips by officers. We should stay until this Congress finishes up some of these tasks.

We have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars.

Many of us voted for these vast sums for the Army and for the Navy because we have no way of determining the exact amount either needs. We have been forced to trust those in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps who speak for their respective branches of the service.

When they use planes built for the Army and the Navy to travel about on week-end trips; when men like Knox go on so-called inspection trips in a 21-passenger transport plane, they betray our confidence.

When our people need gasoline for farming operations; when our people are deprived of gasoline and the reason given is that the armed forces need it, and then when they read in the newspapers that the planes are being used, the gasoline wasted, on pleasure trips or on needless trips by the Secretary of the Navy, by Under Secretary of War Patterson, by high-ranking officials in either branch of the service, they are indignant.

The politicians in the armed forces will catch just what the labor leaders got last week, if they do not watch their step.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] spoke about newsprint a few moments ago. There is something to which I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House. Every one of us receives at our home a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How many of us read it? About 12 Members read it at their homes. Last year I attempted, on account of the difficulty of sending that out to the residence of each Member, to cut it off. A protest went up. There is a waste of paper on the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would prefer to have the copy that goes to my office cut off if necessary.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Do you get a copy at home?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you are going to cut out one or the other, I would prefer to have the one at home. I read it at home more than I do at the office.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I do not get a copy at home. I just get a copy at the office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I send my extra copy to good Democrats in my district.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Do you send that one out?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one that comes to the house I read in the morning and in the afternoon I send it on home.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to congratulate the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reinstate the bill (H. R. 438) for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas, on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ERRONEOUS PRESS REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in some of the press a statement which I think the people of the country are entitled to have the truth about. It has been known for a long time that the Congress, justifiably so, should take a recess after completing the business that is immediately before us. I noticed in the paper this morning, and I understand some of the commentators on the radio have made the same statement, that, according to the resolution, the Speaker and the Vice President can call us back into session during the recess—and this is a recess and not an adjournment—or the majority leaders or the minority leaders.

Some of the press have construed that as an expression of congressional differences with the President of the United States. I think that is not only unfair, incorrect, unreasonable, but, in my opinion, such an erroneous interpretation should be quickly corrected. I recognize when I use these words that whoever wrote the articles are liable to expend his or their wrath upon me, but there are times, especially in wartimes, when there must be plain speaking. Certain members of the press who will resort to this ought to be men enough to take constructive criticism. If there ever was an interpretation and statement made that is inconsistent with the truth, it is that. The only purpose there can be is to bring about division among our people. I do not know how extensive it has been carried, but the one who wrote that, if he is decent, will now carry the fact that his interpretation is absolutely wrong. It is incorrect. There is no foundation for it. These continuous efforts to divide our people should cease in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article entitled "Once There Was a Carpenter," written by Dr. Montgomery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from a paper in my congressional district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this discussion with reference to the contemplated recess or adjournment of the Congress, its reconvening, and so forth, may I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the two Houses of Congress may convene at any time, organize themselves into a Congress and proceed to the discharge of their legislative duties without being called together by anybody. That is a privilege and power inherent in the constituent elements of the Congress which it is fundamentally necessary that the Congress shall hold to and fully establish if that power is ever challenged. It is not consistent with the duties and the responsibilities of the Representatives of the people that there can be any agency in this Government, not even the Congress itself, which can project its judgment and power into the future so as to prevent a Congress convening and resuming its representative duties when in the judgment of the Members of Houses of Congress such resumption is necessary in the public interest. The constitutional powers of the President to adjourn Congress in the event of the inability of the two Houses to agree and the President's constitutional power to call the Congress back into extra session constitutes no limitation upon the general inherent power of the Congress to resume their constitutional duties when in their judgment such resumption is required in the public interest. This I suggest Mr. Speaker, is a consistent, necessary, inherent power which it is the duty of the Congress to assert, defend, and establish if ever it should be called in question.

AIRPLANES FOR CERTAIN OFFICIALS AND OUR SECRET WEAPON, THE O. W. W.—ONE-WORLD WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remark that I am very proud of my two leaders from Massachusetts, and I dislike to see them criticized. On the other hand, I want to express my own happiness—obscurity is my safety.

Another thought I wish to express is, Do not waste your CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. We have to send them to libraries and many of the same prominent people each year. I hold out a dozen each day and send them to various people, and I can assure you they seem to be greatly appreciated and bring about a better understanding of the Congress.

There is a grain of comfort I may give to our majority leader. You would not worry so much about what people think about you if you could realize how seldom they did it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a story about the famous shipbuilder of New Orleans, Andrew Jackson Higgins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SLAUGHTERHOUSES CLOSED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that the last slaughterhouse in my territory has closed up. The roll-back in prices and the failure to intelligently operate the subsidy system, if they were going to have a subsidy, has made it impossible for them to continue any longer. There were 15 of these slaughterhouses 6 months ago; today there are none, and it is absolutely impossible around my territory to buy beef. I think this fully justifies the attitude of the House and the Senate in refusing to go along with the subsidy program. We have got to drop it and begin to handle the food situation intelligently or America is going to face starvation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERSTATE PETROLEUM AND GAS COMPACT (H. DOC. NO. 243)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a certified copy of an agreement, executed by the Governors of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma,

Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, to extend for 4 years, commencing September 1, 1943, the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas.

The original of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, in accordance with a provision contained therein, has been deposited in the archives of the State Department.

The compact between the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas was first executed in February 1935, and received the consent of the Congress in August 1935. Since that time the compact, with the consent of the Congress, three times has been extended and renewed for 2-year periods, the last extension period expiring September 1, 1943.

The compact designed to promote State legislation relating to the conservation of petroleum and gas also has resulted in an effective collaboration of the oil-producing States which are parties thereto upon oil problems of general import. In view of the worthy purposes of the compact, it is particularly heartening to note that the compact, first ratified by 6 States, has been ratified by 12 of the States.

I suggest that the Congress, by appropriate legislation, sanction this extension agreement as required by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1943.*

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House now is to reply to the gentleman from Michigan and some of the Republican Members who are in favor of sending out CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and mailing them to Democrats. They advocate this because they believe that the common people and those who may not be well informed will be prone to believe the misstatements which they make on the floor from day to day and to give credence to the distorted or exaggerated articles that they insert to mislead the people. I feel that many of the statements and erroneous articles should not be printed because they are made by the Republicans for political reasons and to prejudice the people against the administration and the President. But, despite your efforts in that direction, the people will continue to have confidence in President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following the disposition of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SALE OF HORSE MEAT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up S. 832, an act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that deprive me of the right to offer an amendment to S. 832?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after 30 days after the date of enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to sell or offer for sale within the District of Columbia to any person any horse meat or food product thereof unless such meat or food product is plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be, or, in the case of any horse meat or food product thereof which is sold or offered for sale to any consumer at a hotel, restaurant, or similar establishment, unless such consumer is notified that the food which he receives contains horse meat or food products thereof.

SEC. 2. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation prescribed thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, strike out lines 9, 10, and 11, and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The health officer of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 1, line 7, after the word "thereof", insert a period and strike out the balance of the section.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a tear-jerking speech on the subject of horses, much as I might be tempted to try. I do want, however, to explain what this bill does and what my amendment will do to the bill.

This bill proposes that there shall be no sale of horse meat in the District of Columbia unless such meat or food product is plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat," and so on. My amendment, in effect, says there shall be no sale of horse meat here, period.

The amendment proposes to place a period in line 7, after the word "thereof", and to strike out the balance of the first section, so, instead of providing for the labeling and tagging of horse meat, it will merely say that "30 days after the date of the enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to sell or offer for sale within the District of Columbia to any person any horse meat or food product thereof."

That means that the bill will effectively prohibit the sale of horse meat within the District of Columbia. The penalty provisions of the bill provide a penalty of $500 for its violation. That section would remain intact.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have the largest cattle population in this country that we have ever had and there is no need to slaughter horses. Indeed, there is a greater shortage of traction power than of cattle. Horses are needed today for purposes of traction and transportation. The Army is resuming its purchase of horses for those purposes; why encourage the killing of them? If it were a question of starving or eating horse meat I suppose it would be all right to eat horse meat, but for myself I cannot stomach the proposition and I have no desire to see horses sacrificed in this manner when beef cattle can be made available. Horses are too intelligent and have too fine a nervous system to be slaughtered.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, why does not the gentleman move to strike out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. CASE. If we were to do that it would not stop the sale of horse meat. The sale of horse meat is already going on. It is necessary to pass legislation to stop it. If we put a period after the word "thereof" as I have proposed by my amendment the sale of horse meat will be stopped by making its sale subject to a $500 fine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say he is opposed to the sale of horse meat in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. I am opposed to the sale of horse meat for human food anywhere unless it is a matter of preventing starvation. We are a long way from that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A person has got to have proteins, and if there is no other kind of meat on the market except horse meat, why not let the people have it if they want it?

Mr. CASE. Beef can be made available. There are plenty of cattle in the country. Anyone who has any love for horses should support this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have love for both horses and cattle.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota, by his amendment, would destroy the legislation which has unanimously passed the Senate and comes to the House with a unanimous report from your Committee on the District of Columbia. I shall not at this time go into the merits of horse meat as edible food. As far as I know I have never eaten it. I have, however, had certain Members of this body tell me they have eaten it and found it nutritional and that they would be willing to eat it in the future.

This legislation simply proposes that within the District of Columbia when horse meat or horse-meat products are to be sold to the public the public shall be put on notice of that which they are buying. That is the purpose of the legislation. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota is bad, and I trust the House will refuse to support it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the committee have any Member of the House come before it and testify personally that he had eaten horse meat and say that it ought to be made available generally?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The committee had no Member come before it and testify that he personally had eaten horse meat; no. What I said was that I had talked with Members who said they had eaten horse meat and had no objections to it. Those same persons would like to know, as well as the gentleman who would not want to eat it, what he or she were buying when they went into a store.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there a law now that prohibits the sale of horse meat for human consumption in the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; there is not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE), there were—ayes 13, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to its final passage or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PERMIT CERTAIN BURIALS IN THE SCOTTISH RITE TEMPLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2828) to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America, is hereby authorized to permit the burial of the remains of not to exceed two persons in vaults built for that purpose in its temple, situated on lot No. 800, in square 192, at the southeast corner of S and Sixteenth Streets NW., in the District of Columbia, under such sanitary regulations as shall be prescribed for such burials by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure comes before us having been introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]. It has the unanimous support of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and if enacted into law would allow the Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Mr. John H. Cowles, to be buried here in this temple within the District of Columbia. This is a Freemasonry structure for the construction of which Mr. Cowles was himself mostly responsible. The Governors of many States, Senators, Representatives, and officials of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry have said to us, in effect, that they would like to see this done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the measure is meritorious.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next when the business on the Speaker's table has been finished and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION OF BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2988) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, be further amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"SEC. 14. During the existence of a state of war between the United States and any foreign country or nation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to expend, in their discretion, from the money authorized by section 9 of this act to be borrowed, for personal services, supplies, and other expenses in connection with the coordination of nonprotective volunteer civilian services, not exceeding $25,000 per year."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation comes here with the unanimous report of the House District Committee and would allow not to exceed $25,000 within the District of Columbia black-out fund to be used for the coordination of certain services. The District Commissioners and the civilian defense officials of the District have presented a good case. I believe this legislation to be desirable. No new money is involved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF THE PLACING OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY HOMES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2618) to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to secure for each child under

16 years of age who is placed in a family home, other than his own or that of a relative within the third degree, such care and guidance as will serve the child's welfare and the best interests of the District of Columbia; and to secure for him custody and care as near as possible to that which should have been given him by his parents.

SEC. 2. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or public agency that receives or accepts a child under 16 years of age and places or offers to place such child for temporary or permanent care in a family home other than that of a relative within the third degree shall be deemed to be maintaining a child-placing agency. No child-placing agency shall be maintained in the District of Columbia without a license issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Within 60 days after the passage of this act, the Commissioners shall appoint, after consultation with the Board of Public Welfare, a committee of eight persons to formulate and adopt rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, prescribing standards of placement, care, and services to be required of child-placing agencies, pursuant to the intent and purposes of this act. The committee shall be composed of a member of the Board of Public Welfare who shall act as chairman, of said committee, a member of the staff of the Health Department of the District of Columbia, a member of the staff of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and one representative from each of five charitable organizations of the District of Columbia having an organized program for placing children in family homes. Each member of said committee shall serve for a term of 1 year and until his successor is appointed and qualified. The rules and regulations shall be reviewed by the committee annually and, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, may be amended when deemed necessary.

SEC. 4. An application for a license as a child-placing agency shall be made to the Commissioners on forms provided by them and in the manner prescribed. Before such license is issued the Board of Public Welfare shall arrange to have an investigation made of the activities and standards of care of the agency and shall consult with persons having official connection with the agency. If the Board is satisfied as to the good character and intent of the applicant, and that the agency is adequately financed, and that its staff, procedures, and services conform to the established standards of care, said Board shall recommend to the Commissioners that a license be issued.

A provisional license may be issued to any agency which is temporarily unable to conform to all the provisions of the established standards of care upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioners upon recommendation of the Board of Public Welfare.

All licenses shall be issued for 1 year from the date thereof and may be renewed annually on the application of the agency, except that provisional licenses may be issued for not more than 3 successive years from the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 5. No person other than the parent, guardian, or relative within the third degree, and no firm, corporation, association, or agency, other than a licensed child-placing agency, may place or arrange or assist in placing or arranging for the placement of a child under 16 years of age in a family home or for adoption. In accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, any licensed child-placing agency may accept children for placement in family homes and shall have and maintain care, custody, and control of any such child until returned to the person from whom received or until responsibility for the child is transferred to another child-welfare agency or terminated by the order of a court of competent jurisdiction.

Every such agency shall keep and maintain careful supervision of all children under its care, including those placed in family homes, and its officers or agents shall visit all such homes and families as often as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child. Every such agency shall keep such records as shall be required by the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder and all records regarding children and all facts learned about children and their parents or relatives shall be deemed confidential and shall not be open to inspection or divulged except with the authority of the Board of Public Welfare.

Such agency shall in no case charge or receive from the person or persons legally adopting any child any compensation whatsoever therefor; and in no case shall any person taking a child with the intention of adoption demand or receive from such agency any compensation whatsoever for the care of such child even though it shall be returned to the agency.

SEC. 6. Whenever a licensed child-placing agency shall have been given the permanent care and guardianship of any child and the rights of the parent or parents of such child shall have been terminated by order of a court of competent jurisdiction or by a legally executed relinquishment of parental rights, the agency is vested with parental rights and may consent to the adoption of the child pursuant to the statutes regulating adoption procedure. Except in proceedings for adoption no parent may voluntarily assign or otherwise transfer to another his rights and duties with respect to the permanent care and control of a child under 16 years of age unless such relinquishment of parental rights is made to a licensed child-placing agency. Such relinquishment of parental rights shall be a statement in writing signed by the person relinquishing such parental rights in the presence of at least one witness who shall subscribe his name thereto and acknowledge the same before a representative of the licensed child-placing agency. Said relinquishment of parental rights shall be recorded and filed in a properly sealed file in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The seal of said file shall not be broken except for good cause shown and upon the written order of a justice of said court.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners may refuse to reissue or may revoke or suspend the license of any child-placing agency after full hearing on proof of violation of any provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder. Before any license shall be suspended or revoked the holder thereof shall have notice in writing of the charge or charges and shall, at the date and place specified in said notice, which shall be at least 5 days after the service thereof, be given a hearing by said Commissioners, or their designated agents, with a full opportunity to produce testimony in his, her, or its behalf. Any licensee whose license has been suspended or revoked may, after the expiration of 90 days, on application to the said Commissioners, have the same reinstated or reissued upon satisfactory proof that the disqualification has ceased.

SEC. 8. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or public agency who conducts a child-placing agency without a license as provided for in this act or who violates any of the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated under this act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $300 or imprisoned for not more than 90 days, or both. Prosecution for violations of this act shall be upon information in the criminal division of the municipal court of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. That sections 173, and 402 to 411, both inclusive, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. This act shall become effective 4 months after date of the approval of this act, except section 3 hereof, which shall become effective on the date of the approval of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is of importance to the House, to the District of Columbia and to the over-all theory involved in the philosophy of child placement. I should state to the House that during the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill with a similar purpose was presented and passed. It failed of enactment in the Senate and comes back to us in the Seventy-eighth Congress a very real problem under the impact of war, the necessity for the measure being greater, we believe, than in past years.

It deals with the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia. May I say that there will be at least three amendments offered to the measure that the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee has discussed with the authors. I feel that in connection with the two amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], and the amendment to be presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], those amendments do not weaken the purpose of the legislation, but, on the contrary, tend to clarify and to bring the issue fairly before the House.

I yield first to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. As I read this bill there is nothing in the legislation that provides for supervision or visitation of children who have been legally adopted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was not proposed that that phase is to be covered. That is in another sphere.

Mr. DISNEY. I want reassurance that this act cannot be construed in the gentleman's judgment as implying or providing that visitation or supervision of children already legally adopted may happen under this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I reassure the gentleman on that point. The District Committee's consideration of it did not contemplate such action.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Page 4, line 18, after the word "child", strike out the period, add a semicolon and insert "*Provided*, That legally adopted children shall not be subject to such supervision and visitation or other supervision or visitation."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of line 14, page 4, the bill reads as follows:

Every agency shall keep and maintain careful supervision of all children under its care, including those placed in family homes, and its officers or agents shall visit all such homes and families as often as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child.

My amendment provides that where a child has been legally adopted, that ends supervision. The adoption of children has become an important thing in our civilization and if we are to permit supervision and visitation of families where the child has already been legally adopted, we will discourage adoption. None of us would want to adopt a child, then have someone from a public agency come around all the time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's amendment should be adopted. It is one that is sound, it is right, and it will lead to more happiness on the part of all the people involved.

Mr. DISNEY. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me because he and I have had some experience along this line. If we do not avoid the idea that somebody in the department of a State or the Federal Government or the District of Columbia has something to do with the child after it has become ours, then it would be undesirable to have this statute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the explanation the gentleman from Oklahoma makes is correct. This legislation is aimed at doing away with the so-called black market in babies, which has grown to great proportions in the District of Columbia. In other words, the setting up of unlawful brokerage in children within the District of Columbia. I have talked with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the ranking minority member of the committee, in connection with this amendment, and we shall accept it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a child-adoption law, of course the first thing is to get the right kind of a family. I might ask this of the chairman of the committee. The bill safeguards the child in the selection of a home, I assume?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; that is true, and that is the purpose of the legislation. May I say this to the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a complete answer and a good one. I am satisfied.

If it does safeguard the child, there is no reason why we should have any of these new dealers down here fussing around afterward. It is all too evident that every time that little group get their fingers in the pie things go wrong. You remember the President's veto came up here the other day. I do not know who in the world wrote that for him, but it is just too bad.

WAS THE PRESIDENT FACETIOUS, OR IS HE IGNORANT OF LABOR POLICY?

In his message of June 25, 1943, vetoing the Connally-Smith bill, the President, among other things, said:

I doubt whether the public generally are familiar with these provisions. I doubt whether the Congress had the opportunity fully to appraise the effects of these provisions upon war production.

The fact is that the President himself displayed an amazing ignorance of fundamental labor policy and an utter disregard of the reasons for substantive law.

Disapproving those provisions of the bill which provide for a secret ballot and for a cooling-off period of 30 days, the President, among other things, said:

Section 8 requires the representative of employees of a war contractor to give notice of a labor dispute which threatens seriously to interrupt war production to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board in order to give the employees the opportunity to express themselves by secret ballot whether they will permit such interruption of war production.

It would force a labor leader who is trying to prevent a strike in accordance with his no-strike pledge, to give the notice which would cause the taking of a strike ballot and might actually precipitate a strike.

In wartime we cannot sanction strikes with or without notice.

Section 8 further makes it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after the giving of the notice take a secret ballot among the employees in the "plants, mines, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units," as the case may be, on the question of whether they will stop work. This requirement would open the whole controversy over "bargaining units," a fruitful source of controversy and of bitter jurisdictional strife.

Section 8 ignores completely labor's no-strike pledge and provides in effect for strike notices and strike ballots. Far from discouraging strikes, these provisions would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations.

The 30 days allowed before the strike vote is taken under Government auspices might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period. The thought and energies of the workers would be diverted from war production to vote getting.

Is it possible that the President and his advisers are ignorant of the history of labor legislation which has been presented to Congress in the last few years? Is it possible that the President, who is on terms of warm personal friendship with labor leaders, is unaware of their views, of their testimony?

In April of 1941, before the Rules Committee of the House, there was pending an application for a rule on H. R. 4139. Mr. George Meany, who was then secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor and who was also a member of the Mediation Board which was then in existence, appeared as a witness. Among other things, he said:

This bill provides a compulsory mediation feature. * * *

The bill makes it unlawful for employees to quit their jobs for any reason that they see fit to quit, if in quitting would in any way impede the progress of national defense contracts.

* * * * *

We would be opposed to this bill if this cooling-off period were only 10 minutes instead of 25 days, because of the destruction of that fundamental right that we cherish and have cherished since the institution of this democracy under which we live.

If Congress can compel people to work against their will for 25 days, then I submit, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that Congress can compel them to work for 25 months or 25 years.

Then, speaking of the policy of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Meany—and don't forget he was speaking officially for that organization—said:

I want the committee to understand that our policy goes not against the cooling-off period as a matter of agreement between employers and employees; it is against the cooling-off period as a matter of statute law.

I have personally signed agreements as long as I have been connected with the trade-union movement, that call for a cooling-off period. We agree with the employer that when the expiration of an agreement is reached, we set a 3-months period aside in which you have to give notice. That is standard practice and has been for 50 years. That provides for a cooling-off period by agreement between employers and employees so that it cannot be used as a weapon by one side against the other.

That is an agreed, a standard practice that we have had for 50 years and we believe in that practice and we insert it in our agreements at every possible opportunity.

Later, Mr. Cox of the Rules Committee, asked:

Mr. Cox. If he (the individual) is impeding the national defense program, shouldn't he be brought in under the law?

Mr. MEANY. I don't believe in the law so I don't believe anybody should be brought in under a law such as this.

Incidentally, Mr. Meany also expressed a view on the draft law. He was asked and he answered:

Mr. Cox. From what you have said, I take it that you must have been against the draft.

Mr. MEANY. No, I was not.

Mr. Cox. In other words, you favor the drafting of boys to bleed and die for their country but you are against the drafting of others to work and produce.

Mr. MEANY. I think it is entirely different.

So it is evident from the testimony of the secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor that, for 50 years, that organization has followed the policy of a cooling-off period, not of 30 days, but of 90 days, but that it now objects to that policy becoming the law of the land.

On the question of whether there should be a secret ballot before a strike is called, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, is also on record. Appearing before the House Committee on the Judiciary on May 7, 1941, on hearings which were then being held on delays in national defense preparations, Mr. Green testified:

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Green, a moment ago you spoke about when a strike has been officially approved. I am just wondering whether or not in the consideration of legislation you would feel that the Congress ought to enact legislation requiring the taking of a vote, a secret vote, on the question of the strike by the members of a craft?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think you need any legislation. That is the policy of the American Federation of Labor, to take secret strike votes.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. Now, if that is the policy of your organization would you object if we were to write that policy into law?

Mr. GREEN. What for?

Mr. WALTER. Well, perhaps there would be other people affected who have not adopted that fine policy.

Mr. GREEN. That is the principle of compulsion which labor resents.

Mr. WALTER. Is it a principle of compulsion or is it merely an instance of the democratic processes being complied with?

Mr. GREEN. It is a form of governmental control, a form of governmental order saying to labor, "You must do thus and so." Labor would probably do it, all right. It is just like the adoption of our no-strike policy. We have done that wholeheartedly and willingly. But the probabilities are if Congress would say, "You must do that," then there would be rebellion.

Organized labor, through its official spokesmen, having told Congress that for 50 years it had followed the policy of requiring a cooling-off period of 90 days, what reason can there possibly be against incorporating that policy in the fundamental law of the land governing labor relations?

William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, having solemnly advised a committee of the House that it was the policy of that organization "to take secret strike votes," what reason can there be for the President to object to the enactment of that policy into law?

Logically, there is only one reason for the President's objection to section 8, and that is that he does not want a democratic policy, which has shown its worth by lessening strikes, to apply to his political allies.

The President's argument, the argument of William Green, that, if a policy which is good becomes a law, it will be resented and, as Green said, will lead to "rebellion," rests upon the assumption that the few who disregard the Nation's welfare should be coddled and excused from complying with a policy which is necessary if we are to win the war.

With just as much reason might the President and William Green argue that, because citizens as a rule are not drunk and disorderly in public places, there should be no law against drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

Let me repeat. The President either did not know what he was writing about when he penned his veto comments on the eighth section of the Connally-Smith bill or he disregarded the basic reason for all legislation which is intended to lessen misconduct on the part of the citizen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman referred to the President's veto message and wondered who wrote it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Had he read the reasons assigned by the President for vetoing that bill at the time he voted to override the veto?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but I heard the veto message read prior to the vote.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman had not, does he not think he should have before he voted on that important matter?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I heard it, and hearing was enough. Insofar as it referred to section 8, it was illogical and unsound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 5, line 14, after the period, insert a new sentence as follows: "In any such adoption proceeding filed in the District of Columbia, which is consented to by a child-placing agency licensed pursuant to this act, the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia," approved August 25, 1937, as amended (50 Stat. 806), requiring the petition to state the name, age, race, occupation, and address of the natural parents shall not apply."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia is to be commended upon this bill (H. R. 2618). It is a very good bill. I think they have handled an important subject in a very splendid manner. When we are legislating in reference to children, we are really legislating in reference to the worth-while things in America. I am sure this bill is going to mean untold happiness and contentment on the part of hundreds and thousands of people who will be affected by it throughout the years to come.

Let me tell you briefly what my amendment does. In this bil' there is a provision that the parent or parents of a child may relinquish that child to a licensed child-placing agency, and in turn that placing agency may go into court and consent to the child's adoption. They have been very careful to keep matters in reference to the parental background of the child confidential; in fact, this bill provides that this relinquishment paper signed by the parent or parents is sealed by the court and must remain in a special file unopened. My amendment merely makes the existing adoption law conform to the spirit of this bill.

The existing adoption law prescribes that when you file a petition that petition must state the names, addresses, occupations, and so forth, of the natural parents. If that law remains as it is, many of the fine things under the bill (H. R. 2618) will be lost. I hope the committee will see fit to accept my amendment, which provides that when a placing agency consents to an adoption that the information as to the name, address, and so forth of the natural parents need not be given in the petition that is filed in court.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have gone over the matter with the gentleman who offers the amendment and I have discussed it with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the ranking minority Member. I think it is proper that the committee agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel that we in this legislation want to do simply what has been done in approximately 35 States, that is, to protect the health and happiness of a child who is placed in a home, to assist in the sanctity of that home after such adoption has been made, but we certainly desire to bring no hardship on any proper placement. I think the gentleman's amendment will help to clarify the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, and I hope that one of these days his splendid committee will bring in legislation which will double the taxes on houses and apartments here in the city of Washington that do not admit families with children. Such a practice is barbarism and should not be tolerated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The future of America marches on the feet of its children, and certainly we want a happy and healthy childhood for all our children.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. DISNEY. I call attention to the language on line 25, page 4—

Such agency shall in no case charge or receive from the person or persons legally adopting any child any compensation whatsoever therefor.

I am very doubtful of that policy.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is a matter that might well bear attention.

Mr. DISNEY. My information is that foundling homes ought to be able to make a charge against the person taking the child.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it would be a better situation if the adopting parents were required to pay for an investigation, because it would insure something along the line of financial stability, and also prove their good intentions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think we might well leave that question to the discretion of the Senate, which undoubtedly will have a hearing on this bill. I appreciate the importance of the issue that has been raised.

Mr. DISNEY. I think it is important.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think there are two sides to that matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Page 6, lines 23 and 24, strike out "or the rules and regulations promulgated under this act shall."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this strikes out the provision that makes a violation of a rule or regulation a crime. We ought to quit this nonsense in this House in making crimes of violations of rules and regulations. The act already provides that anyone who violates its provisions shall be guilty of an offense. Let us forget this business of making a violation of rules and regulations a crime.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the gentleman's contention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the District business for the day.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to permit the Washington Terminal Co. to use, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, for parking space for passenger motor vehicles, that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as squares S-721 and N-721. Any such use shall be in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may deem necessary and proper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent for the consideration of this measure because I think it should pass before the prospective recess in order to relieve the condition to which it pertains.

We are all familiar with the very crowded traffic conditions at the Union Station, and the practical impossibility of people going there with their families when they are leaving, or meeting friends, or helping them on the way to their trains. We have, just east of the Union Station, two lots which are not being used, which could very readily afford parking space for passenger motor vehicles. Arrangements have already been made for the accommodation of the Army and the Navy cars and trucks which are taken to the station. This bill is for the benefit of the public in general. This will be without any expense whatever to the Federal Government, and the necessary policing will be done. If any injury is done to the property in any way, it will be returned to the Government in its original condition without any expense to the Government. There will be no charge for the parking; there will be no toll. This is simply an effort to relieve that terrible condition of congestion by the use of as much of this space as may be necessary for the parking of passenger automobiles.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I rise to concur in the statement of the chairman and to advise the House that this is a report from the committee by unanimous consent. There will be no cost to the Government. This is to be handled entirely by the Terminal Co., and the property will be returned in its original form.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman for that statement. The situation calls for prompt action on this measure in order that the public generally may be relieved of this unfortunate situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the first line of the said amendment strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 10.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 2397, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $410,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $310,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates $288,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $248,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $225,000 instead of $210,000 as proposed by the House and $230,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out provision relating to disability or death benefits to alien enemy detainees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $115,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $110,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7 authorizes purchase, etc., of two station wagons as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $4,100,000 instead of $2,413,000 as proposed by the House and $4,255,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $1,214,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out limitation on expenditures for operation of observatories as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13 limits amount which may be expended for departmental salaries to $1,310,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,260,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $1,359,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,309,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 strikes out a limitation relating to dairy products as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates $295,000 as proposed by the Senate and limits expenditures for salaries to $260,000 instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates $110,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement and the motion relating to each authorized to be made by the managers is stated:

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $33,940,358 for civilian pilot training. The managers will move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing for $29,400,000 instead of the amount proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 continues available until June 30, 1944, the appropriation for development of landing areas, fiscal year 1943. The managers will move to concur in the amendment with an amendment making the appropriations in the bill available from July 1, 1943, regardless of the date of enactment.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is very much I can add to the statement of the managers on the part of the House, which is self-explanatory.

Of a total of $31,776,000 over the amount of the bill as passed by the House, only approximately $280,000 represents restoration of cuts effected by the committee and by the House. The balance of the increase is the result of supplemental estimates received by the Senate after the bill had been considered by the House, including, however, an amount of $295,000 for field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The Members will recall that when we brought the bill before the House we made special reference in the report, Report No. 343, on page 35, as follows:

> The reduction in the appropriation for 1943 of $444,000, as reflected in the Budget estimates, is accounted for by a decrease of $14,000 recommended for the Washington office and elimination of the Bureau's domestic field offices, which carried an appropriation of $430,000 in the fiscal year 1943.
>
> With respect to the latter item the committee has allowed the Bureau of the Budget recommendation to stand temporarily, without prejudice to the status of the offices as to permanent continuance or discontinuance. The committee has, under authority of House Resolution No. 69, instituted an inquiry of its own with the view of securing complete factual data for the subsequent determination as to their disposition.

The examination referred to in the report has been made. A report was made to the committee and the committee assembled to consider the report. I was authorized, as chairman of the committee, to make known the facts of the report to the Members of the Senate having jurisdiction over this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence between myself, as chairman of the committee, and at the instigation of the committee, and the Secretary of Commerce, as well as the reply of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, to me, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The correspondence referred to follows:

MAY 25, 1943.

The Hon. JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to inform you that the investigation of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, performed under authority of House Resolution No. 69, has been completed. The report of this investigation was discussed by the State, Justice, and Commerce subcommittee in executive session today, following which I was authorized to convey to you certain thoughts of the subcommittee concerning this matter.

First of all, let me state that the subcommittee, as assembled, agreed that there now exists a definite need for the type of service being rendered by the field offices of the Bureau, although not to the degree that this need existed prior to our present emergency.

Certain officials of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce indicated to our investigators that three offices, namely, Memphis, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis could be eliminated without detriment to the field organization or to the service being rendered. The subcommittee feels that there are other comparatively less important offices which should also be closed during this war period, and the Bureau should exert every effort to do so and to reduce this service to essential wartime requirements.

The severest criticism contained in the report on the investigation is directed at the Washington office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for its laxity in directing and coordinating the activities of the field organization The following excerpt from the report on the investigation is given for your information:

"It is definitely true that the efficiency of any given office depends almost entirely on the individual in charge of that office. The administrative control from Washington is very lax, and there is definite room for improvement in this regard."

Another, and rather astounding, disclosure reported deals with publicizing the offices and the services that these offices are equipped to render. Quoting again from the report:

"It was furthermore observed by several businessmen and representatives of business organizations interviewed during the investigation that the field service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was not particularly well publicized, many businessmen did not know of its existence, and that the service could perform services of greater value to the business public in general through better publicity."

That the conditions as quoted existed, even to a minor degree, is both surprising and disappointing to the subcommittee, especially when it is reminded that these offices have been in existence for a period in excess of 20 years.

This information is transmitted to you for whatever action you deem appropriate under the circumstances. However, it is the hope of this subcommittee that the situation as reported and above described may be soon corrected, at least to the extent that further appropriations for this activity may be more fully justified.

The findings of this investigation have been made known to the Senate subcommittee handling the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 31, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of May 25, informing me of the completion of the investigation of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as authorized by House Resolution No. 69.

As you know, I have expressed my conviction that these offices have highly important functions both in war and peace and it is gratifying that your subcommittee agrees there is a definite need for their services. That your investigators should have found certain reasons for criticism is, of course, regrettable, and while steps have already been taken which should correct the principal difficulties mentioned, every effort will be made to conform with the suggestions you have made.

Although a large part of the work of the offices is directly connected with the war effort, it is my desire that they be a medium through which business may be served, both in meeting wartime needs and in preparing for a high level of production when the war ends.

Some further observations on the points raised in your letter are included in the attached memorandum. I assure you that your interest and cooperation in this matter have been very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MEMORANDUM TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS OF LOUIS C. RABAUT, CHAIRMAN, ON BEHALF OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

A careful study of the views expressed by Chairman RABAUT on behalf of the subcommittee confirms our confidence in the high character of the personnel of the investigating group, their objective approach to the problem, and the thoroughness of the study made of the activities of the field service. The investigators now possess facts and observations obtained from a detached point of view which should be distinctly beneficial to the officials charged with the responsibility of administering the field service. It is hoped that an opportunity may be presented to confer with them.

The view that the service be confined to essential wartime requirements is in accord with the policy enunciated by you during the early days of the defense effort. Although a major portion of the activities presently engaging the attention of the field offices is directly connected with the war effort, and effective wartime aid has been given to both Government and business, the need for continued attention to wartime requirements is recognized.

The information, assistance, and guidance given to businessmen to enable them to meet the problems arising out of the conversion of the commerce and industry of the Nation to a wartime basis carries with it another important responsibility. It is most essential that all businessmen, especially owners of small plants, or proprietors of wholesale or retail establishments be given whatever assistance is possible to help them prepare for the reconversion of their plants or businesses to a peacetime basis after the war is won so that productive private employment can be quickly reestablished at a high level.

Specific reference is made to the offices in Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Memphis. It is realized that careful consideration should be given to strengthening these and certain other offices. After proper consultation with businessmen in these cities, if no plan can be evolved to make them more effective, their activities should be absorbed by other offices where we now have effective representation.

For a number of years the Bureau was represented in Cincinnati by a so-called cooperative office, an arrangement under which an employee of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce was designated as foreign-trade manager at $1 a year, assisted by an employee paid by the Bureau. To enable the Bureau to have better representation in Cincinnati, the assistant to the foreign-trade manager, a Bureau employee, was placed in charge of the Bureau's activities, the chamber providing, without charge, the necessary office space and some clerical assistance. The total cost to the Bureau for the operation of this office

is $2,200. A similar arrangement exists in Indianapolis, where the total Bureau cost is approximately $3,200 per year, with one employee on the Bureau's pay roll. The Memphis office, opened in July 1926, occupies space in a Federal building and is staffed by two employees at a total cost of $6,000 a year.

Recognizing the need for more effective administration of the field offices and to provide further integration of the activities of the various Bureaus of the Department of Commerce in the field, particularly the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the Bureau of the Census, R. C. Miller, Assistant to the Secretary, was designated by you as director of the field service on November 20, 1942. Shortly thereafter, as a further step to strengthen the administrative control in Washington, Joseph A. Mack, who had served in the New York office for over 13 years, was transferred to Washington and given the position of supervising the operation of the field service. The means have been provided, therefore, to overcome the laxity cited and very definite improvements in the service are already in evidence in spite of the uncertainties which have confronted the employees since last December.

The observation concerning the publicizing of the facilities of the field offices for aiding businessmen is well taken. The deficiency in this respect is fully realized and steps have already been taken to correct this condition in cooperation with various commercial and industrial groups. In an exchange of correspondence with Herbert L. Mercready, president of the National Industrial Advertisers Association, Inc., 120 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill., it was agreed that there is a definite need for more adequate merchandising of the services of the field office so that a fuller utilization of these services may be made by businessmen throughout the country. Mr. Mercready is preparing to confer with Department and Bureau officials and has offered his complete cooperation as well as that of the association which he heads. Similar discussions are under way with the National Federation of Sales Executives, a Nation-wide organization with headquarters in New York, and with the editors of Sales Management, a publication with wide circulation and contacts among sales personnel. Promise of complete cooperation has been received and a program to achieve the objectives of the committee will be carried on without cost to the Government. Every effort will be made to further develop the favorable public relations which exist between the offices and the businessmen in a number of cities on a wider scale so that businessmen may make greater use of the aid the field offices are in a position to give them in solving their wartime problems.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount allowed by the conference for field offices was $295,000. The suggestion was made to the department that some of the offices could probably be discontinued during the war period. It is left somewhat in their discretion. The committee also criticized the department for the fact that the offices were not as well known in their respective districts as they should have been to businessmen of the area. The department has promised to correct the situation.

There is an item, "Civil Aeronautics Administration; establishment of air navigation facilities in Alaska, $1,687,000; civilian pilot training program, $29,400,000." Bureau of Standards, a new item, for a wind tunnel for the testing of projectiles very necessary to the war effort, $110,000.

The amount, as I said before, for the restoration of cuts was $284,000. Those sums, added to the amount of $295,000 for the restoration of the field offices, makes a total of $31,776,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report was unanimously reported by all conferees on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has explained the main features of the report. I think I have nothing further to offer. I would request that the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. RABAUT. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] who has been a very helpful member of the committee.

WAR TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of the $29,400,000 which it is proposed to devote to so-called civilian pilot training under the C. A. A. War Training Service. This is apart from the training programs carried on by the C. A. A. for both the Army and Navy, and financed from Army and Navy funds.

The appropriation now under consideration is to cover the training of about 8,600 of the Air Force reservists which you have heard referred to as "the forgotten men of wartime aviation." They are the last of that group which many of us feel got a pretty raw deal at the hands of the Government, and all of them who pass this training successfully will become flight instructors. They are going to have full status now as members of the Army Air Forces. They are being called to active duty as they take this training, will wear the uniform, and be paid $50 a month. The C. A. A. will provide the flight and ground training, food, and shelter.

I favor this appropriation because I am sure these boys have a real contribution to make as flight instructors in the war effort. I felt the same way last year, and so did the Congress for it provided money for the program under which these men were originally recruited.

Let me review their case briefly. They volunteered last autumn and winter as enlisted reservists to be trained by the C. A. A. for noncombat Army flying such as glider, transport service, and instructor pilots. When voluntary enlistments were stopped, these reservists found themselves in a sort of no-man's land. They had volunteered on the basis that the C. A. A. would pay the costs of their training, but they would receive no salary. On the other hand, all the new trainees coming to the C. A. A. on assignment from the Army and Navy were on active duty, with pay, and these new trainees had the right-of-way. There were not enough facilities for everybody and in the shuffles and readjustments, the poor reservist volunteers usually got the short end of the stick. They were subjected to delays between courses sometimes for months. To make things worse, many of them were older men, above the 26-year combat age, who had family responsibilities. But they drew no salaries. They underwent severe hardships. The C. A. A. wanted to pay them, and urged that they be put on a pay basis, but there was no legal way that they could be paid salaries while on inactive reserve status. You will recall that the Congress corrected this recently in Public Law 50 by appropriating $3,500,000 to pay them $50 a month while training or awaiting assignment between courses, and limiting the pay-waiting period between courses to 2 months. The pay was made retroactive to last December.

Now about 8,600 of these volunteers are to be carried through to become flight instructors, if we make this appropriation. I say we should do it. The C. A. A. training program has been the most prolific source of flight instructors which the armed forces have had. It has poured out thousands upon thousands of skilled pilots to teach the first stages of flying in the war program. It is not generally understood that all the Army's primary-stage training is done by civilian schools under contract. And it is not generally known, either, that more than two-thirds of the flight instructors doing that work have come from this C. A. A. program. That is proof enough that they are capable and well trained. They are carrying most of the load. This appropriation is just to give us several thousand more of them, which the Army has agreed that it wants and needs. At least, the Army says it wants them right now, and the best we can do is to proceed on the assumption that it will not change its mind during the training period.

There are several thousand more of these enlisted reservists who probably would not bet on it. They are the so-called excess who cannot be fitted into the present program. Those who are young enough and physically fit enough are being permitted to enter the Army's regular flying cadet training for combat work. Some of the others will be graciously permitted to apply for active duty in the air forces as enlisted men. The remainder will be returned to civilian life and reported back to their draft boards. And all this through no fault of their own.

The plain truth is that these men are excess only because the Army now wants fewer such flyers than it wanted less than a year ago. I believe I am a patriotic American, and I know there are great difficulties involved in running a war, particularly one with seven or eight battle fronts. I think our air forces are doing a splendid job on those fronts, and I am not inclined to be small about mistakes they appear to make in the training program here at home.

I have seen the Army flatly repudiate big programs twice after asking the C A. A. to carry them out and after most of the students had been recruited and were in training; and I said nothing critical about it. I have seen hundreds of flying schools and colleges and universities summarily dropped from this program to center it in a smaller number of big schools. I did not like it, but it seemed reasonable to go along, as far as

one can with the Army, because it has the responsibility of fighting the war.

It is high time, however, for somebody to get up and tell the Army that they ought to be able to make up their minds with great deal less pulling and hauling of people back and forth. It seems likely to me that, no matter what tactical and strategic changes may be necessary with the shifts and changes in the war, there will be relatively few major changes necessary away back in the beginning stages of flight training, where new cadets are learning fundamentals. Yet the Army's position is summed up very well in a June 13 news article put out by the C. A. A. War Training Service. This article explains that these 8,600 enlisted reservists are to be called to active duty, and then it says—I quote:

All the foregoing arrangements are subject to changes in the plans in the armed services.

That is the end of the quotation.

The odd thing, to me, is that the Navy never seems to have any trouble fitting the C. A. A. program into its plans, without shoving people around. The C. A. A. is doing a big job for the Navy right now, as well as for the Army. Every naval air cadet starts his flying in the C. A. A. program, and thousands take additional courses with it, including commissioned naval officers who are transferred to the Bureau of Aeronautics from other branches of the service. I read recently that the C. A. A. program is going to give first-stage flight training to well over 30,000 naval flyers during the fiscal year just beginning.

These things are said, I hope, in a constructive spirit. Our Air Forces are proving that they are sound and good. But one of them could be just as good if it was a great deal more considerate of the civilian colleges and commercial flying schools that have been such a great help to it, and of the civilians who go in, often at personal sacrifice, to try to help get the job done.

I have been asked how many war training programs the C. A. A. is carrying on. Formerly, the programs included training for glider, liaison, transport and instructor pilots for the Army, plus precombat and instructor courses for the Navy. All courses were financed out of C. A. A. appropriations.

Today, the situation is this. Under the $29,400,000 C. A. A.-W. T. S. appropriation, work is going forward in a program designed to give instructor training to some 8,600 students for the Army. In addition to this W. T. S. program, C. A. A. is also doing training paid for by the Army and Navy. The Army training consists of a 10-hour screening course for 70,000 Army reservists. The Navy-C. A. A. program embraces training for 37,780 men, all of whom are given the W. T. S. elementary course, some going on to complete the secondary.

DEVELOPMENT OF LANDING AREAS

An item regarding the development of landing areas in which many Members are interested because they have airports which have not been completed in their districts will be found on page 62, line 1, known as Amendment No. 10, under the head "Development of landing areas." The estimates for this item were not available at the time of the regular hearings by the House committee and was placed in the bill by the Senate. It refers to the reappropriation of certain funds in the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The important information about this item is the reappropriation of $99,000,000 which is intended to be used for the completion of 65 airports which the Army and Navy consider of military necessity. These are part of the original 267 airports which the W. P. A. had under construction and which were left in an uncompleted condition when W. P. A. liquidated. This matter was fully discussed on the floor of the House recently when we had before us the last deficiency bill. The membership of the House may be interested to know that of these 267 W. P. A. airport projects 103 have been completed; 71 have been taken over by the Army or Navy, and it is assumed that either the Army or Navy is operating the 71 airports and probably will improve or complete them. A request is before the Bureau of the Budget for $8,000,000 for the completion of 28 others which have not yet been designated by either the Army or Navy as of military necessity. The 65 airports affected by this amendment and which are designated as of military necessity are in the program of the C. A. A., known as the D. L. A. or Development of Landing Areas. These 65 airports in this D. L. A. program are located in 31 States, and for the information of the membership, I include their locations:

Alabama: Demopolis.

Connecticut: Groton, Hartford, New Haven, Windham.

Delaware: Dover.

Florida: Jacksonville No. 2, Winter Haven.

Idaho: Lewiston.

Indiana: Evansville.

Kansas: Wichita.

Louisiana: New Orleans, A. Callender; Shreveport.

Maryland: Baltimore, Salisbury.

Massachusetts: Fitchburg - Leominster; Hyannis; North Andover, Lawrence; Westfield.

Michigan: Pellston.

Minnesota: Duluth.

Mississippi: Greenville; Greenwood; Jackson, Hinds County.

Missouri: Kansas City, Grandview; St. Louis.

Montana: Havre.

Nebraska: Norfolk.

New Jersey: Atlantic City.

New York: Buffalo; Niagara Falls; Westhampton, Suffolk County.

North Carolina: Elizabeth City, Greensboro-High Point, Kinston, Washington, Wilmington, Winston-Salem.

North Dakota: Grand Forks.

Oklahoma: Cushing, Stillwater.

Oregon: Astoria, North Bend, Ontario.

Pennsylvania: Johnstown.

South Carolina: Beaufort; Charleston, Municipal; Columbia, Owens.

South Dakota: Aberdeen.

Texas: Beaumont, Conroe, Fort Worth, Nacogdoches, Longview.

Vermont: Barre-Montpelier, Burlington.

Virginia: Norfolk.

Washington: Aberdeen - Hoquiam, Deer Park, Olympia, Port Angeles, Yakima.

West Virginia: Parkersburg; Wiley Ford, Cumberland, Md.

Wisconsin: Janesville.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I call the gentleman's attention to amendment No. 15 of the conference report, in the bill on page 69, which I note strikes out an amendment adopted by the House prohibiting the use of any part of this appropriation for promotional work and investigation of butter or substitutes for butter.

Mr. STEFAN. It has to do with studies of dairy substitutes. I want to tell my colleague from Minnesota that we went into this matter very thoroughly in conference and we understand that this work is completed and they will do no more of it hereafter. They have finished with it. The gentleman knows my interest in protecting the dairy industry and the interest of farmers who milk cows and produce our badly needed dairy products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman has been most active in protecting the interests of the dairy industry. However, I want it strictly understood and I want the RECORD to show what the gentleman has had to say, that is, that the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce will not engage in this type of practice which we sought to prohibit.

Mr. STEFAN. No more advertising of any kind of product—butter substitutes or otherwise, so we were informed, and I think I have that assurance from my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and my colleague from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. It was with the understanding that there would be no further work along this line that the House conferees receded.

Mr. STEFAN. That is my understanding and we had that assurance in conference with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get a complete confirmation of the agreement we had in the Senate on this particular amendment, I want to ask my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], that he insert the statement made in connection with this program from the Bureau of Commerce in connection with the advertisement or publicity of butter substitutes and that nothing further would be carried on with sums provided in this bill.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Nebraska is absolutely correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I just wanted to verify the statement from the chairman so that the RECORD will show that the Bureau of Domestic Commerce would not spend any of this appropria-

tion for promotional work or in advertisement of dairy products or any substitutes.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota that with the elimination of this particular item from the bill in which the gentleman is so much interested I can absolutely assure him it is a closed book. It was inherited from the W. P. A., and with such inheritance certain studies were completed. They were completed along lines that were beneficial to the Army and the Navy, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota is in agreement with the war effort and would not want any curtailment placed in the bill that might be injurious to the military effort.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct in that respect, but furthermore we do not want any Government agency to use public money to advertise any particular product or to promote the sale of any substitute.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman can be fully assured that none of the funds can be used for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had completed his statement?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I had not.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand, the field officers of Commerce are delighted with this arrangement.

Mr. STEFAN. Those field officers are restored in the bill, as the conference report shows. We are very anxious to help business—small business especially—and we are assured we will see some results. We want this service more available to private business and want the work extended so as to help small business to survive.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment the gentleman from Nebraska, not only for his interest, but his knowledge of this subject of the aviation section as it affects our war effort. I think what the gentleman has said about the intrinsic value of the C. A. A. programs as they fit themselves into the wartime effort is very well put to the House today. I do feel that criticism made of the Army——

Mr. STEFAN. It is intended only as helpful and constructive criticism.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is constructive criticism and I join with the gentleman in emphasizing the importance of this program in the war effort. I know there are many small contractors who have been kept in a state of suspense not knowing from one week to the other exactly what the Army proposes to do, many of whom had gone to the bank and borrowed money to carry out their contracts. The Navy did not indulge in this sort of practice.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right because he knew the condition right along, and I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia for what he did in encouraging civilian pilot training in the United States at a time when we needed it. And along with him I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. KERR] and other members of the committee for making civilian pilot training possible in the days when it was difficult to convince people of its great importance. Let me give you one testimonial.

Here is a letter from a civilian pilot training program trainee, which is typical of thousands:

APRIL 6, 1943.

Mr. BUCKMAN,
Civilian Pilot Training Program,
Boeing Field, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIR: When I talked to you last fall I thanked you for helping me over the rough spots when I was in civilian pilot training program training. At that time I stressed the usefulness of this training.

In order to illustrate the value of the course offered, I will briefly outline my movements in the Ferry Command.

I joined the Ferry Command on May 1 in Long Beach, Calif. At that time I had about 190 hours, and was checked out in a BT 13A—450 horsepower.

After flying PT's, BT's, and copilot on DC3's, Hudsons, and Venturas for about 70 hours, I was given transition in an A28A-2-1200 H. P. motors.

I was checked out as first pilot on the Hudson when I had 280 hours.

I was checked out in a Ventura-2X2000 H. P. engines—when I had 300 hours.

I was checked out in a B25-2-1750 H. P. motors—when I had 325 hours. I was checked out in an A20-2-1600 H. P. engines—when I had about 395 hours.

I attended an Army instrument school and foreign ferry school at St. Joseph, Mo. I was given my instrument card on a B25 at 415 hours, being checked out by a former airline pilot.

I was given an A20 for foreign ferry and crossed the ocean with 485 hours. The total flight was about 14,000 miles.

I am now being checked out in a B17 with approximately 510 hours.

I was commissioned a second lieutenant after 4 months in the Ferry Command and was raised to a first lieutenant after 3 months because of my twin-engine rating.

I am expecting a captaincy to go with my four-engine rating.

This document is not boasting on my part, as this performance has been duplicated by many other civilian pilot training program students.

I feel that civilian pilot training program students have a better background in fundamentals of flying and in care of aircraft than Army pilots and many old-timers.

We lacked the heavy- and hot-ship time, but we made up for it in navigation and meteorology. I have heard some transition instructors say we were preferred because we were more able to cope with the big ships.

This, I realize, is scant praise for the excellent job you and your organization have done in providing pilots at little cost when they were needed.

Sincerely,

Lt. GORDON E. PROCTOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wanted to make sure that the item providing for the airport at Wichita, Kans., is included in this appropriation. It is very much needed and the people in that community are quite anxious about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Wichita, Kans., is included in the 65 airports or D. L. A. project included in this bill. For the information of the Members I will include in the extension of my remarks the locations and States in which these developments of landing areas are included.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate this information. Now, I want to inquire about another and different item, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska with reference to the item for representation which was discussed on the floor of the House a few days ago. I understand this item has been increased since it left the House. It should have been at least decreased. The gentleman will recall we had it stricken out at one time.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas took a great deal of interest in that item and I tried to help him. When it went to conference there was a compromise, and it was cut a little below what the Senate wanted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is still more than the House provided. I regret the other body saw fit to increase it. I do want to commend the distinguished gentleman for his efforts in securing the reduction and saving the taxpayers at least $5,000. He has done a splendid job and we appreciate it.

Mr. STEFAN. You are correct. We allowed $210,000; the Senate increased it to $230,000; the conference committee compromised at $225,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it is still $15,000 more than the House passed.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it is one of those things on which a compromise had to be reached. The gentleman was very much concerned about it and we took his argument into consideration in the conference.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems that my argument was not strong enough or it would not have been increased $15,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's argument received very careful consideration.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I personally wish to felicitate the gentleman and other members of the conference committee on the statesmanlike job that has been done in considering these additional estimates that have been presented to the Senate as well as those that came to the House committee originally.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman understands that some of these items were not in the House bill originally.

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; I do understand that, but I am particularly grateful because the House conferees with respect to the Alaska items as with respect to

these other items that are desired for the war effort had agreed substantially to the Budget estimates. I wish, however, to address a question to the gentleman with respect to the estimates which came to the Senate in the first instance for air facilities in Alaska and for the setting up of a local field office in the Territory of Alaska.

While much of the testimony given before the Senate subcommittee was off the record, on page 244 of the Senate hearings is a break-down of the supplemental Budget estimate for air navigation facilities totaling $1,842,405, of which all but $169,600 is for expenditure in Alaska. It is regrettable that these facilities now planned were not put in several years ago, but we are grateful to have them for the future. Many people do not understand the vital necessity to our war effort of having adequate airports and air navigation facilities in Alaska and the almost equal necessity, in support of the war effort, in giving suitable aid to civilian air transport in the Territory. It is to be noted that the civilian air lines operating in Alaska always give priority to military demands upon them, and so they are really serving the Army and Navy, perhaps even better than they could if they were directly under military control. Air navigation facilities now provided in the bill will serve not only military requirements but also civilian needs. The committee is to be commended for taking the trouble to learn the situation and thus support the program.

In the Senate hearings on page 223 is an exposition of the need of a field office for the Civil Aeronautics Board in Alaska. The need for the office is fully set out in the Senate hearings so there is no occasion to repeat here the sound reasons which support it.

As I read the hearings and the conference report the House conferees have agreed to substantially all these estimates that were sent to the Senate. I have here also a telegram from the Governor of Alaska in which he expresses concern about the setting up of the field office in Alaska which we all know is necessary. I think the amount asked for in the estimate is $32,000 and as I understand this amount has been included in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the committee members appreciate the great help given by the Delegate from Alaska. That item was included. The committee realizes the great importance of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9, page 60, line 6, insert "Civilian pilot training: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended (49 U. S. C. 751, 752), and as further amended, but limited to the training of sufficient persons, presently enrolled in the civilian pilot training program, to produce 7,200 instructor-course graduates for the Army, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when authorized by the Administrator; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; purchase, cleaning, and repair of special aviation wearing apparel and parachutes; traveling expenses; not to exceed $100,000 for the purchase of aircraft for administrative purposes; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft and passenger-carrying automobiles; pay at a rate of $50 per month to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein, while undergoing training and during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses) pursuant to the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, travel and subsistence of trainees, $33,940,358: *Provided*, That not to exceed $441,000 of this amount may be transferred to the appropriation 'Enforcement of safety regulations, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for expenditure in connection with payment of salaries and travel of personnel engaged in supervision and promotion of the safety features of the civilian pilot training program, and not to exceed $258,662 may be transferred to the appropriation 'General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available after September 1, 1943, to pay any member of the enlisted reserve on inactive status."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and agree to the same with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$33,940,358" in such amendment insert "$29,400,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a word of explanation about the amendment. The Budget estimate for this item was $27,874,000. The Senate originally allowed and increased the item to $33,940,358. That was a temporary action on the part of the Senate, pending receipt of additional data. Subsequently, they received from the Bureau of the Budget a revised estimate for this activity of $29,339,533 and that was increased and allowed in conference in the sum of $29,400,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 1, insert "Development of landing areas: The consolidated appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, shall remain available until June 30, 1944, without warrant action: *Provided*, That not to exceed $158,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the development of landing areas program."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the Senate, insert the following paragraph:

"The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is a clarifying amendment and makes the funds retroactive to July 1 should the bill not be signed until after that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

HON. JESSE JONES

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we are passing through an era when criticism is the order of the day. The restrictions under which we must all live have caused many people to attack policies and people more in irritation than in justice. Records of distinguished public service have been ignored and forgotten. Brickbats are thrown where praise should be bestowed.

An outstanding example of a man who has served his country only to be rewarded by unjust criticism, often malicious, is Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce. For more than 11 years, Mr. Jones—first as a director of the R. F. C., then as Chairman of that Board, as Federal Loan Administrator, and as Secretary of Commerce—has given unselfish and devoted service to the Nation.

He was the man who rebuilt the banking structure of the United States after its collapse in 1932. He was the man who revitalized the railroads of this country. He was the man who restored the economic vitality of our business structure. He did this without playing politics and in such a businesslike way that the operations of the R. F. C.—prior to our entry in the war—were conducted at no cost to the Government and with a surplus more than sufficient to take care of all possible losses.

If Mr. Jones, as a public servant, had done nothing else, he would deserve the praise and gratitude of every citizen.

When the United States initiated its national-defense program, Mr. Jones immediately brought the agencies under his jurisdiction into step with our preparedness and war effort.

The activities of the various loan agencies under his control have been of untold assistance to our military effort. Because Mr. Jones was a businessman, he has been able to enlist the aid of businessmen throughout the country.

He and his associates have authorized the use of more than $20,000,000,000 in the war program. They have built and expanded facilities, acquired critical and strategic materials—whenever they were needed by the armed services or the production agencies of this Government.

Critics have attempted to belittle Mr. Jones' part in the war effort. Invariably they have spoken either from ignorance or malice. He has been attacked because he has proceeded along businesslike lines to do the tasks that were assigned to him. The United States could well afford to have more men with his knowledge and experience in high places, for I certainly regard it as no crime to have in government a man who seeks to protect the interest of his country and its citizens.

It would have been easy for Mr. Jones to have been less conscientious and painstaking. It takes no skill to waste the people's money. It takes no training to neglect the people's interest.

When the history of this period is surveyed by the calm judgment of future historians, it is my certain belief that the record of Jesse Jones as a public servant will shine as a bright light. Those who now criticize him, either from selfish motives or because he refuses to yield an inch from what his conscience tells him is the right and proper thing to do, will leave no stains upon his record.

It is my sincere conviction that men who have given as much of themselves to their country as Jesse Jones has done should be praised, and I am happy to be in a position today to raise my voice to extoll such services in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report and the several amendments were agreed to and I ask unanimous consent that that motion be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

PETROLEUM COMMITTEE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Petroleum Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 40 and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, and 69; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$95,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,676"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$122,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,840,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$977,107"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$145,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$261,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, and after the comma, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Number 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$244,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 25, 27, 32, 45, 57, 58, 59, 68, 70, and 72.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1, relating to the Department of Inspections: Provides for the amount proposed by the Senate, $279,640, in lieu of $274,280 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, relating to the Auditor's Office: Provides for $153,010 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $145,810 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, relating to expenses of weights, measures, and markets: Deletes the words "including exchange", thus providing the office with an additional car.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: The one corrects punctuation and the other provides for personal services $95,200 in lieu of $97,700 as proposed by the Senate and $85,400 as proposed by the House. The amount agreed upon will provide for the following items not contained in the House bill: One engineer, P–4; one inspector, SP–6; one accounting and auditing assistant, CAF–5; and clerical and contingent expenses for the People's Counsel, $2,000.

The position of engineer P–4, above noted, is allowed with the understanding that the position, which is currently provided for and at present vacant, will be filled on a temporary basis so that the creation of a new position will not be necessitated, if and when the last incumbent returns from military service.

Amendment No. 7, relating to the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board: The proposal of the Senate is agreed to, which provides $36,630 in lieu of $33,365.

Amendment No. 8, relating to the Zoning Commission: Provides for $12,720 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $9,280 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, relating to personal services of the Office of Register of Wills: Provides for $80,676 in lieu of $83,556 as proposed by the Senate, and $79,056 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10, relating to personal services of the Office of the Recorder of Deeds: Provides for $122,730 in lieu of $127,800 as proposed by the Senate and $116,730 as proposed by the House.

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Amendment No. 11, relating to judicial expenses: Inserts the Senate language, which allows expenses to be incurred in cases before the United States Court of Appeals and the courts of the District of Columbia. This language clarifies the purpose of the appropriation in view of the judicial set-up within the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 12, relating to general advertising: Adopts the Senate's proposed language clarifying the purposes for which the appropriation may be used.

Amendment No. 13, relating to printing and binding: Provides for $63,885 as proposed by the House in lieu of $65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15, relating to the Central Garage: Provide for $1,950 for an automobile for the executive office in lieu of $2,650 as proposed by the Senate and corrects the total accordingly.

Amendment No. 16, relating to Central Control of Emergency Ambulance Service: Provides for $12,000 for this purpose as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the refund of erroneous collections: Provides for $100,000 as proposed by the House in lieu of $75,000 as provided by the Senate.

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Amendment No. 18, relating to personal services: Provides for $495,036 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $489,096 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19, relating to maintenance, alterations, etc.: Provides $43,225 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $49,875 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20, relating to the reappropriation of funds now available, not in excess of $7,000, for new central building of the Public Library: The House accepts the Senate language.

SEWERS

Amendment No. 21, relating to sewers and receiving basins: The House accepts the language inserted by the Senate which reappropriates unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 22, relating to rental of storage property for construction materials: The Senate recedes from its amendment appropriating $15,000 for this purpose.

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

Amendment No. 23, relating to street cleaning: Provides for $713,900 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $543,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24, relating to garbage disposal: Provides for $1,453,400 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $1,168,400 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Amendment No. 26, relating to general supervision and instruction: Provides for $8,840,400 in lieu of $8,898,000 as provided by the Senate and $8,801,150 as proposed by the House. In arriving at this compromise, $29,650 for physical education textbooks, equipment, etc., and $9,600 for 3 assistant principals are added to the House proposal.

Amendment No. 28, relating to science laboratories: The House agrees to the Senate proposal reappropriating unexpended balances for this purpose.

Amendment No. 29, relating to plans and specifications for building construction: Accedes to the Senate clarification of House language regarding such construction.

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 30, relating to salaries and expenses: Accedes to the Senate figure of $496,118 in lieu of the House proposal, $416,760.

Amendment No. 31, relating to medical services: Accepts the Senate language for housekeeping assistance in cases of authentic indigent sick. In agreeing to the program, it is understood by the managers on the part of the House and the Senate that the furnishing of such housekeeping assistance is to be continued only as a temporary program during fiscal year 1944.

Amendment No. 33, relating to inspections: Provides for $214,202 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $208,602 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Accepts Senate proposal for repairs, alterations, etc., to Henry School in order to adapt it for health center and for expenses of operation and maintenance of same. The former amount is $15,000 and the latter $6,120.

Amendment No. 36, relating to repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds of the Glenn Dale Sanatorium: Provides for Senate amount of $12,630 in lieu of House figure of $10,230, and reappropriates $5,100 of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 37: Reappropriates $10,000 of the unexpended balances of appropriations for repairs, alterations, etc., to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, 40, and 41, relating to personal services, Gallinger Hospital: No. 38 changes name of physicians resident at the hospital; No. 39 adopts the Senate proposal of fixing the salaries of certain such medical officers at $6,000; No. 40 retains the House proposal for salaries of other such medical officers at $3,200; and No. 41 provides for a total of $977,107 in lieu of the Senate proposal of $985,107 and the House proposal of $974,707

Amendment No. 42, relating to repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds at Gallinger Hospital: Reappropriates funds presently available and unexpended for this purpose in addition to the direct appropriation.

Amendment No. 43, relating to Washington Home for Incurables: Accedes to the Senate proposal of $19,500 in lieu of the House proposal of $15,000.

COURTS

Amendment No. 44, relating to the juvenile court: Adopts the Senate proposal of $121,595 in lieu of the House proposal of $120,175.

Amendment No. 46, relating to personal services, municipal court for the District of Columbia: Provides for $237,610 in lieu of the Senate proposal of $240,850 and the House proposal of $234,190. This provides for one probation officer at $1,800 and one stenographer at $1,620 to be added to the House provision.

Amendment No. 47, relating to the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia: Accedes to the Senate proposal of $54,443 in lieu of the House figure of $52,510.

PROBATION SYSTEM

Amendments Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52: Amendments Nos. 48, 49, and 50 clarify title of the appropriation. Amendments Nos. 51 and 52 increase by $4,440 the amount of the House proposal for personal services and correct the total for the probation system accordingly.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Amendment No. 53, relating to Board of Public Welfare: Provides for the Senate figure of $203,280 in lieu of the House proposal, $185,540.

Amendment No. 54, relating to board and care of children committed: Reduces the House proposal of $305,000 to the Senate proposal of $286,000 and provides for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 55, relating to personal services, jail: Provides for $145,750 in lieu of the Senate proposal of $149,230 and the House proposal of $142,750. This compromise adds the salaries of two guards at $1,500 to the House figure.

Amendment No. 56, relating to personal services, Workhouse and Reformatory: Provides for the Senate proposal of $641,344 in lieu of $637,544, the House proposal.

Amendment No. 60, relating to the Industrial Home School: Provides for the Senate proposal of $20,000 instead of the House figure, $5,000, which increase is to be used for the repairs and improvements to the buildings now occupied by the National Training School for Girls.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Home for the Aged and Infirm, salaries: The House accedes to the Senate increase for personal services of $3,600.

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, and 65, relating to public assistance: Provides as proposed by the Senate for a limitation of $73,170 on the amount to be expended for personal services; appropriates $261,740 in lieu of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $286,740 as proposed by the Senate; and, in addition, accepts the Senate language reappropriating unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations; accepts the Senate proposal providing for the burial of indigent persons and certification of persons eligible for public benefits.

Amendment No. 66, relating to home care for dependent children: Provides for the Senate figure of $243,400 in lieu of $298,400 as proposed by the House and accepts the Senate recommendation for a reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 67, relating to assistance against old-age want: Provides for the Senate amount, $635,465, in lieu of $635,465 as proposed by the House, and accepts the Senate recommendation for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 69: Provides for a change of date in correction of clerical error.

Amendment No. 71: The Senate recedes from the appropriation of $10,500 proposed for the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency.

Amendment No. 73, relating to personal services, water department: Provides for $244,360 in lieu of $244,860 as proposed by the Senate and $239,760 as proposed by the House. A new position of Registrar, at $4,600, was added to the House figure. The District Commissioners are expected by both committees to conduct an independent investigation of the entire water system of the District of Columbia and of the report made thereon by the General Accounting Office.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendment No. 4, relating to advancements to the Superintendent of Weights and Measures and Markets for use in connection with investigations. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Amendment No. 25, relating to salary schedule of the Acting Superintendent of Schools during the absence of the Superintendent. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 27, relating to assignment of certain teachers to pupil guidance. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 32, relating to amount of appropriation for medical services. The managers on the part of the House will offer

a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment increasing the Senate figure to $755,760.

Amendment No. 45, relating to detailing of psychiatric services by the Public Health Service to the juvenile court. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 57, relating to acquisition of land for Workhouse and Reformatory. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59, relating to the acquisition of land and construction of temporary buildings for the National Training School for Girls. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

Amendment No. 68, relating to the penny-milk program for the school children of the District of Columbia and the supervision of Victory gardens, etc. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 70, relating to the settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 72, relating to construction of a covered reservoir adjacent to the McMillan filter plant and the increase in authority therefor. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year which is soon to begin.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia began hearings on this bill on March 16, the bill was submitted to the House and passed the House on the 20th of April, and carried an appropriation of something less than $55,000,000.

The bill went to the Senate and passed the Senate sometime ago. We have worked out in conference with the Senate a complete agreement with respect to all portions of the bill. We have worked out what we think is, on the whole, a fairly satisfactory bill. The Senate made certain increases in the bill totaling about $1,000,000. Some of those increases can be explained by reason of the fact that after the bill went to the Senate certain additional Budget estimates were presented. On the whole the bill was not greatly changed by the action of the other body.

There have been a number of minor features added in the bill, for example, housekeeping aides in the Health Department, some additional money for the schools, and some additional money for the sewer system and for the refuse department, but, on the whole, no very material changes were made.

If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to consume 5 minutes on a bill which has been fully explained to the House. We are fully agreed. As the distinguished chairman of our committee informed the House, this is the result of a conference with the Senate, and an agreement has been reached. I feel that in this bill the District has been amply provided for as far as those needs for which justifications had been made to us by the various agencies of the District. As the war continues and Washington becomes more and more important as the world headquarters for a world at war, changes will continually be made and new facilities and additional requests will be made of Congress. I think that those new requests should come to us in the form of deficiency bills as emergencies arise. However, with the information we had up to the time we met with the Senate, I believe that everything within reason has been provided for the District that was requested of us by the Commissioners and the various citizens' associations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, H. R. 2397, and include therein a telegram or excerpts therefrom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill and to include therein a letter and a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Pennsylvania oil fields where I talked to both producers and refiners. They tell me that there is approximately 5,000 wells in the field not being pumped. Leases are being scrapped and the casing from the wells sold for junk.

They also tell me that with a 50- to 75-cent increased price on a barrel of crude oil that they can increase production approximately 15,000 barrels a day. They would start to drill approximately 500 new wells and all the old wells would be put back on the pump.

There is an estimated potential volume of 900,000,000 barrels of oil on the western edge of this eastern market which is so sorely in need of gasoline. A 50 to 75 cents a barrel increase on oil would mean less than one-half cent a gallon on refined products. By that, I mean, lubricating oil, gasoline, benzene, naphtha, and so forth.

Let me advise you that approximately 40 to 50 percent of a barrel of crude oil is gasoline. If we can increase production in the Pennsylvania fields 15,000 barrels a day it would mean 7,500 barrels of gasoline, at 42 gallons to a barrel, or 315,000 gallons a day; or in a period of a month they could produce over 9,000,000 gallons of gasoline to afford relief to millions of gasoline hungry people in the highly populated area throughout the eastern section of the United States who are crying for relief. In the name of common sense let us wake up this O. P. A. outfit, or kick them out.

Oil today is at 60 percent parity and the impractical visionaries in the Office of Price Administration have determined to hold the line. Deputy Administrator Sumner Pike is responsible for this hold the line action, that is causing the serious oil and gasoline shortage in America. He is one of the new school of thought intellectuals who has been loaned to Administrator Prentiss Brown.

I do not know how much interest Administrator Brown is paying on the loan, but if I were he, I would discount this loan of Sumner Pike and pay it off and shoot him back to the Securities Exchange Commission from where he originally came. It would be helpful to millions of suffering motorists.

The people of America are crying for gasoline and it seems that we in the Congress should demand that something be done. We know where the oil can be gotten almost immediately to secure the gasoline to afford relief. Why do we tolerate conditions such as exist here in Washington today? Why do we tolerate Sumner Pike?

The oil man wants no subsidies which they are pushing at him. All he wants is a fair price for his oil and he will get the oil which will, I am certain, bring relief to millions of people throughout the East who are begging for gasoline.

Give the Pennsylvania grade crude-oil industry the job to do, a price to insure lifting costs for oil, and they will produce the oil that will produce the gasoline so business, industry, labor, and the farmer can operate in a normal manner.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to increase the price for that oil which is now being pumped and on which the companies or organizations operating are now making a profit in order to get the increased production from wells which have stopped producing, according to the gentleman's testimony? Does not the gentleman agree that if that new production is necessary it would be cheaper for all concerned to pay subsidies on the production from the wells he proposes to make active?

Mr. GAVIN. The people to whom I am referring are not companies, they are small independent producers. There are thousands of them in the Pennsylvania fields who have been on a starvation diet for the past 10 years. They have leases. They pump the oil and they sell

to the oil companies. The oil companies have marketing outlets, retail outlets, and Government contracts. The producers are not making money. But when they cannot get the lifting cost for the oil they abandon the wells and refuse to pump them and the oil is lost when it is needed for gasoline. The oil is in the earth. Approximately 900,000,000 barrels of oil are down in the Pennsylvania sands waiting to be coaxed up out of the earth; when the producers get a price commensurate with the cost to do the job these men will get the oil and the public will get the gasoline. Until such a price increase is granted, they cannot get the oil because of increased material costs and increased labor costs. The price of oil has been static since October 1941. The result is that the industry is dormant, production is decreasing, and the people are going hungry for gasoline.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Wichita Beacon of Wichita, Kans., under date of June 20, relative to the Lea-Bailey bill on aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], who has just spoken on the oil shortage in the Eastern States, I call attention to the fact that these Representatives along the eastern seaboard are as much responsible for that condition as anybody else in the world. The oil production in Pennsylvania is only 47,000 barrels a day. The oil production in Michigan is only 47,000 barrels a day.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman's figures are wrong.

Mr. RANKIN. My figures are correct. I have checked them. That is the testimony given before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the people who know the oil production in the United States.

We are short around 600,000 barrels a day in the Eastern States. If the Members along the Atlantic seaboard had not helped to kill the appropriation for the construction of that short link of the intercoastal canal across the Florida Peninsula, they would soon be getting all the oil and gasoline they need. So why get up here now and say that it is necessary to drill more oil wells in Pennsylvania when we have all of the oil and gas we need, but we need some method of transportation to get it to the Atlantic seaboard, and the very ones who are complaining are preventing the construction of those methods of transportation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the gentleman tell me how the Florida ship canal would put gasoline into the motorists' tanks right now? It would take 3 years to do that job.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is 6 months late and 6 months early. If he had joined with us a year ago we would have had the canal practically completed.

Mr. GAVIN. I was not here a year ago.

Mr. RANKIN. You will be crying a year from now just as badly as you are today, because you will have everybody up and down the Atlantic seaboard on your necks for not having provided the means for bringing oil and gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. GAVIN. They are not my necks. I am trying to secure relief for the long-suffering American people.

Let me explain this to the gentleman in just a minute. We have the oil. Fifty percent of a barrel of crude oil is gasoline. We can increase the production 15,000 barrels a day to take care of these people on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. RANKIN. But 15,000 barrels of oil a day increase would be just like giving it to them with a medicine dropper. What you need is an additional 600,000 barrels a day In order to get that to supply the Atlantic seaboard with oil and gasoline, you will have to have the canal completed across the Florida Peninsula or else you are going to be in a worse condition a year from now than you are today, if the war continues.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I hate to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, but all the transportation facilities in the world, the ships, and the Florida ship canal or anything else, is not going to get oil 6 months from now——

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I know the gentleman has fought this bill for 2 years, but 8 months from today, 9 months from today, a year and a half from today, you will all be singing the same song, and if you had not voted against this proposition all along you would have had oil today. They are undertaking now to pipe oil out of Oklahoma a long distance through a pipe line which will not send more than 250,000 barrels a day at the best, even if your 24-inch pipe line holds, which I seriously doubt. No such line ever has held any great length of time. And there is a very grave question whether or not this one will hold, and when you join with these enemies of the Florida ship canal along the Atlantic seaboard, you help to shut the door of hope in the faces of the people in the Atlantic States for an adequate supply of gasoline and oil.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I suggest to the gentleman there is a lot in what he says, but I can suggest a way that we can get oil and gas, and that is to grant the request for an adequate rise in the price of oil.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman has some bootstrap substitute to offer, I prefer that he offer it in his own time.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is right about the Florida ship canal, but does not the same thing apply to the St. Lawrence waterway? If we had that bill, we would have been able to get lots of oil from the Middle West.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, and these same people along the Atlantic seacoast shot the bottom out of their own boat by opposing the St. Lawrence project. Not only that, but they denied to the people of the northeastern States the use of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year, which that great project would have provided.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 19, insert "*Provided*, That the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Superintendent of the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets, upon requisition previously approved by the Auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money, not exceeding $100 at any one time, to be used exclusively in connection with investigations and detection of short weights and measures, and to be accounted for monthly on itemized vouchers to the accounting officials of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the amendment, change the period to a colon and add "*Provided further*, That the appropriations and authority contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *And provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment numbered 4 simply provides that the Superintendent of the Departments of Weights, Measures, and Markets may be provided by the auditor of the District of Columbia with a small sum of money to enable him to more effectively carry on the duties of his office. The amendment that I offer is an amend-

ment that is being offered to all of these appropriation bills, providing for the validation of expenditures for the interim, if there be any, between the time this bill becomes the law, and the first day of July.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 23, line 18, after the word "available", insert "*Provided*, That the Board of Education is authorized to assign the Acting Superintendent of Schools to the salary schedule for the Superintendent of Schools, contained in the Teachers' Salary Act of 1924, during the time the said Superintendent is granted leave of absence without pay by the Board of Education, and this appropriation shall be available for payment on that basis of the salary of the Acting Superintendent."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: After the word "activities", page 24, line 18, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That from the funds provided for salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia public schools the Board of Education is authorized to pay the salaries of such teachers, not to exceed one in each junior high school and one in each elementary school, as may be assigned, at a grade not higher than P-3, to supervisory duties in connection with pupil guidance."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 32, line 4, strike out "$708,375" and insert "$754,820."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment: In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senate, insert "$755,760."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides an additional sum for the health department. It provides for $940 for traveling expenses here in the District of Columbia, in connection with the work of the health department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 42, line 11, insert "The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to obtain psychiatric service for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia from the United States Public Health Seryice, and, at the request of the Board of Commisisoners, the Surgeon General is authorized to detail the necessary medical and other personnel, not to exceed one psychiatrist, one psychologist, and one nurse, for this purpose."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 45 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57: Page 48, line 18, insert: "For an additional amount for the acquisition by the Commissioners of additional land for the workhouse and reformatory, $750, and the appropriation of $25,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, shall continue available in the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a clear title cannot be assured through conveyance the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said State, and not to exceed $750 shall be available for expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 58: Page 51, line 3, insert: "For the acquisition of a site in Maryland for the National Training School for Girls, including the preparation of plans for permanent buildings and traveling expenses, $42,000: *Provided*, That title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of said property, the Attorney General of the United States at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such property as may be selected in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, and expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of said appropriation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 58 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 59: Page 51, line 16, insert: "For the construction of temporary buildings for the National Training School for Girls on a new site to be acquired in Maryland, including furniture and equipment, $40,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 59.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68: Page 56, line 16, insert: "For necessary expenses, including personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the carrying out, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissions of the District of Columbia, of a 'penny milk' program for the school children of the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture, and for the carrying out of a food-conservation program in the District of Columbia, including the supervision of 'Victory' gardens and the canning of the products thereof, $75,000: *Provided*, That collections from the milk program shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, and that reimbursement for such canning shall be in kind and for the benefit of public-welfare institutions of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 68.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follow :

Amendment No. 70: Page 74, line 4, insert "The Commissioners are hereby authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., growing out of the construction of the Franklin Street Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $47,177.05, for the sum of $32,279.83; and the Commissioners are further authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the said company, growing out of the construction of the Eastern Avenue Bridge and approaches, in the amount of $13,684.14, for the sum of $10,999.45."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 70 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 72: Page 78, line 20, insert "For an additional amount for the construction of a covered reservoir of approximately 20,000,000-gallon capacity on United States Government-owned land adjacent to the present filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan filter plant, with all necessary appurtenances and auxiliaries, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $69,500, to continue available until expended, and the authorized limit of cost of the said reservoir, appurtenances, and auxiliaries is hereby increased from $620,000 to $689,500."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 72 and agree to the same with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 72 and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: After "$69,500" strike out "to continue available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMPTE.

CONVEYANCE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA FOR RECREATIONAL AND WILDLIFE PURPOSES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes, insist on the amendments of the House to the said bill, and agree to the conference asked.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMPTE.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the disposition of business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS USED IN COMMERCE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 82), to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the legislation?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be glad to. This bill in its present terms and provisions was passed by the House in the last Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no difference between this bill and the bill previously passed by the House?

Mr. LANHAM. Except that we have added to this bill three amendments which the Senate committee had recommended. The bill did not come up in the Senate until the last day and in the final rush of legislative work it was not passed. Any further necessary hearings will be held before the Senate committee. We have been working on this for about 4 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are the other amendments that the Senate is going to consider viewed favorably by your committee?

Mr. LANHAM. The three Senate amendments included in this bill are entirely favorable to our committee. Representatives of our committee attended those hearings.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is a unanimous report of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. LANHAM. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SECTION 1. The owner of a trade-mark used in commerce may register his trade-mark under this act on the principal register hereby established:

(a) By filing in the Patent Office—

(1) a written application, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, verified by the applicant, or by a member of the firm or an officer of the corporation or association applying, specifying applicant's domicile and citizenship, the date of applicant's first use of the mark, the date of applicant's first use of the mark in commerce, the goods in connection with which the mark is used and the mode or manner in which the mark is used in connection with such goods, and including a statement to the effect that the person making the verification believes himself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he makes the verification, to be the owner of the mark sought to be registered, that the mark is in use in commerce, and that no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as might be calculated to deceive: *Provided*, That in the case of every application claiming concurrent use the applicant shall state exceptions to his claim of exclusive use, in which he shall specify, to the extent of his knowledge, any concurrent use by others, the goods or services in connection with which and the areas in which each concurrent use exists, the periods of each use, and the goods and area for which the applicant desires registration;

(2) a drawing of the mark; and

(3) such number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark as actually used as may be required by the Commissioner.

(b) By paying into the Patent Office the filing fee.

(c) By complying with such rules or regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

(d) If the applicant is not domiciled in the United States he shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with him or mailing to him a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

MARKS REGISTRABLE ON THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SEC. 2. No trade-mark by which the goods of the applicant may be distinguished from the goods of others shall be refused registration on the principal register on account of its nature unless it—

(a) Consists of or comprises immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter; or matter which may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute.

(b) Consists of or comprises the flag or coat of arms or other insignia of the United States, or of any State or municipality, or of any foreign nation, or any simulation thereof.

(c) Consists of or comprises a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual except by his written consent, or the name, signature, or portrait of a deceased President of the United States during the life of his widow, if any, except by the written consent of the widow.

(d) Consists of or comprises a mark which so resembles a mark registered in the Patent Office or a mark or trade name previously used in the United States by another and not abandoned, as to be likely, when applied to the goods of the applicant, to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may register as concurrent registrations the same or similar marks to more than one registrant when they have become entitled to use such marks as a result of their concurrent lawful use thereof in commerce prior to any of the filing dates of the applications involved and the Commissioner or a court on appeal determines that confusion or mistake or deceit of purchasers is not likely to result from the continued use of said marks under conditions and limitations as to the mode or place of use of the goods in connection with which such registrations may be granted which conditions and limitations shall be prescribed in the grant of the concurrent registrations thereof; and concurrent registrations may be similarly granted by the Commissioner with such conditions and limitations when a court has finally determined that more than one person is entitled to use the same or similar marks in commerce. The Commissioner shall give not less than 30 days' written notice to all applicants, registrants, and users specified by any of the parties concerned of any application for concurrent registration and of the time and place of the hearings thereon. When the Commissioner decides to grant a concurrent registration the proposed registration shall be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office and the application shall be subject to opposition as hereinafter provided for other applications to register marks. Concurrent registrations may be ordered by a court in an action under the provisions of section 4915, Revised Statutes, under such conditions and limitations as the court considers proper in accordance herewith.

(e) Consists of a mark which, (1) when applied to the goods of the applicant is merely descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, or (2) when applied to the goods of the applicant is primarily geographically descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, except as indications of regional origin may be registrable under section 4 hereof, or (3) is primarily merely a surname.

(f) Except as expressly excluded in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section,

nothing herein shall prevent the registration of a mark used by the applicant which has become distinctive of the applicant's goods in commerce. The Commissioner may accept as prima facie evidence that the mark has become distinctive, as applied to the applicant's goods in commerce, proof of substantially exclusive and continuous use thereof as a mark by the applicant in commerce for the 5 years next preceding the date of the filing of the application for its registration.

SERVICE MARKS REGISTRABLE

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, service marks used in commerce shall be registrable, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner thereof makes or sells the goods on which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such service marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

COLLECTIVE AND CERTIFICATION MARKS REGISTRABLE

SEC. 4. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, collective and certification marks, including indications of regional origin used in commerce, shall be registrable under this act, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, by persons, and nations, States, municipalities, and the like, exercising legitimate control over the use of the marks sought to be registered, even though not possessing an industrial or commercial establishment, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner or a user thereof makes or sells the goods or performs the services on or in connection with which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such collective marks and certification marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

USE BY RELATED COMPANIES

SEC. 5. Where a registered mark or a mark sought to be registered is or may be used by related companies, such use shall inure to the benefit of the registrant or applicant for registration, and such use shall not affect the validity of such mark or of its registration, provided such mark is not used in such manner as to deceive the public.

DISCLAIMERS

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall require unregistrable matter to be disclaimed, but such disclaimer shall not prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights then existing or thereafter arising in the disclaimed matter, nor shall such disclaimer prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights of registration on another application of later date if the disclaimed matter has become distinctive of the applicant's or owner's goods or services.

CERTIFICATES

SEC. 7. (a) Certificates of registration of marks registered upon the principal register shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent Office, and shall either be signed by the Commissioner or have his name printed thereon and attested by an assistant commissioner or by one of the law examiners duly designated by the Commissioner, and a record thereof, together with printed copies of the drawing and statement of the applicant, shall be kept in books for that purpose. The certificate shall reproduce the drawing of the mark, contain the statement of the applicant and state that the mark is registered on the principal register under this act, the date of the first use of the mark, the date of the first use of the mark in commerce, the particular goods or services for which it is registered, the number and date of the registration, the term thereof, the date on which the application for registration was received in the Patent Office, and any conditions and limitations that may be imposed in the grant of the registration.

(b) A certificate of registration of a mark upon the principal register provided by this act shall be prima facie evidence of the validity of the registration, registrants, ownership of the mark, and of registrant's exclusive right to use the mark in commerce in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions and limitations stated therein.

(c) A certificate of registration of a mark may be issued to the assignee of the applicant, but the assignment must first be recorded in the Patent Office. In case of change of ownership the Commissioner shall, at the request of the owner and upon a proper showing and the payment of the fee herein provided, issue to such assignee a new certificate of registration of the said mark in the name of such assignee, and for the unexpired part of the original period.

(d) At any time, upon application of the registrant and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner may permit any registration in the Patent Office to be surrendered, canceled, or for good cause to be amended, and he may permit any registered mark to be disclaimed in whole or in part: *Provided*, That the registration when so amended shall still contain registrable matter and the mark as amended shall still be registrable as a whole, and that such amendment or disclaimer does not involve such changes in the registration as to alter materially the character of the mark. The Commissioner shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office and upon the certificate of registration or, if said certificate is lost or destroyed, upon a certified copy thereof.

(e) Copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the Patent Office relating to marks, and copies of certificates of registration, when authenticated by the seal of the Patent Office and certified by the Commissioner, or in his name by a chief of division duly designated by the Commissioner, shall be evidence in all cases wherein the originals would be evidence; and any person making application therefor and paying the fee required by law shall have such copies.

(f) Whenever a material mistake in a registration, incurred through the fault of the Patent Office, is clearly disclosed by the records of the Office a certificate stating the fact and nature of such mistake, signed by the Commissioner and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, shall be issued without charge and recorded and a printed copy thereof shall be attached to each printed copy of the registration certificate and such corrected certificate shall thereafter have the same effect as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form, or in the discretion of the Commissioner a new certificate of registration may be issued without charge. All certificates of correction heretofore issued in accordance with the rules of the Patent Office and the registrations to which they are attached shall have the same force and effect as if such certificates and their issue had been specifically authorized by statute.

(g) Whenever a mistake has been made in a registration and a showing has been made that such mistake occurred in good faith through the fault of the applicant, the Commissioner is authorized to issue a certificate of correction or, in his discretion, a new certificate upon the payment of the required fee: *Provided*, That the correction does not involve such changes in the registration as to require republication of the mark.

DURATION

SEC. 8. (a) Each certificate of registration shall remain in force for 20 years: *Provided*, That the registration of any mark under the provisions of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years following its date, unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of registration.

(b) Any registration published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years after the date of such publication unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

(c) The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files either of the above-prescribed affidavits of his acceptance or refusal thereof and, if a refusal, the reasons therefor.

RENEWAL

SEC. 9. Each registration may be renewed for periods of 20 years from the end of the expiring period upon the filing of an application therefor accompanied by an affidavit by the registrant stating that the mark is still in use in commerce and the payment of the renewal fee required by this act; and such application may be made at any time within 6 months before the expiration of the period for which the certificate of registration was issued or renewed, or it may be made within 3 months after such expiration on payment of the additional fee herein provided.

An applicant for renewal not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ASSIGNMENT

SEC. 10. A registered mark or a mark for which application to register has been filed shall be assignable with the goodwill of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark, and in any such assignment it shall not be necessary to include the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by any other mark used in the business or by the name or style under which the business is conducted: *Provided*, That any assigned registration may be canceled at any time if the registered mark is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used. Assignments shall be by instruments in writing duly executed. Acknowledgment shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment and when recorded in the Patent Office the record shall be prima facie evidence of execution. An assignment shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser for a valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded in the Patent Office within 3 months after the date thereof or prior to such subsequent purchase. The Commissioner shall keep a separate record of such assignments submitted to him for recording.

An assignee not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND VERIFICATIONS

SEC. 11. Acknowledgments and verifications required hereunder may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States or before any official authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country concerned whose authority shall be proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and shall be valid if they comply with the laws of the State or country where made.

PUBLICATION

SEC. 12. (a) Upon the filing of an application for registration and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made and, if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to registration, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office.

(b) If the applicant is found not entitled to registration, the examiner shall advise the applicant thereof and of the reasons therefor. The applicant shall have a period of 6 months in which to reply or amend his application, which shall then be reexamined. This procedure may be repeated until (1) the examiner finally refuses registration of the mark or (2) the applicant fails for a period of 6 months to reply or amend or appeal, whereupon the application shall be deemed to have been abandoned, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unavoidable, whereupon such time may be extended.

(c) A registrant of a mark registered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may, at any time prior to the expiration of the registration thereof, upon the payment of the prescribed fee file with the Commissioner an affidavit setting forth those goods stated in the registration on which said mark is in use in commerce and that the registrant claims the benefits of this act for said mark. The Commissioner shall publish notice thereof with a reproduction of said mark in the Official Gazette, and notify the registrant of such publication and of the requirement for the affidavit of use or nonuse as provided for in subsection (b) of section 8 of this act.

OPPOSITION

SEC. 13. Any person who believes that he would be damaged by the registration of a mark upon the principal register may, upon payment of the required fee, file a verified notice of opposition in the Patent Office, stating the grounds therefor, within 30 days after the publication under subsection (a) of section 12 of this act of the mark sought to be registered. For good cause shown, the time for filing notice of opposition may be extended by the Commissioner, who shall notify the applicant. An unverified opposition may be filed by a duly authorized attorney, but such opposition shall be null and void unless verified by the opposer within a reasonable time after such filing to be fixed by the Commissioner.

CANCELATION

SEC. 14. Any person who believes that he is or will be damaged by the registration of a mark on the principal register established by this act, or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may upon the payment of the prescribed fee apply to cancel said registration—

(a) within 5 years from the date of the registration of the mark under this act; or

(b) within 5 years from the date of the publication under section 12 (c) hereof of a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905; or

(c) at any time if the registered mark has been abandoned or its registration was obtained fraudulently or contrary to the provisions of subsections (a), (b), or (c) of section 2 of this act for a registration hereunder, or contrary to similar prohibitory provisions of said prior acts for a registration thereunder, or if the registered mark has been assigned and is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used, or if the mark was registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, and has not been published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

SEC. 15. Except on a ground for which application to cancel may be filed at any time under subsection (c) of section 14 of this act, and except to the extent, if any, to which the use of a mark registered on the principal register infringes a valid right acquired under the law of any State or Territory by use of a mark or trade name continuing from a date prior to the date of the publication under this act of such registered mark, the right of the registrant to use such registered mark in commerce for the goods or services on or in connection with which such registered mark has been in continuous use for 5 consecutive years subsequent to the date of such registration and is still in use in commerce, shall be incontestable, provided:

(1) there has been no final decision adverse to registrant's claim of ownership of such mark for such goods or services, or to registrant's right to register the same or to keep the same on the register; and

(2) there is no proceeding involving said rights pending in the Patent Office or in a court and not finally disposed of; and

(3) that an affidavit is filed with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any such 5-year period setting forth those goods or services stated in the registration on or in connection with which such mark has been in continuous use for such 5 consecutive years and is still in use in commerce, and the other matters specified in subsections (1) and (2) hereof.

Subject to the conditions above specified in this section, the incontestable right with reference to a mark registered under this act shall apply to a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, upon the filing of the required affidavit with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any period of 5 consecutive years after the date of publication of a mark under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files the above-prescribed affidavit of the filing thereof.

INTERFERENCE

SEC. 16. Whenever application is made for the registration of a mark which so resembles a mark previously registered by another, or for the registration of which another has previously made application, as to be likely when applied to the goods or when used in connection with the services of the applicant to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers, the Commissioner may declare that an interference exists. No interference shall be declared between an application and the registration of a mark the right to the use of which has become incontestable.

SEC. 17. In every case of interference, opposition to registration, application to register as a lawful concurrent user, or application to cancel the registration of a mark, the Commissioner shall give notice to all parties and shall direct the examiner in charge of interferences to determine and decide the respective rights of registration.

SEC. 18. In such proceedings the Commissioner may refuse to register the opposed mark, may cancel or restrict the registration of a registered mark, or may refuse to register any or all of several interfering marks, or may register the mark or marks for the person or persons entitled thereto, as the rights of the parties hereunder may be established in the proceedings: *Provided*, That in the case of the registration of any mark based on concurrent use, the Commissioner shall determine and fix the conditions and limitations provided for in subsection (d) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 19. In all inter partes proceedings equitable principles of laches, estoppel, and acquiescence, where applicable may be considered and applied. The provisions of this section shall also govern proceedings heretofore begun in the Patent Office and not finally determined.

SEC. 20. An appeal may be taken to the Commissioner in person from any final decision of the examiner in charge of interferences or of the registration of marks upon the payment of the prescribed fees.

SEC. 21. Any applicant for registration of a mark, party to an interference proceeding, party to an opposition proceeding, party to an application to register as a lawful concurrent user, party to a cancelation proceeding, or any registrant who has filed an affidavit as provided in section 8, who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or may proceed under section 4915, Revised Statutes, as in the case of applicants for patents, under the same conditions, rules, and procedure as are prescribed in the case of patent appeals or proceedings so far as they are applicable: *Provided*, That any party who is satisfied with the decision of the Commissioner shall, upon the filing of an appeal to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals by any dissatisfied party, have the right to elect to have all further proceedings under Revised Statutes, 4915, by election as provided in Revised Statutes, 4911.

REGISTRATION IS NOTICE

SEC. 22. Registration of a mark on the principal register provided by this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall be constructive notice of the registrant's claim of ownership thereof.

TITLE II—THE SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTER

SEC. 23. In addition to the principal register, the Commissioner shall keep a continuation of the register provided in paragraph (b) of section 1 of the act of March 19, 1920, entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes", to be called the supplemental register. All marks capable of distinguishing applicant's goods or services and not registrable on the principal register herein provided, except those declared to be unregistrable under paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 of this act, which have been in lawful use in commerce by the proprietor thereof, upon or in connection with any goods or services for the year preceding the filing of the application may be registered on the supplemental register upon the payment of the prescribed fee and compliance with the provisions of section 1 so far as they are applicable.

Upon the filing of an application for registration on the supplemental register and payment of the fee herein provided the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made and if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to regis-

tration, the registration shall be granted. If the applicant is found not entitled to registration the provisions of subsection (b) of section 12 of this act shall apply.

For the purposes of registration on the supplemental register, a mark may consist of any trade-mark, symbol, label, package, configuration of goods, name, word, slogan, phrase, surname, geographical name, numeral or device or any combination of any of the foregoing, but such mark must be capable of distinguishing the applicant's goods or services.

Upon a proper showing by the applicant that he has begun the lawful use of his mark in foreign commerce and that he requires domestic registration as a basis for foreign protection of his mark, the Commissioner may waive the requirement of a full year's use and may grant registration forthwith.

CANCELATION

SEC. 24. Marks for the supplemental register shall not be published for or be subject to opposition, but shall be published on registration in the Official Gazette of Patent Office. Whenever any person believes that he is or will be damaged by a registration of a mark on this register he may at any time apply to the Commissioner to cancel the registration thereof. The Commissioner shall refer such application to the examiner in charge of interferences, who shall give notice thereof to the registrant. If it is found after a hearing before the examiner that the registrant was not entitled to register the mark at the time of his application for registration thereof, or that the mark is not used by the registrant or has been abandoned, the registration shall be canceled by the Commissioner.

SEC. 25. The certificates of registration for marks registered on the supplemental register shall be conspicuously different from certificates issued for marks registered on the principal register.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 26. The provisions of this act shall govern so far as applicable applications for registration and registrations on the supplemental register as well as those on the principal register, but applications for and registrations on the supplemental register shall not be subject to or receive the advantages of sections 2 (e), 2 (f), 7 (b), 12 (a), 13 to 18, inclusive, 22, 33, and 42 of this act.

SEC. 27. Registration of a mark on the supplemental register, or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not preclude registration by the registrant on the principal register established by this act.

SEC. 28. Registration on the supplemental register or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not be filed in the Department of the Treasury or be used to stop importations.

TITLE III—NOTICE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 29. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 22 hereof, a registrant of a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register established by this act, shall give notice that his mark is registered by displaying with the mark as used the words "Registered in U. S. Patent Office" or "Reg. U. S. Pat. Off." or the letter R enclosed within a circle, thus (R); and in any suit for infringement under this act by such a registrant failing so to mark goods bearing the registered mark, or by a registrant under the act of March 19, 1920, or by the registrant of a mark on the supplemental register provided by this act no profits and no damages shall be recovered under the provisions of this act unless the defendant had actual notice of the registration: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing requirement as to notice shall be deemed fulfilled in respect to a registered mark used in connection with goods or services of foreign origin if the mark as used is accompanied by the notice of registration used in the country of origin of the goods or services to denote registration there.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 30. The Commissioner shall establish a classification of goods and services, for convenience of Patent Office administration, but not to limit or extend the applicant's rights. The applicant may register his mark in one application for any or all of the goods or services included in one class, upon or in connection with which he is actually using the mark. The Commissioner may issue a single certificate for one mark registered in a plurality of classes upon payment of a fee equaling the sum of the fees for each registration in each class.

TITLE V—FEES AND CHARGES

SEC. 31. The following fees shall be paid to the Patent Office under this act:

On filing each original application for registration of a mark in each class in either the principal or the supplemental register, $15; on filing each application for renewal in each class, $15; and on filing each application for renewal in each class after expiration of the registration, an additional fee of $5; on filing notice of claim of benefits of this act for a mark to be published under section 12 (c) hereof, $5; on filing notice of opposition or application for cancelation, $10; on appeal from an examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Commissioner, $20; on appeal from an examiner in charge of interferences to the Commissioner, $20; for issuance of a new certificate of registration following change of ownership of a mark or correction of a registrant's mistake, $10; for certificate of correction of registrant's mistake, $10; for filing in each class each application communicated to the United States from the International Bureau, Habana, $15; for filing and transmitting application in each class to the International Bureau, Habana, including certificate, $10; for manuscript copies, for every 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents; for comparing other copies, 5 cents for every 100 words or fraction thereof; for certifying in any case, additional, 75 cents; for each additional registration or application which may be included under a single certificate, 25 cents additional; for filing disclaimer, amendment, surrender, or cancelation after registration, $10.

For abstracts of title: For the search, 1 hour or less, and certificate, $3; each additional hour or fraction thereof, $1.50; for each brief from the digest of assignments of 200 words or less, 50 cents; each additional 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents.

For certificate that trade-mark has not been registered—search and certificate (for deposit in foreign countries only), $3.

For title reports required for office use, $1.

For a single printed copy of statement and drawing, 10 cents; if certified, for the grant, additional, 50 cents; for the certificate, 50 cents; if renewed, for copy of certificate of renewal, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of records, per page, 20 cents; if certified, for the certificate, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of drawings, per sheet, 20 cents.

For recording every assignment or other paper not exceeding six pages, $3; for each additional two pages or less, $1; for each additional registration or application included, or involved in one writing where more than one is so included or involved, additional, 50 cents.

The Commissioner shall refund fees paid by mistake or in excess.

TITLE VI—REMEDIES

SEC. 32. (1) Any person who shall, in commerce, (a) use, without the consent of the registrant, any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of any registered mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or advertising of any goods or services on or in connection with which such use is likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers as to the source of origin of such goods or services; or (b) reproduce, counterfeit, copy, or colorably imitate any such mark and apply such reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation to labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, or advertisements intended to be used upon or in connection with the sale in commerce of such goods or services, shall be liable to a civil action by the registrant for any or all of the remedies hereinafter provided, except that under subsection (b) hereof the registrant shall not be entitled to recover profits or damages unless the acts have been committed with knowledge that such mark is intended to be used to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the remedies given to the owner of the right infringed shall be limited as follows: (a) Where an infringer is engaged solely in the business of printing the mark for others and establishes that he was an innocent infringer the owner of the right infringed shall be entitled as against such infringer only to an injunction against future printing; (b) where the infringement complained of is contained in or is part of paid advertising matter in a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical the remedies of the owner of the right infringed as against the publisher or distributor of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical shall be confined to an injunction against the presentation of such advertising matter in future issues of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical: *Provided,* That these limitations shall apply only to innocent infringers; (c) injunction relief shall not be available to the owner of the right infringed in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical containing infringing matter after the commencement or preparation of the engraving or composition work for the issue containing such infringing matter.

(3) If goods bearing a registered mark have been put on the market by or with the authority of the registrant of a registered mark or in any package or other container bearing said mark and a notice that the goods may be resold only unaltered or unrenovated or in the original package or container and said goods or any part thereof have, without the authority of the registrant, been transferred to another package or container or been in any way altered or renovated, any person who shall, in commerce, make any use of or reference to said registered mark upon or in connection with the sale or advertising of such transferred or altered or renovated goods shall be liable to a civil action by the registrant for any or all of the remedies hereinafter provided.

SEC. 33. (a) Any certificate of registration issued under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or of a mark registered on the principal register provided by this act and owned by the plaintiff shall be admissible in evidence and shall be prima facie evidence of registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein, but shall not preclude the defendant from proving any legal or equitable defense which would have been available to him if the plaintiff's mark had not been registered.

(b) If the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15 hereof, the certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein except when one of the following defenses is established:

(1) That the registration or the incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently; or

(2) That the mark has been abandoned by the registrant; or

(3) That the registered mark has been assigned and is being used, by or with the permission of the assignee, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used; or

(4) That the use by the defendant of the name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is a use, otherwise than as a trade or service mark, of the defendant's individual name in his own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with the defendant, or of a term or device which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe to users the goods or services of the defendant, or their geographic origin; or

(5) That the mark whose use by the defendant is charged as an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been continuously used by the defendant or those in privity with him from a date prior to the publication of the registered mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act: *Provided, however*, That this defense shall apply only for the area in which such continuous prior use is proved.

SEC. 34. The several courts vested with jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this act shall have power to grant injunctions, according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable, to prevent the violation of any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent Office. Any such injunction may include a provision directing the defendant to file with the court and serve on the plaintiff within 30 days after the service on the defendant of such injunction, or such extended period as the court may direct, a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which the defendant has complied with the injunction. Any such injunction granted upon hearing, after notice to the defendant, by any district court of the United States, may be served on the parties against whom such injunction is granted anywhere in the United States where they may be found, and shall be operative and may be enforced by proceedings to punish for contempt, or otherwise, by the court by which such injunction was granted, or by any other United States district court in whose jurisdiction the defendant may be found.

The said courts shall have jurisdiction to enforce said injunction, as herein provided, as fully as if the injunction had been granted by the district court in which it is sought to be enforced. The clerk of the court or judge granting the injunction shall, when required to do so by the court before which application to enforce said injunction is made, transfer without delay to said court a certified copy of all papers on file in his office upon which said injunction was granted.

It shall be the duty of the clerks of such courts within 1 month after the filing of any action, suit, or proceeding arising under the provisions of this act to give notice thereof in writing to the Commissioner setting forth in order so far as known the names and addresses of the litigants and the designating number or numbers of the registration or registrations upon which the action, suit, or proceeding has been brought, and in the event any other registration be subsequently included in the action, suit, or proceeding by amendment, answer, or other pleading, the clerk shall give like notice thereof to the Commissioner, and within 1 month after the decision is rendered, appeal taken or a decree issued the clerk of the court shall give notice thereof to the Commissioner, and it shall be the duty of the Commissioner on receipt of such notice forthwith to endorse the same upon the file wrapper of the said registration or registrations and to incorporate the same as a part of the contents of said file wrapper; and for each notice required and furnished to the Commissioner in compliance herewith a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit.

SEC. 35. Whenever the plaintiff shall have established his right to relief in any civil action arising under this act, he shall be entitled (subject to the provisions of section 29) to recover (1) defendant's profits, (2) any damages sustained by the plaintiff, and (3) the costs of the action. The court shall assess such profits and damages or cause the same to be assessed under its direction. In assessing profits the plaintiff shall be required to prove defendant's sales only; defendant must prove all elements of cost or deduction claimed. In assessing damages the court may enter judgment, according to the circumstances of the case, for any sum above the amount found as actual damages, not exceeding three times such amount. If the court shall find that the amount of the recovery based on profits is either inadequate or excessive the court may in its discretion enter judgment for such sum as the court shall find to be just, according to the circumstances of the case. Such sum in either of the above circumstances shall constitute compensation and not a penalty.

SEC. 36. In any action arising under this act, in which the plaintiff shall have established his right to relief, the court may order that all labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, and advertisements in the possession of the defendant, bearing the mark of the plaintiff or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation thereof, and all plates, molds, matrices, and other means of making the same, shall be delivered up and destroyed.

SEC. 37. In any action involving a registered mark the court may determine the right to registration, order the cancelation of registrations, in whole or in part, restore canceled registrations, and otherwise rectify the register with respect to the registrations of any party to the action. Decrees and orders shall be certified by the court to the Commissioner, who shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office, and shall be controlled thereby.

SEC. 38. Any person who shall procure registration in the Patent Office of a mark by a false or fraudulent declaration or representation, oral or in writing, or by any false means, shall be liable in a civil action by any person injured thereby for any damages sustained in consequence thereof.

SEC. 39. The district and territorial courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, the circuit courts of appeals of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall have appellate jurisdiction, of all actions arising under this act, without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties.

SEC. 40. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this act in the same manner as provided for in cases under the patent laws.

SEC. 41. The Commissioner shall make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the Patent Office under this act.

TITLE VII—IMPORTATION FORBIDDEN OF GOODS BEARING INFRINGING MARKS OR NAMES

SEC. 42. (a) Any goods, whatever may be their source, or origin, which shall bear any mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register provided by this act, or any infringement of a mark so registered shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States unless the written consent of the registrant to such importation or entry be first had and obtained or unless such offending mark be removed or obliterated; and, if brought into the United States in violation of the provisions of this section, any person selling, offering for sale, or dealing in such goods shall be subject, at the suit of the registrant, to the liabilities for infringement provided in this act and, in addition, be required to export or destroy such goods or to remove or obliterate such infringing mark therefrom, and such goods shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture for violation of the customs laws: *Provided*, That in order to aid the officers of customs in enforcing this paragraph, the registrant of the mark shall deposit in the Department of the Treasury a facsimile of the registration certificate, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

(b) Any goods, whatever may be their source of origin, which shall bear the trade or commercial name or a simulation thereof of any domestic manufacturer or trader, or of any manufacturer or trader located in any foreign country which by treaty, convention, or law affords similar privileges to citizens of the United States, shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States unless the written consent of such manufacturer or trader to such importation or entry be first had and obtained, or unless such offending name be removed or obliterated, and if brought into the United States in violation of the provisions of this section, any person may be enjoined from selling, offering for sale, dealing in, or advertising such goods and in addition be required to export or destroy such goods or to remove or obliterate such name therefrom, and the goods shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture for violation of the customs laws: *Provided*, That in order to aid the officers of customs in enforcing this paragraph, such domestic or foreign manufacturer or trader shall deposit in the Department of the Treasury a facsimile of his trade or commercial name, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

(c) The owner, importer, or consignee of goods refused entry or seized under paragraph (a) or (b) of this section may have relief against the registrant, manufacturer, or trader by a summary proceeding in any United States court of original jurisdiction, in the district where such goods are held or where such registrant, manufacturer, or trader, or a designated representative, is an inhabitant or may be found, or, if the registrant is a foreigner and no designation of a representative has been filed, then in the District of Columbia, and after such notice and upon such proceedings as the court may direct, the court may determine whether the plaintiff for any reason has the right to import such goods under the trade or commercial name or mark which they bear.

(d) A decree or order of such court for the plaintiff, upon being certified to the collector of the port where the goods are held, shall be warrant to such collector to release the goods from arrest or seizure or forfeiture under this section.

(e) An order or decree for either party, whether interlocutory or final, shall be appealable within 30 days, and the court making such order or decree may, in its discretion, suspend the operation thereof pending appeal.

TITLE VIII—FALSE DESIGNATIONS OF ORIGIN AND FALSE DESCRIPTIONS FORBIDDEN

SEC. 43. (a) Any person who shall affix, apply, or annex, or use in connection with any goods or services, or any container or containers for goods, a false designation of origin, or any false description or representation, including words or other symbols tending falsely to describe or represent the same, and shall cause such goods or services to enter into commerce, and any person who shall with knowledge of the falsity of such designation of origin or description or representation cause or procure the same to be transported or used in commerce or deliver-

the same to any carrier to be transported or used, shall be liable to a civil action by any person doing business in the locality falsely indicated as that of origin or in the region in which said locality is situated, or by any person who believes that he is or is likely to be damaged by the use of any such false description or representation.

(b) Any goods marked or labeled in contravention of the provisions of this section shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States. The owner, importer, or consignee of goods refused entry at any customhouse under this section may have any recourse by protest or appeal that is given under the customs revenue laws or may have the remedy given by this act in cases involving goods refused entry or seized.

TITLE IX—INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

SEC. 44. (a) The Commissioner shall keep a register of all marks communicated to him by the international bureaus provided for by the conventions for the protection of industrial property, trade-marks, trade and commercial names, and the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is or may become a party, and upon the payment of the fees required by such conventions and the fees herein prescribed may place the marks so communicated upon such register. This register shall show a facsimile of the mark or trade or commercial name; the name, citizenship, and address of the registrant; the number, date, and place of the first registration of the mark, including the dates on which application for such registration was filed and granted and the term of such registration; a list of goods or services to which the mark is applied as shown by the registration in the country of origin, and such other data as may be useful concerning the mark. This register shall be a continuation of the register provided in section (a) of the act of March 19, 1920.

(b) Persons who are nationals of, domiciled in, or have a bona fide and effective business or commercial establishment in any foreign country, which is a party to (1) the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed at Paris on March 20, 1883; or (2) the General Inter-American Convention for Trade Mark and Commercial Protection, signed at Washington on February 20, 1929; or (3) any other convention or treaty relating to trade-marks, trade or commercial names, or the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is a party, shall be entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act to the extent and under the conditions essential to give effect to any such conventions and treaties so long as the United States shall continue to be a party thereto, except as provided in the following paragraphs of this section.

(c) No registration of a mark in the United States by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be perfected until such mark has been registered in the country of origin of the applicant, when such country makes the same requirement of nationals or residents of the United States unless the applicant alleges use in commerce.

For the purposes of this section, the country of origin of the applicant is the country in which he has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment and, in the case of associations, the country in which the association has its domicile or its principal office.

(d) An application for registration of a mark under sections 1, 2, 3, 4, or 23 of this act filed by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section who has previously duly filed an application for registration of the same mark in one of the countries described in paragraph (b) shall be accorded the same force and effect as would be accorded to the same application if filed in the United States on the same date on which the application was first filed in such foreign country: *Provided*, That—

(1) the application in the United States is filed within 6 months from the date on which the application was first filed in the foreign country;

(2) the application conforms as nearly as practicable to the requirements of this act, but use in commerce need not be alleged;

(3) the rights acquired by third parties before the date of the filing of the first application in the foreign country shall in no way be affected by a registration obtained on an application filed under this subsection (d);

(4) nothing in this subsection (d) shall entitle the foreign applicant to sue for infringement of his mark prior to the date on which his mark was registered in this country unless the registration is based on use in commerce.

(e) A mark duly registered in the country of origin of the foreign applicant may be registered on the principal register if eligible, otherwise on the supplemental register herein provided. The application therefor shall be accompanied by a certified copy of the application for or registration in the country of origin of the applicant.

(f) The registration of a mark under the provisions of paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this section by a person described in paragraph (b) shall be independent of the registration in the country of origin and the duration, validity, or transfer in the United States of such registration shall be governed by the provisions of this act.

(g) Trade names or commercial names of persons described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be protected without the obligation of filing or registration whether or not they form parts of marks.

(h) Any person designated in paragraph (b) of this section as entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act shall be entitled to effective protection against unfair competition, and the remedies provided herein against infringement of trade-marks shall be available so far as they may be appropriate in repressing acts of unfair competition.

(i) Citizens or residents of the United States shall have the same benefits as are granted by this section to persons described in paragraph (b) hereof.

TITLE X—CONSTRUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 45. In the construction of this act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

The United States includes and embraces all territory which is under its jurisdiction and control.

The word "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

The term "principal register" refers to the register provided for by sections 1 to 22 hereof, and the term "supplemental register" refers to the register provided for by sections 23 to 28 hereof.

The term "person" and any other word or term used to designate the applicant or other entitled to a benefit or privilege or rendered liable under the provisions of this act includes a juristic person as well as a natural person. The term "juristic person" includes a firm, corporation, union, association, or other organization capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The terms "applicant" and "registrant" embrace the legal representatives and successors and assigns of such applicant or registrant.

The term "Commisisoner" means the Commissioner of Patents.

The term "related company" means any person who controls or is controlled by the registrant or applicant for registration in respect to the nature and quality of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used.

The terms "trade name" and "commercial name" include individual names and surnames, firm names, and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations; the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The term "trade-mark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others.

The term "service mark" means a mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others and includes without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce.

Each of the terms "collective mark" or "certification mark" means a mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify or indicate regional or other original, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or to indicate a membership in an association or other organization or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization.

The term "mark" includes any trade-mark, service mark, collective mark, or certification mark entitled to registration under this act whether registered or not.

For the purposes of this act a mark shall be deemed to be used in commerce (a) on goods when it is placed in any manner on the goods or their containers or the displays associated therewith or on the tags or labels affixed thereto and the goods are sold or transported in commerce and (b) on services when it is used or displayed in the sale or advertising of services and the services are rendered in commerce.

A mark shall be deemed to be "abandoned"—

(a) When its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume. Intent not to resume may be inferred from circumstances. Discontinuance of use for 2 consecutive years shall be prima facie abandonment.

(b) When any course of conduct of the registrant, including acts of omission as well as commission, causes the mark to lose its significance as an indication of origin.

The term "colorable imitation" includes any mark which so resembles a registered mark as to be likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

The term "registered mark" means a mark registered in the United States Patent Office under this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or the act of March 19, 1920. The phrase "marks registered in the Patent Office" means registered marks.

The term "Act of March 3, 1881," "Act of February 20, 1905," or "Act of March 19, 1920," means the respective act as amended.

A "counterfeit" is a spurious mark which is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a registered mark.

Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

The intent of this act is to regulate commerce within the control of Congress by

making actionable the deceptive and misleading use of marks in such commerce; to protect registered marks used in such commerce from interference by State, or Territorial legislation; to protect persons engaged in such commerce against unfair competition; to prevent fraud and deception in such commerce by the use of reproductions, copies, counterfeits, or colorable imitations of registered marks; and to provide rights and remedies stipulated by treaties and conventions respecting trade-marks, trade names, and unfair competition entered into between the United States and foreign nations.

TITLE XI—REPEAL OF PREVIOUS ACTS

SEC. 46. (a) This act shall be in force, and take effect 1 year from its enactment, but except as otherwise herein specifically provided shall not affect any suit, proceeding, or appeal then pending. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed effective 1 year from the enactment hereof, including the following acts insofar as they are inconsistent herewith: The act of Congress approved March 3, 1881, entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks and protect the same;" the act approved August 5, 1882, entitled "An act relating to the registration of trade-marks"; the act of February 20, 1905 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 81 to 109, inclusive), entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same," and the amendments thereto by the acts of May 4, 1906 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 131 and 132; 34 Stat. 169), March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1251, 1252), February 18, 1909 (35 Stat. 627, 628); February 18, 1911 (36 Stat. 918), January 8, 1913 (37 Stat. 649), June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 647), March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1268, 1269), April 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 155); act June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332 3d sess.): the act of March 19, 1920 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 121 to 128, inclusive), entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes"; and the amendments thereto, including act June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332, 3d sess.); and section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1526), provided, that this repeal shall not affect the validity of registrations granted or applied for under any of said acts prior to the effective date of this act, or rights or remedies thereunder except as provided in sections 8, 12, 14, 15, and 47 of this act; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting or restricting any statute in force on the effective date of this act which does not relate to trade-marks, or as restricting or increasing the authority of any Federal regulatory agency except as may be specifically provided in this act.

(b) Registrations now existing under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall continue in full force and effect for the unexpired terms thereof and may be renewed under the provisions of section 9 of this act. Such registrations and the renewals thereof shall be subject to and shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act to the same extent and with the same force and effect as though registered on the principal register established by this act except as limited in section 8, 12, 14, and 15 of this act. Marks registered under the "10-year proviso" of section 5 of the act of February 20, 1905, as amended, shall be deemed to have become distinctive of the registrant's goods in commerce under paragraph (f) of section 2 of this act and may be renewed under section 9 hereof as marks coming within said paragraph.

Registrations now existing under the act of March 19, 1920, shall expire 6 months after the effective date of this act, or 20 years from the dates of their registrations, whichever date is later. Such registrations shall be subject to and entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act relating to marks registered on the supplemental register established by this act, and may not be renewed unless renewal is required to support foreign registrations. In that event renewal may be effected on the supplemental register under the provisions of section 9 of this act.

Marks registered under previous acts may, if eligible, also be registered under this act.

SEC. 47. (a) All applications for registration pending in the Office of the Commissioner at the effective date of this act may be amended, if practicable, to bring them under the provisions of this act. The prosecution of such applications so amended and the grant of registrations thereon shall be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of this act. If such amendments are not made, the prosecution of said applications shall be proceeded with and registrations thereon granted in accordance with the acts under which said applications were filed, and said acts are hereby continued in force to this extent and for this purpose only, notwithstanding the foregoing general repeal thereof.

(b) In any case in which an appeal is pending before the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or any United States Circuit Court of Appeals or the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia or the United States Supreme Court at the effective date of this act, the court, if it be of the opinion that the provisions of this act are applicable to the subject matter of the appeal, may apply such provision or may remand the case to the Commissioner or to the district court for the taking of additional evidence or a new trial or for reconsideration of the decision on the record as made, as the appellate court may deem proper.

SEC. 48. Section 4 of the act of January 5, 1905 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 4), as amended, entitled "An act to incorporate the National Red Cross," and section 7 of the act of June 15, 1916 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 27), entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes," and the act of June 20, 1936 (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 248), entitled "An act to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation," are not repealed or affected by this act.

SEC. 49. Nothing herein shall adversely affect the rights or the enforcement of rights in marks acquired in good faith prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 50. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 7, line 3, insert a comma after the word "applicable."

Page 9, line 8, insert an apostrophe before the final "s" in "registrants" and strike out the comma after that word.

Page 18, line 7, strike out the comma after "incontestable" and insert a colon; capitalize and italicize the word "provided"; strike out the colon and insert a comma; add "That—."

Page 18, line 15, strike out "that."

Page 23, line 10, after "of", insert "the."

Page 23, line 12, strike out "a", first occurrence, and insert "the."

Page 23, line 13, strike out "the", last occurrence, and insert "such."

Page 23, line 14, strike out "thereof."

Page 27, line 19, after "additional", insert a comma.

Page 28, line 10, strike out "or", first occurrence, and insert "of."

Page 35, line 14, strike out "of" and insert "for." The official title of this court is "United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

Page 36, line 4, strike out "or" and insert "of."

Page 39, lines 24 and 25, change all capital letters to lower case.

Page 40, line 14, after "section", insert the figure "1."

Page 47, line 17, "trade names" should not be italicized.

Page 48, line 13, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 48, line 16, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma; strike out "act."

Page 48, line 23, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 48, line 24, after "including", insert "the", and after "act" insert "of."

Page 49, line 2, before "provided", change the comma to a colon; capitalize and italicize "provided"; insert a comma after "provided"; capitalize "that."

Page 50, line 16, insert "Patent" before "Office"; strike out "of the Commissioner."

Page 51, line 6, strike out "of", second occurrence, and insert "for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article by a former distinguished Congressman from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on the floor of the House I ventured the assertion that the best service we could render the American people, who are loyally exerting a single-minded effort to the winning of the war, would be to adjourn and go home, following passage of needed appropriation bills.

I was so bold as to say we were contributing little to the victory of which we are now confident, but, on the contrary, were legislating in an atmosphere of hysteria and almost hatred that inevitably must communicate itself to the

Nation and destroy the morale and unity which we need so urgently.

Subsequent events, in my opinion, justify that statement. Since it was uttered the situation has steadily grown worse. Only Friday of last week, within 2 hours after the President vetoed the so-called labor-disputes bill, setting forth specifically his reasons, which the New York Times in an editorial last Saturday said were sound reasons, and following an inflammatory speech by that matchless orator of Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], condemning the action of the President, we saw the spectacle of the House rushing in heatedly and almost hysterically to undo the President's veto with no time given to study the reasons the President gave for vetoing the bill. When we did that we were no longer acting as a deliberative body of representatives of the people.

Of course, the temperature in Washington is somewhat abnormal, and tempers have a habit of responding to the thermometer. But some of the things that have been transpiring cannot be attributed to the dog days. The causes go much deeper than the weather.

The simple truth is that we have been giving more attention to next year's political contest than to the campaigns our fighting men are waging in north Africa, in the south Pacific, in the bleak Aleutians, and on other battle fronts all over the world.

Referring specifically to Attu, I commend to the Members of the House the reading of the article entitled "Company X on Attu" in the June 21 Life magazine. It has graphically pointed out the sufferings and the indomitable courage of our soldiers, many of whom were nearly frozen while going into battle—no amount of clothing was enough; that they had gone as long as 16 days without having a chance to remove even their shoes or socks; that 61 of them went out in one company and 5 returned. The others were killed. All told, in that battle of Attu, 342 of these boys were killed, 1,135 wounded, 58 missing. It is said at least 1,791 Japs had to be killed in this one battle and only 11 were taken prisoners, which shows the caliber of the Japs' fighting force. It is easy to determine the kind of fight that is ahead of us with the Japs from that encounter when they would not be taken prisoners, preferring death. This means a fight to the end. Also let us think of our American boys who are being held Japanese prisoners, dying by the hundreds, as reported by the Red Cross, no doubt through lack of food. Let us think of the killing of these boys in north Africa and on all our fronts and on all seas.

My colleagues, in plain, blunt words, too many of us have been more interested in discrediting the administration and in destroying confidence in our Commander in Chief than in bringing about the speedy overthrow of the brutal Axis Powers.

The cold, unvarnished truth is that some Members of the House have been playing fast and loose with the Nation's destinies. The President's foes have made it perfectly clear they will leave nothing undone to hamper and harass his conduct of the war, regardless of the consequences.

Let it be conceded right here that the President and his advisers have made mistakes—many of them. For such the remedy is criticism, but it should be constructive rather than destructive.

In a program so tremendous as that on which we have embarked, there is bound to be error, waste, and probably some graft. After all, the President has to deal with human beings, and the inherent defects and weaknesses of mankind are manifest in war as well as in peace.

But it is only fair to insist that those who are quick to point out the President's mistakes should be equally eager to give credit where it is deserved. Has anybody here heard a word of praise or commendation for the conduct of the war from those who day after day open the floodgates of abuse and pour calumny and vituperation not only on the head of the President, but also upon those of his subordinates, most of whom are doing a grand job?

Those who make mistakes or worse should be held to strict account, but in decency those who are performing magnificently should not be tarred with the same stick of criticism.

Anybody who takes the trouble to compare the progress made since Pearl Harbor with the record made in our last World War cannot, unless blinded by prejudice and malice or indifferent to his own reputation for fairness, withhold from those responsible for the conduct of the war a generous amount of credit.

Our production record has been magnificent. Donald Nelson has described it as little short of miraculous. Munitions of all kinds have been turned out in such volume as to stagger the imagination.

Very little is heard about that record on this side of the floor and scarcely a word from the other side. Rather, the RECORD is encumbered and valuable time taken up with wild and reckless statements about loss of time because of strikes, absenteeism, and so forth. As to strikes, President Roosevelt, in his message returning S. 796, makes this statement:

> For the entire year of 1942 the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. That record has never before been equaled in this country.

We have recruited a large and efficient Army which has acquitted itself as Americans always do when put to the test. Half-trained soldiers are not being sent out to bare their bodies to the enemy, as was the case in the last war. They are well equipped with the best of fighting and defensive equipment science and industry can produce, whereas a quarter of a century ago they had to depend on our allies not only for arms and equipment, but for food and other supplies.

Yes; I concede the administration has made mistakes—many of them, and some quite serious—but it has also done things of which it has every reason to be proud, and which we should be the first to recognize, if we are, as we pretend to be, representatives of the people and concerned only that their interests go forward satisfactorily.

The tragic fact is that in this House reactionaries on both sides of the aisle have formed an unholy alliance to prevent, if they can, the reelection of Roosevelt next year. They have a perfect right to oppose the President and to elect a man of their own, if they can, but they have no right to play politics at the expense of the war effort. They have no right to inflame prejudices, arouse fears and alarms, to sow seeds of dissension and disunity. If they hate Roosevelt, that is their privilege, but, in venting that hate, they should be careful not to lend aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies.

I suppose Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo also hate Roosevelt. They would rejoice were he repudiated by the American people and ejected unceremoniously from the White House. I dare say that, on the chance that may happen, they may be induced to prolong the war, which they must recognize by this time they have lost.

Goebbels has declared that political and social tensions are so great in this country that it would not be difficult to tear us apart by internal strife and, perhaps, revolution. How Goebbels must have rejoiced at racial clashes which have occurred within recent weeks, the inspiration for which may have come directly from this floor. How he must have reveled at the untimely and unwarranted display of fury, anger, and hysteria evidenced last Friday by the Senate and this House. I have always maintained that our enemies cannot lick us but we can lick ourselves.

Quoting from the Philadelphia Record of June 28, 1943:

> Prospects were never brighter for winning the war abroad. They were never darker for achieving unity at home.
>
> To continue the policy of drift is dangerous.

I have not always agreed with the President. That is my right. But my duty in these days of peril, which, in my opinion, will be long continued, is to uphold his hands as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and to help him carry on this fight to victory.

It may be truthfully said also that some of those high up in administrative circles have been too industrious in keeping an eye on politics. If the people want President Roosevelt for President in 1944, his enemies cannot stop his reelection. Neither can the activities of a few ardent friends accomplish it against the will of the people. The people at that time will express themselves, but they are not interested in politics at this time. People are interested only in winning this war and putting an end to the merciless murdering of our boys and the gradual bankruptcy of our country.

My colleagues, we have a lot of hay down and the time has come when every true American—and we in the House hope to be included in that classification—should ponder the effect and consequences of his every word and deed on the progress of the war.

If we have to hate anybody, let us hate the murderous totalitarian dictators. It should be possible for us to engage in our quadrennial election without tearing down the very pillars of our glorious country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDAY). The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Montana where he was at the time I was voting for the repeal of the embargo act and voting for the lend-lease program and other measures to preserve our country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his question is entirely beside the point, which he knows—we are in war now, and I have no apology for any vote I have ever cast in this House; I voted against every step that I thought would take us into the war and during all of those days, I voted for every bill and every appropriation for our own defense, but once in the war, on the other hand, I voted for every appropriation and every measure that the President has asked for to fight the war. I shall vote for them first, last, and all the time. Any Member of the House, whether on this side or on that side of the aisle, who takes any position that jeopardizes the winning of this war for political reasons is not doing his duty as a Member of Congress or as a representative of the American people.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I have tried to support the President in all his war measures; I have been critical of the home front, and as the gentleman himself has suggested the subject of the fourth term, may I say that there is war on the home front for the fourth term.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that the conditions I have just recited have brought the whole thing to the forefront, but the point I have in mind is that we must keep politics out until we win this war.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman himself mentioned the fourth term.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have tried to make it clear what has brought all of this about. If the people want Roosevelt they will elect him, and if they do not want him they will not elect him. No conniving can defeat the people's will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 25 minutes.

N. Y. A. TRAINING PROGRAM IS IMPORTANT TO THE NATION'S WELFARE AND SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a short time Congress will determine the fate of the National Youth Administration. It will determine whether or not that Administration during the fiscal year 1944 shall train approximately 600,000 youths in industrial pursuits and thus make them effective contributors to our national war economy and useful and efficient members of society. I hope that Congress will say to the National Youth Administration: "You may continue your training program. You are doing a good work."

To the extent that I have a voice and influence I am exercising the same in behalf of a continuation of the N. Y. A. training program.

I say this notwithstanding there is no one in Congress, I believe, who has a greater desire than I have to see that economy in government is effected and that in every possible instance duplication and overlapping are eliminated. It has been argued that since there are half a dozen agencies in the field of vocational training the National Youth Administration might well be abolished and the trainees taken over under other agencies, but I find on very thorough investigation that there are two sound arguments against that proposal. One is that the N. Y. A. training program is a going program that is proceeding at full speed in turning out efficient trainees and constantly infiltrating them into plants all over the country where they are vitally needed and to disrupt that program now would slow up the war effort and do much harm. The other argument in favor of continuing the N. Y. A. training program is that there is no other program just like it. It enters into a different field and taps a potential source of timber for skilled manpower and womanpower that is not reached by any other training agency. I find that while it embraces persons of all races within the scope of its activities it is in many instances the only agency through which Negroes can obtain the technical and vocational training which they desire and to which they are entitled.

HOUSE HEARING WAS UNSATISFACTORY

The hearing which took place before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in respect to the National Youth Administration was unsatisfactory and unconvincing. It was apparent that there was strong opposition in the House which put the fate of the measure in doubt. To some of us it seemed, under the circumstances, only fair to both the proponents and the opponents of the N. Y. A. that before action was taken there should be further hearings which would bring out all of the facts conclusively. Those hearings have taken place before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and printed copies are available for all who desire to read them. In my opinion, the N. Y. A. has made out a good case for the continuation of its training program.

I was impressed by the statement of former Gov. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who was asked his opinion as to whether there is duplication as between the vocational-training program of the Office of Education and the N. Y. A. training program. He said:

> There is no duplication. I might say, as an aside, that I feel that the experience of this war will bring about a development of vocational education hitherto unthought of, and that such development is to be desired. All of the facilities of the schools are being used. Likewise, the facilities of the National Youth Administration. They are to be found where other training is not offered. The two agencies are not in competition. They may supplement each other. For the most part, our National Youth Administration training stations are in spots where those who would like to have the training cannot obtain it from the schools. I have tried to see that there was not any conflict at all.

When asked his opinion as to whether it would be in the interest of economy to abandon the N. Y. A. training centers or stations, and transfer the trainees to the vocational schools under the Office of Education Governor McNutt replied:

> It would be cheaper to maintain the present system for the time being; cheaper and better, for the reason that if you expected the schools to extend that activity it would take too long. The time is short. We cannot wait. The National Youth Administration is set up and is an operating organization today, successfully doing a job.

CLAIM OF POSSIBLE SAVING DISPROVED

So it seems to me that the claim that a saving might be effected by a consolidation of training agencies has been demonstrated to be nothing more than a will-o'-the-wisp. As to the essentiality of the training service that is being rendered by the N. Y. A.—a service that should be continued during the wartime when so many trained persons are vitally needed—I quote from the National Youth Administrator as follows:

> To this committee I should like to submit the fact that since Pearl Harbor, National Youth Administration has trained over one-half million previously unemployed boys and girls. Accepting the estimate in the report that 50 percent of these go into war industry, it means that National Youth Administration has added over 250,000 trained youth to the rolls of war industry since Pearl Harbor. That, I believe, is a contribution of major importance to our war effort.
>
> In the ensuing fiscal year, through the full utilization of our present shop facilities, it will be possible to give an average of 2 months' war-production training to 600,000 persons. In the course of their training these individuals will produce material for the armed services worth millions of dollars. It is certain that the disruption of this program, which transfer to any other group would necessarily entail, would paralyze this contribution to the war effort for months to come. Standing at the critical hour of the war when we shall need to throw every last ounce of our effort into production, I believe that action upon the recommendations would prove very detrimental to the war effort.

REPORT OF MRS. OLLIE M. WEEKS

I have recently made some diligent inquiries to ascertain the extent and progress of the N. Y. A. training activities in my home city, Indianapolis. If the work there is a criterion of what is going on throughout the Nation I am convinced the N. Y. A. training program is well worth while and is deserving of our wholehearted support. I quote as follows from a letter I have received from Mrs. Ollie M. Weeks, secretary of the Indianapolis branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

As per request in your letter of June 19 relative to information I submit the following concerning the Indianapolis projects of the National Youth Administration: There are 750 young persons receiving training in arc welding, radio, machine shop, aircraft, sheet metal, foundry, pattern making, clerical, and power sewing. All receive 160 hours of training per month. The shops are operated on 2- and 3-shift bases. Despite the great effort and resourcefulness there are still not facilities to take care of youths who need and request training for war industry. This program has been especially beneficial to colored persons who are anxious to accept every avenue that will contribute to the war effort. If your investigation goes far enough you will find that the National Youth Administration has offered us the greatest opportunity for training in vital industries and for making a greater contribution to the national defense and general welfare than any other agency in the history of our country.

Having constantly in mind my obligation to be of service to the people I represent and to protect the institutions which contribute to their welfare I could not be otherwise than deeply impressed by the letter of this very competent observer, Mrs. Weeks.

TESTIMONY OF MR. SENGSTACKE

A letter I have received from John H. Sengstacke, president of the Chicago Defender, also impresses me. It says in part:

We can give you thousands of cases of Negroes who have been aided by this agency and who were turned down by the educational authorities. Today thousands of Negroes are on the assembly lines in our war-production plants because the National Youth Administration had the vision to train them.

Mr. Sengstacke is one of the leaders of the Negro race and speaks with knowledge of his subject.

LETTER FROM ALBERT BECK

I have one other letter which especially impresses me, and with the indulgence of the House I shall read it before I take my seat. It is from a prominent businessman of my home city, Albert Beck, president of Niagara Products, Inc., of Indianapolis. He says under date of June 25:

I appreciate your reply to my letter regarding the National Youth Administration. The attitude I take on the matter is, of course, based upon my experience with that division of the National Youth Administration which trains young girls and young women in the profession of using a sewing machine for industrial purposes and that experience has been a very happy one.

When I first had a call from the National Youth Administration back in 1940 asking me if I could use any of their girls I was reluctant to give them a chance because I had a prejudice against these bureaus. I, however, was prevailed upon to take in four National Youth Administration trained girls and they proved so satisfactory that when I need sewing-machine operators my first thought is National Youth Administration.

I just came back from Detroit, having been there during the days of rioting. I noted that the rioters were youths, little more than boys, in the great majority. I believe proper useful outlets for these youths should be provided, and I think that vocational training is an essential toward this end. Many young people are not able to proceed from high school to college and a few months' intense vocational training is then what they need.

From the standpoint of the money spent I don't think it amounts to anything at all when you consider the millions of dollars which are being thrown away in all of our bureaus through inefficiency and mismanagement. While I am on the subject, Mr. LUDLOW, I might say that I get to different procurement centers and I cannot help but notice a loafing in the corridors, smoking cigarettes at desks, and groups lolling around coke vendors with no war-like attitude seen anywhere, much less a business attitude. If it would be possible for someone to plow through these Government offices and either make the people work a whole day's work or get out, millions would be saved. Maybe this cannot be done in a democracy, I don't know, but we do know it is done in business. Thanks again for answering my letter.

ACTION IS DEMANDED NOW

If the National Youth Administration training program is to be saved it must be saved now. The situation requires immediate action. The bill is now pending in the Senate and will be voted on soon. I have had several conferences with the junior Senator from New York, in charge of the bill, and he tells me the vote will be very close. I take this occasion to suggest to Members of the House that you do not depend on letters, or even on the telephone, but that you go in person to the other end of the Capitol and see the Senators from your States and urge them to support the bill to continue the National Youth Administration's training program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 I was given the privilege of addressing the House concerning the meat situation. Shortly after concluding my remarks I left the floor on some business. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] took the floor and among other things referred to an article which appeared in the New York Times. I quote a portion of that article he referred to in his remarks which appear on page 6425 of the RECORD for Thursday, June 24:

Throughout the West an increasing number of individuals are buying and storing in freezers whole carcasses. These people are not comparable with members of the old prohibition bootleg trade; they are patriotic but they are determined that they shall not go hungry.

The gentleman from New York continued, and I quote his own words:

I take exception to that statement and I am inclined to the belief that since they are indulging in the bootleg market contrary to the law of the land—

Now, mark those words—

Contrary to the law of the land and the regulations promulgated thereunder—

Fix your minds on the words "regulations promulgated thereunder"—

He concludes with the statement:

They are not patriotic.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York organized the retail meat industry of Brooklyn and of course has as his constituents a great many gentlemen of that profession. I have nothing on earth to say against them but I do think the gentleman should be a little more temperate in his remarks when he refers to citizens who are represented by different Members of Congress, among whom I happen to be one; he should be a little more temperate and not say that because any of my constituents put up a little meat in a cold storage box, especially when they produce the meat on their own farm, that they are not patriotic.

I do not believe the gentleman from New York knows any more about patriotism than he knows about the beef cattle industry as such if his statement is indicative of his knowledge. I suggest that for a moment he consider his representative functions and duties in a little more detail. A great struggle is going on in this land of ours between people of this country through their representatives in an effort to maintain the sovereignty of the people under a form of government which has been referred to many times as a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. The gentleman is a lawyer. I wish the gentleman would point out where in the "law of the land" as he refers to it, there is succinct, definite authority for many of the regulations which bring about this action on the part of citizens who feel they still have sovereign rights and liberties as citizens of the United States.

I regret very much to feel called upon to speak as I have this afternoon, and I confess that if I had ever been urged to be perfectly free in my utterances and give complete expression to the high distaste, to the sense of outrage engendered by remarks such as the gentleman from New York made concerning patriotic citizens of this country, I would forget my self-restraint to the point of being intemperate in what I might say. These are days—and the gentleman should know it—when public confidence is possibly the greatest motivating influence back of whatever successful war effort this Nation may put forth. Things which harass the people, things which confuse, things which cannot be placed in proper juxtaposition with reason and our form of government perfectly naturally make for confusion and for a certain amount of disrespect not for the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, but for the regulations under which the law is sought to be enforced. A little more confidence in the people of this country by the Government would be the recommendation I would make, and greater confidence in the Government would be the response from the people.

We are confronted with a desperate situation. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in my earnest opinion who are both thoughtfully and patriotically inclined should give serious thought to bringing the people and their Government into closer cooperation looking toward the end of this war rather than making wild, absurd statements such as charging patriotic citizens with a lack of patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2943) for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman take this up with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Did they concur in this?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They concurred in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, the word "records" includes all books, papers, maps, photographs, or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by any agency of the United States Government in pursuance of Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the Government or because of the informational value of data contained therein. Library and museum material made or acquired and preserved solely for reference or exhibition purposes, extra copies of documents preserved only for convenience of reference, and stocks of publications and of processed documents are not included within the definition of the word "records" as used in this act.

SEC. 2. The National Archives Council shall promulgate regulations, not inconsistent with this act, establishing (1) procedures for the compiling and submitting to the Archivist of the United States of lists and schedules of records proposed for disposal, (2) procedures for the disposal of records authorized for disposal, and (3) standards for the reproduction of records by photographic or microphotographic processes with a view to the disposal of the original records. Such regulations, when approved by the President, shall be binding on all agencies of the United States Government.

SEC. 3. The head of each agency of the United States Government shall submit to the Archivist of the United States, in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act (1) lists of any records in the custody of the agency that have been photographed or microphotographed in accordance with the said regulations and that, as a consequence thereof, do not appear to have sufficient value to warrant their further preservation by the Government; (2) lists of any other records in the custody of the agency that are not needed by it in the transaction of its current business and that do not appear to have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government; and (3) schedules proposing the disposal after the lapse of specified periods of time of records of a specified form or character that either have accumulated in the custody of the agency or that may accumulate therein at any time after the submission of such schedules and that apparently will not after the lapse of the period specified have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government.

SEC. 4. The Archivist shall submit to Congress, at such times as he shall deem expedient, the lists or schedules submitted to him in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act, or parts of such lists or schedules, and lists or schedules of any records in his legal custody, insofar as it shall appear to him that the records listed in such lists or schedules do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government: *Provided*, That the Archivist shall not submit to Congress lists or schedules of records of any existing agency of the Government in his legal custody without first having obtained the written consent of the head of such agency.

SEC. 5. Whenever the Archivist shall submit lists or schedules to Congress, it shall be the duty of the presiding officer of the Senate to appoint two Senators who, with the members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers of the House of Representatives, shall constitute a joint committee to which all such lists or schedules shall be referred, and the joint committee shall examine such lists or schedules and submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, a report of such examination and its recommendations.

SEC. 6. If the joint committee reports that any of the records listed in a list or schedule referred to it do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the Government, the Archivist shall notify the head of the agency by which the list or schedule was submitted of the action of the joint committee and the head of such agency shall cause such records to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 7. If the joint committee fails to make a report during any regular or special session of Congress on any list or schedule submitted to Congress by the Archivist not less than 10 days prior to the adjournment of such session, the Archivist may empower the head of the agency who submitted the list or schedule to cause the records listed therein to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 8. Whenever it shall appear to the Archivist that any agency has in its custody, or is accumulating, records of the same form or character as any records of the same agency previously authorized by Congress to be disposed of, he may empower the head of such agency to dispose of such records, after they have been in existence a specified period of time, in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act and without listing or scheduling them.

SEC. 9. Whenever the Archivist and the head of the agency that has custody of them shall jointly determine that any records in the custody of any agency of the United States Government are a continuing menace to human health or life or to property, the Archivist shall cause such menace to be eliminated immediately by whatever method he may deem necessary. If any records in the custody of the Archivist are disposed of under this section, the Archivist shall report the disposal thereof to the agency from which they were transferred.

SEC. 10. At any time during the existence of a state of war between the United States and any other nation or when hostile action by a foreign power appears imminent, the head of any agency of the United States Government may authorize the destruction of any records in his legal custody situated in any military or naval establishment, ship, or other depository outside the territorial limits of continental United States (1) the retention of which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or (2) which occupy space urgently needed for military purposes and are, in his opinion, without sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation: *Provided*, That within 6 months after the disposal of any such records, the official who directed the disposal thereof shall submit a written report thereon to the Archivist in which he shall describe the character of such records and state when and where the disposal thereof was accomplished.

SEC. 11. The Archivist shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session reports as to the records authorized for disposal under the provisions of section 7 of this act and as to the records disposed of under the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of this act.

SEC. 12. Photographs or microphotographs of any records made in compliance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act shall have the same force and effect as the originals thereof would have and shall be treated as originals for the purpose of their admissibility in evidence. Duly certified or authenticated reproductions of such photographs or microphotographs shall be admitted in evidence equally with the original photographs or microphotographs.

SEC. 13. All moneys derived by agencies of the Government from the sale of records authorized for disposal under the provisions of this act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States unless otherwise required by existing law applicable to the agency.

SEC. 14. The procedures herein described are exclusive and no records of the United States Government shall be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. The act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government", approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1219), the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain photographed records of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved September 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 958), and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT moves to amend the bill by redesignating sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 as sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, respectively, and inserting a new section to be numbered 9 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Records pertaining to claims and demands by the Government of the United States or against it, or to any accounts in which the Government of the United States is concerned, either as debtor or creditor, shall not be disposed of by the head of any agency under any authorizations granted pursuant to the provisions of sections 6, 7, and 8 of this act until such claims, demands, and accounts have been settled and adjusted

in the General Accounting Office except upon written approval of the Comptroller General of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made at American University on the Korean Cherry Trees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of June 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD FOR OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the noble and generous heart of America is appalled at the reports of health conditions existing in the Nazi-occupied countries in Europe. Not alone is there actual hunger, but also much disease that is carrying off women and children at an alarming rate, while the threat to the future health of these people is terrifying.

To those who would shush-shush us into saying nothing, to those who contend that anything is fair in war, to those who cold-bloodedly tell us that human beings are replaceable, let me say without rancor or bias that the time has come to so modify the United Nations' blockade as to permit the passage of the foods so desperately needed by the starving millions of occupied Europe.

To those who would have us believe that it is necessary to starve women and children in order to win the war, let me say that the records of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 utterly disprove that contention. The glorious and immortal record of relief performed by Herbert Hoover and his aides back in 1918–19 proves that the lives and health of the millions of women and kiddies in the occupied democracies of Europe can yet be saved without endangering the success of our military plans. So does the present relief work in Greece, initiated by Turkey, and now being carried on by the Swedish and Swiss Red Cross, prove that relief work can be extended to Poland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries, where pestilence, famine, and death walk hand in hand. Let me read to you from State Department Press Release No. 147, dated April 19, of this year, in confirmation of what I say. It reads in part as follows:

This Government and the British Government have received regular reports through the Swedish Government, which has generously assumed responsibility for this scheme, under the general auspices of the International Red Cross Committee, confirming that the foodstuffs sent into Greece are being distributed to the Greek population without interference by the occupation authorities and that there has been no diversion of these supplies to the enemy. Furthermore, these reports indicate that the Axis authorities have entered into agreement with the Swedish-Swiss Relief Commission for the implementation of their pledge, given to the Swedish Government in connection with the negotiations preceding the initiation of the scheme, that Greek native produce would be reserved solely for normal peacetime residents of Greece except insofar as local foodstuffs consumed by the armed forces or officials of the occupying powers are replaced by equivalent foodstuffs imported from Axis scurces for the Greek population.

This Government's approval of the Greek relief scheme was anncunced to the press by this Department on August 7, 1942, on which date the first of the 8 Swedish vessels engaged for the purpose departed from Montreal for Piraeus. These vessels, charter-hire on which is now being met principally by this Government, are carrying monthly quantities of 15,000 tons of wheat donated by the Canadian Government; 3,000 tons of dried vegetables and 300 tons of evaporated milk supplied by this Government; medical supplies furnished principally by the American Red Cross; and miscellaneous supplies and equipment donated by the Greek War Relief Association.

These relief supplies are distributed to the Greek people by a neutral relief commission of 30 Swedish and Swiss nationals under the chairmanship of the distinguished Swedish jurist, Emil Sandstrom. The commission is aided in its task by some 800 carefully selected Greek employees.

To insure its independent mobility, the commission has been supplied with its own motor vehicles. It is in a position to insure close surveillance and control over the distribution of all relief supplies received and to report fully thereon to this Government and the British Government, which will of course agree to the continuance of the scheme only so long as they are satisfied that it is not in fact benefiting the enemy.

Greece is 100-percent occupied by the Axis Powers. If food can be shipped into starving Greece without in any way helping the Axis, why cannot food be shipped to Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries? That is something that those responsible for the "blockade of starvation" will find it difficult to explain. They simply cannot explain. In talking with Prime Minister Churchill about it, a few days before his departure from Washington, he said that for every ton of relief food shipped into the occupied countries, Germany would cut down their allowance by just that much. When I related this to Herbert Hoover a week later, Mr. Hoover explained that the food being sent into occupied areas, by the Germans, lacks vitamins, proteins, and fats—food elements that children must have if they are to grow into healthy adulthood. Germany can only spare grains and potatoes and these are not suitable foods for growing children. Then, too, the Nazis have promised to not cut down on their shipments of food into occupied countries to offset foods shipped in from other countries.

The able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is an outstanding authority on distribution of relief, having been one of Mr. Hoover's trusted assistants in carrying out Belgian relief back in 1918. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] says:

I had ample opportunity to observe the controls of foodstuffs in occupied Belgium and northern France during the last war, as well as in Russia in 1922. During the time that I was in Belgium, the supervision for the importation and the distribution of all foodstuffs was in the hands of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, an organization supervised by representatives of the Spanish, Dutch, and American Governments, and manned almost exclusively by Americans with the aid of a few Dutch. In addition, a great many Belgians were employed within the country. Most of the food came into Belgium and northern France by barge through Rotterdam and Amsterdam. All shipments were checked at every stage in their progress so as to avoid any thefts. Distributions from warehouses to local committees set up by the burgomasters in various towns and cities were again checked and constant inspection was made with respect to the actual allocation of every item of food. Through this method of supervision, it was impossible for the occupying authorities—that is, the Germans—to steal any of the food without immediate reports thereof going to headquarters. Under an agreement with the German authorities, no indigenous foodstuffs could be exported from Belgium. Whenever the movement of even a cartload of vegetables or cereals across the border was reported, replacement of the same was immediately demanded and restitution was made.

It is my understanding that the suggestions which have been repeatedly made for feeding the children in occupied areas would follow the same controls as those exercised during the last war. However, there is one added safeguard. The feeding is confined to the women and children. It can be done through soup kitchens to which the children go for the food. The inspection would be simplified, and complete assurance that none was reaching the occupying authorities could be guaranteed. Insofar as the removal of indigenous foodstuffs is concerned, as well as requiring the occupying authorities to furnish the same proportions of food that they previously supplied, this can very readily be done by those who have had any experience with the shipment and warehousing of foodstuffs. To the lay mind, it all seems very difficult, but to those who have seen it in actual operation it is not a complicated process.

Some of the occupied countries have sufficient credits abroad for taking care of their own nationals providing the United Nations will but give them permission to pass relief food through the blockade. As I recall, all of them have the necessary credits. Take the case of Norway, whose unhappy situation I am somewhat familiar with: There is now due Norwegian shipowners large sums of money by the United Nations, for the use of Norwegian ships. This money has been requisitioned by the Norwegian Government in exile and is available for the purchase of the grains, dairy products, fats, and clothing so desperately needed for their women and little ones. These foods can be purchased in Argentina, and Swedish ships are available for transportation. The record shows that

the Axis are agreeable to this being done, but not so Uncle Sam and John Bull.

There are only two individuals in all the world who can give the word that will permit relief food and clothing to be sent into the occupied countries to save the lives of millions of women and kiddies. They are Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the able gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be possible under a plan of this kind to try it out with a few shipments of food and ascertain whether or not it is helping these people, and, if so, continue with it? In other words, is there any argument against a trial on the part of the heads of either the British Government or the American Government?

Mr. KNUTSON. No good and valid reason has been given why it should not be tried out, but I would like to call on the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to answer that question in detail, as he can speak from experience.

Mr. HERTER. I think there is no valid reason whatsoever once it is begun. If you find that the enemy is making use of the foodstuffs that you have imported or is drawing out of the country some of its own foodstuffs to make up for what is sent in for relief purposes, the entire operation can be stopped immediately. In fact, the operation can begin with that understanding; and if that is done, it immediately puts the full blame for the starving and the miserable health of these people on the occupying authorities.

Mr. CURTIS. Can you ascertain the truth of the situation after the food is sent in there?

Mr. HERTER. There is no difficulty whatever in ascertaining the truth. Large quantities of foodstuffs cannot be moved from place to place without the population knowing that it is being moved. In the entire Belgium and northern France operation, where 10,000,000 people were being fed, there were, roughly, 200 Americans, and they knew exactly where every bit of food was during its entire progress up to the time of consumption in that area.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts is probably as competent an authority on the question of relief as any man in Washington or outside of Washington.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the able gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know what reasons are given by the powers that be whom the gentleman mentioned for not permitting this food to go in? There must be some reason. What is the excuse that is given?

Mr. KNUTSON. The excuse that Mr. Churchill gave me was that for every ton of food that we would ship in the Germans would reduce their shipments into the country by that much, but that is not a valid reason because the foods that are being shipped in by the German Government consist of grains, cereals, and potatoes. The gentleman, being a medical authority, knows that is not proper food for growing children.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. Has there been evidence in Greece, where this has been very carefully supervised by neutral powers, that the Germans were ever sending food into Greece and now are sending in less than they were before?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me again quote from the State Department Release No. 147, dated April 19:

> This Government and the British Government have received regular reports through the Swedish Government, which has generously assumed responsibility for this scheme, under the general auspices of the International Red Cross Committe, confirming that the foodstuffs sent into Greece are being distributed to the Greek population without interference by the occupation authorities, and there has been no diversion of these supplies to the enemy.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that a good many Americans who vigorously opposed this relief plan at the beginning, feeling it would reduce the general effectiveness and that the kindest thing that could be done to these people was to get the war over as soon as possible, have now reversed themselves and have repeatedly said, publicly and privately, that they were wrong and they now strongly urge that measures be taken to allow food for women and children to run the blockade?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true. I have a list of names in my office of a very large number of persons who 18 months ago vigorously opposed sending food to the occupied countries, but now are just as vigorous in demanding that food be sent there.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. In line with what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, as a matter of record the Society of Friends, the Quakers, are feeding 20,000 people in occupied France now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. HORAN. This should form a pattern that a larger operation could follow.

Mr. KNUTSON. What the Society of Friends is doing in northern France, and what the Swedes and Swiss are doing in Greece can be done in Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries, as well as in the balance of occupied France.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the reason for the change in the position of these individuals the gentleman has mentioned is not a matter of humanitarianism or sentimentality, it is a matter of observation of an actual experiment that has been carried on these long months? It is not a matter of theory, it is a demonstrated fact that this can be done. After all, what are we fighting the war for if it is to save freedom for corpses?

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly. How much more helpful would it be to the cause of the United Nations if they were greeted by virile and vigorous people once they get ready to invade these countries, rather than by a people who have lost hope and are disease-stricken, who are absolutely helpless as far as giving aid to the invaders is concerned?

Must we continue to let the German propaganda machine say to the occupied allies that they are being starved by England and the United States?

Must the governments in exile, when they return home, be met by a debilitated, starved, and sickly population and also by crosses row on row that mark the places where sleep thousands who needlessly died from starvation and pestilence?

And when the invasions come, as they must, shall our military leaders be met by a strong and healthy population, vigorous and able to carry on the fight for freedom, or must their main work be fighting pestilence?

Who can supply the food and medical supplies so badly needed? I believe America can, in spite of the so-called food shortage; but if we cannot, then Canada and Argentina can, if they are permitted to send the supplies through the United Nations' blockade. Germany has agreed to permit the supplies to be distributed under the supervision of the International Red Cross or similar organizations, as is now being done in Greece.

Norway could supply her own tonnage, but it would be better and safer to use ships of neutral registry—perhaps by trading ships for the purpose, temporarily.

The technical problems are very simple and can easily be handled if England and the United States will agree to the principle.

On Tuesday last the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and I had a conference with Herbert H. Lehman, Director of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, regarding the situation in occupied Europe. We found Governor Lehman sympathetic and willing to do all in his power to give aid. His was an excellent choice for that important position. Unfortunately for the sufferers in other lands, Governor Lehman is almost helpless in this crisis, as he has no voice in policymaking. That rests with Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill alone. One word from either of them would banish all the horrors of famine and pestilence from Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries. Will they arise to the occasion? The future of white civilization in Europe rests in their hands.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from today's Washington News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from California, where hearings were held for 2 weeks regarding the War Relocation Authority centers located in the West, I feel that I should make a report to the House regarding the evidence presented at those hearings.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] served with me as a special subcommittee of the Dies committee to investigate un-American activities. It was our purpose to determine to what extent the Japanese Government or Japanese agents might be continuing to exercise subversive influence upon the people of Japanese ancestry who are concentrated in the relocation centers. The committee investigators made a 5,000-mile trip looking into conditions at each of the centers with the exception of Tule Lake. Upon completion of their investigation, the hearings were opened in Los Angeles and numerous witnesses appeared at that time. In order to obtain a very clear picture of conditions in the centers, our hearings were very largely confined to the relocation center at Poston, Ariz. The conditions uncovered at that center are illustrative of the conditions existing at each of the other centers as evidenced by the work of the committee investigators.

It is quite evident from our investigation that the operation of these centers has not been entirely satisfactory. While the living conditions are not too good, and the living quarters are overcrowded without exception, nevertheless better results could have been obtained under different handling. No effort seems to have been made to promote a program of Americanism amongst these Japanese people. On the contrary, it is quite apparent that the disloyal Japanese have assumed the ascendancy and have dominated the operation and control of the centers. They have endeavored to influence the thinking of all the Japanese and to force a sentiment favorable to Japan to be expressed by all the évacués. Instances in which Japanese évacués have shown a pro-American attitude have resulted in their being assaulted and beaten by the disloyal. At Manzanar, particularly, some 30 loyal Japanese were removed from the center and placed in an abandoned C. C. C. camp in an isolated area of Death Valley. Instead of penalizing the miscreants, the loyal Japanese were sent into isolated confinement, presumably for their protection. Not only has there been no effort to segregate the disloyal and un-American Japanese from those who desire to remain loyal but on the contrary the disloyal have been given positions of prominence and power in each of the centers.

Each center is divided into various blocks and in each block there are 14 barracks, each of these being divided into 4 large rooms. A family resides in one of these rooms. In addition to the barracks, there is a large recreation hall, a laundry, community lavatories, and the community mess hall. No individual facilities are provided in any of the barracks. The entire living is on a community basis. In the organization of the centers, block leaders are elected by the Japanese and these leaders may be foreign-born or American-born. For the information of the Members, I might explain that the foreign-born Japanese are known as Issei, while those Japanese who are native to this country are known as Nisei. However, the Nisei group have a subdivision known as Kibei. These are the Japanese who have been born in this country, have been educated in Japan, and then have come back here to live. The older Japanese, while they adhere to Japanese customs and ways of life and exert some influence upon the younger Japanese, are not a serious menace. So likewise the Japanese women, enjoying as they do in this country a status of equality with the men, are not inclined to be favorable to Japan where they occupy a very inferior position and are considered as chattels. The majority of Nisei, if removed from a pro-Japan influence, would develop into patriotic and loyal citizens in the main. They readily adopt American customs, American sports, and an American way of life. However, those natives who have been educated in Japan have become the most sinister influence among the Japanese peoples.

These Kibei have received in Japan a thorough indoctrination in Japanese history, culture, and customs. Their education has been almost exclusively devoted to military training. They have been indoctrinated in the art of espionage, military tactics, and Japanese propaganda. Upon their return to the Pacific coast they have established clubs and organizations through which they have endeavored to indoctrinate those Nisei who otherwise would not have come in contact with un-American sentiments. Over 40 clubs of the Butoku-Kai were established on the Pacific coast. Approximately 10,000 Nisei were members. The Butoku-Kai has been in effect a junior branch of the Black Dragon Society of Japan. One of the main cloaks behind which militarism is taught these Japanese is the sport of judo, which resembles the American sport of wrestling, but, on the contrary, is definitely interwoven with Japanese ceremonials and is an important part of the training of every Japanese soldier.

At the relocation centers, instructors in judo have been hired to teach the Japanese this military sport. In addition, speakers have been allowed to visit the various centers and address the évacués in Japanese. The papers published at each of the centers are largely written in Japanese. In spite of all this, there is practically no one connected with the War Relocation Authority who understands or speaks Japanese, much less reads Japanese.

Invariably each disturbance that has occurred at the centers has brought about an increased control of the operation of the centers by the Japanese themselves. Invariably the W. R. A. administrators have acceded to the demands of the Japanese. Invariably the Kibei group, along with some Issei, have obtained more and more control of the centers. It is unfortunate that the personnel directing these centers almost without exception lack any prior experience with Japanese people or Japanese customs. At Poston, the Administration is in charge of persons loaned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As a consequence, the administration of the center has been patterned after the administration of Indian reservations generally. The perpetuation of Japanese customs, games, and sports has been encouraged rather than discouraged, all of which make it possible to stir up pro-Japanese sentiment within the center to the detriment of those who would oppose such a program and who desire to maintain their loyalty to the United States. Finally, a new program of cooperatives is being inaugurated by the W. R. A at the Rivers Relocation Center. A system of cooperatives has been inaugurated with each Japanese in the center being entitled to own a certificate of membership in the cooperative. The persons in control of this cooperative are definitely disloyal Japanese who are utilizing the cooperative as a means of dominating their fellow évacués. With every Japanese a member of the cooperative, each évacué comes, therefore, directly under the domination of those controlling the cooperative. In this instance, as in others, the disloyal Japanese have seized upon the opportunity to gain greater control and to enforce greater loyalty to Japan.

The release of the Japanese évacués should be stopped at once, as there has been absolutely no genuine effort to determine the fitness of the Japanese being released. Even those Japanese who originally had been interned by the F. B. I. at the outbreak of war and who have been released to the relocation centers are today eligible to be released anywhere in the United States except the restricted area of the Pacific coast. I need not state that the sentiment of the people of the Pacific coast, as well as Arizona, is vigorously opposed to the return of Japanese évacués to those areas at any time during the present war, and it is well to add that the United States is at war with Japan, which apparently the administrators of the W. R. A. seem to have either ignored or forgotten.

As a result of the hearings on the Pacific coast, the committee released the following statement:

First. Project personnel lacks previous experience in dealing with Japanese people prior to their present assignments.

Second. There has been no adequate segregation made of loyal and disloyal Japanese.

Third. Government funds have been expended unwisely for such things as teaching the Japanese judo, a form of

Japanese military training; teaching the Japanese to play goh, a form of Japanese checkers; paying salaries to lecturers who visited the centers in an effort to install cooperatives in the centers.

Fourth. Outbreaks of violence, including riots and strikes, induced by the Kibei group, have occurred, yet the instigators have gone unpunished.

Fifth. Loyal Japanese-Americans have suffered beatings at the hands of pro-Japanese in the centers yet the miscreants have gone unpunished. The loyal Japanese have not been afforded the protection to which they are entitled.

Sixth. There are indications that confusion exists as to the responsibility for investigating the personal history and background of the Japanese who are being released at this time from the centers.

Seventh. There is evidence in the hearings that there is lack of planning by the procurement officers of the projects, particularly in regard to food purchases.

Eighth. Sufficient work opportunities for the Japanese have not been provided in the various centers so as to utilize properly the available manpower in a constructive manner.

Ninth. More adequate protection should be given to public utilities, dams, reservoirs and other strategic installations in the vicinity of the relocation centers. The committee is specifically notifying the Governors of California and Arizona regarding this situation in their States.

Tenth. While housing has been provided for all Japanese évacués, overcrowding is apparent. The lack of privacy and the existence of cramped quarters create a condition that should be remedied immediately.

These conditions not only need immediate remedial treatment but they never would have occurred had a more definite policy and a more vigorous direction emanated from Washington. Generally, the local administrators of the centers are capable individuals but they have not had adequate direction and supervision from Washington. Unless there is an immediate change of program in these centers the net result will be that practically the entire group of people of Japanese ancestry will be so thoroughly indoctrinated with anti-American principles as to make an undesirable element in our population, this in spite of the fact that no finer opportunity for Americanization has ever been granted any Government agency.

A new policy regarding the management and operation of the centers should be inaugurated without delay.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. When Mr. Dillon S. Myer, the Administrator of the War Relocation Authority, was before the California delegation some weeks ago, he mentioned the fact that the W. R. A. had originally been authorized to construct 12 camps but that they had constructed only 10 of them. He then made the complaint that the reason they were unable to accomplish this segregation the gentleman speaks of was that they did not have enough camps. Does the gentleman know the reason why the additional 2 camps were not constructed, which would have at least permitted the segregation?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman that ample funds have been provided to the War Relocation Authority to allow them to build the number of camps they might desire. Why they have not built the others I do not know. But if they had really desired to install a program of segregation they could have gradually worked out a program of moving the disloyal Japanese into one camp and taking the loyal Japanese out of that camp, and gradually made one camp a center for disloyal Japanese. Absolutely no effort was made in that regard.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has heard those who have charge of the War Relocation Authority. Who has charge of it?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Dillon S. Myer is the Director of it.

Mr. PATMAN. Did you interrogate him?

Mr. COSTELLO. The committee is going to have hearings starting on Wednesday here in Washington, at which time undoubtedly Mr. Myer will be called as a witness.

Mr. PATMAN. It just occurred to me that the statements the gentleman made were rather unusual, that anyone would permit things like that to go on. I was just wondering why the gentleman did not hear those who are in charge of the War Relocation Authority.

Mr. COSTELLO. The investigation on the Pacific coast was confined to witnesses who are located out in that area.

Mr. PATMAN. But you will give the people in charge a chance to explain?

Mr. COSTELLO. On Wednesday hearings will start here in Washington, and Mr. Myer will be called as a witness during the course of the hearings here in Washington.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California, as I have said before, that I am in favor of shipping them back to Japan when this war is over. The way to tell which ones ought to be shipped back to Japan is, I would just take a blood test.

Mr. HINSHAW. In pursuance of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, if the gentleman will yield, while it was not an official occasion, not one where the testimony was given under oath, Mr. Dillon S. Myer spent several hours with the California delegation on this very question not long ago.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman. I assure him it is the intention of our committee to hear Mr. Myer during the course of the coming week. I may also suggest that the hearings which we held in California were open, and representatives of the press were free to attend and to take what notes they wished to make.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee on doing a splendid job in their investigation of this highly complex and important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I presume it is the intention of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is chairman, after completing the hearings, to report to the House and make the necessary recommendations in connection with an attempt to solve this problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Undoubtedly, as soon as the hearings have been completed here in Washington, a report will be made by the Dies committee to the House regarding the entire matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Did the gentleman's committee have an opportunity to ascertain whether or not the Japanese who are now wearing the United States Army uniform are coming back into California in any numbers?

Mr. COSTELLO. General DeWitt issued an order on April 18 allowing persons of Japanese ancestry who are members of the United States armed forces to return to restricted areas. So far that is the only lifting of the restriction on persons of Japanese ancestry entering the restricted areas.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Are they coming back to California in any large numbers?

Mr. COSTELLO. It has not been definitely indicated to us whether any soldiers of Japanese ancestry have gone out there or not. Rumors came to us from time to time that some had been seen in southern California or at different cities around that area.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. But you were unable to check up?

Mr. COSTELLO. We were unable to check up and verify those rumors as to whether they were or were not. Actually there is no purpose in their returning to the Pacific coast in view of the fact that their relatives are not residing in the restricted area. Unless it would be to visit someone who is located in a hospital there who has not been evacuated, there would be no purpose in an American soldier of Japanese ancestry going into that area.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman will recall that a couple of months ago we had a discussion on this same subject right here on the floor of the House, at which time questions were raised as to the possibility of distinguishing loyal from disloyal Japanese. Does the gentleman think the War Relocation Authority or the F. B. I., or anyone else,

has yet devised a proper method for distinguishing loyal from disloyal Japanese?

Mr. COSTELLO. Frankly, I do not believe they have. As a matter of fact, it is very apparent that none of the administrators of these centers has ever had any experience with Japanese people prior to their coming into control of the centers. I admit it is a tough job to direct a camp of 17,000 people—men, women, and children—directing their entire lives; but they knew nothing of their customs, nothing of their experience, nothing of their habits, yet they were assigned the task of directing their entire mode of living. It is a difficult thing to do. I think they should have obtained some men who had a little prior experience with the Japanese people before doing so.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of California. The gentleman spoke of 10 recommendations. Will the gentleman place those in the RECORD?

Mr. COSTELLO. They are incorporated as a part of my remarks. I did not repeat them in view of the fact that they have already been published.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Would the gentleman say that the prime difficulty was in the original statement of the Japanese, that they were treated so as to make it a race question, instead of as against a pro-America and an anti-America?

Mr. COSTELLO. Just what does the gentleman mean?

Mr. ROGERS of California. In that they were all treated alike as Japanese, when they should have been treated separately, as those Japanese that were pro-American and those that were pro-Japanese.

Mr. COSTELLO. My thought was that once they had been removed from the evacuation centers to the relocation camps, an effort should have been made to distinguish between the good and the bad; at least on those occasions when disloyal Japanese seized upon and beat up pro-American Japanese, then those troublemakers should have been punished. Instead, that was not done, no effort was made to do that, and in any number of instances as a result of this, disloyal Japanese got bolder, and assumed more and more power, and they definitely showed that they are for the Japanese, and that nothing was happening to them, that Americans were too soft, that they did not know how to run a camp, so how could they win a war. That was a perfect medium for them to spread propaganda to the effect that Japan was going to win the war, and these others were told that they had better be loyal, or when the Japs won the war and when they took over America after the war was over it would be a sorry day for them.

Mr. ROGERS of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Did the gentleman discover whether there was much resentment on the part of the Japanese at their original removal from the Pacific-coast area?

Mr. COSTELLO. Generally, I think there was no resentment on their part on being evacuated. They thought that was in the interest of their safety as well as for the general protection of the country. In the centers, the pro-Japanese groups, uncontrolled, have stirred up dissatisfaction.

Mr. JUDD. So that the resentment among those who were originally loyal is the result of what has occurred since that time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes, I think there was very little resentment in the fact that the Japanese had been evacuated from the Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to know if at the hearing anything was brought out that would throw light on the exchange of prisoners, in the fact that we would like to send disloyal Japanese back, and the Japanese in exchange would send our soldiers who are in the Philippines, or in the islands of Japan. I understand that a policy of that sort has grown up in Japan relative to the return.

Mr. COSTELLO. Not to any extent. There has been an effort on the part of the Japanese Government to repatriate some of their nationals and one case we did run across was where Japan had requested a return to Japan of an American-born Japanese who had been aiding in the work of evacuating the Japanese from the Pacific coast. That individual has been released from the evacuation center into the eastern part of the United States. He never was in a relocation center at all, and yet here is a Japanese who was born in this country that Japan is asking to have repatriated as a national to Japan, indicating definitely, their recognition of dual citizenship.

Mr. HORAN. To reward or to punish him?

Mr. COSTELLO. I think it was a case of having a valuable man returned to Japan, in order to utilize his services still further.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] spoke about treating this matter as a matter of loyalty or disloyalty, instead of treating it as a race matter, which undoubtedly it is. As a matter of fact, Americans have been living in Japan for many, many years, and they are now being sent to the United States. Also I call attention to the fact that they endeavor to apply that policy that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] has advocated in the Hawaiian Islands, with the result that those loyal Japanese helped to bring about the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. To what extent are these Japs being used as useful labor on the farms or otherwise, to relieve the labor shortage?

Mr. COSTELLO. Unfortunately, the provision of work at the centers has not developed as rapidly as it should. At one center, near Poston, Ariz., there were available twenty to thirty thousand acres that could be put into cultivation, and only 300 acres have actually been cultivated. It has been claimed that there has been no machinery with which to do the work. At least two or three thousand acres should have been in cultivation at this time, and the Japanese would have found at Poston, Ariz., adequate opportunities to keep them busy and occupied.

I think you would have much less difficulty with them if they were given plenty of work to do.

Mr. HANCOCK. So we feed them and house them in idleness?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct. The pay they receive is limited to from $16 to $19 a month. Nothing more than that can be received, regardless of how much work they perform.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Did your committee ascertain whether any of these Japanese were being returned to Oregon, California, and Washington?

Mr. COSTELLO. As far as I know, none of the Japanese has been released to the Pacific coast. Some of them have been released to the State of Arizona, very much against the protest of the people of Arizona. However, on the Wednesday before we visited the center at Poston, I understand an order was issued announcing that no more Japanese would be released to Arizona. I am sure no Japanese will be released to the three Pacific Coast States.

Mr. ANGELL. Are the releases taking place as rapidly as they were 3 weeks ago?

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know, but I understand they were being released at the rate of 1,000 a week. At least 15,000 or more have been released from the centers and have been able to establish themselves elsewhere in the country without any direct supervision or control.

Mr. ANGELL. I call the gentleman's attention to an extension I placed in the RECORD today from the Legion post at Portland, Oreg., protesting against the release of these Japanese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects

and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 2481.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2714.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 5: The original House bill carries provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943. To this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocation to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make exemptions for the Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services but left the Senate language applicable to all other Federal agencies. The Senate accepted the House modification of the Senate language but added a further exception for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement omits the original House amendment relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration, and also omits all other proposed substitute language of the Senate and House and leaves the continuation of the fund in the form originally reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations. The House provision relating to the Planning Board and Farm Security is covered in other measures. The independent offices appropriation bill, 1944, contains provision prohibiting the funds for that Board in that bill from being supplemented from any other source and similar provision with respect to Farm Security is contemplated in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, 1944, now pending.

No. 60: The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, Wm. E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons, prior to that date, have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61: Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal year 1944, retroactive to July 1 in the event the bill does not become a law by that date.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for 5 days, on account of Government business.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. FAY (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 29, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval

petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, June 29, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1767 and H. R. 340.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The special subcommittee on bankruptcy and reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943. Business to be considered: To hear Mr. MacLeod, Office of Price Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

519. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on a list of papers reported to him for disposal by the United States Maritime Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

520. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers reported to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

521. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency in the amount of $300,000,000 for war housing (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

522. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

523. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the statement that since the act of Congress approved February 19, 1943 (Public Law 1, 78th Cong., ch. 1, 1st sess.), no acquisition of land, by lease or otherwise, has been effected pursuant to its authority; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3055. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3056. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend the law relative to the collection of seed and feed and other agricultural loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3058. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3059. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War With Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to investigate the relationship of assistance granted by agencies of the United States Government to the Shipshaw project in Canada to the program of the United States for furnishing metals for war purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 273. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3060. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Parker and Orion C. Parker, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Ina Burke Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3063. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of H. E. Terrell, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1753. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1754. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by W. L. Williams, of Grayville, Ill., signed by 60 members and friends of the Methodist Church of Grayville, Ill., urging legislation to prevent all kinds of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1755. Also, communications from Herbert Austin, of Carmi; Ellis Hall, of Louisville; L. E. Stoutenberg, of Flora; and Adolph I. Desch, of Wendelin, Ill., representative citizens of southern Illinois, earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1756. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Nellie O. Taylor and 27 other citizens of Elma, Wash., and vicinity, requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1757. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Etta Buckley and 128 other citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by A. Erickson, of Canby, Oreg., and 19 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1759. Also, petition signed by A. H. Smith and 39 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging passage of the Culkin bill (H. R. 1924); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1760. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of the Dubois County (Ind.) Farmers Guild denouncing the activities of and demanding the repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the stoppage of all appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1761. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution adopted by General George A. Custer Post No. 54, the American Legion, Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the release of Japanese from war relocation centers, requesting return to such centers of persons already released and advocating placing war relocation centers under military authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1762. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of 348 citizens of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH P. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1763. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Gertrude M. Sowers and 458 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1764. Also, petition of Mrs. Flonda K. Dyer and 29 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1765. By Mr. WALTER: Petition regarding House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1766. By Mr. WELCH: Tabulated record of sentiments of representative group of citizens of Salinas, Calif., regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1767. Also, petition of the County Supervisors Association of California, adopted June 18, 1943, regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1768. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of the Reciprocity Club, affiliate of Cincinnati Club, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by 39 residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1769. Also, petition of Herbert Hoffheimer and signed by 19 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1770. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, adopted June 18, 1943, supporting the action taken by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requesting that priorities be granted for the construction of 5,000 moderately priced family dwellings for war workers within the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1771. Also, resolution of the San Francisco building and construction trades council, relative to increasing dependency allotments to aged mothers and fathers of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1772. Also, resolution of the Berkeley Lodge, No. 1002, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, commending Gen. John L. DeWitt for the efficient manner in which he conducted the registration and removal of persons of Japanese descent to relocation centers and the courageous stand he has taken in all matters connected therewith, and opposing any action toward the release of native-born Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1773. Also, resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., expressing appreciation of the services of Gen. John L. DeWitt and their confidence in his leadership, and urging those in authority to approve the acts and orders of General DeWitt, particularly in reference to the evacuation of the Japanese people, and to continue General DeWitt in charge of the Western Defense area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1774. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to additional governmental agencies for the purposes of regulating, controlling, or developing transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who countest the nations as the dust of the balance, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, have mercy upon our Nation as we strive to mend its flaws and make it the fit instrument of Thy will in these troubled days. Forgive us that so often drunk with sight of power we have loosed wild tongues that have not Thee in awe.

History's tragic pages remind us that Thy providence knows no favorites, that naught can bend Thy justice and none can break Thy laws that shall not themselves be broken. Facing duties and decisions that outweigh our own strength and our own wisdom, we ask for courage to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. More potent than the raucous voices without may there come the whisper of a still voice within, heard only by obedient hearts:

"Men may misjudge thy aim,
Think they have cause for blame,
Say thou art wrong.
Hold on thy quiet way;
God is the judge—not they.
Fear not, be strong."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF ARMOND W. SCOTT TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. QUINN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COSTS, CANCELATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS DATA OF INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous irrigation data of Indian irrigation projects for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LAND ACQUISITIONS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to

all acquisitions of land by lease or otherwise effected pursuant to Public Law 1, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 1, first session, authorizing appropriations for the Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended January 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OPERATIONS UNDER SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 87)

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board under authority of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603, 77th Cong.) relating to the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS AND APPLIANCES FOR RETIRED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2) and Navy (3); the National Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Federal Security Agency, and the United States Maritime Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Illinois Legislature; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

"House Joint Resolution 50

"Whereas recent authoritative statements of officials of the Federal Government have indicated an intention to augment the national military forces to a number upward of 10,000,000; and a large proportion of these persons will be disfranchised, in effect, in national elections unless some method is devised to facilitate their voting; and, in 1944, the President, Vice President, and one-third of the Senate will be elected to govern this Nation during the period of utmost stress and possibly at the time when terms of peace are being considered; and refusal to grant a voice in national matters to such a substantial part of the electorate may engender a spirit of ill-will and be detrimental to national unity: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein). That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States to cast a ballot in national elections, at least insofar as candidates will be voted for by an entire State; and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be delivered by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each House of Congress and to each Member of Congress from Illinois."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by members of the Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church assembled at the annual Summer School of Theology, Baldwin, Kans., favoring repeal of the so-called Oriental Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE SUBSIDY AND ROLL-BACK PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD at this point three typical letters from citizens of Kansas, two of them farmers, the other from a physician in a small town in the general farming region of the State, stating their views in opposition to the roll-back and food subsidy program.

I can state to the Senate that I believe these short letters express the overwhelming sentiment of the farmers of Kansas, and the majority of the entire citizenship of Kansas. Kansas does not believe in the roll-back and subsidy plan and does not want it. May I express the hope that the conferees will stand firm for the position taken by both branches of Congress in prohibiting subsidies except for the purpose of obtaining maximum production of farm products and critical materials, along the lines of the Aiken-Gillette (Senate) and Wolcott (House) amendments to the bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation another 2 years.

I send the letters to the desk for printing in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point. Also a telegram from the Excel Packing Co. of Wichita, Kans.

I also ask that the letters and telegram be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESKRIDGE, KANS., *June 17, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The farmers of our community want no subsidy. That is final.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. WALKER, M. D.

GARDEN CITY, KANS., *June 14, 1943.*

DEAR SENATORS CAPPER, REED, AND REPRESENTATIVE CLIFFORD R. HOPE: I want to raise my voice again against this subsidy idea that the administration is trying to put upon us folks. It is just cheap politics to buy the labor vote, and, besides, the processors have already taken from $1 to $1.50 off livestock. Besides, labor is getting wages above what we farmers are being paid.

Labor at $1.05 to $1.50 per hour is more than wheat at $1.22, or cattle at $15, or sheep at $7.50, lamb at $15.75, or hogs at $13.50.

Yours truly,

R. T. PLUMMER.

SOLOMON, KANS., *June 20, 1943.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have been thinking about writing you a letter for the last 3 months and finally got to it. Things are getting so rotten that we farmers will have to raise hell yet before this thing is over. It looks like they are trying to make saps out of the farmers. I think it is time for Congress to take over and give us some common-sense legislation; that is all that this country needs. I have talked to a lot of farmers in this part of the country, and the most of them feel the same as I do about it. I think that 90 percent of the farmers are against subsidy of any kind, and they all think that wheat should be at least $1.50 to $1.75 a bushel, which would be in line with other things. I would like to know why they didn't let the wheat farmer vote this spring. Will you please let me know? Now you boys get together down there and put the screws on all of that foolishness, and we will win this war in a lot less time and feel a lot better about it.

Yours truly,

R. C. HEIDRICK.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 24, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Earnestly request your support of legislation killing roll-back on meat products. Cannot save average consumer over $2.40 per annum and, therefore, is without effect on inflation. Please make sure that both roll-back and subsidy are killed, because it would be ruinous to kill subsidy without killing roll-back. Legislation needed to save whole industry from chaos and insure supply of meat to armed forces and civilians.

EXCEL PACKING CO.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this morning a group of sincere, public-spirited women came to my office, and presented to me petitions signed by approximately 1,500 citizens of Pennsylvania. The signatories of these petitions are one in requesting that definite action be taken by the Congress to control the liquor traffic in all strategic military areas throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the petitions and that one of the petitions be inserted in the RECORD without all the signatures attached thereto as a part of my remarks, and that they be referred to the Military Affairs Committee, in order that the members of that committee may become familiar with the mounting concern with which the problem of liquor control is being viewed by great numbers of serious and progressive citizens in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States of America, do earnestly petition the Senate of the United States of America to pass the bill (S. 860) for the moral and physical welfare of our armed forces in the great defense emergency of the present time, and the urgent need for victory in the total war the world is embroiled in now.

ELIZABETH HELLER.
LEO P. TERRY.
HARRY W. LANGENBERG.
(And numerous other citizens, all in the State of Pennsylvania.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; without amendments (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 1252. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects; with an amendment (Rept. No. 365); and

S. 1257. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LUCAS) introduced Senate bill 1285, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1286. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1287, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1288. A bill for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1289. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and I have joined in introducing a bill providing a special method of voting in time of war. It will be remembered that last September a bill which I had introduced to provide a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from their places of residence was enacted into law. The time was short before the election, the provisions of the law were not generally known, and its provisions were carried out only in part.

Our experience with that law in the last election made evident the fact that it could be greatly improved, and the bill now introduced by the Senator from Illinois and myself is intended to accomplish that end. The Senator from Illinois, by reason of his familiarity with the laws of his State of Illinois, and study of the election returns from the land and naval forces in the last November election, has formulated ideas which are of great service in improving the existing law. He has laid emphasis on the fact that it is important not only to legislate to give the men and women in the armed service the vote, but to make sure that such legislation is enforced, regardless of where they are.

It is most desirable that no man or women eligible to vote should be deprived of what is the greatest privilege of the American citizen, that is, having a share in determining through his elected representatives the future policies of his Government. At this period of the world's history, that is the most notable difference between this land of freedom and the totalitarian countries which are attempting to destroy us.

Therefore, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to accomplish the purpose indicated and request that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 11, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

INCREASES IN SALARIES, COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, ETC., TO MEET INCREASED LIVING COSTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the clerk's desk a bill to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social-security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the first of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes.

The enactment of such legislation at this time would, in my opinion, settle once and for all the various proposals for increases for this or that group of governmental employees or Federal beneficiaries.

It will be noted that the proposed 10-percent increase in all payments of Federal salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, and social-security benefits, would apply equally as to all groups of Federal employees and Federal beneficiaries at the same time. This proposed legislation would provide for a 10-percent increase in all such monthly payments for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living over the basic cost during the first half of 1940, to be computed each 6 months, and then to be put into effect as of the first of the fourth month thereafter, so that it would be administratively feasible with very little auditing or clerical difficulty.

This proposed legislation would be fair both to governmental employees and beneficiaries on the one hand, and to the Government on the other hand, in that if the cost of living should undergo a decrease, to such extent as not to support a previous 10-percent increase in such payments, the same would be decreased by 10 percent, provided, however, that there should be no decrease under the basic amounts provided for by law.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would almost automatically do away with the necessity for any proposals for basic increases for any other special groups, except to correct gross inequalities, as to the basic amounts provided for.

If such legislation were enacted as to governmental employees and beneficiaries, then it is quite likely that labor unions would request addendums to their present wage contracts to provide for a similar formula as to future wage increases. Once such a formula were in effect as to governmental salaries and benefit payments, and then as to labor union contracts, every segment of society would realize the futility of attempting to secure a temporary advance by any increase in prices for any special commodities, for such temporary advance would probably shortly be canceled by reason of the operation of such 10-percent increase or decrease formula for adjusting salaries and benefit payments. I believe that the adoption of this formula would be eminently fair for all groups of governmental employees and beneficiaries and would in the final analysis prove to be a greater stabilizer as to the purchasing power of wages, salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, and social-security benefits than any other formula which could be realized.

I sincerely hope that early and serious consideration will be given by the committee to which this bill may be referred, to the end that the bill may speedily be reported back to the Senate floor for the consideration of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill at this time for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1287) to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the 1st of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE submitted to following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriatitons for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 8, line 8, strike out "$5,473,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$31,032,970, of which $25,559,970 shall be available to the Administrator for carrying out any govern-

mental program heretofore or hereinafter initiated with respect to the rationing of petroleum and petroleum products; and all authority heretofore conferred upon the Office of Price Administration and the Price Administrator with respect to such rationing is hereby transferred to the Petroleum Administration for War and the Petroleum Administrator for War, respectively."

On page 10, line 6, strike out "$177,335,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$151,775,030."

Mr. LODGE also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION — RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Chair was kind enough to appoint me one of the conferees on the part of the Senate to participate in the conference on the items in difference between the House and the Senate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. I am at such variance with the action the Senate took with reference to the bill that I desire to be relieved from service as a member of the conference; and I ask the Chair to appoint some other Member of the Senate in my place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair accepts the resignation of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and appoints in his stead the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

RECOMMITTAL OF NOMINATION OF POSTMASTER AT MARLETTE, MICH.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a request of the Senator from Tennessee in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Yesterday, inadvertently, I informally passed over the nomination of John S. Dunsford to be postmaster at Marlette, Mich., among many others. Normally, I have not interfered with the Democratic Party machinery in connection with postmasters under the existing political regime. But this happens to be a case in which I have filed a protest with the committee, and I now renew it. It is a case in which a veteran of World War No. 1 has a prior standing in the postal civil-service examination, and members of the American Legion feel that their highly eligible comrade has been prejudicially kept from this appointment solely for political reasons, solely because he does not belong to the prevailing political party.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the nomination on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is. What I am asking the Senator is if he will allow me to ask, as in executive session, that the nomination be recommitted to the committee in order to investigate whether Mr. Harold Doyle, a veteran of World War No. 1, has been prejudicially dealt with in this case, on the basis of sheer partisan patronage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As in executive session I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT IN PRESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in New York on Sunday last, I spoke at the national meeting of the Eastern Seaboard Substitutes Conference sponsored by the Affiliated Postal Employees.

Unfortunately, it was the hottest day of the year, with the result that a statement that I made was either made inadvertently by me, or the press, which was unusually friendly, got one too many zeros to some figures I quoted.

I stated in the course of my patriotic speech that—

Great as this country is, magnificent as its record has been, proud as we are of the accomplishments of its people, there is still much to be done. The Federal statistics show 3,200,000 suffering from venereal diseases, 1,200,000 war workers who are being treated for syphilis and gonorrhea, and 695,000 young men who were physically fit but were unable to get into the United States forces because of lack of education. Seventy-five thousand young men of draft age are holding down swivel-chair jobs instead of being in the armed forces where they belong, and there are of course the usual rumors that some are of rather wealthy parentage or from families of influence. This is the situation the common people who love their country are called upon in my opinion to remedy, and as I proceed we will discuss what the common people should do politically.

Mr. President, in reporting my remarks, inadvertently the figure was given in the press as 750,000. The figure should have been 75,000. I wish to make that correction.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDEPENDENCE (KANS.) DAILY REPORTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Salute to Congress," published in the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRE-WAR AND POST-WAR POSITIONS OF SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Rutherfordton (N. C.) News, of June 24, 1943, containing a reply by him to an editorial in the June 3 issue of the News, with regard to his pre-war and post-war positions, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WOLL STATES HIS POSITION—LETTER IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to the editor of the New York Times, published in the New York Times for June 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adopt the conference report on House bill 2714.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the conference report on House bill 2714 been placed before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been placed before the Senate, but it seems that no motion has been made formally to adopt the report, and I now make that motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that the RECORD indicates that the report has not been formally taken up for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the report be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

(For conference report, see page 6647, RECORD of June 23, 1943.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order against the conference report on the ground that the conferees exceeded their authority in that the amendment in its present form is plainly legislation. The provision as it passed the House, while it had a legislative intent, unquestionably was in form a limitation, but the conferees have gone clear beyond the differences between the two Houses submitted to them, and have written into the conference report affirmative legislation requiring officers to be confirmed by the Senate for whom confirmation is not now required. I therefore suggest, Mr. President, inasmuch as the conferees have gone completely beyond the differences committed to them, that they have exceeded their authority, and that the conference report is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have only academic interest in this question, but I think as a parliamentary situation the able Senator from Missouri is in error. Therefore I rise without having any interest in the subject matter whatsoever, to discuss it from the standpoint of the rules of the Senate. As I recall, the House conferees inserted legislative language in the bill. That language came to the Senate. There was no modification of that language, or at least no part of it modified. Therefore it gave the conferees a wide range of operation. For that reason I think the conferees could make in the language which was written into the bill by the House any modification they saw fit to make.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language on page 48, line 19, reads as follows:

> No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made.

If the Senator will look at that language he will find that clearly it is legislation, and therefore, the House having entered the field of legislation, in my judgment the action of the conferees is perfectly proper and legitimate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall as though it were yesterday, when the Vice President's seat was occupied by Vice President Garner, and the question arose how far the Senate conferees might properly go when legislative language was inserted in a House appropriation bill. The Vice President held they could go the full length; that they could explore the whole field, and write entirely new language. I understand from this report—and I must confess that I am somewhat lame in my knowledge of the language—that the proposal is to require confirmation of three persons.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. The able Senator from Missouri is striking at it because he believes the conferees have exceeded their authority. I think confirmation by the Senate is quite within the language that is contained in the House bill, and certainly it came within the jurisdiction of the Senate conferees to enter that field and write into the bill such language as conformed to the general purposes which were recited in the House language.

That is a very brief statement, and I say to the Vice President and Members of the Senate, that the matter came up unexpectedly, but a parliamentary question is always an interesting one. For that reason, for what it is worth, I am giving the Chair my views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] yesterday informed the Chair that he would make this point of order. The Chair has had the matter looked into, and makes the following statement with regard to it.

The bill, as passed by the House, prohibiting the use of funds for the payment of salaries of the individuals named, contains this provision:

> No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett.

The insertion of the language "which is now, or which is hereafter made available under or pursuant to any other act," under the precedents both of the Senate and the House, removes the provision from the category of a limitation and invests it with a legislative character.

The precedents of both bodies are practically unanimous that conferees, in adjusting differences existing between the two Houses on legislation, may make germane modifications of the matters in disagreement. In the present case the Senate struck out the section of the bill without inserting any provision in lieu thereof; therefore, the conferees, not being bound by any restrictive language on the part of the Senate, have wider power to deal with the provision and may make any germane modification of the House language. The Chair thinks that the language adopted by the conferees certainly is germane and relates directly to the matter in dispute, and is clearly within the limits of power granted to conferees in such cases. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order, and cites in connection therewith section 3288 on pages 774 and 775 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not argue the case, because I think every Member of the Senate knows exactly what he wants to do about the conference report. I merely wish to say that we have had a very difficult time with it. The last report was overruled by quite a large vote. A further conference was requested, and held, and the present report is the result of that conference. Under it, until November 15, the men will remain in office, and if the President should then reappoint them and the Senate confirm them, they would continue to hold their places. Otherwise they would lose their places on the 15th of November. I think such a solution is very satisfactory. It seems to me that if the 3 men have no such subversive views as have been alleged, this body will give them a fair deal. Furthermore, 5,500 employees in the District of Columbia, and others elsewhere throughout the country, perhaps scores of thousands of them all over the country are now awaiting their salaries or increases of salaries, and unless they receive them through this bill they will not get them. In other words, the bill is being held up for the benefit of 3 men.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think any public purpose is to be served by any undue delay and a restatement of the arguments which heretofore have been made in this body. This matter has been before the Senate on two previous occasions, and the Senate by overwhelmingly decisive votes has decided against any such blackjack procedure as that proposed by the House provision. The first time the Senate voted on the matter it voted 69 to 0 to strike out the House provision. The second time the Senate took the very unusual course of defeating a conference report by a vote of 52 to 17. It seems to me the Senate could not possibly have expressed itself in any more vigorous fashion than was done on those two occasions.

Mr. President, the present conference report contains every objectionable feature, except in matter of degree, which was contained in the original procedure provided by the House bill. The procedure of separating these men from the Federal service on November 15, unless they shall previously have been nominated and confirmed by the Senate, always subject to delay, of course, on a star chamber proceeding before the subcommittee in the House, is only one step in degree less offensive than the original House provision, and it is fully as objectionable on every question of principle. It seems to me that the Senate, as a matter of self-respect, as a matter of devotion to our constitutional form of government, should reject the conference report and send it back to conference.

No one likes to be responsible for delay in enacting an important appropriation bill, particularly one providing for paying the salaries to which certain persons are entitled; but I submit that if the House of Representatives adheres to the course it has been pursuing, it will be its responsibility, and it will have to face the country and take the responsibility, and it will have to face the country and take the responsibility for that course.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on last Thursday a conference report on this same bill was submitted to the Senate, and was rejected by a vote of 52 to 17. The report was rejected and sent back to conference upon two grounds: First, there would be unfair treatment of three employees of the Government under the bill as then reported; second—and a much more important reason, in my opinion—there had been defeated in conference a provision restricting the use of an emergency fund given into the hands of the President. The bill extended the former appropriations, and increased them by $25,000,000, giving the President a total fund of $94,000,000. The Senate wrote into the bill, with respect to the use of that fund, a provision that no part of the fund should be used by the Chief Executive for any agency or for any purpose for which the Congress had refused to make an appropriation.

That provision has been deleted in conference. We have now twice discussed this action of the conference and we have already repudiated the action taken in conference. The Senate now is again asked to surrender its position on this question. We now are asked to abandon the position we took on the first consideration of this bill, and which we took again last Thursday. We are asked to say that the money we have appropriated may be used by the Chief Executive, in effect, to finance some project or some agency for which an appropriation has been refused by the Congress.

To me, that subject is much more serious than a delay in the payment of some salaries; it is more serious in its effect on the country than any rights of any three employees of the Government. Unless we reject this conference report again and write this restrictive provision back into the bill, the President may, if he desires, defeat the intent and purposes of Congress by financing some project from this fund in instances where Congress has refused to appropriate money for such a project.

For that reason, I urge upon this body that the report be rejected, and that we adhere to our position that the limitation be placed upon the funds, as we previously decided should be done, and as we

so decided a second time last Thursday. I hope the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize nothing is to be gained by further debate, but I desire the RECORD to show that I am as much opposed to the conference report in its present form as I was when it was previously submitted, and I think the Senate should reject it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my justification for taking any time at all now is that I was not present when the bill was passed originally, at which time the Senate unanimously eliminated the offensive House provision with regard to the three men involved, and I was not present when the conference report was rejected a few days ago. If I had been present on both those occasions I would have voted to eliminate that offensive provision of the House bill, and I would have voted to reject the conference report.

It seems almost incredible, Mr. President, that any legislative body would resort to the tyrannical method which is involved in this provision. I do not know these men. So far as I know, I have never met any of them. If their names were sent to the Senate for confirmation, I do not know that I would vote to confirm the nomination of any one of them. However, I do not foreclose myself in regard to that question, if their names should ever be sent to the Senate. But among all the 2,000,000 employees of the United States—if there are that many, and I presume there are approximately that many, in view of the war situation——

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are 3,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the figure was 2,000,000. If it is 3,000,000, it further emphasizes my point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be 4,000,000 next week. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Among the 3,000,000 employees of the United States, the Congress of the United States is so afraid of three men because of what they may think or what they may have said, or what they may have quoted somebody else as saying, that it is apprehensive the Government of the United States will collapse unless those men are separated from the pay roll.

I made a brief argument on this question at the last session, when the House had done the same thing in regard to two of these men. I feel that such action by any legislative body outrages all the principles of fair play and democracy, as we think we are now fighting to preserve it in the world.

These men were not given an opportunity to be heard by the House committee. I do not know that they wanted to be heard before the Senate committee, because the Senate committee promptly struck out the language, and it probably was not necessary to hear them. But, regardless of that, I think it would have been an act of fair play to the men to have heard them before some committee. Even the hearings which were had in the other body were not permitted to be made public. The men involved were not even permitted to see them. They do not know yet what anybody said about them that resulted in this legislative assassination.

The so-called compromise simply provides that instead of cutting their heads off day after tomorrow, we are to cut them off on the 15th of November and bring them in on a platter as a Christmas gift to Herod. We are going to give them a slow death instead of decapitating them at once.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If these men are the kind of men the Senator says they are, good American citizens—and I am not challenging them at all——

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not said anything about the men. I have not said that they are good American citizens. I do not know. I assume, in the absence of any proof to the contrary, that they would be regarded as good American citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a great deal of proof to the contrary, let me say to the Senator. Such proof was offered before our committee, and also before the House committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be made public.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is available to the Senator. He can send for it any time he wishes to see it.

That is not the question. The question now is, Are we to hold up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of other Government employees against whom there is no charge of any kind, merely to oppose a procedure which we think is incorrect? I agree that this is not the proper way to discharge men in the public service. I have said so time and again. The fact is that there is a precedent for it, because last year or the year before we did the same thing in the case of a man by the name of Lassar, and the Senate agreed to it. I remember the name and the case, but I do not remember what the charges were.

The House has voted 5 to 1. It was on my motion that the Senate refused previously to agree to the House provision; but we face a very peculiar situation. We passed a measure increasing the salaries of hundreds of thousands of Government employees, 5,500 of whom are in the District of Columbia. We cannot pay the increased amounts to employees against whom nothing has been said. We cannot pay them, forsooth, because the House takes the unalterable position that these three men ought to be fairly dealt with in some way. A fair way of dealing with them has been provided. I would not say that the Senate would not treat them fairly. I would not say that if the cases of these three men were submitted to the Senate, it would be equivalent to throwing their heads to Herod. I do not think that is a fair statement of the case.

If we want to pass this bill so that hundreds of thousands of honest, honorable, hard-working employees may receive the increases in salary which have been awarded to them by the Congress, we will vote for the conference report. If the Senate wishes to vote the other way, that is a matter for the Senate. I am not asking any Senator how he will vote. So far as I am concerned, he may vote exactly as he pleases. I think that is what Senators will do anyway. It seems to me that we had better have a vote and get through with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire for haste in voting, but I did not have an opportunity to express my views on this type of legislation when the bill was previously before the Senate. I rise at this time to express my views, and I shall continue until I conclude.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not discussed this matter at any time it has been before the Senate. I have always voted against this type of procedure. Does not the argument made by the Senator from Tennessee prove how vicious it is to attach legislative provisions to an appropriation bill? If the Senate concurs in this report today, it will do so simply because it is forced to take such action in order to pay other employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true. The truth of the matter is that under the rules of the House if any Member of the House had risen in his place and made the point of order against this provision because it was legislation on an appropriation bill, it would have been eliminated. No Member of the House made the point of order, and the provision remained in the bill.

I am not urging any Senator to vote against the conference report. The Senate may do as it pleases with it. I realize the difficulty with which the Senator from Tennessee has been confronted. It is unfortunate that we must vote with a pistol held at our heads, because tomorrow at midnight the fiscal year ends and a new one begins. I certainly would regret to see any worthy employee of the Government denied pay for one day because we are forced into a situation in which we must stand by our deep convictions as to the viciousness of the proposed legislation or surrender our convictions in order that Government employees may not go without their pay. I am satisfied that they would not go without their pay anyway, because they would not be paid until the 15th of July and I am satisfied that before that time the matter could be adjusted.

I wish to express my profound disagreement with this character of legislation. If we can do such a thing with regard to these three men, we can do it with regard to any other employee of the United States. We could deny an appropriation to pay the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States if we did not like some decision which he rendered, in order to get rid of him. That certainly is a vicious way to legislate. In my judgment the provision is just as unconstitutional in the form in which it is now offered as it was in its original form.

Two months ago we dedicated to Thomas Jefferson a very beautiful monument in the District of Columbia. If

Senators will go there they will see in the circular frieze above his statue the most sublime sentence that ever fell from the lips or pen of a mortal man. We might do well to keep that sentence in mind dealing with this subject. This is it:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

What is sought to be imposed upon the minds of these three men is a form of tyranny. I regret the necessity of expressing my dissent from the principle involved in this proposal. I regret what seems to me to have been the impetuosity of the other branch of the legislature in passing this bill of attainder. I so thoroughly disagree with the principle that I cannot refrain from expressing my views in regard to it. In spite of the action which has been taken on this matter, if the Senate feels, under the circumstances, that it should adopt the conference report, I shall not say anything about it. It is up to the Senate. I desired to place my views before the Senate, and in the RECORD, because they have been my views all along, and they are no less my views now because the execution has been postponed until the 15th of November. Of course, it is true that if the President should send the nominations of these three men to the Senate for confirmation and they should be confirmed, the men would continue to be employees of the United States. I do not think that would change the principle upon which we are now being called upon to pass. Regardless of how the Senate may vote on the conference report, my views as to the viciousness of the principle involved in the proposed legislation will not be altered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as one deeply interested in Federal employees, having manifested my interest on many occasions, I regret the delay in the vote on the conference report. However, on this particular issue the Senate has spoken emphatically and decisively. When the Senate spoke it had in mind that the principle underlying this issue was deeper than the question of the removal of three men.

Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee of the Senate which had the oportunity to consider this question, I wish to say that I could never subscribe to the procedure which has been adopted. I am being called upon to pass judgment—execution, if you will—upon three men who never had an opportunity to come before our subcommittee, who never had an opportunity to plead their case before our full committee, and who have never had an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee or the full committee of the other House. I have heard a great deal about military secrets, and about the necessity of keeping them in order that we might take advantage of the enemy, or, rather, in order that the enemy might not take advantage of us. But why, in the name of God, must we adopt a legislative secret in order to separate three men from the Government pay roll? Why not bring the issue out in the open?

Mr. President, this is a democracy, and free speech is one of the underlying principles of democracy. Free speech is not yet dead, and in my judgment we are about to determine in the Senate that it is very much alive.

Mr. President, this question can be settled today. We can send the bill back to conference, and the conferees can submit another report before the day is over. If that procedure cannot be followed, another deficiency bill is en route, and we can put in that deficiency bill a pay item pertaining to Federal employees. We are not called upon to pass judgment upon these three men at this time; and we should not do so until we hear the testimony and proceed in the American way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I say that it is true, as the Senator from New York has suggested, that a pay provision could be put in the forthcoming deficiency bill, regardless of the three men. However, the House conferees stated that a similar provision with respect to the three men would be attached to that bill. That would result not only in a failure to enact the provisions of this bill, but also a failure to enact the other deficiency bill. In other words, the House conferees stated that they would stand right where they were. It is merely a question of whether we want to stand where we are and not have any bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we are not responsible for the unreasonableness of anyone but ourselves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To vote "yea" is to vote to agree to the report, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and let my vote stand.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is detained in a meeting of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Holman	Reed
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Lodge	Russell
Byrd	McCarran	Scrugham
Capper	McClellan	Smith
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McNary	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	White
Gurney	Nye	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Truman
Butler	Langer	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	
Guffey	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—22

Austin	Buck	Ellender
Bailey	Burton	Gillette
Barbour	Bushfield	Glass
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Brewster	Connally	Moore

Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Stewart	Tobey	
Thomas, Idaho	Walsh	

So the report was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments still in disagreement, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD that when the vote was had a little while ago on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 2714, I was in consultation with certain governmental officials relative to some matters of importance pertaining to my State, and I was unable to be in the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted not to agree to the recommendation of the conferees relative to certain Federal employees, namely, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. I do not think the manner in which this question has been approached is a fair protection of the civil rights of these men, or wholesome legislation.

REPAIR OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY FLOODS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the devastation caused by the recent floods in the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Wabash, the Missouri, the Arkansas, and the White Rivers. It is necessary that the work of repairing the damage should be done at once.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have a little order in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the Senate to be in order. It is not in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Chief of Engineers has testified that it is very necessary that the work of restoring the broken levees and of strengthening those which have been impaired be very promptly undertaken, and he has already made plans to carry that work into execution.

I desire, therefore, to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] dealing with that subject matter. When the bill is passed, which I think can be done, let me say, in a very few minutes——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I maintain the Senate is not in order. This is an important measure, and I desire to hear the discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The Senate has not been and is not in order. The Chair requests the Senate to be in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is necessary that the bill be passed, in order that there may be an appropriation made in the forthcoming deficiency appropriation bill. The authorization is for $10,000,000 and unless the Senate passes the bill the appropriation cannot be made.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois was amended by the Committee on Commerce. There is only one controversial feature in reference to the amendment suggested by the Committee on Commerce, and that controversy has been amicably settled.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is a rule of the Senate providing that Senators must occupy their seats or leave the Chamber. There is conversation going on so that I cannot understand what is happening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair requests that Senators occupy their seats.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I want the order enforced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. OVERTON. May I now proceed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] offered an amendment, which is in section 2 of the bill, authorizing loans to be made by the R. F. C., with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, to railroads whose tracks have been damaged or wiped out as a result of the recent floods.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator permit me to explain? It will take but a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to know the number of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Senate bill 1134.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it on the calendar?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood-Control Act, approved August 18, 1941.

Mr. OVERTON. The objection raised to the provision for loans to the railroads was that it was provided that the loans should be made without interest. The settlement of this controversial provision has been effected, I understand, with the Senator from Missouri, and an amendment will be offered which will provide that interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum shall be charged on such loans.

Mr. President, with this brief explanation, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Before consent is granted, if at all, I should like to make a very brief statement, which I feel morally bound to make.

I favored the bill, but on Friday, when the very able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] asked that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Military Establishment appropriation bill, I objected because the hearings had not been printed. At the same time I told the Senator that I should be willing to have that bill follow the bill which has just been recommitted to the conference.

I do not wish to consent to the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Louisiana is interested, a legislative bill, when I promised that the Military Establishment appropriation bill might have the right of way. If the Senator from Oklahoma does not wish to exercise his right, I have no objection, but I am carrying out the promise I made and the understanding had on Friday and Saturday. If the Senator from Oklahoma desires the right of way to take up the Military Establishment appropriation bill, I shall object to the pending request. If the Senator is unconcerned about the matter I have fulfilled my duty.

Mr. OVERTON. The difference between the two bills is that there will be no trouble in disposing of the War Department appropriation bill, but in order to obtain an appropriation and proceed with this necessary work it is necessary to an authorization, and if an authorization is not now provided it will be too late.

Mr. McNARY. I understand the parliamentary situation, I know the necessity of having an authorization bill precede an appropriation bill, but that does not touch the moral aspects of the situation. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he desires that the bill referred to by the Senator from Louisiana precede the bill he has in charge.

Mr. OVERTON. If I may make another observation before the Senator from Oklahoma proceeds, I think Senate bill 1134 can be disposed of in 5 minutes after the unanimous consent request is granted.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the War Department appropriation bill, I am ready to proceed with the consideration of the bill, but the bill sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana affects a flood-control area which embraces my State. So, personally, I am interested on behalf of my State, I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Oregon, and I should be very glad to have Senate bill 1134 acted on first.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was engaged in a very inaudible conversation when this matter was presented. My point of order is that yesterday House bill 2935, an appropriation bill, was made the unfinished business for today. In that event it is the unfinished business, and should be proceeded with and disposed of before anything else is taken up. I make the point of order that House bill 2935 now has precedence on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana asked for unanimous consent. Unanimous consent having been granted, the Senator from Louisiana has the right-of-way.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not understand unanimous consent to have been granted.

I certainly would not have consented to the request if I had known of it. I cannot consent to it now, if it is not too late. I was on the floor and on my feet attempting to get the attention of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that the Senator from Nevada should not be placed at a disadvantage because the Chair did not happen to be looking in his direction at the moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it will not take over 5 minutes to dispose of the all-important appropriation bill, which must go to conference and must be acted on before midnight. I have conferred with the Senator from Missouri, and the point he was about to raise I understand will not be raised, so that we can dispose of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire of the able Senator to what bill he is referring?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill we have been dealing with is House bill 2935, making appropriations for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency. All that has to be done is to consider an amendment which will be offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not like to be placed in the position of being too hasty in stating that unanimous consent had been obtained when the fact was that it was not obtained.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Nevada will yield, may I have his cooperation in having Senate bill 1134 passed, or acted upon by the Senate, by 3 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly, the Senator will have my cooperation in every way. I wish to say to the Senator that he has my cooperation, but I feel it is my responsibility to have House bill 2935 considered, so that it may go to the House and be enacted into law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been raised.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request, and ask that immediately after the passage of the pending bill, and at not later than 3 o'clock this afternoon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1134.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McNARY. I think we will be ready to take the bill up in 5 or 10 minutes, and I suggest that the Senator say "at or before 3 o'clock."

Mr. OVERTON. I said "at not later than 3 o'clock."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. In order to clarify the record and in order that the Chair may feel in no wise responsible, I wish to say that when the nuanimous-consent proposal was made I was not attending to what was proceeding on the floor, I am very sorry to say, and the Chair was not to blame.

I now ask that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2935.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able Senator from Nevada if he will not take a small item to conference which had to do with the first part of the bill when we were considering it. It is a small administrative item which affects the office of the Secretary of Labor. It amounts to $34,000, and a very good case was made for it in the record of the committee. If agreed to the amendment would make the total appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia $386,000, instead of $352,000. I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not take it to conference for consideration.

Mr. McNARY. What is the figure the Senator wants increased?

Mr. TRUMAN. The appropriation now in the bill is $352,000, and the increase asked is $34,000, making the total appropriation $386,000. It is a matter of administration in the District of Columbia, and if the increase is not granted, possibly the Department will be crippled in carrying out the mandates of the remainder of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Was the appropriation refused by the House committee?

Mr. TRUMAN. The figure in the bill, $352,000, is the amount placed in it by the House committee.

Mr. McNARY. Was the Senator's proposal made to the Senate committee when it had the bill under study?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; it was not made to the full committee. The committee became involved in an argument, and the matter was overlooked. I am now asking the Senator from Nevada if he will take the amendment to conference for consideration there.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that this item is within the Budget estimate, but the House did not allow it, and the Senate committee did not allow it. At the same time there may be justification for it, and I announce that I am willing to take it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 65 to strike out all of line 3 and down to and including line 19.

Mr. President, I will make a brief statement concerning the situation involved. Senators are probably familiar with the fact that the United States Employment Service was taken over by the Federal Government after we entered the war, or it may have been taken over some time shortly prior to that. There has been a feeling or fear that because the Federal Government has taken this operating agency over for the duration of war, it might be a permanent move, and the House has been incorporating a prohibition against using any of the moneys to increase the salaries of any of the individuals in the United States Employment Service.

This organization, as Senators will realize, is the operating agency in dealing with the war manpower problem in the field. The result of this prohibition has been that although the employees in question are now in the Federal service, their salaries have still remained at the lower State level. The result is, for example, that if a stenographic examination is held in my State, and a number of persons pass it, they are immediately offered starting salaries in every other agency and branch of the Federal Government greatly in excess of the starting salary which can be paid in this particular agency, because in it the State salary level prevails.

Mr. President, I am satisfied there is no real issue in this item insofar as the question is concerned as to whether this agency is to be taken over permanently by the Federal Government. The only question is whether this very important arm of the War Manpower Commission shall be saved from the raiding of its personnel which has been going on by other Federal agencies. The turn-over in the various States of the Union varies, as I recall, anywhere from 25 to as high as 300 percent. It is obvious that this very important functioning agency of the War Manpower Commission should not be subjected to such crippling of its efficiency. Therefore, I trust that the Senator from Nevada will be willing to take this amendment to conference, and to give the matter serious consideration there.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed by the Appropriations Committee for 2 and perhaps 3 years, and it has been turned down by the Appropriations Committee on each occasion. It was turned down again on the present occasion. In other words, the language placed in the bill by the House has been sustained by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I cannot take the Senator's proposed amendment to conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say for the RECORD that at a time when we have a shortage of manpower and a manpower crisis in this country I think it is a tragic mistake to have the operating arm, the management arm, the functioning arm of the War Manpower Commission, in attempting to deal with this critical situation, partially paralyzed because of this restriction. If at the end of the war we want the United States Employment Service returned to its previous status it can be done by legislation, but in the meantime let us permit it to function efficiently, and not hamper it simply because there is opposition to permanent federalization of this service.

What harm can it do to permit these individuals to receive the same levels

of salaries paid in the other branches of the Federal Government? What harm can that do, so far as concerns the ultimate issue of deciding what disposition shall be made of the administrative agency in question? Congress will always have the power to legislate on that subject in the future. But now in the midst of this terrible war, when every Senator knows that manpower is one of our most serious problems, it is a great mistake to take this attitude simply because it has some indirect bearing on whether in the future this agency is to be at the Federal level or not. That is a question we can always determine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not think the Senator's amendment involves a question as to whether when the war is over these employment services will go back to the States. Frankly, I feel they should go back to the States, and I think it is very likely that they will go back to the States. But I wish to say that I have the honor to be a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee has held very extensive hearings on the question of manpower. When I say "extensive hearings," the fact is that we have been holding hearings on the subject of manpower from last October until 2 weeks ago. All through those hearings representatives of the War Manpower Commission, when asked why they did not do this or why they did not do that, spoke of how the work of the Manpower Commission is now crippled and impaired because of the enormous turnover in the personnel of these offices. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, these offices of the Employment Service constitute the machinery through which the Manpower Commission has to operate and does operate. This machinery is greatly crippled and impaired because it is not now possible to keep efficient persons in the service of the employment offices.

According to the testimony before the committee, the minute one of the offices employs a capable person, that person is given the opportunity to obtain a job in some Federal agency at a higher rate of pay for doing the same kind of work, and, of course, he does what we would do, or what anyone else would do, and naturally takes the job which provides the higher pay. One of the most serious problems now confronting the War Manpower Commission as testified by Governor McNutt, and attested by practically every other representative of the Manpower Commission who has appeared before the Military Affairs Committee, is the problem of not being able to retain capable and efficient personnel in these offices, with the constant and enormous turn-over in their personnel because of the relatively very low pay now allowed for their employees.

Mr. President, I was very hopeful that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would at least take the proposed amendment to conference, but since he does not agree to do so I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment. That will place the whole matter in conference, and there the conferees may go into the matter further, and obtain a better picture than perhaps they have been able to obtain of the situation with reference to the operation of the War Manpower Commission and how the Commission is now crippled and its work impaired because of the relatively very low salaries which are allowed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a further word in conclusion. I realize that probably to some extent the Federal Security Administrator has brought this on his own head, because I think in all sincerity and conviction he has announced that he is in favor of taking over the unemployment compensation service and federalizing it. I think the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] contains a provision for that to be done.

But Mr. President, that is not the issue, as I see it. What harm can it do, so far as that issue is concerned, to raise these salaries to a level comparable to those paid by the Federal Government? We can determine, and can fight out here when the time comes, what shall be done with the service. So far as I am concerned, I am convinced that, wherever possible, we should maintain the Federal-State relationship. I think it is a mistake to go in the other direction; but for purposes of war it was considered necessary to take the service over, and it has been taken over.

Now why cannot we, for the duration of the war, at least, provide it with a sufficient salary scale so that it can retain its employees and do a creditable job in a very important situation?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it should be emphasized, too, that the Federal Government in taking over the offices did so with the voluntary cooperation of the States. The States themselves recognized that in this time of war, in this time of great emergency, the offices had to be turned over to the Federal Government; and they were voluntarily turned over by the States, for the war period, and in full agreement, so to speak, and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have submitted the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will prevail, as I think it is well worth while.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. MEAD. I merely desire to say that the disparity between the wage rates for the Federal service and for the State service is more widespread now, as the result of the passage of the $300 bonus bill for Federal employees. I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Wisconsin on his amendment, and I trust it will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPAIR OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY FLOODS

Under the order previously entered, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending appropriation of said sum Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

SEC. 2. In order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is authorized to make rehabilitation loan or loans to any such railroad or to the receivers or trustees thereof in such manner upon such terms and conditions and with such security as the corporation may prescribe; except that each such loan shall bear no interest and shall contain provisions for the amortization thereof over a period of not to exceed 40 years. The total amount of loans

and commitments to railroads, receivers, and trustees under this section shall not exceed at any one time $25,000,000. The amount of note, bond, debenture, and other such obligation which the corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provision of this section. The proceeds of any loan made pursuant to this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in making the initial request, I explained the purpose and object of the bill. I simply desire to add to the observations I have already made the statement that the record shows that the area inundated during recent floods along the streams I have mentioned comprises a little more than 9,000,000 acres, the damage is estimated at $96,000,000, and there were reported the deaths of 62 persons.

With that explanation, I submit the bill.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has an amendment to offer, and I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "shall bear no interest" and insert "shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the clerk just read the amendment offered yesterday by the able junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has just been offered.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the Senator from North Dakota seeks to achieve by the amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. If the inquiry is addressed to me, and if I have the floor, I shall be very glad to answer.

Section 1 of the bill undertakes to take care of the damages suffered by railroads by an act of God, in the case of the tremendous floods which caused the sweeping away of trackage and other damage to railroads, especially where they crossed the rivers. I think the evidence shows that in one case the waters impounded in a dam were inadvertently released, and, as a result, one or two of the railroads suffered very great damage.

Section 2 provides that in order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of the railroads which were so damaged, loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and they shall be amortized over a period not to exceed 40 years. The committee amendment, as reported, provided that the loans should bear no interest. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota provides that they shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who was the author of the railroad amendment, is agreeable to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. As the Senator who handled the bill, I am raising no objection to it.

I desire to say it is very necessary that the bill be passed, and I desire to have it passed without any controversial item in it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say that whoever was the author of the bill certainly had in mind that the railroads might need some assistance.

Mr. OVERTON. No doubt.

Mr. DANAHER. And it was deemed to be in the public interest that there be a source to which the railroads could apply for funds; is not that so?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. It is also to be presumed that if the author of the bill thought it would be in the public interest that a loan period of 40 years be provided, it would be advantageous to the public to have the loans made without interest; is it not?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. At that point someone has decided that, even if the railroads need loans, and even if it be in the public interest to have the railroads receive them, it must be in the public interest to have the railroads pay 3 percent interest per annum. I do not know whether the railroads can, in the event of need, finance such loans at the rate of 3 percent. I do not know whether such a provision is fair. Has the committee had any information as to whether 3 percent is the proper rate?

Mr. OVERTON. The information which the Commerce Committee had on that question was, first, as to the damage which had been caused; second, that some of the railroads were in bankruptcy or receivership; and that in respect to all the railroads, they were acting under an advice amounting practically to an admonition from the Interstate Commerce Commission to retire as rapidly as possible their interest-bearing indebtedness, in order to avoid the payment of interest thereon and in order to have a reserve capital with which to meet the impact of the post-war period. Therefore the suggestion was made that the loans be granted to the railroads without any interest, upon the further argument that the railroads are doing a great public service; that commerce on the railroads was interrupted by the floods, and is continuing to be interrupted, at a time when, in the prosecution of the war, it is very necessary to transport as rapidly as possible troops, munitions, and matériel of war. In order that the work of rehabilitating the railroads may proceed promptly, the Federal Government should offer the inducement of letting them have the money on collateral security without interest. That is the argument.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In view of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to be permitted to make these rehabilitation loans only with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I take it it is to be presumed that the Interstate Commerce Commission may deny permission to any railroad to borrow.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. In order that the public interest may properly be served, and in order that the desire of the Senator from North Dakota and those who share his views may be executed, at least in part, I offer, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, language which will read:

Shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from South Dakota conferred with me regarding this bill, which provides for loans without interest. I suggested 3 percent, because the Disaster Loan Corporation, an agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, charges cities, townships, counties, and other political subdivisions which have suffered similar losses 3 percent. I thought probably it was an equitable adjustment of the interest rate. However, if money can be obtained at a lower rate, that is all right. I say that in all fairness to the Senator, because I made the suggestion based wholly on the practice established by the Disaster Loan Corporation in charging 3 percent to private or public corporations and institutions which meet with situations similar to the one described by the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, this was my amendment. It has been my privilege to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and to have made a complete and thorough investigation of the financial set-up of the railroads.

Nearly all the southwestern railroads are located in the particular flood area to which the bill of the Senator from Louisiana relates. Ninety percent of them are in receivership. At least one has been almost completely washed away. It is absolutely essential in this wartime traffic. It cannot be replaced unless the Government takes it over and replaces it.

I had thought that the widening of the openings on a great many of the southwestern streams, the changing of the railroad alinement along the Illinois

River and the Wabash River, and the opening of the bridgehead at Fort Smith, Ark., would have a very great effect on the farm lands which have been inundated by the recent floods. We have never had an over-all flood-control picture for the whole Mississippi Valley. Flood-control work has been done on a piecemeal basis. Back in 1935 a program was outlined by the National Resources Planning Board which called for an over-all flood-control program taking into consideration the small rivers. It is the small rivers which cause flood disasters. The Arkansas River, the White River, the St. Francis River, the Illinois River, the Sangamon River, the Wabash River, the Grand River in Missouri, the Osage River in Missouri, and half a dozen others were the cause of the disastrous floods which washed out farm crops.

I do not want the railroads to have any special privileges over the farmers or anyone else; and when the Senator from North Dakota suggested an interest rate, I suggested to him that it be made not greater than 3 percent, because money can be borrowed on short-term paper for as little as one-half of 1 percent. The same argument was made to me as was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the Disaster Loan Corporation charges 3 percent for rehabilitation loans in the Ohio River Valley. I do not think the railroads ought to have any special privileges, but this is a movement in the public interest, and unless some of the railroads are relocated, unless bridges are raised, and new bridges built in many places, there will be an additional flood menace every time a heavy rainfall occurs in the Mississippi Basin.

I am perfectly willing to accept any amendment which is reasonable, just, and fair so far as the farmers and the railroads are concerned. I have no objection to an interest rate being charged. My idea in offering the amendment in the form in which is was offered was based upon the fact that the railroads affected are nearly all in receivership, and those which are not in receivership are skating so close to the edge that if it had not been for the war effort some of them would now be in receivership.

With that explanation, I am perfectly willing to accept any amendment on the interest question which is fair to all concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the recent floods caused thousads of farmers to lose all they had. They are broke. They are putting in late crops. They are doing just as much for the public interest as are the railroads. I understand that they are obliged to pay 3-percent interest. If the Disaster Loan Corporation charges farmers 3 percent I think the railroads should pay the same rate. That is the purpose of my amendment. If it charges less, there is no objection to the railroads paying less, provided the farmers also pay less.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, because I am a member of the Commerce Committee, that at the committee meeting yesterday I offered an amendment which would strike out that part of the bill providing that money may be loaned to the railroads without interest. The amendment was defeated in the committee. I then explained to the able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. OVERTON] that I would offer an amendment to the bill on the floor. Thereafter I discussed the matter with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and told him that I had planned to offer an amendment. I do not do so because of the amendment which is now before the Senate.

I wish the RECORD to show clearly that I feel that this would be a most dangerous precedent. I think that the argument, sincerely made, that the railroads serve the public welfare, certainly applies in equal measure to the farmer, and to almost everyone else. I am very hopeful that this amendment will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] as amended to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment, as amended, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is the committee amendment pending? I have a separate amendment to offer.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, what action has the Senate taken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was agreed to, and then the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, was also agreed to. That means, in effect, that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities in any area affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out in such area by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting in such area of any crops which are essential to the war effort.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not catch the full import of the first part of the amendment. However, as to the latter part——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I will yield out of mere courtesy to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I did not wish to take the Senator off his feet, but the amendment itself seems to me to be self-explanatory. It simply provides that as to land which has been flooded, and on which replanting is necessary, the quotas and allotments shall be suspended for this year. In other words, a great deal of that land is the best corn land in the world. Crops which were planted there were washed out, and it will be necessary to replant them. It is still possible to grow a corn crop, but it is not possible to grow flax and some other crops which had been planted.

Mr. McNARY. I do not believe that any quotas on the plantation of corn have been worked out as being applicable for this year. As I recall, last year the only quotas were on wheat. Those quotas have been removed for this year. I do not think there are quotas on any crops for this year. However, in any event, whether I am misinformed or not, I have no objection to the amendment because farmers should be permitted the greatest freedom in the planting of whatever crop is most suitable for the soil and for the market.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, when the agricultural appropriation bill was pending an amendment was offered and accepted which provided that all restrictions on the planting of cotton should be removed in the green-bug infested areas and in the flood-devastated areas throughout the country. That amendment was agreed to by the Senate and it has since been agreed to in conference. There is only one crop over which control is being exercised, and that is cotton. There are no allocations for wheat, flax, rye, or anything except cotton. As I understand, the amendment has already been agreed to by the conference committee and has been approved by both Houses of Congress. While I am in favor of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri, I think it comes too late as the whole matter has been already effectively covered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, while I cannot speak for the Commerce Committee because the amendment was not before that committee, personally I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment which I ask to have read.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me where in the bill there is a provision for the rebuilding of bridges which have been washed out? When the bill was

introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] he spoke of the destruction of bridges. In my State many bridges have been washed out. Where is their repair provided for in the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I know, the question of local bridges is not provided for in the bill. In my State we are having the second flood of this year. Each of them has been as serious as any flood on the Missouri River since 1903. There is not a passable bridge across the Missouri River from St. Louis to Kansas City at the present time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I recall, a few days ago the Senate passed a bill which took care of the problem of the repair and the construction of roads and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by the floods. An amendment was attached to a bill which came over from the House, as it may be recalled, by which we undertook to provide for the repairs and replacement of bridges and roads which were destroyed by floods, and set up a $20,000,000 emergency fund for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the amendment simply provides, so far as possible, a directive to the War Production Board, or other governmental agencies of adequate jurisdiction, to assist and aid farmers who, in many cases, lost their farm implements and necessary fencing, by granting to them priorities so far as possible in order that they may continue their farming operations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. However, in order that we may keep the record straight, I should like to make an observation having reference to the War Production Board.

At this moment the War Production Board will grant priorities to anyone who needs fencing, farm machinery, or any other implements which have been destroyed by floods. So far no one has filed any complaints through my office because of inability to obtain priorities from the War Production Board. As I have said, I have no objection to the amendment, but I think great credit is due the War Production Board for its recognition of the emergency in my section of the country as well as in sections of the Southwest and the granting of priorities immediately and with expedition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 6. That in order to aid in the rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have followed very carefully our ventures in the field of relief. I recall that a good many years ago Congress relieved the farmers of North Dakota by buying feed and it also went into the question of fertilizer and food.

Then we loaned money on easy terms for machinery. We thought we had about reached the limit of what the Federal Government should do for the farmers. Evidently it is now proposed to go very much further than we have gone heretofore. As I understand, a previous amendment provided for priorities, and I have no objection to that. The pending amendment mentions seed, livestock, and equipment. Then there is an authorization for a large sum of money. Does that mean that each one of these farmers may acquire a cow, if necessary, or hogs, and seed and all that sort of thing, to reequip his farm on a loan basis? If so, what is the standard? I want to be charitable, but I also want to be careful. I have seen this program grow and grow and grow and I do not want it to be placed on an emotional basis or to be considered a mere reaction to sentiment. Let us always be sensible.

I am rather sorry that the able Senator has offered the amendment. It touches me to object to a proposition of this kind, but I thought, with the relief granted by the bill as originally proposed, plus the charge of an interest rate which was fair to the railroads, and the amendment heretofore adopted the bill would be sufficient, but now we are getting into an entirely new field.

We have other agencies which can do this job without additional legislation. I rather think the Senator is running a chance of losing his entire bill and exhausting sympathy by trying to do something that is not practicable. I do not know who offered the amendment, but, whoever offered it, it seems to me not to be advisable.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I offered it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Then, I suggest to my great friend from Missouri, who generally exercises rare judgment——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. That he is about to submarine his own effort. I am through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I say very frankly that the amendment which I have proposed goes considerably further than the original scope of the bill. The original scope of the bill is limited in respect to the restoration of public works in the nature of dikes and things of that sort. But I say that in this emergency, in view of the serious food shortage which now confronts the people of the United States, it is necessary to go further, not as a means of extending charity to the farmers, not as a means of extending charity to anybody, but as a method of stepping up, so far as possible, food production in the United States, which by the ruinous floods which have taken place has been set back to an almost unprecedented degree in this year when it is worse needed than ever before. As I said a moment ago, in the Missouri Valley we are experiencing our second flood of the year, each one of which has been greater than any flood the Missouri Valley has suffered since 1903.

The Senator from Oregon very properly says that this is somewhat of a departure, but we have had many departures in the last few years. We are spending Government money all over the world without any hope of ever getting it back, under the lease-lend policy; and to say that we are justified in financing production of food to be given to Russia or to England or to north Africa or to any place else, and that we are not justified in protecting ourselves so far as possible by restoring to production this year in a great emergency thousands upon thousands of acres of the most fertile land on the habitable globe, seems to me to be preposterous on its face.

I am not in favor of charity; but this is an emergency; this is the time when we need food more than we have ever needed it in any year in the whole history of the United States; we have assumed obligations practically to feed the world, and to suggest that, by reason of some technicality, we have to sit by with our hands folded and allow this enormous acreage of very valuable alluvial land to go out of cultivation, in this great national disaster, simply does not make sense to me. Therefore, I propose this amendment. It is very frankly for direct relief rather than what is contained in the original bill, which was simply for restoration of public works, which, of itself, is a very meritorious object, and with which I thoroughly agree, but it seems to me that such an emergency now confronts us that direct action is necessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to be accused of being technical. That is a charge which may be brought against a lawyer; I am an orchard man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly did not intend to make any charge against the distinguished Senator from Oregon for whom, as he knows, I have the very highest respect.

Mr. McNARY. The great legal mind of the able Senator from Missouri might look at the technical side; I am not thinking of that side; but I am trying really to do the Senator a kindness which he does not understand or appreciate. H will probably get into such a situation that he will lose his bill; but I shall not dwell on that.

In the greatest seriousness, Mr. President, let me say emergencies are always occurring. This is not the first emergency. I remember when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce, after I came to the Senate, nearly a quarter of a century ago, I went with him and others down the Mississippi River and saw the devastating flood then raging—the greatest ever in the history of that grand old river. That was an emergency. We did not buy farmers cows and spans of mules and harness and oats and barley and alfalfa hay and what not. The farmers who were affected worked out their own destiny. We did, however, appropriate money and extended to them the hope that such a disaster would not occur in the future. I supported legislation along that line to the extent of many millions of dollars, and I am now happy that I did so. That is what we did to insure them against future devastation.

I am willing to go further than this bill, but the Senator need not talk to me about emergencies. As I have said, we always have emergencies; we have had them everywhere all the time. It is just as sorrowful for a farmer to lose a cow 1 year as it is another. The whole thing is the loss of the cow. It is useless to appeal to me on the ground of patriotism and on the statement that this is an unusual situation. That is all folderol. A cow is a cow "for a' that."

I may not be technical, but I cannot think loosely on these questions.

Mr. President, there is no standard provided governing what the Secretary of Agriculture may do to help these farmers. Is he to buy these things and furnish them gratuitously to the farmers, or is he to loan the money? If so, at what rate? This is the only bill I recall where we have not, by some means or method, worked out a formula whereby the farmer could obtain relief while he paid to the Government a part of the money.

I am appealing to the very able Senator, my very dear friend from Missouri. Does he contemplate that the $15,000,000 proposed to be appropriated shall be used to restock these farms without any return of principal to the Government or any penalty in the form of interest? What is his plan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment provides for direct relief; there can be no question about that.

Mr. McNARY. So we are giving $15,000,000 to the group of farmers who have suffered this loss without any obligation whatsoever on their part to repay it or return it to the Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have given about $15,000,000,000 to various other peoples in the world.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that; I voted for those appropriations; but that is the history, and I never found any reason to justify a bill by going back to a study of immediate history. I let the historian of the future write history. That is based on experience and on common sense.

Mr. President, I have given my views. I doubt very much the wisdom at this time of starting on a new process, a new formula for relief which has never been justified by experience and which has not had the sanction of legislative action. But if the Senate wants to do so, I do not want to hold up the bill. I realize we must pass the appropriation bills, and dispose of the conference report, because tomorrow will be the last day of the fiscal year. I subside by saying I think that the pending proposal is hasty, unfortunate, and untimely.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in reference to the pending amendment offered by the able Senator from Missouri, I wish to say that it was not referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce. Therefore, when we considered the bill we did not consider the amendment. As a printed reproduction of it shows, it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the form in which I offered the amendment, it was changed to an authorization. Of course, the printed bill which I introduced as a separate measure contained provision for a direct appropriation, and therefore was properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I have now changed it, and in the form in which I offer it as an authorization it is proper to refer it to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OVERTON. It has not yet been so referred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, but I am offering it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand. I wish to make the statement that the Senate Committee on Commerce, in considering Senate bill 1134, the pending bill, did not consider this amendment, because it had not been referred to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator will recall that I gave notice in the committee of my intention to offer it as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, and I was about to make that observation. During the hearing the Senator from Missouri stated that he proposed to offer not only this amendment, but the other two amendments which have been adopted, when the bill came up for consideration. He said he was going to offer the amendments on the floor of the Senate.

Personally I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, but I cannot accept it as representing the Senate Commerce Committee. As to whether or not it is such an amendment as should receive committee consideration before being acted upon by the Senate is a matter which addresses itself to the sound judgment of the Senate. It is of course a very important amendment, authorizing an appropriation larger than that authorized by the bill itself. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $10,000,000, while the amendment authorizes an appropriation of $15,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I can well understand the motives which prompt the Senator from Missouri in offering the amendment. I can also understand the observation made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I wonder if the proposed work could not be done by the Farm Security Administration. As I recall, several years ago there were some disastrous floods in Alabama, and the Farm Security Administration moved in and gave us relief very much in line with the relief suggested by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I wonder what the Senator would think about putting this work under the Farm Security Administration, because in that agency the machinery and the procedure are available which the Senator from Oregon has suggested are lacking.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should have no objection to that, but it was originally my idea that the matter should be handled by the Disaster Loan Corporation. I consulted with various agencies of Government, which all recognize the very desperate necessity for immediate action in the way of direct relief if crops in the widespread area affected are to be saved, but the best advice I could get, after consulting with everyone I could think of consulting, was that it was probably better to put the matter under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It did not seem to fit into the particular niche of any governmental agency, except the general authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator confer with the head of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was in touch with him; I did not personally confer with him.

Mr. HILL. I have in mind what the Farm Security Administration did in somewhat similar circumstances in the State of Alabama several years ago, in conditions growing out of floods, and knowing they have an organization set-up and prescribed for such work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not make the slightest difference to me what agency handles the matter. What I am interested in is in getting relief for the flood sufferers, and more particularly in attempting to save the crops in that extremely important agricultural area this year.

Mr. HILL. It was the observation of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, together with my own observation of what the Farm Security Administration had done in Alabama, which prompted me to express the thought that perhaps if the Senator placed the administration of the activity in the hands of the Farm

Security Administration it would meet the questions raised by the Senator from Oregon. There we have a going agency whose business it is to rehabilitate farmers and to do the very work proposed by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should be perfectly willing to accept any modification, so long as the work was done. The only thing with which I am concerned is having the situation relieved, and having it done in time for the distressed farmers to make a crop this year.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall yield the floor in a moment.

As the Senator from Missouri knows, I am very much in sympathy not only with the amendments he offered and which have already been agreed to, but I am in sympathy with the amendment he has just offered. It is an amendment of much greater magnitude than the other amendments, carrying authorization for an appropriation of $15,000,000, and I was thinking it might be best that the amendment be offered as a separate bill, and receive committee consideration and have hearings, for no committee consideration has been given to it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it can be done very expeditiously, and I think it should be done at once, because I see very readily what the Senator has in mind.

If it were done when 'tis done, then 't were well it were done quickly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is to be done, it must be done right away, or it will not be effective.

Mr. OVERTON. I certainly shall cooperate with the Senator from Missouri to obtain speedy committee action, if it shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and is to be regarded as a flood-control measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think there is not any question that, as I have offered the measure, as an amendment to the pending bill, it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. It was properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations as I originally introduced it, because it carried a direct appropriation.

Mr. OVERTON. If it shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce, as chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of such matters, I shall undertake immediately to conduct a hearing and report the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not willing to jeopardize the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois, and, with the understanding suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, I withdraw the amendment, and intend to offer it as a separate bill, and have it referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the senior Senator from Missouri for withdrawing the amendment to the pending bill, because I should have some fear of the bill receiving immediate attention, if the Senator's amendment had become part of the measure, and also desire to commend the chairman and subcommittee of the Commerce Committee upon the efficient and speedy manner in which they have considered this legislation.

Some time ago I was called to my home in Illinois. At that time the floods in the Illinois valley were at the very highest peak, and upon my return, after viewing the devastation caused by the floods, I set about to contact the various agencies of government which could afford any relief whatsoever in the various sections of this country and the many people affected thereby.

I first called the Farm Credit Administration and found, through Dr. Warburton, who is deputy governor of that organization, that action to provide immediate aid in the form of loans to farmers for replanting crops destroyed by flood was being carried on at that time. He said that all the money necessary to make the loans needed in connection with the crops which had been destroyed was available.

I conferred with the Red Cross at the time in order to ascertain what they were doing, and learned that they were also on the job in my section of the State, as well as in the other flooded areas.

The Disaster Loan Corporation was standing by, for instance, ready to give aid and comfort to the sufferers of the flood the moment the flood began to recede, by making disaster loans primarily to home owners in the flooded districts, whose homes had been destroyed. The Federal Works Agency was attempting to do something in the way of repairing and reconstructing the facilities of the different localities, which had been destroyed, such as the sewer systems, water works, and other utilities which had gone under as the result of the high water.

The only thing affected by the flood which was not covered directly by an agency was roads and highways. That has been taken care of by an amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The sewer systems and other facilities and utilities of certain municipalities along the affected area will also require some relief. It is my understanding that by the Lanham bill, which was passed by the House, several million dollars is appproriated for this particular purpose. That bill is now pending before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as I recall.

Mr. President, my bill is an emergency measure. That is why I was happy that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] withdrew his amendment. The other amendments he offered, of course, will make little or no difference.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has just stated that the measure is an emergency one. I wanted to inquire with respect to the provisions on page 2, lines 9 to 11, inclusive, under which $10,000,000 is authorized—

For the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who introduced the bill, if that language will prevent the Army engineers from doing more than merely rebuilding the levees or existing flood-control works which were destroyed? In other words, would the language be sufficient to authorize and permit the strengthening of the levees by increasing both the grade and section, or would it limit their reconstruction or repair simply to replacing them in substantially the same condition as they existed prior to the flood and destruction?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in reply to the able Senator from Arkansas that when I returned from Illinois I also discussed with the War Department the question of the rebuilding and the rehabilitating of these levees which had been destroyed by the flood, and learned from the War Department that under section 5 of the Flood Control Act the War Department was limited to the spending of $1,000,000 per annum for purposes of rebuilding and repairing levees and other flood projects. There remained in the fund an unobligated balance at that time of approximately $30,000,000. I was informed that when a flood destroys a levee the Department, under the present law, is unable to rebuild that levee to a greater height than its present height, or to widen the base to a greater width than its present width. Further, the present law would keep the War Department from undertaking to repair or rebuild something which had been destroyed by the flood, though considered to be an immediate emergency, if it were, let us say, 300 yards away from the flood project. Those are basic factors in section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

I immediately conferred with the War Department with the view toward eliminating all those restrictions. My bill in the first instance provided that the Department could spend any portion of the unobligated balance, that it could widen the base of the levee and build it to any height the engineers thought necessary in view of the recent experience, and also any emergency caused by the excessive high water could be given attention.

The Department contends that the language as rewritten, covers all the points which I raised in my original conversation with them, and which is included in the language of the original bill I introduced. The word "strengthen" in the amendment is broad enough to extend the base and increase the height. They did not like the word "emergency" in the original bill. They thought that such a word might be used in a broad sense that would go too far, so it was stricken; however, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, that the bill provides all the necessary power to do what the Senator has inquired about in his direct

inquiry to me. Had the War Department representatives not given me such an interpretation, I would have insisted upon the original language. The amended bill is the same that is now being used, as I understand, by the flood-control committee of the House of Representatives, which has reported out a bill similar to mine. So the House and the Senate committees, and the War Department are satisfied that the language in question will be all that is necessary to provide the relief we need.

One of the primary reasons—in fact, the major reason—I introduced this proposed legislation to existing law was the fact that in my home city of Havana, Ill., we saw the water rise to the highest point it has risen in all of the town's history. In 1844 occurred the previous highest flood in that valley, and so far as records show the flood this year rose 3 feet higher than it was in 1844. Consequently the water went over the top of practically every levee along the river. The seawall at Beardstown, a city of some nine or ten thousand population below Havana some 30 miles, held the water with sacks of sand piled some 3 feet on top of the levee. Great credit is due not only to the civilian population of that community for working day and night to save the city but to the soldiers, who rendered a tremendous amount of useful and hard work in connection with keeping the water from flooding the city and causing much damage. This is only one example of many, which show the necessity for immediate legislation.

Mr. President, my bill will give the Department an opportunity immediately to start planning and making specifications for the rebuilding of the levees to a greater height, for widening their base, and in some places setting back levees where bottlenecks exist with respect to holding back the flow of the water. At certain spots along the Illinois River and other rivers there are narrow stretches from bank to bank. The water cannot flow through fast enough.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his statement. The only thing I was really concerned about was the language to which I referred. I wondered whether it would permit the Army engineers really to do what has been found necessary to be done in view of recent experience. The recent floods have shown that it is necessary to set the levees back. I wondered whether in undertaking to repair and restore the levees the engineers could increase the section and grade and strength of the levee in an effort to prevent a disaster such as we have lately experienced. It occurred to me that merely replacing the levees and the flood control works, restoring them, in other words, to their previous condition, would ultimately possibly prove to be a waste of money.

In my State in the sections which have suffered in the recent floods the people are greatly concerned with respect to this matter. They are hoping that when the work is done under any emergency legislation Congress may enact, or whenever the Army engineers set about to repair the damage, they will take into account the height of the flood, and in making expenditures and in doing this work try to build the levees sufficiently strong, and make such provision with respect to setting them back and establishing flood control protection as to be equal to the exigencies of another emergency and disaster such as has lately been experienced.

I thank the Senator, and I desire to commend him for the bill. It is very timely legislation. It is greatly needed, and I hope the day will soon come when we shall have what the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] referred to earlier in the discussion on the measure, namely, a broad, all-inclusive flood-control and water-development program for the streams of the Nation, not only for my State, but for the whole Nation. Looking to the post-war era, I think that such a program offers one of the greatest opportunities for employment and rehabilitation the Nation can enter upon, because in a period of years it will be one which will be justified and self-sustaining and self-supporting.

I thank the Senator, and I commend him for the legislation he is sponsoring.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind in his remarks. He is obviously correct, in his conclusion with respect to the lands of this Nation, subject to overflow.

Let me say to the Senator that the pending bill is only a drop in the bucket so far as the real control of floods is concerned. The $10,000,000 provided for in the pending bill, as I have previously stated, is strictly an emergency appropriation. However, until the bill becomes law the Army engineers cannot make a single move in the direction of the rebuilding of the levees, unless they want to build them to the same height at which they stood in the valleys last year.

Consequently, as soon as the bill becomes law the Army engineers will be able to lay down their plans and blue prints and specifications with respect to what should be done along every river in the sections which have suffered the tremendous amount of damage from the floods.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In connection with what the able Senator has just stated, Mr. President, I say to him that, as I understand his bill, once the bill is enacted, under its provisions the Army engineers will not have to await the appropriation, following the bill. The bill provides that they may immediately begin the work by the use of existing appropriations. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. I think one of the reasons we want to have the bill passed today is to have the $10,000,000 included in the deficiency appropriation bill which now is pending before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would make it certain.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I certainly hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. LUCAS. One further observation, Mr. President, and then I shall conclude. As I said a moment ago, the $10,000,000 is only the beginning. It is strictly for an emergency, and, as the testimony shows, is about all the engineers can spend in an efficient and economical way before a long-range, well-defined program can be submitted. But the record should show now—and I know this will be done—that an over-all survey will be made of every flooded area throughout the United States, with the view to attempting once and for all to harness the waters which come down in the springtime or in the fall as a result of the heavy rains at those times. We have done, as the Senator from Missouri, I think it was, stated, a piecemeal job upon the flood-control projects throughout the country. It will cost no little sum of money to do the proper job. But if the plan is laid in a way which will take care of the future insofar as concerns the elimination of the damages which frequently occur, the result will be that money will be saved over a long period of time. Each and every year, as a result of the floods, Congress appropriates millions upon millions of dollars—and rightfully so—to this or that agency for relief for the losses sustained. Vision and safety compel me to say that such money should be expended for a great program of flood relief for the whole Nation.

Such a plan is one matter to which the Committee on Post-War Planning, of which the able Senator from Georgia is chairman, certainly should give a tremendous amount of consideration in connection with the problem of unemployment following the war.

I desire to take this opportunity to commend the Army engineers for what they are doing at the present time. Many a hole or a gap in the levees through which the water has rushed is now being repaired. The Army engineers have been able to find a sufficient amount of money in the War Department to enable them to start the work. The sooner they can plug the holes and let the drainage commissioners or the individual land owners have an opportunity to get their pumps in working order, so that they can pump the water from the drainage districts, the sooner will come the time when the farmers, even in those flooded spots, perhaps, will have an opportunity to plant corn and grow a crop, providing the weatherman is with us this fall.

Mr. President, I have said all I intend to say on the bill. I think there is no objection to it on the part of the able majority and minority leaders in the Senate. It is a meritorious measure. It is vital, and should be passed without any delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1134) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 332) to revise the Alaska game law.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 82. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect;

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932;

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 82. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columia; and

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 3030. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996, the War Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the day, on last Saturday I requested that the bill go over until Monday, in order that the hearings might be printed and in order that Senators might have an opportunity to study the various provisions of the bill. The Senator from Oklahoma responded to my request magnificently and generously, and I join him in seeking to have the bill made the unfinished business. I am anxious to dispose of it. It is necessary to dispose of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, today is the 29th of June. Tomorrow will be the last day of this fiscal year. The bill carries some amendments which may not be agreed to in conference, and it may not be finally acted upon prior to the end of this fiscal year. In order that the bill may carry a section which will make it retroactive to July 1, and take care of the time intervening between July 1 and the date of its final approval, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. It is the same provision which such bills ordinarily carry to provide for the time intervening between the beginning of the new fiscal year and the date when the bill is finally approved.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not interested in amendments at this time. They are not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. I do not. I should like to have the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma acted upon. I join the Senator in the desire that it may now be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendments have heretofore been agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Hawkes
Andrews	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Bankhead	Danaher	Holman
Barkley	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Downey	Kilgore
Bone	Eastland	La Follette
Bridges	Ferguson	Langer
Brooks	George	Lodge
Buck	Gerry	Lucas
Butler	Green	McCarran
Byrd	Guffey	McClellan
Capper	Gurney	McFarland
Caraway	Hatch	McKellar

McNary	Radcliffe	Truman
Maloney	Reed	Tunnell
Maybank	Revercomb	Tydings
Mead	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Millikin	Robertson	Van Nuys
Moore	Russell	Wagner
Murdock	Scrugham	Wallgren
Murray	Shipstead	Wheeler
Nye	Smith	Wherry
O'Daniel	Stewart	White
O'Mahoney	Taft	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 61, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 22. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

On page 61, line 18, strike out the figure "22" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "23."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this bill was brought before the Senate on Saturday last, and the amendments which were recommended by the subcommittee and later by the main committee were adopted. It is probable that the bill will not be signed by the President until after the 1st of July. If that should happen, there would be a time gap between the expiration of June 30 and the date when the bill becomes operative. The amendment would close that gap, so that if the bill does not become law promptly on the 1st of July, the beginning of the fiscal year, the appropriations made will be validated from that date and the debts which may be incurred will likewise be validated. That is the reason for the amendment now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before any action is taken I think it would be quite appropriate, in view of the history made on Saturday regarding this bill, which carries a stupendous sum, that the able Senator in charge of the bill should attempt at least to justify this enormous expenditure. I realize that the bill has passed the House of Representatives, and there is always necessity, of course, of large expenditures for military purposes during a period of war, but a sum such as $72,000,000,000 is hardly conceivable in its magnitude, and but few of us have had the opportunity to know what occurred in the committee. I am willing to trust to the judgment of the committee. I took the record home as printed and read it last evening, but I think the Senator should indicate the necessity of expending this mountainous sum of money during the fiscal year. I am not here opposing it; I am only asking for some justification from the source that is in possession of the knowledge which I seek. I shall have no objection to the amendment which is offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. As I have said, I have no objection to the amendment. I think it is quite proper, in view of the lateness of the day as measured by the termination of the fiscal year, and I am willing that the amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to speak in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to. I desire the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, this is not just the time, perhaps, for the few remarks I intend to make, but I am compelled to attend a Senate and House conference in a little while, and I desire to make a brief statement in connection with this bill, which, I presume, is the largest appropriation bill in the history of the world. Perhaps it will be a little difficult for the very able chairman of the subcommittee to satisfy the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This bill is not so large as the one passed at the last session of Congress. The War Department bill passed at the last session of Congress carried $72,000,000,000-plus; this one carries only $71,000,000,000-plus.

Mr. MALONEY. I appreciate the correction. Mr. President, I want to say something on the terrific problem confronting the Appropriations Committee.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I want publicly to confess that the work of the committee is much too great for me insofar as obtaining satisfaction is concerned. Members of the Senate know that the Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees, and at this particular time of the session, when we are rushing toward the dead line of the fiscal year, two or three subcommittees are meeting at the same time. But even if all the members of the committee were enabled to attend the meetings of the subcommittees, I doubt that we could fully meet the responsibility which is expected of members of the committee.

I have long urged—and it is for this particular purpose that I speak briefly—that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, by legislation if need be, but certainly in some manner, should obtain the permanent assistance of experts. It has been my suggestion made to the chairman of the committee and the acting chairman of the committee time and time again, that the office of the Comptroller General be requested to send us a staff of experts who would work with the Appropriations Committee all the time. Frankly, we are not able to deal with these tremendous bills, because we all have other necessary work of the Senate to perform; it is impossible to follow the departments throughout the entire year, to study last year's appropriations with great care, and to study the histories of agencies and bureaus and departments insofar as appropriations are concerned. We cannot do it, and every member of the Appropriations Committee I am sure will agree that, to some extent, he is acting on faith, blindly supporting in this very trying period the requests for appropriations submitted by departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government.

No Senator is going to vote against the very important and tremendous bill with which we are now confronted, but I am certain that there is waste in it; I am certain that there is extravagance in it. The Army does not want waste and extravagance, and, of course, the Appropriations Committee and the Senate do not want waste and extravagance; but we have little choice, for, in the midst of a war, we cannot deny or long delay the request of the Department of War or of the Navy Department or of any other branch of our armed services. I think, however, that we cannot much longer delay, without a great danger of disaster, the acquisition, particularly for the Appropriations Committee, and probably for other committees as well, the permanent assistance of experts.

I have long wanted to make the statement publicly, as I have made it many times in committee, that the committee should have the assistance of experts from the office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I will take but a moment longer to make reference to another all-important subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the subject he has been discussing will he yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that the experience of the Senate Finance Committee in a kindred relationship wholly justifies the thesis he presents, because I doubt whether the Senate Finance Committee could hope effectually to function in respect to the technical phases and the tremendous details of taxation legislation if it were not for the assistance of the permanent staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and if I had not been

speaking under the compulsion of haste and the need to be elsewhere in a few moments, I should have referred to the Finance Committee as a notable example of what might be done insofar as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. If, as the able Senator from Michigan has just said, the Finance Committee were not supported by experts in the field of taxation, I feel—and I say this with an appreciation of the fact that there are experts on the committee—that the Treasury Department would be writing our tax bills. It is a fact, reluctant as I am to admit it, that to a great extent, the appropriation bills are being written downtown. The tremendous bill which is now pending, insofar as the Senate is concerned—and I say this as a member of the committee—has not been cut one penny. I would not know where to cut it, but I do know, paradoxical as it may sound, that there are instances, many of them, where, with the aid of experts, the bill with which we are now dealing could be reduced to a considerable extent.

I have concluded what I wanted to say about that subject at this time, but there is another matter which is giving me great concern, and has for a long time, and that is the need for care of the civilian population. While we are pouring out these great sums of money for the use of our armed forces—and I always vote "yea" on those bills—I fear we are neglecting to the danger point the civilian population of the country. I have said that time and again on the Senate floor, but I desire respectfully to issue a further word of warning.

I have in my hand a story which appeared in the Washington Star on June 22, written by Miriam Ottenberg. The subject of the article is Laundries Desperate for Help as Dirty Clothes Pile Up. That may not excite the interest of many people, but the laundry situation in our country, and particularly in the war areas, is a serious one. It affects the health, in addition to the convenience, of the people. It will affect men and women working in war plants. It is having a damaging effect upon the morale of our people, and this is just one example of what goes on.

We were told some time ago that the civilian supply branch of the War Production Board, given sufficient time, would deal with this subject. That has been repeated to me time and time again by representatives of that branch of the Government. But nothing happens, so far as I can see. In my judgment the situation grows worse. We are approaching a great danger.

I shall not longer delay the Senate upon the matter now. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed as a part of my remarks, and I say to the Senate that unless we are extremely careful and watchful, and do something about it, the forgotten man is coming home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUNDRIES DESPERATE FOR HELP AS DIRTY CLOTHES PILE UP—WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS WHILE MACHINES IDLE AND SERVICE IS CUT

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

While laundry machines stand idle, thousands of Washington residents wait weeks for their shirts, suits, and linens because there aren't enough workers to do the job, a survey of laundries by the Star indicated yesterday.

Even the largest laundries in the Washington area face a further reduction of service and may close entirely, unless immediate steps are taken to provide them with workers.

One laundry reported that if it lost 10 more workers it would have to shut down. The laundry has 2,500 customers.

Another laundry predicted a "precipitous reduction in the amount of laundry that could be handled."

Another called the United States Employment Service yesterday to say that if it didn't get workers immediately it would shut down in 2 hours. A few workers were sent out.

The United States Employment Service is the operating arm of the area War Manpower Commission whose responsibility it is to see that war industries—and the laundries come under that heading—get and keep workers. The area War Manpower Commission, meanwhile, have suggested the laundries ask the War Labor Board to allow wage increases and has sent three men into the plants to find out the causes of absenteeism. It was not until yesterday that the United States Employment Service decided to suggest to domestic workers waiting for jobs that they try the laundries.

The laundries fear the withholding tax will be the last straw. If they can't get wage increases for their workers before the withholding tax takes effect, they fear many of the workers will quit, knowing only that there is less in their pay envelope.

What that will mean in terms of the housewife who has only so much linen or the man who has to have clean shirts to go to work, or the hospitals and restaurants was indicated by the Star survey.

WON'T TAKE NEW CUSTOMERS

Most laundries will take no new customers. One plant hasn't taken a new customer in 10 months. Another turns down 500 new customers a week, 30 customers a day who actually come to the laundry with their bundles of dirty clothes under their arms, and all customers who have used the laundry only once every month or 6 weeks—on the theory that these customers have facilities to do their own washing. That laundry will take servicemen's personal laundry but not that of their families.

Another laundry allows its drivers to accept 4 new customers a week, but only if 4 old customers quit the service. If 10 quit, they can still take only 4, and the new customers can get only "thrifty wash"—unfinished garments.

A number of the laundries have stopped dry cleaning entirely or accept only two garments a week per customer. Others stop the service for 3 to 6 weeks at a time, refuse to take all but current wearing apparel or refuse to take rugs, curtains, drapes and slip covers, hats, gloves, suede and leather jackets, or winter clothing.

MOST ON LONG SCHEDULE

One or two laundries still return the wash a week after it's picked up, but most of them are on a 10-day to 2-week schedule which sometimes stretches into 3 weeks or a month. A number of them have stopped picking up the laundry for 2 or 3 days a week, which makes the unlucky housewives wait 3 weeks even to have their dirty laundry taken out of the house. Two weeks' laundry usually isn't twice the size of 1 week's. The housewives in desperation dig some things they must have out of the dirty wash and do the best they can with it at home.

It's a toss-up between taking the garments and household goods that must be washed or cleaned and letting it pile up in the plants, or refusing to take it at all. Laundries have tried both methods, usually choosing the latter after lofts and borrowed space are filled and bundles of clothes and rugs spill onto the floors around the machines. The work has piled up so that a number of plants are limiting the amount they will store.

If you can persuade a laundry to accept the work, you may have to wait a month for a blanket, 5 weeks for curtains, months for rugs and slip covers. Half your work may come back unironed. Some of it is bound to go astray. One laundry reported a 200 percent increase in the errors made by its inexperienced workers. Several laundries said that 5 percent of the linens and garments in the family bundles go to the wrong people or are lost. One laundry said that last week alone, in the flatwork department, 2,600 pieces in family bundles were separated from the bundles and had to be traced and sent out later.

PRODUCTION DROPS SHARPLY

Workers who quit, workers who don't show up two or three times a week, a general shortage of workers explains the story.

One plant has 22 wearing apparel presses. It is using 4. In the washroom of another plant which requires 23 men, yesterday 9 didn't report at all and 4 more walked out at noon. In another plant with 8 shirt units, 2 are usually idle and the teams of workers who used to turn out 125 shirts an hour have been replaced by inexperienced girls who can't do more than 50. Another plant used to finish 4,300 shirts a week. It now turns out 2,500. One laundry had to stop taking white linen suits for a week because it didn't dare.

In the marking room of 1 plant, where the bundles must be given identification marks before they go through the machines, plant supervisors spent a week, working nights, to train 10 new operators. At the end of the week they had 35 girls working On Monday only 23 reported.

Most plants spend at least an hour in the morning juggling their workers from one department to another so they will have at least a skeleton staff. One plant has installed a public-address system to play music to the workers. The loud speaker is also used to plead with the workers to come back to work the next day.

BONUS SYSTEM TRIED

To get workers and keep them, the laundry owners have tried everything in the book. One plant, with a 10-foot help-wanted sign in front of it, offers its workers a bonus if they will find new employees. Another has been spending $1,000 a month on advertising to get workers. One laundry even called Gallaudet College for handicapped workers but was told the students all had jobs. Another plant has started sending cards to former employees begging them to return to work.

An attendance bonus is the method used by several plants to cut down absenteeism. Until the gas shortage, one of the plants sent a worker with nursing experience on a round of the homes of girls who hadn't reported for work that day. Another plant asks for an explanation from the absentee workers when they return, if they do return. Some plants, incidentally, have a record of uncalled-for wages. The workers simply disappeared.

An incentive-wage system helps the more experienced workers to almost double their basic wages.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when the pending bill becomes law, appropriating $59,034,839,673 for the War Department, and the Navy appropriation bill, already passed by Congress but not as yet signed by the Executive, becomes law, the estimated unexpended balances on July 1, 1943, according to a statement given me by the Treasury Department, available for war expenditures will be $203,782,009,264, excluding contract authorizations.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator repeat those figures?

Mr. BYRD. On July 1, 1943, the unexpended balances will be $203,782,009,264. In addition, there are contract authorizations not yet appropriated for amounting to $24,565,814,717.

Mr. President, this means that on July 1, 1943, more than $203,000,000,000 will be in the Treasury, appropriated for war purposes, but unexpended, and the war agencies of the Government have authority to make contract authorizations for nearly $25,000,000,000 more.

From July 1, 1940, to this date our expenditures for war activities have been as follows:

For the fiscal year ending—	
July 1, 1941	$6,301,043,165
July 1, 1942	26,011,065,089
July 1, 1943	70,219,400,244
Total	102,531,508,493

Therefore we will have in unexpended balances more than twice as much as has so far been disbursed for our war activities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assume, furthermore, that these figures do not include the latitudes available under Government corporations?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct; they do not include the expenditures of the Government corporations.

No Member of Congress is more anxious than I to give every single dollar that is necessary so that we may achieve an early victory in this war. Appropriation bills for war purposes have passed both Houses by a unanimous vote. Every Member of Congress—in the House and Senate—feels, I believe, as I do: That we must provide every single dollar that is necessary. Up to this time the Congress has accepted, practically without change, the estimates presented by the war agencies of the Government, but in view, Mr. President, of the accumulation of these huge unexpended balances, it does seem to me that the time has come when closer scrutiny should be given to the colossal appropriations that are now being made.

We have not as yet reached the level of spending $100,000,000,000 a year for our war effort. On July 1 we will have sufficient unexpended funds to spend $100,000,000,000 each year for 2 years, even though Congress does not appropriate one additional dollar. I understand, however, that it is the purpose of the administration to ask for additional war appropriations during the coming fiscal year. Congress is in almost constant session. It is anxious to appropriate every single dollar necessary to win the war, and an appropriation can be passed in a very short time. Why, then, is it necessary to have unspent balances on hand to the extent of more than $200,000,000,000?

While it is true that balances are necessary in order to take care of actual obligations and commitments, yet an investigation will, I think, disclose that a very substantial part of this 200 billion unexpended balance is not obligated by contractual commitments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield, in that connection I wonder whether we now have a special committee of the Senate which would be authorized to make such an investigation.

Mr. BYRD. I was about to refer to the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will attempt to make such an investigation and ascertain the facts. I think that after July 1 Congress should be fully informed as to these facts. We must understand that an allocation of funds is entirely different from a commitment, as an allocation can be changed at the pleasure of the Department itself. In fact, practically all these war appropriations are virtually made on a lump-sum basis, and they are subject to a transfer from one purpose to another.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I announce, after consultation with a majority of the members of the committee, that an inquiry will shortly be instituted to ascertain the reason why it is necessary to have $200,000,000,000 in unexpended balances on hand, in view of the short time required to enact an appropriation for war purposes. This inquiry will cover the field as to the extent these balances have been obligated by actual commitments, the extent to which the funds have been transferred from the purpose covered in the appropriation bill to other purposes, and other details incident to the need for unexpended balances of this magnitude.

Mr. President, the public debt is now approaching $150,000,000,000. If not a single dollar more were appropriated for our war expenditures, and if we expended the $200,000,000,000 in unexpended balances in the next 2 years, after deducting the revenue from tax income of about $35,000,000,000 a year, the public debt would reach $280,000,000,000 without further appropriations, but we know, of course, that great additional appropriations will be requested in the coming year, so it is not difficult to visualize a debt far in excess of $300,000,000,000, unless greater care is taken in the expenditure of these public funds.

My investigation and observation have led me to the conclusion that the war expenditures for the production of implements of war and for our war preparations have been unnecessarily extravagant and wasteful. I realize that war is always wasteful, and that we cannot expect the same efficiency and economy in the preparation for war that we can ordinarily demand in other expenditures of government, but after making allowance for all this, no informed person, I think, can deny that a great opportunity exists for a more economical expenditure of these war disbursements.

As evidence of the confusion that exists in the War Department in relation to its personnel, on June 8 Judge Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, testified before the Ramspeck investigating committee of the House to the effect that the War Department could dismiss 100,000 clerical employees. A few days later the personnel director of the War Department appeared before the Appropriations Committee, asking for 200,000 additional employees. Then Judge Patterson issued a statement saying that those holding positions in the War Department need have no fear that there would be an immediate reduction of any personnel.

This is merely indicative of the general state of confusion that exists in the personnel of the War Department, which, of course, is true also of many other agencies of the Government.

In the civilian personnel alone of the Army and Navy, there is a great opportunity for economy and increased efficiency. In the War and Navy Departments there are 519,438 employees in the clerical category. That is to say that they are classified as performing clerical, administrative, and fiscal services. This does not include a large number of WAVES, WAAC's, and SPARS that are supposed to be doing clerical work. It does not include any personnel in uniform in either the Army or Navy that is performing clerical work.

Not only could great economy be instituted with respect to these employees performing clerical work in the Army and Navy, but there are over 1,200,000 other civilian employees of the Army and Navy, and while many are performing essential war service, by a reorganization of their activities their number could be reduced, resulting in very great savings to the Government.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why all these matters should not come under the scrutiny of Congress in order to keep the war expenditures on the most efficient and economical basis possible, and all this can be done without in any way interfering with the war effort. In fact, it should increase its effectiveness.

At the beginning of the war effort, in view of the necessity for creating a vast organization for these expenditures, there was some reason for waste and extravagance, but now that we have engaged in the war for more than 18 months, it does seem that there could be a more efficient organization to eliminate at least a part of the waste that now exists in these war disbursements.

I am not asking that one single dollar be curtailed that is necessary to win the war as quickly as possible, but I think the Congress and the people have the right to ask that all care and diligence be exercised so that these expenditures will be made with the utmost efficiency and economy. The time has

come when Congress should carefully scrutinize these war expenditures, not for the purpose of creating one single obstacle to the production of the necessary equipment for the efficient prosecution of the war or for any other activity of our war agencies, but to require increased efficiency and greater economy in connection with the colossal expenditures now being made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on numerous occasions when these stupendous appropriation bills have been under consideration, I have stated that I recognized, as must every other Member of Congress, the necessity, in time of war, of the delegation of power by the legislative arm of the Government to the Executive, but, in my opinion, if Congress delegates any more power than is necessary, it is derelict in its duty. There have been manifestations in recent months that the Congress was concerned about the growth of executive power, and here and there efforts have been made to incorporate in appropriation bills restrictive legislation upon the exercise of executive power. But, Mr. President, when we pass these gigantic appropriation bills and let huge unexpended and unobligated balances pile up, we make a farce of other efforts to curtail or restrict the growth of executive power, for, after all, the great power which the legislative arm of the Government has is the power over the purse strings. I do not hesitate to make the statement that if Congress refuses to appropriate another dollar this war could be carried on for 2 years without any action by Congress. We have permitted the control of the purse strings to be absolutely taken away from us.

Mr. President, I, with every other Senator, acknowledge that we do not wish to take any action which would in anywise hamper the conduct of the war. I think we can search the records of parliamentary bodies in vain to find a better record than that of the present Congress in its support of the war and the unanimity with which the essential war activities have been supported by the Congress. But, Mr. President, it is not wise, it does not add to the efficient conduct of the war, to enable the various Government agencies to escape the scrutiny which they should receive from the Appropriations Committees and from the Members of the House and Senate. They should be required to give a more explicit accounting of the manner in which they have spent these moneys. To do so would, in my opinion, in the end save a burden upon taxpayers amounting to billions of dollars.

Mr. President, when each one of these bills comes before the Senate, brief remarks are made by a few Senators to the effect that the next time it will be different, but it never is any different. Each time these measures go through without proper scrutiny and without a proper accounting being made. We continue piling up billions of dollars in the hopper of the executive branch of the Government, and every time we do that we add to the unnecessary concentration of power in the executive arm of the Government.

I wish to say for the purposes of the record that I think all the other efforts to restrict executive power are futile, so long as we continue to pile up huge appropriations and permit the mounting backlog of billions of dollars which the executive branch of the Government can spend almost as it sees fit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The fact that these huge appropriations for expenditures are made does not justify us in not attempting to hold down smaller appropriations, does it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not thinking so much of our effort to curtail appropriations as of the efforts which have been made to restrict executive power, and of all the speeches which are made to the effect that we are going to do this and do that in order to curtail executive power, and then we proceed to pass these huge appropriation bills, and pile up this great backlog, and give away the control of the purse strings, which after all is the only great power which the legislative arm of the Government possesses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator absolutely, and I want to thank him for his answer to my question; but I should like to ask further, what is the answer to the requests for appropriations which are made to Congress? We are now asked to vote for an appropriation of $71,000,000,000, without any consideration of the matter on the floor. What is the answer? I want to go along with the war effort. I want to do my part to help do what the senior Senator from Wisconsin wants done. But are we to make the appropriation and then make investigation, or are we to have consideration of the matter first before we pass the bill? I understood the senior Senator from Wisconsin to say that we could continue the war for 1 solid year with the money already appropriated. Is that a correct statement of what the Senator said?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, what I said was a rhetorical statement. I do not have the figures before me of the money Congress has appropriated. Take the backlog of lend-lease, for example, take the backlog of any of these appropriations, and we find that the amount of money which has been piled up is simply staggering.

In answer to the Senator's question I think in part the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is the answer. I do not wish the members of the committee or the able Senator in charge of the bill to feel that in anything I have said I wish to single him or his committee out for criticism. I think the Senator from Connecticut has suggested one answer to the problem. I think the Appropriations Committee should have the best permanent staff of experts that it can hire, and as many as it needs. It is penny wise and pound foolish for the Congress to deny itself the necessary assistance in the discharge of its enormous responsibilities, when we grant practically every request of the executive departments for any assistance which they may require in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Mr. President, I did not intend to go into this subject, but I think Senators should serve on fewer committees. I myself am guilty in that respect. We should serve on fewer committees, so that we may concentrate on the important work of one or two committees.

In my opinion the committee system of the Senate should be reorganized. It should be streamlined. Some of the committees should be reduced in size. Let me say that I have written an article on the subject, for a current magazine. In the article I have tried to set forth some of the things Congress might consider in an effort to reorganize in order to meet the problems of modern society.

To answer more specifically the Senator's question, because no Senator or no Representative wants to be put in the position of hampering the war effort, let me say that I think that in order to make an adequate scrutiny of the appropriations some provision would have to be made to give the Appropriations Committee additional assistants, and perhaps to give it more time, in the consideration of such measures.

I do not wish to be in any wise critical of the branch of Congress at the other end of the Capitol; but, Mr. President, year after year the appropriation bills come to the Senate near the end of the fiscal year, with the result that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is attempting to deal simultaneously with several appropriation bills. It is fighting against the deadline of the end of the fiscal year. Such a situation puts the Senate committee at a great disadvantage; it makes it necessary for the committee to do its work hastily and under great pressure; and, likewise, it puts the Senate itself at a disadvantage in conference with the House, because the conferees are confronted with the deadline of the fiscal year. I wish the House of Representatives would send the appropriation bills to the Senate earlier, so that more deliberate consideration could be had by the committee and by the Senate, and so that a more satisfactory situation would be created so far as the Senate conferees are concerned in conference with the House.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. TRUMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield, first, to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how the Finance Committee has gotten along with its additional employees and the additional advice it has obtained from the high-salaried, excellent clerks it has. What is the Senator's judgment on that point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my opinion, and I have repeatedly so stated, that neither the able Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives nor the able Finance Committee of the

Senate could successfully handle a tax bill without the assistance of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. By legislation a joint committee was set up and a staff was created. Recently, as I understand, efforts have been made to augment and to strengthen the staff of the joint committee.

If we could have a streamlining and a reorganization of the House and Senate committees, and then could create several joint committee staffs for handling all important pieces or segments of the legislative field in connection with which experts could be of great assistance, I think the work of both the House and the Senate would be improved, and that we would be taking a step in the direction of modernizing the legislative arm of the Government and enabling it better to discharge the tremendously added burden which has come as a result of the war and the industrialization of our society.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as a member of the subcommittee, that I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, and also with what the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Michigan have said, as to the help which, in my opinion, the Appropriations Committee needs in order to follow through the appropriations from year to year. As a member of the committee and of the subcommittee, I desire to say that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has done a remarkable job in accomplishing what I believe was impossible of accomplishment, when, 2 weeks ago, the $70,000,000,000 bill was placed in his hands, with the necessity of having it enacted into law by July 1.

So, while commending him for the excellent work he has done, Mr. President, I believe that if we are to handle such matters in a sensible way and for the benefit of the country, nothing better could be done than to do what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut first suggested and as was later suggested by the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin and Michigan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to repeat that I hope nothing I have said may be construed as a criticism of any member of the Appropriations Committee of either House or of the combined work of those committees, collectively. I am simply discussing the situation. When we stop to think that, so far as I know, with the exception of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, since the beginning of the Government, no effort has been made to improve the committee organization and to provide the committees with the necessary staffs, when we consider the tremendous increase in the work which has had to be done, when we consider the tremendous complexity of the problems with which we are confronted, I say that we cannot hope to maintain the status and the station of the legislative arm of the Government unless we have the courage to provide it with the necessary assistants in order that it may be on some measure of equality in dealing with the executive arm of the Government in the important and complicated legislative problems.

Mr. TRUMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, I am not on the Appropriations Committee, and I am rather a new Member of the Senate. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, in view of what he has said, if what he has said is true, why should we not cut the $71,000,000,000 appropriation in half and appropriate one-half now, and come back after the recess and appropriate the other half?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that would be operating on a very important and complex bill with a meat ax. We cannot afford to take such a chance. If such step should be taken, it would have to be taken only after careful consideration and only after the committee became convinced that whatever cut was made would not hinder or hamper the conduct of the war.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am very anxious to be placed on record as endorsing what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] have had to say relative to the necessity of the Appropriations Committee having the necessary experts in order to obtain all the facts in connection with the tremendous appropriations which are made. The able and distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has done the job almost singlehanded. I happen to be a member of three or four of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not at all possible for a man to be in three places at once. The special committee which the Senate has authorized, and of which I happen to be the chairman, held some very important meetings while the appropriation hearings were going on. It is not possible for one man, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, to obtain all the facts, as they should be obtained, for the information of the Senate. The only check we have on these expenditures is through the right of appropriating the money and passing the tax bills to raise it.

Last year the War Department came before the Appropriations Committee with an unexpended balance of $35,000,000,000. An effort was made at that time to cut the appropriation to the point where the $35,000,000,000 would be a part of the regular appropriation.

The Department came back this year with unexpended balances of $12,000,000,000. The same procedure should be followed; but, as the Senator from Wisconsin has very aptly stated, we cannot make that sort of a cut with a meat axe. We must know all the facts, and we must know what we are doing.

We have spent 2½ days arguing as to whether $48,000,000 should be spent to teach young men to work in war industry plants. Eight or ten years ago, under the same policy, we expended large sums for relief and rehabilitation in the same manner that we are now expending Army and Navy appropriations. There was a great deal of discussion about "boondoggling" in connection with relief appropriations. All the "boondoggling" which was done—if there was any—in connection with relief appropriations could be completely blotted out by only three examples of the way in which the Army and Navy handle appropriations which we give them without any strings attached. They know how to waste money better than any other organization I have ever had anything to do with. They do an excellent job on the waste side.

We changed the construction program from the Quartermaster Department to the Engineer Department of the Army, hoping that the engineers would use their education and their prerogatives to save the tremendous appropriations which we were making. It was the duty of the Special Committee of the Senate to Investigate the National Defense Program to look into the expenditure for camp construction at Camp Blanding, Fla. That was a tremendously wasteful project. Then we had to go to Memphis, Tenn., to look at an ordnance plant, where the waste was even greater than it was at Camp Blanding.

A week or so ago the committee held a hearing in Kansas City in connection with an ordnance plant known as the Sunflower Ordnance Plant, on which it can be conservatively stated that from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 was thrown away wastefully, because the checks which the engineers are supposed to make on these expenditures are not made. The engineers claim that they are spread too thin, that there are not enough men of ability to do the job.

Tremendous sums of money are being expended in the manufacture of airplanes, guns, airplane engines, and almost everything else one can imagine. I could stand here all afternoon and give example after example showing that tremendous sums of money are simply being thrown away with a scoop shovel.

In appropriating money for unlimited expenditures, I think the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate ought to have experts in their employ, just as the Finance Committee, which levies taxes to raise the money, has experts.

I have almost become a pessimist in the job which has been given to me. It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office. I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the

money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever. It will not help the war effort. We cannot obstruct this appropriation, because we know that it will be said that we are obstructing the war effort.

I desire to offer an amendment to the pending appropriation bill. If the war should suddenly end before all this money is expended, I think there ought to be a way provided so that the Congress could determine whether or not the remainder of it should be expended. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC.—. Notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this act, all appropriations made or contained in this act shall terminate 3 months after the signing of an armistice or agreement for the cessation of hostilities with all the following nations, namely, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator's amendment apply to the thirty-odd-billion dollars which the Army has transferred to the lend-lease fund under the authorization of Congress? As I understand, $32,170,000,000 has been transferred from War Department appropriations to the lend-lease fund, of which only $4,000,000,000 or so has been spent. The expenditure of another $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 during the year is contemplated, leaving more than $20,000,000,000 which cannot possibly be spent until sometime in the future.

Mr. TRUMAN. It applies to all the money covered by the $71,000,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. But it would not apply to the thirty-odd-billion dollars which has already been laid away out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am perfectly willing to have it apply to all unexpended balances when the war is over.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that some steps should be taken to recover that money? Although the expenditure of the entire amount was authorized, it was not necessary that the entire $35,000,000,000 from the War Department and the Navy Department be expended for lend-lease purposes. It seems to me that the transfer was made so as to put more than $30,000,000,000 out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am perfectly willing to have it included in this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator who is interested in this question would prepare an amendment which would recover some of that money and put it back where it belongs, and not where it can be spent without the Congress knowing for what it is spent, or without its being laid away for future use.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me suggest to both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Missouri that while it would be in order to place a limitation on the expenditure of an appropriation in a pending bill, any amendment affecting appropriations already made would be legislation, and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The objective to which the able Senator from Missouri addresses himself is, of course, a sound and appealing one. It is inevitably tied up, however, is it not, with the far larger problem which we shall confront in connection with the liquidation of war contracts when the war is over?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may borrow the phraseology of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that is another problem which we cannot handle with a meat axe. It will involve the entire reconversion program of the United States from war back to peace, and it will desperately involve the entire economy of the country during the period of reconversion immediately following the war.

Mr. TRUMAN. It will be a much more difficult problem than was the problem of conversion from peace to war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be a far more difficult and delicate problem.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And, unfortunately, it may involve just as much money.

Mr. TRUMAN. Perhaps more.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Obviously, it may involve more time because approximately 70,000 contracts cannot be terminated and liquidated in 3 months. What I am asking the Senator is whether a mere arbitrary shotgun limitation, which would suspend all appropriations 90 days after the cessation of hostilities, might not impinge upon an orderly and judicial settlement of contracts.

Mr. TRUMAN. Will not Congress be in session at that time and will not Congress be able to take the necessary action to meet the situation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, Congress will be in session, and I am quite agreeable to having some arrangement made to meet it; but I was wondering whether the Senator is entirely satisfied with the proposal. I concede his very great experience with this problem because of his very able chairmanship of the committee on investigation over which he so spectacularly presides. I ask him whether he would be satisfied to deal with the matter just off hand, at a moment's notice, without thinking it all the way through. Let me add that I wonder whether the termination of the war is not, unfortunately, still far enough away so that we have the necessary time to give to the problem the judicial consideration it deserves.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator may be entirely correct. I will say now, however, that if the committee of which I happen to be chairman has had any success whatever it is because of nine able and very distinguished Members of this body who have given me very good advice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In reply to the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Missouri has suggested that Congress will be in session, and can deal with the matter when it arises.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would be a valid argument against the Senator's amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator just stated that the matter would require legislative action by both Houses. If the amendment is attached to the bill, the action of the Congress would necessarily be on the basis of the situation as it then appeared, provided the war ended before the money was expended.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me it would have to be on that basis, anyway, regardless of whether an amendment is tied on to the bill. The purpose of the bill is to carry on the expenditures from day after tomorrow until the end of the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. During most of the time the Congress will be in session. It is quite likely that if we have the 2 months' recess which we have been talking about, it will be the only recess we shall have within the next year. So Congress will be in session most of the time.

I am wondering if I may reecho the fear expressed by the Senator from Michigan. Congress will be in session, and will be able to deal with the whole subject of conversion and termination of contracts, lend-lease rehabilitation, and all kindred matters that will cost money when the war ends. If we wish to adopt a limitation of 3 months, I wonder whether it would not be better to wait, and to deal with the situation when it arises, rather than to put a stop watch on it now, and perhaps have to set the stop watch ahead considerably when the time comes.

Mr. TRUMAN. We will still have the situation in our hands.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and Congress will be in session, anyway.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In order to terminate the discussion—and I think it will terminate it—I suggest that the amendment is subject to a point of order, and I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that in the form in which the amendment now appears it has the character of a legislative directive, and therefore is subject to a point of order; and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is most unfortunate that the point of order has been made against the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. In view of what our distinguished majority leader has stated, I merely wished to suggest that the object and purpose of the amendment, as I understand, is to put all contractors, everyone in the War Department, and all citizens on notice that when the war terminates the contracts will stop, and the expenditures of these moneys will stop. That is about the only thing as to which the amendment would put them on notice, so they could not come here at any time when Congress attempts to end contracts and say that they did not have notice, that they had been left helpless in the situation. The Senator's amendment would put them all on notice.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They could not come in with any excuses of that nature.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is what I had in view when I offered the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the purposes back of the amendment which has been introduced and held out of order. However, I would say that such an amendment could not be adopted to the bill in safety. If the amendment should be adopted, within 3 months from the cessation of hostilities all expenditures of the funds appropriated would cease under the law. No payments could be made for any purpose out of any money appropriated in the bill after 90 days following the cessation of hostilities. That would mean that the War Department would have to close in 90 days. It would mean that all our forces abroad, wherever they might be, would have to be brought back to the United States and discharged and returned to their homes within 90 days. Of course, that is unthinkable.

Inasmuch as the amendment has been disposed of by the announcement of the Chair that it is out of order, there is no occasion further to discuss it except to say that it involves a matter of very great importance, and one which, in my opinion, should have the consideration of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, inasmuch as the matter has come into the RECORD during the afternoon, I should like to add an observation in order to make the RECORD complete. I am sure the able Senator from Oklahoma knows that the War Department itself has already instigated very serious and earnest studies of the entire problem of what is to happen to war contracts at the conclusion of the war. The same subject is being very intimately investigated by the Treasury Department as well as by several other departments of the Government. The subject is not being ignored. On the contrary, it is receiving very prayerful consideration because, obviously, there will be a terrific issue.

The necessity will be that the answer strikes an appropriate balance between maximum economy, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, adequate assurance of the swiftest possible national transition to a peacetime economy.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I wish to make some reference to the report which was made by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. As I recall his figures, he made a statement that there now is in excess of $200,000,000,000 of unexpended balances. An unexpended balance is different from an unallocated balance. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia how much in the way of unallocated balances we have at the present time, if he has the figures available.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is information which we have not been able to obtain. There is an unallocated balance and there is also an uncommitted balance, and the two are entirely different. The committed balances are those under which contracts have been made. To say that there are allocated balances of funds means that the funds have been allocated for specific purposes, and that the purposes for which the allocations have been made can be changed at will. We have been unable to obtain that information. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the figures given have been obtained from the Treasury Department. After making allowance for all the bills which have been passed and signed, and including the pending one, plus the balances already on hand, there will be $203,782,009,264 available for war purposes, as unexpended balances.

The extent to which the funds have been allocated or committed is most difficult to ascertain. Allocation means nothing. Funds may be allocated for battleships and then spent for something else. When they are committed by contractual obligations, of course, that is a different matter. I have been unable to obtain information as to unexpended balances.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that, as I previously explained to him, the figures are not for the War Department alone, but include all the balances in the Treasury for war purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, from the statement by the junior Senator from Virginia, I gained the impression that the figures he gave related to the War Department.

Mr. BYRD. No; if the Senator will read what I said, he will find that I very clearly said that they related to all balances in the Treasury for war purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then the first point of clearance is that the statement made refers to all agencies of the Government. That is No. 1.

Mr. BYRD. All war agencies.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a fund can be considered in three groups. First, we take the unexpended funds in the Treasury. Such funds may fall under three possible classifications, first, the funds may be free, unallotted, and unobligated; second, the funds may be allocated but not obligated by contract; and, third, such funds may be obligated by contract and held ready for payment on such contract. The Treasury always has vast sums against which checks have been issued but which have not been cleared. It is not proper to say that because the Treasury has funds in its coffers the money has not been obligated. If the money has been obligated, it means that contracts have been made for the expenditure of such funds. The Government makes contracts for the purchase of supplies, but payment is not made until the article purchased has been delivered, tested, approved, and accepted. Then the payment is made. So it may be that the Treasury has millions or billions of dollars which have not been actually paid out as yet, but the contracts have been made, and the goods are being prepared though they have not been delivered, and have not been inspected and approved. So the fact that the Treasury has a very large sum does not mean that the money has not been allocated or contracted for.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would the Senator give the information to the Senate as to how much of this fund has been placed under contract? He is on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The information we had before the committee shows that $12,500,000,000 appropriated heretofore by Congress for the War Department have not as yet been allocated. That means there have been no contracts made for the sum of $12,500,000,000. All the balance has been placed under contract, and the goods are in process of manufacture.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator make a distinction between allocations and commitments for contracts? Allocation means to allot a certain amount of money to be spent for a certain purpose, say, for the construction of battleships, but that does not become an obligation until a contract has been made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is exactly correct. The Bureau of the Budget sets up the allocations every year. The Budget Bureau sends to Congress, through the President, the allocations of funds requested. Then, if the funds are appropriated, they are appropriated as per the allocations set forth by the Budget. There is an allocation when the moneys are appropriated. They are already allocated, but it remains for the contract to be made under the allocation.

Mr. BYRD. I understand as to that, but funds can be allocated without having contracts made. The point I wish to make is that there is a distinct difference between an obligation, which is a commitment made by contractual obligation, and an allocation. An allocation simply means that the department, in its own right, allocates certain funds, for example, to battleships, airplanes, or something else. Until they are contracted for, the allocations may be changed. It is entirely different. I have in my hand a statement and I should like to have the Senator say whether it is correct in respect to the War Department, which shows there were unobligated balances in the War Department of $22,562,000,000 on June 1, 1943. I will ask the Senator if that is correct. That does not include the bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the information before the committee was to the effect that the Department has $12,500,000,000 unallocated and uncontracted and that amount of money is carried by the bill as a reappropriation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Was it not our understanding in the committee that the twelve and a half billion dollars of unallocated money was the amount which would not be allocated as of June 30, 1943?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The figures of the Senator from Virginia were for a date 30 days prior to the date when the twelve and a half billion would be unallocated.

Mr. BYRD. My figures were as of June 1, 1943.

Mr. GURNEY. That is right.

Mr. BYRD. These figures, I may say, came from the Appropriations Committee, and I assume they are correct. They show unobligated balances in War Department funds of $22,562,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Government operates on the basis of a fiscal year beginning on July 1 and ending June 30. The figures placed before the committee were of date June 30, which will be tomorrow, and tomorrow night, at midnight, our information is that the War Department will have twelve and a half billion dollars approximately of unallocated and unobligated money. The pending bill seeks to reappropriate, and when passed it will reappropriate, that twelve and a half billion dollars. This bill carries, Mr. President, $59,000,000,000 of new money together with twelve and a half billion odd thousand dollars, which makes a total of seventy-one and a half billion dollars. The bill of last year carried for this year's use $42,820,000,000, with a $29,000,000,000 carry-over for last year.

The Congress, however, did not appropriate that in the supply bill 2 years ago; it was the residue of numerous deficiency bills.

Before the War Department or any other department can make a contract, it must either have an appropriation or a contract authorization by law. No department of the Government can contract for any sort of services or goods unless it has either the money or a right under the law to make a contract. In the first days of this war, when we were in our preparatory stages, the War Department had to have money before it could contract; so Congress was very liberal in making appropriations by way of deficiencies. But the bill last year, as I have said, carried $42,820,000,000 of new money and twenty-nine-billion-and-some-odd-million dollars of reappropriations, which made the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year which was passed last year total $72,000,000,000. This bill is a little smaller and totals only seventy-one and a half billion dollars.

Mr. President, the money appropriated in the first part of this war was for purposes of preparation, very largely for construction of camps, the building of ordnance plants, powder plants, shell-loading plants, and facilities of that character. Those sums totaled quite a large amount. Those expenditures are practically over. This bill carries about half a billion dollars for the expansion of existing plants and for the building of new plants, very largely for hospital construction.

I realize that these appropriations are enormous, but when we consider the low state of the War Department when this war struck, perhaps we can understand more fully why so much money has been required.

When this war began in 1939 we had a Regular Army of less than 200,000 men, and a National Guard of 200,000 men, making a total, National Guard and Regular Army, officers and all, of about 400,000. At that time we had not built a battleship, a matter which, of course, comes under the Navy, for about 20 years; we had not made a rifle since World War No. 1. All the rifles we had were the old Springfield single-shot rifles or Enfield single-shot rifles and Krag Jorgensens, which were used in the Spanish-American War. We had scarcely built a machine gun, except for experimental purposes. We had not built an antitank gun; we had not built an anti-aircraft gun, it may be said, for 20 years. The cannon we had, the field pieces, were those we got from France in 1919. After the first World War was over, in an adjustment with France, we gave France certain supplies, and took over 3,500 French 75 millimeter cannon. Those cannon had wooden wheels; they had wooden hubs, wooden spokes, wooden felloes and steel tires. One of those cannon pulled behind a caterpillar tractor down the road would not last a mile.

The committee of the Senate tried to provide money with which to modernize those cannon, under Senator Copeland, at that time chairman of the subcommittee. An effort was made to provide money to put rubber tires on these cannon so that they could be taken out on the road, or in the field, and put in such shape that they could travel 12, 15, 20, 25, 30, or 40 miles an hour, as they must travel in modern warfare. We did not succeed in providing the money for that purpose. We did provide some money to experiment with rubber tires on cannon. At the time this war began, only a few cannon were equipped with rubber tires. Now they all have rubber tires.

We tried to provide some money with which to build antiaircraft guns, away back yonder under Senator Copeland. At one time we had only 45 antiaircraft guns in the entire Military Establishment of the United States. We tried to provide some money with which to build more antiaircraft guns, and the Senate said, "No, you cannot have money to put rubber tires on cannon, you cannot have money with which to build new antiaircraft guns, because war is over, war is a thing of the past. We solved that question in World War No. 1, and when we won in World War No. 1, wars were a thing of history. We are not going to have any more war."

We acted in the way I have narrated and as a result our regular Military Establishment declined to 113,000 enlisted personnel, which is all we had in 1929. I think that in 1930 the number was slightly increased.

Mr. President, I can understand why the Congress would not build battleships, and would not put rubber tires on cannon, and would not build antiaircraft guns, and insisted on keeping the antiquated rifles then in use. I can understand that. The people had been educated to believe that wars were a thing of the past, that there would be no more war. Therefore, if there would be no future need for rifles and cannon and antiaircraft guns, why spend the money in building them? The people had good reason to entertain that thought, because they had been taught to believe that that was the situation.

After World War No. 1 was over a plan was proposed for solving international problems. The plan was brought before the Senate, and, after debate lasting many months, it was rejected; the League of Nations was not adhered to by the American Senate. So the first plan for solving international difficulties and problems was a failure.

Shortly thereafter, under a new administration, it was proposed that a general disarmament conference be held. Mr. Harding, then President, or his Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, suggested the disarmament conference. The two of them called a general, world-wide disarmament conference.

The conference was held in Washington. We took the lead in the disarmament program, and as a result an agreement was reached whereby Great Britain and the United States should be on a parity, and Japan should be at a substantial disparity, and other nations should have practically nothing. As the result we again thought, the world having disarmed, and America having taken the lead, that there would be no more war; so we would sink our ships and cease military activities, and America would live up to the program.

Later, under Mr. Coolidge, there was another program for disarmament which led people to believe there would be no more war. Mr. Coolidge suggested that the nations of the world get together and renounce war as a national policy. Under the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact practically all nations of the world reached such an agreement, and we thought again that the world was still sane, and that war was a thing of the past.

Mr. President, that was not all. After the present administration came into power, there was put into effect what is termed the "good neighbor policy." We thought we would lead the world to the good neighbor policy not only on the North American Continent, but in the Western Hemisphere, and throughout the world.

It was because of the acts I have mentioned that the people understood we would have no more international difficulties, and that there was no occasion to build a big navy or a big army or a big air force. That was the condition in which we found ourselves in the early thirties.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have just entered the Chamber and heard the Senator's recitation of history, which is accurate in part only. He seems to lay all the blame on the Congress for the necessity of providing the huge sum of money called for in the pending bill, and says that Congress is responsible for not having the foresight he now has himself.

I served here during the time mentioned, during the consideration of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand pact, and all the years between then and now, and every day of all those years Congress has been fully abreast of the situation, even ahead of the administrations of the War and Navy Departments. I could cite instances of Congress going forward and seeking to build up the national defense, when there was no unified effort on the part of the War and Navy establishments, or the administration, to go along with Congress.

I may have misconceived the Senator's statement, but, if anyone who served here all those years tells me that we are responsible for these huge appropriations and for not having sufficient foresight, but dealt wholly with hindsight, I say he does not understand the history of the country or know what occurred in this Chamber and in the one at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. President, I did not complain about the pending bill. I have tried to be helpful in permitting it to come up today. I know there has been much wastage in connection with the war effort. No doubt, the committee has done the best it could, but it has not the facilities or the personnel intelligently to inquire into the need for all these expenditures, and I have not criticized the committee, because I am a Member of this body and I should have given more attention to it. But I stand here to defend this body, and the Congress as a whole, and all the Congresses which have gone before since the last war, against a charge of dereliction of duty and lack of farsightedness and common prudence.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I was attempting to give a little history and my interpretation of it to show why our Military Establishment had been permitted to reach such a low ebb.

Mr. McNARY. I understood that thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNARY. I beg pardon. I should have addressed the Chair. I am conscious that the rules so provide.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I accurately stated my views. If the Senator wishes to lug in, using his own judgment, a lot of what is not, in my opinion, accurate history, to the effect that Congress is chargeable with all the things which have occurred in the past, I say that every administration which has been in power since the last war, irrespective of political domination, and every Congress, every Secretary of War, and every Secretary of State and all the personnel of the departments, have been equally guilty, if such a word may be used.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I take no exception to the statements made by the Senator from Oregon. I am showing as best I can why we went down to the bottom of the barrel. When the present war began we had practically no Army, not very much of a Navy, and practically no Air Force. We had a few airplanes, but most of them were not equipped with ordnance, and when we got into the war, second-hand, through the lend-lease program back of England, and began to shoot down some of the foreign planes, we found that the foreign planes were in three particulars better than the American planes. We found that the foreign planes had leakless gas tanks. It was possible to shoot through those tanks with a machine gun, and the tanks would not leak. We had no American plane with a leakless gas tank. That was inferiority No. 1.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator has said is true. Almost all the planes we had when we entered the war were not fit for overseas service. Some did not have sufficient fire power. Some did not have the self-sealing gasoline tanks. Some of them were not equipped with armor plates. I could not quite understand why the War Department did not order placed in the planes which were then being built these three essential items necessary for overseas fighting. Subsequently our planes were provided with all three. The fact that planes were built without these three essential items was not the fault of Congress. The Congress appropriated the money and when planes were built it was a question for the War Department to decide whether they should contain self-sealing gasoline tanks, sufficient fire power, and proper armor plate. Whose responsibility was that? Congress appropriated the money, but the War Department ordered the building of the planes.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that Secretary of War Stimson said early in the war that we had approximately 4,000 planes which were fit for overseas service. Notwithstanding that statement, I was reliably informed that we did not have a single solitary plane fit for overseas service, because our planes were not equipped with these three essential items.

I was criticized for making a statement to that effect, but when I wrote a letter to the Secretary asking him if the figures which I gave with respect to the number of our planes which were fit for overseas duty were substantially correct, I received no answer.

When the War Department gave out the statement to the effect that we had 4,000 planes fit for overseas service, the truth is we did not have a single, solitary plane which at that time was equipped with all three of the essential items which the military experts said were necessary for overseas duty. It was not the fault of Congress that we did not have efficient planes. Someone in the War Department was to blame, because in ordering the planes built the three items—self-sealing gasoline tanks, protective armor plate, and sufficient fire power—were not included.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement, which reinforces my argument that when we began the war we did not have very much in the way of planes fit for overseas service.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Secondly, our planes were deficient in the matter of armor plate around the pilot. When we began to shoot down the planes of our enemies we found that the pilot was surrounded by armor plate so thick and so tough that an ordinary rifle bullet or machine-gun bullet would not pierce it. Our planes were not so equipped.

In the third place, we found that the planes we shot down had larger and more powerful machine guns than those placed

in our planes. So we had to rebuild our planes after the war began. That meant that we had to start from the ground. That is the reason the war has cost us so much money to date.

We started without proper information, without properly trained men, and, of course, without money. The reason we did not have the money necessary for building proper equipment and munitions is a simple one. The people back home would not permit their Senators and Representatives to vote huge sums to construct battleships, to build planes and cannon, to put rubber tires on second-hand cannon, or to make new rifles. Why? Because they had been educated to the belief that there would be no more war, and since they believed there would be no more war, why should the Government spend multiplied millions of dollars to build up a great military establishment.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Senate, neither am I criticizing the other House of Congress. I am simply giving for the RECORD, as I understand, the condition which underlies the failure of the Congress to act, which was because the people back home would not permit their Representatives in the Congress to act. Representatives in Congress must go home home every 2 years to report to their constituents, and every 6 years Senators must answer to their constituents at the polls.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation which the Senator describes as prevailin in this country is one which prevailed in all the democracies. As a matter of fact, when attacked, even those closest to the scene of the danger were not ready. France thought she was ready because she had the Maginot Line, but she was not ready. England had no Maginot Line, but she had the English Channel between her and her enemies. But neither England nor France were ready, although the danger of attack upon Europe was imminent from almost the very day that Hitler took power in Germany in 1933.

The democracies of Europe did not want war. Their people did not want war. Because they did not want war they did not believe there was going to be war. The fact that all the nations, as the Senator said a while ago, had signed treaties outlawing war, abolishing war as an instrument of national policy, led the people to believe that there would be no more war, because they believed in the sincerity of the governments, 65 or more of them, which had signed the various treaties which would abolish war. It was not strange that the people believed there would be no more war. Their governments had done everything possible, as they thought, to guard against future wars by means of treaties which were signed. There were many kinds of treaties signed, not only the Kellogg-Briand Pact, but the Locarno-Nine Power pact and all the others of them. Without intending to lull the people into a sense of false security, what had happened in the international field had lulled them into a feeling of security because they thought war had been abolished.

Some of the nations that signed the treaties abolishing war, including Germany, Japan, and Italy, proceeded secretly to prepare for a war which they were planning to bring on, and it took a long time for the people in the democracies to wake up to the situation.

What happened in this country was no different, except in degree, from that which happened in all the democracies. It has always been an amazing thing to me that the nations in Europe which lean right up against Germany, seeing what was going on in Germany, did not prepare adequately to meet the danger they faced, but it was, I think, because the people of those nations—and that is also true of the people of this country—felt that if there was going to be no more war—a condition which had been guaranteed, so they felt by the signing of various nonwar treaties—there was no need to spend billions of dollars in preparation for something they hoped and believed would not happen.

Mr. President, it may be that that is the fault of democracies. It may be that no democracy can always be ready, armed to the teeth, and in all likelihood it could be said that if a country were armed to the teeth, ready for war, it would not be a democracy. Therefore such a situation has its compensations. No political party is to blame, no administration is to blame, no particular branch of the Government is to blame. It is a condition which existed among the peoples of all the free nations of the world, because they did not want war, they did not want to believe there would be war, and therefore they did not get ready for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I concur in what the Senator from Kentucky has stated, and thank him for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is another compensation which I think should be mentioned. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma in his statement that we started from scratch, but I say it was a good thing we did start from scratch, because had we spent hundreds of billions of dollars in building tanks, guns, and other equipment used in warfare, we would have been compelled to junk everything we had prepared, because everything we then built would today be obsolete. Everything we had at that time is today obsolete. We are not now building any such guns as we would have built in 1938 or 1939. We are not now building any such planes as we would have built at that time. The planes built at that time are today absolutely obsolete. The same thing is true with respect to tanks. As a matter of fact only recently we changed the type of tanks being built so that they would not be obsolescent.

Had we spent two or three hundred billion dollars in building equipment, munitions, and supplies, all we could do with them today would be to junk them. We could not use them in this war. So it has been a very fortunate thing that we started from scratch.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Let me remind the Senate that notwithstanding the fact that the United States is a great peace-loving country, we have had on the average a war every 25 years since the country was formed. The United States was born in revolution, in 1776, when we engaged in the first war on a large scale. After the Nation had been formed we thought we were through with war, but that was a fallacy. Not 25 years thereafter we were engaged in a war, the War of 1812. That was not our last war. In 1845 we had the Mexican War. That was not our last war. Then we had the War between the States in the sixties. Then 25 years after that we were engaged in the Spanish-American War, in 1898. Then almost 25 years ago we were engaged in World War No. 1, and now in 1943 we have been engaged for almost 2 years in another World War.

Every 25 years this country has found itself in a conflict. Naturally, I am hopeful that the present one will be the last. Twenty-five years ago our people believed World War No. 1 would be the last one. As I tried to say a while ago, the reason why we were not prepared was because of the conviction among the people that wars were a thing of the past, and that the world had so progressed in civilization that if international troubles did come a way would be found to settle them without resort to arms.

Mr. President, the pending bill appropriates a great deal of money. I am not sure that I am prepared to answer all the questions which might be propounded relative to it.

The appropriations fall into different categories. A few days ago the Senate passed the Navy appropriation bill providing $24,000,000,000 for the purchase, among other things, of 27,000 airplanes. The pending bill provides for the purchase of 100,000 airplanes. Of course, the planes are very expensive. The largest single item in the bill is that for the purchase of the 100,000 airplanes, which will cost an estimated sum of $20,600,000,000. That itself is a very large amount.

The next largest item in the bill is for the Ordnance Department, which amounts to about $15,000,000,000. Of the $15,000,000,000, $3,000,000,000 is for the purchase of ammunition, alone. That is a very considerable sum.

Then, of course, the bill carries smaller amounts. I shall discuss those very briefly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question relative to ammunition?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I was very much interested in reading in the newspapers the other day that in 1 hour's time our forces dropped on the Island of Pantelleria a greater tonnage of bombs than the Japs dropped on Corregidor during the entire 6 months of the siege of Corregidor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. HILL. Of course, as the Senator knows, it did not take 6 months to take the Island of Pantelleria.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, of course, those in charge of our war effort are attempting to do all they can to bring the war to a conclusion by means of the use of airplanes, because that weapon is the most powerful and the least expensive, both in manpower and money, which can be used.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the evidence before the committee disclose the number of planes we are actually making each year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know how many planes we are making. Can the Senator give me that information?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The number of planes built last year totaled approximately 60,000. That was an average of 5,000 a month.

We are now making planes at the rate of 7,000 a month. Next month the rate will be 8,000; and by the end of the year it will be approximately 11,000 or 12,000 a month.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume that includes all types and kinds of airplanes; does it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. We are making three principal types of planes: Fighter planes, bomber planes, and transport planes. The bill carries an appropriation for the building of 100,000 planes, and that number is divided into 38,000 fighter planes, 36,000 bombers, and 21,000 transport planes, at a total cost of $20,600,000,000, or an average cost of $200,000 each. Of course, the small, fast fighter planes do not cost that much; they are comparatively cheap. The enormous four-engine planes cost up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senator makes the statement that we shall produce 8,000 planes next month, does he mean that the planes will be complete in every detail and will be ready to take off, providing we can find the pilots to fly them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. We are training the pilots, and we have the pilots available as fast as the planes are brought into production. The programs are going along uniformly, and there is no bottleneck now with regard to either the making of planes or the training of pilots. The program is in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, because I was interested in the matter of completion of the planes. There was a rumor sometime ago to the effect that, while we were producing at the rate of, let us say, 8,000 planes a month, yet somewhere along the line there were bottlenecks which were preventing the completion of the planes before they were ready to fly, either as fighter, bomber, or transport planes. I am glad that is not true. As I understand, the Senator's statement is that it is not true.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct, in the main. I shall have to qualify the statement slightly. There is the complaint that some of the men in the factories are not so busy as they might be, that they are smoking cigarettes and are sitting and standing around without anything to do. Occasionally that happens. A factory making planes is organized, and one group will be doing one thing on the planes, and another group will be doing something else on the planes, and each man is a specialist in his own line. A number of the factories depend upon parts coming in for the planes. If, for example, some of the electrical gadgets are not available for the planes, the crew that installs such gadgets has nothing to do until the parts are available. Not knowing when the parts will arrive, the management keeps the men there so that when the parts do arrive the men may be assigned to the task of installing them. Occasionally, men are not kept busy because of the fact that the parts have not yet reached the plant.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator is discussing the cost of planes, will he place in the RECORD or will he state at this time the cost of a flying fortress?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator have the information available for the RECORD at this time?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I do not. The cost of a Flying Fortress varies from time to time. Flying Fortresses are becoming cheaper, I will say, because of better facilities of production.

Mr. McNARY. I had the impression, probably formed some months ago, that a Flying Fortress cost approximately half a million dollars. Is that figure in the vicinity of the actual cost?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; that is approximately correct. The reason why the planes cost so much is that when a plane is made, it immediately is out of date. Whenever a plane is completed, it might be said that it is almost out of date, because after its manufacture has been started and completed, the engineers have advanced ideas and improvements, so that the next plane or the next number of planes which are made, embody improvements which make the planes previously completed second-rate, we might say. The factories are making larger planes, more efficient planes, with planes more powerful and faster engines and with heavier ordnance—the cannon and guns. Some of the planes carry guns that shoot a 3-inch shell. Not many of them do, and they may not be really efficient but, nevertheless, the planes are now carrying larger cannon.

The Finance Service of the Army will receive, out of the appropriation carried in the bill, approximately $12,800,000,000. That is to pay the officers and enlisted personnel their salaries.

The food for the Army for the next year will cost an estimated $2,500,000,000. That is at an estimated rate of 72 cents a day a man for subsistence.

The bill carries for the item of clothing the sum of approximately $2,250,000,000. For the item of transportation an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 is made.

Mr. President, I may state for the RECORD that in the Army there are now approximately 7,000,000 men. By the end of the present year, if our plans do not miscarry, the Army will total 8,200,000 men, which is the maximum size to which it is planned to build up the Army. Of course, from then on the question will be purely one of maintenace. That is the size to which the military authorities want to develop the Army, and from then on the question will be one of keeping the Army as near that size as possible. It is thought that an Army of that size can do the job which must be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator repeat the figure he just stated, because it is interesting. He referred to the number of men the Army has agreed upon as the maximum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. By the end of 1943 we shall have in the armed forces, on the Army side, which embraces the Air Corps, 8,200,000 men.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that figure is for the Army alone?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For the Army and the Air Corps.

Mr. LUCAS. For both the Army and the Air Corps; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that is the maximum number of men the Army feels it can obtain and efficiently equip and operate, so far as the total population of the country is concerned?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is the judgment of those in authority with respect to the size of the Army, which embraces the ground forces and the Air Corps. The figure is 8,200,000. If we add to that the Navy, which embraces the Marines and the Coast Guard, the total is a little less than 11,000,000. That is the total of the armed forces expected to be in service at the end of the present calendar year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the figure 8,200,000 is the over-all figure for the Army, including both enlisted personnel and officers. There will be about seven and a half million enlisted personnel, and the remainder will be officers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is true. It also includes the Women's Auxiliary, called the WAAC. It is planned, if possible, to increase that organization to 150,000.

Mr. HILL. It now numbers about 60,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It now numbers a little more than 45,000. It is being rapidly expanded, and it is hoped that it may be increased to 150,000 by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. President, I believe that completes what I have to say. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the enlisted strength of the Army from the year 1930 to the present time.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Enlisted strength of the Army

Fiscal year	Authorized	Actual
1930	125,195	124,301
1931	125,195	125,407
1932	125,195	119,913
1933	125,195	121,788
1934	125,195	123,823
1935	125,165	125,098
1936	171,415	153,212
1937	171,415	164,993
1938	168,415	170,151
1939	171,415	174,079
1940	245,413	249,441
1941	1,500,000	1,361,658
1942	3,100,000	2,000,000
1943	7,000,000	[1] 6,500,000
1944	7,533,000	[1] 7,533,000

[1] Approximate.

The figures for the fiscal years 1930 to 1941, inclusive, include Philippine Scouts.

The figures for the fiscal years 1942 to 1944, inclusive, are based on average figures and are exclusive of Philippine Scouts.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Following that, I desire to place in the RECORD a statement showing the appropriations made for the support of the Army, beginning with the year 1930 and ending with the pending bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of War Department appropriations

Fiscal year	Requested by War Department	Approved by the Bureau of the Budget	Appropriated by Congress		
			War Department military appropriations	Emergency funds and other allocations	Total
1930	$349,986,426	$328,727,164	$332,114,899		$332,114,899
1931	362,382,069	347,299,185	346,979,179		346,979,179
1932	351,304,294	343,170,810	338,920,916		338,920,916
1933	331,243,723	316,195,110	304,961,492		304,961,492
1934	277,509,874	277,746,841	277,066,381	$85,062,913	362,129,294
1935	305,271,321	285,960,155	280,862,094	12,471,801	293,333,895
1936	361,351,154	331,647,277	355,538,204	18,778,058	374,316,262
1937	467,022,415	385,288,153	388,244,859	27,866,583	416,111,442
1938	459,656,768	419,208,326	417,985,029	50,353,707	468,338,736
1939	597,622,788	545,143,122	531,001,997	120,220,196	651,222,193
1940	915,318,325	839,322,260	851,618,610	49,514,672	901,133,282

Total military appropriations:

Fiscal year:	
1941	$8,480,594,407
1942	75,462,593,587
Contract authorizations:	
1941	5,006,589,651
1942	183,145,695

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator include in the RECORD a full statement, showing not only appropriations, but the amounts requested, and the amounts approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. That is in the printed statement. The statement which I have put in the RECORD shows the three items.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I find from that statement that the Congress has approved appropriations practically equal to the total requested by the War Department in the 10 years, 1930 to 1940. Congress could not be as well informed about what was needed for armaments as was the Army; but this record shows that Congress responded very well to the requests of the Army. So it cannot be said that Congress was not diligent in voting the funds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think the Senator is correct in his analysis of the situation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have before me the total of the appropriations for the 10 years. The total is approximately four and a half billion dollars. There ought to have been some money for airplanes in that sum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Until the war broke out in Europe in 1939 this country was not much interested in military activities. Even after the war broke out in Europe, still we were not very much interested. It took Pearl Harbor to arouse America to the situation.

I think it might be well at this point to place in the RECORD the statement that on two occasions we came to the verge of annihilation. If Germany had followed through at Dunkerque; if Germany had had some ships to follow the evacuation of the British Army across the channel, and had moved across the channel, England would have had practically no defense. In the opinion of many, England would have fallen. If England had fallen in the spring of 1940, Germany could have acquired the French Fleet. No doubt it could also have acquired the British Fleet. With the British Fleet, the German Fleet, the Italian Fleet, and the French Fleet, it could have moved across to Canada. Canada had no defense whatever. With bases in Canada, and with her well-equipped war machine, Germany could have moved down on the United States. At that time we had practically no defense. We could not have defended ourselves, and could not have prevented annihilation and eventual capture. In all probability that would have meant that the German flag would have been flying over America long before this. That is item No. 1.

When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor 80 percent of the fighting power of the Pacific Fleet was destroyed or put out of commission. If Japan had known what she could have done at Pearl Harbor, and had had her fleet in the ocean a few miles away from Pearl Harbor, she could have moved in. Our planes in Hawaii were practically all destroyed. There would have been no defense from planes, and no defense from ships, because 80 percent of our ships were out of commission. With our Pacific Fleet out of commission, and no planes in that area, Hawaii would have fallen. Japan could have taken Hawaii, used it as a base, and moved across the Pacific to our western coast, where we had little defense. The Japanese flag might have been flying in America long before this.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. In the discussion of this military bill, nothing has been said about the Navy, except some rather vague allusions. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to put some figures into the RECORD at this point. They may be of interest.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection.

Mr. BONE. The Navy has not been starved for appropriations. In 1933 there was made available to the Navy an appropriation of $334,427,692; in 1934, $572,834,079; in 1935, $371,507,137; in 1936, $498,565,826; in 1937, $559,134,532; in 1938, $558,207,435; in 1939, the year the war began, the Congress made available to the Navy $656,888,908; in 1940, the year following the declaration of war, Congress made available to the Navy $1,050,149,570. The total for 1941 was $5,366,021,065; for 1942, $26,235,661,843. The appropriations for the current fiscal year are $25,800,188,519; and the proposed appropriation for 1944 is $29,434,787,198.

It will be recalled that the Vinson-Trammell Act was before this body in 1934. The Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and Senators and Members of the House generally, were keenly aware of some of the implications of the Hitler movement in Europe, so we began to step up the tempo so far as Naval construction was concerned. If the building is not what it should have been, certainly Congress was exceedingly generous with the Navy in the matter of dollars and cents.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington if he has any figures from 1928 to 1932, showing what appropriations were made for the Navy.

Mr. BONE. No. I sought from the Department only the figures from 1933 on, dating from the accession of Hitler.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be very interesting to include those figures, because when the present President of the United States came into office in 1933 he immediately began to build up our Navy to treaty strength. It will be found that the appropriations for naval purposes for 6 or 8 years previous to that time were limited, to say the least.

Mr. BONE. Very much so.

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever amounts were appropriated by the Congress from 1932 on were for the purpose of building our Navy up to treaty strength in line with what we had agreed on in respect to the 6-6-3 ratio with England and Japan. In my humble opinion it was very fortunate that we had a President who really had at heart the interests of the Navy, and thoroughly understood the Hitler movement in Europe. I do not mean to cast any reflection on anyone in previous administrations with respect to building up the Navy, but we know that little or nothing was done about it for a number of years. The situation was as the Senator from Oklahoma described it a moment ago; the people of the country did not want anything done. They had the notion that we were to live here in a sort of sublime state for the remainder of our existence without any war. We had been led to believe that. After the last war we all said that we did not want to have anything to do with European nations because of their greed, their racial antipathies, and their centuries of fighting among themselves. That is the reason why a spirit of almost helplessness grew up in this country during that particular time. I desired to call that situation to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BONE. With the indulgence of the Senator from Oklahoma, let me say that the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will first yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Appropriations for the Navy had not been extensive in the years preceding 1933 because of the feeling that the world would not suddenly go crazy. Upon the accession of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency of the United States, and upon the accession of Hitler to power in Germany, we entered upon a new phase of human existence. The record will indicate that in 1934, out of N. I. R. A. allotments the President—doubtless moved by what was happening in Europe—lifted in excess of $277,000,000 and put it into the custody of the Navy with the view of building up the Navy.

One more thing which might be of interest is that the last battleship which we built was the *West Virginia*, a ship of approximately 35,000 tons, a very fine fighting ship. It was one of those which were knocked around pretty badly at Pearl Harbor. It cost approximately $26,800,000.

Oddly enough, it was finished at a time when wages were high in the shipyards. As I recall, steel was even higher per ton than it has been during the present building period, and yet, due to technological changes, better propelling machinery, different fire control, and fighting equipment, the cost of new ships in the same category has risen to sixty or seventy million dollars. I find no explanation for it anywhere, but that condition exists.

When we consider that the *West Virginia*, which was finished in 1923, 10 years before Hitler came into power, cost $26,000,000, we can realize that with the allocation of $277,000,000 which was made by President Roosevelt, along with other appropriations made available by Congress, we should have been able to begin a tremendous expansion of the Navy. So far as I can recall, that is what occurred. The Navy has gone steadily up, and we should have the largest Navy in the world. With the program indicated by these figures, if we do not demonstrate to the world the capacity of our Navy to dominate the seas, there is something wrong with America.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Oklahoma stated a moment ago that it was estimated that by the end of this year the Army would have 8,200,000 officers and enlisted men. Appreciating the fact that it must be increased by approximately a million to make that possible, several questions were brought out in the committee in connection with the pay of dependents.

There is now pending before the Military Affairs Committee a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to increase such pay. The question was asked as to what is now being paid to dependents. It may interest the Senate to know that in the hearings it was revealed that of the over-all total of $12,264,510,000 required for the Finance Service of the Army, $11,512,374,665, or 93.87 percent, represents the subappropriation "Pay of the Army"; $720,000,000, or 5.87 percent is for travel; and $32,136,000, or 0.26 percent, is for the remaining miscellaneous items. The total for payment of allowances to dependents of enlisted men is $1,216,559,760. That information was given in answer to a question by the Senator from Massachusetts.

A further question was asked by myself as to whether that could be broken down on a family basis. The statement was made that the War Department is now sending out 3,300,000 checks a month. All of them are not to family dependents, but a large number of them are for family dependents.

The March 1943 figures show that the Government's share of the average check was $29.28; the enlisted man's share was $23.29, making a total of $52.57.

For April the Government's share of the average check was $30.20; the enlisted man's share was $23.60, or a total of $53.80.

For May, the latest figures available, the Government's share of the average check was $28.14; the enlisted man's share was $22.47, or a total family allowance of $50.61.

In short, the average pay for the enlisted man, his relatives and family, half of which he pays himself, is only $50 a month.

I appreciate the fact that this is an appropriation bill and that no legislative amendment would be in order. I hope I shall have the pleasure, as a Member of the Senate, to vote to increase the allowance, because with the present high cost of living, the families left at home are receiving only $50 a month, and I do not think that is sufficient.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In the statement which was made by the Senator a few moments ago, I do not believe he intended to blame Congress for what happened at Pearl Harbor. He said that if the Japs had known it, they could have taken Pearl Harbor. Congress was not to blame for what took place at Pearl Harbor. The Secretary of the Navy made the statement, in a magazine article which was published after Pearl Harbor, that the Navy was ready to fight on the seven seas. We certainly had planes and a navy at Pearl Harbor.

I am not trying to blame any particular person, because I do not know who was to blame for what took place at Pearl Harbor. But certainly someone was to blame for what occurred there, and it was not the Congress of the United States. A great many persons have attempted to blame Congress for what took place at Pearl Harbor. It is ridiculous to try to do so. Someone in the Army, the Navy, or the executive department of the Government was to blame for what took place there.

Even though the Japs had taken the Hawaiian Islands I do not believe that they could have taken the United States. Nor do I believe for one moment that we would have been captured or that the German flag would have been flown over the United States even if Britain had collapsed. The fact is that Britain did not collapse. We must take into consideration many "ifs" and "ands." The German military forces did not cross the English Channel. I have talked with Englishmen and with some of our own military experts. They do not all agree. Some of them think that possibly the Germans could have taken England if they had attempted it. But apparently Hitler did not think he could, because he

did not attempt to take it. But we certainly have not been able to cross the English Channel, and there are many military experts, both in this country and elsewhere, who think it would be impossible for us to cross the English Channel at this time.

With reference to our not being prepared, as the Senator has said by the time an airplane is completed it is almost obsolete because of improvements which have been made in the planes of England, Japan, and Germany. Probably it is not so true of appropriations for the Navy, but if we had appropriated to build more planes, more guns, and other equipment of that kind, the planes and guns would all have been obsolete by 1940, 1941, or 1942. As has been pointed out here, it was demonstrated very clearly that the first tanks which we built and sent to north Africa did not stand up, but went to pieces because they were riveted, and so improved tanks had to be devised.

It was not the fault, in my judgment, of the Congress of the United States. It was not any more the fault of the Republican administration than it was of the Democratic administration, or the fault of the Republicans any more than the fault of Democrats. During my 20 years' service here I think the Congress has been giving to the executive departments practically every single dollar of appropriations they have asked for the Army and for the Navy. At times the Committee on Appropriations, I think, has offered to provide appropriations in excess of those the executive department has requested. Let me ask the Senator from Oklahoma if that is not a fact with reference to some appropriations during the last few years?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may at this point place a little incident in the RECORD it might be of some value.

When the appropriations were being prepared during the spring of 1940 the House passed a bill which in due course came before the Senate committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, I was holding hearings on that measure. The President had submitted his request for money to the House, as he always does. The House, even after the war had broken out in Europe in 1939, had slashed the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget very severely. I cannot be accurate in stating the percentage, but the reduction in the bill which came before the Senate in the spring of 1940 was 10 or 15 or 20 percent. At that time, along the latter part of May 1940, we were having difficulty in the Senate committee in the effort to restore the cuts made by the House. The Members of the House made those cuts because they believed that their people back home did not want large appropriations made. The President had asked for additional funds, though not for any great amount of additional funds, but the House said "No." The bill came to the Senate in that shape. The bill was before my committee when the Germans made their drive against the Allied line, drove the left flank toward Paris, and the right flank toward Dunquerke, and broke through there. That all happened over the week end. Immediately after the Dunquerque debacle had taken place, the sentiment in the committee and the sentiment of the country changed entirely. Immediately we began to receive letters and telegrams and long-distance calls and editorials asking why we did not build up a big Navy and a big Army and a big Air Corps to meet what might come.

That is the way democracy works. The subcommittee went ahead, held hearings, and agreed to restore the items cut from the bill by the House. But, after that had happened, the subcommittee was not satisfied with the appropriations asked for by the War Department and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. So, in executive session, my subcommittee went into the matter and brought before the committee General Marshall and other high-ranking officials of the War Department and asked them if, in view of the emergency, they thought they were asking for all the money they needed.

Of course, there is a rule that an official of the administration cannot ask for money that is not requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. So, they were estopped; they could not say that they wanted any more money. We took the lid off, and, in effect, asked the officials of the War Department to hold a conference and bring us back a confidential memorandum stating to the committee how much money they thought the Congress should appropriate in order to give them the money necessary to build up the Army and the Air Corps. We took a recess. The officials advised us that they would be ready to report in a few days. Evidently—I do not know this to be a fact, but evidently General Marshall and his staff took the matter to the President, because in 2 or 3 days we had notice that the President would address a joint meeting of the House and the Senate. The President came before the joint meeting, delivered his address, and asked for appropriations $2,000,000,000 in excess of the Budget estimates which had been considered by the House and the Senate subcommittee. The President appeared before the joint session of the two bodies, as I recall, on Thursday at 1 o'clock. The subcommittee met that afternoon. We had the break-down of the $2,000,000,000 before us. We considered the break-down during Friday and Saturday. On Saturday afternoon we wrote up the bill and reported it to the Senate on Monday.

The bill, which was passed on Tuesday following the President's address to the joint meeting, restored the cuts made by the House and appropriated in excess of $2,000,000,000 new money. The House immediately accepted the action of the Senate. That is when the Army started building up. Up to that time it was going along in a very slow manner. I think that it is proper to place that statement in the RECORD to demonstrate that when an emergency arises a democracy can function and can do it quickly, as has been proven many times in the past.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I have not thought of blaming Congress or any individual Senator. I blame, if it may be called blame, the conditions which then prevailed. The people thought they were through with war; they thought it foolish to build up an Army and Navy and Air Corps, on the theory that if we built up a large Military Establishment the time would come when we would want to try it out to see if it was good. In the springtime when we see boys on the sandlots playing baseball, we know that they will organize a team and challenge some team on the other side of the tracks. In the fall when we see boys on the sandlots practicing football we know, as a matter of course, that very shortly they will become organized into teams and challenge other football teams. So the people believed that if we built up a big Army and a big Navy and a big Air Corps we would be building up for a purpose, and that, sooner or later, we would want to try them out. For that reason they were not willing to build up a large Military Establishment, and, for that reason, they counseled with their Representatives and Senators against the appropriation of large sums of money for military purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say, if I may interrupt the Senator again——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think any Member of the Senate who was here during the period between 1922 and 1932 who will examine his correspondence and files will find to be true exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. In the matter of appropriating money for the Army and Navy he will find that his mail was largely made up of propaganda from peace organizations, church organizations, labor organizations, and individuals protesting against building up a big Navy and a big Army. As the Senator indicates, the mass of the people of this country, if we may judge by the letters received from various States and various organizations, were opposed to building a big Navy and a big Army because they felt if we built them up we would set up a military regime here or would want to use them in order to try them out.

Of course, that has been the history of a great many countries. Hitler had a large army, and was permitted to build a big army. He was put in power and financed by the same people he is attacking today. Hitler was built up, and everyone who knows anything about the matter knows he was built up and kept in power by the financial interests of Germany. He was encouraged by some of the financial interests in England, and by some of the financial interests in France, because they wanted him in power to suppress what they called the Communist movement in Germany, and as a buffer against communism in Russia. The financial interests were the ones responsible for putting him in power, after Laval, who was then head of the French Government, recalled the money the French had in Vienna and in Austrian banks, and broke the banks. They did not want the Anschluss between Germany and Austria, thinking that if it

were brought about there would then be a coalition, and that France would be subject to attack by both Austria and Germany under the leadership of Hitler. That broke the banks. Instead of hurting Hitler, it tended to increase his power, and after that took place, and to a large extent directly because of that fact, he went into power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator. The suggestion was made a moment ago that someone was in great error at Pearl Harbor. Let me suggest as a possible explanation that warfare has changed from what it used to be. Warfare and prize fighting are almost Siamese twins. Prize fighters do not meet on the street or in secret places and begin to fight. One challenges the other, and after the challenge has been accepted, they meet and sign terms. Then they agree on the time and place when they will meet and put on the contest. That is the way nations heretofore have begun wars. They would become involved in a contest back and forth, reach a point where they could go no further without fighting, then recall their representatives, and declare war, and both nations would begin to prepare for the actual conflict. Later on, when they became prepared, they would go on the battlefield, and begin to fight the case out.

Times have changed, as was demonstrated at Pearl Harbor, because all remember that at the time we were still in conference, trying to solve some of our problems, we were attacked on that Sunday morning in the Hawaiian Islands. The attack might have been made on Washington on that morning, just as well as at Pearl Harbor, and had the attack been made on Washington, or New York City, or San Francisco, or Los Angeles, the condition would have been the same; we would not have been prepared for an attack. So, while a mistake was made at Pearl Harbor, I am not prepared to condemn anyone because of dereliction of duty. It happened as it did because no one was expecting war to break without some notice, and we had no notice.

Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the brief report of the committee in explanation and in justification of the pending bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 357) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bills as passed House and reported to Senate	[1] $59,034,839,673.00
Amount of regular estimates for 1944	[1] 59,425,586,500.00
Amount of appropriations, 1943	42,820,006,365.47
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1944	390,746,827.00
Exceeds the appropriations for 1943	16,214,833,307.53

[1] Together with reappropriations amounting to $12,472,839,200.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS

A statement of the appropriations and reappropriations by services, showing amounts of cash requirements, carry-overs, and total requirements follows:

	Cash requirement	Carry-over	Total requirement
Contingencies of the Army	$22,142,000		$22,142,000
Expediting production	657,011,000	$565,147,000	1,222,158,000
Contingent fund, Chief of Staff	100	128,000,000	128,000,100
Special field exercises	77,000,000	10,000,000	87,000,000
Army War College	124,000		124,000
Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	145,000		145,000
Finance Service, Army	12,264,510,665		12,264,510,665
Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps	6,411,549,008	1,100,000,000	7,511,549,008
Signal Service of the Army	4,646,168,000	900,000,000	5,546,168,000
Air Corps, Army	23,655,481,000		23,655,481,000
Medical and Hospital Department	446,212,000	173,791,000	620,003,000
Engineer Service, Army	2,472,401,500	1,520,000,000	3,992,401,500
Ordnance Department	7,992,577,000	7,050,000,000	15,042,577,000
Chemical Warfare Service, Army	240,025,000	912,474,000	1,152,499,000
Special service schools	1,711,000	100,000	1,811,000
Instruction in armored force activities	580,000	89,000	669,000
Seacoast defense, general	29,632,000	5,930,000	25,562,000
U. S. Military Academy	5,981,000		5,981,000
National Guard	100	64,500	64,600
Organized Reserves	100	9,900	10,000
Reserve Officers' Training Corps	2,125,000	1,200,000	3,325,000
Promotion of rifle practice	100	45,900	46,000
Army of the Philippines	100	205,987,900	205,988,000
Inter-American relations	500,000		500,000
Departmental activities	8,964,000		8,964,000
Total	59,034,839,673	12,472,839,200	71,507,678,873

ARMY AIR FORCES

Over 87 percent of the $23,700,000,000 budget of the Army Air Forces is required for the procurement of airplanes, spare engines, spare parts, and other miscellaneous procurement expenses. This sum will permit production to continue at the maximum rate, which the airplane industry is expected to reach soon after the end of the calendar year.

In addition to these costs which come directly under the Air Corps appropriation, a total of $4,700,000,000 is requested for the new airplane program under other military appropriation titles in the bill. This appropriation will provide 36,000 bombers, 38,000 fighters, 12,000 air transports, and 9,000 trainers with all the necessary spare engines and spare parts.

In the next year, the program of the Air Corps should reach maturity. Another 6 months should see maximum plane production reached. Already the training program has started to level off.

The big task of the Air Transport Command in establishing the necessary airfields, acquiring the personnel to service the planes, and facilities to house and feed the personnel is nearing completion. The Air Transport Command is now operating 90,000 miles of air routes over which they are ferrying planes from the factories to their destination overseas. Personnel and strategic materials are flowing in a constantly increasing stream to the theaters of operation.

While the aviation program in general is moving forward at a very satisfactory rate, certain phases, such as aviation gasoline, still present difficult problems. Production of 100-octane gasoline must be increased to keep up with the rapid expansion in demand. With 70 percent of the Army Air Forces gasoline requirements calling for high-octane gas, great effort will be necessary to keep supply up to demand. The public probably does not realize the enormous rate of gasoline consumption by the air forces. An air force raid on Berlin by 500 heavy bombers from the British Isles consumes more than 800,000 gallons of gasoline. The transportation of this gasoline to the theaters of operation is in itself a major problem.

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

A total of $12,264,510,665 is carried in this bill under "Finance Service, Army." The 2 major items covered are pay and allowances of some 8,200,000 military personnel, and travel of the Army, which together account for 98.4 percent of the total appropriation. The remaining 1.6 percent provides for the salaries of civilian employees at military headquarters and field employees of the Finance Department, personal allowances and compensation for work of enemy prisoners of war, settlement of various claims, expenses of courts martial, and miscellaneous items.

In the absence of a request by the War Department, no action was taken to restore the 10-percent cut in funds for travel in the bill as passed by the House.

Funds for the payment of family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the last four grades are included in this appropriation. The committee is particularly interested in this subject.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

As passed by the House and as reported to the Senate, the bill includes a total of approximately $230,000,000 for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. This is based on a strength of 150,000, of whom 10,000 would be officers. No consideration has been given to a possible increase in the corps over this figure.

It is the intention of the War Department, gradually to substitute female for male enlisted personnel, wherever feasible. The results to date demonstrate that the organization of such a group of women, thoroughly trained to replace male personnel needed in other war activities, has passed beyond the experimental stage.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Of the supplies and transportation gross requirements of seven and five-tenths billions, some one and six-tenths billions are for rail and water transportation, discussed below under Transportation Corps, making $5,900,000,000 available for obligation by the Quartermaster Corps. This amount reflects two and five-tenths billions for feeding the Army, two and three-tenths for clothing and equipage, and one and one-tenth billions for supplies, equipment, animals, and incidental expenses.

As presented in these estimates, the cost of the delivered ration is figured at 72 cents, including raw food costs of 61 cents, plus amounts necessary to cover transportation, special types of rations, and the special packaging required by diverse climatic conditions. At this time last year the corresponding figures were approximately 66 cents and 56 cents, respectively.

Determined that the armed forces shall have all food, clothing, general supplies, and equipment, essential for the prosecution of a global war, the Quartermaster Corps is steering a skillful course in its procurement of the thousands of items included in this program, many of which are fraught with public interest because of the impact of rationing, price subsidies, and roll-backs. Improvements, resulting from continuous research and development work, are being made on the rations, clothing, and equipment issued to our troops, as reports of actual battle conditions are received from theaters in every climate.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

"Army transportation, water" requires approximately $500,000,000, of which, roughly, one-third is for procurement of boats, engines, and pier equipment, and the balance is for operation. Small-boat procurement covers combat and training craft, harbor-defense craft, rescue and salvage craft, and supply craft. The largest item is for supply boats which are used to transport supplies from advanced water bases to the forward lines. The greater part of the operating expenditures is for operation of boats and shore facilities. This covers wages to crews and the operation of the ports of embarkation. Stevedoring is also a major expense. In some theaters of operation stevedoring is furnished as an item of reverse lend-lease.

"Army transportation, commercial" is estimated at $1,000,000,000, of which $770,000,000 is for the transportation of supplies. The railroads have done such an unusually good job of moving men and materials during this war that none of the congestion which we had in the First World War has occurred to date. This is in spite of the fact that the railroads are moving men and materials in far larger amounts than in the previous war. About six times the volume of freight was moved overseas during the first year of this war compared with the first year of the last war. Yet in moving this freight to the ports the railroads operated with 20,000 fewer locomotives. In addition to the shipment of supplies in this country, the Transportation Corps has to ship rolling stock and operate railroads in the various theaters of operation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The estimates for "Engineer Service, Army" provide for nearly $4,000,000,000, of which $1,520,000,000 represents a carry-over from the 1943 appropriation.

In addition to procurement of equipment and supplies for use in active theaters, new construction in the continental United States, on a reduced basis, and expansion and conversion of existing structures and facilities, these funds provide for the continuation and expansion of engineer work in the active theaters of operation.

The committee reviewed in considerable detail the experience of the Corps of Engineers relating to the use or acquisition of real estate, in view of the fact that certain taxing bodies such as school districts are affected by loss of tax income by Federal acquisition of real property.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

The bill provides for the Ordnance Department the sum of $7,992,577,000 under the appropriation, "Ordnance service and supplies, Army," and $55,000 under the appropriation, "Rock Island Bridge." Likewise, it is also reappropriating an unobligated balance of $7,050,000,000, thus providing a total of $15,042,577,000 for the operation of the Ordnance Department during the coming fiscal year.

One of the large items included under the Ordnance Department is $3,889,431,984 for international aid. These funds will be used to purchase guns, trucks, and ammunition for the United Nations, and are a substantial contribution to our allies.

In addition, the ordnance estimates include the sum of $2,800,000,000 for maintenance and procurement of motor vehicles, a new function which it just recently took over from the Quartermaster Corps. The Ordnance Department also procures all the necessary armament for our own forces, as well as for our allies. Some of the items that it procures in large volumes are tanks, jeeps, motortrucks, cannon, machine guns, carbines, and many miscellaneous weapons. The appropriation also contains an item of $80,960,000 for research and development.

SIGNAL SERVICE, ARMY

The Signal Service of the Army handles all communication equipment and facilities. The amount provided for this Service for the coming fiscal year is $5,546,168,000, of which $900,000,000 is a reappropriation. Within this substantial program, the sum of $3,659,473,705 is to be devoted to Army Air Force requirements. Among the various types of items provided for the Army Air Forces are air-borne and air-ground equipment, together with the operation of meteorological stations, Army airway stations, and aircraft warning systems.

One of the major items in the estimates of the Signal Corps is for construction of new telephone systems, new radio systems, and new aircraft warning systems which, however, show a reduction of approximately $140,000,000 as compared with the estimates for the fiscal year 1943. It indicates that the Army has passed the peak of its requirements for these fixed systems. However, the maintenance program calls for a substantial increase brought about by the necessity of maintaining all communication systems which were installed in the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, while the Signal Corps was attaining its peak of construction.

The Signal Corps likewise has made progress in its research and development in connection with radio and radar, and is constantly endeavoring to improve its equipment in every respect.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE, ARMY

The appropriation of new funds for the Chemical Warfare Service amounts to $340,025,000. In addition, the 1943 unobligated balance of $812,474,000 is reappropriated.

Full-scale production of chemical agents and defensive matériel is a reality. Adequate stocks are on hand for immediate use in the eventuality of an all-out gas warfare initiated by our enemies.

The incendiary bomb has become one of the most important munitions presently used by our Air Forces. Testimony reveals that this munition now constitutes a major portion by weight of a bomber load. A large portion of the funds made available for this service is intended for the development and more extensive use of this weapon.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

The health record of the Army to date presents a challenge which is being accepted in an aggressive spirit by the office of the Surgeon General. The program contemplated for the fiscal year 1944, requiring a total of $600,000,000, of which $173,791,000 is a reappropriation, includes over 700,000 general and station hospital beds to be operated here and overseas, as well as the procurement for our own Army and our allies, of some $440,000,000 worth of medical supplies and equipment.

The Medical Department has also associated itself actively with the problem of maintaining a flow of qualified students into the medical schools to the end that the performance of the Surgeon General's mission may rest in competent hands.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

While the war effort is reaching maturity as far as production facilities are concerned, certain expenditures are still necessary for the expansion of plant facilities, the conversion of existing plants to other types of production, and the acquisition and lease of special machinery. For those purposes, $1,222,158,000 is required for the fiscal year 1944. Of this amount recommended by the committee, $657,011,000 is appropriated in the bill, and $565,147,000 is provided as a reappropriation of unobligated prior fiscal year funds. Approximately $313,000,000 is for machine tools for Allied Nations, and about three-fourths of the balance will be used for ordnance production.

The allocation of the amount recommended for the fiscal year 1944 is as follows:

Army Air Forces	$190,000,000
Ordnance Service and Supplies	962,758,000
Signal Service, Army	20,000,000
Chemical Warfare Service	37,100,000
Transportation Corps	2,300,000
Total	1,222,158,000

LEND-LEASE

Exclusive of airplanes, spare engines, and spare parts to be furnished by the Army Air Forces as the strategic situation demands the military estimates for the fiscal year 1944 contain a total of $4,969,967,668 for lend-lease. This amount is distributed as follows:

Air Corps, Army (training)	$37,637,080
Chemical Warfare Service	55,739,272
Engineer Service, Army	203,530,806
Medical and Hospital Department	68,219,040
Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army	3,889,431,984
Signal Service, Army	366,010,624
Supplies and transportation, Army	349,398,862
Army	349,398,862

The total value of articles and services actually turned over or rendered to our allies by the War Department through April 30, 1943, was $4,717,324,391. Of this amount, $1,350,298,210 represents item and services furnished or rendered by the Army Air Forces, principally aircraft, while the remaining $3,367,026,181 involved goods and services furnished by the supply services.

There has been certain reciprocity, known as reverse lend-lease or reciprocal aid, whereby our allies, to the extent of their ability, make available to our forces in the field supplies, facilities, and services on a reciprocal basis. The bill takes into account and deducts reciprocal aid of about $220,000,000, which it is contemplated will be furnished during the fiscal year 1944.

LIMITATIONS

The changes in the bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

Expediting production:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "*Provided further*, That section 403 (a) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public, 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, is further amended to include the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, and to provide that the term 'Department' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively, and, in the case of such corporations, that the term 'Secretary' also shall mean the De-

fense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively."

Finance Department: Finance Service, Army: Pay of the Army:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "*Provided further,* That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for obligation or expenditure or for any expense whatsoever, directly or indirectly, for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (except as may be incident to induction into the Army of the United States), including compensation of military and civilian personnel, transportation on any kind of conveyance belonging to or operated by or at the expense of the War Department, and instruction, education, or training of any kind."

Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "*Provided,* That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties."

(In recommending the deletion of this proviso, the committee calls attention to the fact that the matter involved is one of policy which should be passed upon by the proper legislative committees.)

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "*Provided,* That appropriations in this Act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within two years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The observations of the Senator about what transpired at Pearl Harbor lead me to inquire regarding a matter about which the able Senator from Oklahoma may be able to enlighten us. I have been advised, whether correctly or incorrectly I do not know, that unless specific charges are made by the Army and Navy against the men commanding our military and naval forces at Pearl Harbor, within a certain specified length of time, by virtue of a statute of limitations, the charges will come to repose, and those men will never be brought before a court martial. Can the Senator advise us whether that is the fact? We are passing today probably the largest appropriation in human history. I cudgel my memory, and I can recall no civilized government which ever appropriated in one lump sum such an astounding, staggering sum as that provided in the pending bill, which we are about to pass with a handful of Senators present. The amount appropriated by the bill represents almost two and one-half times the entire cost of our participation in the World War.

I happened to think in connection with the imminent passage of the bill, of the charges against the two men who were at the head of our Army and Navy in Hawaii, and I wonder if the Senator can tell me whether my suspicions with respect to the statute of limitations are correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I regret to say that I am not able to answer the question asked by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while the pending appropriation bill is before the Senate, I believe it would be appropriate to make a few observations concerning rioting which may require the attention of the military, articles about which have appeared in the press all too frequently of late, and which recently found its climax in the city of Detroit.

Before I make further reference to it, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the pending measure for the very capable manner in which he has held the hearings, presented his case to the full committee, and is now presenting his arguments to the Senate.

Mr. President, the recent racial disorders which culminated in pitched battles between bizarre zoot-suiters and our servicemen on the west coast, and which reached a climax in Detroit, where it was necessary to call out the troops to quell civil insurrection, are a national disgrace. We should hang our heads in shame at our own negligence in permitting this dangerous development to spread beyond control.

As one of two original signatories to the Atlantic Charter, we proclaimed to the world our dedication to the broad principles of humanity and justice enunciated in that document of liberty. Immediately after our entry into the war we became mutually bound with the other members of the United Nations to help each other in our common cause.

The "four freedoms" are the keystone of our compact. In their name we have turned our national economy into the arsenal of democracy; in their name our flag is flying the seven seas, from the bleak shores of the Arctic Ocean to the southern rim of the globe; in their name we have trained and equipped and sent forth to battle the largest Army and Navy in our history.

In the name of those same four freedoms we share in the heroic stand of the Russian people, and hope to benefit by the flood tide of Russian victory when she sweeps the beaten armies of Hitler from out of her territories.

The magnificent struggle of the people of China, and the sacrifices which her men and women have made in the name of the four freedoms, against the military might of an invading army which has laid waste vast areas of her homeland, are an inspiration to all men, everywhere. We look to the colored races of Asia and Africa for support in this struggle of the democracies for survival. Without their wholehearted and complete support we cannot win. They have rallied to the banners of freedom. They, too, have pledged their all in this fight for freedom.

It cannot be denied that we have trifled with our chances for victory by the complacency with which we have countenanced the spread of racial differences in our midst. This complacency must be supplanted by vigilance. This indifference must be replaced by serious concern; by righteous indignation and alarm at distrust and hatreds which undermine our whole national structure, and which can bring about its ultimate collapse. They are calculated to create chaos and confusion at a time when our very existence as a nation depends upon our unity. While I am removed from the scenes of these disorders, and have no information from official sources as to their origin, I abhor the untimely occurrences of these manifestations of an alarming degree of disunity, which must bring sorrow to the patriotic people of our Nation, and at the same time bring joy and satisfaction to the propagandists of the enemy.

With morale in the Axis countries at a low ebb, and the experts prophesying the termination of the war by the end of the year, these outbreaks and clashes amongst our people give added stimulus to the propaganda chiefs in Japan and Germany. The stimulus thus provided to our enemy can possibly give them the necessary comfort and confidence to rouse their people to superhuman efforts in order to prolong the war. That is most unfortunate.

These disturbances bear all of the familiar marks of subversive activity by Hitler's agents. The results certainly could not be more disastrous to our cause if they were personally directed by Hitler himself. This internal strife is part of the Nazi announced plan for subjection of the world—a softening up process by which the strength which should be employed against the Nazi is dissipated by internal strife. Thus we have the sorry spectacle of our own armed soldiers marching in the streets of Detroit to protect the lives of American citizens and the safety of American property, and our own people lie wounded and dead victims of our own guns.

The full strength of our armed forces is needed on the battle fronts in foreign lands that we may keep our shores inviolate, that we may bring about an early victory. The energy and sacrifice which is expended in keeping order at home should be added to that being made in engagements against the enemy on the battlefronts of the world. It would shorten the war; it would help overcome our enemies and bring our boys home at an earlier date. Our boys on the battle fronts should command our every ounce of energy.

These pictures of American soldiers with drawn bayonets preserving order on the streets of an American city are of inestimable value to the enemy. That is what troubles me.

We can be sure that the enemy propaganda agents are spreading accounts and pictures among the very people to whom we must look for assistance, portraying these riots and bloodshed, as an

example of unrest and dissatisfaction among the American people.

Our cause is just. We of the United Nations have pledged our all for the liberation and freedom of the common man. Freedom from want and freedom from fear must be attained at home if we are to wage war successfully for those ideals abroad. Our own people, all of them, of every race, color and creed, must have an abiding faith in our dedication to the spiritual ideal that all humanity is one, and that when the victory is achieved, there will be no bitterness, no hatred, no enslavement nor persecution of any man because of his race, color or creed. We must convince our own people that we are sincere when we repeat with the immortal Lincoln, the creed which inspired our founding fathers, "All men are created equal."

It is the sacred duty of responsible leaders in all walks of life, particularly the leaders of religion, of labor and of industry, as well as our public officials to turn our people from these paths of hatred and differences to the paths of friendship and unity. It is obligatory on us to show the futility of strife and how it injures our Nation's cause, and helps the cause of Berlin and Tokyo.

The watchword of the hour is unity, because it is only through unity that we can forge the links of victory. It is only through victory that the ideals of the "four freedoms" can become a reality here in the United States. Victory for the enemy means slavery for all of us.

Let us therefore put forth every effort for the highest possible degree of national unity. To do less would be to neglect our fighting battalions on democracy's far-flung battle fronts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this appropriation has included in it the sum of $205,000,000 for the organization and maintenance of the Philippine Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The appropriation covers all the money required to take care of our entire Army Establishment. The item in question is carried to take care of the Army of the Philoppines just as soon as the islands are freed of Japanese domination.

Mr. BUCK. There is an item of $205,000,000 in it for the Philippine Army. Is that simply a carry-over?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The sum was appropriated to maintain the Army of the Philippines and will be carried in each bill until such time as the Philippines are free again, so that at that time the funds will be available to rehabilitate and maintain the Army.

Mr. BUCK. There is no mention of that item in the bill that I find. There is set forth in the bill the appropriation of $100. The report shows a carry-over of $205,000,000 for the Army of the Philippines.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no other way that funds may be constantly available for the maintenance of the Army of the Philippines, and until the islands are free again the funds carried will not be used. To fail to carry the item would no doubt be a serious blow to the morale of the Filipino people.

Mr. BUCK. That is a goodly sum. If it is not needed it might be stricken out.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the last item in the report, an item in which I am very much interested, because I happen to know the history connected with it. It is as follows:

> The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: *"Provided*, That appropriations in this act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within 2 years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

I may say, Mr. President, in furtherance of my view on that subject, that I know as a matter of fact that many young men, and I take it young women also, in colleges and universities throughout the country, some of whom, for instance, have just completed their junior year in a particular course, were induced to go into these professions, and to take up this work, looking forward to becoming students in medicine and dentistry in the Army. To cut these young men and young women off, and say that they cannot have sustenance from the appropriations unless they are in the last 2 years of their courses, would be to render a great injustice to thousands of young persons in this country who are willing to study, and some of whom are now in the Army studying under this program. Some of them have been in the Army for a year, some for 6 months. To carry out the program which is now suggested by the heads of our Military Establishment, and cut these young people off, and say that they cannot have any support from the Government unless they can complete their courses within 2 years, would be to default in our promise made to these young people when they gave up their college courses.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the committee shared the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Nevada and recommended that this limitation be stricken from the bill, and on Saturday last the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before the Chair makes announcement with respect to the conferees I wish to say that the ratio with respect to majority and minority conferees on the part of the Senate is 1½ to 1 or 3 to 2. My attention was called earlier in the day to the conferees appointed on the Post Office and Justice Department bill as being in ratio of 5 to 2. I shall discuss that matter a little later, and have the situation corrected. At this time I wish to know if we are to have the same ratio of conferees as appointed on the other conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon realizes that it is the custom for the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator in charge of the bill, to furnish the Chair with a list of conferees.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. The responsibility still remains with the occupant of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed list which was furnished by the Senator from Oklahoma contains five majority members and two minority members.

Mr. McNARY. That is not according to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What does the Senator from Oregon suggest?

Mr. McNARY. The ratio should be 5 to 3 at least or 3 to 2. If it were 5 to 3 I would not object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is customary to place on conference committees representatives of legislative committees. As a rule members of legislative committees do not attend the sessions of the Appropriations Committee, but nevertheless that is the rule. I was going to ask that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the author of the only controversial amendment, be added to the list of conferees.

He is the author of the amendment to strike out the limitation with respect to defense plants and the Defense Supplies Corporation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that would make the ratio 5 to 3, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, inadvertently, the Senator from Oklahoma said I was the author of the amendment to strike out the limitation with respect to the defense plants and the Defense Supplies Corporation. That amendment was not the one in which I was interested. I am sure the Senator simply misspoke himself. I was interested in the other amendment which seeks to place a limit on the number of years during which soldiers can be given schooling in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces the following list of conferees on the part of the Senate and trusts it will be satisfactory to the Senate. The names of the conferees will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. GURNEY.

INCREASE OF DEFENSE HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1109, Calendar No. 332.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1109) to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 4. That the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 22) and sections 114 and 115 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 204 and 205) or of any other law shall not be construed to prevent any Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, from leasing or renting any housing accommodations in the District of Columbia, in the city of Alexandria, in Arlington County or Fairfax County in the Commonwealth of Virginia, or in Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, or Charles County, in the State of Maryland, owned or operated by the United States or in which it has any interest and for the tenancy of which he and his family would otherwise be eligible.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,600,000,000."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys, derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in an appropriation account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may request unanimous consent that at this time the Senate take up a bill which came over from the House, House bill 2520, a bill extending the provisions of the so-called pipe line bill? The bill must be passed by the Senate before tomorrow night. I have endeavored to obtain recognition in order to move that the Senate consider the bill. The Interior Department is very anxious to have the bill passed. I have spoken to both the majority leader and the minority leader, and I think there is absolutely no objection to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, what would the bill do?

Mr. WHEELER. It would extend for 2 years the provisions of the so-called pipeline bill which would authorize the President by proclamation to permit certain pipe lines to be built.

The committee held hearings on the bill, and the representative from the Petroleum Conservation Division stated it was necessary to have the bill passed if they were to be able to build any more pipe lines. We asked him if at the present time he contemplated that any more would be built. He said they did not have any in contemplation, except one which the Sinclair Oil Co. was thinking of building from Chicago or Toledo, I think, and that because of that fact they probably might need the legislation, in order to permit them to obtain rights-of-way across the lands in some States in which at the present time they cannot condemn the lands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator doubtless knows, there are very large sections of the country——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if there is to be discussion on the bill, I think I should not yield for that purpose; because we have been waiting for some time, and the consideration of the bills which I am to offer will not require very much time. After their consideration is completed there will be opportunity for discussion of other bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the very distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] advised me that he was favorable to the bill but would desire to be present. He now is in a meeting of a conference committee which is considering a bill which passed the Senate yesterday. If the Senator from Utah will describe his bill there will be an opportunity for the Senator from Ohio to return to the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I sent a note to the Senator from Ohio, as he requested me to do, and I think he will be here immediately. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the subcommittee which handled the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee is the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is ill, and not able to present the bill at this time.

The bill would merely increase the amount of money which has already been allowed to the Defense Homes Corporation for the building of defense houses. In 1943 and 1944 approximately 1,100,000 persons will have to be housed. The bill provides for the housing of those persons.

The bill would not change the primary law, except it would provide that the rentals and the fees which would be received would be returned to the Treasury; but in the meantime they could be used to aid in changing the houses, which primarily are defense houses, and, therefore, are not suitable for use as more permanent structures in case the opportunity for permanent use develops. The President of the United States sent to Congress a message which is included in the report. In the message he suggested the proposed extension. The need is with us, as everyone knows. The housing facilities of the country have been united under one head, with the exception of the facilities which are handled under the Lanham Act. The bill is not in any sense related to that act, but has to do only with defense housing, a matter which is entirely a part of the war effort.

Mr. President, I think there is such complete understanding on the part of all Members of the Senate that any further explanation is unnecessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator in his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to be interrupted.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator. Let me ask what is the total amount which has been expended or loaned for this purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The first bill provided for $1,200,000,000. The $400,000,000 which would be added by the second bill would allow the law to read "$1,600,000,000 for defense housing purposes."

Mr. McNARY. The "second bill" referred to by the Senator is the bill the Senator is now discussing; is it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The pending bill would increase the amount to $1,600,000,000. One billion two hundred million dollars has already been appropriated and has quite generally been allocated.

Mr. McNARY. Of that vast sum, what proportion does the Senator expect the Government will lose by reason of the venture?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In theory, the Government should not lose on these defense housing projects; but in fact, we know the Government will lose on them. I may say very frankly to the Senator—and this is my own opinion—that the fallacy which has been entertained all along with respect to defense housing projects of various kinds has been that the houses should be built in such a way as to be merely temporary structures.

The problem which is facing the defense housing organization is that presented by priorities, allocations, and materials. The organization is extending, and changing its plans to meet the situation so that it will not run into conflict

with the demands for strategic materials.

Of course, the loss resulting from the program will not be so great as that in the case of other military programs, because the houses will be used and will bring in certain returns all the time. Of course, the demand is very great.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that many of these projects have simply a salvage value, as distinguished from a continuous or permanent value.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will go further than that and say that many of them have not even a salvage value, because their construction is such that the salvage will not amount to very much. But wherever sewer systems have been put in for a project, or wherever streets have been built for a project, a primary improvement of that kind will be of value to the community and to the country.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the opinion of the able Senator that this will probably be the last claim of the War Department for funds for this purpose during the present year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think it will be for the present year. If the war continues, there is no doubt in my mind that in 1945 it will become necessary to ask for more housing.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I heard the question of the Senator from Oregon. My own view is that in all probability there will be no more housing, simply because in 1944, so far as I know, there will be no further extension of manufacture. If there should be a further extension of manufacture, undoubtedly more housing would be required; but as I understand, the War Department program has practically come to an end as far as the expansion of manufacturing facilities is concerned. This is calculated on the present program of expansion. In the absence of any further expansion, I should expect this to be the last bill authorizing further housing. Furthermore, I somewhat doubt whether the $400,000,000 will all be needed this year. I think we can leave to the Appropriations Committee the question of whether $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 may be enough. I thought we should be fairly liberal in authorization, so that we might avoid any possible future necessity for a further authorization bill. I hope we can say pretty definitely that this is the last bill on war housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah if this bill has any relationship to the construction of general community facilities, such as schools, in the war-industry areas?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not. This is purely a defense housing bill. I believe the Senator is asking about the Lanham Act funds, which do provide facilities of various kinds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is unrelated to that class of projects?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am informed that the bill to which the Senator from Michigan refers has not as yet been reported.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a bill which has passed the House, and which would provide an additional $200,000,000 for community facilities. The first hearings were held on the bill this morning. They will continue tomorrow. Of course, there is a very close relationship between the two measures, not legislatively, but because of the need for community facilities if the housing program is to be carried through.

Mr. TAFT. None of the money in this bill could be used for community facilities, or for anything except housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill S. 1109 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARE OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED IN WAR AREAS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1130, Calendar No. 372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me about this bill, as did the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and also Mr. Charles Taft. Was this bill, in some other form, before the Senate earlier in the session?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This bill is not a substitute in a legislative sense, but is a substitute for the bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The bill was submitted to the various departments interested, and this is the result of the study, after the Senate refused to make an appropriation in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. I was attempting to revive my memory. I thought the Senator from Arizona had introduced a bill covering the same objective.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. That was rejected by the Senate, was it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the bill was not rejected. The rejection came about in this way: There was an item in one of the appropriation bills for which there had not been legislation. The Senator from Arizona therefore introduced a bill which would provide the legislation. The recommendation came from the President, through the Budget. Because of the legislative situation, the Senator from Arizona introduced his bill. The bill was sent to the Committee on Education and Labor and this is a substitute for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only time this question was before the Senate was when it was attempted to attach a rider providing for this appropriation to an appropriation bill, and I think on the objection of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that item was rejected as being legislation on an appropriation bill. Our committee was practically instructed to prepare a proper authorization bill. That has now been done. In the interval the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] also introduced a bill, but it was never considered by the Senate. This is a substitute for it.

Mr. McNARY. I am very happy to have the explanation. That is what I had in mind. It met defeat in the Senate in some form or other. I recall that I raised the point of order that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. As I understand, this is the authorization bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill or the report. It seems to me to be a most comprehensive plan, and a new plan for Federal assistance in social matters. I notice on page 3, as I hurriedly read the bill, that it provides as follows:

> (b) A State plan for extended school services shall be submitted by the State educational agency. Such State plan may provide for nursery school, before-school and after-school care, health services for children and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper use of extended school services and to safeguard children receiving care under the plan. Such services and care shall be administered by or through public-school systems designated in the plan for such purpose and may be rendered or conducted by public or nonprofit private-school systems.

It seems to me that this bill contemplates an extraordinarily large program, and one which should be given a great deal of consideration and careful thought before we engage in it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill has been given a great deal of consideration, and I am sure a great deal of care. Extensive hearings were held, and witnesses appeared.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Are the hearings printed?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; the hearings are printed and are available.

The statement of the Senator from Colorado as to the comprehensive nature of the bill is correct. It provides for cooperation between Federal Government agencies which have been in existence for a long time and State agencies which have been in existence for a long time. I think it is hardly correct to say that the bill is entirely new in its nature. It calls for cooperation on the part of the Child Welfare Division, which has been in the Department of Labor for a generation.

The theory of the bill is that the various agencies which are already in existence—State educational systems and private educational systems—can furnish the necessary requirements for

nurseries for certain kinds of child care. The need grows out of the war effort. The bill is a war bill. It would come to an end 6 months after the end of the war. It is the pressing need of the emergency which has brought it into existence. The genius of the bill comes from the fact that all the agencies, both in the States and in the Federal Government, which can turn to this activity have turned to it.

Perhaps better than in any other bill we have had in connection with the war effort, the theory of the pending bill represents complete cooperation between the State institutions, both public and private, and the Federal institutions, for the care of children. The need is exceedingly great. While other institutions and agencies of government have established nurseries and have done good work, there is no conflict between them. There would be an expansion of that which has been done, and a general bringing together of the agencies which are already in existence. Because of a lack of funds, some have neglected to take advantage of their opportunities in contributing to the welfare of the children of mothers who are in industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that the bill was placed upon the calendar only yesterday, June 28. At a late hour, after the Senate has passed upon appropriation bills, and other important legislation, the Senator now brings forward a bill of this character. Usually a bill which would be brought up under such conditions would be a noncontroversial bill, which would ordinarily pass by unanimous consent. However, Mr. President, I do not look upon this bill as being in that category. The bill may be a splendid one, and it may be necessary. It may be that some emergency requires its early passage. I doubt if any State now has any plan whereby it could qualify itself to operate under this bill. Perhaps many States would need to enact legislation before they could meet the requirements of the bill. I feel that the bill is one which should not be enacted at the present time. I think the Senate should be put on some notice that a bill of such importance is to come before the Senate so that hearings may be reviewed by Senators who are interested in the subject. Senators should have the opportunity of inquiring into the nature of the bill, what it proposes to do, how it proposes to operate, and what its effect will be upon the country and the different States. I hope the Senator will not press for the passage of the bill today. I may be in favor of it after I have studied it, but today I should be very much opposed to having it passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, all that the Senator has said is true excepting for the fact that the Senator from Utah assumed there would be no opposition to the bill because of the way in which it was handled, the way in which it was presented to the Senate in the first place. The Hayden amendment was offered. The measure was referred to the committee. Long hearings were held upon it. The bill is of an emergency nature. If there be opposition to the bill, it comes about by reason of misunderstanding. There are those who have felt that it would be better to continue the Lanham Act theory. I have no objection to continuing the Lanham Act theory of direct grants to the States without going through the medium of State cooperation. However, there is in reality no conflict between the way the bill would function and the way the Lanham Act functions in the conduct of nurseries and the care of children. The bill would make it possible to expand and use the agencies in the States in such a way that children would actually be benefited. We would not be required to deal with that terrible problem which always arises after a war, namely, the neglect of children which brings great injury, of course, to any community of any nation as the result of a war.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I join the Senator from Colorado in the request that the bill go over. This subject was considered before the Appropriations Committee. I am not unmindful at this time of the way in which the committee voted to report the bill. As I recall, there was opposition to it in the committee. I should like to check on that, however, before making the statement positive. By what I believe was a majority of the full committee the chairman was authorized to offer an amendment on the floor which was considered to be legislation. As the Senator will recall, it was deferred at that time. However, in view of the nature of the proposed legislation and the many objections which lie against legislation of this nature, I join with the Senator from Colorado in requesting that the bill go over for a reasonable time in order that we may have an opportunity of studying it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, after consultation with the leaders, I assumed that the bill would not be controversial in its nature. I can do nothing, of course, but accede to the request of the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from Nevada, and allow the bill to go over for future consideration. However, I trust that the Senate will act upon it soon. The need is great. If we do not make the necessary appropriations for these people many months will pass, and in the meantime a great injury will be done to the mothers who are offering their services to the country; as well as to the children.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the bill goes over I should like to make a remark with respect to it. I have supported the measure because I believe it meets the requirements which a bill of this nature should be designed to meet. In the first place, it expires with the war, at the termination of the war. When the bill comes up I should like to offer an amendment which would make the measure expire with the termination of hostilities instead of termination of the war. However, that is a comparatively unimportant matter.

In the first place, the bill would operate entirely through the States and would not set up a Federal agency throughout the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a question in which some of us are very much interested, and as to which we should like to be entirely certain.

Mr. TAFT. I will state frankly what the difficulty is. The W. P. A., without any legislative authority, set up or supported nursery schools in many sections of the United States. In my opinion it did so without any legislative authority whatsoever. It is spending a considerable amount of money in operating those schools. The W. P. A. will terminate on the 1st of July. It is therefore important that there be some legislation provided by the 1st of July to determine whether these nursery schools shall be continued. The present bill provides for their operation through the States. There are many persons who wish to maintain direct Federal assistance throughout the United States and, incidentally, the personnel of the former W. P. A. desires to maintain it in order that that personnel may have something to do throughout the United States instead of being dissolved as they are supposedly being dissolved by provisions of appropriation acts, and other legislative enactments of Congress. That question arises. I believe the work should be performed through the States instead of through any direct Federal plan. The same question will arise, in the case of the community facilities bill under the Lanham Act. The W. P. A. is again endeavoring to assume the obligation of distributing the money required for the maintenance of schools throughout the United States by direct Federal action.

It seems to me that the work should be performed under the Lanham Act, through State boards of education. We have had before us many State directors of education urging that it be done through the States. That issue arises certainly in connection with the bill referred to, although I think both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor have approved the bill in its present form.

I think that if women are to work in defense industries, if they are to be called upon to work, we must make some provision for taking care of the children, particularly the younger ones, when the women are working in the factories. Otherwise the mothers will not work, and we will not have the womanpower necessary to fill the vacancies in the war-production plants.

There are today in nearly every city in the country exceedingly difficult problems involving juvenile delinquency, which is increasing by leaps and bounds, and for which some provision should be made. The bill operates as to the younger children through the Children's Bureau, it operates so far as the older children are concerned through the schools and through the United States Office of Education. The United States Office of

Education works through the State boards of education, and the Children's Bureau works through the State welfare agencies. It seems to me the matter can be worked out soundly, and the best solution we have can be presented.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should simply like to make an appeal to Senators who have asked that the proposed legislation go over, that they give it their immediate consideration. I assure them that, in my humble opinion, it would be nothing short of tragic if Congress should adjourn or take a recess without enacting legislation on this subject. Congress will have to accept responsibility if such an unfortunate event should occur, with the continued rise in the alarming condition of delinquency among the youth of this Nation. Conditions have reached such a point, in my opinion, that it is absolutely necessary that some sound action be taken on this question.

So far as I know, the bill has received a unanimous report from the Committee on Education and Labor, after careful consideration of the whole problem involved. Naturally a bill cannot be reported which will be satisfactory to everyone, and the fact that the Senator from Ohio suggested that there is a going concern operating in this field at the present time means that it has friends who would like to see it continued. But I believe we should take action on the subject at the earliest possible moment, and I hope Senators who have asked that the bill go over will give it their immediate consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall try to bring the bill before the Senate as soon as I can, and I urge Senators who have not wanted to consider it at the present time to give it earnest study.

I merely desire to add that the Committee on Education and Labor has asked time and time again of all the agencies of Government interested in the bill that they consult and work together, and we brought about unity of action, so far as the regular agency of the Government was concerned. When we came to the end of the P. W. A., this bill became necessary.

As a war effort, there is probably no more pressing legislation. We all know that without the help of the mothers in the industries, we probably would not have had the manpower essential for the needs of the Nation, and the children of mothers should not be neglected. They may be sorely neglected after July 1 if legislation such as that proposed by the bill we are discussing does not come into being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Utah withdrawn his motion for consideration?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah withdraws his motion for immediate consideration of the bill.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I very faintly complained about the ratio of conferees on war establishment appropriation conferences, and that was corrected. I stated then the ratio as 3 to 2, or 1½ to 1, agreed upon by the conference between the Senate majority and minority.

My attention has been called to the appointment of the conferees on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. I observe that there are five Democrats appointed on the conference and two Republicans. Of course, that is far from the proper ratio. I am not attempting to be political; I give political considerations very little thought when it comes to the matter of conferences, but to maintain the ratio, in all fairness another Republican should be appointed on this conference, which still would not bring the number up to the mathematical ratio agreed upon, but would make it 5 to 3.

I ask for a modification of the order, and that the Republican Senator on the subcommittee next in line, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], be appointed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or occupational limitations, in the case"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "establishing such facilities and furnishing such"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

INTERSTATE PETROLEUM PIPE LINES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2520, which is on the calendar. This is the bill which I stated a few moments ago is for the purpose of extending the act known as the Pipe Line Act. The act will expire tomorrow night, and it is important that if it is to be passed at all, it be passed at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the Senator from Montana explain the bill. There are some of us in the Senate, and there is a large section of the population of the country, who have regarded the activities of the Petroleum Coordinator for War with very great misgiving. We realize that he has been so surrounded by the big oil companies that he has his staff made up almost exclusively of representatives of such companies as the Standard of California, and other big oil companies, and I do not want to extend any more authority than is necessary to the Petroleum Coordinator for War.

Furthermore, I am growing tired of the practice of the Interior Department and the crowd there always rushing in on the very last day, at the 59th minute of the 11th hour, and saying, "You have to pass this bill extending this act because the law will expire in 15 or 20 minutes."

It seems to me these matters should be taken up at the proper time, and not brought in as emergency measures.

As I have said, I should like to have the Senator from Montana explain the bill. I do not wish to impede any war effort; I am merely expressing the fears and doubts a great many people have about the petroleum administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Montana tell us the number of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2520) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, this bill was introduced in the House on May 24 last, and lengthy hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was discussed very thoroughly in the committee. The bill was amended as had been proposed by Secretary Ickes, by inserting certain

provisions which restricted some of the things the Interior Department originally wanted.

I shall not read the definitions in the act which the bill would extend, but in section 2 it is provided:

SEC. 2. Whenever the President finds that the construction of any pipe line for the transportation and/or distribution of petroleum or petroleum products moving in interstate commerce, or the extension or completion of any such pipe line already wholly or partly constructed, is or may be necessary for national-defense purposes, he shall by proclamation declare such finding.

SEC. 3. In case the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line is undertaken otherwise than as provided in section 4, the person or persons undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line.

I will state the original purpose of the act. It was proposed to construct a pipe line through Georgia. There is a provision of the Georgia State statute prohibiting condemnation of land for pipeline purposes. The railroads at that time objected to having their lines of railroad crossed by pipe lines. One reason for passage of the act was the existence of this State law. Another reason was that condemnation laws differ so widely in the various States that during the war matters could be tied up indefinitely if legislation of this character were not enacted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at this time, but I repeat that a great many persons have had a feeling of distrust because of the attitude of Petroleum Coordinator Ickes toward some of the big oil companies. It is a disgrace. To begin with, there is a man named Davies who really runs the agency. He receives $51,000 from the Standard Oil Co. and $9,000 from the Government. If the amount of payment were reversed, and he were to receive $51,000 from the Government and $9,000 from the oil company, we would obtain better service from him tomorrow. I do not think there is any question that Mr. Ickes' whole attitude toward the big oil companies building these pipe lines in the Texas field largely controlled by the big oil companies is calculated after the war to give the big oil companies the pipe lines for nothing. When they obtain restoration of tanker service from Gulf ports to the Atlantic ports, the big oil companies will have the independent oil companies, particularly in the mid-continent field, under their control.

I think this extension of right of condemnation is probably necessary. I did wish, however, to repeat my observations about the way in which this whole office has been prostituted to the service of the big oil companies.

Mr. WHEELER. I should be opposed to such legislation if it were not necessary to transport oil to the eastern seaboard, and the only way that can be done in any reasonable time is in the manner suggested.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that a delegation of Senators, including some Members of the Senate who know more about the oil business in a minute than Secretary Ickes would know in a year, such as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], completely demonstrated to Mr. Ickes by facts and figures from official sources that it would be very much more beneficial to the service of supply for the eastern seaboard to build the eastern leg of the proposed pipeline first, and leave the southwestern leg to be served by railroads, than it would otherwise, and Mr. Ickes, after apparently being convinced by these arguments, which were unanswerable, permitted Mr. Davies and Major Parten and that crowd from the big oil companies, to influence him to decide otherwise.

Mr. WHEELER. That matter was gone into and discussed very thoroughly in the committee, because the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] were both present when the matter came up for discussion. The same criticism which the Senator from Missouri has directed against this proposal was directed in the committee. However, those lines have now been completed, at least one of them has been, and the other will be completed, as I understand, by the end of the year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But we do not know what the big oil companies will try to grab off next.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Reserving the right to object, I want to make a brief comment about this measure. We all have our weaknesses, we all have our predelictions. I think Mr. Ickes in that respect, therefore, is quite human. But if I ever saw a man who is zealous for a cause it is the Secretary of the Interior for any cause which he may chance to embrace.

Consequently when Secretary Ickes was designated as the Petroleum Administrator for War, and when he was given charge of the construction of pipe lines under certain conditions, Mr. Ickes, with his usual zeal and enthusiasm, immediately took as his prime mission in life to construct a pipe line everywhere anybody would let him build one. So upon every occasion, to the exclusion of any other method of transportation for petroleum, Mr. Ickes advocated a pipe line.

Mr. President, I want to be sure that there is no Messianic mission in this bill.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not catch that remark, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to be sure that Mr. Ickes is not made the Messiah of pipe lines in this bill, so that he will not consider that the authority which has been conferred upon him has amounted to the declaration of the Congress that the prime mission which he is to employ in life is to build pipe lines everywhere he can possibly find pipe lines not in existence.

I am one of those who believe that Mr. Ickes has done a disservice to the transportation of petroleum by his overzeal for pipe lines. I know that he has not only assumed the authority which the act confers upon him to build pipe lines but he has tried to keep any other method of transporting petroleum from being provided—at least, if it happened to be waterway development. I am confident, Mr. President, that if the able Senator from Montana were to amend the bill so as to give the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over inland waterways, and that provision were to become law, tomorrow Mr. Ickes would propose to double all the inland waterways in the United States. We can be sure of that. He is for anything he has control of. Let there be no mistake about that.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I regard this as permissive authority which is conferred upon Secretary Ickes. I suppose we got along some way or another when we did not have pipe lines, or Secretary Ickes, and probably we can get along without building a pipe line everywhere in the United States, even with Secretary Ickes.

I think Secretary Ickes has been intellectually dishonest in withholding from the Congress information about the facilities which were available for the movement of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. A little while ago when there was a waterway proposal before Congress he sent his representative before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and that representative made a statement to the committee which influenced its action, that we would have sufficient quantities of petroleum on the Atlantic seaboard by the facilities that Mr. Ickes was providing.

After the committee had acted upon that advice, to which it had a right to give credence, Mr. Ickes repudiated the statement and said that of course we would not have sufficient facilities to bring an adequate quantity of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard.

Then when the same proposal was pending before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee, the chairman of which was the able Senator from Oklahome [Mr. THOMAS], Secretary Ickes' representatives refused to disclose to that subcommittee full data as to what demands there would be on the Atlantic seaboard for the petroleum supplies there. Not only that, but Mr. Ickes' representative injected himself into the controversy not only to advocate pipe lines but to oppose alternative methods of transportation which were suggested, in the face of the express limitation in the Executive order making him Petroleum Administrator for War, which denied him authority over the subject of the transportation of petroleum, that function having been given to the Office of Defense Transportation. However, of course, Mr. Ickes absorbs and assumes every authority which it is permissible

by any stretch of power and authority for him to assume. Inasmuch as Mr. Eastman is a mild-mannered man, whereas Mr. Ickes is a man who, in expressing himself, always demonstrates the possession of a great many vitamins, of course Mr. Ickes always noses out the rather mild-mannered and timid Mr. Eastman, and, in the face of express Presidential negative, assumes authority over the transportation of petroleum.

The result is that the Atlantic seaboard continues to be short of petroleum, and Mr. Ickes' estimates continue to fall short of the facts.

I think it should be understood that if the bill is to be renewed, Mr. Ickes will merely be given a permissive authority, and will not be designated by the Congress as the white knight whose purpose will be to build a pipe line anywhere in the United States that the dictates of his cupidity, fancy, or folly may lead him to desire to construct one.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Florida has seen fit to criticize a member of the President's Cabinet; because when the Senator from Florida criticizes a member of the Cabinet there must be something quite bad about him. However, I desire to say about Mr. Ickes that he is a very able executive, and his honesty cannot be questioned by anyone.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that before Mr. Ickes could act, he would be required to obtain a proclamation from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2520) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, first, I desire to obtain unanimous consent that, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session, I may report from the Committee on Appropriations the bill on appropriations for the war agencies, so that the Senate will be able to consider it tomorrow. During the recess of the Senate between now and tomorrow, I desire to report the war agencies appropriations bill, which, in my judgment, will be ready in time to be reported before the Senate meets tomorrow.

The Appropriations Committee also has before it a deficiency appropriation bill which may be ready in time to be reported before tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the face of the necessity which confronts us, I have no other course to pursue except to do the unusual, and say, "All right."

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. The two bills must pass the Senate by tomorrow night; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. When will the Senator report the bill? Will he report it today?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not until tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. So that it will be possible to take up the bill at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And the deficiency bill will follow?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Will that end all the appropriation bills?

Mr. McKELLAR. That will end all the appropriation bills, we hope. There are one or two which have not finally been agreed upon, but we hope to get all of them through.

Mr. McNARY. How many conference reports remain to be agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a conference report which is ready to be presented as soon as the pending matter is disposed of. As soon as we shall have disposed of the pending matter, I shall present the conference report, if I may do so.

Mr. McNARY. How many conference reports remain to be agreed to, in addition to the one the Senator refers to?

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be one on appropriations for the war agencies, and another one on the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the judgment of the very capable Senator that it will be possible for the Senate to dispose of the appropriation bills and all the conference reports by tomorrow night?

Mr. McKELLAR. We hope to do so. Barring accidents, we may be able to do so. Of course, in the last several days, I have been defeated on two conference reports. I am about to make the attempt again, in a few minutes, in presenting another conference report. I will stick out my neck and, if necessary, will take a third licking by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Let me conclude by inquiring whether the hearings on the war agencies appropriations bill have been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. They will be ready by tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me see if the unanimous-consent request covers sufficient ground. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee has requested that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to submit reports on any bills it has ready to report during the recess of the Senate, between the hour of recess today and the hour of meeting tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Tennessee is agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, and 7, and from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for six months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the 'Women's Army Corps'. The total number of women enlisted or appointed in the Women's Army Corps shall not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women of excellent character in good physical health, who are enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213), and who are on the date of such enlistment citizens of the United States between the ages of twenty and fifty years."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The commanding officer of such corps shall be a colonel and such officers of lower rank shall be appointed as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That physicians and nurses shall not be enlisted in this corps: *And provided further*, That commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps shall exercise command only over women of the Women's Army Corps and other members of the Army of the United States specifically placed under their command."

And the House agree to the same.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bilbo	Butler
Andrews	Bone	Byrd
Ball	Bridges	Capper
Bankhead	Brooks	Caraway
Barkley	Buck	Chandler

Chavez	Lucas	Robertson
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Russell
Danaher	McClellan	Scrugham
Davis	McFarland	Shipstead
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Eastland	McNary	Stewart
Ferguson	Maloney	Taft
George	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Gerry	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Green	Millikin	Truman
Guffey	Moore	Tunnell
Gurney	Murdock	Tydings
Hatch	Murray	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Nye	Van Nuys
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wagner
Hill	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wherry
Kilgore	Radcliffe	White
La Follette	Reed	Willis
Langer	Revercomb	Wilson
Lodge	Reynolds	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS BY UNITED NATIONS TOWARD WINNING THE WAR—GALLUP POLL AMONG THE BRITISH PEOPLE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr, President, at this time I respectfully address the people of the British Empire, and I especially wish to have the ear of our distinguished friend and fellow world-wide patriot, Mr. Winston Churchill.

This afternoon we appropriated $71,000,000,000 for our part in participating in the present World War. I am informed by one of my colleagues that last year we appropriated about $75,000,000,000. I dare say that during our participation in the present World War we have appropriated and authorized the expenditure of more money than all the appropriations and expenditures of both the other Allied Powers and the Axis Powers.

In other words, during our participation in the present World War we have doubtless spent more than all the Axis nations and all the other Allied nations combined. I make mention of that fact, and call it to the particular attention of Mr. Churchill and the British people because I have just read in the columns of a magazine having Nation-wide circulation a statement to the effect that a Gallup poll was recently taken in the British Isles, at which time the British people were asked to cast their votes on the relative contribution of the United Nations toward winning the war.

The British people, whom we are aiding, with whom we are cooperating, and whom we are trying to save, being afforded that opportunity, voted as follows:

They voted that Russia had contributed 50 percent to winning of the war; that Great Britain had contributed 43 percent; that China had contributed 5 percent; and we were given honorable mention by their vote to the effect that we had contributed 3 percent to the winning of the war.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerk of the Appropriations Committee will be here in a moment with the conference report. While we are waiting for it, I wish to state to the Senate what is in it.

The Senate voted on this question earlier in the day. To use a slang expression, perhaps I ought not to have "stuck my neck out" again by even asking that the bill again go to conference; but some Members were very much interested in another phase of the conference on this bill, which has been taking place almost daily for weeks, so the conferees were called together. They have made a report, reporting the much controverted matter which was voted on earlier in the day exactly as it then stood.

In addition, the House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment, as amended by the House, placing certain restrictions on the President's use of his personal fund, with certain exceptions. Those exceptions are, first, that he may use it in any way he sees fit for the War Department; secondly, that he may use it for the Navy Department in any way he sees fit; thirdly, that he may use it in any way he sees fit for the State Department, the F. B. I., and the strategic services. There is one other exception which escapes me at the moment, but which I shall state to the Senate as soon as the report arrives.

It is hoped, after conference with various members of the conference committee, that at this time the conference report may have enough votes to be adopted, so that worthy Government employees may receive their increases in salary, and the bill may become law.

As I have frequently stated, I do not agree with the method which the House has adopted for getting rid of the three Government employees in question. I feel very much better about it when I know that before next November they will come before the Senate and receive a fair deal. Ordinarily I would not take the course which the House has taken; but as I have told the Senate half a dozen times or more, this is the only way we can get a bill.

I happen to be the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I do not think we ought to hold up a worthy bill such as this which affects so many of the employees of the Government, and which would increase their salaries to a certain extent.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 88, 92, 98, and 99 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 60 and 61 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss

Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have said about all I wanted to say about the subject. Senators know what is involved. I think it would be wise to vote, and if the conference report is rejected, the bill will have to fail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the Senator from Tennessee, the conferees have made no change whatever in the previous conference report regarding the three men who are to be discharged by the provision of the House bill. Am I correct in that regard?

Mr. McKELLAR. They made no change in the bill as reported to the Senate this morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they have made very great changes every time we reported it. We have reported it so often that I am getting very tired of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been no change in that provision in the conference report voted upon this morning.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, there has been no change in that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. The change which has been made by the conferees is a change affecting the clipping of the President's wings regarding the use of funds appropriated for him by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, though I will not say that it is a clipping of the President's wings. If the Senator from Kentucky claims it is, I remind him he voted this morning to clip the President's wings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes, he did; because that was a part of the conference report which was defeated because that part of it was not in.

Mr. BARKLEY. What part?

Mr. McKELLAR. That part regarding the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator refer to the expenditure of the fund?

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the expenditure of that fund. If that part had not been in the bill, as stated by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the report would probably have been agreed to. But the Senator from Kentucky voted with the fund perfectly free in the President. The Senator from Kentucky voted against agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know how I voted and I know how the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] voted. He voted against the conference report because it did not sufficiently clip the wings of the President. We might as well all be frank about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, let us be frank.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted against the conference report notwithstanding the freedom of the President's fund, but because of the manner in which the employees were dealt with. The Senator from West Virginia voted against it because of the manner in which the fund was dealt with, he wants the President's wings clipped and the conferees have gone out and clipped them, and it is hoped that, now that the President's wings have been clipped, there will be mustered enough votes to adopt the conference report with no change whatever in the manner of dealing with these three men. That is the whole situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, if it is, let us vote on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us try it again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want every Senator to understand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I tried to make it plain to the Senator this morning, but I was utterly unable to do so. I asked him both privately and publicly about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the issue now is that, in order to hold out some hope of getting the conference report agreed to, in spite of the fact that no change has been made in the manner of dealing with the three employees, the manner in which the President is to exercise his power in dealing with the funds appropriated by Congress is so modified as to induce a sufficient number of opponents on that ground to vote for its adoption. That is the whole truth about it. We might as well understand that that is the situation. And it has been frankly stated that the votes will be delivered, and they are now in the process of being delivered to adopt the conference report because the President's wings have been clipped some more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator has correctly stated the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied the Senator hopes that, and I am satisfied the conferees have acted as they have in the hope that it is a sop to Senators who may cast the necessary votes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make the point that there is no business before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not take the position that when the Senator from Tennessee and I are before the Senate there is no business before it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that there is nothing before the Senate, and we are now being confronted by a filibuster by the Senator from Tennessee in an effort to tie up the work of the Senate until he can get his conference report agreed to. I make the point of order that there is no business before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that this morning was the time to have brought that matter up, when I told him about it. I thought that as acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as a part of the organization, when a report was brought before the Senate I had reason to expect, it might have been a very humble reason, it might have been a very good reason, but as a member of the organization I thought I had a right to expect that when the conference committee brought in a report we would receive help from the organization of our side of the Senate. We did not receive that help, but instead we received very active opposition. Due to the activity of our leadership, the conference report was defeated this morning. I am now offering another report, and I hope the Senate will undertake to vote on it, and vote on it tonight. I plead with my friend, the Senator from Missouri, not to make his point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think we ought to vote on the conference report tonight. We have voted on it once today already. The Senate has acted on the conference report three times, and was three times flouted by its own conferees, an overwhelming majority of the Senate flouted three times by its own conferees. The House conferees never took the matter back for a separate vote. Always our conferees have yielded. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no necessity of bringing in the conference report at this hour of the night, and it should be laid over until tomorrow. I repeat my point of order that there is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the conference report and move that it be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. My report and motion have been made, have they not? I move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report has been presented.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I made the motion that the report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not yet in order. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

The clerk will read the conference report for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested——

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought I had the floor, and I did not yield it to anyone to make a point of no quorum. I had sought recognition of the Chair at the time the Senator from Tennessee rose and made his motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to appeal to the Senator from Missouri not to make a parliamentary fight on the conference report. I do not see anything to be gained by throwing it over until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not see any purpose in bringing in a conference report at this hour of the night, flouting three times the declared will of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. At this stage of the legislative situation it is necessary for the Senate and the House to hold late sessions and bring in matters of this kind at a late hour. Ordinarily, in a normal situation, it would not be done, but I do not think any exception can be taken to the fact that it is done in this particular instance. I do not see anything to be gained by forcing the matter to go over.

As the Senator knows, I am in sympathy with his views. I have rendered such feeble assistance as I could.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And rendered very valiant service in the cause.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that he should not complain at my attitude in reference to the matter because he got more votes for his conference report than the last time it had been voted on, so my opposition seems to have helped him instead of hurting him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank all for the small favors they have given me heretofore, and I hope they will continue to give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope sincerely the Senator from Missouri will not delay this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is a very small attendance of the Senate present. If we are to vote on this matter, we should at least have as large an attendance as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are more Senators on the floor now than there will be between 11 and 12 o'clock tomorrow, when the Senate will reconvene.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Therefore it seems to me that on a matter on which the Senate has decisively declared itself three different times, there should be a full attendance of the Senate before we are asked to repudiate that position.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that on a roll call there will be a full attendance of the Senate, if there is a roll call.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There will be a roll call, if a sufficient number of seconds can be obtained, I assure the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If there is no reason to vote on the matter tonight, what reason is there for having a quorum call?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no point of order pending at the moment that a quorum is not present.

I sincerely hope the Senator from Missouri will permit this matter to come to a vote tonight, because I do not think the vote will be any different. There might be two or three one way or the other, depending on the presence or absence of Senators, but by and large the result would be the same this afternoon as it would be tomorrow morning. We have only one more day in which to dispose of the appropriation bills.

I share the feeling of the Senator from Missouri regarding the action of the conferees respecting this measure. We have had a vote on it three times. It has not been taken to the House for a vote. The House has not even been given an opportunity to recede from the language of its provision, which the Senate has three times voted down, and I think in fairness to the Senate and to the conferees themselves the House conferees should have been willing to take the bill back to the House to see whether the House itself, on another separate vote, would insist upon the language in the bill; but that has not been done. We have the conference report before us, and under the parliamentary situation it must be voted on in the Senate first, it cannot be voted on in the House first, and I hope we can dispose of it this afternoon, because tomorrow we will have two other appropriation bills which will be reported between now and 11 o'clock for consideration, and we will have two other conference reports. It is therefore important that this matter be disposed of one way or the other, without going over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to make a motion that the Senate now proceed to take up the conference report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that earlier today the Senate voted on the question whether there should be Senate confirmation with respect to the three persons whose names are contained in the appropriations measure in dispute. Discussion was had as to whether they were this, that, or the other. I very frankly have never seen the testimony concerning these persons. I voted for the report which was made after free conference, with the understanding that if the charges made against these men were established to be true they would be presented in the Senate, and I would have another chance to vote. Now I understand, Mr. President, in addition to giving them this chance before the Senate of the United States, there is in this free conference report a limitation placed upon the expenditure of funds by the President of the United States. I should like to know whether my understanding is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have stated exactly what the limitation is. The limitation is a very broad one. We except entirely the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the F. B. I., and the Office of Strategic Services, and I believe one other agency. I think there are seven in all.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. May we have read the proposed language, as it will appear in the conference report, if it shall be adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that we may understand the complete language, why not have the whole amendment read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 16, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration", and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department, the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been away from the Senate Chamber in attendance on a committee meeting. I wish to know if the conference report now proposes to chop off the appropriation which would be made to pay the salaries of these three men, or if the appropriation is contingent for a period, and then upon reappointment the nominations of these men are to be confirmed by the Senate, because that is the point on which I shall base my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language is exactly the same as that voted upon earlier today.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, that these men shall continue to be on the pay roll for a definite period of time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Until November 15.

Mr. WHERRY. The provision does not withhold the appropriation to pay their salary?

Mr. McKELLAR. It provides for payment until November 15, when they are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the conference report under discussion this afternoon presents one of the most amazing spectacles that has ever been presented in the Senate of the United States or in any other parliamentary body. The will of the Senate on this particular matter has been expressed overwhelmingly on three different occasions. The Senate struck out the House provision in the original bill by a vote of 69 to 0, whereupon the Senate conferees blithely entered into a conference, and after one session, one day, without the House Members making any concessions whatever, brought in a conference report accepting the House provision. That was defeated in this body after full debate by a vote of 52 to 17. It was a very unusual procedure for a conference report, particularly on a general appropriation bill, to be defeated by such an overwhelming vote in the Senate. It evidenced a very strong feeling on the part of the Senate upon this particular matter.

Thereupon the Senate conferees went into another very brief conference and emerged again with precisely the same proposition, or substantially the same proposition, putting in a little sop in the shape of allowing these fellows to stay on the pay roll until the 15th of November, whereupon if they were reappointed, they would have to have Senate confirmation.

The Senate considered the report, and after extensive debate it was again overwhelmingly defeated in this body. Whereupon in the course of 1 day the Senate conferees went back to conference and have returned with precisely the same proposition word for word.

So far as the provision with regard to these three men is concerned, it was voted down earlier today after extensive debate. But in the most bare-faced attempt to trade votes that I think I have ever witnessed in this body it was hoped to win sufficient support for the same proposition which was voted down earlier today, by simply placing another provision in the measure for the purpose of hamstringing the President of the United States, a provision which has nothing on the face of the earth to do with the proposition which has been the subject of debate here all the time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the Senate itself started the matter of taking away personnel by not making appropriations?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have heard the Senator make that statement. I do not know whether it is true. It makes no difference who first started the practice; it is bad. It should never have been indulged in. So far as I am concerned, I have voted against such a proposition whenever I could.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that so far as Dave Lasser was concerned, the Senate was the body which took him off the pay roll, by cutting off the appropriation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be true; I cannot dispute the Senator's statement. I do not recall the facts.

I do recall that, as to one of the men involved in the present matter, to wit, Goodwin Watson, the House put in the same provision last year, and I recall that the Senator from Kentucky and I and several other Senators even at that time opposed the provision on the ground that it was outrageous, sumptuary legislation. I still think it is. I think it is as bad now as it was when the Senate voted 69 to nothing against it. I think it is just as bad now as when the Senate turned down the first conference report by a vote of 52 to 17; and certainly the proposition is identical to the one which the Senate turned down earlier today.

I think the Senate, in order to protect the orderly processes of free government, should adhere to its position, and should allow the House to take the responsibility, if it desires to do so, of defeating meritorious legislation by adhering to an indefensible position.

Mr. President, before I take my seat, I desire to say that I think the inclusion of a sumptuary provision, as the Senator from Kentucky described it, by the conferees in the attempt to pick up a few antiadministration votes on this infamous proposition, makes it even worse.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on several occasions I have voted against the attempt to deprive the three persons involved of their positions by cutting out the appropriation. I still think it is wrong; but I still feel that, beyond the interest of the three men involved, is the interest of the Government of the United States. The Government must carry on. Whatever law Congress may pass, some individual citizen of the country is involved, and many suffer; but, nevertheless, we still pass the law.

We now have before us a situation which involves the practical question, Will we, because of the fact that three particular persons are involved, jeopardize the passage of a bill which is of much importance to the country as a whole, forgetting about the purposes or the reasons for the bill itself or the effect which it must have?

Imagine the millions who will be affected or the thousands who will not receive their pay on the 1st of July, if the bill is not passed, because someone wants to protect three particular persons. Senators talk about believing in the rule of the majority, which is democracy at its best; and yet they object to a conference report because it would interfere with the welfare of three particular persons. Thousands are dying. They do not object, because they feel they are dying for the good of the whole country. Thousands are injured for the benefit of the whole country; thousands are making the supreme sacrifice for the benefit of the whole country; but at this moment we are willing to jeopardize the welfare of the Government itself and the making of salary payments to thousands of employees of the Government because we feel that three employees should not be discharged. Of late we have been hearing how England does things. England's way of doing things may be all right. Some may agree; some may not. Nevertheless, we have been told that England uses the method advocated in the report. England gets rid of the ones who are not wanted by denying appropriations.

Irrespective of all that, the conferees have worked hard. They have tried to carry out the Senate's idea on the proposition. On several occasions, I have

voted against dismissing the three particular men because I did not think the procedure was correct.

I still insist that government should prevail and should carry on, notwithstanding the suffering of individuals. In this instance, I shall stand by the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate on this question. I realize that compromises are necessary, but we cannot compromise the Constitution of the United States. It has been stated that votes will be cast in favor of the compromise in order that the wings of the Executive may be clipped. I desire to say to the Senate now that in attempting to clip the wings of the Executive, the Senate will clip the Constitution of the United States. That is not the way to discharge the three men concerned. Above the portico of the Supreme Court Building, across the park, are engraved the words "Equal Justice Under Law."

The majority has no right to take away, illegally, the rights of the three men who now are a minority. That is not the way we do things under the Constitution. I do not believe that anyone should sacrifice the three men concerned. I am not pleading for the three men particularly; I do not know them. The question is not who they are, but how we are to proceed.

The Government will go on if we will simply adhere to the Constitution. Members of the Senate should be very careful, when they cast their votes, that they do not by their votes take away or compromise the rights of the men concerned, merely for the sake of clipping the wings of the President.

I desire to say now, upon the record, that I am in favor of the provision which is called the one for clipping the wings of the President, but I will not sacrifice a principle the sacrifice of which would be a violation of the provisions of the Constitution.

It has been said on this floor that the men concerned can go to court, that they can sue. However, that is not the way to proceed. Do we realize what it would mean to have this case carried to the Supreme Court of the United States?

I should like to see this body clip the wings of a man who hires men of this kind. That is the way to reach the issue, not to go down to the bottom and discharge the men, as is proposed to be done under the bill.

I hope every Senator who votes on the conference report will have in mind that if he attempts to clip the wings of the Executive by voting to accept the report, he will be clipping the wings of democracy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate the hard work the Senator from Tennessee has done upon this conference report. I know he is honest and conscientious in his efforts. However, a great deal has been said about clipping the wings of the President. When it comes to a proposition to clip the wings of the President, I desire to say that today we are engaged in an all-out war, and this is no time to clip the wings of the President by limiting the use of money appropriated for emergency purposes during a war such as the one in which our country finds itself engaged.

The money is given to the President of the United States to meet emergencies caused by this war. We are planning a recess for 60 days. The President may need some of this money for some of the things for which this report may prohibit its use.

No matter what we may think of the President, I do not think we should clip the wings of the President in time of war by taking away emergency money. I voted for the conference report before, but I shall vote against it this time for that reason. I feel that we should stand by the President in this emergency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in the discussion which has taken place here, apparently the inference has been left—whether intentionally or unintentionally makes little difference—that the conference committee has suddenly written something into the bill. Let me say to the Senate that when the bill first came before the Senate for consideration the language in question was written into the bill as an amendment. The provision limiting the use of the money which was voted to the Chief Executive was agreed to by the Senate. The bill went to conference, and the conferees eliminated the provision.

That limitation on the use of those funds was the act of a majority of the Senate. It is no compromise to put that language in the bill. It was inserted by a vote of a majority of the Senate. The conferees made the mistake of taking it out.

A great deal has been said about the clipping of wings. If there is need for the clipping of wings, they ought to be clipped; but this is not a clipping of wings. Under the Constitution, of which my friend speaks, the Congress is authorized to make appropriations of money. That power lies solely with the Congress. I am advised that the bill would place in the hands of the Chief Executive some $69,000,000 by reappropriation, and in addition some $25,000,000 of new appropriations.

What does this language provide? Why all the talk about clipping of wings? The language does not provide that the President may not use the funds for any purpose he sees fit, unless he should assume the postion of using the money absolutely to destroy the force and effect of an act of Congress. What is the language of the provision? It it to the effect that the President may not use his funds to supplement an appropriation; and he may not use them for an agency of Government for which the Congress has denied an appropriation. I can understand the appeal which is made by some Senators on the ground of leaving the President free in time of war. Heaven knows, Congress has left him free. Let me say in all earnestness that if Congress has done anything which has not met the approval of the people of the country, it has been to surrender its power to the Chief Executive.

Let me be frank. The time has come when reasonable restraints must be used if the powers of the Congress are to be safeguarded. I submit that it is not an unfair restraint, when we put into the hands of the President some $90,000,000, to say that such funds shall not be used to defeat the will of Congress.

There has been much said about the three employees whom it is proposed to sever from the Government pay roll. I do not want to see wrong done to them, or to any other man. However, the matter of the relationship between the Congress and the Executive, and the matter of the welfare of the people of the country are not partisan questions. They are far more serious subjects than that of the three employees concerned, or any other three officeholders under the Government.

Mr. President, I submit that it is a fair restriction. It is a fair provision to say to the Chief Executive that these funds must not be used for any agency for which no appropriation has been made, or for which an appropriation has been refused by the Congress. I do not think it is unfair. I do not think it is a clipping of wings. I think that is a severe phrase to use.

As this restriction is now before the Senate, it is much less a restriction than this body voted into the bill before it went to conference, and before the conferees took the provision out. I submit that it is a fair restriction, a sound provision, and ought to stay in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think we are losing sight of one of the important factors in the bill. It is true that it imposes a rather modest, very heavily qualified restriction on the use of certain funds by the Executive; but that restriction applies to only a small part of the funds which are available to him, and still permits him to use them for military purposes.

It is also true that the bill contains language regarding three Government employees. That language is distasteful to me. I heard the eloquent statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] a few days ago that that language smelled of ancient tombs in which liberty lies buried. I think that is an accurate description. I share the view of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that this is not the right way to treat people. But under our system of government, Mr. President, it is possible to attach riders to appropriation bills, whether we like it or not. I do not like it, but it is possible, and that is what has been done in this case.

With all the talk about the powers of the President and the treatment of the three individuals, I think we are losing sight of the fact that there are 5,500 employees of the Government in the District of Columbia, and about 100,000 other employees of the Federal Government in the United States whose source of livelihood is at stake in this bill. That is a

practical consideration, too. We have a contract with those people. We have held out to them the understanding that we would look after them. It is not right to discuss this question and never refer for a minute to what is, after all, the main purpose of the bill, which is to pay the salaries of servants of the Government.

I do not enjoy hearing it implied that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has not shown sufficient zeal in representing the viewpoint of the Senate. I have been a conferee at all the conferences, and I can certainly vouch for the rugged way in which he has stood up for the viewpoint of the Senate at all times. But we confront gentlemen who have very strong views of their own, and concessions must be made in order to obtain a result.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Senator from Tennessee is indefatigable. I have been with him most of the time. He has been working morning, afternoon, and night on appropriation bills. He does not spare himself at all. I am certain that any other Member of the Senate who observed the Senator from Tennessee would subscribe to my statement that he has faithfully sought to represent the viewpoint of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it not a fact that in spite of the repeated votes in the Senate on this question, because of the fact that the Senate conferees have yielded at every conference the House has never taken a record vote on this matter since the bill originally passed the House? Is not that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I am not familiar with what has transpired in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is my impression that the Senate has yielded in every conference, and that there never has been a distinct vote in the House on the proposition, as there has been in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether or not the House has taken a vote, but certainly it is not accurate to say that the Senate has yielded in every conference.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There have been several conference reports on which the Senate has yielded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not correct that the House acted on the bill originally, that the next action on the conference report was the refusal of the Senate conferees to accept the House language, that thereupon the conference report was brought before the Senate and was voted on by the Senate, but that the House conferees have never taken that matter back to the House for a vote? The Senate has voted three times on it, but the House conferees have not taken the matter back to the House for a vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know what the House has done or has not done. All I desire to say is that the Senate conferees have tried sincerely and laboriously to reach an agreement which would meet with the wishes of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is a member of the conference committee. As a member of that committee, he knows that the matter has not been taken back to the House by the House conferees for a vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator is trying to get me to say what has taken place in the House. I do not know what happened there.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not trying to get the Senator to say what has taken place in the House. However, as a conferee the Senator certainly knows what took place in connection with the conference report on the bill. The only vote which could be taken on the report was taken in the Senate, and it has not been taken back to the House by the conferees for a separate vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have voted against the conference report on two or three different occasions. I have always felt that the method proposed is not a proper one, although I must confess that in the early days when I first came to the Senate, several other Senators and I did take occasion, when there was a Republican majority in the Senate, to proposed to cut off the appropriation for an individual who was appointed by the then Republican President. The Senate voted to cut off the appropriation, and thereby the man was forced to quit his job.

I do not like the idea of proceeding in the manner proposed by the other body, but I wish to say that so far as its being unconstitutional is concerned, there is nothing unconstitutional about it. After all, the Congress of the United States, under the power given to it, can write in an appropriation bill any limitation it wants to write. There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent Congress from saying that money shall not be appropriated for a certain person.

I think the Senator from Tennessee is one of the most diligent and hard-working Members of this body. I think there is no doubt that he has done the very best he could do. I am not willing to tie up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of employees because of objections to three men who happen to be employees of the Government. When I vote upon the conference report I shall vote to agree to it. I think we all should vote in favor of agreeing to the report, and I should like to have a vote on it now.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three or four features of this matter which do not appeal to a great many Senators. When the bill first came before the Senate it appeared to me to be outrageous that three men should be specifically named and it should provide that they should not be continued in office without giving them an opportunity to be heard, and that the Senate should pass upon the matter without itself having an opportunity to know whether it was right or wrong to bar them. That was the impression I received.

We now have a great deal in addition. The majority leader has made the statement, in effect, that some sort of a sop has been handed out by way of a change in the bill for the purpose of gaining some votes by means of an agreement of some character. The Senator from Massachusetts has said that only a mild restriction on the President's powers is proposed If votes are to be obtained by only a mild restriction, that merely indicates the cheapness of the votes. That does not change the situation in any way whatever.

Again, we all know that because of the fact that an attempt is being made to oppose the President, regardless of whatever may be the real motive, tomorrow morning the newspapers will herald the situation over the Nation as a fight against the President of the United States; and no doubt it will be a fairly sweet morsel to Hitler and Mussolini to know that a fight is made against the leader whom they so bitterly hate and that by such an inducement votes can be obtained in the Senate of the United States. It appears to me to be one of the saddest features of a situation of this sort that our enemies may know that one who is particularly opposed to them is also particularly hated by some of those who have votes in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, the fact that the proposed restriction is not severe does not change the seriousness of the situation which arises by reason of this matter. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan has called to our attention the fact that these men have certain constitutional rights, and that their constitutional rights are being ignored. That seems to be a very small matter. However, if votes are to be changed as the second vote is taken today, I wonder what reason can be given except that the proposal is made for the purpose of clipping the wings of America's war leader, in the midst of war, and in connection with matters which may materially affect the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Tennessee if there has been any evidence that the three men have been guilty of any personal conduct which the committee considers to be inimical to the interests of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that question has been discussed so often in this body that it seems to me that if the Senator had been here he would have heard it.

Mr. PEPPER. Have the men done anything in the performance of their duties which, so far as they personally were concerned, was inconsistent with the security of the country, or anything of that kind?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been examined by the so-called Kerr committee of the House. Their own testimony was taken. It comprised the principal part of the testimony taken by that

committee. The men admitted that they had been members of a great many subversive organizations.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. They testified to that effect to such an extent that both the Dies committee and the Kerr committee strongly recommended to the House the action which the House subsequently took. Whether that testimony is true, I do not know.

I do not think the method adopted by the House is the proper way to handle the matter. However, if we want the bill passed so that worthy employees of the Government may receive their salaries, the only way to secure its passage is along these lines.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator permit me to inquire about one matter?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. I have heard the expression employed that the funds under the bill we are considering were to be used to pay the salaries of employees. I am now advised by a Member of the Senate sitting near me that the bill contains funds only for certain increases allowed the employees.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BONE. And the employees will draw their regular salaries?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been drawing the salaries, but not the increases which have been provided by law.

Mr. BONE. What I mean is that they are not going to starve to death?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether they are going to starve to death or not; I do not know them all, and I cannot say, but I know that $143,000,000 is appropriated for them in this bill.

Mr. BONE. I am concerned with whether it affects the regular pay roll on July 1, the pay roll under which they have been previously paid. We should get that clear in our minds, because there is an impression here that if the bill should be rejected they would not draw any salary at all, and I do not understand that to be the case. They would draw their regular salaries as of July 1. I may be in error about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has often been explained. Under the bill the three men in question will draw their regular salaries until November 15, and if the President reappoints them and the Senate confirms them, they will continue to draw their salaries regularly.

Mr. BONE. I am fearful the Senator has not gotten my question. As I understand, the bill contains an amount to make certain wage increases.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. It does not affect the regular salaries of the employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been explained a dozen times.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator tell me yes or no?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is absolutely true.

Mr. BONE. There are a number of Senators who have not understood it that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. It increases the salaries. I do not know how that could have been misunderstood.

Mr. BONE. But the argument has been made here today by Senators that if the conference report were rejected these men would not draw any salaries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I have not heard that.

Mr. BONE. Let us get it clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think any Senator who knows anything about the matter could have said that.

Mr. BONE. That is how obscure this whole matter is, because there are Senators sitting right around me who had that impression in their minds.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were entirely mistaken.

Mr. BONE. I wish to take the floor later in my own right.

Mr. MEAD. Will my distinguished friend from Florida yield to me for an observation?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from Florida asked a moment ago whether there was anything in the record that these men may have done anything inimical to the welfare of the United States. I wish to say that there is much in the history of these men which may not be in the record. One of them served in the Navy of the United States during World War No. 1, and another one lost his son at Belleau Wood. That should be in the RECORD. If that is subversive, we should have a lot of that particular type of subversiveness. One of them, as I stated, served in the Navy during World War No. 1, and another lost his son at Belleau Wood.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the kind of thing I wanted to refer to. The three men are being condemned and convicted not only without trial, but for something which they did not do personally which was inimical to the public interest, so far as anyone has disclosed to my knowledge.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When the first conference report was before the Senate I offered to yield my time to any Senator who could tell of his own knowledge anything about any of these three men, and no Senator accepted the challenge and the invitation. In other words, all we know about it is what we have been told by a subcommittee over in the House, and even the members of the full Committee on Appropriations in the House, when they inserted this provision in the bill, were not apprised of the record before the Kerr committee. I have been told that the other members of the full Committee on Appropriations were not even given access to the facts, yet we are asked to pass what amounts to a bill of attainder on the basis of what somebody else thinks on evidence we have not heard and about which we know nothing.

Mr. PEPPER. If I know anything that is supposed to be inherent in American character it is the principle of tolerance and decency and fair play. Because on hearsay evidence these men are supposed to have belonged to some kind of an organization, the greatest offense of which I suspect was that they favored the nationalistic government in Spain instead of the Fascist government, because they were merely reputed to be members and perhaps admitted membership in an organization which had that faith—as I did, and as many other Senators on this floor did—they are being condemned by the American Congress and kicked out of employment by the American Government.

Mr. President, what has become of tolerance in America? Are Senators going to ask what kind of organization a Senator or citizen belongs to when he has not personally done anything which makes him obnoxious as a citizen or as an elector?

I suspect that if Thomas Jefferson had been on the Federal pay roll he would have been condemned by the Dies committee and the Kerr committee as not only an atheist or agnostic, but as a Communist; yet he preached to America the sprit of tolerance, which has become ingrained in American character as a fundamental American characteristic.

We talk about the four freedoms, including freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience, yet the Senate, which is called the greatest deliberative body in the world, is asked to condemn men without trial, not because of culpable conduct, but because of their affiliation with an organization which indicated their own philosophy and opinion.

Mr. President, the American Congress will be condemned before the world as intolerant and as believing in a kind of fascism which we profess to fight, if we allow ourselves to commit this kind of offense. It will give encouragement to a resurgence of all the old animosities which have stood for intolerance in this country from its inception.

Talking about democratic government, talking about the citadel of freedom, talking about the last stronghold of independence, are we to kick out of an agency three men, one of whom served his country in its uniform in a fight against tyranny a generation ago, and another gave his son to his country's cause, because they had opinions, and are we to say they are ineligible to hold office under the American Government?

Mr. President, that would do more harm than the $71,000,000,000 appropriation we made here today could do good, because we would belie the essence of American character here in the heart of the Nation, in the Congress, if we committed ourselves to that kind of conduct.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I join heartily in the remarks of the last speaker, and much else that has been said this afternoon. It may seem anticlimax for me to raise the point I now wish to raise, but during the course of the discussion the fact gradually emerged that it is not a question of the Senate giving away to the President of the United States. The question arises whether the Senate is abandoning its rights to the House of Representatives. If the House of Representatives can by riders impose a condition such as that imposed in the bill now under discussion, it can impose any other condition, and the same appeal can be made.

Suppose they imposed the condition that none of this money should be available unless three Senators, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Massachusetts, for example, should resign from the Senate. Would we hear these appeals to pass the bill because the fate of those three Senators would be of minor concern in comparison with the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of employees of the Government? There are principles involved which far outweigh the temporary interests of even a large number of employees, and one of the principles is, If Senators believe strongly in a principle, are they going to abandon it because the House of Representatives makes an unreasonable request that they shall abandon it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not really believe that the House has been unreasonable. I believe the Senate has been more or less unreasonable with the House. The House has adjourned and its Members have gone home to enjoy the evening with their families. The House has not yet been called upon, as I understand, to have a yea-and-nay vote on this particular measure.

Mr. GREEN. That is the very point I am coming to.

Mr. MEAD. I really believe we should invite the House to vote on the question at a convenient hour tomorrow. I believe the House, realizing the record of patience we have made, will, if given an opportunity, agree with us and settle this question without delay.

Mr. GREEN. That was the point I was coming to. A great deal has been said by the chairman of the Senate conferees and by some of his fellow conferees concerning how hard they have fought to sustain the position of the Senate. In spite of the three votes had in the Senate, the Senate conferees have returned, but never once, so far as I have learned, have they insisted or even requested the House conferees to go back to the House and ask for another vote on the question by the House. As the Senator from New York has just stated, who knows but that the House might recede from its position? We do not know that the matter was fully considered by the House when the measure was originally passed. In view of the fact that the wages of 100,000 employees, or whatever the number may be, hang in the balance, the House may recede, realizing that its demand is unreasonable, and that it cannot force this unreasonable condition on the Senate at the sacrifice of principle. I should really like to ask the Senator from Tennessee, who, as I understand, is the chairman of the Senate conferees, whether the Senate conferees have ever tried to insist that the House conferees take this matter back to the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, Mr. President, we have done so, and we were met with the flat refusal that the House conferees would not take it back to the House. The Senator from Rhode Island has served as a conferee in many conferences. I say to him or to any other Senator who thinks he can manage to bring the House to the terms of the Senate, that I should like to have him take my place. I will resign my place as a conferee instantly, and allow any Senator who thinks he can change the attitude of the House with respect to this matter, to make the attempt. I shall step out as a conferee immediately after the vote which is about to be taken, and let any Senator try it. If the Senate shall again reject the report nothing would give me more happiness than to see my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island as one of the conferees in opposition to the House position on this matter. I wish to say to him that in my judgment he would not have any better success than I have had.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from Tennessee has not answered the point I made. It was not whether the conferees would withdraw from their position. It is whether the House conferees would refuse to take the question back to the House so it might vote on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate conferees have made such an attempt time and again.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Senate of the United States will have fallen quite low if it abandons a matter of principle—and by its vote I must assume that it regarded the question to be a matter of principle—merely because a group of conferees refuses to take a question back to the House. In other words, if the small number represented by the conferees—not the House of Representatives itself, but the small number of Representatives appointed as conferees—is to be unreasonable and is to refuse to take the matter back to the House when it has been voted by the Senate three times, it seems to me we shall be grovelling at the feet of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. Not just yet. In a minute I shall yield. It seems to me we are lacking all sense of the proper dignity of this legislative body, supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, if we fail to take the action I propose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I simply wish to ask the able Senator from Rhode Island if he does not think that the Senate conferees would adequately express the will of the Senate if they should merely notify the House Members that the Senate is going to stand pat with respect to this issue, and continue to do so.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to me that instead of now receding after three test votes, in which the Senate has reaffirmed its position, it would be better to send the conferees back with instructions to demand that this matter be taken back to the House of Representatives by the House conferees, and let us see what happens on another vote in the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If in the impending vote the conference report is voted down, as it has been voted down before, I shall ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be discharged as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, and shall further ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is on the Appropriations Committee, take my place and endeavor to induce the House to agree to vote on the matter.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What will be the status of the three men if the conference report is agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. The three men will continue to be employed as they are now until November 15. If prior to that time the three men are reappointed to their positions by the President, and their nominations are sent to the Senate and confirmed, they will continue to serve. If the President should not send their names to the Senate, or if the Senate should fail to confirm their nominations after their names are sent to the Senate, then on November 15 their terms of office would expire.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee another question. I know that he will be glad to answer and illuminate any question.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my extremely tired condition after working day and night trying to secure the passage of various appropriation measures, I am afraid I cannot illuminate any question, but I shall be very glad to try to answer any question.

Mr. GREEN. Then I shall not trouble the Senator. I know that he has done much hard work, and I do not want him to understand from my remarks that I think he has not. If the parliamentary situation were such that I could do so, I should like to move to amend the pending motion, to the effect that the conferees be instructed to hold another conference and demand that this question be submitted to the House.

Mr. AIKEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I recorded as having voted on this question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Vermont has voted in the negative. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BRIDGES asked for the regular order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk be directed to continue to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Chair announced that the Senator from Rhode Island was on his feet, and he was recognized, so even if the call of the roll had been begun, it was automatically vacated when the Chair recognized the Senator from Rhode Island. I make the point of order that the Senator from Rhode Island had the floor, and the matter is now open for discussion.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. One could not conceive of a more unfortunate time to accuse a person of an offense which reflected upon his patriotism and love of country than during a war. The Members of the Senate have before them certain vague charges, implications, innuendoes. As I stand here at my desk I am not aware of the nature of the charges against these three men, except that there have been most unfortunate connotations. If we remove these men from their positions we will bruit whatever these vague charges are and have been. They have been bruited all around both Halls of Congress.

Mr. President, there is nothing more priceless than a man's good name. If we sustain the charges by removing the men, which is precisely what we shall do if we accept the conference report, we shall not only bring down upon them opprobrium and reproach, but we shall visit on their children and their grandchildren a terrible stigma which they will never live down. A man who is worthy to be called a man is jealous of his honor. Imputations of dishonor have led to many unfortunate things in the world. I think we have had some unpleasant discussions because it has been said time after time that if the Senate does not agree to the conference report, thousands of employees will not have money with which to buy food. That is not true. The fact is that the bill provides for salary increases, but at the price of ruining the good names of three men. Their good names are their priceless possessions, which do not belong to us. No Member of the Senate would permit such a thing to be done to his own son. Every Member of the Senate would fight it until he fell dead on this floor, before he would ever let that be done to his own flesh and blood. Yet we would blithely do it to three of our citizens in order to assure the payment of an increase in salary to some employees, but at the price of the honor of those men.

I had hoped the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would be in the Chamber at this time, because I desired to discuss with him one matter with relation to his remarks. In connection with his remarks about duties and obligations and what it means to visit punishment on others, let me call the Senate's attention to one little incident in American history, to be multiplied 100 times.

During the administration of Theodore Roosevelt a naturalized Greek by the name of Perdicardis was captured by a Moorish bandit by the name of Raisuli. Roosevelt sent a cablegram, "I want Perdicardis alive or Raisuli dead." He got Perdicardis alive; but if he had not gotten Perdicardis alive, there might have been a war. President Roosevelt might have caused the lives of hundreds of American boys to be sacrificed in order to defend the proposition that an American citizen had a right to go anywhere in the world and to maintain the freedom of his body.

In the days of the Roman Empire, a man who was a Roman citizen went with safety anywhere under the flag of Rome, under the imperial eagle of the Roman Empire. He was free. It meant something to him to be an independent and free citizen of Rome, and it meant something to him to have the rights and independence of his family and children preserved.

Mr. President, it means nothing to say that these men could be vindicated after we had besmirched their characters. A man is entitled to justice at the hands of the Senate. That is the attitude I take regarding the matter. I believe the problem is not complicated, but is elemental in its simplicity.

I will not vote to put the stamp of illegality, not only on a man, but on his children and his children's children, so that people will read it, and so that his children will never again be able to say, "My father was an honorable man who occupied an honorable position under the Stars and Stripes."

The Senate has no right to do that; and I, for one, am willing to forego the risk of not having increased pay go to certain employees, because to me it is more important to stand here and uphold the rights of men under freedom in America, and to prevent the sacrifice of the most important principle in the world, the principle for which our boys are dying now all over the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "nay." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has been called from the city on important business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—32

Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Lodge	Taft
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	McNary	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
George	Revercomb	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Bone	La Follette	Overton
Butler	Langer	Pepper
Chandler	Lucas	Radcliffe
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Shipstead
Danaher	Maloney	Truman
Downey	Maybank	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Green	Millikin	Wallgren
Guffey	Moore	Willis
Hatch	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Davis	Smith
Austin	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Bailey	Gerry	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Gillette	Tobey
Bilbo	Glass	Tydings
Burton	Hayden	Van Nuys
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Byrd	O'Daniel	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Wilson
Connally	Reynolds	

So the report was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from further service on the conference committee; and in that connection I also ask unanimous consent that my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be appointed in my place.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee is not serious in that request.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very serious about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator ought to withdraw from the conference. I know what a hard job he has; but still, judging from the last roll call, he is making progress. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not making progress when I realize that the Senate pages will go off the pay roll on July 1. There is no money with which to pay them. There are 21 of them. They will go off the pay roll, as will the pages in the House, the school teachers of the District of Columbia, and thousands of other employees.

I feel that I have never done my duty any better than I have done it in connection with this matter. I have made every effort to secure the adoption of the conference report. The Senate has turned it down at least three times. Under those circumstances, especially when my distinguished friend from Rhode Island says that he could have the House conferees and the House Members change their views, and that it could be easily managed if there were a proper representative of the Senate on the committee, I should be delighted if he would accept my place, and persuade the House to change its view at once.

I ask unanimous consent that that arrangement be made.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, when the Senator from Tennessee displays the vigor he does, and the happy phrasing of which he is capable, I know that the time has not yet arrived to replace him. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, every time he brings back this report he makes progress. I hope that the next time it will be taken back to the House, and that progress can be made there. I do not believe that we could do better than to keep the same conferees, with the instruction—not necessarily formal, but informal—that the Senate conferees try to persuade the House conferees to take this measure back to the House.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will remain on the conference committee. He is making progress. Eventually he will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Senators are very kind. I have done everything a mortal man could do with the limitations which I have, not only to get this bill through but to get all other appropriation bills through by tomorrow night. I took a great deal of pride in that ambition. I shall be very much disappointed if this bill does not get through. But the Senate is determined about the matter. It has said so time and again, although each time a few more Senators voted for the conference report. Perhaps if more Senators would study it, there would be more votes in favor of it.

I am sorry for the page boys. I wish to tell them that I did everything I could for them, and for the boys over in the House, for the school teachers, the policemen, and thousands of other employees throughout the country, who not only will not receive any increase in salary, but will not receive their salaries. I am very sorry. I meant no harm in being persistent. I greatly regret that the Senate has not stood by the Senate conferees. Tomorrow I shall insist on some other Senator taking my place.

Mr. BARKLEY Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything further to come before the Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). The Chair has a message from the House of Representatives to lay before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Chair lays the message before the Senate, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee and to the Senate that we all appreciate the hard work he has done. I especially appreciate it. I know how hard-working the Senator always is, and how interested he is in anything he undertakes.

This is not the first time that the two Houses have had difficulty over an appropriation bill. In my service I have seen many occasions when it was necessary to pass a continuing resolution in order to pay Government employees until an appropriation bill could be passed to pay their salaries out of the Treasury. These employees do not draw their pay until the 15th of the month. They are already provided for up until day after tomorrow. It does not seem to me impossible that the conferees of the two Houses may get together. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not weary in what I am sure he thinks is well-doing. On the last vote he had almost a majority of the Senate. I hope the differences between the two Houses may be settled.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the past 2 months I do not think there has been a single day that I have not worked 12 hours, largely on appropriation bills. I take pride in my work on the bills. I take pride in the magnificent help which I have received from the other members of the Committee on Appropriations. They have done a wonderful work under very great difficulties. The House sent over some of the bills a little later than usual, and that has made our work more difficult.

I have tried my best to be honest, fair, and just in every way. When my colleagues turn down a report of this kind, it makes me feel that perhaps I should not be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been turned down in the Senate so many times that every time I see a defeat coming I merely back up to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator makes a great mistake, as leader, in not standing by committees of the Senate when they make reports. I have always understood that it was one of the duties of the leader to stand by the majority of a committee.

Yesterday my distinguished friend announced at the very beginning that he would fight the conference report. He said that he did not know anything about it, and had not as yet examined into it; yet he made a powerful speech against members of the Appropriations Committee. He made me feel rather downhearted and weary.

When a bill is reported, either from a conference committee or from a Senate committee, I have always felt that unless there was something very unusual about it, or something to which Senators conscientiously objected, the committee should be given reasonable support. It certainly should not have the active and terrific opposition of the leader of the party which is undertaking to put these measures through. I have tried to act in the best of faith. I have tried not to lose my temper, and I do not believe I have lost it at any time during this entire controversy. Again and again I have tried to attain certain results; but it seemed that the more I tried the more vigorous the opposition became. When the terrific opposition came today, with a strong speech from the majority leader, he certainly lined up a number of votes against the conference report. Otherwise I believe the conference report would have been agreed to earlier in the day.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I cannot yield now.

Mr. President, I cannot ignore the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not mean to reflect on the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that what the Senator said was in the utmost of kindness. However, when I rose yesterday I did not say that I did not know anything about the subject. In the last Congress the same question was brought before the Senate. Only two men were involved then, and not three. At that time I took the same position

that I took yesterday and have taken today. I do not recall the position which was taken by the Senator from Tennessee in the last Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was the same as that of the Senator from Kentucky. However, we were both overruled, and Mr. Lasser went out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not referring to Mr. Lasser. I am referring to Mr. Dodd and Mr. Watson, who were eliminated by the House in the last Congress. We made a fight in the Senate to defeat the provision affecting those two men, and we were successful. I took the same position then that I take now, that such a provision is unconstitutional. I have a deep and conscientious conviction upon the subject.

I appreciate the Senator's mild stricture concerning my opposition to the position of the committee. Frequently I am conscientiously in doubt about what attitude I should properly take with regard to bills reported by committees. I think I have frequently offended some of my colleagues, especially those on this side of the Chamber, by standing by committees sometimes when I might have been justified in voting against them. However, in a matter of this nature I must remember that I have taken an oath, as has every other Senator, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I do not think that I am required to stultify my own convictions on a constitutional question in order to stand by a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say with the utmost kindness that I do not think the Senator from Kentucky should blame himself too much for having stood by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. As we all know, especially in the past few months, the Senator from Kentucky has not upheld the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not kept books on the subject, but I do not recall any particular instances. I do not suppose that the fact that I am majority leader necessarily makes me an automaton, and therefore I am required to vote to support every committee report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have often voted against my own committees when they have reported bills which I could not support.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With all due respect to the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me that it is more important for the majority leader to stand by the Senate than to stand by the Appropriations Committee or any other minor segment of the Senate.

As one who has always been opposed to this type of legislation, I am very grateful for the support of the majority leader. I am glad that he returned to the Senate in time to render very valuable support in the last two or three defeats of the Appropriations Committee which have taken place.

I also suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that while the Senator from Kentucky was necessarily absent because of illness, the Senate, under its own steam, defeated the effort to include this provision in an appropriation bill by a conference report two or three times. As a matter of fact, we have actually lost ground since the Senator from Kentucky returned. We have not defeated the proposal by as great a margin since the Senator returned as we did while he was away. I do not believe it is fair for the Senator from Tennessee to upbraid the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator has said is undoubtedly true. No longer than an hour ago I expressed the view that instead of the Senator from Tennessee chiding me he ought to thank me for my opposition, because he got more votes with my opposition than he got while I was absent.

Yesterday I rose and made the statement that I had been necessarily absent when the question was before the Senate on two previous occasions. On one occasion the Senate voted 69 to nothing to eliminate this provision. Had I been present the vote would have been 70 to nothing. On another occasion, when the conference report was defeated 52 to 17, I was still absent. Had I been present, my vote would have made it 53 to 17.

Having been absent and not having had an opportunity to vote or express myself on those two occasions, yesterday I felt that I ought to express my views. For many years I have had a deep and abiding conviction on this question. I do not ask any other Senator to vote against the conference report. I merely explain why I voted against it. The Senator from Tennessee flatters me when he says that my speech influenced the vote of any other Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Missouri are rather hard on themselves. I think the Senator from Kentucky certainly defeated this measure twice today. If there is any satisfaction to be gained from defeating an appropriation bill of this kind, the Senator from Kentucky is entitled to a full measure of satisfaction for having defeated this worthy measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I obtained satisfaction from the defeat, the Senator from Tennessee should obtain satisfaction from a defeat by a smaller margin.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think perhaps the Senator from Kentucky has misunderstood the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I frequently do. [Laughter.]

Mr. TUNNELL. I listened to the Senator from Tennessee, and I thought that whatever reflection he might have made on any Senator was on the leader of the party which is trying to put this bill through. I did not think that he meant the Senator from Kentucky. I thought perhaps he was referring to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not attempt to elucidate or even illuminate that subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I said the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I did not mean the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] when I said the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join me in the hope that he and I do not become confused. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I should like to conclude this discussion and make a motion for a recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in the mood to recess, but I hope the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Tennessee will not become confused. I hope that the Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the bill, will stick it out. We are making progress. It will take a little time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I join in that hope.

SALE OF HORSE MEAT OR FOOD PRODUCTS IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, which was, on page 2, to strike out all of section 3, and insert:

SEC. 3. The health officer of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943 (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James B. M. McNally to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph T. Votava to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Horace Friertson to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George E. Proudfit to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Reuben Gosnell to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John S. Service, of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires July 14, 1943.)

Thomas D Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Hobart Newman, whose term expires August 21, 1943.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Richard J. Cullen, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Huxley Madeheim, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

George C. Chesney, from the District of Columbia, to be head industrial consultant in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $6,500 per annum, in the Washington office.

Ernest L. Marbury, from the State of Alabama, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Alabama State office.

Joseph S. Dorton, from the State of North Carolina (previously confirmed for the position of area director at $4,600 per annum), to be deputy regional manpower director, at $5,600 per annum, in the North Carolina State office.

Glenn L. Bobbitt, from the State of North Carolina, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum, in the Raleigh area office.

Leo H. Carney, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Erie area office.

Harold S. Woodley, from the State of Michigan, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Battle Creek, area office.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Don Elwood Lowry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 4, 1942.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Wilson Turner Douglas, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Curtis Alan Schrader, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

Capt. Victor Haller King, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to the examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be lieutenant colonels, with rank from July 1, 1943

Maj. Paul Americus Harris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Jefferson Cleveland Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Hugh Franklin Conrey, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Edwin Clark Maling, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Maj. O. D. Wells, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Frank Celestine Meade, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Paul Wallace Cole, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Charles Speir Lawrence, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Clarence Matthew Tomlinson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Julian Buckner Haddon, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Clem Oliver Gunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Wilber Russell Ellis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Donald Weldon Brann, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. George Bernhard Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter John Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Roswell Emory Round, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Lester Frank Watson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. William Edwin Vecqueray, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Haynie McCormick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Albert Theodore Wilson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Cornelius Emmett O'Connor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Hartwell Matthew Elder, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Park Holland, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. John Gross, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Thomas Russell Howard, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Samuel James Adams, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Albert Gillian Kelly, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Wayne McVeigh Pickels, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Owen Russell Marriott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vida, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Harold Patrick Henry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Frederic Pierce Van Duzee, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Burns Beall, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. John Bartlett Hess, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Allen Francis Haynes, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Harold Gaslin Sydenham, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. George Windle Read, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 2, 1943

×Maj. Francis Hudson Oxx, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Henry Stanley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Donald Greeley White, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Weston Bessell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Charles George Holle, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Wylie Moreland, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Wayne Stewart Moore, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Henry Franklin Hannis, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edward Albert Routheau, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Wilson Burnett Higgins, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Frederic Lord Hayden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Warren Cressman Rutter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Harold Frank Handy, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Richard Clare Partridge, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Edward John McGaw, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Harold Thomas Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. Tyree Rivers Horn, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Joseph Leo Langevin, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. William Hardy Hill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Louis Jacob Claterbos, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Auguste Rhu Taylor, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Kenneth Mitchell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Frank Andrew Henning, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Ewart Gladstone Plank, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Malcolm Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Bernard Linn Robinson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Maj. John Robert Culleton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. James Goodrich Renno, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Charles Steinhart Whitmore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Hobson Stratton, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Lee Armstead Denson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Lawrence Granger Smith, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Edward Haviland Lastayo, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. George DeGraaf, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Lathrop Ray Bullene, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Alexander Samouce, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Wallace Ford, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. George Dewey Vanture, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Pastor Martelino, Philippine Scouts (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Harry Earl Fisher, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. Donald Sylvester Burns, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Donald James Leehey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Joseph Eugene Harriman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Maj. George Joseph Loupret, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Thomas Arnett Roberts, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Verne Donald Mudge, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
×Maj. John Loren Goff, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Francis Henry Morse, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Edward Macon Edmonson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Gordon Holder, Coast Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Halstead Clotworthy Fowler, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Maj. Leslie Burgess Downing, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. William Ignatius Brady, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Eugene Martin Link, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. John States Seybold, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Harry Bartlett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Donald Breen Herron, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Edward Clinton Gillette, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Russell Owen Smith, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Homer Watson Kiefer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Myron McMillin, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Joseph Harris, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
×Maj. John George Howard, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Robert Hugh Kreuter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Laurence Wood Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Donald Frank Stace, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Reynolds Johnston Burt, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. John Dickerson Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Clarence Henry Schabacker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Fred Lebbeus Hamilton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. John Francis Cassidy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. John Foxhall Sturman, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Joseph Jacob Billo, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Clarence Clemens Clendenen, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. William Carleton McFadden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Eugene Collum Johnston, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Hess Walker, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
×Maj. Lyman Lincoln Judge, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Frank Needham Roberts, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Lawrence Edward Schick, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
Maj. Courtney Parker Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Henry Chester Hine, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. William Price Withers, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Frederick Robert Pitts, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Crump Garvin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Hamilton Peyton Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Thomas Dresser White, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
×Maj. Frederick Mixon Harris, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Dwight Acker Rosebaum, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Kenneth Gilpin Hoge, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Richard Candler Singer, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Aladin James Hart, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. William Richter Tomey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Joseph Honore Rousseau, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Lawrence Joseph Carr, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Maurice Wiley Daniel, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Alexander Hamilton Perwein, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Clovis Ethelbert Byers, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
×Maj. Oscar Raymond Johnston, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. George Andrew Rehm, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Edward Carl Engelhart, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Charles Whitney West, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
Maj. Park Brown Herrick, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Herbert Carl Reuter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Harold Edward Smyser, Infantry (temporary colonel.)
Maj. Esher Claflin Burkart, Field Artillery (temporary colonel.)
Maj. Thomas Eginton Whitehead, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Alexander George, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Francis William Farrell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Wilmer Brinton Merritt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Harry Clark Wisehart, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Charles Merton Adams, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. John Ferral McBlain, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
×Maj. Richard Meade Costigan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Gustave Harold Vogel, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Basil Girard Thayer, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Edward Joseph Sullivan, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
Maj. James Perrine Barney, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Wilbur Sturtevant Nye, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Charles Harlan Swartz, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Leland Stuart Smith, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Carl Frederick Duffner, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Millard Pierson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Harlan Thurston McCormick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Ray Olander Welch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Julian Erskine Raymond, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. George Honnen, Infantry (temporary brigadier general)
Maj. Charles Porter Amazeen, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Edward Thomas Williams, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Frank Thweatt Searcy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Alan Lockhart Fulton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Terence John Tully, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Earl Crist, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
Maj. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Lemuel Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Escalus Emmert Elliott, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Milton Cogswell Shattuck, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary brigadier general).
Maj. Hayden Adriance Sears, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. John Thomas Lynch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. John Black Reybold, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. William Dickey Long, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Henry Irving Hodes, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Joel Tudor Yancey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Leon Eugene Lichtenwalter, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Sidney Rae Hinds, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Halley Grey Maddox, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Harold Todd Turnbull, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Maj. Hugo Peoples Rush, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Wray Bertrand Avera, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Charles Fox Ivins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Walter Daniel Buie, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Maj. John Taylor Ward, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. John Elmer Reierson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Maj. Henry Jackson Hunt, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be captain with rank from July 15, 1943

First Lt. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1943

Second Lt. Weldon Marion James, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Norton Reynolds, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. William Elza McEntire, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Bryan Brand Harper, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Second Lt. Joseph Herbert Paul, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William John Feallock 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Murray Hendrix, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Alvin Edward Hebert, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Second Lt. George Miles McNeese, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Joseph Richard Ambrose, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ogden Nelson Pratt, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald K. Bennett, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Richard Condie Sanders, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Ernest Roderic Manierre, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Fleming Harris, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Rollin Murray Winingham, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Malcolm McMillan Heber, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Lee Baseler, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Harold Caldwell Smelser, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Gerhard John Schriever, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Adolf Milton Wright, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Cecil James Looke, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Preston Breckenridge, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. George Edward Glober, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. William Edward Hubbard 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Afton Gayle, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Second Lt. J. Garrett Jackson, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Carrell Thurman Murrell, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Edgar Allen Romberg, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Orville Herman Rehmann, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Orie Olin Schurter, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frederick William Baum, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Monroe Fawcett, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Stanley Richard Vosper, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Ellsworth Boyd, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Philip John Kuhl, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Alexander George Evanoff, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Jerry Dentler Page, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Rollen Henry Anthis, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Austin Cunningham, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Ralph Amos Reeve, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald Leonard Clark, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Maurice Leslie Martin, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Herbert Batte, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Herman Walter Wright Lange, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Cook Tredennick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack Conrad Miller, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Hall Livingston, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Hunter LeGear Stockton, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jene Earl Mills, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Pratt Alexander Warren, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Warren Randall King, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Gray Platt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Leslie Harness, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Peter Denisevich, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Philip Archie Hatten, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Gilbert Warren Curl, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ernest Lester Ramme, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Cobb Benjamin, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Blair Green, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Harlan Bull, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Burbank Webster, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Ellsworth Andrew Cragholm, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Emerson Wallace Grant, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Blatchford Robinson, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Stephen Dana Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Francis Carter, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Kethley Gillmore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Cyril Dean Sterner, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Marion Walton Walker, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Alvin Kersting, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Walker Sample, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Richard Irvine Manning, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Addis Emmet Moseley, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Misha Nicholas Kadick, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Storey Sandiland, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Charles Hilpert, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Houghton Collart, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Scandrett, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Darrel Gee Costello, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Francis Woodrow Adams, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Henry Symbol, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. David Samuel Daley, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Louis Howard Ressijac, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Lanier McKnight, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack Finney Lane, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Mix Gilbert, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Robert Jackson Natzel, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Charles Douglas Johnston, Infantry (temporary major.
Second Lt. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harry Paller Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Eric Edward Duckstad, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Edwin Winter, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Royal Linehan, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Stephen Davenport McElroy, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harold Diedrich Hansen, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Emil Paul Eschenburg, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Edward Arn, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Francis Meisinger Libershal, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Francis Hubbard, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Luverne Richardson, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Ben King Humphrey, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roger McKee Crow, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Edward Sullivan, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Donald Thomas Bennink, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Alfred Filer, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Horace Albert Hanes, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Stuart Moss Porter, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Alvan Neavitt Moore, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Chester Goers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. David William Iunghuhn, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Darrel Cavness, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lester Bennett Johnson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Richard Sears Lovering, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Elmer Austin Dixon, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. MacPherson Morgan, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Kennedy Lovelace, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Edward Unverferth, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Edward Alban, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Thomas Metcalf, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Earl William Edwards, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Bert Perrin, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Thomas Shelby, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Norton Graves, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Carrolton Adams, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Thomas Robert Ford, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter John Wagner, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Lewis Zoeckler, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Wright Andrew Scoville, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Bailey Crum, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Arden Charles Brill, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Washington Shivers, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Clyde Stump, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Herbert Ernest Rice, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Fogg Twombly 3d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Tom Spencer Phair, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Carl Paul Walter, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Troxell Olin Mason, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Merle Reed Preble, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Charles Hall, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Charles Durgan, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Everett Albert Hansen, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Gerard George Wolke, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Milton Hightower 3d, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Hal Dale McCown, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Hugh William McClary, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Oscar Marion Brumfiel, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Henry John Richter, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Barkeley McPherson, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Emil Franklin Hawes, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Harold Lahlum, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Condit Ingalls, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Vallard Cassius Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Fershing Brown, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Peter Clark Manson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Claire Tillson, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Nye Maguet Scofield, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Walter Greenwood, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Law Bryan, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Melvin Desmond Clark, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth Howard Bayer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Marvin Kinzer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harold Donham Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Zim E. Lawhon, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Bradford Rosson, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Edward Nitsche, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Channing Stowell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Somer Shapland, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Harry Pell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ben Lovell Burdick, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter Alexander Edens, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Vincent Wilson, Infantry (temporary major).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William John Miehe, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.
Lt. Col. Claude Wiggins Cummings, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 5, 1943.
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Lowry, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 7, 1943.
Lt. Col. William White Southard, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 10, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Thomas Grant Tousey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 14, 1943.
Lt. Col. Charles Granville Souder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 15, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Harrison Horton Fisher, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 15, 1943.
Lt. Col. Laurent Lescelles La Roche, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Stanley Gibson Odom, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1943.
Lt. Col. Horace Sumner Villars, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
Lt. Col. Joseph Richards Shelton, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
Lt. Col. Burgh Smith Burnet, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Robert Keith Simpson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
Lt. Col. Don Guernsey Hilldrup, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Henry Wiley Grady, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Percy Elisha Duggins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Brown Shirk McClintic, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Henry Cheesman Dooling, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Paul Henry Streit, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Earle Douglass Quinnell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frank McAlpin Mocse, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Arthur Raymond Gaines, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frederick Arthur Blesse, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from July 18, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Emory Howard Gist, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Samuel Augustus White, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Francis Moylan Fitts, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
Lt. Col. George Franklin Aycock, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frank Smeeton Matlack, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
Lt. Col. Lewis Edwin Joel Browne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
Lt. Col. Charles Earle Brenn, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
Lt. Col. Cleon Joseph Gentzkow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Hale, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
Lt. Col. James Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
Lt. Col. Arthur George Compton, Medical Corps, with rank from July 21, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Jay Moore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 21, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Alfred Robert Thomas, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

Lt. Col. Logan Mitchel Weaver, Medical Corps, with rank from July 24, 1943.

Lt. Col. Oral Bevoly Bolibaugh, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Charles Edward Sima, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Turberville Arnest, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Levi Maxwell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 27, 1943.

×Lt. Col. William Love Starnes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 28, 1943.

Lt. Col. Orlando Jefferson Posey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 28, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Daniel Franklin, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 29, 1943.

Lt. Col. Haskett Lynch Conner, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Arthur Howard Nylen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 31, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Walker McCaw, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 31, 1943.

To be majors

×Capt. William Weaver Nichol, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Richard Paul Johnson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Joseph Upton Weaver, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. George Darsie McGrew, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Leonard Frank Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Major Samuel White, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Robert James Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Llewellyn Lancelot Barrow, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Leonard Theodore Peterson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. George Prazak, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Roger Hubbard Allbee, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Urho Robert Merikangas, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. John Bernard Herman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. William Grelle Schmitz, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Bronko Peter Lelich, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×First Lt. Fred Albert Heimstra, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. William Harris Curry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Thomas Henry Crouch, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Philip Drescher, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Max Wendell Carver, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 19[illegible]

First Lt. Richard [illegible] Fraser, Medical Corps (temporary m[illegible], with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Willard Ferguson Angen, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. John Roscoe Grunwell, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Bollerud, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Thomas Rush, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Sanford Williams French 3d, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Hilbert Adolph Peter Leininger, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. John Van Eman Berger, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Leslie Doughtie, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Hugh Beauregard Disharoon, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Morris Hardaway 3d, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Joe Dulaney Schutz, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. N. Robert Drummond, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Norton Schwartz, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 5, 1943.

First Lt. Frank Henry Thone, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 8, 1943.

First Lt. Irl Richard Long, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Spencer Amos O'Brian, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Ralegh Howard Lackay, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Henrik Moursund, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harold Emerson Albaugh, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Edwin Smalley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

×Lt. Col. William Dale White, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Neal Anthony Harper, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Earle Jefferson McClung, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Earl Lee Hering, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leroy Poston Hartley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Edward Crawford Alley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lynn Harold Tingay, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Marhl Hector Welch, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Daniel Bratton, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Thomas Luther Spoon, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. John Robert McEvoy, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Andrew Bainter Anderson, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Raymond Joseph Talbot, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. James Maxwell Murphy, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Lincoln Coombs, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Richard Durham Darby, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Frederick Robert Krug, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Stanley Clifford Smock, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1942.

Lt. Col. Burlin Chase Bridges, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Earl Noonan, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Josiah Wistar Worthington, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 27, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Fred Chester Waters, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Edward Van Tuyl, Veterinary Corps, with rank from July 31, 1943.

To be major

×Capt. George Townley Price, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be majors

Chaplain (Capt.) Peter Christian Schroder, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 21, 1943.

Chaplain (Capt.) John Henry August Borleis, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1943.

Chaplain (Capt.) Hudson Bissell Phillips, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Carrol Conrad Barrick, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Thomas Raymond Jones, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Cornelius John Curran, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Gerard Adrien Belanger, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

×First Lt. Guy Wycoff Harlow, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 29 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James B. M. McNally to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

Joseph T. Votava to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

Horace Frierson to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George E. Proudfit to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

Reuben Gosnell to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

Ike P. Taylor, of Alaska, to be area director for Alaska at $7,000 per annum, in the Juneau office.

Joseph H. Braunagel, of Illinois, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Peoria area office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance

Harry Clyde Ingles

To be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers

Dawson Hope Mullen, Jr.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Frederic J. Hughes, Jr.
Vince Moseley
Adolph Benedict Schneider, Jr.
Freeman Irby Stephens
Bertram Allen Weeks

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Albert Rhoades Buckelew

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Alpheus Heise Seeley

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Merr L. Abbott, Sheridan.

IOWA

LaVaun B. Raymond, Garrison.

OHIO

Lorand T. Lewis, Apco.
Durbin W. Gerber, Dover.
Charles A. Hart, Minerva.
Harry B. Croner, Piqua.
Thomas G. Williams, Vermilion.

PUERTO RICO

Mary Peet de Velazquez, Humacao.

TENNESSEE

Regie H. Ray, Ducktown.
LeRoy J. Eldredge, Hixson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, for the constancy of Thy care, for the countless revelations of Thy presence, and for Thy manifold mercies, accept our grateful praise. Whatever may be our trial, give us courage to stand without compromise and grace to rise superior to censure and self-interest. Make our feet swift to run and our hands eager to work and the words of our Saviour will be so woven in our affections that we shall hallow them forever.

O Lamp Eternal, radiate from the heights of Thy holy hill; O Light that falls from the upper world, shine on our country; O Voice Divine, speak to all our people for only Thou art good. Grant that all things rebellious and unjust may lose their power and things ennobling and enriching may prevail throughout our land. We bless Thee for the Master whose love for humanity encircled Him with invisible power; beneath His blessed feet it broke forth amid confusion and vexed minds; it put on immortality; it never faileth. Dear Lord, unfold in us the glories of love rising above jealousies and contentions which plucks the sting of sin and inspires love for love and hate for hate and makes alive forevermore. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 647) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 32, and 72 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 10 to the foregoing bill.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2865) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, WOLCOTT, GIFFORD, and CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Joe G. Montague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Columbia magazine entitled "Listen, Son."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the McKeesport Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Ralph B. Starkey, chairman of the legislative committee of the Cooperative Marketing Association of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Coshocton Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent address by the Judge Advocate General of the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of food subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE DIMINISHING SUPPLY OF CRUDE OIL IS CRITICAL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. I ask unanimous consent that such order be canceled and that I may be permitted to address the House tomorrow in lieu thereof following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the depletion of crude-oil reserves in this country has reached a most serious stage. It is due largely to the increased demand on the part of the Government and to the low ceiling price on crude oil. Just recently representatives of the armed forces testifying before a Senate committee said that there is an impending shortage of oil in this country. It is certain that the armed forces use more than 200,000 barrels of gasoline per day. Before the end of the year the amount will probably be doubled. It is well to observe that the Government uses about one-fourth of our oil supply. This does not include the tremendous amount used by the war industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the price of crude oil is so low, compared with the cost of production, that there is not much inducement to make new discoveries for additional production. The production of crude oil last year was about 50 percent of that of the year before. It is about the same this year. Crude oil is about 60 percent of parity. It is just as low as it was 5 to 10 years ago. The increase of 50 cents per barrel would stimulate production and increase the price of gasoline only about 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon. But the most important thing, however, is the fact that at present the supply is at a dangerously low ebb and that little is being done. The situation can be corrected to some extent at least if done right away by stimulating new production by increasing the price of crude oil. It is imperative that we have a sufficient supply to take care of the demands of our planes, our tanks, and our ships. The Government does not put a price ceiling below cost on its ammunition or its guns or planes or ships. Such ceilings would restrict production. There can be no reason for restricting the production of oil by placing a ceiling below cost. It is neither reasonable nor right that a government should strangle by price restriction the production of a national resource so necessary to the prosecution of the war. It is time, I say, for those in authority and in high places to take a practical, realistic attitude toward this important problem before we have another situation of "too little and too late."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press entitled "Let's Get Down to Earth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CADETS, MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a certain newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from a soldier serving in the armed forces in reference to strikes back home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by Mr. Goss, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter from the O. P. A. I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Raymond Gram Swing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

O. P. A. AND THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include certain newspaper and radio comments and resolutions of press associations concerning the Office of War Information. The cost, I am informed by the Government Printing Office, will be $270.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE MARVIN JONES

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a former Member of this

House who upon yesterday was appointed War Food Administrator—one of the most difficult and important jobs existing on the home front, and the conduct of which will affect our successful prosecution of the war all over the world.

I refer to Hon. Marvin Jones, who for 24 years served the district I now represent with honor and distinction not only to himself and his district but to the Nation.

Marvin Jones knows and is a friend to the man who follows the plow. He prefers to deal with facts rather than theories. He is a man of practical experience who received his early training on the farm; he knows and loves and understands the soil; and as one who served as chairman of the great Agriculture Committee of the House for 8 years, he is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been promoted. I know of no man in the entire country who has served with such marked distinction in the legislative, judicial, and administrative branches of the Government and who is better fitted for the place.

Drafted for the job as he was, Marvin will answer the call with every resource he possesses. He will meet with red tape and divided authority. He will deal with many people who still put themselves and their own interests above the welfare of the country. He will not be able to satisfy all of us, but I have every confidence he will get the job done.

It is always gratifying to see a former Member of this body—one who understands our problems—receive recognition, and I feel confident that the many friends which Marvin Jones has on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of the Congress will wish him well in the successful discharge of the heavy duties incumbent upon him.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn that Chester Davis has resigned. I believe, however, no better man could have been selected from any area to succeed him than Marvin Jones. I know of no one who understands the food problem any better than the man who is now placed in charge of the War Food Administration. I believe the President should be commended upon his selection; I am sure the people in general throughout the United States will view his work with favor; and I believe if he is given full power that he will carry out an effective war food program.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I feel regret over the retirement of Chester Davis, and my feelings with reference to the appointment of my long-time friend, Marvin Jones, are not wholly divested of that sentiment because of my affection and high regard for Mr. Jones.

The office which he is undertaking to fill at the present moment is one which has been fraught with terrible confusion and fracas right from the beginning. I have known Marvin Jones, Mr. Speaker, since the year when you, and he, and I first entered the University of Texas.

Marvin Jones through the years has grown, as inevitably he would, due to amazing qualities of manhood, personality, intelligence, patriotism, well-directed and earnest effort. I voice the hope, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Nation on the appointment of one who has proved himself an able servant, one who has a wealth of experience as background, that that experience and the judgment which he has developed through the years will be given some opportunity to express itself and not be too hindered, too harassed, or too entangled by red tape and attendant confusion between various agencies of government. I hope, Mr. Speaker, for the country and for Marvin Jones, that he will be given an opportunity to do the kind of job I know he is capable of doing.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to pass any encomiums on Marvin Jones, although I have known him longer than any man in this House. He and I were reared in the same community in Cooke County, Tex. My father was his father's family physician. The men in this House who served with him for many years know his high character, his outstanding ability, and his knowledge of the problems of agriculture and food. Speaking for myself and also as chairman of the Texas delegation, I am sure I voice the sentiment of that delegation and through them the sentiment of all the people of Texas in saying that we have the utmost confidence in Marvin Jones and feel sure he will perform the duties of his new assignment with fidelity and efficiency.

He did not seek this job. He already had a lifetime job on one of the highest courts in the land. He was drafted and accepted it as a matter of patriotic duty. I feel in this critical hour when harmony, cooperation and teamwork are so much needed he will receive the hearty support and cooperation of all the Members of this House without regard to party affiliation. We are in a dangerous war that calls for the best in all of us. I know Judge Jones so intimately that I can assure you he has none of the dictator about him. His one big thought now is his country and the winning of the war. He believes in representative government and will want to carry out the will of Congress. Our duty is to determine policy and then give him the necessary legislation with authority to act. We can then forget the mistakes and differences of the past few weeks and solve the complex problem that is causing our people so much worry. Marvin Jones will do his duty and prove a great Food Administrator if we will but do our duty. Let us give him our wholehearted support.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I delivered before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, June 28, entitled "Floods in War and in Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COOLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials, one from the Rochester Times-Union and the other from the Rochester Catholic Courier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by Mr. Alan C. McIntosh, publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn., entitled "A Dead Branch on the New Deal Tree."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have known Marvin Jones personally for a dozen years and I have known Chester Davis for an equal period of time. But the personalities of the men are not involved. Chester Davis represents 95 percent of the agricultural thought of America against subsidies for food. Marvin Jones must represent the

President in opposition to 95 percent of the agricultural thought of America. That is the thing that is involved.

I met Chester Davis on the Committee of Twenty-two in 1926 when we came here on the McNary-Haugen bill, a bill that did not ask 1 cent of subsidy from the Government. Chester Davis is a man who has been grounded in the school of thought involved in the McNary-Haugen bill and it is therefore easy to see that he is against subsidies for food. Jones is committed to follow the repudiated policy.

THE HANDLING OF THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the handling of the food situation is by far the greatest of all New Deal follies, fantasies, fallacies, and failures. The question is whether there will be enough food for the American people this next winter.

I want to read a few lines from an editorial in the Washington News of today which gives the reasons why Chester Davis resigned. I have a high personal regard for Marvin Jones and wish him well. He must be a very courageous individual to accept the appointment as War Food Administrator under such chaotic conditions which are getting worse daily.

ANOTHER FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Chester Davis quit his job as War Food Administrator for two good and sufficient reasons:

1. He found "that I have assumed public responsibility while the authority, not only over broad food policy but day-to-day actions, is being exercised elsewhere."

2. He could not advocate and defend the administration policy of roll-back price subsidies because "I do not believe such subsidies will be effective in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply. We do not have in this country anything approaching these conditions."

Convinced that in the circumstances he could not succeed, Mr. Davis did the right thing in resigning, and in stating clearly the reasons which impelled him to that decision.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram I have received from the Simmons-Boardman Publishing Corporation and my answer thereto, also a telegram I have received from the American Farm Bureau Federation and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the military order and statement concerning the naming of the Alaska Military Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

PAY OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I introduced and secured the adoption of an amendment raising the base pay of the men in our armed forces to $50 a month.

Some Members of Congress opposed that amendment and some of them have been saying that the raise was not justified, that we are paying those men too much and they are wasting their money.

I have taken occasion to make some investigations, and I find that, according to ability, the men in our armed forces are buying more Government bonds than any other class of people in America.

Not only that, but they have a great many expenses to bear that they could not meet if it had not been for that raise. They are not wasting their money, but, as I said, are doing more to support our war efforts in proportion to their incomes than any other class of people we have.

Remember they are not striking or threatening to strike, and they are not paid in proportion to those people who are striking and slowing down our war industries. They are giving their all to win this war. I have no apology for making the fight to give them this raise which they so richly deserve. When the war is over, it is my hope that we extend their pay at least 6 months or a year until they can get back into civilian life, find employment, and adjust themselves to post-war conditions.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentleman propose an increase of 20 to 30 percent?

Mr. RANKIN. That would suit me all right; but that measure is not before the House. It may come later. I, for one, am in favor of adequate pay for the men in our armed forces, and for that reason I introduced and fought through the amendment to raise their base pay to $50 a month.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CHESTER DAVIS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MARVIN JONES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to say to my colleagues that I think practically all of us are acquainted with Marvin Jones. I never met Mr. Davis and never saw him but once or twice. I do know that the people of this country have a very very high regard for Mr. Davis. Regardless of many of the sins of the New Deal agricultural program, which Mr. Jones has been a party to, I hope he will not follow such a course during wartime. I think in fairness to Mr. Jones and in fairness to the war effort we should start from scratch. I reserve the right personally to criticize Mr. Jones in case he does not follow the right kind of a program from here on. He cannot now continue to be a part of an agricultural program that caters to a few so-called basic crops that represent but 25 percent of the national farm income. I do not even want to mention to him the fact that he has been one of the leaders of an agricultural program that gives 6,400 farmers in the great State of Texas a subsidy of $12,000,000 a year, which is more than the farmers in 35 other States obtain. I do not want to mention a lot of unpleasant things in connection with the unfair and unjust New Deal agricultural program. I think we should start out with Mr. Jones as Food Administrator at this time and try to help produce the food that is necessary to win this war, and do it by quitting talk about price and instead getting into high gear in production. If we do not do that, we shall not have anything to eat. We spend plenty of time talking about appropriations for food production, but the O. P. A. does not let the canners preserve this food after it is produced. I hope Mr. Jones can measure up to his responsibilities.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It passed the Senate and was referred to the House Committee on Claims, was unanimously reported by that committee, and is now on the calendar.

The bill was introduced at the suggestion of the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson. Its purport is to permit the War Department to settle claims for up to

$1,000 during the period of the war; the limitation now being $500, as is now provided by statute.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am wondering what the effect of that will be in relation to a paragraph that is in the Army appropriation bill now pending in the Senate, unless action was finally completed yesterday, which provides authority for the War Department to settle claims for damages to personal property not exceeding $500.

Mr. McGEHEE. I am not familiar with the provisions of the bill pending in the Senate, but I do know that there are several acts of Congress which conflict in some respect and do not give the War Department the proper authority to settle claims up to $500. This bill consolidates them into one and makes it easier for settlements to be made, and increases the amount they can settle for during the period of the war to $1,000.

Mr. CASE. I certainly am not opposed to the War Department's having authority to settle these small claims without requiring special legislation on each one, but in view of the fact that section is a new one in the appropriation bill and will have some bearing upon the use of money appropriated for the coming fiscal year, it would be well to examine the language of the appropriation bill and, before this bill is acted upon in the Senate, have appropriate language placed in it to avoid any possible conflict.

Mr. McGEHEE. May I say to the gentleman, as I stated before, I am not familiar with the provision of the amendment offered in the Senate on the appropriation bill, but I take it that the War Department making this recommendation and following the committees in each branch of the Congress in the passage of appropriation bills and other bills affecting it would certainly call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this legislation is pending, which would take care of the situation as they desire it. I stated to the Members that during the period of the war this permits the War Department to settle claims up to $1,000. I might say further this will relieve your Claims Committee in both the Senate and the House of a great deal of work. It will certainly lessen the expense of settling claims, because we are all familiar with what it costs to put a bill through the two branches of Congress. I think it should be passed. It is concurred in by the entire membership of the Claims Committee.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill does not take away any right from the claimant?

Mr. McGEHEE. No; no.

Mr. MICHENER. But it simply confers the right on the Department to adjust claims up to a given amount?

Mr. McGEHFE. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. But if the claimant does not want to accept the amount offered he can then present his claim just the same as he does now?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition, if the Department acts adversely, the claimant can file his bill in Congress?

Mr. McGEHEE. He can file his bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Department acted adversely within the amount they could act upon, then the claimant still has the right to come to Congress?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is right.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The question I raised was merely to be sure that that paragraph in the appropriation bill does not act as a limitation upon what you propose to do here.

Mr. MICHENER. The last law enacted dealing with a specific matter prevails. If the bill to which the gentleman now refers fixes the amount at $1,000 and then later in the week an appropriation bill fixes the amount at $500, there is no question but what the last law enacted will prevail.

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true. I might answer the gentleman further by saying, since he has called this proviso to my attention, and on account of the insistence by the War Department on the passage of this bill, having called me two or three times yesterday, I shall be glad to go to the Senate committee and inform them of the passage of the act with this proviso, with the view of eliminating the proviso in the appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I am wondering about the burden of proof and the degree of evidence required before the War Department will be permitted to approve a claim. Does the bill tend to make the Government responsible?

Mr. McGEHEE. It places no restrictions whatever. It is left entirely in the judgment of the representatives of the War Department. In the event the War Department should turn down a claim, even though it is within the amount as called for in this bill, then the aggrieved party or the injured party has a right to have this bill introduced in Congress.

Mr. NORRELL. I was thinking there should be some degree of liability before the War Department could be permitted to act favorably on a claim.

Mr. McGEHEE. In answer to the gentleman's question, I cannot visualize just how such language could be incorporated in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of War, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of $500, or in time of war not in excess of $1,000, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after May 27, 1941, when such claim is substantiated in such manner as the Secretary of War may by regulation prescribe, for damage to or loss or destruction of property, real or personal, or for personal injury or death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army while acting within the scope of their employment, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction, by criminal acts, of registered or insured mail while in the possession of the military authorities, claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages to real property incident to the use and occupancy thereof, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property, or the personal injury or death, shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee. No claim shall be settled under this act unless presented in writing within 1 year after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred: *Provided*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 1 year after its occurrence, any claim may on good cause shown be presented within 1 year after peace is established. The amount allowed on account of personal injury or death shall be limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, except that no payment shall be made to any claimant in reimbursement for medical or hospital services furnished at the expense of the United States nor, in the case of burial, of such portion of the expense thereof as may be otherwise paid by the United States. Any such settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or for personal injury or death of such persons, if such damage, loss, destruction, injury, or death occurs incident to their service. The Secretary of War may report such claims as exceed $500, or in time of war $1,000, to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the War Department for the settlement of claims under the provisions of other laws shall be available for the settlement of claims of the same character under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That portion of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 586), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of War is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property when the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of $1,000, occasioned by heavy gun fire and target practice of troops, and for damages to vessels, wharves, and other private property, found to be due to maneuvers or other military operations for which the Government is responsible, and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress at each session thereof

through the Treasury Department for payment as legal claims out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.", is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; 34 U. S. C. 215–217), shall hereafter be inapplicable to the War Department.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015; 33 U. S. C. 564), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. The act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 880), and by the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1436), is hereby amended by adding, after section 5, the following sections:

"SEC. 5a. Any authorization or direction in this act to the Secretary of War, and any reference herein to a decision, declaration, or other action by the Secretary of War, shall include authorization or direction to, and action by, as the case may be, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes, acting under such regulations as he may prescribe. Any settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to the contrary.

"SEC. 5b. The provisions of this act shall be applicable also to civilian personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, including such personnel and employees engaged on civil works."

SEC. 7. The act of February 13, 1936 (49 Stat. 1138; 31 U. S. C. 224a), shall hereafter be inapplicable to acts of officers, enlisted men, and employees of the Army and officers, employees, or agents of the War Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on next Thursday, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders..

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS, 1943

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2536), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise, and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or occupational limitations, in the case"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "establishing such facilities and furnishing such"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments numbered 1, 10, 12, 17, 18, 21, 23, and 25: These amendments are technical and clarifying amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 2: The House bill provided that as one of the conditions for approvability of a State plan for vocational rehabilitation such plan should provide that vocational rehabilitation under it should be available only to such classes of individuals as should be approved by the Administrator. The Senate amendment provided that vocational rehabilitation under such plan should be available only to classes of employable individuals defined by the Administrator. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5: Under the House bill one of the requirements for approvability of a State plan for vocational rehabilitation was that it contain such provisions as to the qualification of personnel for appointment in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards. The Senate amendment numbered 3 provided that the plan should contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system. The Senate recedes.

Amendments numbered 6 and 7: Under the House bill one of the requirements of a State plan was that it provide for compliance with such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator might establish. The Senate amendments required the State plan to provide such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to such expenditures as the Administrator might find reasonable and necessary. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 8, 9, 13, and 30: These Senate amendments provided for including within the scope of the Act war disabled civilians certified to the State as such by the Federal Security Administrator, and for having the Federal Government pay the necessary cost of providing vocational rehabilitation for them. As defined in section 10 (b), the term "war disabled civilian" means (1) civilians (except those paid for services as civilian defense workers) disabled while serving after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the war in the Aircraft Warning Service, as members of the Civilian Air Patrol, or as members of the United States Civilian Defense Corps (including registered trainees); and (2) civilians disabled while serving during a corresponding period as officers or members of the crew of a vessel owned or chartered by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or operated under charter from such Commission or Administration. The disability in any such case must be incurred in line of duty and not due to the civilian's own misconduct. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The conference agreement retains the provisions of these Senate amendments.

Amendment numbered 30 also retained the definition of the terms "vocational rehabilitation" and "rehabilitation services" which were contained in the House bill. This amendment eliminated, however, a provision which provided in effect that such terms should not be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, and that a State plan might be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services. As a result of the conference action on this amendment, the provision of the House bill just referred to is eliminated.

Amendments numbered 11 and 14: Senate amendment numbered 11 provided, in effect, that disabled individuals might be given medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or their occupational limitations. The language of the House bill which was stricken by Senate amendment numbered 14 would have limited such medical examinations to disabled individuals who were found to require financial assistance. The conference agreement retains and clarifies Senate amendment numbered 11 and the House recedes from its disagreement on Senate amendment numbered 14.

Amendment numbered 15: This amendment provided for including in the rehabilitation services furnished to needy disabled individuals transportation, occupational licenses, and customary occupational tools and equipment. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 16: This amendment provides that the conditions prescribed by the Administrator with respect to increased amounts payable to any State prior to July 1, 1945, which he finds to have substantially exhausted its funds, should be contained in "general" regulations. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 19 and 20: Under section 7 (a) (1) of the House bill the Federal Security Administrator was authorized to utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency and to enter into agreements and cooperative work arrangements with public agencies and private persons, agencies, and institutions for services and use of facilities and to compensate them therefor. These amendments have the effect of limiting this authority in connection with vocational rehabilitation to disabled persons actually residing in the District of Columbia. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 22: Among the powers granted to the Administrator by section 7 of the House bill was the authority to contract with other agencies, including foreign agencies for the making of studies, investigations, and reports relating to handicapped individuals. This amendment eliminated that authority. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 24 and 26: Section 7 of the House bill also authorized the Administrator to conduct appropriate courses of instruction for personnel or detail them to such courses of not more than six weeks duration conducted by others and to provide the personnel so detailed with necessary materials, subsistence, and other expenses. These amendments limited the exercise of this authority to July 1, 1945. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 27, 28, and 29: Under the House bill the Administrator was authorized to promulgate such regulations as he found necessary or expedient in carrying out the purposes of the Act. These amendments limit the authority of the Administrator to making such rules and regulations governing the administration of the Act as he finds necessary in carrying out its purposes. The House recedes.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2536) generally referred to as the rehabilitation bill. This bill was passed by the House a few days ago and went to the Senate. There were 30 amendments added in the Senate. I think with the possible exception of 2 or 3 of those amendments, they definitely improve the bill.

The conferees on the part of the House met with the conferees of the Senate. Of course, as usual, there was a little giving and taking. The only matter in the bill now in controversy, or which was in controversy at the time of the conference between the House and the Senate was amendment numbered 30, which added the civil air patrol, the merchant marine, and some of the other activities. Glancing at the report you will find that most of the amendments, practically all of the amendments, are clarifying amendments. It is simply the changing of one or two words. For instance, in line 22 on page 2 the word "persons" is changed to "individuals." In amendment No. 2, on page 3, it changes the language from "such classes of individuals as shall be approved" to "classes of employable individuals defined by the Administrator."

These amendments, I think in the main, improve the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill left the rehabilitation of veterans in the hands of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; as I just told the House, we do not have any service-connected veterans in here; but, of course, the service is open to all veterans, and we do not have anything in here about the T. V. A.

Mr. RANKIN. And you do not have anything in here about the R. E. A.

Mr. BARDEN. Nothing about the R. E. A.

Mr. RANKIN. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain what category is the C. A. P. put in? Are they in the Office of Civilian Defense? They are not in the armed branch of the service.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I understand that they are not in the armed branch.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the status of the C. A. P. now? They are in uniform, are they not?

Mr. BARDEN. I think not. I could not answer the gentleman definitely concerning that inquiry.

Mr. STEFAN. We are dealing with them in this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to know under what jurisdiction the C. A. P. comes, whether they are in the civilian defense or not.

Mr. BARDEN. I could not say whether they are under civilian defense, but I know that they are under the supervision of the Government and are performing patrol service overseas for the Government and their discipline is regulated by the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman understands I do not want to be facetious.

Mr. BARDEN. I understand; that is just one of the things that I am thinking about myself.

Mr. STEFAN. Are they being put under the jurisdiction of Mr. Landis, of the United States civilian defense organization; does the gentleman know that?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I thought I knew almost everything about this bill, but that is one definition I cannot give the gentleman.

Just in that connection, however, I want to say this, that the amendment which places the Aircraft Warning Service, the Civil Air Patrol, the merchant marine, and some others referred to, which are kindred services, has this provision in it:

> Any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States or any department or agency or instrumentality thereof for services as a civilian defense worker)—

Now, those who are on patrol are excepted. These men are not on the Government pay roll, but volunteer their services; they get no pay for it. And as to the merchant marine, the men who now carry the supplies across the seas and serve on patrol when such conditions are met, and this by all means the most important:

> But no individual shall be considered to be a war-disabled civilian unless he is disabled as a result of disease or injuries or aggravation of preexisting disease or injury incurred in the line of duty during such period and not due to his own misconduct.

That to me is very clear and I think it is just. We have passed a bill which takes care of the Federal expenses of the service-connected veterans and in effect these men must be service-connected; they must have been injured in line of duty while in the performance of their duty, and then if they apply for rehabilitation service the cost of that particular kind is paid wholly by the Federal Government. In other words, the service provided for in this bill is on a 50-50 matching basis and there are many reasons why this should be done.

One is that all the records pertaining to these men are in the departments here in Washington; they are the ones that can determine whether or not these men were injured in line of duty, and if they were they are certified to the States and then they are given the rehabilitation training that they request.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman has just made the statement that all of the records are kept in Washington covering these workers, members of the Office of Civilian Defense, Aircraft Patrol, and others. Now let us assume that at the end of 3 or 4 years a case arises where rehabilitation is necessary. I think the gentleman is making an argument against his amendment, because they will have to go through the records for the use of the people who are out in the States, who may be 2,000 miles from here, or those out there will have to come to Washington.

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry; I am afraid the gentleman has misunderstood my remarks. While the records remain here, they are certified from Washington; the same records are here that are provided for the certification of veterans.

The veteran enlists in your State or mine and goes into service. He may serve in the State, but the records are here in the Veterans' Administration and we very wisely provided in the legislation we passed that these veterans should be certified to the State by the Veterans' Administration. This will be negligible unless we have some air raids or an invasion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If we have an air raid or a bombing raid it will very likely strike in some concentrated area. If it were to strike New York City and a tremendous rehabilitation load were to grow out of it, I think it would be hardly fair to harness all of that expense on the State of New York. I think that these men—and I cannot see it any other way—I think that these men who carry the tankers through the Atlantic and the Pacific and pilot the supplies to the soldiers, these men who pilot the Civil Air Patrol planes hunting submarines, those who man the volunteer services without pay are just as much service-connected and just as closely connected to the war as you could possibly make them. What is the difference if a man is on an oil tanker carrying oil to north Africa and that ship is shot out from under him and he is blinded by the fire, as I have seen some of them—what is the difference in the status of that man as far as the Government's responsibility to rehabilitate him is concerned and the fellow who is blinded putting the oil in the tank? I cannot see any distinction myself.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As a matter of fact, is there not a substantial difference in the compensation paid? Are not these men on the tankers paid substantial bonuses for every trip in the war zone?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry that I cannot give the gentleman any definite information on that, but I am not concerned with whether a man gets 50 cents or $50.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. BARDEN. We are concerned, however, with a rehabilitation program. This is no pension bill. We have provided rehabilitation for the disabled of this country under this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. A pension bill will follow, though.

Mr. BARDEN. I know; we are not concerned with that here.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It will come eventually.

Mr. BARDEN. But I want to say this, I am not yet mad with the boys who are carrying the supplies across the seas, not yet.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As I understand the gentleman's position now he is placing all these classes and groups to which he refers in exactly the same category as the disabled war veterans back from the battle fronts.

Mr. BARDEN. No; the gentleman did not understand me to say that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman made himself very clear.

Mr. BARDEN. I said that as far as the Government's responsibility for rehabilitation is concerned, I can see absolutely no difference.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wanted to be clear about it.

Mr. BARDEN. Why should New York State, just because a man left the country from the port of New York, be considered his domicile should he be injured in mid-Atlantic and New York have to pay 50 percent of the rehabilitation cost when it is the burden of the Federal Government because of the nature of the war service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I correctly understood the amendment which the gentleman is discussing the only difference is that the Federal Government will pay all of the costs of rehabilitating these people referred to, whereas if the amendment were not in the bill the States would be required to pay half.

Mr. BARDEN. That is exactly the difference. That provision was not in the bill when it went to the Senate. It was in the bill when the bill came to the House committee but the committee eliminated it on a vote of 8 to 6. The Senate restored the provision. There was another amendment in which more Members of the House were concerned than this and we retained every part of that and the Senate receded. We conferees receded on this. Two of the conferees did not sign the report but no minority views were filed. Eight of the ten conferees did sign the report and I believe that the addition to the bill, if anything, improves it. Certainly it does not injure the bill and I sincerely hope the House will adopt the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is an improvement to the bill. I do not know of any more hazardous occupation outside the front-line trenches than that of the men who take these tankers across the submarine-infested oceans and who carry supplies to our soldiers. Those who enlist in this service come from all over the country, but the records, as I understand it, are kept in these Government agencies in Washington; that is, in the Government agencies. I think it is a very, very wise provision myself.

Mr. HART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. Before the gentleman leaves the floor, I hope he will explain to the House what was done on the part of the Senate conferees in yielding when the House conferees agreed to accept this amendment. As the gentleman stated at the outset of his remarks, it was a give-and-take proposition, and, while the House conferees accepted amendment 30, it was not until the Senate had agreed to accept a very important concession that the conferees of the House demanded. I hope the gentleman will elucidate on that.

Mr. BARDEN. That is true, and I will touch on that in a minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Regarding amendments numbered 8, 9, 13, and 30, which we discussed a little while ago and which refers to the Civilian Air Patrol, may I inform my colleague that since we were talking about it I spoke to Mr. Landis, of the Civilian Defense organization, and he tells me that the C. A. P. has been taken away from the Civilian Defense and has now been taken over entirely by the War Department. They are uniformed, they are paid a per diem and also a mileage. The reference in these amendments is merely for the rehabilitation of the C. A. P., is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey as to the Senate conferees yielding, I think the House should understand that we yielded on 26 of these amendments while the Senate only yielded on 2 or 3.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman if in his honest, conscientious opinion he does not think that at least 25 of the 26 amendments improve the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. I think a great many of them do.

Mr. BARDEN. You are not giving away much when you are helping yourself, then.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In view of what the gentleman from Nebraska just reported, is it not true then that the Civil Air Patrol is now taken out from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They receive a per diem. If they receive money from the Government they cannot come under this bill. That takes them from under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think so, and the legal draftsmen did not intend to take them out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is a question what the bill says. It is in there.

Mr. BARDEN. If it is, it would be too bad. If that did happen, it would be in line with the gentleman's views.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They are no longer in the bill, if that statement is true.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think the gentleman misunderstood the purpose of my question awhile ago. I am trying to ascertain whether these men on tankers are not civilian employees covered by workmen's compensation on the part of their employer. Is not that employer then responsible for any rehabilitation? They paid a premium for that purpose; it is part of their compensation, and I do not think the Federal Government ought to come in and give vocational training to the employees of the Standard Oil Co. or any other oil company.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman, he has probably missed the purpose of this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I want to get straight.

Mr. BARDEN. The purpose of this bill is to rehabilitate the employees of the Standard Oil Co., the railroad companies, the small companies, and the individuals.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But they paid compensation insurance for that.

Mr. BARDEN. We make no distinction in the body of the bill with reference to that. So far as the folks that you are referring to are concerned, this is about one of the finest pieces of labor legislation that has ever passed through this House. This is one piece of legislation that every labor organization and every laboring man is a thousand percent for, anyway you figure it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does the gentleman want the Federal Government to pay for the vocational training of an employee who has been covered by his employer for that purpose and has paid a premium?

Mr. BARDEN. When they come in and qualify under this bill, if they are blind then the Government pays them a blind compensation, and as soon as you can rehabilitate them they get off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But the gentleman realizes the insurance company insured the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. BARDEN. We are not dealing with the insurance company.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You will be.

Mr. BARDEN. No; we are not dealing with the insurance company.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The Standard Oil Co. pays a premium to rehabilitate any injured employee.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the amendment says:

> Any civilian disabled while serving at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as an officer or a member of the crew of the vessel owned or chartered by the Marine Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated under charter from such Commission or Administration.

That does not sound like the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is all Standard Oil Co.

Mr. BARDEN. No.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. What did the conferees do with reference to the Taft amendment limiting rehabilitation projects to public institutions?

Mr. BARDEN. What is that?

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there anything in the conference report that limits the rehabilitation enterprises or projects to only public institutions?

Mr. BARDEN. No; there is nothing like that in it. Senator TAFT was a member of the conferees and heartily approved the result of this conference.

Mr. COLE of New York. An amendment was put on this bill limiting places where persons could be rehabilitated to public institutions only.

Mr. BARDEN. No, no. I think every member of the conference would have objected to that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it was with some regret that I found myself unable to surrender my convictions and agree to the conference report in its entirety. I call to the attention of the House the fact that this bill was reported from our Committee on Education unanimously and passed by the House unanimously. Amendment No. 30 was inserted by the Senate. My objection is to amendment No. 30, which puts back into this bill after it was stricken out by our committee certain classes of people who will come under 100-percent Federal rehabilitation. This bill changes the existing law in one respect. It provides for 100-percent administrative cost by the Federal Government. To that extent the classes of people who are included in this bill, if this amendment remains will be under the influence of the Federal Government.

The classes designated in the bill by the Senate as "war disabled civilians" and to which I object, are the Aircraft Warning Service, members of the Civil Air Patrol, members of the United States Citizens Defense Corps, registered trainees for protective services, and those who may be employed by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or operating under charter from such commission or administration.

Before proceeding to the particular amendment, I wish to call attention to one thing that in my opinion was inadvertently overlooked in our conference yesterday with the Senate. In amendment 30 the Senate struck out this language:

> Such terms shall not, however, be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, but a State plan may be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services.

This provision in some degree safeguarded the States. They need or they need not adopt the entire program. That provision was taken out. Therefore it takes away from the State some of the safeguards we have attempted to throw around them in this bill and places in the hands of the Federal Government the right to say to a State, "You either adopt the whole program or we will not accept the plans that you submit to the Federal Security Administrator for approval."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. In just a moment I will yield to my distinguished chairman, for I know what he is about to say. He is about to say that he conferred with the director of the rehabilitation program yesterday, who said that practically all of the States of the Union now have a full program.

Mr. BARDEN. May I correct the gentleman and say that all of them have that?

Mr. DONDERO. The entire number; I will accept the gentleman's correction. But be that as it may, nevertheless, if a State chooses to submit a plan to the Federal Security Administrator without the full content of the program, he would have a right to reject it. He would not have that right if that language had remained in the bill. To that extent I think it takes away one of the safeguards to the States.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that, of course, no point was raised by the gentleman or anyone else about that in the conference we had with the Senate.

Mr. DONDERO. I am stating plainly that that matter was inadvertently overlooked.

Mr. BARDEN. In view of the fact that every State in the Union with a rehabilitation program today, which is 46 out of the 48, has the entire program of its own volition, where would we be with a kind of a half-baked program in some States, with the Veterans' Administration having authority to send a disabled veteran there to be rehabilitated? Say Michigan had only a part of the program and veterans from Michigan were certified there by the Veterans' Administration to be trained. Michigan would have to say, "We do not have anything. We cannot do that because we do not have the program." Then Michigan veterans would have to be sent somewhere else.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that we have been operating a rehabilitation program in this country for 23 years.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Not under this bill but under the basic law. We have never had any difficulty. There has been a happy relationship between the States and the Federal Government without this legislation. So if there were anything to that proposition, it would be removed in the light of experience through the years. I look with favor upon and have supported the present Federal and State rehabilitation program.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman will admit that this bill is a vast curtailment

of the Federal authority as it existed in the basic act. We have thrown many, many safeguards around the States that did not exist in the basic act. Is not that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is correct; and that was our purpose in framing this legislation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I was somewhat surprised at the statement of the chairman of the committee just now that this program is in operation in 48 States.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I did not say that. I said 46 out of the 48 States, as I recall.

Mr. CHENOWETH. One of the highly controversial issues in this bill was physical restoration. The gentleman does not mean to tell this House that 46 States have a program of physical restoration and rehabilitation?

Mr. BARDEN. None of the 46 States has a physical-restoration program under the law except as it has kind of stretched it out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Michigan was bringing out that under this provision they might be compelled to have it against their wish.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that, while physical restoration may not have been adopted in the States, four States under the basic law are now operating such a program and it is recognized on the part of the Federal administration. The language in the basic law, in my judgment, is broad enough so that it could be interpreted to include that, but we attempted in this bill to spell it out a little more distinctly.

Now let me come to the point I want to make and the reason why I could not sign the conference report. This provision in the bill, amendment No. 30, placing all of these classes of people entirely under the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator, does one thing. They can be rehabilitated in the States and the Federal Government is to pay the entire cost, if this conference report is adopted. They will pay only half if it is not adopted, and the States will pay the other half. But the thing to which I object is adding to the growing bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

This means expansion of bureaucracy in Washington. I have before me a list of 102 new agencies of this Government set up in Washington in the last 10 years, a list prepared by a gentleman in the State of Texas. I do not know how many more there are, but here is a list of 102. No one need be surprised that we have chaos and confusion in the Nation's Capital. The report recently filed by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures presents the amazing fact that in April of this year more than 3,000,000 people were in the executive branch of the Government and the monthly pay roll had mounted to the indefensible sum of more than $552,000,000 or the staggering total of $6,624,000,000 annually.

As evidence of the disregard of the Nation's welfare and the wanton waste with which bureaucracy operates, let me call to the attention of the House the fact that while newspapers throughout the country have been forced to curtail the use of newsprint, our Government issued 250,000 copies of a 146-page booklet entitled "The Fleas of North America." Such was the news release given to the American people by a nationally known radio commentator. How can we justify our position in adding to the juggernaut of government—this Federal Frankenstein—and at the same time limit the newspapers of the country to the point where the public cannot obtain information while the 3,200 Government press agents issue such pamphlets which are only thrust into the wastebaskets.

In a recent poll taken among the farmers of the Nation, 89 percent expressed it as their opinion that the production of food was hindered most by too much interference from Washington.

Let me say that this kind of governmental juggernaut will not only plague the Congress, and I think it is doing so now, but it will beset and impoverish the people of the United States unless it is reduced instead of increased.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman ever tried to cut out one of these bureaus? We are holding hearings now on the Federal Coal Commission bill, to extend its life. It is perfectly amazing the number of Republicans who come and ask for an extension of this Commission.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that the ship of state ought to be put in drydock, and the Congress of the United States, with the legislative tools at its command, should begin to cut away the barnacles in order that the ship of state may again ride at even keel.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is waterlogged now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. The sooner we do that the sooner the Federal Government will administer the laws of this country more efficiently and solve the problems we have before us.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under this bill an air-raid warden or watcher who might be injured while protecting his own property or that of his neighbor would come under this program?

Mr. DONDERO. He would. The gentleman from Connecticut asks the question whether or not an air-raid warden would come under this program. He would. I do not believe in setting up classes in the United States. I do not believe this class of people are any more entitled to rehabilitation—and I am for the rehabilitation program—than the man who works in a defense factory and loses a leg and is not able to rehabilitate himself. The States are doing it under the existing program. It would also do it for an air-raid warden without the amendment in question. For that reason I think it is a mistake for the Congress of the United States to include these people and place them completely under Federal control.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a natural step, after you recognize responsibility for the Federal Government to rehabilitate them, to turn around and pass pension laws covering the same people.

Mr. DONDERO. There is something in what the gentleman says. It is not quite so easy if it has to be done through the States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Do these new classes of people who are brought under the provisions of this bill have to qualify from the standpoint of financial need?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Do the air-raid wardens and watchers have to qualify from the standpoint of financial need?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the bill itself spells that out.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not the philosophy of this bill that only those who are injured but who are in need financially and cannot take care of their needs are covered by it?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, that should be the philosophy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman ever considered having this under the United States Employment Agency for the disabled? There is one for the disabled veterans, you know.

Mr. DONDERO. That is done largely now through State organizations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But would it not be a good plan to have the Federal Government have one? It would help in securing jobs for people.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is being done through the many employment agencies in the States, with a great deal of satisfaction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the Federal Government could help in getting Federal jobs.

Mr. DONDERO. Possibly that is true.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It seemed to me that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] was confused about this matter. This bill does not bring in new classes under the rehabilitation program. It simply provides that as to a particular class, in amendment No. 30, the Federal Government assumes all of the cost, whereas under the present program the States would pay half of it. Is that not correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. That is the only difference, with one exception. That is this: that under this bill as it is drawn that class would have to be certified first by the Federal Security Administrator here in Washington.

On the other hand, if it is left to the States, they would be certified by the State vocational rehabiiltation boards.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They are certified only so that the State might be relieved of half of the cost, but if they are not certified, then they can still participate, but the State would pay half of the cost.

Mr. DONDERO. The State would pay half of the cost, and the Federal Government would pay the other half, plus all the cost of administration.

I hope the conference report will be sent back for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, to say that there is not one word in here creating a new bureau, setting up a new agency or anything kindred to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said. Here is the only question involved, and I think the gentleman would be frank enough to admit this. Is the Federal Government in this group to pay 50 percent or 100 percent? If they pay 50 percent the State pays 50 percent. If they pay 100 percent, then they pay 100 percent. That is all there is and there is nothing else in it. They are now entitled to the rehabilitation, under the general bill. There cannot be but one thing and that is this: Is this service connected close enough to the Federal Government and the war that it should pay 100 percent for the rehabilitation?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] 3 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the controversy that has arisen here, it is not quite just the difference between 50 percent and 100 percent payment by the Federal Government, there is also the question as to whether the disabled require financial assistance. As the bill comes to us from conference, disabled individuals can qualify under the Federal-State matching program only if they need financial aid; but those war-disabled civilians under the classifications we are discussing, air wardens, civil air patrol, aircraft warning service, or the Maritime Commission, are to be provided 100-percent Federal money for their rehabilitation, regardless of their financial status, or whether they can get money for such purposes from pension, compensation, or insurance.

If the language we have in subsection 3, under amendment 13, were inserted under amendment 9, I think it would handle the problem. As the language now reads, anybody who serves and is injured as an air-raid watcher, can come in, even if he is a millionaire, and get 100 percent payment from the Government for his rehabilitation, without having to prove that he requires financial assistance with respect thereto.

I think the bill should go back to conference for revision of the two things that have been mentioned here. One is to make sure the States will not be compelled, in order to get Federal aid, to set up a complete rehabilitation program, if they do not want to. The other is with respect to the classifications of individuals who are to get 100-percent Federal money for their rehabilitation, and whether or not they must prove they need financial assistance. The latter could be remedied by adding the one clause to subsection (1), on page 6, at the end of line 7, as we already have it in subsection (3).

After the word "civilians" strike out the semicolon and insert the following: "And found to require financial assistance with respect to vocational rehabilitation, after full consideration of the eligibility of such individual for any similar benefit by way of pension, compensation, or insurance."

I think it is bad to adopt a policy under which any citizen who volunteers for example, to serve as an air warden in his block is automatically made a Federal responsibility, regardless of his own financial status. I think most of them do not want to be getting Federal money for their patriotic service. But I believe we ought to have this safeguard, and if suggested language is made a part of the bill, it will meet most of the objections that have been mentioned by those conferees who refuse to sign the report.

I favor 100-percent Federal money for those injured in Federal war work, if they need it. But I do not think they ought to get rehabilitation at public expense, unless they actually are found to need it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. They will be entitled to rehabilitation service, but how many of them does the gentleman think will ever ask for it? There may be millionaires who are serving on oil tankers who are injured, but for all practical purposes I am wondering how many of them would ask for rehabilitation.

Mr. JUDD. I doubt that many millionaires will be be serving on oil tankers; and the grounds for rehabilitation of men in the merchant marine are different from those serving in the voluntary civilian services. The former have insurance, and in addition they have higher wages; they receive up to $600 a month to take care of such contingencies. Some groups have workmen's compensation benefits in case of injury. I think they ought not to be certified for voational rehabilitation unless it is found that they need financial assistance in order to get it.

Surely it is strange for us to require that disabled civilians show financial need before they get 50-percent Federal aid, but do not require that war-disabled civilians show any financial need whatsoever in order to get 100-percent Federal payment for their rehabilitation services.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I refused to sign this conference report. I think whenever a conferee is in position that he cannot sign a conference report he should explain his position to the House. I agreed to all of the Senate amendments except 8, 9, 13, and 30.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has already made a statement as to our attitude. I think perhaps I ought to explain the history of this legislation. We have had a vocational rehabilitation law in the United States for over 23 years, the first act having been passed on June 2, 1920. This law provides vocational rehabilitation for all civilians. No groups or classes are recognized. All are treated alike, who can qualify for this training. That is what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and myself are now insisting should still be done.

However, for some reason, which I have not been able to ascertain, there is an influence seeking to place certain groups of civilians in the same category with disabled war veterans who are coming back from the battle fronts. These veterans receive rehabilitation training at solely Government expense. Civilians are rehabilitated by the States, with the Government contributing one-half of the cost. We believe that vocational rehabilitation is a State function, except for the disabled war veterans, and that there should be no change in the policy that has proved so successful for the past 23 years.

We are not arguing against the rehabilitation of these groups. They are entitled to it, if they are injured, and will receive this training under the present bill without the Senate amendments. We merely say that all civilians should be treated alike.

The Committee on Education had this matter up when this bill was first considered. You will recall that originally this bill also included veterans. Vigorous protests were made by veterans' organizations. It was the general sentiment that veterans should be considered separately from civilians. Subsequently, a bill was passed providing for vocational rehabilitation of disabled war veterans only. This left only civilians in the bill. Our committee then eliminated the sections creating these groups of civilians. The House passed the bill in this form.

The bill went over to the Senate where the provisions were reinserted. This is the controversy before us.

Let me call attention to the rather absurd situation in which we find ourselves today. We are called upon to provide for rehabilitation training for certain groups of civilians who may render a Federal service of one kind or another if they sustain injuries in line of duty. At the same time, to my knowledge, not one single act has been passed providing any medical or hospital care in such an event.

I submit that it is ridiculous to provide rehabilitation training for these special groups at straight Government expense, when there is no provision to even pay their doctor or hospital bills in case of accidents.

As I have mentioned before, any person in any of these classes named in the Senate amendment is eligible for this

training under the program now in effect, and which is continued by this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. An air-raid warden tomorrow night is injured in his own automobile going to his station as a result of a test black-out. He secures damages from the person who ran into his automobile; yet under this bill it would still be the responsibility of the Federal Government to pay for his rehabilitation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right. It sets up these civilian groups in the same category as disabled war veterans. I maintain that persons entitled to rehabilitation should be divided into only two groups. One is the veterans to whom we owe a primary obligation to rehabilitate at wholly Federal expense. The other, the civilian group, which will include air wardens and the other classes herein named. The Federal Government will contribute one-half of the expense. In this bill, we are also providing that the administrative expense shall be paid 100 percent by the Federal Government. Heretofore it has been 50 percent. Another clause in this bill would provide that if any State runs out of money the Government can advance the whole amount necessary to carry on the program. Surely we are being more than liberal with the States.

Another singular thing. Not one word of testimony was given before our committee that any State had requested that this provision be inserted. The States are willing to pay their share of this expense and are satisfied with the bill as it passed the House.

As far as the maritime group is concerned I think it would be a mistake to set them up as a separate class. Perhaps they are in a little different category, but I believe it is a mistake to establish any classification of civilians for this rehabilitation training. Everyone involved should be treated alike. All will be taken care of. The States are not asking to be relieved of this obligation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Do the hearings show the number of these particular groups who come within the provision of this bill who would be entitled to this service? The States are not asking for this?

Mr. CHENOWETH. There was no testimony that any State was asking for such a classification or that it is necessary. I do not recall a single witness who appeared before our committee in support of the proposal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, only this morning I have talked with the gentleman from my own State who has in charge this program and with some Representatives of other States who are interested in the program in those States. They approve this conference report and they want it adopted.

I can understand the point of view of the gentleman from Michigan and some of the others here who are not satisfied with it, but did you ever see a conference report which was entirely satisfactory to both sides? By the nature of the action it is the giving and the taking between the two Houses in order that we may have a bill. If you send this conference report back the chances are 9 out of 10 that this Congress will adjourn for the summer with no legislation on this subject. This Congress is getting ready to take a recess for the summer but the States need a continuation of this program. They do not need it for the interest of the States particularly; they need it for the interest of the war effort. They are training these people to work in the shipyards and factories where they are making munitions of war, and they need it now when there is such a shortage of manpower. The physically handicapped and the disabled can be trained to fit in the program and reduce the manpower shortage. It seems to me to be a great mistake to quibble about this mere difference here as to whether the Federal Government is going to pay 100 percent of the cost or 50 percent of the cost for certain classes of people who are rendering a Federal service. Members of the Civil Air Patrol are doing the same thing that the Air Corps does in the Army and Navy, guarding our shore line. Service in the merchant marine of this country is certainly just as hazardous as any service that can be rendered in the interest of the welfare of this country. It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to adopt this conference report and let this program go forward and let these people be trained by the Vocational Rehabilitation Service of each State. We need the services of these people. As far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to see the Federal Government pay the entire cost of these services because the services referred to are really in the interest of the war effort. If, of course, these people are not certified for 100-percent participation they will still be eligible for 50-percent participation under the general statute. It seems to me we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I think the conference report should be adopted and this act put into effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the Members that the real fight in the conference committee and the thing which we cherished most was this provision which kept in the States the right to run this program. The amendment was originally offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Your committee after considerable effort worked out that amendment to leave the control of it absolutely in the States. The Senate amended that. They wanted to put in a merit system and so forth which would have put the control back in Washington where we do not want it. We stuck solidly for this amendment and agreed to recede on amendment No. 30. We have in this bill what we most wanted and what the Senate has failed to recede from certainly is not injurious to it.

I hope the House will adopt this conference report because it needs to be in effect by July 1.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would not the gentleman say that by insisting upon State control of this program that we have secured at least 90 percent of what we wanted?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely and I will say that this is the best piece of States rights legislation that has gone through the Congress since I have been here and even one who did not like the bill could not say to the contrary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] rise?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask for a division of the House.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the motion comes too late. I do not like to make that point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion having been made to reconsider and to lay it upon the table, the Chair thinks that it is not at liberty to exercise any further option in the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I will not insist on it.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill 2714, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments, Nos. 5, 60, and 61 to said bill, dis-

agreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.
3. National Archives.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1134. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. RADCLIFFE be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate, vice Mr. WAGNER, resigned, to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) entitled "An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the agency:

United States Maritime Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 97, 122, and 123.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "herein" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words, "in this Act"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,128,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,349,063"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment in the proviso thereof, and after the word "projects" where the same first occurs in such proviso, insert the words "under his supervision."

At the end of the first paragraph of said amendment, following the word "funds" and before the period, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That during the first four months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months."

In the third paragraph of said amendment after the word "elsewhere", and before the comma, insert the following: "at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made."

In the third paragraph of said amendment before the word "*Provided*" strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out all of the proviso down to and including the word "made".

In the fourth paragraph of said amendment after the word "necessary" insert the following: ", in the discretion of the Administrator."

At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third paragraph of said amendment, in the first proviso thereof, after the word "tenancy" and before the semicolon, insert the following: ", or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or Territory, whichever amount is the larger"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

(Second conference report)

The managers on the part of the House at the second conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

TOTALS, AND OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

The following amendments relate to correction of totals, technical correction of text, etc.: Nos. 19, 120, and 121.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 97: Strikes out the language inserted by the Senate authorizing parity payments for the crop years 1943 and 1944.

U. S. WAREHOUSE ACT

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates $464,115 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—LOANS

Amendment No. 122: Appropriates $20,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RURAL REHABILITATION

(Farm Security Administration)

Amendment No. 126: Retains the House provision, with amendments as indicated in the following text. The portions of the House provision which have been deleted are incorporated in the text, enclosed by brackets. New language, proposed to be added, is shown in italic type.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress

semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects *under his supervision*, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds: *Provided further, That during the first 4 months of the fiscal year ending June 30; 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months.*

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere *at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made*, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine: [*Provided*, That no loan shall be made out of such funds except loans which have first been offered and refused by other lending agencies (including the Emergency Crop and Feed Division of the Farm Credit Administration, the Production Credit Associations, and private lending agencies) customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made]. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, *in the discretion of the Administrator*, for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

Amendment No. 127: Retains the House provision, with an amendment shown in italic type in the following text:

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C., 1000–1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C., 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, $1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said Act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of two times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, *or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or Territory, whichever amount is the larger*; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House report the following amendments in disagreement:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 87: Strikes out the House language limiting the appropriation to payments "for compliances with soil-building practices and water conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended" and inserts language making the appropriation available "for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended", etc.

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes the House provision prohibiting incentive payments.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building.

Federal crop insurance

Amendments Nos. 98 and 99, Federal crop insurance: Appropriates $7,818,748, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House language providing for liquidation of the corporation.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there is no disagreement among the conferees in reference to the items in the agricultural appropriation bill which are disposed of in the conference report and so far as I know there is no objection to the conference report. Unless some Member desires to discuss the matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 69, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment

Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87. I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] desires to offer a preferential motion and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House that we are getting down to the time when we are trying to recess, and that we only have three amendments in disagreement. I cannot understand just why any Member would not want to agree to my motion.

We have retained the $100,000,000, making the total amount $400,000,000. All the Senate amendment, which I am asking your concurrence in, does is to leave this money available through the period 1945 to be used in connection with soil conservation, tied in with production. Why would you put the $100,000,000 in and then write in some language that might prevent using same? So I am hoping that we will have no trouble in agreeing to my motion so that the Senate amendment, which is short and definite, will be carried out in line with the purpose of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Act. That is, that it shall remain for the proper period so as to continue the program which has been running successfully for several years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is all I want to say at this time. I cannot understand why we should not agree to this Senate amendment, which is fair. I would like to make one further statement. In a great many instances during the past months, instead of the Congress doing something definite in the interest of being helpful, what you have been doing is cutting appropriations and putting in amendments to destroy programs and various agencies. If and when some of these agencies fail, which they are going to do, then where will the responsibility lie? You have not passed any legislation and when these programs and agencies fail, the Congress will be held responsible. If we cannot give them something definite, like I proposed in my bill, H. R. 2837, giving definite power to the Food Administrator, then let us not by cutting appropriations and putting in amendments hamper various programs and what they are trying to do so that if and when they should fail, these agencies, along with the President, will not be in a position to put the blame on Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my motion will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that a feeling of fatigue has settled upon this deliberative body. I am just as anxious to go home as any Member of this body. I am just as anxious to find a bit of respite and relaxation from what in all modesty I can say has been a rather arduous labor on the Appropriations Committee for the last 6 months. But no matter how inclement or hot the weather in Washington, and no matter what fatigue of spirit and mind I may experience, it is not sufficiently impelling to sacrifice or to surrender the principle which I long ago espoused.

The boys in Africa are fatigued, too, and the boys in the Pacific and the boys everywhere, yet they must carry out their duty even as we must carry out our legislative responsibility.

So I find myself in disagreement with the preferential motion that was submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, and I do so simply because it is a matter of deep conviction.

It is years now since I have been contending in the well of this House that the salvation of the American farmer is a substantial price in the open market place. That will mean a free agriculture, that will mean a free farmer, who is the backbone of the country. I do not propose now or at any other time to forsake that principle or to forsake that position, for any other decision will simply mean the alternative, namely, Government control.

Perhaps it is not telling tales out of school to say that sometime in the course of this session the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before one of the committees of the House and, when the question was submitted as to why he did not let the farmer alone to obtain parity prices in the open market, by inference and almost expressly he stated that it would mean the losing of control of the American farmer. That is involved here now as it has been in every palliative that has ever been voted by this and by the other body. There can be no free and traditional agriculture unless there be free and uncontrolled farmers who are not held in dependency upon Federal aid. That means that there must be adequate prices. Palliatives such as here proposed are no substitute for adequate prices.

Now it is proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina to strike the House language so that the funds that are carried in this bill can be used for purposes other than for soil compliances and water conservation practices. Those are things that run to the soil, those are things that run to the enrichment of a natural resource. Everything else, of course, is on an individual basis in the form of a production payment or an incentive payment. There is ample money in this bill for soil compliances; in fact, it would require only $200,000,000, yet on the basis of the vote of this body the other day there is $400,000,000 carried in this bill, but the money cannot be expended unless the House chooses today to vote down its earlier position and adopt the language whereby the money can be used for incentive and for production payments.

I contended that there was no obligation on the part of the Congress in this respect, and I went back to find the official document of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which was issued on the 3d day of December 1942. I read you this language from this official document as indicated on page 36:

> The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

That was as early as December 1942, when the program was first announced.

On the 3d day of June 1943 there was a summarization of the whole program in a very effective brochure, and there again on page 40 appears this language:

> The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

There never was any question at any time in any of the official literature of the Department of Agriculture that this was a wholly contingent program. That is reason number one why I stand by the House position.

Reason number two is this. Every quota on every commodity with the exception of cotton has been suspended. Let me repeat that. Every quota on basic commodities with the exception of cotton has been suspended.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is in error. Quotas are now in effect on tobacco, and it would be very unfortunate if those quotas were lifted. It would be calculated to completely destroy the food program for the Nation, because the farmers in our section of the country prefer to grow tobacco.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Quotas are still in operation on corn, unless a farmer plants 90 percent of the war crop goals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is right, but I am speaking of the basic quotas on corn and wheat as contemplated under the 1938 act. The lid has been taken off.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is mistaken on that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is not mistaken. The gentleman has for his authority the words of the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency before our committee itself. The Agricultural Adjustment Act Administrator has testified time and time again that those quotas has been taken off. I grant you, of course, that there has to be a 90 percent compliance with the so-called war quota, but I am speaking about the amount of corn that the

farmer can raise or the amount of wheat that a farmer can raise if he is disposed to do so. In that respect the gentleman from Illinois is correct. If this needs further argument, I respectfully refer any member of this House to pages 710, 711, and 712 of the House hearings where the testimony of the Administrator can be found. I rely upon the record.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One point that has never been covered to my satisfaction or never attempted to be covered, as far as I can understand, and I think it is important, is whether the farmers themselves understood, first, that the Secretary of Agriculture had the authority to promise this payment and, second, whether they understood that it was contingent upon an appropriation by the Congress that might not be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that his authority is derived from the two basic acts, but has always stated at all times, in the press, over the radio, and through the instrumentality of departmental bulletins, that it was always contingent upon appropriations hereafter to be made by the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In fairness, does not that situation obtain with regard to every other commitment which has been made in the past? Are not all of these commitments contingent upon the Congress, in good faith carrying out the commitments made by the Secretary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two differences. Let me point out what they are. The first is that at no time in the past have the quotas been taken off. The very purpose of acreage allotment payments was to offset diminished acreage by a payment from the Treasury. The very purpose of the payment was to secure compliance with the acreage plan. The quotas have now been lifted. The second difference lies in the fact that under Executive order, every payment made hereunder will be credited in determining parity prices under the Price Act. In one moment we tell the farmer that here is a payment on a limited amount of your crop. In the next breath we say that it will be deducted from a determination of parity prices on his whole crop. Do you consider that a service to the farmer?

So, first of all, this was contingent; second, the quotas have been suspended; third, this is a palliative which has been repudiated by the House on several occasions only last week. Finally, it does not run to the soil. It does not enrich a natural resource. The other thing is this, and I point this out particularly to the gentleman from North Carolina, under the directive issued by the President of the United States, which was the provocation for the introduction of the Bankhead bill, the President said that in determining ceiling price for a commodity, every payment made to the farmer would be deducted for the purpose of that calculation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that still in?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is, by Presidential fiat. Of course, they undertook to undo it by means of the Bankhead bill, but as the gentleman will remember, it failed in the Senate in overriding the veto.

So these payments will be deducted. So what good do they do? If we are going to be consistent in the position we took last week, then the thing to do is to vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] under which he proposes that the House recede from its earlier and very consistent position.

I can only reaffirm the position which I have consistently taken for a long time. Pay the farmer for those practices which enrich and conserve the soil. That is fair and proper. That conserves and rebuilds a great natural resource.

Thereafter give him the fullest measure of freedom in operating his land. Assure him a fair price for his products and he will do the rest. The whole history of farm production stands as eloquent testimony to the capacity, the resourcefulness, the patriotism, and the diligence of the American farm in producing food and fiber. He needs no bureaucratic control from Washington.

Yet here are these ever present lures of small payments as a substitute for adequate prices. Every payment has a string to it. That is the string of Federal control.

None of them will serve as a substitute for good prices in the open market place. As Governor Townsend, the A. A. A. Administrator expressed it to the committee: The greatest incentive in the world is a good big price. You cannot beat it.

Is it not high time that we forsake these efforts to control the farmer and give him the fullest measure of freedom to work out his own destiny. He will do it because he has always done it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the present situation, if this House is to be consistent, we must vote for the Fulmer motion because just last week the House approved $400,000,000 for the purpose of redeeming the good faith of the Government to the extent that the good faith of the Government was involved in these commitments. The very adroit argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would lead this House to believe that the proposition of subsidies is involved here. A subsidy, as it is usually understood, is not here involved. These payments are made under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and this Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make the commitments. Now, in good faith, the Congress ought to direct the Secretary to carry out the commitments he has made. By calling it a subsidy the opposition hopes to bring the proposition into disrepute because subsidies at the present time appear to be in the "doghouse," so far as Congress is concerned. There is but one outstanding thing involved in this matter, and that is the good faith of the Government and the morale of our farmers. The payments are being made under the Soil Conservation Act which the Congress passed. I have never regarded these payments as subsidies. The payments are for the purpose of encouraging an improvement of the topsoil of the agricultural lands of America which will inure to the benefit of generations yet unborn. It is a national investment in the greatest national resource.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture has held that this soil conservation money can be used for incentive or subsidy payments?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, you can call it incentive or subsidy or whatever you want to call it. It is payment for compliance, and compliance means the diversification of crops.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. In the very next section we take care of that. I propose to offer an amendment that not one dime of this money can be used for incentive payments. That ought to be satisfactory to every Member of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I am serious about this. I think that in good faith we ought to keep these commitments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the Fulmer motion is adopted, it will result in substantially the same payments being made for compliance for soil improvement as have been made in previous years under the A. A. A. program?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. We certainly should provide the money without any restrictions upon it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, there is a question of principle involved here, and the House should understand very clearly the question that is involved.

The motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment is an amendment to permit the Government to carry out the commitment which the farmer understood was made by the Govern-

ment when he, the farmer, signed up last fall for the 1943 crop year.

If Members are confused about this, and vote to renege on that agreement, they will have much explaining to do. Let me illustrate:

I have a letter from a farmer who plants winter wheat. He had to decide before he planted his wheat what his 1943 crop plans would be. He had then to decide whether he would sign up on the 1943 triple-A program. He did decide. He decided to shift some of his winter wheat crop land to other crops more wanted in the war effort. To do this, he had to buy some equipment for handling crops other than wheat. He borrowed money at the bank to do so. He counted, he still counts on the Government making good to him the promise of certain A. A. A. payments if he farmed in compliance with his agreement.

Now this winter wheat farmer has kept his part of the bargain. He is not in position to change the bargain if he wanted to. Certainly it is unfair if the Government, now through Congress, says it will not permit the appropriations already agreed upon to be used to carry out the bargain.

The gentleman from Illinois has raised the point that quotas were lifted for wheat and corn. That is beside the point. The quotas were lifted—but not until after that farmer planted his wheat. They were lifted along in January and February and this farmer had to plant his winter wheat months before that. I am advised that for the farmers who produce 70 percent of our national wheat crop the lifting of quotas came too late for them to increase their wheat acreage.

Now do not be confused.

The proposal to permit the funds to be used for crop adjustment payments is nothing new. The only new thing is to propose that the money be not used for such a purpose. Under the Soil Conservation Act of 1936 and the Farm Act of 1938, money has been payable for two types of compliance—soil and water conservation practices and crop adjustment programs.

If the Congress wants to say that in the future, on crops not yet planted, for crop years not yet planned and committed, the funds shall not be used to pay for anything except strict soil and water conservation practices, that would be another matter. But the proposal before us is to make such a proposition retroactive.

Keep this fact clearly in mind: the purposes for which the money would be payable under the Senate amendment are the purposes for which the money has been payable for at least the past 4 years, conservation and crop adjustment.

The confusion, if any, comes about because of the talk about an incentive payment program that came along in February. About 100 million dollars of new money was asked for that, and the subcommittee turned the request down. They did it at their first meeting, I understand, by a vote of 6 to 1. Very properly they announced their action at the time so that the Department of Agriculture and the farmers would be on notice. But they did not then, and never afterward served notice on the farmers that the 1943 crop contracts presented in the fall, signed up in December, and acted upon by the farmers, like the wheat farmer I have cited, would be changed or the bases for payment changed.

If you want to change the rules for next year, that is all right if you do it in advance. If you want to reaffirm the committee's action on incentive payments, that is not going to violate the contract I have cited. But on the matter now pending, keep faith. Do not change the rules on payment after the farmer has planted his crop and operated his farm on the terms announced to him last December.

Under permission granted by the House, I include the following letter and tables supplied by the Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In compliance with your request by telephone June 29, 1943, we are submitting some information regarding the commitments of the Department of Agriculture on 1943 program payments to farmers for the production of war crops and for carrying out soil-conservation practices.

The original 1943 program of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, has announced and presented to farmers in the fall of 1942, provided allotments for the 1943 crops of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, and payments for planting within such allotments. These allotment payments which were in addition to the soil-conservation practice payments, were subject to appropriations by Congress and were contingent upon the planting of specified adapted crops urgently needed in the war effort. That is, the allotment payment would be made if the farm devoted a certain amount of land to the production of war crops, such as soybeans, flax, potatoes, peanuts, hemp, etc.

As the war progressed and more information became available on the requirements for our armed forces, allies, and for the rehabilitation of people in occupied countries, it was found necessary to modify the provisions of the original program to obtain increased production of wheat and corn.

On January 8, 1943, the limitations on the planting of corn were removed and on February 23, 1943, marketing quotas and allotment recreations were removed from the 1943 wheat crop.

At the time winter wheat was planted in the fall of 1942, these original provisions were in effect and almost all of the winter-wheat farmers complied with them by planting within their allotments. For these farmers who produce about 70 percent of the Nation's wheat, the modifications in the program came too late for them to increase their 1943 wheat acreage.

Marketing quotas and allotment restrictions are still in effect for the 1943 crops of cotton and tobacco, and the performance of farmers with respect to these two crops as well as winter wheat was in good faith and the commitments of the Government appear to be valid since they were in accordance with the laws under which the farm programs are administered.

The removal of limitations on the planting of corn and spring wheat before planting time made it necessary for us to provide measures to obtain the urgently needed acreages of war crops which would have to compete with corn and spring wheat.

The difficulty of obtaining the desired production of war crops in the Corn Belt and in the spring wheat area was intensified by the removal of limitations on the planting of wheat and corn which are more profitable than the adapted war crops. About 90 percent of soybeans and approximately 50 percent of canning crops are produced in the Corn Belt and almost all of the flax is produced in the spring wheat area.

The 1943 program as finally determined contemplated the expenditure of about $400,000,000 to farmers for production of these needed war crops and for carrying out soil-conservation practices.

This amount, after deductions for administrative expenses, naval stores, and insular division, was to have been divided about equally between payments for conservation practices and payments to assist farmers in shifting crops urgently needed for the war effort. War crop goals have been established on approximately 80 percent of the more than 6,000,000 farms in the country.

The commitments of the Government as presented to farmers provided that the payment, which otherwise would have been made for planting within allotments, would be made if farmers who signed a farm plan planted at least 90 percent of the total war crop goal established for the farm.

The amount of this payment for each farm was to have been equal to the payment which otherwise would have been computed on the allotments of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The intent of this payment was to partially compensate farmers for the smaller returns they would receive from the war crops.

In almost every instance, a considerably less return per acre is received from the war crops than is obtained from the competing crops of corn, wheat, cotton, etc. This fact is illustrated in tables I, II, and IIa, in which comparisons of gross returns per acre are shown for corn and soybeans, corn and flax, and for wheat and flax. We would like to point out that the gross returns from the war crop are less than from the competing crop in all States for which data are shown.

The high degree of participation by farmers in the 1943 program indicates that they have responded to the commitments of the Government with respect to these payments. The extent of their participation is shown in table III in which the indicated 1943 acreages of some of the urgently needed crops are compared with the 1942 acreages of such crops. The 1943 acreage of flax is 29 percent greater than the 1942 acreage. The soybean acreage is up 18.5 percent; potatoes, 13.6 percent; dry edible beans, 16.2 percent; dry field peas, 35 percent; and peanuts, 12.5 percent.

We would like to assure you that we appreciate this opportunity of supplying you with this information. If we can be of further service, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

LEROY K. SMITH,
Director, North Central Division.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of gross returns per acre from corn and soybeans*

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Corn		Soybeans		Difference in favor of corn (2)—(4)	Percent soybean value is of corn
	Yield [1]	Cash value [2]	Yield [1]	Cash value [3]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ill.	47.6	$49.98	21.2	$30.22	$10.76	78
Ind.	43.4	45.57	17.0	31.45	14.12	69
Iowa	48.9	51.34	19.1	35.34	16.00	69
Minn.	39.6	41.58	15.7	29.04	12.54	70
Mo.	27.8	29.19	12.2	22.57	6.62	77
Ohio	44.4	46.62	19.0	35.15	11.47	75

[1] Yields for both corn and soybeans represent the 1937–41 weighted average.
[2] Cash value of corn determined on basis of $1.05 per bushel.
[3] Cash value of soybeans determined on basis of loan rate of $1.85 per bushel.

TABLE II.—*Comparison of gross returns per acre from corn and flax*

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Corn		Flax		Difference in favor of corn (2)—(4)	Percent flax value is of corn
	Yield	Value [2]	Yield	Value [3]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Iowa	48.9	$51.34	10.6	$28.51	$22.83	56
Minn.	39.6	41.58	9.9	26.93	14.65	65
S. Dak.	19.2	20.16	7.0	18.83	1.33	93

[1] All data for districts 3 and 6, in which most of the flax is grown.
[2] Value of corn determined on basis of $1.05 per bushel.
[3] Value of flax determined on basis of local loan rates.

TABLE IIa.—*Comparison of gross returns per acre from wheat and flax*

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Wheat		Flax		Difference in favor of wheat (2)—(4)	Percent flax value is of wheat
	Yield [1]	Value [2]	Yield [1]	Value [3]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mont.	11.4	$15.50	4.4	$12.54	$2.96	81
N. Dak.	10.3	14.01	4.3	12.26	1.75	88

[1] Yields for both wheat and flax represent the 1937–41 weighted average.
[2] Value of wheat determined on basis of $1.36 at Minneapolis.
[3] Value of flax determined on basis of $2.85 at Minneapolis.

TABLE III.—*Planted acreages of some urgently needed crops with 1943 and 1942 comparisons*

	1942 planted acres	Indicated 1943 planted acres	1943 planted acres as percent of 1942 planted acres
Corn	91,011,000	96,827,000	106.4
Flax	4,691,000	6,051,000	129.0
Soybeans	10,762,000	12,750,000	118.5
Potatoes	2,793,000	3,174,000	113.6
Beans, dry edible	2,135,000	2,480,000	116.2
Peas, dry field	501,000	677,000	135.1
Peanuts	4,647,000	5,230,000	112.5

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I think the fundamental issue here was well stated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. That issue is whether the Federal Government will carry out the commitments which it has made to the farmers of this country.

It is true that commitments which the Department of Agriculture may make in advance of appropriations are subject to whatever action Congress may take in making the appropriation. That is true in the case of every appropriation we make. The men in the Army of the United States getting $50 a month do not get their pay unless we appropriate the money; we take them into the Army, we tell them they will get $50 a month, but if we fail to appropriate the money they will not get it.

There has been as much of a commitment in connection with the payment of those sums of money to farmers for carrying out their part of the farm program as there could possibly be in connection with any dealings which the Federal Government has with its citizens. These farmers who signed up in our present farm program understood when they signed up that there were to be certain definite payments made. They had every reason to believe these commitments would be kept. For years these promises and agreements had been made and kept on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is it not true that the Department of Agriculture was authorized under the law to make these commitments?

Mr. HOPE. The Department of Agriculture is authorized, under the Triple A Act of 1938, to make commitments, just as fully as any Government agency is authorized to make any commitments.

There is a provision still in conference which states that for next year these commitments are not to be made. That is all right. I am in favor of not making comitments for another year, but there we serve notice in advance; we modify the fundamental law in that particular; but as long as we have that law on the statute books authorizing commitments to be made and as long as the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under that law, has gone out and made these commitments, as long as farmers have signed up contracts relying on those assurances, then I say that in good faith we ought to go ahead and appropriate the money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. We really passed on that question last week when we agreed to the Senate amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation from $360,000,000 to $400,000,000.

It will not take anything like $400,000,000 to make practice payments; it will take less than $200,000,000. The remainder of the money can be used only for making the regular triple A payments. I am satisfied that when a majority of the House voted to increase the amount they meant that these triple A payments should be made. The fact that on a later vote the purpose for which the $400,000,000 could be used was limited to practice payments indicates that some Members misunderstood the issue on which they were voting and the purpose for which the increase was made.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What is the other payment to be made except soil conservation payments?

Mr. HOPE. The payment which is made to farmers who comply with the program, such as adjusting their acreage of the basic crops—and planting the required acreage of war crops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, may I state for the information of the Members of the House that the next amendment to be voted on is amendment No. 88. I propose to move to recede and concur with the following amendment:

In lieu of the language stricken by the amendment insert: Provided no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for an incentive payment as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

This amendment should be satisfactory and I am going to ask your approval of same.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, one thing in which I am interested in connection with this subject matter is that we if possible perfect a bill for transmission to the President before the end of the fiscal year. We have now reached the point where the two houses have agreed upon every matter of controversy contained in the bill with the exception of the limitations upon the use of the $400,000,000, upon the amount of which both Houses have agreed, for soil conservation and production payments; and the matter of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation appropriation which is still in dispute. Everything else with the exception of these two subject matters has been agreed to by both Houses, and if it is possible for this House without doing violence to any conscientious convictions that its membership may entertain to agree to a procedure which will result in an agreement and in the sending of the bill to the President, I would be very glad for that end to be achieved.

I offered the motion to further insist upon our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87. There are three amendments in disagreement which relate to this $400,000,000 which Congress by action of both Houses proposed to make available for soil conservation payments and production payments. We are now considering the first one. The second one will

be the limitation imposed when the bill was in the House with relation to the making of incentive payments. There is still a third amendment, No. 92, by which the Senate undertook to strike out language which was included in the House bill which would limit the program for next year to soil conservation and water conservation benefits, and the over-all amount of the commitments that can be made next year to $300,000,000.

I made the motion on behalf of the committee because it represented the views of a majority of the committee that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87, but I think that factor does not preclude me from stating to you what I think would be a fair basis of compromise for the positions of the two Houses. The other days, as you will recall, this House voted by a majority of 10 not to recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87. The Senate yesterday, voting on the same question, insisted upon its position, with only two Senators voting to the contrary. So you will observe that a tremendously greater majority of the Senate is insisting upon the Senate provision than there is of the House insisting upon the House position. The House was almost evenly divided.

I think a fair compromise of this matter would be to recede from our disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87, to recede with the amendment offered by Mr. FULMER and concur in Senate amendment numbered 88, and then to insist upon our position with regard to Senate amendment numbered 92. If you do that, I have assurances that the Senate will then recede on amendment numbered 92, which is the amendment that limits the program for the next year. If you take these actions, the effect will be that you will permit this program of the Secretary announced last fall to be carried out in accordance with his commitments for the present year. At the same time you will serve notice you will limit his authority for the next year by this language stricken out by Senate amendment numbered 92. You will serve notice on the farmers of the country that next year they will not be able to get the same types of payments they got heretofore, that they will not be able to get any type of payments except for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices.

That, in my judgment, is all right so far as next year is concerned. But so far as this year is concerned when the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of law, section 16 of the Domestic Allotment and Soil Conservation Act, has committed the Government up to $400,000,000 for the types of payment that have been made heretofore and which were contemplated this year, and after the farmers have executed their farm plans accepting the proposal of the Secretary, I do not think it is good conscience to repudiate that obligation. Next year, all right, we have the right to make such plans and such limitations as we deem proper for next year.

The gentleman from Illinois referred to this as a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle with me. I think the Government of the United States ought to comply with its promises to everybody to whom it makes promises or to whom any official of the Government makes promises by authority of law and no question has ever been raised by anyone, so far as I know, but that the Secretary of Agriculture had the authority of law to make the promises that he made on December 5, 1942, to the farmers of this country to make to them certain types of payments, and I say we ought to make good on them.

We should then limit the program for the next fiscal year by insisting upon the language which the Senate struck out in amendment numbered 92. You talk about incentive payments. I do not know whether anyone has a clear idea of what an incentive payment is or not, but on page 734 of the hearings there is a statement in detail of the type of payments which it is intended to make out of this $400,000,000 which the House language might not allow to be made. In other words, the House, if its position should continue as it has been, would be taking an attitude of appropriating the money, then refusing to allow the payments to be made if a narrow definition of "incentive payments" should be adopted. The Secretary's plan provides for the payment on cotton of $77,223,000, to corn $50,293,000, to wheat $59,884,000, and to tobacco and other crops in stated amounts as you will observe from reading the hearings. These payments have been promised by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law to the producers of these various commodities throughout the United States and it seems to me that we would not be acting in good faith to repudiate his promise.

I hope, therefore, that the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 87 will prevail. I expect to vote for it myself, and I expect to vote for his motion with regard to Senate amendment No. 88 to recede and concur with an amendment which will prohibit the payment of incentive payments of the type which were estimated for in House Document No. 101. Let us not make any mistake; it was House Document No. 101 that the committee refused to approve. House Document No. 101 and the $100,000,000 which was estimated therein is not in this bill and never has been in this bill, so that if we adopt the motion which the gentleman from South Carolina has offered with reference to Senate amendment numbered 88, it will prohibit the making from this fund of incentive payments as described in that House document.

Just what is an incentive payment? If you pay a man to terrace his farm or to improve his farm, is that an incentive payment? It is open to some difference of opinion, but, at any rate, if you take these actions you will take what has been the viewpoint of the majority of the House and you will enable the farmers of the country to receive the money that has been promised to them, at the same time you will limit the program for next year so that nothing but soil-conservation and water-conservation payments can be made for the next year. I want to heartily approve the nonpartisan arguments which have been advanced from both sides of the aisle by members of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], than whom there is no more loyal friend of agriculture in the House, has advocated concurring in the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, and on the Democratic side the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, is supported by his Democratic colleagues. It seems to me that there is every good reason, especially in view of the fact we are approaching the end of the fiscal year and that the Senate has yielded to us on many important items in this bill, that we ought to be able to agree to the motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, settle this matter once and for all and get this bill out of the way and send it down to the White House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not about time that we stop the Department of Agriculture from making promises in advance on something where the money is not appropriated?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can subscribe to that statement. Too many commitments have been made not only by the Department of Agriculture but also other Federal officials before these officials came to the Congress to secure consent for what they did. Then they try to bind us not only on their domestic commitments but also on commitments made to foreign countries.

I think the best service we could perform here today would be to shake loose the dependency of the farmers upon the United States Treasury. The farmers do not want money out of the United States Treasury, they do not want subsidies, nor do they want incentive payments.

We all believe in soil conservation, and the money that is provided in this act should be used exactly for that purpose. We know that if the funds are approved without the House amendment the Secretary of Agriculture and his Solicitor will rule that they can use the money for incentive or subsidy or any other type of payment. The farmers do not want this money. They want fair and decent prices at the market places and they want to be free from bureaucratic domination from Washington. We can perform that service today. I do not know of a single farmer who feels that a commitment has been made to him for funds out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When Governor Townsend, the Administrator, was before the committee I asked this question: "What in your judgment, Governor, is the best incentive for securing production?" His answer was, "A good big price. You cannot beat it."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmers are well satisfied with the prices they are receiving today, and they will gladly waive any payment that they might receive as an incentive or subsidy from the United States Treasury. Let us vote to make the farmers free, and give them a square deal in the market place for the things they produce.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday we had up the Commodity Credit Corporation bill to prohibit subsidies. That prohibition was approved by a large majority of the Congress. But do you know what you did? You wrote in there, although the subsidies had never been authorized by law, that any commitments which had been made up to the time of the passage of the act should be carried out.

I am asking you here today to take care of the farmers who acted on this handbook which was distributed to them months ago. You did the honorable thing last Friday and I believe you are going to do the honorable thing now. You said last Friday, "Those subsidies were not authorized by law. We are against them. But we hereby authorize you to carry out any commitments you have made up to the time of the passage of this act." That is exactly what the gentleman from South Carolina is asking you today, to carry out the commitments that have been made up to this time, and then say later in this bill that you are not going to do it any more.

You noticed in the correspondence between Chester Davis and the President yesterday that Mr. Davis said he had the farm program for 1944 in shape where it could be announced on the 15th day of July. That is the program for next year. This year's program was worked out last June, July, and August, and in the fall it was announced to the farmers.

I say to you, I believe you should feel as I feel, you being the keeper of your conscience as I am the keeper of mine, that we owe it to the farmers of this Nation, having permitted the program to be announced and told them, for instance, that for each bushel of wheat they produce they will receive a payment of 9.2 cents provided they produce certain war crops, which they have planted and which they are producing today. I say we cannot escape it. I do not like it. I do not like it a bit, because they are going to take that 9 cents away from him when he goes to sell his wheat, unless we can change the program; but at this hour I have some hope that within 30 days we will change that situation and that 9 cents will not be deducted from the market price.

Above everything else, I ask you today to do no more than you did last Friday when you protected the canners and packers on any commitments which have been made on subsidies. How can you escape the responsibility of protecting every farmer in this Nation on the commitment that was made to them, not 3 weeks ago, but months and months ago?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 92, noes 112.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 174, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—197

Abernethy	Gore	Newsome
Allen, La.	Gorski	Norrell
Andersen, H. Carl	Gossett	Norton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Green	O'Connor
Beckworth	Gregory	O'Konski
Bland	Hagen	Outland
Bonner	Hare	Pace
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Ark.	Patton
Brooks	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Bryson	Hays	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Poage
Burch, Va.	Hendricks	Price
Burchill, N. Y.	Hill	Priest
Burdick	Hobbs	Rabaut
Camp	Hoch	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Hoeven	Randolph
Carlson, Kans.	Holmes, Wash.	Rankin
Case	Hope	Richards
Celler	Hull	Robertson
Chapman	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Clark	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Coffee	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rogers, Calif.
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Cooper	Kee	Sadowski
Costello	Kefauver	Sasscer
Courtney	Kelley	Satterfield
Cox	Kennedy	Sauthoff
Cravens	Keogh	Sikes
Creal	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Kirwan	Smith, W. Va.
Cullen	Klein	Snyder
Cunningham	Lane	Sparkman
Curley	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Curtis	Larcade	Steagall
D'Alesandro	Lea	Stefan
Davis	Lemke	Stewart
Dawson	Lesinski	Stockman
Delaney	Lynch	Sullivan
Dickstein	McCord	Sumner, Ill.
Dies	McCormack	Sumners, Tex.
Dilweg	McGehee	Talle
Dingell	McGranery	Tarver
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Doughton	McMillan	Thomason
Drewry	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	Madden	Voorhis, Calif.
Elliott	Magnuson	Walter
Feighan	Mahon	Ward
Fernandez	Maloney	Weaver
Fisher	Manasco	Weiss
Flannagan	Mansfield, Mont.	Wene
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Whelchel, Ga.
Forand	Martin, Iowa	White
Fulbright	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Fulmer	Mills	Whittington
Gale	Monroney	Wickersham
Gathings	Mundt	Winstead
Gavagan	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Gibson	Murphy	Worley
Gilchrist	Murray, Tenn.	Wright
Gillie	Myers	Zimmerman
Gordon		

NAYS—174

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Mruk
Anderson, Calif	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Griffiths	Norman
Andrews	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Angell	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Hale	O'Neal
Arnold	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Auchincloss	Halleck	Ploeser
Baldwin, Md.	Hancock	Poulson
Beall	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Bell	Heidinger	Pracht
Bender	Herter	Ramey
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mo.	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Holmes, Mass.	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Horan	Rizley
Boren	Howell	Rockwell
Brehm	Jeffrey	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Jennings	Rohrbough
Busbey	Jensen	Rolph
Butler	Johnson, Anton J.	Rowe
Canfield	Johnson, Calvin D.	Schiffler
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Schuetz
Carson, Ohio	Jones	Schwabe
Carter	Jonkman	Scott
Chenoweth	Judd	Shafer
Chiperfield	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Keefe	Slaughter
Clevenger	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Compton	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Kunkel	Springer
Day	LaFollette	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Lambertson	Stevenson
Dirksen	Landis	Sundstrom
Disney	LeCompte	Taber
Ditter	LeFevre	Talbot
Dondero	Lewis	Taylor
Douglas	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	McCowen	Tibbott
Dworshak	McGregor	Towe
Ellis	McLean	Troutman
Ellison, Md.	McWilliams	Vursell
Ellsworth	Maas	Wadsworth
Elmer	Martin, Mass.	Wasielewski
Elston, Ohio	Mason	Welchel, Ohio
Engel	May	Welch
Fenton	Merrow	West
Fish	Michener	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Miller, Conn.	Willey
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	Wilson
Gearhart	Miller, Pa.	Winter
Gerlach	Monkiewicz.	Wolcott
Gifford	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette		Woodruff, Mich.
Goodwin		

NOT VOTING—60

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	O'Leary
Barden	Granger	O'Toole
Barry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Phillips
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Plumley
Bloom	Holifield	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Russell
Buckley	Johnson, Luther A.	Scanlon
Burgin	Johnson, Ward	Sheppard
Byrne	Kilburn	Sheridan
Capozzoli	King	Short
Cochran	Kleberg	Somers, N. Y.
Cole, Mo.	Luce	Stanley
Culkin	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Eaton	Merritt	Treadway
Fay	Morrison, La.	Van Zandt
Fellows	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Nichols	Vorys, Ohio
Folger	O'Hara	Wheat
Ford		Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Scanlon for, with Mr. Cole of Missouri against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Somers of New York for, with Miss Stanley against.
Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Cochran with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. King with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Hall and listening and heard my name called, but I could not get up here in time to answer. That is the position I am in.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, and did he hear his name called?

Mr. FOLGER. I was; yes, sir. I tried to get up here so that the Clerk could hear me, but I could not make it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not answer?

Mr. FOLGER. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says he was in the Hall and listening and failed to hear his name called, he qualifies.

Mr. FOLGER. I was listening and heard my name called, but I could not answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5; insist on further disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 60 and 61, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of what amendment is being disagreed to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are two amendments still in disagreement. One amendment relates to restrictions upon expenditures from the President's fund, and the other relates to the denial of salary to three men charged with subversive affiliations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 88: Page 69, line 20, strike out all of lines 24 and 25 and the words "incentive payments" on page 70.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 88.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for the purpose of offering a preferential motion.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULMER moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment numbered 88 with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the language stricken by the amendment insert 'Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.'"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] 2 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take very much time on this motion. The language written in by the Senate speaks for itself. I believe it is in line with the wishes of the Members of the House. It is certainly in line with my ideas in connection with the operation of the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program. The reason I have advocated the retention of the $400,000,000 was to carry out different contracts with farmers in connection with the soil-conservation and production program, and for the further reason that I do not believe, in the midst of this great emergency, when the farmers are having everything on the face of the earth to contend with, that this is the time to break faith with these farmers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is the definition of "incentive payments" as given in this House document?

Mr. FULMER. The House document refers to various crops other than the major crops that would receive benefits under this appropriation in connection with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The purpose of this amendment is not to use any of this money for incentive payments, referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture last spring.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in February the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Subcommittee on Agriculture and asked for $125,000,000 with which to pay incentive payments. One hundred million dollars of that was to be taken out of the moneys that are provided under the authority carried herein. There was another source for $25,000,000, making in all $125,000,000. The money was to be used for a very specific purpose, namely, for some 16 crops, which included Irish potatoes and sweetpotatoes, carrots and onions, soya beans, and various other types of commodities. House Document 101, to which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] refers, would provide $125,000,000 for incentive payments on this particular assortment of commodities. That proposal was rejected by the subcommittee by a vote of 6 to 1. Nothing thereafter happened. However, when this bill came on the floor, we wrote in this proviso, which was subsequently approved by the House:

Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

That is reasonably definite language. That means that not a single dollar in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 can be used for the purpose of making incentive payments. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] proposes an amendment in lieu of the language that was carried in the bill, and in lieu of the language that was stricken by the Senate. He, in substance, provides that no part of any appropriation in this bill shall be used to pay incentive payments as defined in House Document 101. That means that no money in this bill shall be used for the payment of incentive payments on the 16 various crops that were defined to us in that House document. But you see what it will do?

It does, therefore, indirectly place the seal of approval on the payment of incentive payments for others than those agreed to or identified in House Document 101.

I personally cannot go along with that sort of thing because it offers an opportunity for discretionary action, and in fact it would permit the use of money for incentive payments for other than those crops; it would leave within administrative discretion of the Secretary, as advised by the solicitor of the Department, on which of the crops incentive payments might be paid, and that places the seal of approval on the limitation that has been rejected time and time again by the House, and so I hope that the motion will be defeated.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. In view of the vote the House has just taken with reference to the payments that were promised, and in view of the fact that in the eyes of some there is a question of what an incentive payment is, does not the gentleman think that this language would permit, perhaps, the same treatment, at least, avoid conflicts. I think that is the real purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, to avoid complications because of this other prohibition, and then authorize the payments that we have voted should be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Georgia, I am sure, agrees with me that we are validating and approving a principle of incentive payments with respect to anything within the discretion of the

Secretary, except the sixteen-odd commodities mentioned in House Document 101.

Mr. PACE. If it is left to the Solicitor of the Department, that may be correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is left to administrative discretion.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the question arises as to what is an incentive payment.

Now, in the light of the whole legislative history, in the light of the fact that the action of the subcommittee served notice in February that no appropriations for the payment of incentive payments would be made, and as a matter of fact, with the legislative history of the bill, does the gentleman think he can give us a proper interpretation of incentive payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My definition is this: That any payment which inures to the enrichment of the soil or for water conservation practices must necessarily be considered as an incentive payment.

Let me therefore summarize the situation. Time and time again we have rejected the principle of incentive payments on the ground that they are but a palliative for adequate prices for farm products. We restated that position in this bill. The Fulmer motion now proposes to approve incentive payments provided they are not paid on the various crops outlined in Document No. 101. This motion should therefore be defeated.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the last remark made by the gentleman from Illinois was very significant and I hope that it did not escape your attention. He said that his contention is that any payment not made for the purpose of encouraging the improvement or conservation of the soil is an incentive payment. I cannot agree with that contention. In view of statements made in the House when the language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 was adopted, I think "incentive payment" may be construed to be more restrictive in meaning.

The House has just voted to permit types of payment which are not payments for the improvement of the soil or for the conservation of the soil. It has just voted to permit production adjustment payments. Last week we voted to appropriate $400,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House, in order to make that particular type of payment as well as soil conservation and water conservation payments. Now the question is: Do you want to vote for a continuance of the inhibition against incentive payments in the language in the same section of the bill or do you want to permit the making of the type of payments for which the House and Senate have just appropriated the money and of which you have by two roll-call votes indicated your approval?

I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concerning his interpretation of the language of the Fulmer amendment. The gentleman says that the language of the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] means that it permits incentive payments except for such payments as were contemplated by House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. I think that clearly is not a correct construction of the language contained in the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina. His motion reads:

> Incentive payments as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

In other words, that document defines what was expressly referred to therein as incentive payments, and any type of payment on any type of agricultural commodity which comes within that definition is inhibited by the terms of the Fulmer motion. At the same time, the votes of the House in agreeing to Senate amendments Nos. 86 and 87 indicate the purpose of the House to provide for payments of the Government's obligations under the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law on or about December 5, 1942.

All that you would do if you adopt the Fulmer motion would be to say to administrative authorities that "the type of incentive payment you want authority to make in this House Document 101 with reference to some types of commodities, that type of payment as defined therein you shall not make from this $400,000,000 fund for any commodity"; but you have provided in the previous language that payments can be made to carry out the obligations of the Government as created under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and of the Domestic Allotment and Soil Conservation Act by the announcement made last fall by the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, is not that what you want to do? And it is what I suggested we ought to do in my judgment to endeavor to arrive at an agreement with the Senate and send this bill to the White House in discussing the first motion which was offered. If the House should not adopt this motion after having adopted the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], with reference to amendment No. 87, it would clearly be adopting two utterly inconsistent positions, although I do not think that even if the House language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 remains in the bill payment for the program announced last fall can be prevented.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should make this clear. Does the gentleman feel that if the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is now adopted it would still permit the payment of these incentive payments on the 16 crops referred to in this House document?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly not. I think if the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted it will expressly prohibit the making of payments of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I think, however, it will permit the carrying out of the program announced on December 5, 1942, under which certain production payments on cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and other commodities were promised by the Secretary, and that if you do not adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] it will still be a matter of some doubt as to whether or not the Government will be able to make those payments although the House has twice voted, once last week and again this afternoon, that it desired those types of payment made.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is not the effect of the Fulmer amendment to ratify and confirm what the Committee on Appropriations did when it denied and refused to make available $125,000,000 for incentive payments?

Mr. TARVER. Absolutely so, and I think it is so clear that there ought to be no mistake about it. The discussion in the House has all been directed to the problem of whether or not we were going to carry out these commitments the Government, through the Secretary of Agriculture, announced in the fall of 1942. If the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted it is clearly apparent that we will be providing and that it will be construed to have been the intention of Congress to provide for the carrying out of that program which was promulgated last fall and at the same time to prohibit the making of the type of payments which were outlined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, which the committee refused to approve. Without the Fulmer amendment language some doubt is cast on the Secretary's program although I still believe it could be carried out.

If you adopt this amendment, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one other subject matter it completes the agricultural appropriation bill and I sincerely hope the vote of the House on this motion may be in line with the last two votes of the House relating to the same subject matter and that it may approve the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As long as the House has decided to permit these payments we should permit them to be made on these war crops which are needed in connection with the war effort rather than to confine them to cotton, corn, wheat, and these basic crops.

Mr. TARVER. The position of the House as I understand it from the last two votes has been that we should keep our contracts that were made last fall and limit payments in future the soil and

water conservation practices. We have another Senate amendment in the bill, No. 92, upon disagreement with which it is hoped the House will insist, which proposes to strike out language which would limit the payments for next year to soil conservation and water conservation practices. We think that language ought to stay in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we grow weary of well doing. The House long ago took an emphatic position, a consistent position, on this question and through this entire session has sustained its opposition to subsidies. And now some of those who have voted repeatedly against subsidies and for permanent stabilization of farm prices are advocating an amendment to undo all that has been accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the debate this afternoon has been by the lawyers of the House rather than the farmers of the House. And it has been a typical small town justice of the peace debate. They have quibbled over hair-splitting technicalities and definitions—whether somebody agreed or did not agree—whether there was an implied contract or no contract—whether notice was given or not given, and so forth. And in the plethora of argument have completely lost sight of the one question before us—a square deal for the farmer.

May I interrupt this learned discussion by the legal lights of the House long enough to humbly submit the views of a farmer?

I sold my wool clip yesterday and got 2 cents a pound less than I got before the war. Now will you name any nonagricultural commodity—or any product of labor or industry—that is selling for less today than it sold for before the war?

Wheat slumped on the Chicago market following announcement of a Government loan 5 or 6 cents below the market just as harvest is starting. The corn crop in Missouri is a failure and there is no feed grain or protein supplement for sale. Livestock is down and the cost of production steadily mounting. Farmers are sending their stock to market half finished and are shipping their brood sows and herd cows. The Producers News Bulletin reports the largest hog run in history. Farmers are discontinuing feeding and local auction sales are off 20 to 40 percent.

The farmer alone is being pushed around. Nobody else is being penalized. The products, prices, and income of no other groups in the Nation are being rolled back. And yet there is neither beef nor pork to be had in many of the markets of this city. It will be realized when it is too late that meat has been rolled back and prices are low—but there is no meat.

And here is an amendment to authorize payment of subsidies and sabotage the program for stabilization of farm prices we have been working so long to establish.

Mr. Speaker, the House and the Congress have repeatedly denied subsidies. And every group in the country which wants cheap food and is seeking to exploit agriculture and lower the price of farm products is advocating subsidies.

Every member of the committee reporting this bill except one has voted against incentive payments and all other forms of subsidies every time the question has been voted on by the committee.

I trust the House will continue its opposition to subsidies and its demand for fair prices for farm products in the open market along with everybody else both now and after the war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this motion will be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 37, noes 114.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 187, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—177

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Keogh
Allen, La.	Doughton	Kerr
Anderson, N. Mex.	Eberharter	Kirwan
	Feighan	Klein
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	LaFollette
Barden	Flannagan	Lane
Bates, Ky.	Folger	Lanham
Beckworth	Forand	Lemke
Bland	Fulmer	Lynch
Bonner	Gale	McCord
Boykin	Gathings	McCormack
Bradley, Pa.	Gavagan	McGehee
Brooks	Gibson	McGranery
Brown, Ga.	Gilchrist	McKenzie
Bryson	Gillie	McMillan
Bulwinkle	Gordon	McMurray
Burch, Va.	Gore	Madden
Burchill, N. Y.	Gorski	Magnuson
Burdick	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Camp	Green	Maloney
Cannon, Fla.	Gregory	Manasco
Carlson, Kans.	Hagen	Mansfield, Mont.
Celler	Hare	
Chapman	Harless, Ariz.	Marcantonio
Clark	Harris, Va.	Martin, Iowa
Coffee	Hays	Miller, Nebr.
Colmer	Heffernan	Monroney
Cooley	Hendricks	Mott
Cooper	Hill	Murdock
Costello	Hobbs	Murphy
Courtney	Hoch	Murray, Tenn.
Cox	Hoeven	Myers
Cravens	Holmes, Wash.	Newsome
Creal	Hope	Nichols
Crosser	Jackson	Norton
Cullen	Jarman	O'Brien, Mich.
Cunningham	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Connor
D'Alesandro		Outland
Davis	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pace
Dawson		Patman
Delaney	Johnson, Okla.	Patton
Dickstein	Kee	Peterson, Fla.
Dies	Kefauver	Peterson, Ga.
Dilweg	Kelley	Pfeifer
Dingell	Kennedy	Price
Priest	Smith, W. Va.	Weaver
Rabaut	Snyder	Weiss
Ramspeck	Sparkman	Wene
Randolph	Spence	West
Rankin	Starnes, Ala.	Whelchel, Ga.
Richards	Steagall	White
Robertson	Stefan	Whitten
Robinson, Utah	Stewart	Whittington
Rogers, Calif.	Stockman	Wickersham
Rowan	Sullivan	Winstead
Sadowski	Tarver	Woodrum, Va.
Sasscer	Thomason	Worley
Satterfield	Vincent, Ky.	Wright
Sauthoff	Voorhis, Calif.	Zimmerman
Sikes	Walter	
Smith, Va.	Ward	

NAYS—187

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Miller, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Miller, Pa.
	Gifford	Mills
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Monkiewicz
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Mruk
	Gossett	Mundt
Andrews	Graham	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Grant, Ind.	Norman
Arends	Griffiths	Norrell
Arnold	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Hale	O'Konski
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Bell		Ploeser
Bender	Halleck	Poage
Bennett, Mich.	Hancock	Poulson
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Bishop	Harris, Ark.	Pracht
Blackney	Heidinger	Ramey
Bolton	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Busbey	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Howell	Rockwell
Canfield	Hull	Rodgers, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Jeffrey	Rogers, Mass.
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Rohrbough
Carter	Jennings	Rolph
Case	Jensen	Rowe
Chenoweth	Johnson, Anton J.	Schiffler
Chiperfield		Schuetz
Church	Johnson, Calvin D.	Schwabe
Clason		Shafer
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Compton	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Crawford	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Curley	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Kearney	Springer
Day	Keefe	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Kilday	Stevenson
Dirksen	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Disney	Knutson	Sundstrom
Ditter	Kunkel	Taber
Dondero	Lambertson	Talbot
Douglas	Landis	Talle
Drewry	Lea	Taylor
Dworshak	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	LeFevre	Tibbott
Ellis	Lewis, Ohio	Towe
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Troutman
Ellsworth	McCowen	Vursell
Elmer	McGregor	Wadsworth
Elston, Ohio	McLean	Welchel, Ohio
Engel	McWilliams	Welch
Fellows	Maas	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Willey
Fish	Mason	Wilson
Fisher	May	Winter
Fulbright	Merrow	Wolcott
Gamble	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavin	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—67

Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.		O'Leary
Bloom	Hart	O'Neal
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	O'Toole
Buckley	Hébert	Philbin
Burgin	Holifield	Phillips
Byrne	Izac	Plumley
Capozzoli	Johnson, Luther A.	Rivers
Cochran		Russell
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Sabath
Culkin	Kilburn	Scanlon
Durham	King	Scott
Eaton	Kleberg	Sheppard
Fay	Larcade	Sheridan
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Short
Fogarty	Luce	Slaughter
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Somers, N. Y.
Furlong	Merritt	Stanley
Gallagher	Morrison, La.	Sumners, Tex.

Thomas, Tex.	Van Zandt	Wasielewski
Tolan	Vinson, Ga.	Wheat
Treadway	Vorys, Ohio	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Scanlon for, with Mr. Cole of Missouri against.

Mr. Tolan for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Miss Stanley against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Scott against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Cochran with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. King with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 92: On page 70, line 22, strike out the following: "*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil building practices and soil and water conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000."

And insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the total expenditures of which including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 92.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 98 and 99, which relate to the same subject matter, the Federal Crop Insurance Act, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. Speaker, this subject matter was very fully discussed in connection with the conference report considered last week, and I do not care to add anything to what I said at that time. If any Member desires to address the House on this subject, I shall be glad to yield him time.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I was the first man to offer a bill in Congress to put into operation crop insurance. Let me tell you why I offered that bill several years ago.

Out of my long experience in farming and in dealing with farmers, I found every year in some section crop failures because of hailstorms, floods, drought, boll-weevil infestation, or something like that. Because of crop failure, for which farmers were not responsible, many of the smaller farmers were put out of business. I felt sure that we could, if given proper time, work out a satisfactory program which would do two things; stop voting relief for those farmers whose crops were destroyed, and, second, continue them as successful farmers.

During the years before we had insurance, what happened? From year to year we would come to Congress and appropriate money purely for the relief for those people, as high as $60,000,000 in some instances. We have voted millions to take care of that situation. You should look up the relief record, money appropriated by Congress to say nothing about millions spent by the Red Cross for relief because of crop failure.

Besides that, without protection of crop insurance, the class of people we want to help would go out of business on account of those crop losses, and then what happens? Why then you would have them come to the Farm Security Administration, giving them 100-percent loans to buy land, with the hope we may be able to make land owners out of them? It does not make any difference to many of you how many millions we may lose under the land-purchase program, including grants in a great many instances.

When this program was put into operation it was definitely understood that we would pay the expenses until we were able to work out, on a fair and sound basis, crop insurance, therefore, you should not refer to the expense of this program as losses. You are spending billions for plants and plus-profit contracts, and industry and contractors are not taking any chances, but when it comes to farms, that is different. During the 4 years under the wheat program we have had losses of only $17,000,000. During the 1 year with cotton we have had losses of about $4,500,000. Under the 3-year contract with wheat farmers our losses are becoming much smaller, and we want to put cotton on a 3-year basis.

The thing I want to get over to you is this, we should not do this at this time in this great emergency.

I realize there will have to be some revamping of this legislation. That is true with other farm legislation. But I want to ask you seriously, Is this the time to do it? The farmers are up against every type of problem that you can mention right in the midst of the greatest emergency in which we have ever been engaged. If we do not continue this insurance program, we will be simply telling the farmer next year, "You will not have an opportunity to pay a premium for insurance; you must plant your crop and take your chances." If you want to wipe out this program, why not wait until after this emergency? Why not wait until we have had time to work out a sound, satisfactory program? Suppose it would take 10 years, would not it be worth the price? There are other crops that will be taken in as we go along under this program.

There are a number of large farmers in this country who oppose this legislation. They do not take any insurance. Why? Because they are able to take the risk. If they have a short crop, they can double up with fertilizer and everything next year to make good their losses. But millions of small farmers and sharecroppers who could be protected and kept on the farm and off relief, as well as out of the hands of the Farm Security Administration under the rehabilitation and land-purchasing program, will be forced out of their present farm operations. When these small farms lose out, why, those large farms will take them over on their large farms as renters or sharecroppers.

The plea that I make to this House, regardless of the merits or demerits of this program, is not to wipe out this program now in the midst of this great emergency.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as this bill was reported to the House in the first instance the subcommittee recommended liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. It provided the necessary funds to meet all commitments for that liquidation. The Senate, however, struck the House language and

proposes now to provide an administrative fund of something in excess of $7,000,000 to continue the Corporation.

I have repeatedly expressed my objection to carrying on this experiment further, for this reason: We have insured wheat for 4 years. Adding the administrative expense and the losses, we lost $41,000,000 on wheat. We have insured cotton for 1 year. For that 1 year we lost one and one-third million dollars. The experiment has gone forward far enough. We should not endanger the Treasury now by letting this program run so that flax, fruit, corn, and other commodities will be added, only to increase the losses to the Federal Treasury. Four years is enough as an experiment, so it should be liquidated now. If this were so popular and if millions of farmers were involved, as the gentleman from South Carolina says, why is it that only one out of every three wheat farmers in the country has undertaken in 4 years to take out crop insurance? If this is so popular why is it that only 1 out of every 10 cotton farmers has bothered to take out crop insurance on cotton? The losses are growing larger year after year. Taking the loss, plus the administrative expense, the Treasury was out six and three-quarters millions in 1939; it was out ten and a half million in 1940; it was out $12,000,000 in 1941, and $12,000,000 in 1942. That is a sufficient experiment at the expense of the Public Treasury. It should be stopped now. The motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] should be voted down. This was defeated by an overwhelming majority of this House last week. It should be defeated now by an even greater majority, so that we can serve notice on the Senate as to how the House feels about it at the present time.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I want to state to the gentleman that the total amount stated by the gentleman in every instance included the expenses of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned that.

Mr. FULMER. And the total amount lost over the 4 years is only $17,000,000. We have voted as high as 50 and 60 million for relief prior to this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The whole story is that the difference between the premiums collected and the indemnity paid was a loss of $17,000,000 to the Treasury. Then if you add $24,000,000 for administrative expenses, the United States Treasury, meaning the taxpayer, was out $41,000,000 on this program. Those facts cannot be controverted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has stated that this program has thus far cost the Federal Government $40,000,000. Even this is not out of line with the original understanding. My recollection is that the crop-insurance bill authorized an appropriation of $100,000,000, and it was clearly understood in the beginning that the Government would defray all administrative costs which might be incurred by the experiment in the field of all-risk crop insurance. It was likewise clearly understood that the Government would suffer losses as it has suffered in the prosecution of this program. The losses suffered have not been altogether disappointing.

All-risk crop insurance was an experiment. We knew that it was an experiment and we knew that it was an experiment which no private corporation in America could or would undertake. No private corporation was in a position to accumulate the information and the data which of necessity had to be accumulated. Prior to the inauguration of an insurance program the Federal Government and only the Federal Government was in a position to obtain the necessary information and but for the tremendous Agricultural Adjustment Administration set-up which we at that time had in this country, we could never have collected the necessary information.

Congress authorized this experiment and now because forsooth the experiment has not proven to be a grand and a complete success, we are urged to abandon it. Will we go up the hill and down again because in the operation of the cotton program for 1 year we have lost $1,000,000? As participation in the program increases premium rates decrease. It is hardly reasonable to expect the administrators of this program to develop an actuarially sound program on cotton within the short space of 1 year. The gentleman from Illinois says that they have had 4 years' experience on wheat. Yes; that is true. But we were told in the beginning, and the Congress and the country knew that it would probably take 10 years to work out a sound, businesslike, self-sustaining program for crop insurance.

Practically every other person engaged in various and sundry vocations and avocations of private life can obtain insurance upon their businesses and property, and even upon their talents. Even a chorus girl can insure her voice and a tap dancer can insure her toes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The chorus girl will pay for it if she does not have some "sugar daddy" to pay for it for her.

Mr. COOLEY. Maybe the chorus girl will have a "sugar daddy" to pay for it for her. The gentleman may be an authority on that but I am not. Neither am I asking Uncle Sam to finance this program forever, but I do insist that it not be liquidated at this time. The gentleman from Detroit objects, but certainly this is not the first thing he has objected to. The crop-insurance program is a very important part of a well-considered and well-rounded farm program.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Which gentleman from Detroit objected?

Mr. COOLEY. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was from Detroit. I am sorry if I was in error. Perhaps he lives outside of Detroit, but at any rate we know that he is from the State of Michigan.

In all earnest, I am looking at this program purely from an unselfish standpoint. As I have said many times, it does not mean anything at all to the people of my district, but if it is continued even they may at some future date be greatly benefited by it. Certainly it means much to many farmers of the Nation at the present time.

It cannot actually be said that we are losing money. The money is not lost. The benefits are paid to distressed farmers and the money goes to farmers who have suffered a loss of 75 percent by reason of crop failure, either on account of pests or drought or floods or some other catastrophe which has befallen them. We have annually spent millions upon millions for relief in distressed agricultural areas.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and also the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for sponsoring this splendid movement.

Is it not just as important as it is to give war-risk protection to our merchant shipping?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman's statement. We are now writing war-risk insurance and this is a very hazardous undertaking.

Even if the Government suffers loss by this all-risk crop-insurance program, only farmers in distress are benefitted by it, and I hope that the program may be continued and that the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this matter of crop insurance until we are thoroughly familiar with the fact that the farmer is the only large producer in this country who does not have an opportunity to secure some form of insurance. In all other cases where we need insurance to take care of a national need the Federal Government has provided it.

I have a $10,000 United States Government insurance policy that the United States Government issued to me in the last war. On this policy the Government has paid all administrative expenses for 25 years. A great many other Members of his body hold similar policies. And, every man who comes back from this war is going to have Government insurance, and the United States Government will pay every dollar of administrative expenses. You would not come before this House and claim that we are giving these men something they should not have in providing insurance at cost because the United States Government needs these men to fight.

In like manner the United States Government needs the farmers of this country to produce crops and all this amendment does is to give them an opportunity

to produce those crops with some reasonable degree of assurance that they are going to get some little return when the season is over. That they are going to have some little something to show for their work when the season is over. I fear we are not going to get the crops produced which we need unless we can give the farmers a more efficient, a cheaper and a sounder way to protect their crops, and there is no sounder way than to provide some of the administrative expenses to take care of the system of crop insurance whereby our farmers may know that regardless of the season they will at least have something to see for their labor when the season is over.

But it is said that under this program there has not been as much paid in as has been paid out during the last 4 years, and that is perfectly true. But is there a Member of this House who has had any opportunity of observing the organization of any form of insurance company, whether it be life, fire, or casualty, who would expect such an organization has made a profit during the first 4 years?

I want to say that there never has been such an insurance company, fire or life, or old-line insurance of any kind, that could show a profit during the first 4 years.

You know and I know that any sound insurance company always will have a certain period of time in which it does not make a profit.

On the basis of that same reasoning you cannot expect farm insurance, which has never been successfully carried before in the history of the world, to show a profit during the first 4 years. But at the same time we have got to provide some kind of assurance, before the farmers begin to grow their crops, before these men start their production, that when the season is over they are going to have some return at the end of the year, and we have to furnish crop insurance, just as we are giving Government insurance to other businesses and commercial interests in this country to protect them from unexpected losses. We must provide the farmers against unexpected losses in producing their crops if we are to expect these crops to be produced in the quantities we desire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, assuming that there have been losses sustained by the Government in the last 3 or 4 years in its crop insurance policy, have we stopped to think whether or not the losses sustained have been more than the expenditures would have amounted to had we not had this insurance policy? In other words, it has been the policy of this Government for the last quarter of a century to assist agriculture when large areas of crops have been destroyed by natural causes or causes over which the farmers had no control.

In the last quarter of a century, or the last 25 years, we have expended upwards of a billion dollars aiding those whose crops were lost by drought, hail, storms, floods, hurricanes, or other natural causes. However, for the last 3 or 4 years the Congress has not spent money to aid farmers for crops that have been lost in that way. The Congress had a group of farmers before it last year and year before last from areas that had suffered untold losses on account of excessive rains, and they asked for $20,000,000 in one area, and in other areas $40,000,000 in the way of relief. The Congress said to them: "No, we have now established a policy of insuring crops and we have abandoned the policy of contributing to the support of farmers who have lost their crops by natural causes."

We have saved the amount contributed heretofore in the way of relief, and the amount we have lost on insurance has not been equal to the average annual amount lost on contributions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that the Crop Insurance Corporation was authorized to enter into 3-year contracts with the wheat growers of the country and that thousands upon thousands of those 3-year contracts have not been completed?

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman is right, and in fairness, good conscience, and equity the Congress is bound to carry out these contracts.

And if the contracts are abrogated by this vote we take here they will charge we have broken faith with these farmers who entered into the three-year contracts.

And the Government would still be the loser. I think in all fairness and in justice to those who worked out this scheme of insurance, that they should have sufficient time to see whether or not under fair conditions, under normal conditions, it will work. You cannot determine a policy in 1 year, you cannot determine a policy in 2 years; it "takes more than one swallow to make a summer" and it takes more than 2 years or 3 years to determine whether or not this plan of insuring crops can be effectively, efficiently, and economically carried out. I therefore feel it would be inadvisable to discontinue the policy at this time.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If, as the gentleman states, it takes 3 or 4 years to complete the experiment, how does the gentleman justify the 3-year contracts that were entered into?

Mr. HARE. I understand there has been no loss on those, but you are breaching those contracts on which the time has not expired; in other words, the period for which they were entered into has not expired, yet you are terminating the contracts.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, but if it is based upon experience which has been gained during a period of years, it does not seem they should have entered into contracts for a period of 3 years not knowing what the results would be.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that they have had less losses on the 3-year contracts than any others.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, no doubt there have been losses in the way of administrative costs, but this was reasonably anticipated for a few years or possibly several years, when Congress enacted the original law. My thought is that within a few years the administrative costs should be reduced to a minimum or to a point where there would be little or no losses over a period of years. There are administrative expenses, or losses if you prefer to call it, in all the Government activities where an effort is made to provide insurance or annuities of any kind.

I have not had an opportunity to make inquiry but I doubt very much whether the premiums paid by our veterans are sufficient to pay losses and administrative expenses. I am quite certain that the deductions from salaries of Government employees are sufficient to pay retirement annuities and all administrative expenses, and that is a program that has been in operation for a period of upward of 20 years and yet no committee has recommended that this policy be abolished. But simply because the farmers have not been able to perfect a program of insurance within 1 or 2 years that will pay all losses and administrative expenses and leave a surplus in the Treasury some Members suddenly become economy-minded and now insist that the whole scheme be abolished. Apparently, some have been recently bitten by the economy bug, because I see some of those opposing this motion stood here 2 months with tears in their eyes pleading for the oppressed income-tax payers and urging that they be forgiven their income taxes for 1942 to the tune of approximately $3,000,000,000 when more than one-half of that amount had already been paid into the Treasury. Still they insist that ten or fifteen million dollars a year in the way of administrative expenses is too great a burden for the Federal Government to bear in assisting farmers to work such a crop-insurance plan. I agree that probably this is a heavy burden, but when we take into consideration the appropriations made by the Congress for the relief of farmers when crops are destroyed on account of rains, floods, hail, storms, insect pests, and so forth, these amounts sink into insignificance, and in support of this statement and in justification of my argument, I want to quote from the report of the President's Committee on Crop Insurance submitted in House Document No. 150 in the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress showing expenditures for agricultural relief during the 10-year period ending June 30, 1936, where the amount totaled $615,937,000.

The report says:

Distressed farmers in 48 States, together with farmers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska received relief from the net Federal expenditures totaling $615,937,000 during the 10-year period ending June 30, 1936, as follows:

Alabama	$11,420,000
Arizona	3,088,000
Arkansas	14,125,000

California	$11,365,000
Colorado	19,584,000
Connecticut	222,000
Delaware	104,000
Florida	9,446,000
Georgia	13,381,000
Idaho	7,995,000
Illinois	8,698,000
Indiana	4,223,000
Iowa	8,646,000
Kansas	32,102,000
Kentucky	4,302,000
Louisiana	10,013,000
Maine	2,674,000
Maryland	4,007,000
Massachusetts	489,000
Minnesota	31,911,000
Michigan	4,966,000
Mississippi	10,611,000
Missouri	21,903,000
Montana	24,718,000
New Hampshire	609,000
New Jersey	3,693,000
New Mexico	14,744,000
New York	3,451,000
Nebraska	21,739,000
Nevada	2,119,000
North Carolina	11,466,000
North Dakota	63,132,000
Ohio	7,403,000
Oklahoma	19,907,000
Oregon	3,789,000
Pennsylvania	3,691,000
Rhode Island	94,000
South Carolina	11,434,000
South Dakota	53,362,000
Tennessee	6,236,000
Texas	71,803,000
Utah	11,586,000
Vermont	741,000
Virginia	6,890,000
Washington	5,363,000
West Virginia	5,386,000
Wisconsin	12,463,000
Wyoming	10,560,000
Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska	4,043,000
District of Columbia	245,000
Total	615,937,000

Mr. Speaker, these contributions were made by the Federal Government to farmers for losses sustained on account of rains, floods, storms, hurricanes, and so forth, over a period of 10 years without insurance. If this 10-year period was representative of other 10-year periods it would pay the losses and administrative expenses under the crop-insurance program for more than 20 years. Now which is the cheaper to the Federal Government, the crop-insurance program or the crop-relief program?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best arguments I ever heard made for crop insurance is implicit in an episode in real life on a plantation in Hale County, Ala. One of the best Negro farmers in that county came to see the owner of the plantation to get his "advances" agreed on for Christmas and the next year. As soon as the mission had been revealed, the owner said: "Why, Charlie, we just had our settlement for this year two weeks ago. You had paid your account in full and had $700 coming to you. I paid you that and suggested that you put it in the bank. You said you were going to do so. You didn't owe a cent in the world, and ought to have $700 in the bank. That's more money than I have. Why borrow money to run on next year, on which you'll have to pay interest, when you have your home, your mules, your cows, your chickens, meat, and everything else you need and more money than you could possibly need to finance your farming operations all next year? What's become of your money?" Charlie replied: "It's still in the bank, Captain. That's where it's going to stay. You don't think I'm fool enough to risk my own money on next year's crops, do you?"

That is exactly why we need crop insurance, because no one who knows the perils of farming would take the risk if he could avoid it. No one farmer can be sure of a crop. He must run the risks of drought, floods, excessive rains, pests, and other contingencies. But a hundred thousand farmers can each be sure of an average crop if they could pool their interests and their efforts on widely separated tracts, so that good and bad weather and infestation of pests may be averaged. That is the simple reason for crop insurance. The spread of the coverage makes the insurance safe and takes the gamble out of the occupation. No farmer nor group of farmers can do the insuring. The Government can, and without risk of loss over a period of years if a sufficient number are insured to obtain the necessary spread of coverage. The Cotton Belt over, or the Wheat Belt over, or the Corn Belt over, the risks will be equalized, spread, and three-fourths of an average crop may be safely guaranteed. A small premium, in kind, will pay the losses and the expense of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has faith in the sound venture of crop insurance. Its action is in disagreement with ours. This is now the only thing which separates us from a finished enactment. Every other segment of the Nation's interest has been taken care of except agriculture. We are begging of you to do this not in any sense as a gratuity—it is not—but because it is a sound business proposition. It will cost you $2 for every one you save if you scuttle this ship. You have been paying out forty, fifty, or sixty million dollars a year in crop-failure gratuities. We are asking you to continue this experiment in the soundest of all institutions, insurance; give it a chance to prove itself and save money while you are so doing.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does not the gentleman believe, if it is a sound proposition, that private insurance companies would have taken it up a long time ago?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not; because as long as Congress deals out gratuities no sufficient number of farmers can be expected to insure their crops at their own expense. No private institution can charge a premium for doing what the Government gives gratuitously If, however, we stick to our guns and prove by our continued support of our institution of crop insurance, through the test period of 10 years, that we mean business, and will not supply the dole, then private insurance companies would be glad to insure crops just as cheerfully as they now insure lives, health, and property.

Crop insurance is actuarially sound. It will prove a safe business activity if we support it during its infancy. It can be made self-sustaining, or even profitable. Let us give it a fair chance. Let us not kill our own child!

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misapprehension on the part of those who have spoken in favor of this amendment. One of them referred to "the leadership on the other side." The truth about the matter is that the leadership in opposition to this amendment is from this side of the aisle. Every member of the subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill originally reporting this bill and constituting the conference committee submitting this conference report, both majority and minority Members, after hearing the representatives of the Crop Insurance Administration and all others interested and sifting the evidence and the statistics, decided unanimously—without a dissenting vote at any stage of the proceedings—that crop insurance ought to be abolished. And now an amendment is offered from the floor seeking to overturn the carefully considered judgment of those who have given more study to the subject than anyone else here this afternoon, and its proponents are endeavoring to sustain their position by charging that the leadership in opposition to their unofficial amendment comes from the other side of the aisle.

Let me repeat, that every member of the subcommittee which heard and studied the cost and results of crop insurance, both Democrats and Republicans, has consistently opposed continuation of this ill-starred activity.

And for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker. The United States Treasury has taken an awful beating on crop insurance, and is in for a still worse beating in the years ahead if it is continued. I realize it is popular to turn to the United States Treasury on every occasion for every deficit in order to cover up the errors and mistakes in every utopian failure. It is a simple and popular remedy. Just pay it out of the Treasury. It is perfectly all right to take any amount out of the United States Treasury at any time. And that has worked for the time being. But the war and the heavy demand for revenue to support the war have awakened the country to the effect of these unwarranted drafts on the public funds. The people are at last becoming Treasury conscious. And all the more these last few weeks since we have raised taxes and since taxpayers have made their second quarterly payment

and have begun to get the reaction from the pay-as-you-go plan.

This House may not be interested, but the taxpayers will be interested to learn that the cost of this Dean Swiftian project exceeds the cost of any of these relief projects in relation to benefits derived. It costs the Government $2 for every dollar paid the farmer. The losses are stupendous and continuous. No private company would consider such absurd ratios. It is the most uneconomic, unbusinesslike, impractical proposition ever seriously suggested even in Government finance, and it grows steadily worse.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Speaking of it from an economical standpoint, under the report of the President's committee, Document 150 of the First Session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, it is reported there in table IV that for the 10-year period ending June 30, 1936, the Federal Government had spent $615,937,000 for farm relief in the way I have referred to already. This would carry the insurance that we now have in force for a peak of 15 years without costing the farmer 1 cent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That has nothing in the world to do with the proposal before us. It does not have the slightest relation from any point of view. And if you really want to consider it as a relief project why not give the money directly to the farmer and thereby save half of the cost to the Government?

But still more surprising—the farmers themselves do not want crop insurance. We have been given the impression by some of these ardent advocates of continuing crop insurance that the farmer will pine away if he can get insurance. What do the reports of the Crop Insurance Corporation itself show? They show that notwithstanding the efforts of the employees of the Department to recruit patrons and sell insurance, the number taking insurance steadily dwindles from year to year. The farmers do not want it. They are not taking it. Those who have taken it are discontinuing it notwithstanding the efforts of the Department to retain them as clients. Outside of the employees of the Department who will lose their jobs if crop insurance is discontinued and a few here on the floor, who from that point of view are serving the employees rather than the farmer, there is no demand for this huge expenditure.

And regardless of whom those advocating this amendment represent, they do not represent the taxpayers. I challenge you to stop any taxpayer on the street or on the farm and ask him about saddling this heavy burden on the Treasury. The farmers do not want it. The taxpayers do not want it. The members of the committee which has studied the project do not want it. And I trust the Members will show by their vote that the House does not want it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER) there were—ayes 82, noes 142.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-four Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in connection with the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments that are still in disagreement and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker appointed the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, SHEPPARD, WENE, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 275), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 2714, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the House further insists on disagreement to the Senate amendments and agrees to the further conference requested by the Senate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 275, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 229, noes 21.

So, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the House agreed to consider the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take it that every Member knows what this resolution calls for. It permits the taking from the Speaker's table the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 2714), with the Senate amendments thereto, in complying with the Senate request for a further conference. The resolution provides that the House should further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Objection on the part of the gentleman from New York to granting the Senate request for a further conference makes this resolution necessary. I was appealed to only about 20 minutes ago to call a meeting of the Rules Committee for the reporting out of this resolution. I complied not because I have been in favor of the House further insisting on disagreeing with the Senate amendments.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming vote of the House, I am of the opinion that the House has acted unwisely in the matter of this disagreement in denying to appropriate for the salaries of three Government employes alleged to have been guilty of un-American activities. I am satisfied that in the near future, when prejudice will no longer prevail, these three gentlemen, none of whom I have ever met—Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, and Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr.—will be found to be loyal, patriotic, and sincere American citizens.

I am indeed gratified that each of these three men is of old American stock, and certainly they have the right under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution to express their views in opposition to the Nazi-Fascist influences in our country, as they have done, and that is all they are actually guilty of.

On careful investigation and sane examination of the activities of these men, in the days to come, the prejudice that has been created against them will be found to have been entirely unfair and unjustifiable and that they have only acted within their rights and in the interests of our country under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

I regret exceedingly that the conditions prevailing at this particular time have impelled me to take this action in bringing this resolution before the House.

In all the years of my service I have never felt as regretful of my action as I do at this particular time, and I hope the Senate will remain steadfast in the position it has taken. My action was prompted by the necessity for preventing delay in payment of the salaries of over 400,000 Government employees.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any more time. I yield to the gentleman from New York the same amount of time I have consumed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this rule is reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. As one Member of the House objected to sending the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to conference, it was necessary for the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule in order to expedite consideration of the bill and get it to conference as speedily as possible. This rule is brought in to expedite consideration of the bill because we have almost reached the last day of our fiscal year, which will be tomorrow. I am surprised that anyone, particularly my distinguished colleague from New York, should have objected, because this bill carries the salaries of some 400,000 civil-service employees, and if it does not go through either tonight or tomorrow morning there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. First of all, the gentleman knows that those salaries can be protected by a continuing resolution. Second, the unanimous-consent request that was submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] provided that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments. I say that the Senate amendments take out of this bill a matter which is not only extraneous but unconstitutional. The responsibility for holding up those salaries rests on you.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman refers to an amendment upon which this House has passed almost unanimously two or three times. The rule simply provides that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments and send the bill to conference. The amendments in question are Senate amendments numbered 5 and 60, amendment No. 5 relating to the President's control over the emergency funds with certain limitations upon them and No. 60 is the so-called subversive salary amendment affecting the pay of three gentlemen on the Government pay roll, Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett. I hope the rule will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, although I have taken only 2 minutes, I have agreed to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I think he will not take the whole 3 minutes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TIME TO QUIT FOOLIN'—APPOINT HOOVER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress should end—and end now—the indecision, the hesitancy, the vacillation, which are typical of this administration.

Even though, prior to the war, the President's experiments were certain to bring us national bankruptcy, the temporary destruction of individual opportunity and the American way of life as our forefathers had known it, all hope of recovery was not obliterated.

But, with the coming of the war, the President's egotism, his refusal to delegate tasks and authority to men of known ability and independence, are characteristics which must be counteracted if the war is to be won, the welfare of our people and our national existence preserved.

The history of this administration from its inception down to the present moment is one of crisis following crisis, emergency succeeding emergency, each manufactured and each used as an excuse for the grasping of additional power, the expenditure of additional billions.

The President has met every simulated emergency by the creation of a board or a commission or the appointment of some so-called czar. Boards, commissions, and czars have followed each other in rapid succession. Patriotic, self-sacrificing, independent men, each of whom had demonstrated his ability in his particular field, have been called to Washington by the President, each in turn having been assured that he would have opportunity to correct some glaring fault in our national economy or Government, and each—with but one exception—has found himself unable to perform the task allotted him because he has been denied the authority to follow his own judgment; because he has been hampered by the quarreling and bickering among the President's little would-be dictators.

The one exception is Jeffers, who, when the bureaucrats attempted to hamstring him, asserted himself and has brought order out of the confusion in the rubber program.

The stumbling block over which competent executives, called to aid in the solution of our problems, have tripped and fallen is the President's egotism; his firm conviction that he is indispensable; a superman, possessed of a master mind. Never was an individual more mistaken.

Chester Davis, like others who preceded him, like some who are still in Washington, is a man of ability. Left alone, given authority, the chances are that he would have solved the problem given him. But Chester Davis has gone the way of all those men of energy, of demonstrated capabilities, and he is out.

Another man, a man of admirable character; a man we all admire and respect, Marvin Jones, our former colleague, will now step up and be sacrificed on the altar of the President's self-assurance.

It is time to quit "foolin'." Congress should take charge. The President played politics with the labor situation until it threatened serious impairment of our war efforts. Then, goaded by the people, the Congress acted.

The food problem is, or soon will become, as serious, or for that matter, more serious, than was the labor problem. Again, the President is playing politics, toying with the idea of subsidies, of drawing upon the general tax fund to appease certain pressure groups.

Again Congress should assert itself. Congress should create the office of director of production, processing, transportation, and distribution of food. It should give the director the power to solve the food problems, free from interference by the Chief Executive or any of his subordinates.

Congress should name as that director a man of unquestioned patriotism, who has demonstrated his ability to solve the problem. That man is Herbert Hoover.

Before any recess or any adjournment, we should assure the country, by legislation of that character, that we mean to do our part to enable the people to do their part on the home front, insofar as feeding our civilian population, our armed forces, and the forces of our allies is concerned.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, believing that those opposed to any proposal in the House should have the right to be heard, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, my objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was not made in a spirit of obstruction or for the purpose of holding up legislation in this House. I objected for the reasons I stated when the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] had the floor, that the request of the gentleman from Missouri and the motion which we are now considering directs the House conferees to further insist upon the House disagreement with the Senate amendments.

One of the Senate amendments eliminates that provision which prohibits the payment of salaries to three individuals now on the Government pay roll, Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett. Those of us who oppose this provision certainly could not permit the unanimous-consent request to be granted without objection, nor can we support this motion. As we have never had any opportunity to vote on a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, I feel that this is an opportunity to express ourselves again on this issue particularly because events since this prohibition was inserted in the bill emphasize all the more the reasons to eliminate it.

Since the House took the position it did we have had a decision from the United States Supreme Court in the case of William Schneider against the United States dealing with the basic issue involved here. I wish you would read the decision in that case.

I read some very pertinent portions of this historic ruling of the Supreme Court:

> The constitutional fathers, fresh from a revolution, did not forge a political straitjacket for the generations to come. Instead, they wrote article V, and the first amendment, guaranteeing freedom of thought, soon followed. Article V contains procedural provisions for constitutional change by amendment without any present limitation whatsoever except that no State may be deprived of equal representation in the Senate without its consent (cf. *National Prohibition Cases* (253 U. S. 350)).
>
> This provision and the many important and far-reaching changes made in the Constitution since 1787 refute the idea that attachment to any particular provision or provisions is essential, or that one who advocates radical changes is necessarily not attached to the Constitution (*United States* v. *Rovin* (12 F. (2d) 942, 944–945)).
>
> As Justice Holmes said, "Surely it cannot show lack of attachment to the principles of the Constitution that [one] thinks it can be improved" (*United States* v. *Schwimmer*, supra (dissent)).
>
> Criticism of and the sincerity of desires to improve the Constitution should not be judged by conformity to prevailing thought, because "if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate." (Id. See also Chief Justice Hughes, dissenting in *United States* v. *Macintosh*, supra, p. 635.)
>
> Whatever attitude we may individually hold toward persons and organizations that believe in or advocate extensive changes in our existing order, it should be our desire and concern at all times to uphold the right of free discussion and free thinking to which we as a people claim primary attachment. To neglect this duty in a proceeding in which we are called upon to judge whether a particular individual has failed to manifest attachment to the Constitution would be ironical indeed.

I submit that attachment to the Constitution is the only requisite for employment in government.

And again, in the same majority opinion the Supreme Court said:

"With regard to the constitutional changes he desired, petitioner testified that he believed in the nationalization of the means of production and exchange with compensation, and the preservation and utilization of our 'democratic structure—as far as possible for the advantage of the working classes.' He stated that the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' to him meant 'not a government, but a state of things' in which 'the majority of the people shall really direct their own destinies and use the instrument of the state for these truly democratic ends.' None of this is necessarily incompatible with the 'general political philosophy' of the Constitution as outlined above by the Government. It is true that the fifth amendment protects private property, even against taking for public use without compensation. But throughout our history many sincere people whose attachment to the general constitutional scheme cannot be doubted have, for various and even divergent reasons, urged differing degrees of governmental ownership and control of natural resources, basic means of production, and banks and the media of exchange, either with or without compensation. And something once regarded as a species of private property was abolished without compensating the owners when the institution of slavery was forbidden. Can it be said that the author of the Emancipation Proclamation and the supporters of the thirteenth amendment were not attached to the Constitution? We conclude that lack of attachment to the Constitution is not shown on the basis of the changes which petitioner testified he desired in the Constitution.

You are here legislating out of office three men whose only crime has been that of being anti-Fascist. They belonged to organizations that were engaged in what? They were engaged in aiding republican Spain, in aiding China, and in fighting fascism. I say there is not an American soldier today who would not get on his knees and thank God if we had aided China and had not sent scrap iron and oil to Japan, or if we had aided Loyalist republican Spain, which would have been in this war on our side, instead of abetting a Franco Fascist Spain which is doing the work of our Axis enemies, or if we had stood up collectively with other nations against fascism and nazi-ism instead of having given our blessing to a policy of appeasement at Munich and its consequent strengthening of Hitler and his satellites.

You have not only adopted a precedent which is contrary to every concept of democracy but you have also acted in violation of the Constitution. You have invaded the power of the Executive to appoint. You are now saying to the Executive whom he may appoint and whom he may not appoint. You have distorted the Constitution.

Further, the preponderant majority of the press has been condemning your action editorially all over the country. Here you are, holding up the salaries of thousands of Government employees simply because you insist on carrying on a witch hunt against men whose attitude and whose conduct has been 100 percent anti-Fascist, and you who insist on this disgraceful action, must take the responsibility for holding up the salaries of thousands of employees. It is your insistence on an undemocratic, unconstitutional, and irrelevant provision in an appropriation bill which will cause hardship to so many faithful Government employees. I also ask you, Why do you not pass a continuing resolution so that these people may be paid?

I say that a vote against this motion at this time will serve notice that the House does not insist on the position that it took—a position which is contrary to the fundamental concepts of democracy, and, what is more, not in keeping with the anti-Fascist character of this war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were —ayes 205 and noes 22.

So the resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

FEDERAL AID IN CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that two additional conferees be appointed for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2793), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. MOTT.

The Clerk will notify the Senate.

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 139, consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, this is simply a renewal of the oil pact that the House has renewed on several other occasions?

Mr. BOREN. This is the fifth time that the House has taken this action.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BOREN. It is a unanimous report both from the Petroleum Committee and the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., the 16th day of February 1935, by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and thereafter recommended for ratification by the representatives of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and subsequently ratified by the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, which said compact was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such compact by House Joint Resolution 407, approved August 27, 1935 (Public Res. No. 64, 74th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1937, by an agreement executed in New Orleans, La., the 10th day of May 1937, by the representatives of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and New Mexico, and was duly ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, Illinois, and Colorado, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 183, approved August 10, 1937 (Public Res. No. 57, 75th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1939, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Michigan, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 329, approved July 20, 1939 (Public Res. No. 31, 76th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1941, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 228, approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 246, 77th Cong.).

The extended and renewed compact dated the 1st day of April 1943, duly executed by the representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and which extended and renewed compact has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, reads as follows:

AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Whereas, on the 16th day of February 1935, in the city of Dallas, Texas, there was executed "An Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas" which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahome, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado,

and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"Article I

"This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"Article II

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"Article III

"Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"(a) The operation of any oil well within an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas in paying quantities.

"(c) The avoidable escape into the open air of the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing, or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any state.

"Article IV

"Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"Article V

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"'Article VI

"Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as

"THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION,

the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, cicumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) By the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) By a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: Such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"Article VII

"No State by joining herein, shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"Article VIII

"This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon 60 days' notice, withdraw herefrom.

"The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article 1. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"Done in the city of Dallas, Tex., this 16th day of February 1935.

"Whereas said interstate compact was heretofore duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1937, its original expiration date, to September 1, 1939; and

"Whereas said interstate compact was again duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1939, its second expiration date, to September 1, 1941; and

"Whereas said interstate compact was again duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1941, its third expiration date, to September 1, 1943; and

"Whereas it is desired to again extend and renew said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas for another period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, its present expiration date, to September 1, 1947: Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the said compact entitled 'An Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas' executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be and the same hereby is, extended for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, its present date of expiration, this agreement to become effective within those States joining herein when executed by any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, and New Mexico, and consent thereto is given by Congress.

"The signatory States executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Executid as of this the 1st day of April 1943, by the several undersigned States, at their several capitols, through their proper officials thereunder duly authorized by statutes, resolutions, or proclamations of the several States."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of section 1 is hereby expressly reserved.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the leading editorial from the New York Times of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BECKWORTH was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech made by Gen. C. S. Adams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SABATH and Mr. DIRKSEN were granted permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and to include excerpts from the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. MARVIN JONES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Judge Marvin Jones has been appointed by the President as Food Administrator to take the place of Mr. Chester Davis. Judge Jones was general chairman of the

so-called United Nations Food Conference held at Hot Springs, Va. As I have pointed out heretofore, that assemblage was composed almost entirely of devotees of the planning cult, that its primary purpose was not the consideration of food but the planning of a new world order along communistic lines and a superstate to rule it.

It will be interesting now to observe what part Judge Jones will play in this movement as food administrator of the United States. How and to what extent will he use the highly strategic position he now holds to regiment our American farmers as well as our whole population in accordance with the underlying schemes of the world planners?

Will Judge Jones use his high position to intensify the present New Deal controls and interferences in agriculture that already have our farming population in a state of virtual slavery? Will he also inaugurate more direct measures for communizing agriculture in the United States? Should it be surprising to anyone if he should use the high office to which he has been appointed to carry out these ends, knowing that he presided over the Hot Springs conclave where the Russian delegation was given top position and which by his actions he heartily approved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GRANT of Alabama was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALL OF CALENDAR WEDNESDAY DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment Numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 5: The original House bill carries provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943. To this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocations to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make exemptions for the Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services but left the Senate language applicable to all other Federal agencies. The Senate accepted the House modification of the Senate language but added a further exception for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement omits the original House amendment relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration, but retains the proposed Senate language as modified by the House, and later modified by the Senate, to except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

No. 60: The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons, prior to that date, have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61: Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal year 1944, retroactive to July 1, 1943.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

WAR PRODUCTION COST

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the War Department Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, whose duties are to originate, draft, and steer through the House and defend in conference the War Department appropriation bills, is constituted of seven members of whom I am one.

This places upon me a direct responsibility not only for appropriating War Department moneys but to see that this money is well spent. I have tried to discharge that duty to the best of my ability. In April 1942 I determined to study production costs in our defense plants manufacturing War Department material and equipment.

I was determined to learn just why a medium tank which weighs 30 tons costs $90,000. Why a 105-mm. gun on two wheels costs $21,000 and $83,000 on a self-propelling mount, and why a Springfield rifle was costing us $60 each when a commercial rifle costs much less. I was determined to learn just why material was costing us what it does cost. The costs given are those furnished by the War Department to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They include spare parts, testing costs, freight, and other charges up to the time these weapons are delivered at some place in the United States, where they can be turned over to the fighting forces.

AUTHORITY FOR VISITING PLANTS

In November 1942 I asked the Under Secretary of War for a letter of authority authorizing me, as a member of this subcommittee, to go into any defense plant in the United States, inspect the plant and records, take copies of production records and costs, and see just what they were doing with the money our committee was appropriating for this Department. After some delay and some hesitation, I received the letter from the Under Secretary of War.

Maj. Gen. Levin Campbell, Chief of Ordnance, immediately gave me letters to every ordnance plant to which I wanted to go. This officer from the beginning gave me all the assistance he could, taking the position that "if there is anything wrong we want to know it. If we can improve methods, we want to do so. If you can help us to become more efficient, we will appreciate your help." I want to express my appreciation.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the sympathetic help given me by both the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They assured me they would give me all the support I needed and do anything in their power to correct any matter that needed correcting in the production program.

I approached the factory management in the spirit of cooperation. My approach was something like this: "My name is ENGEL. I am a Member of Congress, representing the Ninth District of Michigan. I am here to have you educate me so I can do a better job in spending your money. I have a right to ask and shall expect your fullest cooperation. I want facts, just facts."

I started my trip January 29, 1943, and spent 44 days inspecting 47 plants. I spent 2 weeks in General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford's. I received on the whole splendid cooperation from everyone for which I am profoundly grateful. I saw the factories convert raw ore and scrap into everything from a rifle barrel to a 16-inch gun ready to go into action.

WHAT WAS FOUND

Production: No one who has studied the problems, as I have tried to study them, can spend 44 days going through plants and seeing the wheels of production roll without coming to the conclusion:

First. That on the whole we are doing a magnificent job of production;

Second. That labor, as a whole, has worked faithfully and well and that labor is entitled to a full share of the credit for such production; and

Third. That the conversion of peacetime plants into war production plants has been the most amazing chapter in the industrial history of the world and both to management and labor, from the head of the production plants on down to the lowest-paid worker, must go great credit.

After having visited the 47 production plants, I spent a day at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds with a group headed by the Chief of Ordnance. I watched them operate various types of equipment and saw them fire everything from a carbine up to an 8-inch gun, with competent officers explaining the effectiveness and the wartime use of each piece of equipment.

With another group I spent several more days in going through the Signal Corps establishment at Monmouth, N. J.; the Chemical Warfare plant at Edgewood Arsenal; and the engineering cantonment at Fort Belvoir, Va.

We saw demonstrations of chemical warfare equipment, the firing of various types of weapons; we saw demonstrations of radar, the latest equipment of the Signal Corps; and ended the trip by examinging engineering equipment at Fort Belvoir and watching the demonstration of an engineering battalion taking a beachhead under simulated artillery, machine-gun, and airplane attacks. No one can see this demonstration without becoming impressed with the fact that we do have the most modern and effective war equipment in the world.

It gives one confidence and faith in the armed forces and great credit must go to the leadership of Maj. Gen. Levin Campbell, chief of ordnance; Maj. Gen. T. J. Hayes, in charge of production; and Maj. Gen. G. M. Barnes, in charge of research and the development of new products and who is undoubtedly one of the outstanding ordnance experts in the world.

COSTS

Before I go into detail and discuss the question of costs, I want to make these observations: First, the appropriations required by war agencies have been so great they are incomprehensible to the average citizen. Many reasons can and will be given for such costs. I shall point out repeatedly items where costs are excessive.

However, the principal reason why, in my judgment, such prohibitive costs have been possible is that the administration, and those representing the administration, have continually measured all progress in war production by the amount of money or the number of dollars spent.

The public is informed that we are spending three, four, or five billion dollars, or more a month and the public takes it for granted that because we are spending large sums of money that we are making great progress. This not only discourages economy but actually encourages waste. The more a department or service can spend, the more credit it is given for having made progress in war production. It is this fact, I believe, more than any other, that is responsible for the tremendous costs in our war program.

Measuring of progress in production by the number of dollars spent should be stopped. We should measure that progress by telling the public frankly how many planes, how many tanks, how many guns, and how much equipment of various types we are making. Fear of having the enemy know these facts is no longer a reason for not doing so.

THE TAXPAYER EVENTUALLY PAYS PAY-ROLL COSTS AND CORPORATION PROFITS

I have taken the position that the extent to which a corporation is engaged in government business in wartime, that corporation's pay roll is a Government pay roll because it is the taxpayer who actually meets that pay roll. I have taken the position that the extent to which that corporation is engaged in war production, to that extent the profits are being paid by the taxpayer and the taxpayer has a right to know the facts, both as to pay roll and profits.

CORPORATION PROFITS

I believe in the capitalistic form of government. I believe in the profit system. I believe that a company engaged in any type of business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit, sufficient to set aside a surplus to act as a cushion against another depression. It should be allowed to set aside money for reconversion to peacetime industry. On the other hand, I do not believe that any company is entitled to excess profits. No corporation should be permitted to take 20 percent profit when that profit is paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been brought down as low as $500 and by bond buyers who are receiving a low rate of interest on the money they are lending to the Government.

I believe in decent wages. I believe in skilled labor being paid and paid well. You have in war industries many skilled men, toolmakers, diemakers, and others. I was fascinated as I watched these men work. It takes years to make an expert diemaker.

Should the worker who operates a simple machine that he can learn to operate in 2 or 3 weeks be paid as much, or more, than the skilled craftsmen who built the die which makes it possible for the workman to turn out his work? That is the issue that I wish to present to this House and let no one misquote me or misunderstand me. I repeat—I believe in good wages, I believe in decent profits. I am opposed to excess profits. I am also opposed to giving the unskilled worker the pay of the skilled worker who is compelled to serve an apprenticeship of years before he is entitled to the wages of a master workman.

EXCERPTS FROM PLANT NOTES

I took notes as I walked through the various plants with the superintendent, foremen, and others. Before I retired at night, I would rewrite the notes and write down my impressions on a portable typewriter. I want to give you a few excerpts from the notes I took. It will give you some idea of the impression the trip left on my mind. I am hoping that by doing so I can best give you the same kind of an impression.

I walked through a plant with the superintendent. I pointed to a young girl welding and the following conversation took place:

Question. How old is that girl?
Answer. Eighteen years old.
Question. Where did she come from?
Answer. Kresge's Dime Store, selling ribbons.
Question. How much does she make?
Answer. Sixty-five dollars a week.

This is pay at the rate of $3,380 a year. The base pay of a major in the Army is $3,000. Other girls still work at the ribbon counter for $18 a week and pay income taxes to help the Government pay this girl $65 a week.

Question. How much experience does she have to have?
Answer. From 2 to 6 weeks.

In driving out of a town I passed a mile and a half of automobiles—workers going to a 7:30 a. m. shift at a war production plant. I visited the bank cashiers in surrounding towns of 1,000 people or more from the area in which these people live. I interviewed the cashiers with a result something like this:

Question. Who are these people working in the factories?
Answer. They are farmer boys, gas-station attendants, grocery-store clerks, drygoods-store clerks, former automobile salesmen, etc.
Question. Do you cash their checks in your bank?
Answer. Yes.
Question. How much do they make?
Answer. Anywhere from $120 to $220 every 2 weeks.
Question. Do they have any special skill?
Answer. H--l, no. They were hauling manure last fall, digging potatoes, husking corn, pumping gas, selling groceries, drygoods, etc.

Farmer boys are making more money in a factory in 1 year than the farm is worth upon which their father has been trying to pay a mortgage for a lifetime.

I go through a Government arsenal. The superintendent informed me he is being paid $6,500 a year after 38 years of service. A defense plant offered his $4,000-a-year assistant foreman, $6,500, plus a $5,000 bonus, or $11,500 a year.

The base pay of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff; Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commanding the Pacific Area; Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, commanding the allied forces in Africa; Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Army, is $10,200.

Tank welders in other factories, after 4 weeks of training, are being paid $67 a week. Girls in still another plant, after 2 to 3 weeks of training are earning as much as $269.72 a month for a 48-hour week. This is pay at the rate of $3,236 a year. Other girls receive $146 for 2 weeks for work assembling oil pumps. This is pay at the rate of $3,800 a year. The base pay of a lieutenant colonel in the Army is $3,500, while the base pay of a colonel in the Army is $4,000 a year.

Thousands of other girls in the country are being paid $18, $20, and $25 a week, with income tax exemptions lowered to $500 and paying taxes and buying bonds so their good sisters with no more training can be paid $65 to $75 a week. Machine-gun assemblers are being paid from $4,700 to $8,740 a year. The base pay of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell is $8,500 a year. He is in command of the entire supply system of the Army from tanks and 16-inch guns down to pistols. He has control of billions of dollars worth of contracts. He is charged with the responsibility of spending billions upon billions of dollars in clothing, feeding, transporting, and equipping the Army upon the battlefields of the world. His base pay is $8,500 a year, or $240 less than some machine-gun assemblers assembling a .50 caliber machine gun.

Soldiers and sailors at Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Tunisia, Bizerte, on battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, on airplane bombers, all have to learn not only to take down and assemble these same machine guns blindfolded, but have to learn to operate them. Some of them get as little as $50 a month.

When they come back they will have to pay an income tax the rest of their lives to pay back the money we borrowed so these factory machine-gun assemblers can be paid from $4,700 to $8,740 a year.

I am wondering what will happen when they do come back. The Government pays $55.80 a week in pay and per diem to girls while learning to mend shoes. The same Government pays $50 a month to the young men in the service who are wearing those shoes.

There are two factories in the same city owned by the same company and both engaged in war production: The first is paying an average of 99 cents an hour, the second $1.42 an hour. The workers in the first factory average earnings of $2,115 a year while the workers in the second factory average earnings of $3,650 a year.

Can we wonder why there are labor troubles and why the strikes?

A farmer came to my office in the interest of the Farm Security Administration pleading for more credit for the farmer. He told me of a neighbor's boy who is working in a defense plant and who had spent the Sunday before at his home. The young man had two kicks: The first, prices were too high; and the second, he was losing $32 because he had not been able to work that Sunday. Millions of workers in America are still working for low wages, some for pre-war wages which have not kept pace with skyrocketing costs of living.

SUMMARY AND OVER-ALL PICTURE ON COMPANIES WHOSE PLANTS I VISITED

Factory pay rolls of the companies whose plants I visited and whose reports I was able to obtain, including General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and General Electric, excluding Government arsenals, show an aggregate total pay roll for the year 1942 of $2,316,041,747. The total number of employees working in these plants aggregated 850,522. Their average annual earning for the year 1942 was $2,725. The total number of man-hours worked for the year was 1,706,484,931. The average amount paid for each hour actually worked was $1.35. While factories were on a 48-hour basis, in most instances lay-offs because of lack of material, absenteeism, sick leave, vacation leave, and other causes, brought the actual number of hours worked down to an average of 38.6 hours for each week for the year.

I was not able to obtain the total number of stockholders in all of the companies surveyed but it is interesting to note that the 6 companies, including Chrysler, General Motors, and General Electric, but excluding Ford, have a total of 764,364 stockholders. It is my judgment that the entire group of corporations surveyed have more than 800,000 stockholders with an average of 850,522 employees. These companies have nearly as many stockholders as they have employees. Corporations, after all, are just aggregations of individuals.

SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT ARSENALS

Five Government arsenals located in four States in the eastern half of the United States show an aggregate pay roll for 1942 of $108,474,270. These arsenals had an average number of 50,464 employees during the year 1942 while the average earnings per employee during the year 1942 was approximately $2,130.

DETAILED INFORMATION AND FACTS

In addition to the general facts in the summary above given, I submit herewith detailed facts taken from pay rolls and earnings given me by plant superintendents or taken from the records.

At first I did not expect to use the company name; however, for fear that the statement might be questioned and to give an opportunity for correcting errors, if there are errors, I shall give the name of each company.

At the General Motors Fisher tank plant welders train 4 to 6 weeks, and now make $67 per 48-hour week with a base pay of $1.29 per hour.

At the Diesel plant, at Detroit, women 18 years old and up earn as high as $269.72 per month for a 48-hour week, on jobs that I was told took them from 2 to 3 weeks to learn. Toolmakers in 1942 were making from $525 to $625 per

month. Operational valve grinders made $293 per month, and I was told it took from 6 to 8 weeks to learn this job. Sweepers earned $200 to $210 per month.

I asked employers for a table showing the three men who had the highest earnings for the year 1942 and the three men who had the lowest earnings in each craft. I also asked for the same information for the month of December 1942, with the following results:

Springfield Armory: Drop forgers showed earnings per employee during the year 1942 ranging from $3,370 to $4,858. Barrel straighteners from $2,540 to $4,169. Barrel riflers from $2,567 to $3,940. Carpenters from $2,515 to $3,111. Die sinkers from $3,771 to $4,906. Electricians from $2,458 to $3,597. Operational machine grinders from $2,352 to $2,916. Operational machine punch press from $1,902 to $2,895. Toolmakers from $3 455 to $4,103.

Rock Island Arsenal machinists were paid from $39.20 to $65.57 per week. Laborer, classified, from $24.40 to $37.71. Toolmakers from $42 to $69.60. Machine operators, lathe, from $37.60 to $62.64. Machine operator, driller, from $28 to $46.40 and tool designers from $44.24 to $62.50. The highest paid men in the Rock Island Arsenal were, first, drop forgers. Their wages ranged from $3,370 to $4,858 per year. Second highest, barrel straighteners whose wages ranged from $2,540 to $4,169. Third highest, barrel riflers, whose wages ranged from $2,567 to $3,940. I have many more items, but this will give an idea of what the pay is at Government arsenals.

Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co.: The highest paid labor I found was in the plants of this company. This company, I was informed, attempted, through the War Labor Board, to readjust its wages trying to bring up the lower paid group and reducing the higher paid group, but I was informed, was unsuccessful.

I am including a copy of their report to me of the annual earnings of the highest and lowest paid employees in the group known as machine-gun assemblers who are assembling .50 caliber machine guns, machine gun filers, and others. Out of the 25 machine-gun assemblers in this high-low group, 5 earned in 1942 from $8,000 to $8,741; 7 earned from $7,000 to $8,000; 7 more earned from $6,000 to $7,000; 4 earned from $5,000 to $6,000, and out of the 25 only two earned less than $5,000 during 1942, 1 who earned $4,959.72, and 1 earned $4,788. Twelve out of the 25 received more than $7,000 and 22 out of the 25 earned more than $6,000, all in 1942. These men assembled .50 caliber machine guns after they are manufactured, each one assembled a certain part of the gun. The average number of hours worked per employee in 1942 was 47.9.

The $8,741 a year paid to the highest paid of these machine-gun assemblers is $241 a year more than the base pay of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, the Chief of the Service of Supply of the entire United States Army, who is charged with the responsibility of procuring and furnishing and supplying on every front in the world what we are told will be an army of 11,000,000 men with clothes, food, fighting equipment, ammunition, and so forth.

Think of paying a machine-gun assembler $241 a year more than the base pay of Lieutenant General Stillwell, who commands the armed forces in the Chinese theater.

Is there anyone in or out of labor circles who can look those facts in the face and justify them?

Is there anyone in this country of ours who has a son in the service who can look that son in the eye and defend pay rolls such as these when, in the final analysis, the money to meet these pay rolls has to be borrowed and will ultimately have to be paid in taxes by that son, should he be fortunate enough to come back from the war?

I am wondering just what these 11,000,000 men will say when they are discharged from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and resume their places in civilian life.

I am inserting in the RECORD exhibit A, which gives the facts on .50-caliber machine-gun assemblers. It shows the amount that employees earned, straight earnings, overtime, other bonuses and total earnings for the years 1941 and 1942. I have left the names of the employees blank.

If anyone would like to have the names of any particular case shown there, I shall be glad to furnish the name of the employee so he can check it back.

The total earnings for these 25 employees for the year 1941 was $87,017.64. These same employees earned in 1942, $171,915.32, or approximately twice the amount they earned in 1941. Their straight earnings in 1941 were $71,926.47 and in 1942, $134,775.52. Overtime in 1941 was $10,854.94 and in 1942 overtime was $28,674.25. Other bonuses in 1941 were $4,236.23 and in 1942, $8,465.55.

Machine-gun filers: The record shows that of the 44 .50-caliber machine-gun filers in the Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., 2 were paid $8,000 to $8,230; five between $7,000 and $8,000; 10 between $6,000 and $7,000; 18 between $5,000 and $6,000; 6 between $4,500 and $5,000 and 2 between $4,200 and $4,500; and 1 of the 44 was paid $2,928. Out of the 44 only 9 made less than $5,000 during that year.

I am also enclosing the break-down of the pay roll of these 44 men. This break-down shows that the aggregated total earnings in 1941 was $155,858.34 and in 1942 these same men earned $260,503.62. Their straight earnings for the year 1941 were $129,727.32, while their straight earnings for 1942 were $201,275.84. Their overtime earnings in 1941 were $19,500 and in 1942, $44,020. Other bonuses paid them in 1941 were $6,630 and in 1942, $15,207.

In case after case these people earned more than twice as much in 1942 as they earned in 1941 and then we talk about inflation. These are not isolated cases as you will find similar cases in other companies. Let us take some of these facts into consideration when we talk of inflation, roll-back of prices and subsidies.

Jack & Heintz, Inc.: I was only able to obtain the factory pay-roll breakdown on this plant for the last 3 months of 1942—for October, November, and December:

	October	November	December	Total
Straight time wages	$829,273.12	$912,244.45	$1,029,969.99	$2,771,487.56
Overtime premiums	195,553.70	252,589.31	248,465.96	696,608.97
Night shift premiums	32,277.46	39,295.40	44,481.27	116,054.13
October production bonus	117,000.00			117,000.00
Christmas bonus			944,300.00	944,300.00
Total	1,174,104.28	1,204,129.16	2,267,217.22	4,645,450.66

This factory pay roll shows that for the 3 months of the total pay roll $4,645,450, $2,771,487 was straight pay while $1,873,963 was overtime, and other premiums and bonuses included $944,300 Christmas bonuses. The total number of man-hours for the 3 months was 2,497,135. The average pay was $1.86 per hour. The average number of employees for the 3 months was 3,593. The average employee received for the 3 months $1,293, or an average of $431 per month, or at the rate of an average annual earning of $5,172. This pay for 3 months is broken down as straight wages $773, bonuses paid $520, including $260 Christmas bonus, per employee.

Continental Motors Corporation—Muskegon, Mich., plant: The average number of employees that this plant employed during 1942 was 4,470. The total wages paid for the year was $14,135,000. This shows that the average earnings per employee at this plant for the year 1942 was $3,162. The total number of hours actually worked was 9,903,865, which brought the average hourly earnings to approximately $1.42 an hour.

Let me emphasize again that factory pay rolls which are incurred in the production of war material which is being paid for by taxes and bonds are not confidential and to the extent that these pay rolls are incurred in war production, they are public pay rolls and the public is entitled to have the facts.

I asked for and obtained the three highest and the three lowest paid employees for each classification for the year 1942. This record shows as follows: The workers in the crankshaft department were paid from $3,643 to $3,915 for the year; flywheel workers were paid from $3,489 to $4,258, men engaged in shipping motors received from $3,148 to $4,536. The motor test department employees were paid from $3,300 to $4,318; handscrew machine operators were paid from $3,633 to $4,983. Out of nine workers representing the

three highest and the three lowest in this department, only one worker received less than $4,100 and only three workers received less than $4,500. Two elevator operators were paid $3,277 and $3,165. Automatic screw machine operators earned from $4,380 to $5,185. Punch press operators received from $3,860 to $4,957; carpenters were paid from $3,468 to $3,984, while electricians were paid from $3,918 to $4,529. Janitors were paid from $2,850 to $3,196 for the year, while toolroom workers were paid from $3,671 to $5,906 for the year 1942. Welders received from $3,862 to $4,267. Tool designers were paid $4,963 to $7,299. Aircraft assemblers were paid from $4,047 to $4,881. Aircraft testers were paid from $4,202 to $4,795. Engineers were paid from $3,114 to $4,579. The highest janitor was paid more than the lowest paid engineer. These are the amounts actually paid these employees during the year 1942.

I also asked for the monthly earnings for these employees for December 1942, showing the actual earnings for the 40-hour week, plus bonuses for overtime, and so forth. This factory was on a three-shift basis, so outside of the tool room and one or two other departments there would be comparatively little overtime beyond the 48-hour week. There are a number of cases where the amount of bonus paid exceeds the 40-hour earnings. For instance, December earnings of one stock chaser was given as $201.48 straight time, while his overtime bonus was $283.56, making total earnings for the month of $485.04. In the experimental department one man received for the month of December $239 and $215 for overtime, making a total of $454 for the month. In the service stock department one man's actual earnings were $405, of which approximately $196 was straight time and $208 was overtime.

I also have a break-down of the machine-shop department's pay roll for the 2-week period ending December 13, 1942. Total of hours worked for the 2-week period was 109,652. Total bonus hours worked, 17,827. Total hours paid, 127,480. The regular earnings were $67,718.30, while the bonus earnings were $90,267.92, and the total earnings for this department for the 2 weeks were $157,986.22. In department after department the bonuses exceeded the regular earnings for the same period.

The machine-assemblers department for the same 2-week period ending December 13, 1942, showed the total hours worked was 225,993. The total hours paid was 282,403. The bonus hours were 56,412. The regular earnings were $123,-624.33. The bonus earnings in this department were $283,548.05, or more than twice the regular earnings, while the total earnings were $407,172.38. Here are departments whose bonus earnings were twice the amount of the regular earnings. A summary of the entire payroll department for that same month was: Total hours worked, 580,799; bonus hours, 126,041; total hours paid for, 706,841. The total earnings of these employees for this 2-week period were $896,-184, of which the regular earnings were $487,316, and the bonus earnings were $408,978. The bonus earnings were almost as large as the regular earnings.

NORGE REFRIGERATOR CO. AND NORGE PRODUCTS CO., DIVISION OF THE BORG-WARNER CORPORATION

Norge Refrigeration Division: This company employed before the war somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 people. The average number of employees in 1942 was 1,018. Dividing the total pay roll by the number of hours worked, we find that employees were paid on an average of 99.8 cents an hour, they averaged $40.58 per week and $2,113 per year. The three top men earned in a sample week $69.34, $49.64, and $40.21.

Norge Products Co.: This company was running full force only during the last 5 months of 1942—from August to December. When we take the total pay roll including bonus, overtime, and so forth, and divide it by the number of hours worked and the number of employees, we find that these employees earned on an average of $1,521 during the 5 months, or $304 a month, or at the rate of $3,648 per year. The average pay per hour was $1.42. The highest paid individuals received $106.49 per week in the toolroom while machine operators earned $88.07 per week. These people received time and a half for overtime, 5 cents an hour additional for night work after 2:30 p. m., 2½ percent vacation bonus, and those who were not on piece work received 20 percent over the base rate until piece work was introduced. Bonuses were running as high as 50 to 60 percent.

Despite repeated appeals by me to the War Department that business be placed in the old plant, despite repeated promises, the old plant in 1942 instead of having 3,500 employees had an average of only 1,018 employees. The Government went out, rebuilt another plant, at public expense, operated by another corporation, the Norge Products Co., which is also a subsidiary of Borg-Warner and employed 795 people in the second plant while the first plant remained two-thirds idle.

In the old plant the average pay per hour was 99.8 cents; in the new plant $1.42. In the old plant the average annual pay was $2,113; in the new plant they were paid for 5 months at an annual average rate of $3,648. The wages paid throughout the new plant are from 50 to 75 percent higher than in the old plant. Both plants are subsidiaries of Borg-Warner and are located 2 miles apart. The manager informed me, as did the Government inspector, that unskilled men could earn from $60 to $80 per week in the new plant for 40 to 45 hours' work by operating a one-purpose machine after a 3 weeks' learning period. I saw one individual whom I recognized. He was a businessman in town. He locked his place of business, went to the factory with apparently no experience, and was paid, at the end of a few weeks, $67.42 for 1 week of 45 hours.

GIRLS PAID $55.80 PER WEEK TO LEARN TO MEND SHOES

At Fort Devens, Mass., an Army post, the Government advertised for girls to learn to repair shoes. They advertised that they would pay $55.80 a week. Upon writing to the Civil Service Commission and the Army officials, I was informed that these girls worked 48 hours a week and were paid for 52 hours, at 40 cents an hour. This gave them in wages $20.80 a week. In addition to this, they were paid $35 a week for living expenses while taking the training. The Government was actually paying these girls $55.80 a week to learn how to repair shoes while the soldiers in the service who wore these same shoes were being paid as low as $50 a month.

FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH GRADERS CERTIFIED FOR $1,560-A-YEAR JOBS

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, of Boston, and a director of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, which was organized under the Civil Service Commission by an Executive order and transferred to the War Manpower Commission, testified before the Labor-Federal Security Agency subcommittee recently.

Dr. Carmichael testified that the Civil Service Commission had certified for this National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, Washington domestic servants, some of whom had not passed the fourth, fifth, or sixth grades and whose entire work experience had been only in domestic service. They certified these people for filing clerks, machine typists, and punch-card-machine operators. The salary was $1,260, plus $300 increase, or a total salary of $1,560 a year. He further testified that they had to separate certain individuals from the pay roll, "but, as you know, it is quite a process to separate one person from the service."

CONCLUSION

A number of years ago Congress passed the Walsh-Healey Act to protect labor and to assure that on public contracts labor would be paid the wage rate that prevailed in the community in which the manufacturing was being done. Mme. Perkins, Secretary of Labor, has filed with each of these plants a wage rate which is supposed to set forth the prevailing wage rate in the area in which the contract is given at the time the contract was let.

When I asked about the prevailing wage rate, I was told it was obsolete; that it was not being considered and in every case the wages paid were far beyond that prevailing wage set by the Secretary of Labor in the community in which the contract was let.

Nonwar plants and nonwar labor have been hard hit in the face of these facts. A system of labor piracy was testified to by Chairman McNutt before our committee and which brought about the orders to freeze wages far beyond the prevailing wage in a certain area. A new company coming into a locality with Government contracts set the price of wages so high that other local companies could not compete and the best labor left them and went to the new company.

Millions of workers in the country in nonwar, but essential activities are frozen by Executive order at pre-war or nearly pre-war wages.

On the other hand, we see millions of others whose wages are far in excess of the prevailing wage, sometimes double

that prevailing wage, also frozen. We find on the one hand, as shown herein, machine gun assemblers being paid a wage rate in 1942 which ran as high as $8,741 a year. On the other hand, we attempt to freeze a half million coal miners at wage rates that give them annual earnings of from $1,200 to $1,700 a year. These miners see young people with little, if any, skill working in factories and in some cases earn from two to four times the annual wages that they are being paid.

While I do not condone wartime strikes, I have a great deal of sympathy for these half million coal miners without whose work the factories of the country cannot produce. They are, I believe, entitled to a pay which will enable them to support themselves and their families in comfort and which will keep pace with the ever increased costs of living.

The wage earner who has been faithful and who has worked hard and continued to accept his pre-war wage rate without striking is being penalized by being frozen in his job at the wage rate for the duration of the war.

While the wage earner who has continued to insist upon increased wages, who has struck or has threatened to strike for increased wages, or who has benefited from a system of labor piracy, is being frozen at a wage rate that is sometimes two or three times that of the first-mentioned employee.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is as old as the world itself. There is a tradition that at the building of King Solomon's temple, a group of workmen killed a great master builder because he refused to make it possible for them to obtain master wages to which they were not entitled. This great master builder solved that problem at its inception at the cost of his life. It will take great courage now as it did then to bring about a solution of this and other problems confronting our Nation today. It is extremely doubtful whether the master workman at the other end of the avenue has that courage. It is extremely doubtful whether his personal ambition will permit him to bring about a solution of these problems at the cost of his political life. I am fearful that if these problems are not solved, he will find his country in ruins at his feet and he himself go down in history as its destroyer.

EXHIBIT A.—*.50 caliber machine-gun assemblers*

[Taken from Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. pay roll for 1941 and 1942]

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank	$3,102.43	$529.92	$217.29	$3,849.64	$3,740.46	$849.92	$369.34	$4,959.72
Do	3,257.72	543.54	219.96	4,021.22	6,617.95	1,529.01	389.22	8,536.18
Do	2,929.71	446.02	128.91	3,504.64	5,262.32	1,192.54	343.71	6,798.57
Do	2,709.29	371.47	121.04	3,201.80	4,689.26	887.38	316.79	5,893.43
Do	2,892.31	451.95	234.58	3,578.84	5,846.84	1,338.96	342.43	7,528.23
Do	3,143.72	523.61	124.62	3,791.95	5,958.37	1,295.79	377.19	7,631.35
Do	2,005.70	272.12	91.89	2,369.71	4,235.98	832.78	229.49	5,298.25
Do	2,970.32	409.43	208.45	3,588.20	6,551.89	1,388.48	346.36	8,286.73
Do	2,816.35	379.84	185.66	3,381.85	5,438.24	1,085.04	325.46	6,848.74
Do	2,632.16	339.11	148.47	3,119.74	4,766.19	959.70	302.74	6,028.63
Do	2,693.13	373.71	131.85	3,198.69	5,377.51	1,105.36	313.04	6,795.91
Do	3,128.64	485.66	163.21	3,777.51	6,846.67	1,523.63	370.94	8,741.24
Do	2,944.23	461.97	214.13	3,620.33	5,692.98	1,115.69	347.56	7,156.23
Do	3,010.53	473.22	107.76	3,591.51	4,451.31	926.88	355.89	5,734.08
Do	2,934.55	436.85	145.17	3,516.57	6,080.68	1,294.72	346.01	7,721.41
Do	2,769.89	354.59	181.39	3,305.87	4,769.38	937.79	320.35	6,027.52
Do	3,284.58	554.85	204.30	4,043.73	6,516.60	1,470.49	392.23	8,379.32
Do	3,260.84	525.90	165.27	3,952.01	6,285.34	1,393.59	386.92	8,065.85
Do	2,864.61	420.47	232.22	3,517.30	5,488.53	1,200.53	332.19	7,021.25
Do	3,154.06	526.94	245.25	3,926.25	5,925.45	1,341.23	374.57	7,641.25
Do	3,008.24	505.28	109.32	3,622.84	4,832.95	1,063.19	359.88	6,256.02
Do	2,650.16	403.85	129.68	3,183.69	4,196.86	920.69	315.40	5,432.95
Do	2,369.61	295.13	185.08	2,849.82	3,908.33	596.88	273.67	4,778.88
Do	2,770.40	413.60	163.16	3,347.16	6,209.21	1,433.68	329.37	7,972.26
Do	2,623.29	355.91	177.57	3,156.77	5,086.22	990.30	304.80	6,381.32
Total	71,926.47	10,854.94	4,236.23	87,017.64	134,775.52	28,674.25	8,465.55	171,915.32

EXHIBIT B.—*.50-caliber machine-gun filers*

[Taken from Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. pay roll for 1941 and 1942]

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank	$2,811.52	$379.52	$212.79	$3,403.83	$5,747.59	$1,122.64	$326.50	$7,196.73
Do	2,885.67	442.53	202.62	3,530.82	5,951.88	1,305.09	340.63	7,597.60
Do	3,030.66	467.91	225.47	3,724.04	4,500.78	897.40	354.84	5,753.02
Do	3,062.80	496.29	199.81	3,758.90	5,487.05	1,121.04	361.96	6,970.05
Do	2,891.05	432.46	169.70	3,493.21	4,360.29	862.22	337.85	5,560.36
Do	2,721.17	415.70	219.53	3,356.40	3,717.89	790.57	317.92	4,826.38
Do	3,317.48	533.87	224.72	4,076.07	4,407.79	932.26	389.96	5,730.01
Do	1,846.79	218.73	171.75	2,237.27	2,289.20	429.86	209.02	2,928.17
Do	3,155.72	486.95	205.71	3,798.38	3,896.77	853.99	368.66	5,124.42
Do	2,895.82	402.07	219.32	3,517.21	4,367.54	941.42	337.49	5,646.45
Do	3,051.20	471.07	187.93	3,710.30	4,239.29	992.26	358.66	5,590.21
Do	3,172.51	474.04	177.47	3,824.02	4,519.06	913.89	372.79	5,805.74
Do	3,110.87	486.16	228.68	3,825.71	4,902.65	1,009.36	365.34	6,277.35
Do	3,106.31	478.50	222.58	3,807.39	4,610.45	965.15	366.05	5,941.65
Do	3,026.76	451.41	161.56	3,639.73	4,934.42	1,285.33	352.40	6,572.15
Do	2,681.16	339.46	177.81	3,198.43	3,572.90	632.60	308.75	4,514.25
Do	3,054.07	459.46	221.20	3,734.73	6,277.82	1,366.09	360.47	8,004.38
Do	3,204.18	477.12	208.72	3,890.02	4,583.91	975.17	374.74	5,933.82
Do	3,004.28	443.29	170.38	3,617.95	4,352.18	1,154.05	353.67	5,859.90
Do	3,019.79	480.04	223.72	3,723.55	5,160.12	1,013.23	354.19	6,527.54
Do	3,238.45	496.38	150.87	3,885.70	5,293.49	1,236.80	381.94	6,912.23
Do	3,000.21	434.57	166.26	3,601.04	3,983.95	977.79	348.82	5,310.56
Do	3,026.55	469.20	146.21	3,641.96	4,605.23	1,201.14	356.62	6,162.99
Do	2,569.97	388.01	102.76	3,060.74	3,215.71	681.41	303.63	4,200.75
Do	3,160.98	484.81	130.48	3,776.27	5,545.32	1,195.22	363.79	7,104.33
Do	2,720.35	410.28	139.50	3,270.13	4,076.78	956.04	317.99	5,350.81
Do	2,974.69	439.86	114.07	3,528.62	3,853.32	719.18	348.50	4,921.00
Do	2,926.67	451.80	133.98	3,512.45	4,227.39	905.88	343.45	5,476.72
Do	3,021.07	425.08	117.99	3,564.14	6,083.34	1,173.64	352.82	7,609.80
Do	3,072.79	470.26	121.95	3,665.00	5,127.86	1,279.94	362.25	6,770.05
Do	3,167.60	493.20	75.96	3,736.76	6,137.16	1,331.63	377.07	7,845.86

EXHIBIT B.—*.50-caliber machine-gun fliers*—Continued

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank	$3,260.81	$509.67	$99.63	$3,870.11	$5,306.65	$1,149.85	$384.96	$6,841.46
Do	2,740.88	418.07	81.93	3,240.88	3,762.47	875.17	320.60	4,958.24
Do	2,600.68	364.94	75.57	3,041.19	3,049.75	781.01	301.66	4,932.42
Do	2,923.65	439.40	82.27	3,445.32	4,174.03	831.19	345.37	5,350.59
Do	3,205.49	496.28	86.41	3,788.18	6,465.40	1,387.59	377.92	8,230.92
Do	2,901.83	451.55	81.38	3,434.76	3,227.04	848.82	337.14	4,413.00
Do	3,061.72	462.68	77.92	3,602.32	4,337.22	1,057.01	358.91	5,753.14
Do	2,765.59	403.70	73.94	3,243.23	4,012.52	866.74	323.69	5,202.95
Do	2,733.30	416.79	63.05	3,213.14	4,288.89	941.98	323.20	5,554.07
Do	3,075.00	515.05	70.64	3,660.69	4,732.54	1,081.31	366.90	6,180.75
Do	2,785.38	393.06	137.98	3,319.42	4,462.84	1,057.08	323.62	5,843.54
Do	3,145.65	526.67	130.87	3,803.19	5,082.27	1,190.85	376.83	6,649.95
Do	2,598.10	349.77	137.27	3,085.14	3,554.00	724.23	298.09	4,576.32
Total	129,727.32	19,500.66	6,630.36	155,858.34	201,275.84	44,020.12	15,207.66	260,503.62

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. First, I think the gentleman should be complimented for the information he has presented to the House on the question he is discussing, and I hope the Members of the House who are not present will read his speech.

I was interested particularly in the matter he referred to, the Colts Manufacturing Co. particularly, since I know something about that company.

I have wondered why the management has not made some effort through the War Department or otherwise to cut down some of the high wages that have been referred to and bring up the level of some of the lower-paid employees.

Mr. ENGEL. I was informed that they tried to reclassify these wages by bringing down the higher and bringing up the lower levels. However, I think the gentleman, in order to get an answer to that question, will have to go to the War Labor Board.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a matter for the War Labor Board.

Mr. ENGEL. The War Labor Board; yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have been very much interested in this exposé of unwarranted defense-plant wages as brought before the House by the gentleman from Michigan.

Does not the gentleman feel that in all this talk we have had about roll-back on butter and meat prices that really the roll-back should apply to these defense-plant wages?

Mr. ENGEL. I have some very definite ideas on that subject and I expect to discuss the question of inflation sometime later.

I do feel that the roll-back or any policy cannot be effective as long as we allow the doubling up of wage income in 1 year over the preceding year. Butter and meat represent farm labor and farm investment. When you roll back butter and meat prices you in effect roll back farm labor or wages. If you roll back farm wages, why not defense-plant wages?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the RECORD should show that the gentleman's colleagues who are on the subcommittee of appropriations for the War Department and on the Appropriation Committee have had a very deep appreciation for the work the gentleman has been doing.

The gentleman from Minnesota has properly taken cognizance of the significance of what the gentleman is saying.

The gentleman from Michigan has pursued this study of costs in war production under handicaps that would have discouraged many of us. Not only has he arranged with others so he could take the 44 days that were necessary through the spring and winter to do this work, but I think most of us know that during the pursuit of the studies he incurred an automobile accident that would have stopped most men, but before the doctor thought he should be out, he set out again, went back to the job, a one-man crusade, and resumed his diligent work and studies of the costs, at first hand, in the war-production plants throughout the country.

I hope that the Members of the House who are not present will take the opportunity to read the gentleman's remarks.

A short time ago he made a statement on the floor, which statement had very wide press notice.

The studies that the gentleman has been making and the conclusions that he is now presenting of the cost of war production throughout the country is deserving of equally good press and I hope that the gentleman of the press will do all they can to call attention to the conclusions that the gentleman is making.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his kind remarks, and also for the support that I have had from my subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota is a member. I owe a great deal to my colleagues of both the subcommittee and the full committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as well as the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] have been very cooperative. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] have done outstanding work on that subcommittee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am in receipt of a labor paper from my district called Greater Los Angeles Labor in which they quote certain Government statistics to show that the labor employed in the defense industries, numbering something close to half a million have received increases in wages averaging 72.4 percent over the same period of time in which the cost of living has increased 25.2 percent which shows a net gain in real wages of 37.7 percent. I believe the figures the gentleman has obtained are far in excess of those I have just quoted and I think it is a great contribution to the whole question.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the gentleman found in his investigations any instances of the employment of more people than necessary?

Mr. ENGEL. I found this situation: A plant may have orders enough to run two or three shifts. Reduced orders from the Army may require the plant to reduce from three shifts to two shifts. They may retain that labor so that in case they go back to three shifts, or from one to two, the labor will be available. I went into one plant, for instance, where they were loading shells and where they were working at only 40 percent of the rated capacity. At that plant they kept additional people on the pay roll because they did not know at what moment they might have orders to increase to 50 or 60 percent of their capacity.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder whether these high wages and extravagent practices the gentleman has revealed to us has not had a deleterious effect upon farm production in this country. The gentleman mentioned the case of the repairing of shoes where girls were paid an hourly wage which brought them within the purview of the War Labor Board through a set wage, but he stated also that they received a per diem bonus which was in excess of their weekly wage. I wonder if it would not be possible for us to take

action against such bonuses, which are clearly outside the realm of our ability to regulate, yet which throw our whole production methods out of gear.

Mr. ENGEL. I personally feel that they do not have to pay that type of wage. I believe these people will work and work faithfully without such a wage being paid, but once having paid it, once they have received it, it is hard to give it up. The administration has scrambled the eggs and now finds it impossible to unscramble them.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SNYDER, STARNES of Alabama, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor of being a member, has recently approved unanimously and is now seeking an early rule on the so-called Fulbright resolution, with which most Members of the House are already familiar.

In form and language it is perhaps one of the simplest resolutions ever to be submitted to this body, but in its purpose and effect is as important and far-reaching as any ever to be considered. It reads in its entirety as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate, to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation of the United States therein.

To those of you who fear that an early consideration of this resolution may precipitate debate and disputes in this body which might prove disastrous in our relations with our allies at this particular time, especially with the joint offensive imminent, may I say that I anticipate little or no contest in the passage of this resolution by the House. It came from our committee with the complete and enthusiastic support of every member thereof, Democrat and Republican alike. As you know, we have some pretty strong dissenters usually in our committee, and when it reports out a measure to the House without a critical voice having been heard, it is a pretty clear indication that that measure will meet with the well-nigh unanimous approval of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The passage of this resolution will impose upon our country a moral obligation that would insure our active aid in all the multitudinous post-war problems, social, economic, and educational; and in questions of world trade, world transportation, and world armament; but above and beyond all, in the establishment and permanent maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It will circumvent, prevent, and prohibit a repetition of our cowardice after the last war, our failure to live up to our God-given opportunities, duties, and responsibilities, and our attempted selfish retreat into smug isolationism. It will give our allies notice that they may count upon us and our assistance in all these problems, for to date, judging the future in the light of their experience of the past, they do not know what our intentions are, and they may now, together or separately, be formulating policies which will not enure to our advantage.

This resolution has the merit of not bearing the stamp of and not having been inspired by either political party. Nor was it proposed by the administration. It is simply a well-formulated expression of the general opinion and determination of the people of this country. It has been aptly termed a "grass roots" resolution.

And, finally, its passage will lay the cornerstone for a real and well-defined foreign policy for this country, and we have never had a very definite foreign policy save for the good-neighbor policy and the international trade agreements as formulated by Cordell Hull, and the Monroe Doctrine. One important illustration of our lack of foreign policy heretofore is our commitment nearly 50 years ago to defend the Philippines, yet never attempting to acquire by treaty or otherwise the islands and bases absolutely necessary for strategic defense thereof.

A much simpler illustration of our lack of foreign policy is the fact that, almost to the day of Pearl Harbor, we were professing eternal friendship for and an abiding sympathy with China in her desperate and heart-rending struggle with Japan, yet we were furnishing Japan with all the scrap and all the oil and all the munitions she desired with which to crush China, and with which to roll the monsters of modern motorized warfare over the helpless bodies of her people, and with which to send crashing into her massed population the bombs and high explosives against which these defenseless people had nothing to impose save their naked breasts.

By all means let us begin the formulation of a sensible, definite foreign policy and publish it abroad that all may see that this, the mightiest country on the globe, intends, this war over, to discharge its just duty and responsibility to its own people and to all the world—duties incumbent upon it by very reason of its power and greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a short visit home, and while there, I attended the commencement exercises of one of the oldest and best preparatory schools in the South, the Battle Ground Academy at Franklin, Tenn.—its fifty-third commencement, by the way. Twenty-five fine, outstanding teen-age boys, most of them just turning 18, attained their certificates of graduation, and 17 of them had already received their orders of induction into the Army, the remaining 8 expecting theirs almost any day; in fact, of the 17, some left the school grounds, certificate in hand, to board a bus for the induction center. Not one of the boys seemed to mind; in fact, they seemed happy, even in their immaturity, to serve their country wherever called. But, Mr. Speaker, many an oldster there was more emotionally upset than can be adequately expressed, to think that these youths, just a whisper away from childhood, with a faint down marking where a beard one day will grow, must go direct from the playing fields of prep school to the horrid pit of war.

I remember that once I closed a graduating address delivered at a high school with these lines from Longfellow:

How beautiful is youth! How bright it gleams!
With its allusions, aspirations, dreams;
Book of beginnings, story without end,
Each maid a heroine, and each man a friend,
All possibilities are in its hands.
No danger daunts, and no foe withstands
In its sublime audacity of faith.
Be thou removed, it to the mountain saith,
And with ambitious feet, secure and proud,
Ascends the ladder, leaning on a cloud

But, now that the "brazen throat of war hath roared" the lives of these boys are timed to the throbbing of the drum.

For some of those boys sitting on the stage that bright June morning, whose souls have never known anything more terrible than a bleeding nose at football, instead of ascension on a ladder leaning on a cloud, there may be sleep—the "sleep that knows not breaking morn of toil, nor night of waking."

Oh, the arrant knaves and fools of European statesmen of the last generation, with our assent, to write a clumsy peace that would let this thing come to pass! Imposing and inserting terms and omitting their necessary safeguards that wrung from Marshal Foch the exclamation, "Gentlemen, this is not a peace that you have written; it is only an armistice for 20 years." He missed his prophecy by one year only. And, oh

the ignorance and bigotry and stupidity of the statesmen of our country of that day and era, who refused to permit us to accept our responsibilities in world affairs, and declined to permit of us at least the endeavor to cooperate with other nations to preserve a lasting peace!

Mr. Speaker, I have drawn upon this personal experience of mine many times in discussing the last post-war period—once upon the floor of this House. I trust this repetition at this time will be forgiven. I was fortunate enough to be on detached military service in Paris after the Armistice of World War I, and I saw the Peace Conference in progress. I was privileged to see President Wilson as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with his high ideals and noble purposes of justifying the sacrifice of our war dead by the writing of a just and lasting peace and the setting up of a strong and effective League of Nations, with the active participation of our country, that would have ushered in a new era when nations settled their differences at the council table and not on bloody fields of battle.

One by one his 14 points and his proposals for peace terms were bartered and whittled away by the sly, shrewd, and selfish statesmen of Europe. He could not defend his position because he knew already that doubt and uncertainty pervaded the halls of Congress, and he had no commitment of his legislative bodies, such as this resolution, to strengthen and inspire him. Finally he had nothing left but his plan for the League of Nations. Regardless of the peace terms, he thought just with this simple instrument permanent peace could be insured, surely its acceptance by his people would be unanimous, and he hurried home to lay it before the country. But the Senate would have none of it. "No," said the elder statesmen, "let the souls of the dead, far beyond the last horizon's rim, keep maching for the peace they died to insure. We will have none of your theory of internationalism. We are girt by wide and mighty oceans. We are sufficient unto ourselves. Let the rest of the world attend to its own affairs, and we will attend to ours."

It was my sad privilege later, after this repudiation, to catch one fleeting glimpse of Wilson as he slowly moved about the street near his home in Washington, a pitiable wreck of a paralytic that walked toward an early grave with shuffling step and drooling mouth and staring, vacant eyes.

And I recall seeing, just after his death, a picture drawn by that great cartoonist, Cary Orr, captioned "The Chief Joins His Legions," and it pictured Wilson entering the spirit world, and there, drawn up in review to meet him, were all the hosts of the late American dead, their poor skeletons of bodies standing stiffly at attention; one ghostly figure blew upon a phantom bugle; another raised the phantom colors. For the dead Commander in Chief, whose dream had come to naught, was taking over command of his legions of dead whose death had come to naught.

May God prevent the recurrence of such an episode in our history! The passage of the Fulbright resolution will prevent such an exhibition this time on the part of Congress, and our dead in World War II will not have died in vain; those who, as their comrades return, are destined to forever sleep beyond that last opening in the hills and far across the wide and wildering wastes of oceans, will know that in dying they verily found the dream, ideal, and objective that they so willingly pursued.

Members of my committee bespeak the aid of the House generally in obtaining an early rule for the consideration of the Fulbright resolution.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House adopted an amendment to the war agencies appropriation bill which in effect would abolish the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information.

I share, with all Members of this House, a high regard for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], who offered that amendment, and I am sure if that distinguished gentleman, who is one of the most able Members of this body, had considered fully the effect of his amendment he would have altered it somewhat, at least, before offering it.

Most of the debate on the amendment in the Committee of the Whole centered on the so-called propaganda phases of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. Very little attention was given to the broader effect of the amendment.

During consideration of nearly every appropriation bill for fiscal year 1943 there was a recurring refrain from both sides of the aisle that there be established a central information agency to coordinate and tie together the various news releases and statements of facts and policies emanating from the Government departments, bureaus, and agencies. Not only was there an insistent demand from Congress that a central bureau be established but almost unanimously the press of the Nation was attacking the Government for conflicting statements by various Federal officials on such subjects as rubber, oil, production, prices, manpower, and on down the line.

The public was confused, and there were evidences, rather pronounced, that the public was losing confidence in the accuracy of military news. The charge was being made that the Navy was withholding news of the complete destruction of our fleet at Pearl Harbor, and other charges were made that bad news was withheld until some compensating good news could be released at the same time.

Into that picture of confusion, doubt and uncertainty, came the Office of War Information. In assuming the directorship, Mr. Elmer Davis summed up its basic policy in this sentence:

This is a people's war, and to win it they should know as much about it as they can. We will tell the people the truth and nothing but the truth. Only information of value to the enemy will be withheld.

Having served in practically every position on the editorial staff of a daily newspaper, I have watched, perhaps with more than ordinary interest, the manner in which that policy has been carried out. I also was one of those who demanded on the floor of the House that a central agency for information be established.

Through the past year the O. W. I. has battled within all the councils of Government for the prompt, complete, and accurate reporting of military news.

It is true that not all of the conflicting statements have disappeared, but most of them have, due to the coordinating work of the O. W. I. Let us look into some of the other effects of this amendment. Radio networks and their affiliated stations along with independent stations are devoting approximately $100,000,000 in radio time in their desire to cooperate in helping to keep the people who are at war accurately informed on such matters as bond sales, scrap drives, food conservation, and other important matters. The radio industry depends upon O. W. I. to bring all these facts together in their proper proportion and perspective. Without the work of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch the radio industry would have to go back to the 33 different agencies, and then face the task of evaluating information obtained on single subjects rather than having the whole matter tied together in one bundle.

Likewise the advertising industry has made available around $100,000,000 in advertising space in newspapers and magazines. The advertising council responsible for filling this white space with valuable information for our people depends on O. W. I. to do the same job it does for the radio industry. If it were abolished the Advertising Council likewise would have to fall back on 33 agencies, some of which are in a sense competitive.

Through an agreement worked out with the motion picture industry, the O. W. I. makes 26 pictures during a year, and the industry itself makes 26 others, thus giving a picture a week on some important war topic. All of that is under the Domestic Branch of O. W. I.

Retail stores from coast to coast have been very liberal in making available the use of their windows for posters relating to the war program. Under the present plan one poster each week is released on some subject of timeliness and importance.

Enemy propaganda is constantly flooding the American home front, and O. W. I. is the only agency in the Nation that regularly exposes by the light of fact all the dark lies and fallacies of what the enemy is saying.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a strong tendency in this body to curtail expenses and save the Government and the people money.

The Domestic Branch of O. W. I. costs less than $9,000,000 per year. By the expenditure of that amount it makes possible the effective service of the free

communication media of America—the press, radio, advertising, motion pictures, and magazines—in doing an effective job, and one, which though done by private effort, costs several hundred million dollars per year.

If the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. were abolished, as provided in the amendment already adopted by the House, the costs of every Federal war agency unquestionably will rise, and even with the increased costs the results are not likely to be nearly so favorable as they have been under the present system.

Charges have been made that the Office of War Information has engaged in political practices. These accusations, it seems to me, can hardly stand the light of careful examination.

The Director himself has warned all officials and employees of the Office that they can no more afford to be concerned with politics than can the Army or the Navy.

The personnel of the Office for the most part is made up of professional people who are concerned only with how they may best present the facts, and the information programs, so far as I have been able to learn, have not dealt in political issues, but with matters entirely related to this global war. It has been pointed out previously that until very recently the Director of the Domestic Branch was Mr. Gardner Cowles, an ardent Republican and a prominent midwestern publisher. Following his resignation, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, another prominent Republican, but a sincere American and a very fine Pacific coast publisher, has left his own newspaper to come here as Director of the Domestic Branch.

I mention the fact that both of these able journalists are Republicans not for the purpose of injecting politics into the discussion but in an effort to show, as I think it does show, that the agency has not been political or partisan either from the standpoint of personnel or policies.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so much concerned about the so-called home-front propaganda activities of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch as I am about the clearance and coordination features of the agency.

The war activities of this Nation and its Government on the home front are exceedingly complex. The daily lives of millions of people in many ways are affected by the decisions of the many agencies charged with carrying out the program.

Such decisions and the subsequent actions taken are of utmost interest and importance to the people they affect, and they are entitled to full and accurate information as quickly as it can be transmitted.

Now, in this complex pattern of Federal activity, several agencies may share responsibility in some measure for the handling of what would seem to be a single problem, such as food, gasoline, or inflation control. Each one of these agencies naturally has a primary interest in its particular phase of the problem. It is only natural if each agency attempted to keep the public informed of its own activities, without any relation whatsoever to the other parties or agencies doing the same job, conflict and confusion inevitably would result. We saw that happening a year ago and we cried out against it, as rightly we should.

The domestic branch of O. W. I. provides the central clearance facilities which are necessary to give the public an accurate, ungarbled picture of the war activities of the Government as a whole.

The branch has what is known as an inter-agency liaison system through which the news bureau clears all war agency news releases, including speeches and statements by ranking officials thus eliminating, or certainly minimizing, contradictions that might result if statements were made on the basis of the functions of a single agency rather than in relation to what all other agencies are doing.

Just as an example of the extent to which the press of the Nation depends on O. W. I. to gather up loose ends and tie them together, is the fact that newspapers maintain 54 full-time correspondents who make their headquarters in the O. W. I. press room. The news bureau handles an average of 2,500 queries per month from the newspapers of the Nation.

The O. W. I. clears and issues over 250 news releases a week. It serves 1,867 daily newspapers which have a circulation of more than 141,000,000; 1,500 trade papers; 2,300 trade associations; 10,600 weekly papers, and 1,800 foreign language newspapers.

Let us examine very briefly some of the special reports that have been issued from time to time, and which have been used rather extensively by Members of the Congress. Bear in mind that all of these have been issued through the domestic branch of O. W. I.

In October of last year the O. W. I. issued the first clear-cut report on American aircraft. That report, very comprehensive and accurate, did more than any other one thing to end what was developing into a first-class controversy with reference to American planes as compared to those of enemy nations.

On March 26 of this year a report was issued on absenteeism. Many Members of this body referred to that report and quoted from it.

On April 17 of this year the O. W. I. Rubber Report was released. It dealt with a number of matters that were disputed in various quarters, but subsequent developments have proved the accuracy of that report.

Again, in April of this year, the O. W. I., after a careful survey of all transportation facilities and problems, issued a Transportation Report which still is a basic document in the consideration of the transportation problems which daily arise.

Without going into a discussion of other reports, may I simply refer to them as examples of a type of service which no other agency of the Government is equipped to do. Among these are:

Report on Air Transport, issued June 7, 1943; Report on Willow Run, February 14, 1943; Report on Nazi Slave Labor, March 28, 1943; Small Business Under the Axis, March 30, 1943; Food Report, April 15, 1943; Alien Property, May 6, 1943; Recovery of American Wounded, May 19, 1943; Lend-Lease Report, a series released at different times.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the other body, and then in conference, sufficient arrangements may be agreed to that will permit the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. to continue its functions particularly in the field of coordination of news, and of information for the radio, the advertising council, and other private agencies that depend on it for guidance in the preparation of material to aid the war program.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who had 20 minutes this afternoon to address the House, and found it impossible because of the lateness of the hour to use the special order, I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes next Tuesday after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of the legislative program in order for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for 1 day, on account of being a member of the special committee of the House attending a meeting the the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

To Mr. LESINSKI, for 1 week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a magazine article taken from the Virginia Quarterly Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or

in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The special subcommittee on bankruptcy and reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943. Business to be considered: To hear Mr. MacLeod, Office of Price Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

525. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

526. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Pan American Airways, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928, Forty-fifth Statute 413; to the Committee on Claims.

527. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the fourth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended January 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; with amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 340. A bill to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution granting consideration of H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiencies appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3066. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3067. A bill to make October 12 a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3068. A bill to amend section 23 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3069. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3070. A bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3071. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Res. 274. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on the Public Lands with respect to methods of increasing the production of oil and gas on public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. Res. 276. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate recent charges in the public press that members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps are being furnished contraceptives by the Department of War; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1775. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Clint Logan, of Louisville, Ill., director of the Illinois Farmers' Institute, for the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and rollback in prices on foods for the reason that it would decrease production and would be unfair to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1776. By Mr. HOPE: Petition favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Thomas E. Keigher and 98 other citizens of Schenectady and Scotia, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, proposing that allotments to aged mothers and fathers be increased to that being paid wives, and that Congress review the entire system of allotments to the end that a decent standard of living can be maintained by the fathers, mothers, and wives of the men fighting the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1780. Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, regarding the serious housing problem and urging that 5,000 moderately priced family dwellings for war workers be built within the city and county of San Francisco, and that the Honorable John M. Blandford, National Housing Administrator, be urged to act favorably on such request; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1781. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kurty Mertig, of New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to Executive Order No. 9066; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come seeking wide horizons around our noisy days. Through our preoccupied and cluttered lives we would clear a highway for Thy holy purposes. Join us, we pray, with those farsighted souls who, toiling in darkened valleys, have heralded the coming day and lifted men's eyes to the eternal hills.

Midst all the busy shuttles of legislation, as here is woven the fabric of law and order shielding the life of our democracy, may we not be so enmeshed in the immediate mechanics of our task as to lose sight of the total pattern shown in the Mount of Vision. As we have undertaken on this continent a government of, by, and for the people, may we not lack the spiritual quality and a sense of the divine sovereignty without which no such government can long endure. Putting off the works of darkness and putting on the armor of light, may our loins be girt and our lamps burning, and ourselves as men who watch for the coming of their Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to the roll. A quorum is present.

PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, stating that he is in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation advising that pursuant to the authority contained in section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Act, as amended, a new corporation has been created under the name of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, and enclosing certified copies of the charter thereof, to be filed in the office of the Secretary, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be placed on file.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

CLAIM OF PAN-AMERICAN AIRWAYS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Pan-American Airways, Inc., against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

RESOLUTION OF THE MISSOURI SENATE—FLOOD RELIEF PROGRAM IN MISSOURI

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I present a resolution passed by the Missouri State Senate with reference to the necessity for immediate flood relief and ask that it may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Missouri will be received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Resolution 72

Whereas for the second time within the past month the Missouri River and its tributaries in the great State of Missouri have destroyed homes and places of business, laid waste to growing crops, flooded fertile farm lands, demolished important bridges, and washed away long stretches of valuable Missouri highways; and

Whereas this destruction has brought great financial losses to this heretofore prosperous and energetic people who live in these fertile valleys and in the cities adjacent to these important streams; and

Whereas unless some prompt and concerted effort is made to restore and rehabilitate these homes, these places of business, and these important highways, and unless some aid is given in the replanting of the crops in these fertile valleys, this State and this Nation will suffer an enormous loss; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Missouri, That we call upon the Members of Congress and those in high places in Washington, D. C., to act at once in this emergency by throwing the great resources of our National Government behind a substantial rehabilitation program, making it possible for these homes to be rebuilt, these places of business to be restored, these farm lands to be recultivated, and these highways and these bridges to be replaced; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, to Missouri's Senators and Members of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board, urging their prompt and individual attention to this most important matter.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Wilbur J. Carr (a member of the Woman's Safety Committee of the American Automobile Association), Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing for the registration of bicycles in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE SUBSIDY AND ROLL-BACK PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I continue to receive letters and telegrams from leaders of farm organizations and many crossroads farmers asking me to do my best to oppose any legislative proposals in the Congress that will force the roll-back and subsidy program on the country. I am heartily in sympathy with these appeals. I am firmly convinced that it would be a great mistake if farmers were obliged to do business in this country under the subsidy program. I sincerely hope the Congress will head off anything along that line.

I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD two letters of protest I have just received from prominent farm groups in Kansas.

There being no objection, the letters were received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILLIPS COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Phillipsburg, Kans., June 25, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We feel that the subsidies roll-back prices will be of great detriment to us in this part of the country. All of the small packers of meat have been compelled to quit business as they could only break even before the roll-back of prices.

Some towns are practically out of meat now. We also feel that the roll-back will break the agricultural price structure, and we would appreciate your help in defeating the bill.

Yours very truly,

C. L. ZOLLER,
Assistant County Agent.
WILL BRANDON,
President, Phillips County Farm Bureau.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Coldwater, Kans., June 25, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER.

DEAR SIR: I am county agricultural agent of this county but I am also owner-operator of about 960 acres of crop and grass land in this county. I am trying to produce my part of the food to win the war and will contribute my share of the beef, wheat, eggs, etc., to gain this end, therefore, I am writing this as an actual producer as well as county agricultural agent.

From my standpoint, and also the standpoint of every man I have talked to, we do not want and do not need subsidies such as the Office of Price Administration proposes. Subsidies are not the answer to our present problem and, rather than helping our present situation, it will hinder our food program. By all means legislate against all proposed Office of Price Administration subsidies.

The farmers of Comanche County are trying to do the superhuman job of producing food with the available supply of manpower and equipment they have. I believe every farmer in America is doing the same thing. All we want as farmers is some kind of a market for our products so that we can pay the cost of production and have an equal footing with labor as far as net income is concerned. Unless all this talk on price roll-back and subsidies is settled the farmers are going to quit their superhuman efforts to produce. Several farmers now favor a little let-up because they have been given the wrong patriotic talk. For example, to produce more hogs, and now they are in the hog business and cannot get grain or protein feed to produce the hogs they set out to produce.

The whole set-up at present is disturbing to the farmer rather than soothing him into greater production. The beef price roll-back has cost this county $200,000 at the present time on our beef cattle alone if the present reduced prices carry on to the time we market our feeder cattle. Maybe the situation will right itself, but you cannot say it will until it is done. We are not condemning the entire rationing program as we believe in essential rationing, but we are condemning some of the price fixing and other price policies assumed by the Office of Price Administration. We believe they are out of their field and that Congress should clarify a lot of the wild actions of the various agencies that are all dealing with our food-production program. Better yet, get the program all in one office and maybe that office can agree with its own decisions rather than leave us in the present turmoil we are in.

Thanking you for anything you can do to right our present situation, I remain,

Yours very truly,

H. L. MURPHEY,
County Agricultural Agent.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 29, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of William Carroll Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of the municipalities of Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1292. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1294. A bill amending section 3540 of the Revenue Act of 1941, "Use of motor vehicles tax"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1295. A bill providing for loans to war service persons for educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000,000 for emergency flood-control work, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3030, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. MOTT had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States;

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army; and

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 2349. A bill to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 368); and

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; without amendment (Rept. No. 369).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 2683. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 370); and

S. Res. 156. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inspect naval establishments in the Western Hemisphere; with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 997. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army; with amendments (Rept. No. 371).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1991. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year; with amendments (Rept. No. 372).

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION AT APPLETON, WIS.

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Republican Party's Dedication," delivered by Senator WILEY before the Republican Convention, at Appleton, Wis., June 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE JONES TO THE MADE IN AMERICA RUBBER LUNCHEON, HOUSTON, TEX.

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and telephoned to the Made in America rubber luncheon in Houston, Tex., on June 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMANDER GAINES OF CHARLESTON, W. VA.

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article in reference to Commander Richard K. Gaines, son of former Congressman Joseph Holt Gaines, of Charleston, W. Va., published in the West Virginia Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF SENATOR HOLMAN ON LABOR RELATIONS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by him in response to a resolution adopted by a convention of labor leaders held in Eugene, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair awaits the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess yesterday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], as acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, thought he probably would have two bills ready for the Senate to consider when it met today. I have just received word that it will be at least half an hour before the Appropriations Committee can be ready to report. There is nothing particularly urgent to be done while awaiting the report from the Appropriations Committee. In a moment I shall suggest that the Senate take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, inasmuch as it is past 11 o'clock would it not be well to recess until a definite time, say to 12 o'clock noon, so Senators will be on notice to be here then?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I may say also that the Senator from Utah, who is interested in a bill on the calendar which went over yesterday at the request of a Senator, may ask to have that bill considered. He is, however, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs which is also in session.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a. m.) took a recess until 12 o'clock noon.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CARE OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED IN WAR AREAS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1130, Calendar No. 372.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know where the senior Senator from Colorado is, but when this bill was called up yesterday he asked that it go over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, did the able Senator from Utah make a motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator made a motion.

Mr. McNARY. I had in mind what the able Senator from Georgia has just now stated, the opposition of the Senator from Colorado. Personally I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "War-Area Child-Care Act of 1943."

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 2. For the purpose of providing funds for child care necessary to assure the availability of women for employment, where essential to the prosecution of the war, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, $1,500,000 and for each fiscal year thereafter, $20,000,000: *Provided*, That the above authorization shall expire 6 months after the date of termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate. Such sums shall be used for making payments to State (and under circumstances specified in section 8 to local public authorities) for expenditure in accordance with State plans, submitted and approved as provided in this act, for day care or extended school services for children of mothers employed in war areas. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses of Federal agencies in connection with the administration of this act.

SCOPE OF PLANS

SEC. 3. (a) A State plan for day-care services shall be submitted by the State public welfare agency. Such State plan may provide for day care through foster family home services or in day-care centers, community-wide information and advisory services for mothers, health services for children, and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper use of day-care facilities and to safeguard children receiving care under the plan. Such services and care shall be administered by or through public agencies, other than school systems, designated in the plan for such purpose and may be rendered or conducted by public or nonprofit private community agencies other than school systems.

(b) A State plan for extended school services shall be submitted by the State educational agency. Such State plan may provide for nursery school, before-school, and after-school care, health services for children and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper use of extended school services and to safeguard children receiving care under the plan. Such services and care shall be administered by or through public-school systems designated in the plan for such purpose and may be rendered or conducted by public or nonprofit private-school systems.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 4. (a) State plans for day care and State plans for extended school services may be presented by each of the several States. Any such plan may be considered for approval only where one or more war areas are in such State and the plan shows that it is in accord with the State program for care of children of employed women developed jointly by the State departments of education and welfare after consultation with the child care committee of the State defense council or a State committee, including representatives of the State departments of education, welfare and health, labor, management, and other appropriate public and private agencies and civic groups, that the estimates of State participation submitted with such plan include all State funds and appropriate personnel which may feasibly be made available by the State, and that Federal funds are necessary to provide for expansion or improvement of day care or extended school services in war areas within the State.

(b) A State plan submitted in accordance with subsection (a) to be approved under this act must—

(1) provide such methods of administration as are necessary for efficient operation of the plan, including local advisory committees similar in function and representation to the child-care committee or State committee referred to in subsection (a);

(2) provide for effective utilization of appropriate facilities and services of State agencies for administrative, advisory, and supervisory services and of appropriate facilities and services of local public and nonprofit private agencies to provide day care and extended school services in war areas; such utilization may include, under conditions specified in the State plan, payments by public authorities designated in the plan to nonprofit private agencies for day care or extended school services on a per capita, per diem basis under agreements approved by the State agency responsible for administering or supervising the administration of the plan;

(3) establish schedules of fees designed to provide contributions from parents which would be equitable in view of their wages or the general level of wages paid to such parents in the area and in view of the care and services provided their children;

(4) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the approving officer designated in section 6 may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as such officer may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(5) include with the plan an initial statement of anticipated operations for the period ending on the next succeeding 30th day of June following submittal of the plan estimating by classes and amounts—

(A) the necessary cost of State personnel in providing administrative, advisory, and supervisory services under the plan, including travel, subsistence, and clerical expenses, and the part of such cost to be met from State funds, from funds made available under this act, and from other Federal funds;

(B) the cost of providing, in each war area which is to receive financial assistance, day care or extended school services, as the case may be, and auxiliary services under the plan, and the part of such cost to be met from funds made available under this act, from other Federal funds, from State funds, from fees, and from local public and private participation, including maintenance, facilities, equipment, utilities, and services furnished;

(C) the approximate number of children to be cared for, the kind of care to be provided, the local agencies by which such care will be provided, and the estimated cost per child of such care by each such agency.

STATE AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION

SEC. 5. (a) A plan shall be approved only if, from estimates furnished pursuant to the preceding section, the Federal approving officer referred to in section 6 finds that for the period covered by such estimates at least half of the total expenditures under the plan is provided through fees and through State and local participation, and such plan shall remain approved for any fiscal year thereafter only on such a finding for such year. For purposes of this act, the total expenditures under the plan shall not include any part of the cost of alteration or construction of facilities which exceeds $1,000 for any one local project.

(b) For purposes of this act, State and local participation shall not include moneys, supplies, or alteration or construction of facilities or acquisition of equipment to the extent paid for out of Federal funds, the rental value of any facility to the extent it was constructed with donated Federal funds, and the service of any person to the extent such person is compensated from Federal funds.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. The Federal approving officer shall be the Chief of the Children's Bureau in the case of State plans for day-care services and the Commissioner of Education in the case of State plans for extended school services. The approving officer shall approve any State plan for day care or extended school services, as the case may be, meeting the requirements of sections 4 and 5 of this act. With the approval of the Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") each approving officer is authorized to establish procedures and promulgate regulations with respect to State plans within his jurisdiction and with respect to the allocation by such approving officer of funds to States on the basis of their needs and proposed expenditures as estimated in accordance with section 4 (b) (5).

PAYMENT TO STATES

SEC. 7. The Administrator shall from time to time determine the amounts which shall be available from funds appropriated under this act for approved day care and extended-school-services plans, respectively, and shall notify each Federal approving officer and the Secretary of the Treasury of such determinations. From time to time each Federal approving officer shall review each plan he has approved and estimates which have been submitted of necessary total expenditures to be made thereunder and shall determine the amount of Federal funds under this act which, when added to State and local funds and other resources which under section 5 (b) are not included as State and local participation, is necessary to carry out the State plan during the period for which certification is made, and shall certify for such period such amount reduced or increased, as the case may be, by an amount equal to any sum by which he finds that unadjusted payments with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the amounts which were necessary for such period: *Provided*, That the total certified for a fiscal year for a State plan shall not exceed the total allocated for such plan for such year. The approving officer shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount to be paid to each State (or under circumstances specified in section 8 to local public authorities) out of funds determined by the Administrator to be available for approved day-care plans or extended-school-services plans, as the case may be; the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay the State (or local public authorities), at the time or times fixed by the approving officer, the amount so certified.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

SEC. 8. If in any State the State agency responsible for administering or supervising the administration of an approved State plan is not authorized by State law to make payments from funds made available under this act to local public authorities for day care or extended school services provided by public or nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the State plan, the Federal approving officer may certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such local public authorities such parts of the total amount to be paid for carrying out the State plan as may be designated in such plan and estimates submitted therewith.

OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. If there is reason to believe that in the administration of any State plan approved under this act there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 4 and the Administrator, after he has given reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds that there is such failure, the Federal approving officer shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made under such plan for any period subsequent to such finding and prior to a certification to the Federal approving officer by the Administrator that he is satisfied that there is no longer such failure to comply. Until such certificate is received the Federal approving officer shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to payments under such plan.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "State" includes Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii;

(b) The term "war area" means a local area found by the Administrator to be one in which substantially increased employment of women remains or has become essential to the successful prosecution of the war;

(c) The term "day care" means care provided in war areas during any part of the 24-hour day by community agencies other than school systems for any child 16 years of age or under, whose mother is employed (but may include emergency care for the full 24 hours when required by exceptional circumstances affecting individual children);

(d) The term "extended school services" means such care provided by school systems;

(e) The term "nonprofit private agency" means any private agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I made the motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill because, if the bill is to be effective and if we are to continue and expand the care of children, it will be necessary that an appropriation be made so that the various agencies of the Government and the various State plans may operate.

As I stated yesterday, opposition to the bill is not direct opposition to it as such, but opposition which has come about because under the Lanham Act efforts were made and institutions set up and progress made in taking care of nurseries and child-welfare activities. Our committee cannot in any way disparage what has been done, and it does not do so, but after a study of the social-security agencies, the pending bill was reported, since the Lanham Act may be discontinued under the order to discontinue the Public Works Administration.

The objection made to the bill in the hearings was that probably non-State agencies would be discriminated against,

that is, that private institutions in some States where the laws of the States make it impossible for the States to contribute to private institutions may not receive the benefits.

I think the committee has met the objection in section 8 of the bill, which I shall read. Any institution which can fit into a State plan and which would be acceptable to the Administrator and consistent with the spirit of the law, would be allowed to function, and the Federal Government would pay when the States would not.

I shall read section 8, so that Senators may see that we met the problem, and I think solved it as well as it can be solved, where there is a difference or conflict between the Federal and State laws. Section 8, found on page 9, reads as follows:

> If in any State the State agency responsible for administering or supervising the administration of an approved State plan is not authorized by State law to make payments from funds made available under this act to local public authorities for day care or extended school services provided by public or nonprofit private agencies in accordance with the State plan, the Federal approving officer may certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such local public authorities such parts of the total amount to be paid for carrying out the State plan as may be designated in such plan and estimates submitted therewith.

Mr. President, under this provision nonprofit private institutions, as well as public institutions, will be taken care of.

As I stated yesterday, the bill has had months of study and months of consideration. The various agencies and various State representatives, working under the leadership of the Social Security Agency, have met and ironed out the different conflicts in the plans.

The bill comes before the Senate practically without opposition. There cannot be opposition to the spirit and motive and purpose of the bill; in fact, the Government is already doing what it provides for. The opposition which exists is due to a conflict between two Federal agencies, and that opposition has already been met, in that the Government has determined to discontinue the Public Works Administration agency.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary to speak further about the bill and about its purposes, and I suggest that it be put to a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions about the bill. It is a matter to which I have not given any consideration at all. The appropriation is of $20,000,000 annually, I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. During the war period. The bill has the usual war-period limitation. It will run for 6 months after the date of the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, following the provisions in many other acts.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it on a matching basis with the States, or the institutions which take advantage of it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is on a matching basis, except where an outright grant is given, where the State law is in conflict, as provided in section 8, where the State law does not allow grants, and the State cannot appropriate to private institutions. In such case the Federal Government grant would be all the money paid. In other words, the theory of the bill is that the children are to be taken care of, and the mothers are to be taken care of, and if a State law is of such a nature that it will not allow State funds to be used for nonprofit private institutions, the Federal Government, on certification of the approving officer, can pay the funds.

Mr. GEORGE. Who is to have charge of the operations within the State?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The proper State agency. Generally it will be under the State board of education. The same agencies with which our Children's Bureau has been working for the last 20 years will have charge.

I may say that the plan is one which is consistent with and which continues the State-Federal cooperative arrangement which has been in operation since the Children's Bureau was established.

Mr. GEORGE. Can the Senator give us any information about what appropriations are now being made for child welfare activity?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The appropriations now being made for child welfare come under direct grants as appropriations under what is termed the Lanham Act. Under a division of the Works Progress Administration grants were made, and many agencies are now functioning. The bill is not in conflict with those agencies, but, as the Senator knows, the Works Progress Agency was ordered closed. If the Lanham Act shall be renewed, there will be no reason why the agencies which have been set up under direct grants cannot be continued.

A grant was made 2 or 3 days ago to the city of Arlington, and the work which is being done there will undoubtedly be effective and efficiently performed. Our committee cannot in any way take exception to the work which has been done. The Lanham Act has met the approval of both the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at different times. At the present time the proposal to renew the Lanham Act is before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Lanham Act funds have practically expired. There is now a proposal to extend them by appropriating $200,000,000 for all purposes of the Lanham Act.

In my opinion, the Lanham Act was never intended to include child-care services. I know there are other Senators who disagree with that conclusion, but I went through the provisions of the community facilities bill, and it was intended to provide for community facilities, such as schools in areas where the growth had been so rapid that the localities could not take care of the situation, in and about defense plants, and in and about schools. There was included, however, a provision that the Federal Works Agency could help maintain these schools in those areas. That provision has been extended, without any further authority from Congress, until those in charge have set up a child-welfare agency which is making direct grants to many schools and private institutions for child care. In my opinion, that is beyond the scope of the Lanham Act. I do not think there is any legislative authority for such action. Nevertheless, it is being done. If the proposed legislation is passed, it should be made clear in any renewal of the Lanham Act that this particular subject is not covered by the Lanham Act. Certainly the Lanham Act was not intended for such a purpose as this. In my opinion, its provisions have been extended far beyond what was intended when the act was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The pending bill would go beyond the Lanham Act. Under that act a single purpose only can be accomplished. It is the purpose to bring into this activity all agencies which have to do with child training.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Utah, when referring to agencies which have to do with child welfare, mean Federal agencies or State agencies?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Federal agencies and State agencies both, because this is a cooperative plan. The Federal Children's Bureau, which has been in the Labor Department, and which was recently transferred to the Federal Security Agency, is one of the sponsors of the bill. All the agencies which have been brought together for the war effort and placed under the Division of Welfare in the Federal Security Agency have united in sponsoring this measure. It provides for complete Federal-State cooperation wherein the expansion comes in allowing the schools to be used for pre-school-age children as well as after-school-age boys and girls in an attempt to overcome the great threat of delinquency in the country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I confess that I know nothing about the bill, but it seems to me we would be taking a most important step if we should enter into nursery-school, before-school, after-school care, health services for children, and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper use of extended school services and to safeguard children receiving care under the plan. A very serious question arises as to how far the Federal Government or any agency of the Federal Government should have control of the child life of the country.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia need have no fear of the Federal Government stepping in under this scheme and having control of child life. It can only operate under the State plan. That is the difference between this plan and operations under the Lanham Act. The Lanham Act provides a direct grant, and it is completely controlled by the Federal agency. It is because of that fact that the departments of education in the various States and the child-welfare departments in the various States united with the Federal Government in an attempt to continue what has become

our Federal-State way of carrying on these welfare institutions. It can be seen from reading section 8 that more protection is given to the States under this measure. This is a States-right act in every particular.

Mr. GEORGE. My questions grow out of my unfamiliarity with the bill. I do not indulge in the optimism with which my friend from Utah regards this as a war baby and a war activity. This activity will stay here, I may say to my friend. There will be too much pressure ever to permit its curtailment after the war is ended. This is the way most of the bureaus begin. They gradually grow and expand.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They have grown out of a real need, probably, and if the need continues it may well be that they should be continued.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps so, but are we ever to distinguish between Federal responsibility and local responsibility?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill distinguishes between them. Of course I cannot say any more than the Senator from Georgia can whether after this beginning the work will be continued. It is true that the land-grant colleges started as a war effort, and they have been continued, and no one regrets their continuance. If during a war period it becomes certain that the good which has been done to working mothers, and the good which has been done to children whose mothers have to work, is a good which is to be continued if our economic system remains as it is today, and there is a scarcity of manpower, I am sure the Senator from Georgia will support a continuation of the arrangement, if there are the same human and humane demands made upon the Government of the United States as are made today. But as a matter of fact the bill is a war measure, it is an emergency measure. Its provisions will come to an end 6 months after the close of war.

Mr. GEORGE. I know that is the hope of the distinguished Senator from Utah, but I would not place too much reliance on the hope, because I know with what energy and enthusiasm the agency of Government having the administration of this fund will beseech the Congress of the United States to continue it. I have a feeling that a generation or two of children who are forced to lean too heavily upon the Federal Government, or any government, for that matter, may not be the kind of citizens the country should have 20 or 40 years hence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If that is the case, then the Lanham Act should be discontinued.

Mr. GEORGE. I have never examined the Lanham Act, but I never thought that the Lanham Act authorized the establishment of nurseries. I may be wrong about it, because it did not come within the jurisdiction of any committee on which I hold membership. The Senator realizes how very little opportunity we have to study such matters which are handled exclusively by committees of which we are not members. I never thought the Lanham Act funds should have been used for that purpose. I do not question the desirability of doing these things, but I think there is an important question of public policy involved in how far Government is to supersede in matters of this kind. I am not unfriendly to the motive or purpose behind the bill; but I am apprehensive that in spite of all the hopes of the distinguished Senator from Utah—and I know him to be perfectly sincere—despite all his hopes and my hopes, I am apprehensive that this is the beginning of a very widespread program of child control, to the extent that Federal funds will be disbursed all over the Nation and used for this very laudable purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is not a beginning, let me say to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not mean a beginning.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But it is a correction of something which has already begun. In the attempt to bring it into line with our Federal-State theory.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I can appreciate that; but I have a very strong feeling that we are embarking on a program which we shall not be able to abandon when the war is over, and that it is a program which will call for the spending of more and more public funds. I do not think we have yet arrived at the time when we begin to appreciate the size of our national debt and the burden of carrying it; but certainly we will arrive at that point at some time. Unless there is an imperative need for Federal appropriations in connection with programs which largely should be carried on by the local communities, I have misgivings about whether we should provide such appropriations. I am speaking frankly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, I agree in general with what the Senator from Georgia has said. However, in one sense, the question involves which Federal agencies shall administer the program. We had hearings this morning before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; and in effect the question is which of two Federal agencies shall administer the program. Of course, the Federal Works Agency is now spending a considerable amount of money for the care of children whose mothers are engaged in war work. The justification for the expenditure of Federal money under that program arises from the fact that the Federal Government is asking the mothers to go into factories, and some care must be taken of their children while the mothers are away from their homes. That is the justification for the expenditure of Federal money, an expenditure which certainly will not continue after the war. The act will not continue after the war.

The program now is being administered by the old W. P. A., to tell the truth, with a new and fancy name, operating under the Lanham Act. It is somewhat restrictive. There are some things it cannot do. It cannot do as good a job as has been done.

However, the real issue, as I understood it this morning, and the question which we must decide, is whether the Federal Government is to operate directly in making grants to individual schools and institutions throughout the country, or whether the Federal Government is to operate through the States. For instance, not long ago there appeared before our committee a school superintendent from Maine who said that the Federal Government has come in through the Federal Works Agency and is attempting to make grants to schools in his area—Kittery was the place, I believe—for the operation of the schools, and that the State department of education said it did not know how much the cost to operate a school should be. The Federal Government is making grants. The official of the State department of education said they were using $40,000 to operate the schools in that district, and that all of a sudden they found a grant of $80,000 made from Washington to conduct the schools in the district. The State director said, "For heaven's sake, if there is to be money to operate the schools in the crowded and newly settled districts where money is not yet available it should go through the State department of education."

The matter involves in part the question of school aid, but that is not the only question involved. There is also the additional question, which will arise under the Lanham Act, as to the operation of the schools. However, insofar as schools are taking care of the children of mothers who are at work in industry, the program is now being handled through the W. P. A. The bill attempts to set up a State-Federal system under which the State boards of education and the State welfare boards will actually operate the program.

I think after the war there will be much less pressure for that kind of a system if we avoid the situation of having one of the Federal departments attempt to deal directly with the people of the various States. I think such dealings primarily create pressure on the Congress to have the Federal-aid program continued. The organizations concerned are ones such as the W. P. A. and similar organizations as to which criticism has arisen.

Apart from the original question, we seem to have the question, really, as to who shall operate the program, and as to whether it shall be operated more or less efficiently. That is the practical question before us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not notice any repeal clause in the bill. The agency the Senator from Ohio has described is still continuing in full force, and the effect of the bill would simply be to pyramid another agency on top of it. The Senator says the other agency does not have the proper approach, but the Senator does not propose the repeal of anything. The proposal is simply to create something new, to compete with the original agency.

Mr. TAFT. All authorizations of funds for the agency have expired. Unless the Senate chooses to renew the authoriza-

tion for the agency, it will not be renewed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Lanham Act has not been repealed.

Mr. TAFT. No; but the authorization has expired; and without a new authorization act, a bill for which is now pending in the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the agency cannot continue operations.

Frankly, what happened is that the old W. P. A. organization was about to be abolished and was said to be abolished, and then the child-welfare activity and the school activity were found as an excuse for continuing it. That is my opinion, as I draw the conclusion from the actual facts. That agency should be ended. It is not equipped to do the work. The Federal Works Agency has no knowledge of how to operate schools; it has no knowledge of how to operate child-care agencies. If the work is to be done at all, it should be done through the States and through the United States Office of Education and the Children's Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that under the Lanham Act there yet remains $200,000,000 unexpended.

Mr. TAFT. No; I referred to a new authorization bill for $200,000,000. That bill has not as yet been reported to the Senate. If the bill is passed, it should contain the clear statement that no activities undertaken by other agencies of government should also be undertaken under the Lanham Act. That would be a very simple thing to provide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask a further question. Can the Senator advise what funds are now provided under the Lanham Act for the next year?

Mr. TAFT. There are none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. None at all?

Mr. TAFT. None at all after the 1st of July. I correct that statement in part; there may be a small amount. My understanding is that all the funds are allotted and are practically exhausted. That is the reason for the new $200,000,000 authorization bill which shortly will be before the Senate.

However, the question of whether there should be included in the bill authority to continue the child-welfare program is a matter which the Senate can decide at the time when the bill is before it. The decision depends on what action the Senate may take on the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why do we not wait, and take up the pending bill with the other bill, and decide on both of them together?

Mr. TAFT. That would be perfectly all right, except the two are not necessarily related.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think they are related.

M . TAFT. My contention is that in any event the Lanham Act does not contain a legal authorization to carry on a child-care program. The lawyers have advised me that it does. I do not suppose anyone will raise that question, but certainly the Senate has never passed on the question, and never has granted such authority. Yet, apparently, the authority is to continue.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to enter into a discussion or conflict as to which bureaus of Government should handle the work. Our committee was given this task because of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget wanted the child welfare work continued, and wanted the nursery-schools program continued. However, they wanted them continued under the Federal Security Agency, under which in the Government's organization, the proper Federal agency to handle the work was selected. I do not use the word "proper" in any derogatory sense.

A recommendation was made to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of the Budget. It was decided that there never had been an authorization for the work. That is the answer to the Senator's question about whether the Lanham Act is continuing. The nursery schools came into existence as a result of administrative action, not as a result of legislative action. The Administrator decided that Lanham Act funds could be used for this particular need. With the transfer, and with the stopping of the Work Projects Administration, the agency which handled that activity came to an end; but the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation, and since there had been no authorization, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], at the request of the Senate, introduced a bill providing the authorization. That bill is Senate bill 876. In the consideration of Senate bill 876, which included what the Bureau of the Budget recommended, and presented it to the Senate in the form of a bill, the pending measure was worked out as a substitute, under the direction of various agencies and the Federal Security Agency, which is the agency having to do with child care.

This bill gets away entirely from the direct grant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would be a strong point if at the same time the Congress did not continue an agency which does make direct grants. It seems to me that we ought to move one way or the other. According to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in a few days the Senate will consider the question of providing $200,000,000 for the Lanham Act activities.

As I understand, the Lanham Act is administered in connection with private welfare agencies, and grants are made to private welfare agencies which are doing the job at the present time, and have done it over a long period of years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not a long period of years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not mean that the Lanham Act has been in effect for a long period of years, but the private agencies have done the work over a long period of years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The private agencies have done it, and the private agencies will share in this grant, if the State law permits it; and if the State law does not permit it, the Federal Government will take care of the expenditures. That was one of the objections made by private agencies. In reading the hearings the Senator will discover that a representative of one of the States did not even know about a petition for a grant made by one of the cities in his State. A protest came from the city that action had not been taken. Under those circumstances there was criticism of the administration of the Lanham Act, because of the fact that a direct grant was asked for.

Then the Federal Government sent out its agents to investigate. A grant might be given to one city in a State, and not to another. Objection was made, not by me, but by a witness. I do not know about the administration of the act. As I have previously stated, the Lanham Act is a child of our committee, as is this bill; but the child-welfare and nursery provisions have been set up by administrative action. The Senate decided that there was no authorization for the use of those funds under that act. Therefore this bill provides the authorization.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Yesterday we heard the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] telling about waste in the war effort, and how various departments were fighting one another. On page 81 of the hearings we find the following statement:

> The War Manpower Commission, entrusted with the high responsibility of administering available manpower, with true vision, has promulgated, as national policy, the principle that mothers of young children are not to be encouraged to seek industrial employment.

So, apparently, we have the War Manpower Commission against this measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, no.

Mr. LANGER. That is what is stated on page 81 of the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The head of the War Manpower Commission is also the head of the Federal Security Agency, which has recommended this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Then, am I to understand that the statement on page 81 is not true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator has read the statement of a witness. I do not say that it is not true. I agree that mothers should not be in industry. I agree with all my heart and soul that they should not be in industry, and I wish they did not have to be in industry; but they are in industry, and children are being neglected as a result. Because children are being neglected and mothers are not being taken care of, the Government has stepped in to try to do some good. No one objects to that. The witness whose statement the Senator has read could not oppose the humane efforts of this bill. If he had done so, the institution which he represented would have condemned him instantly. He could not oppose such efforts, any more than the Senator from North Dakota could condemn the Government of the

United States for trying to take care of women and children when women are being employed in the war effort.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, I am in favor of that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the Senator is. How can the Senator oppose a bill such as this? How can anyone imagine that the head of the War Manpower Commission would be opposed to a bill of this kind, when women are in need, and children are not being taken care of?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. When the statement was made it was not challenged.

Mr. LANGER. We are not as familiar with this subject as is the distinguished Senator from Utah. We are seeking information.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am trying to give it.

Mr. LANGER. The statement which I have read indicates that the War Manpower Commission is against the bill. Where is the testimony which shows that it is in favor of it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Charles P. Taft is the spokesman for that organization. He represents the Administrator.

Mr. LANGER. Where is his testimony?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On page 9. Mr. Taft said:

> I am Director of Community Service of the Federal Security Agency, and I am appearing in support of S. 1130.

The witness whose statement the Senator read was opposed to the bill because he liked the way in which the Lanham Act was working. He cannot oppose this bill when the Lanham Act comes to an end. If the Senator will read his whole testimony, he will see that he does not oppose the bill. He offers amendments, and in the provisions which we have adopted we have taken care of the objections, so that nonprofit private institutions may share in this money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is Mr. Taft an employee of some commission under the War Manpower Commission, or is he the head of some organization under that Commission?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The War Manpower Commission is under the Federal Security Agency, and Mr. Paul McNutt is chief of the War Manpower Commission, so he represents the same agency, of course. That is my point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask a further question, more or less of a technical nature. Today is the last day of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; and yet the authorization which is being considered by us today, and which is found on page 1, is an authorization for $1,500,000 for this fiscal year. The sum of $1,500,000 is supposed to be contributed for direct relief, and for taking care of children. Why do we need an authorization for the present fiscal year, when the fiscal year is practically over?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the bill was written sometime ago.

Mr. TAFT. The bill was written long ago, when we had to provide for a month or two of operations during the present fiscal year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Can we not strike out that language?

Mr. TAFT. The authorization could be entirely eliminated; but even if the bill were passed with that authorization in it, it would be entirely void, because, of course, no appropriation would be made for this fiscal year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I was about to say the same thing. There is no problem involved. Of course, the Appropriations Committee would handle that question. As the Senator from Ohio has said, the bill was written sometime ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Perhaps a deficiency appropriation could be made, if the authorization were in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I doubt whether the institutions would start doing any work without an authorization. I hope they have not done so. If they have done so, they have done what someone has suggested has already been done in the child-welfare work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand that the Senate is about to vote on some question. I should like to know what it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 1130 is before the Senate, and open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment. In order to meet the last objection, I move that in lines 9 and 10 on page 1, and line 1 on page 2, the words "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, $1,500,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter, $20,000,000" be stricken out, and that the words "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for each fiscal year thereafter, $20,000,000" be inserted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if it is not out of order, I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on page 2, line 3, after the word "of", I move to amend by inserting the words "hostilities in", so that it will read: "*Provided*, That the above authorization shall expire 6 months after the date of termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President", and so forth, instead of "termination of the present war", which may be many years after the termination of hostilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that with reference to all of these emergency bills the Senate has been adopting a provision terminating all of them on a definite date. For instance, the recent ones passed by the Senate will be terminated in 1945. It seems to me that it would be well to carry out that policy. I suggest it to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. It is agreeable to me if agreeable to the author of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The wording in this bill is the same as that which we have put in several bills. Dates of termination have been provided, at which time a review can be made by Congress and the time extended if it is felt necessary to do so. I have no objection to making it July 1, 1945, if that is the desire of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment and I now offer another amendment. I move to strike out the language on page 2 beginning in line 1, as follows:

> *Provided*, That the above authorization shall expire 6 months after the date of termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> *Provided*, That the above authorization shall expire on June 30, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 4, line 16, after the word "services" I move to strike out the word "and", and to insert "(3)" and the words "provide for the effective utilization." The subclause then would read:

> (3) Provide for the effective utilization of appropriate facilities—

And so forth. Does the Senator from Utah object to the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not understand the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. The State plan referred to on page 4, line 7, subclause (b), must make certain provisions. Subclause (1) in line 9 sets forth a provision for methods of administration.

Subclause (2) in line 14 provides for effective utilization of appropriate facilities and services of State agencies.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Subclause (3) which I propose merely adopts the existing language, "provide for effective utilization of appropriate facilities and services of local public and nonprofit private agencies." Thus, Mr. President, if there be local facilities adequate to do this work which the Senator from Utah wishes to have accomplished, the State plan may make provision under this language for the utilization of such services.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe the amendment is in complete harmony with the spirit of section 8, and therefore I accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we should renumber the subsequent subclauses which commence at the top of page 5 which are (3), (4), and (5). We should substitute in lieu thereof the numbers (4), (5), and (6), respectively. I move to amend accordingly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I offer a further amendment with reference to section 8 on page 9. I invite the Senator's attention to line 10. After the words "public authorities" I move to amend by inserting the words "or nonprofit private agencies."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Where does the Senator propose to insert those words?

Mr. DANAHER. On page 9, section 8, line 10, after the words "public authorities" I have moved to amend by inserting the words "or nonprofit private agencies."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Connecticut. Is there a conflict between the amendment which he proposes and the spirit of the entire section?

Mr. DANAHER. There is not.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The reason I ask the question is that under section 8 the Federal Government may take care of nonprivate agencies where the State law prohibits it being done. If there is no conflict I shall be happy to accept the Senator's amendment because the spirit of the whole of section 8, as I understand, is in complete keeping with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. There is no conflict. The proposed amendment is in keeping with the objective sought to be accomplished in section 8, I will say to the Senator, and it is for that purpose that I have offered the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As we all know, this is the last day of the fiscal year. The deadline for passage of appropriation bills is tonight at 12 o'clock. The committee is ready to report to the Senate House bill 2968, the war agencies bill. If we are to pass the bill we shall have to proceed with its consideration very quickly, and I should like to ask the Senator from Utah how much more time the pending bill is likely to consume.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah is ready to vote upon the bill now. I think the Senator from Connecticut has one more amendment and then we will be ready to vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to conclude what I have to say and to correlate my proposed amendments with the objectives sought to be accomplished in not to exceed 5 minutes, in view of the cooperative attitude of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I ask for action on my last amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am happy to accept the amendment if it is agreeable to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut on page 9, line 10

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I move that the same words be inserted on page 9, line 14, after the words "public authorities."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I now turn back to page 8, line 20. Allow me to invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that now that section 8 has been correlated as the amendments have accomplished it, in line 20 we should insert after the words "public authorities" before the closing parenthesis, the words "or nonprofit private agencies."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I have only one other point about which I wish to question briefly the Senator from Utah. Turning to page 1, in line 7, it becomes apparent of women for employment. It does not that the authorization there contemplated is to provide funds for child care necessary to assure the availability specify that they must be employed in war industries, does it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the spirit of the bill deals with war industries. But if we put that specification in, as the Senator already knows, the question of what industry is not contributing to the war effort will be a most difficult one to decide. I am afraid that if we do more than to express the fact that it is a war emergency act, and that it will come to an end with the coming to an end of the war, we will probably do violence to some individual who may want to take care of some children in a very needy situation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thought that the Senator from Utah would be bound to answer my question in the negative. The question I asked was whether the language as used would limit the authorization to provide for the day care of children of mothers in war industries. The answer is "No," and the Senator has proceeded to explain the reason why the answer is "No." Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that is correct, but the bill uses the words "essential to the prosecution of the war."

Mr. DANAHER. That is a limitation, I understand, and it is descriptive merely. It does not limit, however, the authorization to child care for mothers employed actually in war industries. With reference to the last point, Mr. President, it seems to me we can very properly accomplish a complete achievement of the purposes the Senator has so ably explained here this morning.

Let me call his attention to the fact that in line 7 the bill refers only to assuring the availability of women for employment. The bill does not say that it proposes to take care of the children of women who, in fact, are employed, but only those who are available for employment. That could be an entire city full of people, if one chooses. Is not that so?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that is true.

Mr. DANAHER. The point obviously, then, Mr. President, is that it is a very general and I think a too broad definition of authority.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that the War Manpower Commission under the Executive order of the President is today specifying what industries are deemed essential. It, therefore, seems to me that we could very properly utilize the essentiality as determined by an existing agency to the end that there shall be made available whatever funds are to be provided for the care of the children of women who are employed in industries declared to be essential by the War Manpower Commission. If we do that, Mr. President, we will avoid that too broad generalization which is inherent in the language of the bill now pending before the Senate.

Therefore I move to correct that language to accomplish the end I have explained by striking out from line 7 the words "necessary to assure the availability of women for employment, where", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of mothers employed in industries", and after the word "war" in line 8 to insert the words "as defined by the War Manpower Commission."

Restated, then, let me say to the Senator from Utah that the clause would read:

> For the purpose of providing funds for the child care of mothers employed in industries essential to the prosecution of the war, as defined by the War Manpower Commission.

And so on. In that way, Mr. President, we will correctly define the objective claimed for Federal interposition in this situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may we have a vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I overlooked inadvertently that on page 2, in line 7, we should correlate the expression "public authorities" with action already taken with reference to section 8. So, after the words "public authorities", I move to insert "or nonprofit private agencies."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is a corrective amendment, and I am glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut is agreed to.

If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 26, 1943:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Ine: Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act or the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417);

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 889. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction of the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;*

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; and

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind.

On June 29, 1943:

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 367) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that there are no copies of the bill available.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course there are as yet no printed copies of the bill as reported, but if this bill is to be passed today it should be proceeded with immediately.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not object to that. I merely thought it should be known that we are taking up a very large appropriation bill without having printed copies before us; that is all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it not be possible to have copies of the bill as it was referred to the committee distributed on the desks of Senators?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, that can readily be done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the matter I was going to suggest has been covered, and the remedy suggested by the able Senator from Ohio meets the situation, I am sure. Of course, we cannot proceed without some print of the bill before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Copies of the bill will be placed upon the desks of Senators. I thought I might be permitted to make an explanation of it, and then take it up later after we get copies of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that being done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered; but before any amendment is stated, I think that probably it would be better for me to make a general statement of the bill, if that be satisfactory.

Mr. McNARY. I would appreciate the Senator doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendments, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. A subcommittee print of the bill has just reached my desk. Is that the bill the Senator has reported?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not exactly as it has been reported. I am having some copies made with notations of amendments in pencil or pen, and I will get them as soon as possible.

Mr. McNARY. The subcommittee print, however, generally conforms with the report of the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. President, the first amendment appears on page 6 of the bill after line 10 in the copy of the bill I have. It relates to the Board of Economic Warfare.

We left the amount just as the House fixed it, with the following proviso:

No part of any funds appropriated or made available herein to the Board of Economic Warfare shall be used directly or indirectly for the procurement of services, supplies, or equipment outside the United States except for the purpose of executing economic programs or policies formally approved in writing by a majority of the Board and such writing has been filed with the Secretary of State prior to any such expenditure.

I desire to explain why that proviso was inserted. It was added for the purpose of having the Board itself determine on policies before they were carried out. There has been some confusion in the Board, and the Board being composed of officials who are already in other offices, we thought it was very much better to have the Board itself make the policies.

The next amendment is, on page 9, line 17, under the Office of Price Administration, to insert:

Purchase of commodities or services and the testing thereof for the purpose of assuring compliance with the law, but such purchases shall not be induced through any illegal method constituting entrapment.

It was thought advisable to insert that language so as to make it perfectly clear that we did not want to adopt any short cut.

The next amendment is on page 10, and it is one of the most important of all the amendments. It will be remembered that the House committee reported $165,000,000 for the O. P. A., and the Budget had asked for $177,335,000. The House committee reported $165,000,000, but when the bill went to the floor of the House, "$165,000,000" was stricken out and "$130,000,000" was inserted.

The Senate committee felt that in order to enable the O. P. A. to do what it has to do, $177,335,000 should be inserted, and that was done by the committee.

The next amendment is to be found on page 13, at the bottom of the page, where the House bill contained the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used for payment of the salary or expense of any person who, directly or indirectly, pays any subsidy of any kind or character whatsoever, or who directs or authorizes the payment of a subsidy, or who participates in the preparation of or calculations for the payment of a subsidy, or who directs any other person to pay or prepare or calculate or supply information for the payment of a subsidy, or any person who, directly or indirectly, collaborates with, consults, cooperates with, or

directly or indirectly aids any other Federal agency for the payment or the preparation of a subsidy; or of any person who engages or participates as aforesaid in the preparation, formulation, or carrying out of any plan or scheme involving the purchase of any commodity by the Government for the purpose of its resale at a price lower than that paid by the Government: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce to which the price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Administrator, as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity.

Mr. President, that was stricken out by the committee because Congress has already dealt with the subject of subsidies, and this particular provision could not have been effective, anyway, Congress having passed on that subject.

The next amendment is on page 17, line 22, in the proviso beginning "*Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be available," where the committee inserted the words "except under regulations approved by the President," so that the proviso would read:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall not be available, except under regulations approved by the President, for the salary of any person who, at the time of his employment hereunder, is in the active service of the armed forces of the United States.

The subcommittee inserted the words "except under regulations approved by the President." Upon consideration in the full committee, the whole proviso was stricken out, so that it could go to conference, and there have determined just what was proposed by the proviso. I think that is very wise.

The next amendment is found on page 20, at the top of the page, where the following is proposed to be inserted:

Civilian defense: Not to exceed $13,359,600 of the unexpended balance of $100,000,000 contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for the same objects and purposes, including the obligations chargeable to said appropriation, and subject to the same conditions and limitations: *Provided,* That the total amount available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed $400,000.

The appropriations herein made for the Office of Civilian Defense shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

The Civilian Defense asked for an additional $1,263,000. The House did not allow it. Dr. Landis came before our committee and testified that he wanted it restored, but that he might be enabled to operate with a smaller sum. He thought that perhaps $263,000 might be cut off. After a most careful examination of all the facts, the subcommittee and the full committee having discussed the matter as it arose, the committee felt that the amount allowed by the House was proper, and limited the appropriation to that sum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As to the language in line 12, "shall not be supplemented by funds from any source," I thought the civilian defense was partly cared for by the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The States cooperate in civilian defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. They do cooperate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Would not that language prohibit a State cooperating in civilian defense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all, but if the Senator has any doubt about it, the word "Federal" might be inserted just ahead of the word "source." I would have no objection to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that should be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think probably it should be, and if the Senator suggests it, I ask unanimous consent that the word "Federal" be inserted before the word "source" at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modification will be made.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee state whether this appropriation is an increase over that of last year?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. There is a decrease.

Mr. BYRD. How much of a decrease for the Office of Civilian Defense?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have sent for the clerk of the committee, and I shall answer the Senator in a few moments.

The next amendment is to be found on page 22, line 18, where an increase of $100,000 is recommended. Those representing the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs came before the Senate committee and asked for an increase of $200,000. The matter was gone over most carefully by the committee, many proposals were offered, and finally a compromise was made cutting the amount in two. I think that was a very proper compromise and hope that when the matter comes before the Senate the amendment will be agreed to.

The next amendment is under the National War Labor Board. The Board asked for two amendments, one in line 17, page 24, an increase of only $19,613. They showed that they needed that much more, and the committee allowed it.

A very much larger sum was allowed in line 23, where the committee proposed to strike out "$13,841,300" and insert "$14,341,300," an increase of $500,000. The Board made a good showing as to the need of the increase. Their duties have been added to by Congress, as we all know. Personally, I feel like saying a kindly word for this Board. I think they have been trying to do their duty, and so far as these two amendments are concerned, I hope the Senate will agree to them.

The next amendment is found on page 26, but that comes under the Office of War Information, and if the Senate will permit me, as the principal controversy revolves about that organization, I should like to pass over the items in that category and turn to page 30, line 18, under the "Office of War Mobilization, salaries and expenses." That is the organization presided over by our former colleague and friend, Jimmie Byrnes. The committee allowed the amount asked for to operate his organization, which is a very moderate sum, being only $138,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the Office of War Mobilization, can the Senator identify for me who are the two assistants to Mr. Byrnes who are covered by this arrangement?

Mr. McKELLAR. One of them is our former congressional friend, Marvin Jones, who has now been appointed to another office. I am told that Mr. Ben Cohen is the other.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose the Senator hopes that is not true?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know Mr. Cohen at all. I have never met him to know him. Of course, that is evidence of my not very extended acquaintance.

The next amendment is on the last page of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am interested in the agency provided for on page 26, the Office of War Information. Why did the Senator skip that item?

Mr. McKELLAR. I asked to skip it for the present. I shall take it up immediately after going through the other items. I do not think there will be much controversy about any of the other items. I believe the only controversy will arise over the Office of War Information. I suggested that it be taken up last. If it would please the Senator, however, I shall be glad to take it up now.

Mr. McNARY. No; never mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. If Senators will turn to page 42 they will find what is to my mind a very important amendment, and I hope it will be unanimously agreed to by the Senate. It is section 203, beginning in line 20, as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I need not discuss that language. I think every Senator knows what it is. If any Senator wishes to ask questions concerning it I shall try to answer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a bill of general application dealing with this subject was passed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Has it passed the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it has not. The agencies involved in this proposal are war agencies. We are not certain by whom the various appointments in the war agencies are being made. The war agencies are not set up by the Congress, but are set up by the Executive, and under those circumstances we felt it was proper to make this limitation.

Mr. McNARY. If the McKellar bill were written into statute it would cover these identical agencies?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as the McKellar bill failed to pass the House the committee placed this provision in the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is why we placed it in the appropriation bill, yes.

Mr. President, I turn back to the point of principal difference in the Senate committee, both in the subcommittee, let me say, and in the full committee. The votes on the questions which arose in connection with this item were exceedingly close. There was a difference of only two or three votes in some cases, and in others perhaps a difference of only one vote. I believe in one case there was a tie vote. I do not recall on which question that vote was had, but I know there was one tie vote. These votes dealt with the Office of War Information.

Mr. President, I desire to say a few general words about the Office of War Information. I was a trial lawyer for about 18 years. In that period I examined a great many witnesses. Since I have been in the Senate I have served on the Appropriations Committee for a very long time, and I suppose in that committee we have examined not only several hundred but perhaps a thousand or more witnesses in the course of a year.

The other day we had before us, with respect to this particular provision, Mr. Davis, the head of the organization, whom I had never seen before, so far as I recall. I had seen his pictures and recognized him from them. We also had before us Mr. Sherwood, whom I had never seen before, so far as I know; Mr. Eisenhower, brother of General Eisenhower, whom I had never seen before; Mr. E. P. Hoyt, who has recently been appointed head of the domestic branch of the O. W. I.; Mr. Philip C. Hamblet, Mr. James Allen, Mr. Radford Smith, and Mr. Joseph Barnes.

Mr. President, I do not think I ever knew witnesses to give a better account of themselves. They all went through a very searching cross-examination by, I believe, all members of the committee. The members of the committee were exceedingly interested.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. The Senator from Tennessee is seemingly addressing himself to the Republican side of the Chamber on a very important question—his face is turned in that direction—and I am very anxious to hear what the Senator has to say.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am addressing myself to the Senate of the United States, without regard to party. If I stood facing toward the other side of the Chamber, it was inadvertently done, and I beg pardon of the Senator from Illinois. I did not intend to offend him in any such manner.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that, but I simply could not hear the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall try to speak loud enough to be heard, and I hope I can. If Senators on either side of the Chamber feel that I am not giving them enough attention, I hope they will say so, as the Senator from Illinois did.

Mr. President, as I have said, the principal controversy came up over the Office of War Information, and the committee in the short time we had to do so, made as careful an investigation as I have ever known to be made by any committee. All the gentlemen who appeared for the O. W. I. knew their business. They spoke with frankness. They spoke in an outright manner. I wish to say that they made an excellent impression on me, and I thought the action of the House in cutting out the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. was not warranted by the facts as they were brought before us.

It was suggested that the Domestic Branch was politically minded, and it seems that one pamphlet was sent out which Mr. Davis himself very frankly said, as soon as it was brought to his attention, was improper and ought not to have been sent out, and he was sorry that it had been, and the office had it stopped.

His attitude throughout the entire hearing continued to be one of frankness and openness. The agency had asked for approximately $7,800,000 with which to operate the project. The House cut it out entirely, as I recall. The committee took up each item. I find that I do not have before me the Budget statement. I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts will let me use his.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I am glad to give mine to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, who is always courteous and always diligent in these matters.

The Domestic Branch had itemized its requests. I should like to have all members of the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, listen to my statement, because it seems to me these matters are important. By the way, I think I should say that another charge which has been made against the O. W. I. is that it has been propagandizing.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I concur in the Senator's statement regarding the appearance of the witnesses, as our chairman has described it, but I make the observation that I never listened to so many fair words that were at such wide variance with the person's performances.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, Mr. President, we have differences of opinion, that is all I can say in that connection.

I desire to say relative to the political side of the matter that what developed when the witnesses were examined about their politics was remarkable. We asked about their politics. The remarkable development was that we found the first man, Mr. Davis, was an American Labor Party man; the next man, Mr. White, was a dyed-in-the-wool Republican. He is the head of the branch now under discussion.

Mr. HOLMAN. But he is a new man.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is a new man, but if I remember correctly, he was given a very fine character by the distinguished Senator and my very dear friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not going back on that, I am substantiating it. But he has had nothing to do up to now with the conduct of the agency.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but in this bill we are dealing with nothing except the future. We are dealing with operations in the fiscal year 1944, and Mr. White has charge of the operations for the domestic branch. He seems to be a very fine man.

The next man was a Mr. Sherwood, whom I had never seen before. He conducted himself well, and testified frankly and openly.

The fourth man was Mr. Eisenhower. I believe I had met Mr. Eisenhower once before, just in passing; I think I was introduced to him, although I am not sure. I was introduced either to him or to his brother, General Eisenhower; I am not sure which. Mr. Eisenhower made an excellent witness, a fair, frank, and open witness. He answered all questions. All the witnesses did. All the gentlemen were of the same fine character. Of course, some were not as prominent in the investigation as others were, but each had a word of explanation. They answered every question fairly and frankly and openly, so far as I could see, and they made out an excellent case for the Domestic Branch of the organization, so far as I could ascertain.

The Foreign Branch was not interfered with at all by the committee, except the committee increased the amount the House had allowed. However, in the full committee a motion was made to cut the appropriation for the Foreign Branch by $2,000,000, and that motion carried.

Members of the committee are sitting on both sides of me; and if I make any mistake of fact in submitting the matter, I hope they will call attention to it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I may not have followed the able Senator's statement as accurately as I should have done. I am interested in the subject he is discussing. He stated the Senate committee had increased the amount for the foreign service, as he described it; did he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That item appears on page 29 in the print of the bill I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; in line 4.

Mr. McNARY. The amount was increased to $27,000,000, was it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, to $27,000,000; but the full committee cut $2,000,000 from it, leaving it at $25,003,590.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. Now I understand. So the $27,000,000 was inserted by the subcommittee, was it?

Mr. McKELLAR. By the subcommittee. The full committee cut that amount by $2,000,000, leaving it at $25,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will make a note of that.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I hope the Senator will make the point that the subcommittee had originally increased the House figure by approximately $5,000,000, and that subsequently the full Senate Appropriations Committee reduced the increase of $5,000,000 by $2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me observe that as the item is left it is $3,000,000 in excess of what the House allowed; is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is true that the subcommittee restored a sum somewhat in excess of $3,000,000 to the Domestic Branch, the appropriation for which the House had entirely eliminated, and that it increased the amount allowed by the House for the Overseas Branch. I think that statement is correct. Am I correct in my statement that the subcommittee voted to appropriate $3,000,000 for the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., as compared with zero which had been granted by the House of Representatives?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true. The amount allowed was a trifle over $3,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. Is it not also correct to say that of the nine functions of the O. W. I., the subcommittee voted to retain six, and voted to increase the amount for the Overseas Branch? Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. I am now coming to that point. If the Senator will permit me to continue my explanation, I shall be glad to proceed.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be delighted to have the Senator proceed. I hope I may be recognized during his discussion of the question, because possibly he and I may interpret some matters somewhat differently.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; very likely we shall. Of course, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

As to the Domestic Branch, the witness was Mr. White, who comes from the State of my good friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. Mr. White is a good Republican. I am talking now about the Budget estimate of $153,563 for that office.

Office of Program Coordination, $248,650.

News Bureau, $988,097.

Bureau of Publications, $769,090.

Bureau of Special Services, $986,096.

Radio Bureau, $811,499.

I am emphasizing that because of something which will arise a little later.

Bureau of Graphics and Printing, $1,774,672.

Motion Pictures Bureau, $1,222,904.

Field Operations Bureau, $1,911,335.

That is a total of about $8,800,000, in round figures.

Instead of allowing the Office of Director $153,563, the subcommittee allowed $125,000.

For the Office of Program Coordination the subcommittee allowed $220,000 instead of $248,650.

For the News Bureau the subcommittee allowed $900,000 instead of $988,097.

For the Bureau of Special Services the subcommittee allowed $950,000 instead of $986,096.

For the Radio Bureau the subcommittee allowed the full amount. The subcommittee struck out entirely the item for the Bureau of Graphics and Printing. It amounts to $1,774,672.

Reductions could very well be made in some of the smaller items; but the subcommittee struck out entirely the item for the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, $1,774,672; and for the Motion Pictures Bureau, for which $1,222,904 was asked, the committee allowed $50,000.

Let me digress long enough to say that if we are to use motion pictures in war information—and it is the best means of aiding the war effort of which I know—to my mind the reduction of the appropriation from $1,222,904 to $50,000 is a destruction of that method of handling the problem.

For the Field Operations Bureau nothing was allowed. So the subcommittee allowed $3,061,000 of the $8,800,000, in round figures, which was asked for. I think some small items were added in the full committee, $800,000 of which was for the purpose of liquidating the remainder of the Domestic Branch.

Mr. President, I do not think that the Domestic Branch ought to be liquidated. We are in a war. The other day the Senate, without batting an eye, gave $47,000,000 to Mr. Aubrey Williams to train boys in industry. I do not suppose Mr. Williams was ever engaged in industry in his life; but be that as it may, without a qualm the Senate appropriated $47,000,000 for an utterly useless proposal.

These appropriations are for advertising ourselves in the war. In my judgment it has been done in a perfectly honest, straightforward, and successful way, with two or three exceptions. Those exceptions are frankly admitted. We all make mistakes. Even as good a man as I am, or as my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], make mistakes. I do not think that because the Office of War Information has made some mistakes, which it has frankly admitted, it ought to be "gutted," if I may be permitted to use a very ugly word, in any such way as this. I think it ought to have an amount commensurate with the character and quality of work which it is doing.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are members of the committee have been asking me whether the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee is defending the action of the committee. I ask that in a spirit of seeking information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am stating the picture just as I see it. All of us, including the Senator from Massachusetts, reserve the right to say what we desire to say.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely; and I hope the Senator does not think that I am criticizing him in any way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator is not.

Mr. LODGE. I certainly would not do such a thing; but I was curious to know whether it was the custom for the chairman of the committee, or the acting chairman, to defend the action of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been the custom heretofore, just as it has been the custom for the leader on the side which is responsible for the Government to help committees on the floor. However, our leader has opposed two bills, so I think we might as well be perfectly unconventional and submit the matter just as we see it. That is what I wish to do in this case. I differ with my colleagues. The vote on the main amendment was very close. I think it was 12 to 10. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether that statement is correct. Was not the vote 12 to 10?

Mr. LODGE. On the motion-picture amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the main amendment, which was the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], confining the appropriation to a little more than $3,000,000. That amendment was adopted by a vote of 12 to 10, or a margin of only 2 votes. The vote was very close.

Under those circumstances, as I have tried to explain the action, I am trying to be perfectly fair. I am telling exactly what our successful opponents got in this measure, and what they cut out of it.

I disagree with the reductions in these appropriations. We must pass a bill. The only question is as to the amount. We must decide whether to cut it all out, as the House did, or to allow $3,500,000, as the Senate committee has done, or to allow what I think is a fair sum, something in the neighborhood of $6,000,000, for this activity. I am making an argument for that amount at this time, because I feel that even if the domestic branch is in the entire control of a good Republican from Oregon, it will be honestly administered. That is all we want in this war. I do not want to have politics enter into the transaction. I am as much opposed to political propaganda in this activity as is any other Senator. I do not think that this organization ought to be engaged in political propaganda. I have said so 40 times while the hearings were being held. I stand by that statement.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that a message from the House may be laid before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that the House has disagreed to the $10,000,000 authorization?

Mr. OVERTON. No, it has not disagreed to that part of it. It struck out everything but the $10,000,000 authorization.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. I would get much more satisfaction if the Chair would not speak at the same time someone on the floor is speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has the right-of-way over a Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. The Chair then should order that situation, and bring it about. What did the Chair say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was appointing the conferees. The Chair appointed the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I am sorry about that, but I wanted to impress upon the Chair the difficulty of understanding a Senator who is speaking on the floor at the same time a statement is being made by the Chair.

Mr. OVERTON. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that what the House did was to amend the Senate bill and strike out all the amendments contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the House strike out the two amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And also the railroad amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. But they did not strike out the $10,000,000 authorization?

Mr. OVERTON. No; they did not disturb the $10,000,000 authorization.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, unless some Senator has a question to ask, I am through.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator a question with respect to the appropriation for printing and graphic purposes of a million and a quarter dollars, as I recall, which was stricken out of the bill. Will the Senator elaborate upon that so that I may understand it?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, the only evidence which we had concerning this matter was the evidence of the various officers in this activity, and three advertising men. They all testified in favor of—I say they all testified in favor, but I think the advertising men merely said that they approved what this board was doing, and spoke especially of advertising. Their evidence related to advertising, and to the good work which was being done by the bureau of graphics and printing, and I do not think it should be excluded. That is what I have to say about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator's explanation. I was wondering whether the graphic and printing work was not more or less tied into the whole scheme.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is, and I think that so far as the political side of it is concerned, the selection of Mr. Hoyt is an absolute assurance that there is no purpose to use this organization as a political instrument, but that it is to be used as a means of advertising this country in the great war.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator, along that line, that I am happy Mr. Hoyt was selected. I am glad they selected a Republican to head this particular branch of the work at the present time because certainly he is a good Republican, as the Senator has said, and no complaint could be made along political lines.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think he is a good citizen and a good man.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I finish with one remark?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I am as strongly opposed to political propaganda or political considerations in connection with the spending of this money as is the Senator from Tennessee or any other Member of the Senate. I am glad that he has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As will be recalled, before the creation of the O. W. I. many persons felt that they were not receiving the information which they should have. It was felt that the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments were perhaps withholding too much information.

The public was willing to have any information withheld which would be adverse to our war effort, or give encouragement to the enemy. However, outside that exception they felt they ought to have the information, and I think we agree that they should have it. Is it not true that the Office of War Information really and truly is, in a way, fighting a battle to give information to the people, and to cause other agencies to release information so that it may be given to the people?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is accurate. I think they have made some mistakes. It seemed to me that some of their publications were wholly unwarranted; but that is neither here nor there. They said that they had come to the same conclusion themselves, and frankly admitted it.

As the Senator from Alabama knows, and as all other Senators know, there is no Member of the Senate more devoted to Government economy than I am. Perhaps I am talking too fast, because there is one Senator who possibly believes in it more than I do, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But I know that neither he nor anyone else more strongly desires that Government operations be conducted economically and with an absence of waste than I do. However, I really, truly, and honestly believe, from the testimony which was given before the committee, that we should expend these funds and operate this agency in proper order so as to help win the war as soon as possible. There was no countervailing testimony, no testimony on the other side. It all came from those connected with the agency.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as one member of the subcommittee——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I merely wish to ask one question.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, we have not yet taken up the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee was merely explaining the amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to make a speech before we take up the amendments?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know why such questions should always be directed at me, as to whether I will make a speech, and what I will talk about, because I do not talk very often.

Mr. HILL. The Senator always makes a good speech.

Mr. LODGE. I am flattered, but I shall not take much time of the Senate. I believe that if a record had been kept of the time consumed by the Senator from Alabama since he has been a Member of the Senate, and a record of the time consumed by me since I have been a Member of the Senate, the record would

show that more time has been consumed by the Senator from Alabama than by me. It seems to me that I have the privilege of every other Member of the Senate, namely, of being recognized by the Chair, and when obtaining the floor doing what I wish to do under the rules.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to say, with regard to the Senator from Massachusetts, that he is one of the most industrious members of our committee, barring none. There is no member of the committee who is more industrious or more intelligent. I take off my hat to him for taking such an active part in the affairs of the committee. I am glad to serve with him. I differ with him about this matter very strongly. It is not often that we differ, but I differ with him very strongly about this subject. I know he is perfectly sincere and honest in his views, and I hope the Senate will listen to what he has to say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to say that I agree with everything the Senator from Massachusetts has said concerning himself. He speaks seldom, and when he does speak he makes a short speech and always a good speech. I am always glad to hear him speak. I was merely interested to know whether we would have a debate on the O. W. I. before taking up the amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. They will be taken up in the regular order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish merely to put myself on a par with all other Members of the Senate, and since the distinguished chairman has made a statement about the bill, it seems to me that I am within the bounds of propriety in rising and making whatever statement I wish to make. I did not realize we had to clear here on matters of this kind.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has made a very much appreciated remark, which I shall always value. I say with very deep sincerity that it is an inspiration to serve with a man who works as hard and as faithfully as does the Senator from Tennessee. In fact, I have never seen anyone quite like him. During the heat of the present summer, and in all the many activities of the Senate, he has been here in the morning, he has been here in the afternoon, he has been here at night; and he has not merely been putting in time, either. He has been paying close attention; he has been making witnesses justify themselves, he has been making a real contribution. It is a very easy thing to be inspired by his example to be industrious, too.

He is right when he says that we are usually in agreement on these matters. The Senator from Tennessee is against waste of governmental funds, and so am I. The Senator from Tennessee is against having any politics in war agencies, particularly the O. W. I., and so am I. The Senator from Tennessee is in favor of furnishing to the American people information about the war in a clear, well-defined form, and so am I. The Senator from Tennessee was favorably impressed by Mr. Elmer Davis, and I am frank to say that I was, too. I think he is a sincere American. As a matter of fact, I do not happen to care whether these officials are Republicans or Democrats or American Labor Party adherents or believe in any party at all; I want to be sure that they are honest Americans, and if they live up to that qualification they can belong to any party they may want to affiliate with.

Mr. Davis made a splendid impression. His philosophy of the function of this kind of office in time of war I think is a true one. How much of an administrator he is, how much of a check he maintains on all the different employees under him in the various bureaus, and how much his background has taught him the tricks of administration that go into the follow-through on all these matters, I do not know; but he is a man of merit; and my belief is that the bill as is presented to the Senate does the things that every Senator so far as I am aware, wants to have done. The Senator from Tennessee wants waste eliminated; he wants politics kept out of the war; and he wants the American people to have a clear and factual presentation of the war.

I think the House of Representatives, if I may say so within the rules, went altogether too far in striking out the entire Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. I became convinced of that, and, as I recall, I was the one who in the subcommittee offered to restore the amount for the News Bureau, for the Office of Program Coordination, and for the Radio Bureau. Those three activities I personally felt very strongly should be restored to the bill.

Let me describe these nine bureaus in the Domestic Branch.

The first is the Director's office; the second is the Office of Program Coordination, which is the office which deals with national advertising, newspaper advertising, and billboards, and determines the relative priorities for publicity among the different Government departments, so that, for example, the whole billboard campaign will not be given over to the buying of War bonds when some of it should be given over to advertising some other Government campaign. We had the testimony of national advertisers, who were very emphatic on that point. My impression is—and that is where I differ with the Senator from Tennessee—my impression is that those national advertisers confined themselves entirely to the Bureau of Program Coordination. That is all they want to have put in the bill, because they said that the system which had been developed whereby the advertising agencies could do the composition and the art work, subject to a general precept from the Government, had worked well. That has brought me to the conclusion that the Bureau of Graphics and Printing was a superfluity, because the system utilized by the national advertisers would, I thought, be satisfactory.

We left out the Bureau of Publications. That is the Bureau that publishes leaflets and pamphlets for use in the so-called discussion groups, pamphlets which may criticize the Ruml plan, which set forth the conditions that ought to be established in the post-war world, and various others matters of that kind. That Bureau is abolished. I do not seek to deny that that has been cut out. It is a function which a majority of the committee thought should be discontinued.

The Motion Pictures Bureau has been drastically reduced, but that does not mean any intention on the part of anyone who voted for the reduction to eliminate the motion pictures as a vehicle of public information. That impression should not be allowed to be created. It simply means that we concluded it is much better to have the motion pictures made in Hollywood by moving-picture professionals, under a Government precept, if you will, rather than have the Government itself try to make moving pictures. That is all that means. So if Senators support the decision of the committee with relation to the motion picture item, they will not be voting to abolish the use of motion pictures in the distribution of information to the public.

As a matter of fact, the Office of Education is now doing a tremendous work making motion pictures for educational purposes. The Army and the Navy are constantly making motion pictures for educational purposes. There is no question about doing away with the motion pictures. Such a suggestion simply does not correspond with the facts.

Mr. President, I think we have put back some good items. I think we have got to have the News Bureau, because if it were not retained we would have conflicting statements coming from the Government departments, which would simply revive the trouble and the criticism which were rife and which led to the formation of this agency.

I think it is necessary to have the Office of Program Coordination to coordinate newspaper advertising and billboard programs.

I think it is necessary to have the Radio Bureau. If we did not have the Radio Bureau, every Government department would be making its own separate appeal for radio time, and the air would be so full of Government programs that nobody would listen to the radio. It is necessary to have some agency that will allocate the time.

I think a good argument was made for the Bureau of Special Services. That Bureau does two things: It conducts a clipping service for the benefit of the other Government departments and it provides an information agency for the individual with regard to his country.

Those are the positive recommendations which we made as to the Domestic Branch.

We favored going beyond the appropriations provided by the House insofar as the Overseas Branch was concerned. I myself favor that, because the Overseas Branch has begun the construction of radio stations which, I think, can have an important effect, and, unless money is given them, they will have to stop midway in the construction of radio stations. There have been criticisms, to be sure, of the effectiveness of the Government's overseas program. Many of us have heard it; I know that I have. Most of the criticism springs from the fact that O. W. I. has never been told what are the national war aims of this administration. The O. W. I. cannot be blamed for that. In the Middle East, for example, the O. W. I. circulates its pamphlets stressing our tank production, our plane production, and showing how strong we are and how sure we are to win the war. Some of the leaders there say, "We know you are going to win the war; we know you can make more tanks and planes than anybody else; there is no use telling us that. What we want to know is, What are you going to do for us?" The O. W. I. cannot tell them that. There is only one place where that information can be obtained, and everybody knows where it is; but that just leaves them with the choice of dropping the thing altogether, in which case the people in far-away places would forget that the United States had a part in this war and would think that it was being carried on entirely by Great Britain and Russia, or else keeping up this present line of propaganda which I think, under the present circumstances, is the best we can do.

So I believe that this is a liberal and a fair report which will put back some very well-merited activities which the House struck out.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to call attention to a matter which I took up in the subcommittee and in the full committee this morning, and which involves the Petroleum Administrator for War and the Office of Price Administration. I proposed a step which is legislative in character, and which would require suspension of the rules, a step which would transfer from the Office of Price Administration the sum of $25,000,000, which is what they spend on rationing petroleum and petroleum products, to the Petroleum Administrator for War. In that connection I should like to refer to page 480 of the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, where Representative LUDLOW was questioning Mr. Ralph Davies, who is the Deputy Petroleum Administrator. Mr. LUDLOW asked this question:

Mr. Davies, from your very clear and convincing analysis of the petroleum situation, I rather got the impression that you think that it would be in the interest of sound efficiency and economic administration if the rationing activity and the Petroleum Administration might be brought under one head. Was I correct or not?

Mr. DAVIES. Views may well differ as to what is and what is not good organization. My own view is that you could not well separate supply from distribution. In brief, yes, I do think that the control, the rationing of the product, should go hand in hand with the provision of the supply in the first instance.

That was Mr. Ralph Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator. I read further:

Mr. LUDLOW. So that in looking at the matter entirely objectively, it would be your thought that it might be wise to lift the rationing of gasoline and fuel oil from where it is at present and put it under the Fuel Administration?

Mr. DAVIES. From an organizational standpoint——

Mr. LUDLOW. From an objective standpoint.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes. From an organization standpoint, I would have to say "Yes, I do think so," although when I say so I do not look with any—well, I do not like the rationing job. It is nothing but a headache. We do not want it. We are making no bid for it, but I must answer your question honestly by saying, "Yes," I think that it ought to be put there.

That is a very flat statement by the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, that he thinks that the distribution of petroleum products should be in the same agency which controls the supply of petroleum products.

The testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations indicates the same thing. In that connection I should like to make a few remarks on the testimony we took on this matter in the Senate subcommittee. I refer particularly to the testimony of J. R. Parten, who is the director of the Transportation Division of the Petroleum Administration for War. I read:

Senator LODGE. I will ask: Is it true that in Canada the public has more gasoline than is available to the public in region 1, per capita?

Major PARTEN. They have a comparable system of rationing in Canada to that on the eastern seaboard, and I ask Mr. Swanson to elaborate on it.

Senator LODGE. Comparable does not mean identical?

Major PARTEN. That is correct.

Senator LODGE. It is not identical?

Major PARTEN. It is comparable but not identical.

Senator LODGE. Is it more or less lenient?

Then we proceed to the testimony of Mr. Swanson, in which he shows that the citizen in the eastern part of Canada has twice as much as the citizen in region 1.

Then I took up the matter of an increased supply of gasoline for region 1, and I made the point, which I have been seeking to make with Mr. Ickes for some little time, that full advantage in the eastern part of region 2 has not been taken to get more gasoline into region 1.

Let me say at the outset of the discussion of this subject that I do not subscribe to the theory that we should ration the rest of the country as strictly as region 1 is rationed merely because misery loves company. That is not a good reason, and when I am told that every available transportation vehicle is in use now to get gasoline from the sources of supply into the industrial East, of course I realize there is no earthly point in rationing people to provide gas which cannot be transported. But the point which occurs to me, and which has occurred to me for some time, and which I have taken up with Mr. Ickes, is that rationing in the area adjoining region 1, on the same basis with region 1, would decrease the need for tank trucks for retail delivery, and to that extent we could increase the supply in the East.

I am bringing this matter up in order to show the confusion and the bedlam and the intolerable division of responsibility and authority which exist on this question. It is a system which is set up to compel men to pass the buck, and that is why I brought up the amendment.

I asked this question of Major Parten:

I have been informed that if the eastern parts of region 2—that is, Ohio and down in through there—if that part of the United States were rationed on a parity with region 1, a supply of gasoline could be built up there at Toledo, for instance, which would mean that a smaller number of tank trucks—trucks I am talking about now—would be used for retail delivery to filling stations, and that those tank trucks could be used to make the haul into region 1, and that thereby the amount of gasoline available to the people in region 1 would be increased. Is not that correct?

Major PARTEN. Senator, we have had up with the Office of Defense Transportation many times the question of feasibility of using motortrucks—on gasoline, for instance—into New England from such places as Toledo and Chicago, but our studies have indicated and Office of Denfense Transportation's studies have indicated, that there are so many problems involved in attempting to do that—particularly in the manpower problem, the truck service and repair problem, that on the long hauls, it has been the opinion of the Office of Defense Transportation—and we have concurred—that that was not a feasible movement.

I referred him to the hearing of the day before, at which the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation had agreed with my contention. Let me just quote from the testimony. I asked him this question:

Senator LODGE. Why is it not possible to ration an area that has the gasoline in the tanks if you have got the transportation facilities to take the gasoline out of the tanks?

Major PARTEN. Senator, it has been our experience everywhere. It was our experience right here on the east coast.

Senator LODGE. Why?

Major PARTEN. We did not get a cut of consumption within the limits of available gasoline until filling stations ran out all up and down the coast.

Senator LODGE. So really the reason you do not want to do this is because you do not think you can enforce it?

Major PARTEN. We just do not think it is practical. We do think it is our duty to haul all of the petroleum from those shorter sources that we can haul, and we are doing that, and when and as those shortages occur, they must restrict—in other words, we are going to haul everything out of there we can haul out.

Senator LODGE. Well, the more I study this oil question the more I realize it is full of mysteries. You have admitted that I was theoretically right, and you have been courteous enough not to say that I was practically wrong. I would call your attention, however, to the fact that there are some people who think I am right all the way through. One of them is Mr. Prentiss Brown, of the Office of Price Administration, who was before us the other day, and I asked him the same question, and he said this:

"Senator, the subject matter of that question was pretty thoroughly discussed by Mr.

Eastman last Monday before a special committee of northeastern Congressmen headed by Representative FRED HARTLEY, of New Jersey. I was there, and from that meeting I judged that Mr. Eastman believes that more gas could be obtained; that is, that there are transportation facilities to obtain more gas for the eastern area. I do not think that any of the experts who have studied the questions believe that anything could be accomplished by going into the districts west of the Mississippi River.

"Senator LODGE. No.

"Mr. BROWN. But that the nearby locality in zone 2 was the one where something might be gained along that line. I suggest that you look at that testimony which I believe is now in print, and can be obtained, and that you get Mr. Eastman's answer along that line."

Now, here is Mr. Eastman's answer, and I quote:

"I think last year and so far this year most of the oil they received and which they took into Buffalo, came from Chicago, and last year from Toledo. The haul from Toledo is shorter than the haul from Chicago. If it would be possible in any way to augment the supply at Toledo, and particularly to use and move that supply from Toledo by the boats which can be operated on the Lakes and on the canal, that would increase the capacity of the canal and the amount of work that those vessels could do. It is almost 2,500 miles against 1,000 miles.

"Mr. HARTLEY. Is not that a reason why rationing should be extended to the Western States to build up the stocks at Toledo?

"Mr. EASTMAN. I cannot speak beyond the subject of transportation. Possibly trucks could be made available to carry oil from Chicago to Toledo; and there is more oil available in Chicago than in Toledo. We think we can make trucks available for that service.

"Mr. EASTMAN. Yes. The more supplies you have in district 2 the more work those cars can do in comparison to what they do in hauling from Texas and Louisiana.

"Mr. HARTLEY. In other words, there are facilities that can be used provided the stocks are built up in district 2.

"Mr. EASTMAN. Facilities are being used now. Tank cars are hauling oil from southwestern points. If more oil could be made available in district 2 that would increase the amount of oil those same tank cars could haul into district 1."

Now, it seems to me that the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation, it seems to me they are on my side.

Major PARTEN. Well, sir, since Mr. Eastman made that statement before the Hartley committee, we went into conference on the matter of trucking that gasoline Mr. Eastman is talking about from Chicago to Toledo and Mr. Eastman's office decided with us that it wasn't a good thing to do. That was what I had reference to in my recent statement.

Senator LODGE. I am just quoting the record.

Major PARTEN. Yes. Now, I grant that we can haul more petroleum to the eastern seaboard from Toledo than we can from Chicago or from St. Louis. That is certainly true, but a thing that we must be mindful of is that a very small portion of the tank-car transportation that is coming to the—and including the Great Lakes transportation—a very small portion of that is in gasoline. Most of our transportation is in crude oil, special products for the armed services, or including kerosene and heating oil and residual fuel oil for heavy industry. Only a very small portion of the total petroleum movement to district 1 consists of automotive gasoline. We are producing locally something in the order of 175,000 barrels a day of gasoline. A great deal of gasoline is coming in by pipe lines. Some is coming in by Great Lakes tankers, some by barges, and some by tank cars.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to give me his attention for a moment to verify what I am about to say respecting offering an amendment of this character, which would transfer rationing of gasoline from O. P. A. to the Petroleum Administrator for War, and which would require a suspension of the rules. In view of the attitude taken in the Senate recently on legislating on appropriation bills, the Appropriations Committee this morning took the action which I shall now state. They adopted a resolution unanimously calling the attention of the appropriate legislative committee, which, I understand, is the Committee on Banking and Currency, to this proposal, and transmitting it to that committee, urging that prompt action be taken on this subject. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if my understanding is not correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Concerning the operation of the O. P. A.?

Mr. LODGE. Concerning the transfer of gasoline rationing from O. P. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct. I think every member of the committee felt that it would probably be better to transfer this matter to the same organization which has charge of the supply—that is, the Petroleum Administrator for War. But we are not a legislative committee, and if we had even authorized an amendment to be offered on the floor it would bring up the whole question of food administration and every other kind of administration. So a resolution was prepared urging the Committee on Banking and Currency to act on the matter as promptly as possible.

Mr. LODGE. I am much obliged to the Senator for that courteous rejoinder. I see some members of the Committee on Banking and Currency present in the Chamber now. I certainly hope they will respond to the plea of the Appropriations Committee to consider this matter promptly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I should add that there is nothing in the bill concerning it. So far as the committee's attitude is concerned, it felt very favorable to the report submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachuetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the attitude of the Appropriations Committee regarding the importance and advantage of having oil rationing and production placed under one head apply only to that commodity, or would the same philosophy apply to the food situation and other situations?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that there was no test of sentiment obtained in the Appropriations Committee on the question of food rationing, but I heard a number of individual comments to the effect that food might well be put on a basis consistent with fuel rationing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the same elements of chaos are basically evident everywhere, when these functions are divided and not geared?

Mr. LODGE. Exactly. Some persons made the argument that we should not bring this matter up today, because it would cause a great uproar and a Roman holiday, if you please, because there was so much dissatisfaction abroad in the country with the way in which rationing was being conducted.

Mr. President, I do not think that is ever a good argument in the Senate. The Senate is the forum for the discontent of the people. If the people are discontented with rationing—and I believe they are profoundly discontented with it—then this is the place where it should explode, and this is the place where we should have our Roman holiday.

The people in my section of the United States do not begrudge a single drop of gasoline which is used to fly a bombing plane or to fuel a tank in the combat area, but they do begrudge, and justly so, unnecessary deprivation which is forced upon them by bad planning and faulty organization. I say in all seriousness, and particularly do I say it to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, that that situation in my section of the United States is causing a very great change in the morale of the home front.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Banking and Currency Committee has anything to do with rationing. Rationing is done under the priority section, which is in the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee, and is under the charge of the War Production Board. The War Production Board has power to move the rationing from one place to another if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate legislative counsel, Mr. Wood, is of the opinion that it was done under the bill setting up the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. TAFT. No; the bill setting up the Office of Price Administration has nothing to do with rationing. It is entirely under the priorities law which is in the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate counsel told me about it yesterday, and he showed me in the Office of Price Administration law language which referred to that.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Price Administrator has no power to ration anything except as it is delegated to him by the War Production Board.

Mr. LODGE. There is a difference of opinion with respect to that matter. I will take it up later. The point I wish to stress is that the crumbling of the home front is due in large part to the way in which rationing is being handled. The American people cannot be convinced that when people in Canada have about twice as much gasoline as they

have, when they hear of gasoline operations in the black market, when they see the confusion and the contradiction prevailing in Washington—they cannot be convinced that the program is well planned. So I hope that the proposal submitted by me will receive prompt action at the hands of the committee.

I thank the Senate for its attention.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, I can say frankly, was very much impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Massachusetts in connection with the problem of the rationing of gasoline and oil. I rather imagine that the sympathies of all the members, or at any rate, a substantial majority, were with the Senator at least in the objective that he sought to accomplish. The only reason the committee did not feel at liberty to act upon the matter was that it had had no opportunity to hold hearings upon the measure. It was for that reason that it voted to authorize a resolution calling the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee to the importance of the subject.

I say this in a preliminary way, not because I intend to talk about the Senator's suggestion, but because I want to talk about the other suggestion which he made in the committee with respect to the appropriations for the Office of War Information. It is only fair to say that in my opinion the appropriation for the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information would have been considerably less than has been recommended by the committee if it had not been for the frank and industrious manner in which the Senator from Massachusetts gave study to the problem. He felt convinced, as he has stated to the Senate, that certain of the bureaus which constitute a part of the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information should be maintained. And so a sum somewhat in excess of $3,000,000 was allowed to provide for the functioning of these bureaus, and $500,000 was allowed to provide for the liquidation of two or three others.

Members of the Senate will realize the pressure under which the Appropriations Committee is working at this time. The war-agency bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives only on the 19th of June. In other words, less than 2 weeks ago this measure was placed in the hands of the Senate Appropriations Committee for its consideration. Numerous other appropriation bills were pending. Numerous conferences were in progress, and it was utterly impossible for us to give the detailed, close scrutiny to each item that members of the Appropriations Committee would like to give.

As a consequence, I left the committee this morning in the conviction that we had not sufficiently studied the importance of the functions which will be cut off entirely if the committee amendment is agreed to without modification. So, Mr. President, when the proper time comes it will be my purpose to offer an amendment to restore the appropriation for the Domestic Branch of this service to $5,500,000.

Let me point out the significance of that sum. As every one knows, the House Committee on Appropriations in its several branches devotes considerable time to the preparation of each appropriation bill. They have much more time than we have to study these measures, and they go into greater detail as a consequence. The House committee, after having received the justifications from the Bureau of the Budget, after having held hearings at length, having received the testimony of Mr. Elmer Davis and his assistants, came to the conclusion that an appropriation of $5,500,000 should be allowed. That, Mr. President, was the considered judgment of a responsible committee of the House dealing with this important measure which provides the funds for the operation of certain war agencies.

When the bill was reported to the floor of the House, because of the wealth of criticism which had welled up about some of the activities of O. W. I. and its predecessor organizations, a motion was made to cut the Domestic Branch off altogether. Much of the feeling which sustained that motion in the House was due to the fact that some Members of the House felt that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. was operating in a partisan manner, that it was guided by the purpose of indulging in partisan propaganda or propaganda for objectives for which the Senate and the House had not given their approval. What is overlooked, Mr. President, is that the official of the Office of War Information who appeared before the House committee in defense of the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for the continuance of these functions was a Republican, Mr. Gardner Cowles, of Iowa, against whom no charge that he was engaged in partisanship can be leveled. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Cowles left his own private business concerns, to come to Washington at great sacrifice, to handle the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. He told the committee he was concerned only in seeing that the American people received in sufficient amount factual reports upon the activities of the various war agencies. Mr. President, there is nothing to indicate that his statements in that respect were incorrect. There is nothing to indicate that what was done under his direction in any way deviated from the principle which he laid down.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any evidence before either the House committee or the Senate committee to indicate that the agency has been used for partisan propaganda purposes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator in all frankness that there was evidence of that kind, but not relative to the operations under the direction of Elmer Davis. Some months ago, I submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, calling for a study of the operations of the O. W. I. As a result of that resolution, the whole Judiciary Committee, sitting as a body, had Mr. Davis and his assistants hold a press conference in its presence. At the conclusion of that press conference, during which the Washington representatives of the press asked every question they could think of, the Judiciary Committee conducted an executive examination of Mr. Davis and his assistants. It was developed there, for example, that the publication entitled "Battle Stations for All" had been prepared in the Office of War Information, and that in the publication there were numerous statements very critical of policies which had actually been adopted by Congress. As an example, let me say that in the tax bill a year ago Congress had decided, although, of course, there was division of opinion in both the Senate and the House, that a certain depreciation allowance should be made for oil. The Treasury Department did not agree with that. After the action had been taken, nevertheless, the booklet referred to attacked that principle. There were numerous other instances. There was a pamphlet to which the Senator from Oregon took exception. That pamphlet was distributed overseas.

However, those two pamphlets are practically the only ones I remember of which there was any criticism; and Mr. Davis voluntarily asserted, before the appropriations were even acted upon, that such things were being abandoned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator inadvertently made a misstatement, although I know he made it in the best of faith. One of the pamphlets was prepared while Mr. Davis was the head of the O. W. I. There were more than two; but as to the one to which I have reference, Mr. Davis said it had been published without his looking it over or his knowledge, so to speak.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought that was the publication "Battle Stations for All."

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it was one dealing with another controversial matter, which I shall not mention.

Mr. Davis also stated that if he had had opportunity to examine it probably he would have deleted certain portions to which the members of the committee objected. I think the Senator desires to make a complete statement, and therefore I mention that further detail.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct in that respect; I remember it now.

In response to the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], let me say that it is clear, as was developed in the testimony before the House committee and in the testimony before the Senate committee, that under the present direction of the Office of War Information the Domestic Branch is devoting itself exclusively to the important task of distributing to the people of America the information they should have, without propaganda and without any political partisanship.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In line with what the Senator from Illinois said, let me say

that it also was shown in the committee that in the original estimate of some eight-million-odd dollars covering Mr. Davis' domestic activities there was included approximately $700,000 for the Office of Publication, which was responsible for the pamphlets referred to. Mr. Davis himself testified before the Appropriations Committee that he did not want any of the $700,000; that the publication and pamphlet situation met with his complete approval so far as the elimination was concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I must interrupt the Senator at that point to suggest that that sum of money covered something in addition to the publications. It covered the work of the O. W. I. under the heading of "Books and magazines," which is another activity, and one which the O. W. I. desires to continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is a fair statement, but the appropriation item was voluntarily given up by Mr. Davis, because he wanted to eliminate the controversies over publications.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How long has it been since the controversial matters were eliminated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been several months.

Mr. LUCAS. Has any question been raised with respect to any attempt by the O. W. I. to propagandize the country with respect to any partisan information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have heard of none.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the real basis for the elimination of the funds? As a matter of fact, from my understanding of the argument, it would seem that the real basis for the elimination of the funds with which to carry on what seems to be one of the important functions of government in the conduct of the war has centered around politics. That is why I am so much interested in the question. I should like to know why there is opposition to this small appropriation to carry on the work which Mr. Elmer Davis is, in my opinion, doing in a commendable way at the present time. If I can obtain an answer, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think it is incumbent upon me to answer the question precisely in the way in which the Senator has propounded it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may answer it in his own way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall answer it in this way: I am now endeavoring to outline the reasons why, in my opinion, the activities which will be abandoned if the committee amendment is agreed to should be maintained; and I shall undertake to show why, in my opinion, at least, they serve a useful and highly desirable public purpose. In doing so I think I shall demonstrate that there is no politics or partisanship involved.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought perhaps the Senator had discovered, in reading the evidence before the House or the evidence which was taken before the Senate committee, the real basic reason why the House of Representatives completely cut off all appropriations and appropriated only a sufficient amount to liquidate the organization. I have never heard any real reason for that, other than the basis of partisan politics. If there is any other reason I should like to know it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must say in all frankness to the Senator that, of course, there were other reasons. Complaints were received with respect to certain radio programs, and some of the news which was given out. Statements which are made over the radio do not always suit all listeners, and some of the listeners naturally wrote to their Senators and Representatives. Let me point out to the Senator, however, that the essential fact is that the House Appropriations Committee heard all the evidence, and, after consideration, rendered its verdict and said that the Domestic Branch ought to have $5,500,000. Then, on the floor of the House, in response to what I call emotional appeals and emotional attacks, that was all stricken out. I think the members of the Senate committee agreed that it would be a great mistake if that action should be permitted to stand, so our committee was unanimous in recommending appropriations which would restore certain of those items, and I wish to urge upon the Senate the restoration of some more, and to show why, in my opinion, they should be restored.

For example, the Senate committee has now restored the appropriation for the so-called news bureau in the Domestic Branch. That means that the committee was practically a unit in recommending that appropriation. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] advocated the restoration of that bureau on the floor of the Senate. I intend to advocate the restoration of some others.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry to take the time of the Senator, because I know he expects to present this matter in an orderly way, item by item. It seems to me, from what little I know of the entire question, that practically all the items are tied together. That is why I asked the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] a moment ago about the elimination of the appropriation dealing with graphic and printing matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall deal with that subject presently.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator placed before the Judiciary Committee the resolution asking for an investigation of the agency now under consideration, the O. W. I., did he not have in mind that there was something wrong in the operation of the O. W. I.?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. What I had in mind was that there were a great many rumors and reports, and I wanted to find out what the truth was. I knew of some of the pamphlets, and I felt that they were wrong. I wanted to find out whether, as a matter of policy, it was the purpose of O. W. I. to continue that sort of work. The introduction of the resolution and the hearings which we held had the beneficial effect of bringing about the cessation of that sort of activity.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I remember that hearing, it was in executive session. I was examining the witness, Mr. Davis, at the time the hearing closed, with the understanding that I should be permitted to continue the examination.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to know why no further hearing has ever been held on the O. W. I. from that day to this.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The answer is very simple. The members of the Judiciary Committee were overly considerate of the author of the resolution. The Senator will recall that shortly after that executive hearing was held I became ill with a cold, and had to absent myself from the Senate for more than 2 weeks. When I returned I became so involved in matters coming from other committees, including the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee, that I have not attended a single meeting of the Judiciary Committee since. That is the only reason.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it fair for us to say that that hearing has not been concluded?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. So far as I am concerned, I feel that it should continue.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the Senate should not gain the impression that the Judiciary Committee has gone into this matter and completed its hearings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I make no such statement, and wish no such impression to be gained. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it is my conviction that great public interest will be served if the various committees of Congress undertake to keep in close contact all the time with the agencies which Congress creates and for which it appropriates money. In this instance I believe it would be highly valuable for the Committee on the Judiciary to continue its contact with O. W. I.; and I, for one, shall urge that course.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. We should continue that hearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is utterly different, Mr. President, to try to answer a problem of that kind by cutting off appropriations for essential services. My theory is, let us give them the money which they need, and then let us watch them and make certain that they carry out the policies laid down by Congress. I think it would be a very beneficial thing for members of the various committees of the Senate to watch the O. P. A., for example, with respect to agricultural matters. I think it would be a good thing for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to have its eye on the operations of the Department of the Interior, for the Finance Committee to be in constant touch with the Department of the Treasury, and so forth. But, as I have said, that is a very different matter from cutting off the functioning of agencies

because we do not like some of the things that some of the agencies or some of their employees have done.

Mr. President, the Bureau of the Budget, in preparing the justification for the appropriation, divided the functions of the Domestic Branch into several categories.

The first is the Office of Director. That appropriation, estimated at $155,000 plus, was utterly cut off by the House of Representatives. The full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has restored $125,000.

I shall not go through the entire list of items and sums. They are obvious from the record.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. When the House cut off the $155,000 for the office of Director, that meant that it eliminated Elmer Davis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It eliminated him so far as his office dealt with the Domestic Branch. That is, it eliminated that portion of the office of Director. There was a much larger appropriation for the office of Director in his supervisory capacity, and for expenditures for the overhead of the Overseas Branch.

Mr. LUCAS. But so far as any activity of Mr. Davis on the home front was concerned, the elimination of the $155,000 by the House meant the complete elimination of any activities on the part of Mr. Davis in connection with the O. W. I. work on the domestic front.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me what argument was made on the floor of the House, or what facts were given, in support of the elimination of the Domestic Branch? That is what I wish to know.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unfortunately I have not had an opportunity to read the debates on the floor of the House, so I cannot answer the Senator's question. My time has been occupied in reading the House hearings and listening to the hearings before the Senate committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I am certainly not complaining about the Senator not having that information. I have not had the opportunity to follow the debates in the House of Representatives.

It seems very strange that, apparently, for no good reason, they would with just one swoop cut out entirely the activities of Mr. Davis as a result of this particular appropriation. I simply cannot understand it. I cannot understand why, in the great war effort in which we are engaged, any legislative branch of Government would want to eliminate completely from the picture this very important activity, in my judgment, on the home front. I hope that before this debate is over someone will give me the vital reasons for doing this to Mr. Davis and, in my opinion, doing it to America in the great conflict in which we are engaged in the attempt to save ourselves from destruction by the forces of tyranny.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will give me and all other members of the Appropriations Committee credit for having restored a substantial amount of the appropriation.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; I certainly do. I think the committee has done a fine thing. I commend it for what it did, and I commend the Senator from Wyoming for the fine thing he did in restoring the full amount, as the bill came from the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the following are the branches of the Domestic Service which were restored by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate: The Office of the Director, the Office of Program Coordination, the News Bureau, the Bureau of Special Services, and the Radio Bureau. Those branches have been restored.

The following are the principal branches which have not been restored, and it is to the consideration of the functions of these divisions of the Domestic Branch that I invite the attention of my colleagues:

The Bureau of Graphics and Printing. For that Bureau, the Bureau of the Budget recommended $1,774,672. The committee recommends nothing for it.

The Motion Pictures Bureau. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $1,222,904. The committee recommends nothing for it.

The Field Operations Bureau. For that Bureau the Director of the Budget submitted an estimate amounting to $1,911,335. The committee amendment provides nothing for it.

I shall undertake to show that on the record those three Bureaus are as deserving of the support of the Senate as are the Bureaus for which the committee has made favorable recommendations.

Let us consider first the Bureau of Graphics and Printing. That Bureau was justified in the House committee not only by Mr. Davis but by Mr. Cowles. Let me give the Senate an example of what the Bureau does. It has distributed posters intended to arouse the interest and the morale of the country. During the First World War, war posters were used with great effect, not only for the sale of bonds but for marshaling the support of the public to the war activities of the Government. The poster campaign this year is thus described in the hearings:

> These include planned campaign posters for Government agencies on such specific topics as food conservation.

I am reading from a memorandum which was submitted by Mr. Cowles, not by Mr. Davis or Mr. Eisenhower. It was not submitted by anyone having a political ax to grind. It was submitted by Mr. Cowles, a gentleman who is a leader in his profession, one of the prominent newspapermen of the country, a man who is in Washington devoting his patriotic services to his country. He gave these examples:

> Food is a weapon—do not waste it.
> More women must work.
> Work on a farm this summer.
> Five hundred thousand each of 4 posters, at $25 per 1,000, or $50,000 per month—$600,000.
> Twelve general posters—one poster a month on a general war subject, such as Remember Pearl Harbor, Americans Always Fight. Examples: The Four Freedoms, etc.

Then there is a break-down of the cost of performing the poster service. In the justification this is what was said:

> The Bureau of Graphics and Printing is responsible for the effective use of graphics material in information campaigns for the home front, and for the centralized control of the primary printing requirements of the Domestic Operations Branch.
>
> Posters are traditionally a wartime method for conveying simple, clear, and vivid war appeals to the American public. Thirty-two posters have had planned distribution of more than 1,000,000 copies.

Mr. President, I could occupy considerable time in going through all this justification. I shall not do so. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the justification, as presented to the House Committee on Appropriations, for this division and the other divisions I shall discuss, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The Senator is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am interested in his statement about the figures, but I cannot find on our desks a copy of the bill as reported by the committee. There is no way to follow the Senator's discussion of the figures. I have not been able to locate a copy of the bill.

It is my understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee added approximately three and one-half million dollars for the Domestic Branch. Am I correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; $3,561,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That includes $500,000 for liquidation. The actual amount is approximately $3,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; $500,000 for liquidation of the divisions which I should like to have restored.

Mr. President, the next item that has been eliminated altogether is the motion-picture branch. Let me read to the Senate a list of some of the motion pictures which have been distributed. I read from page 929 of the House hearings:

> A. One-reel subjects: The following subjects have been completed and are either in release or will be in release before June 30 in 16-mm. editions by the Bureau of Motion Pictures. Those marked with an asterisk (*) are 16-mm. reduction editions of Office of War Information films distributed theatrically through the War Activities Committee's cooperating theaters and are described in the theatrical release list.

Now listen to the subjects:

> Men and the Sea—cadet training for United States Maritime Service.
> *Salvage.
> *Manpower.
> *Japanese Relocation.
> *Dover.
> *Paratroops.
> *Troop Train.
> *Right-of-Way.
> *Farmer at War.
> *Food for Fighters.

And so on, indicating that the sort of motion picture being prepared includes the type of picture most likely to convey to the people of the country a visual image of what the Nation is doing, a highly desirable activity.

We must remember, Mr. President, that we are living in a new age, in which the radio and the motion picture have become the most effective means of disseminating news and factual information. It is quite impossible for the people throughout the country to understand what is being done in this tremendous World War without a visual demonstration being brought to them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if the Appropriations Committee questioned the value of motion pictures as a medium for the communication of ideas and information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The action of the committee was based upon the contention—I hope I am stating it correctly—that the Government should not make any motion pictures at all; that such pictures should be made by the established motion picture companies at Hollywood and elsewhere, and that the war agencies should be dependent upon what those concerns may do, independently and voluntarily, for the manufacture of such pictures.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that this Bureau has rendered valuable service to the motion-picture industry, especially in making news reels and giving them information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my opinion that the Senator is entirely correct, and that the one-reel subjects, a partial list of which I have just read, are desired by the theaters. They like to have them and the public also likes to have them displayed.

Mr. BONE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I understood the Senator to say that there has been some animadversion by the O. W. I. on the action of Congress dealing with the depletion allowance in the case of oil wells. Was that criticized as a political or partisan gesture?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was pointing out to the Senate that the Congress of the United States had written a law at the last session of Congress and had taken a stand. This item is not now in debate, and I mentioned it solely in answer to a question propounded by another Senator, because the O. W. I. has abandoned that sort of activity. But after the Congress had spoken, and the President had signed the bill, the Office of War Information sent out a pamphlet which criticized the action of Congress. The pamphlet was distributed to various clubs, associations of women, and associations of men; it was being sent out as an expression of the Office of War Information, and it was directly contrary to the spoken word of the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony on that subject before the committee was that the O. W. I. had withdrawn that pamphlet and that in the future the particular pamphlet and any similar pamphlet would not be issued at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator made reference to that, because that acknowledgment upon the part of Mr. Davis was one of the factors which convinced all the Members of the committee of his very high standard, his very high character, and his impartiality in administering this agency. Because he said it was a mistake, and that it would not be repeated, it is only fair to Mr. Davis to say that it was initiated before he became the head of the O. W. I.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the question of whether it would be repeated was brought up in the committee, and I took occasion to have the clerk of the committee call Mr. Davis and ask if it would be repeated, and we were again assured, over the telephone, that it would not be repeated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I could consume much time to show that the Bureau of Graphics and Printing does a tremendous and valuable work. Last night I asked Mr. Davis to make a statement for me with respect to this particular agency. He sent a letter to the chairman of the committee from which I quote the following:

> We further request the restoration of the $1,774,672 which was asked for the Bureau of Graphics and Printing. We have arranged with other agencies to do most of the poster work for the Government. These other agencies had asked for over $4,000,000 to do the same job, which sum was cut out of their budget in reliance on the Office of War Information to do it.

The significance of that statement is clear. Several of the war agencies thought it necessary to issue posters of the character which I have described, and they were asking the Bureau of the Budget for money to do the work. The Bureau of the Budget cut the appropriations out of their respective requests and placed one estimate in the request for the Office of War Information; so that if the Senate now follows the recommendation of the committee in completely cutting off the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, then no branch of the Government, no war agency, will have funds with which to carry on this highly desirable work.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Assuming, as I do from the language of the bill before the Senate, if it is adopted in the form the committee has presented it to us, that the O. W. I. will be permitted to prepare and publish pamphlets and other literature, I notice at the end of the section having to do with O. W. I., a provision which reads:

> No part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended by the Office of War Information for the preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States.

Does that mean that pamphlets are issued for our allies but we are not to know what is in them? What does it imply? Would it mean that a Member of Congress could not have one of these pamphlets without being accused of sedition?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that I am endeavoring to explain an amendment which I intend to offer, and I prefer not to go into extraneous matters with which I am not presently concerned. When the appropriation in question comes before the Senate for consideration, then, if I can add anything to the enlightenment of the Senator, I shall be very glad to do so, but I should prefer not to be sidetracked at the moment.

Mr. BONE. I will not press the Senator except to say I was rather curious to know why we should spend public money to circulate pamphlets among the French and other peoples in various sections of the world where we are engaged and not let the American people see them.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that if the Senator will wait, he will have that matter explained; but briefly, this whole function is divided into domestic and foreign agencies, and this bill deals only with the domestic agency, and the foreign pamphlets, the kind dropped from airplanes, and so forth, for propaganda purposes, would be excluded.

Mr. BONE. I hope we will drop enough of them among our French allies to induce them to quit fighting among themselves during this bloody period and at least give us a chance to help them. I think we owe that small contribution to the war effort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee is not interfering with that at all. It may be appropriate at this time to read another paragraph from the letter of Mr. Davis written last night, because it deals with that specific subject:

> In the Bureau of Publications we had already eliminated pamphlets, and had determined to eliminate the issuance of "Victory Speaker" guides and other material on controversial topics. These items amount to $261,000 out of $769,090 requested. Their elimination would also occasion a slight reduction in personnel, impossible to estimate at present, but probably not less than $50,000, making a total for this work of $311,000. Of the rest of our estimates for this Bureau, the largest item was $200,000 for mats for newspapers willing to carry war messages free. Among the others are included the book and magazine divisions previously mentioned.

The previous mention to which he referred was his suggestion that $80,000 should be permitted for that work, which serves as a liaison between O. W. I. and the publishers of books and magazines, costing about $80,000.

Mr. President, there remains only one other item, to which I wish to refer briefly, that is, the Field Operations Bureau. For this bureau the Budget recommended $1,911,335. The Senate committee has cut that all out and it was

on the assumption that this work was mostly in duplication of the work done in Washington. I have looked carefully into this matter, and I am confident of the strong ground upon which I stand when I say that that assumption was a mistaken one. The Bureau of Field Operations is essential to provide the local liaison between local communities, local governing bodies, local newspapers, and the information which should come to them from the war agency. In every little community of the land there are the offices of the Office of Price Administration let us say, for example. The Office of Price Administration has no radio or press bureau. It has no such facility, and this bill contains no appropriation which would enable it to keep in touch with local newspapers and local radios, and the distribution of essential war information.

This morning, after the committee acted, I asked Mr. Davis to give a brief statement of precisely what the field services are. I should like to read the statement into the RECORD at this point:

Fifty-eight field offices of the Office of War Information perform an essential public information function for 359 field offices of war agencies in key cities in all but four States. If this service were not provided through the Office of War Information field information set-up, most if not all of the war agencies would find it necessary, in the public interest, to establish their own field information staffs and facilities. The present cost of $1,911,000 for war information operations in the field would be multiplied at least by two and perhaps more if that became necessary.

In Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and other major cities, for example, there are 10 or 11 important war agency offices—regional or State offices. Each of these offices has a responsibility to keep the public in its locality informed.

When the Office of Price Administration or the War Production Board or the Office of the Defense Transportation Coordinator decides upon some action involving rationing or prices or use of automobiles, for example, the decision is put into operation, not in Washington, but in the cities and towns throughout the country. It is essential for civilians in each locality to know precisely what they mean in that locality and what is expected of people in the way of compliance, and so on.

The field information facilities supplied by the Office of War Information enables these war agencies in key cities to provide the press, and through the press, the public, with this vital kind of current information.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, after examining the entire record of the hearings before the House committee and the Senate committee, in making the statement that to deny the O. W. I. the money necessary to carry on this field service would be to deny the people in their localities the opportunity of getting the information with respect to this far-flung war program that we have. There can be doubt about that desirability. If we do not have these field offices, the alternative is that all this information must come from Washington. The complaint of the localities is that the information which comes out of Washington is in most instances too general to serve the purpose.

So, Mr. President, I feel that in justice to the effort the Office of War Information is making, in justice to the people, in justice to the war effort, we should restore a sufficient amount of the appropriation to enable the Office of War Information to carry on all these functions.

Therefore, at this moment, for consideration when the proper time comes, I shall offer an amendment, on page 29, line 7, to insert in lieu of the figure which came from the House the figures "$5,500,000," so that it will read:

Five million five hundred thousand dollars for the Domestic Operations Branch.

Mr. McKELLAR. And to strike out the remainder of the language?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To strike out the remainder of the language.

EXHIBIT A

BUREAU OF GRAPHICS AND PRINTING

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATE

The Bureau of Graphics and Printing is responsible for the effective use of graphics material in information campaigns for the home front, and for the centralized control of the primary printing requirements of the Domestic Operations Branch.

Posters are traditionally a wartime method for conveying simple, clear, and vivid war appeals to the American public. Thirty-two posters have had planned distribution of more than 11,000,000 copies. Seventeen additional posters are now in production.

The Bureau coordinates the poster production of other war agencies to avoid duplication of themes and costs, and to insure the most efficient use of the available facilities for display. For topics which are broader than the responsibilities of a single Government agency, the Bureau develops posters and other graphics material for Office of War Information. Examples are posters on military security, the United Nations, and the nature of the enemy we fight.

In continuing its function of coordinating the needs of war agencies and bureaus of Office of War Information for graphic war messages, the Bureau of Graphics and Printing will intensify attention to two objectives during the next fiscal year. The first is to increase the effectiveness of a variety of graphics materials in obtaining public understanding of why wartime programs are necessary and how they work for the benefit of the individual citizen and the Nation. An illustration of this objective was the extensive use of posters, show cards, charts, and pictorial devices to explain the mechanics of the point-rationing system. Graphics for such programs must be produced on explained and specific schedule in order to coordinate understanding with action.

The second objective is to achieve more effective distribution of all Government posters. Posters must reach the right places at the right times, and must be properly displayed, or else the investment of manpower and money made in the poster will be partially lost.

DOMESTIC OPERATIONS BUREAU OF MOTION PICTURES

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATE

Activities of the Bureau of Motion Pictures have been carried out in three phases: (1) Original creation and production of war films, (2) coordination of the motion-picture activities of other Government agencies, and (3) liaison with the motion-picture industry in order to achieve the maximum distribution of Government war films and to assist the trade in making its own films significant to the prosecution of the war.

The Bureau plans, writes, and produces films on important war topics for distribution through (a) commercial theaters and (b) nontheatrical channels such as colleges, civic and business groups, city and country school systems, commercial libraries, and local defense councils. Through the war-activities committee of the motion-picture industry, more than 16,000 theaters have been pledged to show Government factual films, and a picture of 1 reel or less is released every other week to an estimated audience of 90,000,000.

The Bureau of Motion Pictures produces special films for the information campaigns of other Government agencies, such as the campaigns of the War Manpower Commission in critical labor areas, of the armed services in encouraging recruiting of specialists, and of the War Production Board in its drive for conservation of materials. The Bureau also reviews scripts of other Government agencies to coordinate treatment and priority. It advises the War Production Board on the allocation of film stock for the use of civilian Government departments.

The Bureau assists the motion-picture industry in obtaining accurate factual information for films dealing directly or indirectly with the war. War information films also are produced and distributed by the industry without cost to the Government. The America Speaks series, composed of films on 26 war subjects, and released alternately with the Office of War Information films, reach a weekly audience of about 90,000,000. The Bureau also cooperates with the newsreel companies by preparing special footage which is utilized by the news reels with their own editorial treatment. The Non-Theatrical Division has mobilized a majority of the estimated 20,000 16-millimeter sound projectors in the country for the showing of war films. Four or five new films are issued each month and currently there are 37 1- and 2-reel subjects totaling nearly 13000 prints in the hands of 185 distributors. The local audience reached by these films is estimated at over 5,000,000 per month.

The basic problems of organization, coordination with industry and with other Government agencies, and the establishment of channels of distribution have, in general, been met. It is felt that the present schedule of one war film a week on the screens, plus the short special treatments required in bringing information of a timely nature to the people, represent about the maximum demand which the Government should make on public screen time. Therefore, the 1944 program will be a continuance of 1943 plans. Better coverage of timely subjects will be obtained by the production of special newsreel material to be released to the news reel companies for their own editorial handling. Motion-picture footage made in this way will be used in the editing of nontheatrical subjects for the Bureau.

The nontheatrical distribution system will be continued on its present basis and strengthened through establishing additional outlets so that groups, organizations, and institutions in all sections of the country can readily obtain authentic war-information films.

FIELD OPERATIONS

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATE

The relationship of the Office of War Information to the other war agencies in the field differs from the relationship in Washington.

In Washington the Office of War Information clears and issues material produced by the other agencies. In the field the Office of War Information itself does most of the writing and producing of mass media information work for the larger war agencies.

For example, the Office of War Information in the field performs the newspaper, radio, and other general public information work for the Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Office of Defense Trans-

portation, and the War Labor Board; clears and frequently assists in the preparation of field radio materials for all Federal Government agencies; and clears, issues, and frequently assists in the preparation of press and other information materials for the Office of Civilian Defense as a Federal agency; the War Manpower Commission, and the United States Employment Service, where feasible; War Relocation Authority, Petroleum Administration for War, National Housing Agency; and Federal Public Housing Authority; the war information releases of the Department of Agriculture; Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services; Civil Service Commission as regards its wartime recruiting activities, and occasionally on request performs public information work for the armed services. News from military and naval centers does not clear through the Office of War Information, but the Office of War Information clears all their local radio programs.

The Office of War Information field offices transmit to the people information originating with the war agencies in Washington and also with the regional State and district offices of the war agencies. This is due without competing with the normal channels of public information but rather by cooperating with them to make authoritative information available in those ways which are most convenient and useful to the media.

By far the biggest part of the field-office job is release of news that originates locally in the administration of war measures. In this, the Office of War Information field offices are guided by policies and basic facts supplied by the respective war agency information division and by the Office of War Information in Washington. They also provide a central source for information on all civilian war activities in any area; a newspaper or radio station not familiar with the detailed operations of each agency can turn to them for facts. This does not, however, preclude newsmen from making direct contact with any agency official. The open-door policy is strictly observed. In addition, the field offices answer public inquiries received by mail, telephone, and in personal calls. They maintain stocks of posters, books, and pamphlets for distribution. They perform services in the field for all Office of War Information bureaus, such as local radio clearances for the Radio Bureau, promoting and distribution of 16-millimeter films for the Motion Picture Bureau, and obtaining statements and recordings for the Overseas Branch.

By maintaining these flexible but compact organizations in the field, the Office of War Information is able to render necessary local information services for war agencies, using less manpower and at a smaller operating cost than would be necessary if each agency were to maintain a separate field-information service.

Field offices fall into two categories, differing chiefly in size. The larger offices, located in 12 major cities, parallel the locations of the regional offices of the major war agencies. The staff in each of these Office of War Information offices is headed by a director who is responsible for the information operations of the particular office, for maintaining relationships with the regional administrators of the several war agencies, and for maintaining general supervision of the Office of War Information personnel in his own and neighboring Office of War Information branch offices.

The Bureau of Field Operations does not have any offices which are set up solely for decentralized administration. All such offices are operating offices, responsible for executing the functions of the Office of War Information as a whole in their particular areas. In the 12 major offices referred to, the maximum personnel in 1943 included a director, his deputy, a radio director, one or more information specialists, each devoting his major time to information needs of one or more war agencies, and the necessary clerical assistance.

The other field offices are responsible for Office of War Information operations either in entire States, when there is only one office in a State, or for smaller areas when the concentration of war activities in a State makes more than one office desirable. Occasionally a district office will be set up within a State where information problems are substantial and it is impractical to handle them from a distance. The Bureau of Field Operations is responsible, also, for war agency information service to the extent found necessary in Puerto Rico and Alaska.

In addition, the Bureau administers and supervises the Canadian branch office of the Office of War Information at Ottawa. This office was first projected by the News Bureau after the Office of War Information and the State Department had agreed that the Office of War Information's appropriate function in Canada is more analogous to its domestic operations than to its overseas functions. Later the office was made the responsibility of the Bureau of Field Operations. The budgeted staff consists of one man and a secretary. The functions of the Canadian Branch are: (1) To maintain general liaison for the Office of War Information with the Canadian Wartime Information Board, (2) to furnish to the media of public information in Canada background information regarding the war effort of the United States, (3) to handle such public information output needs as are required by the United States war agencies having offices in Ottawa, and (4) to transmit to the Office of War Information information about the Canadian war effort.

In 1944, the Bureau of Field Operations will perform these functions:

1. Production of press releases, radio scrips, and announcements, and background information materials on behalf of the several war agencies.

2. Clearance for policy and time priority of all Federal Government radio program materials originating in the field.

3. Clearance as between agencies and for over-all war information policy, the information materials produced by Government agencies whenever the Office of War Information itself does not do all production work.

4. Handling of special assignments from Washington on behalf of the several war agencies.

5. Handling of special tasks for the Office of War Information Domestic Branch on assignment, collecting material or arranging distribution of Office of War Information materials such as posters or pamphlets.

6. Handling special assignments for the Overseas Branch, making surveys, or transcriptions, or covering news events for overseas use.

7. Making daily or periodical public reaction reports for Office of War Information or other agencies, such as reporting weekly on the aspects of the war program which are least understood or most need clarifying.

8. Conducting on a limited scale the public inquiry function, answering by telephone or mail, and more important, by radio program or newspaper columns of the question and answer variety, queries received from the public.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope that at this time the bill may be read for the consideration of committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Board of Economic Warfare," on page 2, line 16, after the words "Revised Statutes", to insert "section 3741, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22)."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I wish to say before proceeding to an explanation of the amendment, that the House has asked for a further conference on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I shall not make any motion with respect to that now. The House a few moments ago refused to recede from its position with respect to Mr. Lovett, Mr. Dodds, and Mr. Watson, by a vote of 301 to 71.

I was asked for an explanation of the first amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wish to know what the issue is. I wish to know the question before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the hearings:

Senator TYDINGS. That deals only with provisions which forbid you to make contracts in which any Member of Congress has an interest?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. These contracts are made outside the United States, and the chances are almost a billion to one that no Member of Congress could have an interest, and this creates confusion in the foreign country, therefore it should be eliminated to facilitate your ability to make contracts?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is this the committee amendment on page 6, line 10?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, on page 2, line 16.

Mr. LODGE. I am familiar with that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 9, to insert:

No part of any funds appropriated or made available herein to the Board of Economic Warfare shall be used directly or indirectly for the procurement of services, supplies, or equipment outside the United States except for the purpose of executing economic programs or policies formally approved in writing by a majority of the Board and such writing has been filed with the Secretary of State prior to any such expenditure.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wonder if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I am sure the chairman of the committee would not want any of this work being done by the Board of Economic Warfare to be suddenly cut off and stopped on account of this provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if it would not be agreeable to the Senator having the bill in charge, after the word "used" in line 11, page 6, to insert "after August 15, 1943"? That will give several weeks time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the committee amendment, on page 6, line 11, after the word "used" I move to insert the words and figures "after August 15, 1943." That will give the Board of Economic Warfare time to put this provision in operation. The Senate would not want to shut off this work. The bill might become law within the next 24 or 36 hours.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the purpose of the amendment. The matter of the date can be considered in conference.

Mr. HILL. Yes. It will be in conference.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to know whether it is the Senator's purpose in interpolating the language "after August 15, 1943" to place such a limitation on the word "used" that no commitments between now and then shall be made.

Mr. HILL. My thought was to use no money after that date. No commitment would be made after the date the bill becomes law. Certainly the Board of Economic Warfare would carry out the spirit and intent of this limitation, which would mean that they would immediately begin to conform with any requirement of this limitation.

Mr. DANAHER. In the light of the Senator's answer I will restate the proposition in another way. It is the Senator's purpose that such commitments as have hitherto been entered into may be executed.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. And payments out of this appropriation may be made up to and including August 15, 1943.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the committee amendment on page 6, line 14, after the word "executing", I move to insert the word "general."

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to take that to conference.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Alabama proposes to insert the word "general", in line 14, page 6, after the word "executing"?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Why does the Senator desire to do that?

Mr. HILL. I am sure it must be the intention of the committee in offering the amendment that this limitation shall apply to what we may call the general programs, rather than to any one particular contract or any one particular purchase, or anything of that sort.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know about that, Mr. President. The word "program" and the word "policy" are very general words anyway, and it seems to me if we are not going to require that the individual contract be approved we lose the force of this amendment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator would not want to require every individual contract to be approved by the Board, would he, under some general policy or program laid down by the Board? For instance, the Board might have a representative in Spain who makes some kind of a contract. The Senator would not want the agent there to wait until the Board approved the contract.

Mr. LODGE. No; but that is not what the language contemplates. It seems to me the word "program" and the word "policy" are general terms. It is not a contract, it is not a specific agreement, and I frankly do not see the point of doing what the Senator requests be done.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the insertion of the word "general" could possibly do any harm. I think it would result in carrying out what is in the Senator's mind, and what is really the purpose of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me the amendment is very broad and general, in fact rather subtle as it now stands, and the insertion of the word changes the language of the committee amendment very materially.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator knows that many applications are made for export licenses and such matters. I take it the Senator does not believe the Board should pass on such questions, but rather on general programs and policies.

Mr. LODGE. No. I will say to the able and distinguished and capable Senator from Alabama, that he knows as well as I do that there is not anything in the amendment which requires the Secretary of State to countersign every contract and every specific order which is issued. It uses the words "programs and policies," and failing any more detailed explanation than I have been given, I should be opposed to inserting the word "general" in the committee amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the word "general" is inserted, obviously a consideration of particular programs and policies is excluded; and that is exactly what it is not desired to do.

Mr. HILL. I do not think so at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we might take the matter to conference. We shall have to go over it in conference, anyway.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not sure. Speaking for myself only, I can imagine a situation in which there would be a desire to make a test case of some particular question in order to make certain just what the policy was. As I understand the word "general," it would prevent subjecting any particular phase of the program to close scrutiny. The only way the program could be enforced as a practical matter would be by what is called a spot check; and it seems to me the bill should include provision for a spot check.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Board is supreme; and, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, the whole question will be considered in conference, anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment, on page 6, line 10. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. HILL. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Price Administration," on page 9, line 17, after "rationing of commodities)" and the semicolon, to insert "purchase of commodities or services and the testing thereof for the purpose of assuring compliance with the law, but such purchases shall not be induced through any illegal method constituting entrapment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,250,000" and insert "$8,925,659."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 18, before the words "of which", to strike out "$130,000,000", and insert "$177,335,000"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "sum not less than $59,551,042 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of $165,000,000" and insert "amount sums."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, after the word "office", to strike

out the colon and the following additional provisos:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used for payment of the salary or expense of any person who, directly or indirectly, pays any subsidy of any kind or character whatsoever, or who directs or authorizes the payment of a subsidy, or who participates in the preparation of or calculations for the payment of a subsidy, or who directs any other person to pay or prepare or calculate or supply information for the payment of a subsidy, or any person who, directly or indirectly, collaborates with, consults, cooperates with, or directly or indirectly aids any other Federal agency for the payment or the preparation of a subsidy; or of any person who engages or participates as aforesaid in the preparation, formulation, or carrying out of any plan or scheme involving the purchase of any commodity by the Government for the purpose of its resale at a price lower than that paid by the Government: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce, to which the price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment of the committee would strike out all the provisions relating to the activities of the Office of Price Administration with reference to subsidies. It seems to me that the amendment should be agreed to, because subsidies will be dealt with under the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. However, I wish to object to one portion of the amendment, which I think should be separated from the remainder of the amendment. I ask that the portion of the amendment beginning in line 3 on page 15, and extending through line 7 on that page, be separated from the other portions of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. I ask for a separation of that part from the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean he desires to have the proviso restored to the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I object to the part of the committee amendment striking out that proviso.

Mr. McNARY. The proviso to which the Senator refers is the one on page 15, beginning in line 3; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; beginning in line 3.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator refers only to the proviso; does he?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The bill as passed by the House contained a proviso reading as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.

It seems to me that is a perfectly proper limitation, and one which should remain in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am quite sure the Senator will find that Mr. Brown, in his statement, said:

There has been a great deal of confusion about Office of Price Administration use of standards and grade labeling for price-control purposes.

In no true sense of the term does Office of Price Administration require standardization of any product. This is primarily the function of the war-production agencies. Where Office of Price Administration uses minimum standards, it uses them to describe and classify the commodities for which maximum prices are established. The Office of Price Administration order then provides that a particular article must meet the minimum specifications if it is to command the particular ceiling price. Office of Price Administration regulations do not prohibit a manufacturer from producing an article which does not meet these minimum specifications. But the manufacturer would be required to sell that article at a lower price. Neither do Office of Price Administration regulations prevent a manufacturer from making an article of better quality than the standards describe. Standards are thus used by Office of Price Administration with two purposes, both of which are essential for effective price control. One purpose is the adequate description of the article for which a ceiling price is established. This is necessary to avoid confusion among buyers and sellers as well as to create a sound basis for compliance and for enforcement. Many commodities are customarily bought and sold on minimum standards or specifications. The other purpose is to protect consumers against deterioration of quality or serviceability, without corresponding price reduction, which is plainly a disguised form of price inflation.

Under those circumstances, we felt that the provision should not be in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand the matter, Mr. Brown claims his orders do not require any standardization relative to grade labeling. If he does not, there can be no objection to the elimination of the proviso. However, the fact is that the Office of Price Administration has done exactly that.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection I think it should be noted that Mr. Brown said:

It should be pointed out also that, of the 290 standards provisions contained in the 265 price regulations, 159 are accepted trade categories. Other Government agencies established 90. Only 41 were developed by the Office of Price Administration.

He went on to explain that they are not in any way abusing their rights in the matter. I do not think the prohibition should be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we agree to the rest of the amendment, and separate the portion I have indicated?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to have that done.

Mr. TAFT. May that be done, so that we may first consider the first part, and have it approved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 13, with the exception of the proviso beginning in line 3, on page 15, and extending down through line 7 on the same page.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the proviso beginning in line 3 on page 15 and continuing through line 7 on the same page.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in my judgment, when we passed the price control law we did not give anyone authority to standardize or provide for labeling or elimination of trade names. There is a strong faction in the Office of Price Administration and in some other governmental agencies which believes that that should be done. I do not question whether it should be done. I only say it was not intended. I do not know whether any Senator has read the rayon hosiery order which was issued in an attempt to standardize women's stockings. It covers some 20 pages. It has upset the entire trade, and has resulted in great objection from the trade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, being an old bachelor, I have not had much to do with ladies' stockings, so I cannot answer in one way or the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. In any event, Mr. President, I cannot see any objection to retaining in the bill the words:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if anyone desired to standardize or socialize American business, the elimination of the prohibition certainly would afford one of the major methods of approach; would it not?

Mr. TAFT. It certainly would; it is a part of the general program. I do not think it is necessary to argue the matter, but it seems to me that the prohibition is something to which no one should take exception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike out the proviso beginning in line 3, on page 15, and continuing through line 7 on the same page.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as I understand, if we wish to vote against the use of this money for grade-labeling, we should vote "no"; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. No; that is not correct. I think that is an erroneous statement. If we wish to restore the prohibition against grade labeling, we should vote "aye".

Mr. TAFT. We should vote "no." The question arises on the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Senators should vote "no" if they are opposed to the committee amendment; and if they are in

favor of the committee amendment striking out the proviso they should vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as I understand, the committee amendment is to strike out the proviso. Therefore if we wish to retain the proviso and prohibit the use of the money for grade labeling, we should vote "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may we have the proviso read so that we may understand it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 3, after the word "herewith" and the colon, it is proposed to strike out *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, after the word "certified", to strike out the colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be available, except under regulations approved by the President, for the salary of any person who, at the time of his employment hereunder, is in the active service of the armed forces of the United States."

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the copy of the bill which I have on my desk does not correspond with the amendments which are being stated. May we have copies of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have a copy of House bill 2968?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have, but it does not correspond with the amendments which are being stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the previous amendment was to strike out all the language on page 13, beginning in line 23 with the proviso, down to and including line 11, on page 15. The amendment was divided, and all the language was stricken out except for the amendment which has just been rejected.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the first place, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. DANAHER. In the second place, may we have an explanation of the amendment beginning on page 17, line 22, and extending to page 18, line 2?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to answer any questions I can answer. The language proposed to be stricken is:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall not be available except under regulations approved by the President, for the salary of any person who, at the time of his employment hereunder, is in the active service of the armed forces of the United States.

The reason for that amendment is that this is under the Office of Strategic Services, and the question of a man being in the Army, or in uniform, is a matter of very great importance. This language would exclude him. We thought we had cured the trouble when we added the words, "except under regulations approved by the President," but the full committee, after discussing the question, came to the conclusion that we had better strike out the whole proviso, and that is why it was stricken out.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think I was the one who offered the motion to strike out all the language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. My reason for doing so is that the Office of Strategic Services is, among other things, an overall intelligence organization for all the services, and it operates directly under the joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. McKELLAR. It operates all over the world.

Mr. LODGE. It operates all over the world, and it engages in numerous activities which are of a confidential nature. This is a controversial question. I believe this is the forerunner of the kind of unified military policy which we are going to have at sometime. It will be necessary to have it, because our conduct of military affairs involves joint operations to an ever greater extent. This is an organization to meet the requirements of joint military operations, and it is distinctly of a military character. I could not see any reason for having a proviso limiting the Office of Strategic Services in its right to utilize military personnel, because the job they have to do is of a military character, and I could not understand why such language was put in in the first place.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or two?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let us assume a case. Assume that the Office of Strategic Services should desire to employ for special strategic service a man who in fact holds a commission, and is receiving remuneration for his service in the Army. Would he be barred from receiving additional compensation in the functions of the Office of Strategic Services, if this proviso should remain in the bill?

Mr. LODGE. He might be barred from receiving additional compensation. I do not incline to the view that he should receive additional compensation. I think that if a man is a major in the Army, and is assigned to the Office of Strategic Services, it is another type of military duty. There is no reason why he should receive additional compensation. If this proviso is simply directed at the question of whether they shall be paid out of the War Department appropriation or paid out of this appropriation, that is simply a technical matter which can be straightened out in conference; but I was very much opposed to imposing a limitation on the Office of Strategic Services which would in any way prevent it from utilizing military and naval personnel.

Mr. DANAHER. If we do not adopt this proviso, a man could receive a salary as a commissioned officer, and in addition receive compensation for his services to the Office of Strategic Services. Is not that so?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is conceivable.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not believe it is conceivable. I do not believe that an officer or enlisted man of the armed forces can receive extra compensation from any source.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from South Dakota is correct. I think there is a definite statute on the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is true; but I think the less we talk about it on the floor of the Senate, the better. The committee unanimously agreed on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to insert:

Civilian defense: Not to exceed $13,359,600 of the unexpended balance of $100,000,000 contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for the same objects and purposes, including the obligations chargeable to said appropriation, and subject to the same conditions and limitations: *Provided,* That the total amount available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed $400,000.

The appropriations herein made for the Office of Civilian Defense shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any Federal source.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that the committee amendment has been modified in line 12, after the word "any", by the insertion of the word "Federal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed.

The question is on agreeing to the modified committee amendment at the top of page 20.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs," on page 22, line 18, after the word "corporations" to strike out "$30,685,000" and insert "$30,785,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National War Labor Board," on page 24, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,369,613."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 23, after the name "United States",

to strike out "$13,841,300" and insert "$14,341,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of War Information", on page 26, line 20, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 21, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 21, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$145,000" and insert "$175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$28,972,504" and insert "$35,037,593."

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Bilbo	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to inquire what amendment is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 29, in line 2.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is a total. The disposition of that amendment will depend on the disposition of the amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the committee amendment which begins in line 6 and continues through the figure $50,000 in line 12. So if it is now in order, I will present my amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the amendment to the total will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is an amendment to an amendment, and I submit that the parliamentary situation is such that an amendment to an amendment is in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee misunderstands. I was referring to the amendment in line 2. That is a total.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The disposition of that amendment will depend on what is done with the amendment I have offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair has just announced that the amendment in line 2 would be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I misunderstood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment to strike out the words in italics reported by the committee and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch."

That raises the whole question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to propound a question to the Senator. Does that mean that the various items enumerated in lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are to be stricken out, and that a lump sum of $5,500,000 is to be appropriated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the form in which I have offered the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. There is very little order in the Chamber. I appeal to the Chair to maintain order. Otherwise we cannot be aware of what we are doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order and remain in order.

The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I now wish to make an inquiry. I am interested in the part of the amendment which refers to the Domestic Operations Branch. So far as I am personally concerned, I have reasons to wish that appropriation to be increased.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to have the Senator make that statement.

Mr. McNARY. If the total is increased in line 2, will that bring about an increased appropriation to the branch equal to that which was provided by the Budget, or by the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the able Senator from Oregon, let me say that the figures in line 2 constitute a total of all the appropriations for the O. W. I.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am merely stating the whole question. The language following that is a proviso constituting a limitation. I have offered an amendment which I understand harmonizes with the Senator's desire to increase the amount of money available to the Domestic Operations Branch. If that amendment should prevail, the figures in line 2 would have to be changed. We must approach the problem by dealing with the figures in line 7 and subsequent lines.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I say to the Senator that the amendment in line 2, on page 29, has been temporarily passed over until we determine whether the increase proposed by the Senator from Wyoming shall be made.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that perfectly. If there is an increase in the total amount in line 4, will that reflect an increase in those items appearing in lines 8 to 12, inclusive?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it will not. The items to which the Senator refers, appearing in lines 8 to 12, inclusive, are reflected in the figure which appears in line 7, namely, $3,561,499. I have moved to increase that figure to $5,500,000. That will result in restoring to the domestic branch certain items which have been eliminated.

Mr. McNARY. However, my understanding is that the Senator's amendment at this time is to increase the item of $22,500,000, which has been deleted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, that is not my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the amendment affecting the Overseas Operations Branch.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read? There has been so much confusion in the Chamber that I have been unable to follow the language of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the clerk reads allow me to say that if the Senator from Oregon will give me his attention I think I can clear up the difficulty. It was my own error. I assumed that my amendment followed immediately. I find that the committee amendment in line 4 precedes it. I am not offering any amendment to change that figure, so that the amendment may well be stated before I offer my amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator had every reason to misunderstand me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 29, in line 4——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is calling attention to the amendment in line 4 which is before the Senate at the present time. Without objection, the amendment in line 4——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not wish the Senate to act on the amendment in line 4. I am seeking recognition.

I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill to turn to page 30, lines 11 to 13, inclusive. The bill is

pretty much hashed up. What I have in my hand is called a subcommittee print. Some of the language has been eliminated in pencil and in other parts of the paragraph additional words appear in the margin in pencil. I assume it is intended to state a committee amendment, and I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill tell me whether or not I am correct in my understanding that the following is the committee amendment:

No part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended by the Office of War Information for the preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a committee amendment, but it is not now before the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand it is not before the Senate at the moment, but what we do with reference to this particular amendment may have a very definite bearing on what we do with reference to the amendments both in line 4 and in lines 7 to 10, inclusive, on page 29. I want to know, Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will tell us whether or not the purpose of the amendment in lines 11 to 13, inclusive, is to forbid the distribution of literature prepared by O. W. I. within the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment reads:

No part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended for the Office of War Information for the preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States.

It only refers to the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. Now, Mr. President, does it apply to any literature prepared by O. W. I.?

Mr. McKELLAR. It applies to all literature prepared by O. W. I.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, what would be the function of Domestic Operations Branch of the O. W. I. with reference to literature to be distributed in the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean printed literature?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, printed literature.

Mr. McKELLAR. They would have none.

Mr. DANAHER. There would not be any; is that it?

Mr. McKELLAR. There would not be any under this amendment. Mr. Davis himself agreed to the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. It is not a case of what Mr. Davis agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. He not only agreed to it, but the whole committee agreed to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the operations under the Domestic Operations Branch be limited, in the Senator's understanding, to the dissemination of news through the news bureau and to coordinating programs through the Office of Program Coordination, and that sort of thing?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the committee amendment stands.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. If the committee amendment does not stand, if we were to adopt the language as I understand it to be proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, the limitations contained in the committee language would be removed, would they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Connecticut is right.

Mr. DANAHER. I think so, too; and I want to find out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not the intention.

Mr. DANAHER. That is the way it reads as it has been presented to us.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is partly right, if I may explain for a moment.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have it explained.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will note, if he will consult the break-down of the Budget Bureau, that $8,865,000 was estimated for the domestic side of this equation as differentiated from the foreign or overseas side, and the work fell into some 10 or 11 specific categories. In the event the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming is adopted without categories, that amount would be available for all 11 of them, including the office of Division of Publications. However, if the committee amendment remains in the bill the five and a half million dollars could not be used for the printing of pamphlets and for the things which have generally been the subject of criticism. As the chairman of the committee has stated, Mr. Davis has given us his word, that he is through with the pamphlet idea as a part of the O. W. I. operations. That will be in the law, and he asked for it. Have I made it clear to the Senator?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has certainly made a splendid statement. The Senator does help my understanding of the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those are the facts.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no doubt that those are the facts, and I thank the Senator from Tennessee as well as the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Connecticut now understand that the adoption of the amendment which I shall offer in a few moments when we reach the proper place will not defeat the purpose of the Senate committee amendment if it should be adopted?

Mr. DANAHER. I believe I understand that that would be a necessary result. I would reverse it, though, and say that if the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming should be adopted with reference to lines 7 to 13, inclusive, on page 29 the amendment so adopted would be subject to the limitation contained in the committee amendment on page 30. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is the Senate about to vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, the amendment on line 4, page 29, should be disposed of first.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will wait until that is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$22,500,000" and insert "$25,003,590."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, after the words "Operations Branch", to strike out "and no funds shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch", and insert "and not more than $5,061,499 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch, as follows: Office of the Director, $125,000; Office of Program Coordination, $225,000; News Bureau, $900,000; Bureau of Special Services, $950,000; Radio Bureau, $811,499; Motion Picture Bureau, $50,000; and for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of branches herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in branches herewith reduced or eliminated, $500,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I inadvertently presented out of order a few moments ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 7, in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee it is proposed to insert "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day, when there was a smaller attendance than there now is, I endeavored to explain the reasons why I offer this amendment. I shall repeat the reasons now very briefly.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended to the Congress for the Domestic Operations Branch an appropriation in excess of $8,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations of the House, after listening to the evidence presented by the agency and by other persons who were called before it, recommended to the House the appropriation of $5,500,000. That was the judgment of the

House Appropriations Committee. Upon the floor of the House it was upset and the whole item was stricken out. So, as the bill came to the Senate, there was no appropriation for the Domestic Operations Branch.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, however, felt that that was an erroneous action. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] took a very active part in explaining to the committee why, in his opinion, it was an erroneous action and an undesirable action for the Senate to cut off certain of these bureaus. So, as a result of the discussion there, the sum of $3,561,499 was inserted by the committee. My feeling was that that was not sufficient to provide for this necessary service of O. W. I. So I am offering an amendment which adopts the judgment and verdict of the House Committee on Appropriations.

If the committee amendment shall be adopted, then three very important functions of O. W. I. will be absolutely cut off. They are, first, the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, which is the bureau which publishes the war posters desired by every war agency. Appropriations for the purpose for other war agencies were eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget because the Bureau of the Budget, in the interest of economy, desired to concentrate all the poster function in O. W. I. If we do not restore that appropriation, there will be no posters.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is not my understanding that there will be no more posters. Certain advertising agencies and connections are prepared to get out these posters. As a matter of fact, our subcommittee recommended a sum $200,000 less than the one now being considered for this item. The subcommittee reported for this item, in line 7, the sum of $3,061,499, which leaves a considerable sum, in my opinion, for all these agencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator misunderstood what I said. I stated that if the committee amendment stands, the various war agencies will not have any funds by which they can issue the posters they desire, and the O. W. I. will have no opportunity to continue this activity. It is true that certain advertising agencies are cooperating, but there is no possible way of determining whether or not their cooperation may not cease tomorrow. So I say that from my point of view it would be a grave error to cut off that bureau entirely.

The same thing is true of the Motion Pictures Bureau. I have already described to the Senate numerous motion pictures prepared at the request of the Coast Guard for stirring up recruiting, at the request of the Treasury Department, and others, all carrying out the war effort.

Finally, the third bureau which in my judgment should not be abolished is the Field Operations Bureau, because that is the only Bureau by which the necessary war information can be brought home to the States and to the localities in the manner in which they desire it.

I pointed out, for example, how O. P. A. operates. It operates in the West, it operates in New England, it operates on the Pacific coast, and it is quite impossible to expect the information service which is necessary in the local terrain to clear through Washington. Washington is not sufficiently in contact with them.

I say, Mr. President, that unless the Field Operations Bureau is maintained, we shall be cutting off the effective way of distributing, in the most economical manner, the information which the States and the localities, in cooperation with the Government, and the Government bureaus, should have. It is for that purpose that I am offering the amendment, which had the support of the House Committee on Appropriations, in order that O. W. I. may function through the Domestic Operations Branch.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. Is the amendment to strike out all in italic, from line 7 to line 12, eliminating all reference to the different branches, and to substitute $5,500,000, increasing the amount $2,000,000, to be allocated indiscriminately?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Maryland will wait just a moment, the clerk will again state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. May it be stated in toto?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee, beginning on page 29, line 7, it is proposed to insert the following: "and not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch."

Mr. LODGE. The amendment is ambiguous; it does not state how much of the existing language is stricken out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, in the understanding of the Chair, is in lieu of all the matter in italics, and the typewritten memorandum, or addition, appended to some copies of the bill extant in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is exactly correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator let me explain the matter? I think I can do so. I think he is on solid ground.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate that. I merely wanted to say that there is nothing ambiguous about my amendment. I stated I think no less than five times that the purpose is to strike out all in italics, and substitute the language which was read by the clerk, so that there would be a total appropriation of $5,500,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield further.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there should be no difficulty in understanding exactly what is involved as between the committee amendment on the one hand and the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming on the other. Briefly, the Budget Bureau, before the bill was taken up in the House committee, authorized an estimate of $8,865,906 for the domestic program. When the estimate reached the House committee, the House committee cut it down to five and one-half million dollars. When the bill was considered by the House, the House struck out the entire appropriation, so that when the bill came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations for consideration, there was not a single dollar provided for the Domestic Operations Branch of O. W. I.

What the committee did was to restore some $3,600,000 for the domestic operations of O. W. I. It did not restore that figure in a haphazard manner; it took up each 1 of the 11 break-downs which divided the work and the functions of the Domestic Operations Branch of O. W. I., and considered each on its merits, to ascertain whether or not, in view of the testimony adduced on the part of Director of O. W. I. and other witnesses, a case was made out for the continuance of the particular function originally estimated for by the Budget.

Not only did we do that, but at first in the committee it was proposed to make a blanket cut, by some motions, or a blanket increase, by other motions, but after discussion on blanket motions of one kind or another, it was thought that that would not be the fair way to appraise the work of these 11 agencies. So the committee, on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], as I recall, agreed to consider each branch separately, and we had a committee vote on each 1 of the 11 branches of the Domestic Bureau of O. W. I.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The result of the vote was 12 to 11, as I recall, in favor of the amendment which is now in the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is in error as to that. If I may point out, the votes varied. There were some votes larger than others. As a matter of fact, there was one, I believe, which was 8 to 13 or 14. Some members of the committee evaluated one function of the domestic activity as more worthy than another. So there was no uniformity in the votes, which again proves and accentuates the point that members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, were assaying the value of these

operations in as detached and fair a way as was humanly possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I remember the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] made the motion that this plan be adopted, and his motion was agreed to by a vote, as I recall the figures, of 12 to 11. I have sent for the figures in order that I may be accurate in my statement.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I may say that that was in the full committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the Senator from Maryland is now talking about what happened in the subcommittee. I made the motion in the full committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Louisiana made a blanket motion in the full committee, after the subcommittee had reported, but the motions to which I am now addressing myself were separate motions predicated on the merits of the particular function in question, and I may say that some members voted for one function and voted against other functions. So there was no uniformity; there was no desire to take a broadax and walk into the O. W. I. and cut down agencies on the domestic front, but, in my humble judgment, only those agencies were finally retained which were justified by the evidence adduced before the committee, which was rather extensive.

Mr. President, in all candor I do not believe that the real ingredients which entered into the committee's decision on this matter have been fully appraised or presented. For example, if Senators will look into the Budget break-down on the Domestic Operations Branch they will find the sum of $1,222,904 for motion pictures. Keep that figure in mind—the figure $1,222,000—for if the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] prevails there will not be $1,222,000 for motion pictures, because that would envisage an over-all appropriation of in excess of $8,000,000. The Senator's own motion cuts down that amount. Do I make that plain?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that that is not necessarily true. Under the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming all the money could be devoted to motion pictures.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct, but I am supposing that if all these agencies have value, and are all to be retained, if the full amounts of the estimates were not appropriated, that there would be a corresponding leveling off in the respective agencies comprising the 11.

What did the committee do? Did it say, "Motion pictures are banned?" Did it say that there ought not to be any motion pictures for the education or information of the people? Not at all. The committee knew, because it had evidence before it, that the Navy was making motion pictures for the information of the country, for the training of men in the Navy, and for civilian matters related to the Navy. It knew that the Army was making motion pictures for similar purposes, many of which we have seen. It also knew that for propaganda purposes to engender patriotism the big motion picture companies of the country had produced what had been supposed to be masterpieces. I will name just one—"Air Force." Many Senators have seen it. If we are to try to develop patriotism, and the will and confidence to win, what better picture could anyone produce than "Air Force"? There were other motion pictures produced by the private companies already in existence. Therefore we did not assume that O. W. I. could make a better picture for patriotic purposes than the private industries themselves were making.

Mr. Davis, in testifying before the committee, said that one of the most important parts of our motion-picture program is to keep liaison between the C. W. I. in Washington and the motion-picture industry in California, to give directives, to give the industry a line of thought. Something may need to be stressed or developed. For example, it might be "Don't tell the enemy what you know." The industry will weave that into any number of their pictures, particularly those which deal with the war. Therefore we took a very liberal view by giving to the O. W. I. $50,000 so that they could keep a liaison or a coordination between themselves and the exhibitors in respect to the things they wanted to develop in motion pictures. There was nothing parsimonious about that. It was not proposed to cut down that appropriation because of a desire to deal a sweeping blow at O. W. I., but we knew the Army was making motion pictures, we knew the Navy was doing the same thing, and that there was not any point in having one more organization engaged in making motion pictures. But there was a point in giving O. W. I. sufficient money to correlate and more or less direct the kind of pictures that would best serve the purpose for which O. W. I. was created.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Motion Picture Bureau, it was estimated by the Budget, was to receive $1,222,904, and the committee offered it $50,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I said so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator has said so. The Senator says that is no effort to be parsimonious. If that is not an effort to be parsimonious, I do not know what would be. The $50,000 would be of absolutely no service. It would mean that there would be no picture shown so far as this organization is concerned. Estimates for appropriations propose to be made for other activities of Government have been denied them by the Bureau of the Budget on the assumption that provision was to be made for O. W. I.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The view of the subcommittee and the whole committee was that it was not necessary for O. W. I. to continue the production of pictures, because pictures are being made by the Army, by the Navy, and by other agencies of the Government for educational and patriotic purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Quite true.

Mr. OVERTON. The $50,000 was provided for in order that the O. W. I. may maintain a liaison with the expert producers of motion pictures in the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then as I understand, instead of having motion pictures to demonstrate what is going on in the Army, we are to have liaison.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the Army makes its own movies, and the Navy makes its own movies. The Office of Education, which the Senator from Maryland did not mention, and which is receiving a large appropriation, is making motion pictures.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LODGE. I hope a motion will not be made to strike out the $50,000. It will be of the greatest value to maintain this service in Washington to tell the motion-picture producers in Hollywood the line which should be taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How many pictures have been made by O. W. I. up to this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot answer that question; I do not know the number; but not a great many. One or two or three are now in process of being made, which no one as yet has seen.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any evidence before the committee disclosing the value from the standpoint of propaganda of any of the pictures which have been made?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The committee took the view, I will say to the Senator, not that an O. W. I. picture had no value, but that it was a duplication of what was already being done.

Mr. President, I should like to bring out that there was a certain philosophy expressed by the committee members who supported the provision for $3,600,000. After mentioning one or two more instances, I shall try to develop how that philosophy expressed itself with respect to the particular categories which were retained in the bill. Before I do that I ask Senators to note that the field operations are eliminated from this bill. The Budget estimated that $1,911,000 would be necessary to carry on the field operations. Even if the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming should be adopted that full amount would not be available for that purpose, unless it were taken from other places. But the reason the committee provided nothing in the bill for field operations is quite simple, and I believe convincing. For example, every Senator knows that the Office of Price Administration maintains a publicity man in his State. I defy anyone to refute that statement. Every Senator knows that the War Manpower Commission maintains a

publicity bureau in each office it has all over the country. And so it is with other Government agencies.

The plausible and feasible play on words which has for its purpose "putting over" the appropriation is based on the fact that it is claimed we need the O. W. I. agency to coordinate and deal with the respective publicity agencies of the other agencies or bureaus and departments, apart from the O. W. I. Mr. President, we do not need it. Even now, while we have it, that argument falls to the ground because, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that procedure is not being followed. The Office of Price Administration deals with its price boards in the various counties and cities and sections; it does not go to the O. W. I. for anything. The War Manpower Commission in each State does likewise. Perhaps there may be some little cooperation there.

So the contention about the field agencies being necessary to keep Hitler from swimming the Atlantic Ocean simply is not well-founded, and no evidence was submitted to our committee to prove that it was.

As a matter of fact, the O. W. I. in Washington daily releases news items having to do with the war in one theater or another or in one phase or another. Such news is carried by the great press associations in practically all the metropolitan press, large and small. By the time the release is sent by mail to the O. W. I. Office in Washington or Colorado or Illinois, the news is from 48 to 72 to 96 hours old, and all they can do there is reproduce it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not the testimony which was given to me by Mr. Davis and by his assistants. It is precisely to avoid that situation that the field services are desired.

Let me read to the Senate what Mr. Davis stated in a letter written to me, which I received this morning:

> 2. Field services: We have 12 regional and 48 branch offices—the difference being mainly in the size of the city served, and the regional offices having only very slight supervisory powers over the branches. Their functions are as follows:
>
> (a) Production of press releases, radio scripts and announcements, and background information material on behalf of the various war agencies. (Our Radio Bureau, whose budget was allowed as requested, would be gravely hampered in its work if the field services were abolished; as radio scripts, no less than news releases, must often be rewritten to serve local interests and particular local needs.)
>
> (b) Clearance for policy and time priority of all local Government radio programs in the field.
>
> (c) Clearance between agencies, for overall information policy, of the news material produced by various agencies on the same story.
>
> (d) Handling special assignments for the Overseas Branch of Office of War Information.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, because to prove what I have just been attempting to argue I do not think I could obtain a more conclusive bit of evidence than certainly is supplied by the first paragraph, if not by the others of the communication the Senator has just read.

For example, let us consider the statement relative to what the field services do—that is, the regional and the State offices. List, Mr. President:

> Production of press releases.

Was not that what I said? The press releases are released in Washington, for the whole country, and afterwards are released in the regional and State offices, and are sent to the newspapers, where they are piled up on the editors' desks. The editor makes a mental resolution that he will try to look through them. Finally, he finds he is late getting his paper out, and that he has to write an editorial or an article covering a late piece of news; and into the wastebasket go the releases.

The Byrd committee has brought out the facts about that situation on many occasions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such evidence was not brought out before our committee, at all. There was not a scintilla of evidence before our committee to show that the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Here is Mr. Davis' statement:

> Production of press releases——

Mr. McKELLAR. That statement was not brought out before our committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. It should not be used in support of Mr. Davis' statement, if it is not exactly what it says.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I certainly offered it for exactly what it says.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely differ with the Senator as to the conclusions he is reading into the item.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the letter goes on to say that they are to issue releases dealing with information material on behalf of the various war agencies.

Good heavens above, Mr. President. If we want to know something about the price of an article, do we go to the O. W. I. in Baltimore, or in Memphis, Tenn., or in Cleveland, Ohio? Of course we do not. We go to the O. P. A. office. There is where we obtain the information. What good is there in having another bureau dealing with the same thing, at a cost of $2,000,000 a year? It does not make sense. It does not deal with the Office of War Information in relation to propaganda, counterpropaganda, or any psychological or spiritual effort directed to the husbanding of the energies of the people in the war effort.

If we want to know whether labor is available in Baltimore, New York, or Newark, N. J., do we go to the O. W. I.? No; we go to the War Manpower Commission or to the business employment services.

All the talk about coordinating the other agencies of Government is plain humbug. There is nothing to it except plausibility—the kind of argument a criminal lawyer makes in arguing to a jury, in attempting, by a flow of words, usually using some Biblical quotation, to bamboozle the jury into believing the culprit is not guilty and to prevent them from sending him to the hoosegow. [Laughter.]

There is very little evidence to show any use for this work.

I read further from the letter:

> (b) Clearance for policy and time priority of all local Government radio programs in the field.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I prefer not to yield. I have been rather generous in yielding. Frankly, I have a little cold, and I find it somewhat difficult to speak, as the Senator can appreciate. I do not want to be discourteous. If I have not made myself plain, and if any Senator desires to ask me a question about something I have said, I shall be glad to answer it.

This is the tip-off. Follow it closely. How much is $2,000,000? It is an average of $40,000 for each State. Whether it be a small State or a large State, just imagine the average State—$40,000 a year for each State is being spent in O. W. I. Think of the tremendous responsibility. Hitler will be at our back door right away, the people will quit working in the factories, and all our rationing and bond-buying programs will simply go out the window, without $40,000 to carry on these activities in each State.

> (b) Clearance for policy and time priority of all local Government radio programs in the field.

I can see those boys perspiring now, as they struggle against all the Axis propaganda to spend $40,000 in the cause of patriotism.

> (c) Clearance between agencies, for overall information policy, of the news material produced by various agencies on the same story.

Rot! [Tearing letter in two.] Those are just words.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to hand me back my letter? [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I beg the Senator's pardon. To show the Senator what a generous nature I have, he gave me only one piece of paper, and I return two to him. [Laughter.] I am sorry I tore the Senator's paper.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not blame the Senator, because he was making a very dramatic appeal, in the manner of which he is so capable.

Mr. TYDINGS. All of these techniques have been developed in recent years by agencies of the Government. The technique of "coordination" has been developed. The word "coordination" has cost the Government millions of dollars in waste. There is nothing to it. I venture to say that in Baltimore, or in any city in Oregon, or in any other State, there is very little effort to coordinate.

I dare say that very few conferences are called, and that there is very little clearance of the various press releases, policies, and so forth through O. W. I. Each agency handles its own press releases. When I pick up my own newspaper, the Baltimore Sun or the Baltimore News, what do I read? "O. P. A. announces today——"; "O. P. A. said——"; "O. P. A. detecting those who are pleasure drivers." "O. P. A. says this is the ruling." It does not come through O. W. I. The radio program comes from O. P. A.

So, Mr. President, I do not think we need concern ourselves and wear out all our handkerchiefs drying our tears over the elimination of the $2,000,000 for the field service.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I had understood that the amount allowed for the field service was $1,300,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I took the Budget estimate and explained that the items would all have to be reduced if the allowance were $5,500,000 instead of eight-million-odd dollars. It is true that the amount allowed for the field service would be less than $2,000,000. I am only explaining how the O. W. I. got by the Bureau of the Budget with a figure of $2,000,000.

An agency goes to the Budget Bureau and obtains an allowance of $1,800,000 for some particular function. Then when it gets into a little hot water before Congress, it is willing to take 60 cents on the dollar and call it square. If it ought to have had $1,800,000 when it first went before the Budget Bureau, if its position was sound and secure, and sane, it ought to have it now. It is the same old story, "If you cannot get it all, get something and carry on the function."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting a conference report on the bill continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June', and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than one year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.' Only one appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made during the calendar year 1943 which shall be on the basis established by this amendment.

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term '$2,650,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the term '$3,400,000,000'.

"SEC. 3. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a) and by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term 'June 30, 1943' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945'; and is further hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'without regard to provisions of any other existing law relating to public funds: *Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year and shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed ninety days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107) as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1945, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

"SEC. 4. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"SEC. 5. Subsection 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase'.

"SEC. 6. (a) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942.

"(b) No subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any commodity referred to in subsection (a) either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices so established, maintained or announced as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, maintained or announced, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the maximum or support prices

on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

"(d) The definition of the term 'person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term 'person' as used in this section.

"SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941, (55 Stat. 498), as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322, as amended, and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, and for carrying out the purposes of the Act of March 11, 1941. Such authority to buy commodities used for food purposes shall include the power to buy them for the purpose of selling at a loss, but any such purchase for sale at a loss (1) shall be made only from the farmer at a price not less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, and not less than the support price therefor as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, or (2) shall be made in the open market at a price which will reflect such price (referred to in clause (1)) to the farmer; and no such purchase for sale at a loss shall be made for the purpose of reducing or rolling back any maximum price established under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further*, That the War Food Administrator shall not approve purchases for the purpose of selling at a loss, except those required to carry out any program (other than a roll-back program) announced prior to July 1, 1943; and such approvals shall not involve losses in a total amount in excess of $150,000,000. The Government agency or corporation making such purchases shall dispose of the commodities purchased as soon as feasible through the regular recognized channels and functions of trade and distribution used in free and independent enterprise; but no such commodity shall be sold or disposed of by any governmental agency or corporation (1) at a price below the price limitations imposed by sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, or (2) contrary to the provisions of the last sentence of this subsection or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act. No governmental agency or corporation shall buy any such commodity for the purpose of selling it at a loss except pursuant to the authority contained in this section.'

"SEC. 8. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH A. BUTLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will ask the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to explain the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the committee on conference on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill had two bills before it, which were entirely different. One was a substitute for the other, but they were very similar in some respects.

The committee could not see how it could throw out a provision which was adopted by both Houses of Congress. Therefore we have adopted and agreed on the wording of the so-called Aiken amendment, which was also adopted by the House of Representatives.

With regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation itself, the principal difference was in the amount of additional borrowing power given to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate provided $1,000,000,000 additional. The House provided $500,000,000 additional, and the conferees agreed on $750,000,000.

The House agreed to the Senate amendment providing for an audit of the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Comptroller General of the United States. I think in that audit provision we have set a very excellent example for Government corporations. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not to be subject to the preaudit provisions affecting ordinary Government departments, but it is to be subject to an audit similar to that made of commercial corporations, by public auditors. That audit report is to be submitted to the Secretary for comment or question, and then finally submitted to Congress. The House agreed to accept that provision, which was not in the House bill.

When we come to the Aiken amendment the words are rearranged, but they are practically those adopted by the Senate. In my opinion that amendment prohibits all subsidies, as applied to agricultural commodities or any product manufactured from agricultural commodities. The language of subdivisions (1), (2), and (3) seemed to me to be so broad that it would prohibit all roll-back subsidies and all kinds of subsidies except as they are expressly excepted from the provision. The express exceptions apply to vegetables, oils, and other commodities. The language is:

> The foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943.

That validates one or two of the subsidies of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but not others, such as the cheese subsidy.

With respect to the so-called O'Mahoney amendment, the conference committee agreed on a modification of that amendment, I think retaining the principle, spirit, and purpose of that amendment. Section 7 as it now appears in the bill provides:

> That the authority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 598), as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator—

And so forth. The act of July 1, 1941, referred to, is the so-called price-support section. This section has nothing to do with direct subsidies. It is now confined to the purchase of commodities for sale at a loss, which is another method, and often an easier method, of paying a subsidy indirectly rather than directly.

This section is confined to that purpose, and provides that no Government corporation shall buy food commodities except in accordance with the provisions of this section. If any agency contemplates the purchase of goods for sale at a loss, it must obtain the approval of the War Food Administrator, as provided in the O'Mahoney amendment, and he may approve it only if he determines that it is necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, civilian population, and so forth. In other words, the only purpose for which this indirect subsidy can be used is for the purpose of increasing agricultural production.

It is further provided that such purchases may be made only directly from the farmer, at a price which is in accordance with the Price Control Act, or in the open market at a price which will reflect to the farmer the price to which he is entitled under the Price Control Act.

So this particular kind of a subsidy cannot be paid to any processor but must be paid directly to the producer or to the open market in which the producer can sell his goods.

The House, however, was unwilling to agree to such a provision regarding the purchase for sale at a loss without certain limitations, and it provided, therefore, that this appropriation could not be used for carrying out any programs except those which were announced prior to July 1, 1943, and even then not for any roll-back program. So this method cannot be used indirectly

to validate the roll-back subsidies. It can be used to validate any other existing program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it is provided that the total loss involved in connection with any such indirect subsidy methods shall not exceed $150,000,000, without further approval of Congress.

Protection is given in the provision that an agency buying such goods, though it may sell at a loss, may not sell below the parity price fixed in the Price Control Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What indirect subsidy or commitment has been made for which this money can be paid?

Mr. TAFT. The Commodity Credit Corporation has made the following commitments:

Oil fats, including peanuts, soybeans, and flax, which may cost $60,000,000 during the year. That is an exception from the Aiken amendment, and I believe may be paid as a direct subsidy outside the $150,000,000.

Second, canning crops, $25,000,000. That also is a direct exemption from the Aiken amendment, and I think may be paid outside the $150,000,000.

The programs which involve purchase and sale of commodities, which fall within this section, and are validated by this section, relate to sugar beets, which involves an expense of about $25,000,000 a year; dry edible beans, involving an expense of $10,000,000 a year; a milk program involving an expense of $10,000,000 a year; a cheese program involving an expense of $25,000,000; and foreign commodities such as coffee and cocoa, involving an expense of $9,000,000 a year.

Those programs have been announced.

I believe there is one more program in preparation which has been worked over for a long time and which possibly may be announced today, but I do not think it is a very material program.

So I do not think the Commodity Credit Corporation requires more than about $80,000,000 to carry on the programs which are covered within the $150,000,000. However, the committee felt that the Commodity Credit Corporation might carry on the programs for perhaps 2 years. They can use the money only for the purposes I have mentioned, and they can continue the existing programs.

In general, the effect of the bill now is to invalidate all roll-back subsidies and to validate the other subsidies which have already been announced. If the Commodity Credit Corporation desires to provide other subsidies, it must return to Congress. If it returns to Congress I think section 7 provides a method of paying subsidies which Congress may well consider at that time, favorably, because the money may be used only for subsidies to producers for the purpose of increasing the maximum production.

Mr. President, I believe the conference committee is in agreement, except that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] did not sign the report. He did not sign it because he does not feel we should invalidate the roll-back subsidies. My own personal opinion is that we should not do so, but since both the House and the Senate voted to do so in practically the same language, the members of the conference committee felt they had no choice in that respect.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I was very pleased to hear the able Senator from Ohio say that he shares the view which I expressed in the conference as to invalidation of the proposed subsidy program. If he will permit me to impose for a moment upon his time, I should like to say that I did not sign the conference report, nor did I approve the Senate bill, because I was very anxious to see a limited subsidy program and a price roll-back. I discussed that matter at some length on the floor of the Senate when the bill was under consideration. The views which I then expressed I still hold.

Mr. President, the Office of Price Administration and the other agencies of Government concerned with this program, who, I assume, voice the opinions and desires of the President, have said that they did not see how it would be possible to maintain stabilized prices and wages without the aid of subsidies. That is a deplorable situation, but I believe it. I think the administration might have inaugurated a more proper program a long time ago. The O. P. A. did not act quickly enough. However, last week I said in the Senate, and I now repeat, that because we have nothing else to offer, and because those who have most closely studied the situation have expressed the view that there is now no other way to stabilize wages and prices, I believe we should provide a limited amount for restricted subsidies. I cannot turn my back on that view, and on my own conviction that it is going to be extremely difficult, though I hope I may be wrong, to prevent a runaway inflation.

Mr. President, the action of the Senate is a repudiation of the views of the administration on this subject. I said then that I very much deplored the need to provide food subsidies, but I see no safe alternative. That is the reason I did not sign the conference report, and the reason I shall vote against it in the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while I should like to agree with the Senator from Connecticut in not wishing to invalidate roll-back subsidies, my theory is that we should stop subsidies. Subsidies are not an effective method of price control in a broad general way, although there are specific places where they can be applied successfully. I think the place to stop them is where they have now reached, and without any further authority from Congress. However, Congress felt that the place to stop them was before the roll-back subsidies. I take it that was proved by the votes in both Houses. What we have done is to stop the subsidy program without any further authority of Congress at the point it had reached just before the roll-back subsidies were announced.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like the record to be made clear. I supported the Taft amendment in the committee and was hopeful that I might be afforded the opportunity to support it on the floor of the Senate. I wanted a rigid limitation. I was most insistent in the committee that the Office of Price Administration should submit to us a set of standards which it proposed to use. We did not receive them in time for the consideration of the committee, but subsequently I received such a report or statement from Mr. Brown of the O. P. A. and I put it in the RECORD during the course of the debate. I want the subsidies to be limited as much as possible. I hope I do not go far beyond the views of the Senator from Ohio, if at all, in that respect.

He has repeatedly said in the committee and on the floor of the Senate that, were he the Price Administrator—and I may say that he served in the Food Administration during the last war—he would want some money for subsidies, and of course I should if I were Price Administrator. We are not far apart, although he has a clearer gift of expression on this subject than I have.

Mr. TAFT. I could not possibly have the clarity of the Senator from Connecticut, but I was alarmed when I began to hear about this two- and three-billion-dollar program, which was not yet in any definite form, but which was being talked about in influential Administration circles.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator and I discussed that matter at some length in the committee and outside the committee, and we were pretty much in accord, and I insisted, and finally got the officials to state, that they would tell us how much money they would need. Mr. Brown and Mr. Jones agreed that $500,000,000 was sufficient, and I made that a part of the record during the course of the debate in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I have completed my statement. It seems to me that the conferees have obtained as liberal a treatment of subsidies from the House conferees as we could expect to obtain, and that we obtained as liberal treatment as we ourselves were able in the conference committee to get in behalf of the Senate action. I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland desire to discuss the conference report?

Mr. TYDINGS. I may discuss the conference report, but if there is to be no further debate on it, I shall not discuss it. I have a right to the floor, and I am perfectly willing to give way, in the interest of the expedition of business, but if there is to be further debate on the conference report, I shall address myself to it as well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to debate it to this extent, that if we are not to have a roll call on it, I want the RECORD to show that I am utterly opposed to the report and shall vote against it.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the report can be considered immediately, I have no disposition to stand in the way of a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the report for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

Mr. WAGNER subsequently said: Mr. President, day before yesterday the Chairman of the War Shipping Administration in Washington wrote me a letter in reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, assuming that I would be one of the conferees. I was not a member of the conference; but I ask unanimous consent that just preceding the vote on the Commodity Credit Corporation conference report, this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 28, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: The bill (H. R. 2869) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States as it passed the House, contained section 6 prescribing certain prohibitions and limitations on payment of subsidies by the Government or any agency thereof with respect to agricultural commodities.

The bill as amended in the Senate contains in sections 5 and 6 amendments of comparable purpose.

Inasmuch as the activities of the War Shipping Administration were referred to in the ccurse of consideration of the measure and inasmuch as there may be some confusion and misunderstanding as to the application, or intended application, of the amendments in question to the activities of this agency in respect of providing war risk marine insurance at noncompensatory rates and in fixing freight charges for transportation of certain commodities lower than might otherwise be fixed on a commercial basis, it is deemed desirable to call the history of these matters to the direct attention of the conferees on the Senate amendments to the House bill.

The activities of the War Shipping Administration in furthering the maintenance of price control and in helping to bear part of the war cost of transportation have been explained on various occasions to the Congress and its committees. These activities may be summarized by stating that this agency in respect of marine insurance and ocean freight rates does not, in certain cases, charge sufficiently high rates to absorb all the war cost involved.

On July 20, 1942, the Honorable S. O. BLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, included in his remarks (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6398 ff.) the memorandum and correspondence relating to reduction of ocean freight rates on certain coal and petroleum products, reduction of war risk insurance rates on coal and petroleum products, and lifting the war surcharges otherwise applicable to ocean freight rates between the mainland and the Territories and possessions.

The Congress had considered the problem of, and authorized governmental assumption of, wartime increases in transportation costs arising from marine war-risk insurance during the consideration of legislation which became Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942.

The policies and activities of the War Shipping Administrator with respect to these matters were set forth in House Report No. 2572, Seventy-seventh Congress, on the bill H. R. 7424, and again in the House Report No. 107 on the bill H. R. 133. This portion of the report reads as follows:

"The Administrator also performs very important functions in the conduct of the economic phases of our war effort, especially in connection with the battle against inflation. Freight rates established by the Administrator for ocean transportation and the insurance rates charged in connection with the insurance of vessels and cargoes have a direct bearing upon the cost of goods imported to the United States and exported to our allies or friendly governments. Under Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Administration has authority to adjust its insurance rates in order to meet the economic, strategic, or military considerations of our war effort. Under its general operating authority, the Administrator may adjust his freight rates to conform to the same requirements. Under these powers, the Administrator has made insurance available at noncompensatory rates so as not to interfere with the price ceilings established by the agencies entrusted with the development of economic policy and so as to assist in the maintenance of satisfactory economic and political relations with our allies or friendly neutrals. Noncompensatory freight rates have also been provided where required by our economic or military needs. As a consequence, shippers or consignees of oceangoing cargo are not required to assume the full extraordinary cost of transportation resulting from the war effort. This cost, which largely represents war risk insurance expenditures, extra cost of voyage delays resulting from convoy and block-out operations, the cost of crew bonuses, and many other factors, in reality constitutes part of the cost of conducting the war and should properly be borne, at least to a large degree, by the taxpayers as a whole rather than by any group of shippers or consignees."

Most recently, during the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on the national war agencies appropriation bill, 1944 (H. R. 2968), there was a full discussion concerning the noncompensatory cargo war risk insurance and the reduced freight rates for the transportation of petroleum products and coal. See hearings, part I, pages 604, 640–643.

It is our understanding from the text of the provisions in question and the debate in Congress, that these provisions are not designed and do not affect the policies and activities of this agency above discussed. There is, as was pointed out in the hearings of the national war agencies appropriation bill (p. 643), no actual payment of funds to anybody under these provisions. The revenues of this agency may be less than they might otherwise have been, but no payments are made from the appropriations of this agency in respect of the said activities.

However, inasmuch as the lowered rates fixed by this agency do apply to some agricultural commodities, particularly exports of food to territories and possessions, if the conferees are of the opinion that the provisions in question apply to prohibit such lowered or noncompensatory rates by this agency or other agencies in respect of transportation or insurance, it is suggested that in connection with any language which may be adopted by the conferees, there be included a provision to the effect that nothing therein shall be construed to prohibit the payment of, or the absorption by, the Government or any of its agencies of the increased costs of transportation, including insurance, due to the war.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained in a committee meeting.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Austin	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bone	Kilgore	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Taft
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Burton	McClellan	Tobey
Butler	McFarland	Truman
Byrd	McNary	Tunnell
Capper	Maybank	Tydings
Caraway	Millikin	Van Nuys
Chandler	Moore	Wallgren
Chavez	Murdock	Walsh
Connally	Murray	Wheeler
Danaher	Nye	Wherry
Davis	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—13

Ferguson	Maloney	Stewart
Green	Mead	Vandenberg
Lodge	Pepper	Wagner
McCarran	Revercomb	
McKellar	Russell	

NOT VOTING—21

Bailey	Downey	Hayden
Ball	Ellender	Johnson, Calif.
Barbour	Gerry	Reynolds
Bridges	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Glass	White
Clark, Idaho	Guffey	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Wilson

So the report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution No. 33, which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed in the next to the last sentence of the amendment made by section 7 to strike out section 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or" and "or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. CLASON, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses or the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed in the next to the last sentence of the amendment made by section 7 to strike out "section 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or" and "or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the executive office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that at the time the conference report was taken up I was directing my remarks to the field services of O. W. I., and I was attempting to prove by what I thought was everyday run-of-the-mine evidence, that there was no real necessity for the field and State services. I should now like to read some of the releases which emanate from Washington, which go through the field and the State offices, and which find placement on the country editor's desk, and which eventually find themselves in the bonfire.

Mr. Paul Mallon, one of the best known and most respected and reliable newspapermen in the Capital, wrote, under the heading "The Nation's politics," that he went to the O. W. I. office a day or so ago and obtained a number of releases. He sorted them out and showed what was in them. Here is one which was put out on prosthetic devices:

To counteract threatening local shortages of false teeth, artificial eyes, and limbs, and similar products, the Office of Price Administration today revised the method by which manufacturers may apply for adjustment of maximum prices on these commodities.

It goes on for 300 words.

Then he makes the cryptic observation—

But that first paragraph was enough for me.

Then there is the release put out by O. W. I. from the Department of Agriculture, which contains several thousand words about various subjects, headed "Why canned milk was rationed. What is behind the ice-cream situation? Put more punches in wartime lunches."

Mr. Mallon continues:

Unfortunately none of these questions or admonitions was answered in the hand-out.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has just read, "Put more punches in wartime lunches"?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, "Put more punches in wartime lunches"; not more lunches into punches.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wonder if that is not a very good doctrine, especially at the Capitol? I think there ought to be more punches in the lunches here. They are very poor and served at very high prices. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. If we would take a little of the $2,000,000 being used to put "more punches into lunches" we would have better lunches I should say.

Then Mr. Mallon goes on to say:

Then came one-half dozen announcements which would hardly cause even Walter Winchell to yell "Flash" or "Stop the presses."

Then Mr. Mallon quotes this:

The effective date provision of amendment No. 5 to revise maximum price regulation No. 148 is amended to read as follows:

And Mr. Mallon writes:

Blah. Blah. Blah.

Continuing he says, after enumerating several releases.

No self-respecting newspaper would print any of it. If Mr. Davis himself, as a radio commentator, had broadcast such stuff to the people of this country, he would not have lasted beyond one broadcast.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Having in mind all the Mallon article and whatever point the Senator wishes to make with reference to it, if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and shall further adopt the committee amendment on page 30, lines 11 to 13, will not all that sort of thing be terminated?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The Senator, I think, perhaps misunderstood what I attempted to say a moment ago in answer to his first interrogatory. What Mr. Davis said would be discontinued was the pamphlet category of operations. For example, patriotic, inspirational pamphlets and so forth, racial pamphlets, and so on. He did not refer, as I understand, to the press releases which come from the various agencies.

Mr. DANAHER. The term "or other literature" appearing in the committee amendment on page 30, line 13, does not include this type of material.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will not mind if in a serious way I answer his question somewhat humorously. I do not think that even one who is illiterate would call what I just read literature. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. What is the intention of the committee of which the Senator is a member in using the term "or other literature?"

Mr. TYDINGS. It would not include press releases, I may say to the Senator. They would not be manufactured by O. W. I. They would be released, however, through O. W. I. agencies.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think I can elucidate that point. The purpose of the committee was to eliminate printed matter which was read by the public in the form in which it was issued by the O. W. I., but to retain the power to put out mimeographed or typewritten releases to be used by the press. "Literature," as used in the amendment, signifies printed matter put out by O. W. I. and distributed by O. W. I. to be read by the public

in the identical form in which the O. W. I. put it out.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. First let me thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I listened to the proceedings throughout the executive session when Mr. Davis appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary. We queried him at very considerable length with respect to a series of pamphlets, "and other literature"—adopting the committee's language. It certainly was apparent that O. W. I. was putting out material on controversial domestic issues intending that it should be used by study clubs, and discussion groups, and similar bodies.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct; and Mr. Davis told us that that phase of activity would be discontinued so long as he was Director. In addition, we tried to eliminate it by writing the amendment in the bill to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. Davis also said—and this matter is public knowledge, for there was no executive session restriction with respect to it—that he issued a directive in which he said that as a representative of the Chief Executive he felt himself duty bound to present the policies and the views of the Chief Executive, and that those policies and those views would permeate whatever releases and whatever indoctrination he sought to bring about as the result of those releases.

Now let me ask the Senator from Maryland if it is his view that, granting that the activities with reference to "any pamphlet or other literature" are abandoned—I am using the language of the committee amendment—will the releases henceforward to be issued by the O. W. I. through its Domestic Branch continue to inculcate into the American mind plans for meeting the prosthetic shortage, and otherwise informing the public how to remove beetles from tomato plants, and information of that character?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's question is very pertinent, and it shows how the committee was discriminating, I think, between endeavoring to obtain money for essentials and to deny money for nonessentials.

For instance, if the field services are eliminated, there still will remain, under the committee recommendation, a sum of money amounting to $900,000 which would be available for the dissemination of news.

That is altogether right and proper, as differentiated from what might be called, in the main, stereotyped matters and matters unrelated to the war effort or to the war itself. The committee tried to give to Mr. Davis' office—and, certainly, with my support—sufficient money to make the news releases actually releases of news, but to withhold money for use for the pamphlets and discussions and other things which, insofar as possible, it was able by regulation of appropriations, to prevent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. If we agree to the committee amendment and provide for the itemized services, we shall definitely limit all the sort of thing to which the Committee on the Judiciary and the majority of the Committee on Appropriations have heretofore objected; will we not?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is my understanding; and Mr. Davis gave his word that under his direction that would be eliminated.

Mr. DANAHER. I most certainly would take his word. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have taken considerable time. The hour is late, and I desire to conclude by stating what we did include in the bill. We eliminated certain things. I have mentioned them. However, we put in the bill the appropriation for the Director of the Office of War Information. We included in the bill provisions for the appropriation of all the money which would have been provided if the original items had been retained in the bill. We allowed $225,000 for the Office of Program Coordination, and a good argument can be made out for doing that. By a properly and efficiently coordinated program, the Government could actually save money, as against letting the work be handled without coordination. We included $900,000 for the News Bureau. For the Bureau of Special Services, which was described very ably by the Senator from Massachusetts, we allowed $950,000, which is practically all that was requested. As I recall, that Bureau deals with furnishing information and other things acquired by the O. W. I. from other governmental agencies.

For the Radio Bureau we allowed an appropriation of $811,499, which was all that was asked for. The committee took the position that the radio was the most effective medium the agency could use, and that if the Radio Bureau was to exist the committee should not be parsimonious in allowing funds for use of the most effective medium, by means of which all could have information as to what was going on.

Then we considered the Motion Picture Bureau, which I have discussed. We said, "Do not make motion pictures, but we shall give you $50,000 to enable you to coordinate the efforts of those who are making motion pictures, so that their efforts will conduce to the furthering of the war effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The item we placed in the bill represents a very slight cut below the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget; does it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; the cut is very slight.

Let me state, and then I shall conclude my discussion of the bill, that we finally inserted an amendment providing for the liquidation of certain branches. The amendment is set out on a side slip. Inasmuch as we had cut out two agencies and had provided for the liquidation of another one, Mr. Davis said he would require time to liquidate them, that some accrued pay and accrued leave were due to some of the employees. He said that some contracts had been only partially fulfilled—for instance, perhaps a contract for the making of a motion picture; and he said there was office furniture and equipment which would have to be gathered together. He estimated that $800,000 would be necessary in order to pay for the accrued leave, for the partially completed contracts, and for the liquidation of the agencies. The committee originally allowed $300,000 additional for the liquidation of the agencies. This morning the committee increased the amount to $500,000, by the following amendment:

> And for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of branches herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in branches herewith reduced or eliminated, $500,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the committee I was not convinced, nor am I yet informed, what justified the increase of the appropriation for the particular item under discussion from $300,000 to $500,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me state briefly what the committee did. The Senator remembers the discussion. Mr. Davis asked for approximately $800,000 if we were to take such action. We did not think he should have that much although, of course, it would not be efficient and economical to have a badly-handled liquidation. Obviously, it would be much better to have a well-directed liquidation than to have a hastily-made one which ultimately might result in having the Government come out on the little end of the deal.

Therefore, in order to give Mr. Davis the money to pay for the accrued leave and to use in completing the partially completed contracts, so that the Government would not break its word, some of us who had agreed to the appropriation of $300,000 finally agreed to the appropriation of an additional $200,000, so that all the extraneous operations would be discontinued.

This is my final word. If we have eliminated from any of the items any appropriation which would save an American life, which would make things easier for the boys abroad, which would conduce to a better prosecution of the war, I should prefer, not only to restore it, but to double it. The committee tried intelligently to select the items which had merit, and, on the basis of the evidence before us, to eliminate the items which did not seem to be justified.

Frequently one hears it said, "Why quibble about a couple of million dollars when you spent so much yesterday for the Army and the Navy?" Mr. President, if we spent for the Army and the Navy more than we should have spent, the Army and Navy appropriations should be reduced. However, even if it

be true that we spent more for the Army and the Navy than we should have spent for them, that is no excuse for appropriating for other agencies money the need for which is not fully justified. In my judgment, the sooner we begin to scan all appropriations and to find out where savings can be made, the better shall we be keeping faith with American men who are out on the firing lines all over the world.

Therefore, I ask the Senate to believe those of us who are members of the committee, and who are supporting the committee amendment, when we say we did not approach the matter with any hostility to the O. W. I., as such. We tried to ascertain, as a result of our examination, the matters for which the O. W. I. made out a real case. As to any matter for which they did make out a real case, we tried to provide them with the sinews of war, so that they could do a good job.

Only in the cases in which the evidence was not sufficiently clear or adequate to justify the appropriation did we consent to a reduction.

Finally, I ask the Senate to remember that the bill came to this body without having in it an appropriation of a penny for the Domestic Operations Branch of the O. W. I. The committee have restored to the bill an appropriation for $3,600,000 for the Domestic Operations service. To show that we were generous, although I do not recall that Mr. Davis asked for more funds for use in the foreign field, because the House had substantially cut down the appropriation for that field, we, on our own volition, this morning provided for restoring either $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 of the appropriation; so that in the foreign field, where the O. W. I. is and, I believe, should be most effective, there will not be any stringency of money with which to prosecute its activities in the war effort. Therefore, in view of all these facts, in my judgment it would be folly to increase the amount to $5,500,000. I think the committee's position, after hearing all the evidence and voting on each matter separately, clearly shows that we tried to do an efficient job, and to give to Mr. Davis all the help which his testimony and that of others showed was necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make an announcement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that this is the last day of the fiscal year, and that there are several appropriation bills which have not yet been finally acted upon by the two Houses, including this bill and two or three conference reports, and possibly another appropriation bill, it will be necessary for the Senate to sit into the night in an effort to clear up the appropriation bills. I wish to make that announcement now so that Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is very easy to make a critical attack upon any war agency. When one considers that these agencies have been brought suddenly into being to perform an utterly new service, one realizes that no agency can operate without making mistakes. The War Department makes mistakes. The Navy Department makes mistakes. All war agencies make mistakes. Even the Senate and the House make mistakes.

I wish to make it clear that when the witnesses for the O. W. I. came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the problem before that committee was almost exclusively related to what is being done in the Oveaseas Branch. I wish to point out that the testimony and the examinations before the Senate Committee on Appropriations were devoted more than 90 percent to the affairs of the Overseas Branch; and the showing which was made by Mr. Davis and his associates was so effective that, as the Senator from Tennessee has just said, the committee increased the amount of the appropriation above the amount which was allowed by the House.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator absolutely certain that 90 percent of the time was devoted to the examination of the Overseas Branch? I know that I personally spent almost 3 hours on the Domestic Operations Branch. I wonder if the Senator has gone through the hearings and counted the pages. I have no such impression as that stated by the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not counted the pages. It may be that the percentage which I announced was a little excessive. However, I do know that the Senator from Massachusetts devoted a great deal of time to the subject, and contributed very materially to the improvement of this bill over the state in which it was when it came to the Senate from the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator speaks of criticism. If I correctly recall, there was not a single particle of evidence criticizing the O. W. I. The evidence was that of 8 or 10 O. W. I. employees, together with 3 advertising men; and I think that was all the testimony there was. All the testimony was in favor of the O. W. I., and there was none against it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want that statement to go unchallenged. There were some pamphlets and other activities of the O. W. I. which evoked some criticism.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those were presented by the witnesses, and they said that such things would not occur again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we might spend the whole night in talking about the details. I do not propose to do so. I merely wish to make it clear that the purpose of my amendment is that this question may be taken to conference where it may be determined on a factual basis, whether or not there was good reason for the action of the House committee in allowing $5,500,000 for the domestic branch. I am satisfied, from my reading of the RECORD in the House and in the Senate, and my presence in the committee, that we would be making a great mistake if we were to cut out certain of these bureaus.

I realize, Mr. President, that the form in which I presented my amendment in the beginning might easily arouse the belief that it was intended to permit the O. W. I. to transfer funds, and thereby defeat the action of the committee. That was not my purpose.

I agree with everything the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has said, and everything the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said with respect to the care which was devoted by the committee to the items which appear in the bill as reported by the Senate committee. Therefore, instead of taking out that break-down, I am presenting a modified amendment which retains the break-down and adds the items which were left out.

I send to the desk a modified form of my amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 7, in the committee amendment, in lieu of the italics, it is proposed to insert:

And not more than $5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch, as follows:

Office of the Director, $125,000.
Office of Program Coordination, $225,000.
News Bureau, $900,000.
Bureau of Special Services, $950,000.
Radio Bureau, $811,000.
Motion Picture Bureau, $250,000.
Book and Magazine Divisions, $175,000.
Field Service, $1,300,000.
Bureau of Graphics, $764,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment was read so rapidly that I did not catch the last two figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that the committee amendment with respect to the Motion Picture Bureau allowed $50,000, as I recall.

My amendment would allow $250,000, because that is the amount which was represented to me by Mr. Davis and his associates as being necessary in order to enable them to carry on the coordination which every member of the committee suggested should be permitted.

The amendment would also add $175,000 for the Book and Magazine Divisions, in order to permit the O. W. I. to carry on liaison work with the publishers of books and magazines.

For the field service, which has already been discussed at length, my amendment would allow $1,300,000, which is a substantial reduction below the Budget figure; and $764,000 for the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, which is also a substantial amount.

That permits the question of an increase to $5,500,000 to be decided on the basis of additions to specific amounts for specific bureaus.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate very briefly.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that under Rule XVIII any Senator may ask to have this motion divided and obtain a separate vote on each item?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The opinion of the present occupant of the Chair is that this is a motion to strike out and to insert, and therefore is not subject to division.

Mr. LODGE. So that if the Senate should wish to agree with the Senator from Wyoming on one item of the amendment and disagree with him on another, it could not do so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any member of the Senate may move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding of the situation is that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming shall be voted down, the committee amendment will then stay in the bill, broken down exactly as it is, so we will accomplish the same result by voting "No" on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming as we would by taking it up seriatim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator's statement is intended as a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will state that the committee amendment would still be open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, Mr. President, this is an amendment to an amendment. Would not an amendment to that amendment be an amendment in the third degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in the third degree.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I make a further parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. If the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming should be rejected, would not Senators be foreclosed from changing an individual item in the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; they would not be foreclosed. The committee amendment would still be open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, allow me to add an additional word. If the amendment which I have offered should be adopted, the whole matter would then be sent to conference and the conferees would be afforded an opportunity to go into each of these items, item by item, and dispose of them.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In the break-down contained in the amendment just offered by the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator follows the break-down in the committee amendment until he reaches the Motion Pictures Bureau.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And then he increases the appropriation from $50,000 to $250,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And then adds the Field Operations Bureau, $1,300,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Then the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, $764,000. Then the Books and Magazines Division, which is a subdivision, not appearing in the Budget submission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason is that that part of the division of publications has been eliminated. The Administrator explained to me and in the letter which he wrote to the chairman of the committee this morning, that there was a substantial service being performed in that division which should be continued by way of liaison with the publishers of books and magazines.

Mr. OVERTON. Therefore, if the Senate should desire to add to what the committee has already done, namely, an appropriation for the books and magazines division, as well as an appropriation for field service, and one for the Bureau of Graphics and Printing, the Senate should vote in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming open to a perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, it is not.

Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Maryland and to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is a possibility, of course, that modifications might be made in this amendment by way of acquiescence of the mover of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the right to modify his amendment at any time before the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I will defer to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Oregon speak. I have spoken too much already.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not wish to foreclose the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I do not find myself in accord with his views, but I shall speak for only a moment.

For several days I have been preaching the necessity of passing the appropriation bills by midnight tonight. I shall carry that preaching into practice.

Mr. President, I am interested in one phase of this question, namely, the Domestic Operations Branch. I think it is doing good work. It is releasing news from military fronts, obtaining information from Government agencies, and in turn making it available to the public. For that reason I am supporting the continuation of the service.

I am particularly interested at the present time because of the character and type of the individual chosen a few days ago to administer the branch. Perhaps I am provincial, perhaps I am leaning on my friendship. At least, I am asserting my admiration and knowledge of one who I believe and know will administer this branch with integrity, character, forthrightness, and efficiency. I make reference to Mr. E. P. Hoyt, managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, of my home State, the oldest and best Republican newspaper west of the Mississippi River. I am sure that statement will meet with general accord of all those who live in that great section of our country.

Mr. Hoyt was selected for this purpose because of his unusual attainments as an executive and an administrator. He does not play small politics. He is not spiteful. He has the necessary courage to brush aside all matters which might entice others to do things which would be subject to criticism.

I rose particularly for the purpose of stating to the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I am in favor of his amendment. I should like to see the amount increased from $3,500,000 to $5,500,000. I am interested in many of the items enumerated. I am particularly interested in the item pertaining to the field service. I have received telegrams from some very dependable and independent newspapermen of the West stating that this agency is rendering a valuable service to them.

Mr. President, I wish to read a statement made by Mr. Hoyt which characterizes his attitude in all public matters, which has won my admiration. The question of propaganda has been raised, and it has been asserted in criticism that there is too much propaganda in this news agency. There has been. I, myself, think some politics has been involved. Errors have been made, and just criticism could be leveled at some of those who are and have been connected with the agency. Mr. Hoyt made a statement publicly on the day he arrived in Washington, which was the day on which the House had practically eliminated the branch which he was appointed to administer. The statement to which I refer is as follows:

> This office will not be concerned with propagandizing the American people. My policy is to give to the country the straight information about the war and give it to them straight. This means there will be no pamphleteering from this office. It also means this office will yield to no political pressure and will serve no political interest.

That is Mr. Hoyt speaking.

> This is an office of war information. It will deal only with information about the war. We Americans have never needed to be urged to win the war, but we work best when we know what we are working for, sacrifice most when we know what we are sacrificing for, endure the longest when we know what we are enduring for. The more we know about the war the faster we will win it. The O. W. I. job is to furnish that knowledge.

Mr. President, that is an honest statement from an honest man whom I have known a number of years.

For the reasons I have stated, and because of the work which has been done, and which I think Mr. Hoyt can do in this capacity, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, because I think it is necessary to give Mr. Hoyt all the tools he needs to

do the job for which he is splendidly equipped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote, but merely to speak a word in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am not familiar with all the details regarding the showing that was made by the O. W. I., by Mr. Davis and his staff.

I think all of us can agree that what the American people really crave in the midst of this war is reliable information. However careful the newspapers may be in reporting war activities and world events—and I make no suggestion that they are intentionally careless—we all know how impossible it is frequently, from the sketchy reports of world events and the progress of the war, to derive a comprehensive picture of what is going on in the world. Certainly the American people are entitled to all the information they can get, and I am sure that the press itself is eager to obtain and to report reliable information, and they are in a position to determine, I think, as accurately as anyone else, what is reliable information.

In my contacts with the people, which have not been so extensive as I might have liked during the war, because we have all been tied down here to our work, I have found in some cases almost a pathetic eagerness on the part of the people to know the facts, and one of the reasons why I believe it will be good for the Congress and for the American people to take a recess for a couple of months is to enable men who have been serving for years in both branches of the Congress, and who are familiar with what has been happening, to get back among the people, commune with them, learn something from them, and at the same time impart information to them, for in spite of all that may be said about Congress, my experience and observation lead me to believe that the people still trust their representatives, and are eager to hear them, and to believe them.

Mr. President, the amount involved is not large, $2,000,000. Of course, that is a good deal of money compared with what most of us possess; it is more money than I will make this whole year, so far as that is concerned. [Laughter.] It is a considerable amount, but in comparison with the value of the information to which the American people are entitled, which is a morale builder, to keep them informed about what is going on, through a source which is reliable, I think the amount involved is small.

In regard to what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] said about the new appointment, certainly if anyone had any fear that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. might be administered for a political purpose, the fact that Mr. Hoyt, who is a life-long Republican, and is editor of one of the largest and most important Republican newspapers in the United States, should be a guaranty that the office is not to be used for any partisan political purpose, to advance by propaganda any political scheme which someone might imagine the administration would like to hatch up.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any assurance that Mr. Davis will not resign, and that Mr. Hoyt will not resign, within 10 days from this time? How can we possibly consider this question on the basis of the personality of those who happen to be in control, when we note what has happened in the last week?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from Ohio answers his own question. He knows I cannot give any assurance that anyone will not resign from a position, except that I think I can say that there is no likelihood of any Member of the Senate resigning in the immediate future. [Laughter.]

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had not expected to make any observations on the subject before the Senate, but in view of the fact that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] read some extracts from newspapers, I thought perhaps I would indulge in the same pleasure, and that I would make my selections from the other side of the argument.

There is another reason, perhaps, why I should say something, and that is that as a member of the Truman committee, I headed the subcommittee which investigated, in the city of New York, the facilities which we are discussing. I know something about their value. I have seen this very activity in working order, and I wish to say that I heartily agree with the observation made by the distinguished minority leader when he said that this appropriation should be increased.

Mr. President, the war is costing us about $300,000,000 a day, according to a newspaper account I recently read. Just yesterday we appropriated about $72,000,000,000 for the Army. That of itself amounts to about $200,000,000 a day. The appropriation we are now considering is less than about a half hour's cost of the war. It is about one three hundredths of 1 percent of the cost of the war. I believe that if we should appropriate $100,000,000, and see to it that it was prudently invested, both here and abroad, it would be an investment in economy, in saving American lives, in reducing the cost of the war, and in saving precious materials and equipment which will be necessary if the war shall be prolonged.

Mr. President, authorities have been quoted disparaging the use of money by the O. W. I. On the other side of the ledger, we find authorities of national reputation, editorial writers from all over the Nation, joining in commending this facility.

I have here a telegram from George Fielding Eliot, in which he makes the following statement:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 21, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully ask your favorable consideration for restoring appropriation for Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information which is doing a vitally necessary job. No democratic state can fight a successful war without the full support of its people, and full support must be based on intelligent understanding of what is being done and why. For this purpose the American people need timely and adequate information, and the task of giving it cannot possibly be left in the hands of the several departments and agencies concerned, each pleading its own cause in the court of public opinion. This could result only in increased confusion in the public mind both as to the conduct of the war and post-war policy. Particularly as regards military information I think it is vitally necessary to have a civilian agency with adequate authority taking part in the work of preparing and releasing such information for the public, and this will be increasingly necessary as the scope and scale of military operations increase.

I know that mistakes have been made in some details but on the whole I think Elmer Davis has done a first-class job and should be sustained. We have made truth our weapon in our foreign propaganda and it is even more essential that the truth should be disseminated to our people daily and hourly to sustain and inspire them in the midst of all their trials and sacrifices.

Sincerely,

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT.

Mr. President, I have here a long editorial from a newspaper in my home State, the Post Star, of Glens Falls, N. Y., of which I shall read only one paragraph:

There is a great need for the perpetuation of this agency to represent the sound desire of the people to be told all that can be told without giving aid and comfort to the foe. If the people's legislators now wipe out this avenue of approach, the news-hungry citizens will have no one to fight directly for them among the high places. What sense is there in doing that?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to my friend the Senator from New York that the editorials and telegram which he has read presupposed that we have cut out the local or the home front of the O. W. I. We have not cut it out. We examined it and eliminated only those parts which we thought had no value. We preserved all the functions which carried the truth and the news to the people of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. As I read on, Mr. President—and I am only reading a paragraph here and there—the Senate will understand that these editorials in the main criticize both the House and the Senate, particularly the House, for reducing the amount for O. W. I. under the Budget estimate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the House made a mistake in taking the broadax and cutting the whole thing out. I simply wish to point out to the Senator that I do not believe those who wrote the editorials and sent the telegram which the Senator is reading have had an opportunity to examine into the various categories through which O. W. I. functions, and without taking exception to anything the Senator is reading, I believe that if those whose correspondence he is now reading knew all the facts they would not be so strong for keeping in the part we have cut out, but they would be just as strong as we are for keeping the part we have maintained.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the Senator that in some instances we have cut the appropriations so low that the authorities of the O. W. I. have asked us to wipe them out altogether. In one instance they wrote a letter, which was read to the subcommittee, in which they said it would be better to have no money at all than the money we are now allowing.

I now read from an editorial published in the New York Times of June 22. No one will dispute that its editorial policy has in the main been sound. The editorial concludes:

For these reasons we hope that the Senate restores the item struck out by a partisan vote in the House of Representatives and that the House, on sober second thought, concurs in this decision. Mr. Davis deserves an opportunity to show that he can do the job for which his experience and character equip him.

I read from an editorial published in the Herald Tribune of New York of June 21. That is a very well-known publication, which has not been always espousing the cause of the New Deal. The editorial says:

The Domestic Division of the Office of War Information has done some foolish things, it has made some mistakes, and it has manifested some tendencies which may lend color to the congressional suspicions and hostilities. It has also done valuable work in damming the former floods of unregulated Government press agentry, in controlling the outpourings of conflicting and confusing speeches by vocal public officials, in generally reducing the original "information" chaos. Its field offices have avoided duplication and more local confusion among the clashing governmental agencies. It has an essential function in providing domestic news for its own Overseas Branch. And, most important of all, it has by patience and good sense done a great deal to inculcate into the military services an understanding of the vital importance of keeping the public informed and a better idea of how to do it. The steady improvement in the news policies of the services is largely the result of the fact that the Office of War Information was created and a man of Mr. Davis' integrity and knowledge placed at its head.

Mr. President, I read from an editorial published in the News Age-Herald of Birmingham, Ala., of June 20, as follows:

Nothing is more important than that the people of this country have an orderly, adequate service of information concerning the vast multiplicity of important things now being done in Washington. The Office of War Information is directed toward facilitating and coordinating that service. It is a logical system. It is under one of the ablest, most objective newspapermen in this country. Should all that he and his organization are doing on the home front be discontinued and a return made to the disconnected, chaotic system under which every department puts out its own news?

To us that idea is intolerable.

To lose Elmer Davis' service in this respect would be a tragedy.

I also read from an editorial published in the Post Dispatch of St. Louis of June 19, as follows:

The Office of War Information has roused some opposition, partly because of its faults and partly because it has refused to yield to reactionary pressure. Its enemies concentrated their spite in the House last night, and the result was the vote to end its domestic functions. Surely the Senate will not go along with this move to hamstring a useful and, in fact, necessary war agency.

I read from an editorial published in the Globe Democrat of the same city, of June 20, as follows:

But conceding these faults, the fact remains that the Office of War Information's Domestic Bureau is performing an essential function in facilitating and coordinating the dissemination of news from Government departments and agencies, not only to the press but to the radio and the motion pictures. Any newspaper editor or Washington reporter can testify to the difficulties of covering all of the Government activities in wartime without the aid of a coordinating agency such as the Office of War Information.

The following is from an editorial published in the Times-Dispatch of Richmond, Va., of June 20:

Yet the House, in its blind rage against the administration, has cut out the entire appropriation for the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information, while slashing the Foreign Branch of the agency by nearly $13,000,000. Already the Office of War Information is at a grievous disadvantage when trying to compete with the German, Italian, and Japanese propaganda agencies overseas, for it has had far less money at its disposal than they. Now, unless the Senate comes to the rescue, its usefulness is apt to be almost destroyed. This is a strange definition of "economy." It looks much more like peanut politics.

The Vindicator, of Youngstown, Ohio, under date of June 20, concludes an editorial as follows:

But the war effort must be carried on by bureaucracies, just as private industries of national scope must set up their own bureaucracies throughout the land. In either case abuses should be curbed but reformers should remember that abolition is not correction, and should beware of throwing out the baby with the bath.

I read from an editorial published in the Boston (Mass.) Herald of June 21, under the head "The Irritating Elmer," as follows:

Doing away with the Domestic Division of the Office of War Information, Congress would penalize the people more severely than it would punish Mr. Davis—but it would surely get a cheer from the Berlin, Tokyo, and Rome ministries of propaganda. They would probably tell their people that the Americans are afraid to hear the truth about the war.

Also from an editorial published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegraph of June 21, as follows:

On Davis' behalf, it might be said that he has managed to keep himself and his office relatively free from politics. His batting average has been high in view of Office of War Information's potentiality for becoming an out-and-out center of controversy in the hands of a less capable Director.

This latter fact is one big reason why the Senate can be expected to restore all or most of the appropriation cuts made by the House.

Finally I read from an editorial published in the Commonweal, issue of July 2, 1943, headed "A sorry mess," as follows:

The vote on the amendment to cut the appropriation of one agency—the Board of Economic Warfare—which everyone agreed is doing a splendid job, is indicative of the spirit of the proceedings. That amendment was defeated by a scant 15 votes. Of course the worst display of ill temper was the vote to kill the Office of War Information's domestic branch. If this vote is sustained in the Senate, every journalist knows perfectly well that the result will be confusion worse confounded. What mistakes the Office of War Information made are more than compensated by the fine service it has rendered.

Let us hope that the Senate, when it comes to act on the bill voted by the House, will be more moved by the welfare of the Nation than by irresponsible petty politics.

I maintain that in view of all the billions of dollars we are pouring into the war effort, we should consider this appropriation patiently. From my observation, and from the testimony to which I have listened in the committee, I believe we could wisely and prudently invest $100,000,000 in the domestic and our overseas branches, and in doing so we could save many American lives, we could save materials that are costly and expensive, we could shorten the war, and we could confuse our enemies.

I hope we shall be motivated by a patriotic desire to be liberal with this agency when we cast our votes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the clear and lucid statement of the Senator from Maryland has been most helpful. For my part, I should be willing to take a chance on having less propaganda and on letting the American people find their own way if they are given the facts, rather than take a chance on an overdose, by means of press and radio, of propaganda which might gradually lead to the extinction of our people.

Every Member of the Senate knows what has happened to freedom of speech in almost every nation of the world. The United States and Britain alone, of all the nations throughout the world, today retain a free press. In the countries in which the liberty and dignity of the individual have been lost, propaganda and domination of the thinking of the people have been a forerunner of that loss.

Mr. President, I am not an alarmist; but in connection with the activities of the O. W. I., we are not without evidence that there is under way a studied

propaganda by our Government to control the media through which the people obtain their information about what is going on in Washington and how the war is progressing.

Let me enumerate four instances. A few months ago the country was startled when, by direct orders of the President of the United States, the press was barred from the International Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va. Soldiers with fixed bayonets were posted to keep the press at a distance. That was a far cry from Woodrow Wilson's "open covenants openly arrived at."

Just 10 days ago that was followed by the most bitter attack ever unloosed against the newspapermen of the United States. Mr. Elmer Davis, the chief of the O. W. I., in a public speech said the Washington press corps is inadequate, and that in Washington the news is covered more poorly than it is in other places. That, as we all know, was simply a misstatement of fact. It is not true.

So we have the right to ask, "Why did Mr. Davis make such statements?" As legislators, we have a natural inclination to look for the motive. My reaction is that it is the beginning of an effort to discredit the Washington press, to try to convince the American people that what they read in the newspapers or hear over the air is falsified or untrue. Once that is accomplished, the way will be open for complete dependence upon the O. W. I. for the news.

Yesterday, from the reports of the press conference of the President, we had additional evidence that Mr. Davis was firing the first shot of a continuing campaign. The President attempted to place upon the newspapermen the responsibility for all the failures in Washington. He charged, according to the newspapers published today, which reported his words, that the bickering in Washington is caused by the press and the radio.

Let me recall that on the day before the President spoke, Mr. Chester Davis, the President's own appointee, resigned, leaving the implication that it was the policies of the President, particularly those in regard to food subsidies, and his refusal to delegate authority, which were responsible for his departure.

On the very day the President spoke, the Vice President of the United States made public a 26-page statement accusing a Cabinet officer, also the President's appointee, of obstructing the war. Certainly, the press had nothing to do with that.

Those are but a few links in a chain of circumstances. It seems to me that the safest road we can travel on the O. W. I. appropriation is to keep it small, so that the agency in question cannot have the power or the funds to infiltrate political propaganda into the free press and radio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], as modified, as a substitute for the provision proposed by the committee on page 29, beginning in line 7.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Pepper
Andrews	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reed
Bankhead	Holman	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Scrugham
Brewster	Langer	Stewart
Bridges	Lodge	Taft
Brooks	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Burton	McClellan	Tobey
Butler	McFarland	Truman
Byrd	McKellar	Tunnell
Capper	McNary	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chandler	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Davis	Moore	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ferguson	Nye	White
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Green	O'Mahoney	
Gurney	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], as modified, as a substitute for the provision proposed by the committee on page 29, beginning in line 7.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are detained on important public business.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is paired on this question with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who, if present, would vote "yea," and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—34

Andrews	Kilgore	Russell
Bankhead	Lucas	Scrugham
Barkley	McFarland	Stewart
Bilbo	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Maloney	Truman
Caraway	Mead	Tunnell
Downey	Murdock	Van Nuys
Green	Murray	Wagner
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Hayden	Pepper	
Hill	Radcliffe	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hawkes	Reed
Brooks	Holman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Tydings
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chandler	McClellan	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Moore	White
Eastland	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	
George	Overton	

NOT VOTING—22

Austin	Connally	Reynolds
Bailey	Ellender	Shipstead
Ball	Gerry	Smith
Barbour	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Glass	Wiley
Bushfield	Guffey	Wilson
Chavez	Hatch	
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have an amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have not as yet been disposed of.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the Bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 403 (a). For purposes of this section—

"'1. The term "Department" means the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company, respectively.

"'2. In the case of the Maritime Commission, the term "Secretary" means the Chairman of such Commission, and in the case of Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company the term "Secretary" means the board of directors of the appropriate corporation.'

"'*Provided further*, That section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'"(k) All the provisions of this section shall be construed to apply to Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company"'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education or training of Class IV-E Conscientious Objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its territories and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this Act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such Class IV-E Conscientious Objector college or foreign service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be available after August 31, 1943, for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
H. C. LODGE, JR.
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of War Information," on page 30, line 6, after the words "approval of the", to strike out "Director of the Bureau of the Budget" and insert "President."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate has just adopted an amendment which ought to close all disagreement as to what the totals should be in lines 2 and 4 on page 29, those being the totals for the amounts with respect to which we have just voted, I ask unanimous consent to take up those two amendments which were passed over, so that we may conclude that portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none. The first amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, at the beginning of line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$28,972,504" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,037,593."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 10, to insert:

No part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended by the Office of War Information for the preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 13, to insert:

The appropriation herein made for the Office of War Information shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 17, to insert:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Mobilization, including salary of the Director at $15,000 per annum; salaries of two Assistant Directors at $9,000 per annum each; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; and printing and binding; $138,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Production Board," on page 31, line 22, after the word "section", to strike out "3848" and insert "3648"; in line 24, after the word "airplane", to strike out "$88,200,000" and insert "$89,335,440"; and on page 32, line 1, after the word "than", to strike out "$136,000" and insert "$271,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions" on page 38, line 24, after the word "and" the first time it occurs, to insert "actual."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 10, after the word "subsistence", to strike out "of" and insert "at."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 42, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 1, to change the section number from 203 to 204.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 204. On the effective date of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943, (1) the amounts appropriated in the first, second, and fourth paragraphs under the heading "Vocational rehabilitation" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be consolidated into one fund and shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943, except that not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in providing rehabilitation for disabled residents of the District of Columbia, including printing and binding, travel, and subsistence; and (2) the amount appropriated in the fifth paragraph under the heading "Vocational rehabilitation" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943 and for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1559, 1560).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the purpose of the amendment.

Senators may recall that late yesterday evening final action was taken on the conference report revising the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Prior to that time the Labor and Security bill,

containing appropriations for Federal aid for vocational rehabilitation, had already passed the Senate, and there was no way by which to secure any action in conference on that measure in order to conform with the action of the Congress in revising the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The amendment which I have offered would not change the substantive law which has been enacted at this session of Congress. It would not appropriate one additional dollar of money. It would merely straighten out the appropriation which is contained in the Federal Security and Labor bill now in conference in conformity with the revision adopted almost unanimously by both Houses. If this amendment is not included in this particular appropriation bill, the language with respect to the amounts contained in the Federal Security and Labor bill, now in conference, will not make sense when the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 becomes law, because the section numbers have been changed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is the amendment legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, it is not. It is in order because it is in conformity with a law which has already been enacted at this session.

Mr. LODGE. Would the amendment, in and of itself, make any appropriation of funds?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It would make no additional appropriation of funds. It simply makes the appropriations already made and in conference under the Federal Security and Labor bill conform to the revisions made in the basic law by the Act which was completed yesterday when the Senate adopted the conference report after the House has acted upon it.

Mr. LODGE. What would be the effect if the proposed amendment should not be agreed to?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The effect would be that in many instances the appropriations contained in the Federal Security law would not make sense if the President should sign the bill the conference report on which was adopted by the Senate yesterday, which we have every reason to believe he will do, since all the agencies are in favor of it. In other words, the number of section 6 in the old law has been changed, and yet there is an appropriation in the Federal Security bill, where this amendment ought to have been included, but there was not time to do it. Therefore, it would be meaningless. For example, $25,000 is appropriated in section 6, which makes sense in the old law, but does not make sense in the new law, because section 6 is not related to the $25,000 item of the appropriation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement concerning this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943 make changes in existing law which require modification of the appropriation language of the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act. For example, one appropriation item is of $95,000 "for carrying out the provisions of section 6" of the basic Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This is the section authorizing an appropriation for administrative expense, but under the 1943 amendments to the basic act, section 6 provides vocational rehabilitation for residents of the District of Columbia. The appropriation bill carries an item of $25,000 for carrying out a special act for vocational rehabilitation in the District of Columbia, but under the 1943 amendments this special act is repealed, and similar provisions carried in section 6 of the amendments. Several other similar inconsistencies make the proposal I have offered very necessary. It should be noted that this proposal becomes effective only on the effective date of the 1943 amendments, so, if for any reason these amendments do not become effective, the existing appropriation language of the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act would remain applicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. May we not have a vote on the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to submit an amendment, which I think should be in the bill, so as to provide that if the bill shall not be signed tonight, whatever may be done tomorrow shall be legalized.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is already provided for in the bill, I am advised by the clerk of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I shall not offer the amendment, but I send an amendment forward which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$4,000,000" and to insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment. This item to do with the Office of Civilian Defense. The bill carries $4,000,000, and I am moving to strike out the $4,000,000 and insert $5,000,000, adding $1,000,000 to the appropriation.

Mr. President, this is the only bill carrying money which recognizes those working on the home front. This particular bureau has two separate functions. One is to protect the people against air raids, the second is to organize the people in the States for civilian defense work.

The Authority here in Washington, under Mr. Landis, has organized every State and every city of any consequence. Mr. Landis works with the Governors of the States and the mayors of the cities. He has organized approximately 14,000 local civilian defense councils. He has working throughout the country some 644 field men. I am advised by Mr. Landis that if this item remains in the bill at $4,000,000, he will have to stop his work with the Governors and the cities of the Nation. Therefore, Mr. President, 14,000 councils, organized for home work, local councils of defense, will be without supervision from Washington. I do not think that should happen.

The appropriation amounts to only 10 cents a person. These councils have a membership ranging from 20 to 1,000. There are over 10,000,000 people organized in the councils, and if this money is not appropriated we will simply say to the members of the councils, "Your services are not worth 10 cents apiece to the Government. Your services are not worth a thin dime to the war effort."

For one, I am not willing to make such a statement. Someone might ask what these councils do. I can tell the Senate what they did recently in my State. Recently a flood occurred in Oklahoma. A million acres of land were under water. The Governor called the councils in the counties where the floods occurred. The councils went to the rescue. The members of the council stood on the bridges during the night, and as the trees came down the rivers they tried to prevent the trees jarring the bridges loose so that they would float away. As houses came down the river, they tried to keep them from destroying the bridges. But in spite of the work they did, many bridges were destroyed. On one particular span across the Arkansas River there were some 20 members of one of these defense councils. A house came down the river and struck the bridge. The bridge went out, and the 20 men on that span were engulfed in the waters of the raging Arkansas River. Six of those men were drowned, and so far as I know, their bodies have not as yet been found. The remainder were washed on down the river, and they got into trees and saved themselves by that means. The other members of the defense council had boats in the river. They heard the cries of the men in the trees, and rescued them.

Mr. President, these defense councils were instrumental in saving many lives in that flood. They removed men, women, and children from the homes which were entirely surrounded by water. They actually assisted in removing furniture and livestock from the inundated valleys to the hills. That was only a part of the work they did.

If this money is not appropriated, Mr. Landis advises, his work in connection with these 14,000 councils will have to cease. What effect that will have upon the war effort, of course, I cannot tell.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It is my understanding, and I want the able Senator to confirm it, if he can, from his knowledge of the matter, that all the councils which the Senator has mentioned are State councils, appointed by either the Governors

or the mayors of the cities, or local authorities.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Director of Civilian Defense, Mr. Landis, works through the Governors and through the mayors. The mayors first organize the citizens of their cities, the Governor organizes the citizens of a State outside the cities, and, of course, he works with the mayors of the cities, and he works with the county commissioners. So that every State has a State organization, and the State organization has subsidiary organizations, to the end that the people of the Nation may be organized in this defense work.

Mr. President, I think 10,000,000 men and women are organized in these defense councils, but if the Congress refuses this million-dollar appropriation, that action will be a condemnation of the work these men and women have done to date.

I am not willing to put my stamp of disapproval upon the work these ladies and gentlemen have done and for that reason I have offered the amendment, to increase the appropriation from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this item was discussed at very considerable length before our committee. It was first discussed in the House, and the House provided $4,000,000. The bill came before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittee struck out the increase of $1,263,000 which Mr. Landis had asked, and the full committee sustained its action.

The Senate has already adopted the amendment, and of course, there will have to be a reconsideration if the amendment is to be considered, but I do not object to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is in error in his last statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe I am mistaken about that. It is a separate item, as I understand. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Four million dollars was provided by the House; the Senate subcommittee and the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate itself have passed upon that item. We heard all the testimony in the committee. Mr. Landis, himself, said that he did not need the whole amount; that we could very well strike off $263,000. The committee felt that $4,000,000 was ample for this organization. Therefore, it seems to me that the provision should be kept as it is. The opinion of the committee was unanimous, except for the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], now offering the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In the hearings Mr. Landis stated he wanted and needed an additional $1,263,000. I offered an amendment making that increase in the committee this morning, but it was disagreed to. Later I called Mr. Landis, and he advised me that he could get along, and do the work as he has been doing it, with $1,000,000 additional; that is, he could keep in touch with the Governors and the mayors of the several cities if the sum of a million dollars were added to his appropriation. If the money were not added, he would have to confine his operations to one activity; that is, protection against air raids, and the civilian work would have to be stopped, so far as he was concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a correction. I said the action of the committee this morning was unanimous. That is not correct. It was unanimous until this morning, and when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] offered his amendment, the vote was 7 for and 16 against.

Mr. President, I very earnestly ask the Senate to vote this amendment down.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Pepper
Andrews	Holman	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Barkley	Kilgore	Revercomb
Bilbo	La Follette	Robertson
Brooks	Langer	Russell
Butler	Lodge	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tobey
Danaher	McNary	Truman
Davis	Maloney	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh
George	Murdock	Wheeler
Green	Murray	Wherry
Gurney	Nye	White
Hawkes	O'Daniel	
Hayden	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am not willing to have an amendment which affects 130,000,000 people, which affects directly the Governor of every State, which affects directly the mayor of every city in the United States, which affects the members of 14,000 defense councils, and affects directly 10,000,000 members of such councils, be acted upon by the Senate without a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "yea," and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—26

Andrews	La Follette	Stewart
Bankhead	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Maloney	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Truman
Eastland	Murdock	Tunnell
Green	Murray	Vandenberg
Hayden	Pepper	Wagner
Kilgore	Russell	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Holman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Langer	Revercomb
Byrd	Lodge	Robertson
Capper	Lucas	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Taft
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh
Davis	McNary	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Gurney	Nye	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Clark, Idaho	Reynolds
Bailey	Connally	Shipstead
Ball	Ellender	Smith
Barbour	Gerry	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Gillette	Tydings
Brewster	Glass	Van Nuys
Bridges	Guffey	Wallgren
Buck	Hatch	Wiley
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Willis
Bushfield	Moore	Wilson
Chavez	Overton	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 98 and 99 to the bill.

VISIT BY SENATORS TO THE WAR FRONT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement to the Senate regarding a matter in which the Senate is interested, but which has no connection with the pending bill. Senators are familiar with the fact that there has been some discussion in the press and in the Senate, among Senators, regarding the suggestion that certain Senators from certain committees take a trip abroad for the purpose of carrying on a continuation of investigations of war-materials production and distribution and other matters pertaining to the war. The first I knew about the proposal was when I received a confidential letter from the President, dated March 23, transmitting a confidential memorandum to him by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, regarding a suggestion which had been made by the Truman committee as to the appointment of a subcommittee of that committee to continue its investigation of the war activities outside the United States. Inasmuch as both communications were confidential, of course, I will not reveal them. Later, I discussed the matter with the President.

In the meantime, before anything was done about the matter, the Committee on Military Affairs became interested, and took some action looking toward the appointment of a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to make a similar trip and similar investigation.

In frankness, I think I should state I was not enthusiastic about the proposal, for reasons which I explained to members of the two committees.

Finally, after discussing it with both committees, I withheld my approval of the suggestion.

The only reason why I was called upon to take any action or render any decision in regard to the matter was because the Chief of Staff and, later, the Secretary of War suggested that if such a trip were to be made, it should be made in coordination with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], as minority leader, and with me, as majority leader of the Senate.

I might say it was suggested that it was undesirable to have a series of committees of Congress traveling abroad at this time, in connection with the war; that is a single committee could be selected, and if all members of the committee could go at the same time, occupying only one plane, the Army could provide facilities for the transportation of such a committee. It has been suggested that the subcommittee representing the Truman committee be limited in number to four. Later, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs designated two members of that committee to go on a similar trip.

As majority leader, I was asked to give my sanction to the project. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] likewise was asked to give his sanction to it. We discussed the matter, and have discussed it ever since the 23d of March, when I received the confidential memorandum from the President.

Some 2 months ago, I suggested to the Senator from Missouri that in view of the situation which then existed—the first suggestion was that the committee go to north Africa—inasmuch as operations in north Africa were then proceeding, and that probably they would soon be over, I did not feel justified in sanctioning a trip of that sort to north Africa at that time; and at my suggestion the Senator from Missouri, as chairman of the Truman committee, agreed for the time being to abandon the trip, not to press for it.

I left Washington some 5 or 6 weeks ago. While I was absent from Washington, the Committee on Military Affairs reiterated its desire to send two members of the committee to the war fronts. I was communicated with while I was away, and was asked to give my approval; and it was indicated to me that the Secretary of War had approved it, the Chief of Staff had approved it, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] had approved it, and so forth.

I replied that I would not take any action with regard to it until I could return to Washington and could confer with the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, the Senator from Oregon, the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman of the Truman committee, and other Senators. It was obvious that if such a trip were to be made, it should be made by but one committee, and that the Senators who went should go together; there should not be a series of committees undertaking to investigate the war going across both oceans or, it might be, around the world, with one following another at intervals of months, weeks, or even days.

Since I have returned to Washington I have been trying to compose the situation, so as to determine whether such a trip should be made. I still insist that the matter is not one which the Senator from Oregon and I should primarily have been called on to pass upon. The War Department has control of the airplanes. The War Department knows what it needs them for; it knows what it can do with them. I felt that if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff desired to have a senatorial committee or a congressional committee go to the war fronts they should take the responsibility of saying so and of providing the facilities, although I could well understand why they should want the cooperation, at least, of the Senator from Oregon and myself in regard to the personnel.

This morning I had a conference with the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff in regard to the matter. They advised me that they could furnish the facility for such a group, not to exceed five, representing the committees interested and involved, to take such a trip. While their first suggestion was that the group be not larger than four, they said it would make no particular difference if another member were added, making it five.

Therefore, I have conferred with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the chairman of the Truman committee [Mr. TRUMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in regard to the matter. I felt, and still feel, that there is no committee which has any priority of claim of the right to designate the members of such a committee to go abroad. Of course, the Committee on Military Affairs is interested. The Committee on Naval Affairs would be interested, because ships of the Navy are all over the world. The Appropriations Committee, which has brought in the bills appropriating all the money for the expenditures in the war, would have an equal, if not a prior claim, because of the amount of money involved, to have members of that committee designated. The Committee on Foreign Relations, which sponsored the lend-lease measures under which we have expended or appropriated some $13,000,000,000 or $14,000,000,000, would have a legitimate claim to have some member of its committee investigate, especially abroad, with regard to the situation.

However, the upshot of it all is that after these conferences have been held in an effort to compose the situation and do justice to the committees involved, the Senator from Oregon and I have agreed to sanction and recommend five Members of the Senate to be at the disposal of the War Department for such facilities as the War Department has available, and at such time as the War Department has them available, and, at such time and under such circumstances as will not interfere with the duties of our military commanders and our armed forces abroad, to make such a trip for the investigation of matters pertaining to the war.

It is not a matter on which the Senate must act, but I am calling it to the attention of the Senate, and will give the names in a moment. Two of them are members of the Military Affairs Committee, designated by the chairman. Two of them are members of the Truman committee, designated by the chairman. Three of them are members of the Appropriations Committee. Two of them are members of the Naval Committee, but not designated by the chairman. Of course, some of the Senators are members of more than one of the committees I have named. So both the committees representing the armed forces and the committee appropriating the money are represented in the selection of the five Senators whose names I shall now read.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the purpose of the trip, and where are they going?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot tell the Senator where they are going. The purpose of the trip, as I have gathered it from

those who have sponsored and initiated it, is to investigate matters pertaining to the conduct of the war, not as to policy or strategy, but to investigate the matter of materials and the distribution of materials, because it is distinctly understood, as I understand, that the committee is not to investigate or report upon military strategy or upon anything which would in any way impinge upon the authority of the military or naval officers in regard to the actual conduct of the war.

As to where they are going, I understand that originally the trip was projected to north Africa, but it has been broadened.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who projected the trip originally, and for what purpose was it projected? The Senator has been talking ever since he rose about the projection of this trip and the ramifications of it. So far as I know, no resolution was ever introduced in the Senate having to do with such a trip. I agree with the Senator from Illinois. I should like to know where this committee is going, wl at committee it is, and what its jurisdiction is to be. We have apparently been setting up committees one after another. I can understand the feeling I have seen expressed in the newspapers by some very important officials, both of the Army and Navy, and by Mr. Justice Byrnes, to the effect that we have so many committees that the officials of the Government do not have an opportunity to attend to their own business, because of necessary attendance upon committees. This seems to be another committee for the same purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as my information goes, the trip was first projected by the Truman committee. It was later projected by the Committee on Military Affairs. It did not originate with the War Department. It did not originate in any resolution adopted by the Senate. However, the Truman committee, acting under the authority of the resolution which created it, and which authorized it to investigate war production and many other matters—and the resolution is so broad as to include nearly everything regarding the war—conceived the idea that it would be well to send such a committee abroad. The Military Affairs Committee which, of course, from its name, is interested in military affairs, felt that if such a committee were appointed it should at least be representative.

My information is that it is proposed first to go to Newfoundland, then to Scotland, then to England, then to north Africa, and probably through the Near East into India, and other places, finally probably to Australia and back home to the west coast, which would be a circumnavigation of the globe. If any further detailed information is desired, it will have to be obtained from the chairman of the Truman committee and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, or from those who are expected to go.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I do not wish to interrupt his statement or take the Senator from Illinois from his feet. I should like to have the opportunity of making this statement before the list of members of the committee is read. After that is done there might be some question of personalities with regard to our colleagues in the Senate.

I should like to point out that I do not think any public purpose is to be served by any committee of the Congress going around visiting battlefields. In the first place, I do not think that the members of the committee would see anything.

During the last war I happened to be an officer in the Army stationed in France at a place called Langres. One day I received a hurry-up order to report at Chaumont, 30 or 40 kilometers away, to the Adjutant General of the A. E. F. I was informed that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives was coming over there to make an investigation of the general front. I had been detailed to accompany the committee as one of the officers in charge of the trip. It was made perfectly clear to me in that conversation with the Adjutant General of the A. E. F. that under no circumstances were we to permit those distinguished solons to go any place where any of them might be hurt.

That involved the proposition that they were not going to see very much of what was going on. The tour was conducted on that basis. I assume that all the other Army officers who accompanied the committee received the same orders which I received.

So far as I am concerned, I have the very greatest respect for the magnificent work which has been done by the committee headed by my colleague. I think it has saved the Government millions of dollars, and that its investigations on the ground in the United States have resulted in tremendous benefit. I think that the investigation conducted on the ground by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate for the purpose of developing the physical facts connected with the necessary defense of Alaska was very valuable to the country; but when it comes to areas where we are actually engaged in combat, I do not believe that any public purpose would be served by a junket trip for Senators, Representatives, or anyone else. I do not believe that the responsible military and naval commanders on the ground would let them see enough to stick in their eyes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, allow me to say, although I think I have already stated it, that I did not initiate the movement to send this committee abroad. Neither did the Senator from Oregon. I would not have done so, and personally I would not sponsor such a trip because my personal views are very largely in accord with those expressed by the Senator from Missouri. However, when the two committees initiated the matter and took it up with the War Department, and the War Department advised them and advised me and the Senator from Oregon that they had the facilities available, and could furnish the transportation, and put it on our doorstep to decide whether it should be done, it seemed to me that probably it was not our duty to stand in the way by opposing the projected trip. It is purely a matter for the War Department itself to decide whether it has the facilities it can spare. Whether the trip would result in anything of value, I do not believe anyone can now predict. That will depend on future events.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able majority leader whether the chairman of the committee on Naval Affairs had anything to do with the proposed trip?

Mr. BARKLEY. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Navy is very much involved in the war.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated a while ago that the Navy is as much involved as is the Army, because the Navy is all over the world. But it so happens that two members of the committee, the names of whom I shall soon read, are members of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield, so that I may ask him a further question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Will any money for the trip be requested from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that any will be. The War Department has advised me that that matter offers no complication.

Mr. LUCAS. As one of the members of the committee, I wish to state emphatically that if any money is to be requested, I will not vote a single dime for the trip.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may make an observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has expressed some doubt as to whether there would be any value attached to the proposed trip.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said that whether there would be would depend on future events. No one can predict.

Mr. DANAHER. Well, the members of the party making the trip might come back and write a book. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Another famous American has done the same thing, with apparently fruitful reward.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, it may be recalled that it was once said, "Oh * * *, that mine adversary had written a book!"

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. President, after there has been consultation, as I have indicated, the committee selected is not a subcommittee of any committee. It is a mixed committee, and therefore its members are listed according to their seniority as among themselves, but not according to their seniority on the committee of

which they are members. It is mixed because it comes from several committees.

The following Senators compose the list:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as the chairman of the group, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I think I can say that the Senator from Oregon, as the minority leader, under the situation laid before us by the Secretary of War and by the Chief of Staff, concurs in this recommendation.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 33, line 18, after the word "Authority," I offer an amendment to strike out "$48,170,000" and substitute "$43,170,000." In other words, my amendment would provide a cut of $5,000,000 in the appropriation for the War Relocation Authority.

Some time ago the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made an address in the Senate which was very effective and appealed to me. He had the facts to back up what he said showing that the Japanese in relocation camps were being pampered and coddled, and so on, down the line. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], representing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, made an investigation. I believe the investigation by his subcommittee showed that there had been waste, extravagance, coddling, and pampering of the Japanese in the relocation centers. I believe we can well make a cut of $5,000,000 in the item.

I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the statement I have made is borne out by the facts observed by his committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, last year the War Relocation Authority spent $75,469,648. That much money was allocated to it; and if any unexpended balance remains, we shall not know it until the end of this day. It is assumed that all the money has been spent. However, the War Relocation Authority did not call on the Appropriations Committee, and did not come before the committee until the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] sent for it. It automatically cut its own appropriation $27,000,000. In the bill it now asks for $48,170,000.

I am sorry that I am not able to read to the Senate, and that they have not been printed so that they are available to the Senate, the hearings of investigations which the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs made into the handling of the Japanese by the War Relocation Authority. I hold in my hand the galley sheets of the printed hearings.

However, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the statement which was made in the hearings with reference to the number of employees, and to read the statement Mr. Myer made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs. He was asked how many employees were in Washington. He said, "Approximately 110 at the moment." That was on January 17, 1943. He further said:

> The size of the staff is in a state of flux in Washington for this reason: We have had, up to the middle of December, a regional office in San Francisco, an office at Denver, and one at Little Rock. The total number of civil service employees as of January 1 was 1,665, including all the clerks.

I wish Senators could look at the list of employees and note the employees in Washington. A solicitor, for example, receives $666.66 a month. There are analysts, senior clerks, head executive officers, and so forth. The director receives $10,000 a year, and the assistant director receives $8,000, I believe. The salaries are tremendous, and unauthorized, in my opinion, for the doing of the job which is being done.

No real effort has been made to segregate the loyal Japanese from the disloyal. Between 105,000 and 110,000 Japanese were taken, by Executive order, off the Pacific coast, and were put into the relocation centers. That was done in the interest of the safety of the people of the United States, at a time when it was not known what would be the attitude of those Japanese toward the Government of the United States. The good ones have been put in the camps with the bad ones, assuming there are good ones and bad ones. No real effort has been made to segregate the two groups.

It is my judgment that at Camp Manzanar those who are against the Government of the United States and those among them who would help destroy the United States—and there are many of them—will total as many as 50 percent of the citizens of the United States between the ages of 17 and 37 who are kept there. I should like to give the Senate those figures.

In the 10 relocation centers there are 105,750 internees. There were 19,963 Japanese of military age.

Only 6 percent of those, or 1,181, volunteered for Army service. Twenty-four percent of them, or 4,783, answered "No" to the loyalty question. In other words, when they were asked whether their loyalty was to the United States or to the Emperor of Japan, they said their loyalty was to the Emperor of Japan. Many of them stated that if given the opportunity they would help destroy the United States, and many of them said they were loyal to the Japanese Emperor because they expected to win, and they expected to collect indemnities after the war.

The people who are loyal to the United States in the centers, in many cases, have been beaten and bruised by the enemies of this country, and the F. B. I. is frequently not informed; they have to find out about the cases in the newspapers.

Japanese have been released without the F. B. I. being notified. If the disloyal were segregated from the loyal, as should have been done many years ago, and placed in internment camps, and given the treatment they ought to have, automatically this agency would need less money to take care of this 67 percent who are second-generation Japanese, who were born and educated in the United States, and have never been to Japan at all. Sixty-seven percent are American citizens because of their birth.

In my opinion, this is a wasteful agency. The school teachers, for example, are paid about 50 percent higher wages than the local school systems pay their teachers, in the States where the camps are located, and the teachers are taken from the local schools. The activity may be perpetual, and we may have this agency on our hands always, if they continue as they have functioned so far.

The protection of the localities is inadequate. Only about 150 or 160 limited-service soldiers guard them on the outside, and usually a Caucasian, as they are called, on the inside, and Japanese fellows on the inside whose loyalty is questionable.

Although the agency confesses they had $27,000,000 more than they wanted, and did not appear to justify the $48,170,000 they asked for, I believe that the Senate should make some showing to this agency that the appropriation should be cut, so that it will serve notice on them that in the future it is not going to tolerate the continuance of an agency of this sort, which, in my opinion, is breeding trouble for the people of the United States in the future, because the good and the bad—if there are good and bad—are in the camps together, and the bad ones so far have had the upper hand. The War Relocation Authority is treating it as a social experiment, at the expense of the people of the United States.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. In just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not desire to trespass on the Senator's time, but in one camp we visited, some of the Japanese, in answer to the loyalty question, said their loyalty was to Japan. Some of the project directors called them in and suggested that they would give them favors or privileges if they would change their minds and later should not be disloyal. They have been pampering the disloyal people. With the Japanese-Americans who are loyal to the United States and are willing to work or fight for the United States, I have no quarrel. There are about 7,500 American-Japanese now in the Army of the United States. I applaud and appreciate and approve their loyalty. But I do not approve a project director saying to an inimical Japanese, who is against this country, and whose loyalty is to the Emperor of Japan, who says he would like to destroy the United States, "Go

to the picture show tonight and I will give you some privilege if you show up later and just change your mind. Go back up there and see if you cannot come in with the right answer."

Mr. President, I feel very strongly about this matter. I feel that every Jap in those camps who said he was against the United States was against the United States. Many of them, too, who said they were for us are against us.

I feel that this appropriation should be cut, as a lesson to the War Relocation Authority, to make them get rid of some of the useless employees they have here in Washington. I think they have too much money, and that they have spent too much money, that it is a wasteful agency, and that we should keep these camps only so long as we have to keep them. I have a rather strong conviction that they should be turned over to the Army, and that this agency should be abolished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on this amendment, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one particular case that was presented to me by a man in whom I have great confidence, who seems to know exactly what he is talking about.

I have a friend in my city in my State who was born and raised in the State of Colorado. His father owned and operated a ranch in that State, an old fashioned cattle ranch, of about 10,000 acres. He raised 10 children there. Those of his children still surviving own the ranch, and every year they lease some two or three or possibly four thousand additional acres, of which about 900 acres are ordinarily in cultivation.

Of course, under present conditions of farm labor, it has been very difficult for them to farm that 900 acres of land. My friend's brother, a young lad of about 17 or 18, has been trying to do all the farm work on the land.

In order to get some labor for this ranch, which has been in the family long enough for the old man to have raised 10 children, they went to one of these Japanese camps, which happened to be in the neighborhood, and tried to get some Japanese labor. My friend sent me a list of the specifications of housing, food, and social treatment which he said covered conditions so much better than the conditions under which his father had raised a family of 10 children on the same ranch, that he took it as a physical impossibility to conform to the requirements of the relocation authority, or whatever it is called, for the kindly treatment that had to be given to these Japanese laborers if they were turned over for labor on an American ranch.

My friend suggested to me he had concluded that it would be better for him to leave his prosperous business in St. Louis and go back to Colorado and work on the ranch himself, than to try to support a lot of Japanese laborers on the ranch, in the luxury to which the relocation outfit thought they should be maintained.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it should be said, apropos of what the Senator from Missouri has stated, that 50,000 of these Japanese are on the pay roll of the American Government. They get from $12 to $15 a month, and do not have to work at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Senator seen a list of the standards which are provided wherever they go to work? They are so much above the ordinary standards provided for American labor in some sections that it is preposterous.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me until I finish my statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army procures food for the Japs interned in the camps. We spend an average of about 55 cents a day to feed an American Army private, and I have eaten in mess halls in various places in the United States and in the Aleutians, and those men are the best fed people I know anything about. We spend between 45 and 50 cents feeding the Japs in the camps, and they get the same food we feed Army privates, and they get food which the people in the neighborhoods cannot get. The Army has bought up all the food, in many cases it has rationed food, which the people of the United States cannot get.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot yield, because the Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. President, what is suggested is an arbitrary cut, I know, because we do not understand how much the agency needs, or how much the waste has been, but I am convinced that if they can cut the appropriation to $27,000,000 without coming here at all, and, as I understand from the Senator from Nevada, they did not come until he sent for one of them, and they were satisfied with the Budget estimate, we should show that we can cut it more, and make them live $5,000,000 better than they have lived in the last year, in addition to their own $27,000,000 cut.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the senior Senator from New Hampshire yield to his colleague?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to amplify and supplement what my colleague has said. I will do so in 30 seconds by relating a happening which took place on the plane on which I was traveling from Boston to New York last night. There happened to be on the plane a captain of the Air Force from Tucson, Ariz. He reported to me along the same lines that the Senator has been speaking, that in one of the large military camps our men are being fed canned milk, while in a relocation camp 60 miles away the Japs are given fresh milk from the local herds of cattle. An indignation meeting was held to take up that matter, and the situation was reversed.

Mr. President, what that captain told me illustrates what is going on in this country. Our own men, our soldiers, are being "sold down the river" and given canned milk, while the Japanese are given fresh milk.

I think the amendment offered by my colleague is a timely one.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] a question. I know the hearings covered many pages, and are so lengthy that they perhaps should not be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is there any break-down of the hearings which in a simple way would give to the American people the facts which have been discovered concerning this situation?

Mr. CHANDLER. I may say to the Senator that the hearings are being printed, and just so soon as they are they will be given to the Senate for its information and to the news agencies and reporters who wish to give the information to the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. The copies of the hearings will be limited. Can a résumé be prepared which may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the people of the country?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall undertake to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard the testimony given by Mr. Myer yesterday, and I am very frank to say that it was not very satisfactory. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] both said the cut was an arbitrary one. It seems to me it would be very proper, in view of the testimony given yesterday, especially that given by Mr. Myer, to accept the amendment, so far as I individually can do so, and let it go to conference. I hope that can be done.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on page 33, line 18.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Arizona is very much interested in the Japanese problem. As a matter of fact, I believe it is the most difficult problem confronting our State at this time. There is no question that the Japanese who are located in Arizona have "muffed" a golden opportunity to prove their loyalty to the United States. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the bad and disloyal should be separated from the loyal, if there are any loyal. I do not know how one is going to determine that question. Arizona

does not want Japanese brought in from other States and located in camps in our State and released to go where they will in Arizona.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As the Senator from Arizona knows, pursuant to the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs we held hearings in his State at Phoenix, Ariz., during a part of which time the Senator from Arizona was present. There were 1,150 Japanese in Arizona before the war, and now there are 31,000. If the Senator's State were required to keep and provide for that many Japanese it would create a desperate situation among the farming population of the State. I am in sympathy with the Senator's problem, and I am anxious to help him in any way possible.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the feeling is running high against the Japanese in Arizona. Of course, the problem cannot be solved at this late hour on the floor of the United States Senate; but, inasmuch as the subject has been brought up, I felt that I should tell the Senate of the United States that it is a problem which must be solved or there is going to be trouble in the State of Arizona.

I was in the State and conducted a brief investigation in conjunction with Steve Tormey, Arizona State commander of the American Legion. I will say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that the feeling in the State is much higher now than it was when he was there.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the subject which is being discussed with respect to the Japanese is one in which I am very deeply interested, and heretofore I introduced proposed legislation on this subject. I wish to make an observation at this time, before the vote is had on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

There is pending now before the Senate a bill which I introduced dealing with the Japanese question. It provides for doing what is proposed to be done in connection with the pending bill, that is to make lawful the things now being done by Executive order. For some reason the Department of Justice does not look with favor upon my bill. There is no difference between the provisions of my bill and the directives contained in the Executive order, except that the bill provides that the War Department and Navy Department shall have charge of the Japanese who are being held in custody in concentration camps and elsewhere in the country. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire simply provides for a reduction of the amount which was fixed by the committee in the pending bill to be appropriated for the War Relocation Authority.

I wish to make a further observation. The great mistake is that these Japanese are *not* held in custody by the War Department and by the Navy Department, but instead, are held in custody by the War Relocation Authority, a group of civilians whose expenses are provided for in this appropriation. I assume that an amendment providing for transfer of custody to the War Department and Navy Department could not be offered at this time. I have discussed the matter privately with other Members in the Chamber during the course of the evening. As I understand, such an amendment would be subject perhaps to a point of order because it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I think the whole matter is one which should be handled by the War Department.

The proposal to separate or segregate the loyal from the disloyal has been mentioned here. That should not be very difficult, because I do not think there are any loyal Japanese. I simply do not think they come that way. The War Department is better equipped to handle them, because they are people, as we all know, who cannot be handled with gloves. I do not like the idea of petting or pampering them and, as has been stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], providing support for them superior to that afforded the American people. I do not like that idea of petting and pampering the Japanese and keeping them in luxury. I think they should be handled by the War Department with special instructions to treat them as prisoners.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator on the point he has last spoken of, that I have received a very strong protest from some very important citizens of St. Louis, that is, from a very strong organization which has recently been organized in the Middle West section, in fact, all over the United States, known as the War Dads, based on some factual evidence. They complain very bitterly that it is a matter of absolute record, at least so testified to by some of the correspondents who have been on ships coming home, that German prisoners or Italian prisoners being sent to the United States or to Canada on ships are treated very much better in many respects than the American wounded men returning to the United States are treated.

Mr. President, I think it is time for us to quit pampering the Japanese in the United States, who ought to be treated as prisoners. I cannot see any sense in pampering them. I am in favor of treating prisoners justly and fairly, according to the principles of international law. I am in favor of treating persons who are in concentration camps fairly, but I certainly cannot understand any principle which requires them to be treated better than we treat our own people.

Mr. STEWART. I think the Senator is quite correct in his statement. I agree with it, and I think probably as good a place as we can begin is on the Japs.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question in the Senator's time, if he does not object. There is no question in my mind, and I do not think there is a question in the mind of anyone who has visited the camps and made any investigation, that there are conditions there which should be remedied. I should like to ask the Senator when his report will be made and whether the report will make definite recommendations relative to the correction of those conditions.

Mr. CHANDLER. The report has already been made to the Committee on Military Affairs. It has been ordered to be printed, and the committee ordered the subcommittee to take it up with the President of the United States, to see if there could not be issued an order abolishing the War Relocation Authority, and turning over control of the Japanese to the Army. I may say the Army does not want to be given control of them, but I think it should have control of them; because in many States—for instance, in the Senator's State—there are ten or fifteen thousand Japanese who are segregated from white persons, and are guarded by military police who have had only limited service. Some of the guards have shotguns; there is a guard tower about every half mile, and there is a wire fence around the land on which the Japanese are kept. For instance, at the Gila River camp, only a wire fence separates them from the Gila River Valley. We are told that the Japanese cannot get out, but the wire fence is all that prevents them from getting out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that one of the things in which the Senator from Arizona is interested is the matter of who is responsible for the conditions existing in Arizona, whether the fault is with those in Washington who are in charge, or whether it is with the people who are on the ground.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, the Washington authorities.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the War Department should take charge of the camps. I have been awaiting the report of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Kentucky and its recommendations, because I myself will have some definite recommendations to make after we have completed our investigation in conjunction with the American Legion in the State of Arizona.

Let me say that, for instance, the Rivers Camp, alone, embraces 7,000 acres of some of the best land in the State of Arizona.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is alfalfa land.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; it is alfalfa land, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CHANDLER. The land was rented from the Indians.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; it was rented from the Office of Indian Affairs. The Japanese are raising vegetables on only about 700 acres of the land and are running cattle on the remainder of it, just as was done before they got hold of it. They could be producing food to be sent across the ocean, where it is needed, if they wanted to do what they should do. In my investigation I found that they did not work more than 36 hours a week; and at 4 o'clock—to be exact, at 5 minutes after 4 in the afternoon—I saw tractors standing idle, although they should have been in use.

Mr. CHANDLER. It should be remembered that while the farmers of the country need farm machinery, but cannot get it, these people have farm

machinery stored in the barns. It should also be remembered that the Japanese in the camps do not have to work if they do not want to do so. However, if they do work they are paid $12 or $16 or $19 a month, and have their housing furnished, and get the best food to be had in the United States.

Mr. STEWART. The money they are paid is so much velvet.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; it is velvet. They cannot be made to work. From the time when the bell rings to indicate that the time for work has arrived, many of them settle down and amuse themselves and play games. I saw many of them playing games.

Let me say that the Committee on Military Affairs sent me to New York to meet the Red Cross ship *Arcadia*, on which 800 wounded American boys were brought to New York. I went through that ship with Major General Kirk, the new Surgeon General of the Army; Major General Gross, the Chief of Transportation; Maj. Gen. Terry, Chief of the Second Service Command; and Major General Groninger, in charge of the port of New York. I saw Tennessee boys, Kentucky boys, and boys from all over the United States, without arms, without legs, without eyes, shot through and through. They were not complaining. They were deeply concerned with what was happening in the United States. They were glad to be home. They were glad they had been able to make the sacrifices they had made for their country. They just wanted to know that there would not be any strikes in the United States and that the Japanese would no longer be treated in the fashion in which they have been treated, at the expense of our own kin.

The authorities have no right to treat the Japanese in the way they have been treated; and anyone who is responsible for the treatment which has been given is bound to receive the opprobrium and criticism of all our people, especially when our own boys and our own people have to suffer so much. I wish some of the other Members of the Senate could have seen the boys I saw in New York.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask if the report shows that it is true that persons in the medical profession, doctors and also nurses, were available to the Japanese in the camps, although in the same territory civilians do not have medical attention.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, yes; the Japanese have fine hospitals; they have orphanages; they get milk and fresh vegetables, and have doctors and hospitals and facilities that are not available to the local people. Oh, yes; they are well taken care of in that respect.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Japanese doctors are used, are they not?

Mr. CHANDLER. In each camp there usually is one doctor whom they call a Caucasian doctor, and the rest are called Japanese doctors. You cannot say white man and brown man in those camps. If a man is a white man, you have to call him a Caucasian.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator interpret that to be a restraint on the freedom of the press? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I want to add one word to what I have already said on this subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. On the point raised by the Senator from Nebraska about the doctors, let me say that the Japanese doctors are paid professional wages, just as other professional men are.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, during the time the bill I have mentioned has been pending—the bill which provides that the War Department and the Navy Department shall have custody of all the Japanese, without respect to whether they were born in this country or otherwise—we have held hearings. At the time last year when hearings were held the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] were members of the subcommittee. We went rather exhaustively into the entire question. We dug up an old report known as the Summerall report. I believe at the time the report was written General Summerall was Governor General of the Hawaiian Islands. From the report we found that conditions there had been quite intolerable. We brought the report more or less up to date by taking other testimony. Why we tolerate these people, I am not able to understand. The reason for my interest in the matter and the reason for holding the hearings we have held is that I have received a great many letters and other communications from people in the State of California, where of course the Japanese question has been most acute. My information, which I think is accurate—the Senator from Kentucky may be able to verify it—is that at the moment there are no Japanese in the State of California.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. STEWART. I have had numerous letters about the situation because of my interest in it and because of the fact that my interest was known. I believe we are likely to have serious trouble when we undertake to send the Japanese back to California.

Mr. CHANDLER. The only Japanese in California are the two groups in the relocation centers. There are two relocation centers in California.

Mr. STEWART. We have gone rather far afield in this discussion.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator from Tennessee have any idea how many United States prisoners the Japanese have?

Mr. STEWART. The only information I have is what is available to the Senator and to others. The prisoners on Corregidor numbered about 30,000, I believe, according to the best figures we have. A few others have been taken. The number is probably in excess of 30,000.

Mr. TUNNELL. I take it that there are also a certain number of civilian citizens of the United States in Japan.

Mr. STEWART. There were some in the Philippine Islands. Of course, there were a few in Japan. My belief is that the number is very small. No doubt there are a few.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was wondering whether there was any connection between the treatment which we are giving the Japanese who are in our control and the treatment which United States citizens who are prisoners are receiving in Japan.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator mean that we are treating them unusually well?

Mr. TUNNELL. I am wondering how Americans are being treated by the Japanese.

Mr. STEWART. I do not have any information on that subject. I do not know what treatment American prisoners are receiving at the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. TUNNELL. Consideration must be given to that subject.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I do not know any more than what we have all read in the newspapers.

Mr. President, I believe that is all I care to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Effective 30 days following the date of enactment of this act, no part of any appropriation made by this act, or any other public funds, personnel, services, or property shall be used to enforce, directly or indirectly, further compliance by any processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer with, or to prosecute further a violation by any such person of—

(1) any rule, regulation, or order issued for the purpose of establishing a maximum price for any commodity intended for civilian consumption, or use, where any court in any proceeding to which such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer is a party finds (A) that such rule, regulation, or order does not afford to such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer a generally fair and equitable operating margin, (B) that the provisions of such rule, regulation, or order operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in the industry or trade of such processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer, unless such changes are necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement, or (C) that such rule, regulation, or order was iscued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory committee composed (in addition to members appointed to represent unorganized or otherwise unrepresented branches of any affected industry) of representatives and

alternates chosen by, and assigned to, such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representatives of each branch of such industry;

(2) any rule, regulation, or order relating to rationing with respect to a commodity intended for civilian consumption or use, where any court in any proceeding brought to enforce compliance by such person with, or to prosecute a violation by such person of, any such rule, regulation, or order, finds (A) that provision has not been made for the distribution of such commodity through the usual and established channels of trade (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, or retailers) in the same proportion (so far as practicable and recognizing changes in demand and in available facilities and the importance of preserving small enterprises) as that in which such commodity was distributed during the calendar year 1941, or (B) that such rule, regulation, or order was issued without advising and consulting with a standing advisory committee composed (in addition to members appointed to represent unorganized or otherwise unrepresented branches of any affected industry) of representatives and alternates chosen by, and assigned to such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representative of each branch of such industry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I am compelled to make the point of order against this amendment. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is perfectly obvious.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I realize that a point of order is proper, but at the time I submitted that amendment I filed notice of intention to suspend the rule in order to have the amendment considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. Does the Senator from Montana now wish to move to suspend the rule?

Mr. MURRAY. I now move to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, before action is taken on the motion I should like to call attention to the purpose of the proposed amendment.

The object of the amendment is to protect small business concerns and business generally from the effect of certain orders, regulations, and practices of the Office of Price Administration which are having a very serious effect. It will be observed from a reading of the amendment that it is intended to overcome the effect of the practice or procedure of the Office of Price Administration in connection with several important matters. One is in connection with the ceiling prices which are fixed by the Office of Price Administration, and which, in operation, fail to afford a fair margin of profit, thus affecting many concerns in the country. These firms, when charged with violations, are not given the opportunity of showing that the ceiling prices fixed by the Office of Price Administration fail to afford fair margins of profit and violate the intention of Congress at the time the law was enacted.

The amendment proposes to permit business concerns to have an opportunity in the field, when charged, to prove, in defense of any proceedings which might be brought against them for violating the ceiling prices, that the prices fixed by the Office of Price Administration do not afford such business firms a fair margin of profit. That was the intention of Congress at the time the original price-control bill and the anti-inflation bills were passed.

This amendment has three provisions. The first relates to the subject of fair margins of profit; another provision provides for an equitable allocation of goods, which under the regulations of the Price Administration is not provided. The regulations now in effect prevent a proper distribution of goods to business concerns of the country and as a result many firms are forced to buy in the black market. The third provision in the proposed amendment is one which would compel the Office of Price Administration to set up advisory committees to be consulted before such rules, orders, and regulations are put into effect. This would prevent the issuance of many unwise and hurtful orders and regulations.

The Committee on Small Business Problems of the Senate and a similar committee in the House have been holding hearings and conferences and business concerns throughout the country have sent representatives here to complain of the serious consequences of these regulations and orders issued by the Office of Price Administration. An effort has been made on the part of these committees to induce the Office of Price Administration so to remedy these orders and regulations as to protect the concerns affected. A short time ago the two committees, from the House and from the Senate, held a joint meeting at which a resolution was adopted covering this very matter. I ask that the resolution of the two committees, one from the House and one from the Senate, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the small meat industry, including small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, has complained for several months to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate against various practices imposed upon them by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture, which threaten to drive them out of business and disrupt the distribution of meat and meat products for essential civilian needs; and

Whereas the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate have held both joint and individual hearings and have otherwise investigated conditions in the meat industry and said committees as a result of said investigations and hearings are persuaded that the small meat industry, including the small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, is in danger of being destroyed; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to conform with the express mandate of the Congress in the Second Emergency Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has further resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture properly to guide the flow of meat and meat products through the orderly channels of distribution; and

Whereas, Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, known as the Price Control Act, title I, section 2 (a) provides that the Administrator shall "appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be," and the said section further provides that "The Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classification, differentiations, and adjustments therein"; and

Whereas the Price Administrator has not exercised said discretionary powers and has not set up such an advisory committee, as suggested in the act, and has not regularly consulted all segments of the meat industry, namely, the large and small slaughterer and nonslaughterer in the packing industry, the large and small processor; the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer; all of which has contributed to the break-down of normal distribution and the destruction of small businesses throughout the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business, That—

1. The Office of Price Administration immediately establish fair and equitable margins between the price of livestock and the price ceilings set on sales of meat and meat products for all processors, packers, wholesalers, and retailers;

2. The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration immediately establish quotas for nonslaughtering packers as well as slaughtering packers and allocate adequate supplies to the small wholesalers and retailers in all areas of the country, so that when meat rationing is put into effect adequate initial inventories will be held by such packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers; and

3. The Administrator of the Office of Price Administration immediately proceed to discharge his discretionary powers under the act (Public Law 421, 77th Cong., ch. 26, 2d sess.) by immediately establishing a meat-industry advisory committee that will include in its membership equal representation for the large and small slaughterers and nonslaughterers in the packing industry, the large and small processors, the wholesaler, the retailer, and the consumer, which advisory committee shall be regularly consulted by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with regard to all new regulations, amendments to existing regulations, directives, orders, or any promulgations with respect to the form thereof, and the classifications and adjustments therein as the same affect the meat industry; and

4. Copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture and that this committee be advised promptly by the Price Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture of action taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It may be entirely worthy,

but the committees of the Senate have not passed on it. The Senate has not passed on it. A two-thirds vote will be required to suspend the rule. I hope the rule will not be suspended, and that the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion to suspend the rule was not agreed to, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2968) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this afternoon the House sent a message over asking for a conference on House bill 2714. I shall not discuss it, but ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2714, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 30, 1943.

Resolved, That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate still further insist on its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61, agree to the still further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint as conferees on the part of the Senate, the same conferees who served previously on this bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate at the still further conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and several midshipmen for appointment as ensigns, all in the Navy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—JOHN M. HOUSTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, July 1, 1943, at 12 meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Virginia V. Tucker, Helena.
William B. Mims, Phenix City.

ARKANSAS

Don H. Stalls, Turrell.

CALIFORNIA

Victor F. Vieira, Esparto.

MINNESOTA

James M. McGuire, Rush City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, source of every joy and the inspiration of every earth-born hope, well may Thy praise our lips employ; we bless Thee that our lives are so mercifully preserved and still hold the freshness of Thy love. We rejoice that this is our Father's world; life, deep and boundless, is ours and the wings of the morning are not strong enough to carry us away from the sheltering care of the Good Shepherd.

This day, interpret to us again the ways of righteousness and truth, making us aware of our mastery over human life and destiny. In every situation help us to show moral self-control with a very deep sense of our trusteeship. Thou who art the Ancient of Days, who led our fathers to summits of faith and assurance, lead us on, feeling the supreme obligation that we owe this generation. Almighty God, amid the strife and confusion among men, let Thy light, which has never been extinguished, shine forth like a beacon from a promising morning. Kindle in all eager, passionate hearts an invincible desire to subdue all discords, to unite against antagonisms within and military vandalism without. Grant that we may seek eagerly the blessing of Him who bade us love mercy, deal justly, and to walk humbly with God, the Father of us all. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1109. An act to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment,' approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States."

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARE, TARVER, THOMAS of Texas, ANDERSON of New Mexico, ENGEL, KEEFE, and H. CARL ANDERSEN.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the course of the general debate today.

The SPEAKER. If there is general debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentleman from Idaho confine his request to general debate on the Lanham bill, because conference reports may be considered, and, of course, we would not want any committee to be sitting during the consideration of conference reports.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that the Committee on the Public Lands is very vigilant in responding to all calls of the House. If this request is granted, I can assure the Speaker that the members of the committee will be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Speaker has stated before, and I agree with him, that committees should not seek permission to sit while a bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule in the House. If the gentleman's request covers permission to sit during the general debate on the Lanham bill, which would include the debate on the rule, that is one thing, but permission to sit while a conference report is under consideration is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. WHITE. I am in full agreement with the gentleman's suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman modify his request and ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to sit during the general debate on the Lanham bill?

Mr. WHITE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell the House what bill the committee has under consideration?

Mr. WHITE. The Committee on the Public Lands is holding hearings on the Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve contract.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It merits inquiry, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, delivered at the Republican State Convention held at Appleton, Wis., last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Toledo Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISSENSION ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Vice President WALLACE has attacked the Secretary of Commerce, accusing him of obstructing the acquisition of critical materials required for the war effort and, among other things, of impeding the delivery of essential materials to General MacArthur.

Secretary Jones has replied that the 28-page attack is filled with malice and misstatements.

This further evidence of dissension and lack of coordination on the home front is deplorable. It is unthinkable that these two top officials in the Roosevelt administration are unable to compose their differences and cooperate in the war effort.

Secretary Jones, in effect, asks for a congressional investigation. In compliance with his request, I am today introducing a resolution providing for a thoroughgoing investigation of the charges made.

Division of authority, bungling, and incompetency cannot be allowed to continue on the home front without undermining the war effort. The home front must be made worthy of the millions who must bear the brunt of the conflict on the fighting fronts overseas.

PRICE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McLEAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS NOT TRYING TO STOP RUN-AWAY INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the letter Mr. Chester Davis wrote to the President he said the reason subsidies would not work was that we had not passed tax laws that would siphon off enough purchasing power. The President replied that he has been trying to get tax laws passed. I do not think the President is responsible and I do not think Mr. Morgenthau is responsible. You will recall that this Congress has resented in the past the administration's sending bills up to the House and asking the House to pass them. A revenue bill must originate in the House. The Treasury has adopted the policy of being ready and willing to submit any information and be helpful in any way in the world, but not being in the position of being dictatorial and telling the House what to do. It is not Mr. Morgenthau's fault, it is the fault of Congress. Congress will be to blame when we have run-away inflation, which we are on the brink of right now because we have not only not siphoned off taxes, we have crippled the only agency that is trying to stop inflation and even cut out the appropriation for the O. W. I., the only organization that has a well-planned and coordinated educational campaign to stop run-away inflation.

THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE AND AFTER

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution of the American Legion Post of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Battle of Washington reaches a crescendo of thinly veiled innuendoes and crashing derogations.

With the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare—who in another capacity is the Vice President of the United States—charging the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with "hamstringing bureaucracy" we have the unusual case of a bureaucrat calling a bureaucrat a bureaucrat. To this discordant note President Roosevelt adds a charge against newspaper men of responsibility for the bickering in Washington.

It begins to look as if the "Bureautopia" of the visionaries is in danger of becoming like the proverbial house divided against itself—it cannot stand.

But as dark as the picture may be there is always the silver lining. There is yet hope for "horse sense," logic, and sound American fundamentals, and we can be thankful that they are still with us to fall back on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters I have received from Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT AND LIQUIDATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a situation that has arisen in the last few days with respect to the settlement and liquidation of war contracts.

About a week ago a representative of the War Department very courteously came to me, as Chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, with a proposal that there be attached as a legislative rider to two appropriation bills involving some $105,000,000, permission to make settlement and close out contracts. It was very considerate of him to say to the legislative committee that they would like to attach a legislative rider. Of course, I objected, and the committee proceeded to have hearings on the matter.

We find that it is a difficult and complicated question; that the Comptroller General has advised me that it is so far-reaching that he is even unable to give us an opinion at this time on it. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that, due to the recess, we have postponed completion of the hearings and final disposition of the matter until after the recess, in order that we may give it deliberate and careful consideration, and have time to think it over. This ought to emphasize the error involved in the practice of attaching legislative riders on appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1134), to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Mississippi explain the bill for the benefit of the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to provide $10,000,000 as an emergency appropriation for the repair of flood-control works damaged or destroyed, and to strengthen those works, by the recent major floods extending from the Wabash River in Illinois and Indiana to the Arkansas River in Kansas, and embracing excessive floods along the Wabash, the Sangamon, the Illinois, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Arkansas, and the tributaries of those rivers, in which the Chief of Engineers estimated that some 9,000,000 acres of land were inundated and some $96,000,000 in damages were done. This bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Flood Control to the House, after extensive investigation and hearings. It is my purpose in calling up the Senate bill, which has been passed by the other body, to offer the House bill as amended by the committee, as a substitute for the Senate bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And in that way you could send it to the conference committee for the final draft?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In my district in several counties through which the Wabash River flows this Congress 3 or 4 years ago authorized a survey of the Wabash and its tributaries for purposes of certain flood-control work. During this recent flood thousands of acres of corn and other crops were destroyed. I wonder if any of the funds made available by this bill will be allocated to the project along the Wabash River, to correct that situation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will be allocated not only to the Wabash but along all other rivers where existing works, whether constructed by local interests, by the people themselves, or by the Federal Government's participation were damaged or destroyed, and for strengthening those levees, and other flood-control works.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is there anything provided for dredging the channel of the river to keep it from overflowing thousands of acres of rich bottom land in that valley? This authorizes the War Department or some other agency to dredge the channel in that river to stop these disastrous floods?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say in response to the gentleman's question that this is an emergency appropriation. It does not authorize the construction of any new works. Those works could only be authorized after the Chief of Engineers has submitted a report and after the committee and the Congress have adopted that report. But I may say that the House has conducted hearings with respect to the Wabash and other rivers upon which we have heard Members of the Senate and the House, and those hearings will be available soon, and it is proposed for new work to submit a comprehensive bill sometime later to deal with additional projects and authorizations. But this matter here deals with the restoration of works along the Wabash and along the other rivers of the country which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, recently.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to inquire of the gentleman whether this bill provides

for immediate repair work for the levees along the river to protect the valleys.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. Under existing law, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1941, $1,000,000 is authorized to be allocated for flood repairs and for flood relief, annually.

The Chief of Engineers reports that because of three excessive floods along the Missouri River, two excessive floods, one being 9 feet higher than any flood which had occurred previously along the Arkansas River, and excessive floods along the upper Mississippi River, that the $1,000,000 is utterly inadequate, and the committee, following the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, proposes to make available $10,000,000 for emergency work.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to add for the benefit of the House that the Corps of Engineers has been working very arduously and I understand are without funds for this emergency work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the purposes of this legislation, to provide additional funds.

Mr. PLOESER. I also want to say on behalf of a great many people who are living in the Missouri River Valley, that I compliment the Committee on the splendid work it is doing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand this bill and the situation regarding the section 5 emergency money under the flood-control law is made necessary by two factors. Those are the several recent floods, plus the fact that the War Production Board, and perhaps some other agencies, have stopped the various flood-control works that were under way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is generally true, primarily because of the floods themselves, and because even if the War Production Board had not stopped the regular work this emergency repair work is so important that it should be done.

Mr. CURTIS. One other question. There has been considerable said here about the Missouri River and the Missouri River Basin, and there was before the committee a special bill to authorize some $3,000,000 for emergency work on that river. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to tell us for the record how this bill covers that situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I propose to take that up in the 5-minute discussion. I will say that the gentleman from Nebraska appeared before the committee, of which he is a prominent and valuable member, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and other gentlemen who have been interested in this matter. This is a committee bill, and covers all the bills.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that even if we authorize this expenditure this money cannot be used to build levees beyond their preexisting heights nor to construct new levees. It is just the repair work and the replacements, where they have to be made, that are to be covered in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is generally correct in his understanding, but I want to be perfectly frank with the gentleman and the House and state that it is the recommendation of the Committee on Flood Control that this bill should go further than the previous emergency works. In other words, if a levee has been damaged, or if it has been crevassed and it is found necessary to increase the height of the levee, or to increase the section of the replacement, the language of this bill will permit of the building of the levee to a height and section to which it should be built rather than at a later time rebuilding the repaired levee. The work that can be done under this bill, while it is emergency in character, will permit levees where repaired or restored to be constructed to the proper height and section because it is felt it would be wasting Federal funds just to build the levees to the former height when the entire levee line should be rebuilt later. As stated, the bill does not provide for constructing flood-control works where none now exists; it does not provide for major improvements or extensions, but only for repairs and minor improvements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the only new work that can actually be done?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On existing levees, if such work is found necessary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. There is no provision in this bill made for loans to those who have suffered flood damages?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; not at all. The Congress has made ample provision for rehabilitation loans, and under existing statutes loans may be made to individuals suffering flood damages, as was done in previous floods.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman from Mississippi says this bill authorizes the restoration of levees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does it also authorize the extending of the levees where that is necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying that it authorizes the restoration of leeves and the strengthening of levees so as to tie in to a levee where repaired or restored that may be built larger than it was formerly, and in that sense the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. We have a bad situation on the Missouri side of the Missouri River up in northwest Missouri. Many of the levees there have been damaged or destroyed by the recent floodwaters and must be repaired and replaced and in many instances should be extended in order to protect thousands of acres of fertile Missouri soil.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am thoroughly aware of that and the committee went into it very carefully. Permanent provision for new works will be contained in a bill the committee proposes to bring in later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much does this bill carry?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Ten million dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for any dams on these streams?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. All this bill provides for is just the restoring and repairing of existing works where they were constructed by the local interests or by the Federal Government and strengthening repairs and restorations, where made, so that the restorations may be permanent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general", made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

SEC. 2. In order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is authorized to make rehabilitation loan or loans to any such railroad or to the receivers or trustees thereof in such manner, upon such terms and conditions, and with such security as the Corporation may prescribe; except that each such loan shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and shall contain provisions for the amortization thereof over a period of not to exceed 40 years. The total amount of loans and commitments to railroads, receivers, and trustees under this section shall not exceed at any one time $25,000,000. The amount of note, bond, debenture, and other such obligation which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provision of this section. The proceeds of any loan made pursuant to this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities in any area affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out in such area by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting in such area of any crops which are essential to the war effort.

SEC. 5. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation 'Flood control, general', made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I should like to make a brief statement.

The substitute I offer is the bill reported by the House Committee on Flood Control with the committee amendment. As will be noticed from the House committee report on this bill the Senate amended S. 1134 by including the language of the House bill as reported, and in addition to the language of the House bill the Senate authorized $25,000,000 for loans to railroads, on account of flood damages, authorized rehabilitation loans, and authorized the suspension of quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act where recent floods occurred. It is our view that the House should adopt the bill as reported by the House Committee on Flood Control, the purpose being to authorize $10,000,000, the amount recommended by the Chief of Engineers, approved by the Secretary of War, and approved by the Director of the Budget as being absolutely imperative to provide for the repair and restoration of levees and other flood works throughout the Nation. It is the view of the Committee on Flood Control that the other amendments in the Senate bill are not satisfactory and that the adoption of the amendment I propose should enable this legislation to go to conference where the amendments adopted by the Senate may be considered.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is there any limit as to what streams shall be considered when these repairs are made? In other words, will it apply to tributary streams as well as to the main stems of the principal rivers?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The only limitation at all is that it is applicable to all the rivers of the United States. As I stated a few moments ago, the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and several Members from Indiana and Illinois introduced similar bills. Most of those bills were applicable to the streams in which the individual Members were interested. It was the view of the Committee on Flood Control that all of the rivers where floods have occurred should be treated alike, and the pending bill is not restricted to any stream or to the tributaries of any stream.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I take this opportunity of complimenting the very able chairman of the Committee on Flood Control for bringing in this bill which I feel will have a very great beneficial interest to that part of the country which was so badly devastated by the recent floods.

Mr. GRANGER. What limitation is placed on the use of these funds by the words "recent floods"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is about as broad as language could be. The words "recent floods" would be for interpretation of the Chief of Engineers, but it is the intent to include the floods of 1943. The testimony before the committee, which went into this matter very carefully, showed that the recent floods extended from the Sangamon River and the Wabash primarily to the Arkansas in Kansas and the upper Missouri, but that there were also floods in other parts of the country, including California.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with that statement, unless there are some further questions, that this bill should be passed. It is an emergency matter. As I previously stated, it provides for the repair and restoration along every stream and every river along which floods have occurred. Of course, it is an emergency measure and does not undertake to provide for new flood works that have not been heretofore constructed by local interests or authorized by the Congress of the United States, and constructed by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Is this the bill to which Senator MCCLELLAN offered an amendment in the Senate in reference to the building of roads that were damaged by flood waters?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that I do not recall the junior Senator from Arkansas having offered such an amendment to this bill, but I understood that the junior Senator did offer an amendment to the highway bill which will come up shortly for consideration, which bill is now in conference.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As a member of the committee, I want to say that the full committee is behind this bill. I felt it should be reported in some form unanimously. It does contain a provision which gives a little advantage to two groups of projects; however, those were protected and taken care of in earlier legislation. The purpose of the provision in the bill is to insure that those particular projects which had already obtained priority in earlier legislation would not be interfered with by virtue of this emergency legislation. With reference to the sums of money which would be made available, that will be spent in accordance with the determination of the Army engineers so that all parts of the rivers will be protected and does not result in one project getting an advantage over another. The money will be spent in the best interest of the whole country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite well aware of the fact that I am in accord with his views. In my judgment neither the Hartford, Conn., nor the Louisiana projects should have been included. They are both already provided for under existing law.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to commend the committee on its fine work in this matter.

The House bill which I offer as a substitute authorizes $10,000,000 to be appropriated, and that pending the appropriation that amount may be allotted from existing flood-control appropriations, to be reimbursed provided no funds allotted under this authority shall be diverted from the unobligated funds made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of 1944, for specific projects therein enumerated which are located in Connecticut and Louisiana. Section 2 of the bill provides that it is additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of existing legislation.

The funds are to be expended by the Chief of Engineers in the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by

recent floods. I invite attention to the report of the committee. The bill enlarges the authority of the Chief of Engineers in section 5 of the act of 1941. It authorizes the Chief of Engineers to strengthen the levees repaired or restored. As pointed out in the report, short extensions to provide adequate ties to high ground can be made. Short setbacks may be made, but only minor improvements can be made under the authority to strengthen. Where there is a break or a crevasse, the Secretary of War is authorized in restoring or rebuilding the levee or other protective work to construct it to the proper grade and section. If the recent floods demonstrated that the levee generally is too low or too small, the part restored or repaired could be built to the proper section. When the remaining levee is enlarged and raised, it would not, therefore, be necessary to rebuild or raise the part of the levee restored or repaired. The emergency appropriation does not authorize major improvements. As stated, the appropriation authorized is additional and supplemental to the existing authority for the allocation of $1,000,000 annually. I trust that the bill will pass unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some tables which I have had prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency measure and should be passed without opposition; but it does not begin to cure the trouble. Until we do on all other rivers of America what we have done on the Tennessee, we are going to have these recurrent flood disasters coupled with an unconscionable waste of one of America's greatest natural resources, and that is the hydroelectric power in these streams and their tributaries.

I have just had compiled figures for 1942 showing the amount of electricity used in America and the overcharges by States according to the Tennessee Valley Authority rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates; the Bonneville Administration rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates.

According to the T. V. A. rates the American people were overcharged $1,185,233,674 in 1942.

According to the Tacoma, Wash., rate, the overcharges were $1,583,000,000.

According to the Bonneville rates the overcharges were $1,556,000,000.

According to the Ontario, Canada, rates the overcharges were $1,382,000,000.

At the same time we are lagging far behind the rest of the civilized world in rural electrification. We only have 38 percent of the farm homes of America electrified, while the powers we are fighting against have an average of 90 percent of their farms electrified. At the same time the American farmer is appealing to us to get this service extended to every farm home in America and to get their rates reduced.

Ten years ago the Commonwealth Southern, of which Mr. Wendell L. Willkie is the latest graduate, was buying power from Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, and selling it to residential consumers within sight of the dam at 10 cents per kilowatt-hour. Last year the residential consumers of my home town paid 1 cent a kilowatt-hour for their electricity. Last year that power cost the residential consumers of my home town on an average 1 cent a kilowatt-hour, and where the power company was paying 2 mills a kilowatt-hour for this power wholesale we pay more than twice that amount.

Why should we permit this vast amount of wealth to flow to the seas unharnessed and to carry death, ruin, and destruction in its wake every year when, by the passage of proper legislation, and with the expenditure of less money than we are wasting on many other things, we could harness these rivers and protect everybody along these streams perpetually and at the same time give to America a wealth of power richer than the diamond mines of Golconda. We used last year less than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste annually in these navigable streams and their tributaries.

Are we going to sit here and appropriate money for everything else on earth and see some of those funds we have appropriated used to build such projects as the Shipsaw Dam in Canada for the benefit of the Aluminum Trust?

Are we going to see lend-lease money used to build dams in other countries to furnish competition for us and to make the lives of the people in those countries more comfortable and their homes more attractive, while at the same time denying to the American people the use of this great wealth of hydroelectric power that belongs to them?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question and I am sure the gentleman can answer it. Does the Rural Electrification Authority have any intention whatever of creating with the funds we have been appropriating insurance companies to carry the insurance on the material and the property that they have?

Mr. RANKIN. That insurance question about which you have heard so much is a matter for the cooperatives themselves. They have the right to insure their property with anybody they please. They are not taking money out of the Federal Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. FISH. I wanted to know the facts.

Mr. RANKIN. That is a fact.

May I say to the gentleman from New York that right in his own back yard there is the great St. Lawrence project that would produce 10,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year. In my humble opinion, it would reduce the rates in the State of New York alone, just through the force of the yardstick, more than $100,000,000 a year. Yet we come along and quibble about rural electrification trying to protect the farmers of this Nation in trying to insure their lines by the cheapest insurance they can get, and let this great wealth of power go to waste.

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by the residential users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	262,462	349,202,000	$9,134,800	$6,184,260	$2,950,540	$5,581,363	$3,553,437	$5,106,353	$4,028,447	$4,823,174	$4,311,626
Arizona	96,137	117,680,000	4,508,900	1,997,443	2,511,457	1,803,560	2,705,340	1,650,257	2,858,643	1,560,079	2,948,821
Arkansas	150,625	123,004,000	5,615,200	2,684,066	2,931,134	2,425,766	3,189,434	2,218,004	3,397,196	2,094,470	3,520,730
California	1,839,900	1,876,605,000	56,562,000	37,613,730	18,948,270	33,993,762	22,568,238	31,052,538	25,509,462	29,355,678	27,206,322
Colorado	217,270	194,901,000	8,053,100	4,396,993	3,656,107	3,970,178	4,082,922	3,631,948	4,421,152	3,430,621	4,622,479
Connecticut	472,439	521,297,000	19,994,400	10,617,026	9,377,374	9,577,318	10,417,082	8,757,547	11,236,853	8,277,682	11,716,718
Delaware	60,961	60,960,000	2,688,000	1,290,240	1,397,760	1,163,904	1,524,096	1,064,448	1,623,552	1,008,000	1,680,000
Dist. of Col	67,891	209,169,000	5,177,800	4,292,396	885,404	3,878,172	1,299,628	3,541,615	1,636,185	3,350,037	1,827,763
Florida	350,975	426,672,000	17,411,400	7,661,016	9,750,384	6,929,737	10,481,663	6,337,750	11,073,650	5,989,522	11,421,878
Georgia	383,695	485,145,000	15,294,100	9,252,931	6,041,169	8,365,873	6,928,227	7,649,050	7,645,050	7,234,109	8,059,991
Idaho	110,037	204,946,000	5,191,200	3,000,514	2,190,686	2,709,806	2,481,394	2,481,394	2,709,806	2,341,231	2,849,969
Illinois	1,849,955	1,817,960,000	69,688,500	39,861,822	29,826,678	36,028,955	33,659,545	32,892,972	36,795,528	31,081,071	38,607,429
Indiana	762,796	754,230,000	28,725,700	15,914,038	12,811,662	14,362,850	14,362,850	13,127,645	15,598,055	12,409,502	16,316,198
Iowa	479,103	446,734,000	18,686,300	9,791,621	8,894,679	8,838,620	9,847,680	8,072,482	10,613,818	7,642,697	11,043,603
Kansas	341,343	309,163,000	12,842,200	6,677,944	6,164,256	6,035,884	6,806,366	5,522,146	7,320,054	5,213,933	7,628,267
Kentucky	344,604	308,900,000	11,587,000	6,963,787	4,623,213	6,291,741	5,295,259	5,747,152	5,839,848	5,434,303	6,152,697

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1942*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Louisiana	296,105	236,550,000	$10,854,200	$5,253,433	$5,600,767	$4,754,140	$6,100,060	$4,341,680	$6,512,520	$4,102,888	$6,751,312
Maine	186,895	158,561,000	7,114,000	3,272,440	3,841,560	2,952,310	4,161,690	2,703,320	4,410,680	2,553,926	4,560,074
Maryland	470,929	359,224,000	13,380,800	7,827,768	5,553,032	7,065,062	6,315,738	6,462,926	6,917,874	6,115,026	7,265,774
Massachusetts	1,152,014	920,085,000	43,264,600	20,810,273	22,454,327	18,820,101	24,444,499	17,219,311	26,045,289	16,267,490	26,997,110
Michigan	1,342,654	1,641,918,000	50,634,300	32,051,512	18,582,788	28,912,185	21,722,115	26,431,105	24,203,195	25,013,344	25,620,956
Minnesota	543,552	607,094,000	21,439,100	12,498,995	8,940,105	11,276,967	10,162,133	10,312,207	11,126,893	9,754,791	11,684,309
Mississippi	150,454	147,467,000	4,748,200	2,639,999	2,108,201	2,383,596	2,364,604	2,179,883	2,568,317	2,060,719	2,687,481
Missouri	695,521	692,011,000	24,883,800	14,457,488	10,426,312	13,039,111	11,844,689	11,919,340	12,964,460	11,272,361	13,611,439
Montana	98,625	115,262,000	4,103,600	2,084,629	2,018,971	1,883,552	2,220,048	1,723,512	2,380,088	1,629,129	2,474,471
Nebraska	234,130	217,885,000	8,796,000	4,785,024	4,010,976	4,318,836	4,477,164	3,949,404	4,846,596	3,738,300	5,057,700
Nevada	26,142	35,253,000	1,336,100	618,614	717,486	558,490	777,610	510,390	825,710	482,332	853,768
New Hampshire	130,380	111,382,000	5,434,300	2,385,658	3,048,642	2,157,417	3,276,883	1,972,651	3,461,649	1,863,965	3,570,335
New Jersey	1,123,048	945,608,000	45,232,900	21,711,792	23,521,108	19,585,846	25,647,054	17,912,228	27,320,672	16,962,338	28,270,562
New Mexico	59,487	50,768,000	2,468,500	1,014,554	1,453,946	915,814	1,552,686	839,290	1,629,210	792,389	1,676,111
New York	3,506,955	2,841,238,000	128,057,500	64,412,923	63,644,577	58,266,163	69,791,337	53,271,920	74,785,580	50,326,598	77,730,902
North Carolina	407,588	437,757,000	15,025,700	8,759,983	6,265,717	7,903,518	7,122,182	7,227,362	7,798,338	6,836,694	8,189,006
North Dakota	71,711	71,522,000	3,008,300	1,446,992	1,561,308	1,308,611	1,699,689	1,197,303	1,810,997	1,131,121	1,877,179
Ohio	1,686,920	1,800,472,000	61,304,300	39,234,752	22,069,548	35,495,190	25,809,110	32,429,975	28,874,325	30,652,150	30,652,150
Oklahoma	303,306	241,190,000	11,625,600	5,522,160	6,103,440	4,987,382	6,638,218	4,568,861	7,056,739	4,313,098	7,312,502
Oregon	282,929	524,796,000	11,039,700	7,849,227	3,190,473	7,087,487	3,952,213	6,480,304	4,559,396	6,127,034	4,912,666
Pennsylvania	2,203,207	2,202,202,000	83,919,000	46,826,802	37,092,198	42,295,176	41,623,824	38,602,740	45,316,260	36,504,765	47,414,235
Rhode Island	187,735	131,941,000	6,855,300	3,146,583	3,708,717	2,838,094	4,017,206	2,598,159	4,257,141	2,454,197	4,401,103
South Carolina	196,246	210,772,000	6,845,800	4,162,246	2,683,554	3,758,344	3,087,456	3,436,592	3,409,208	3,251,755	3,594,045
South Dakota	76,022	71,758,000	3,140,000	1,485,220	1,654,780	1,340,780	1,799,220	1,224,600	1,915,400	1,158,660	1,981,340
Tennessee	383,691	586,620,000	12,412,300	10,016,726	2,395,574	9,048,567	3,363,733	8,279,004	4,133,296	7,819,749	4,592,551
Texas	930,574	785,774,000	33,438,700	17,154,053	16,284,647	15,515,557	17,923,143	14,178,009	19,260,691	13,408,919	20,029,781
Utah	137,159	157,238,000	5,172,300	2,948,211	2,224,089	2,663,734	2,508,566	2,436,153	2,736,147	2,301,674	2,870,626
Vermont	75,737	77,589,000	3,321,200	1,491,219	1,829,981	1,348,407	1,972,793	1,232,165	2,089,035	1,165,741	2,155,459
Virginia	412,047	452,617,000	17,101,300	9,268,905	7,832,395	8,379,637	8,721,663	7,661,382	9,439,918	7,233,850	9,867,450
Washington	491,374	898,364,000	18,292,600	14,103,495	4,189,105	12,749,942	5,542,658	11,652,386	6,640,214	11,012,145	7,280,455
West Virginia	273,670	228,011,000	9,228,200	5,057,054	4,171,146	4,567,959	4,660,241	4,171,146	5,057,054	3,949,670	5,278,530
Wisconsin	649,693	720,978,000	23,703,400	13,463,531	10,239,869	12,159,844	11,543,556	11,116,895	12,586,505	10,500,606	13,202,794
Wyoming	43,763	40,298,000	1,843,100	868,100	975,000	785,161	1,057,939	716,966	1,126,134	678,261	1,164,839
United States	26,620,456	26,936,773,000	990,185,300	556,830,188	433,355,112	503,080,419	487,104,881	459,812,470	530,372,830	434,681,794	555,503,506

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by commercial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	38,107	219,355,000	$5,725,500	$3,297,888	$2,427,612	$2,696,711	$3,028,789	$2,576,475	$3,149,025	$3,114,672	$2,610,828
Arizona	15,581	98,982,000	3,064,600	1,360,682	1,703,918	1,109,385	1,955,215	1,063,416	2,001,184	1,284,067	1,780,533
Arkansas	34,365	121,251,000	4,609,500	1,954,428	2,655,072	1,594,887	3,014,613	1,521,135	3,088,365	1,470,431	3,139,069
California	357,160	3,425,247,000	58,611,900	37,101,333	21,510,567	30,302,352	28,309,548	28,895,667	29,716,233	34,991,304	23,620,596
Colorado	37,562	224,889,000	6,898,700	3,311,376	3,587,324	2,697,392	4,201,308	2,566,316	4,332,384	3,118,212	3,780,488
Connecticut	62,097	443,042,000	13,935,800	5,825,164	8,110,636	4,752,108	9,183,692	4,543,071	9,392,729	5,490,705	8,445,095
Delaware	8,916	48,863,000	1,435,300	647,320	787,980	528,190	907,110	505,226	930,074	610,003	825,297
Dist. of Col	10,706	239,901,000	4,657,700	3,670,268	987,432	2,999,559	1,658,141	2,873,801	1,783,899	3,469,987	1,187,713
Florida	66,069	422,991,000	14,823,400	5,573,598	9,249,802	4,535,960	10,287,440	4,328,433	10,494,967	5,247,484	9,575,916
Georgia	63,313	460,195,000	12,949,800	6,241,804	6,707,996	5,089,271	7,860,529	4,869,125	8,080,675	5,892,159	7,057,641
Idaho	18,980	175,294,000	3,282,900	1,628,318	1,654,582	1,323,009	1,959,891	1,260,634	2,022,266	1,529,831	1,753,069
Illinois	248,833	1,434,019,000	49,100,000	23,469,800	25,630,200	19,198,100	29,901,900	18,412,500	30,687,500	22,193,200	26,906,800
Indiana	107,360	698,135,000	19,546,100	9,968,511	9,577,589	8,131,178	11,414,922	7,779,348	11,766,752	9,401,674	10,144,426
Iowa	95,499	535,692,000	16,076,600	8,263,372	7,813,228	6,752,172	9,324,428	6,462,793	9,613,807	7,781,074	8,295,526
Kansas	57,642	505,978,000	11,055,500	5,560,917	5,494,583	4,532,755	6,522,745	4,333,756	6,721,744	5,251,363	5,804,137
Kentucky	47,980	218,027,000	7,090,700	3,743,890	3,346,810	3,056,092	4,034,608	2,921,368	4,169,332	3,531,169	3,559,531
Louisiana	46,519	360,454,000	10,809,600	4,334,650	6,474,950	3,523,930	7,285,670	3,372,595	7,437,005	4,086,029	6,723,571
Maine	30,303	114,753,000	3,656,100	1,685,462	1,970,638	1,371,038	2,285,062	1,305,228	2,350,872	1,583,091	2,073,009
Maryland	74,266	412,005,000	12,036,400	6,607,984	5,428,416	5,404,344	6,632,056	5,175,652	6,860,748	6,246,892	5,789,508
Massachusetts	172,737	735,105,000	27,713,200	10,780,435	16,932,765	8,785,084	18,928,116	8,397,100	19,316,100	10,170,744	17,542,456
Michigan	167,517	1,356,991,000	36,941,500	18,840,165	18,101,335	15,367,664	21,573,836	14,702,717	22,238,783	15,958,728	20,982,772
Minnesota	101,590	523,254,000	17,649,000	8,206,785	9,442,215	6,688,971	10,960,029	6,371,289	11,277,711	7,730,262	9,918,738
Mississippi	29,483	146,324,000	4,733,100	2,021,034	2,712,066	1,647,119	3,085,981	1,571,389	3,161,711	1,902,706	2,830,394
Missouri	123,930	691,679,000	20,433,500	10,604,987	9,828,513	8,663,804	11,769,696	8,296,000	12,137,499	10,012,415	10,421,085
Montana	21,646	92,696,000	3,045,000	1,446,375	1,598,625	1,175,370	1,869,630	1,120,560	1,924,440	1,358,070	1,686,930
Nebraska	42,346	181,905,000	6,081,900	3,192,998	2,888,902	2,603,053	3,478,847	2,493,579	3,588,321	3,010,541	3,071,359
Nevada	5,158	74,718,000	1,331,200	593,715	737,485	484,557	846,643	463,258	867,942	560,435	770,765
New Hampshire	17,779	61,792,000	2,367,800	1,046,568	1,321,232	854,776	1,513,024	816,891	1,550,909	987,373	1,380,427
New Jersey	187,423	866,953,000	35,601,900	13,350,713	22,251,187	10,894,181	24,707,719	10,395,755	25,206,145	12,603,073	22,998,827
New Mexico	12,579	107,935,000	3,689,200	1,390,828	2,298,372	1,132,584	2,556,616	1,084,625	2,604,575	1,313,355	2,375,845
New York	600,144	3,940,139,000	131,908,200	52,499,464	79,408,736	42,870,165	89,038,035	41,155,358	90,752,842	49,597,483	82,310,717
North Carolina	74,036	415,674,000	11,211,400	6,233,538	4,977,862	5,078,764	6,132,636	4,854,536	6,356,864	5,874,774	5,336,626
North Dakota	21,259	74,032,000	3,074,600	1,282,108	1,792,492	1,042,289	2,032,311	999,245	2,075,355	1,205,243	1,869,357
Ohio	209,884	1,316,500,000	37,576,100	20,742,007	16,834,093	16,946,821	20,629,279	16,232,875	21,343,225	19,614,724	17,961,376
Oklahoma	52,861	217,222,000	7,844,200	3,529,890	4,314,310	2,870,977	4,973,223	2,737,626	5,106,574	3,318,097	4,526,103
Oregon	43,271	427,311,000	7,462,600	4,417,859	3,044,741	3,604,436	3,858,164	3,447,721	4,014,879	4,164,131	3,298,469
Pennsylvania	312,847	1,536,607,000	44,547,800	22,273,900	22,273,900	18,220,050	26,327,750	17,418,190	27,129,610	21,026,562	23,521,238
Rhode Island	24,624	94,734,000	4,153,900	1,690,637	2,463,263	1,374,941	2,778,959	1,308,479	2,845,421	1,586,790	2,567,110
South Carolina	35,647	200,140,000	5,108,000	2,742,996	2,365,004	2,237,304	2,870,696	2,135,144	2,972,856	2,584,648	2,523,352
South Dakota	21,500	81,847,000	3,122,200	1,323,813	1,798,387	1,080,281	2,041,919	1,030,326	2,091,874	1,248,880	1,873,320
Tennessee	53,169	342,360,000	6,989,300	5,207,029	1,782,271	4,249,494	2,739,806	4,060,783	2,928,517	4,913,478	2,075,822
Texas	161,975	1,195,318,000	30,110,700	14,663,911	15,446,789	11,953,948	18,156,752	11,442,066	18,668,634	13,820,811	16,289,889
Utah	14,804	105,401,000	3,073,200	1,410,599	1,662,601	1,149,377	1,923,823	1,097,132	1,976,068	1,327,622	1,745,578
Vermont	11,705	50,398,000	1,636,800	730,013	906,787	594,158	1,042,642	564,696	1,072,104	687,456	949,344
Virginia	63,607	432,389,000	12,046,400	5,649,762	6,396,638	4,613,771	7,432,629	4,421,029	7,625,371	5,336,555	6,709,845
Washington	64,301	876,056,000	12,789,700	8,837,683	3,952,017	7,213,391	5,576,309	6,907,438	5,883,262	8,338,884	4,450,816
West Virginia	37,724	156,365,000	5,308,800	2,691,562	2,617,238	2,197,843	3,110,957	2,123,520	3,185,280	2,542,915	2,765,885
Wisconsin	106,509	725,961,000	18,754,700	10,052,519	8,702,181	8,214,559	10,540,141	7,858,219	10,896,481	9,489,878	9,264,822
Wyoming	6,153	46,541,000	1,606,900	707,036	899,864	575,270	1,031,630	549,560	1,057,340	665,257	941,643
United States	4,219,457	27,233,420,000	767,278,900	372,407,694	394,871,206	303,983,435	463,295,465	290,822,646	476,456,254	349,245,237	418,033,663

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by industrial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	40,372	3,125,357,000	$22,303,300	$16,415,229	$5,888,071	$10,259,518	$12,043,782	$12,088,389	$10,214,911	$15,255,457	$7,047,843
Arizona	2,024	487,340,000	5,190,900	2,616,214	2,574,686	1,635,134	3,555,766	1,925,824	3,265,076	2,429,341	2,761,559
Arkansas	28,310	438,890,000	6,586,300	4,307,440	2,278,860	2,693,797	3,892,503	3,174,597	3,411,703	4,004,470	2,581,830
California	300,385	6,794,045,000	83,061,300	77,606,216	5,395,084	48,555,761	34,445,539	57,934,907	25,066,393	72,128,130	10,873,170
Colorado	23,170	428,031,000	7,007,900	4,218,756	2,789,144	2,634,970	4,372,930	3,104,500	3,903,400	3,917,416	3,090,484
Connecticut	7,402	1,454,493,000	20,000,700	12,620,442	7,380,258	7,880,276	12,120,424	9,300,326	10,700,374	11,720,410	8,280,290
Delaware	1,627	235,635,000	2,761,500	1,830,875	930,625	1,143,261	1,618,239	1,347,612	1,413,888	1,701,084	1,060,416
Dist. of Col	3,750	990,372,000	7,833,400	5,608,714	2,224,686	3,501,530	4,331,870	4,128,202	3,705,198	5,209,211	2,624,189
Florida	5,216	413,347,000	7,904,100	4,307,735	3,596,365	2,687,394	5,216,706	3,169,544	4,734,556	3,999,475	3,904,625
Georgia	3,982	1,567,527,000	14,299,800	10,224,357	4,075,443	6,392,011	7,907,789	7,535,995	6,763,805	9,495,067	4,804,733
Idaho	6,868	401,231,000	2,944,100	2,240,460	703,640	1,401,392	1,542,708	1,648,696	1,295,404	2,081,479	862,621
Illinois	82,919	7,145,238,000	86,736,000	49,873,200	36,862,800	31,224,960	55,511,040	36,776,064	49,959,936	46,317,024	40,418,976
Indiana	79,562	2,834,623,000	36,792,600	23,179,338	13,613,262	14,496,284	22,296,316	17,071,766	19,720,834	21,523,671	15,268,929
Iowa	44,417	1,034,869,000	11,973,000	7,686,666	4,286,334	4,801,173	7,171,827	5,663,229	6,309,771	7,147,881	4,825,119
Kansas	26,902	559,480,000	7,996,200	5,349,458	2,646,742	3,342,412	4,653,788	3,942,127	4,054,073	4,965,640	3,030,560
Kentucky	22,783	1,151,071,000	14,125,800	9,308,902	4,816,898	5,819,830	8,305,970	6,851,013	7,274,787	8,644,990	5,480,810
Louisiana	6,583	1,048,331,000	9,484,900	6,193,640	3,291,260	3,869,839	5,615,061	4,562,237	4,922,663	5,757,334	3,727,566
Maine	16,047	701,918,000	7,930,800	5,242,259	2,688,541	3,275,420	4,655,380	3,862,300	4,068,500	4,869,511	3,061,289
Maryland	26,005	1,700,855,000	20,243,200	12,247,136	7,996,064	7,651,930	12,591,270	9,008,224	11,234,976	11,376,678	8,866,522
Massachusetts	7,477	2,667,659,000	42,471,000	25,227,774	17,243,226	15,756,741	26,714,259	18,559,827	23,911,173	23,443,992	19,027,008
Michigan	19,412	4,098,897,000	46,703,100	25,780,111	20,922,989	16,112,570	30,590,530	18,961,459	27,741,641	23,958,690	22,744,410
Minnesota	20,891	1,109,388,000	15,923,000	9,967,798	5,955,202	6,225,893	9,697,107	7,340,503	8,582,497	9,251,263	6,671,737
Mississippi	13,442	372,720,000	5,302,000	3,366,770	1,935,230	2,104,894	3,197,106	2,476,034	2,825,966	3,122,878	2,179,122
Missouri	34,721	2,105,949,000	23,331,500	16,355,382	6,976,118	10,219,197	13,112,303	12,039,054	11,292,446	15,188,807	8,142,693
Montana	2,226	1,528,762,000	8,522,400	7,150,294	1,372,106	4,465,738	4,056,662	5,266,843	3,255,557	6,638,950	1,883,450
Nebraska	12,686	373,903,000	5,095,400	3,480,158	1,615,242	2,175,736	2,919,664	2,562,986	2,532,414	3,230,484	1,864,916
Nevada	133	44,758,000	609,800	499,426	110,374	312,218	297,582	367,709	242,091	464,058	145,742
New Hampshire	3,073	314,730,000	4,533,500	3,078,247	1,455,253	1,922,204	2,611,296	2,266,750	2,266,750	2,860,639	1,672,861
New Jersey	4,820	3,187,891,000	38,418,500	22,628,497	15,790,003	14,138,008	24,280,492	16,673,629	21,744,871	21,014,920	17,405,580
New Mexico	344	19,444,000	441,500	211,037	230,463	132,009	309,491	155,408	286,092	196,026	245,474
New York	22,120	11,648,360,000	101,452,900	59,045,588	42,407,312	36,928,856	64,524,044	43,523,294	57,929,606	54,886,019	46,566,881
North Carolina	29,630	2,646,290,000	25,935,900	19,815,027	6,120,873	12,371,424	13,564,476	14,601,912	11,333,988	18,414,489	7,521,411
North Dakota	2,739	34,724,000	925,300	506,139	419,161	316,453	608,847	372,896	552,404	470,052	455,248
Ohio	100,844	8,020,198,000	84,353,000	53,985,920	30,367,080	33,741,200	50,611,800	39,730,263	44,622,737	50,190,035	34,162,965
Oklahoma	24,251	803,171,000	10,890,100	7,263,697	3,626,403	4,541,172	6,348,928	5,357,929	5,532,171	6,751,862	4,138,238
Oregon	13,009	1,061,051,000	7,968,900	7,076,383	892,517	4,422,740	3,546,160	5,211,661	2,757,239	6,574,343	1,394,557
Pennsylvania	56,775	11,961,631,000	120,569,900	84,760,640	35,809,260	52,930,186	67,639,714	62,455,208	58,114,692	78,732,145	41,837,755
Rhode Island	1,410	580,420,000	8,997,200	5,515,284	3,481,916	3,445,928	5,551,272	4,066,734	4,930,466	5,128,404	3,868,796
South Carolina	14,267	1,274,139,000	11,816,500	9,039,623	2,776,877	5,648,287	6,168,213	6,652,690	5,163,810	8,401,532	3,414,968
South Dakota	1,987	69,532,000	1,570,300	832,259	738,041	519,769	1,050,531	612,417	957,883	772,588	797,712
Tennessee	14,538	3,904,715,000	20,781,400	18,557,790	2,223,610	11,596,021	9,185,379	13,674,161	7,107,239	17,248,562	3,532,838
Texas	82,391	2,735,775,000	31,646,900	20,855,307	10,791,593	13,038,523	18,608,377	15,380,393	16,266,507	19,367,903	12,278,997
Utah	3,380	854,879,000	7,105,900	5,073,613	2,032,287	3,169,231	3,936,669	3,737,703	3,368,197	4,711,212	2,394,688
Vermont	6,203	171,946,000	2,922,700	2,124,803	797,897	1,329,829	1,592,871	1,566,567	1,356,133	1,975,745	946,955
Virginia	15,575	1,318,548,000	14,516,300	10,190,443	4,325,857	6,372,656	8,143,644	7,504,927	7,011,373	9,464,628	5,051,672
Washington	29,229	4,378,781,000	24,206,800	20,212,678	3,994,122	12,635,950	11,570,850	14,887,182	9,319,618	18,784,477	5,422,323
West Virginia	24,592	2,368,446,000	23,104,700	15,526,358	7,578,342	9,703,974	13,400,726	11,436,827	11,667,873	14,417,333	8,687,367
Wisconsin	77,266	1,933,118,000	26,604,700	16,069,239	10,535,461	10,056,577	16,548,123	11,839,092	14,765,608	14,925,237	11,679,463
Wyoming	1,579	57,794,000	1,006,300	562,522	443,778	351,199	655,101	414,596	591,704	522,270	484,030
United States	1,369,334	104,163,272,000	1,092,843,200	735,835,844	357,007,356	459,952,075	632,891,125	542,792,206	550,050,994	683,653,812	409,189,388

Here are the total overcharges, by States, for all users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	340,941	3,693,914,000	$37,163,600	$25,897,377	$11,266,223	$18,537,592	$18,626,008	$19,771,217	$17,392,383	$23,193,303	$13,970,297
Arizona	113,742	704,002,000	12,764,400	5,974,339	6,790,061	4,548,079	8,216,321	4,639,497	8,124,903	5,273,487	7,490,913
Arkansas	213,300	683,145,000	16,811,000	8,945,934	7,865,066	6,714,450	10,096,550	6,913,736	9,897,264	7,569,371	9,241,629
California	2,497,445	12,005,897,000	198,175,200	152,321,279	45,853,921	112,851,875	85,323,325	117,883,112	80,292,088	136,475,112	61,700,088
Colorado	278,002	847,821,000	21,959,700	11,927,125	10,032,575	9,302,540	12,657,160	9,302,764	12,656,936	10,466,249	11,493,451
Connecticut	541,938	2,418,832,000	53,930,900	29,062,632	24,868,268	22,209,702	31,721,198	22,600,944	31,329,956	25,488,797	28,442,103
Delaware	71,504	345,458,000	6,884,800	3,768,434	3,116,365	2,835,355	4,049,445	2,917,286	3,967,514	3,319,087	3,565,713
Dist. of Col	82,347	1,439,442,000	17,668,900	13,571,378	4,097,522	10,379,261	7,289,639	10,543,618	7,125,282	12,029,235	5,639,665
Florida	422,260	1,263,010,000	40,138,900	17,542,349	22,596,551	14,153,091	25,985,809	13,835,727	26,303,173	15,236,481	24,902,419
Georgia	450,990	2,512,867,000	42,543,700	25,719,092	16,824,608	19,847,155	22,696,545	20,054,170	22,489,530	22,621,335	19,922,365
Idaho	135,885	781,471,000	11,418,200	6,869,292	4,548,908	5,434,207	5,983,993	5,390,724	6,027,476	5,952,541	5,465,659
Illinois	2,181,707	10,397,217,000	205,524,500	113,204,822	92,319,678	86,452,015	119,072,485	88,081,536	117,442,964	99,591,295	105,933,205
Indiana	949,718	4,286,988,000	85,064,400	49,061,887	36,002,513	36,990,312	48,074,088	37,978,759	47,085,641	43,334,847	41,729,553
Iowa	619,019	2,017,295,000	46,735,900	25,741,659	20,994,241	20,391,965	26,343,935	20,198,504	26,537,396	22,571,652	24,164,248
Kansas	425,887	1,374,621,000	31,893,900	17,588,319	14,305,581	13,911,001	17,982,899	13,798,029	18,095,871	15,430,936	16,462,964
Kentucky	415,367	1,677,998,000	32,803,500	20,016,579	12,786,921	15,167,663	17,635,837	15,519,533	17,283,967	17,610,462	15,193,038
Louisiana	349,207	1,645,335,000	31,148,700	15,781,723	15,366,977	12,147,909	19,000,791	12,276,512	18,872,188	13,946,251	17,202,449
Maine	233,245	975,232,000	18,700,900	10,200,161	8,500,739	7,598,768	11,102,132	7,870,848	10,830,052	9,006,528	9,694,372
Maryland	571,200	2,472,084,000	45,660,400	26,682,888	18,977,512	20,121,336	25,539,064	20,646,802	25,013,598	23,738,596	21,921,804
Massachusetts	1,332,228	4,322,849,000	113,448,800	56,818,482	56,630,318	43,361,926	70,086,874	44,176,238	69,272,562	49,882,226	63,566,574
Michigan	1,529,583	7,097,806,000	134,278,900	76,671,788	57,607,112	60,392,419	73,886,481	60,095,281	74,183,619	64,930,762	69,348,138
Minnesota	666,033	2,239,736,000	55,011,100	30,673,578	24,337,522	24,191,831	30,819,269	24,023,999	30,987,101	26,736,316	28,274,784
Mississippi	193,379	666,511,000	14,783,300	8,027,803	6,755,497	6,135,609	8,647,691	6,227,306	8,555,994	7,086,303	7,696,997
Missouri	854,172	3,489,639,000	68,648,800	41,417,857	27,230,943	31,922,112	36,726,688	32,376,195	36,272,605	36,473,583	32,175,217
Montana	122,497	1,736,720,000	15,671,000	10,681,298	4,989,702	7,524,660	8,146,340	8,110,915	7,560,085	9,626,149	6,044,851
Nebraska	289,162	773,693,000	19,973,300	11,458,180	8,515,120	9,097,625	10,875,675	9,005,969	10,967,331	9,979,325	9,993,975
Nevada	31,433	154,729,000	3,277,100	1,711,755	1,565,345	1,355,265	1,921,835	1,341,357	1,935,743	1,506,825	1,770,275
New Hampshire	151,232	487,904,000	12,335,600	6,510,473	5,825,127	4,934,397	7,401,203	5,056,292	7,279,308	5,711,977	6,623,623
New Jersey	1,315,291	5,000,452,000	119,253,300	57,691,002	61,562,298	44,618,035	74,635,265	44,981,612	74,271,688	50,580,331	68,672,969
New Mexico	72,410	178,147,000	6,599,200	2,616,419	3,982,781	2,180,407	4,418,793	2,079,323	4,519,877	2,301,770	4,297,430
New York	4,129,219	18,429,737,000	361,418,600	175,957,975	185,460,625	138,065,184	223,353,416	137,950,572	223,468,028	154,810,100	206,608,500
North Carolina	511,254	3,499,721,000	52,173,000	34,808,548	17,364,452	25,353,706	26,819,294	26,683,810	25,489,190	31,125,957	21,047,043

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1942*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
North Dakota	95,700	180,278,000	$7,008,200	$3,235,239	$3,772,961	$2,667,353	$4,340,847	$2,569,444	$4,438,756	$2,806,416	$4,201,784
Ohio	1,997,648	11,137,170,000	183,233,400	113,962,679	69,270,721	86,183,211	97,050,189	88,393,113	94,840,287	100,456,909	82,776,491
Oklahoma	380,418	1,261,583,000	30,359,900	16,315,747	14,044,153	12,399,531	17,960,369	12,664,416	17,695,484	14,383,057	15,976,843
Oregon	339,209	2,016,158,000	26,471,200	19,343,469	7,127,731	15,114,663	11,356,537	15,139,686	11,331,514	16,865,508	9,605,692
Pennsylvania	2,572,829	15,700,440,000	249,036,700	153,861,342	95,175,358	113,445,412	135,591,288	118,476,138	130,560,562	136,263,472	112,773,228
Rhode Island	213,769	807,095,000	20,006,400	10,352,504	9,653,896	7,658,963	12,347,437	7,973,372	12,033,028	9,169,391	10,837,009
South Carolina	246,160	1,685,051,000	23,770,300	15,944,865	7,825,435	11,643,935	12,126,365	12,224,426	11,545,874	14,237,935	9,532,365
South Dakota	99,509	223,137,000	7,832,500	3,641,292	4,191,208	2,940,830	4,891,670	2,867,343	4,965,157	3,180,128	4,652,372
Tennessee	451,398	4,833,695,000	40,183,000	33,781,545	6,401,455	24,894,082	15,288,918	26,013,948	14,169,052	29,981,789	10,201,211
Texas	1,174,940	4,716,867,000	95,196,300	52,673,271	42,523,029	40,508,028	54,688,272	41,000,468	54,195,832	46,597,633	48,598,667
Utah	155,343	1,117,518,000	15,351,400	9,432,423	5,918,977	6,982,342	8,369,058	7,270,988	8,080,412	8,340,508	7,010,892
Vermont	93,645	299,933,000	7,880,700	4,346,035	3,534,665	3,272,394	4,608,306	3,363,428	4,517,272	3,828,942	4,051,758
Virginia	491,229	2,203,554,000	43,664,000	25,109,110	18,554,890	19,366,064	24,297,936	19,587,338	24,076,662	22,035,033	21,628,967
Washington	584,904	6,253,201,000	55,289,100	43,153,856	12,135,244	32,599,283	22,689,817	33,446,006	21,843,094	38,135,506	17,153,594
West Virginia	335,986	2,752,822,000	37,641,700	23,274,974	14,366,726	16,469,776	21,171,924	17,731,493	19,910,207	20,909,918	16,731,782
Wisconsin	833,468	3,380,057,000	69,062,800	39,585,289	29,477,511	30,430,980	38,631,820	30,814,206	38,248,594	34,915,721	34,147,079
Wyoming	51,495	144,633,000	4,456,300	2,137,658	2,318,642	1,711,630	2,744,670	1,681,122	2,775,178	1,865,788	2,590,512
United States	32,209,247	158,333,465,000	2,850,307,400	1,665,073,726	1,185,233,674	1,267,015,929	1,583,291,471	1,293,549,122	1,556,758,278	1,467,580,843	1,382,726,557

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3010), was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend the remarks I have previously made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that the report of the House Flood Control Committee is rather full and will give the Members full information with reference to the emergency measure, the provisions of the bill, and the damages on the various rivers of the country.

APPOINTMENTS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Indiana briefly state for the RECORD the purpose of the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide in the case of cadets and midshipmen at either the Military or the Naval Academy, or nominees thereto, whose legal residence, by reason of redistricting the State, falls in a new congressional district, that such cadets, midshipmen, and nominees be charged to the new district, but to preserve the number of appointments otherwise authorized from the new district by temporarily increasing such number in an amount equal to the newly acquired cadets, midshipmen, and nominees.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the fact that I am one of the beneficiaries of this bill, I simply wanted a statement for the RECORD. I shall be very pleased to see this bill pass.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This merely preserves to the Member of Congress the statutory right he now has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, or nominees for appointment thereto, whose place of residence, by reason of redistricting the State concerned, falls in another congressional district, and who were appointed with respect to or nominated by the Representative of the former district, shall be charged to the Representative of the latter district, but the number of cadets and midshipmen, respectively, allowed at such respective academies for the Representative of such latter district shall be increased by the number of such cadets or midshipmen, as the case may be, and by the number of such nominees who are appointed and qualify.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, at the end of line 9, strike out the comma and insert "as additional numbers."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the commas, and after "midshipmen", insert "otherwise."

Page 2, line 4, after "be" insert "temporarily."

Page 2, line 6, after "qualify", insert "*Provided*, That such temporary increase in numbers authorized herein for the Representative concerned shall be reduced accordingly as each cadet or midshipman, in attendance at either academy under an appointment from such former district is finally separated therefrom."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE JESSE JONES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are informed by the press that another controversy has arisen between the departments of the Government, and the critics are snapping at the heels of the great Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any man in the Government who has protected the interests of the American people it is Jesse Jones. It may be all right to open the doors of the Treasury with lease-lend money to finance our allies in the fight for civilization, but when it comes to opening the Treasury and removing all restrictions in paying out money to foreigners in dealing with the tricksters of other countries, in their schemes to profiteer at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, as proposed by these critics, I say the American people will be found squarely behind Jesse Jones.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] just a few moments ago stated that the blame for the failure to pass certain legislation rested upon the Congress and not upon the administration. Certainly he did not have in mind any fancied failure of Congress to adopt the Smith-Connally bill, or of the House to pass the Hobbs bill, or of the House to pass the Smith bill, which has been over on the other side for a couple of years. The House did not fail on any of those bills and each was opposed by the administration. It seems to me it is rather unkind for the gentleman from Texas to lay the blame on Congress, especially when the Members on the majority side for more than 8 years have been swallowing all this legislation which now appears to give them a stomach ache. I say you should not criticize the House for gulping down that New Deal legislation which is now bringing disaster. You asked for it. You forced it through the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was one of the most insistent, yet now he blames the House because it followed the President in his legislative program.

I notice the majority leader is here today, as usual. He frequently, or sometimes—I will put it that way—he sometimes weeps and grieves publicly from the well of the House because I criticize some New Deal fallacy. I hope the gentleman will take occasion to remonstrate privately and off the record and confidentially with HENRY WALLACE and Jesse Jones to end their name calling, their charges of incompetency and worse leveled at each other, because I might be tempted to follow their example of criticizing something in the administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article by William Henry Chamberlain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, July 7, after the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 271, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 2975, calling for authorization of an additional $300,000,000 for housing. I presume the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], will be in a position to furnish the House the information that I have been unable to obtain, namely, where this money is needed. The President, the War Department, and the Navy Department say they feel that the appropriation is absolutely necessary.

Realizing the need for the housing, we reported the rule, feeling that the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be in a position to give that information, which, as I said, I have been unable to obtain. Up to this time we have authorized and appropriated $1,200,000,000 for war housing. This additional $300,000,000 will make $1,500,000,000. That is in addition to the $500,000,000 which has been authorized by the Congress for the various housing facilities and services needed in the various sections of the country where this housing became necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I want it understood that I am in favor of the rule and the bill, but I feel it my duty to again call attention to what I believe to have been extreme recklessness and to the fact that a great deal of money could have been saved if the War Department had used better judgment than to build these great plants far removed from populated sections, which now makes necessary the additional housing. Had the plants that were already available in many sections been utilized, I am sure that more than half of this tremendous sum for housing could have been saved.

The Corps of Engineers in the War Department appointed, as I am informed, a site committee that selected the sites for these plants, and I firmly feel that they were imposed upon and their judgment warped by the conniving of real-estate operators in the selection of sites.

The administration in many instances is criticized for this tremendous expenditure and for constructing these plants away from the populated sections where labor and transportation and all these facilities were available. This criticism, I feel, should be directed against the Corps of Engineers, or those responsible for the lack of foresight and abuse of power in the selection of sites.

I am convinced that if the Construction Division had remained under the supervision and direction of the able Quartermaster General, Edmund B. Gregory, millions upon millions could have been saved to the Government, but, unfortunately, the influential gentlemen representing the big interests forced the taking away of the Construction Division from the jurisdiction of Quartermaster General Gregory and placed it under the direct jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. This was immediately after General Gregory, apparently questioning the activities of some officers and officials cooperating with his division in certain transactions, "cleaned house" to prevent misuse of power or favoritism in the awarding of construction contracts and the acquisition of sites. I feel that if the President had had the time to penetrate the underlying reasons for this transfer he would not have sanctioned it.

Personally, I feel that the President, instead of being criticized, should be sympathized with because, due to the insistent demands of the Republican press and the Republicans in general, that he appoint Republicans in his Cabinet, he appointed to the two most important positions the Republican Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, who was Secretary of State under President Hoover, and later the Republican candidate for Vice President, Mr. Knox, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Many well-informed persons are of the opinion that if better judgment had been used and economy practiced by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, we would have saved in this respect alone millions upon millions of dollars. I know that some of the plants that have been constructed will never be used.

You and I have received many complaints from sections where hundreds upon hundreds of farmers have been dispossessed of their rich farm lands, thereby reducing the production of foodstuffs which is sadly needed now, when they could have selected desirable sites, better suited, at much lower cost and closer to the populated sections of our country, where there was plenty of housing, where we had facilities, and to which it was not necessary to build highways, or to build sewers or water mains, construct schools and other needed facilities to make life possible in the new towns which, after a few years, will be nothing more nor less than ghost towns; and this at a tremendous, wicked, and unnecessary cost to the Government.

I do not want to detain the House by reading some reports and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include some short excerpts from statements appearing in newspapers on some of these subjects; also statements made by the majority whip, Mr. Ramspeck, relative to the fraud of which some of the officers have been guilty; and also a report on the vast acreage that has been unnecessarily purchased at tremendous prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, is there anything in there about housing in Detroit and the way the housing proposition was handled?

Mr. SABATH. Nothing that I know of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I have a great deal of information on the situation in Detroit and elsewhere in Michigan, and right there I am reminded, due to the question propounded by the gentleman from Michigan, that millions upon millions have been wasted on the Ford plant in Willow Run and several other plants in the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert an article relative to the abandonment of a mammoth plant but recently completely at a cost of $30,000,000 near Amarillo, Tex., which was fully equipped with expensive machinery and ready to go into operation:

UNITED STATES MYSTERIOUSLY ABANDONS COSTLY AMMONIA INSTALLATION

AMARILLO, TEX., June 26—"No longer required" is the only explanation given by the War Department for suddenly closing down its mammoth Cactus ordnance works, an ammonia plant reputed to have cost around $30,000,000 and originally scheduled to start production within the next week or two.

A spokesman for the Department said in Washington it has been decided that the plant, which was under construction for more than a year, is not needed now and that it soon will be sold to a private corporation or a foreign government. No other details were forthcoming.

I feel that Congress and the country are entitled to know the reasons for the building and shutting down of this plant.

Mr. Speaker, here I insert another extract from an article setting forth how the Frauds Division of the Department of Justice, under the direction of Tom Clark, is doing effective work of investigation of frauds in connection with war construction, and I hope they will continue their good work.

FORT BELVOIR OFFICER, FIVE OTHERS, ACCUSED IN HUGE FRAUD CASE—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CHARGES CONSPIRACY IN BUILDING HOOSIER PLANT

The Justice Department announced today that a Federal grand jury at Indianapolis had indicted six persons, including a lieutenant colonel in the Army Engineer Corps, on charges of conspiring to overcharge the Government $190,000 on rental of equipment used in building the Hoosier ordnance plant near Charlestown, Ind.

Attorney General Biddle said that the charge involved collection by the defendants of $335,000 in rentals and recapture charges compared with approximately $145,000 which the equipment would have cost the Government had other contractors been dealt with, but that information obtained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicated total overcharges of around $600,000 as a result of the alleged conspiracy.

Purchases of vast acreages by the War Department have been questioned and reports indicate that some of these purchases have been unnecessary. I insert here a newspaper report in that connection:

VAST ACREAGE BOUGHT BY ARMY

War needs of the Army in the last 2 years have made necessary the purchase of 137,450 acres of land and several buildings in the Sixth Service Command at a cost of more than $29,000,000, the Great Lakes division of the Army's Corps of Engineers announced yesterday.

Officers said that figures on the size of the Army's holdings in the three-State command—Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan—prior to the war-purchasing program were not available, but that the buying more than doubled the amount of Army-held property in this area.

The engineers included in their purchases the Stevens and Chicago Beach Hotels and the Battle Creek (Mich.) Sanitarium, which was converted into the Percy Jones General Hospital. They said they bought 2,580 separate parcels of land ranging in size from 1 to 680 acres.

The engineers do all the property buying for the Army. All told, yesterday's announcement said, the Army now sprawls over 32,000 square miles of land in this country. This includes camps, airports, bombing and artillery ranges, depots, storage yards, and munition dumps.

Mr. Speaker, the War Department had been warned by me and others whose judgment should have been taken that some of these plants should not have been constructed, especially the Willow Run plant.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] appeared before the committee, after having made investigations of some of these projects, and, although the committee felt that it should hold executive sessions, yet he was permitted to testify and has furnished the committee with valuable information in support of the charges he has made.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana. He is the gentleman to whom I was referring.

Mr. WILSON. Since the gentleman from Illinois has referred to that particular situation I would like to make this observation. I was asked to appear before the Rules Committee by the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, and I came prepared to issue a statement which I thought the committee would be glad to hear and should hear. I expect to utilize what opportunity is given me today on the floor of the House to give such information to this committee as I have on hand.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I want to conclude my remarks, because I have a few more matters that I feel I should call to the attention of the House.

And lest I forget, I want it to be understood that the men now in charge of the housing work—Mr. Blandford and the men with him, Mr. Emmerich and Mr. Ferguson—appeared and testified before our committee in executive session, and we cross-examined them thoroughly; and I am convinced that they are extremely able, capable, and sincere men and certainly desirous of doing the right thing in protecting the interests of the Government. But unfortunately they are placed in an embarrassing position. The War and the Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission demand this housing. Housing officials are obliged to carry out the wishes of these agencies, and, though they have in some instances cut down the number of housing units requested, still they cannot completely ignore the housing demands of these agencies.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not now; I am sure the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. Speaker, one more thing that has been annoying me, and I presume it is annoying to many others, is the recklessness with which some of these properties have been injudiciously purchased and acquired, including the taking over of about 400 or 500 hotels, including the Stevens in Chicago, the largest in the world, which are now being abandoned and offered for sale. I presume at that time the departments needed these hotels. I even defended the purchase of the Stevens Hotel in Chicago because I believed the price for which they acquired it was very low—$6,000,000—considering that it originally cost $28,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Just to avoid any confusion I hope the gentleman will also state that the money for the purchase of these various hotels did not come in any way from the appropriations authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SABATH. From what fund did this money come?

Mr. LANHAM. I assume from money turned over to the War Department. These hotels are used for offices of various kinds. This appropriation we have before us today has to do with living quarters for the industrial workers at the various plants.

Mr. SABATH. Correct. I thank the gentleman for making that clear. Nevertheless it was out of Government money.

The Stevens Hotel was taken over about a year ago; and only 3 months ago they sold all of the furnishings, and within a few weeks thereafter they announced they were going to abandon the hotel. People interested urged the War Department not to sell the furnishings, because it would be impossible for anybody to take back the building and obtain new furnishings so that the hotel could be reopened. Those furnishings

could have been stored for only $3,000 a month, which would have cost $9,000. By selling the furniture and furnishings, it will cost the Government over $2,000,000 to refurnish.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many instances of reckless expenditures and reckless actions by key officials of the War and the Navy Departments in connection with the purchasing and constructing of buildings, that I feel they should even at this late date be informed that the House expects more judicious and economical action from them. We are obliged to appropriate billions of dollars gathered by taxing the American people. Yet the War Department expends the money so recklessly as to border on its being criminal.

The Department asked for $35,000,000 to construct the Pentagon Building here in Washington, which amount we gave; but before the building was half completed an additional $35,000,000 or even a larger sum was needed. Unfortunately, the President is being charged with the excessive expenditure, when, as a matter of fact, we all know that it was and is humanly impossible for him to give these matters the time they require. He in good faith appointed these outstanding Republicans to these important places and they in turn appointed other substitute Republicans to carry on. The Secretary, the Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and their subordinates, especially those who have been made officers from civil life and who have been placed in positions beyond their capacities, should be charged with and blamed for the reckless expenditures that have been made.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think the President ought to know better than to monkey with these Republicans?

Mr. SABATH. I do not think he is monkeying with them; I think they have imposed on him.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But he appointed them.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I said that he appointed them, because he believed they were the outstanding Republicans, who would have the interests of the country at heart, and upon whom he could rely to aid him in his tremendous tasks. It was rumored that the President even offered a Cabinet position to a former Republican candidate for President, whose name I cannot recollect at this moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean Mr. Landon?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; he is the gentleman whose name I momentarily could not recall. Personally, I do not know whether the President could at that time or at any other time have found more outstanding Republicans than these two gentlemen, but, unfortunately, as Republicans they are not in accord with his own views and known policies. They are inclined to follow the viewpoints of the big interests, while it is the President's aim to aid the common people and protect the taxpayer. But I appreciate the viewpoint of the gentleman from Texas. His opinion is cherished by a vast majority of the President's friends that many Republicans have been appointed by the President who are not in accord with his views.

We read only a few days ago that one Mr. Chester Davis who was honored by appointment to high position by the President resigned because he could not have his own way, which was not for the best interests of the country at large and not in accord with the President's policies. Yes; he appointed many other Republicans, unfortunately, I will say, and he and the country would be better off had he appointed loyal and able Democrats in their stead who would not have played politics and tried to undermine him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois, and Chicago I assume, referred to Secretary Knox and to Secretary Stimson, who, he claims, have been monkeying with the President. Does not the gentleman think he should now get rid of them?

Mr. SABATH. Many feel it would be better for this administration if he did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We agree with the gentleman; at least, I agree with the gentleman. When the gentleman goes down there, will he speak to the President about that?

Mr. SABATH. Well, confidentially—and this is off the record—I have several times told the President I thought he had made mistakes appointing so many Republicans in high positions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman ought to help him rectify them.

Mr. SABATH. I wish I could—because I remember how the Republicans that President Wilson appointed, and the industrial leaders he trusted, turned against him.

Mr. Speaker, the same tactics and the same unfair methods are being practiced and used against President Roosevelt, and his life is made almost unbearable by continuous sniping and scurrilous attacks, and especially by those whom he had appointed and later was obliged to dispense with; yes, even by those who still are holding important positions under him.

But, fortunately, due to the extraordinarily courageous and able manner in which he has conducted the affairs of this Nation, these tactics will not, I am sure, have any effect, because he knows not only how to give it, but also how to take it. The people are appreciative of his great service and the able manner in which he has been carrying on under the most adverse and annoying conditions. He is recognized, unquestionably, not only in this country but the world over, as the outstanding leader fighting for the democratic institutions and freedom and liberty and human treatment for all.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It does look to us innocent bystanders that the Army, Navy, and the War Department are the only agencies of the Government that are really doing an outstanding job in this war.

I cannot recommend the O. P. A. or the rest of them.

Mr. SABATH. I realize that you, unfortunately, the same as other Republicans, do not approve the work that has been done by the O. P. A. or by any other bureaus or departments. I wonder whether there are any other bureaus or departments outside of those you mention whose activities you do approve or give credit to for doing good work. I know that after the history has been written you will find that all those departments headed by Democrats will be shown as having performed real, efficient, and honest service, in contrast to those bureaus or departments headed by Republicans; and, notwithstanding your remarks, I will say that you and all others properly informed will come to the conclusion that both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy could have surrounded themselves with more experienced and more able men to carry on the important activities and they would not have allowed themselves to be seduced by influential Republican manipulating contractors and manufacturers and would not have permitted them to take advantage of the Government to the extent that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the Secretary of the Navy had reliable and dependable men they never would have advised him to sign the contract with the Standard Oil Co. giving them the Elk Hill oil reserves, and he would not have been obliged to admit that a mistake had been made and that the contract should be canceled. I am informed that, notwithstanding the ruling of the Department of Justice that the contract was illegal, it has not been canceled as yet and that the Standard Oil Co. is there still drilling wells.

The same recklessness applies to the War Department where Republicans were appointed and relied upon to carry on, who were undeserving of the trust reposed in them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think the President should have been smart enough not to pick these fellows and that he ought to get rid of them by this time?

Mr. SABATH. He hoped to secure the cooperation of all regardless of their political affiliation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did he not give Mr. Hoover some consideration?

Mr SABATH. Hoover made such a miserable failure when he was President, for Heaven's sake, you would not ask the President to put him in, would you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He did not fail at feeding the world in the last war?

Mr. SABATH. This because he had guiding and binding instructions from the great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. But when Hoover was on his own as President, surely you nor anyone else will contend that he fed the American people. Is your memory so short that you do not remember the de-

plorable conditions which existed while he was President? You also must remember when thousands of ex-service men came to Washington pleading for food and aid, instead of giving them work or bread it was his order to give them lead.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee, who is a spokesman for the New Deal and a real authority, whether he thinks Col. Frank Knox has made a good Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SABATH. Thanks for the compliment. However, I am not a spokesman. I only defend the administration when it is maliciously accused, libeled, and deliberately smeared. As to the Secretary of the Navy, I will say that I believe a good Democrat would have surely taken and displayed a more friendly interest in the administration in general and would have done better. I have nothing personal against Mr. Knox. Personally he is an affable gentleman. But, unfortunately, as I have stated, he has failed because he has surrounded himself with Republican assistants who did not possess adequate capacity and experience.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee will agree that, even though his contentions may be correct that some Republicans in the administration were palmed off on the President, Mr. Roosevelt did select Harry Hopkins and Sam Rosenman for himself. He did not have any help on them.

Mr. SABATH. I am actually surprised that the gentleman from Ohio, whom I highly esteem, should try to place Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman in the same category with the many inefficient Republicans. He knows, or should know, like others who are attempting to make a political issue of the close friendship of Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman with the President, that these two gentlemen are the brainiest and most loyal Presidential aides, and have rendered the country and the President most yeoman and valuable service. I defy anyone to prove to the contrary. No one can honestly say that Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman are not thoroughly patriotic and able gentlemen.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think Colonel Knox has failed to make good and that they have made good? Will the gentleman give me an answer to my question?

Mr. SABATH. I have answered a similar question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and other Republicans unfriendly to the Secretary of the Navy, and therefore there is no need to answer again, especially in view of the fact that I have taken so much of the time of the House, and I am now compelled to conclude. However, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I will be in much better position to answer after I shall have received more complete reports on the Standard Oil and other contracts entered into by the various Navy bureaus under Secretary Knox.

I have called attention to these various matters, not with the intention of retarding the activities of the War and the Navy Departments but with the hope of stopping the reckless and extravagant expenditures and in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of any time left, and now yield 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the rule as far as I have heard. There is a contest on this bill as to the amount of money involved. It carries $300,000,000 for war housing. The committee was divided as to the sum of money that should be included. I want to go on record at the outset by saying that I shall support an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] reducing the amount from $300,000,000 to $200,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, although I have supported all these war housing bills in the past, I take this position because when those who offered the bill appeared before the Rules Committee they were unable to give us or refused to give us the information that we asked, both the chairman, myself, and other members, as to where this money would go, the amounts, the projects, and so forth. We were told we must go into executive session, which we did, then we proceeded to ask these questions and we got no answers. We did not get this information even in executive session. We spent some 2 hours in executive session, which was wasted time.

If those who are backing the legislation, particularly those representing the housing agencies, refuse to give information that Members of Congress and members of the Rules Committee ask, then I think we could well afford to slice a certain amount off the bill. If they can make out a case in the future they could come back next year for more.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what information was requested of me that was not given that I could appropriately have given.

Mr. FISH. The information asked of the gentleman was referred by him to the head of the Housing Agency who did not give the information either to the chairman of the Rules Committee who asked him or to myself, all of this taking place in executive session, which I do not think we should go into any further. We did ask the gentleman and the gentleman referred the question to Mr. Blandford.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman I brought before the Rules Committee myself the confidential information given by the Navy Department and given by the War Department with reference to this measure. Of course, the hearings themselves show the allocations by States, and for obvious reasons it would not be wise to state the particular places where certain projects will be built because that would simply increase the expense to the Government.

Mr. FISH. The very purpose for which the Committee on Rules went into executive session, as the chairman knows—and he is sitting right next to the gentleman from Texas—was to get this information as to projects and not by States. We got no information whatever in regard to these projects. If I am wrong, I want to be corrected by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I yield to him.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York is right that we did go into executive session to obtain that information, because we did not wish to embarrass the War Department. At the same time, we felt that we ought to have that information as to where these tremendous sums were going to be expended. They were to be spent not on new projects so much as on some of the old, already built plants, many of which may never be utilized.

Mr. LANHAM. In all fairness, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly; I want to be fair.

Mr. LANHAM. The information as to the localities of the specific projects would have to be given by the administrative authorities. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Administrator of the National Housing Agency was present and rose to give that very information, but then he was interrupted and his testimony concluded in order that the gentleman from Indiana might be heard.

Mr. FISH. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that at all, because I asked that specific question at least three times, and so did the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and we got no answer. He had ample time to answer but he declined to furnish the information.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I have just now been handed a report from the War Department, which is marked "Confidential." It is a little late. I did not wish to delay calling up the rule until that had reached me. However, it is forthcoming now, and the gentleman can glance at it when the time comes.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in certain sections of the country men engaged in war production work are living with their families in shacks, tents, and camp wagons, amid filth and squalor?

Mr. FISH. I am certainly aware of that. That is why I am supporting the bill to the extent of two-thirds of the amount, or $200,000,000, so that they can take care of these very conditions to which the gentleman refers. They should be given preferred treatment.

Mr. WELCH. You cannot take care of these conditions by cutting down the amount asked for.

Mr. FISH. Yes; because a lot of this money does not go to relieve the conditions to which the gentleman refers. I am as interested as is the gentleman in taking care of the sore spots immediately, and it will be taken care of by the first $200,000,000. Let them come back and ask for more if they can show the need for it.

Mr. WELCH. May I further state to the gentlemen that it has been found that as many as eight men engaged in defense work were living in one small room, sleeping in what are called hot beds, some going out and others coming in?

Mr. FISH. I realize that such conditions do exist. We are trying to remedy them, and they should be given preferred treatment.

Mr. WELCH. Why cut the appropriation provided for in the bill?

Mr. FISH. Why have appropriations for other places when we do not need them? We will take care of the conditions to which the gentleman refers, where 8 or 10 or 12 men are sleeping in 1 room. What I am insisting on is that it is about time we began to discuss the Army appropriations. There has been a lot of waste, recklessness, and a lot of expenditures which have not been warranted from the beginning. Up to now it has been almost a sacred matter; we must not discuss the Army recommendations or appropriations. They have been sacrosanct. But thank God the time has come now when we can discuss them and bring them out in the open the way the Senate did yesterday, and denounce the waste and the squandering of the taxpayers' money. I propose to do it about these very recommendations and to show what the Army is doing with a new TNT plant in the State of New York.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I merely want the RECORD to show that there has been a discussion of Army appropriations. While we recognize that in the haste of the war effort we cannot control everything, the Army appropriation bill that was reported this time did make a cut of $387,000,000 below the Budget request.

Mr. FISH. Is it the $71,000,000,000 bill to which the gentleman is referring?

Mr. CASE. Yes. It was the first time since Pearl Harbor that Budget estimates on War Department requests have been cut.

Mr. FISH. That is what I am referring to, and thank goodness we are beginning to scrutinize them.

I have here an article from the New York Times of June 23 which reads as follows:

TNT WORKS TO STOP PRODUCTION JULY 31

Seven thousand five hundred-acre plant in Niagara County, N. Y., to be closed for lack of need of product.

Company operating United States-owned concern aids replacement of 7,500 war workers.

This dispatch comes from a town called Modeltown, N. Y., and is dated June 22.

The huge Lake Ontario Ordnance Works, in operation 9 months, will stop production of TNT July 31 because, its commanding officer said today, of the lack of need for its product.

The sprawling plant, covering about 7,500 fruit-rich acres in Niagara County, is Government-owned and operated.

Then it goes on to say that the plant has its own water supply system, adequate to meet the needs of a city of 100,000. It has a power plant, railroad, transportation system, telephone and electrical distribution system, fire department, well-equipped hospitals, and so forth. Here is a huge expenditure by the War Department. The plant has only been set up and operated for about 9 months, and it is going to quit on the 31st day of next month, after expenditures of millions and millions of dollars. Has not the Congress the right to ask questions about legislation, to scrutinize it before passing upon war appropriations? Where are these housing projects to be erected? How is the money going to be spent?

I remember protesting about the hotels taken over by the Army and asking for information. They took over 400 hotels, and within the last week they released 206 of these hotels, yet we are told we must not criticize recommendations made by the War Department.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Of course, we should make these examinations. I am sure the gentleman would not want to indicate that this particular TNT plant should keep on operating after there was no need for its operation?

Mr. FISH. I am just exposing what has been done. The Army chose the plant and set it up. The Army took 7,500 acres of fruit trees, the best land they could find, and set up this plant, and now they are going to abandon it after they have wasted all these millions of dollars. This is only one instance. I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] will show four or five others. I am simply stating that it is about time we criticized some of these wartime expenditures. I am opposed to this $300,000,000 because they did not make out a case. They did not give us the information we are entitled to. I will vote to cut $100,000,000 from the bill and if they need more, let them come in and make their case.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Right along that line which the gentleman is discussing, I have here a newspaper article quoting the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, saying that industry has failed by 5½ percent to meet the production needs of the Army ground forces. That was in May. He said this failure of May production is the most critical single occurrence in the Army supply program. Now, does not the gentleman feel that perhaps this instance to which he has referred is one particular item when General Patterson says the Army needs have fallen off 5½ percent?

Mr. FISH. Well, it may be the fault of the Army. Evidently they did fail. Maybe it was Mr. Patterson himself who failed, and is using that as an alibi to place the blame on private industry. It looks to me as if he has absolutely failed in locating and building this now useless TNT plant. It must be obvious that the time has come for Members of Congress to investigate these war expenditures and stop the waste and extravagance and often reckless recommendations of the War Department.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. In my district they have cut one of these large plants 50 percent. I understand it is because of a shortage of steel to make those products. Can you blame the War Department for the shortage of steel?

Mr. FISH. You can blame them for setting up a plant and not knowing in advance what they were going to need. They have priorities on everything. The gentleman should not try to alibi the War Department. They have a priority on all the steel and copper and everything they need.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I do not see how I can yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, while I am discussing this subject I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, one of the most distinguished and lovable Members of the House, if he has any particular information about the deferment of Mr. Leon Keyserling, who is in his thirties, around 34 years of age, counsel general for the National Housing Agency, married, without children; yet he has been given a deferment. He is one of the 89,000. There are 89,000 too many deferments given to these Federal appointees and officeholders, who are hiding away in governmental fox holes on the governmental pay roll. I am opposed particularly to these young men like Keyserling, holding well-paid jobs, who should set an example for the rest of the Federal employees, when sons of parents in your district and in mine, sometimes two or three in a family, are called into the service. Why should this young man 34 years of age be declared essential to carry on the National Housing Agency? Perhaps the gentleman can elucidate and inform the House on the necessity for this deferment.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that I do not think that is any more pertinent to the subject of whether or not these workers in some sections need some living quarters than many of the other things that have crept into

this debate, which have not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and which have nothing in the world to do with the question at issue.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman had nothing to do with holding Mr. Keyserling in office, but I thought he might furnish some information about it, because a lot of these bright young men are being declared as essential, and I believe the higher up they are the more they should feel it was their duty to take the lead in serving their country in the armed forces, and not in the well-paid and safe Government dugouts in Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that inasmuch as the Rules Committee seems to be making of itself a legislative committee and since he says that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has not given proper consideration to this matter, when there are almost 300 pages of hearings in addition to several days of confidential hearings, it might be up to the gentleman's committee to look into these deferment matters. They do not pertain to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee never made any such statement, nor criticized the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We asked for information which they refused to give us. We are nothing but the servants of the House. We tried to get this information and Mr. Blanchard refused to give it to the chairman and myself. We were not trying to legislate. We were not trying to amend the bill. We have no right to amend the bill except on the floor of the House. We have a duty and right to get information, which was denied us. It is the first time that it has been denied to the Rules Committee since I have been a Member, by any bureaucrat or agency of the Government. The information was not presented even after we went into executive session.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION POLICIES DESTROY LOW-COST FOOD

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been told continually that the price controls now being administered by the Government are for the benefit of the consumer, particularly the consumer in the large cities of this country. Let me take just one example to prove the absurdity of this contention.

PANCAKE FLOUR

The average housewife throughout the length and breadth of this Nation utilizes the equivalent of at least ten 20-ounce packages of pancake flour a year. All she has to do is to mix this flour with milk or water or both and make her pancakes. Everything, including sugar, soda, and salt, is already in the mix. Pancake flour is not rationed and pancakes represent a substantial portion of the diet in many millions of families, particularly those of hard manual laborers such as coal miners and lumberjacks.

There were two kinds of pancake flour generally sold throughout the United States. The nationally advertised standard brands were sold in 20-ounce packages at retail somewhere between 12 and 15 cents per package. There were, in addition, the pancake flours on which the buyer's brand was placed, which were unadvertised and which were sold almost exclusively through the chain-store systems all over the country. The retail price of this type ran from 5 to 7 cents per 20-ounce package. Of the total consumed, about 40 percent came from the advertised brands and 60 percent from the other brands. For the sake of this illustration I am not trying to distinguish as between the ordinary pancake flours, the buckwheat flours, or the soybean flours, because the illustration which I give applies equally to all three, even though some price adjustments would have to be made for each.

Ceilings were placed on pancake flours. These ceilings were supposed to represent prices as of March 1942, but because of contracts made a year earlier, most of these prices were based on May or September 1941 costs. Since ceilings were placed on pancake flour, the cost to the manufacturer of every ingredient has gone up. This applies to the manufacturers of the standard brands as well as to the manufacturers of the unadvertised brands. Using 6 cents as the average price at which a 20-ounce package of unadvertised pancake flour was sold at retail, the cost of the ingredients had increased by slightly over 1 cent, to say nothing of increased labor costs. The industry asked for a 1-cent increase, indicating that it would be willing to absorb the additional labor costs and the slight excess in cost of ingredients. The O. P. A. officials were apparently sympathetic, but have been themselves, because of orders from the higher-ups, unable to grant the increase. What was the result? Eighty percent of all the manufacturers of unadvertised brands have gone out of business. Fifty percent of the volume of pancake flour which used to be distributed is no longer being distributed. Housewives wishing to buy pancake flour today must pay 12 cents to 15 cents for the advertised brands, and can only buy in limited quantities. While the manufacturers of the advertised brands are continuing to supply their customers with limited quantities, even these manufacturers are seriously squeezed because of the ingredient cost increases which have taken place since November 1941. To make the matter even worse, and this is the most shameful aspect of the situation, two new companies have come into the market manufacturing this type of pancake flour, and because of the fact that they had no previous history nor previous ceilings to meet, are allowed to price their product at the maximum price being charged for any similar product as of the time they began business. These new companies are charging 19 cents to 24 cents per 20-ounce package, and some housewives are forced to pay this price if they want pancake flour. One of these two companies bought up the machinery of a company which had been forced out of business by the Administration, and presumably the same will happen in time for all the companies which are being forced out.

Can any more absurd situation be found? If the 1-cent increase in price had been allowed on the 6-cent package, housewives would still be able to buy at 7 cents a highly nutritious, unrationed food. Because of the failure to grant this increase, they are required to pay 100 percent to 300 percent more for a greatly curtailed quantity of the same product.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has rendered a great service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress so well. What he says is very true. There are two large mills and perhaps more, in my own district, which are closed now because they could not get a slight raise. These new companies are selling their product for more, and it is a product of inferior quality.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that these companies who have heretofore been selling pancake flour at 6 cents a package had to go out of business and that the Administration is permitting other companies or other concerns to go into business and sell the same product at 24 cents a package?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information that he can place in the RECORD along with the extension of his remarks, which would give us enlightenment on how come there is a spread of from 6 to 7 cents in the price between advertised and unadvertised brands?

Mr. HERTER. I can answer the gentleman's question.

The spread is accounted for by the fact that the advertised brands pay for advertising, for greater distribution costs, and usually for better packaging.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 1½ additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman also be good enough to place in the RECORD the names of the individuals who financed or who have stock interests in these new companies which took over this manufacturing business?

Mr. HERTER. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. In further reference to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, is this not the fact that the difference between this price is purely due to the advertised product and the superior package, but the quality and quantity is exactly the same?

Mr. HERTER. Almost identically the same.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

FEDERAL UNION?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution clarifies the way for Congress in its responsibility as the direct representative of the people for a very important duty—that is, to separate such proposed machineries as are feasible to accomplish a just and lasting peace consistent with the general welfare of the American people, from those numerous plans which would prove thoroughly unworkable and create greater difficulties and catastrophes than those we are seeking to avoid.

One of the latter which is receiving considerable attention is the proposal of Mr. Clarence K. Streit, known as Federal Union. This proposal is to form a union of such nations of the world as have most nearly common objectives and standards, or as it is put by him under his latest plan, such nations as have compelling ties.

Under this plan such nations as are to form the Federal Union will cede certain of their powers just as the States of the United States have ceded certain powers to the Federal Government. Under this plan, Mr. Streit proposes a union government and citizenship, a union defense force, a union customs-free economy, a union money, and a union postal and communications system. Of course, this Federal Union would have to have some power of taxation and power to borrow money on the faith and credit of the combined nations.

In other words, Mr. Streit proposes a world government in which the nations thereof would stand in the same relation to it as the States in our Union stand with relation to the Federal Government, with practically the same relative powers and responsibilities. It would also mean that once we were in that world government we would have no right of secession any more than the States had in our Civil War.

It is the contention of the supporters of Federal Union that it is patterned after the United States, and that because the United States has prevented war between the States, this proposed Federal Union, being analogous, would prevent further wars between the nations, and establish a just and lasting peace. One of the first difficulties of the supporters of Federal Union is that there is practically no analogy between the United States and the proposed Federal Union.

In the first place the primary purpose of the union of the Thirteen Colonies was not to prevent war between those States, as is the purpose of the Federal Union.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

If there was any such intention to prevent war between the Thirteen States in the minds of the constitutional founders, it was only incidental, and it would require considerable imagination to find reference thereto unless it is in the clause "to insure domestic tranquillity," which, inasmuch as it follows the clause "to establish justice," undoubtedly referred to the tranquillity of communities rather than with reference of State to State.

In the second place there is no analogy in that these Thirteen States of the Union first fought the war and after the war had been won, they then began negotiations for the forming of a union of the Thirteen States. Federal Union proposes to accomplish the union of world governments while we are fighting this war. This in the nature of a shotgun wedding, or a wedding by a justice of the peace, to be later confirmed by a minister. For Mr. Streit contends that this union can be effected by the President and the Congress without consulting and against the will of the people. This formality of submitting the plan to the people, he says, can be observed later after the provisional union has been effected. Our Constitution of the United States was adopted with careful deliberation and after the Revolutionary War had been fought to a successful conclusion. It is doubtful if the Thirteen States of the Union could have accomplished both of these great objectives of winning the war and establishing a Federal Government at one and the same time. This is equally true of forming a Federal Union while we are fighting this war.

In the third place, there is no analogy because the Thirteen States were contiguous and all situated in one small area and had been living in one house, so to speak, for 150 years. Such unions of adjacent, contiguous, independent states have not been unusual. They have been formed not only as republics, like the United States of America and the Swiss Federation, but also, to take the worst examples, in such autocracies, as Germany and Italy. Federal Union, on the other hand, is proposing such a federation of nations scattered all over the world, and there is no precedent of success under those conditions. The only example we have is the British Empire, and there the proof is against the success of a union of such scattered, independent units, for I think it will be generally conceded that of the two, this British Empire is disintegrating rather than integrating and solidifying.

In the fourth place, there is no analogy because the formation of our Federal Government out of independent States was a process of slow evolution and growth, extending over a period of nearly 300 years. The first Thirteen States had undergone a growth and interdependence of nearly 150 years before they formed the Union, and that evolutionary process resulting in the present 48 States took nearly another 150 years. In the proposed federal union of nations, on the other hand, the proponents thereof seek to accomplish this at one fell swoop and practically overnight by revolutionary processes. The fact that the first was accomplished by an evolutionary process, through a period of 300 years is no indication that it can be done practically overnight.

In the fifth place, there is no analogy because the Thirteen Original States, as well as those subsequently added, were bound together by a common language, while in Federal Union it is proposed to unite peoples of various and different languages.

In the sixth place, Federal Union is not analogous to the United States because the proposed nations for the former are rife with all the dynamics of war, while in the latter these were practically nonexistent. In the United States there were no differences in ideologies except on the slavery question which, while it was recognized at the time of the framing of the Constitution, was not solved. And this as we know provoked the bloodiest and most destructive civil war in the history of the world.

There was no excessive nationalism. In fact the States had enjoyed independence for so brief a time that it can hardly be said that a spirit of nationalism had been generated in the independent States.

There was no economic pressure to speak of. Such bickering as there was between the States over tariffs was negative and never approached what we today understand as the economic pressure in nations.

There was, of course, no imperialism or spirit of imperialism.

As we know, not one of the States was burdened with militarism.

Even those war-breeding elements of fear, hate, and revenge were so negligible as to make the union feasible. In the proposed Federal Union, or Federation of Nations, on the other hand, all of these dynamics of war have existed for centuries; they have not been eradicated and perhaps will find just as violent expression after this war as they ever have.

The Thirteen Colonies had in the main common objectives and common standards. The United States, with the exception of those leading up to the Civil War at least, was free from the ideolo-

gies, excessive nationalism, economic pressures, imperialism, militarism, fear, hate, and revenge, one or more of which characterize practically all of the nations with whom it is proposed to form a federal union.

Proponents of Federal Union and similar ideologies have been obliged to change their plans several times because of the various insurmountable objections and barriers found in every plan advanced up to the present time. Recently in a discussion in the American Forum of the Air, Mr. Streit stated that his first plan was a federation of democracies; that he had abandoned that plan for a British-American union. When pressed he admitted that he had also abandoned that plan; that the present and last Federal Union plan contemplated a Federal Union of the United States with those nations with which we have "compelling ties." These he enumerated, although not as an exhaustive list, as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, the United Kingdom, the Union of South Africa, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and France.

However, before the discussion ended he had evolved a new plan. When asked why he did not include Russia or China, or both, this apparently presented a hurdle which he could not overcome with Federal Union. I understand Federal Union, Inc., has about 75 chapters all over the United States. About half of them favor including Russia, while the other half is against it. They also differ widely on including China. So in the forum discussion, to meet that obstacle, Mr. Streit proposed the forming of two organizations: First, Federal Union, comprising an integrated government as above stated, and in addition to that the United Nations, which would be open to membership for all the nations of the earth who wished to join.

In other words, that is to say, Federal Union, consisting of the enlightened, progressive, and desirable, the chosen, elect, and superior nations of the earth, would constitute one nation. Then as such a unit they would invite all the other nations rejected as unfit, too backward, and perhaps too dangerous for Federal Union to join them as the United Nations for what—just imagine—to attain a just and lasting peace between the nations of the world.

One is reminded of what I believe it was Clemenceau is alleged to have said when he was apprised of the Wilson peace plan at Versailles. He retorted, "That means we will eventually have to give up our colonies." And when another imperialistic representative said, "Oh, no; I don't think we'll have to go that far," he snorted, "Then, by God, you don't want peace, you want war."

It is obvious to the most superficial that the obstacles presenting themselves from every angle spring from the fact that there is no analogy between the United States and the Federal Union except the attempt to organize various independent units into one organism. Right there the analogy ceases. For instance, I believe that, according to Mr. Streit's figures, the population of the above-named countries acceptable for Federal Union would be about 200,000,000 people. Just what would Federal Union do if the British Empire accorded India, with its 350,000,000 people, Dominion status? How could this be prevented in a democratic nation? And yet, if Great Britain should do this, would not the Indians by right of representation dominate and control the entire Federal Union? In other words, the people of the United States would be governed by the Indonese. Nevertheless this is something we would have to face.

As I said earlier, Mr. Streit changes his plans involving the destiny of all the people on the earth, and especially the 130,000,000 Americans very rapidly. I think it may safely be said that at the present time his leading lieutenant is Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the United States Supreme Court. Now, in the short space of 45 minutes in the American Forum of the Air Mr. Streit changed his plans so quickly that his lieutenant, the Justice, could not keep up with him.

While Mr. Streit stated that Russia and China could not be admitted to the inner circle of Federal Union, but would have to be satisfied with membership in the United Nations, Justice Roberts still wanted to operate under the old plan, for in that same forum discussion the Justice said:

> One objection that I hear often is that it must be all or none, and that we cannot hope that all nations will join in any such union. On the contrary, I think it clear that those nations who are willing to join should be invited to join now, and that such as do join should federate to make their united power felt throughout the world.

Clearly, Mr. Streit left his lieutenant, the Justice, out on a limb. His precarious position is obvious. Mr. Streit's proposed union government would consist of a congress composed of a senate and house, and a 5-man executive board instead of a president. Each nation will be entitled to 1 representative for each million inhabitants, and 2 senators with one additional senator for each 25,000,000 population. Two members of the board would be elected by the congress, and the other 3 by direct popular vote of the people of member nations.

It requires practically no arithmetic to state that under such representative government Russia, China, and India, with their combined 1,000,000,000 of population, would not only control the congress but the executive board; and the people of not only the United States, but the rest of the world would be governed by the Slavic and oriental nations. Mr. Streit, as before stated, hesitates to go so far, but the Justice in effect says "yes" without batting an eyelash. He is driven to this because no formula of representative government could be devised which would avoid this result. Justice Roberts, on the other hand, seemed to sharply disagree with Mr. Streit's contention that the United States could join a federal union through action by the President and the Congress. Asked whether such a step would have to be submitted to the people under article V of the Federal Constitution, the answer of Justice Roberts in the forum was, "I said I thought it should be done." It requires but little imagination to foresee what devastating effect the submission of such a question to the people of the 48 States would have on our unity in winning the war.

Justice Roberts is just as vague as is Mr. Streit in many concepts of Federal Union. To get away from the forum discussion, I would like to discuss for a moment a speech alleged to have been made by Mr. Justice Roberts on May 1 last, before the American Society of International Law. Justice Roberts did not seem to be overanxious to discuss that speech in the forum. In it he said:

> It is said that nations are not ready to be tied together in a complicated governmental organization, wholly new and untried. I answer that the important matter is not how much, but how little authority should in the first instance, be delegated to any such government. It would seem that a very simple bill of rights—a power to raise and support armies, a commerce power analogous to that exercised in the United States by Congress, a power to create an international medium of exchange, and a power to create a federal postal system, would be essential, and that little, if anything more, should initially be attempted: perhaps not that much.

It might be asked: Does Justice Roberts propose to build this stupendous world government on a contradiction, on a paradox by saying, the weaker we can build this organism the stronger it will be?

And when he says "perhaps not so much," which authorities or powers is he doubtful about? Which would he eliminate?

Or does he mean that it must be made to look attractive and harmless, like a trap, because after the trap has been sprung he can do with the victim as he chooses?

Under Mr. Streit's proposal of a union government and union citizenship, it is true, of course, that all immigration laws would be repealed, and citizens of any nation would have free access, requiring not even a health examination to pass from the territory of one nation to another, just as in the United States we can pass from one State to another freely. They have no answer to the question as how to prevent millions upon millions from the lower brackets in foreign countries from an influx into this country to enjoy a more abundant life and the "four freedoms" in preference to the hardships of rehabilitating their own countries in Europe. Nor can they answer how the employment, commercial and farm economy of our country could stand the burden of such an influx.

When, in the Forum of the Air this question was asked of Mr. Streit, Justice Roberts sprang to the rescue with the following answer:

> Congressman, I think that is not a question to be decided in the fundamental concept of union at all. That is a matter that can be settled and left for settlement later. It is a matter that can be left to each government at this time.

Well, I think that the American people will want that and a host of similar questions answered beforehand, not after the trap has been sprung.

Take for instance the matter of "a customs-free economy" free trade between

the nations of the earth just as now exists between the States of our Union. To establish this by revolution, overnight, would flood our markets with industrial and agricultural products from the cheap labor of sister nations. Regardless of how desirous we may be of gradually eliminating trade barriers as the standard of living of other nations approaches our own, to permit flooding of our markets as proposed would engulf and smother our own standard of living in a moment.

Other equally dire and disastrous consequences would flow from such measures as transferring the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, the power to lay and collect taxes, the power to borrow money on the faith and credit of the United States, the power to declare war, and so forth, all of which the people have entrusted to Congress exclusively under constitutional safeguards, to another and foreign sovereign power.

We have only to examine the Keynes-Morgenthau proposed international exchange or bank plan to know who would furnish the gold or whatever medium of exchange the system would use as a base for Federal Union money. Under the Keynes-Morgenthau bank plan the United States, as a creditor nation, would furnish the cash while the other nations could put in I. O. U.'s, and the borrowers, having 75 votes to our 25, could not only compel us to loan, but use these loans for "boondoggling" or any purpose they see fit, and compel us to continue and increase the loans until we were broke. How do we know that a federal-union monetary system would be any better?

Of course, the proponents of federal union have not immediately included the power to tax and the power to borrow money. It would be difficult, however, to explain how a federal union of world states could be operated on a shoestring any more than the United States can do so even in peacetimes.

In short, such a proposal as federal union would not only present such dissension, discord, and strife as would seriously divide, hamstring, and frustrate our united efforts to win the war, but it would saddle on a new and untried political organism a program so stupendous that it is bound to bog down and is foredoomed to failure; and not only that, but if the American Nation should become a member of federal union, she would be putting herself in the position of a woman who marries a man because she cannot reform him in any other way. But after the marriage she would find herself in a predicament more critical and calamitous than ever, and one from which she could not extricate herself except with isolation and humiliation.

Congress, after a decade of abdication, is again resuming its rightful function as the organism through which the people of the United States speak and govern their domestic as well as their foreign affairs. I believe that the Fulbright resolution will enjoy the universal approval of the American people. It is a step and medium by which the people can express themselves through the Congress on a safe and sane foreign policy for the attainment of a just and lasting peace between the nations of the earth, if such a thing is humanly possible.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York called attention to the closing of some explosive plants. I think the record should show that the subcommittee on War Department appropriations went into that question in their recent hearings.

The reason certain explosive plants are being closed are three: First, because the speed of production has exceeded original estimates; second, because the developments of the war have decreased the need for certain types of explosives—we had more in north Africa than we had to use, but thank God we had more rather than running short—and third, because a new, more powerful explosive is being developed and so we are turning to that and reducing the production of the old type. At this point I wish to read a few of the sentences which were left in the printed hearings out of the extended discussion we had on this subject. I quote:

Colonel HOFSTETTER. The principal items in there are for the expansion of explosive plants which we need because a new explosive has been developed, which is more powerful than anything we have had in the past. * * * We have been under considerable pressure from the Air Corps to bring about increased production of this product. That explosive is considered much more powerful than TNT, and they find that if they can use this powerful explosive they can accomplish the same results by using a smaller number of planes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Texas that he has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Alabama to call up a conference report.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Allen, Ill.	Green	Morrison, La.
Baldwin, Md.	Hall,	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Nichols
Barden	Hall,	O'Hara
Bell	Leonard W.	O'Leary
Boren	Hébert	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Phillips
Buckley	Izac	Plumley
Byrne	Jennings	Rivers
Capozzoli	Johnson,	Russell
Cochran	Luther A.	Sasscer
Culkin	Johnson,	Scanlon
Dawson	Ward	Sheppard
Dingell	Kilburn	Sheridan
Eaton	King	Somers, N. Y.
Fay	LeFevre	Tolan
Fernandez	Lesinski	Towe
Fitzpatrick	Luce	Treadway
Ford	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Furlong	Merritt	Vorys, Ohio
Gallagher	Monroney	Wheat

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the rule, were dispensed with.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June,' and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.' Only one appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made

during the calendar year 1943 which shall be on the basis established by this amendment.

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term '$2,650,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the term '$3,400,000,000'.

"Sec. 3. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a) and by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term 'June 30, 1943' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945'; and is further hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'without regard to provisions of any other existing law relating to public funds: *Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedure to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year and shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed ninety days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1945, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General; *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

"Sec. 4. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"Sec. 5. Subsection 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase'.

"Sec. 6. (a) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942.

"(b) No subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any commodity referred to in subsection (a) either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices so established, maintained or announced as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, maintained or announced, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the maximum or support prices on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

"(d) The definition of the term 'person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term 'person' as used in this section.

"Sec. 7. The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further,* That the authority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498) as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322, as amended, and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, and for carrying out the purposes of the Act of March 11, 1941. Such authority to buy commodities used for food purposes shall include the power to buy them for the purpose of selling at a loss, but any such purchase for sale at a loss (1) shall be made only from the farmer at a price not less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, and not less than the support price therefor as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, or (2) shall be made in the open market at a price which will reflect such price (referred to in clause (1)) to the farmer; and no such purchase for sale at a loss shall be made for the purpose of reducing or rolling back any maximum price established under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further,* That the War Food Administrator shall not approve purchases for the purpose of selling at a loss, except those required to carry out any program (other than a roll back program) announced prior to July 1, 1943; and such approvals shall not involve losses in a total amount in excess of $150,000,000. The government agency or corporation making such purchases shall dispose of the commodities purchased as soon as feasible through the regular recognized channels and functions of trade and distribution used in free and independent enterprise; but no such commodity shall be sold or disposed of by any governmental agency or corporation (1) at a price below the price limitations imposed by sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this Act or section 3 of Public Law 729 approved October 2, 1942, or (2) contrary to the provisions of the last sentence of this subsection or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this Act. No governmental agency or corporation shall buy any such commodity for the purpose of selling it at a loss except pursuant to the authority contained in this section.'

"Sec. 8. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH A. BUTLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of

the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the matter recommended by the committee of conference is the same as the first section of the Senate amendment. It was the same in substance as the provision of the House bill.

Section 2 would increase the amount of obligations which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to have outstanding at any one time by $750,000,000. The bill as it passed the House would have authorized an increase of $500,000,000 and the Senate amendment would have authorized an increase of $1,000,000,000.

Section 3 is the same as section 3 of the Senate amendment. It contains the provisions of section 3 of the bill as it passed the House and in addition requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to maintain complete and accurate books of account and provides for the audit of its financial transactions by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions.

Sections 4 and 5 are the same as sections 4 and 5 of the bill as it passed the House.

Section 6, except for rearrangement and clarification of language, corresponds to section 6 of the bill as it passed the House and to the Aiken amendment which was included as section 5 of the Senate amendment.

Section 7 is a modification of the O'Mahoney amendment which was included as section 6 of the Senate amendment and applies only to commodities used for food purposes. It validates programs of buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and programs for support prices under section 4 of the Act of July 1, 1941, if the program was announced prior to July 1, 1943, but does not validate any roll-back program. Section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is amended to provide that the War Food Administrator must approve such programs (other than roll-back programs) and places a limitation on losses of $150,000,000.

Section 8 is the same as section 8 of the bill as it passed the House.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. Members are familiar with the measure as it passed the House so I shall only undertake to deal with the provisions of the bill as they have been changed by the conference committee. A new provision in the conference report would establish a system of accounting to be conducted by the General Accounting Office. It is a rather long provision, but there was no objection on the part of any of the conferees either from the House or Senate, and it was worked out in conjunction with officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation and is acceptable to them. I assume there will be no objection to that part of the bill, although it was not in the House bill.

The material changes in the bill, or at least two provisions of the bill in which the Members are mainly interested, are the so-called subsidy provision of the bill, and the provision incorporated by the conferees which amends the buying and selling provisions of section 2 of the original Price Control Act. The subsidy provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill were in substantial agreement. The conferees adopted portions of the language from both bills, not for substantial reasons, but for clarity and for better expression and without substantial change. It is provided that no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942.

A provision embodied in the conference report would prevent subsidy and other payments except those that have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, either for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices so established, maintained, or announced as may have been or may hereafter be ordered. This means that no maximum or support price can be reduced or rolled back and the difference made up as a subsidy or other payment, nor can such payment be made in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, maintained, or announced. This means that when an increase in maximum prices is to be put into effect it must be done directly and not on a resort to subsidies, nor can a subsidy be used to cover any portion of any maximum price already or hereafter established from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated.

This language is in effect the same as the language employed in the House bill.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that this prevented roll-backs that were not in effect up until August 1, 1943. Why did you pick August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. It permits the fulfillment of obligations that accrue down to August 1.

The purpose is to validate contractual relationships, regardless of the technical situation, and insure carrying out in good faith any obligations that have been entered into in good faith. I think we should give the same consideration to any moral obligation that would be expected in case of legal obligations.

Mr. POAGE. I am perfectly willing that you shall carry out the contracts, but do we understand that they can make new commitments between now and August 1 that will be binding?

Mr. STEAGALL. It applies only to those that accrue.

Mr. POAGE. It applies only to those that are now in existence, where the obligation has already been created and must be fulfilled between now and August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is undertaking to validate any obligations or commitments that accrue down to that time.

Mr. POAGE. That is not today, that is a month from tomorrow. Does that mean that during the next month commitments can be made and they will be fulfilled?

Mr. STEAGALL. The limit June 15, 1943, applies to commitments.

Mr. POAGE. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, under the conference report roll-backs are barred.

Mr. STEAGALL. As I have indicated and will further indicate as I proceed, that is true, but not entirely.

Mr. McCORMACK. For all practical purposes does not the conference report bring about the elimination of roll-backs and subsidies except to the extent of $150,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. No, the gentleman is in error. The $150,000,000 mentioned in the bill has reference to an entirely different matter, the purchase and sale of commodities. This provision does not apply to subsidy payments which have accrued prior to the 1st day of August. It does not apply to subsidy or other payments until the end of the current crop season, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, if the Government was committed to the payment of the subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943. It does not apply to Government-owned wheat sold for feed, if sold at the parity price of corn. It does not prevent adjustments in the maximum and support prices of competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed required to bring about and maintain the necessary relationship in the price of such products necessary to secure necessary production for the war effort.

There is one further provision in the Senate bill that was incorporated in the conference report and not in the House bill to which I should like to call attention. If you will refer to subparagraph (c) under section 6 on page 3 of the conference report you will find this language:

> Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Referring specifically to the so-called roll-back on butter and meat products, does this authorize the payment of any subsidy on either meat or butter after August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is terminated as I have indicated.

Mr. HOPE. Does it permit obligating the Federal Government for any payments in the way of subsidies on meat and butter after June 15?

Mr. STEAGALL. August 1 is the time in which that authority would expire.

Mr. HOPE. What I want to get at is, between today and the 1st of August can any agency of the Federal Government obligate itself to pay subsidies on meat or butter?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is not the intent, unless it accrues prior to August 1.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that under this conference report roll-backs and subsidies for processed meat and for everything else the people in the cities require for food are eliminated?

Mr. STEAGALL. As far as roll-backs and subsidies are concerned, that is true, within the limits of the provisions I have indicated.

Mr. LYNCH. So that no provision at all is made for the great mass of people living in the cities so that they might have a reduced cost of living through this Commodity Credit Corporation bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think the gentleman understands my answer to that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I call the gentleman's attention to subparagraph (c) which he has just read. Does that mean that when any concern such as a processor sells commodities to the Government there may be an adjustment of price in order to comply with the formula laid down in section 3 of the act of 1942?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know that I quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the Government buys, say for the Army or the Navy or Lend-Lease, meat, for instance.

Mr. STEAGALL. Purchases for Government agencies for governmental use are excepted from this provision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would then permit claims to be filed with the O. P. A. or the proper agency for some commodity that had been sold at a loss?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know just what situation you have in mind.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Perhaps it is my fault, but it strikes me that there is confusion and a contradiction within section 6 between the various subsections of that section. In subsection (a) we have the broad language that no maximum price—and "maximum price," I take it, means ceiling price—shall be established for any agricultural commodity or anything processed therefrom below the support price to the producer. To my mind, that is a flat prohibition of all subsidies and all roll-backs. Then we get to subsection (b), where the policy against subsidies and roll-backs is announced, but with certain qualifications, with a permission to take care of the present Government commitments.

As I say, perhaps it is my lack of understanding, but I think when you read them together the two subsections do not mean anything. I wish the chairman would be kind enough to explain that to me and possibly to some other Members of the House who might experience a similar difficulty.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think there is any contradiction there. It simply says they cannot fix maximum prices below support prices.

Mr. WRIGHT. When you say you cannot fix a maximum price, that means that you cannot sell to the ultimate consumer at a price less than the price you pay the producer. In other words, that is a direct prohibition against subsidies or roll-backs and it is an all-inclusive provision. There are no qualifications, although there is an attempt to qualify in the later subsection.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think there is any question about the interpretation to be put on the language. The gentleman has indicated what the purpose of the legislation is. That is what we intend to do, within the limits of the exceptions.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Do I understand that the compromise involved in this conference report would sanction the Commodity Credit Corporation making incentive payments or subsidies already under way to increase production of articles like tomatoes, corn, beans, hemp, sugar, vegetable oils, and fats; that there is appropriated therefor $150,000,000. Am I correct in that assertion?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is talking now about a provision in the conference report which was not dealt with by the House bill, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks. It will be remembered that in the original price-control bill there was a provision permitting subsidies and the purchase and sale of commodities where the administrator finds that maximum production of necessary products was not being had. The purpose of that is to secure and maintain adequate production for the war effort. That was in the original price-control bill. It should be said in this connection that that authority was limited to the purpose of obtaining necessary war production and, not to undertake to enter into discussions that are controversial, the fact is that nobody connected with the passage of that bill dreamed that it understood its purpose was to control inflation, or it was to obtain necessary production for war, and except as to that phase of the economy affected by increased production, the cost of living did not enter into the calculation.

Now, in this bill the Senate adopted what was known as the O'Mahoney amendment. The conferees amended that amendment so as to spell out again the authority contained in section 2 (e) of the original Price Control Act as it applies to food, and only as it applies to food.

Mr. CELLER. So that you still have incentive payments to increase production as to food; is that correct?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. CELLER. And what is the amount that is provided for that purpose?

Mr. STEAGALL. There is not any appropriation and there is not any limit as to the money that can be spent. The only limitation in the bill, the only fund mentioned is a limit upon the losses that may be sustained in connection with carrying out the food program. It does not deal with section 2, the buy-and-sell provision, except as it relates to the production of food, and it provides that it shall be under the control of the Food Administrator.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I just wanted to ask the gentleman one question. Does this relate to the noncompensatory cargo war-risk insurance or reduced freight rates for agencies such as the War Shipping Administration?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am not sure that it does.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter addressed by the War Shipping Administration to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. This letter was identical with the letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate. The letter was written by Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

JUNE 28, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: The bill (H. R. 2869) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States as it passed the House, contained section 6 prescribing certain prohibitions and limitations on payment of subsidies by the Government or any agency thereof with respect to agricultural commodities.

The bill as amended in the Senate contains in sections 5 and 6 amendments of comparable purpose.

Inasmuch as the activities of the War Shipping Administration were referred to in the course of consideration of the measure, and inasmuch as there may be some confusion and

misunderstanding as to the application, or intended application, of the amendments in question to the activities of this agency in respect of providing war risk marine insurance at noncompensatory rates and in fixing freight charges for transportation of certain commodities lower than might otherwise be fixed on a commercial basis, it is deemed desirable to call the history of these matters to the direct attention of the conferees on the Senate amendments to the House bill.

The activities of the War Shipping Administration in furthering the maintenance of price control and in helping to bear part of the war cost of transportation have been explained on various occasions to the Congress and its committees. These activities may be summarized by stating that this agency in respect of marine insurance and ocean freight rates does not, in certain cases, charge sufficiently high rates to absorb all the war cost involved.

On July 20, 1942, the Honorable S. O. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, included in his remarks (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6398 and ff.) the memorandum and correspondence relating to reduction of ocean freight rates on certain coal and petroleum products, reduction of war-risk insurance rates on coal and petroleum products, and lifting the war surcharges otherwise applicable to ocean freight rates between the mainland and the Territories and possessions.

The Congress had considered the problem of, and authorized, governmental assumption of wartime increases in transportation costs arising from marine war-risk insurance during the consideration of legislation which became Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942.

The policies and activities of the War Shipping Administrator with respect to these matters were set forth in House Report No. 2572, Seventy-seventh Congress, on the bill H. R. 7424, and again in House Report No. 107 on the bill H. R. 133. This portion of the report reads as follows:

"The Administrator also performs very important functions in the conduct of the economic phases of our war effort, especially in connection with the battle against inflation. Freight rates established by the Administrator for ocean transportation and the insurance rates charged in connection with the insurance of vessels and cargoes have a direct bearing upon the cost of goods imported to the United States and exported to our allies or friendly governments. Under Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Administration has authority to adjust its insurance rates in order to meet the economic, strategic, or military considerations of our war effort. Under its general operating authority, the Administrator may adjust his freight rates to conform to the same requirements. Under these powers, the Administrator has made insurance available at noncompensatory rates so as not to interfere with the price ceilings established by the agencies entrusted with the development of economic policy and so as to assist in the maintenance of satisfactory economic and political relations with our allies or friendly neutrals. Noncompensatory freight rates have also been provided where required by our economic or military needs. As a consequence, shippers or consignees of ocean-going cargo are not required to assume the full extraordinary cost of transportation resulting from the war effort. This cost, which largely represents war-risk-insurance expenditures, extra cost of voyage delays resulting from convoy and black-out operations, the cost of crew bonuses and many other factors, in reality constitutes part of the cost of conducting the war and should properly be borne, at least to a large degree, by the taxpayers as a whole rather than by any group of shippers or consignees."

Most recently, during the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on the national war agencies appropriation bill, 1944 (H. R. 2968), there was a full discussion concerning the noncompensatory cargo war-risk insurance and the reduced freight rates for the transportation of petroleum products and coal. (See hearings, pt. I, pp. 604, 640-643.)

It is our understanding from the text of the provisions in question and the debate in Congress, that these provisions are not designed and do not affect the policies and activities of this agency above discussed. There is, as was pointed out in the hearings of the national war agencies appropriation bill (p. 643), no actual payment of funds to anybody under these provisions. The revenues of this agency may be less than they might otherwise have been, but no payments are made from the appropriations of this agency in respect of the said activities.

However, inasmuch as the lowered rates fixed by this agency do apply to some agricultural commodities, particularly exports of food to Territories and possessions, if the conferees are of the opinion that the provisions in question apply to prohibit such lowered or noncompensatory rates by this agency or other agencies in respect of transportation or insurance, it is suggested that in connection with any language which may be adopted by the conferees, there be included a provision to the effect that nothing therein shall be construed to prohibit the payment of, or the absorption by, the Government or any of its agencies of the increased costs of transportation, including insurance, due to the war.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Administrator.*

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think I have made this situation quite clear. We found that the Commodity Credit Corporation was making large purchases for the lend-lease program. It developed that there was no contractual understanding between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the lend-lease organization with respect to losses or expense of administration on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation. So that it means that the Commodity Credit Corporation was keeping open shop for the purpose of supplying such commodities and goods as might be required for the lend-lease program, with any losses that might accrue to fall upon the Commodity Credit Corporation. We did not think that was sound practice, and so the bill as amended provided that the Corporation should be reimbursed all money expended and all losses if any and services performed. The provision is broader than I indicated to the gentleman from Virginia. It is section 8:

Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or the Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies.

The language of the provision is clear as the gentleman will see.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. The chairman read from page 3, section 6 (a) of the conference report:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any other commodity, etc.

Would the effect of this be to wipe out the Office of Price Administration insofar as it regulates maximum prices?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not in the least. It simply adds a provision which would require observance of the support price of commodities announced by the Department of Agriculture. If that were not provided, we would be in the unthinkable position of having one Government agency support one kind of a price, or nullifying a price established by another agency of the Government. The provision would not create the situation suggested.

Mr. McGRANERY. The effect, if the chairman of the committee will permit, would be that the Office of Price Administration must of necessity follow the recommendation as to the price of these products furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CELLER. The War Food Administration.

Mr. McGRANERY. The War Food Administration.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

In reference to support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman intend to leave the impression upon the House that the War Food Administrator will have veto power over all prices of food commodities? I think that is the impression that is left with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just interrogated the chairman.

Mr. STEAGALL. No, I do not think that is correct.

Mr. PACE. Is not he acting in an advisory capacity rather than in the capacity of complete authority and if there is conflict then the decision must be made by Judge Vinson, who occupies that position?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. May I ask a further question? Will the Commodity Credit Corporation be permitted to carry on its normal operations regarding the support price program?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. PACE. It will not be crippled in that regard?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, no. That is made very clear.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that section 6 makes it clear that you cannot under the provisions of section 6 place a ceiling on any commodity or livestock? This would, of course, affect over 20,000,000 people who have not received any

increase in their wages; this will bring about an increase in the cost of living that these people cannot stand, and I feel it would result in a great injustice.

We must take into consideration those people, the consumers of the Nation, and not only the few you are trying to protect by this program. I think it is an outrageous provision to say that no ceilings should be placed on any livestock or any commodity—that is, any agricultural commodity—and I feel it should be defeated.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the gentleman is entirely in error in that both as to the language and the purpose of the bill. No such thing is undertaken, and no such thing is accomplished.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. As I understand, the $150,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for roll-backs that have been already contracted for prior to July.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. LYNCH. What is the $150,000,000 for?

Mr. STEAGALL. The $150,000,000 is the limitation of losses that may be incurred in connection with the food program authorized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 29½ minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired, and the remaining time is under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The House has heretofore prohibited incentive payments. Section 6 of this bill will prohibit subsidy payments. Section 7 will prohibit support prices. How does the gentleman from Alabama calculate that we are going to feed this Nation next year?

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman's construction in regard to support prices. We even require the Price Administrator to support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Well, certainly there is no question about the House voting this week to absolutely prohibit incentive payments. Certainly there is no doubt about section 6 of this bill prohibiting subsidy payments to anyone—farmers, processors, or anyone else. Then section 7 of this bill reads as follows:

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322, as amended, and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, and for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941. Such authority to buy commodities used for food purposes shall include the power to buy them for the purpose of selling at a loss, but any such purchase for sale at a loss (1) shall be made only from the farmer at a price not less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, and not less than the support price therefor as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, or (2) shall be made in the open market at a price which will reflect such price (referred to in clause (1)) to the farmer; and no such purchase for sale at a loss shall be made for the purpose of reducing or rolling back any maximum price established under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further*, That the War Food Administrator shall not approve purchases for the purpose of selling at a loss, except those required to carry out any program (other than a roll-back program) announced prior to July 1, 1943; and such approvals shall not involve losses in a total amount in excess of $150,000,000. The Government agency or corporation making such purchases shall dispose of the commodities purchased as soon as feasible through the regular recognized channels and functions of trade and distribution used in free and independent enterprise; but no such commodity shall be sold or disposed of by any governmental agency or corporation (1) at a price below the price limitations imposed by sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, or (2) contrary to the provisions of the last sentence of this subsection or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act. No governmental agency or corporation shall buy any such commodity for the purpose of selling it at a loss except pursuant to the authority contained in this section."

Section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941, is what we commonly refer to as the Steagall amendment, and is certainly a most valuable provision of law, both for the Nation and the farmers. Under this section 4 the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to support certain prices to producers in order to secure increased production. This support can be either by loans or by purchase and sale programs. In many cases loans will not do the job and such purchase and sale programs are required. Naturally these often involve some losses.

This section 7 provides that these support-price programs which have been announced up to this date may be carried out with the total cost limited to $150,000,000, but it appears, as I construe it, that this section expressly prohibits any such purchase and sale programs involving any loss for the 1944 crop. I think that would be a terrible mistake, to prohibit these programs in the future, and I do not believe the Congress really wants to do so.

Under my construction of the provisions of this bill I am unable to vote for this conference report. I just do not understand how we can tie the hands of the Food Administrator, not only limit his funds but prohibit him from conducting any of the programs so necessary to secure the food we must have to feed our citizens, our armed forces, and a good many of our brothers in arms, and still expect him to do a good job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes. I think you will find by reading the conference report, that there is preserved in the language of the bill all of the prohibitions against the payment of subsidies for the purpose of reducing maximum prices and for rolling back prices.

We recognized that certain of these subsidy payments have accrued. To cut the date on which these accruals might have been paid off at the enactment of the bill, it was pointed out, might work some hardships, so we have given the agencies of the Government 30 days in which to liquidate and pay the subsidies which have accrued.

Following the enactment of the bill there can be no further commitments. So what it virtually means is that, should the President sign the bill tomorrow, or tonight, they have until August 1 to pay the subsidies which have accrued from the date on which the subsidy was announced up to the date of the enactment of the bill. But assuming that the President does not sign the bill for another week or 10 days, we still have a limitation in here that they cannot continue the program which has already been announced beyond August 1.

We provide also—and this is material, because many questions have been asked in respect to it—that any program that has been announced for canning vegetables, frozen vegetables, agricultural products preserved in brine, and any program that was announced before June 15 may continue throughout this crop year. That was necessary because some of the canners have agreed to take the crops at a certain price, and also necessary because the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to subsidize the increase in wages which was recently given to workers in canning factories; but beyond this crop year they can pay no subsidies for such purpose.

We have provided in section 7 of the act, which is a modification of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment, a limitation on section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act; and let us understand very definitely that section 7 applies solely to subsidies

or other payments made under the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act. Subsidies can be made under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act by the Price Administrator when he determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained; in other words, he is authorized at the present time to pay subsidies to obtain the maximum amount of production of any commodity. We limit that authority in section 7 by stating that when it is found necessary to subsidize food products the program, if he is to do it, must have been laid out before tonight at 12 o'clock, and even then it is limited to $150,000,000.

Let me say in respect to the question asked by the gentleman from Georgia of the chairman that this does not in any manner affect any support price program because there are no support price programs under 2 (e) of the Price Control Act and if he will refer to section 6 of the act on page 3 of the conference report he will find this language:

SEC. 6. (a) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942.

It is true that with the adoption of section 7 the Price Administrator or the War Food Administrator could not develop and announce and effectively put into execution a plan to subsidize support prices under the Price Control Act. They would be forced to increase the prices to absorb the differences. Applying that to a specific case, the support price of butter is 46 cents; the parity price of butter is 41 cents. We have specifically provided in this bill that no maximum price shall be set below the support price, which is 46 cents, and we prevent the rolling back of the price of butter from 46 cents, the support price, to 41 cents, the parity price. It is provided that that shall be taken care of by increasing the price so the producers will get their support price not by way of subsidy or roll-backs or out of the Treasury of the United States but by an increase in prices.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I wish I could follow the construction of the gentleman, but he will notice at the bottom of page 3 that the limitation of support prices is not confined to section 2 (e) but goes further and states:

And the authority conferred on the Secretary under section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941—

Which is the Steagall amendment under which the Commodity Credit Corporation is now operating about 30 support price programs; and, therefore, for 1944 those programs not having been announced on July 1 of 1943, they will all be prohibited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are supporting them by buying and selling.

Mr. PACE. By buying or selling. It will absolutely annihilate the program under the support price theory.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not my understanding that the section will interfere with any support price programs because instead of supporting those prices by a subsidy they will support them by increasing the price to the consumer.

Mr. SABATH and Mr. HOPE rose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether this amendment would affect any program similar to those which are in effect now with the exception of the roll-backs on butter and meat.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know of any programs that are in effect at the present time which are not roll-back programs. The only programs which I know which have been announced which might have been announced under section 2 (e) are the butter program and the meat program. These are roll-back programs. The coffee program has not gotten to the point where it has been announced, and because we prohibit the payment of roll-backs this section would not apply; unless, therefore, a program is announced under 2 (e) previous to 12 o'clock tonight this does not apply anyway.

Mr. HOPE. Under this provision it would be possible next year, would it, for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce price support programs and for the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry them out as it has carried out such programs during this current year?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and then the only prohibition would be that they could not subsidize those support prices. They would have to increase the maximum price under section 6 (a) to offset it, in other words, if the existing price of butter was 46 cents and a new support price of 48 cents was announced they could not subsidize the other 2 cents—they would have to increase the price of butter 2 cents to absorb it.

Mr. HOPE. One further question on that point, if the gentleman will permit: That does not apply, however, to subsidies on fats and oils, as I understand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does not apply to competitive domestic vegetables, fats and oil seeds.

Mr. HOPE. The programs such as we have now will be carried on as they are now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman explain the meaning of paragraph (c) of section 6 on page 3?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is to protect the packers in certain actions or claims which they have pending. I interpreted the language of the amendment which I introduced here on the floor of the House to include that, because I considered that these claims would have accrued and that if the subsidies had accrued then they would have a cause of action against the Government for them. In the Aiken amendment this language was in here. It was more specific. It is in there specifically for the purpose of protecting any claim which anyone may have against the Government growing out of the accrual of subsidies. That was put in there designedly and specifically for that purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the adjustment of prices or sold below the support price?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think there is a contradiction between subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 6, inasmuch as subsection (a) is a sweeping prohibition against any subsidies, and subsection (b) is a prohibition against subsidies but also has a qualification? I cannot read the language of the two subsections together and make up my mind what the law is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Subsection (a) has to do with maximum prices, and subsection (b) has to do with subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. Subsidies are the way you regulate your maximum prices?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. WRIGHT. If you are going to have a maximum price which is less than your supporting price, it is done by subsidy?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you take the language of the House amendment, you will have subsection (a) following the prohibition against subsidies. The only difference is we have split them up and called them (a) and (b) and (c). Instead of making one long sentence, we state there is no subsidy to be paid, then we say that the maximum price shall not be below these standards to absorb the differential which will be reflected in the subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. All of these incentive payments and subsidies are going to be transferred to the consuming public under this plan?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us make ourselves clear. I will not answer "Yes" or "No" without saying that we have not disturbed in this bill any of the subsidy or incentive-payment programs which are authorized for the purpose of increasing production.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have the gentleman explain to the House how the supporting programs of the future will be operated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. By increase in prices.

Mr. COOLEY. By increase in prices. So the chairman's answer to my question a moment ago regarding the effect of the normal operations of the Commodity

Credit Corporation in the future being the same as in the past was not entirely correct, as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, a supporting price may be below or above parity. I can understand where, if the supporting price is below parity, then, in order to encourage maximum production, they might be authorized to subsidize perhaps up to parity. If it is above that, they will have to increase the price.

Mr. COOLEY. Does this act permit that to be done?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes a continuance of the support program. The only difference will be that unless the support program is for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production, then the price must be raised. If the subsidy or if the support price is put on there to obtain a maximum amount of production, then they may subsidize under existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. You do not disturb that operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, sir; very definitely we do not.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that under section 6 the sky will be the limit as to prices of all farm commodities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. If the President or the Price Administrator wants to take the ceilings off, they may, and if they do, they assume responsibility for runaway inflation. Take butter, for example. There is no more reason why they should raise the maximum price on butter from 46 cents to $1 merely because of this bill than that they set it at 46 cents in the first place. They have the authority to maintain that just where it is, at 46 cents. The only difference in your cost—and let this be understood—I repeat, the only difference in your cost of living which will result from the enactment of this bill as it is written now and the subsidy program of the O. P. A. is the amount that they roll back butter and meat products. In respect to butter, it will be a maximum of 60 cents a year, because that is all the butter you can buy, 12 pounds of butter at 5 cents a pound.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The language is very obscure in section 6. I would like to know what you mean with respect to the butter program. When does the roll-back take place under this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is only fair to assume that in respect to butter and meat products that they can continue these subsidies until August 1, but they must be liquidated in full on August 1.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does it mean that after August 1 they have to raise the price to take care of that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is right.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention to section 8 and ask him whether or not it was intended by that language to nullify the action of the Congress heretofore taken in prohibiting the payment of subsidies out of the Army and Navy and lend-lease fund?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; this does not affect that.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No such intention whatever?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman mean section 8?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. That merely provides for reimbursement where the Commodity Credit Corporation is used as the agency.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

COMMODITY CREDIT ACT EXTENSIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, all during the depression when unusual laws were passed, and during this war, the Congress has carefully guarded these laws by placing an expiration date on them or providing they should expire on the passage of a concurrent resolution or 6 months after the end of the war, or in some way has caused these laws to expire upon the happening of a certain event or at a certain time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Act happens to be one of the laws passed during the depression. It expires tonight at midnight unless it is extended by Congress. This proposal is to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation Act for 2 more years and to provide $750,000,000 additional to be used by that Corporation.

The Senate passed a bill and the House passed a bill providing for this extension. There is not a great deal of difference between the two bills. The conferees did not have much in conference to discuss or to change. Consequently, the bill that is before you now on this conference report is one that I personally would not favor if it were in an original bill on the floor of the House for passage, but the situation is such that we must vote for the conference report to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We must legislate, we must do something. We cannot see this Corporation's life expire. In that situation, there is nothing left for us to do but approve this conference report.

VETO POSSIBLE

It would not surprise me if the Chief Executive vetoed this bill. If he did, his action would be consistent with his statements in the past. He has told Congress that if some other method was desired to prevent inflation to suggest it and it would be perfectly all right, but we are in the attitude of stopping subsidies and roll-backs without offering any other alternative whatsoever.

CONGRESS VULNERABLE

I personally believe this Congress is in a very vulnerable position for the reason that we have not done anything to siphon off excess purchasing power or otherwise effectively act to prevent inflation. Mr. Chester Davis called attention in his letter of a few days ago to the fact that we could not successfully administer subsidies in this country as they do in England and Canada because in those countries tax laws have been passed that siphon off a sufficient amount of the excess purchasing power so that the price-control problem is not a major one. Mr. Davis was exactly right, except I believe in some cases subsidies can be used to keep down the cost of living. The President in answering him called his attention to the fact that he has consistently and persistently called upon Congress to pass tax laws that would siphon off this excess purchasing power, but Congress has failed to do it.

The reason I say Congress is vulnerable is that, first, we have not siphoned off the excess purchasing power to protect the value of money and prevent runaway inflation, and, next, we are opposing things that the Executive wants, like subsidies, roll-backs, and things like that, which it is insisted can be used on certain commodities in certain ways to hold down inflation; yet we are offering no alternative whatsoever.

Further, the O. P. A., the only agency in existence that has for its purpose the keeping down of prices and price control—we crippled and injured seriously and retarded its effectiveness, if we did not destroy it, when it came before the House and we cut out a substantial part of its appropriation. Not only that, the Domestic Division of the O. W. I. has gotten up a coordinated and well-planned program to warn the people of the nature and dangers of runaway inflation, but we abolished that division entirely when the bill was in the House.

So, as far as the record is concerned, this Congress looks like an inflationary Congress.

I do not believe any Member of this Congress would advocate inflation. I think we are all opposed to it. Yet we are not doing a thing to stop inflation,

we are doing the things that permit and in fact cause inflation. The people of this country must be warned and must be told that it is necessary for them to pay another dollar in taxes to protect the other dollar they have left in their pockets. If they do not, the $2 will not be worth 10 cents in the future.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman just stated that we had provided no way to drain off the excess purchasing power of the consumer, to stop inflation. How does the gentleman believe we would accomplish that fact by further subsidizing the consumers, if their purchasing power should be drained off?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not advocating subsidies and I am not advocating rollbacks, but sometimes you have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. In some cases subsidies can be used to keep down the cost of living.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the letter from the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to President Roosevelt, which was published June 28, 1943, in which Mr. Davis offered his resignation. It is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Some time at your convenience I should like to discuss fully with you the future direction of the food program. After I have completed two undertakings I should like to be relieved of my present responsibility. The two unfinished jobs that I should carry further before leaving are:

1. Rounding out and announcing the general 1944 food-production program; and

2. Holding three meetings in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco that are essential in launching the broad food educational program.

These major programs should be well shaped up and under way before the middle of July.

Two main causes have brought me to the reluctant conclusion that I will not be able to serve you satisfactorily in my present capacity.

1. I find that I have assumed a public responsibility while the authority, not only over broad food policy but day-to-day actions, is being exercised elsewhere.

2. You must have in my position a man who can wholeheartedly advocate and defend the program of broad general subsidies you announced on June 15. I cannot do this for the reason that I do not believe such subsidies will be effective in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply. We do not have in this country anything approaching these conditions.

Respectfully yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS.

I am also inserting herewith President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Reply to Mr. Davis. It is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT

DEAR CHESTER: I have given a good deal of thought to your letter of June 16, and your request to be relieved of responsibility for the future direction of the food program.

No one appreciates more than I do your ability in dealing with agricultural matters. But I am sure that you will agree with me that effective teamwork is absolutely necessary.

Before the Office of Economic Stabilization was established, differences as to prices and wage policies from time to time arose between the various war agencies which frequently had to be brought to me. The act of October 2, 1942, directed me to stabilize the cost of living so far as practicable on the basis of the levels prevailing on September 15 and authorized me to exercise my authority through such department, agency, or officer as I might direct.

Under that act, and before you accepted the office of Food Administrator, I set up the Office of Economic Stabilization and authorized the director, among other things, to resolve disagreements which might arise between the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator and to issue to them policy directives. If we are to stabilize all prices we must place the final responsibility in one official. I know of no better method of coordinating the work of the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator, although that method does require a willingness on the part of both administrators to accept the decisions of the stabilizing director. The country realizes that stabilization applies not only to food but to many other things, such as rent, clothing, and wage decisions. The broad objective is, of course, to prevent the cost of living from spiraling upward and the purchasing power of the dollar from spiraling downward.

I agree with you that we cannot fully or effectively enforce our price or rationing programs, or fully or effectively stabilize the cost of living, without an adequate tax and savings program to drain off the excess purchasing power. I have emphasized that fact in my budget message, in my statement on the hold-the-line order, and on other occasions.

HOLDS TO SUBSIDY PROGRAM

But because the Congress has not yet provided the tax legislation I have requested I cannot sit back and fail to advocate other measures, such as limited consumers' subsidies, which I am convinced can help to prevent the cost of living from getting completely out of hand. Of course you know that I also favor and have advocated such support programs and incentive payments to producers as will enable us to obtain the necessary war production.

I think you will also realize that I did not announce a program of broad, general subsidies at my press conference on June 15. I stated my views on limited subsidies in order to maintain farm prices and hold down consumers prices, and stated my willingness to give full and sympathetic consideration to any program which would accomplish these two ends. None has been offered me.

I am truly sorry that you feel unable to continue as Food Administrator subject to the coordinated controls which I have established and which I believe essential for the proper functioning of our war effort. But it would be unfair to you to insist that you remain in your position when you feel that, all things considered, you cannot wholeheartedly support a program to hold down the cost of living.

There can be no disagreement on the program for 1944, which you recently discussed with me. Everybody is agreed that far greater efforts must be made to increase production next year.

However, the result of such a program for crop maturing in 1944 will not make itself felt until at least a year from now. What I am concerned with is the objective of keeping the cost of essential foods down for the next 12 or 14 months. That, it seems to me, is of immediate concern to the country. The pay envelope of tens of millions of our citizens will not compensate them for great increases in their food bills.

In regard to the program for next year, I do not think that it would be advisable for you finally to determine and announce it. Whoever takes over as Food Administrator would then be called on to administer a program which he had no part in determining. That would really be a case of dividing authority.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It will be noticed that Mr. Davis insisted that the reason he did not believe a program of broad general subsidies would work was because we do not have in this country a current tax and savings program that would drain off excess buying power as they have in England. It should be noted, however, that President Roosevelt was merely trying to do something, since Congress had failed or refused to carry out his program, that would siphon off the excess purchasing power. It should be noted that President Roosevelt said "Effective team work is absolutely necessary."

It occurs to me that Mr. Davis should have resigned from his position with the Federal Reserve Bank in St. Louis, which pays him an annual salary of $25,000 a year. If he had resigned from that position, he would probably have been more cooperative and engaged in a more sympathetic way in the effective team work that President Roosevelt says is absolutely necessary.

NO COMPLIMENT TO MR. DAVIS

The Honorable Jimmie Byrnes and the Honorable Fred Vinson resigned from lifetime positions to take thankless and difficult jobs. They are to be commended for burning their bridges behind them and getting on the President's team to do a real job in wartime. If Mr. Davis had resigned from his position doubtless he would have had more incentive to work on the team and have been more considerate of the wishes of the Chief Executive. Mr. Davis' leaving as he did is not a compliment to him. The War Production Board and many other governmental agencies have dollar-a-year men who have been big executives in the biggest corporations in the country. They maintain their positions with the corporations that they represent and receive fabulous annual salaries. Naturally they, too, have less incentive to faithfully work on the team than one who has severed all connections. It is doubtless easy for such a person to find fault, demand more power, and finally quit and leave town if he cannot get everything that he wants. A serviceman who is inducted for $50 a month cannot throw off his patriotic responsibility in such an indifferent fashion.

Possibly Donald Nelson's job has been more difficult for that reason, but I am sure that the number of men who have caused trouble for these reasons is very small, as the War Production Board has done a wonderful job which could not have been done without the aid and effective assistance of these executives of proven ability of big business.

While we should not restrain ourselves in deservedly criticizing one who leaves the Government's service in wartime in a huff without an adequate excuse or reason, we should at the same time give full credit to that other large group com-

posed of men and women who are patriotically rendering a fine service for our country in time of war without compensation or for a very small amount of compensation, and at the same time sacrificing comforts and pleasures to endure hardships and inconveniences in order to render the service.

It will be noted in the President's reply that Congress asked him to stabilize the cost of living as of September 15, 1942. This he has been trying to do. Attention is invited to the text of the President's reply to Mr. Davis. It discloses that he has tried to get Congress to do something about inflation by adopting an effective tax and savings program to drain off excess purchasing power, but Congress having failed to carry out his recommendations, he could not sit back and fail to advocate other measures, such as limited consumers' subsidies, which he was convinced would be of help in keeping down the cost of living and keeping prices from getting completely out of hand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I notice the conferees have brought back to the House a report containing a provision for auditing by the General Accounting Office the financial transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The language of this provision is substantially the same as that contained in the amendment I offered last Friday, when this bill was up for consideration in the House, which was voted down, with the exception of a clause that was not contained in my amendment, and which I consider very objectionable.

The clause I refer to is to be found in subsection (b) of section 3, which reads:

> And shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed 90 days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report.

It is my understanding this language or language similar to it is to be found in only one other Federal statute, namely, Tennessee Valley Authority.

What possibly could be the purpose of this provision? Let us suppose the Comptroller General makes an audit of the financial transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation that does not suit this agency or the Department of Agriculture. These two bodies would then make what in effect would be their own audit. The two audits would then be submitted to the Congress. Which one would the Congress accept? That of the Comptroller General or the Commodity Credit Corporation and Department of Agriculture?

The work of auditing financial transactions is a highly specialized vocation. Certainly few men in Congress are fitted to offer scientific criticism of an audit made by the Comptroller General's office of the transactions of so large a business affair as that of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is hardly likely, therefore, that should two different reports be submitted they will receive anything but political consideration from the House. The Department of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation will be sure to have their friends to support them in their position. To the degree this would be done the true audit will be weakened. How possibly can this be questioned?

I cannot conceive any other reason for putting this provision in the law than to provide an opportunity for this agency to doctor up its books.

Furthermore, if this language is permissible with respect to Commodity Credit, then why should it not be applied to all the other Federal agencies?

According to Senate Document No. 172, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, there are 15 New Deal agencies not subject to audit at all and 5 partially subject to audit. Following is a list of those partially subject to audit and those not subject to audit:

PARTIALLY SUBJECT TO AUDIT

First. Commodity Credit Corporation.
Second. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Third. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
Fourth. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
Fifth. Tennessee Valley Authority.

NOT SUBJECT TO AUDIT

First. Banks for cooperatives.
Second. Disaster Loan Corporation.
Third. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Fourth. Federal home loan banks.
Fifth. Federal intermediate credit banks.
Sixth. Federal land banks.
Seventh. Federal National Mortgage Association.
Eighth. Federal Savings and Loan Association.
Ninth. Inland Waterways Corporation.
Tenth. Panama Railroad Company.
Eleventh. Production credit corporations.
Twelfth. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Thirteenth. RFC Mortgage Company.
Fourteenth. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
Fifteenth. Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

Since the financial transactions of Commodity Credit are to be subjected to audit it may be expected these other agencies will also, in due time, be placed under audit. Will each one of them not be here clamoring for the same provision for fixing its books as the one contained in the bill before us? Certainly that may be expected. And what is to prevent all the other agencies of the Government which are subject to true audit from coming to Congress and asking for the same exemption as we are here granting to Commodity Credit Corporation?

I conceive this to be a viciously corrupting piece of legislation and as having in it the possibility of finally completely destroying the value of the General Accounting Office as regards the financial transactions of the various Federal agencies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with a good deal the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said in addressing the House; at least in his conclusion that the House will have to share the responsibility if there is increased inflation in America, and apparently that is inevitable. We are skating on very thin ice and should take some constructive action before we recess.

I believe the House was correct in turning down the request of the President for the roll-back on meat, butter, and coffee and subsidies on farm commodities, because a vicious circle would have been started which would have cost the Government two or three billion dollars a year. On the other hand, I do not know whether or not the President will veto this Commodity Credit Corporation bill; but, whether he does or not, I do know that he will blame Congress, because he has already said so, for any more inflation. He made a public statement to that effect within the last week. Consequently, I am proposing the following resolution, which I hope will be adopted and I believe certainly should be adopted before we take a recess within the next few days:

> *Resolved*, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a committee of seven Members of the House to study prices, wages, and rents and all matters connected with inflation, to sit during the session of the House or any recess thereof, and to report back to the House with recommendations for legislation by September 15, 1943.

Not only have we a right, but we have a duty to legislate. I think we will not be fulfilling that duty if we take a recess for 2 months and do nothing about this vital issue affecting all of the millions of consumers, particularly after we turned down the recommendations of the President for further price control. Therefore I am asking action by the Committee on Rules and the House to appoint a special committee to study the whole question of inflation and price control, adopt a policy or program, and report to the House by September 15.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the House unanimously adopted the Fulmer resolution which authorizes the House Committee on Agriculture to thoroughly and completely investigate the subject the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. This resolution is far more comprehensive than dealing with farm prices. This goes into the question of prices, wages, rent, and the whole inflationary spiral.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the Fulmer resolution does not embrace rents.

Mr. FISH. Nor does it take in wages. This takes in wages, prices, and the whole question of inflation. I think it is our duty to do it before we recess. We must do it since we refused the administration's request for subsidies and roll-backs. I believe we are able and competent to place checks and limits on

future inflation in the House of Representatives. We have a right to do it and it is our duty to do it without evasion or delay. This is our opportunity. If this resolution is adopted, then I believe we can afford proper and adequate relief to millions of consumers, to those on fixed incomes, to the white-collar class, to dependents of veterans and disabled veterans, to the firemen and policemen, to civil-service employees and those receiving pensions, and to all wage earners. Something of this kind must be done and done at once or the Congress will be properly blamed for evading the issue and voting to take a recess regardless of the consequences of higher costs of living and inflation.

Mr. Bernard Baruch was right in 1940 when he suggested and urged placing ceilings on everything, including wages. The administration muffed the ball and by halfway measures and half-baked ones have added confusion and uncertainty instead of nipping inflation in the bud. Mr. Baruch is one of the ablest thinkers in America and has more vision than all the bureaucrats and brain trusters combined and far more practical experience and knowledge. His cooperation and suggestions for curbing inflation should be sought by the special committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think the House and the country has a perfect right to question the President's sincerity in asking for a program in view of the fact that he has refused Chester Davis the privilege of coming to the White House to discuss a food program.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION REMAINS INCOHERENT IN CRISIS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

A farmer sends me a photostat of a document entitled "War Production Program—1943 Farm Plan." This is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and tells a farmer how much he can grow. These instructions are for this summer, when we are all being told that there is a shortage and we are all being propagandized to plant Victory gardens—although we are not being given gasoline to reach these aforementioned areas of agricultural provisioning.

This particular farm consists of 98 acres. The crop land consists of 74.5 acres. The farmer who ran this acreage in 1941 was permitted to plant 15 acres of wheat. His measurement was inaccurate or the sun, rains, and hard work blessed him and when the crop was harvestable, lo and behold! he had produced 19 acres of wheat. He was fined $198 for producing.

CROPS RESTRICTED

In 1943, although he can use 74.5 acres, he has been allotted 20 acres of wheat, 4 acres of alfalfa, and 10 of potatoes—and no more. For this, he will receive a "production practice allowance of $40.87." If he grows more, he will be in trouble. There is also a provision which reads, "An additional $15 may be earned by planting two acres of forest trees." Who wants forest trees when we need to eat potatoes? That man could plant the whole of his 74.5 acres if he could get farm labor, machinery, and gasoline to do it.

Now, I want to ask what is the sense of such restrictions? What good do they do us? What sense does it make to have any restrictions on agricultural production at all when there is such pressing need for more and more food?

INDEX TO WEAKNESS

This particular instance is an index to the weakness of Mr. Roosevelt's administration. It never gets organized. It works at cross purposes. It is so personalized that a bureau functions without regard to the necessities of the moment simply because it will not stop functioning when it is no longer needed.

The War Labor Board is another example of administrative maladriotness. Mr. Roosevelt actually faced two strikes, one on the part of John L. Lewis, the other on the part of the War Labor Board which took the position that if Harold Ickes made a sane and businesslike settlement of the coal strike, it, the War Labor Board, would resign in a body. In other words, nothing mattered but that this Board's face be saved.

Our mandarins are worse than the Chinese mandarins; the Chinese variety sometimes removed themselves from impossible situations by committing suicide as a service to their people. Our mandarins will not remove themselves from a public job no matter what happens to the country. Once they get on the public pay roll they hang on for dear life unless the corporations they have been attacking hire them away.

A couple of weeks ago the country thrilled to the thought that all this was to be corrected, that Byrnes, advised and assisted by Baruch, would put an end to these bureaucratic monkeyshines, that they would streamline administration. The weeks are passing but nothing is being done along these lines. No obstructions to efficient management of the country's business have been removed.

REORGANIZATION BARRED

I do not question the ability of either Byrnes or Baruch; but they are not being permitted to hire and fire, to reorganize, consolidate, amalgamate, and cut out the administrative nonsense that is distressing and perturbing this Nation.

Gov. Tom Dewey is standing out in front of the Republican parade because he is attacking the one dread evil which the whole American people is now recognizing—administrative incoherence. The people know that the administration is cockeyed. They still do not blame Roosevelt, because they say he is busy with the war, but any student of public opinion can recognize that what Tom Dewey says about the management of our business is making a deep impression upon a long-suffering, loyal, and patriotic people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a strange doctrine that this bill will bring about inflation. Is it not better for the consumer to pay a higher price now and drain off some surplus funds rather than to force the Treasury to borrow money and the consumer to have to pay it back later on at a time when he does not make such good wages? This is largely the issue. As we have heretofore stated, during the last 2 years wages have gone up 40 percent, living costs 24 percent. Reasonable increases in the cost of food are to be expected. The comments of the President endeavoring to blame us for a degree of inflation by this particular act does not hold water.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio moves that the conference report on H. R. 2869 be recommitted to the committee on conference with instructions to the House conferees that the language contained in section 3 (b) be stricken out and that the following language be inserted in lieu thereof:

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office (in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions) and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation, under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVAGAN) there were ayes 160 and noes 32.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker I make the point of order that there is no quorum present and I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-nine Members have arisen; not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed in the next to the last sentence of the amendment made by section 7 to strike out "sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or" and "or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to correct an error which places a restriction upon the operation of this particular provision of the bill, not intended by the conferees.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman advise the House what the error is that the gentleman would like to have corrected?

Mr. STEAGALL. The error referred to is a provision in the original price control act which places a limitation upon the Price Administrator and which did not apply in this case and was not intended to apply; it was simply an error made in the haste of the committee's work last night.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three distinct respects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] may address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a resolution of Local 2213 of the United Steel Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS APPROPRIATION, 1944

Mr. SNYDER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the military establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) "making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 403 (a). For purposes of this section—

"'1. The term "Department" means the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company, respectively.

"'2. In the case of the Maritime Commission, the term "Secretary" means the Chairman of such Commission, and in the case of Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company the term "Secretary" means the board of directors of the appropriate corporation.':

"*Provided further*, That section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(k) All the provisions of this section shall be construed to apply to Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education, or training of Class IV–E Conscientious Objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its territories and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such Class IV–E Conscientious Objector college or foreign service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available after August 31, 1943, for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in

the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Restores the provision proposed by the House, including the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation within the provisions of the law relative to the renegotiation of contracts, amended to include the Metals Reserve Company and the Rubber Reserve Company.

Amendment No. 2: Restores the limitation proposed by the House barring the use of appropriations contained in the bill for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, rephrased and amended so as to cover costs incident to such liquidation as may be necessary.

Amendment No. 3: Restores the limitation proposed by the House barring the use of appropriations contained in the bill for painting war scenes or portraits, or for decorative art projects, amended to extend the effective date to August 31, 1943.

Amendment No. 4: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation proposed by the House barring expenditures for educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry except for two years preceding completion of such education.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Makes the provisions and appropriations in the bill effective from and including July 1, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5: Page 3, line 6, at the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment after the word "services" insert a comma and the following: "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 be considered together. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 60: Page 48, line 19, strike out lines 19 to 25, and on page 48 strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Amendment numbered 61: On page 49, line 10, strike out "305" and insert "304."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House further insists on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall take 1 minute, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a final effort to reach agreement with the Senate on the urgent deficiency bill, carrying appropriations for the payment of employees of all governmental agencies with the exception of the Army and Navy, by reaffirming the determination of the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 60. This amendment, Senate amendment No. 60, is the much-discussed amendment eliminating the House provision denying use of any money appropriated in this or other bills for the payment of salaries of the three Federal employees charged with subversive affiliations.

The preferential motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 60 and agree to the same would mean the abandonment by the House not only of its proposal to deny money for the salaries of these three men but would establish a far-reaching precedent involving the relinquishment of the right to deny money for the salary of any employee appointed by the executive branch of the Government and would be, to that extent, a limitation upon the right of the House to initiate legislation denying money for any purpose, and the right—to that extent—to control the purse strings of the Nation. It is too serious a matter to be thus lightly determined on a motion to recede and concur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, we discussed this amendment on two other occasions, but this is the first time that we have an opportunity to vote on the proposition squarely, that is, whether or not we want to eliminate this prohibition against the payment of salaries to these three Government employees. As I stated yesterday, this issue is very fundamental. It is a constitutional issue, it is an issue that goes to the very heart of democratic government, it is an issue that involves the anti-Fascist character of this war. I believe the House has made a serious mistake. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe that you have made a serious mistake. This is the time to correct it and I hope the Members will support my motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the Kerr amendment to eliminate three men from the pay roll. They are not discharged, and the operation is clearly within the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

I hope the House will vote against the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which eliminates the Kerr amendment, which was placed upon this bill when it was before the House. I think we should have a roll call on it so that everyone may have an opportunity of expressing his sentiments at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to recede and concur.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 71, nays 301, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—71

Bender	Hale	Miller, Mo.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Burchill, N. Y.	Hart	Myers
Burdick	Hays	Norton
Celler	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Coffee	Herter	O'Connor
Cooley	Hobbs	O'Konski
Crosser	Hull	Outland
Cullen	Jackson	Pfeifer
Dawson	Kean	Ramey
Delaney	Kee	Robinson, Utah.
Dickstein	Kefauver	Rogers, Calif.
Dilweg	Kelley	Rowan
Ellison, Md.	Keogh	Sabath
Feighan	Kirwan	Sadowski
Fogarty	Klein	Smith, Maine
Folger	LaFollette	Smith, W. Va.
Forand	Lemke	Stearns, N. H.
Fulbright	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Gale	McGranery	Weiss
Gavagan	McMurray	Wene
Gordon	Magnuson	Willey
Gorski	Mansfield, Mont.	
Granger	Marcantonio	
Hagen		

NAYS—301

Abernethy	Cunningham	Holmes, Mass.
Allen, La.	Curley	Holmes, Wash.
Andersen, H. Carl	Curtis	Hope
	D'Alesandro	Horan
Anderson, Calif.	Davis	Howell
Anderson, N. Mex.	Day	Jarman
	Dewey	Jeffrey
Andresen, August H.	Dies	Jenkins
	Dirksen	Jennings
Andrews	Disney	Jensen
Angell	Ditter	Johnson, Anton J.
Arends	Domengeaux	
Arnold	Dondero	Johnson, Calvin D.
Auchincloss	Doughton	
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Johnson, Ind.
Barrett	Drewry	Johnson, J. Leroy
Barry	Durham	
Bates, Mass.	Dworshak	Johnson, Luther A.
Beall	Eberharter	
Beckworth	Elliott	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bell	Ellis	
Bennett, Mich.	Ellsworth	Johnson, Okla.
Bennett, Mo.	Elmer	Jones
Bishop	Elston, Ohio	Jonkman
Blackney	Engel	Judd
Bland	Fellows	Kearney
Bolton	Fenton	Keefe
Bonner	Fish	Kennedy
Boren	Fisher	Kerr
Boykin	Flannagan	Kilday
Bradley, Pa.	Gamble	Kinzer
Brehm	Gathings	Kleberg
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	Knutson
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	Kunkel
Bryson	Gerlach	Lambertson
Buffett	Gibson	Landis
Burch, Va.	Gifford	Lane
Busbey	Gilchrist	Lanham
Butler	Gillette	Larcade
Camp	Gillie	Lea
Canfield	Goodwin	LeCompte
Cannon, Fla.	Gore	LeFevre
Cannon, Mo.	Gossett	Lewis
Carlson, Kans.	Graham	Ludlow
Carson, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	McCord
Carter	Grant, Ind.	McCormack
Case	Gregory	McCowen
Chenoweth	Griffiths	McGehee
Chiperfield	Gross	McGregor
Church	Gwynne	McKenzie
Clark	Halleck	McLean
Clason	Hancock	McMillan
Clevenger	Hare	McWilliams
Cole, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Maas
Cole, N. Y.	Harris, Ark.	Madden
Colmer	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Compton	Heidinger	Maloney
Cooper	Hendricks	Manasco
Costello	Hess	Martin, Iowa
Courtney	Hill	Martin, Mass.
Cox	Hinshaw	Mason
Cravens	Hoch	Merrow
Crawford	Hoeven	Michener
Creal	Hoffman	Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.	Sundstrom
Miller, Pa.	Richards	Taber
Mills	Rizley	Talbot
Monkiewicz	Robertson	Talle
Monroney	Robsion, Ky.	Tarver
Mott	Rockwell	Taylor
Mruk	Rodgers, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.
Mundt	Rogers, Mass.	Thomas, Tex.
Murphy	Rohrbough	Thomason
Murray, Tenn.	Rowe	Tibbott
Murray, Wis.	Sasscer	Towe
Newsome	Satterfield	Troutman
Nichols	Sauthoff	Vincent, Ky.
Norman	Schuetz	Vorys, Ohio
Norrell	Schwabe	Vursell
O'Brien, Ill.	Scott	Wadsworth
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shafer	Walter
O'Neal	Short	Ward
Pace	Sikes	Wasielewski
Patman	Simpson, Ill.	Weaver
Patton	Simpson, Pa.	Weichel, Ohio
Peterson, Fla.	Slaughter	West
Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Ohio	Whelchel, Ga.
Philbin	Smith, Va.	White
Pittenger	Smith, Wis.	Whitten
Ploeser	Snyder	Whittington
Poage	Sparkman	Wickersham
Poulson	Spence	Wigglesworth
Powers	Springer	Wilson
Pracht	Stanley	Winstead
Price	Starnes, Ala.	Winter
Priest	Steagall	Wolcott
Rabaut	Stefan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ramspeck	Stevenson	Wolverton, N. J.
Randolph	Stewart	Woodruff, Mich.
Rankin	Stockman	Woodrum, Va.
Reece, Tenn.	Sullivan	Worley
Reed, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.	Wright
Reed, N. Y.	Sumners, Tex.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—59

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	O'Hara
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	O'Leary
Barden	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.		Plumley
Brooks	Hall, Leonard W.	Rivers
Buckley		Rolph
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Russell
Burgin	Hébert	Scanlon
Byrne	Holifield	Schiffler
Capozzoli	Izac	Sheppard
Chapman	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Cochran	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	King	Tolan
Dingell	Lesinski	Treadway
Eaton	Luce	Van Zandt
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Fernandez	May	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wheat
Ford	Morrison, La.	
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baldwin of New York for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. King with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Schiffler.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Plumley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate, and on that I desire recognition.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1134, the emergency flood-control bill, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. WHITTINGTON, ALLEN of Louisiana, ELLIOTT, CLASON, and CURTIS.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the privilege of service in this House is one that comes to but few people in the country. Five times I have been elected to serve in this body. For 8½ years now it has been my pleasure to be among you. No one could appreciate this honor and this distinction more than I do. The task I have assigned myself today is a heartbreaking one.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise you that I have resigned my seat in the House of Representatives, effective July 3, 1943.

In taking my leave of you, I want to thank you all for your courtesies and kindnesses to me, which have been far beyond my deserts. No matter what fate may hold in store for me, the years spent in this Chamber and the friends that I have made here shall always be a treasured possession.

I never had a more difficult task to perform than this one. Even now I hesitate and pause.

I arrived at my decision to take up this new line of endeavor only after long and sober consideration.

If I felt I could best serve by remaining here, I would do so, no matter how great the sacrifice to myself. However, by temperament I am eager for action, and since the pattern for victory has been pretty well shaped, I feel that I can best serve by passing on to this new field of endeavor.

My new position with the aviation industry will deal with the promotion of American civil aviation to a world-wide factor. This is most important, since we expect the aviation industry to not only furnish employment for a great number of servicemen when they return, but also to be a factor in maintenance of world peace and the promotion of world commerce in the better years that will follow the war.

Full well I realize the weight of the cares and duties which the Members of this body carry, and I do not intend to depreciate in any degree the important work that must be carried on here. The problems which this House will face in the next few years are such as to require weeks and months of close application and study. A balancing and weighing of different proposals and methods, patience and determination, and ability to bear up under the unfortunate and unfair attacks of unlearned critics.

Never shall I cease to be grateful to my colleagues for the liberal education which they have given me. The defeats and victories which I have passed through in this chamber have sharpened my wits, elevated my vision, tempered my ambition and shown me the error of some of my ways. Your debates have inspired me with love of country, your counsels have given me new insight into the hearts of men and your friendship has shown me the real meaning of that word.

I leave the House of Representatives with the firm conviction that it is the real rock of democracy in the Nation. Here are the real representatives of the people. The Members of this body are on the job every day. They represent changes in the opinion of the people better than a Gallup poll. The House knows what the people feel, and the action of the House reflects the views and wishes of the people.

The other body of the Congress may make decisions of more wisdom and based upon calmer reflection, and sheltered from the hurricanes of passion—but this House is the real and authentic voice of the people. As long as the House stands, with its authority unchallenged, the people have a champion; the people cannot be oppressed.

Yours is a great responsibility. It is you, if every other agency of Government fails, who must finally preserve our American institutions, and safeguard free enterprise.

If I could leave behind me one warning or one suggestion for a simple prescription which would best guarantee these things, it would be:

Never to permit to die the two-party system. I think that nothing more disastrous could happen to this Nation than that the two great parties of this country be amalgamated into one. If there is any one thing more important than an honorable, intelligent, fearless, majority, it is a healthy, well-informed, vigorous minority. Only by the preservation of this system can we be sure that dictatorship shall never overtake us.

It is proper that everyone should have the right to criticize individuals in Government, be they in the executive, judicial, or legislative branch of the Government.

But no one should be heard to criticize any of these as an institution.

Therefore, no one in this body should ever stand idly by and hear the Congress of the United States maligned as an institution.

You must know there is a group in this country who are exerting diligent effort to discredit and, if possible, destroy the Congress of the United States.

Always, wherever I may roam, it will be my pleasure and privilege to defend the House of Representatives and its Members from attack and vilification.

Among my fondest recollections will ever be my association with the three great Speakers of the House under whom I served. Joe Byrnes gave me my first lessons in parliamentary procedure and the traditions and history of the House. He was a friend and a kindly and tolerant teacher. Will Bankhead continued my training and encouraged me to express my opinions freely. Then he showed me how to clothe these opinions so they would be more attractive. He helped me as he did many others in his patient and kindly way. Then came my service under the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, our present Speaker, who has been a model to us all in the statesmanlike manner in which he has borne the burdens incident to the greatest war in history. Never too busy, despite the tremendous cares of his office, to take time for personal consultation with any of us—knowing and understanding our problems as Members of the House, as well as the problems confronting the Chief Executive and the other departments of Government in this hour of peril—I think it is not too much to say that the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, has proved himself to be one of the outstanding men of our generation. And his stature increases with each added responsibility and each passing day, as America in this time of world turmoil and strife proves that our form of government is best in war as it is most beneficial in peace.

In the years to come, if it should again be my duty to perform public service, I hope that this call will bring me back to this House. I am certain should I return here as a Member in the years to come, there would be many changes. But should I ever return, I am also sure that I would find many friends here, for among you are some of the truest and best friends that I have ever had. Among you are the greatest statesmen of the Republic—leaders who will carry America forward to a new height of glory in the days when peace shall come again.

So I bid you adieu as a colleague. I now become one of your constituents. Tax me, regulate me—yes—even investigate me, as you wish. I know you and trust you. Should my services ever be needed to help our country, I am at your command.

Finally, my friends, I leave you with this pledge: I pledge you that I shall never knowingly do anything which will give you cause to regret the trust and the confidence you have reposed in me.

Now, good-bye, and God keep you.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of genuine regret that I learn of JACK NICHOLS' resignation from the National House of Representatives. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], as we refer to him under the rules, although we can shortly refer to him as JACK NICHOLS even under the rules, came here in 1935 and was a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Prior to his election to Congress he had a wide and varied career as a lawyer and businessman. He came to the Congress admirably equipped to perform his duties.

His sound judgment, his dynamic force, his diligence to duty, and his indomitable courage quickly made him an outstanding Member of this House. He has championed great and liberal legislation, which shall endure and stand the test of time.

As chairman of a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate civil and commercial aviation, he has made a notable contribution to American aviation. He has long been interested in aviation and has avidly studied all its phases. He leaves us to occupy an important position in this new industry which shall have such an important bearing on America's future.

His many friends in the House join with me in wishing him Godspeed in his chosen field of endeavor. We knew him as a kindly, warm-hearted, at times impulsive, almost overgenerous friend, as well as a notable statesman. He was always loyal to any cause he espoused. He was loyal to his friends.

We deeply regret his departure and hope that the future holds for him all the good fortune and blessings he so richly deserves.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, I am certain I speak the sentiment of each member, as well as the host of friends of our retiring colleague, in saying we are deeply grateful to our distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for his kind and appropriate remarks with reference to our colleague from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS. I am sure it is a source of great regret to all the Members of this House on both sides

of the aisle that our colleague from Oklahoma has of his own volition resigned his membership in this body to embark in the aviation world.

Many of us remember his predecessor, the late W. W. Hastings, who was one of the ablest Members ever to serve in this House. When JACK NICHOLS came here as a new Member 8½ years ago he made it plain that he did not expect to fill the place of Bill Hastings. He realized that no new Member could do that. But JACK NICHOLS began applying himself to the task before him. With his untiring energy, his devotion to duty, and his determination to make good, he soon had won the confidence, respect, and admiration of his colleagues. Moreover, having a marvelous voice, a keen mind, and a quick wit, JACK NICHOLS in due time established himself not only as an able and vigorous debater but also as an outstanding legislator. He possesses the happy faculty of making and keeping friends, and his resignation as a Member of Congress is a distinct loss to our State and to the Nation.

No Member of either House of Congress has more information on the important subject of civil aviation than he. As he has made good in Congress, I predict that he will also make good in his new field of endeavor.

Permit me to add that in offering congratulations and good wishes to our retiring colleague that the great aviation company with which he is to be affiliated is also to be congratulated in securing the services of our colleague at what I am told is a considerable increase in salary over that paid a Member of Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As a member of the Oklahoma delegation, I second the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. We of the Oklahoma group hate to lose our tireless, effective, and efficient colleague from Oklahoma. Night was never too dark nor the storms too strong for Jack to go to bat when it was necessary in the interest of his State or in the interest of his country. He has served the Nation and his State well, not only through his membership on the important Committee on Rules, which membership brought great distinction to our State, and his service as chairman of a select committee on aviation, whose proceedings he so ably conducted, but in his other activities which extended through his brilliant career here in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have known JACK NICHOLS for a number of years. He like Will Rogers and Gene Autry and other notable Oklahomans, typifies the true pioneer spirit that exemplifies Oklahoma. He has a firm handshake and a ready smile. He is capable, he is honest, he is efficient. I am sure we shall miss him.

Jack, I wish you success in your new undertaking. You certainly merit the confidence imposed in you. I congratulate the company in its wise selection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, on the high statesmanship expressed in his farewell message, and to join with him in the splendid tributes that he paid to the three Speakers under whom he has served.

This House is the better for JACK NICHOLS' service as a Member. Times have not always been so rosy among the Members, and sometimes Jack and I have had a word or two over local matters, but I have never served with a better natured, more big-hearted, forgiving chap than the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS.

I wish him the best of luck, Godspeed, and congratulations on his service here and his service to be with the institution which is fortunate enough to have secured his services.

I sometimes wonder what kind of a speech a man ought to make when he retires from Congress. I suppose a speech when he voluntarily retires would be of different character than when he retires involuntarily, but I hope that when I come to make one I can make one of the caliber that the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, made today, and that, too, will be on voluntary retirement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, quite intimately for a number of years. He is largely a creature of his own creation—the rough and tumble that has won against odds and adversities as much so as any man within my acquaintance. Jack has made good in every battle. He does not know what it means to be whipped and stay whipped. About the time his foes look for a final decision against him they find he is just beginning to go into battle.

I regret that we are losing him. It is going to be hard to replace him. I have enjoyed my service with him during these 6 short months.

May he prosper and make good par excellent in his new field of activity. More power to you, Jack.

HON. JACK NICHOLS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has just addressed this body indicating his plans to resign to enter a field of private endeavor. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to his past endeavors and bid him Godspeed in his new task.

It is fitting that we pause here in the midst of a day of unusual endeavor, even conflict, to wish Jack well in his new choice. His has been a militant spirit always with a shoulder to the wheel, or if there was division amongst us, always in the thick of the fray fighting for his conviction.

It has been my privilege to know Jack more intimately than most of you, perhaps, and I know him to be a man with a great heart, real capacity, and strong purpose. I have treasured our friendship especially because he has proven himself loyal and everlasting as a friend, broad gaged, and high caliber.

All who have had Jack as an advocate of their cause have found him able, ardent, and fearless. All who have had him as an adversary on an issue have found him unyielding, determined, forceful, ever militant and aggressive to carry his point. In victory he has always been modest and magnanimous. In defeat he has ever been the best of sports entertaining neither bitterness nor rancor.

His achievements here we will ever hold in high esteem and point to justly with pride. His has been a leading role, his a service of no ordinary kind. The Congress I know regrets his departure even though it be a task of great importance carrying with it personal good fortune that calls him forth. The Oklahoma delegation especially deplore our loss in his gain in his new adventure and only our intense good will for Jack personally can mitigate our regrets.

Congress loses today the highly capable energies of one of the very best among us but America gains for one of our greatest and most vital industries a good hand and a great mind.

I predict that Jack will make his mark high on the scoreboard of aviation's history. And with the deepest earnestness I bespeak my regret at his going but extend my constant friendship and my everlasting faithful good wish to attend his every endeavor.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

DEFENSE HOUSING—INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2975, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that in the debate on the rule many matters were mentioned which have no connection whatever with the bill now before us for consideration. It is unfortunate also that, although the House votes without a dissenting voice for many billions of dollars to conduct various plants that are necessary in our war effort, having appropriated within the last month more than $100,000,000,000 unanimously for this purpose, it always seems to gag a little when we bring up these measures which are relatively small in amount in order to make those plants effective in their operation.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about this bill and the act which it seeks to amend. I wish to call your attention, in the first place, to the fact that it is decidedly and wholly a war measure. The act has to do only with the duration of the war. It becomes ineffective when the war is over.

The purpose of this act is to furnish living quarters for industrial workers in these various plants to the extent that housing is not already available and cannot be furnished by private capital. Not very long ago the President of the United States sent to the Congress a recommendation for an authorization of an additional sum of $400,000,000 for this purpose. The Senate on yesterday passed a bill similar to this, providing for $400,000,000 for this purpose. Now, some have had the hardihood to rise on this floor and say that three-quarters of the amount recommended, $300,000,000, which is the amount reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is entirely too much. In the first place, compare it with the more than $100,000,000,000 voted in the last month for the operation of these various plants. Over against the testimony of these gentlemen who cannot be thoroughly versed in the matters concerned, we have testimony in the form of a message from the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our forces; we have the statement of the Secretary of War; we have the statement of the Under Secretary of the Navy; we have the testimony of the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, the workers who occupy these various dwellings, and the private real-estate people of this country, that this money is necessary for this purpose.

I would call your attention to the fact that it is recommended by private builders of the United States, as well as by those who have charge of such public construction as may be necessary. Now, this is a colossal undertaking. Of course, mistakes have been made. Perhaps other mistakes will be made, but the mistakes which were referred to in the debate on the rule have nothing in the world to do with this measure and did not arise in connection with any funds that were authorized by bills from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I wish to call your attention further to the fact that every penny of this money to be authorized here is to be used for temporary construction. The committee will present three committee amendments to further amplify the provisions of existing law, to assure the temporary character of this construction, and when we return to peace, private industry will be left as it should be left, to the matter of the necessary real-estate construction in this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What provision, if any, is made in the legislation to protect private industry in the construction of these homes if the facilities are in those areas to build those homes, rather than the Federal Government?

Mr. LANHAM. May I call to the attention of my good friend from Michigan the fact that the private builders appeared before us through their representatives.

The War Production Board and its representatives, the National Housing Agency and its representatives testified before the committee. They stated that priorities will be given for private construction for living quarters for these war workers to exactly the same extent that they will be given for public construction, and there is an absolutely harmonious agreement between the War Production Board, the National Housing Agency, and private building industries in that respect, and private industry is also urging the passage of this measure.

Mr. DONDERO. I am very gratified to hear that explanation, because in some areas, particularly in the Detroit area, there has been some complaint that private industry was not protected in the building or construction of homes as against the Federal program.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and that has been true formerly to a great extent, but those objections have been obviated, and there is now agreement satisfactory to all parties concerned.

With reference to the need for these buildings, if you will look on page 43 of the hearings, you will see the allocation by States of the buildings to be constructed. Of course, it will be readily understood that it is not advisable to place in the RECORD the various localities, because that would have a tendency to enhance the cost of whatever the Federal Government might have to acquire in carrying out these projects.

We had 2 days of executive hearings, when the witnesses who came before us were from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. The Navy Department and the War Department gave us their respective needs, and I have them here by their various locations. Of course, they gave us that testimony confidentially.

The Navy representatives testified that the Navy will need for its various shore stations and installations, 175,000 units during the next year.

The War Department outlined the number of units it would require. The Maritime Commission said that it would likely need 15,000 units but would try to get along with 10,000 units.

In addition to the needs of the War Department and the Navy Department, as well as the Maritime Commission, there are a great many industrial concerns which are making things for the Government and which are not directly connected with the Army, the Navy, or the Maritime Commission, which require this housing.

We held hearings for over 4 weeks. The printed hearings include 281 pages. We had several days of hearings in executive session. We have gone into this matter very carefully, and all of the authorities who have had to do with such construction and all of the workers who have to be accommodated by such construction at these various plants have appeared before us by representatives in support of this legislation.

Let me call to your attention the fact that even in those plants which are not being enlarged or extended they are increasing the number of shifts of workers and that means additional housing is necessary also.

Personally, I believe that there will be full need for the $400,000,000 which the President requested, but the committee has reported out this bill for $300,000,000, and, in my judgment, there can be no reasonable doubt on the part of anyone familiar with the circumstances that this sum will be required for the necessary construction of the temporary quarters to take care of these various workers.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me, from the information that I have received from the people in the city of Detroit, that the people engaged in private building construction could construct two or three times the number of houses that they are now constructing if they were allowed priorities. The whole question gets down to the question of materials, and naturally this building material is being allocated either to private builders or to the National Housing Agency for construction purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Michigan that priorities are going to be extended on exactly the same basis, and the private people who appeared before us, with respect to that question, are in favor of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My own feeling on this housing matter—and I think it represents the feeling of 95 percent of the people in the city of Detroit—is that these houses should be constructed by private builders, under an F. H. A. program, and that priorities on all materials that are available should be given to them.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman will understand that this legislation is only for the duration of the war, and that is the reason we are going out of business under this act when this war is over. But in many of these instances, with these temporary living quarters, private

capital cannot run the risk of building them because there will not be a return to justify the investment unless the war should go on for years and years and years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman how these houses are going to be built—whether they will be constructed on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or by letting them out on competitive bids?

Mr. LANHAM. The contracts for their construction are going to be let to the lowest bidder. There has been very little under the administration of this act of the negotiated contracts. They are let under competitive bids.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is satisfied that we will get value received?

Mr. LANHAM. We expect to because we are now using much less critical material and we have reduced very materially the cost of these various dwellings.

Mr. JENSEN. Where are the places where these buildings are to be erected?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I wish to reserve my time after that.

If the gentleman will look at page 43 of the hearings, and copies of the hearings are available, he will see the allocations by States. We cannot put them in by localities, because that would just make it more expensive for the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman is satisfied that these houses are needed.

Mr. LANHAM. There is no doubt about it in my mind. Many Members have come to me and testified that in their own districts in the operation of plants they are needed.

Mr. JENSEN. I am wondering if there is to be no end to the building of these houses.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me ask the gentleman: Will there be any end to this matter of appropriating billions of dollars for war purposes? We have appropriated without a dissenting vote over one hundred billion dollars for these plants in the last month, and this bill, I think, amounts to less than one-half of one percent of the money that has been appropriated for these plants.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I have heard some testimony to the effect that there was a prejudice against the use of prefabricated houses. Can the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. LANHAM. The law does not provide for any particular kind of housing, whether it should be ordinary construction, prefabricated construction, or otherwise. It is the purpose of the administrators to use the various kinds of housing available within the cost limitations in order to keep these various people in business and in order to have the construction as economical as possible at each particular place.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: Down in southern Indiana there is a manufacturer of prefabricated houses.

Mr. LANHAM. There are some in my State also.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. He claims that he has been adversely treated by this administration in the use of this type of house.

Mr. LANHAM. They recently came here from all over the country and we had a conference with them at the end of which they expressed themselves as being very well pleased.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has made a splendid presentation. He has carefully studied the whole subject. I wish he would tell us what provision has been made so that at the end of this war these buildings will not be left to compete with private dwellings.

Mr. LANHAM. They will not, and I shall present three committee amendments to be placed upon this bill to assure the temporary character of this construction.

Mr. GATHINGS. And may I ask what will become of the land that has been purchased for the purpose of building these projects?

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the land is only leased. Some of it, of course, was purchased. We shall have to make the best disposition we can of it. That is a question that will arise later, but this is purely a duration measure and this housing is to be disposed of. It is temporary housing and is to be taken out of the way at the end of the war.

Mr. GATHINGS. I trust the gentleman's amendment will carry out that purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Who is to determine where this war housing shall be established?

Mr. LANHAM. It is determined in several ways. The plants that need workers put in their applications and make their requisitions for the necessary housing. Then an investigation is made by the Federal authorities and also by the local authorities to determine the accuracy of those requisitions. The Army and the Navy, with reference to their plants, of course, advise the numbers of workers they are going to need at those plants and then a survey is made to determine what housing is already available, what can be constructed by private industry, and the remainder, of course, will be taken care of by these temporary buildings.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is a big country with conditions varying greatly from one area to another. Do these agencies differentiate as between cold climates and warm climates in the character of this building?

Mr. LANHAM. There is a different kind of construction for the different sections of the country.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE. The gentleman states that this was a temporary project. Can the gentleman state for the House just what disposition is contemplated of these temporary buildings after the war?

Mr. LANHAM. We expect to salvage the buildings as far as possible. If some of the farmers wish to buy some of these prefabricated buildings and move them on their farms, they will have the privilege, but we expect to get the Government out of this business absolutely.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I am heartily in accord with the purpose of the bill and what it is sought to do, but in my district we have 9,000 empty houses we are trying to get the Government to occupy.

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the vacancies are with reference to construction not yet completed and some with reference to plants that have reached their storage capacity and those houses may have to be occupied again. I do not know whether the houses to which the gentleman refers are publicly built houses or privately built houses.

Mr. MURPHY. They are privately built houses.

Mr. LANHAM. Then they do not come at all under the operation of this act.

Let me make this point: The National Housing Agency, of course, is not responsible for any vacancies that exist for the reason that when the War Department or the Navy Department says, "We are going to operate at such and such a place and we have to have so many houses there," then it is the business of the National Housing Agency to see that the quarters are available for those people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It may be that subsequent changes in the plans of the Navy Department and Army account for some of the vacancies. A powder plant may have reached the point of saturation and some of the buildings be vacated, but later those buildings are likely to be occupied when the plant resumes its operation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say in my home town the Government constructed 350 houses. There are great defense plants there. Less than half of those houses are now occupied. They are standing idle in that community.

Mr. LANHAM. That may be true but, if so, there is a reason. You will understand that with approximately 2,000 of these projects all around over the country it would take the administrative authorities to give you the details about any one of those projects. We who serve here legislatively cannot possibly do that and it is not possible to answer those questions from the floor.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Referring to the list on page 43, that includes only the States. May I ask if the committee deliberation covered the Territories and notably the Territory of Hawaii?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes; the Territory of Hawaii is covered.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There is a very serious shortage there at the present time.

Mr. LANHAM. The Territories are included. We do this construction in the continental United States and without the continental United States wherever it is necessary to carry on our war effort.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not the case that a great part of the construction under previous allocations from our committee was permanent construction, and for that reason some of the demountable houses were not used?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. In this appropriation it is all for temporary structures?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. There are no permanent structures carried in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it contemplated to have all of these in an unfurnished condition, or does the act propose to legalize and authorize the Housing Authority to furnish these homes complete?

Mr. LANHAM. I think they have put temporary furniture in some of these homes and tried to make up for that in the rent because there were some instances in which workers could not bring their household effects with them, but for the details with reference to that I refer the gentleman to the administrative authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] as he desires.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, from a hurried reading of the hearings on the pending bill, that there are many areas in this country badly in need of housing for war workers. However, I rise to express the hope that we might have some better planning and a wiser outlay of any funds which might be appropriated, under the authority we are today considering, than has been the case in the past.

Adjoining the Kingsbury ordnance plant, in the district which I have the honor to represent, the Government acquired some 775 acres of fertile farm lands and embarked upon a program of building 2,974 dwellings at a cost of some $10,000,000. The addition of utilities, site improvements, commercial and administrative buildings, including one school, brings the over-all cost up to some $13,000,000. We understood that these buildings were to have been ready for occupancy sometime last fall. I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. A. J. Parkin, housing manager of Kingsford Heights, as this project is known, under date of May 20, 1943, informing me that 134 units have been occupied.

It looks like Kingsford Heights is destined to be a ghost city even before it is fully ready for occupancy. Not only was there a case of bad judgment in ordering construction of this large number of homes at Kingsford Heights, but there has also been unwarranted delay in their construction, which may have in part contributed to the mistake which has been made. Let me point out an example of bureaucratic red tape which has interfered with the program at this site.

The contract for overhead electric distribution was awarded on June 6, 1942. The contractor immediately presented a complete material list to the Federal Public Housing Authority, which, in turn, filed the application with the War Production Board for the necessary priorities. After some consideration, the W. P. B. decided that there was too much critical material involved, and they asked Federal Public Housing for a complete new redesign of the system. These plans and specifications were then redesigned and again submitted to F. P. H. A. and, through them, to the W. P. B. last fall. The priority certificate was finally received by the contractor on January 2 of this year, and the contractor was then advised that it was too late for January allocations of copper. The copper was allocated for February, that the work could be undertaken by March, some 9 months after the contract was awarded.

If our armies in the field were throttled by such delays, we shudder to think of the consequences; such, however, is typical of the confusion on the domestic scene.

In the nearby cities of Walkerton and Knox, Ind., the housing authorities had constructed hundreds of temporary buildings for the workers at the Kingsbury ordnance plant. These were occupied in the early days of work at the plant, and when it became apparent that Kingsford Heights was destined to be a ghost city, efforts were instituted—probably to save somebody's face—to compel the residents of the temporary dwellings in the little communities of Walkerton and Knox to move into the newly completed project at Kingsford Heights. These people had lived in these communities for a year or more; their children attended schools in those communities; they had made church, business, and fraternal contacts, and had considered these communities as their home. Naturally they objected strenuously to the efforts to drive them from these Government-owned houses to another Government project located a very few miles away. These objections were registered with authorities in Washington and with the regional office of the F. P. H. A. in Chicago with the result that the effort was dropped. We hope that efforts will not be made to revive this mass removal of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, these thirteen millions put into this project must be paid for by the taxes and the savings of our American people. It is one of those extravagances which bring the cost of the war far above what it necessarily need be. If further funds are to be made available for the housing of war workers, the Congress must insist that they be expended more wisely and with better planning and thought given to the actual needs which exist than is apparent today from a trip through the ghost city of Kingsford Heights.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been defended on the basis of the small amount of money involved. May I remind the Committee that a 10-cent Defense stamp is a small thing, that the aluminum spoon which the little girl gave to the scrap salvage collection was indeed a small thing also, that the little pieces of scrap iron which we have asked the school children and others to turn over are small things; but when multiplied by thousands of cases it becomes large. Any contention that this authorization of appropriation is justified on the ground that it is a small thing certainly should not merit any consideration.

Our distinguished chairman mentioned the fact that this is a small appropriation compared to the billions of dollars which we have appropriated for other purposes and that it would materially aid the war effort. I wonder how 45,000 empty houses standing around all over the country today are going to assist in the prosecution of this war. Forty-five thousand dwelling units already constructed, and offered for rent, are standing idle today. What do those 45,000 houses represent? They represent more than $100,000,000 of investment; money which was taken from these same little 10-cent Defense stamps and these small bonds that our children and our mothers and our workers are buying to support this war effort.

But that is not all. It represents 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials; mind you, 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials have been invested in those houses that are standing idle today, that are serving no useful purpose in the war effort, and that 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials have been diverted from the war effort. Pray tell me how that is aiding the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] it was stated by the speaker who preceded me that private capital, private builders,

had the same access to priorities as public builders. Did it ever happen to occur to you that a private builder has to go to the National Housing Agency before he can get 1 pound of critical material? By an agreeement made on December 11, 1942, the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency entered into an agreement whereby the National Housing Agency was given the exclusive programming of the war housing.

Mind you, all housing today is war housing. We have no other housing.

Then the National Housing Agency is authorized to program private and public housing. Before private builders can get critical materials they must go to this National Housing Agency before they can carry out their housing program. That is indeed a national disgrace. If I had 30 or 40 minutes extra to spend today I would cite to you not only 1, 2, 10, or 20 examples of violations of American fundamentals, I would point out to you 100 such cases. When private builders have to go to the National Housing Agency, their competitor, before they can even think about building houses, it becomes disastrous. Permission to build must come from the National Housing Agency which has exclusive control of all critical materials allotted to housing. In other words, they have to go there and beg on their hands and knees for a little critical material. Private builders have been refused by their competitors a thousand times where they have been granted one priority. That is an absolute fact, and I have 60 pages prepared to present those facts to you today, as compiled in the last 60 days by an auditor, a certified public accountant, who has spent 2 months auditing and compiling these facts.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is absolutely right in that statement.

Mr. WILSON. That is absolutely right, and do not let anyone tell you anything different. I can prove every statement I am making.

The National Housing Agency, in agreement with the War Production Board, was granted exclusive diversion of all critical materials between public and private housing. I do not have time to go into this report; I will have to pass it all up. I just cite a few things I have noted down, and I wish I had time to point out to you the complete lack of an auditing system for these cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. My distinguished chairman on the floor of this House, just a few minutes ago, told the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee business was out. Let me remind you that right today the National Housing Agency is negotiating 150 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. That is an absolute fact.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman made the statement that private builders could not get priorities. Does that mean they could not get priorities in defense areas or in general home building?

Mr. WILSON. I will answer the gentleman in this way. They are in the position of a hungry child who is being permitted to have perhaps one-tenth of the food it would want. They are in the position of having to go to their enemy or their competitor and beg for crumbs, and they have to accept only such crumbs as they can get. When the distinguished chairman of my committee said that private builders had agreed to this, I say they agreed to it because it was the only recourse they had, as I have pointed out here, in this agreement they made with the War Production Board.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Does the gentleman think priorities should be granted for homes that are not in defense areas?

Mr. WILSON. Absolutely not; nothing but war houses in defense areas.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I might remind the gentleman that in my county in the last 2 years private developers have built over 10,000 houses and have 3,000 now under construction. They had no trouble getting priorities provided. They were building defense housing in line with the war effort.

Mr. LANHAM and Mr. SADOWSKI rose.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I will yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman give me 5 minutes?

Mr. LANHAM. I will give the gentleman a minute on this point.

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield me that.

Mr. LANHAM. I was going to yield the gentleman the time. It was shown in the hearings that private and public builders had exactly the same priorities for defense housing.

Mr. SADOWSKI. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that the statement made by this gentleman does not apply to the city of Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry, I must go into this report and point out just a few projects.

Did you know there are 17,000 workers on the pay roll of the National Housing Agency, and did you know that 18 percent of that 17,000 are drawing $3,800 or more per year, when only 3.8 percent of the people on the pay roll of the Government in other capacities are drawing that figure? That is more than the base pay of a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army today. Can you imagine that? It amounts to more than $12,000,000 a year just to pay the people on this particular pay roll who are drawing $3,800 a year or more.

I mentioned that we had 84 percent occupancy in these units, 316,000 completed, 45,000 unoccupied, 45,000,000 tons critical material wasted, $150,000,000 thrown away, to say nothing of man-hours and lumber wasted.

Now I want to mention a project or two with which I am familiar. The committee has heard about one of these several times, the Versailles project. I tried one time to get the committee charged with the responsibility of investigating this agency to go to that area to see for themselves before it got under way, but I did not succeed.

There the public builders erected 100 brick houses; nice houses. Forty-three of them are occupied. Fifty-seven percent of them are not occupied. They have taken in $17,000 operating income and have spent $28,000 in operating expense. In other words, it has cost 165 percent of the operating income to operate those houses.

I want to mention another project. They have programmed another group of houses within 13 miles of the town I was working in when I was elected to Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I appreciate the statement that my distinguished colleague from Indiana is making. In my home city of Connersville, the Government constructed 350 permanent houses. At this very moment less than half of those 350 houses are occupied.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and they will continue to be unoccupied. The Kingsbury ordnance plant project was built in northern Indiana. I heard about that project some weeks after it had been programmed. I am on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I think I am an authority on war housing needs. They did not need one single house.

The Federal Public Buildings Authority is erecting 2,970 houses at Kingsbury, Ind.; 286 of those houses were ready on March last, and 500 were made available the next month, and 1,000 the next month. They have never rented more than 242 of the original 286 houses that were complete in March, and yet they are continuing to build 1,500 more in addition to the 1,400 they have already practically completed. Even though they are going ahead and building these houses, even though they are also planning where they are going to move them when finished.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I wonder if you know whether the houses at Burns City are occupied?

Mr. WILSON. The houses are not occupied. Two hundred and fifty of those houses were made available about a month ago. There are 23 people who have rented houses in that project. Twenty-one of those have moved in. Twenty-one, with 250 available. Now they are building 350 more. The executive officer, Captain Oberlin, told me that

they had passed their peak of employment and were on the downgrade. I have a telegram from that same area, received yesterday, which reads as follows:

Because of rapidly diminishing employment in this district we urge that work now being done in distress labor areas be transferred here where men and equipment are operating barely 35 percent production basis. Your cooperation is earnestly solicited. We await your response with deep interest.

That is signed "Will Herman." I do not know Mr. Herman, but I believe his observation is correct.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Private builders in my city were denied the right to build these war houses because of the fact they could not get priorities.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to say to the gentleman from Detroit, that that is the rule and not the exception.

Mr. SADOWSKI. For the last 2 years our private builders were practically forced out of business in my city, and we have had public housing whether we wanted it or not. A unit that cost the Government $4,000—I will take you down and show you that any private builder in the city of Detroit could build the same unit for $3,000.

Mr. WILSON. I have hundreds of illustrations right here to prove that the gentleman is absolutely correct. This is by an audit of a distinguished auditor on Capitol Hill.

Now let us see what the President said in asking for this money:

The size of this program founded as it is upon minimum absolute need.

What could be more ridiculous? What could be more absurd? In my opinion, the National Housing Agency has developed into a national housing scandal, a national disgrace, and therefore should be materially revised. I am not condemning the National Housing Agency in its entirety. I feel it my duty to select the rotten apples from the barrel which are threatening to spoil the whole barrel.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to have the gentleman insert as a part of his remarks the different housing authorities we have now.

Mr. WILSON. I have that. Prior to the President's Executive Order No. 9070 of February 1942 there were 16 different Government agencies building houses. Now they have brought those all together under what they call the National Housing Agency, and developed the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Administration, and the Federal Public Buildings Authority—3 outfits, but this audit as made in the last 60 days shows that every one of those 16 agencies is still functioning under this new organization. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. What kind of housing do they have in Burns City? Have you got the cost of those?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, I have the cost of the whole project.

Mr. LANDIS. It is a regular firetrap down there, is it not?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I have the pictures here to show that a lot of these houses blew down before they were ever occupied, if anyone would care to look at the pictures. My contention is this, that this critical material which they have used to build these 600 houses if it had been diverted to private enterprise to build 100 houses, they would have been occupied and they would have been something in the way of creative wealth to that community. They would have been livable. It would involve private funds and not Government funds. I have not been a single place where the public housers have not told me they could build four houses for every one they are building today. I cite you one example, Los Angeles County, Calif.

Because of the red tape injected into this housing program by the National Housing Agency in the matter of priorities they have been necessarily curtailed to 450 a month, in order to let the Federal Public Housing Authority get in and get its share of the spoils. They formerly built 4,500 per month.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that private builders would have to go to the Federal Housing Agency before they could get a priority on building houses?

Mr. WILSON. That is exactly correct, and I defy anyone to challenge that statement.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANHAM. The statement of the gentleman is not correct, because the Federal Housing does not come in this.

Mr. WILSON. You are speaking of the F. H. A., and I say that the F. H. A. has to come to the National Housing Agency the same as public builders to get priorities?

Mr. LANHAM. They all have to get priorities from the War Production Board.

Mr. WILSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I want to correct that statement. I am sure my distinguished chairman does not want to make that statement.

I am going to read this statement: In December of 1942 the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency entered into an agreement whereby the National Housing Agency was to get, first, exclusive programming of all housing; second, exclusive control of all critical materials allotted to housing; third, exclusive division of all critical materials.

That is an exact statement which I copied here yesterday or this morning from the statement on this matter by the War Production Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes because there are other Members who are interested in this matter.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if his purpose in yielding me additional time was so I could answer questions?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. He was yielded additional time for whatever purpose he wished.

Mr. WRIGHT. I merely want to state that even though the Housing Authority has the right to program, that nevertheless they have to go back to the War Production Board to get priorities the same as any other building agency has to.

Mr. WILSON. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sure the gentleman will find that correct.

Mr. WILSON. My good friend from Pennsylvania is not correct.

Now I want to go over one other matter: Our distinguished chairman mentioned the fact that the Federal Public Housing Authority was obliged to go out and build houses because the Army and the Navy asked for them; the fact that the Army and Navy asked for them they were obliged to go out and build houses, as our distinguished chairman said, places the responsibility squarely on your shoulders and on mine. That responsibility comes right down to the United States House of Representatives to decide the question, are we going to make it a policy that when the Army or the Navy asks for anything they shall have it without question? Is that to be the policy of the House? It certainly has not been in the past.

I want to refer to the audit on June 11, 1943, of the chief auditor of the Federal Public Housing Authority, who was requested to furnish a statement last fall regarding the status of the cost-plus projects. He stated that he did not have such a list. He suggested that the supervisor of the project development might be able to furnish that list of the buildings. The supervisor stated that he did not have such a list and that the F. H. A. was compiling a list of projects that were not over 90 percent completed.

Now, the policy of this Federal Public Housing Authority, for which we are appropriating this money today, has departed and gone far astray from the policy set out by the Federal Housing Agency—the F. H. A.

Mr. Chairman, I have here the figures to show that projects are costing us 155 percent, for the temporary, demountable projects, of what permanent, good construction by the Maritime Commission and the Navy is costing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of call-

ing attention to page 111 of the hearings, beginning at the top of the page, to the statement by Mr. MacDonald, in which he said:

We made no distinction between the public and private.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] asked this question:

Mr. MacDonald, how long has that policy been in effect?

Mr. MACDONALD. As to rating, you mean?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. The equal treatment of public and private?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would say that that has been an established principle ever since last fall. Now, I cannot date it accurately, but there was at one time, as I mentioned, several schools of thought, and some which felt that the public housing reflected more conservation, and therefore should be given a higher rating, and others that private builders were developing the houses faster, and therefore making them available more satisfactorily, and that had certain supporters.

But the policy itself in the War Production Board has been since last fall to apply the same rating and apply the same material allowances to public and private.

That was in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. The War Production Board said the private housing was entitled to the same priorities as the public housing.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. That is an incorrect statement on the part of the War Production Board, because they have allotted and authorized to the National Housing Agency priorities.

Mr. LANHAM. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, in 5 minutes it is very difficult to attempt to portray to any great extent this whole problem of national war housing. I should like to limit my part of the discussion to a few factual points because we have time for little more than that. In the first place, the national-war-housing program calls for caring for 1,100,000 immigrant war workers who will be moving to places throughout the United States this next year where national-war industries are located. The program contemplates nothing more than caring for these migrant workers, for nothing else whatsoever. It seems to me that the housing of the war workers is as important as any other part of our national-war program. It is just as important to see that these men have decent conditions in which to live as it is to see that we make actual appropriations for the Army or the Navy. In fact, both the Army and the Navy have requested this appropriation. They stated that it is indispensable to the war production effort. It does seem to me in view of this fact to be a very important point.

I might point out in connection with the controversy that has been raised here regarding public and private housing that this is not a matter of either public housing or private housing. I think it should be emphasized that in the housing program for next year this bill which we are debating today takes care of only 22 percent of the entire housing contemplated. The entire war-housing program is 78 percent private, only 22 percent public housing, and it is the public housing that we are discussing here today.

On page 6 and again on page 26 of the hearings these findings are broken down so that any individual in the House wishing to discover just how the money is being spent, whether it is for dormitories, for family units, for single dwelling units, and so forth, can get the facts.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not a fact that the gentleman was a member of a committee which went out to the coast to investigate the housing situation?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I was on such a committee.

Mr. POULSON. Did the gentleman not find that in the localities where the greatest amount of defense work was being carried on there was an acute shortage of housing facilities?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I thank my colleague from California. Our subcommittee not only visited places on the west coast but we were in Kansas City and many other places where war industries have been established, and saw at first hand the heavy housing program that confronted them with the great number of immigrant war workers. The Pacific coast is probably harder hit than any other section of the country, but the problem is by no means limited to the west coast. We find it on the Atlantic coast as well; we find it in the South, and we found it in the Midwestern States. It is a matter that cannot be considered on a sectional basis but must be considered on the basis of the entire country.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not a fact that a great deal of absenteeism is due to the long distances many of the war workers have to travel on account of housing?

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank my colleague again for raising that question for it was a point I was going to discuss in just a moment. We found out a great deal about the problem of absenteeism. Wherever our subcommittee raised the question it was pointed out that absenteeism was in a great many instance due to improper housing or to the fact that the workers had to travel such great distances. We found one instance in which workers were traveling back and forth daily a round-trip distance of 120 miles, using up crucial materials such as gasoline and tires in the trip each day. The whole problem of absenteeism, it seems to me, has been greatly accentuated by the lack of adequate housing facilities.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. In just a moment.

There is another feature I wish to touch upon briefly before my time expires, and that is the health problem facing these communities. We talked with a great many physicians in communities where the problem of congestion has been increased, and almost unanimously they are begging for more housing, saying it must be provided now, saying that if they do not get this housing there is increasing danger of an epidemic in those communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that the need for houses on the coast and the diversion of this critical material to these projects in the Middle West and Indiana where they are not needed will help to promote absenteeism? Because you are not getting the critical material that you need.

Mr. OUTLAND. In answer to my friend from Indiana, I may say that it seems to me that the first step to determine is a study of where these essential war workers are going to be located. Testimony before our committee shows it is being made by the War Manpower Commission after consultation with the Army and the Navy and the various other agencies. I am not competent to say just how much housing is needed. It seems to me that in California we have a terribly acute problem but I should say that if we are going to have a comprehensive construction plan it should be put into effect first in those places where the need is most critical; and that was emphasized by the chairman.

This housing is of a temporary nature only. Not one dollar that is being appropriated in this new bill is for permanent housing. It is for materials and labor necessary to construct these in congested areas and in no other place in America.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. In reference to the question that the gentleman from Indiana propounded of the gentleman from California, did it not develop in the hearings in San Francisco that the situation so far as building materials are concerned has eased up very materially within the last few months?

Mr. OUTLAND. I do not recall exactly in regard to that, but that is my general impression, yes.

In conclusion may I say that I hope very much that the House agrees to the passage of this extremely important war measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to acknowledge the fact that

the National Housing Agency is not perfect. We as Members of Congress are not perfect. Our activities here in Congress are criticized by our constituency and we in turn ask our constituency not to condemn or praise us because of one, two, or five votes. We ask to be allowed to submit our entire record for their consideration and that is what I hope, Mr. Chairman, we will do this afternoon as far as the housing situation is concerned. Let us look at the entire record as established by the present National Housing Agency under the administration of what I consider a sincere and hard-working organization.

I am making no plea for the National Housing Agency but I do say at this time that what is now known as the National Housing Agency is doing a very fine job according to the testimony presented to our committee and the report of a subcommittee of our committee which recently returned from an inspection trip of various projects. I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Indiana on the fine manner in which he has presented his arguments. I am not taking exception to those arguments except to the extent that you will note he did not inform the membership where he obtained the figures that he submitted for our consideration. There are hearings here on the desk and I want as many as possible of the Members to get a copy of the hearings and read them, and I am sure that you will then agree that this agency has shown a good and sufficient reason for the $300,000,000 they are asking for.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman questioning the source of the figures I gave?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am.

Mr. WILSON. I will tell the gentleman where I got every figure.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish that the gentleman from Indiana had given them during various parts of his speech—but I would be glad to have that information at this time.

Mr. WILSON. I got them from Mr. Lee, of the National Housing Agency, and I have them in black and white. If you want to give me time, I can give the break-down completely. That is a nice thing that he did, furnish me that information which I requested. So far as the Kingsbury plant is concerned, I have that in black and white given me by Mr. Lee, of the National Housing Agency, and I will be glad to show you that.

Mr. McGREGOR. Again I refer you to the hearings and figures submitted by the heads of the various departments, and their figures speak for themselves. Now, my distinguished colleague mentioned the Kingsbury plant. I call your attention to the fact that the Kingsbury project was projected in 1941 and that project was not under the National Housing Agency. The present Administrator had that project handed to him.

Mr. WILSON. But they are building 1,500 houses today and only 242 of those opened up since March have been occupied.

Mr. McGREGOR. I again refer the gentleman to the hearings of our committee, and they are here for everyone to see. The Kingsbury-Laporte ordnance plant project was projected in 1941, not under the National Housing Agency. I am making no plea for the housing agency of that time, although I do remember very distinctly that my distinguished friend from Indiana did go with the committee to these particular areas, I think in 1941, and insist on houses being put into his district, and possibly in these very areas that he is now objecting to.

I just want to go forward with my thought relative to the needs of this $300,000,000. If you will take the hearings as before our committee, I desire to cite you a number of pages in the hearings. Mr. Blandford's justification for this request of $300,000,000 you will find on pages 4 and 5. You will find the request of the Manpower Commission and their backing for this bill on pages 6 and 7. Relative to the vacancies that my distinguished friend from Indiana has brought up I refer you to the hearings where this statement was made, and if it is in error I assure my distinguished friend or anyone else who questions it that we will call the men before our committee and we will find out who is right. There is a 91 percent occupancy of all family units and 84 percent of all the housing units at this time.

The average of all with the single units included is 84 percent. You can readily understand how you will have a vacancy in the single occupancy units. Those men are called for the draft, they are called from one plant to the other. When the Manpower Commission appeared before our board, and the Secretary of the Navy sent his statement and that was the very thing he based his request on. We are getting in-migration more than we ever had before. This bill covers 1,100,000 units. The men have been working in these plants, 3, 4, and 5 months, living in a single room, and I call the attention of my friend from Detroit to that fact. I am sorry he was not before our committee when the Detroit people were there. The men are moving from the single units to other places where they can get houses so that they can live with their families. I also call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this was originally a request for $400,000,000. Your committee reduced it $100,000,000 to $300,000,000. I voted in the committee to reduce it to $200,000,000 but after getting all the facts together and carefully analyzing the over-all picture I firmly believe that $300,000,000 is needed.

In view of the fact that none of the present funds for war housing can be used to take care of fiscal 1944 in-migration, the size of this in-migration makes absolutely imperative the program of war housing construction to be covered by the proposed authorization. The reasons for the in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers during fiscal 1944, which produces this housing need, may be summarized as follows:

First. Development of new war plants in some selected areas;

Second. Vast expansion of employment in existing plants, due to increasing shifts, longer hours, and the development of full plant capacities—all to meet production schedules that are doubling or even trebling;

Third. Recruitment of replacements for men drawn into the armed services;

Fourth. Depletion of local labor supply by the draft;

Fifth. This need for the additional war housing program, based upon a fiscal 1944 in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers, has been emphasized by the following:

(a) A special request by the President, sent to the Congress on May 13, 1943.

(b) Reports of regular congressional committees, which have held hearings on the whole subject matter.

(c) Special reports of congressional investigatory committees, portraying war housing needs.

(d) Testimony of agencies of the Government responsible for war production, such as the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission.

(e) Independent field surveys and studies of the National Housing Agency, working with local industrial, building, labor, and community groups.

(f) Various labor organizations, Nation-wide and local.

(g) Various representatives of private enterprise, including the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders.

MINIMAL NATURE OF THE PENDING AUTHORIZATION

The pending authorization, as approved by the House committee, is for only $300,000,000, as contrasted with the $400,000,000 requested by the National Housing Agency to build the publicly financed portion of the war housing program needed to take care of 1,100,000 in-migrants during fiscal 1944. Besides, this whole request for public construction covers only a fraction of the total program. Specifically, it covers only 200,000 units—70,000 dormitories, 40,000 conversions of existing structures, and 90,000 temporary family units of new construction—out of a total program of 940,000 units required for the 1,100,000 war workers. The other 740,000 units are to be provided entirely by the use of existing private structures, by privately financed conversion of existing structures, and by privately financed new construction. Moreover, the publicly financed portion of the whole program, to which the pending authorization relates, is limited entirely to the temporary housing needs which private industry is unable to serve—such as temporary dormitories, or conversions of those existing structures which private owners cannot afford the risk of converting solely for the war period, or temporary family units in areas where the need after the war is not sufficiently certain to justify and stimulate private construction.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to say to the gentleman that I, the same as the gentleman and the rest of us here on this floor, agree that we are for war housing for war workers. The only thing is that I should like to see this program used as

supplementary to the program of the private builders. I want to see that the private builders are first allocated all of the available building material, that priorities are given to them. In my city of Detroit four of the largest builders in the city were idle all last year and could not build houses because they could not get material and could not get priorities.

Mr. McGREGOR. The great problem with a lot of our private business is that they want to build a permanent house and they do not care to build a temporary house for the low-income group. I feel this is because they cannot be sure how long their property will be rented.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not true. The type of houses they are building now range in price from $4,000 to $5,000. They cannot build a house over $6,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Do I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is in opposition to this bill, which relates to temporary houses for war workers?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No, I am not in opposition to this bill but I am in opposition to the program of national housing which takes away critical building materials from private builders and gives them to national building agencies.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am in complete accord that private contractors should be given same consideration as public, but I believe my distinguished chairman read from the record—and if I am wrong, we will be glad to bring the man before our committee—that private contractors and public contractors were on exactly the same priority. If I am in error I will be willing to stand corrected.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I understand the housing project at Burns City, Ind., in my district, is made up of temporary houses and that the people down there claim the houses are not fit to live in. If there are only 23 houses occupied out of 600 down there, there is something wrong. If they are going to build these temporary houses any place else, they are not fit to live in. They blow over; they are made of cardboard and wood, and they have cracks in them. I have visited the place myself. The people say they will not live in them.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I read from the hearings. Mr. Blandford made this statement, and if this is in error, we will call him in. This is regarding Burns City:

> The project includes 600 units, of which 374 units are now available for occupancy. Some of these became available in April, others this last month, and the balance are still under construction. Twenty-two units are leased, 60 applications for dwellings are now being processed, and other applications are being received.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it true they are proceeding with this appropriation on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, or is it on a contract basis?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is absolutely untrue for any statement to be made that a large portion of this project is carried on under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I am not going to disagree or agree with my distinguished friend from Indiana on the past activities of Housing Administration, but I will say to this House that there will be less than 10 percent and maybe less than 5 percent of this cost on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. We do have some places where because of the immediate labor being necessary and completion being demanded by a certain date, the contractors will not bid, but it is not really on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. There is a contract established and they cannot exceed a certain amount.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I was wondering what the status of this program is. Is it about completed, or do you expect to ask for more funds later?

Mr. McGREGOR. In my candid opinion, and in reading the hearings of the other body in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday—this will probably be the last housing bill, because we have carefully gone into this whole situation and we feel that we have taken care of the permanent structures and this will take care of the temporary. Now we are doing this because of the request of the War Production Board, the Manpower Commission, and the Army and the Navy. However, I assure my colleague from Ohio that conditions change from day to day—but to my mind this is the end as the picture looks at this time. Again I say--private contractors will not build these temporary houses, because they have no assurance of how long they are going to be occupied. They say it is a loss of money.

I honestly and candidly believe—and I believe my record will justify my statement that I am opposed to any unnecessary expenses—that this bill is necessary in order to keep our workers from going from one place to another, because they just will not stay in localities that do not have adequate housing facilities for themselves and their families—and decent living quarters are necessary for them to give their best efforts to the war program.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I have yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. I thank you. I have here a copy of a report submitted yesterday by the investigator for the Truman committee to the committee. It is not the committee's report. It is his report, submitted to the Truman committee. I read:

> Investigations disclose that there are at least 150 cost plus housing deals in full swing at present, and the method of handling them is only one of the many old practices still going on.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. Let me make this statement to the gentleman, however. We have held hearings for weeks and weeks, and we never had anyone appear before our committee and make any such statement. The gentleman is a member of our committee. If he had this information it was his duty as a legislator, representing the district that he so ably represents, to submit that information to the committee so that we could call in those men, instead of waiting until the last minute, when the bill is up for consideration, and give us some information that we should have had before.

Mr. WILSON. I made it clear earlier in the day why you were not given that information.

Mr. McGREGOR. Now, attention has been called to 10 or 15 instances where the National Housing Agency has been in error. Multiply that by 10 and you have 100. That makes 100 errors out of around 3,031,952 units constructed. If the opposition cannot bring up more than 100 places that are bad, our batting average is pretty good. That is far less than 1-percent error.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Now private capital is so willing and able and anxious to come in and build these houses. Is it not true that at the time these projects were instituted private capital was not ready, and the Government had to do it?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is true.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not true of our city of Detroit.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. It applies to every city, including Detroit.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I am thinking of Vallejo, Calif., where last fall over two-thirds of the workers traveled from 10 to 40 miles back and forth to work.

Mr. McGREGOR. This money will be used to move workers closer to the plant in order to save our automobile and rubber supply. There is no question that there have been errors made, but all we ask is to take the total of the work, the average good and bad of the work, and I feel certain you will agree with this committee's report and pass this bill authorizing $300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is desired to use a few minutes for the disposition of a

conference report, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the defense housing bill (H. R. 2975) and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 278), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the week ending July 3, 1943, it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported to the House, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 92.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated December 3, 1942."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 98 and 99.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER E. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

(Third conference report)

The managers on the part of the House at the third conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes out the House provision prohibiting incentive payments. The House recedes with an amendment, restoring the matter stricken by the Senate, amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated December 3, 1942."

It is the purpose of the conferees that the language substituted for the House language stricken by the Senate amendment No. 88 shall make possible compliances by the Department of Agriculture with every commitment made in the announcement of the 1943 agricultural adjustment program as announced on December 3, 1942, with subsequent modifications, except that the payments outlined in House Document No. 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, shall not be made and future commitments shall be restricted as provided in the House language, stricken by Senate amendment No. 92, from which the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building. The Senate recedes.

In disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to amendments Nos. 98 and 99, relating to Federal crop insurance. The House appropriates $3,500,000 for the liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, providing for the payment of losses on the current year's crop, and prohibiting the writing of any further insurance on subsequent crops. The Senate appropriates $7,818,748 and strikes out the House language providing for the liquidation of the corporation.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2481, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the conclusion of agreement on all items in dispute in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, with the exception of two amendments, No. 98 and No. 99, dealing with the subject of Federal crop insurance.

It is the purpose of the managers on the part of the House to move, after the conference report has been considered, to further insist upon disagreement with the two Senate amendments in question, and we have reason to believe that the Senate will recede from its insistence upon those amendments, in which case, if this conference report is adopted, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the next fiscal year will have been completed.

The conference report which you are now considering deals only with two amendments, Senate amendment No. 88 and Senate amendment No. 92. Amendment No. 88 is an amendment striking language which barred the use of any of the $400,000,000 provided for soil conservation and crop adjustment payments in the payment of incentives. There was not a very general agreement as to just what constitutes incentive payments. We have had that subject matter under discussion on several occasions during recent days and on yesterday, as you will recall, a vote was had in the House with regard to the inclusion of some substitute language in connection with the Senate amendment, which would have made clear that it was not the purpose of the Congress to prohibit the carrying out of the farm program as it was projected last December by the Department of Agriculture, and carrying out all commitments made by the Department under authority of law to the farmers of the country.

The House on yesterday, by a majority of 10, declined to approve the language that was suggested in the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. We have agreed in this conference report upon substitute language which you have heard read, but which I shall read again to you in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to what the language provides, and in that connection I call your attention particularly to the language of the statement of the managers on the part of the House explaining the meaning of this language as it is understood by the House and the Senate conferees.

For the language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 it is proposed to insert this substitute proviso:

Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall

be used for any incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payments of acreage allotments and commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended and as enumerated and set forth in the 1943 agricultural conservation program bulletin dated December 3, 1942.

It is the purpose of this language, as it was agreed to by the House and the Senate conferees, to provide, as stated in the statement of the managers, that commitments made by the Government through the Department of Agriculture to farmers of the country in connection with the farm program for the present crop year 1943 shall be carried out; that the promises of the Government in this respect shall be made good; and it is the further purpose that the payments which were projected in House Document 101, and which have been referred to as incentive payments, shall not be made, and it is not the purpose to have them made.

Insofar as this bill is concerned, no money was included in the bill for the purpose of making any of those payments, but the language of the amendment which is here recommended to the House is intended to prohibit the possibility of those particular payments being made from the $400,000,000 appropriation.

The Senate amendment No. 92 struck the language inserted in the House bill which would have limited next year's program to soil conservation and water conservation payments, and which would have limited the amount of next year's program to $300,000,000.

In the conference report the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 92, and therefore the language stricken by the amendment will remain in the bill if this report is approved and if the bill, as it will be after the approval of the report, is finally enacted into law. This simply means that we are providing for the discharge of all obligations of the Government in the current program and at the same time we are limiting next year's program to soil conservation and water conservation purposes to the amount of $300,000,000. Also that the farmers of the country will have notice before they begin their next year's crop operations as to just what these commitments are and will not incur expenditures, as they have done this year, because of other types of payments which have this year been promised to them and which cannot be promised them next year under the language of this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the language of the conferees, as it is now proposed, contemplate about the same result or would result in about the same thing as would have resulted from the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina yesterday?

Mr. TARVER. It is my opinion that it would bring about exactly the same result.

Mr. MURDOCK. And by keeping faith with farmers, it would deal justly, insofar as payment to farmers who have acted upon the recommendations of the Government?

Mr. TARVER. It protects their rights under commitments heretofore made by the Department of Agriculture and makes a limitation effective as to future commitments.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. What has been cut out of the 1944 program then?

Mr. TARVER. The crop acreage or production adjustment payments are cut out; the payments which have heretofore been made and will be made for the present crop year on cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts will not be made on those crops for the 1944 crop year if the language of the bill as recommended in the conference report in connection with the items to which I have directed attention, is approved by the Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly what payments could be made under the terms of the bill with regard to 1944?

Mr. TARVER. Any soil or water conservation payments, payments to farmers for terracing their land, for planting legumes, or certain types of fertilization, for planting trees or planting permanent pastures. There are numerous types of soil conservation and water conservation practices that can be paid for under the limitations outlined in this year's bill if this report is approved.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that, but if the language presently proposed were adopted would it be possible as to 1944 to make any payments at all which would be of an incentive character on war crops?

Mr. TARVER. After 1944?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; in 1944.

Mr. TARVER. It will not be possible to make any payments on 1944 crops except soil conservation and water conservation payments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House left the conferees in a rather difficult position on one amendment, namely, amendment No. 88. The confusion and the difficulty arises from the facts first that the House by a record vote earlier in the week boosted the amount in the bill for soil conservation and domestic allotment purposes from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000; secondly, the House by a record vote expunged the House language and substituted the Senate language so that the money could be expended for other than soil compliance purposes in order to carry out what the House evidently felt were the moral commitments of the Department of Agriculture to the farmers. In the light of that action some administrative difficulty would manifestly arise over the fact that there was still language which the House retained by record vote which forbade the payment of so-called incentive payments; so our responsibility was to modify that language somewhat to bring it in line with the rest of the bill as approved by the House by a record vote.

In pursuance of the responsibility we therefore contrived the language the gentleman from Georgia read a moment ago, namely, that we did preserve the interdiction against incentive payments, but we provided an exception and said that except that the money in addition to that for soil compliance purposes and for water conservation practices could be used for agricultural allotment commitments, namely, the so-called commitments that were made in the program when it was announced in December 1942 by the Department of Agriculture. We implement that in the bill by language in the report which makes it reasonably clear they can go ahead and carry out their commitments including soil conservation and soil compliance practices, but we made it quite clear to the Department that they cannot commit the country, they cannot commit the Congress, they cannot commit the Federal Treasury to a commitment program in 1944. That is very definite. These are the two commitments that are contained in the report and the conferees were quite unanimous on that part of the report.

I might say that the only items in disagreement now are those relating to so-called crop insurance that will be reported in disagreement directly and I hope to say a word or two more about it. It has been represented to the House and it is a fact that the House conferees had unanimously and consistently opposed on every occasion the continuation of the so-called Crop Insurance Corporation. We have provided for its liquidation. It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of that insurance program. That item will come up directly.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments in disagreement relating to crop insurance be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the proviso beginning in line 21

after the word "newspapers" down to and including line 2 on page 77.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 and 99.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. TARVER. I yield for the purpose of the gentleman's offering the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99, and concur in the same.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some of the issues in this particular appropriation bill are getting a little threadbare since we have been back here three or four times and will probably have to come back once more. The agricultural appropriation bill for 1944 will now be concluded with the exception of this one item involving continuation of the Crop Insurance Corporation.

I merely recapitulate the argument that has been made heretofore. We reported the bill with a provision that this corporation ought to be liquidated because its losses, that is, the excess of the indemnities over premiums, plus expenses, both put together, amounted to the sum of about $41,000,000 in 4 years. We have concluded unanimously in the subcommittee that the experiment has gone far enough, so we provide sufficient funds to take care of the commitments that have been made and then liquidate the Corporation. The Senate, on the other hand, struck out this language and wants to continue this insurance corporation.

The gentleman from North Carolina now offers a preferential motion to the effect that we recede and concur in the Senate amendment which means to embrace the Senate position and to continue the operation of the Corporation.

I think I can add one new item to the general argument and that is this: One of the Members of the Senate appeared before us in conference this morning with a very brief statement in the nature of a summarization as to what could be done, according to the officials of the insurance corporation. Frankly, I was amazed, in view of the fact they had asked for more than $7,500,000 to carry on this work that they now say they can carry on with $3,000,000. I do not know when or how or by what magic they have suddenly changed their notion as to the amount of money that is necessary. They thought that perhaps that might induce the House conferees to change their position.

Our position is not predicated upon the amount of administrative expense. It is predicated on the fact that this is a losing operation, that it has been unsuccessful after 4 years of trial on wheat and 1 year on cotton, that there is danger that other commodities will be added and the losses to the Treasury will be greater year after year. We concluded that the wise, sensible and common sense thing to do is to liquidate it now. That is the action we propose and I suggest that the preferential motion be voted down by a great and smacking majority.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Exclusive of administrative cost, what has the cotton crop insurance program cost the taxpayers of America today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the figure before me, but the loss on cotton for a single year, including the administrative expense, was more than $1,300,000 and on wheat the loss was over $40,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman said he did not complain about the administrative cost because the law provided that the Government should defray that expense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman must get me right. I said that the proposal that was made to us this morning that they could get along on $3,000,000 of administrative cost does not represent the whole story. Our contention is that taking it all in all it is an unsuccessful operation, it has had its experimental period, the stamp of failure must be put upon it, so it should be liquidated now.

Mr. COOLEY. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: He said it lost $40,000,000 on the wheat program, but that figure includes the administrative cost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will tell the gentleman what the figure is. The loss of indemnities paid to farmers over premiums collected from the farmers for 4 years was $17,000,000, the administrative cost $24,000,000, the aggregate is $41,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is a correct statement of the figures. Did the gentleman support this program initially when it first came before the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In your conference with Members from the South, and especially the gentleman who has just spoken, did you ever learn how long the industrial North tax-paying States are going to continue to support them and keep their farmers on a hand-out?

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to answer that question? I will be glad to compare the statistics of the State of North Carolina with the statistics of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to compare the record of the State of Michigan and what it has paid out in taxes and the amount it has received in benefits. You have been on our pay roll for too long.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what you think.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know of any risk incurred in business that is not covered by insurance, aside from agricultural risks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I do not. On the other hand, I do not know of a single insurance venture covering any field of human activity where the administrative expense is taken out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I can cite an insurance program established at Governmental expense. Does the gentleman feel there are now insurance companies, private insurance companies, operating to take care of farm risks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that kind of a risk because they cannot afford to take the loss and I do not believe the taxpayers of the United States can afford to take it either.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is said that Lloyds will insure anything. Must it be said America cannot do as well? Of course it takes time and numbers to establish insurance. If this crop insurance is now voted out does the gentleman believe that within the next 100 years it will ever be brought up again after this so-called experiment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no idea. So far as the private companies are concerned, they tried it. Every one that went into this venture failed and none have tried it since that time. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to use the largesse of the Federal Government in season and out for a losing venture? If that is the case we might as well insure every human endeavor of which the mind is capable and wash the loss through the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. When we knock out the provision today, we are saying to the American farmer, "You have no protection and can have no protection under any insurance scheme." That is not very encouraging to future farmers.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Have we not had fairly good crops in this country during the last 4 years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. If we have lost $41,000,000 in 4 years when the crops are good, what would happen in a bad year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this thing was such a lure why is it that only 1 out of 3 wheat farmers have taken the insurance and 1 out of 10 cotton farmers? We got the figures last year as applied to different counties in Texas

and it was amazing to see how many farmers would insure for 1 year then drop out for the next 2 years because they could not be lured into the scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the preferential motion will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make this final effort to save the crop-insurance program. It may be a futile effort. It is very significant when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois attempts to liquidate a corporation which he has bitterly opposed from the very beginning. No real friend of the crop-insurance program wants to liquidate it at the present time. Certainly the gentleman from Michigan favors its liquidation, but he has never been a friend of all risk crop insurance.

It was an experiment. I knew it was an experiment, you knew it was an experiment, and the gentleman from Illinois knew it was an experiment. The cotton program has operated 1 year. It is true we lost $1,000,000, but the original bill authorized an appropriation of $100,000,000.

Why should we abandon it? If it is abandonded at the present time it probably never will be undertaken again. Is it not somewhat unreasonable to expect any administrator to set up a Nation-wide corporation, operating in every wheat-growing and cotton-growing county in America, and set it up on an actuarially sound basis in the brief space of 2 or 3 years? As the participation in this program grows the premiums will decrease. It is hoped that after a while, maybe 2 or 3 more years, it can be made actuarially sound and cheap enough to attract the farmers into the program.

One word about the comment of the gentleman from Michigan. I want it definitely understood now that I am not asking the gentleman from Michigan or anyone in this Congress to pension the State of North Carolina. I think the tax-paying record of that great commonwealth will compare very favorably with the record of the State of Michigan. My recollection is that North Carolina in paying revenue into the Federal Treasury is probably next to the State of New York and even ahead of the State of Michigan.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Is it not true that every time we buy an automobile or a Frigidaire Michigan gets the credit for the tax we pay?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the reason the gentleman from Michigan can be so satisfied about the revenue situation in Michigan.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not true that every time we buy a package of cigarettes we pay a tax to North Carolina?

Mr. COOLEY. What has that to do with crop insurance? The proposition here is whether we are going to do the foolish thing of having gone on record as in favor of this program just 12 months ago and now going down the hill again and wrecking the program, because the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois and some others do not think it has been successful. Of course, it has not been successful. Of course, it is not making money. But, I repeat, this money is not lost when it is paid out in benefits to the farmers. It goes into the pockets of distressed farmers who have lost more than 75 percent of their crops because of some disaster over which they have had no control.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlement from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we wanted to start out to prove that even the well-established life insurance is fallacious and without sound economic foundation, we could do it by taking any 10 Members of this House and rigging up a scheme on a 3-year basis and prove that it cannot be done. It takes time and numbers to put any insurance on a mathematical basis.

Mr. COOLEY. I doubt very much that any corporation would be able to demonstrate the soundness of an insurance program in 3 years.

Some mention has been made of the activities of private corporations in the field of all-risk crop insurance. They have undertaken it, and they have failed; there is no question about it. They failed because of various and sundry reasons. They did not have the necessary data, they did not have the necessary funds, and they did not have the necessary interest in the farmers they sought to insure. We have the information and the data, we have the necessary funds, and certainly we have an interest in our farmers. I hope very much that the program may be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 2935, the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina told about the private companies which attempted to insure crops failing. That was because they were conducted on a businesslike basis and the business was no good. They did not have back of them the United States Treasury, as you want to put the United States Treasury back of this crop insurance program. I have known that one Governor of a Carolina State said to the Governor of another of the Carolinas that it was a long time between drinks, but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] does not want any time at all between hand-outs for the cotton planters, not a minute.

We are down to the time when we need every dollar we can get, every dollar we can get to carry on the war, not experiments, as the gentleman concedes this crop insurance to be.

I have seldom heard a more bitter Republican speech from the Democratic side than that made this morning by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. He told how the Army and the Navy, that we are all backing, have been wasting our money. He said they were not only wasting it but, if I understood him correctly, he said they were guilty of criminal negligence in the spending, and he pointed out just how it had been wasted.

Here is another Government agency and they want us to give them more money to continue this New Deal experiment, which, it is admitted, has cost us forty-one million and over. When are you going to get around to quit trying to get something for nothing from the Federal Government, raiding the Federal Treasury, and get down and put all of our efforts behind the war effort?

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman propounding that question to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just wants another sugar daddy for this cotton-crop insurance, and the armed forces need all the money we can raise.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to appear stubborn regarding this item, but I sincerely believe that this is a worth-while program and one which the Congress should provide for the producers of this Nation—those who must feed us.

It is rather singular that members of the Committee on Agriculture who set up this program a few years ago must come here and fight for its life as against what amounts to a legislative enactment by the Appropriations Committee. I understand there was a time when legislative committees were permitted to make their own appropriations, but I wonder if it is not an evil of equal degree that the Appropriations Committee is permitted to legislate, to discontinue a program set up by the Congress, legislatively, through a determined effort on the part of some who have from the beginning never consented to its organization.

I wish it were possible for you to agree to give us another year or two to try to demonstrate the usefulness of this program. It is not fair to say that only 10 percent of the cotton farmers are interested. Many more are interested. The program was started late last year

and was put in the hands of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, many of whom were not in favor of it, did not endorse it and did not try to get the farmers to come into the program. I think I can confidently tell you that if the cotton program is not operating in a manner entirely satisfactory to the overwhelming majority of this Congress after 3 years, all of us will join in its dissolution. I wish so much that you could permit this item of $7,000,000 to remain in the bill, as fixed by the Senate, in order that this program may go forward.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of developing one further point?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. It is a fact that we authorized this corporation to enter into 3-year contracts, which have been in existence only 1 year.

Mr. PACE. And which have effected considerable saving and will effect considerable saving in the future. I do not know, but I am told that the last vote in the Senate was 49 to 10 to maintain its position. I may say that we might dispose of this bill more quickly by concurring in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I do this for the purpose of replying to the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The language included in the bill as it passed the House provides for the carrying out of any Government obligations under existing contracts. As far as the 3-year contract is concerned, every one of those 3-year contracts had written into the face of it a statement that it is contingent upon the making of appropriations by Congress to carry out the Government's obligations. Each of those contracts is legally terminable after the expiration of 1 year. The Government's liabilities do not extend beyond 1 year except by its consent.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the contracting parties assumed that when a 3-year contract was executed the Government would stay in business for 3 years?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no, because the provision is placed in the contract itself providing for the termination of the contract.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY].

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the measure of man's progress in the long and difficult march toward civilization is his ability to eliminate preventable hazards and to alleviate the results of those hazards which he is yet unable to master. That is what civilization means. Insurance means that we accept collective responsibility to help alleviate the hazards that happen to some of us. Insurance means that we bear collectively those burdens which are often disastrous when borne personally.

As far as I know, there is not a single one of my constituents who will benefit from this crop-insurance program; but I am interested in Americans; in farmers. I represent a city constituency. However, I am interested in doing everything that can be done to give fair treatment and justice to the men who plant and harvest our crops. Farming is a hazardous occupation. If we can develop means and methods by experimentation, as we are doing, to eliminate those hazards or to alleviate the results of those hazards, I think we will be very, very wise to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 62, noes 100.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 223, answering "present" 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—135

Abernethy	Gregory	Murdock
Allen, La.	Hagen	Murphy
Beckworth	Hare	Murray, Tenn.
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Newsome
Boren	Hart	Norrell
Boykin	Hays	O'Connor
Brooks	Hendricks	O'Konski
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Outland
Bryson	Hoch	Pace
Bulwinkle	Hoeven	Patman
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	Patton
Burgin	Hope	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Horan	Peterson, Ga.
Carlson, Kans.	Hull	Pittenger
Chapman	Jackson	Poage
Coffee	Jarman	Price
Colmer	Johnson, Luther A.	Priest
Cooley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramspeck
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Courtney	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Cox	Kefauver	Richards
Cravens	Kelley	Rivers
Creal	Kerr	Robinson, Utah
Crosser	Kirwan	Rogers, Calif.
Cunningham	LaFollette	Sadowski
Curtis	Larcade	Sikes
Davis	Lemke	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	McCord	Sparkman
Dilweg	McGehee	Spence
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Dworshak	McMillan	Steagall
Eberharter	McMurray	Stefan
Feighan	Maas	Stewart
Fernandez	Magnuson	Stockman
Flannagan	Mahon	Vincent, Ky.
Fogarty	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Fulbright	Marcantonio	Whelchel, Ga.
Gale	Martin, Iowa	White
Gathings	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Gibson	Mills	Wickersham
Gilchrist	Monroney	Winstead
Gordon	Mundt	Winter
Gore	Murdock	Worley
Granger	Murphy	Wright
Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman

NAYS—223

Andersen, H. Carl	Andrews	Baldwin, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Angell	Barrett
Andresen, August H.	Arends	Barry
	Arnold	Bates, Ky.
	Auchincloss	Bates, Mass.
Beall	Gross	Pfeifer
Bell	Gwynne	Philbin
Bender	Hale	Ploeser
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Poulson
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Powers
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Blackney	Harris, Va.	Ramey
Bland	Heffernan	Randolph
Bloom	Heidinger	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hill	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Robertson
Buffett	Hoffman	Rockwell
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Burchill, N. Y.	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Busbey	Jeffrey	Rohrbough
Butler	Jenkins	Rolph
Camp	Jennings	Rowe
Canfield	Jensen	Sabath
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Anton J.	Sasscer
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Calvin D.	Satterfield
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Sauthoff
Celler	Johnson, J. Leroy	Schiffler
Chenoweth	Jones	Schuetz
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Schwabe
Church	Judd	Scott
Clason	Kean	Short
Clevenger	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Slaughter
Compton	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Costello	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Curley	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
D'Alesandro	Lambertson	Springer
Day	Landis	Stanley
Delaney	Lane	Stevenson
Dewey	Lanham	Sullivan
Dickstein	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Dies	LeFevre	Sumners, Tex.
Dirksen	Lewis	Sundstrom
Disney	Ludlow	Talbot
Ditter	Lynch	Talle
Dondero	McCormack	Tarver
Douglas	McCowen	Taylor
Drewry	McGranery	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McGregor	Thomas, Tex.
Ellis	McLean	Thomason
Ellison, Md.	McWilliams	Tibbott
Ellsworth	Madden	Towe
Elmer	Maloney	Troutman
Elston, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio
Engel	Mason	Vursell
Fellows	May	Walter
Fenton	Merrow	Ward
Fish	Michener	Wasielewski
Fisher	Miller, Conn.	Weichel, Ohio
Forand	Miller, Mo.	Weiss
Gamble	Miller, Pa.	Welch
Gavagan	Monkiewicz	Wene
Gavin	Mott	West
Gearhart	Mruk	Whittington
Gerlach	Murray, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Gifford	Myers	Willey
Gillette	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson
Gillie	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Graham	O'Hara	Wolverton, N. J.
Grant, Ind.	O'Leary	Woodruff, Mich.
Griffiths	O'Neal	Woodrum, Va.
	O'Toole	
	Phillips	
	Plumley	
	Pracht	
	Robsion, Ky.	
	Rowan	
	Russell	
	Scanlon	
	Shafer	
	Sheppard	
	Sheridan	
	Snyder	
	Somers, N. Y.	
	Stearns, N. H.	
	Taber	
	Tolan	
	Treadway	
	Van Zandt	
	Vinson, Ga.	
	Wadsworth	
	Wheat	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Case

NOT VOTING—72

Allen, Ill.	Green	Norton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Leary
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	O'Neal
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	O'Toole
Buckley	Hébert	Phillips
Byrne	Holifield	Plumley
Capozzoli	Izac	Pracht
Clark	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Cochran	Keefe	Rowan
Culkin	Kennedy	Russell
Cullen	Kilburn	Scanlon
Dingell	King	Shafer
Doughton	Kleberg	Sheppard
Durham	Lea	Sheridan
Eaton	Lesinski	Snyder
Fay	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Stearns, N. H.
Ford	Merritt	Taber
Fulmer	Morrison, La.	Tolan
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Treadway
Gallagher	Nichols	Van Zandt
Gorski	Norman	Vinson, Ga.
Gossett		Wadsworth
		Wheat

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Case for, with Mr. Treadway against.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Shafer against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gallagher.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Cappozoli with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. King with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Norman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I voted yea; I withdraw my vote and vote nay.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, and I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion of Mr. TARVER to further insist was then agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the amendments in disagreement were disposed of, was laid on the table.

INCREASING THE AMOUNT AUTHORIZED BY DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) increasing the amount authorized for defense housing, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 2975) has for its purpose the increasing by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing.

I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee for about 5 weeks on the west coast and that committee conducted hearings in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, in which much of the housing that has been built up to the present time is located.

My observation was, as we went about those three States, that a great need, not only for the housing that had already been built, but for additional housing, was present. I might say that in each community in which we held hearings, different ones expressed themselves that where local funds were available they should be permitted to build houses, and that was in agreement with the members of the committee. But we found so many places where thousands of houses were needed where no one wanted to spend their own money to build houses that perhaps after the war would be taken down. In other words, the families who are moving from place to place today will not be in those areas after the close of the war.

We were in areas where many more houses were needed in the interest of the war effort. In some localities we were told by defense plants that they could use 25,000 to 50,000 additional workers. For instance, in the city of Portland, Oreg.——

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman from California state the conditions that he found and explain the situation that he found in my area, the Portland area, where we have hundreds of workers who have gone there; in other words, tell us what the situation with respect to housing is.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will state to the gentleman from Oregon we found in his congressional district and in the Portland area that there were hundreds of thousands of workers who had come to that area to work in the shipyards or in the airplane manufacturing plants, and on account of the lack of housing facilities had returned to eastern States. Further, we found in that area, in one housing unit alone just lacking a few houses of being a 10,000 unit, and in that particular area the need for more housing was very apparent for the simple reason of the construction of ships and the repairs to airplanes in that area.

We also found that in Bremerton, Wash., ships that had been damaged at Pearl Harbor had been lying at dock for 3 or 4 months and the need for repair was great. We were told by the Navy Department that they could use 25,000 to 50,000 additional workers and that it was very important that they have further housing, additional to the emergency housing that had been provided; that it was needed to take care of the increased number of workers they were prepared to place in those shipyards to repair ships damaged in the present war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I guess this would be a good time to make a confession. It is that at the time I was appointed a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I had considerable resentment toward the Federal buildings program. I had that resentment because of my own personal experiences as a construction superintendent on various Government war projects.

I was superintendent of construction on a large industrial war plant in the city of St. Louis. I had charge of 5 buildings there and on 1 building the Government changed the plans 93 times. On another war plant I had occasion to make an excavation 4 times as large as the Chamber in which we are now assembled, drive pilings on every 30-inch center, put in footings, reinforced steel, place the concrete, and set bolts for the erection of steel; then have someone from Washington decide that they were going to put in only 3 open-hearth furnaces instead of 4 that had been planned, and I had to fill up a place the area of this Chamber.

I have had forms for concrete built in areas the size of a quarter of a city block, reinforcing steel in place, runways down, electric conduit in place, everything ready to pour the concrete—and somebody higher up comes along and tells me they have changed their minds, and they are going to put in a wood-block flooring instead of concrete, and then it was a matter of tearing the whole thing out and lowering it 2½ inches because someone had made an error.

I have had to go out, like a thief in the night, and steal a mile of railroad track in order to complete a Government defense project because I could get no priorities through. Because of these facts I had resentment; but now that I have had an opportunity to study a different phase of Government construction, the Public Housing Administration, and serving as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that resentment has disappeared, because that organization has been willing to sit down with me and discuss the problems affecting my Nation and my country and to give me the benefit of the experience that they have had and benefited by, and which, added to the information which I have sought and obtained, has convinced me that this program is absolutely necessary.

We have heard the statement made that some of the members of the Public Housing Administration receive a salary of $3,800. In this war effort we must have men and we must pay for them—this is war. I have paid carpenters $150 a week. I paid a man running a bulldozer as much as $225 a week at a war plant. I have seen bricklayers receive from $150 to $160 a week. I have paid $80 a week for ordinary labor. Contrast that with the charge that only 18 percent of the men who direct this program receive more than $3,800 a year and it is not surprising that some mistakes have been made. We cannot condemn them too much considering the load they carry. I do not doubt that mistakes will

be made in the enormous program which is now in effect for the construction of housing near shipbuilding yards, projects built to accommodate men who are repairing fighting ships, men who are working in ordnance plants and other war industries which no one knew would grow up in that vicinity or when they will be abandoned. In view of these facts it is absolutely necessary.

It is part of our war program. We must furnish for these ordnance plants a place for the workers to live and we must pay for it. I face this matter with an unbiased mind. Being a private contractor before I came to Congress, and being desirous of being more helpful in the war effort, I took a job as superintendent of construction on war plants. As a contractor, I realize the problem that is going to face us, but as a contractor I would not want to go out and invest money in a construction job building houses which I knew were temporary and on which the chances were I would not be able to get a return on the investment. On matters of this kind it is a Federal problem.

We have been assured by the Housing Authority that it will permit private builders in any section in the Nation to come in and assume any portion of the building they can take on, and we have been assured there will be cooperation with the local authorities, they will consult with the real estate boards, the Chambers of Commerce, and the various agencies in determining how many conversions can be made before new construction is brought in. I believe in a program of that kind, and I believe it can be worked out as economically as any we can formulate.

Mistakes have been made, I know that, but I believe the new administration which is now directing the policies of that agency will do a good job, and, you know, we cut a hundred million dollars from their appropriation in committee. I believe the new agency can justify the money it now requests and that the program as formulated and presented to this House can easily be justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Building and Grounds Committee, as most of you know, for a number of years. When this housing program first started I approached the whole subject with a good deal of skepticism because I did not want a lot of houses built in cities all over the United States that would be eyesores or that would be empty after this war is over. Naturally, approaching it from the viewpoint of skepticism, I gave it a little bit more study than I otherwise would have done. I soon became convinced, however, that if we are going to win this war we are going to have to have houses for the people who are doing the work in our war plants.

I was astounded at the vast number of people who have had to move their homes. For instance, in my own city of Kansas City, we have had during the last 12 months a net increase of over 50,000 people. Twenty-five thousand people have moved out of the town, the boys have gone into the service and for other reasons these 25,000 moved out. But over 70,000 have moved in. The result has been that we have had somewhat painful adjustments there. We have a plant about 15 miles from Kansas City. Great numbers of men drive back and forth, taking 2 or 3 hours a day to go to and from their work. As long as they can do that, I have no complaint, if they can get back and forth and do the necessary work to win this war. But there are many communities all over the United States where there are not yet sufficient houses within driving distance to properly man the war plants. I am urging every one of you gentlemen today as patriotic American citizens to give us the necessary funds to see to it that the required number of houses are built to take care of the workers who are going to have to make the machines and the munitions we need to win this war.

I have had the feeling this program has been handled better than some of the programs that we witnessed. I have gone to various places in the United States and I find that usually we do not have any more houses than we need. It is true that in some rare instances we hear of cases where too many houses were built. If you dig deep enough though, you will usually find there is a good reason for that. For instance, the military authorities themselves have changed their plans. I know of one place where they have vacant houses, and I was astounded that they would have vacant houses there, but I found that was a plant making munitions. Now, I do not suppose that the highest general in our Army knows the exact amount of munitions we are going to need. The tide of the war ebbs and flows. The only way we can insure the liberties and the safety of this country is to know that we are going to have the munitions when we need them. So around some of these vast munition plants where they are turning out shells by the millions it has been necessary to provide several months in advance perhaps for a possible influx of 15,000 or 20,000 additional workers.

Suppose that a great invasion of the continent of Europe should take place and we would have several million men on the continent in a very short time. You would have a tremendous increase in the number of shells and small arms that we would have to have. If the people who are planning the production for this war did not provide in advance the necessary facilities so that they could say to the man operating that plant, "Put on an additional 10,000 men," and if he was in a position where he would have to say, "I do not have the houses, and it will take 6 months to build them," we might lose this war as a result of just that sort of thing.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I, like the previous speaker, have had several years of experience on the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I think we have a very unusual committee. There has been very little friction. The nature of our work is such that it deals with public buildings and public facilities in locations scattered all over the United States, so it has never been approached as a political proposition and politics has not been injected into our consideration.

At this time I wish to pay my respects to the splendid chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who naturally has to take the brunt of the work of this committee in listening to the various suggestions made by Members of Congress and listening to the Army, the Navy, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Housing Agency on the question of housing needs.

We realize that in our present emergency we must do things that probably we would not do in our ordinary activities. However, we are at war and we must provide houses for men who are engaged in war industries. We have spent now about $1,200,000,000 on housing, and this bill calls for an authorization of $300,000,000 more. There is no question in my mind that the Federal Housing Authority needs more money. The President in his message to Congress recommended $400,000,000. Our committee held extensive hearings that lasted over 4 weeks and we came to the conclusion that there was needed and we voted to recommend to this House an increase of $300,000,000. Naturally, we hope the National Housing Agency will not have to use all this money. However, that will depend entirely on the Committee on Appropriations, when the representatives of the Housing Authority go before that committee to justify their needs as they have laid out their program.

I have visited a good many areas in this country where our war activities are centered, the shipyards, our naval activities, and many other activities in San Diego, and our activities in many other areas on the Pacific coast as far north as Seattle, Wash. We are all familiar with the tremendous expansion of war industries, airplane plants, shipbuilding yards, munitions dumps, and everything else that has to do with making munitions to fight this war. Naturally, into the Pacific coast area there has been a great influx of in-migrant workers. There was not the manpower there, consequently they had to be brought into that area. We have built thousands and thousands of housing units in that area.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman refers to his trip to the Pacific coast. It was my privilege to attend the hearings of the committee, and I want to thank the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], as well as the other members of the subcommittee, for inviting me to sit in on the hearings in San Francisco. I understand that as a result of your investigation of the Bay area you feel that there are some 6,000 of these units that should be allotted to the Bay area and 1,000, particularly, to

the Hunters Point district, which is my congressional district, the Hunters Point dry dock. I wish the gentleman would go into some detail as to the situation in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. We spent quite a little time in San Francisco. The gentleman is right. We made a trip to Hunters Point, where they are building new drydock facilities for the Navy. While there is a necessity for public housing, more of the dormitory type and temporary units, I think the greatest satisfaction we got out of our trip not only in San Francisco and in Los Angeles but in almost every other community on the coast was that we found that private capital could absorb most of the needs from now on. Of course, the buildings we have already programmed are not yet completed. In almost every area where we made our investigation we found that the public and private programs kept ahead of the manpower employed in the area.

Mr. ROLPH. You found that particularly true in the San Francisco Bay area, did you not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That is true. While there will be needed in the future in some localities on the Pacific Coast additional temporary housing and dormitories to take care of the influx of in-migrant workers, there also has been an extensive allotment of priorities to private builders, so that they can utilize vacant lots in the communities where they already have facilities such as sewers, sidewalks, water, and electricity, which will eliminate the use of strategic material. That is the picture we found.

We visited Burbank, where there was a public housing program. We had a hearing and a meeting in the city of Burbank. They said they did not want any more public housing, but they were in position right then and there to build 2,000 private homes.

We must realize that we are not going to scrap all of these large industrial plants that we have built to make munitions of war. They are still going to be utilized. There will be a certain amount of permanency after this war is all over which will add to the value of the communities. Certainly we want to build in these communities as many private homes as we possibly can, or build them by private contract, so that we will have a permanent investment, and not only have a housing unit that pays its proportionate share of the taxes of the community but also an American who is contented and satisfied because he is living in his own home.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say that as far as the permanent homes are concerned, Hunters Point is a definite improvement and will perhaps be the largest repair station in the entire country.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That is true, and with our two-ocean Navy there is no question but what you will need those facilities to make the necessary repairs, and so forth.

I just want to make one further observation relative to Detroit. We regret that we did not have an opportunity on our trip to stop off in Detroit, but as I recollect, there have been about 26,800 allocations made to private builders. That does not mean that that is going to be the limit.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Is that all the private builders could absorb—that 26,000?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. No; I do not think so. In a previous visit to Detroit I think I know somewhat of the sentiment of the real estate men and the private builders.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman understands me.

What I want is for the private builders to develop this program to the fullest extent themselves, and then if it is necessary for us to supplement it, all right. I would be willing to go that far, but I do not want the Government coming in and building any more Government projects for rental developments, when we have our own private builders who are able to do that job and are only waiting for the material. We are waiting for the material to get priorities to do the work.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In answer to the gentleman, let me say that for several months there has been a closer relationship established between the Federal Housing Authority and the private contractors of the country. They have a better understanding.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee, because they were largely responsible for bringing about that condition. I know that condition has been developed now. It is a good condition, and I want to thank you and your committee for doing that splendid work, because it is in the right direction.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. With regard to private housing, it is our understanding now that if there are a thousand houses to be built in a community an agreement has been between the Housing Authority and the private builders. They are all invited in before any action is taken, and the program is laid before them; they are then given an opportunity to take a part or all of that construction. It has taken some time, as the gentleman will appreciate, to bring about that harmonious relationship between the private builders and the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman is aware of the fact that several thousand homes are badly needed in the San Francisco Bay area, particularly in the Hunters Point district.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman that your colleague from San Francisco [Mr. ROLPH] has just brought out that fact, and if I recollect, there have been about 7,000 or more units authorized for that area. That is, to take care of the increase in migrant workers who will be employed at Hunters Point. Some of those units are being built now. We found that they were just keeping ahead of the employment at Hunters Point when we were out there on our inspection. I presume that the additional housing will be completed in time so that there will be places for these people to live who are going to work at Hunters Point.

I think that covers what the gentleman had in mind. We made a very comprehensive study of the situation not only at Hunters Point but in the whole San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. WELCH. I visited there within the past 30 days, and I know how badly those homes are needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position clear, because it may appear as if I were opposing this legislation. I am really not opposing this bill and I am not opposing this committee. I think the committee in itself is a splendid committee and has done a fine job and has tried to clear up a bad mess in this Government housing. I am definitely and unalterably opposed to any more of these Government housing projects—Federal Housing projects for rental. The people of the city of Detroit are not renters. They are home owners. They want to own a home of their own. They want to have a garden. They want a place for their children to play. They do not want to be cooped up in any of these rental projects.

We have had more trouble, we have had no end of grief ever since we have had these Government projects put into our city. We just do not want any more of these Government rental projects. They have been the cause of a lot of our worry, grief, and turmoil. They have caused no end of misunderstandings, jealousies and hatreds.

I understand that this bill calls for mobile houses, temporary houses, which are needed, and which can be moved from place to place wherever the necessity is visible for our war effort, and that all of these temporary houses will be removed when the war is over. I am going to vote for the bill, but I do say that I hope this Congress will take a firm position in the future and allow our private building industry to build our homes for our people. In Detroit we do not need all this Government help, because our builders were doing a splendid job. Our private builders under the F. H. A. program were supplying homes, but what happened was that Government housing agencies took the priorities away from our private builders under the F. H. A. program. Those critical materials were thrown over into Federal public housing agencies. So the private builders had to stand idly by and watch the Government housing being built by Government agencies. It was not a good thing. It is not a healthy thing. I, for one, am going to oppose it and I do not care who is going to be for it in my city. I do know that 95 percent of the people of my city are opposed to it. They want home ownership. They do not want rental projects. They want F. H. A. houses built by reputable builders according to high building

standards. They want homes that meet the needs of the housewife and her family of children. Nearly every worker in the city of Detroit has $400 or $500 for a down payment to purchase a home under the F. H. A.

Today they are actually being denied the right to purchase a home. They are denied the right to be home owners. They must be renters. Under present regulations a builder must build houses for rent, and not for sale. This may sound silly, but it is true. If you have $500 in your pocket and ask a builder to sell you a house he cannot do it. "I'm sorry, but they are built for rent, Government regulations," he says to the would-be purchaser.

I say that this is not a healthy condition.

Priorities on building materials should be first given to F. H. A. builders. All that they can use should be released to the private builders to continue their program under F. H. A., as originally planned. Then, if the private builders cannot fill the needs for homes for war workers, then, and only then, should national housing agencies step in. Only then should priorities be released to the national housing agencies. I charge that the national housing agencies actually and deliberately destroyed our F. H. A. building program in the city of Detroit and set us back 2 years in home construction. We did not need their meddling and interference, their heckling and grabbing off priorities on critical building materials. And to the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], I want to say that we definitely will not stand for it any longer. They have hurt us deeply and seriously and we do not want to see them around our city. And our city housing commission can get out with them. They have muddled and messed up our housing situation so badly that they have not a friend in town. I have spoken to Mr. LANHAM, the chairman, and I feel that he is in sympathy with my views. Evidently our Detroit situation is not an isolated case, and this national housing rental program under supervision of city housing commissions has fizzled out all over the country.

I repeat, we are a city of home owners, not renters. Our people want to purchase houses built under F. H. A. by private builders. Home ownership is the surest guaranty against fascism and communism and makes for loyal Americans at home.

The Clerk may read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500,000,000."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds unanimously voted to report three committee amendments necessary to carry out the purposes of the committee in assuring the temporary nature of this construction and its use, and by direction of the committee I offer those amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be read and considered together, in view of the fact that they relate to the same purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"'SEC. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception only of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities, finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and reexaminations shall be reported to the Congress.'"

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.'"

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: '*Provided further*, That the term "administrative expenses" as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities.'"

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the very able chairman of this committee before which this bill has been pending for the very efficient and competent way in which it was handled, and particularly commend and thank the committee for presenting these committee amendments.

Back in April, I introduced H. R. 2518 for the purpose of attempting to effectuate the express intention of the Congress directed to the demolition of these buildings, these temporary houses, after the emergency. The original Lanham Act contained a provision that it was the intention of Congress that defense housing be of a temporary nature and taken down after the war. I was somewhat fearful that absence of funds for their demolition might be used as an excuse for their continuance after the emergency, so introduced my bill providing that funds be set up for this purpose out of rents.

My bill, similar in provision to these amendments, was local in its scope. The committee amendment is Nation-wide in its scope. It provides the means for carrying out the expressed intention of the Congress as to demolition of temporary housing after the war. In my opinion, it is not only necessary but extremely wise.

Some of this temporary housing, as many of us know, is located in sections where it was not particularly wanted, but the communities accepted it in furtherance of the war effort. It is substandard, not in keeping with surrounding properties; and if, after the war, it is not taken down, it will become more substandard, detrimental to values of surrounding properties, and in many instances might, as was the case after the last war, become ghost cities or possibly be sold to bargain-hunting private investors and rented as substandard properties out of keeping with the surrounding homes or carried on permanently as a Government-owned housing proposition which is contrary to the intent of the Congress. We do not want to put the Government further in the permanent real-estate business. I am happy that my bill, local in its scope, has, by this amendment, been strengthened, enlarged, and made Nation-wide. Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you on your splendid work and thank you for your cooperation.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: On page 1, line 7, after the word "thereof", strike out "$1,500,000,000" and insert "$1,400,000,000."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely changes the authorization of the appropriation from $300,000,000 to $200,000,000. The bill for the $300,000,000 additional authorization was

not reported unanimously from the committee. There were some of us who did not feel that $300,000,000 was necessary at this time, but due to the fact that there was an urgent need to get through before the recess or adjournment the bill was voted out and allowed to go to the committee of the House for further consideration.

I have pointed out some instances of waste and extravagance, and it is those instances which have caused me to offer this amendment. I am sure that the Federal Housing Administration with private funds can take care of a lot of the housing that is being programed for construction by the funds authorized in this bill. I am sure that if they will build the houses which are much needed on the west coast and in other places and cease construction of houses in areas where they are definitely not needed that $200,000,000 will very adequately do the job. I want to recall to you again the figures I offered here earlier this afternoon: Eighteen percent of the 17,000 persons employed in the National Housing Agency are paid $3,800 a year or more—more than 18 percent—more than $12,000,000 a year. This to me is preposterous. The very idea that 18 percent of these people would be drawing down more money than do lieutenant colonels in the Army does not seem right to me. Then I pointed out a lot of projects in Indiana with which I am very familiar, some very near home, that were programed where there absolutely has never been need shown for them. Mr. Blandford, when he appeared before the Rules Committee in executive session, did not point out a single place where these houses were needed. In one case in Indiana they finished 288 houses in March and have rented only 242 to date. Yet they are going ahead with the construction of 2,700 more and at the same time are making plans to move those houses to some other area. They have 350 within 13 miles of my home that are definitely going to be standing there idle, with no use for them; no one will ever live in them.

No one has pointed out to me how these empty houses are going to expedite the winning of the war. Some one made the statement that the Army and the Navy had originally planned a program which would make these houses necessary. In most of the instances I have pointed out to you the Navy or Army program has not been changed one iota. In one instance it has been changed and may account for part of the vacancy that exists. I want to read a telegram from that area which came to me yesterday from a man wanting defense work because there is a serious unemployment situation at this time.

The request of the President was for housing for in-migrant war workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it becomes a question of whose judgment we should follow with reference to the amount in this bill. The message of the President, the recommendations of the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the various workers concerned and the representatives of private industry are for $400,000,000. The Senate has passed a bill for $400,000,000. The committee after very careful and deliberate consideration decided to report this bill for $300,000,000. Consequently we have already made a reduction of $100,000,000 in the amount that has been recommended by all of the agencies concerned with this housing.

I call your attention to the fact that this measure is simply an authorization and that in getting the appropriations to carry out these projects it is necessary for the administrative agencies to make out their case before the Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment the amount should not have been reduced to $300,000,000 as an authorization, and I think it clear we should not adopt this amendment, especially in view of the fact that the committee has made a reduction of 25 percent in the amount suggested. This amendment to reduce by 50 percent the amount recommended by all these authorities should not prevail.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I heartily agree with what the chairman of our committee has said. I was originally for reducing it to the figure which the gentleman from Indiana has suggested. We had that vote in the committee and we were defeated. We made a compromise cut to $300,000,000. It is the hope of every member of this committee, and I know the same is true of every Member of Congress, that this committee or the Federal Housing Authority does not have to use it, but this is an authorization and it will have to go before the Appropriations Committee and they will have to be shown how this money is going to be spent before they will grant it. They have the final say as to how much money this organization is going to get. They may not give them a nickel.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague; and may I make the statement that with reference to the Navy Department I hold here the confidential information given us place by place which shows that the Navy will require within this next fiscal year beginning tomorrow 175,000 units for the Navy alone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this authorization is approved does the gentleman expect that any of the money will actually be available before the end of 1943?

Mr. LANHAM. It is certainly hoped so, because the time when such building as is necessary can be done most economically would be during the summer and the late fall. That is one thing that gives urgency to the consideration of this measure at this time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will probably have to wait now for a conference report from the Senate on the deficiency bill, which is the bill in which the Kerr amendment was adopted.

The Senate has been offered two compromises on that amendment, one providing that these three men, Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, men whom we eliminated from the appropriation would continue on their jobs until October 1, at which time the President could submit their names to the Senate and the Senate could vote either to confirm or reject them. The second compromise provided that they could stay on until November 15.

The Senate has rejected both of these proposals, which is all right with me. I am glad it did. I do not think that the House would have been willing to accept those compromises and if the Senate now accepts either one of the compromises it is taking a very arbitrary position and one which they cannot maintain. The Senate has said that the House should not interfere with the executive department of the Government and if they accept one of these compromises they are taking the position that while we should not interfere they are willing to vote to confirm these men. It comes with poor grace from the Senate to say to us that we should not interfere with the executive department when they recently passed a bill providing that the Senate must confirm every employee of the Government who draws a salary of $4,500 or more.

If the conference report comes back with a compromise of that sort, so far as I am concerned we shall reject it. The report of the Kerr committee has been printed for every individual to study, so there is no reason for their position, and I intend to ask for a roll call vote on it. I hope that the House will accept no compromise and that we will vote to maintain the position that we have taken up until this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

CONDEMNS WALLACE-JONES SQUABBLE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this is no time for New Deal headliners to give public airing to their dirty linen, or to engage in free-for-all brawls charging each other with pre-war mistakes and failure to meet their official responsibilities in the conduct of the war. The attack unleashed by Vice President WALLACE against Commerce Secretary Jones remind us too much of what has taken place in certain countries of the Old World when officials began fighting each other. At this time, when millions of American men are giving their all to free the world from Axis domination, and the American people are making tremendous sacrifices for victory it seems to me that New Deal officials should assume leadership for national unity instead of trying to discredit each other. The many shameful inner New

Deal fights of the past 2 years give aid and comfort to our enemies, and are terrific admissions that New Deal policies have been failures.

There will be ample time for investigations when we have won the war. Personally, after unconditional surrender by our enemies, I will insist on thorough congressional investigation on such vital matters as:

First. Why did Vice President WALLACE, when serving as Secretary of Agriculture, discourage American experiments in the production of plants, shrubs, and trees, which produce quinine, castor, and other seeds for essential oils, flax fiber, hemp, jute, sisal, rubber, and hundreds of other products, which we were forced to import from the now conquered areas of the Far East? Was it because he wanted to support foreign-owned cartels dealing in the exclusive production and sale of these vital products?

Second. Why did Secretary Hull, as spokesman for the administration on foreign policy, when he was in possession of facts which plainly indicated that Germany, Japan, and Italy were arming for another world conquest, permit the sale of billions of dollars worth of war materials, like scrap iron, steel, aviation gasoline, airplanes, war machines, and machine tools, copper, and other critical metals to these countries from the resources of the United States?

Third. Why was Japan and Italy included as most-favored nations by the administration, thereby securing for them the benefit of the low tariff duties provided by the reciprocal trade law for their cheaply produced imports into the United States, which gave those countries an abundance of dollar credit with which to purchase war materials in this country?

Fourth. Why did Treasury Secretary Morgenthau purchase $700,000,000 worth of Japanese gold at the inflated price of $35 per ounce to be used by Japan for the purchase of war materials in the United States?

Fifth. What are the reasons for the failure of Admiral Kimmel and General Short to be on the alert the 10 days preceding the disaster at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941?

Sixth. Who are the planners for a new order for the people of the United States?

These and many other investigations of New Deal policies should take place after the war is won, and full responsibility placed where it belongs, but this is no time to stir in the mess and create disunity. The American people like a good political fight, but right now they are only interested in one fight, and that is the battle to defeat our foreign enemies and get the war over. The people will take care of those who seek to destroy our American form of government and system of free enterprise. Squabbling in Washington between New Deal chieftains should stop.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the subject matter that is before the House right now, namely, the authorization of an additional $300,000,000 for the war housing program. For the past several years the House has had before it bills relating to housing. Of course, when we first took up the matter of housing several years ago the programs were for slum-clearance low-cost housing projects. This House approved those projects for 3 or 4 years in succession; however, it was not long before the House decided that the administration and some of the principles in this low-cost slum-clearance program were not in conformity with American principles of democracy, so we refused to approve further slum-clearance low-cost housing projects.

One of the main reasons for the refusal of the Congress to approve further slum-clearance projects was that the local administration of the Housing Authority had various systems of charging rentals. When the Congress decided to approve war housing it specifically did so with the intent in mind that a system of rents be charged which would be known as economical rents insofar as possible. Everybody will admit, I believe, that war housing is absolutely necessary at the present time, and I would be the last one on the floor of this House to disapprove any program calling for war housing if absolutely necessary.

I find, however, that in many of the war housing projects the local housing administration is setting up a schedule of rents which is known as the graded rent schedule. This graded rent schedule calls for the payment of rent not based on the amount of space which the tenant occupies but based almost solely upon the amount of income which the tenant receives. For certain specified units containing exactly the same type of equipment and the same amount of space nine different amounts of rent can be charged under that schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is certainly not the intent of this Congress and it is certainly not the intent of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. If we are going to charge rental for these units according to the income of the tenants, then I say we are deviating from the principles of economy and the American principles upon which this Government was founded.

In the first place, if you charge rents to these various tenants according to the amount of income they receive weekly, you are putting a premium on laziness, incompetence, and absenteeism, and you are at the same time putting a penalty on energy, competence, and thrift. Therefore, in spite of the many words of praise that have been given to the administration of the National Housing Agency, in my opinion this is a matter that must be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a time of prosperity such as this is no time to foist upon the American people what I call a socialistic system of charging rent. If we are going to charge rent according to the income of an individual, why should we not carry the matter further? Why should we not charge for every commodity according to the income of the individual? We could charge for clothing according to the income of the individual, we could charge for food according to the income of the individual, and so on ad infinitum.

This is done because the Congress of the United States does not know it and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds does not know it.

I have had it said to me by officials of the Housing Agency that in a great majority of the projects under the war housing program in this country they are charging under a schedule of graded rents. In other words, if a tenant makes $600 a year, for a certain unit he is charged $13 a month, but if he makes $2,000 a year he is charged $40 for exactly the same unit, for exactly the same purpose, and although he has the same number of children.

If this Congress wants to go on record as approving such a system it certainly will have objection from me, and I think it will have objection from the people of the United States. It is a matter that in my opinion can be corrected, because under the act as originally passed and as intended by the Congress an economic rent should be charged. To foist upon the people of America a socialistic system of this kind and to fool this Congress is reprehensible to the highest degree.

The chairman of the committee told me that he was not aware that such a system was being put into effect, and I have his assurance that he will endeavor to see that the wishes of the Congress are carried out in all respects.

This matter was called to the attention of the Administrator early in February by me. If I had more time I could prove to you that this system is in effect, by showing you a circular explaining this proposition put out by certain of the local housing authorities. It reads:

> For this reason, the graded-rent system provides that rents shall be fixed by the family income within certain general brackets of income called rent grades, according to the size of the family.

The writer of this circular goes on and proves it because in his explanation he says it was based on the same principle as a slum-clearance program, which this Congress has turned down.

I hope the chairman of the committee will be able to give this Congress some assurance that this socialistic program will not continue insofar as this war housing program, at least, is concerned, during this period of prosperity.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman has said. He and I have discussed this matter. The committee will be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has just said that he would be glad to give it consideration. Is not the gentleman willing to say to the House that it certainly was not the intention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to permit a graded rent schedule to be put in force in these war housing projects?

Mr. LANHAM. As I said to the gentleman, I do not want to assume to speak for the entire committee. We are going to have a meeting next Tuesday with the administrative authorities. Personally, I have never seen any justification for charging a different rental for property of the same kind and value. I do not know what all the circumstances may be. I was ill, as the gentleman recalls, when the matter was discussed with the committee before. At the committee hearing we shall have with the authorities on Tuesday I shall be glad to take that matter up with the gentlemen and see if we cannot get that situation worked out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman and to the Committee that I had an amendment prepared which I intended to present this afternoon. In that amendment I think were words which would have cured what I think is a reprehensible practice on the part of those in charge of these war housing projects. However, I felt in view of my conversation with the chairman that that situation would be corrected. I believe that if I had had an opportunity to present my amendment it would have been adopted by this House. I hope the committee will see that corrections are made.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that there are one or two matters to which the committee wishes to give attention, and we intend to do that when we have this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON) there were—ayes 96, noes 97.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILSON and Mr. LANHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 97 and noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2975, pursuant to House Resolution 271, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were ayes 135 and noes 52.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1109) to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill, H. R. 2975, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,600,000,000."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: *"Provided further,* That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Numbered 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in an appropriation account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further,* That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2975, as amended, as follows:

"That section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out $1,200,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,500,000,000.'

"SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: *'Provided further,* That the term "administrative expenses" as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities.'

"SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided,* That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common-fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further,* That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.'

"SEC. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"'SEC. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception only of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities, finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly

demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and reexaminations shall be reported to the Congress.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to vacate the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 2975, was passed and lay the House bill on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The title was amended.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three particulars: First, at the conclusion of the remarks I made in the House on yesterday that I may attach a letter from the Department of Agriculture and certain tables; second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therewith a letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service, and from the Comptroller General of the United States; and, third, to include a daily prayer for victory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request is granted.

There was no objection

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CURLEY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short radio communication.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech that I made as well as a speech made by Mayor LaGuardia at the Consumers' Conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very fine tribute to the memory of Mrs. Meloney by Mrs. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] be permitted to include excerpts in the extension of his remarks made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Tacoma Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two or three short letters on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include several short telegrams concerning the Motion Picture Branch of the Office of War Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today and I ask unanimous consent in lieu thereof that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program and following other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RED ART PROPAGANDA

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I propose from time to time to bring to the attention of the Membership of this House the methods used by the Communists of the United States in making their ideology an influence if not control of various organizations.

Now that J. Stalin, dictator of Soviet Russia, has brought about the dissolution of the Comintern of the Third Internationale, everyone should be free to speak about communism in the United States without someone yelling saboteur, Nazi collaborator, or accused of undermining the war effort of the so-called United Nations. I merely bring this point out now, not that it affects me the least bit, because I have openly opposed the ideology of communism every day for the past 22 years, and propose to do so just as long as God permits me to live; but I mention it now because many people who are unutterably opposed to communism have been afraid to say anything, due to the "gestapo" and dictatorship tactics that certain elements in our country have used to smear people who believe in the principles of our republican form of Government.

Communists have successfully invaded from time to time the field of art. At the present time Artists for Victory, Inc., in cooperation with American Artists Group, Inc., are sponsoring a national competition in art on the subject, "Interpreting the Christmas Message for Our Own Times." Everyone who knows the first lesson in communism appreciates the fact that communism is atheism. Nevertheless do not be surprised to find Communists interested in a Christmas message, especially when it promotes any of the theories of the New Deal.

As Roger Baldwin, president of the American Civil Liberties Union, said many years ago, "We must get a lot of American flags and make the people believe we are the patriotic Americans," and likewise with Earl Browder's little leaflet, entitled "Who Are the Real Americans?"

The Communists have long realized and have repeatedly stressed the importance of art as a means of propaganda, and they are brazenly making use of it in this country. They are not operating on their own as Communists, but follow their usual procedure by boring from within worthy patriotic and legitimate art societies and organizations. Having all but dominated the art projects of the W. P. A., the Communists can be depended on to make every effort to usurp all the patriotic art endeavors of the various American art groups.

Artists for Victory was conceived and was in the process of organization by the Fine Arts Federation of New York City—before Pearl Harbor—as a patriotic aid to our national defense. At that time, it will be remembered, the Communists were using every effort, including art, in their party publications, to sabotage our national defense. With our entry into the war, Artists for Victory was given impetus under the sponsorship of its originator, the Fine Arts Federation of New York City. And since then the Communists by all the subtle subversive subterfuge at their command, have made efforts to steal "Artists for Victory" as their own.

Officers of the Fine Arts Federation of New York City charge that Henry Billings, representing himself as coming from Archibald MacLeish's office—then the O. F. F.—informed them that all artist societies and organizations (including the Communists) must share in the Artists for Victory movement before it would receive governmental blessing or financial support. That Henry Billings, of Archibald MacLeish's office, was particularly intent upon having the Com-

munists bore from within Artists for Victory, is evidenced by his past record for Communist leanings. Billings was on the organizing committee of the John Reed Club School as far back as 1930. He also belonged to the American Artist Group, Inc., according to the Daily Worker of September 9, 1940. The pro-Communist American Artists Group, Inc., with that high-sounding patriotic designation, is now using Artists for Victory, Inc., for setting up sectional and then national art competitions with awards of from $50 to $300. Artists for Victory, Inc., was set up on April 8, 1942, and sponsored by the United American Artists and the American Artists' Congress, according to the Daily Worker, official Communist organ, of April 10, 1942, page 7. It was addressed by Lynd Ward, president of the American Artists' Congress, which has been denounced as a Communist-controlled front organization by a number of liberal artists who were formerly members, among them being George Biddle, Dr. Meyer Shapiro, Ralph M. Pearson, Lewis Mumford, and William Zorach—Art Digest, May 1, 1940, page 3. The active leaders of the discredited American Artists' Congress are the spearhead of Artists for Victory, Inc.

Hobart Nichols, president of the National Academy of Design, is also on the jury, the pro-Communist group having succeeded in having this outstanding artist serve as the president of Artists for Victory, Inc. But as vice president, the wily Communists selected one of their kind in Hugo Gellert, an artist on the staff of the Daily Worker and other Communist publications. Gellert is one of the reddest of the Reds, and has long been a notorious participant in Communist activities. Gellert as vice president of the phony Artists for Victory, Inc., will encourage his communistic type of art. An example of Gellert's artful Communist art may be found in a booklet issued by the International Workers Order, printed in 16 languages and in full color. Gellert, who illustrated the booklet, goes the Communist limit in a graphic effort to stir up race hatred, but how this effort may be made to conform with any patriotic efforts of American Artists Group, Inc. of which he is vice president, is not made known by Communist Hugo Gellert. He has always been a prime mover on the Communist art front. He was active in forming the Artists Union, a Red group in the Communist front, which was so patently communistic, that Gellert and others dissolved it to form the United American Artists, affiliated with the C. I. O., which at the time seemed to have domination over the art commissions under W. P. A. The United American Artists flourished for a time, securing most of the art commissions dispensed by W. P. A. But with W. P. A. on its way out, the C. I. O. fired most of the membership of United American Artists for failure to pay dues. This twice-defunct group of Communists found some fellow travelers of the same tinge in the American Artists' Congress, which in turn was quietly disbanded when it was unmasked as a Communist front. And so from one organization to its successor, all bearing patriotic titles to disguise their real intentions, the heterogeneous Red groups have banded together under the American Artists Group, Inc., which now pretends to patriotic effort in furthering Communist propaganda, commercialism and politics through fostering Artists for Victory, Inc. This organization by infiltration and dubious methods is now frustrating the real American patriotic efforts of the Fine Arts Federation of New York City, the originators of Artists for Victory. While the Communists in this country may in good faith accede to the dissolution of the Comintern, and profess no more interest in the "world revolution," they are carrying on their subversive activities in our cultural, economic, and political institutions for the advancement of the cause of the Communist Party of America, and its complete domination of the United States.

On the jury of the national competition sponsored by the Artists for Victory, Inc., in cooperation with the American Artists Group, Inc., there are men like Hobart Nichols and Harry Wickey, eminent artists, whose integrity and patriotism are not subject to challenge. Nor can there be any question about the need of suitable propaganda in the field of art in support of the war. The jury includes also Rockwell Kent, whose past activities and opinions have been such as to make him unsuitable for this post.

Mr. Kent is listed as the president of the Artists League of America, which was formed out of the United American Artists and the American Artists' Congress, hereinbefore described, at a national conference held June 14, 1924, and described enthusiastically in the Daily Worker of June 15 and 17, 1942. The meeting was held at the Fraternal Clubhouse in New York City, headquarters of the International Workers Order, a Communist-controlled fraternal organization. Participating in the sessions were Samuel Sillen, writer for the New Masses; Paul Strand, of the League of American Writers; Art Young and William Gropper, both cartoonists for the Daily Worker, and Samuel Putnam, a Communist writer for the Daily Worker. Art Young was elected honorary president.

Rockwell Kent has clearly expressed his sympathy and support of the Communist Party and the movement for which it stands. His name appears as a member of a committee of professional groups for Browder and Ford, the Communist candidates for President and Vice President in 1936. In 1938, he supported the candidacy of Israel Amter, Communist candidate for Congressman at Large in New York. He was a member of the United May Day Provisional Committee organized by the Communist Party in New York City in 1939. In the New Masses of February 18, 1936, page 21, he openly declares that he regards as the only worth-while political cause of today—communism.

Kent, who was the keynote speaker of the artists' war conference of June 14, 1942, gives ample evidence in his book, This Is My Own, of his opposition to the war and to our Government during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. His attitude toward the war has changed since June 22, 1941, when Russia was invaded by Hitler. Permit me to cite some of the choicest passages from Mr. Kent's book:

> Meanwhile they scream for war. Legislators complaisant to the 10-year status quo of unemployment, active in opposition to the rights and aspirations of labor, zealous in their advocacy of the curtailment of civil liberties, traitorous and subversive to the principles of democracy in America, now call upon us in the holy name of democracy to fight for it abroad. On the foundation of Nation-wide unemployment, underprivilege, and discontent our Congress and administration pile a final, crushing weight of armament—to save democracy! To save? To bury it. Deeply and from my heart, in utter reverence I pray; God damn them all.
>
> In the fall of 1939 we warned ourselves, each other * * * we swore to God, each other, and ourselves to keep at peace. I'll keep my oath. Let others just keep theirs (pp. 392, 393).

While Kent was most outspoken in his condemnation of the United States and what it stands for, he was equally frank in his admiration for the Soviet Union and its policies, as indicated by the following excerpts from This Is My Own:

> And Russia and the non-aggression pact? "Good," I exclaimed. "They've served that perjured double-crossing Allied outfit right. * * * And when the Soviet armies grabbed off half of Poland, I, we, and everybody with a grain of common sense and human decency was glad. * * * And Finland? And Sweden? They're all right. Stalin, it seems, didn't want them. * * * I'm grasping for the truth in all experience—in Communists. They've been so often right (pp. 384, 385).

On page 291 of his book, Rockwell Kent speaks in highest praise of the following organizations cited as subversive by the Attorney General: League for Peace and Democracy, National Committee for People's Rights, International Labor Defense, the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, the League of American Writers. He admits his own membership in the following Communist-controlled organizations:

American Artists' Congress, vice chairman.

United Office and Professional Workers of America.

American Youth Congress.

Descendants of the American Revolution.

Committee for Fair Play to Puerto Rico.

International Labor Defense.

National Committee for People's Rights, chairman.

League of American Writers.

International Workers Order, vice president.

American League for Peace and Democracy, member national committee.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign.

In addition his record shows his association and support of the following communistic organizations:

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; signer of open letter against the Dies committee, Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pages 1 and 5.

Frontier Films; member, advisory board; letterhead.

Letter to the President defending the Communist Party and the New Masses; signer, member of initiating committee; New Masses, April 2, 1940, page 21.

Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy supported by the Communist Party; sponsor; New Masses, March 16, 1937, page 26.

Progressive Committee to Rebuild the American Labor Party—Communist-supported wing; member, executive committee, leaflet.

New Masses, Communist weekly; contributor, August 23, 1938, page 9; October 18, 1938, page 21; April 26, 1938, page 21; February 22, 1938, page 22.

Letter urging closer cooperation with the Soviet Union; signer; Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, page 25.

Open letter to American liberals defending the Moscow trials; signer; Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pages 14, 15.

Conference on Pan-American Democracy; sponsor; letterhead, November 16, 1938.

Soviet Russia Today; artist; November 1937, page 70.

In the light of the foregoing facts, disclosing a loyalty to communism and the Soviet Union paramount to his loyalty to the United States, Rockwell Kent has demonstrated his total unfitness to act as juror in any competition devoted to patriotic purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, until further notice, on account of illness in family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. ELMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of Senate of the following titles:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 1, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1869. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Cross to George F. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3072. A bill to amend section 3540 of the Revenue Act of 1941, entitled "Use of Motor Vehicle Tax"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3083. A bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to the giving of notice of threatened interruptions in war production, etc., and to political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938, so as to grant for an indefinite period the right to locate and patent mining claims within certain areas of the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 3085. A bill adjusting the compensation of civilian employees in the laundries of the Army Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3086. A bill to provide identification buttons for persons discharged from military or naval service on account of physical defects not due to personal misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3088. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3089. A bill to exempt from income tax certain individuals with gross incomes of $1,800 or less whose gross income has not increased by more than 20 percent over that for 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3090. A bill to provide for compulsory savings during present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until January 1, 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 277. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the operations and expenditures of the Board of Economic Warfare, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and any other affiliated or subsidiary corporations in the acquisition of critical materials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing appointment of a special committee to study prices, wages, and rents in order to curb inflation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 280. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the procurement of strategic and critical materials through the agencies of the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 281. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems, and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 282. Resolution authorizing investigation by the Committee on the Public

Lands of naval petroleum reserve No. 1 and adjacent public lands; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Dr. W. R. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita Tabor Hammack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3078. A bill for the relief of Pauline B. Werner, Loretta M. Coots, and Charles H. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3079. A bill granting a pension to Jessie Meryhew Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Howard Rasmussen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Robert Branch; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc., to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1782. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Lulu Bon Rice, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and signed by some 49 other residents of that community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1783. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 60 members of the parent-teacher organization of Tioga County, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry S. Mabie and 109 citizens of Bay Village, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1785. Also, petition of Mrs. John Martimer and 100 citizens of La Valle, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1786. Also, petition of Magdalene C. Eller and 72 citizens of Haxtun, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1787. Also, petition of Mrs. H. P. Ramsey and 40 citizens of Littleton, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1788. Also, petition of Mrs. Albert Stabler and seven citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1789. Also, petition of Hazel D. Beistel and 92 citizens of Ruffs Dale, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1790. Also, petition of Mrs. C. F. Truax and 71 citizens of Minot, N. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1791. Also, petition of 129 members of the New Mexico Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Sandoval, N. Mex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1792. Also, petition of Philip Swing and 39 citizens of Evansville, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1793. Also, petition of Frances Reed Rowe and 42 citizens of Genesee, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1794. Also, petition of Martha E. Mark and 20 citizens of Millersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1795. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Baram and 143 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1796. Also, petition of Rev. E. Stanley Watkins and 19 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1797. Also, petition of Annie E. Leslie and 44 citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1798. Also, petition of Mable Saunders and 113 citizens of Blue Earth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1799. Also, petition of Flora B. Kaight and 20 citizens of David City, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1800. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Kilgore and 19 citizens of Woodruff, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1801. Also, petition of Lillie Manney and 27 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1802. Also, petition of Grace Anderson and 20 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1803. Also, petition of Mrs. G. H. Wilkin and 28 citizens of Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1804. Also, petition of Pauline Parker and 40 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1805. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert T. Tummbleston and 1,347 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1806. Also, petition of Anna McHatton and 20 citizens of Akron, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1807. Also, petition of Mrs. W. L. Jenkins and 26 citizens of Fayetteville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1808. Also, petition of S. M. Dunnam, Jr., and 45 citizens of Lynn Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1809. Also, petition of H. W. Berneking and 41 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1810. Also, petition of Mrs. E. R. Small and 32 citizens of Princeton, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1811. Also, petition of Robert H. Ayers and 63 citizens of Andrews, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1812. Also, petition of Frances A. DeGraff and 230 citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1813. Also, petition of Alice G. Moncure and 20 citizens of Richmond, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1814. Also, petition of Mrs. Lionel Bertrand and 167 citizens of Welsh, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1815. Also, petition of Alice Porter and 58 citizens of Allegan, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1816. Also, petition of Ethel I. Swisher and Mary Savage and 75 citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1817. Also, petition of Joey Denton and 20 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1818. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Nelman and 58 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1819. Also, petition of V. E. Jennings and 20 citizens of Buckhannon, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1820. By Mr. CARTER: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State of California, urging the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army and endorsing House bill 997 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1821. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State of California, memorializing the Congress to pass the Lea-Welch bill suspending the exemption from tolls in favor of the United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1822. Also, petition protesting against the release of Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. Also, petition of Jennie Price, of Berkeley, Calif., and 40 citizens of Alameda County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1824. Also, petition of Olive B. Jones and 40 other residents of Richmond, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1825. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. George G. Foster, of Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 1192; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1826. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Yakima, Dayton, Garfield, Palouse, Selah, Cowiche, Moxee, and Walla Walla to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1827. By the SPEAKER: petition of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning consideration of House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of stillness, as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear like a distant song the call of the better angels of our nature. Forbid that the toil of life or the dust of common days should rob us of life's meaning, its dignity, and its beauty. Save us from the supreme folly of missing Thy glory by turning to grasp for the baubles of vanity with our foolish freedom, our fleeting pleasures, and our fatal self-indulgence.

We hear the low, sad music of humanity as in disrupted and invaded lands men mingle tears with hopeless tasks and days and nights are filled with terror and horror. Even as we brood on the pain and anguish of the world, by faith may we discern a rainbow of hope through the tears of the exploited and the disinherited. May there be redemption in the cross to which by selfish power humanity is nailed. Seeing we spend our days as a tale that is told, let us haste to speak the best that is within us, lest ere ever the day has worn to noon we hear the one clear call before our word is said and our deed is done. May we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1109) to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to

be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. PABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 88)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $100,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAR CONTROL AND REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITION

Mr. ANDREWS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bartow and vicinity, in the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Florida petition the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina.

Mrs. ANNA D. COBB,
Mrs. MAUD D. RATHBUN,
Mrs. JOHN G. PHILLIPS
(And sundry other citizens of the State of Florida).

RESOLUTION BY DIRECTORS OF GOOSE RIVER (N. DAK.) NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION—FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. LANGER presented a resolution adopted by directors of the Goose River National Farm Loan Association, of Mayville, N. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, has introduced a bill, House Resolution 50, to provide for improving the functioning of the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System; to relieve Federal land bank borrowers of stock liability; to organize the Federal land banks and the national farm-loan associations as membership corporations, and to provide for placing Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis and for increasing the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations; to establish a method for determining the interest rates on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to provide for refunding and guaranteeing certain bonds of such banks; to establish a method for adjusting certain agricultural indebtedness; to provide for limiting the taking of deficiency judgments by Federal land banks and by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and for other purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Directors of the Goose River National Farm Loan Association of Mayville, N. Dak., That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to act upon and pass the foregoing bill now pending in Congress as expeditiously as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Senator GERALD P. NYE, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Representative USHER L. BURDICK, Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, and the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, respectively.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—ATTITUDE OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the North Dakota Farmers Union, by Glenn J. Talbott, the State president.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *June 25, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate should insist upon the appropriation bill it passed for the Farm Security Administration. The Senate loan authorization for rehabilitation of small farmers and putting them into food production was itself too little in view of Bureau of Agricultural Economics data and testimony on production results obtained by small farmers and in view of Allied food requirements. The Allied Nations cannot afford to cast aside any food-production opportunities. Administrative funds must be related to loans outstanding and not to loans to be made or Treasury losses from inadequate servicing of old loans will many times exceed the sums denied for administration.

The House denial of loans to a farmer to permit him to become a member of a cooperative reverses Natonal Government's consistent policy of encouraging farmer cooperatives. Further, the cooperative provision as well as the restrictions on rehabilitation loans, is an attempt to deny farmers who most need credit the same consideration shown larger prosperous farmers through farm credit system, including land banks, production credit associations, and banks for cooperatives. The effort to cripple Farm Security Administration by restrictions or removal from proved and successful administrators is an effort to wipe out small farmers at a time when the Allied Nations desperately need fullest possible food production and should be crushed like a fifth-column plot. We are advised Food Administration will ask wheat farmers to increase acreage 30 percent or 16,000,000 acres next year. Action just concluded by House singles out and strikes at wheat farmers who produce the only basic crop now below parity. It denies him parity payments. It eliminates his crop insurance. It restricts the added hundred million triple A payment money to soil practice payments so he cannot get 23 cents per bushel from wheat to which parity entitles him. In view of tremendous increase in acreage needed next year, such mayhem on wheat farmers now is insane.

The Senate must not compromise.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
By GLENN J. TALBOTT.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. 413. A bill to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va.; with amendments (Rept. No. 373).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1156. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 374).

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. ELLENDER), from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Meador; with an amendment (Rept. No. 375).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 376); and

H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 377).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 275. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 378).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1286. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 379).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; with an amendment (Rept. No. 380).

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library I report favorably without amendment a small bill authorizing the disposition of certain papers by the Archivist. I ask unanimous consent that it may now be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H. R. 2943, to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1296. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1297, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1298. A bill to authorize the appointment of honorably discharged veterans of the armed forces to positions in the Government service without regard to the civil service laws: to the Committee on Civil Service.

CONNECTION OF INTER-AMERICAN AND ALASKAN HIGHWAYS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for a defense highway in the United States to serve as a link to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Alaskan Highway, and for other purposes I may say that when the Alaskan Highway was constructed I objected to the way it was being paid for. I objected to the United States Government furnishing all the money to build that highway, which was nearly 1,695 miles long. I object again to the promise made by our Government to Canada that for 2 years after the war we shall maintain this highway without a single dollar of cost to the Dominion of Canada. Inasmuch, however, as the Alaskan Highway has been built, and another highway, the Inter-American Highway, has also been built, I believe that at the earliest possible moment we should connect the two highways by the route proposed in the bill I am introducing.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1297) to provide for a defense highway in the United States to serve as a link in connecting the Inter-American Highway with the Alaskan Highway, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

FUND FOR ENTERTAINMENT OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 163), as follows:

Resolved, That the unexpended balance of the sum of $1,000 made available for expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Seventy-eighth Congress (accepting an invitation to have delegations from the Senate and the House of Representatives attend a meeting held under the auspices of the Dominion of Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association), is hereby made available for expenditure during the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress for the purpose of enabling the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate to defray the expenses of entertaining as its guests distinguished foreign visitors to the United States. The expenses incurred for such purpose shall be payable upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 164), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration was given authority to administer the Rural Electrification Act; and

Whereas rural electrification has been extended rapidly throughout the country for the benefit of farmers; and

Whereas the success of the rural electrification program has been influenced by a policy of encouraging farmers to become members of cooperative groups which, in turn, should be and must be encouraged to become free from political or Government controls as rapidly as possible; and

Whereas Congress, in approving of the Rural Electrification Act, set forth its policy of protecting the Rural Electrification Administration from political influences and political controls; and

Whereas it is now reported that the Department of Agriculture has declared that Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives' funds were taken to promote and finance insurance companies and that this use of such funds is open to serious question; and

Whereas it is now contended, and evidence at hand supports the belief, that groups have been organized and supported from Government funds to engage in activities intended to influence the Congress and other Government agencies and which activities are declared to be in violation of the letter and spirit of the Rural Electrification Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is authorized and instructed to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and for the purpose of determining whether political groups or organizations have been created to influence the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and if so, how they have been organized and how they have been financed, and what efforts they have made to influence the administration of the act, whether the administration of Rural Electrification Administration has not suffered since Rural Electrification Administration was made subject to the Department of Agriculture, and whether Rural Electrification Administration should not be restored to its original status as an independent agency responsible only to the Congress, and whatever other facts are helpful in determining a policy for Rural Electrification Administration which would carry out the original purposes of the Rural Electrification Act.

THE FOOD CRISIS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was pending before the Senate yesterday I withheld any observations on the subject because of the pressure of time. I reluctantly voted against the conference report, despite my own belief that the so-called roll-back and price subsidy program are unsound, because I cannot approve, in this emergency, the total prohibition of any anti-inflation experiment unless and until we can produce a sure-fire substitute. I favored and supported the committee recommendation which would have permitted the completion of existing experiments, while restricting their expansion unless and until they prove their worth. No man can be dogmatic in this dilemma and say "This is the way." We must proceed by trial and error. Thus far we have had too much error. But it seems to me that we must all lift our sights to the broader vision of the total responsibility which the total government confronts, in behalf of the whole American people. Therefore, I feel it my duty to make this frank statement to the Senate in connection with the desperate situation which the country confronts in respect particularly to the food crisis. I am doing this as a prelude to asking for the publication in the RECORD of excerpts from an editorial printed in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "A Baruch Committee for Food."

Mr. President, I am profoundly disturbed by the situation which we and the country—and let us never forget the country in this respect—confront as a result of the existing situation. There is a food crisis in America, and it will become increasingly ominous. It can ruin the war effort at home and abroad. Farm production is as basic as munitions production. Food, in this war, is as essential as bullets. Meanwhile, there is also a price and wage crisis in America, and it will increasingly threaten suicidal inflation unless adequately managed.

Why we have been allowed to drift into this hazardous mess by the administration's management of our national economy is a matter of opinion and mostly a post mortem matter. In my own view it is a result, first, of a wrong basis of approach in the original price-control bill, and the failure effectively to gear prices and wages together; the result, second, of confusion and inepitude and timidity and mismanagement of the system chosen to be pursued; and third,

a total lack of concentrated executive and administrative leadership, with adequate power to deal with the total over-all food problem.

But whatever the reasons, here we are, and the present question is where do we go from here and where does the country go from here.

It seems to me that we find ourselves, speaking of the Government as a whole, in a wholly untenable situation. On the one hand the administration intrenches along one line of battle and clings incorrigibly to a position which the overwhelming sentiment of Congress, and I believe of the country, rejects. Congress, on the other hand, intrenches along another line of battle—a far better line, in my view, I may say—and clings relentlessly to a different pattern which the President and his top-flight "kitchen cabinet" reject. Meanwhile, Mr. Chester Davis, who is probably the most competent War Food Administrator available throughout America for this over-all responsibility, resigns, and is even denied a Presidential interview in this connection, because he substantially differs with the President's administrative pattern and declines longer to carry a responsibility without sufficient power to achieve a synchronized result.

Mr. President, in spite of my complete sympathy with the congressional viewpoint, it seems to me this leaves the Government as a whole, including Congress, in a position of sheer chaos at a moment when chaos must be cleared away before it is too late. Where does it leave the food problem, with Capitol Hill entrenched at one end of an argument and the White House entrenched at the other? Where does it leave the American people? Where does it leave the dire need for increased farm production? Where does it leave the ultimate consumer? Where does it leave the battle against inflation? Where does it leave the Army and the Navy? Where does it leave the united war effort? They are left at the mercy of an unliquidated quarrel within the Government itself.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that some effort must be made somewhere, somehow, to find a clearing house which can create and produce a unified, practical program which can have the reasonable fidelity of both Capitol Hill and the White House, so that we can have action instead of argument. I can see nothing but disaster ahead if we are to continue to be clinched in an impasse. An impassé at home can be just as fatal as an impassé at the battle front.

I do not know the answer, but when the New York Herald Tribune, with whose editorials I occasionally agree, draws a parallel between our previous rubber chaos and the present food chaos, I think the analogy has validity, and when it suggests that a Baruch committee was able to clarify the rubber situation satisfactorily and that this might be a pattern for clarifying the food situation, I am impressed with the importance of exploring such possibilities.

I suppose this situation is primarily in the hands of the President. If there were appointed an adequate Baruch committee—if that can be used as a generic term, without referring in this instance to Mr. Baruch himself—if there were the equivalent of a Baruch committee, composed of men who know, composed of leadership in which the American people have confidence, composed of men who could present a united recommendation to all of us in respect to the composition of our differences and to the course to be pursued, I have a feeling that if something of this sort could be done, it would not only be a benediction but it might well avoid an ultimate crisis, which we simply encourage and fertilize by persistent difference in opinion respecting the proper approach as between Congress on the one hand and the administration on the other.

Therefore, with this preliminary comment, I am asking that excerpts from the New York Herald Tribune editorial entitled "A Baruch Committee for Food" shall be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BARUCH COMMITTEE FOR FOOD

America's new $700,000,000 rubber industry by the end of this year will be capable of meeting all essential civilian, as well as military, requirements. Manufacturing capacity of the 40 plants throughout the country by December will be in excess of 800,000 tons a year, which is more than the Nation ever consumed before.

These figures are amazing enough standing alone, but they become even more amazing when one recalls that up to a few months ago the country was virtually without a wartime rubber program. We might have been floundering about today had not the President had the good sense to appoint Bernard M. Baruch as head of a committee to consider the various competing rubber production plans, strip the complex controversy of partisan politics and decide upon a definite and consistent course of action.

There is a striking parallel between the chaos which prevailed with respect to rubber at the time the Baruch committee was set up and that which prevails today with respect to food. So contradictory are many of the steps that have been taken to date, so deep is the cleavage regarding the economics of the problem among even the best informed leaders of opinion, and so thoroughly enmeshed in politics has the whole issue become that complete break-down is threatened, if, indeed, it is not already upon us. It is fair to ask whether the time has not come to set up a new Baruch committee to determine which of the several roads advocated should be taken and how our policies in the fields of production, distribution, and consumption can be brought into harmony with that objective.

* * * * *

These are merely typical examples of the cleavages of opinion that prevail on the very fundamentals of wartime food policy. They could be multiplied several times over. Moreover, they represent merely the honest differences among those whose opinions on the question are entitled to respect. They take no account of the politics in which the problem has become so deeply mired, such as the feud between the farmer and organized labor and the President's thoroughly opportunistic approach to the issue.

The time has come when there must be an end to this pulling and hauling, this jerry-building of food policy. And the best way a new start can be made, in the view of this newspaper, is through the same approach as that taken on the rubber problem. The crying need of the moment is for an intelligent study of the whole problem by a group of disinterested experts who can decide, if not just how we are to get there, at least where we want to go.

EFFECTS OF DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Effects of Disposal of Surplus Property," delivered by Senator TYDINGS before the National Chamber of Commerce War Council and thirty-first annual meeting, New York City, April 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Realism," delivered by him on June 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ATTACK ON RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY at an open-air meeting on the courthouse plaza, Baltimore, Md., on June 22, 1943, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the attack by Hitler on Russia, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE REPUBLICAN WOMEN OF APPLETON, WIS.

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WILEY before a breakfast meeting of Republican women, at the Hotel Conway, Appleton, Wis., on June 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SENATOR LOOKS AT CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Senator Looks at Congress," written by Senator LA FOLLETTE, and published in the Atlantic Monthly for July, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. EUGENE REYBOLD BEFORE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on June 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE O. P. A.—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST DISPATCH

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In Fairness to OPA," printed in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS SUPPORT POST-WAR SOCIAL SECURITY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD polls from various sources endorsing an expanded social-security program for post-war America, which appear in the Appendix.]

WE MUST FACE THE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY MAX EASTMAN

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Max Eastman, entitled "To Collaborate Successfully We Must Face the Facts About Russia," published in the July 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA—ANSWER TO ARTICLE BY MAX EASTMAN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Answering Max Eastman," published in PM of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES ARE INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidies Are Inflation," from the Washington News of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUSTICE TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—EDITORIAL IN THE BOSTON GLOBE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Admitted Injustice," published in the Boston Globe of May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM ZYGMUNT ZYGIELBOJM TO PREMIER SIKORSKI OF POLAND

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Zygmunt Zygielbojm to Premier Sikorski, of Poland, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR APPALLING MANPOWER WASTE—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Appalling Manpower Waste," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FRESH BEEF SITUATION—ARTICLE FROM THE BILLINGS (MONT.) GAZETTE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from B. L. Surface, of 322 Park Street, Bismarck, N. Dak., enclosing an article from the Billings (Mont.) Gazette entitled "Says Fresh Beef Rots on Tracks," which appears in the Appendix.]

LAWYERS IN THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter by Thomas I. Emerson, associate general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, printed in the New York Times of June 30, 1943, and his reply thereto, printed in the New York Times of July 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE JOB COLOR LINE IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles from the Socialist Monthly Bulletin of the Washington Local of the Socialist Party, which appear in the Appendix.]

DANGERS IN ANTI-INFLATION DRIVE—ARTICLE BY LEWIS HANEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Haney Cites Dangers in Anti-Inflation Drive," written by Lewis Haney and published in the New York Journal-American of June 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLONEL RICKENBACKER—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Sherrill Hillman, entitled "Rickenbacker Nets $260,000 in Stock Deal," published in PM of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 30, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is nothing in the form of unfinished business before the Senate. I understood that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill was ready, and that the Senator from Georgia desired to have it considered. It will probably take a little time to dispose of it, in view of the motion the Senator contemplates making. I do not like to have the Senate recess for an indefinite period. I understand there will be several speeches on the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the majority and minority leaders prefer, we might proceed with the conference report. It would be a little more convenient to have it taken up later in the day, but I can submit the report at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe we had better start in on the report, and perhaps we can accommodate ourselves to the Senator from Georgia, who had made arrangements to do something else.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 92.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated December 3, 1942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 98 and 99.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask the Senator whether we should not have a quorum. No quorum has been called this morning, and I think Senators should be put on notice what is to be taken up.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Smith
Bridges	Langer	Stewart
Brooks	Lodge	Taft
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	McNary	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the partial conference report which has been submitted deals with the language of the agricultural appropriation bill which provides for the manner of payment of appropriations for soil-conservation and domestic-allotment purposes.

The first amendment amounts to a recession on the part of the House, and permits the payments on the 1943 crop to be made in accordance with the provisions of the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture as of December 3. In other words, under the bill as it now stands, with the conference report, the Congress and the Government will keep faith with all farmers on the commitments which were made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The other amendment which was agreed to in conference represents the settlement of a disagreement between the House and the Senate as to the method of allocating the funds for the next crop year, for 1944 crops. The House provision allowed $300,000,000, and confined it strictly to soil-conservation and water-conservation payments. The Senate likewise limited it to $300,000,000, but left it in the discretion of the Department of Agriculture as to how the funds were to be applied.

The Senate receded on its amendments, and under the provisions of the conference report $300,000,000 will be paid next year on a program solely related to soil conservation and water conservation.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, does the conference report contain the crop-insurance item?

Mr. RUSSELL. The crop-insurance matter is in disagreement, and I shall make a motion affecting that matter when the pending motion is disposed of.

Mr. NYE. I shall not address myself to the crop-insurance item until the pending motion is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 30, 1943.

Resolved, That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are still in disagreement between the two bodies amendments Nos. 98 and 99, which relate to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I have felt very strongly that Federal crop insurance has not had a fair trial. The provisions of the House amendment permit compliance with the contracts of insurance for the year 1943, but prevent entering into any new contracts of crop insurance. The Senate conferees and the conferees on the part of the other body have devoted a great deal of time to discussion of this matter. There has apparently been no time when there was any possibility of the conferees agreeing. The Senate conferees have, therefore, insisted that the matter be taken back to the House for votes on three separate occasions. An effort was made when the bill was before the House in the first instance to restore the appropriation for the Federal Crop Insurance Act for the next year. It was defeated when the bill was originally before the House.

In the other body there have been 3 separate votes at the insistence of the conferees on the part of the Senate. On the first record the vote in the affirmative was 160 and the vote in the negative was 208. When the matter was carried back for a second vote those in the other body who were supporting the position of the Senate to continue the program of crop insurance were unable to secure a record vote in the House, because only 31 Members of the House supported the demand for a record vote. Therefore, the amendment was voted down by a standing vote of approximately 80 to 152. I do not have the exact figures.

We then went back into conference on the matter. The Senate conferees suggested every possible compromise which could be conceived of. The House conferees were adamant in their position that they would not allow any funds whatever to be voted for the purpose of carrying on the program after the end of the current fiscal year. Some statements were made that if no losses were entailed on this year's program it might be possible to get a deficiency appropriation, but no definite agreement was had to that effect.

Yesterday the matter was again voted on in the House. The vote was 135 in favor of the Senate amendments and 223 against them. It was very evident that the measure, instead of gaining in strength in the other body, has been losing ground on each of the four successive votes which have been taken. If there were any possibility on earth, Mr. President, of sustaining the Senate's position I should make a motion that the Senate insist on its amendments so that the conferees would carry the matter back to conference; but I am convinced, from the hours we have labored on the subject, that the House is not at all likely to recede or to accept any reasonable compromise. In the conviction that it is impossible to gain anything by further considering the matter, and realizing the importance of having passed a bill to enable the Department of Agriculture to function, I move that the Senate recede from its insistence on its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to ask the Senator a question relative to procedure. The Senate just agreed to the conference report; did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Were not the crop-insurance amendments a part of the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. The crop-insurance amendments have never been in any of the reports, because the conferees have never been able to agree on them. We have adopted three partial reports on the bill, but none of them have included the crop-insurance amendments; because the conferees have not been able to agree on them. The amendments on crop insurance are now before the Senate as a separate proposition, for the Senate to deal with as it sees fit.

Mr. LANGER. Is not that unusual?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; there is nothing unusual about it. The Senate had a record vote on the proposition the other day. The matter was not contained in the conference report. The House conferees had insisted that the Senate take a record vote, and they were not willing to take the matter back to the House until the Senate had a record vote.

Mr. LANGER. I understood we had a record vote; but I thought the matter was contained in the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is carried in the conference report, but as a matter still in disagreement. The House and Senate still are in disagreement regarding it.

The Senator will understand that in conferences on multitudinous items of a bill, oftentimes there will be three or four or five reports, and the conferees will agree on all the propositions on which they can agree, and include them in the report; but those on which they cannot agree are reported separately to the respective Houses.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I voted against the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendments pertaining to crop insurance are not in the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that, but I want the RECORD to show I voted against the conference report because the crop-insurance matter is not included in it. That is one of the reasons why I voted against the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well. Of course, the Senator has that right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator what has been done to the F. S. A.?

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriations for the F. S. A. were made in full amount for the farm-tenant-purchase program. The amount for loans and grants for rural rehabilitation was reduced from $97,500,000 to $60,000,000. The appropriation for the administrative fund was reduced from the Senate figure of $29,000,000 to $20,000,000. All that has been

agreed to in a previous conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Have any functions of the agency been transferred to any other agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all; all are kept together as an entity.

Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate recede from its position on the amendments.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1109) to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500,000,000."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"SEC. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception only of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and reexaminations shall be reported to the Congress."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. RUSSELL's motion that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the last thing I desire is to take a position resembling a departure from support of the very able chairman of the Senate conferees and the subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee, with whom I have labored through long hours of hearings and, it would seem, almost longer hours of conference in an endeavor to iron out the differences existing between the Senate and the House with respect to the pending appropriation bill. That chairman, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is deserving of every bit of confidence the Senate has expressed and bestowed upon him; and to depart from agreement with his views on the pending motion is not a pleasure on my part.

But with his motion to have the Senate recede from its position in support of continuation of Federal crop insurance I must disagree, even to the extent of urging that his motion be defeated and the issue returned once again to conference.

It is true that the House has thus far proven relentless in its determination to kick crop insurance overboard. It has voted about 2 to 1 to sustain the position of its conferees. But the Senate has voted 5 or 6 to 1 to sustain our own conferees in support of crop insurance. Surely that entitles the Senate to further consideration at the hands of the House.

Moreover, in order to win enactment of this annual appropriation bill, the Senate and its conferees have receded from their position on a number of most vital issues. So wide were the differences between the House and Senate on this bill that there had to be broadness in accomplishing compromises. Surely the House cannot successfully maintain that the Senate has not been most liberal in its effort to iron out the differences and accomplish enactment of this necessary legislation.

On the question of farm security the Senate went far in the way of surrender in order to accomplish continued life for this agency which means so much to so many. It was not easy for me, as a member of the conference, to surrender on the items of money to be made available to F. S. A. But surrender we did, to the end that F. S. A. would not be abandoned completely in this grave hour.

I have never before experienced quite as much difficulty as that which I experienced when, in order to save other advantages for the farmer, I joined our other conference members in abandoning the Senate position in support of authorizing parity payments next year on crops that might not have attained parity prices in the market. But I surrendered in that instance—and I think other conferees entertained like notions—only because I felt convinced that before another winter came there would be readiness in the House of Representatives to see how all-important it would be to afford such authorization if food production was to be attained.

I leave the subject of crop insurance long enough to recite facts that make continuation of parity money seem inevitable.

Wheat is the only commodity which has not attained a parity price. Wheat prices are still about 20 cents a bushel under parity.

The only support left for the wheat farmer since the parity payments are outlawed by the action of Congress on the agricultural appropriation bill is the 85-percent loan availability. This loan at 85 percent of parity is just about the market price for wheat today. The chance of the wheat farmer receiving a parity price is nil, especially with the ceiling prices prevailing on flour and bread.

The miller and the baker, in order to come out even on their transactions, cannot afford to pay more than 85 percent of the parity price for wheat. So, between the Government and its ceiling-price program and the miller and baker purchases of wheat and flour, there is not left the ghost of a chance for the wheat farmer to get a parity price since the parity payments for next year are thus far denied.

Yet, the Government is asking the farmer to give the country and the world an increase of about 30 percent in wheat production next year.

Who is foolish enough to believe that the farmer is going to produce more wheat when he can get only 85 percent of parity as a price for it instead of turning his acres to crops that are commanding better prices?

If the Government is going to continue to try to hold the line with its price-ceiling program the Government must provide the way to win fair prices for the production of wheat. The obvious answer seems to be in restoration of the availability of parity money for the 1944 crop. How can Congress long ignore this obvious fact? I am glad to note that the grain interests of the country, including especially the Federal Association of Grain Cooperatives, are to launch a campaign directing attention to the serious threat which the present situation is offering.

It is not surprising that the wheat farmer is distressed by what we are leaving in prospect for him. This demand for wheat at prices under parity is just one more headache to add to those created by machinery shortages and labor shortages along with the regular headaches with which the farmer has to contend. One of these days the American farmer is going to demand to know what are the plans of the administration for American agriculture in the years to come. Are we getting ready to ditch the American farmer so that we can be the market for the farmers of the world? On March 14, 1940, I said before the New York Board of Trade.

If the time has come when American agriculture is to be abandoned as a basic, if not the basic, American industry, with the world an outlet for our manufactured production in exchange for the world's agricultural production, let there be no deception about it. Give warning to the farmers that this is the goal, and thus give them a chance to adjust themselves to that which will follow.

That was in 1940, when there seemed to be some little indication that the American farmer was about to be sold down the river to the end that America should become a great market for the world in manufactured products, to be traded for the agricultural production of the rest of the world. Only this spring George D. Riley, writing in the Washington Times-Herald and quoting F. F. Elliott, Chief Agricultural Economist of the Department of Agriculture, said, among other things:

The outline—

Speaking of the outline and the plan of Mr. Elliott and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—

fits in snugly with recurrent reports that the planners have in mind creation of a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America supplying the food.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Riley be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1943]

CAPITAL COMPASS

(By George D. Riley and Page Huidekoper)

We used to chuckle a bit over the one about the hayseed moron who moved to the city because he heard the country was at war, but since we've learned about plans being drawn up in the Department of Agriculture we're not sure about that moron story being funny.

It seems the Bureau of Agricultural Economics wants to make 20 percent of the rural population of the United States move to cities after the war, whether the ruralites like it or not.

F. F. Elliott, chief agricultural economist of the Department, says the plan to cut postwar rural population to 80 percent of its present level is in line with the projected revamping of American economy and possibly that of the entire world.

The outline fits in snugly with recurrent reports that the planners have in mind creation of a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America supplying the food.

FARM CONTROL PLAN

Elliott tentatively suggests that farm production be maintained "at such levels and in such patterns as to permit adequate diets adapted to the economic resources and food habits of the different income groups."

The blue print he is drawing up would include an organized market system, controlled presumably by the Government, with fixed prices for the farmer, the marketman, and the consumer.

Elliott says the plan is in line with objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter, especially the third of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want.

Maybe the rubes will be able to stay in the country after the war if they want, though, because Elliott did admit "it may be that the goals actually realized will fall somewhat short of the ideals we have discussed."

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it is high time to be giving incentives to the farmers, not the time to be removing those incentives and protections, such as crop insurance. This week the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] introduced a bill calling for an appropriation of $15,000,000 to be used for the relief of farmers in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma who recently lost their homes, crops, and livestock in the disastrous May floods; and yet there are those who have condemned and are seeking to abolish the Federal crop-insurance program, saying that it is impracticable because its books show a capital loss of about $20,000,000 after 4 years of operation—4 years of operation during which it has brought insurance benefits to farmers whose crops were destroyed by natural causes over which they had no more control than the unfortunate farmers had over the recent May floods.

Every Member of the Senate is aware of the devastation which followed the May floods in those States. Senators will also, no doubt, be interested in knowing just what part the Federal crop-insurance program has played in these flood areas this year. In 183 counties there were 61,314 wheat and cotton farmers whose crops were insured. Of those insured producers, it is estimated that 20,364 lost all or a major part of their growing crops on 340,390 acres. This is a major loss for these producers, and it is a major loss for the Corporation; but that is exactly why the Congress provided our farmers with this form of crop protection, for which they pay a reasonable premium, just as they pay their fire- or life-insurance premiums. The insured farmer in the flooded areas did not lose his crop income.

This flood loss is recent—and its devastation dramatic. But somewhere in the United States every year that the Federal crop-insurance program has been in operation, thousands of farmers have suffered crop losses just as costly—and they will continue to do so as long as they must follow the hazardous occupation of farming. Certainly, now, when this Nation needs food as never before, is no time to remove this protection for the American farmers.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

The losses in these flood areas are great—but each year during its operations on wheat alone, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has provided far greater protection and exposed itself to the possibility of far greater loss than that provided in this flood relief measure.

During the past 4 years—1939 through 1942—the Corporation insured the production of 363,446,000 bushels of wheat on a total of 1,296,200 farms, in round numbers. For this protection, insured farmers paid premiums totaling 41,879,000 bushels. During that period crop losses were sustained by 407,636 farmers, who were paid indemnities totaling 62,453,000 bushels. In providing this protection to wheat farmers the Corporation sustained a net loss of 20,574,000 bushels, involving $17,994,111.

Cotton crops were insured for the first time in 1942, when 176,000 farmers paid premiums amounting to 63,000 bales; and as of May 31, 1943, 46,800 of these farmers collected 103,000 bales of indemnities for crop losses. Among the heaviest of these losses were crop failures resulting from floods and hail.

PARTICIPATION OF FARMERS IS INCREASING

The number of farms insured under the wheat program has shown a steady increase each year:

In 1939 there were 165,775 farms insured; in 1940 there were 379,710 farms insured; in 1941 there were 420,939 farms insured; in 1942 there were 503,266 farms insured; in 1943 there were 512,000 farms insured.

It is to be noted that the farms insured in 1943 are for the first time insured for a 3-year period.

In the first year of wheat insurance approximately 10 percent to 11 percent of the farms were insured. This was about the same percentage for cotton in its first year with approximately 176,000 farms.

FARMERS NOW TAKING CROP INSURANCE FOR THE "LONG PULL"

Farmers are accepting crop insurance as a desirable business practice instead of merely as an occasional "flyer" to gamble against a bad year.

In the summer of 1942 the Corporation announced that all wheat contracts beginning on the 1943 crop would be for a period of 3 years. The fact that approximately half a million wheat farms are now covered by this new longer term contract for 1943–44–45 is clear evidence that farmers are taking crop insurance for the "long pull."

FARMERS HAVE AN INVESTMENT IN CROP INSURANCE

Many farmers have carried their crop insurance through good years knowing that they could "come out on it" only in the long run, but that in the long run they would need it. Some of them have invested thousands of bushels of wheat with the Corporation on this basis. In some instances the total of these premium payments exceeds the amount the individual farmer would receive if he had a complete loss at the present time.

These farmers have continued their premium payments because they knew that the resources of the Federal Government were great enough to protect

their investment in crop insurance during the first trial period. They did so because they believed that the Congress was determined to provide a sufficient time in which to place Federal crop insurance on a sound permanent basis or to prove definitely that it was impracticable. It is recognized that the former position has not been reached. I am sure that the farmers would not agree that the latter has been proved. Under such circumstances, it probably would be much more difficult in the future to gain their confidence in the stability and intention of other Government programs in which they are asked to participate on the basis of immediate contributions for future, long-time benefits.

GOVERNMENT HAS AN INVESTMENT IN CROP INSURANCE

The Government has invested a substantial sum of money in a pioneering, American endeavor to provide American farmers with security against crop failure. Considerable stress has been laid upon the matter of costs by saying that it has cost the Government $23,000,000—administrative expenses—to give wheat and cotton farmers about $20,000,000—operating losses, in benefits. This is not the real picture.

The true picture of these operations is that it has cost the Federal Government about $23,000,000 to provide approximately $55,000,000 of benefits to farmers who have suffered crop losses. Of this $55,000,000 in benefits, the farmers themselves have contributed about $35,000,000 in premiums.

Nor does that even complete the picture. One little appreciates the responsibilities under the law which the Crop Insurance Corporation has had to assume. It likely will interest the Congress to know that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation actually carries over 3,000,000 records on its books. That is to say, it has had to go to an enormous expense in setting up premium rates and the average yields per acre on every wheat and cotton farm. The law so charged the Corporation. There are, as nearly as can be ascertained, 1,556,000 cotton allotment farms in 19 States, and about 1,500,000 wheat allotment farms in 36 States. The premium rates and average yields for every one of those farms have been established, and are now available to tenant or landowner with an interest in a cotton or wheat crop. He can call at the county A. A. A. office in his county and sign an insurance application and premium note within 5 minutes, provided he applies before he plants his crop and within the time limit set by the Corporation.

During the 4 years of operations, this rate and yield information has been constantly improved upon. This insurance information is a very real asset to be counted against the investment which the Government has made in this program—but this asset can be capitalized upon only by continued operation of the program.

In many instances the Crop Insurance Corporation has increased the rates to prevail for this insurance. In some sections they have been increased as much as 15 percent. It is fair to assume that in another 2 or 3 years there will have been accomplished an adjustment which will allow crop insurance to carry itself.

EXPERIENCE IS BEGINNING TO PAY DIVIDENDS

The investment in Federal crop insurance is just now at a point where it is paying dividends in the experience of administration. To abandon the program now is to abandon this effort at the very time when it is possible to base operations upon experience rather than theory, as was necessary in the first years of the program.

For example: First, there is the showing of operating cost reduction: The cost of handling each wheat-insurance unit has been cut 56 percent since the first year beginning in 1939. Furthermore, it cost only 63 percent as much to handle each cotton-insurance unit in 1942, the first year of cotton insurance, as it did to handle each wheat-insurance unit in 1939, the first year of wheat insurance.

Second, operating losses have been reduced: The excess of indemnities over premiums for wheat insurance has been reduced from 66 percent in 1940 to 49 percent in 1941, and to a low of 20 percent in 1942.

Third, there has been a vast improvement in contract provisions. Many changes and improvements have been made in the provisions of the contract. One of the most important is the adoption of a 3-year term contract for wheat. The Crop Insurance Act prohibited the making of contracts for a period longer than 1 year during the first 3 years of operation. This not only increased the administrative expenses, but also increased the loss experience of the Corporation. Under the 1-year contract, the farmer had an opportunity to come into the program for a year when crop conditions appeared unfavorable and stay out when the prospects just ahead of seeding time appeared good. In other words, to some extent farmers were given a chance to outguess the Corporation, and some of them did so. Since the beginning of 1943 the Corporation has been operating under a 3-year contract, the maximum benefits of which will not be realized until the 1944 crop year. Other improvements have been made in contract requirements and adjustment procedures as a result of operating experience.

Mr. President, once we have perfected a thoroughly safe and businesslike method of insuring growing crops of wheat and cotton, the Congress can then extend Federal crop insurance to other crops, if it so desires. Let me emphasize that the Corporation cannot include other crops. Only by amending the Federal Crop Insurance Act can the Congress extend this form of protection to the producers of other crops.

OPERATIONS COMPARE FAVORABLY WITH COMMERCIAL COMPANIES

It is not possible to measure farms, establish rates, prepare accurate yield information, collect premiums, and distribute benefits without incurring expense. Compared with the operations of private insurance companies, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been administered very economically. The total income of the Corporation during the first 4 years has been about $43,000,000 furnished by the Government and about $35,000,000 in premiums by farmers, a total of about $78,000,000. Fifty-five million dollars of this has gone for benefits distributed back to farmers, leaving a balance of about $23,000,000, which represents administrative expense.

This means that the expense ratio of the Corporation has been approximately 30 percent, as compared with a combined average of approximately 41 percent for stock and mutual fire insurance companies.

DOES NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Federal crop insurance does not compete with any privately financed insurance company for there is no other agency or corporation that writes all-risk crop insurance. All-risk crop insurance means just what the name implies. It protects the farmer from losses caused by all natural hazards such as droughts, floods, excessive moisture, insect and animal pests, wind, hail, frost, winter kill, and so forth.

At various times private companies have recognized the need for this type of insurance and have attempted to write it. But after repeated attempts they have failed and retired from the field. There were many reasons for these failures, some of them being lack of adequate actuarial information, insurance of price as well as yield, and lack of a national spread of the risk and operations. The greatest reason probably was that no single private company was willing to or able to absorb the initial losses inevitable in establishing such a program on a national basis.

There were no all-risk crop insurance companies operating in the field at the time the Federal crop insurance program was established. Furthermore, before this program was recommended the President's committee on crop insurance met with representatives of commercial insurance companies and received their approval and support of the program.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS WANT CROP INSURANCE

Each of the three Nation-wide farm organizations have asked for the continuation of Federal crop insurance. In testimony before the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, stated:

> Retain crop-insurance program for wheat and cotton until further trial of this program can be made. * * * I think it will succeed. (Hearings, pp. 729–730.)

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, stated:

> Our established crop-insurance program should be retained * * * the millions of lower income farmers need insurance protection today just as much as when crop insurance was instituted. They have no reserves. They can be ruined by crop failures. * * * We are just really getting started on crop insurance. (Hearings, pp. 835–836.)

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, stated:

> The need for a workable plan of crop insurance has long been apparent. At present neither cooperative nor private agencies ap-

pear to be equipped to carry a practical crop-insurance program. Under the circumstances, the Grange has given its support to the Government crop-insurance program. * * * We believe that the plan should be continued and its plan gradually broadened as experience justifies. (Hearings, pp. 909-910.)

For my own State, Glenn J. Talbott, president, North Dakota Farmers Union, and member of the executive council of the National Farmers Union, stated:

We recommend the Budget request for administrative funds, $7,718,748 as compared to the House figure of $3,500,000, and that the last proviso in the House bill be stricken out completely.

In North Dakota crop-insurance programs are carrying themselves to the extent of a little more than a million and a half bushels over indemnities paid thus far. (Hearings, pp. 881-882.)

The proviso in the House bill, referred to by Mr. Talbott, is the one which amounted to an ordering of liquidation.

NOW IS NO TIME TO ABANDON CROP INSURANCE

In the past, A. A. A. commodity payments to wheat and cotton farmers have provided a small measure of insurance to the producer. As farm prices rise or the amount of these payments is decreased, this protection becomes proportionally less. High prices and commodity loans provide no income for farmers whose crops have failed. Crop insurance does, and, in addition, provides a substantial credit base for his farming operations.

The Federal Government is asking farmers throughout the country to make sharp increases in their production of many war crops. This expansion involves added production risks. The farmer who has the security of crop insurance is in a better position to carry these inevitable increased risks in his expansion of war crops. To abolish the crop-insurance program now would be for the Federal Government to deny existing crop-insurance protection to wheat and cotton farmers at the same time that it is asking them to assume added production burdens and risks to help win the war. Such action would hardly seem to be consistent with the general policy to aid farmers in their all-out war-production effort.

NEED FOR CROP INSURANCE REMAINS

Furthermore, the proposed abolishment of Federal crop-insurance protection to wheat and cotton farmers does not abolish either the hazards to these two crops or the consequences of crop failure to the producers and their communities. Nor does the action taken provide any alternative to meet the financial and human costs of crop failure which led to the establishment of a Federal crop-insurance program after 20 years of effort on the part of farmers and investigations by the Federal Government.

Adoption of Federal crop insurance was hastened by the disastrous crop failures in many areas which brought a heavy relief burden upon the Federal Government in the 1930's. To abandon this effort to enable wheat and cotton farmers to provide themselves with a measure of security against crop losses is once again to expose the Federal Government to the full measure of the relief burden in years of crop failure.

But a system of crop insurance will do more than lighten the relief load on Government in time of crop failure. It will also enable the American farmer to maintain a greater measure of independence by providing his own protection against years of loss.

To use insurance for this purpose requires thrift and foresight on the part of the farmer. But the farmer must have more than that. He must also have the opportunity to do so—the opportunity to insure himself and his family against the hazards of production and the loss of living income.

Industry has this opportunity through both private and Government channels. Labor has it through Government sponsored unemployment insurance. Only the Federal Government can provide this opportunity for farmers and round out a system of protection for America's major producing groups.

To abandon crop insurance after only 4 years of chance to properly adjust rates and risks is bad faith upon the part of Congress. I hope the Senate will insist upon another conference with the House on this vital issue, this action which can and does mean so much in the way of a betterment of conditions for the wheat and cotton farmers and so much to the Government in the way of freedom from direct relief responsibilities.

I should like, Mr. President, to add but one thought. Federal crop insurance was created by legislation passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. No one has had the temerity through regular legislative channels to move the repeal of Federal crop insurance. Instead, the opponents of the system wait their chance to use as a vehicle for repeal an appropriation bill that comes to the Senate late, affording us little or no opportunity to do the kind of work on this and other such bills which every member of the committee wants to do.

They come at the last moment, and then, in the interest of obtaining the passage of the bill before the end of the fiscal year, insist that there must not be more consideration than that which has already been afforded.

I hope that the Senate will insist upon its crop-insurance amendment and, much as I dislike to request it, deny the action which the Senator in charge of the conference report has requested in his motion to recede and accept the House provisions.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who signed up 3-year crop-insurance contracts last year?

Mr. NYE. I do not know just how many, but I think it is fair to say there were hundreds of thousands.

Mr. REED. The number was 487,000.

Mr. LANGER. It was my recollection the number was nearly half a million; and they were relying on the Government.

Mr. NYE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. They signed a contract saying, "If you sign up at this rate for 3 years, you will be insured." It is a further fact, is it not, that they would not insure for 1 year, that they insisted on a 3-year contract just a year ago?

Mr. NYE. The Senator means the farmers would not sign a 1-year contract?

Mr. LANGER. No; the Government.

Mr. NYE. That is correct. The only insurance made available until a year ago was on a 1-year basis.

Mr. LANGER. Then they changed it to a 3-year basis, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas has stated, and the farmers signed up for 3 years, and they now have a contract for 3 years. If the motion of the Senator from Georgia shall prevail, 487,000 farmers will suffer.

Mr. NYE. The farmers will have experienced a very definite act of bad faith on the part of their Government.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota may I offer a comment?

Mr. NYE. I am through.

Mr. REED. I want the junior Senator from North Dakota to understand that I intruded upon the conference committee yesterday, when I stated what the Senator from North Dakota has said, that there are 487,000 3-year contracts outstanding, and asked whether we were going to walk off and leave them. I was reminded that in each of those contracts was an escape clause, whereby the test of whether the Government would carry it out depended on an appropriation by Congress. Of course, that is correct, but how many of the 487,000 farmers when they signed, realized that the Government could walk out if it felt like doing so?

Mr. NYE. Of course, there was no such thought on the part of the farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There appeared in last night's New York Sun an item about which I should like a word of information and comment from the Senator from North Dakota. In the column These Days by George E. Sokolsky appears the following:

A farmer sends me a photostat of a document entitled "War Production Program—1943 Farm Plan." This is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and tells a farmer how much he can grow. These instructions are for this summer when we are all being told that there is a shortage and we are all being propagandized to plant Victory gardens—although we are not being given gasoline to reach these afore-mentioned areas of agricultural provisioning.

This particular farm consists of 98 acres. The cropland consists of 74.5 acres. The farmer who ran this acreage in 1941 was permitted to plant 15 acres of wheat. His measurement was inaccurate or God, the sun, rains, and hard work blessed him and when the crop was harvested, lo and behold, he had produced 19 acres of wheat. He was fined $198 for producing.

In 1943, although he can use 74.5 acres, he has been allotted 20 acres of wheat, 4 acres of alfalfa and 10 of potatoes—and no more. For this he will receive a production-practice allowance of $40.87. If he grows more he will

be in trouble. There is also a provision which reads, "An additional $15 may be earned by planting 2 acres of forest trees." Who wants forest trees when we need to eat potatoes?

Will the Senator from North Dakota please tell us, if he can, first, whether or not in 1941 there prevailed a practice by which this farmer could legally be limited to a planting of 15 acres of wheat?

Mr. NYE. There did.

Mr. DANAHER. And he at that time could and probably was subjected to a penalty of $198 for overproducing?

Mr. NYE. I presume he was. I have heard of more severe penalties for a smaller offense than seems to have been involved in this case. There was a time when a farmer, so the story ran, was afraid to come out of the wheatfield at seeding time and shake himself for fear that some kernels of wheat would fall out of the cuffs of his trousers and he would be seeding some wheat that would find him in the fall having planted an overacreage, which would result in a penalty at once.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from North Dakota whether it is still a fact that, under the bill now before us, House bill 2481, provision is made for continuation in 1944 of an allotment program, thus preventing this particular farmer from planting more than 20 acres of wheat.

Mr. NYE. All provisions of that kind are now gone from the bill. Such provision is in the law, but the pending appropriation bill does not provide any means of any authorization for commitments which would permit the allotment program to be carried on next year.

Mr. DANAHER. The law which prevailed in 1941, and which will be abandoned in 1944, is in effect this year, 1943?

Mr. NYE. No; it has been abandoned entirely, in respect to wheat, at least. There will be no restrictions upon wheat acreage this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Here is an article by a very able writer——

Mr. NYE. We all respect him as such.

Mr. DANAHER. Who, of course, is relying upon what he says is a photostat of a document issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, which purports to allot to this particular farmer correspondent of his only 20 acres to wheat, 4 acres to alfalfa, and 10 to potatoes.

Mr. NYE. If my memory serves me correctly, last spring the triple A did undertake the usual allotment program, and then resorted to a great many changes, which finally lifted all restrictions from the planting of wheat and some other crops. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas can further clarify that point.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask a question to point up whatever answer may be forthcoming from the Senator from Kansas and from the Senator from North Dakota. Is there in the pending bill even $1 which will be paid to someone for restricting production of foodstuffs?

Mr. NYE. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. What foodstuffs are thus restricted?

Mr. NYE. Tobacco is one.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not like tobacco for breakfast. I refer to food.

Mr. NYE. Some count tobacco a food. This bill provides money for the payment of benefits to cotton producers who have complied with their program.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not eat cotton.

Mr. NYE. One cannot eat cotton, of course. I think no foodstuffs are affected.

Mr. AIKEN. Cotton is one of the largest crops we have.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Connecticut does not eat it.

Mr. DANAHER. We use it in making cottonseed meal and cottonseed oil and cake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of Mr. Sokolsky's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That man could plant the whole of his 74.5 acres if he could get farm labor, machinery, and gasoline to do it.

Now, I want to ask what is the sense of such restrictions? What good do they do us? What sense does it make to have any restrictions on agricultural production at all when there is such pressing need for more and more food?

This particular instance is an index to the weakness of Mr. Roosevelt's administration. It never gets organized. It works at cross purposes. It is so personalized that a bureau functions without regard to the necessities of the moment simply because it will not stop functioning when it is no longer needed.

The War Labor Board is another example of administrative maladroitness. Mr. Roosevelt actually faced two strikes, one on the part of John L. Lewis, the other on the part of War Labor Board, which took the position that if Harold Ickes made a sane and businesslike settlement of the coal strike, it, the War Labor Board, would resign in a body. In other words, nothing mattered but that this Board's face be saved. Our mandarins are worse than the Chinese; the Chinese mandarins sometimes removed themselves from impossible situations by committing suicide as a service to their people. Our mandarins will not remove themselves from a public job no matter what happens to the country. Once they get on the public pay roll they hang on for dear life unless the corporations they have been attacking hire them away.

A couple of weeks ago the country thrilled to the thought that all this was to be corrected, that Byrnes, advised and assisted by Baruch, would put an end to these bureaucratic monkeyshines, that they would streamline administration. The weeks are passing but nothing is being done along these lines. No obstructions to efficient management of the country's business have been removed. I do not question the ability of either Byrnes or Baruch; but they are not being permitted to hire and fire, to reorganize, consolidate, amalgamate, and cut out the administrative nonsense that is distressing and perturbing this Nation.

Governor Tom Dewey is standing out in front of the Republican parade because he is attacking the one dread evil which the whole American people is now recognizing—administrative incoherence. The people know that the administration is cockeyed. They still do not blame Roosevelt because they say he is busy with the war, but any student of public opinion can recognize that what Tom Dewey says about the management of our business is making a deep impression upon a long-suffering, loyal, and patriotic people.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like the comment of the Senator from Kansas on this general subject.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Up to March of this year, I think it was March when the Secretary of Agriculture lifted all restrictions upon wheat acreage——

Mr. LANGER. It was April.

Mr. REED. I stand corrected. I accept the statement of the junior Senator from North Dakota. The Secretary of Agriculture lifted all restrictions on wheat acreage. Up to that time the restrictions did apply. In cases where the farmers themselves, by two-thirds vote, adopted a marketing quota upon wheat, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized, and really required, to collect a penalty on wheat marketed outside the agricultural adjustment program.

Mr. President, that law was carried out, including the crop harvested in 1942, and some rather severe injustices resulted.

When the Secretary of Agriculture removed that restriction in the spring of this year any farmer who had not sold his wheat was relieved from the penalty. A farmer who had sold his wheat had paid the penalty. An injustice was done to the one who produced and marketed his crop in the same crop year. I have a bill pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Representative HOPE, of Kansas, has a similar bill pending in the House, which would permit those who paid the penalty to be placed on the same basis as those who had not produced and sold wheat in the same crop year and were thus not obliged to pay the penalty.

Mr. President, I do not know whether I have answered the inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut. In my opinion a very definite injustice was done to the producer of wheat who produced and sold his wheat in the same crop year. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that there are not now any restrictions upon the production of any crop, except, as has been developed, tobacco and cotton.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from North Dakota who have taken part in the discussion, because it seems to me to be important to develop the facts with reference to this policy. It would most assuredly be an anomaly in this year of impending shortages if production were to be restricted.

Mr. NYE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in that conclusion.

Mr. REED. Permit me to say, Mr. President, that when the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he urged that 15,000,000 more acres of wheat be planted this year than were planted last year. It would be very poor policy to impose penalties upon those who would raise more wheat under such a program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Georgia will not prevail, because I am satisfied that if the Senators on the floor really understood the desperate plight of the average wheat grower in America they would vote against the motion. If there is anything I know thoroughly, it is the problem of the wheat farmers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator a question. In view of the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House, there is no possibility of having the crop insurance feature incorporated in the bill. The House has voted on the crop insurance feature four times. I deplore the elimination of the provision as much as does any other Member of the Senate; but in view of the attitude of the House, if we reject the motion of the Senator from Georgia, what are we to do?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that the cotton farmers have been taken care of. The peanut farmers have been taken care of.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me inquire how the cotton farmer has been taken care of.

Mr. LANGER. Because the cotton farmers get parity, but the wheat farmers have not yet gotten parity.

Mr. SMITH. That is an accident.

Mr. LANGER. But it is the situation.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that; but how does the Senator hope to get the crop insurance provision into the bill, in view of the present situation?

Mr. LANGER. If I were one of the conferees I would go to the conference and would stay there forever, if necessary, until the crop-insurance provisions were agreed to. Why should hundreds of thousands of wheat farmers be sacrificed?

Mr. SMITH. I understand the necessity, and I understand the deplorable condition. Nevertheless, we are endeavoring to legislate, and we must legislate with the consent of the House. The House absolutely refuses to give consent to the crop-insurance provision.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. NYE. I should like to address myself to the question the Senator from South Carolina has propounded. I have been sitting as a member of the conference, as has the Senator from South Carolina. I am not so sure as he seems to be that the House will maintain its position in spite of what we do about the matter.

Mr. SMITH. The House voted just yesterday.

Mr. NYE. I understand it did; but I have very good reason to believe that if the Senate will stand its ground today, the House will recede on that item.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator can make me feel that that is a certainty, I should be willing to fight for the crop-insurance provision. Some 20 years ago the Senator from Oregon and I wire members of a committee to investigate the possibility of having crop insurance. We recommended it, but it was a long time afterward before it was put into effect.

Eight miles below my Lee County farm, week before last, a hail storm destroyed every vestige of crops—cotton, corn, tobacco, and so forth. Seventy-five percent of the crops were insured. The owners would have been ruined had it not been for the insurance. To my mind it is one of the most hopeful and reassuring programs that have ever been adopted by the Congress. It has not had time to work itself out to the point where it would be self-sustaining. I cannot understand the position of the House, except that perhaps it is based on the loss which has been incurred.

Mr. LANGER. I am very well acquainted with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the dean of the Senate. No Member of the Senate has more tenacity, more real "guts," than has the senior Senator from South Carolina. I know that if he makes up his mind to go into the conference and fight he can get this crop insurance. I am satisfied of it.

Consider the position of the average wheat farmer. We have already practically strangled the Farm Security Administration. It is dying a slow death. There is no question about that, in view of the report of the conference committee. I think the Senator will agree with that statement.

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. LANGER. Consider the average farmer in the Northwest. I direct my remarks to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He can bear me out. When the average young couple are married, they may have a little debt. They go to a bank to borrow money to put in a crop of wheat. If the crop insurance is in force, the bank, knowing that it will be insured, will probably lend them the money. If they cannot get it from the bank, they may get the seed from the Government. They go along, and what happens? After the grain gets up a little it may freeze, or if it is up a little higher the wind may level it to the ground. If that does not happen, there is likely to be a drought—and I have seen the effects of droughts on thousands of acres.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is not telling me anything that I do not know from experience.

Mr. LANGER. That is the reason the Senator is for crop insurance.

Mr. SMITH. I would do all in my power in behalf of crop insurance. The Senator speaks of obstinacy. I have been on conference committees with Members of the House, and they can be just as obstinate as we can. It is like the old saying about an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. It is just a hell of a butt, and we do not get anywhere.

If the Senator's colleague is correct, and he has some assurance other than wishful thinking, I am perfectly willing to have the question go back to conference, and cuss some more. That is about all it has amounted to up to the present time.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, my information is something more than wishful thinking. Perhaps there is a little wishful thinking woven into it, but it is not all wishful thinking. I hope the Senate will insist upon its amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator have any reasonable ground to believe that the House will change its position?

Mr. NYE. I have.

Mr. SMITH. After four votes?

Mr. NYE. After four votes.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean to say that we are wearing down the House, or is there a change in conviction?

Mr. NYE. The evidence would not indicate that we are wearing down the House. As matters stand in the House, its most recent record vote was about 2 to 1 against the proposal to continue crop insurance. The Senate has a record of 5 or 6 to 1.

Mr. SMITH. I am not talking about the Senate.

Mr. NYE. I am told that if we will stand our ground in the Senate, there is a good prospect that the House will alter its position. Beyond that I am not at liberty to say.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Let me appeal to the Senator once more to go back to conference and fight as he has never fought before in order to save crop insurance for the wheat and cotton farmers.

Mr. SMITH. If I had anything with which to fight, or if we had some means of persuading the House to take this or something worse, we might get somewhere. I am perfectly willing to try again. I do not wish to fall out with the Senator's colleague, Mr. NYE, but if he has deceived me, I will give him the devil afterward. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am as much in favor of crop insurance as is the junior Senator from North Dakota. I know the necessity of it, and I know the merit in the whole program. However, I understand that in this appropriation bill there are funds to take care of the 1943 insurance, and that there may be some possibility, in some other appropriation bill, deficiency bill, or authorization bill, of taking care of the 1944 insurance. So this is not the final word. If 1943 is taken care of, that will take us up to January 1, and perhaps we can work out something between now and then.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Colorado on the conference committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I am not on the conference committee.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator has reference to the 3-year contract.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. There is a 3-year contract still in existence. It runs into 1944, and I believe that is the end.

Mr. LANGER. But there is no appropriation for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is provision in this bill for 1943.

Mr. LANGER. For 1943, but not for 1944. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado point out any provision for 1944.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question of 1944 is pending; but 1943 is taken care of.

Mr. SMITH. I think the 3-year contract is taken care of in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. No; it is not.

Mr. NYE. The 1943 contract?

Mr. SMITH. There is a 3-year contract.

Mr. NYE. The bill provides for the continuation of insurance which is already in force.

Mr. SMITH. That is the 3-year contract.

Mr. NYE. But no new contract may be entered into.

Mr. SMITH. The bill takes care of contracts which are in existence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the senior Senator from South Carolina that he is willing to battle once more, I will yield the floor; but if the conference report comes back and it is still against the wheat farmer, I reserve the right to speak again on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. I hope the Senator does not have the idea that members of the conference would not fight as hard for the wheat farmer as they would for the producer of any other major crop.

Mr. LANGER. I know the Senator from South Carolina would.

Mr. SMITH. I almost gave up hope when the vote was taken yesterday in the House, because that was the fourth time the House of Representatives had voted on the question. If there is a chance, I shall vote to reject the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and try once more; but I serve notice now that we must find some way to keep the crop insurance going.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much indeed.

Mr. SMITH. If the House will not do it, let us put it on some appropriation bill and get it through anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	Eastland
Andrews	Butler	Ferguson
Austin	Byrd	George
Ball	Capper	Gerry
Bankhead	Caraway	Green
Barkley	Chandler	Guffey
Bilbo	Chavez	Gurney
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Brewster	Connally	Hayden
Bridges	Danaher	Hill
Brooks	Davis	Holman
Buck	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Kilgore	Nye	Thomas, Utah
La Follette	O'Daniel	Tobey
Langer	O'Mahoney	Truman
Lodge	Overton	Tunnell
Lucas	Pepper	Tydings
McCarran	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McClellan	Reed	Van Nuys
McFarland	Revercomb	Wagner
McKellar	Reynolds	Wallgren
McNary	Robertson	Walsh
Maloney	Russell	Wheeler
Maybank	Scrugham	Wherry
Mead	Shipstead	White
Millikin	Smith	Willis
Moore	Stewart	Wilson
Murdock	Taft	
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INLAND WATER CARRIERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Recently the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision that is of great interest to Members of the Congress in connection with legislation which was enacted to assure transportation on the inland waterways and to protect producers who had hoped to make use of the inland waterways in the handling of the transportation of freight.

Congress passed what was called the Transportation Act of 1940. That act placed under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission the regulation of rates by rail, and truck, and also by barges on the inland waterways. There was a great deal of opposition to that bill in 1940 because many legislators feared—and so stated on the floor of the Senate as well as of the House—that the inland waterway transportation would suffer under the domination and regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the reason that the Commission was said at that time by many Senators and Members of the House to be a railroad-minded body. Assurances were given, however, and a section was written into the law directing the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the regulation of rates, to give the benefit to the inherent savings which could be made by the waterways in the arrangement of rates, and providing that the Commission should not discriminate against the waterways, but that inherent advantage of low-cost water transportation should be protected.

Under such assurances from the sponsors of the legislation and because of amendments which were added, the bill finally passed.

The decision handed down by the Supreme Court on the 14th day of June repudiates this act of Congress and the particular section dealing with the protection of the waterways.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my recollection that the debate in the Senate at least left the clear understanding in the minds of Senators, so expressed in the RECORD, that no such thing could ever happen under the conference report on the bill which was adopted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I so understand, and that is why I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota that if there had been any other construction placed upon it, the bill would have been defeated?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That was generally understood. In a footnote to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Douglas, and Mr. Justice Murphy, there appear the names of Members of the Senate and the House who protested this legislation until they were assured that it would provide direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission not to show any prejudice against the waterways.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but, under the pressure of the legislative situation during the last few weeks, I have not had time to read the opinion. So I should like to ask, How does the majority opinion escape that legislative history?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall go into that. As I have said, Senators and Members of the House who showed apprehension and discussed what the Interstate Commerce Commission would do are named in a footnote to the opinion. I quote from it as follows:

> The following Senators and Representatives, among others, either required assurance that the Commission would not discriminate against water carriers or expressed the conviction that under the statement of policy, the Commission would be unable to discriminate against water carriers: Senators Austin, Clark of Missouri, Connally, Ellender, Lucas, Miller, McNary, Norris, Pepper, Shipstead, Truman, and Wheeler; Representatives Bland, Bulwinkle, Crosser, Culkin, Halleck, Lea, Pierce of Oregon, Sparkman, and Wadsworth.

A case was decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission from which an appeal was taken by the Inland Waterways Corporation. The appeal was to a three-judge court in Chicago, and that court unanimously overruled the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission appealed to the Supreme Court, and on the 14th day of June the Court rendered a decision in favor of their claim, with Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Douglas, and Mr. Justice Murphy dissenting.

I now give a few words of the history of this case.

On October 15, 1939, the railroads proposed before the Interstate Commerce Commission to do away with all rail proportional rates eastbound from Chicago, on grain moving into Chicago by the Illinois waterway by barges.

A proportional rate had been in effect under which grain moving from Chicago to eastern points had the same rates as grain coming in by lake or rail to Chicago.

This proposal left in effect certain proportional rates from Chicago to certain points in the East located west of a Pittsburgh-Buffalo line on grain coming into Chicago from Illinois points in

any manner, except by barge; second, grain coming into Chicago from the Northwest by rail or lake, and third, grain coming into Chicago by rail from Kansas City and St. Louis.

The proposal was also to kill all proportional rates, eastbound from Chicago, on all grain coming into Chicago by barge from all parts of the West if it was destined to New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, and all points in New York and Pennsylvania except points in those States west of a Buffalo-Pittsburgh line.

The net result of the decision is to destroy the great bulk of the grain movement on our inland waterways, the savings on which go to the farmers, under the decision of the three-judge court in Chicago. In their decision their finding was that all benefits from this saving through shipping grain by water went to the farmer.

The proposal of the railroads to abandon and to deny to shippers by barge, by the inland waterways, the same proportional rate to the East which grain coming down the Lakes into Chicago by rail would enjoy, was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. As a matter of fact, as a result of the decision, it costs 8 cents a hundred pounds more to ship grain to the East if it comes to Chicago by water, that is, over the inland waterways, than if it comes by rail or down the Lakes.

A majority of the Supreme Court reversed the three-judge court in Chicago, holding, in an involved and highly technical opinion, that in a proper proceeding, presumably with the whole Nation's grain structure and a different record before them, proportional rates on ex-barge grain might be approved.

The trial of this case, which ended with the Commission and the Supreme Court completely ignoring a specific provision in the 1940 Transportation Act that there should be no discrimination against water carriers in the application of proportional rates, extended from October 15, 1939, to June 14, 1943. It is now back before the Interstate Commerce Commission, presumably for another 4-year controversy. Meanwhile, the farmers are denied low-cost transportation on waterways developed for public use.

Justices Black, Douglas, and Murphy dissented from this decision of the Court, stating that Members of Congress had pointed out when the Transportation Act of 1940 was before them that they feared Interstate Commerce Commission regulation because the Commission was railroad-minded; that the railroads knew how to strangle water carriers by procedural delays and how to profit by such delays, and that this action of the Commission shows that their fears were justified. This dissenting opinion is ruggedly honest in its reasoning, clear in its understanding of the real public issues involved, and expressed in language which the American people can understand. I believe those who have the Nation's welfare at heart should read the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black, and I ask to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Interstate Commerce Commission against Inland Waterways Corporation, and the dissenting opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on June 19 we had an exhibition of how those who publish newspapers and write editorials for the interests which are asking for special consideration and privilege act in speaking for those who sustain their publications. The Traffic World, in its issue of June 19, vents its spleen upon Justices Black, Murphy, and Douglas for their dissenting opinion.

Mr. President, I think the three Justices are to be complimented for being attacked from such a source. To show how these people, when they do not get the kind of decision they want, retaliate upon those who will not go along, I wish to quote from an editorial in the Traffic World. In the editorial there is language attacking Justices of the Supreme Court more violently and reprehensively than I have ever before noted in public print. I quote from the editorial:

> If anything were needed to convince thinking people that Justice Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, is just a cheap demagogue and not a jurist—

This must also apply to the other two dissenting Justices, that is, Justices Murphy and Douglas, because they agreed with Justice Black. The editorial continues:

> or to remind those who may have forgotten in the time that has elapsed since President Roosevelt disgracefully appointed him to that distinguished bench—it is furnished by his dissenting opinion in the ex barge grain rate decision. We are not now referring to the righteousness or unrighteousness of his conclusions, but to his reasoning and language, which are those of the small-time politician and not of a learned lawyer.

I call attention to the fact that if that editorial applies to the three Justices of the Supreme Court dissenting, it also applies to the Members of Congress who anticipated what was going to happen if the Transportation Act of 1940 became law, and anticipated what would happen when the matter reached the Interstate Commerce Commission, after having specifically pointed out to the Interstate Commerce Commission that they must not discriminate against waterways.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that when the bill which became the Transportation Act of 1940 was under consideration in this body, some of us stood on this floor for 3 days—I know the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin did, and I know I did, and I know of several other Senators who did—and pointed out specifically the construction likely to be put upon the law by railroad-minded Interstate Commerce Commissioners, if we passed the bill in its then shape. It was vehemently and specifically denied for 3 days on this floor that any such construction was possible. I remember the representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission sitting right here on the floor next to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and supplying him with denials that it was even remotely possible that such a construction could be put on the act as has actually been put on it. In my judgment, the measure could not have been passed through this body, or through the Congress, and probably would not have been signed by the President, except for those vehement denials as to the possibility of any such construction.

We charged then that what has happened would happen; that the Interstate Commerce Commission, a railroad-minded body, would deliberately start out to destroy all efforts at water transportation. The Senate saw fit to believe protestations which were made against any possibility of such an occurrence, but what we predicted has unfortunately and lamentably come to pass.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With respect to the statement that representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission sat beside me and told me what was in the bill, let me say that I think I knew what was in the bill, because long and protracted hearings were held on it in the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield again?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that I did not mean to say that they were putting words in the mouth of the Senator from Montana, but they were speaking with the voice of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Senator from Montana, and through him to the Senate. I did not mean to say that they were putting words in the Senator's mouth. I know he always speaks for himself.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that we did provide in the bill, and it was my understanding, that transportation by water, by truck, and every other kind of transportation would be taken into consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am as much opposed to the ruling which the Interstate Commerce Commission has made with respect to this matter as is the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very certain that is true, and I am glad the Senator from Montana made the statement, because that has been his position at all times.

Mr. WHEELER. That was my position then, and it is my position now. The ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the ruling of the Supreme Court are both contrary to the

construction which I have placed on the law and the construction which I told the Senate would be placed on the law.

I wish to say that I wanted the regulation to be made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, because I thought that Commission would at all times provide for rates to be fixed according to the inherent advantages of the different forms of transportation. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] knows, we have been holding hearings for the last 2 months upon proposed legislation to regulate the traffic bureaus of the country. Representatives of the Department of Justice have been heard at great length on the matter, and so have representatives of the railroads. We have not as yet concluded the hearings. They will be taken up again at the conclusion of the recess of Congress. I am hopeful that the Interstate Commerce Commission will recognize the inherent advantage of different forms of transportation. I will say that I have been disappointed by some of the rulings made by the Commission in permitting truck and bus rates to be raised to the level of railroad freight rates.

There is a concerted effort now being made to permit railroads to get into the truck and bus business. When Congress reconvenes after the recess I intend to introduce proposed legislation to prevent railroads from owning busses and trucks. I think the railroad business should be divorced from the bus and truck business. I think the express companies, which are owned by the railroads, should not be permitted to engage in the trucking business. I think the railroads should not be in the trucking business; I think the railroads should not be in the water transportation business, and I think they should not own air transportation facilities.

I know the idea exists in the minds of many persons in this country that all forms of transportation should be owned by one group. If that ever happens we will have no competition in transportation in the United States. I shall oppose any such movement with all my strength.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to make one comment on the statement made by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very happy indeed to hear the statement made by the Senator from Montana. It seems to me that until such time as we come to a system of monopolistic control, under which a man could go to an office at Helena, Mont., or Bowling Green, Mo., or Madison, Wis., or Bismarck, N. Dak., or any place else, and ask one responsible official what was the cheapest way for him to transport a bill of goods from one point to any place on the habitable globe, and have it routed by the cheapest possible route, whether by air, by rail, or by water, or part water, and part air, and part rail—a sort of monopolistic control which would necessarily mean Government ownership, as I see it—I say, Mr. President, until we come to such a time as that there ought to be the completest competition and separation between these various forms of transportation.

I am particularly glad that the Senator from Montana has mentioned in his discussion the matter of air transportation. I happen to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Aviation of the Committee on Commerce. That committee has been holding some hearings, not public hearings, but preliminary hearings, for the purpose of forming committee views as to policy on post-war aviation. I find that the interoceanic steamship companies and the railroads are already prepared to move in and try to take possession of the vast field of development which will unquestionably take place in aviation when the war is over. I say that is completely wrong. I do not think that the steamship companies, or the railroad companies, or truck companies should be permitted to participate in the development of aviation as a transportation field any more than I think the railroads should be permitted to dominate the water carriers, or truck transportation, or vice versa.

It seems to me that in the decisions on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to which the Senator from Minnesota has been referring, sustained, unfortunately, by the Supreme Court of the United States, the Commission is flouting the theory of the necessity for the utmost competition between various forms of transportation until such time, if it ever comes, as the Government, in its wisdom, may conclude to take over all forms of transportation and operate them as a Government monopoly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee whether it is not true that frequently the directors of railroads do not own any stock until a day or two before they are elected directors? Is it not true that often a clerk in some office, for example, is picked out as a director of a railroad?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think it is true that the railroads pick out clerks for such positions. I think it will be found that most directors of railroads are either connected with some large industry or belong to some banking concern in the city of New York.

Mr. LANGER. That is what I had reference to. Some clerk in a banking house is picked to be a director of a railroad.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I know, clerks in banking houses are not picked for such positions. Directors or officers of banking houses are often chosen as directors of railroads. I do not know of any instance of a clerk in a banking house being picked as a director. There may be such instances, but I do not know of any.

Mr. LANGER. The Northern Pacific Railroad traverses both the States of Montana and North Dakota. I understand that some of its directors own only 5 or 10 shares of stock in the railroad, and that some of them hold very minor positions in other concerns.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have much doubt that that may be true. I think that is true with respect to every corporation of any size in the United States. Often directors of corporations hold only a sufficient number of shares to qualify as directors.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator said he was going to introduce proposed legislation later in the year. In that connection, let me ask the Senator why the State of Montana or the State of North Dakota, for example, should not have two or three directors on the board of a railroad which traverses those States?

Let me say that sometime ago, after extended hearings, the North Dakota State Railroad Commission reduced the intrastate rate from Minot to Edgeley $100 per car of wheat. The distance between those two towns is a little over 100 miles. If a farmer or other citizen of North Dakota or of Montana had been a director of the railroad he would years ago have discovered the situation which existed concerning high interstate rates. It seems to me the public should have some representation on the board of directors of the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I think the States traversed by the railroads should have representatives on the boards of directors of the railroads. One of the troubles with the railroads, and one which Mr. Jesse Jones commented on, either publicly or before our committee, is that the directors and officers have to spend too much time traveling back and forth to New York to see their bankers, to find out what should be done. There is no question in my mind that such a situation is undesirable. For instance, the Southern Pacific Railroad operates almost entirely on the Pacific coast, but its main offices were maintained in New York City, and at one time most of the directors and officers were living in New York City.

Those who operate a railroad should be familiar with the territory through which the railroad passes, and some of the members of the board of directors should know something about conditions in the States traversed by the railroad.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether in his judgment the members of the boards of directors of the railroads should be appointed by a State agency, or whether there should be some similar arrangement.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether that should be done; because if they were appointed by a State agency, there might be some difficulty. If a State agency were to take over the railroads, there would be conflicting interests between the States, and I am not in favor of that.

Mr. LANGER. I mean the members of the board of directors.

Mr. WHEELER. Let us consider the Northern Pacific Railroad, for instance. On its board of directors there would have to be at least one member from every State traversed by the line.

Mr. LANGER. That would mean only five or six.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure that would be a feasible arrangement. I think that someone from the States traversed by the railroad or someone who knows something about conditions in those States should be on the board of directors.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Montana worked hard for the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1940, and I am sure he worked in good faith to protect the waterways. Mr. Eastman appeared before our committee and discussed the bill at length, including the waterway provision. Of course, we assumed he spoke for the Commission.

However, when the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission came to be made in this case, certainly Mr. Eastman did not speak for the Commission, because he dissented. He dissented, because he favored the legislation. We had assumed that when he appeared before the committee he spoke for the Commission. Commissioners Porter, Alldredge, and Johnson also dissented.

To show the arrogance of the Commission in its action on the matter, I quote from the statement of the attorney representing the railroad interests who made the proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission:

> We made this proposal, as I have stated several times, and filed these tariffs, with the hope that we could drive this business off the water and back onto the rails where it belongs. We are not in love with water transportation. We believe that we are entitled to that grain business.

Well, Mr. President, they got their way with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As a result, the Commission said in its decision that the new rate is now to be imposed on grain which, following arrival at Chicago after shipment from the Northwest and Central West by means of barge on the Illinois waterway, is shipped by rail to the East. The result of the Commission's decision and the Supreme Court's opinion is that grain which has arrived at Chicago after shipment by barge on the Illinois waterway will be subjected to a rate 8½ cents higher, when shipped by rail to the East, than will grain which has arrived at Chicago by lake steamer or by rail. The Interstate Commerce Commission may have the view that the rate is not a prohibitive one; but who will ship grain by way of the Illinois waterway, and subsequently have to pay a rail rate 8½ cents higher, rather than ship the grain to Chicago by all-rail or all-lake steamer transportation, in the first place?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that, of course, the rate is a prohibitive one, because before our committees the experts have testified that the regulation of freight tariffs on wheat is such a delicate matter that even a difference of half a cent may determine how the grain is to be shipped.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; but in the present case there is a differential of more than 8 cents.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I say that is prohibitive.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But the interstate Commerce Commission says it is not prohibitive. The Commission means that people can ship grain, anyway. However, the result is that grain is not shipped in that way and will not be shipped in that way.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on the inland waterways and the intercoastal and intracoastal waterways; but all efforts made in that connection now are being thwarted and the legislation passed by Congress for those purposes is now being emasculated by a decision of an agency of Congress, sustained by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he concludes?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the powerful Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators who are interested in the matter will make it the first order of business after the recess, and that a concerted effort will be made to reverse the flagrant violation of the legislative intent of Congress committed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think all the other members of the committee, in addition to the chairman, will be very much interested in an endeavor of that kind. Such an effort certainly should be made. I think the Commission's action is one of the most flagrant violations of good faith, as well as a violation of an act of Congress. After we had obtained assurances from sources upon which it was thought reliance could be placed that such a decision would not be rendered, those assurances were completely ignored.

EXHIBIT I

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 175—OCTOBER TERM, 1942—THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD CO. ET AL., APPELLANTS, *v.* INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ET AL.—ON APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS—JUNE 14, 1943

(Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court.)

By schedules filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission to become effective October 15, 1939, the appellant eastern railroads [1] sought to deny grain arriving at Chicago by barge over the Illinois Waterways the privilege of moving out of Chicago by rail on "proportional" rates applicable to competing grain arriving at Chicago by lake steamer or rail. The only other rates on which the ex-barge grain could move eastward by rail from Chicago were "local" rates, which were in all cases higher than the existing "proportional" rates. The proposed schedules were protested by barge lines and others desirous of maintaining the existing proportionals as to ex-barge grain.

[1] Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., New York Central Railroad Co., New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Erie Railroad Co., and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

Understanding of the controversy thus precipitated and the consequent litigation which has brought it to this Court requires a statement of the rather complicated rate structure to which the proposed schedules related.

The proposed schedules applied to grain, grain products and grain byproducts, but for convenience we refer to them all as "grain." They dealt not only with grain coming by barge via the Illinois Waterways to Chicago, but also with grain so arriving at Peoria, Ill., St. Louis, Mo., and other related rate-break points. Chicago is illustrative of all, and for convenience we shall follow the practice employed by the parties in briefs and argument, and confine our discussion to it.

Grain originating at Chicago, grain brought there by truck, or by rail under intrastate rates, and grain which had forfeited its transit privileges, moved eastward by rail from Chicago on local rates. Their validity as such has not been questioned in this case.

Grain originating at certain places distant from Chicago had the privilege, however, of moving eastward from Chicago by rail on the lower proportional rates, although it came to rest at Chicago for marketing or processing. These "proportionals" varied according to the region of origin or the region of destination; and, in some instances, according to both.

Official territory lies east of Chicago and is divided into central territory, trunk-line territory, and New England territory. Central territory lies west of a line drawn through Pittsburgh and Buffalo. To this territory there were three different sets of proportionals, set with reference to the territory of origin.

Grain originating at certain points in Illinois moved out of Chicago by rail to central territory on Illinois reshipping proportionals, which, however, did not apply to ex-barge grain and were not affected by the proposed schedules.

Grain originating in northwest territory moved out of Chicago by rail to central territory on northwest proportionals, which were in some instances higher, and in others lower, than the Illinois reshipping proportionals. As first published, these proportionals applied only to grain originating in northwest territory, which comprises generally North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and certain Canadian provinces. The northwest proportionals were originally and have continued to be applicable on grain arriving at Chicago by lake.

In 1932 the northwest proportionals were amended to make them apply to shipments which "arrived by boat line at Chicago * * *." At the time this wording was put into the tariffs the only water-borne grain to which they applied was that arriving from the northwest by boat over the Great Lakes. The Commission has decided that the effect of this amendment was to make the northwest proportionals apply to grain arriving by barge over the Illinois waterways, which were opened in the following year, 1933; and we accept its determination of this issue. While shipping points along the waterways vary from 57.5 to 200.9 miles in distance from Chicago, some grain arriving there by barge originated at points as far beyond as Kansas City and St. Louis. The northwest proportionals were the only ones which applied to ex-barge grain moving out of Chicago by rail to central territory, and the proposed schedules canceled them as to such grain.

Grain brought by rail from trans-Mississippi territory which included, among other places, Kansas City and St. Louis, moved out of Chicago to central territory on trans-Mississippi proportionals, which had been

set by the Commission 3 cents lower than the northwest proportionals, in order to equalize the Twin Cities with Kansas City. The trans-Mississippi proportionals did not apply to grain coming from these points by barge, and therefore such grain had to pay a higher rate for the outbound haul than was required of grain coming from them by rail. No complaint has been made, however, of this; and the appellees have been content to assert that they are entitled to the northwest proportionals as to such grain.

"Trunk-line territory" lies between Central territory and New England territory, which comprises the New England States. To trunk-line and New England territories the proportionals did not vary with the point of origin of the grain. These proportionals applied to grain coming to Chicago by barge over the Illinois waterways, and the proposed schedules canceled them as to such grain. The existing schedules provided that "in no case shall the combination through rate to and from the reshipping point via rail be less than the local rate from the reshipping point to destination, the difference necessary to protect the local rate from the reshipping point to be added to the reshipping rate therefrom." No such provision was made with respect to the barge-rail traffic, and the Commission found accordingly that "the barge-rail rates are far below the local rates from the reshipping points in contravention of the fourth-section rule,[2] while the all-rail rates are in strict conformity with that rule."

When the proposed schedules were filed with the Commission, that body, acting pursuant to its authority under section 15 (7) of the act,[3] suspended them for the allowable period of 7 months and entered upon a hearing of their lawfulness. The last testimony was heard, and the record in the case closed, on January 26, 1940. On September 18, 1940, the President approved the Transportation Act of 1940.[4] Thereafter the appellee Inland Waterways Corporation requested the Commission to dispose of the proceeding in the light of the new act. On July 31, 1941, Division 2 of the Commission found that "the proportional rates here in issue have never been applicable on this barge traffic moving on unfiled rates," and that "the schedules under suspension are not shown to be unlawful." It announced that an order would be entered vacating the already expired order of suspension and discontinuing the proceedings.[5] When the period of compulsory suspension ended, the carriers had voluntarily continued the suspension.

In its petition for rehearing and reconsideration of this report the Inland Waterways Corporation asserted that the Commission had permitted discrimination against a connecting line forbidden by section 3 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940.[6] It suggested that the Commission fix the existing proportional rates as the proper ones, stating that: "Theoretically, the Commission is not limited to a choice between the unlawful proposed rates and the present rates, but may, upon an adequate record, prescribe some different basis of rates for the future. Actually, no different proposal has been introduced which could support a different basis of rates than those presently in effect. That fact, however, cannot possibly militate to justify the proposed rates, but could only compel the post-

---

[2] SEC. 4. (1) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to this part or part III to charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the transportation of passengers, or of like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance or to charge any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of this part or part III, but this shall not be construed as authorizing any common carrier within the terms of this part or part III to charge or receive as great compensation for a shorter as for a longer distance: *Provided*, That upon application to the Commission such common carrier may in special cases, after investigation, be authorized by the Commission to charge less for longer than for shorter distances for the transportation of passengers or property; and the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated common carrier may be relieved from the operation of this section, but in exercising the authority conferred upon it in this proviso the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed; and no such authorization shall be granted on account of merely potential water competition not actually in existence: *And provided further*, That tariffs proposing rates subject to the provisions of this paragraph may be filed when application is made to the Commission under the provisions hereof, and in the event such application is approved, the Commission shall permit such tariffs to become effective upon 1 day's notice (54 Stat. 904, 49 U. S. C., sec. 4 (1)).

[3] 44 Stat. 1447 as amended by 54 Stat. 912, 49 U. S. C. sec. 15 (7), reading:

"Whenever there shall be filed with the commission any schedule stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge, or any new individual or joint classification, or any new individual or joint regulation or practice affecting any rate, fare, or charge, the commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, at once, and if it so orders without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice; and pending such hearing and the decision thereon the commission, upon filing with such schedule and delivering to the carrier or carriers affected thereby a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than 7 months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after full hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed change of rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period; but in case of a proposed increased rate or change for or in respect to the transportation of property, the commission may by order require the interested carrier or carriers to keep accurate account in detail of all amounts received by reason of such increase, specifying by whom and in whose behalf such amounts are paid, and upon completion of the hearing and decision may by further order require the interested carrier, or carriers to refund, with interest, to the persons in whose behalf such amounts were paid, such portion of such increased rates or charges as by its decision shall be found not justified. At any hearing involving a change in a rate, fare, charge, or classification, or in a rule, regulation, or practice, after September 18, 1940, the burden of proof shall be upon the carrier to show that the proposed change, rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable, and the commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over all other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

[4] The provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act particularly relied upon by appellees which were amended or added by the Transportation Act of 1940 read as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions—all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy." (54 Stat. 899.)

"SEC. 3 (1). It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this part to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided, however*, That this paragraph shall not be construed to apply to discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any other carrier of whatever description" (54 Stat. 902, 49 U. S. C., sec. 3 (1)).

"SEC. 3 (4). All carriers subject to the provisions of this part shall, according to their respective powers, afford all reasonable, proper, and equal facilities for the interchange of traffic between their respective lines and connecting lines, and for the receiving, forwarding, and delivering of passengers or property to and from connecting lines; and shall not discriminate in their rates, fares, and charges between connecting lines, or unduly prejudice any connecting line in the distribution of traffic that is not specifically routed by the shipper. As used in this paragraph, the term 'connecting line' means the connecting line of any carrier subject to the provisions of this part or any common carrier by water subject to part III" (54 Stat. 903, 49 U. S. C., sec. 3 (4)).

"Part III, section 304 (c). * * * Differences in the classifications, rates, fares, charges, rules, regulations, and practices of a water carrier in respect of water transportation from those in effect by a rail carrier with respect to rail transportation shall not be deemed to constitute unjust discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage, or an unfair or destructive competitive practice, within the meaning of any provision of this act" (54 Stat. 935, 49 U. S. C., sec. 905 (c)).

[5] 246 I. C. C. 353.

[6] See footnote 4, supra, for the text of this provision.

ponement of any change in the present tariffs pending further hearing, and the introduction of a lawful proposal."[7]

The decision of the whole Commission on reconsideration was announced on December 1, 1941.[8] In it the Commission took official notice that certain of the protestant barge carriers had attained common carrier status under the act, and stated that "no useful purpose would be served by further hearing or reargument."[9] The Commission reviewed the existing rate structure and the probable effects of the proposed changes in operation as contrasted to the effects of denying them, and said:

"The proposed schedules will not prohibit the movement by barge-rail even to trunk-line territory, their principal commercial effects being to reduce the profits of the Chicago elevator operators. * * *[10]

"Protestants maintain that the proposed schedules will be unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, and unduly prejudicial * * * and unduly preferential * * * This is based primarily on the fact that under the proposed schedules the ex-barge rates will be higher than the ex-rail or ex-lake rates, although in each instance the physical carriage beyond the reshipping point is substantially the same. But the latter is also true of local grain, grain brought in by truck, or by rail under intrastate rates, or grain which has forfeited its transit privileges. To adopt protestants' premise would mean that all proportional rates lower than local rates and differing from each other according to the origin of the commodity would have to be condemned. As pointed out by the division, reshipping or proportional rates are in their essence balances of through rates. Such balances are, of course, determined by the measure of the in-bound and through rates and properly may vary according to the relative length and nature of the in-bound and through service. It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might prescribe proportional rates on the ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations.

"The facts of record, as detailed by the division and summarized herein, clearly show that respondents are justified under section 1 in treating the ex-barge traffic the same as local or ex-truck traffic and that the proposed schedules cannot be condemned as unlawful under sections 2 and 3 of the act.

"On reconsideration of the record in the light of the petitions and replies thereto and our prior decisions, we find that:

"(1) The proportional rates here under consideration were legally applicable on the ex-barge traffic where the so-called policing provisions were strictly complied with.

"(2) The proposed schedules are shown to be just and reasonable and are not shown to be otherwise unlawful."

Accordingly the Commission ordered:

"That the order heretofore entered in this proceeding, suspending the operation of the schedules enumerated and described in said order, be, and it is hereby, vacated and set aside as of December 22, 1941, and that this proceeding be discontinued."

After the Commission had announced its decision and on December 12, 1941, appellant Mechling Barge Lines sought to intervene on the ground that since the record had been closed it had become a regular common carrier by water of grain by barge to Chicago and other rate-break points, and was entitled to the protection afforded to such carriers by the Transportation Act of 1940. It urged that the decision be set aside and, if it should be thought necessary to this end, that it be given an opportunity to introduce evidence. This was the first offer to assist the Commission in any way in the establishment of proportional rates fixed with reference to the ex-barge grain. No specific suggestion was made, however, as to the amount of such rates or as to the evidence which would be introduced in support. This petition was denied by the Commission on January 21, 1942.

On January 16, 1942, the Inland Waterways Corporation had filed its complaint in the United States district court seeking an injunction against the enforcement of the Commission's order. Various other parties were allowed to intervene in the case as plaintiffs and defendants. The Attorney General did not participate, giving as his reason the existence of a conflict in litigation between coordinate agencies of the Government, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The opinion of the specially constituted three-judge district court was announced on April 16, 1942.[11] It stated that:

"The Interstate Commerce Commission took no evidence addressed to the issue whether the rate proposal in question is in violation of section 3(4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940, or contrary to the national transportation policy enacted by the last said act; but the Interstate Commerce Commission passed upon the legality of said rate proposal upon evidence taken without reference to such issues and before they existed." It concluded that the order was of a "character which this Court is authorized to enjoin and set aside," and should be set aside on the ground that it "discriminates against water competition by the users of barges." It decreed that the Commission's order vacating the already-expired suspension of the proposed schedules and discontinuing the proceedings be annulled and that the railroads be "permanently enjoined * * * from acting upon the authority of the aforesaid order."

The case is here on appeal.[12]

In the proceedings before the commission the protestants pitched their case upon two propositions: (1) To deny the ex-barge grain the benefit of proportionals sought to be canceled was necessarily unlawful since the physical carriage beyond Chicago was substantially the same, no matter where the grain originated; (2) since denial of that benefit was necessarily unlawful, the Commission was bound to maintain the status quo by canceling the proposed schedules and thus perpetuating the existing rate structure, whatever might be its defects.

As the Commission correctly observed with reference to the first contention, "to adopt protestants' premise would mean that all proportional rates lower than local rates and differing from each other according to the origin of the commodity would have to be condemned."

Proportional rates so differing and lower than local rates for like outbound transportation have a long history, antedating the Interstate Commerce Act itself. Long hauls have generally been thought entitled to move at a rate less than the sum of the rates for local or short hauls between intermediate points. The practice of routing commodities such as grain to centers for marketing and processing has been widespread and often a necessary feature of the process of distribution. In many instances stop-overs for marketing and processing have not been considered as disrupting the continuity of transportation to more distant points, and consequently the grain has been allowed to move on at a rate lower than the out-bound rate on grain originating locally and not from a distance.[13] To get the outbound business competing carriers frequently would offer rates similarly computed.[14] Proportional rates established on this reasoning[15] have become deeply embedded in the transportation system of the country, and have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission,[16] by the Federal courts, this one included;[17] and, so far as it has spoken on the subject, by Congress itself.[18] We see no reason for repudiating them now.

Having pointed out the error of the protestants' basic contention, the Commission stated that "It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might prescribe proportional rates on this ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." Pending the commencement of such a proceeding it ordered the vacation of the already-expired order of suspension and ordered the discontinuance of the instant proceedings.

Despite this statement, much of the argument in this court has proceeded upon the

---

[7] Petitions for reconsideration were also filed by "Chicago protestants," operating elevators and dealing in grain at Chicago; Illinois Agricultural Association, representing shippers located on the Illinois waterways; Finnegan Warehouse Co., operating an elevator on the waterways; and the United States Department of Agriculture. These petitions are not incorporated in the record, but it appears that the action of Division 2 was assailed by these protestants under sec. 3 (1), set out in footnote 4.

[8] 248 I. C. C. 307.

[9] From the report of the Commission it appears that the Inland Waterways Corporation was the only one asking further hearings. It stated that further hearings could be useful only to establish the information of which the Commission took official notice, and suggested that the Commission avoid the necessity for them by taking such notice.

[10] Even under the proposed schedules, the combination barge-rail rates are in many instances lower than the all-rail rates. Much grain that arrives at Chicago is consumed locally or is shipped out by lake. In the case of grain arriving by rail, such disposition often leaves the elevator with a "transit balance" as a result of which ex-barge grain may move eastward by rail on the proportional rates.

The district court apparently did not find that there was no evidence to support the Commission's finding that it was the elevator operator, rather than the farmer, who is affected by the proposed schedules. In any event, the foregoing would seem sufficient support for the Commission's finding, and we do not suppose that the finding makes any difference in the law to be applied.

[11] 44 F. Supp. 368.

[12] Urgent Deficiencies Act of October 22, 1913, 38 Stat. 208, 219–220, 28 U. S. C. secs. 47, 47a; sec. 238 of the Judicial Code as amended, 28 U. S. C. sec. 345.

[13] E. g., Unlawful Rates in Trans. Cotton by K. C. M. & B. R. R. Co. (8 I. C. C. 121); *Central Yellow Pine Association* v. *V., S. & P. R. Co.* (10 I. C. C. 193).

[14] Berry, A Study of Proportional Rates, 10 I. C. C. Practitioner's Journal 545, 602.

[15] For the variety of practices so sustained, see Locklin, Economics of Transportation (1935), pp. 122–123, 629–631.

[16] See the dissenting opinion of Chairman Eastman in the present case. Other cases are collected in Berry, supra, footnote 14.

[17] *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* v. *United States* (279 U. S. 768); *Great Northern Ry. Co.* v. *Sullivan* (294 U. S. 458); cf. *Board of Trade* v. *United States* (314 U. S. 534).

[18] Sec. 11 of the Panama Canal Act, 1912, 37 Stat. 566, now 49 U. S. C., sec. 6 (11), set out in its present form in footnote 23, infra. Cf. S. Rept. No. 433, 76th Cong., 1st sess., p. 10.

assumption that the Commission's order resulted from its belief and findings that the discrepancies between the proportional rates not canceled in the proposed schedules and the local rates as applied to ex-barge grain were in all respects lawful, and that it actually approved or prescribed a rate structure containing such discrepancies. We do not so understand the action of the Commission.

True, the Commission stated that the railroads "are justified under section 1 in treating the ex-barge traffic the same as local or ex-truck traffic," and found that "the proposed schedules are shown to be just and reasonable." But this does not constitute a finding that the rates were lawful; they "may lie within the zone of reasonableness and yet result in undue prejudice" or otherwise violate the act.[19] The Commission also stated that the facts of record show that "the proposed schedules cannot be condemned as unlawful under sections 2 and 3 of the act."[20] But this statement followed immediately upon the Commission's statement that from its conclusion that protestants' claim as a matter of right to the existing proportionals was erroneous, "It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might prescribe proportional rates on the ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." Read in the context, we think it meant only that the proposed schedules could not be struck down upon the erroneous view advanced by the protestants. The finding of the Commission that the proposed schedules "are not shown to be otherwise unlawful" is, we think, to be similarly read. This form of finding has been held by the Commission not to constitute an approval or a prescription of the rates under suspension.[21] Since the Commission refused to approve or prescribe them, they stand only as carrier-made rates which, under the Commission's decisions, leaves them open to possible recovery of reparations.[22] Like the Commission, we also refrain from approving or prescribing them.

The case had been developed before the Commission upon the theory that the proposed schedules must stand or fall in their entirety. There has been no suggestion, nor is it apparent, that it would have been feasible for the Commission to pick and choose among the items in the existing and proposed schedules.

To perpetuate the existing rate structure by sustaining the district court's injunction would entail numerous and serious violations of section 4 (1).[23] Under that rate structure, ex-barge grain moved from Illinois River points to Baltimore, New York, and Boston at combination rates lower than the local rates for domestic grain from all points in central territory west of a line running south from Bay City, Mich., through Fort Wayne and Indianapolis, Ind. So also did the ex-barge grain move out at combination rates lower than local export rates on grain from all points in central territory west of a line running southwardly and south along the Indiana-Ohio line; and lower than the local export rates on corn from all points in central territory west of a line between Paynesville and East Liverpool, Ohio, near the Pennsylvania line. Unlike the barge-rail rate, the all-rail rates are, as the Commission has found, in strict conformity with section 4 (1). Congress by the Transportation Act of 1940 amended section 4 (1), but nowhere in the Act or in its legislative history is there any suggestion that from the mere fact that grain moving from beyond Chicago to New York travels by barge for the 60-mile leg of its journey to Chicago—less than 1 percent of the total haul—it shall as matter of law be entitled to a rate from beyond Chicago to the seaboard less than that from the Pennsylvania line to the seaboard.[24]

Appellees make no better showing with respect to the effect of the injunction on the rate structure west of Chicago. To sustain the injunction would require a holding that grain originating 60 miles from Chicago must as matter of law be given the benefit of proportionals fixed with reference to grain from the Northwest territory, embracing points in Canada and as far west in the United States as Washington and the Dakotas. In addition to the disparity in distances, there is the further fact that the grain from the Northwest is predominately wheat, while that from the territory served by the barge lines is predominately corn from Illinois. Nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940, or in the statements of even the most ardent congressional champions of water transportation, affords the slightest warrant for a decision that the Commission must treat as legally identical such widely disparate factual situations.

Finally it is claimed that the Commission was obliged to continue the section 15 (7) proceedings and establish special proportionals for the barge lines under section 6 (11) of the act.[25] This duty is claimed by appellees to derive from the provision of section 15 (7) that after suspension and hearing of a proposed rate change the Commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. The construction contended for would have the effect either of imposing a practically impossible burden upon the Commission or of making resort to the Commission's powers under section 15 (7) so rare as to make such powers of little practical significance. Suspension cases are very numerous, and in many of them the construction contended for would require the Commission to readjust the entire rate structure of an important section of the country.[26] We have already noted the breadth of the rate structure here involved. To require the present proceedings to be continued until proportionals can be set with reference to the barge transportation would hardly be within the intention of Congress, which in terms, made the Commission's power discretionary, and legislated upon the assumption, formed after much experimentation with the period of suspension,[27] that suspension cases could normally be carried to completion within 7 months and to that end commanded in section 15 (7) that the Commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over all other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

The record had been closed on January 26, 1940, when the last testimony was heard. The Transportation Act of 1940 was not enacted until September 18. At the time the evidence was taken it was not clear whether some of the barge lines operating in the waterway were common carriers, and none had obtained certificates of convenience and necessity from the Commission as now required. They had not filed reports with the Commission from which the results of their own operations might be judged, and they had not filed tariffs showing their rates. All of this has since changed. The

---

[19] *United States* v. *Illinois Central R. R. Co.* (263 U. S. 515, 524).

[20] Sec. 2, 49 U. S. C. sec. 2, reads as follows:

"If any common carrier subject to the provisions of this chapter shall, directly or indirectly, by any special rate, rebate, drawback, or other device, charge, demand, collect, or receive from any person or persons a greater or less compensation for any service rendered or to be rendered, in the transportation of passengers or property, subject to the provisions of this chapter, than it charges, demands, collects, or receives from any other person or persons for doing for him or them a like and contemporaneous service in the transportation of a like kind of traffic under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, such common carrier shall be deemed guilty of unjust discrimination, which is prohibited and declared to be unlawful."

The pertinent provisions of sec. 2 are set forth in footnote 4, supra.

[21] *Standard Packing Co.* v. *Union Pacific R. Co.* (190 I. C. C. 433); *Parkersburg Rig & Reel Co.* v. *Chicago & N. W. Ry. Co.* (198 I. C. C. 709); *William Kelly Milling Co.* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* (211 I. C. C. 53); *Kansas City Ice Co.* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* (215 I. C. C. 616, 619); *Halifax Coal & Wood Co.* v. *Atlantic & Y. Ry. Co.* (219 I. C. C. 594); *Moorehead Cotton Mills Co.* v. *Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co.* (231 I. C. C. 437).

[22] See cases cited in footnote 21, supra, Compare *Arizona Grocery Co.* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.*, (284 U. S. 370); 50 Yale Law Journal 714.

[23] See footnote 2, supra, for the text.

[24] Indeed, the legislative history shows that the water interests vigorously championed the long-and-short-haul clause as a measure necessary to prevent ruinous competition.

[25] Sec. 6 (11) provides:

"When property may be or is transported from point to point in the United States by rail and water through the Panama Canal or otherwise, the transportation being by a common carrier or carriers, and not entirely within the limits of a single State, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have jurisdiction of such transportation and of the carriers, both by rail and by water, which may or do engage in the same, in the following particulars, in addition to the jurisdiction otherwise given by this chapter:

"* * * (b) To establish proportional rates or maximum, or minimum, or maximum and minimum proportional rates, by rail to and from the ports to which the traffic is brought, or from which it is taken by the water carrier, and to determine to what traffic and in connection with what vessels and upon what terms and conditions such rates shall apply. By proportional rates are meant those which differ from the corresponding local rates to and from the port and which apply only to traffic which has been brought to the port or is carried from the port by a common carrier by water." (49 U. S. C., sec. 6 (11).)

[26] Salt from Louisiana Mines to Chicago, 69 I. C. C. 312, 313. See also, Livestock to Eastern Destinations, 156 I. C. C. 498.

[27] In the original form provided by section 12 of the Mann-Elkins Act, 1910, 36 Stat. 539, 552, the period of suspension was not to exceed 120 days, with the proviso that if the hearing could not be concluded within that period the Commission might in its discretion extend the time for a further period not exceeding 6 months. Section 4 of the Commission Division Act, 1917, 40 Stat. 270, 272, provided that until January 1, 1920, Commission approval must be had for the filing of increased rates. By section 418 of the Transportation Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 456, 486, the initial suspension period of 120 days was retained, but the permissible period of further suspension was shortened to 30 days. "The increased size of the Commission and its divisional organization rendered the shortening of the suspension period feasible" (1 Sharfman, the Interstate Commerce Commission, 203). The Commission was authorized, however, to require the carrier to keep accurate account in detail of all amounts received by reason of an increase going into effect at the end of the period of suspension and to require at the end of the hearing that they be refunded. The present provisions with regard to the Commission's power of suspension and of requiring an accounting were enacted by section 2 of the Mayton-Newfield Act, 1927 (44 Stat. 1446, 1447).

applicable law has changed. The issues raised by the position of the parties did not call for a fixing of new combination rates, for it was contended barge grain was entitled to the existing proportionals.

The policy provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940, as well as the specific statutory provisions, provide only standards of considerable generality and some overlapping. It requires administration to "recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each"—rail, water, and motor transport. It also seeks "sound economic conditions" for all kinds of transportation.[25] For more than a year after the enactment of this act, and until after the Commission had finally disposed of the case, appellees showed no disposition to make proposals or to develop a record upon the basis of which the Commission might prescribe rates in view of their particular circumstances, and under the provisions of the act designed with reference to them. Instead they relied upon the erroneous view that they were by law entitled to the fortuitous and in many respects unlawful benefits of the existing rate structure. Their nearly 4 years of litigation have not, however, been in vain, for during all this time they have managed to keep the proposed schedules in abeyance, first, by compulsory suspension for the allowable period of 7 months at the hands of the Commission, then by the railroads' voluntary act at the expiration of that period, and, finally, by the compulsion of the district court's injunction.

Our function does not permit us either to prescribe or approve rates, and our decision carries no implication of approval of any rates here involved. Nor are we at liberty to prescribe general attitudes the Commission must adopt toward the exercise of discretion left to it rather than to courts. We decide only whether the Commission has acted within the power delegated to it by law. We are of opinion that it has and that the decision of the court below must be reversed.

Mr. Justice Rutledge did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 175—OCTOBER TERM, 1942—THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILWAY CO., ET AL., APPELLANTS, *v.* INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ET AL.—ON APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO—JUNE 14, 1943

(Mr. Justice Black dissenting.)

The issue in this case is whether the farmers and shippers of the Middle West can be compelled by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads to use high-priced rail instead of low-priced barge transportation for the shipment of grain to the East. I agree that, in the words of Division 2 of the Commission, "this record is replete with complexities and technicalities" which have almost, but I think not quite, successfully obscured that simple issue. The district court, which held that the Interstate Commerce Commission's order "discriminates against water competition by the users of barges" understood the issue.[1] The railroads, which proposed the increase in the cost to barge shippers, also understood the issue as is shown by the frank statement of their representative at the Commission hearing: "We made this proposal, as I have stated several times, and filed these tariffs with the hope that we could drive this business off of the water and back onto the rails where it belongs. * * * We are not in love with water transportation * * * and we believe that we are entitled to that grain business." From behind a verbal camouflage of "complexities and technicalities" there emerges one single easily understandable question: Rails pick up grain in Chicago which may be brought there by rail, lake transport, or inland waterway barge. Is it lawful for a railroad to deprive midwestern grain farmers and shippers of the benefits of cheap barge transportation by charging a higher tariff for reshipment of grain originally transported to Chicago by barge than the same railroad charges for reshipment of the same grain from Chicago to the same places when the grain is brought to the reshipping point by rail or by lake?

The record shows, and it was admitted at the bar, that barges can by reason of their inherent advantages carry grain more cheaply than railroads. The Commission found that inbound grain barge rates to Chicago ranged from 2.75 to 4.5 cents per hundred pounds for hauls of distances of 57 to 200 miles as contrasted with rail rates for the same distances ranging from 9.5 to 13 cents. Grain can thus be brought to Chicago far more cheaply by barge than by rail. However, only a small proportion of the grain which is sent to Chicago stays in that city, and the new tariff approved by the Commission and by this Court will charge so much more for the shipment of grain to the East when the grain is brought to Chicago by barge than is charged for shipment of grain brought in by rail that this natural advantage of barge transportation will be destroyed. Hereafter it will cost 8.5 cents more to ship ex-barge than ex-rail grain to the East.[2] Under the existing rates, a farmer can ship his grain from Kansas City to New York by barge to Chicago and rail from Chicago to New York for 4.625 cents less than if he uses rail transport all the way from Kansas City to New York. Under the new schedule approved today, that differential is wiped out, and he will hereafter pay 3.875 more to ship by barge and rail than if he ships rail all the way. This order in substance gives ex-barge traffic a 4-cent disadvantage where it previously had a 4-cent advantage. Similar penalties are imposed upon shippers who use barge lines in Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois. The Commission, as its sole finding on the impact of the rates on the barge lines, found that the new rates would not prohibit barge shipments. Such a finding is irrelevant. A rate need not be prohibitive to be discriminatory. The new rate is manifestly intended to and will have the effect of transferring most of the barge traffic to the railroads, since shippers will not customarily pay 10 percent more to ship by barge-rail than by rail alone.[3]

Certain questions may be put to one side without elaborate discussion. The new rates cannot be justified on a theory of distinction between long and short hauls, since the distances covered are substantially the same whether barge-rail or all-rail transportation is used. The Court asserts that the existing all-rail rates are lawful under the long and short haul clauses, while the existing barge-rail rates are unlawful. But there is nothing in the long and short haul clause which requires that shippers by rail to Chicago from points in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri must be granted a low rate for shipment beyond Chicago which is denied to those who ship into Chicago by barge. Nor is the fact that the rates directly affected by the new tariff are "proportional" of any significance.[4] A through rate may be invalid because of one factor only of the combination of rates which make it up, "and that factor may be a proportional rate."[5] The only issue to be decided is whether the barge shipper shipping from a given point to Chicago should be given any different proportional rate than rail shippers shipping from the same point to Chicago for equal service out of Chicago, and, for reasons to be set forth below, I find no justification for such a discrimination.[6]

There is no factual issue here on which we are bound to accept the Commission's judgment as we were in *United States* v. *Chicago Heights Trucking Co.*, 310 U. S. 344. Here we have a rate revision which can serve no conceivable purpose except to force shippers to use railroads instead of barge lines. Reasonable persons may differ as to the wisdom of such a policy, but not as to the certainty of its result; and, as will be shown, Congress has made the policy judgment and has flatly forbidden the Commission to do what it has done. The situation is similar to *Mitchell* v. *United States*, 313 U. S. 80, 97, in which the Commission sought to shelter a flatly forbidden discrimination behind the shield of expertise. There, too, we were cited to the Chicago Heights case and our many other decisions upholding the right of administrative agencies to make factual judgments. We replied that "On the facts here presented, there is no room, as the Government properly says, for administrative or expert judgment with respect to practical difficulties. It is enough that the discrimination shown was palpably unjust and forbidden by the act." Such, I think, should be our answer here.

This tariff is an unjust discrimination within the meaning of section 2 of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U. S. C. section 2, which prohibits a carrier from demanding a charge either higher or lower than

---

[25] See footnote 4, supra.

[1] 44 F. Supp. 368, 375.

[2] The figure given is the increase in cost of shipment to the best eastern market. The cost varies, depending on the destination of the grain.

[3] The new rates for shipment from Chicago to the East, of course, do not prohibit barge shipments to Chicago since the small amount of grain consumed in that city will not be affected by the outgoing rates, and some grain can still be carried to the East by lake transportation for so much of the year as the Lakes are open to traffic.

The Court quotes the finding of the Commission that "the proposed schedules are not prohibitive" and that their principal effect will be to reduce the profits of the Chicago elevator operators. If the schedules operate unfairly, as I think they do, it is immaterial whether the farmers or the elevator operators bear the burden of the unfairness; but the Court in relying on this finding pays little regard to the fact that the court below found as a fact that the saving from barge transportation "accrues to the producer" and "does not accrue to the Chicago elevator operator." Unless the Court is willing, as apparently it is not, to reexamine the evidence and to conclude that the court below is in error, we must take the facts as they are given to us by the district court. In any case, I think the district court was correct.

[4] "A through rate is ordinarily lower than the combination of the local rates. When a through rate is made by combination of rates for intermediate distances the rate for the later link in the shipment is, when lower than the local, spoken of as a proportional rate" (*Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry.* v. *United States*, 279 U. S. 268, 771).

[5] *Ibid*, 776.

[6] The Commission and the Court refer to the fact that ex-barge rates are now equal to ex-truck rates. This is irrelevant. If there is a discrimination against truck shippers, the remedy is an improvement of their situation, not a destruction of barge shipping. In the words of Chairman Eastman in his dissenting opinion, "My tentative opinion upon it is that where the movement by truck is from territory from which grain can be moved by rail or by water to Chicago subject to the application of the reshipping rates eastbound, the failure to apply such rates to the grain brought in by truck does result in violation of sections 2 and 3, provided adequate provisions for the identification and policing of such shipments are practicable and enforceable."

is charged by any other person for doing for him "a like and contemporaneous service in the transportation of a like kind of traffic under substantially similar circumstances and conditions." Many decisions make clear that this section does in fact require a real equality. *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Baltimore & Ohio Railway Co.*, 225 U. S. 326; *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* v. *United States*, 279 U. S. 768. The Commission counters with a contention that here there is "a dissimilarity of conditions prior to the rendering of the transportation service for which the charge in issue is assessed."

True there is a difference, if only one, in the conditions prior to the rendering of the service from Chicago to the East. The difference is solely that one class of grain moves in to Chicago by barge and another moves in by other means; and this is a ground not of legitimate distinction, but of unfair discrimination. The discrimination would be no worse if the benefits of the cheap through rates were given only to shippers on a favored railroad coming into Chicago, and not to other shippers by rail (*Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* v. *United States*, supra, 773). Here all circumstances and conditions are substantially similar, and the Court ought to require the Commission to obey the law by following its own previously announced rule in *Chattanooga Packet Co.* v. *I. C. R. R. Co.* (33 I. C. C. 384, 392, 393), in which the Commission said: "If carriers are permitted to apply higher rates for the same service on traffic routed over connecting water lines than on traffic via the all-rail connections, they will be in a position to destroy all-water competition and to deprive shippers of the advantage of their location upon navigable waters. * * * We are of the opinion and find that, by restricting their proportional rates to traffic routed over their southern rail connections, defendants are unjustly discriminating against complainant and against shippers who desire to route their goods over complainant's boat line."

The decision of the Commission also violates section 3 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U. S. C. section 3 (4), which under the 1940 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act is applicable to the appellees, and which forbids carriers to "discriminate in their rates, fares, and charges between connecting lines." This section became applicable to the appellees in the course of the Commission's disposition of this case, but before its opinion was filed. This circumstance is not, as the Commission seems to have supposed, a reason for ignoring the section. No more obvious "discrimination in their rates, fares, and charges" can be imagined, particularly in the light of the general policy of the Transportation Act of 1940.

I think that approval of this tariff is a defiance of the Transportation Act of 1940. 54 Stat. 899. This act declared it to be "the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each." Title I, section 1. The act commands the Interstate Commerce Commission that "all of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy." Congress, fearful, in the words of several members, that the Commission was "essentially a railroad minded body,"[7] took every precaution to prevent discrimination against water carriers.[8]

Senators, particularly those from the Midwestern States where the barge lines involved here were operating, were especially fearful that the Commission would do substantially what it has done in this case. They required repeated assurance by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate that the bill was written in such manner that the Commission could not if it desired permit discrimination against water carriers. At great length the chairman of that committee explained to apprehensive Senators that the bill contained provisions in three different places which imposed upon the Commission the imperative duty of standing in constant opposition to discrimination against shippers by water.[9]

House Members shared the same fears. The first conference report was defeated in the House because it was believed that the bill did not offer adequate protection for water carriers against hostile Interstate Commerce Commission action.[10] A proponent of the bill told the House that "It is not fair to suggest, in my opinion, that the Commission and the courts will not look to this declaration of policy whenever they are called upon to make such construction of the statute and application of it. * * * The specific provisions of the bill carry out the declaration of policy. The courts and commissions will recognize that. * * *."[11] Defending the policy provisions as a complete protection against Commission action antagonistic to barge transportation, another sponsor of the bill, opposing a safeguarding amendment, declared that to consider it necessary "You will have to further assume that the Interstate Commerce Commission will not enforce it. You will have to assume that if a case goes to the courts the courts will neither construe nor enforce the provisions of this policy."[12] As I see it, the Commission in this case has declined to enforce Congress' policy and the Court has failed to construe and enforce the act as Congress clearly intended it should.

This is not all. The first conference report having been defeated, the second conference report brought in changes intended to offer more protection to water carriers. The conferees reported that: "This measure will place upon the Interstate Commerce Commission not only the power, but the duty, to protect and foster water transportaion and preserve its inherent advantages."[13] As a closing, clinching argument intended to persuade the House that the Commission would be fair to water carriers, the statement of Commissioner Eastman (who dissented from the order of the Commission here) was quoted. Eastman assured the Congressmen interested in water transportation that certain provisions of the bill "coupled with the admonition in the declaration of policy in section 1 that the provisions of the act be so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation, will afford adequate protection in this respect. If experience should show that further protection is needed, contrary to our expectation, Congress can amend the act, but such a restriction as is now proposed is, we believe, both unnecessary and undesirable."[14]

The final statement of the last proponent of the 1940 act, spoken just before the vote was taken on the second conference report, were these: "There is nothing whatever in the pending measure which could by any fair interpretation be regarded as unjust to water transportation or to any other kind of transportation." The speaker then read the policy provisions of section 1 and asked: "How much plainer could language be than that is? It is crystal clear that there is no basis in the bill for the apprehension expressed by those opposed to the measure."[15]

Although these proceedings were not initiated under the 1940 act,[16] the Commission

---

[7] 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5965, 5883, 5880–81. Legislation similar in purpose to the 1940 act was considered by Congressional committees in the 74th and subsequent Congresses. Opposition to legislation giving the Commission authority over water transportation came from representatives of the water shippers. A typical protest was made by Cleveland A. Newton, general counsel, Mississippi Valley Association, in the hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 5379: "This bill if enacted into law will place water carriers along the coast and upon our inland rivers under the absolute domination and control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That Commission was created to regulate, conserve, and control railways. It is a railway-regulating agency. It naturally has the railway viewpoint, and past experience convinces us that the Commission, as now constituted, is railway-minded and that it would not be in the public interest to place water services under its domination and control. * * * We have observed the performance of the Commission in the past, under a comprehensive declaration of policy enacted by Congress, and that experience, we regret to say, has not inspired confidence." Hearings, p. 471.

[8] "Mr. LUCAS. * * * Under the bill, as I understand it, the Interstate Commerce Commission would have the power, and it would be its duty, to fix rates on the Illinois River with respect to the transportation of that wheat and corn. Would it be possible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the rate the same as the railroad rate from that point to St. Louis?

"Mr. WHEELER. Not if the Commission does its duty, because the bill specifically provides that it must take into consideration the inherent advantages of the water carrier. Everyone agrees that goods can be shipped more cheaply by water than by rail." 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5879.

The following Senators and Representatives, among others, either required assurance that the Commission would not discriminate against water carriers or expressed the conviction that under the statement of policy, the Commission would be unable to discriminate against water carriers: Senators Austin, Clark of Missouri, Connally, Ellender, Lucas, Miller, McNary, Norris, Pepper, Shipstead, Truman, and Wheeler; Representatives Bland, Bulwinkle, Crosser, Culkin, Halleck, Lea, Pierce of Oregon, Sparkman, and Wadsworth.

[9] 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6125–6128.

[10] The first conference report was rejected by the House on May 9, 1940, 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5886. The second report was accepted on August 12, 1940, 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10193.

[11] 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9685.

[12] 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9863.

[13] 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10172.

[14] 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10191. In his dissenting opinion, Chairman Eastman said: "The report states that the 'proposed schedules will not prohibit the movement by barge-rail even to trunk line territory, their principal commercial effect being to reduce the profit of the Chicago elevator operators.' I do not so understand the evidence. * * * As I understand it, the effect of the proposed schedule, unless the prices paid to the farmers whose grain is barged are reduced, will be to limit the outlet of the ex-barge grain to local consumption in Chicago and to the lake and lake-rail routes to eastern points."

[15] 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10192.

[16] The 1940 act gave the Commission jurisdiction to regulate water transportation directly. Here the same effect is achieved under the Commission's other powers by a tariff aimed at shippers who have previously used water transportation. For the background and nature of the 1940 act see Eastman, The Transportation Problem (30 Amer. Econ. Rev. 124); Stein, Federal Regulation of Water Carriers (16 Jour. Land and Pub. Util. Econ. 478); Harbeson, the Transportation Act of 1940 (17 *ibid*, 291); Regulation of Water Carriers (50 Yale L. Jour. 654).

should have felt itself bound by that congressional expression of policy. Yet the legislative history just recited makes it clear that the Commission has flagrantly flouted the express mandate of Congress. It is said, however, that the Commission reserves the right to take further action in a "proper proceeding" in which it "might prescribe proportional rates [on the ex-barge traffic] or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." At some future day the Commission may correct this discrimination. But the day for Commission action was the day this case was decided, and the day for action by this Court is now. The Commission is not bound by the technical procedures of the common law, and it should not strain to avoid the enforcement of congressional will because of the formal fashion in which questions are presented to it. In this proceeding it was the Commission's duty "to protect and maintain a transportation system free from partiality to particular shippers. The Commission acted in its capacity as a public agency" and was obligated to carry out "duties imposed upon it by Congress in the interest of shippers generally, the national transportation system, and the public interest" (*United States* v. *Trucking Co.*, supra, 354). The fact that this was not a formal proceeding to fix proportional rates under section 6 (11) (b) did not detract from the Commission's powers (*Chicago R. I. & P. R. Co.* v. *United States*, 274 U. S. 28, 36; *United States* v. *New York Railroad Co.*, 272 U. S. 457, 462). The Commission itself in cases where the command of Congress was far less emphatic than here, has stated that an investigation and suspension proceeding such as this one "opens for consideration the lawfulness of the suspended rate under all provisions of the act" (Sugar From Gulf Coast Port Groups to Northern Points, 234 I. C. C. 247, 251). "The reproach of dealing with the matter piecemeal" is incurred by the Commission here as it was in *United States* v. *Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 499, 510). It cannot, with due regard to its duty, shift responsibility "from the shoulders of the present to the shoulders of the days to come." Here, as in that case, postponement serves to leave "this particular carrier helpless in the interval." [17]

Congressman BLAND, who opposed the 1940 act on the ground that it lacked sufficient safeguards to prevent action by the Commission hostile to water transportation called attention to the procedural delays in rate cases before that body, delays which he declared would be used to strangle financially weak water carriers, forcing them to "yield or transfer their operation to other streams." He pointed out this "would mean the death of water carriers"; that the railroads knew how to obtain delay and knew the disastrous consequences that would follow to their competitors; that railroads "seek to profit" by procedural delay; and that the diversity of their interests and extent of their revenues was so great that they could survive delays which would be unendurable for competitors.[18] The Congressman was a good observer and a sound prophet.

[17] The court interprets the Commission's order as leaving open the right of the shippers affected to bring actions for reparations for injuries suffered under the new rates. This will bring small practical comfort to the barge lines since the shippers will be unlikely to ship by barge when the price of every shipment is dependent on future legal proceedings. The barge lines, "helpless in the interval" pending new legal proceedings, risk serious financial injury, if not bankruptcy. While the shippers can ship by barge now and sue later, they are presumably interested in buying transportation, not lawsuits.

[18] 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10181.

The judgment of the district court enjoining enforcement of this order was correct and should be affirmed.

Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Murphy join in this opinion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views of the Interstate Commerce Committee upon the Transportation Act of 1939, presented to the Senate at that time by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the minority views (pt. 2 of report 433) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

(To accompany S. 2009, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by extending its application to additional types of carriers and transportation and modifying certain provisions thereof, and for other purposes)

A minority of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill S. 2009, having considered the same, recommend that it do not pass.

IMPORTANT REASONS WHY S. 2009 SHOULD NOT PASS

1. Regulation of transportation in any form or by any tribunal operates to increase the cost of the service to the public. Regulation, therefore, should never be carried beyond a point positively necessary to curb improper practices and protect the public interest.

2. While the need for the regulation of the railroads has been proved, there is no showing of any need to regulate water carriers and other modes of transportation for the protection of the public interest or for the purpose of reducing the cost of transportation to the producers and the consumers of the Nation.

3. The producers and the consumers of the Nation pay the entire cost of transportation (including the tax payments that are made by each mode of transportation) regardless of what that total cost may be. Chairman WHEELER stated during the hearing:

"He (the farmer) pays the transportation cost on the thing he sells and he pays the transportation cost on the thing he buys."

Unquestionably, the burden of the freight cost falls most heavily upon the farmers, because, as Senator WHEELER points out, he pays the freight cost in both directions. Why then should the burden on the farmers be increased in the slightest degree? Why should the Congress hurriedly enact this legislation and risk increasing the farmers' burden at this time? Are not the farmers being dispossessed of their homes and their farms rapidly enough as a result of present economic inequality? The official records show they have been dispossessed by the hundreds of thousands. Since 1925 over one-third of the farms in the United States have changed hands through forced sale. Since when has the farmer received any interest return on his investment or for the sweat of his brow? Why should the consumers be called upon to bear any increase in the cost of transportation during these trying times when about one-half of our population is being called upon to feed the greatest relief roll in our history?

4. The witness, Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and chairman of its legislative committee, testified that the bill will operate to stabilize the rates over water routes and prevent such rates from being so low as to come under the prohibition against "destructive competition." In the sense of considering water rates versus railroad rates, "stabilization" means a freezing of the water rates and a discontinuance of the practice of making water rates each day so as to move commerce at low cost. Mr. Eastman testified in opposition to the bill on his own behalf and also on behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission. All opponents of the bill, without exception, expressed a definite belief the bill will operate to increase the cost of transportation to the public.

5. The water highways of the Nation have been improved at public expense for the sole purpose of providing arteries of commerce over which transportation and distribution may be had at low cost. Regulation and the fixing of minimum rates, as the bill provides, will increase the cost of distribution materially, and that increased cost will be paid largely by the farmers.

6. Has demand for regulation of water carriers come from the farmers? Positively no. Has it come from the consumers? Positively no. Has it come from commercial organizations? Positively no. Has it come from the processors or distributors? Positively no. Where has the demand for regulation come from? It comes from the railroads. Railroad management wants to increase the railroad earnings for the benefit of the holders of their stocks and bonds. This is the sole purpose of this bill.

7. The bill is not designed to help railroad labor in any manner whatsoever. It cannot be interpreted nor applied so as to help railroad labor. Railroad labor—like all other labor—is sorely in need of a general increase in business activity in all directions to increase employment. This needed increase in business cannot be stimulated by raising the cost of transportation nor by the elimination of water carriers which should be used more extensively in an effort to expand industry and increase the volume of traffic for all modes of transportation. Examine the circumstances of the railroads that are in financial difficulty and it will be found that they are not losing tonnage to water routes. They are being crushed under the weight of their own structures. The tonnage now moving by water that might possibly be diverted to the railroads would not increase the employment of railroad labor. It would merely increase the distance between the engine and the caboose, and it would throw out of employment approximately 100,000 workers who are now engaged in the handling of this commerce. A diversion of traffic from the trucks to the railroads is not likely to increase rail-labor employment to any material extent. If all truckers are thrown out of their jobs it is certain to intensify the unemployment situation. Over 80 percent of the truck traffic is short-haul commerce that railroad management has proclaimed repeatedly as being undesirable and costly for railroad handling.

8. The coastal waterway improvements are nearing completion. The Great Lakes waterway improvements, including the New York State Barge Canal, are nearing completion. The Mississippi waterway improvements are nearing completion. They constitute the greatest inland system of improved navigable waters in the world. The improvement of the Mississippi waterway system is of such recent date that water-front facilities and watercraft necessary to economic and efficient handling of the enormous tonnage available to it is in its pioneering development stage. Regulation, as provided in this bill, is certain to stifle, retard, and possibly prevent the construction of this needed equipment. The requirement, under the restrictive provisions of this bill, to show a public necessity and convenience before engaging in water-carrier service will operate to the disadvantage of

the entire region tributary to this waterway system and particularly the Gulf ports that should be important distributing centers for much of this area.

9. The declaration of policy (sec. 1), the minimum rate authority (sec. 26), the rule of rate making (sec. 30), and the long-and-short-haul provision (sec. 50) must be read together to understand the true meaning of this bill and appreciate the important and disastrous increases in the Nation's freight cost that are likely to follow in its wake. Notwithstand fervent representations by the proponents of the bill to the contrary—the four sections of the bill herein referred to are designed to hold the rate levels of the water carriers and the motor carriers to the railroad rate levels, or substantially so, and the need of the railroads for revenue to maintain their property and pay dividends. The bill was prepared and presented by railroad lawyers.

10. The bill attempts to codify (and, in a considerable degree, to rewrite) the whole body of Federal regulatory transportation law, which represents accumulated experience, necessary amendments, and court decisions of half a century. Its enactment will result in uncertainty and prolonged litigation to determine its meaning. Mr. Eastman urges that such extensive and important changes should be given long-time consideration. Codification is the duty of a public body which will consider such an enormous undertaking from the standpoint of the public interest. Aside from the origin of the bill, the undue haste and procedure adopted in furthering it are not only improper but tragically dangerous. Originally proposed by railroad management and railroad lawyers, this bill seeks to impose extreme and destructive regulations upon water carriers and motor carriers for the sole purpose of capturing for the railroads the business now moving over water and vehicular highways, and restore to the railroads a monopoly in the field of transportation. This will not be in the public interest.

BRIEF HISTORY OF REGULATORY LEGISLATION

(Supporting No. 1)

Following an exhaustive study, and recognizing the demand of an injured and outraged public, the Congress of the United States passed, and the President signed, the Interstate Commerce Act on February 4, 1887, to become effective April 5 of the same year. It was aimed to correct and to eliminate certain practices and abuses of the railroads of that period, involving the granting of special and discriminatory rates and privileges, the giving of rebates to favored shippers, and the charging of higher rates at intermediate points than was being charged from more distant points over the same line and route on the same commodity. Regulation of other modes of transportation and particularly water transportation has been urged for a long period of time. Application of regulation to water carriers was urged for the purpose of lessening their influence in the reduction of railroad rates and not because of any other wrongdoing against the public interest. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its first annual report in 1888, made the following recommendation:

"The Commission also recommends that the carriers engaged independently in interstate traffic on the rivers, lakes, and other navigable waters of the country be put in respect to the making, publishing, and maintaining rates upon the same footing with interstate carriers by rail. It is believed they will be benefited rather than harmed thereby, and that the execuses now made by carriers by rail for great disparities in rates for corresponding transportations as between points which are and points which are not affected by water competition would thereby to a large extent be taken away."

No one can read the above recommendation and be left with the impression that regulation is wanted or needed for any other purpose than to raise the water cost of transportation high enough to eliminate any need for the railroads to reduce their rates.

The above report was made to the Fiftieth Congress, and for over 50 years each Congress has refused to place the water carriers under regulation of any agency of the Government. During all this time there has been no showing of any need for regulation of water carriers to protect the public interest, and there is no such showing at the present time. Many of the railroads are in bad financial condition while others are in excellent financial condition. The roads that are in bad shape, for the most part, cannot and have not pointed to water competition as the basis for their trouble. The condition of the roads that are in bad shape has been seized upon by the Association of American Railroads as a possible means of destroying all competitive modes of transportation and restoring the monopoly they held for so many years. The Interstate Commerce Commission, unwittingly or otherwise, has lent its influence to the idea of regulation, until all modes of transportation are now under regulation except the carriers by water.

The economy of transportation by water must be preserved, and the carriers by water should not be placed under regulation until it can be shown they are indulging in monopolistic practices and failing to give to the public the low water rates the producers and the consumers are entitled to enjoy over these publicly maintained highways.

Regulation of the railroads, in its present form, has been made necessary by reason of their own improper acts. They were not put under regulation for the purpose of protecting some other mode of transportation. That the present regulation of the railroads is not rigid enough is abundantly demonstrated by their acts and practices currently from year to year. (See S. Rept. No. 25 (in six parts, 76th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 71, 74th Cong.) The provisions of the original Interstate Commerce Act did not reach and correct all of the railroad practices that were regarded as improper and against the public interest, and, therefore, the act has been amended from time to time until it is now claimed by railroad managements that the railroads of the Nation are being strangled by a system of strait-jacket regulation. The minority find no basis for subscribing to that viewpoint. Furthermore, it is significant that railroad managements are not seeking the repeal of any provision of the act which might operate to reduce the cost of transportation to the public.

It is important to observe here that during the 50-year period of building up regulation of the railroads to correct their abuses the Congress has not only refused to put the water carriers under regulation but it has responded to public demand for the improvement of the Nation's waterways and has appropriated public funds to provide arteries of commerce over which transportation and distribution may be had at low cost. We must not now be blinded by the financial condition of some of the railroads and the smoke screen that is hiding the purpose to regulate the water carriers of the Nation. The purpose of this legislation is to prevent one type of carrier from rendering transportation service at low cost when by so doing it will depress the rates of another carrier or operate to divert the business from the high-cost carrier. The public is entitled to water-carrier service at low cost, and regulation cannot do otherwise than stabilize and increase the cost of the service.

Motor-carrier regulation was enacted in 1935 without public demand for such regulation. It has not operated to reduce the cost of motor-carrier transportation. The witness representing the motortruck operators reports general satisfaction with regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. They should be satisfied with their regulation, those who have remained in the business, because their rates have been rapidly stabilized and thousands of the small independent truckers who were able to make a living before regulation are now out of business. Many of the independent truck operators who have thus far survived have been denied the privilege of maintaining service at rates profitable to them but lower than existing charges. Would there have come an expression of satisfaction from the larger truck operators except for the fact that they are collecting increased charges and are being relieved rapidly of the competition of independent operators? It is significant that no such position was taken by the motorbus operators. The witness, Mr. Eastman, stated the Commission has invoked the minimum-rate rule extensively against truck operators to prevent the establishment of rates and charges that were regarded as being too low.

The improper practices of the railroads that made necessary the present regulation of them does not appear to have been adopted by the other modes of transportation. There is positively no evidence, nor is there the slightest suggestion, that water carriers have indulged in or are indulging in the practice of charging rates that are excessive, that are discriminatory, that are preferential, or that are prejudicial.

While the motortruck carriers, under regulation, have been able to stabilize most of their rates and charges on the basis of the railroad-rate levels, or closely to that level, there is no showing of improper or unfair dealing with the public as regards discrimination, preference, or prejudice. Their use of the public vehicular highways in the future may, therefore, be predicated upon their convenience and necessity more largely than upon their economy and savings in transportation costs to the public.

The bill carries no provision that assures the preservation or the protection of short-line railroads, many of which will be ruthlessly destroyed if and when their joint rates and services with other railroads are terminated.

WATER AND MOTOR CARRIERS

(Supporting No. 2)

The expansion of water-carrier and motor-carrier service is of recent development and largely within the past 15 years. This development has gone far toward breaking railroad monopoly in the field of transportation. It came about following the unusual increases in railroad rates of 1920. These railroad-rate increases, following former heavy increases, left little or nothing of the consumer's dollar for the farmer engaged in the production of the essentials of life. These high rates were forcing industry to decentralize and shorten the transportation haul in every direction, or relocate at points having deep-water navigation and low-water rates. The shift of population following the shift of industry had its effect upon congressional representation and it awakened the Nation to the economic danger of such a trend. Agriculture needed and sought relief from these high freight costs. Farms could not be moved and industrial workers were necessarily concentrating along the rim of the Nation and farther from the source of farm production. The answer to this growing economic problem was found when agriculture and industry joined hands for the improvement of all navigable waters for transportation purposes, together with an extensive program for improved vehicular highways.

The water highways and the vehicular highways belong to all the people and should be used forever in the public interest. The improvement work is nearing completion and whatever benefit can be obtained from low-cost transportation over these highways should be conserved in the public interest.

Regulation of water and motor carriers cannot and will not lower the cost of transportation for these means of distribution. There has been no showing that water or motor carriers need to be regulated for any purpose except to lessen the effect of their competition upon the railroads. The adoption of this legislation clearly contemplates a freezing of the water-carriers' rate structure to a higher level approximating the railroad rates.

THE PRODUCERS AND THE CONSUMERS TO BEAR THE INCREASED BURDEN

(Supporting No. 3)

That there will be an increase, and likely a substantial increase, in the Nation's transportation bill by the adoption of this legislation, there can be no reasonable doubt. It seems incredible that any person can take refuge in the thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been urging regulation of water carriers since its first annual report in 1888 to curb their effect on the railroads, will not be immediately sympathetic to an increase in water rates. And, if they were not sympathetic to an increase, they would have no escape from the demand imposed upon them under the provisions of the bill when they are confronted with a formal proceeding in which demand is made for an increase in the water-transportation rates.

There can be no concealment of the fact that the producers and the consumers of the Nation actually pay the entire cost of transportation, regardless of what that total cost may be. Nor should it be overlooked that included in that cost are the tax payments that are made by each mode of transportation. The carriers in every case are simply tax collectors and not taxpayers in the true sense.

Unquestionably, the burden of the freight cost falls most heavily upon the farmer, because, as Senator WHEELER points out, he pays the freight in both directions. Why then should the burden of the farmers be increased in the slightest degree? Why should the Congress hurriedly enact this legislation and invite an increase in the farmers' burden at this time? Are not the farmers being dispossessed of their homes and their farms rapidly enough under our present economy, which has stabilized disparity and inequality? The official records show they are being dispossessed by the hundreds of thousands. Since when has the farmer received any interest return on his investment or for the sweat of his brow? The consumers should not be called upon to bear increased transportation costs during these trying times while they and the producers are being asked to carry the greatest number of unemployed on relief.

Farm income has declined 40 percent in the years from 1920 to 1938. The ratio of prices paid to prices received by farmers has dropped from 105 in 1920 to 78 in 1938. The decline in income and in ratio is a staggering and destructive blow that will take a long while to correct and overcome. Nothing has so far been accomplished through farm-relief measures to permanently improve this situation. Despite the fact that we paid out 34 percent more in farm subsidies in 1938 than we did in 1937, farm income was 11 percent lower in 1938 than it was in 1937. Legislation of this kind can only make this vicious attack on the farm standard of living worse. During this time the total units of farm production have shown an increase.

The income for the more prosperous railroads in 1938 was sufficient to equal an aggregate return on the stocks and bonds of all the railroads of the Nation approximating 2 percent. No other important economic group fared better. Certainly the farm income and consumer income is in no condition to sustain the slightest increase in the cost of distribution. The average revenue per ton-mile of the railroads was, in 1920, 1.052 as compared with 0.982 in 1938, a decrease of 6⅔ percent. The revenue ton-miles for the same years decreased 29 percent, while railroad employment decreased 53½ percent. The physical condition of the railroads at the end of 1938 is reported as normal or better; all roads being included and taken as a whole. The income to railroad investors, on the whole, is not satisfactory but it has been uniformly better than most of the industrial groups and far better than farm income (which has been below zero for a long while). There is no economic sense to voting aid and assistance to the farmers in one bill while in another bill (this bill) the Congress permits the taking of a greater sum from him by means of increasing his freight costs.

Nowhere, apparently, has reasonable or proper consideration been given to the interests of the producers and the consumers of the Nation in the preparation of this bill. Regulation is certain to increase the cost of transportation to everyone even though residing inland from water ports. The price paid the farmer for grain is based upon the cost of water transportation over a considerable part of the distance on its journey to the consumer. Regulation, admittedly, will be helpful to some of the carriers, but it will be costly to the public and improperly so.

INCREASE THE FREIGHT COST

(Supporting No. 4)

For years the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended regulation for water carriers for the purpose of harmonizing the cost of transportation over both water and rail routes. Mr. Eastman expresses the opinion this legislation will operate to stabilize water rates. Opponents of this bill have expressed a definite belief it will operate to increase the cost of transportation if it becomes law. Under the provisions of existing laws the railroads are entitled to earn 5¾ percent on the money invested in railroad plant. The railroad managements represent this investment to be in excess of $26,000,000,000. On the railroad basis of investment the annual net income should be $1,495,000,000. Their net income has been about one-third that amount and has been held down by competition of other modes of transportation, largely water-carrier competition. The manner in which it is proposed to regulate water carriers means increasing the water-carrier rates more nearly to the rail rates. While there are some provisions of the pending bill that provide for the fixing of rates according to the character and type of service, such provisions are definitely qualified by language that commands the protection of the railroad revenues. Water-carrier regulation is not demanded by the public, it is not wanted by the public, it cannot reduce the transportation cost to the public, and it has absolutely no purpose except to stabilize the water rates upward.

WATER AND VEHICULAR HIGHWAYS—WHO BENEFITS FROM LOW-COST TRANSPORTATION

(Supporting No. 5)

The Great Lakes Waterway system is among the first of our inland water routes to be improved for heavy freight traffic. The dredging and improving of the Lakes chain, the building of water-front facilities, and water craft are all a part of this important water highway and for the most part the improvements have been prosecuted at public expense. This system now connects with ocean commerce at Montreal over the St. Lawrence River and at New York over the New York State Barge Canal.

Great ocean ports have been developed at the principal cities along the east and west coasts and along the Gulf. Over these improved waters is handled the import and the export business of the Nation and all foreign shipping with a few unimportant exceptions. These ocean ports are being connected with a system of coastal canals stretching along the Gulf and the Atlantic to form almost a continuous inland route from Corpus Christi, Tex., to New York. This inland route provides protection to shipping from the hazards of ocean navigation.

The Mississippi Waterway system constitutes the most recent undertaking of the Federal Government to bring deep-water navigation into the heart of the Nation's productive area from the soil and the mine. From the Gulf at New Orleans it stretches northward to Minneapolis, Minn., and like fingers of the hand it serves Pittsburgh, over the Ohio; Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City, over the Missouri; Chicago and the Great Lakes over the Illinois, and numerous other points of importance over improved tributaries. Upon this system rests the hope, and the only hope, of agriculture and a great inland empire for a reduction in the freight cost of distribution. The purpose that inspired the improvement of this great waterway must not be defeated by the regulation of water carriers and the fixing of minimum rates. Water-front facilities and watercraft are just coming into service on this improved highway. Commerce over it is on the increase and the benefits of low-cost transportation are accruing to the farmers of the region and farm products are on the move that otherwise would have no value to the farmer. It is impractical, in this brief appeal for defeat of this legislation, to enumerate any considerable number of specific instances where farmers and consumers receive benefit from the low-cost transportation now being made available. It is hoped the following citations will be convincing and sufficient evidence to overwhelmingly defeat this bill:

Gen. T. Q. Ashburn, president, Inland Waterways Corporation, testified as to important movement of grain by water and on which the farmers actually did receive materially higher prices because of the low water costs of transportation. General Ashburn filed for the record a letter dated Dalton, Mo., December 7, 1938, from the Farmers Elevator Co. It reads:

"Because of the loading facilities the Glasgow Elevator Co. has on the river, they are able to pay 6 cents a bushel more for corn and wheat than we can and this grain that belongs to our trade territory is going to Glasgow.

"We are about 4½ miles from the river where we think might be a good place for us to load on barges. Would we be allowed to build a loading dock on the river? Could we load as many as 5,000 bushels on these barges or would we have to have more grain than that at one time?

"Unless the railroad lowers their freight rates or we can load on the river, it looks as though we will be put out of business. Any information along this line will be very much appreciated."

This elevator company, while feeling it is likely to be put out of business, is not asking that the low water rates be denied the farmers of that locality.

Quoting in part from a telegram from McKee Feed & Grain Co., Muscatine, Iowa:

"We have an elevator located on the Mississippi River at this city and last year moved more than 2,000,000 bushels of corn via Mississippi River to New Orleans for export. We attracted corn from points as far west as 150 miles due to our ability to pay a good price on account of cheap transportation on the river."

Please take serious note of the fact that the farmers received a higher price for the corn that went into the world market than was currently being paid elsewhere. Also from the record is a telegram to Chairman WHEELER from Hart, Bartlett, Sturtevant

Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo., dated April 7, 1939. It reads:

"Permit us to call attention to the fact that our organization moves large quantity grain by river, particularly for export. We handle this grain on very narrow margin of profit. We are enabled to pay higher prices for such grain because river transportation is available. Furthermore, under ordinary circumstances when United States grain is near a competitive basis in foreign importing markets the fact that grain can be moved from interior of the United States by water often makes export business in grain from this country which could not be exported without the benefit of water rates. This certainly has a bearing on the price which our farmers receive for their grain, and we believe that your committee should give these facts due consideration."

The record contains a communication from Mr. H. D. Rolf, president, the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Montana Division, reading in part as follows:

"Attention is directed to the fact that the farmers' union, Montana division, has consistently urged the development of navigable waters for transportation purposes. We are a long way from the consumers' market, and the cost of distribution of our products absorbs the larger portion of our consumer dollars. The only way we farmers of Montana can realize a greater share of the consumer dollar is to reduce the cost of distribution.

"The only way we see of materially reducing the cost of distribution is through a utilization of water transportation over as great a portion of the distance as is reasonably possible. We have advocated the development of the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi, and we have been very aggressive in our demand for this development."

The North Dakota division of the Farmers Union, the Farmers Elevator Association of South Dakota, the Farm Bureau Federation of Minnesota and South Dakota have joined in the demand for the improvement of the upper Mississippi River for transportation purposes and to reduce the cost of distribution. Supporting communications from these and numerous other cooperative farm-marketing organizations constitute a part of the record in this proceeding. The Midland Cooperative, having a membership of approximately 100,000 farmers and consumers, supports the need of water transportation at low cost and is on record against regulation of water carriers because they feel that regulation is certain to increase the cost of water service.

The witness, McClure, testified as to his knowledge of a substantial reduction in rate on cotton over the water route. The witness, Childe, expressed positive knowledge that sugar costs are now figured on the basis of water-cost transportation; that railroad rates on sugar from Colorado to Chicago have been reduced to equalize the water rate from New Orleans. The witness, Feltus, expressed positive knowledge that in the distribution of grain and grain products, all savings in the cost of water transportation goes to the producer or the consumer and that such savings are not absorbed by the millers or other intermediate agencies of distribution. He also expressed positive knowledge that coal consumers of the Northwest are given the benefit of the low cost of water transportation. The record contains many important and interesting illustrations from which we submit the following:

The all-rail mileage from Duluth to Buffalo is almost exactly 1,000 miles, and it is almost the same by the water route. The difference is about 12 miles. The normal rate for transporting grain by boat from Duluth to Buffalo is around a cent and a half to 2 cents per bushel for 1,000 miles, which represents an actual cost of less than one-half mill per ton per mile.

"From Duluth to Buffalo, where the rate is depressed because of this water competition, it is still 18½ cents per bushel. In other words, it is 17 cents per bushel more to transport grain by railroad, under this depressed rate from Duluth to Buffalo, than it is to move it by water from Duluth to Buffalo.

"Now the cost for hauling grain 1,000 miles from eastern Montana to Duluth is 25 cents per bushel."

Some of the proponents of this bill have expressed doubt that the producers and the consumers get the benefit of the low cost of water transportation. The record is conclusive against this viewpoint. Even though there might be merit in a contention of that kind, it would constitute no sound basis for regulation to increase the water cost of transportation. The Congress has the power to inquire into the uses being made of our inland navigable waters and vehicular highways. If the public is not receiving the benefit of low-cost transportation to the extent it should, there are proper means to compel adequate consideration of the public interest.

What has been said of the economies of water-carrier transportation applies with equal force to motor-carrier transportation except, of course, the economies of motor-carrier service are much less in amount and frequently the only preference in the use of motor-carrier service as against railroad service is convenience. That motor-carrier transportation over the Nation's highways has increased the economy and efficiency of distribution is amply supported by the record. Regulation of motor carriers covers only a short period of time and there is much doubt if it has brought any benefit to the public.

The shrinking of the income of the producers and the consumers of the Nation by means of increased cost of transportation that is bound to result from the enactment of this bill is a factor the supporters of this legislation seem determined to ignore.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR WATER-CARRIER REGULATION

(Supporting No. 6)

There is no public demand for the regulation of water carriers or motor carriers. No demand comes from the farmers; no demand comes from the consumers; no demand comes from commercial organizations; no demand comes from processors or distributors. A committee of six, composed of railroad management and railroad labor points to regulation as a means of aiding the railroads in building up their revenues and traffic. This committee, however, claims the greatest need of the railroads is a general increase in business activity on a wide scale. The President, in his appeal for legislation to aid the railroads, has not requested regulation that is designed to increase the cost of water-carrier transportation and eventually destroy the economy and efficiency of water- and motor-carrier service. Railroad management and railroad lawyers drafted this legislation to codify the act to regulate commerce and it is most difficult to locate all dangerous provisions of the bill. It is generally conceded, however, that the bill is designed to improve the income of the holders of railroad stocks and bonds.

RAILROAD LABOR

(Supporting No. 7)

Railroad labor—like all other labor—is sorely in need of a general increase in business activity in all directions. The revenue and labor situation as to one railroad may be excellent, but that will not benefit the revenue and labor situation as to other railroads. Many of our railroads have been comparatively prosperous during the lean years of the depression. Others have gone from bad to worse, without regard to their freedom of water competition. The national railroad situation cannot be solved en masse. The basic cause of the sick railroads must be determined individually and dealt with accordingly. It is impossible to make 100 suits of clothes fit 100 men that are tall, short, thin, and fat by cutting all suits to the average measurement of the 100 men. The same principle applies to transportation and many other economic questions. The railroads reduced the number of workers from 2,022,832 in 1920 to 940,000 in 1938—a reduction of 53½ percent—while the ton-miles of revenue freight decreased only 29 percent. The cost of moving 1,000 ton-miles of revenue freight was reduced from $10.78 in 1921 to $6.41 in 1937. These figures demonstrate that railroad labor is contributing generously to the economy of rail transportation. Putting it another way, it is important to observe that the Railroad Brotherhood members move a greater number of pounds of revenue freight a greater distance per hour of service than the employees of water or motor carriers. Calculate the number of motor-carrier employees it requires to move 3,000 tons of freight 150 miles that can be moved that distance by railroad in 8 hours with a train crew of 5 men. The manpower required to move freight by water is greater than the manpower required to move the same volume by railroad over the same distance.

This committee has received noncontroverted evidence showing that railroad employment would not be improved if all water commerce that might be diverted to the railroads is so diverted. This evidence shows the additional tonnage taken from the water carriers can be handled on regularly scheduled trains by increasing the distance between the engine and the caboose. The presently unused tractive power of service locomotives might employ a few extra grunts, but that is about all. Considering this diversion of tonnage from water carriers to rail carriers from the standpoint of employment, it would throw out of work approximately 100,000 workers now engaged in this service without helping railroad employment in the slightest degree.

As to the diversion of motor-carrier tonnage to the railroads, it should be remembered that more than 80 percent of this tonnage is short-haul traffic that railroad management has represented they cannot handle profitably and were not handling profitably before the advent of motor-carrier service.

This bill is not designed to help railroad labor in any manner whatsoever. It is solely for the purpose of increasing the net income and improving the railroad financial structure and freezing it at its present level or higher. Such a program cannot revive industrial activity that is so badly needed.

IMPROVED WATER HIGHWAYS

(Supporting No. 8)

All of our coastal and inland waters have required extensive and costly improvement work to make them suitable for present-day navigation. This improvement work has, for the most part, been prosecuted with Federal funds under the direction of the Secretary of war and the United States Army engineers. The most costly of these improvement works per mile of navigable water is the coastal harbors and channels. Closely approaching this cost is the improvement of the Great Lakes system. Then follows the Intracoastal Canal system and the Mississippi River system. The Mississippi River system, per mile of navigable water made available by improvement work, is the most economical development of the entire navigable waterway program. This system is so situated as to serve the greatest area of production within our border. It cuts through the center of our productive area from North to South for a distance of 2,000 miles. It cuts through the center of this region from East to West

for more than 2,000 miles. It has 2,000 additional miles of improved tributaries.

Water ports are now within an average distance of 155 miles of all inland shipping points. Exclusive of maintenance and operation, the cost to the Federal Government in the development of this entire system of improved navigable waters is less than $2,000,000,000. Maintenance and operation has been approximately $700,000,000. The provisions of bill S. 2009 are designed to curtail the use of this great waterway by leveling the water-carrier rates to the basis of the railroad rates or substantially so. The idea is to force the tonnage back to the rail carriers.

The Congress, for over 50 years, has withstood rail-carrier demands for water-carrier regulation and throughout that time it has ignored the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission to put water carriers under regulation. There are sound reasons for keeping the water carriers free from regulation.

POLICY SECTION—MINIMUM RATE—RATE-MAKING RULE

(Supporting No. 9)

Section 1, declaration of policy; section 26, minimum-rate authority; section 30, rule of rate making; and section 50, long-and-short-haul rule, are inseparable in the application and interpretation of this bill. While the preamble of section 1 provides that regulation of all modes of transportation shall be so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each, the section also definitely qualifies that language by declaring for sound economic conditions among the several carriers; the maintenance of reasonable charges without discrimination or unfair competitive practices; and most important of all is the mandate to construe the section to the end of insuring the preservation of a national system of transportation adequate at all times to meet the full needs of the commerce, the Postal Service, and the national defense. The rule of rate making gives some support to the preamble of section 1, but both are related and controlled by the specific provision of section 26 which gives to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix a minimum rate applicable to a contract carrier. The minimum charge so prescribed by the Commission shall give no advantage or preference to such contract carrier in competition with a common carrier. The Commission is further directed to give due consideration to the effect of such minimum charge upon the movement of traffic by such carriers.

A careful reading of the bill and particularly the aforementioned provisions will disclose that these provisions, despite the generality of some of the clauses inserted therein, could reasonably be interpreted to mean that in the determination of rates and charges applicable to waterway carriers, due consideration must be given to the effect of such rates and charges on the movement of traffic by railroads, to the need of adequate and efficient railroad service, and to the need of railroad revenues sufficient to enable the railroads to provide such service to the public. This view may find support in the significant proviso of section 23 (8) which makes it mandatory for the Commission to assign the fixing of rates for all modes of transportation to the same group of administrators within the Commission. Any doubt as to the meaning of these provisions as applied to this bill would eventually have to be resolved by the United States Supreme Court. Meanwhile, the attendant litigation through the Commission and the courts would result in several years of chaos, which would tend to destroy the ability of the water carriers to perform an adequate and economical service to the public. Should the Supreme Court hold, as under the bill it clearly appears it must, that consideration be given to the need of the railroads for revenues sufficient to enable them to maintain a more expensive service, then the ability of water carriers to perform an adequate and efficient service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service would be totally destroyed.

CODIFICATION

(Supporting No. 10)

This attempt, originated by a group of railroad lawyers, to codify, revise, and rewrite the whole body of Federal regulatory law should be summarily rejected by the Senate. Witness after witness, who qualified as authorities on transportation law, protested their inability to understand, in the brief time given to compare and study this bill with existing law, the full import of its many provisions. Not only was this made most difficult by the changes in wording, phraseology, and definition in the provisions taken from numerous statutes, but the manner in which they had been shuffled and the many new provisions which have been included in the bill added to the confusion.

The chairman of the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Eastman, strongly opposed this method of codification as not in the public interest. Mr. Eastman testified at length on this subject. His remarks, condensed with care to preserve their context, are as follows:

"Senate 2009, instead of adding a new part or parts to the Interstate Commerce Act providing for the proposed regulation of water and air carriers and the special investigations, undertakes to combine the present part I, which deals with railroads and affiliated companies, with the present part II, which deals with motor carriers, and interlards therewith the new provisions with respect to the regulation of water and air carriers and the special investigations. The result is a virtual codification of the entire Interstate Commerce Act, and in the process many provisions have been changed materially and in ways that were not proposed, specifically, at least, in the report of the committee of six, and which have not been recommended in any other report which has been made public. * * * It seems to me that every major objective of the bill can be accomplished, and readily, without such codification. * * * If there were need for such a codification, a public body should do the work and make a report of what it has done before the matter comes up for consideration. * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. It is really the function of Congress to declare the public policy, rather than that of the Commission.

"Certainly. I did not intend to say anything to the contrary to that. If you have in mind the public body, that would not necessarily be the Commission. I mean a public body as distinguished from a committee of railroad executives, railroad employees, a body that looks at this matter from the standpoint of the public interest and then makes a report in which it shows just what has been done, what is proposed to do, and what the reasons. * * * If you are going to undertake such an important job as the codification of the Interstate Commerce Act, I think, as a matter of procedure, the initial work should be done by a body representing the whole public and that that body should make a report which will disclose what it has done and the reason for it, so that those who are directly interested and concerned can have full notice of what is proposed, instead of being asked in the middle of a session to consider, without any such report, a bill of 183 pages, or two-hundred-odd pages, such as the bill before the House, and be asked to look through and find out, at their peril, in what way it may affect them. I do not believe that is proper procedure.

"The present part I has for its nucleus the original act to regulate commerce of 1887, but includes the many and extensive amendments which have been made since that time. From the standpoint of form, arrangement, and phraseology it is, because of the way in which it was evolved, an imperfect product; but it has been the subject of much litigation, many of its provisions have been interpreted by the Supreme Court, and its administration is not now attended by any serious legal difficulties arising out of imperfections in form or phraseology.

"While the railroads, motor carriers, and water carriers are all engaged in transportation, they function, operate, and do business in general in very different ways, and any sound system of regulation must recognize, and be adjusted to those differences. When the Motor Carrier Act, 1935—part II of the Interstate Commerce Act—was proposed, the plan of interlarding the new regulation with the old regulation of part I was considered and rejected. The danger of tampering with the provisions of part I, which had undergone so much litigation and court interpretations, was realized, and it also seemed desirable that the motor carriers should have a statute of their own which would define their duties and responsibilities and the jurisdiction of the Commission over them. It required a little more paper and ink, but otherwise produced clearer-cut results and simplified the situation for the thousands of motor carriers."

As to the adoption of a codifying act, the minority subscribes to the views above expressed by Mr. Eastman. It must be clear that if Congress adopts this revision and codification, in such large part prepared by attorneys for the railroads, and enacts it into law, superseding existing statutes, that much greater changes will be wrought in the law and much greater injury will be done than Congress can now realize.

CONCLUSION

Regulatory legislation in the past has been designed to correct and eliminate certain abuses and improper practices of the railroads as they adversely affected the public interest, and to prevent the imposition of discriminatory and excessive rates and charges that were the outgrowth of a monopolized system of transportation. In short, such legislation has been designed to protect the public. S. 2009 has no such purpose. It is a new departure in legislation in that, under the specious pleas of "equality of regulation," it seeks to force water carriers and other modes of transportation to increase rates to the level of rail rates or substantially to that level and maintain them there. The ultimate result would, of course, force the competitors of the railroads out of business, thus depriving the public of low-cost transportation.

Public demand for regulation, as proposed in this bill, is definitely lacking. While the proponents of the bill insist its enactment will be helpful to the railroads, they have made no attempt to show that it will serve or help the public who will be called upon to pay higher rates and charges for transportation service. The opponents of this legislation are in accord on the proposition that this bill will operate to increase the cost of transportation, but the proponents insist the increase in the water rates will not necessarily bring them up to the level of the rail rates. The regulation of water carriers under this bill can have no other purpose than to force water rates up to a point where the water carriers cannot successfully move commerce at a saving to the public. The same is true as applied to motorbus transportation which now supplies low-cost passenger service to the public. The whole purpose of the bill is to protect the holders of railroad securities.

The minority of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, for the reasons herein set forth and abundantly supported by the record, recommend that the bill S. 2009 do not pass.

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I do not wish to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish the floor.

Mr. REED. I yield briefly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess for 2 minutes.

At the expiration of the recess (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. RUSSELL'S motion that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in the next 20 minutes I wish to talk about farm-crop insurance. In my service in the Senate I doubt if there has been a single matter which has come before the Senate about which there has been so little information and so much misinformation as obtained with respect to the important question of crop insurance. I hope to be able to clear away some of the mystery or fog surrounding this question.

The Farm Crop Insurance Corporation is a statutory body, created by authority of the Congress, and not established by Executive authority.

Let me begin by reading from page 6881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I read with some astonishment the view which the House Committee on Appropriations took on this question. Let me read from the remarks of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who is one of the conferees on the part of the House:

> I might say that the only items in disagreement now are those relating to so-called crop insurance that will be reported in disagreement directly, and I hope to say a word or two more about it. It has been represented to the House and it is a fact that the House conferees had unanimously and consistently opposed on every occasion the continuation of the so-called Crop Insurance Corporation.

Down to that point, Mr. President, there can be no criticism. That is the privilege of every Member of the House.

Speaking of the action of the House Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member, Mr. DIRKSEN continued:

> We have provided for its liquidation. It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of that insurance program.

Mr. President, I had the idea that when it was found desirable to discontinue a body set up by authority of the Congress such action should be taken through the legislative committees; and yet here is action taken by the House Appropriations Committee which has the effect, to use the language of the very brilliant Representative from Illinois, of liquidating, by action of the Appropriations Committee, a body which has been set up by legislative authority. That is my objection No. 1. I appeal to the Senate, out of respect for its own dignity, to object to and dissent from that kind of action.

Mr. President, I wish to proceed to the next point. In this connection I should like to appeal to those who have not, perhaps, followed this matter as closely as some of the others of us have. I wish to separate immediately the crop-insurance program from the N. Y. A., the A. A. A., and F. S. A, and all the other so-called agricultural agencies. All of them, with the exception of this agency, more or less partake of a subsidy, charity, alms, or help of some kind.

Here is a program which has but one purpose, namely, to help remove the ever-present fear of the farmer of a crop failure and its results upon him, his family, and his income. There is no charity about this program. There is no subsidy about it in its long-range intention. It is true that immediately the Government of the United States is sponsoring and financing it. There is no other agency in the United States great enough and willing to do so. But the hope is that within 3 more years we shall be able at least to determine whether or not it is feasible to work out a crop-insurance program, first, for wheat; secondly, for cotton, and then for any other crop which may be considered. It is hoped that by then we shall be able to determine whether we can work out a program which will carry itself, and if it can, the Government will not be expected to participate.

I can appreciate the fact that in the controversy with respect to the production of wheat some of my good friends from States in New England, from New Jersey particularly, and from West Virginia, look at us differently from the way we look at ourselves. We are farmers from farm States. We produce food, of course, and we are interested in receiving the best price for it we can obtain. Conversely, Senators who come from States along the Atlantic coast, and West Virginia, principally, are concerned about obtaining their food as cheaply as possible, and so then have indulged us during the past 10 years quite considerably with our so-called farm program. However, I wish to say to my colleagues from those States that this program is separate and distinct, that it does not partake of subsidy or of charity. We do not ask for either. We do not want it, and we do not expect it.

Mr. President, I have found greater misunderstanding among Members of the Senate, and of the other House, if you please, concerning this program, than about anything else I have discussed with them. Yesterday I went over to the House and discussed this very program with Members of the House. I found them in almost total ignorance of the extent to which the farmers have participated in the program.

Allow me to give the figures, first with respect to wheat. The law providing for wheat crop insurance was enacted in 1938. The program became effective in 1939. In 1939, 165,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1943, 360,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1941, 371,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1941, 412,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish in any way to hinder the speech the Senator is making, but does he have the figures on that huge number represented by State lines?

Mr. REED. I have, and I shall get to them in a moment.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. This year, 1943, there are 487,000 farmers holding wheat crop insurance.

I have broken down this information by States. When I say I have broken it down, I mean that I have obtained the information from official sources. I shall read the list of States which have principally participated because of the nature of their farming. When I reach the bottom of the list, if any Senator should desire to know what his State is doing, I shall be very happy to tell him, and I hope the senior and junior Senators from Nebraska are present.

The farmers of Nebraska have 67,000 contracts. Nebraska tops the list. The farmers of Kansas come next with 42,000. The farmers of Ohio come third, with 40,000 contracts. The farmers of Michigan come fourth, with 32,000 contracts. In Indiana the farmers have 32,000 contracts. In Missouri they have 30,000. In Illinois they have 29,000. In Oklahoma they have 22,000. In Minnesota they have 20,000. In North Dakota they have 13,000. In South Dakota they have 9,000. In Texas they have 9,000. I have given only the round numbers, in thousands.

In order to show that this program is not sectional in its scope, I will say that among the Eastern States, Pennsylvania raises more wheat than any other State. In Pennsylvania there are 7,086 of these contracts. In Maryland there are 2,448. In Colorado there are 4,138.

If the Senator from Oregon is intertested in the number of wheat crop insurance contracts in his State, I shall be very happy to put the number into the RECORD at this point. If any other Senator is interested in his State I shall be very happy to furnish the information. In Oregon there are 3,990 wheat crop-insurance contracts this year.

Last year Congress authorized adding cotton to the program theretofore confined to wheat. So there has been only 1 year's experience relating to that commodity.

The following figures will show the manner in which the farmers in the cotton areas have come forward to participate in this program.

In Texas, 54,000; in Georgia, 25,000; in South Carolina, 20,000; in Alabama, 12,000; in Louisiana, 11,000; in Oklahoma, 9,000; in North Carolina, 9,000; in Missisippi, 9,000; in Arkansas, 8,000; in Missouri, 3,990.

Allow me to say that anyone who attempts to speak with any degree of assurance as to the permanent outcome of this program is either holding out false hopes, or does not really understand what he is talking about. It has taken 5 years—from 1938 to the present time—to survey this country as to the number of wheat farms, the conditions on each farm, and the approximate yield over a period antedating this insurance, so as to obtain all the facts and determine the premium rate which must be applied. That is not a slight job; it is a tremendous undertaking.

As has been said before, there was a fundamental mistake in the original act. The original act forbade contracts to be written for periods of more than 1 year. That was a grievous mistake. Nobody was to blame. Crop insurance was a new thing. We are struggling for a desirable end. We are charting untraveled roads, and seas over which no ships of experience have passed. So we spent 5 years and twenty-odd million dollars in accumulating this experience. The term period has already been changed from 1 year to 3 years. That is extremely important, for the reason that in every wheat belt of the country the prospects for a crop depend largely upon the condition of the soil. When the seed is put into the ground—I know it is so in Kansas where wheat is sown in September—if there is plenty of moisture in the ground in August and September, the farmer feels he does not need much insurance, that he can be fairly sure of having a good crop, but in Oklahoma, Kansas, eastern Colorado, and Nebraska, if in August there is a dry soil, and no water in the subsoil, the chances of obtaining a crop are not very good and the farmer takes out insurance.

That has been corrected; but so long as the 1-year-term contract was followed this was an impossible thing, and the law tied the hands of the administrator of this program for 3 years before the administration could change that one feature.

There have been a number of other features which have been improved. Originally the county average for the year on the farms was taken. That was wrong, too. It meant that the poorest farm could be insured on the basis of the yield of the average farm of the county. That was stopped, and now the individual farm is the basis, which is the only way to operate safely.

I have been much interested in this program. It contemplates what seems to be a simple thing, but which in reality is difficult. As I have previously said, the fear of a crop failure overhangs the farmer all the time. If by concerted action we can provide him with insurance, which is only spreading out the risk from an individual basis to a wider basis, so as to remove that fear from the farmer, we have done a very definite thing that improves his mental and financial condition. Mr. President, there was no way that this could be done except the way that it has been attempted and is being carried on.

We have now sufficient experience so that we can look forward with some degree of hope that in 3 years more the program will be on a sound basis. I should not want to hold out to my colleagues that, in my opinion, it can be settled in less than 3 years. If at the end of 3 years our experience during that time demonstrates that it is not feasible, and we cannot work out a satisfactory program, then, by all means, I am willing to let go, but I urge upon my colleagues that here is a program which does not call for subsidies, which does not call for charity, and which does not call for alms.

The Government is helping temporarily, yes, through the initial period; there is no other way to do it, but what we are trying to do is to improve the farmer's economic and mental situation so as to give him insurance for which he himself, not the Government, will pay. We are not asking any participation by the Government and do not expect any. We are trying to work it out on a safe basis.

Now I want to refer for a moment or two to what I regard as the unreasonableness of the House conferees. The House wrote into this bill an appropriation for this year of $3,500,000, and then undertook to say that no part of the appropriation could be used to carry this program beyond the 31st of July of this year. The Senate increased the appropriation of $3,500,000 to $7,818,748. So far as the money is concerned, that was the difference between the two Houses.

I am not a member of the conference committee, but I am a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill. I talked with all the Government agencies whose representatives appeared before the committee, and I want to say unhesitatingly that the Federal Crop Insurance Administration is easily the most efficiently handled and most economical of any agency that came before the committee. I think I can demonstrate that. All the other agencies want more money. This agency came and took what the Senate had written into the bill, which was the Budget estimate. We found afterwards that this had happened: Cotton was added only last year, and there were expected to be about twice as many contracts as were actually written. So after the estimate was made, an appropriation was provided of a little more than $8,000,000 for the use of this agency. They did not have as many contracts as it was thought they would have; the cotton contracts were only about half what was anticipated and what had been appropriated for.

I discovered yesterday morning, in pursuing this matter further, that this agency had on hand unexpended $1,600,000. They had not spent it all. Most Government agencies, according to my experience, would have gone ahead and spent it all. So I tried to figure out some basis on which we could meet the House. As I have said, I am not one of the conferees; but I have been so much interested that I intruded on the conferees yesterday and made a suggestion to them. After a conference in the morning with the responsible officers of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, I suggested that we would take the figure of $3,500,000, which the House had written into the bill; that we would reappropriate the unexpended balance of $1,600,000; that the Senate would recede from its appropriation of $7,818,000; that we would strike out the language, liquidating, as Mr. DIRKSEN said, this program after July 31.

The conferees permitted me to intrude upon them yesterday. I laid the suggestion before them, I called attention to what could be done; I conferred with the representatives of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation only yesterday morning, and they agreed that could and would carry on this program according to what I have said.

I called the attention of the conferees to the fact that there are outstanding 487,000 3-year wheat-crop contracts of insurance now in existence. I want to say here that the answer I got from the spokesman of the House conferees was this: "Is not the Senator familiar with the fact that in every insurance contract there is written a provision that it may be terminated if Congress fails to appriate sufficient money?"

I told the House chairman that I certainly knew that, but, certainly, I had no intentions, so far as I was concerned, of letting the Congress of the United States authorize a program for 3 years, have it signed up by 487,000 farmers, and then walk out on them. That may be the conception on the part of the House of good faith and governmental ethics, it certainly is not mine.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that the very able chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], felt he had to come before the Senate and move that the Senate recede. He stated this morning how he felt about it. He makes the motion against his own heart and against his own desire, and said so this morning. He feels, however, that it is rather necessary for him, in view of the parliamentary situation, to take such action. I regret that he feels that way about it.

I wish to read again the sentence which shows how Mr. DIRKSEN feels about it:

> It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of this program.

I am appealing to the Senate to go on record, in the vote that is about to be taken on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, to make plain in an overwhelming manner how it feels about keeping the faith with these 487,000 farmers in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all the world is hungry except the Nation in which we are fortunate to live. A year from now, 2 years from now, that hunger will be worse, and we, too, may have our first taste of it, for the first time in the history of our Nation. We shall be forced to fall back upon the more economically produced food, such as wheat and soybeans. The two amendments which the Senate has under discussion can have great effect upon how much food will be available in 1944 and 1945 for us and our allies. On April

1 of this year, we had the largest supply of wheat on hand in our history, but as every Senator knows, we will be forced to feed much of that wheat to livestock during the coming year, or until such time as the numbers of our livestock are reduced again to normal, or below normal levels.

In anticipation of these great needs, plans have already been completed to attempt to increase our wheat acreage to 68,000,000 acres for the crop of next summer. That acreage would be about 15,000,000 above the 53,000,000 acres now in the ground. That means nearly a 30-percent increase. If we succeed in securing this great increase, we will be only 5,000,000 acres short of the record plantings of 1919, and 2,000,000 acres short of the plantings in 1938. Most of that wheat will be planted this fall. The wheat farmer, who, like all farmers, is hard pressed for labor, must make his decision throughout the winter-wheat area in the next 8 to 12 weeks as to whether or not we shall secure this increased acreage. The Senate should think twice before yielding on benefit payments and crop insurance for the wheat farmers.

If we fail to provide crop payments, which this year will be 9.7 cents per bushel on the normal yield of the farmers' allotment, what incentive will that be for the winter-wheat and spring-wheat producer to go all-out next year? If we withdraw the opportunity for wheat producers to secure crop insurance, and thus tell them that the Congress and the Government of the United States refuse to offer them any protection against crop failure, how likely is the wheat grower to make an all-out effort?

Mr. President, the cash price of wheat today is below the 85 percent of parity loan already announced on the crop now coming in. More than that, the futures for September and December wheat based upon the present crop prospects for a normal yield and upon the present supply and demand, are also below 85 percent of parity. Although I opposed it, this body has withdrawn authorization for parity payments on next year's wheat crop. We cannot tell the farmer that he can with any certainty expect to receive more than 85 percent of parity for his 1944 crop; indeed, we cannot assure him of even that return, in view of the shortage of storage space, which may prevent him from securing a commodity loan at 85 percent of parity.

I may add that last year thousands of farmers in North Dakota were unable to secure loans at 85 percent of parity. Every farmer whose wheat had an unusually high moisture content had difficulty. The appraiser would go into the granary, and if the moisture content was just a trifle high, one-eighth of 1 percent, he would refuse to make the loan.

The wheat farmer is the only producer of a basic crop who is not securing parity or very nearly parity, or considerably in excess of parity price. If we fail to authorize the War Food Administrator to contract with wheat farmers for crop payments for 1944, then it will take around $150,000,000 to make up for wheat farmers the difference between the loan return and full parity. Who knows what the conditions will be in 1945, when we would be called upon to make this appropriation? Who can say with any certainty that the Congress would then carry out what should be a moral obligation under the A. A. A. law, which will be the law of the land, at least when our winter-crop wheat is planted this fall? How can any Senator stand here and say that we are affording wheat producers equal treatment with other farmers, let alone with our industrialists and other producers of vital war materials, when at the same time that we call upon our wheat growers to make a 30-percent increase in acreage, we withdraw three of the four income protections which we have afforded them in peacetime?

I know that the former Food Administrator, Mr. Davis, told our subcommittee that perhaps 85 percent of parity would be enough reward for the wheat producer. Mr. President, I doubt the judgment displayed by the former Food Administrator in that regard, when he agreed with the position taken by the House in this matter. As long as the parity law is on the books, I do not see how we can repeal it indirectly for one crop, while guaranteeing it for other crops, and I want to offer my strong objections to the action taken by our conferees in receding on amendment 92. I do not know if the new Food Administrator has had opportunity to make his decision in this matter known to any Member of the Congress. I would think that we should hesitate before tying his hands as he assumes the heavy responsibilities of that post.

Mr. President, I come now to the other item remaining in dispute with the other body. More than 20 years ago in my State the farmers were campaigning for crop insurance. When they secured control of the State government through the Non-Partisan League, they attempted, within the limits of one State, to furnish themselves that elemental protection against risks not of their own making but from acts of Nature.

In the State of North Dakota crop insurance against damage by hail has been a tremendous success. We have saved the farmers there, in hail insurance alone, nearly $50,000,000, as compared with the price they would have had to pay for old-line insurance. Not only that, but we have millions of dollars available today with which to pay losses.

The organized farmers of the West have never ceased between then and now to hope and work for an even more practical method of crop insurance. When, in 1938, this was at last secured on one crop, they felt that our Nation had at long last given them some equality of treatment as compared with the many privileges extended to other economic groups. Mr. President, if we recede and concur with the position taken by the House, we do not repeal thereby the Crop Insurance Act, but we are serving warning that it is the intention of the Congress to repeal that act when the last of the present 3-year contracts expire in 1945. Is that to be the reward of this Congress to the wheat and cotton producers for helping to win the war?

Mr. President, I know the desire of the other body, and perhaps of some of my colleagues, to recess and go home. But, Mr. President, I believe that we should make our position unmistakably clear. I believe we should make yet another offer through our conferees to find some middle ground not having such disastrous effects, in the hope that perhaps we may find unexpected support on the other side. As for myself, I believe we should force, if necessary, the postponement of the congressional recess in order to make clear to the country and clear to the farmers that we are not a party to this sectional and partisan attack upon the cotton and wheat growers of the Nation. But in any case, Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that if we ultimately are forced to give in to the circumstances created by the delays of the other body and its Appropriations Committee in what I consider to be a deliberate effort to place this House at a disadvantage, I, and I am sure many of my colleagues, will move at the earliest possible moment following the recess to restore such damage. And, Mr. President, if the action of the other body does prevail, I can assure the Senate that the day will come when millions of our farmers will again be stirred to action in defense of their homes and their rights.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in opposition to the motion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendment with respect to the extension of crop insurance. This morning the Senate Committee on Commerce reported favorably the flood-control bill, introduced by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], providing out of the Federal Treasury $15,000,000 to compensate the farmers who sustained losses from the floods which have just swept over the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. President, I voted to report that measure. I imagine the Senate will vote for such a measure. I hope the Congress will authorize it, and that the President will approve it, because certainly the farmers who have sustained loss from this act of God are entitled to assistance from their Government. The time has passed when the National Government will look with callous eye upon people who have been the victims of misfortune which came to them through no fault of their own.

Mr. President, the expenditure of $15,000,000 has been recommended today by one of the standing committees of the Senate, every dime of which will go to compensate farmers who sustained losses to their crops or croplands. Yet here it is proposed that the Senate recede from a provision which would allow the continuation of crop insurance, when only three and a half million dollars is essentially involved, as I was advised a few minutes ago by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is now within hearing of my voice.

Mr. President, if we take such action we shall be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I know, of course, that the crop in-

surance applies only to wheat and cotton at the present time in the order which I have named them. But I know that it was contemplated in the first place that the principle of crop insurance should be applied eventually to all crops, at least to those crops with respect to which the Department of Agriculture had been able to work out reliable actuarial data.

I do not mind confessing that we who are interested in citrus production, not only in Florida but in Texas and Arizona and California, have been urging upon the Department of Agriculture the study of citrus fruit and the compilation of actuarial data which may make possible the development of the citrus industry of the Nation. The Department has compiled such data, and says to us that if it were peacetime the Department would recommend, on the basis of the data already accumulated, a crop-insurance plan for the citrus industry.

Mr. President, if a freeze were to strike my State it would practically bankrupt the State. It would make bank after bank fail; it would ruin producer after producer, and packer after packer. In such event we might be here asking some recompense from the Congress because of disasters of this nature against which we would be unable to protect ourselves.

Mr. President, I do not know of any industry more hazardous than the farming industry. The poor farmer gambles against the market and gambles against Nature, and lucky, indeed, is he who in a season wins both gambles.

I have been present at meetings of fruit and vegetable growers in Florida, and I have heard them testify that as many as four crops in succession have been utterly lost because they have been unable to make them, by reason of one hazard or another which has interyened. The result is that it is possible only for the rich man to carry on that kind of farming and the little fellow is entirely excluded from the industry.

Mr. President, the crop-insurance plan is a cooperative plan. As Senators know, essentially the Government only fixes the premium and takes the responsibility for miscalculation in the amount fixed, and pays the overhead of operating the plant. So essentially, and in the long run, the only cost to the Federal Government will be the overhead cost of operating the plant. From the viewpoint of the drain on the Federal Treasury, would not that be the best insurance we could have, as against such a claim upon our good will as the one in the Senate Committee on Commerce honored this morning to the extent of $15,000,000? If it had been the wheat crop which had sustained injury from an act of nature, and if the crop-insurance plan were continued in effect, we would not have had to recompense sufferers by means of the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury. They would have been entitled to recompense from the reserve which would have been established and protected by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, while the so-called wave of economy is sweeping the country, let us not actually cut off our noses to spite our faces. Let us not commit the folly of extravagance under the guise of economy.

Some years ago a number of persons thought it was extravagant to build public roads. Now no one considers that other than a wise investment. Not many years ago some persons thought the expenditure of money for public education was extravagance and profligacy. Mr. President, niggardly economy was responsible for the humiliating fact that a few days ago, in a certain receiving center of the United States Army in a certain State, as attested by a witness on the scene, of 600 white boys who passed through the receiving center, 193 were rejected because they could neither write nor sign their names nor read a line. Of 600 white boys 193 were rejected because of illiteracy from the service of their country in its hour of greatest trial, due to the fact that someone practiced false economy.

Not only that, Mr. President, but through February of this year 300,000 men between the ages of 18 and 44 were rejected from selective service because they were illiterate. Not only that, Mr. President, but 2,997,000 American men and boys between the ages of 18 and 44 are unable to wear the uniform of their country and help fight its battles because they have been rejected because of educational, mental, physical, or moral deficiency—nearly 3,000,000 of our fellow Americans, Mr. President. Someone kept those boys out of the hospitals or kept them out of the schools or denied them adequate training because it was thought it would cost too much money to provide such care or education. The country lost the services of those men. Many a married man left behind him a wife or children, to take the place in the armed services of an illiterate man or boy with lesser dependents and obligations, who should have had the married man's place in his country's service, and who would have had it if he had had greater opportunity somewhere along the trail of his life.

Mr. President, I am sure Senators are able to discriminate and differentiate between what may properly be dispensed with and what by all means should be preserved of the good things we have done in the past.

We all know how difficult the farming problem is. I am not a farmer, but in my State we have much farming activity. A great deal of farming is hazardous. Certainly, if the farmer wrestles with the market, that is enough of a contest. He has never been able for long to best that one enemy. When we contemplate the struggle with the vicissitudes of inclement weather and the hazards of Nature, Mr. President, we see that we make the farmer the greatest gambler in the land.

The proposal is to set up a cooperative plan in which the farmer may participate, and by means of which in the long run the farmers themselves will pay all the premiums and will create all the reserves, the Government paying only the overhead. I say such a step is in the direction of steadying and stabilizing the position of the farmer, diminishing his hazards, reducing his gambles, and making him more assuredly self-supporting and self-sustaining.

Therefore, I hope that when only $3,500,000 is involved, we shall not stifle in its early inception the establishment of a principle which has prospect of becoming one of the greatest contributions we can make to the preservation of the American farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say first that no boys from my State have been rejected from Army service because of illiteracy, because my State happens to have its school system so arranged that everyone can get an education, and the State appropriates sufficient money for the purpose.

However, I am gratified to hear the Senator from Florida take the stand he has taken with reference to legislation for crop insurance, even though his State does not now benefit by it to any extent whatever. If Members of the Senate could have gone into the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota a few years ago and have seen for themselves what the farmers in certain sections of those States had to endure during a period of 6 or 7 long years of drought, not a Member of the Senate would vote against providing crop insurance.

I recall that my late distinguished colleague, Senator Walsh, and I took a trip through northeastern Montana, bordering on the Canadian line on the one hand, and on the North Dakota line on the other. Due to the drought conditions in that area, the girls had to wear overalls because their folks were unable to buy them ordinary clothes. They had to go without shoes. Eventually the Red Cross had to help. Senator Walsh and I returned to Washington. We appealed to the Red Cross to furnish those boys and girls with clothes, so that they could go to school that fall. Not only that, but a great many of the farmers who had come to Montana were compelled to leave their farms and go to work in factories. As a result, the owners of the larger farms and men of money bought the farms which were abandoned, and many were turned over to the insurance companies. So today there are fewer operators of small farms in that area because they could not take the risks the operators of the large farms could take.

After that, the people of Montana advocated hail insurance. Then the Government of the United States provided for crop insurance.

Let me say to the Members of the Senate that while many of the farmers are prosperous, the wheat farmers are not. Today the cattle raisers and sheep raisers are prosperous; probably they are two of the most prosperous farm groups. But the wheat farmer in my State is one of the few farmers in the country who is not getting parity for his products.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have to leave the floor, and I wish to ask a question. If

the wheat growers of the Senator's State were to sustain the kind of loss which would entitle them to any appreciable amount of compensation under the crop insurance plan, if the crop-insurance plan were not in effect is it not probable that in one way or another they would appeal to the Government for help in meeting their losses?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. That is exactly what they had to do. During the drouth years we asked for and we got, an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States in order to give the farmers enough food and enough clothes to see them through the winter.

Although we have not had such a situation in the last 2 or 3 years, I am told that conditions this year have been bad. The season has been very wet. As a result of the long wet season, I am told the wheat farmers have not been able to put in their crops. Unless there is a very long growing season there may be a crop failure this year.

We hear much said about a shortage of food. We want the wheat farmer to plow more ground and put in more crops. I do not know how he will be able to do it. I am sure that a good many farmers are not going to do it. They are not going to take the gamble if they know that they can not insure their crops. Many of them will say, "We will go into the defense industries in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, or somewhere else, where we can get $8, $10, $12 or $15 a day rather than stay on the farm and take a chance, work long hours, and perhaps after all lose our crops and get no insurance."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to divert the Senator from the line of his argument, but there is one point which it seems to me should be taken into consideration. As I understand, this program was put into operation for the first time in the crop season of 1939. Therefore we have had only that much experience. In an enterprise of this kind, entering a new field, with all the hazards which confront the production of cotton and wheat, it is obvious that some time is necessary to gain the experience which would afford a sound acturarial basis. If this program is cut off now, it may be said that all the money which has been spent in getting this much experience will be wasted.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The question has been asked, Why should the Government continue with the program when it is losing money? Practically every insurance company which has ever started without experience has lost money at the outset for a considerable period. We have gained some experience during the period of operation of the crop-insurance program. It may be that the Department has been too wasteful in some respects; it may be that it has not had employees with the necessary experience; but surely the Department has now had some experience. In my judgment it is doing a good job.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If I had my way, I would insist on the Senate amendment from now until doomsday, before I would let the House say that we must eliminate the crop-insurance program, which has been of such great benefit to the wheat growers. I cannot speak for the cotton growers, but I do know that the program has been of great benefit to the wheat growers in my State and in other areas in the great Northwest.

It would not be fair to end the program now. Let me say to my Republican friends in the Senate, as well as those in the House who have voted to abandon the program, that if they think they are making friends among the farmers of the country by eliminating an appropriation of approximately $3,000,000 for crop insurance for the farmers in the Northwest, they are making a sad mistake. They will turn every farmer in that section of the country against them if they cut off crop insurance, which is so vital to them.

Mr. President, I have been through that territory. I have seen wheat farmers come to the Northwest from Indiana, Massachusetts, and many other States to take up homesteads. I have seen the little shacks in which they have lived. I have seen how their wives and children live in those shacks. I know something of the hardships which their wives have endured. I have seen some of them taken to insane asylums. The only thing that causes me to wonder is that so many of them stuck through the tough, hard years of homesteading on those farms, and endured the trials and tribulations through which they had to pass. Hardly any other class of American citizens would go through what the farmers of North Dakota and eastern Montana have gone through.

Sometimes we hear talk about the hardships of some industrial workers. This morning I received a letter from a union man saying the farmers were getting too much for their products. I venture the assertion that the man who wrote the letter is receiving $300 or $400 a month, whereas a farmer on a small farm is fortunate if he can make $300 or $400 a year after paying the expenses of his family.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator very pertinently mentioned the political phase of this question. I ask the Senator, On whom do those who talk about individual enterprise have to depend most?

Mr. WHEELER. They must depend on the farmer. The farmer is the backbone of conservatism and free enterprise. If we eliminate the farmer and drive him from the farm into the industrial centers, we shall not have a capitalistic system in the United States. On the one hand we shall have the big industrialists, and on the other hand the workers.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the Senator another question. I would not have presumed to mention the Republican Party——

Mr. WHEELER. I thought the Senator was one of its leaders.

Mr. REED. What chance does the Senator from Montana think the Republican Party would have if it should lose the farmers of Michigan, Kansas, and Nebraska

Mr. WHEELER. It would have about as much chance as the proverbial snowball in hades. If it should turn against the farmer, it would not deserve any more chance than that.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. It is stupid on the part of anyone, whether he be a businessman, a professional man, or a worker, to seek to destroy the farmers by failing to provide $3,000,000 for crop insurance. A day or so ago we appropriated in excess of $70,000,000,000 for the Army for the purpose of carrying on war, for the purpose of destruction; and yet we hesitate to vote three or four million dollars for production, for keeping the farmer in his home and for keeping alive the little rural communities, churches, and homes. When we talk about destroying the farmer and driving him off the farm by refusing to give him crop insurance, we are not thinking in terms of preserving democratic institutions in the United States.

Mr. President, I am not speaking on the basis of hearsay. I am not a farmer, but I have been through that territory time and time again. I have visited the homes of wheat farmers in the Northwest. I know the sufferings, trials, and tribulations through which they have passed. The crop-insurance law was enacted largely for the purpose of giving some kind of assurance to the wheat farmers. Later the cotton farmers were included. If we destroy crop insurance, we shall drive the farmers off the farms and into the factories. So I hope that the motion of my good friend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to House bill 2481.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McNARY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, Senators who wish to vote in favor of crop insurance should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana

[Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably detained in committee meeting.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bilbo	Lodge	Russell
Bridges	McKellar	Stewart
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Van Nuys
George	Moore	Wagner
Hayden	Radcliffe	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—53

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	Hill	Scrugham
Bankhead	Holman	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Taft
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Burton	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Gerry	Overton
Bone	Gillette	Reynolds
Bushfield	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hatch	Walsh
Byrd	Hawkes	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	
Eastland	McClellan	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

During the course of the debate relating to crop insurance,

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1252. I have discussed the matter with the majority and minority leaders, and have received their approval for consideration of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from North Dakota objects to the consideration of this bill, and another bill of similar nature? Let me say to the Senator that these two bills are exceedingly important in connection with the program for food production, and are in keeping with the desires of the Food Administrator, with the idea that we may have a greater production of food in the sections of the country where production of food is made available by irrigation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration of the measure provided these proceedings will be placed in the RECORD following my discussion of the question of crop insurance. Several Senators have already discussed crop insurance, and it is my purpose to say a few words about it.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota desires to speak on the important subject of crop insurance, and wishes his remarks on the subject to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the speech made by the senior Senator from North Dakota, and the discussion which followed his speech.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from North Dakota does not wish to yield if the consideration of the bill will lead to discussion.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I will say that I do not believe consideration of the two bills which I propose to take up will lead to extended discussion, but if the Senator from North Dakota is of a different mind, and believes that too great a break would occur in the sequence of the discussion in which he is interested, I will not press the matter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that he had agreed to recognize the junior Senator from North Dakota following the speech of the senior Senator from North Dakota. He understood, however, that the Senator from Nevada had conferred with the junior Senator from North Dakota about two bills; that is the reason why the Senator from Nevada was recognized.

Mr. MCNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the matter now under discussion be placed in the RECORD following the speech to be made by the junior Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the Senator from Nevada, are the projects covered by the bill located in more than one State?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes, the projects are located in 17 States. They are projects which come under two acts of Congress, one known as the Wheeler-Case Act, and the other the General Reclamation Act.

Senate bill 1252 would amend the Wheeler-Case Act so certain irrigation projects may be authorized, and appropriations therefor made when, as and if Congress makes appropriations. Both bills are approved by the Secretary of the Interior. They are approved by the Food Administrator. They have received unanimous vote in the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. HILL. Are all Senators from the 17 States in question in full agreement concerning the bill?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I should say emphatically "yes." So far as I know, they all are in agreement respecting the bill.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to say that the Secretary of the Interior has approved the bill, also the Food Administrator, as well as the Senators from the 17 States involved, and that the bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. MCCARRAN. That is true, Mr. President. There is a letter in the RECORD from the head of the War Production Board in which he gives his approval in principle to the policy of the bill.

Mr. HILL. The head of the War Production Board has joined with the Secretary of the Interior and the Food Administrator in favoring the bill.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be appropriate to state that the Senate, in the Interior Department appropriation bill, has already taken action on appropriation for reclamation, which is altogether in harmony with the measure which the Senator from Nevada is now urging upon the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I wanted to ask. What relation have the two bills referred to by the Senator from Nevada to the projects which were approved in the Interior Department appropriation bill recently passed?

Mr. MCCARRAN. No appropriations have been made for the purposes set forth in the two bills. They merely provide authorizations. The appropriations would have to come when, as, and if the Secretary of the Interior, after having made survey and examination of the land, should see fit to ask Congress for an appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. What relation have the bills to the action we took recently in the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. They have no relation whatever to that action, except that the Interior Department appropriation bill carries sanction for the provisions contained in the bill. No appropriation is now proposed to be made for the purposes of these bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask if the proposal would require additional and favorable reports from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and action on the part of the Committee on Appropriations? I call attention to the fact that the Interior Department appropriation bill is now in conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The report I have received is that the House is not going to yield even with respect to the projects contained in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand that statement to be correct.

Mr. McNARY. So there is no relation in any way existing between the two bills and the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no relation whatever.

Mr. HILL. Are both bills to which the Senator from Nevada has referred Senate bills?

Mr. McCARRAN. Both are Senate bills. Both bills have been approved by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. HILL. The bills were approved by unanimous report of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not had time to read either bill. It is my understanding from a glance at the first paragraph of Senate bill 1252 that no more than $2,000,000 can be charged to irrigation, or $500,000 to flood control, on any one project. Does that provision refer to previously authorized projects only?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not altogether. Let me explain the matter to the Senator. Projects were previously authorized in which the W. P. A. and the Civilian Conservation Corps were involved. The W. P. A. and the Civilian Conservation Corps are out of the picture, so the bill would provide authority for appropriations, hereafter to follow, for the completion of the projects on which those agencies were working when they were put out of existence, and also, if the Secretary of the Interior should see fit to do so, to go forward under the Wheeler-Case Act, which is a law now, applying to the arid and semiarid regions of the West for small projects. The bill deals only with small projects in connection with which no great amount of money is involved in any instance, but where 160 acres or more of land may be put into production quite promptly.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill would not have any effect at all on the so-called public power projects, would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all. I specifically queried the Department of the Interior on that subject. No such matters are involved. Some power may be developed on some of the projects; but if power is developed, its use is limited to utilization within the project itself, not for sale to or to be utilized by the public generally.

Mr. AIKEN. If a dam costs $4,000,000, the bill would provide that $2,000,000 could be charged to irrigation, $500,000 to flood control, and the remaining $1,500,000 would have to be a direct appropriation by Congress; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. A direct appropriation, but the amount might be repaid or charged to the land for repayment.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill would not apply to dams where power is produced for sale, would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether any question of State-Federal relationships is involved in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not in the least.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the report. The report refers to a committee amendment which does not seem to appear in the bill.

What I have in mind is that the report on Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375, states that "the following amendments were adopted by the committee"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the bill now under consideration by the Senate is Senate bill 1252, Calendar No. 374. The Senator is referring to a different bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understood that Senate bill 1252 had been passed by the Senate, and that the Senate now has under consideration Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that Senate bill 1252, Calendar No. 374, is under consideration by the Senate. The bill has not as yet been passed.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1252) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), is hereby amended to read as follows: *"And provided further*, That expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation as defined in section 4 (b) shall not exceed $2,000,000 for dams and reservoirs in any one project, and that expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet costs allocated to flood control by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department, shall not exceed $500,000 on any one project."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (vii) of subsection 3 (a) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(vii) The part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to flood control as recommended by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department."

SEC. 3. Subsection 3 (b) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) No actual construction of the physical features of a project shall be undertaken unless and until (1) the Secretary has found that lands, or interests in lands, deemed necessary for the construction and operation of the major features of the projects have been secured, or sufficient progress made in their procurement to indicate the probability that all these lands or interests in lands can be secured, with titles and at prices satisfactory to him; and (2) the Secretary has found (i) that water rights adequate for the purposes of the project have been acquired with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, or that such water rights have been initiated and in his judgment can be perfected in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him; and (ii) that such water rights can be utilized for the purposes of the project in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Any part of a project hereunder may be designated as a division of the project by the Secretary if he, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, deems this desirable for orderly and efficient construction or administration. The term 'project,' as used in subsection 3 (b) and section 4, shall be deemed to mean also 'division of a project,' designated as provided in this subsection. Any project authorized for construction from appropriations under the head 'Water Conservation and Utility Projects' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685), hereinafter called the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, may be designated by the Secretary, upon agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, a project under this act and shall thereupon be subject to all the provisions and requirements thereof, except those of subsections 3 (a) and 3 (b)."

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(d) For each project, on which construction is commenced or continued under this subsection, appropriations heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to section 12 and the unexpended balance of the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, in addition to being available for other authorized objects of expenditure, shall be available for expenditure, by the agency to which available, in lieu of the 'services, labor, materials, or other property, including money,' authorized to be utilized under section 2 and subsection 5 (b). All expenditures on each such project may be excluded (1) from the project construction costs to the extent the Secretary finds necessary to keep the reimbursable costs within the findings made under subsections 3 (a) (iv), 3 (a) (v), and 3 (a) (vi), and (2) from the costs that but for this subsection would be required to be returned under section 5, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture for the successful prosecution of the project; and as to each such project the limitations on expenditures provided in sections 1 and 9 shall be inoperative.

Appropriations made pursuant to section 12 shall be available for expenditures for continuation of construction on any project heretofore undertaken under the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, and such expenditures and those from the 1940 water-conservation appropriation may be excluded from the costs of any such project in determining the amounts required to be reimbursed, to the extent the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture jointly determine is necessary to keep reimbursable costs within the ability of the water users to repay. No project may be initiated for construction or, if heretofore authorized, continued under this subsection unless the Secretary, following consultation with the Secretary of Agricuture, finds that the proposed construction under this subsection is justifiable as an aid in the production of needed agricultural products and the President approves said finding. The utilization of services or labor of prisoners of war under section 2 is authorized, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of said prisoners. From and after the date 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, this subsection shall no longer be of any force or effect except as to projects on which construction has been initiated or continued under this subsection prior to said date."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $300, the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase or service authorized for the Department of Agriculture under this act or under the 1940 water-conservation appropriation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there is a typographical error in the title of the bill. In the second line of the title, the figure "119" should be changed to read "1119."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects."

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1257) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the provisions of the bill are extremely broad, giving general Federal power to operate irrigation systems anywhere and everywhere. I particularly desire to ask whether the report is correct in saying that certain amendments were agreed to. I read from the report:

The following amendments were adopted by the committee:

Page 2, line 17, change the colon to a period and insert after the period the following:

No such amendment appears in the copy of the bill I have. I do not know whether it is part of the bill or is not part of the bill. In any event, the amendment is quite an extensive one. It provides that—

Municipal or miscellaneous water supply, electric power, or flood-control features may be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary as incidental to and part of reclamation work undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio has directed my attention to what seems to be an error in the printing of the bill. In other words, as the bill comes before the Senate it should be printed showing the amendment in italics. However, the amendment does not appear in the bill as now printed. Therefore, I must ask that the matter be deferred until a later time, when it can be properly brought before the Senate.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE AND OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few months ago, it was my privilege to introduce a bill providing for the partial amendment of the Servicemen's Dependency Allowance Act of 1942. Since that time, more than a dozen other bills, many of them exact duplications of each other, were also introduced to amend this act.

These bills have all laid buried in the Senate Military Affairs Committee until last Monday, when representatives of the War and Navy Departments met with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to recommend certain vital changes in the organic structure of the Dependency Act—changes which prove that the Dependency Act has been riddled by practical application—changes which prove that what the Dependency Act really needs is a complete overhauling job, not just a few minor repairs.

Newspaper stories, especially the recent campaign conducted by the New York newspaper PM, have described the excruciating hardships imposed on the thousands of families of our fighting men as a result of the outworn provisions of the Dependency Act. If Congress recesses now, without taking some action to alleviate these sufferings—which also constitute a serious threat to the morale of the armed forces—we must then answer to the 3,500,000 persons throughout this Nation who have become the victims of military relief.

No bill yet proposed, including mine, is the solution to this critical situation. Congress must take the responsibility for a completely revamped Dependency Act, and if we prolong the country's agony until fall, we must be prepared to face the consequences.

Mr. President, I do not think Congress should take the recess proposed to be taken shortly without providing some form of assistance to the aged of the country. I ask Members of the Senate to remember that over 1,000,000 persons signed a petition in 1937 asking for old-age pensions. Yet to the present time no definite action in that respect has been taken.

Mr. President, I repeat that if nothing is done to raise the pay of the privates in our armed forces, hundreds of thousands of members of their families, if not millions, will actually suffer.

INVESTIGATION RESPECTING CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 161, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 161), submitted on May 24, 1943, by Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MOORE) and subsequently reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto, whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of what the resolution proposes to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is a resolution to investigate primarily a highway leading between continental United States and Fairbanks, Alaska. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I think those Senators are more familiar with what it is proposed

to do by the resolution than are the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Let me say further to the Senator from New Hampshire that this is another one of those resolutions that come to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate without any evidence and without any written report to substantiate them. I know nothing about the resolution at all; I know nothing about the facts other than what I have been told from time to time concerning the proposed investigation by the members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

I repeat once more that, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—and I know the other members of the committee will agree with me—I dislike to assume the responsibility in cases of this kind to recommend an appropriation without any facts to support it. I hope that in the future legislative committees, when resolutions are referred to them, will procure some evidence and submit a report to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, so that the members of that committee may ascertain whether the amount allowed should be $3,500 or $10,000 or $25,000. I have made a similar statement repeatedly on the floor, but it does not seem to have done any good.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I inquire from what standing committee the resolution was reported?

Mr. LUCAS. It was reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I have consulted with members of the minority and members of the majority of my committee, and they are all for it, but I make the statement I have made by way of explanation.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator himself does not know what investigation is being authorized; all he is going on is its face value?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know why the investigation is to be made, I will frankly say to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make an observation. I am not a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but some time back in the winter charges were bandied around regarding the location of the highway to Alaska, and the matter came before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We had a hearing or investigation with respect to it, and took no action because we did not think there was any need for action. In spite of that, it seems it has been whispered around, and probably publicly stated, that there was something wrong with regard to the location of the highway. Those who are responsible for the location of the highway, as I understand, welcome an investigation in order that the facts may be revealed, and that whatever the facts may be they will satisfy the people, instead of having the matter bandied around from mouth to mouth that something was wrong in regard to it. It is for that reason, as I understand, that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported the resolution and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was asked to provide the funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not present in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when this matter was considered, because, as every Senator knows, I have been very busily engaged for the last few weeks in the Appropriations Committee, and I have not kept up entirely with the work of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; but I said to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who is in charge of the subcommittee dealing with this matter, that whatever he and the committee did would meet my approval. I am approving it under those conditions.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The building of highways by the United States Government primarily outside the United States is a matter involving a policy which is somewhat controverted. It is proposed to build a second highway through Canada for the purpose primarily, of maintaining access to Alaska, and there is also the question of side roads, feeder roads, to be built. That is the chief reason for the resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to understand that it is for the purpose of investigating the so-called Alaskan Highway?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Primarily.

Mr. BRIDGES. With all its ramifications?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the purpose of the resolution is to investigate the Alaskan Highway, why is it not so stated in the resolution? Why are the provisions of the resolution so broad?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The resolution is drawn according to the standard form of resolutions and was prepared for us by the legislative counsel.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution covers—

Highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It was thought they should be included.

Mr. LODGE. Why should it not include overpasses and tunnels and roads in cities to relieve traffic conditions?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think that authority is included.

Mr. LODGE. I think if this matter is to be gone into at all it should be gone into thoroughly, and we ought not to confine ourselves simply to highways and bridges, when in a great many of our cities there is a very pressing problem connected with traffic through the cities which should be diverted.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If it be so desired, such matters may be covered by the investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Nevada, let me say that I was led to support this resolution which has been reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the statement that it was intended to investigate the construction of a highway to Alaska.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is the primary purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it means that the committee is to investigate the whole highway system of the United States, and whether there shall be superhighways built as a result of the war and future planning, a different situation is presented to me. I should like to know whether, under the resolution, it is intended to investigate all the highway systems of the United States and, if so, why it was not so stated.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The only objective at the present time is that which has been stated. The reason for the wording of the resolution is that it is in the standard form of such resolutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be a standard form of resolution, but any kind of standard form of resolution would indicate the limitation which would be imposed on the committee in its investigation.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If I should suggest an amendment, would it be in order?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is always in order to amend anything before the Senate.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I shall suggest an amendment, the exact wording of which I shall prepare at once. I shall confine it to the objectives which have just been stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the theory upon which I thought the resolution was offered.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the theory I stated a moment ago, that is the theory on which the Senator from Nevada discussed the matter and other Senators discussed it with me.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If I may be allowed, I shall furnish the wording. It will take only a moment or two.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be advisable to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I still have the floor.

Mr. LODGE. The Presiding Officer asked whether there was objection, and I wanted the RECORD to show that I objected to acting on the resolution in its present form.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wanted to say that several months ago, last year as I recall, a charge was made that the Alaskan Highway was being built in such

manner as to be a scandal. So a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was appointed, of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was chairman, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and I were members. We made quite an investigation. We had the Army engineers before us, and all those who were supposed to know anything about that particular highway.

We were told at that time that the highway could not be put into passable condition because of a certain kind of material on top of the ground, a sort of mud which would make it impossible to have a passable road. We were particularly told that bridges could not be constructed so as to make the highway passable.

The Army engineers convinced our committee, and we so reported, that the route chosen was the logical and sensible one on which to build the highway. I do not know whether the highway involved in the resolution is the one we considered, but up until that time, I think it was shown, it was costing about $160 a ton, for the freight charge alone, to fly gasoline into Canada and Alaska. The subcommittee was perfectly satisfied that the proposed route was the proper one, and during last year the highway was built, and at least temporary bridges were constructed, so that the highway was passable last year.

The idea of the engineers at the time of the investigation was that they would build the road through the summer and fall months, and drive on the ice in the winter. I have been informed that the result was that the road was in condition to be used last winter.

There was apparently considerable opposition or rivalry between two or three possible routes. There were certain air routes which seemed to have preference for one or another of the routes, and apparently the charge that the one chosen was the wrong route grew out of that rivalry.

The Army engineers were so clearly of the opinion that the route selected was feasible that we reported that that was the proper route. I thought I should give this history.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Illinois has been objected to.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will yield, I am not objecting to having an investigation of the road to Alaska, but anyone who reads the phraseology of the resolution can see perfectly well that it is not at all restricted to Alaska; in fact, Alaska is not mentioned once. I certainly should be derelict in my duty if, in the case of a resolution even confined to highways, roads, streets, and bridges, I did not insist that it cover overpasses and underpasses, and everything else appropriate to relieve traffic congestion in cities. That is why I objected. I want the Senator from Nevada to understand I do not object to his proposal.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think the objection will be answered if in line 5, after the word "bridges", we insert "in the Territory of Alaska", and omit lines 11, 12, and line 1 on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution not being before the Senate, it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I heard him, I think the very distinguished Senator from Nevada said, "in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The road starts at Edmonton, Canada, and ends at White Horse.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; the suggestion is very pertinent.

Mr. McNARY. A portion of the road lies out of the jurisdiction of the Territory of Alaska, if the Senator wants an investigation.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is a very pertinent suggestion, and it should read "in the Territory of Alaska and in Canada."

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to the drafting of the resolution, in view of the comprehensive breadth of the language, which would permit an investigation of every road over which the Government hauls material anywhere in the United States, really what should be done would be to rewrite the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being objection, the resolution is not open to amendment, and it will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate had under discussion Senate Resolution 161, dealing with the American-Canadian Highway. Some objection was made to the language of the resolution, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] has agreed to certain amendments, which I think will be satisfactory to all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution not being before the Senate, it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Has the objection of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] been met?

Mr. LUCAS. It has. He has approved it.

I ask unanimous consent to take the resolution from the calendar and have it considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, the resolution covers a very broad field. I do not doubt the wisdom of those who have approved it, but it is of great importance, and therefore I must object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, until I read the language to him? I do not believe he will object. As amended the resolution would read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, costs, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto.

And so forth. In other words, the language "highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly" has been stricken from the resolution. It is limited solely to this one activity, and really should not be objectionable.

Mr. WILSON. With that understanding, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have it read? Does it include highways from Mexico or only the American-Canadian Highway?

Mr. LUCAS. It does not include highways from Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the words "maintenance of", it is proposed to strike out "highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly" and insert "the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads"; in line 9, after the word "equipment", to insert "costs"; and in line 11, after the word "thereto", to insert a period and strike out "whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 161), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of the American-Canada Highway, and proposed feeder roads, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, costs, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and

places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing an investigation of the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads."

TRANSFER OF GASOLINE RATIONING TO PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, yesterday I informed the Senate that the Committee on Appropriations had voted unanimously to transmit an amendment of mine, which would take the gasoline rationing functions from the Office of Price Administration and put them in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator for War, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with a plea for prompt action. At that time the Senator from Ohio raised the point that that was not the proper committee. Since then I have had a memorandum prepared by the counsel of the Senate going into that question in great detail, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By section 201 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, the President was authorized to transfer to the Office of Price Administration "any of the powers and functions relating to priorities or rationing conferred by law upon any other department or agency of the Government with respect to any particular commodity or commodities."

On April 7, 1942, the President issued Executive Order 9125 which provides in part as follows:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and for the purpose of assuring the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, it is hereby ordered, as follows:

* * * * *

"3. The Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to delegate to the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator such of his functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to priorities or rationing, as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate for the effective prosecution of the war; and in the administration or enforcement of any such priorities or rationing authority or any priorities or rationing authority heretofore conferred upon the Office of Price Administration or upon the Price Administrator by the Office of Production Management or by the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Price Administrator is hereby authorized:

"(a) To exercise all functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to such priorities or rationing in the same manner, and to the same degree and extent, as if such functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion had been conferred upon or transferred to the Office of Price Administration directly by Executive Order.

* * * * *

"(d) To exercise, to the extent necessary for the purposes of this order, the functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion conferred upon the President by paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1941 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (Pub. Law 89, 77th Cong.), and by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (act of March 27, 1942, Pub. Law 507, 77th Cong.).

"4. War Production Board Directives No. 1 of January 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 562), No. 1A of February 2, 1942 (7 F. R. 698), No. 1B of February 9, 1942 (7 F. R. 925), No. 1C of February 28, 1942 (7 F. R. 1669), and any other authorizations of the Office of Production Management or the War Production Board with respect to priorities or rationing, and all regulations or orders issued, or actions taken, by the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator pursuant to such directives or authorizations, are hereby, until withdrawn or superseded, continued in full force and effect, as if issued pursuant to this order or under authority conferred pursuant to this order. No provision of this order shall be construed to impair the right of the Administrator to maintain pending, or to institute, civil proceedings, or to take any other action with respect to violations prior to the date of this order of any priorities or rationing regulation or order heretofore issued."

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 66, consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas. Order of Business No. 382 is a House joint resolution in identical form. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have an explanation of the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides for consent to an interstate oil compact which has been entered into among the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky.

I will say that in 1935, six States entered into a compact such as the present compact. Later on other States joined in that compact. The compact which we have before us has been signed by the Governors of all the States involved, and the secretaries of state of those States. I have spoken to the majority and minority leaders concerning the joint resolution, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Mines and Mining. The Senate received a message from the President of the United States on June 28 transmitting the compact to the Senate. There is no disagreement whatever with respect to it at any place along the line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 139.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 66 will be indefinitely postponed.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I call attention to Calendar 378, House bill 3026, and also Calendar 381, House bill 1991, for which I intend to ask consideration a little later. Before making the motion for consideration I wish to make an explanation of House bill 3026. It is necessary that this bill be passed before Congress takes a recess in order to retain for some of our colleagues in the House the right to make appointments to West Point and Annapolis. Certain States have been redistricted under the new census; consequently there are less districts in some States than there previously were, and appointments previously made from a district which has been merged into adjacent districts have been charged to Members of the House who live in the adjacent districts. Some Representatives would thus be limited in the appointments they may make until the appointees named from the old district have graduated from the academy.

The question arises, of course, as to whether the passage of the bill will result in increasing the number of cadets and midshipmen at the academies. Of course it will, because when one State lost a House Member another State gained one. So the State which gained a House Member will have four more cadets and four more midshipmen, and the State which lost a Member will have the number heretofore appointed until those now in the academies are graduated. I believe the situation which now exists should be corrected. The bill has passed the House. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish to make a little further explanation of the measure. Two years ago, as I recall, we gave the academic boards at both West Point and Annapolis the right to keep the academies up to maximum strength by filling vacancies from qualified alternates. Consequently, when we retain to the sitting Members of the House their right to appoint, it will simply cut down the

number of qualified alternates who might otherwise be appointed to the academies. I believe the bill to be well worth while, and it should pass immediately in order quickly to become law.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. How many additional cadets and midshipmen will be appointed?

Mr. GURNEY. The bill does not actually provide for additicnal cadets and midshipmen. Those who are there now from the districts which have been done away with will remain there until they graduate.

Mr. WILLIS. There will be additions from the new districts, will there not?

Mr. GURNEY. There will be additions from the new districts in the States which gained House Members.

Mr. WILLIS. How many appointments will there be altogether?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not have the exact figures. Whatever new districts were created in one State were lost in another.

Mr. WILLIS. Do the academy boards approve of this measure?

Mr. GURNEY. Both the Military Academy and the Naval Academy boards have approved the measure and requested that it be enacted into law.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the passage of this measure mean that in the event a Member of Congress now has a vacancy because of the failure of a candidate to qualify in the last month or two, such vacancy might be filled by an alternate from another district or State?

Mr. GURNEY. No, the purpose of the measure is to correct that situation, and to keep for the House Member the privilege of filling the vacancy. He would lose that privilege if he should fail to pass the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. The bill has no application to the Senate?

Mr. GURNEY. No, it has no application to the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it not true that the issue involved in this measure is that either a Representative will be permitted to make appointments to fill vacancies, or the boards of the two academies may fill vacancies? If vacancies are not filled by congressional appointment each year, the academic boards may fill up the cadet or midshipman personnel to the required strength?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTPONEMENT OF INDUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 1991, Calendar No. 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "while" to strike out the word "satisfactorily", and in the same line before the word "course", to strike out the word "normal"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "ceases to", to strike out "perform satisfactorily", and to insert "pursue"; and on the same page, line 9, after the word "pursue", to strike out "satisfactorily."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 144, which had been unanimously reported from the House Committee on Agriculture. The bill deals with marketing quotas for burley and flue-cured tobacco. Because of the effort to stimulate food production, and the possibility that that might interfere with the acreage of this tobacco, the tobacco growers and the Department of Agriculture have recommended that the joint resolution be passed. It simply would extend the marketing quota provisions of the present law to apply to the 1944–45 crop. While I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of that committee, has authorized me in his name to report the joint resolution to the Senate and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the joint resolution has not yet been received from the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was informed by a Member of the House that the joint resolution had been received by the Senate. I will withdraw my request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to say that of course I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky, but I think it is thoroughly bad legislative practice in the closing hours or days of a session to reach into the calendar and ask unanimous consent for consideration of bills on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether it is contemplated that there will be a further call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is. Of course, some of the measures which have been called up by unanimous consent have involved continuations of existing laws about to expire. In such cases the measures present an emergency situation. Perhaps some of the measures which have been called up today do not come within that category. I contemplate that the Senate will have a call of the calendar before a recess is taken.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to have that assurance; because while emergencies may justify reaching into the calendar and picking out measures here and there, I think it is much better for all Members of the Senate for measures to be reached on the calendar, rather than in a fashion as to which Members are not advised.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, and join in his observation, in a general way; but, of course, we all understand that when we are approaching what we hope will be the tail end of the session, prior to a recess, if and when we have one, such situations do arise. It is not uncommon for requests of that sort to be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask what the legislative plan is for the remainder of the day?

Mr. BARKLEY. The legislative plan for the remainder of the day is to recess until tomorrow as soon as possible. I think that will be done shortly. However, to be perfectly frank, some nominations are on the way to the Senate, and we anticipate they will reach the Senate in a few minutes. Following consideration of the nominations, we hope to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, just used the illustration that the Senate was approaching the tail end of the session. Let me point out that when one approaches the tail end, it generally is the part of wisdom to proceed with caution. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's observation might bring on a considerable amount of conversation in which I do not wish to indulge. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I think we should have a general idea, if the majority leader is able to give it to us, as to approximately how long it is anticipated the Senate will be in session before the recess is taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean today?

Mr. MALONEY. No; I mean before the Senate takes a summer recess or adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated at the beginning of the week, I have entertained the hope, and it has been generally believed, that we could conclude our labors on necessary legislation and take a recess by Saturday. It is not now quite so certain that we shall be able to do that, although it is still possible. There are certain hangnails of legislation, if I may use the expression, which may not be entirely taken care of or concluded by Saturday night. Monday will be a holiday. I want to confer with the Members of the Senate as to whether they desire to have a session of the Senate on Monday. The Fourth of July falls on Sunday. Whenever that occurs, the celebration of the Fourth of July usually is had on Monday. I do not know how many Members of the Senate desire to be away, to deliver Fourth of July speeches. Personally, I see no reason why the Senate should not be in session on Monday, if there is necessary business to be transacted. It is not certain that we shall be able to conclude the session by Saturday night, although I hope it will be possible to do so; but, at the latest, it should be possible to conclude the session by next week, if it is necessary to go over until next week.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it certain that there will be a session of the Senate on Saturday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so.

ADJUSTMENT OF PAY STATUS OF CERTAIN WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to call up a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. It is rather urgent that the bill be passed. Its consideration will take only a brief time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know what the bill is. I am sure the Senate will consider the Senator's request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I refer to House bill 2349, calendar number 376, a bill dealing with the adjustment of the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall object to consideration of any bills on the calendar by unanimous consent unless we can be given definite assurance that the measures in question are of an emergency character.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am advised that the bill I refer to is of such character. There are pending several cases of warrant officers who, having been temporarily commissioned, are drawing half pay, less pay than they were receiving prior to their promotion. The sole purpose of the bill is to provide that when such persons are promoted in grade they shall not be demoted in pay.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is there any reason why the bill cannot be considered on the call of the calendar?

Mr. REVERCOMB. None, except that early passage of the bill is urged by the War Department because of the unfair treatment of such men who have been promoted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent that a bill on the calendar be taken up. It is in order to move to do so. If that is done, no objection can be raised. Senators objecting to consideration of the bill could merely vote "no" on the motion to take up the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2349) to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2349) to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say for the information of the Senate, in order that we may avoid any confusion in connection with the efforts of Senators to have the Senate take up worthy and meritorious bills, that it is entirely possible that tomorrow a situation may develop so that we can have a call of the calendar; or, if not tomorrow, certainly on Saturday. Unless a measure presents a situation involving the expiration of a law, I hope Senators will await the call of the calendar for further consideration of measures.

INVESTIGATION OF BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE AND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, some time during the last few days we have observed an unusual occurrence in Washington, in that the Vice President of the United States, who is Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Secretary of Commerce, who is the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of various subsidiary companies or corporations, have made charges and countercharges against each other regarding accumulation of strategic war materials. They have indicated a desire to have a congressional investigation of those very serious charges which concern the successful conduct of the war.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that one of the principal topics of contention has been the supply of quinine for the American boys who are fighting in the Tropics?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not further true that there has been a very long and serious delay in obtaining quinine, and that that has delayed military operations in the Tropics and endangered the health of our soldiers?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is certainly true. It is further true that the accumulation of a great many strategic war materials needed for the prosecution of the war was authorized by Congress as far back as 1939, have been held up and the delay costly to the whole war effort. These charges are serious. These delays have been costly. They have a very serious effect on the future conduct of the war, as well as the past conduct of the war. I am therefore out of order sending to the desk a resolution calling for a senatorial investigation of this situation, and I ask for its appropriate reference and immediate action.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire admits that it is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. BRIDGES subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the resolution which I submitted be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is not the committee to which it should go. It should go to the committee which has been dealing with this subject, the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BRIDGES. It has to do with the conduct of the war and the occultation of strategic war materials.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So does the legislation under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Bureau of Economic Warfare have been acting. That legislation has all been sponsored by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that is the committee to which the Senator's resolution should go.

Mr. BRIDGES. Regardless of whether it has to do with the conduct of the war?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course. All sorts of legislation having to do with the conduct of the war has been sponsored by various committees of the Senate besides the Committee on Military Affairs. The whole subject of this controversy has arisen under legislation sponsored by the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the committee to which the Senator's resolution should go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution (S. Res. 165) submitted by Mr. BRIDGES was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the operations and activities of the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the various corporations created or organized pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, relating to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities defined by the President as strategic or critical materials pursuant to such section 5d, and to report to the Senate

at the earliest practicable date, the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the message from the President in regard to an executive nomination having reached the Senate and having been received at the desk, I presume that it will be laid before the Senate when we go into executive session.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS AND COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I hay have until midnight tonight to submit reports from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and/or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, sundry routine nominations in the Army were reported earlier in the day. I ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

MAJ. GEN. MILLER GRIEVE WHITE

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of Brig. Gen. Miller Grieve White to be major general. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. I have consulted with the majority and minority leaders, and I understand that there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I cannot let this confirmation pass without saying a word in behalf of Brigadier General White—now major general. He has been doing one of the finest jobs in the Army, and I am very happy to see him promoted to the rank of major general.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the Army nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in Canada.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION

George Henry Payne, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1943 (reappointment).

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Miller Grieve White (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Louis Emerson Hibbs (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ray Wehnes Barker (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Guerdon Hearn (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Godfrey Lehman (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lester Thomas Miller (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas James Hanley, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Egbert Branshaw (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Frederick Mixon Harris (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward John McGaw (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Nicholas Young (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Edward Raab Covell (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Edward Lewis (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Peter Powell Rodes (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Henry Tunner (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Casper Ball Rucker, Infantry.

Col. Harold Arthur Bartron (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Hendricks Beverley (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Boyle Kelly (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Raymond Peck (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Percy James Carroll, Medical Corps.

Col. Dabney Otey Elliott, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Oliver Boone Bucher (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Alfred Warrington Marriner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Hobart Raymond Gay (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Bruce McBride, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert William Crichlow, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Peyton Kane (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Harrison Alexander (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth George Althaus (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lester Amiel Daugherty (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank August Heileman (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Richard Emmel Nugent (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Leonard Pierce (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Myron Ray Wood (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henning Linden (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Edward Bastion, Medical Corps.

Col. Edward Wrenne Timberlake (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Byron Elihu Gates (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Pinckney Bledsoe (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Philip Hayes, Field Artillery.

Col. Ross Gordon Hoyt (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Lewis Culin, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. George Francis Schulgen (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Alexander Dumas (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Seymoure Ross (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roger Maxwell Ramey (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Hugh Johnston Knerr (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ned Schramm (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Caraway Arrowsmith (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Earl Seeley Hoag (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Albert Jesse Browning, Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Julius Cecil Holmes (major, Military Intelligence Reserve), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Medical Director Edward U. Reed to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Third Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director George C. Thomas to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Eleventh Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director William L. Mann, Jr., to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Thirteenth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Joseph J. A. McMullin to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Fifth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Richard H. Laning to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, First Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Danield Hunt to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Twelfth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Frank Baldwin to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as Director of the Naval Cost Inspection Service, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Everett G. Morsell to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district supply officer, Ninth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Arthur H. Mayo to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, Calif., to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director John J. Gaffney to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for temporary service, while serving as district supply officer, Fourteenth Naval District, and with additional duties as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Pearl Harbor, and supply officer, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Malcolm G. Slarrow to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Norfolk, Va., to rank from the 1st day of July 1943.

Civil Engineer Henry F. Bruns to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as superintending civil engineer of Area VI and Area VII, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer James T. Mathews to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as superintending civil engineer of Area IV, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer John J. Manning to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as director, Atlantic Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer Carl H. Cotter to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as director, Pacific Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Denmark, now assigned as Acting Chief of the Division of European Affairs in the Department of State, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in Canada.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

George Henry Payne, member of the Federal Communications Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Miller Grieve White

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Don Elwood Lowry et al.

(NOTE.—A list of the names of all persons whose nominations for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 29, 1943, under the caption "Nominations" beginning with the name of Don Elwood Lowry on p. 6740 and ending with the name of Guy Wycoff Harlow on p. 6745.)

IN THE NAVY

PROMOTIONS

To be captains

Francis T. Spellman
Charles D. Leffler

To be commanders

Alan R. McCracken — Burton Davis
George L. Menocal — Robert M. Morris

To be lieutenants

Rufus L. Taylor — Harry A. Barnard, Jr.
Roger M. Keithly — Charles M. Holcombe

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Eli B. Roth — William G. Kornahrens
Robert C. Barnes — Charles Holovak
Clarence W. Becker — David G. Bryce

To be surgeons

Arthur W. Eaton, Jr.
Stephen E. Flynn

To be passed assistant surgeons

Howell E. Wiggins — Robert O. Canada, Jr.
Robert B. Greenman — Vernon E. Martens
William F. Queen

To be dental surgeon, with rank of lieutenant commander

James H. Connelly

To be passed assistant dental surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant

Edward V. Barth

To be ensigns

Richard J. Kroth
Jonathan J. Crowder

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Franklin M. Haines, Jr.
William F. Babcock

To be assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Chester J. Kurzawa

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of of ensign

Louis N. Saunders, Jr.
Robert R. Wooding

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign

John F. Tynan, SC-V (G)

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Dorothy M. Armstrong, Hull.

MISSOURI

Kenneth C. Patton, Clarksville.
Alfred M. Pondrom, Florissant.

VIRGINIA

Edward C. Oslin, Boydton.
Elsie P. Jones, Urbanna.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Gordon, Bramwell.
Harry C. Loudon, Fairmont.
Paul D. Young, Omar.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, Thou art very great. Thou art clothed with honor and majesty. Thou coverest Thyself with light as with a garment. Thou stretchest out the heavens like a curtain. Thou layest the beams of Thy chambers in the waters. Thou makest the clouds Thy chariots and walkest upon the wings of the wind. O Lord, how manifold are Thy works; in wisdom Thou hast made them all; the earth is full of Thy riches.

Heavenly Father, every day's dawn awakens the echo of Thy merciful providence—a miracle of Thy great love, so gloriously and impartially given. We pray that we may lay hold of this truth and hide it away in our hearts. Direct us to hallow all our days with a reverent recognition of Thee as our Creator, and may we love to call Thee "our Father." We beseech Thee ever to inspire us with the faith that springs like the eagle soaring to meet the sun and praying exultingly unto Thee: "O Lord, Thy will be done." Give us the spirit that enables us to walk our ways in contentment and peace. Make sorrow a stranger to all our firesides and let Thy love radiate in all our homes, and unto Thee shall be the praise both now and ever. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of H. R. 2869.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1130. An act to provide for the care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the continued bungling of the O. P. A. regarding the meat situation in the United States is growing worse hourly. I bring this to your attention again this morning for the simple reason that in some areas the people are not receiving meat even though they have points entitling them to buy it. Cattle are being taken from the fattening pens and placed back on the ranges. This certainly seems to be a shame when we have more meat animals today in the United States than at any time in the history of our Nation. We are killing one of the best businesses the country has ever had all because some people down here in O. P. A. who know nothing whatsoever about it set up rules and regulations that strangle it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous consent requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Hon. Gordon H. Turner, an official of the National Youth Administration in Nashville, together with a report by Dr. S. L. Smith, Chairman of the Tennessee National Youth Administration Advisory Committee, for the fiscal year just closing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and by request to include a short summary of peace proposals submitted to me by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made by Edward R. Murrow over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Philadelphia on June 20, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE IN NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention frequently to the shortage of meat in New York City and the situation this morning I will say is getting worse. People stand in line for hours to get a lamb chop. Steaks are out of the question. Roast beef is beyond the pay range of anybody in New York unless he has ample economic security; yet the New York Times this morning again repeats the statement that there is a vast surplus of cattle, and a Mr. Montague, general counsel for the United States Southwestern Cattle Growers, says that there is a surplus of 15,000,000 head of cattle in the West. What are you going to do to help get this beef to New York? We have been struggling with this question for some time.

There must be some solution found even if it means the seizing of some of these cattle. The War Food Administration seized corn in western elevators, the time

may have arrived for drastic action by way of seizure of cattle to get meat to industrial areas. The War Powers Acts give ample authority. The price paid maybe will be the standard price set by the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. The growers and farmers should have no losses, but that meat should be gotten to the East.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, although the House may little note it should long remember July 1, 1943. Today marks the inauguration of a great change in the affairs of the American people. It is the day that marks the beginning of a pay-as-you-earn tax collection system. I believe it is safe to state that this day marks the beginning of the end of retroactive personal income taxation. It is the day on which the employers of the United States begin to withhold at the source taxes on the income of about 40,000,000 persons.

While the Congress did not approve of my original proposal to move the tax clock ahead 1 year without any doubling up of taxes, it did make the greatest change and improvement in our personal income tax law since its enactment in 1913.

I only want to take advantage of the occasion to say a few words which might fall under the heading of "unfinished business" as far as pay-as-you-go taxation is concerned. I am prompted to do this because I know that the final terms of that legislation came to rest rather heavily and somewhat unfairly on some taxpayers and employers. I therefore want to assure all those who may feel they have been unjustly dealt with that pay-as-you-go legislation is not regarded by some as complete, perfect, or finished. As it stands it is merely the best that could be done under difficult circumstances. Therefore, so far as I can do so I shall make every effort to prepare and enact legislation that will remove any inequities which may be demonstrated. Whenever new revenue legislation is again taken up in which changes of that kind properly may be included I shall do all I can to that end.

NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2968, the national war agencies bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington News of June 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the report of a meeting of farmers living in Howard County, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from the farmers of Wayne County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'NEAL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE ACT CONCERNING THOSE INDUCTED OR ENLISTED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which I regard to be of very considerable importance to those who have left their civilian occupations and who are now enlisted in the armed forces of the United States.

This bill provides protection for all those who, while they are enjoying civil service eligibility, are inducted or enlisted in the armed forces, by suspending permanent appointments to civil-service positions for the duration and a short period thereafter. While the bill does not in any way infringe upon appointments under war-service regulations, it gives the service man or woman the opportunity to avail themselves of a previously acquired civil service status at the end of the war.

The bill also provides that no period of time served subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall be counted in determining the period of eligibility for appointment under the civil-service laws if such person's name appeared on an eligible register or on a reemployment or replacement list of the Civil Service Commission at the time he entered active military or naval service or if he attained eligibility during such service.

Since this bill affords a substantial measure of protection to those in the armed forces of our country, I am sure it will be given very careful consideration by the committee and ultimately by the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in reference to the meat situation that there are many representatives from rural areas that would appreciate very much if he would join in remedying this meat situation. It so happens that before there was interference in Washington meat flowed to New York in plentiful quantities. The trouble is not with the farmer. That is not the place that we need any drastic action on the part of the Government. The action that must be taken is right here in Washington, to stop bureaus, principally the O. P. A., from destroying food and interfering with its processing and distribution.

The gentleman should help us enact H. R. 2837, which would place the entire food situation under one head. This bill is the outgrowth of the farsighted efforts of our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., in creating the Republican study committee on food.

GOVERNMENT ARSENALS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The object of the joint resolution is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to declare quotas on burley and flue-cured tobacco for the crop year 1944. Under the present law, it is necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture before he can declare quotas to make certain determinations. Due to the uncertainty of our export trade in tobacco and our labor situation, it is purely a guess with the Secretary, and he does not know whether he will be able to make the determination with any degree of accuracy. We are anxious to see that the quotas are retained for the crop year 1944. This resolution would give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to declare quotas for the crop year 1944. In no other respect is the present tobacco law changed.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. We do not want to have the growers of tobacco subjected to the uncertainty that might grow out of the conditions with which we are confronted, and this measure simply freezes the industry as it now is.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the object of the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. It lets the farmers go ahead on the present basis.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It gives the Secretary the right to declare quotas for the crop year 1944. Then the program would have to be submitted to the growers under a referendum and two-thirds would have to approve it.

Mr. JENNINGS. This measure has the unanimous approval of the representatives from the tobacco-growing sections of the country?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. It does not mean alone the production of tobacco, it means also the production of foodstuffs, because it enables the grower of tobacco who also grows foodstuffs to keep his labor on the farm.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I make the observation that the committee felt when this matter was presented yesterday morning—and it was fully and completely presented—that the legislation would assist in promoting the food program because it was very clearly demonstrated that if the labor were taken off the tobacco production now there would be an expansion in tobacco production and acreage would be devoted to it which would otherwise be devoted to the production of food.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I call attention at this time to the fact that we have heard a lot about the most-favored nations, and now we are hearing about our most-favored crops. In addition to what has been said, I should like to point out this. What has been said about the bill is of course true. What we are doing is allowing the people who raise tobacco to decide for themselves, by a two-thirds vote, whether they want to increase the acreage or do not want to increase it.

I should also like to call your attention to the fact that although tobacco is bringing 195 percent of parity at the present time, our tobacco friends the other day were pretty anxious to roll back the price of butter when the matter of roll-back was under consideration, and that this crop, a minor crop in the United States, is getting legislative advantages and has the sources of the United States Treasury to help them hold it up there at the same time that a big product like butter has to be subjected to all these whims of the New Deal.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Permit me to say to my good friend from Wisconsin, who always has an eagle eye peeled for the defense of butter, that I am from a dairying section, and the tobacco-producing section of the country has more milch cows than any other section except Wisconsin and Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And Michigan.

Mr. JENNINGS. I include Michigan—I am always for the dairy industry—east Tennessee is a great dairy section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the finding of the total supply of tobacco, the reserve supply level and the amount of the national marketing quota, and the provisions of section 313 of said act relating to the apportionment of the national marketing quota for tobacco among the States and farms, national marketing quotas for burley and flue-cured tobacco for the marketing year 1944–45 shall be proclaimed and the national marketing quotas and State and farm acreage allotments shall be the same as for the preceding year: *Provided, however*, That an additional acreage not in excess of 2 percent of the total acreage allotted to all farms in each State in 1940 shall be allotted in accordance with the applicable provisions of subsection (a) of section 313 and an additional acreage equal to not more than 5 percent of the national marketing quota shall be allotted to farms on which no tobacco was produced in the last 5 years in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g) of section 313. This joint resolution shall not have the effect of modifying or repealing any other provision of said act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 26, 1943:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2556. An act for relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1943:

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

On June 29, 1943:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 1642. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 120]

Baldwin, Md.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson,
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ford	Ward
Barden	Fulmer	Kilburn
Bonner	Furlong	King
Bradley, Mich.	Gallagher	Lea
Buckley	Gifford	Lesinski
Burdick	Green	Magnuson
Byrne	Hall,	Mansfield,
Capozzoli	Edwin Arthur	Tex.
Cochran	Hall,	Merritt
Costello	Leonard W.	Morrison, N. C.
Culkin	Hancock	Nichols
Cunningham	Hartley	Norton
Curley	Hébert	O'Hara
Dawson	Holifield	O'Leary
Ellsworth	Izac	Phillips
Fay	Johnson,	Plumley
Fish	J. Leroy	Robsion, Ky.

Russell	Smith, Va.	Van Zandt
Shafer	Taylor	Vinson, Ga.
Sheppard	Tolan	West
Sheridan	Treadway	

The SPEAKER. On this call 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement issued by Judge Marvin Jones, immediately following his induction into office as Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter from Mr. Biggers, respecting certain remarks of the President of the United States, together with excerpts from the Land O' Lakes News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina calls up a conference report upon the Labor-Federal Security Administration bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 12, 15, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment with the following proviso inserted at the end thereof: ": *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as States laws are complied with"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$595,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That this program shall end June 30, 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,328,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"None of the moneys appropriated by this Act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,098,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 19, 24, and 30.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H BANKHEAD,
M. C. TARVER,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 1, salaries: Appropriates $386,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $352,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, salaries and expenses, Working Conditions Service, Division of Labor Standards (national defense): Eliminates language and appropriation of $700,000 inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3, salaries and expenses, child labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act: Appropriates $225,000, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $253,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4, salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare: Appropriates $360,000, instead of $350,000 as proposed by the House and $378,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Restores language, proposed to be stricken out, inhibiting regulations discriminating between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics amended by adding a proviso to prevent restriction on the free choice by patients of the type of practitioner desired.

Amendment No. 6, grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): Appropriates $4,400,000, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 7, Food and Drug Administration enforcement operations: Appropriates $2,323,580 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $94,400 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, salaries, Howard University: Appropriates $595,340, instead of $591,240 as proposed by the House and $597,840 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Changes language in paragraph making appropriations for loans to students to provide that such loans shall be made only to those persons who received loans during the fiscal year 1943.

Amendment No. 11: Provides that the student-loan program shall not continue beyond June 30, 1944, and eliminates a provision, proposed by the Senate, restricting the number of beneficiaries to 2,000.

Amendment No. 12: Provides for supervision of the Office of Education defense-training program by the Federal Security Administrator as proposed by the House instead of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Restricts application of provision requiring sale of slides and films to slides and films hereafter made.

Amendment No. 14: Provides $45,000,000 for training of nurses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and includes language to carry into effect Public Law 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, the so-called Bolton bill.

Amendment No. 15: Provides for payment in advance by the District of Columbia of amounts due St. Elizabeths Hospital as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16, grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: Appropriates $35,328,000, instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $37,328,502 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Restores a limitation proposed by the House to prevent interference by Federal agencies with the operation of State merit systems for appointment of personnel.

National Labor Relations Board

Amendment No. 18, salaries: Appropriates $1,715,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,415,000 as proposed by the House.

Railroad Retirement Board

Amendment No. 20: Eliminates a restriction, proposed by the House, on the amount which might be paid to any person serving as referee during any one year.

Amendment No. 21, salaries: Appropriates $2,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,706,769 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22, miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $490,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House.

War Manpower Commission

Amendment No. 23, general administration: Appropriates $11,000,000, instead of $9,994,800 as proposed by the House and $12,177,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, apprentice training service: Appropriates $475,500, instead of $465,500 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26, apprentice training service (national defense): Appropriates $600,000, instead of $550,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27, travel expenses, Employment Office Facilities and Services: Allocates $2,098,000, instead of $1,980,000 as proposed by the House and $2,275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $47,500,000, instead of $45,500,000 as proposed by the House and $50,500,000 as proposed by the Senate for Employment Office facilities and services.

Amendment No. 29: Restores a provision, proposed by the House, requiring the maintenance of State salary scales in the employment service during the period of Federal operation.

Amendments in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. As to each of such amendments the motion authorized to be made by action of the managers on the part of the House is stated:

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill a provision, inserted by the House, prohibiting the use of the funds of the National Labor Relations Board in any case involving an agreement between management and labor which has been in force more than 3 months. A motion will be made to recede from disagreement and concur in the amendment with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out and add at the end thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of three months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person."

Amendment No. 24: Requires confirmation by the Senate of all persons appointed to positions the salaries of which are paid out of the appropriation for General Administration of the War Manpower Commission and whose salaries are at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more. The managers will move to insist on disagreement.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $41,800,000 and reappropriates $6,000,000 for the National Youth Administration and strikes out a provision, proposed by the House, for liquidation of the National Youth Administration. A motion will be made to recede from disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Senate in the consideration of this bill, added 30 amendments. Out of the 30 amendments, 27 were agreed to in conference, and 3 are reported in disagreement. One is with reference to the National Youth Administration, another relates to an amendment to the National Labor Relations Board appropriation which would prohibit the use of funds in any investigation where complaint is filed after the agreement entered into between the managers and employees or labor which has been in existence for 3 months of satisfactory service or unless complaint were filed within 3 months after the agreement. The third is an amendment offered in the Senate known as the McKellar amendment, which would require Senate confirmation of all appointees in the Manpower Commission drawing salaries of $4,500 a year or more.

One amendment of the Senate agreed to by House conferees was one increasing the appropriation for training nurses. This was in response to an act passed by the House which became a law after the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations had recommended appropriations for 1944. As I have suggested, it was a bill providing Federal aid to nurses, to be trained, with the understanding that they would be available for services in the armed forces. This appropriation approximates $45,000,000. There was no disagreement on the part of the House conferees or the Senate conferees on this item.

Some discussion arose over the amendment passed by the House originally that would prevent discrimination on the part of the Children's Bureau in selecting physicians or persons to officiate at the birth of the children of servicemen. It will be recalled that a few weeks ago the Congress provided that Federal aid should be given to all wives and children of servicemen at the time of the births of such children.

In other words Congress provided that the Federal Government would provide medical care and hospitalization for expectant mothers, who are wives of servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. The bill as it passed the House carried a provision which prevented discrimination in the selection of persons to officiate at the birth of such children. In other words, the bill provided that any person licensed under a State law to practice obstetrics should be available if requested by the prospective mother to officiate at the birth of her child. There was some difference of opinion as to the wisdom of this provision in the House bill, but it was passed without objection. The committee submitted this proposal upon the theory that if a State has enacted legislation providing the qualifications of persons to officiate at childbirth or to practice obstetrics, then it is not within the province of the Federal Government to nullify the acts of the States and arrogate to itself the right to determine who shall officiate at the birth of a child. Therefore that amendment was inserted to prevent discrimination by the Children's Bureau. The conferees have agreed upon this amendment, and it is no longer in question.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that the report now contains a provision that people have the right to choose their own physician?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. So long as he is sanctioned by the State law in which the parents reside?

Mr. HARE. The prospective mother will have the right to select her own physician provided that physician qualifies under the law of the State.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The lack of discrimination only applies to obstetrics?

Mr. HARE. Only to obstetrics.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is very clear?

Mr. HARE. Very clear and definite, because we do not want it to apply to crippled children and other functions of the Children's Bureau, but only to wives and children of servicemen.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr BULWINKLE. I did not quite understand the gentleman. Will the gentleman explain to the House what discrimination exists if you adopt the Senate proposal? I understood the Senate struck out the House provision. That was the Senate amendment. Now you propose to reinsert it with this amendment. What discrimination exists if you adopt the Senate amendment?

Mr. HARE. No discrimination, because the Senate receded.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. There is discrimination now being practiced by the Children's Bureau, which refuses in this program to allow soldiers' wives to use practitioners of certain types who are licensed by the laws of their States to practice obstetrics. The committee intended to remove that discrimination. If the Senate amendment is agreed to, the discrimination will continue.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But the Women's Bureau provides only for medical men to practice obstetrics.

Mr. HARE. No. I did not say with the Women's Bureau. We understand that the practice of the Children's Bureau is that they will not permit anyone to officiate at childbirth unless it can be shown that this particular person has a certificate or a diploma from a particular kind of college, and has been recommended to serve in this capacity.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be some restriction?

Mr. HARE. Not if the State has first qualified the individual. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman indicate whether there is any money in this provision for N. Y. A. for college assistance, or is all included in the Senate amendment for training in industrial work? My observation of N. Y. A. has been chiefly in regard to its benefits in high school and college aid during the depression.

Mr. HARE. The Senate amendment carries a provision for $5,000,000 for student aid in colleges, very much on the same basis it was carried last year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does that apply to high-school students?

Mr. HARE. It does not. It applies only to student aid in colleges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of the Members will remember that this provision was passed by the House without opportunity to discuss it, when this bill was under consideration 2 or 3 weeks ago; those in charge of the bill after having moved, and the House voted, to have 5 hours for debate, started reading the bill after 3 hours and 45 minutes, and the provision was passed before opportunity was given to discuss it before the House.

However, the Senate subcommittee wisely decided to strike out the provision forbidding the Children's Bureau to set up professional standards for those practitioners of obstetrics who could qualify to receive Federal money under this bill. That provision was stricken out in the Senate subcommittee and the amendment was agreed to unanimously by the Senate.

Now the conferees have reinserted it, and added a still further amendment, which throws the door wide open for anybody to get Federal money who can persuade a State licensing board to give him or her a license to take care of women in childbirth. If this new amendment, at the top of page 2 of the conference report read, "The foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of 'any physician' or 'any obstetrician,' of her own choice," instead of "any practitioner," we would have no difficulty. I do not believe anybody would have any objection to that.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the Federal Government under the Constitution has any power to impose its judgment upon the residents of a State as to who shall be permitted to practice medicine or obstetrics for them?

Mr. JUDD. I am strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government is under obligation to see that money that it appropriates is spent only for services of the highest standard.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will admit that other residents of a State, other than wives of soldiers, can select any type of practitioner licensed by the laws of their State?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. Why should the Federal Government say that soldiers' wives cannot do that? They cannot have that privilege, but all other residents of a State may, of course, have it, under the State law.

Mr. JUDD. Other residents are paying for their services out of their own pockets. The services for these wives are being paid for by Federal money.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman desires to restrict the privileges of soldiers' wives in selecting practitioners of their own choosing, who are licensed by the laws of their State?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I do, because in some States the laws are so loose that practically anybody can practice obstetrics.

We would not be imposing our will on the States. We would merely be saying, as we do in appropriation bills almost every week, that in order to get Federal money certain prescribed conditions must be met. Existing legislation gives the Children's Bureau the power to establish such standards. The program has produced most excellent results. Do we want to change it now, and forbid the maintaining of standards for the care of the wives and babies of our soldiers?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where the doctors have all gone to war, and most of them have, and the community is in need of doctors, why not call on some of these practitioners licensed by the State, who meet the requirements of the State, whoever they may be, to care for the women who are about to give birth to children?

Mr. JUDD. It is interesting to note why so many of the doctors are in the Army and Navy and the so-called practitioners are still at home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, our women will not stop having babies just because the doctors are in the service, and someone other than graduate doctors must care for them while the doctors are in the service.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the gentleman does not mean that the way it sounds. Doctors are not responsible for women having babies. They merely deliver them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I mean it. They cannot wait until the doctors return from the war before they have babies.

Mr. JUDD. Civilian doctors are reduced in number and the other practitioners are at home because the Army and Navy takes the former into their Medical Corps and will not take the latter for the care of the men, that is one of the principal reasons why I believe we should not do less for their wives, at least not in a program supported by the Federal Government. The question is, Are we willing to vote these funds without some restrictions on their use?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The women are still having babies, are they not? They must have care, must they not, even if that care cannot be the best?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is not with these States which have laws requiring that persons in order to practice obstetrics, have to meet the same high standards in basic sciences, clinical training, internship, and so forth, as do regular physicians. The difficulty is with the many States which do not have such laws that they do not require sufficient training or adequate standards.

To be specific with regard to one class of practitioners, the osteopaths, a few States, such as New Hampshire, Texas, Colorado, California, give unlimited licenses to practice to osteopaths. They have correspondingly high standards to protect their people.

In about 10 other States osteopaths are not forbidden to practice obstetrics, but they cannot use any drugs.

In some other States they can use some drugs, but not certain other drugs. Do we want our soldiers' wives to be placed in the care of those who cannot give them a proper drug or an anesthetic to relieve their pain or to check hemorrhage that may otherwise be fatal?

In many States osteopaths are not forbidden to practice obstetrics but are forbidden to perform any surgical operations, or any but minor operations.

As the Members of the House know, there are many obstetrical cases in which serious lacerations result and if repair is made immediately the mother will recover; otherwise she may die, or may have anatomical and functional abnormalities that are permanently disabling or require serious operations later.

The gentleman from South Carolina said he had no objection to allowing other practitioners than physicians to practice obstetrics under this program; but would not extend the privilege beyond the practice of obstetrics. If it is proper to let down the bars for the care of women in such a crisis as childbirth, just why should we maintain higher standards for the care of children, normal or crippled? Or is that contemplated after this provision today serves as an entering wedge? In all or practically all of the States, osteopaths are licensed to practice manipulation; the treatment of bone, joint, and muscle conditions is the field in which they usually regard themselves as specialists. How long is the Children's Bureau to be allowed to hold to present standards for the care of crippled children?

I cannot in good conscience approve this provision which, by a rider on an appropriation bill and without full hearing and careful consideration, drastically alters the procedures we have built up over a period of many years and have followed with such excellent results for needy mothers and children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. I hope very much that during a war like this we will not abandon the standards that have been worked out so carefully, and especially for the care of the wives and babies of men whom we have called into military service, and for whom we are therefore responsible during the absence of their husbands.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to you on this amendment from the standpoint of a physician with 25 years' experience, and one and one-half as State health director, in which time I had charge of the administration of the funds under the Children's Bureau, which we allocated to Nebraska.

I think we should see the picture accurately and then decide in our own minds which is the proper way to go.

As State health director of the State of Nebraska for one and a half years, I had these funds under my supervision. I want to say to the House that this amendment, if it is left in this bill, will hinder the administration of the funds in a manner which is wise.

There are many States in which individuals are permitted to take care of obstetrical cases, but where they are not permitted to perform certain acts, like the administration of hypodermics or like the repair of lacerations. It is a question of deciding if this House wants quantity of care or quality of care for the wives of our soldiers. In the practice of surgery and in the practice of obstetrics many new things have been discovered in the last quarter of a century. There are many medicines that are being used today by men who have qualified to take care of women who are having babies that were not used a few years ago.

If you adopt this amendment it will make it impossible for the children's bureaus or the health directors in many of the States to use the funds and give these women who are going to have babies the type and quality of care you would want your daughter or your neighbor's daughter to have. This is true because the midwife, and the chiropractor in some States, take care of obstetrical cases and they will continue under this provision. You are in effect keeping future mothers from getting the quality of care they should have.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? That is a serious misstatement of fact.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I decline to yield at the moment. I said that in many States chiropractors, osteopaths, and midwives are not permitted to give hypodermic injections. They are not allowed to use any surgical procedures and many of these cases, you all realize, need that quality of care and they certainly should be entitled to it; yet under this bill you are making it impossible for them to receive that quality of care.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman indicated that chiropractors could practice in obstetrical cases. The gentleman says he is a former State health officer. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there is not a single State in the United States which licenses chiropractors to practice in obstetrical cases? If the gentleman has any doubt about it I have a letter in my files that I will presently read to the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman is right in his statement, but I do know there are many States in which they are practicing obstetrics, including Nebraska and the gentleman's own State.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know of any chiropractor who is licensed to practice obstetrics. This proposed amendment limits the administration of the funds specifically to only those practitioners that are licensed to practice obstetrics. So the Children's Bureau would have no trouble at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is the gentleman making a speech or asking a question? Let us have questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the gentleman if under the Federal Employees Compensation Act we did not set up the type of physician or practitioner who could receive funds from that act? If this bill is passed it certainly will not be in conformity with the standards of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe that is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that issue?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not now. I wish to make this statement: I think it not only opens the door in obstetrical cases, but it opens the door in the case of crippled children who are entitled to funds. I know some medical men who are not capable of taking care of some club feet in children. I think you are opening it up so that such cases cannot get the kind or quality of care they need. We want to be careful at this time that we do not pass a law that will make it easier for bad practices to creep in, practices we are not proud of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I understood the gentleman in his reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to say that he thought the action of the House should be in conformity with the rules governing the operation of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that hardly comes in here; the unemployment compensation law hardly enters into this picture.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows that the United States Employees' Compensation Act provides for the use of osteopaths, does he not? It was amended in 1940 to so provide.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It set up a standard to preclude them from taking care of many cases under the compensation act.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman still insists, however, that he is not in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to say to the gentleman: That a man who is not qualified to do surgery should not do surgery and a man not qualified and with all the equipment necessary to take care of obstetrical cases should not be allowed to take care of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this question on June 16. I wish now to reiterate what I said at that time in general terms, that I am not unmindful of State legislation, but I think we should try to protect the health of the American people generally. This of course has been the policy of organized medicine for many years, a policy to which I wholeheartedly subscribe. The Members of this House certainly cannot forget the problems of a few years ago such as

diphtheria, typhoid fever, cholera, smallpox, and many other illnesses that were so common then but which under the skillful research of organized medicine have become so rare today.

Most of you are also aware of the great strides organized medicine and research work have made in the care of acute infections of every kind—especially pneumonia.

If you insist on this amendment it will certainly be taking a backward step and I am sure that the American people do not want that sort of thing.

I am also thinking of the men in the armed forces in which case the surgeon general agrees with organized medicine in not commissioning those who are not graduates of recognized medical schools and he says further, in backing up his views on that point:

> It has recognized only that school of medicine that has its foundation on proven scientific research and practices in the healing art that are subscribed to by the vast majority of physicians throughout the world.

He further goes on to state:

> The surgeon general is charged with the preservation of the physical well-being of the military forces. This responsibility cannot be discharged in the absence of fixed standards of preventive measures, diagnostic procedures, and curative therapy. These standards are found only in the school of regular medicine and are based upon scientific fact that precludes the integration of healers of schools that are founded on dogma or cult.

That in itself is reason enough for this House to take into consideration, and uphold.

In addition to the opinion of the surgeon general relative to commissioning medical men for the armed services he is also opposed to this particular legislation. The American Medical Association as well as the various States and county medical societies are also opposed to this proviso which lets down the bars and insists on the Children's Bureau of the Labor Department recognizing people who they know do not meet the qualifications of regular practitioners of medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, let us see if we cannot get ourselves on to a basis of thinking where we will understand the problem confronting us.

The States of this Union, with the exception of three, I believe, license osteopaths to practice obstetrics. In my State, for example, an osteopath is a member of the State examining board. In State after State they have to take the same examination to practice as does a medical practitioner, and they are licensed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this time. The gentleman did not yield until he had finished his statement. I will try to correct some of the glaring misstatements that the gentleman made in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, State after State has osteopathic hospitals. In the city of Detroit, for instance, is located a great osteopathic hospital that handles thousands of obstetrical cases. In the State of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is located one of the greatest obstetricians there is in the country. I know many highly qualified osteopathic obstetricians whose services are being used daily by women who want the services of an osteopath. Bear in mind that he must be duly licensed under State law to practice obstetrics.

In view of the great shortage of practioners that exists in the country, the attitude of the committee is that these soldiers' wives or anybody else are the ones to determine who is going to preside at the delivery of her child. We are straining at a gnat anyway, because, after all, if a wife wants to go to an osteopath, that is her business. She can do it in any State where that osteopath is licensed to practice obstetrics. She is doing it today, and she can continue to do it. The only discrimination that exists is that the wife of a soldier who employs an M. D., that M. D. gets his pay out of these Federal funds, but the wife of a soldier who has had her children delivered by an osteopath, who is qualified and licensed to practice as such, must pay out of her own pocket. You can clearly see what the discrimination is.

There has been a lot of fuzzy thinking about this situation. May I state with some certainty and definiteness that I have a letter from the National Chiropractic Association, Inc., its legislative counsel here in Washington, in which it is stated:

> This is to advise you that to my knowledge the chiropractors are not licensed to practice obstetrics in any State.

That leaves out the question of neuropaths and it leaves out the question of chiropractors. We get down now to the question of midwifery. The doctors who have talked here today and who are so vigorously presenting the case of organized medicine, referred to the fact that we are going to turn these people over to the practitioners who practice midwifery.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. In just a moment. The gentleman had his opportunity.

Mr. FENTON. I had 2 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have in this file the State laws of every State relating to the practice of midwifery. I have examined all of them and I say without fear of contradiction that there is not a single State in this Union that licenses midwives to practice obstetrics. They have limited licenses to practice midwifery. This particular provision in the bill relates only to those individuals who are licensed to practice obstetrics by State law. That eliminates chiropractors, that eliminates midwives, that eliminates neuropaths, and any other cult of that kind. If a woman wants to employ a midwife in the State of Pennsylvania, she can do it today; and many of them do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to this: A statement was made by the gentleman from Nebraska in response to a question of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that this would throw out of harmony the Federal attitude on this question. May I call attention to the fact that Public Law Numbered 558, Seventy-fifth Congress, passed in 1940, specifically provides:

> The term "physician" as described in the United States Employees' Compensation Act includes surgeons, osteopathic practitioners within the scope of their practice as defined by State law.

This is in compliance with the attitude of the Congress adopted in 1940.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman realize that the osteopathic physicians he is speaking of are not licensed or commissioned in the Army to take care of the military men?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say this, that I think that the gentleman is perhaps correct that the Surgeon General and the medical men that have charge of that situation for the Army do not permit the commissioning of osteopaths in the Medical Corps of the Army. But I will say this: I make no great plea for osteopathy; I am only making a plea for fairness and lack of discrimination.

Mr. JUDD. Fairness to whom?

Mr. KEEFE. To the expectant mother. The mother in this case has the right to choose any person that she wants that is licensed according to the State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin wants the facts to be stated correctly.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I do.

Mr. FENTON. Chiropractors are licensed to practice obstetrics in certain States.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman name one?

Mr. FENTON. Also, midwives are licensed to practice in certain States.

Mr. KEEFE. All I have to say is that I have here the laws of the States. The gentleman cannot put his finger on the law of a single State in the Union or name one where chiropractors are licensed to practice obstetrics nor can he point to a single State where midwives are licensed to do anything more than midwifery, and their practice is limited to that and that alone.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In view of the fact that the gentleman's very strong argument is based on fair play, does he believe it is fair to change the existing laws in order to give an advantage to that

class of men practicing medical arts who cannot serve in the armed forces?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not believe that is at all a fair question, because it assumes we are changing existing law. That is not the case.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does this change in any particular any existing law? The Children's Bureau issued an arbitrary regulation.

Mr. KEEFE. It does not change any existing law in any way, shape, or manner. The only thing it does is say to the Children's Bureau, "You shall not discriminate in the matter of allocation of these funds as between those people who are licensed by State law to practice obstetrics." That is all it says.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Perhaps I can add a little light at this point.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question?

Mr. JUDD. I should like to know this: Does the gentleman consider that in order to be permitted to practice obstetrics under this program it must specifically state in his license that the individual is licensed to practice obstetrics? In that case there would be less objection. Confusion arises where men are licensed to practice various healing arts without specific mention of obstetrics. Unless it is expressly forbidden that he practice obstetrics, it is believed this bill would permit him to receive Federal money.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as the unanimous action of the Senate and House conferees is concerned, we consider that the person must be licensed to practice obstetrics, and that alone. That is what is provided in the pending law.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, we are discussing here a conference report on a bill involving over $1,100,000,000. All of the time so far has been taken up with the discussion of a minor provision in the bill. It seems to me that when a subject matter of this importance is pending we ought not to allow ourselves to be sidetracked by the discussion of a minor provision which was regarded as so unimportant by the doctors in the House when the bill passed the House that they did not even offer an amendment to strike it out. Now we are asked to give all of the time in the consideration of this conference report to a discussion of the pros and cons of this doctors' fuss between doctors of a certain type and those of another type who might practice obstetrics for these soldiers' wives.

I want to direct your attention, if I can, to what I regard as one of the subject matters involved in the further consideration of this bill, which is of very much greater importance. I refer to the National Youth Administration appropriation. You will recall that when the bill was reported to the House the full committee by a majority of one, with 10 members of the full committee absent, struck out the provision for the National Youth Administration, and the House was thereby given no opportunity to discuss the matter of whether or not it wanted to make provision for continuance of the National Youth Administration. That I think was regrettable, because I think there should be the fullest opportunity for every Member desiring to do so to discuss that very important subject matter.

When we come to the question of receding or not from our disagreement to the Senate amendment carrying the N. Y. A. appropriation there will be only 1 hour of debate, utilized principally by the members of the committee, and very little opportunity for that thorough discussion and consideration which would be desirable. However, I want to express the hope that the House may agree to the Senate amendment restoring the funds in this bill for the carrying on of the National Youth Administration. That is now strictly a war-training program. It is an integral part of a training-for-industry program set up under the guidance of the Bureau of Training in the War Manpower Commission, and a program which, in their judgment and in the judgment, apparently, of all of those having to do with the matter of industrial production for defense, is essential to our war effort.

It may be possible that at some time the work of the N. Y. A. should be consolidated with the work of vocational education. I am very much in favor of the appropriations which we have made heretofore and which we are carrying in this bill for vocational education. I believe that the vocational educational authorities of the States are doing a magnificent job, but there is no reason on that account at this time to abolish the National Youth Administration, which in its own field is also doing an important job, and is training for industry at the rate of 1,000 youths per day at this particular time. I know how it is in my district. Other gentlemen know how it is in their districts. We view these matters from the standpoint of what we find out in our own localities, and there may be sections of the country where administrative abuses have been carried on in this organization. It would be impossible with some far-flung organization that some administrative authorities should not exercise foolish judgment, but in my country where these work-training centers are being operated, exceedingly useful work is being done, and boys and girls are being taken out of these hills in north Georgia and given a type of training which they could not get from any available vocational-education school, or from any other source if the N. Y. A. were not available. Perhaps it could be consolidated with the work of vocational education in such a way as to function efficiently, but according to all of the evidence adduced before our subcommittee, it would require at least 6 months, if we should decide to integrate this work of the N. Y. A. with vocational education, for that to be accomplished.

In other words, we would have at least six months practically lost in this work-training program. Assuming that the training program is important to the cause of national defense, and I believe all agree that it is, certainly we ought not to stop now and try to work out somebody's plan of consolidation of the N. Y. A. with some other agency. The only effect would be to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery, which is undertaking to train for war production and I sincerely hope the House may not take that action, but may be willing to allow this program authorized by the Senate amendment to proceed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that the adoption of the amendment No. 5 would open up all obstetrical cases to a class of practitioners who are now denied the right to take care of their fathers in the military, and rightly so, by the Surgeon General?

Mr. TARVER. I favor the adoption of the proviso in question which the gentleman did not offer to amend when it was agreed to by the House, when the bill was under consideration in the House, and which would simply assure to the wife of a soldier the right that every other citizen of their States has, to have the type of practitioner to attend her that she may desire, provided that practitioner is licensed to practice obstetrics according to the law of that State.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to talk about youths after they had reached a somewhat more mature stage, and I think that the idea of rejecting a conference report because of this minor provision in the bill ought to be defeated by the House, so that we may consider these other more important subject matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am not one who has supported many of the requests for additional funds, which have been made by a number of agencies. It has been my thought and policy that we have an obligation to restrict and carefully audit the requests which come to us from the administrative departments, but I am going to support the action of the other body in restoring to this bill the N. Y. A. appropriation, and I am doing it for one reason, and one reason only, and that is because of the fact that this is a war-training program and in my city of Philadelphia, the great United States Marine Corps Depot of Supplies has found this service to be of great help, as have many other great industries engaged in war work in the Philadelphia area.

A letter from the Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, from the commandant, states:

> The local National Youth Administration undertook the fabrication of a number of items which were urgently required, and to date have produced approximately 600,000 pieces of clothing and equipment for

marine use, the manufacture of which would have cost $35,000 if manufactured here at the depot.

The value of this service to the Marine Corps is not covered by this saving in manufacturing costs alone. The National Youth Administration facilities took over the making of several items needed only in small quanities, the production of which at this depot would have seriously interfered with the planned operation of the production lines of items required in large quantities. This particular arrangement has been of great aid, and is especially appreciated.

The quality of the work done by the National Youth Administration facilities has been highly satisfactory, and the local officials have not only expressed their willingness to cooperate in every way possible, but they have made such cooperation effective.

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The National Youth Administration has been in existence for 7½ years. During that time it has given work and training to 4,600,000 youth. It is fair to estimate that over half of these youth are now serving our country in our armed forces or in war industries. They are more loyal citizens and more efficient workers and fighters by reason of their experience in N. Y. A.

The present important consideration, however, is what contribution is the agency now making toward the war. The N. Y. A. throughout the country is engaged in training youth for jobs in industries having war contracts. It has 39,000 work stations; that is, machines on which youth are being trained. The agency is providing war industries approximately 17,000 trained youth per month. Over 98,000 N. Y. A. youth have been trained since July 1 last. The bulk of these are trained for machine operators, welders, sheet metal and radio welders.

The cost of this training, exclusive of monthly pay, is about $40 per month. In addition the youth are paid from $20 to $25 per month while in training—about 15 cents an hour.

The N. Y. A. training stations are complete production shops and the youth are engaged in producing for the armed forces and public hospitals. In Pennsylvania alone about 2,000,000 such articles have been made during the past year. These include cartridge containers for the trench bomb, parts of the bazooka bomb and other ordnance, and in the power sewing-machine shops signal flags, clothing, mattress covers, and many other articles.

The average wage paid by industry is 60 cents an hour to trainees; the average wage paid to those in the vocational schools is 55 cents an hour and ranges from 40 cents to $1 an hour. In such cases they are not producing for the United States Government as in the case of the N. Y. A. youth. As an example, the amount paid by industry to the 2,500 persons in Philadelphia, schools alone, on a yearly basis, amounts to over double the total payment per annum to the 6,200 N. Y. A. youth currently enrolled in Pennsylvania. In the former case it amounts to $3,120,000 per year. N. Y. A. youth have been paid since July 1, 1942, $1,145,000, and at that rate it will amount to approximately $1,537,000 for the year. These payments to the school trainees are made by industry under a provision in their contract with the Government permitting up to 2 percent of the cost of the contract to be used for training under which industry receives a profit allowance on the money they spend for training. All of this is paid by the Federal Government.

The schools contend that their average cost of training is about $27 per youth. This, however, is a matter of bookkeeping. For example, in one of our shops 3 teachers are assigned by the schools for training; each of these counts the total number in the class of 30 as trainees, although they are the same youth, thereby getting credit for training 90 youth, or 3 times the actual number of youth trained. In addition, not fully included as part of their cost of training, is rent, light, heat, janitor service, cost of materials, and other incidental overhead expenses, which are borne by N. Y. A.

Again, in training within industry, the schools pay instructors of foremen how to up-grade workers and estimate as trainees the total employees who profit ultimately from the training of foremen. Example: The instructor may train 15 foremen; each foreman may have 15 people under him; the teacher reports training 225 men. No overhead is included in such cases as part of the training cost.

The schools could not satisfactorily conduct the N. Y. A. shops less expensively if they should be turned over to them. As a matter of fact, the salaries paid are considerably higher than those paid by the N. Y. A. The average monthly cost of N. Y. A. foremen for 48 hours a week in Pennsylvania is approximately $213; the schools pay from $312 to $416 per month on the same basis for foremen with the same qualifications, that is, mechanics with at least 6 years' experience in industry. The larger amount is paid in the big cities.

To turn them over to the schools, it would be necessary to negotiate separately with the school board where the shop is located in each individual case. It would be necessary to take complete inventory and process it under United States Treasury mandates. All this would delay the training of workers for months at a time when the national emergency does not brook a delay.

The War Manpower Commission recently gave out a statement in commendation of the N. Y. A. training program and gave as one reason that it is more flexible. N. Y. A. machinery can be readily moved from areas of labor scarcity to labor surplus areas, or to a place where it can best serve industry, and it can readily regulate the training in accordance with the job specifications outlined by industry. School machinery, on the other hand, cannot be moved across State lines. In fact, it has been found by the War Manpower Commission to be difficult to move school machinery within the State because of opposition by the local school board, business association, and Government.

Industry has the power of setting up its own training courses under a 2-percent-of-cost provision in war contracts. However, of the 500 war industries to which N. Y. A. has furnished youth in Pennsylvania, only 10 have their own preemployment training classes. Those 10 have employed an average of 202 N. Y. A. youth each, in addition to those trained by themselves. See attached table.

In the cases of the large industries they soon exhaust the local trainees for their classes. In addition, most of the corporations do not have the space or available machinery to conduct training courses, and they prefer to have the N. Y. A. and the schools do it for them to free their own machines and staff for capacity production.

In estimating the cost of the N. Y. A. program there should be taken into consideration the fact that over one-third of our youth in the whole country are in resident work centers; that is, they are taken from communities where they have no adequate training facilities and are boarded at our center while in training. In this way the N. Y. A. is supplying industry with trained workers who would otherwise not be available, and thereby making a very substantial contribution to the labor market. Of course, the expense of these centers brings up our average cost.

Another consideration is that the administration of Federal funds is highly technical and the school personnel are not trained for it and it would take time to train them. As a matter of fact in most communities where N. Y. A. shops are located the superintendent of schools and the teachers have had no vocational-education training. In many localities the school board would not assume the financial obligations involved. The vocational-training appropriation requires them to finance the operations until the end of the fiscal year before they can be reimbursed. The delay involved by the transfer would be enormous and it would be a very costly and wasteful operation.

The N. Y. A. in this State alone has, during the first 8 months of the fiscal year since July 1, 1942, supplied 37,590 youth to industries having war contracts. The average monthly enrollment is 6,200. In Pennsylvania there are 95 shops. These include machine operation, welding, sheet-metal work, aviation sheet metal, radio assembly, radio code operation, aviation mechanics, aviation instrument repair, foundry and forge work, patternmaking, power sewing-machine operation, and woodworking.

I am attaching a list of some of the principal industries to which N. Y. A. has furnished youth in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The N. Y. A. has many letters from war industries expressing satisfaction with N. Y. A. youth furnished them and urging the continuance of the N. Y. A. program.

The N. Y. A. shops are about 90 percent full. Most of the shops are located in communities that do not have adequate vocational training facilities.

The N. Y. A. has had good cooperation in Pennsylvania from the schools. As a matter of fact, about 1,500 high-school students are being trained in N. Y. A.

shops in the afternoon or evening, at the request of the high-school principals.

With the induction of boys into the service, the number of girls in our shops is increasing. We have a number of applications for training of women over 25 years of age, and also for the training at night of women who work during the day. We suggest that Congress make it possible for N. Y. A. to train persons over 25 years old and remove the restrictions that they must be unemployed, subject, however, to the approval of the War Manpower Commission, which would approve such training only if there were not sufficient facilities available in the schools, and facilities suitable for the training needed.

The following is a list of some of the principal industries to which the N. Y. A. has furnished youth in this region:

Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa	1,119
Naval stations	434
Army air depot, Middletown, Pa	329
Dravo Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa	272
Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa	274
Glenn Martin Co., Baltimore, Md	250
Piper Aircraft, Lock Haven, Pa	229
Other Army stations	235
Westinghouse, Philadelphia, Pa	216
Duplan Silk Co., Kingston, Pa	181
New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J	178
Baldwin's, Eddystone, Pa	170
Pennsylvania R. R	168
American Bridge Co., Ambridge, Pa	155
Western Aircraft, Trenton, N. J	143
Progressive Coat & Apron Co., Philadelphia, Pa	142
Curtiss-Wright Co., Passaic, N. J	141
Western Electric, Clifton, N. J	129
Aviation Manufacturing Co., Williamsport, Pa	130
A. Rief Textile Co., Philadelphia, Pa	117
Charles May Textile Co., Philadelphia, Pa	154
Sylvania Mfg. Co., Emporium, Pa	112
U. S. Civil Service Commission	108
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa	103
Foster Bros., Philadelphia, Pa	90
Cramp Shipbuilding Co., Philadelphia, Pa	100
Fleetwood Aircraft, Bristol, Pa	88
National Fireworks Co., Elkton, Md	88
Jacobs Aircraft, Pottsville, Pa	88
American Car & Foundry	81
National Tube Co., Ellwood City, Pa	76
Radio Corporation of America, Camden, N. J., and Lancaster, Pa	74
Fairchild Corporation, Hagerstown, Md	71
Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa	65

Industries in Pennsylvania having preemployment training classes N. Y. A. youth employed by them:

Sun Shipbuilding Co	1,119
Dravo Corporation	272
Westinghouse	211
Lukenweld	44
S. K. F. Industries	23
Armstrong Cork Co	103
Cramp Shipbuilding Co	89
Brewster Aircraft	38
Brown Instrument Co	0
Aviation Mfg. Co	120
Total	2,019
Average	202

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion of amendment of the Senate No. 5, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to H. R. 786. The position of the subcommittee, as I understand it, is based upon the idea that anyone who is licensed under the laws of a particular State to practice a particular profession should be allowed to receive Federal funds under this bill in performance of his profession. I believe and earnestly insist that the Federal Government in extending funds for the payment of medical services should be able to designate the type of professional qualifications to be required from those practitioners. It has not been the policy of the Congress to follow the qualifications adopted by the State laws in matters of this kind. The present Employees' Compensation Act permits the payment of compensation to physicians and osteopathic practitioners who are licensed by State law. Many States authorize chiropractic practitioners to carry on their profession. H. R. 786 is filed for the purpose of including chiropractic practitioners under the Employees' Compensation Act. The fact that this bill is pending shows that we do not with Federal funds authorize the payment of anyone for rendering medical services who may be entitled to practice in a particular State. I feel that the position of the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, is sound and that it should be supported.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, while we are considering this bill I want to say a few words about amendment No. 30. I hope the House will recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment. At this time, when we are straining every effort to convert the materials and manpower resources of this country into our effort to win the war, I do not think that we can wisely take a chance on discontinuing the N. Y. A. It is unquestionably true that the N. Y. A. has rendered a good service in training boys and girls to do highly skilled war work. The war production of this country will need the services of every boy and girl who can be trained during the next year. The N. Y. A. is in a position to carry on this work, and I certainly hope the Members of the House will not take the chance of impeding the war effort by discontinuing the N. Y. A..

Everyone on this floor knows that the subcommittee made a most thorough and searching investigation of every facet of N. Y. A. and its recommendations were based upon the facts thus ascertained. Should not their recommendations have been followed? I for one believe that they should be.

It is true that measured by the size of its appropriation N. Y. A. does not loom large in our financial scheme of things. However, measured from the standpoint of its value to our youth and to the Nation, it is exceedingly important, now in the midst of war even as it was in prewar days.

Long before war came, N. Y. A. had been moving to gear its efforts to the need for trained manpower which it clearly foresaw. It trained youth in construction and mechanical skills which were certain to be in demand, and they were. As a result of its foresight a half million youth have been trained in the skills that plane manufacturers, shipyards, and the thousands of other war companies are crying for, and this great accomplishment has been packed into the relatively few months that separate us from Pearl Harbor.

To this great contribution to the war effort Tennessee has made its proportionate contribution. Approximately 1,000 Tennessee youth are currently in training and this training has been concentrated on machine-shop work, welding, and sheet-metal fabrication, particularly with reference to aircraft. Month by month the number of boys on the program has decreased and the number of girls has increased until at the present time they are about even. Over 2,000 of these youth have entered employment since the commencement of this fiscal year and have lent the strength of their arms and the skill of their hands to fashioning the implements of war.

To the shipyards in other States we have provided hundreds of welders and other skilled mechanics, and from all reports that have come to my ears they have acquitted themselves well, as was to be expected. The industries to which they have gone have sent back requests that more Tennessee youth as well trained as those that have come to them be provided. I need but mention corporations such as the Engle Shipbuilding at Pascagoula, Miss., and the Jones Construction Co. at Panama City, Fla., to make clear the vital importance of the production in which Tennessee youth are participating. This is not to say that there have not been hundreds of placements within the State because there have been with such corporations as Vultee Aircraft at Nashville and many others. Had it not been for N. Y. A. and the training facilities which it offers it is certain that many of these youth could not have made that contribution to the war effort which they are now making.

In thinking about these things it has often occurred to me that the value of N. Y. A. is not appreciated as generally as it should be, because we think of manpower as being composed of units that are identical—in other words that we are dealing with a problem that is purely quantitative. Nothing could be further from the truth, for the manpower problem is qualitative as well as quantitative. What would happen if all machinists, for example, were suddenly withdrawn from industry? We know that the wheels of industry would grind to a slow stop for, without machinists, industry cannot operate. Take away welders and the ships which we are turning out in such incredible numbers would not be possible. In the light of these facts is it not apparent that the National Youth Administration has done much more than merely to supply industry with over a half million men and women in little more than a year. The outstanding fact about these half million is that most of them have been thoroughly trained as welders, as radio technicians, as machine shop helpers and in a score of other skills which are indispensable in the building of the tools of war.

I am aware that there are those who suggest that industry can do all the training that is necessary. I recognize fully the immense capacity of American industry but I recognize also that they are being called upon to produce war goods in such quantities that the energies of management, foremen and workers alike are being stretched to the limit. I think it is utterly absurd even to suggest that industry now be saddled with this additional task.

Yet there are those who now, at the very hour when the crisis approaches, would destroy this agency that has in peace and in war made such magnificent contributions to the Nation. In my humble estimation such a proposal is as incomprehensible as it is indefensible.

I think of what N. Y. A. has meant to the Tennessee youth who were and are eager to lend their hand to the war effort. I think of the Tennessee youth who, through the earnings made possible by N. Y. A., were enabled thereby to complete their college education, so that as engineers, chemists, physicists, they could go forth to lend their aid to the war effort. I think of these things and then wonder if we are in our good senses in wanting to destroy this agency now in the midst of war, when we need the maximum skill of the hands that toil, the maximum learning that educated men can bring to bear upon the immensely complicated problems confronting us.

Our action upon N. Y. A. will be for me a portent of the future. If in the midst of war we destroy an agency that is making a great contribution to the winning of the war, what may we do when peace again returns and the ties which now bind, or should bind us, are torn?

Gentlemen, no good can flow from such action. We are at war, when our every action must conform to the needs of war and the needs of war clearly demand that this agency be continued. We must take action to assure that this is done.

SENATE CONFIRMATION AMENDMENT SHOULD BE REJECTED

Amendment No. 24, which was placed on this bill by the Senate would require confirmation by that body of all persons appointed to positions for general administration of the War Manpower Commission whose salaries are at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more. I am glad the managers on the part of the House will move to insist on disagreement with that amendment. This amendment is the entering wedge of an effort to place the executive control of the Government in the hands of the Senate. If this amendment were adopted a similar provision would be attached to every appropriation bill and thus the constitutional responsibility of operating the executive department of the Government would be transferred to the Senate. This would bring about a division of responsibility which would promote inefficiency and would greatly disrupt the effective operation of many governmental agencies. Senatorial courtesy would require that Senators of every State pass on the confirmation of Federal employees doing work in their particular States. Thus agencies in the various States would be directed by the Senators of those States. This was not the intention of article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which requires the confirmation of officers of the United States. A review of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention will show that the framers of the Constitution only had in mind the superior executive officers who are the administrators of the various agencies. In 1820 Thomas Jefferson in a letter to James Madison very forcibly pointed out the evils which would come from a provision like this.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Auchincloss	Gifford	O'Leary
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Pfeifer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	Phillips
Barden	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Barry	Hall, Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Hébert	Robsion, Ky.
Bloom	Holifield	Rogers, Calif.
Bonner	Horan	Russell
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Shafer
Buckley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Burgin	Kilburn	Snyder
Byrne	King	Starnes, Ala.
Cannon, Mo.	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Capozzoli	Lambertson	Taber
Chiperfield	Lea	Tolan
Cochran	Lesinski	Treadway
Cooley	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Culkin	Ludlow	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	Maas	Voorhis, Calif.
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wasielewski
Ford	Morrison, N. C.	Whelchel, Ga.
Fulbright	O'Hara	White
Fulmer	O'Leary	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Pfeifer	
Gallagher	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JUDD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JUDD moves to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to concur in Senate amendment No. 5 without amendment.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were ayes 25 and noes 88.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 212, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—152

Allen, Ill.	Hart	Outland
Allen, La.	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Heffernan	Poage
Andrews	Heidinger	Powers
Angell	Herter	Pracht
Auchincloss	Hoeven	Price
Barrett	Jeffrey	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Jensen	Ramey
Bennett, Mich.	Judd	Randolph
Bishop	Kean	Rankin
Brooks	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Kelley	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Chiperfield	Keogh	Rolph
Clark	Kilday	Rowan
Clason	Kinzer	Scanlon
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Schuetz
Cravens	Knutson	Schwabe
Creal	Kunkel	Scott
Cunningham	LaFollette	Sikes
Curtis	Lambertson	Simpson, Ill.
Davis	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	LeCompte	Slaughter
Dickstein	LeFevre	Snyder
Dingell	Lewis	Sparkman
Disney	Lynch	Stanley
Doughton	McCowen	Stewart
Douglas	McGranery	Sullivan
Durham	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Ellsworth	McMurray	Taber
Fenton	Maas	Talle
Fisher	Madden	Taylor
Fogarty	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomason
Forand	Marcantonio	Tibbott
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Towe
Gale	Miller, Conn.	Troutman
Gathings	Miller, Mo	Wadsworth
Gavagan	Miller, Nebr.	Walter
Gavin	Miller, Pa.	Weiss
Gerlach	Monroney	Welch
Gilchrist	Mruk	Wene
Gillette	Murphy	Wheat
Gordon	Murray, Wis.	Whelchel, Ga.
Gorski	Norman	Willey
Graham	Norrell	Wolcott
Gross	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Hale	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Halleck	O'Konski	Wright
Harris, Ark.	O'Toole	

NAYS—212

Abernethy	Brehm	Coffee
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Bryson	Colmer
Anderson, N. Mex.	Buffett	Compton
Arends	Burch, Va.	Cooper
Arnold	Busbey	Costello
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Courtney
Beall	Camp	Cox
Beckworth	Canfield	Crawford
Bender	Cannon, Fla.	Crosser
Bennett, Mo.	Cannon, Mo.	Cullen
Blackney	Carlson, Kans.	Curley
Bolton	Carson, Ohio	D'Alesandro
Bonner	Carter	Day
Boren	Case	Delaney
Boykin	Chapman	Dewey
Bradley, Pa.	Chenoweth	Dies
	Church	Dilweg
	Clevenger	Dirksen

Ditter	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Drewry	Johnson,	Rivers
Dworshak	Luther A.	Rizley
Eaton	Johnson,	Robertson
Eberharter	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Elliott	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
Ellis	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Ellison, Md.	Jonkman	Rowe
Elmer	Kee	Sadowski
Elston, Ohio	Keefe	Sasscer
Engel	Kerr	Satterfield
Feighan	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Fellows	Landis	Schiffler
Fernandez	Lanham	Smith, Maine
Fish	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Flannagan	Lea	Smith, Va.
Folger	Lemke	Smith, W. Va.
Gamble	Ludlow	Smith, Wis.
Gibson	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Gillie	McCormack	Spence
Goodwin	McGehee	Springer
Gore	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Gossett	McMillan	Stefan
Granger	McWilliams	Stevenson
Grant, Ala.	Magnuson	Stockman
Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Sumner, Ill.
Gregory	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Griffiths	Manasco	Talbot
Gwynne	Martin, Mass.	Tarver
Hancock	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Hare	May	Thomas, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Merrow	Vincent, Ky.
Harris, Va.	Michener	Voorhis, Calif.
Hartley	Mills	Vorys, Ohio
Hendricks	Monkiewicz	Vursell
Hess	Morrison, La.	Ward
Hill	Mundt	Weaver
Hinshaw	Murdock	Welchel, Ohio
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	West
Hoch	Myers	Whitten
Hoffman	Newsome	Whittington
Holmes, Mass.	Nichols	Wickersham
Holmes, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Hope	O'Connor	Wilson
Horan	Pace	Winstead
Howell	Patton	Winter
Hull	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Jackson	Philbin	Worley
Jarman	Pittenger	Zimmerman
Jenkins	Ploeser	
Jennings	Rabaut	
Johnson,	Ramspeck	
Anton, J.	Reece, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—67

Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	O'Neal
Barden	Hall,	Patman
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Bell	Hall,	Phillips
Bland	Leonard W.	Plumley
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Poulson
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Holifield	Russell
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Sabath
Burdick	Johnson,	Shafer
Burgin	J. Leroy	Sheppard
Byrne	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Capozzoli	Kilburn	Short
Cochran	King	Starnes, Ala.
Cooley	Kleberg	Steagall
Culkin	Lesinski	Tolan
Fay	Luce	Treadway
Fitzpatrick	McLean	Van Zandt
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Fulmer	Merritt	Wasielewski
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	White
Gallagher	Mott	
Gearhart	O'Hara	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Short.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Co'ey with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. King with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to adopt the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 58, line 12, after the figures, strike out the balance of the line and lines 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19, with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out and insert at the end thereof, and before the period, the following proviso: *"Provided*, That hereafter notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where such agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia moves to recede and concur in said Senate amendment No. 19.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia be divided.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, in view of the motion that he made, and which I did not hear, what the parliamentary situation is with reference to my proceeding.

Mr. HARE. The motion was that the gentleman's motion be divided, and the first part has been voted on.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the parliamentary status?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moved that the House recede and concur, and the House voted to recede. The question now is on the motion to concur.

The gentleman from Virginia was yielded 10 minutes by the gentleman from South Carolina and has been recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Under the motion to concur, the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment would still be in order?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Would the motion I made to recede and concur with an amendment be voted on prior to the motion made by the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no motion pending to concur with an amendment. The motion to recede was carried. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to make a motion to concur with an amendment?

Mr. HARE. I offer such a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert at the end thereof, and before the period, the following proviso: *"Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where such agreement shall be opened for inspection by any interested person."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is not my motion a preferential motion? Should it not be voted on first?

The SPEAKER. After the House has receded, a motion to concur with an amendment takes precedence over a motion to concur. The gentleman has left of his motion only the proposition to concur, because the House voted to recede. Then the gentleman from South Carolina offered a preferential motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is voted down my motion will be in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary situation then is that the vote comes first on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment. If that is voted down then my motion which is to recede and concur in the action taken by

the Senate will be in order. I will be just as brief as I can.

Mr. Speaker, for over 2 years this House and the country felt rather indignant at the policy that has been pursued by certain labor organizations in setting up their headquarters and their offices at cantonments, and at Government works all over the United States, entering into more or less phony contracts with the contractors for a closed shop. The net result of this was that your constituents and mine who lived in the vicinity of those public works and wanted jobs had to pay tribute to labor unions, become members of a union, pay an initiation fee, and then pay dues to go to work for his Government. You are all familiar with that.

The thing that brings this about is the fact that the same thing happened out at the Kaiser shipyard. I am informed that Kaiser entered into one of these closed-shop contracts with the A. F. of L. when he had only 66 men working for him. Then, of course, the operation mushroomed out and became quite an important contract with some 25,000 employees. Some of those fellows object to living up to a contract which was made before they secured employment with the plant.

That amendment was put on in the House; it was stricken out in the Senate. The motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is to concur with an amendment which would ratify all of those contracts provided they had been in existence for 60 days; in other words, if this Kaiser contract is a spurious contract, a "phony" contract, then when you vote for the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina you solemnly put the stamp of approval of the Congress of the United States upon a spurious contract, doing the thing that this House has been complaining about for 2 years, namely, requiring people to pay tribute to a labor union for the privilege of working for their country in a war industry. I do not think the gentleman from South Carolina really wanted to do that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just put that proposition to you. If you vote for the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina you amend the National Labor Relations Act by taking away the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board to investigate these contracts that are claimed to be spurious and you take away their jurisdiction to permit the employees of those plants to hold an election to determine whether they want this union or that union. I just do not think these gentlemen thoroughly realize the extent of what they are doing.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman quite inadvertently said 60 days. I know he meant 3 months.

The purpose of the amendment has been correctly diagnosed by the gentleman from Virginia. The members of the committee who are sponsoring the proviso feel that under present conditions there ought not to be permitted any labor trouble or dispute in the war shipyards which would have the effect of interfering with production for the war effort now being so successfully carried on there and we are willing so far as we are concerned to legislate with reference to that particular situation and to try by the adoption of this proviso to prevent the disruption of labor relations in the Kaiser yards.

Those who entertain the views of the gentleman from Virginia, that the National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction in that case ought not to be removed should, of course, support his motion. The issue is clear: It is just a question of whether or not we are going to permit the C. I. O. to come into that shipyard situation with the backing of the National Labor Relations Board and stir up trouble which would not otherwise exist.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to answer briefly the gentleman from Georgia. He and I are agreed about the facts as he stated them, except if you are going to take away the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board to hold an election amongst the employees of the Kaiser plant to determine who they want to represent them, if that is what they want to do, and that is what the gentleman from Georgia says they want to do——

Mr. TARVER. I agreed with the gentleman who said that is what we want to do. We are in agreement on that. The agreement was in effect more than 3 months without complaint.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If you are trying to do that, then you want to take away their jurisdiction to hold an election in any war plant. In other words, should you not repeal the Labor Relations Act during the period of the war? That is in effect what you do. Why should you have an election in any plant? If you follow the statement of the gentleman from Georgia the effect of the amendment is to stop all employees from having the democratic right to vote under the National Labor Relations Act as to who they want to represent them and to that extent repeals the National Labor Relations Act. Is that not a perfectly clear proposition? Are not the gentleman from Georgia and I agreed on it? Why make an exception and try to say that the Kaiser Co. is a special case?

As a matter of fact, the language which they have adopted does not make the Kaiser Co. a special case. The language applies to every case and the language which they have adopted in effect says: "If you have entered into a phoney contract and if you have gotten by with it for 90 days, then, we, the Congress of the United States, hereby put our stamp of approval upon the phoney contract which you have made and have gotten away with."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May not that provision affect the bill we just passed a few days ago providing for elections?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it would. It is impossible to predict what may be the ultimate effect of trying to write such an amendment to the Labor Relations Act in an appropriation bill here on the floor of the House when 9 out of 10 Members do not understand what it is.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am a little bit confused and perplexed at the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Am I mistaken in this: Is the gentleman defending the National Labor Relations Board at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am defending the act of Congress as it is and I am defending the jurisdiction of the Board to do the things that the Congress told them to do.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Speaking of the Kaiser yard, is it not a fact that if the National Labor Relations Board should hold the A. F. of L. contract not a closed-shop contract, and it would be what the gentleman has referred to as a phoney contract, and held an election and the C. I. O. should become the bargaining union, would that not result in a closed shop just the same as it is now except the C. I. O. would control it instead of the A. F. of L.?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The only difference would be that the majority of the employees as contemplated in the law would decide whom they wanted to represent them. I do not know whether they want the C. I. O. or A. F. of L. That is not the question at all. The question is whether under the democratic processes provided by the National Labor Relations Act these people, 25,000 of them, shall have the right to say whether they want the A. F. of L. or C. I. O. They may vote for one or the other. They will probably vote for the A. F. of L., but I want them to have that right which the law gives them.

Mr. MOTT. I may say that the National Labor Relations Board has messed up that situation in the Kaiser yard to a great extent, and I may say further that if the C. I. O. got control there, it would not guarantee anyone the right to work for the Government without paying a fee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not talking about that particular controversy. I am talking about the National Labor Relations Act and the unwisdom of trying to amend it on the floor of the House.

Mr. KLEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I would like to understand the gentleman correctly. If the gentleman's motion carries, does it mean that any group of employees could go in

and bargain for the union of their own choice?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what the law provides. If you adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina you take that right away from them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman's motion would keep in force and effect the existing powers of the National Labor Relations Board as given to it by the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get this picture clearly before the membership, I would like to read, for the benefit of the House, the provision carried in the House bill which passed 10 days or 2 weeks ago:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which had been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

That simply means that where an agreement has been entered into by a bargaining agency of any group of employees with the management and the agreement or contract has been in full force and effect for at least 3 months and no complaint has been made in the meantime, it would then be unlawful for the Board to take jurisdiction so long as this appropriation is available. That is, this appropriation could not be used to supplement or implement or encourage someone after it had been in operation for 3 months without complaint to go into this plant and encourage the employees to join another bargaining agency and have another election during the next 9 months. That is all there is to it.

There was no objection to that amendment when it passed the House. The Senate struck out that amendment, as I understand, not because there was any particular objection to it, as the RECORD will show, but because the Senate thought there should be additional language, and in the conference the Senate conferees suggested additional language, which the House conferees accepted. I want to read the additional language for the benefit of those present:

Provided, That hereafter notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person.

This language added to the original proviso in the bill simply means that hereafter when an agreement is entered into between management and the bargaining agency of the employees' notice shall be posted in the plant that such an agreement has been effected, and that notice shall contain information as to where the agreement shall be inspected. It does not say that the notice must be posted but it says that if they expect to be protected under the 3 months' limitation it shall be posted. There is no law requiring it to be posted. It only provides that if those entering into the agreement want the agreement protected and defended by the law to prevent some racketeer from coming in later and stirring up the employees so that they will say, "We want another election, we want to join another union, or we want to do this, that, or the other," those who entered into the agreement, which under the law they had a right to do, would be protected at the expiration of the 3 months' period if such notice were posted and filed for inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If employees are dissatisfied with the representatives they have, when could they get an election?

Mr. HARE. Any time within 3 months.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But suppose a phony contract goes along and passes the 3 months' period, then they are helpless, they cannot do anything about it.

Mr. HARE. A phony contract?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARE. No; it would not be phony because it must be published.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Suppose it is published and still is "phony"; they cannot do anything about it, can they?

Mr. HARE. Suppose the gentleman has entered into a contract with Mr. A, for example, notice is posted, and the agreement is over here in this corridor where it can be inspected, and I for example, as an employee of the gentleman, fail to inspect it within 3 months, nobody has trespassed upon my rights.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Suppose it is a perfectly bona fide contract and I do inspect it and it is over 3 months old and the employees get dissatisfied with their present representative and want to change their bargaining representative, how can they do it?

Mr. HARE. They cannot do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, the bargaining agent they choose at one election is there forever, is he not?

Mr. HARE. No; not forever, but only so long as this appropriation is available.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not want to make a speech, but I do want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HARE. If a contract has been in force for 3 months and the individual has been satisfied with it for 3 months he will have notice of it all of this time. If he has been satisfied with it for 3 months and someone comes along and makes him dissatisfied, then he is estopped for the next 9 months from filing a complaint and being considered by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How long does that condition prevail? How long is he tied to that contract before he can change his mind and get another bargaining agent?

Mr. HARE. At the expiration of the appropriation carried in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, until 1944 his hands are tied?

Mr. HARE. That is right. If he acquiesces in it for 3 months and makes no complaint, the idea is that he is satisfied. He has had plenty of time to consider it, plenty of time to deliberate. If somebody comes along and makes him dissatisfied after that, then he is stopped from expressing his dissatisfaction. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent racketeers interfering with the production in the war industries of this country. There is no attempt to amend the National Labor Relations Act. This is only an attempt to have orderly procedure and orderly conduct and, if people are satisfied, to prevent some racketeer from bringing in additional information, or new news, so to speak, and arranging in some way to discourage production in a plant or production in another plant, thus continuing to have turmoil throughout the country in our war-production plants.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I should like to know what is the purpose that is sought to be accomplished here. What evil is there in the existing law that requires a committee to take some legislative action on an appropriation bill? What evil are you trying to correct?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We are trying to correct the evil of racketeers going into plants where everything is going along smoothly, where everybody seems to be satisfied, and propagandizing the employees, so that in a week or a month or 2 months the racketeers will have a sufficient following to proceed to file a complaint or have an investigation made and have a new election, thus causing additional expense on the part of the Government to hold the election; whereas if the racketeer had kept his hands in his own business and allowed the people to do their own thinking, they would continue maximum production without any interference.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why is there not provided in the proposed legislation a space between the time when these elections may be held, instead of having it couched in this language? I understood the gentleman to say it would be 9 months before they could have another election.

Mr. HARE. No; 9 months on this assumption. Suppose we made an agreement on July 1, today. Or suppose an agreement is made between an employer and his employees. That agreement is posed in the plant, where the employees have a right to see it.

Now, if they go 3 months and no complaint is made by anyone, then under this provision here it would be 9 months after before any action could be taken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman did not answer the question. Why do you not put specific language in there that would provide that 9 months should elapse between the expiration of the 3 months and the opportunity to investigate? May I make this observation?

Mr. HARE. The gentleman is taking my time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I just want to make this suggestion. Frequently with regard to prohibition elections, that is, elections like we used to have, it was provided that a reasonable length of time should intervene between these opportunities. That is what you are trying to do in this particular situation?

Mr. HARE. That is right.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You want to avoid a period of continued agitation?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why don't you write it specifically into the enactment?

Mr. HARE. This is an appropriation bill, and that would be legislation, which would be subject to a point of order. We are trying to accomplish the same thing by a limitation on the appropriation which is the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under the hypothetical case the gentleman states, does he mean it will be 9 months before the Board on its motion could intervene, or does he mean it would be 9 months before the men employed by that employer could make a complaint with the Board?

Mr. HARE. What I mean is that the Board would not have the right to go in, would not have the right to intervene.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But if complaint were made by the men?

Mr. HARE. That would be a different matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand it, it would not make any difference how many complaints piled up after the 3-month period.

Mr. HARE. The Board would not have jurisdiction to investigate that case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, the gentleman freezes the condition for 9 months irrespective of the matter of complaint.

Mr. HARE. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Andresen, August H.	Gallagher	Merritt
Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Gifford	Nichols
Barry	Green	O'Hara
Bloom	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeifer
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Plumley
Byrne	Hollfield	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Russell
Capozzoli	Johnson, Ind.	Sabath
Cochran	Johnson,	Shafer
Culkin	J. Leroy	Sheppard
Drewry	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Eaton	Kilburn	Tolan
Ellsworth	King	Treadway
Fay	Lea	Van Zandt
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Vinson, Ga.
Ford	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Fulbright	McLean	Wadsworth
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Furlong		

The SPEAKER. On this roll 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the House should not be in any way convinced by any interpretation of the law that I might make, because I am not a lawyer, and I am no expert on labor law. I do hope, however, that I may supplement to some degree the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and try to point out some of the difficulties under which the conferees labored. It is true that the House took a certain action on this matter. That action would have prevented the National Labor Relations Board from interfering with what is known as the Kaiser case. That went to the Senate, and the Senate struck out the House language. If that fact stood by itself, it would be important and significant to us, but I think the Members ought to remember what the Senate was trying to do, and while I am not going to go too far, I do suggest that they turn to page 6567 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see the observations of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the observations of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the observations of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Members will then see that the Senate was then trying to find new and more satisfactory language, and the Members did not have time to complete the work, and merely suggested that the matter go to conference where an attempt could be made to iron it out. I think that many times in the conference we were all disposed to give up and call it a day. I am not in a position to say whether this final language is good or bad. These people who are particularly interested in it and who seem to have made investigation think this language would accomplish what they want to do.

I think I understand what the situation is. If you adopt the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], you will in effect be saying that all existing contracts are frozen as they are, as far as an investigation by the National Labor Relations Board is concerned. As to whether they have been filed for 90 days heretofore or not does not matter. It is only hereafter that the 90-day provision applies, and you do say that all these contracts, whether phony or not, cannot be set aside by the National Labor Relations Board. If you do not think that is proper practice, then you follow the alternative and support the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], which in effect restores the Senate language, and does give authority and permission to the Board to interfere in these cases.

All I seek to point out to you is an extremely complicated matter. Personally I felt the place to iron out labor legislation was before the proper legislative committees of the House and not before the Appropriations Committee. I do think it is bad legislation, but I certainly was in no position to be an expert upon it, and I simply went along with the group.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman believe that in effect this is simply bringing to the floor of the House a jurisdictional dispute between two labor organizations?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It quite obviously was, if you had seen the people from both camps sitting around us suggesting to us which way to vote. It is pretty hard for a person who knows nothing about the complete circumstances to take action upon it.

This amendment represents a sincere endeavor to say that we are going to try to stabilize the labor situation where it is and that from this time on there shall be no raiding. We had available the testimony of people who had made a study of the national defense situation. They had very pronounced views on the subject, and after going round and round and people drawing their own versions and suggestions, this is the language we approved. It is not the last word in human wisdom. It cannot be when the conferees got together for only a very short period. But a sincere effort was made to present the issue to you. If you feel that the National Labor Relations Board should not interfere in any of these controversies, naturally the House language is desirable. If you feel it should interfere, then the original position taken by the Senate is all right. But if you wish to say that hereafter there shall be no raiding, then the langauge adopted by the conferees would be the language you should favor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, any position which brings together the support of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], will, in my judgment, bear most careful scrutiny. I have never been known as an A. F. of L. man or a C. I. O. man. I have tried to be fair to both organizations. I have a great many members of both organizations in my district, although the members of the C. I. O. predominate. As far as the A. F. of L. is concerned, I am enjoying the honor of being with the majority of you on their prescribed list, posted as an enemy of labor, and they are dedicated to the task of eliminating me from the Congress next year, as they are dedicated to the task of eliminating a majority of you, because we voted for the anti-strike bill. So I am not partisan in this matter from the standpoint of the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. The only thing I had in mind in participating in writing this proviso was to try to do something to prevent the interruption of essential production for the war effort.

All of the shipyards on the Pacific coast, according to the evidence before us, with the exception of three small yards, were operating under a master agreement with the A. F. of L. When these two new yards of Mr. Kaiser were projected, the master agreement, before a majority of the employees were employed, was extended with the consent and authority of the administration in Washington to these proposed new units. According to the evidence before our committee, it might have been difficult to have gotten the necessary employees for use in the construction of these yards without that having been done, since those employees were members of the A. F. of L. and would have been unwilling to go into a yard where an agreement making the A. F. of L. the bargaining agent of employees of the yard was not in effect.

Now, one thing is clearly apparent, and that is that this threatened interposition of the National Labor Relations Board in the affairs of the two Kaiser shipyards in question is almost certain to bring about very material interruption in the very fine record being made by those yards in the building of ships for the war effort. This is not a permanent amendment to the National Labor Relations Act. This is an emergency measure. It is only to be effective for the 12 months that this appropriation bill is effective, and it is intended to prevent during those 12 months the interruption of production in those two shipyards or in any other plants which are similarly situated. Ordinarily I do not believe that any bargaining agent for employees should be selected until a majority of those who are to be employed can take part in the selection.

It was our information that the C. I. O. is preparing to raid, as the saying goes, quite a number of other industrial plants of the country if they are successful in their efforts to get the National Labor Relations Board to hold this election and install them as bargaining agents for the two Kaiser shipyards on the west coast. We think that, regardless of the merits of the controversy, it would be extremely unfortunate to have such a controversy interfering with production at this particular time, and that the doctrine of the greatest good for the greatest number, that is, the matter of securing greatest efficiency in production for the war effort, should be the most important objective governing our actions. With that reason in view we should enact this proviso and stop this squabbling out there on the Pacific coast or anywhere else in the country until this emergency is over, especially when the contract, whether it was proper at the time of its inception or not has been in effect for 3 months without complaint.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman has mentioned the Kaiser case. As a matter of fact, there are a number of cases in which we have the same situation. The gentleman from Georgia will recall that a Member of the other body, a member of the conference committee, cited a case in his State where the production of magnesium was very much interfered with by a similar situation.

Mr. TARVER. And we understand a large number of other cases are pending. Unless this is done, war production will be seriously interfered with.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned as to who is the union bargaining agent in the Kaiser plant in Portland, Oreg. I am, however, seriously concerned in the production of ships to win this war. Kaiser launched a ship in one of his Columbia River plants in 4 days, 15 hours, and 21 minutes. That ship was on her way to the Solomon Islands with a cargo in 14½ days.

Will an election as advocated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] increase that record? That is a matter for this House to determine. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for either the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., but I seriously believe that an election held at this time would slow down production in the Portland shipyard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to clearly understand exactly what we are doing this afternoon with respect to this amendment.

Insofar as the relationship between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. is concerned, if this committee amendment is adopted it will cut both ways. While the Kaiser case evidently is the outstanding case and the one which perhaps prompted the A. F. of L. to suggest this amendment, there are other cases of the same character. I have no hesitancy in saying that this amendment represents the position of the American Federation of Labor. Its representative came before our committee and clearly made its position known. There should be no misunderstanding about that at all. There is no doubt in my mind but what it was precipitated by the situation that exists out in the Kaiser yard. I want, in these few remarks, to see if we cannot understand just what the facts are before we vote.

I think it may be fair to say that when the original contract was entered into out on the west coast, at least so far as the evidence disclosed before our committee, there was a stabilization plan that had the full approval of the interested government agencies here in Washington.

A contract was entered into for the purpose of stabilizing employment in the shipbuilding industries on the west coast. At the time those contracts were entered into in 3 Kaiser yards he had a comparatively small number of employees. That number has grown, I understand, to nearly 80,000 and there is a steady toll of money clicking into the till of the collective bargaining agency. This has now attracted the attention of the rival union and they are out there trying to stir up an election so they can get the collective bargaining rights and I suppose transfer that roll of gold into their own till instead of into the till of the A. F. of L. Fundamentally to me that is the fight that exists as far as the Kaiser plant is concerned. There is no fight as far as wages are concerned; those are fixed by the Government. There is no fight over working conditions or housing or anything else; they are all determined by the Government. The sole question is the question of representation and bargaining authority, and going with that is the right to collect the dues and determine to which till it is going. As far as I personally am concerned I have no interest one way or the other except to see that production is maintained.

The contention was made to the committee by those who ought to know that if the National Labor Relations Board is to be permitted to order elections in all of these cases where representation is disputed in plants, you are going to have a political election in every one of these plants that will run over a period of weeks and very seriously interfere with production.

The attitude of the Senate conferees very clearly was that we as a Congress should endeavor to see if we could not stabilize conditions at least for the duration and allow these bargaining rights under existing contracts to remain as they are, provided they have been in existence for a period of 3 months without a complaint being filed. As to any future contract, if a complaint is filed within 90 days after its posting in the plant affected then as a matter of course

the N. L. R. B. will have jurisdiction to order an election. It relates only to placing these existing contracts in status quo. If you vote for the committee amendment you are voting to freeze the contracts that have been in existence for a period of 3 months or more without a complaint being registered against them. That is all there is to it. I believe when we vote we should know exactly what we are doing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, all there is to this amendment is to keep the National Labor Relations Board from going out on its own petition and stirring up trouble and creating labor dissension in this country. This amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina makes it perfectly clear that every man who goes to work in these plants has access to and knows about the agreements that are in existence. If the employees in the plant themselves on their own motion want to start something or do something they have a perfect right to do it, but it keeps the National Labor Relations Board in its own place attending to the business of the passing on the disputes that are brought to it by disputants instead of stirring them up itself.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] will be adopted.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 169, noes 11.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 62, line 23, insert after the figures ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I send the following motion to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was put on the bill in the Senate. It was not considered by the subcommittee of the House, the full committee, or by the House itself. It was not, as I understand it, considered by the subcommittee of the Senate or the full committee of the Senate.

This amendment provides simply that all appointments in the Manpower Commission carrying salaries equal to or exceeding $4,500 per year shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, on the motion I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 192, noes 22.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 5, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25 and on page 66, strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive, and insert the following:

PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, $35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed $918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, $4,000,000, together with not to exceed $1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not to exceed $250,000 for travel expenses, $2,750,000.

PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, $50,000.

PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal year 1944 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however*, That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 of paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am

about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

PAR. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgment of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

PAR. 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however,* That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further,* That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of $86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury, will be necessary for such purposes.

PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment or cremation (not to exceed a total of $100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided,* That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of $300.

PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 30 and concur in the same.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in fairness and in justice to the House as well as to your committee a short statement should be made relative to the motion I have offered by direction of the committee.

Earlier in the year the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate to your subcommittee asking for an appropriation of approximately $45,000,000 for what was known as the National Youth Administration. The item suggested made some difference in the work of the National Youth Administration to that which prevailed heretofore. Prior to that time the program had been to give needy unemployed young people work and at the same time provide a compensation for such work. The item presented to your committee eliminated the condition or provision of need and employment and provided work employment for youth from 16 to 25 years of age with a provision that if the Chairman of the Manpower Commission found it necessary he could at any time waive the maximum age limit. The subcommittee,

feeling that this was a new program, thought the matter should be sent to the House for consideration and decision. However, upon motion in the full committee this particular item was eliminated. The matter then went to the Senate and, as I understand, estimates similar to those submitted to the House subcommittee by the Bureau of the Budget were submitted to a subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Senate. The subcommittee presented it to the full committee and the full committee eliminated the item. However, in considering the bill in the Senate the item for the National Youth Administration was inserted and sent to conference. Your conferees on the part of the House agreed that it should come to the House for consideration, and for that reason it is here today.

Mr. Speaker, I may say briefly that the work of the N. Y. A. as proposed in the bill is primarily to furnish pre-employment for persons who first agree before being employed that upon completion of their course of instruction they will be available for work in industry. That is, they will be able to go into plants now engaged in the production of war equipment.

Let me say in this connection there is not a minute of the day in which we are not reminded of the fact that our country is in a war, the greatest war of all history, a war in which we are spending millions of dollars daily in the production of munitions, materials, and equipment. We have between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 persons directly employed in the production of equipment, and so forth, or about twice as many as are now enlisted in the armed forces to use the equipment in battle. The latter are daily insisting upon increased and more efficient equipment for use. This does not include forty to forty-five million engaged in agriculture and industries contributing indirectly to the war effort.

We have found in our production program that the preemployment training of persons going into industry contributes materially to their increased ability for production in industry. The unanimous testimony of employers and managers of industrial plants is that the training program has contributed much to the efficient and increased production in practically all of our war-production plants.

The Manpower Commission in an effort to see that the manpower of the country is utilized to the highest degree in our war effort, particularly on the home front, has recommended and adopted several different training programs for the purpose of increasing industrial efficiency and the production of war equipment. I shall attempt to analyze them but will make no effort to go into details.

First. It was soon found in our enormously increased number of workers in industry that it was not sufficient to have a thousand or twenty thousand persons physically able to work in a plant, but it was necessary to have capable, trained, and experienced overseers, foremen, or supervisors to direct this large number of inexperienced workers. It was impossible to employ a person at the gate, send him inside of the plant, and tell him to go to work and expect him to accomplish very much unless there were someone there prepared to tell him where to work, how he should proceed, and how the work should be done. It was soon found that the number of such overseers was limited and it was necessary to begin training people for supervisory work. Therefore, a program of what is known as in-plant training was provided. Men and women of experience were employed primarily to train workers who were to direct other employees.

In the second place, it was soon discovered that with an enormous number of workers in a plant it was necessary to have an over-all training program—that is, a program that would train for coordination and correlation of the work in a plant or industry so that the entire production program would function with the least possible loss of time or friction. This type of training required persons thoroughly familiar with every operation in a plant or industry and the work was designed to train others so that they might become familiar with every operation within such plant or industry. This program was classified as apprenticeship training or apprentice training service.

In the third place, Congress appropriated last year $100,000,000 to be used in training war-production workers through the United States Office of Education in cooperation with State and local vocational schools. This type of training was designed to give preemployment training to war production workers less than college grade, fitting them for work in industry.

In the fourth place, Congress appropriated $25,000,000 to be used in what was considered a war-production effort to train people in rural communities through vocational schools in the construction of farm machinery and equipment and to train people how to repair and operate such machinery and equipment. This latter agency also dealt primarily with people of less than college grade.

Fifth. Another program inaugurated through the United States Office of Education in cooperation with colleges and universities was set up and designed specifically to give training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and so forth that they be better qualified to meet pressing needs in industrial plants.

Sixth. The National Youth Administration was by Executive order placed under the Manpower Commission where it was specifically designed to provide training to the unemployed youth of the country and that such training was designed specifically to meet the needs of industry. Under the proposal as submitted to the Congress the question of being unemployed was no longer a prerequisite for work training through the National Youth Administration and the proposal was to give the Chairman of the Manpower Commission the right to waive the age limit if found necessary. The outstanding difference between the training provided through the vocational schools and the National Youth Administration is that in the N. Y. A. persons are paid a certain amount while taking the training.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am too fond of my good friend from South Carolina to engage in an argument with him, but does not the gentleman realize that the business colleges of the country, the private schools, and even most of the public schools, are opposed to a continuance of N. Y. A. at this time?

Mr. HARE. Yes. I think the gentleman is correct in that statement, but these schools and colleges are not charged with the responsibility of furnishing munitions and equipment to our young men in the armed forces.

Mr. SHORT. I am really surprised that my good friend from South Carolina, who is so basically sound on most important questions, would favor the continuation of the N. Y. A. at this time.

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman understood me to say at the outset that I am going to present the facts upon which this is brought to the House, for it is his responsibility as much as mine to see that we have maximum production in our war program.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman does not believe in it any more than I do.

Mr. HARE. That may be true, but I want to be certain not to shirk my personal responsibility.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Does not the gentleman from South Carolina believe that the department of education of the various States can carry on this same shop work the gentleman refers to, instead of paying $47,800,000 as carried in this bill?

Mr. HARE. I will get to that in a minute.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does the gentleman not know that in the industries of this country they can train these applicants for jobs a thousand times better than these starry-eyed nincompoops are doing and, in addition to that, industry has the tools and overhead and instead of wasting valuable materials as a lot of these theorists do, it saves materials? Let us be practical about this and give industry a chance.

Mr. HARE. I am not going to be drawn into an argument. I want to present the facts as they have been submitted to our committee, and you can draw your own conclusions and make your own arguments, but I will say that my conclusion from the facts submitted to us, the N. Y. A. trained and furnished more people to work in industry this past fiscal year than any other training agency of the Government.

I have told you something about inplant training, but that is not sufficient, because it is not only necessary to have someone with experience to train a raw recruit but it is necessary to have the entire work program in a plant set up in such a way so that maximum production may be reached in the course of a day or a week, because every person in a plant is not engaged at work on the same type of machine. There are different types of machines, different types of work. It is necessary to have someone to correlate the different types of work so that they may dovetail into each other in every plant, in order that at the end of the week you will have the maximum production in that plant. We have referred to this as apprentice training service.

In addition, the Congress last year appropriated $100,000,000 in the way of grants to the States to be used in the vocational schools where they would teach young men and young women how to operate different types of machines, so that upon the completion of their courses they would be able to go into a plant, into industry, and contribute more efficient service in the production of the war equipment so highly needed.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Not yet. I want to get through and give you the facts and let you decide your own responsibility. I am not going to try to shoulder it for you.

In addition, by Executive order the National Youth Administration was transferred to the Manpower Commission last year; it had been engaged in furnishing employment and work to young men and young women in different parts of the country, teaching and training them by actual experience how to operate different kinds of machines, lathes, welding, the use of tools, and so forth. It was then decided that if this program was to continue these young men and young women should first agree that if they were furnished this training they would be available to go into industry and thereby meet the growing need for employees in industry.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Not yet.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to help you out.

Mr. HARE. You can help me out when I get through. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman some time.

The question is this: Do we have sufficient production in this country? Is the need for workers in this country of such great importance as to justify these various types of training? If so, then we should provide for them. If not, then they should be eliminated. They are all provided for in this bill.

In other words, if the problem of production of munitions and war equipment for our armed forces is sufficiently important to justify a training program, we should provide for it. If not, we should say so and eliminate the whole thing. I will not have the time to go into detail. The National Youth Administration told us 6 weeks ago, that it was training 1,000 people per day, that it was sending 500 of them into industry every day. We were told by industry that this training has proven to be very valuable in the way of increased production. If from this evidence—and it has now been available for 3 weeks—you feel that the services rendered by this agency for the promotion of our war program and our production effort are worth $48,000,000, then you should support the amendment attached to this bill by the Senate. If you are convinced that it is not contributing value received and promoting our war effort to that extent, you should remove not only this agency but every other training agency in the same category.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I just wanted to say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHORT]——

Mr. SHORT. I am from Missouri. Do not get it wrong.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That I thought it would be far better to put our young boys into overalls and give them something constructive to do than to have them run around in zoot suits looking for trouble.

Mr. SHORT. All right. I am glad the gentleman has his audience in the gallery to applaud him.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield me a minute?

Mr. HARE. Not at this time, but shortly.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for his boundless generosity.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the National Youth Administration through these several years. I voted for it last year with the understanding that perhaps we did need to give it 1 more year to get this training program under way to supply the trained workers for war.

I have tried to watch the program in my own district. It has been a good one, but I believe it has outlived its usefulness at this time. The statistics I have seen published as to the training program for workers who have been coming into industry and the future numbers needed lead me to believe that the only thing the N. Y. A. can contribute in the future as it has been contributing in the last few months in Oklahoma is to sap from the farm and rural districts the boys who are so vitally needed to produce the food that we need to win this war.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman has just now hit the nail on the head. The men who are really getting the cream of the milk in the N. Y. A. are those who have employment under it and are getting good salaries out of it. They are using rubber and gasoline down in my State to beat the bushes to try to get boys off the farm into some little work that could better be learned in industry and in the public-school system of my State. The public-school officials in my State, both State, county, and municipal, are a unit against the continuation of this vermiform appendix in our educational system.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman would yield now just for an observation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. My record in support of the N. Y. A. is not as good as that of the gentleman. I think in the early days of the organization it did more to develop the zoot-suiters than any other outfit in our country. However, a man was brought into the organization about 2 years or more ago who cleaned it up to a very considerable extent. The program it is now carrying on, I believe, can be justified. Contrary to the attitude I have heretofore taken, I now have a friendly consideration for it and believe its existence can be justified when confined to the program it is now carrying on.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman. In conclusion, the breaking point with the N. Y. A. and myself came about a month ago when I received through the mail a very fine mimeographed letter put out by the N. Y. A. appealing to the youth of the country to take advantage of the courses that were being offered by the N. Y. A. to be of service to their Nation in industry, stressing their courses in shorthand, in bookkeeping, and other such courses. That letter happened to have been addressed to a young man who had been in the military service for 2 years.

With the colleges, universities, and business colleges stripped of students this coming fall, I hardly think it is necessary now to continue this additional set-up with a high overhead to duplicate the work that is now being efficiently handled through the public-school systems of the country by the vocational education program. This Nation needs man and woman power to win the war, but the simple existence of additional training capacity will not give us these extra hands. I am convinced that there are enough regular educational facilities, with their instructors, now available and at work under the vocational education program to satisfactorily do the job and thus save this $40,000,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] 1 minute.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to say anything. I think we are ready to vote. No one will deny nor doubt that the N. Y. A., in the depths of the depression, with millions of men out of work, did a little good. You could not spend millions upon millions of dollars

without accidentally helping somebody a little, but the N. Y. A. did not send you, Mr. Speaker, to college, nor did it send me. We shined shoes, sold papers, fired furnaces. We were not pampered by patronizing paternalistic Federal bureaucracy that gave us a free education at the expense of surrendering our own individual freedom. This thing is silly, it is crazy, it is cockeyed. There is no excuse at this time, when our house is on fire and men are fighting and dying, to continue the N. Y. A. The business colleges and the private trade schools, and even the public schools of the country are against it. Practically every State system of education is giving vocational education, and we are now asked to tax the people to continue this extra extravagant bureau that is no longer needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to clarify the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from South Carolina made the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. If that motion is voted down, and I hope it will be, then I shall move to insist upon the House amendment, which is the amendment providing for the liquidation of the N. Y. A.

There are a great many arguments which I could advance why the N. Y. A. should be discontinued; however, I have time only to comment on one phase. The question is, Do we need the trainees of the N. Y. A.? If you will turn to page 23 of part II of the War Manpower Commission hearings, you will find where Mr. McNutt testified that we had $2,091,000 for training-within-industry training in this bill. We had last year approximately $1,000,000 and trained 500,000 supervisors. I am assuming that if we double the money we can train 1,000,000 supervisors in 1944. The next paragraph is for the Bureau of Training, $100,000,000. This money will provide for the pre-employment training of 800,000 and the supplemental training of 2,000,000 more in 1944. The next paragraph is for the rural training programs, providing for $11,500,000, which was increased by the committee to $12,500,000, and which provides for the training of 600,000 farm workers. Then we find $30,000,000 more for short-course training, and intensive college courses for 800,000 more persons. Then if you will turn to part II of Federal Security Agency hearings, on page 157, you will find vocational educational training, $14,000,000. We trained 2,629,000 persons last year with this amount and should train the same number this year, the appropriation being the same. This will make a total of 7,829,000 people who are going to receive some sort of training from some sort of Government agency at Government expense, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, at a total cost to the taxpayer which will exceed $150,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, the real question is, do we want to go out and borrow $48,000,000 from the bondholders of the Nation to continue the N. Y. A. and add 100,000 or 200,000 trainees to that program, which would add less than 2 percent trainees to the 7,829,000 we have already provided for during the coming year in this bill? That is the real issue. Last year we had up the question of the C. C. C. and we were told on the floor of this House that we could not get along without it. They said the Civilian Conservation Corps was needed for the war effort. The Secretary of War's office asked for it, The Adjutant General asked for it, as did many more. I wonder how many of the Members of this House who are here today would vote to reinstate the C. C. C. How many Members would vote to reinstate the N. Y. A. a year from now if it is abolished today?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is from Michigan, and many of us here have visited Detroit, and it is a fact that we all know that Ford and Kaiser and these other great institutions have their own schools and are training these men.

Mr. ENGEL. Oh, I visited 47 defense plants and walked through them with the superintendents, I asked them about the N. Y. A. training, and the most that any of them said was that N. Y. A. trainees were adaptable. Here is an opportunity to save $48,000,000, and it is up to us to do it, and no kind of argument can convince me that we should borrow $48,000,000 to continue the N. Y. A. another year. If there is any agency in the Government that has wasted money, it is the N. Y. A. Three years ago when I went through the various departments coming under the Labor-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I had each department make a report to me and, among other things, list the number of cars that department had in Washington.

Mr. Aubrey Williams, as the head of the N. Y. A., reported that he had an old Pontiac, a Chevrolet, and a Ford. Imagine my surprise 2 weeks later when I found a brand new Packard twin-six four-door sedan parked by the House Office Building, with a colored chauffeur, in uniform, at the wheel and marked "National Youth Administration, Federal Security Agency."

The committee had placed a limitation of $700 on the amount that he could spend for a car. Mr. Williams testified that he had bought this new Packard twin-six four-door sedan for $700, and I asked him whether he also got the colored chauffeur, in uniform, at a reduced price, also.

On February 1, of this year, the University of Maryland made it compulsory for senior students to take 8 hours a week of welding during the last semester before they were graduated. Students were compelled to drop subjects which they had scheduled in a specialized course in order to make it possible to take that course in welding. The students were paid 25 cents an hour by the N. Y. A. in spite of a provision which the committee placed into last year's bill that no one could receive N. Y. A. training unless he agreed, in writing, to accept employment in industry after the course was completed. As I recall it, there were over 400 students at the University of Maryland who took this course.

When I took the matter up with Mr. Williams, on April 9, he wrote me as follows:

> I would like for you to know that this is the only university where the entire senior class has been assigned with our knowledge for such training as a part of the course of the university for which credit is given by the university toward a degree.
>
> At the present time university and college seniors of Delaware State College for Colored Students, Rural Free Delivery, Dover, Del.; St. Cloud State Teachers College, First Avenue S., St. Cloud, Minn.; Duluth State Teachers College, Duluth, Minn.; Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; Prairie View State Normal and Industrial College, Prairie View, Tex.; Ranger Junior College, Marston and Pine Streets, Ranger, Tex.; and Baylor University, Waco, Tex., are receiving training for war industries in accordance with the policies as outlined in my letter to Mr. Byrd.

Mr. Williams attached to this letter a letter he had written to Mr. H. C. Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, which embodied the following conditions:

> 1. Only those seniors who formally apply for such training should be considered for assignment to war production training activities.
>
> 2. Approval shall be given only to those applicants who intend to use specific training in machine shop, sheet-metal and arc-welding activities in seeking employment in war industries upon their graduation from the university.
>
> 3. Approved seniors shall agree in writing to accept such employment at the time of their assignment to a war production training activity.

I wonder how many of these senior students will work in a factory?

Mr. Williams entirely disregarded the law to the effect that only trainees who agreed in writing to work in industry should be permitted to take the N. Y. A. training course.

On page 316 of the hearings, you will find a list of 11 trucks which Mr. Williams turned over to the city of Clarinda, Iowa, as a donation. While it is true the trucks were old models, I understand that they were turned in by the city for a number of good trucks.

On page 316 of the hearings, you will find the following testimony:

> Mr. ENGEL. Mr Williams, will you put in the record a detailed statement as to these cars that were sold, which you told us about off the record, giving the make of the car and the year, and what you received for it?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. They were simply turned over to the municipality of Clarinda, Iowa.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. Turned over to them for nothing?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. There was no particular value on them.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. You gave them to the municipality?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they were listed as junk.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. Is that legal?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. If you take them off the list it is legal.

In other words, under Mr. Williams' interpretation of the law all you have to do to give away Government property legally is to take that property "off the list." He has utterly disregarded the law and the mandate of this House together with provisions laid down in appropriation acts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there is a single person on this floor who is not ready to vote on this proposition. I know I am. As the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] said, all the argument in the world would not change him. His mind is made up. I suppose there are more men on the floor of this House whose minds are made up, and all the argument in the world, regardless of how good that argument might be, would not change them at all.

All I want to say about this situation is this: I do not have any particular reputation in this House for squandering the public's money. When I have given my time to studying a proposal, as I have this one, and have gone into it as thoroughly as I have gone into this one and have visited these training centers as I have seen them operate in my own State and in other States of the Union, I am not going to change my attitude by a little emotional appeal that here is a chance to save some money.

I have not heard a single partisan in opposition to this program tell this Congress what you are going to do with the 90,000 trainees who are being trained every month by this agency. What are you going to offer to take its place? "Oh," you say, "we are going to turn them over to the vocational training schools, they will take charge of it; or we will turn them over to some other agency." I say to you that you have an operating organization. It has made many mistakes which I recognize—many mistakes. They may have spent a lot of money foolishly, but it is being condemned today, with arguments that it does not deserve.

The argument just made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that the N. Y. A. is stealing the boys from the farms is not justified. Do you want to know what is taking the boys from the farms in Oklahoma and all over this country? Read these ads that appear in the newspapers all over the country—ads from the shipbuilding companies and the War Manpower Commission—urging youths from 16 years of age and up to apply to the nearest employment office to be placed on the pay roll of these shipbuilding companies at from 60 to 80 and 90 cents an hour. When they are placed on the pay roll you are paying their wages out of public funds paid the contractor. Then these same shipbuilding companies turn around and turn over 40,000 of them a month to the N. Y. A. to train—the same people who are on the pay roll of these shipbuilding and other companies. What boy or what girl on the farm or what child of high-school age—a kid of 16—would not be attracted when he reads those ads and has a chance to go and get a job that will return him 50 or 60 or 70 or 80 cents an hour while he is being trained on one of these projects?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The N. Y. A. has been very, very enthusiastic to send the men in our area to the shipyards, when, as a matter of fact, another branch of the Government is trying very, very hard to entice labor to do other defense work in Oklahoma. I cannot see any sense in this cross-purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I think I understand the situation of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has always been a friend of N. Y. A., but Oklahoma is for economy now, and the gentleman is for economy.

As far as the gentleman who is addressing you is concerned, if he believes a proposal to be right and in the direct interest of winning the war, he is not going to be swayed by any specious argument or any emotional appeal.

Mr. Speaker, in my examination of the arguments pro and con, one thought has been uppermost in my mind—will the continuance of N. Y. A. help the war effort or, conversely, will the discontinuance or disruption of N. Y. A. harm the war effort? That, in my judgment, is the underlying question we must answer.

In dealing with this question, let us face the facts, and if we do, it should be clear that the central and dominating fact on the home front is that the rate of speed with which we produce the tools of war will determine whether more or less of our soldiers shall have to pay with their lives for victory. That is a hard and solemn fact, but a fixed fact that we cannot escape. Cost what it may, we must do everything that lies within our power to increase and speed production of these tools and implements of war—not next month or next year but now. If you agree with that fact, then you must also agree, for it follows inexorably, that we must not upset existing organizations which are contributing to the increase of production unless it can be shown clearly and unmistakably that such disruption will not hamper the war effort and bring closer the day of victory.

In the light of these considerations let us examine the record of N. Y. A. Briefly, the facts as I have found them are as follows:

From July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, the National Youth Administration gave war production training to 303,000 previously unemployed boys and girls. It is conservative to estimate that over 400,000 will have been given training in the 12-month period of fiscal year 1943 and that number, or even half that number of semiskilled workers provided for war industry cannot be discounted.

At the present about one-half of all N. Y. A. trainees are females, and the percentage is increasing, consonant with our national needs. Boys of draft age now represent only one-third of all males and this percentage has decreased consistently and may be expected to decrease still further. Moreover, many in this draft-age group, while acceptable to industry, are not up to the physical standards of the armed services.

Over a thousand N. Y. A. trainees leave the training program every day, and a thousand other trainees, mostly without any work experience, take their places. Of those who leave, between 650 and 700 a day enter employment, the majority of them in war industries. While it is not practical to follow through on every trainee who leaves the program, there are sound reasons for assuming that many, in all probability most, of the remainder likewise find employment in war or other essential industry. Some of the trainees enter the armed services, where their N. Y. A. training in mechanics gives them an additional value.

This accomplishment has been achieved at what I believe to be a reasonable cost. To provide training for a boy or a girl for an entire month, to pay them a small wage in return for their 160 hours of work and for the goods which they produce, to provide food and lodging and limited medical care for those in resident, and to do all of this at an average cost of only $66.91 per trainee per month is, I believe, an outstanding achievement that no one honestly can find fault with. The average period of training for each person is 7 weeks, which in terms of cost is $108.44. These figures include all costs of every character.

As is known, but not as well known as it should be, N. Y. A. training is carried on by means of production. N. Y. A. youths learn how to produce by actually producing. The parts and articles they make are principally for the Navy, Army, and Maritime Commission. A large part of this production is of the "nuisance" order type, things made to order for a specific but limited need, which could not profitably be made by private contractors and which would have had to be made by a shore establishment or an arsenal, if they had not had the production facilities of the National Youth Administration to call upon. Other items are such as may be greatly needed to break production bottlenecks which are holding up shipments of implements of war to our soldiers. Here the saving of time is infinitely more important than the saving in cost. Any fair consideration of N. Y. A. must take account of and give credit for this production, which, though not of great proportions when measured against our gargantuan war production, still does loom large when measured against the amount of money appropriated to N. Y. A. Let me give you an idea of the extent of this production by citing the number of parts or articles made for a few Government establishments in the past 10 months:

Portsmouth Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. Y.	1,214,318
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	406,047
Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.	102,731

United States Navy Coast Guard, New England	20,884
United States submarine base, Connecticut	1,384
United States Maritime Commission, various shipyards	13,795
Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill	1,282,747
Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y	8,129

Important as N. Y. A. production is, the acid test of N. Y. A.'s value is in its service to war industry. What do the managers of American industry, the men who guide the production of the tools of war think of N. Y. A.? Do they say it should be abolished?

I have made it my business to find out what industry thinks. I have examined hundreds of letters from companies producing war material and perhaps no other factor has been more important in determining my attitude toward N. Y. A. than those letters. Seldom have I known of a Government agency which received so general and so generous a tribute as is found in these letters. Here is one from the American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.:

We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the fine work that the National Youth Administration has been doing in the training of girls. The girls we have employed whom you sent up here, have worked out excellent and we only wish, if it were possible, that you expand your operations so that you might be able to give us more girls between the ages of 18 and 30 of the same caliber as those whom we have received.

We find that girls who have had the National Youth Administration training are thoroughly conversant with the use of machine tools, blueprints and micrometers. This is extremely important to us.

Here is one from the Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., of Duluth, Minn.:

In the course of the past few months we have employed approximately 90 welder trainees from your training center, situated at 4832 Grand Avenue, Duluth, Minn.

We have found them to be very satisfactory and have shown that they have had exceptional training in their respective fields.

We would like to recommend that the present age limit of trainees be increased to permit the training of older people in order to meet the demands which will be brought about by the drafting of the 18- and 19-year-old men.

One from Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.:

We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women who have been trained by the National Youth Administration and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply. * * *

We want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the fine cooperation which we have received from your organization.

Another is from the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.:

We have received 726 who have come to us as trained welders, machinists, and sheet-metal workers. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on this fact and express the appreciation of this company for the splendid work the National Youth Administration is doing in the war effort.

I would like to inform you that we have a greater need for welders, electricians, and sheet-metal workers than we do for machinists. I am quite sure that we can use all of the trainees in the first three crafts that you can send us.

Also one from the Ford Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.:

Your training facilities, with the present restrictions, will supply us with a limited number of young people. It leaves out, however, the possibility of training the much larger number of older men and women our program requires.

We are sure that, if the restrictions as to age limit could be removed from the National Youth Administration program, your training centers could do a much bigger job in the training of many hundreds of people needed in our war industries. Your training center in Brooklyn is of unusual quality for our purposes because you have a great variety of machine-tool equipment and in larger quantities than is found in the average vocational training school. Also, you are doing production work which enables trainees to more nearly assimilate actual factory conditions.

And the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.:

Truly the National Youth Administration here in Houston in the last year or so has been of material benefit to the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, and I understand likewise to many other industries here. This benefit has come to us through what your organization has done for thousands of men and women in preemployment training. You have given these young people something that has made them valuable to us.

Our employment records show that approximately 75 percent of the 4,000 welders now working for us here have been given preliminary training by the National Youth Administration. The boys that we have hired from the National Youth Administration rolls on the average make better employees than welders hired from other sources. This is probably due to the fact that there has been a close cooperation between the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation and the National Youth Administration, and also that the majority of your instructors have worked for us and are familiar with our welding requirements, rules, and regulations, since these are taught to National Youth Administration trainees along with their welding training.

And from the David Bell Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.:

We wish to thank you, the New York State Employment Office and the National Youth Administration project for the splendid help you have given us in securing trained help for our machine shop.

We find that it has helped speed up production by being able to have our girls trained before they are employed by us.

We ask you to pass this letter on to whomever is responsible for the fine cooperation this plant has received. We hope that we will be able to call on you often in the future to keep our national-defense program at the peak of production.

From the Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.:

About 2 years ago, we rented for $1, a piece of ground to the National Youth Administration of Pennsylvania, so that they could erect a school building to train persons in different crafts. This building is located on Ninth Street and Ridley Creek, Chester, and there is some talk of closing this school.

The school has really been of great benefit to the shipyard. They have furnished to us 459 welders, 92 machinists' helpers and machine operators, and 63 sheet-metal workers from January 1, 1942, up to and including January 21, 1943. At the present time, they have enrolled in their school 190 trainees. Of course, they not only supply employees to their shipyard but serve other industries in the locality; however, we would naturally expect to receive, as we have done in the past, 75 percent of their trainees to work in the shipyard.

As stated before, I understand that there is some question of closing this school and other schools of this type. Personally, I believe it would be a mistake to do so, as you know the shipyard is needing mechanics especially welders. Anything you can do to assist in keeping the school open will be appreciated.

And from the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

This National Youth Administration training has fitted these employees for duties much more advanced than is usually the case with inexperienced help.

I feel that any extension of training similar to the National Youth Administration, particularly for women or for older men, will be very beneficial to the industry and war effort of this country and should be encouraged.

And from Richmond Shipyard No. 1, Kaiser Shipbuilding Co., Richmond, Calif.:

This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the short will become still more acute. The figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of Selective Service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.

These shipyards appreciate the work your organization has been doing in the past and thank you for your continued cooperation.

This all bears upon the question of whether or not industry wants to and is willing to do its own training. I have just cited above examples of the letters which have been received from outstanding industrial firms throughout the country in which they indicate very definitely that they cannot do the job alone. An outstanding example of this is the Henry Ford plant. You all know about the magnificent school which Henry Ford established a good many years ago and which still continues to function for the training of his skilled mechanics, his designers, his technicians. If any plant in the world has devoted interest, time, and attention to training it has been the Ford plant. However, I have here a letter written by the United States Employment Service, copies of which were sent to several hundred applicants at the Ford plant at the request of the Ford management. This letter promises very definitely to these workers that if they will take training under N. Y. A. auspices at such and such an N. Y. A. shop for so many hours, they will be assured of employment at such and such a wage in the Ford Willow Run plant, indicating quite clearly that while Henry Ford does do training, that it is done in the higher brackets of skills, that in this period of terrific demand for workers he is unable to meet the situation alone and is glad to get the help of the National Youth Administration. This same situation is duplicated nationally, in spite of all of

the quibbling you may have heard to the contrary.

Now, what are the main charges made against this agency? I think I know all of them and know them well, for I have made it my business to listen to, record, and investigate all such as have come within the range of my knowledge.

The charge has been made that the National Youth Administration is duplicating the work of the other training agencies operating under the War Manpower Commission. Let us examine these various agencies under the War Manpower Commission that are engaged in training programs for the war industries.

One of these training divisions is the Apprenticeship Training Service, which was originally organized some 10 years ago under the National Recovery Act—N. R. A.—for the purpose of promoting apprenticeships in the technical and skilled occupations on a national scale. Their job has been to promote a program of long-term indentured apprentices in the various trades. They still carry on this function under State law, and within the last year or so they have also added a side line—that of promoting the advancing worker and upgrading programs for skilled operators and production specialists. Obviously, the National Youth Administration does not enter into either of their fields. The N. Y. A. job is specifically to take the man who has never been employed and in a few weeks' or months' experience to give him those semiskills or techniques that will quickly equip him to do a war job.

Another of these training agencies is designated as training-within-industry. The purpose of this training group, as explained by its division head, is to train industrial plant foremen. Clearly there is no duplication there on the part of the National Youth Administration. They do not attempt or pretend to train foremen.

A third division of this training program of the War Manpower Commission is the E. S. M. W. T., which, gentlemen, means a branch for training in engineering, science, and management. This is a college function. Their job is to give short-term courses in science, engineering, and so forth, to men of college grade. This is purely a professional technical field; National Youth Administration does not enter into this area of training. We must bear in mind that the National Youth Administration takes a youth without work experience and gives him a job on a war-production program that gets him ready for welding, for machine shop, or sheet-metal work, and does not deal either with foremen, college engineers, or chemists.

Another training agency under the War Manpower Commission which deals particularly with the training of farm workers, is the rural work program operated under the Office of Education. This agency is engaged in the work of training farm workers. The National Youth Administration was one of those agencies which foresaw this possible shortage of farm workers early and throughout the country rural youth under the auspices of the National Youth Administration built approximately 1,000 farm shops in connection with rural high schools for the training of farm boys in farm mechanics and all of those skills which the boy on the farm needs. In my own State, 28 such farm shops were built. These are now being used by the Smith-Hughes and other agricultural training agencies for rural youth. In some localities, the National Youth Administration uses these farm shops, in others they are entirely under the control of vocational education. But in no case is the National Youth Administration training farm workers in the same locality and in the same school, in the same shops, where the Smith-Hughes people are operating. There is no duplication of effort.

This brings up the fifth of these training groups, which, like the Rural and the E. S. M. W. T., is a program under the Office of Education. The Office of Education designates this next program as its vocational training for war-production workers (V. T. W. P. W.) program. This is a vocational training program for industrial workers and its work has been divided into two groups. One is the supplementary training program. This is a program which is given to men in industry who, wishing to increase their skill while on the job, take night courses or courses in their off time to improve themselves in their techniques. There might be a question in some of our minds as to just where the lines of this supplementary program and the so-called upgrading program of the apprenticeship service do not cross, or parallel each other, but again the National Youth Administration does not enter into either the upgrading field for employed workers or the supplementary training for advancing workers on the vocational education program. Their work is to take the boy who does not have any skill and give him some skill.

Now we come to the second part of the V. T. W. P. W. program under the Office of Education. It is called preparatory, or preemployment training, and is operated through directives and regulations issued by the Federal Office of Education to the State vocational boards down to the local level. This preemployment training is also the field in which the National Youth Administration works.

This would be the only place in the entire War Manpower Commission where the charge of duplication might be substantiated, so far as the National Youth Administration is concerned. Now, mind you, I say "might." The N. Y. A. operates workshops for training in 556 localities. I have made a study of the locations of preparatory war-training programs in the vocational schools. I have also made a study of the locations of such programs operated by the National Youth Administration. I find that 196 of these locations are in localities in which there does not exist any war-production training within the schools. Certainly there is no possibility of duplication with existing agencies if such agencies do not exist in those localities. In 243 of the remaining locations, the war training is given under the joint auspices of the local vocational authorities and the National Youth Administration.

You will pardon me if I refer for a time to this cooperative program as carried out in my own State—Wisconsin. Wisconsin, I think most educators will admit, has carried the banner for years in this matter of vocational training. We have 47 vocational schools in the State of Wisconsin—1 in each of the major cities of 5,000 population or over. And when I say vocational schools, I mean honest-to-God vocational schools, in which there is real training given with the full support of both organized labor and of industry. I do not mean that sort of industrial arts where they make tin cans into ash trays, or broomsticks into necktie racks—I mean schools which have foundries, lathes, milling machines, patternmaking shops, and all of those things which contribute to the training of men for factories.

Wisconsin is justly proud of its vocational system. Now, I am saying that even in Wisconsin, where vocational education is widely and firmly established as a part of a highly diversified industrial State, there is need for the services of the National Youth Administration, and this is borne out by the statements of the vocational educators themselves. In my own city of Oshkosh I have the emphatic word of our vocational director, Mr. Bleyer, that there is the closest cooperation between him and the N. Y. A. officials, and that he has assisted in the training of hundreds of youth, who, without the cooperation of the National Youth Administration, could not have been trained.

There would seem to be complete coverage by the 47 vocational schools in Wisconsin; yet there are 5 communities in Wisconsin in which the National Youth Administration operates training programs where there are no vocational schools. In 2 cities these shops are 80 miles from the nearest vocational school—1 at Plattsville and 1 at St. Croix Falls.

Now, take Milwaukee. You probably have heard of the Milwaukee Vocational School, the largest school of its kind in the world. Educators from all parts of the country, and of the world, have visited the Milwaukee Vocational School; yet here are letters from two nationally known Milwaukee industrialists — the Kearney-Trecher Co., which makes the Milwaukee milling machine; and Allis-Chalmers. Understand, too, gentlemen, that both of these plants, these huge, nationally known firms, have training programs of their own—apprenticeship programs. They utilize the Milwaukee Vocational School wherever possible—and still these firms come out definitely and say that in this all-out war effort they are grateful for, and in need of, every possible training assistance that can be had, and they particularly mention the services of the National Youth Administration.

Now, there is no doubt that in some of the 48 States there are certain locations in which both the vocational schools and the National Youth Administration can and do operate separately, but that does not mean duplication of effort. In fact, it may mean absolute integration and cooperation of effort for the purpose of getting the greatest number of sorely needed workers for war industry. The field is wide. The Training Bureau of the War Manpower Commission has as its chief job the coordination of all of these training facilities, and you can readily see that duplication of effort is one of the things with which they would be most concerned.

There are several functions which the National Youth Administration is carrying on which no other agency is organized to do. Forty percent of the N. Y. A.'s program is carried on through resident centers, which because of local restrictions and local laws and conditions, the schools or other local agencies are not equipped to operate. These resident centers are established in places where training is not available, and are used to house and subsist you who come from areas where there is no training opportunity.

Another valuable assets which is peculiar to the National Youth Administration is its ability to shift workers from a labor supply area to a labor shortage area. For example, the National Youth Administration has trained and transferred into the New England States over 7,000 workers; into the Seattle area over 6,000 workers for aircraft and ship workers. They are sending into the submarine base at Hunter's Point, Calif., 100 marine electricians and welders per month, and so forth.

Another valuable quality which the N. Y. A. program possesses in a high degree is its flexibility, its mobility, its ability to set up quickly and effectively a shop-training program in spots where the training is most needed. For example, the Kaiser Yards at Richmond, Calif. The N. Y. A. resident training center and welding facilities are located immediately adjacent to the Kaiser yard. And over a period of months the National Youth Administration has trained and inducted into the Kaiser yard trained welders. So effective is this training that the Kaiser firm in one of the recent issues of their house organ Fore N'aft, devoted two full pages to a commendatory description of the N. Y. A. training program for their shop. The National Youth Administration is so set up that it can and does move machines, shops, buildings, across State lines, across regional lines, from city to city, wherever the War Manpower Commisison determines the training is most needed. It is not bound, as are the local training agencies, by any traditional restrictions of law or regulation, institutional or jurisdictional restraints.

In the past year, this agency moved 10,500, or more than 25 percent of its work stations to new locations, as the urgency of training needs developed in various parts of the country. It has proved to be the only training agency that is capable of rapidly moving and setting up its facilities to meet immediate needs.

The second charge is that N. Y. A. costs are higher than those of other agencies. I have shown previously at what low cost per trainee the National Youth Administration operates. At this point I should like to pursue the matter a little further, for in the Report of the Joint Committee there appears a comparison of the costs of the National Youth Administration with the costs of the Office of Education. Four cost items are there compared although it is admitted in the report that the data for the Office of Education are incomplete. To substantiate this statement, I quote from the report itself:

> It must be borne in mind that the Office of Education does not meet all the expenses borne by the National Youth Administration. The cost of equipment, rent, and instruction is frequently taken care of by arrangement with school authorities.

What possible value such admittedly lopsided comparisons can have is beyond my power to imagine unless it be intended to cast an odious reflection upon one of the agencies, for if in fairness we take those items in the record that are truly comparable, an entirely different story is revealed. The salaries of the N. Y. A. are $13.75 against $16.60 for the Office of Education; other costs are $12.48 for the N. Y. A. and $8.78 for the Office of Education. Now, if we add the figures for each agency we find that the N. Y. A. costs for the two items under consideration are $26.23, whereas the Office of Education cost figures are $25.38, a total difference of 85 cents.

Nor does this tell the whole story, for everyone recognizes the fact that in the production program carried on by the National Youth Administration and in the N. Y. A. trainee-transfer system there are certain costs which N. Y. A. properly and necessarily sustains which are not incurred by the Office of Education. It is not practical to attempt to assess the amount which these costs are of the total of other costs, but it is certainly reasonable to assume that if these costs were abstracted then it might very well be that the comparison of costs would be considerably in favor of the National Youth Administration.

As I stated at the outset, I have taken the time and the trouble to examine very closely into the administration of N. Y. A. affairs and it is my considered judgment that the program is efficiently administered and that on the score of costs it compares favorably with any Government agency.

Another criticism made of the National Youth Administration is that it has thousands of idle work stations. The apparent purpose of this criticism is to make it appear that N. Y. A. is grossly inefficient in the use which it makes of the equipment at its disposal. How far this is from the truth the record itself very clearly reveals. When Mr. Williams appeared before the committee he stated that N. Y. A. had 39,000 work stations in active use. At this point the chairman of the committee interposed that the Budget Bureau testified there were 55,000 work stations of which 16,000 were not in use. Asked about these 16,000 work stations, Mr. Williams stated that some were in warehouses and some were on loan to other agencies. Mr. Williams was then requested to provide a statement for the committee concerning the precise status of the 16,000 work stations in question. That statement, which is part of the record, shows that 4,675 work stations were on loan to other agencies; 3,260 work stations had been transferred to other agencies, 6,652 work stations had been or were in process of being declared surplus for disposal by the Treasury, and only 2,227 of the 16,814 work stations were held in warehouses for the use of the National Youth Administration. Now let me again point out the fact that N. Y. A. is constantly opening or closing training shops as the changing manpower needs of industry and the supply of trainees available at a given point may dictate.

In this regard, let me point out that when the National Youth Administration appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, they agreed that with certain funds they could utilize their training stations to train 400,000 during the year 1942–43. The records show that they fulfilled this agreement, and will have actually trained some 20,000 more than this number during the fiscal year.

Actually, the National Youth Administration has made extremely efficient use of its machines. Here, for example, is the record for the month of March of this year. There were 9,756 machine-shop stations available during the month of March, upon which 17,583 youths were employed. This means that these machine-shop stations throughout the country averaged nearly 16 hours of operation out of the 24 hours daily, which I assure you is a good record.

I wish now to discuss specifically the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in which we find all of the arguments anyone has ever advanced against the N. Y. A. These are summed up in the conclusions found at the end of the report proper. I propose to consider each of these conclusions separately and in the same order as they appear in the report. The first and second conclusions, having to do with duplication and cost, I have mentioned previously.

The third conclusion contains the charge that N. Y. A. enrollment has fallen off markedly, while the number of females is rapidly overtaking the number of males. It is true, as I pointed out earlier, that the number of females on the program is increasing, for which development N. Y. A. should certainly receive praise rather than blame. Insofar as the other charge in this conclusion is concerned, the record does not bear out the contention of a marked falling off in trainees. In the report the number of trainees on the defense training program, the forerunner of the present war-production training program, is shown as 57,297 on July 30, 1941. For November 25, 1942, the comparable figure, shown in the report, is 53,603. The figure as of May 26, 1943, not shown in the report but easily verifiable, is

52,721. The facts here given speak for themselves.

The fourth conclusion states that N. Y. A. has been forced to depend more and more on boys beneath the draft age of 18 for its male trainees. In view of the large number of boys taken into the armed services, it should hardly cause surprise that this should be so, but why it should be held to the discredit of N. Y. A. is beyond my power to imagine.

The fifth conclusion states that the equipment of N. Y. A. is not being utilized to an extent commensurate with satisfactory results. That it is not being utilized to full capacity is well known, and it was Mr. Williams who first brought that fact to the attention of Congress. Within the financial, age, and other limitations placed upon the N. Y. A. by Congress, I think the utilization of N. Y. A. equipment has been exceedingly satisfactory.

The sixth conclusion is to the effect that only 50 percent of the youth trained by the National Youth Administration use their skills in war industry. Assuming for a moment that the statement is accurate, which I do not admit, I should like to ask whether 200,000 trained youth provided for war industries is not in itself a record to be proud of. However, the figure takes no account of those who go into other essential industry, such as those industries concerned with the maintenance of the home front. It is my considered judgment that at least 80 percent of N. Y. A. trainees use their training in a way that is of great benefit to the war effort, to essential industry, and to government.

The final conclusion is that N. Y. A. has created fear in educational circles of centralized control of all education.

I am particularly glad to discuss this charge, for it is precisely because I am unalterably opposed to a federally controlled or operated system of education that I have supported the National Youth Administration. There is need now, and doubtless will be greater need in the foreseeable future, for an agency whose peculiar function it is to provide work and training to young people who are ready to enter industry but who are without work experience. This need may last for some time or it may disappear overnight. Therefore what we do as a Federal Government should be of a nature that can be quickly ended if and when its need ceases to exist. If we were to place this work within the framework of the schools, every man in this House knows we should be actually committing this Government to the nationalization of education.

We have in the National Youth Administration a structure recognized as temporary, and even if we should ask for and secure legislation, it would still be temporary, and not an integral part of the regular continuing departments and functions of the Federal Government.

Those who are asking Congress to abolish this agency because it is likely to become a Federal educational agency are the very same people who are asking Congress to expand Federal appropriations for the admitted purpose of putting the Federal Government deeper and deeper in the business of supervising and financing our educational system. It is they—the very same ones who denounce the National Youth Administration—who are working night and day to put the educational system under the control of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have one of these training centers in my own home town. For a space of four blocks in either direction from that center property values have been lowered. They do not have a reputation in my territory of turning out the best of mechanics. They employ solicitors to go around to the boys and girls, men and women who are taking regular vocational training, which costs about one-tenth as much under the Bureau of Education and under the State authorities, and they are soliciting with paid solicitors, furnished with automobiles running around, urging these men and women to leave the State training schools that are paid for by us but do not cost as much, to come to this N. Y. A. private boarding school.

Now, maybe that is the thing to do. The N. Y. A., according to Mr. Williams, at page 373 of the hearings, proposes to train with $49,000,000, 58,000 trainees. The other cost, with about $100,000,000, trains 880,000. In other words, this N. Y. A. training program as a whole—that is about all they do—will cost us approximately $880 per trainee as against $125 for the regular outfit that goes through our schools.

In my territory, out of their private boarding school, we see a white boy and a black girl come out, and a black boy and a white girl come out together. The entire program has been demoralizing. It has been demoralizing all the way through.

I do not think that we ought to permit it to continue any longer. I hope the House will vote against the motion to recede and concur and get rid of the expenditure of $49,000,000. It is time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in the full Committee on Appropriations, made a very forceful statement concerning the project at Auburn, his home town, relative to the Negroes and whites slipping around together; Negro girls and white boys, and white girls and negro boys. When this bill was presented to the House I addressed the House and invited the gentleman to make a statement for the record, since he had not appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not just at this time. The gentleman did not appear before the subcommittee and give it the benefit of the alleged information, and, of course, there was no opportunity to read the charge he made before the full committee because it was not made of record.

The gentleman today has made some slight reference to the subject matter which he discussed more fully before the full committee and upon which he based a major portion of his opposition when he was before the full committee.

I want to ask the gentleman from New York now, before he questions me, whether he is acquainted with one William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman, of his home city of Auburn, N. Y.

Mr. TABER. Who?

Mr. TARVER. William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman, of the gentleman's home city of Auburn.

Mr. TABER. I did not know there was such a person.

Mr. TARVER. He signs his name as "William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman," and in a telegram from Auburn, N. Y., dated June 15, 1943, he states:

> Have positive knowledge value of Auburn trained National Youth Administration youth to war industry. Youth being placed very important work. Social activities of youth above reproach and any statement to the contrary to facts evidence unfamiliarity with Auburn National Youth Administration center.

May I ask the gentleman if his home town is Auburn, N. Y.?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. TARVER. Does he know one Charles D. Osborne, publisher of the Citizens Advertiser?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. TARVER. Is he a reputable man?

Mr. TABER. Well, that depends.

Mr. TARVER. I know that depends on whether he agrees with the gentleman or not.

Mr. TABER. No; it depends on whether he is telling the truth or not.

Mr. TARVER. Well, of course, he would not agree with the gentleman under the gentleman's construction of the facts, so he would not be telling the truth. A telegram from this gentleman states:

> Concerning the National Youth Administration, Auburn, as a fine example of furthering war effort: Would ask how much Mr. TABER knows of local operations and question whether he has ever visited or investigated local center for facts of accomplishments.

May I ask the gentleman if he ever visited the N. Y. A. center at Auburn?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman seems to doubt that the gentleman from New York has done so.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Georgia is cluttering the RECORD up with a lot of stuff that has no basis. I have told the House what I have seen with mine own eyes and heard with mine own ears.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman from New York know the pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Auburn, N. Y.?

Mr. TABER. I will have to admit that I do not.

Mr. TARVER. Well, perhaps the gentleman is better known to the pastor than the pastor is known to the gentleman.

The pastor, at least the gentleman who signs himself as the pastor of the First Methodist Church in Auburn, N. Y., has sent a telegram regarding charges made by the gentleman against the N. Y. A. center at that place, in which he says:

Have found no untoward mingling of races at Auburn, N. Y., center speaking from personal observation.

WARREN G. ODOR,
Pastor, First Methodist Church.

And the gentleman is not acquainted with him?

Mr. TABER. I have only told what I saw with my own eyes.

Mr. TARVER. Here is a sheaf of telegrams from outraged citizens from the gentleman's home city of Auburn, N. Y. I will not have the time to read them, but they all complain of the gentleman's criticism of the Auburn N. Y. A. center and say that his criticisms were entirely without facts and basis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

There are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, who want to destroy everything that has been started by this administration, who want to destroy the H. O. L. C., the C. C. C., and everything else, including the N. Y. A., that had its birth during the years of this administration.

The gentleman from Michigan is proud of having destroyed the C. C. C. I do not think the future will show that he did a very good job as to that. I think the future will show that there has been a tremendous waste of Government property and dissipation of assets of the C. C. C. in not keeping them for use in the emergency that will undoubtedly follow this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to discuss the matter under limited debate which prevails here, but I do want to say that in my judgment this organization has shown its usefulness in this time of national emergency and that it would be a tragic thing to abolish it as is insisted should be done by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

I sincerely hope that the motion of the chairman to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin and others that this is not going to be an emotional appeal; I am going to stick to facts. The preceding speaker went out of his way to read some telegrams in his unwarranted attack on the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER. Now, if you want some facts in connection with the N. Y. A. program I will give them to you in just a few minutes. I also have some telegrams. Last year the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I spent three weeks on the Pacific coast investigating private shipyards building ships for the Navy. We made a thorough inquiry into the training program in each of those shipyards, inquired into just how much the N. Y. A. was worth. In our report, which was filed with the full Committee on Naval Affairs on February 15, you will find the following quotation:

Your committee considered the various types of training, such as the so-called public-school program and the National Youth Administration program, both of which were found to be unsatisfactory. The in-plant training of new employees, conducted by a majority of the shipyards, appears to be the most satisfactory method.

That was our reference to it in the report. After all the propaganda that has been spread around by N. Y. A. I thought it best to do a little further investigating to see what had happened in the 6 months which have elapsed since we looked into that situation on the Pacific coast. I wired the naval supervisors of shipbuilding in each of the three Pacific coast naval districts, and for your information and for the information of the gentleman from Georgia who wants facts, I received from the Seattle supervisor of shipbuilding the following wire:

National Youth Administration training program in this area understood to be on relatively small scale and has not heretofore been brought to attention this office in any way. A check of experience at principal shipyards here shows that only a few hundred new employees, principally welders, were received from this training program during the past year.

Mind you, that is the Seattle area where there are thousands and thousands of shipyard workers.

I now read another telegram from the naval supervisor of shipbuilding in the eleventh district, the Los Angeles area:

My opinion is that for new naval ship construction the National Youth Administration program has proved to be of little if any value and is not now in this area a factor in training for ship construction.

That from the supervisor of shipbuilding in the eleventh naval district.

I have one more from the San Francisco Bay area, the largest shipbuilding area on the Pacific coast, again from the naval supervisor of shipbuilding:

Re your inquiry effectiveness of National Youth Administration training program, this agency has not been of any material assistance in either preemployment or advanced shipbuilding training programs in this area. Principal cause for lack of effectiveness due to policy of agency that program must be built around production, which precluded more general utilization of their excellent equipment as was necessary in shipbuilding training programs. In comparing results of National Youth Administration limited training program and cost of same with that of State-financed preemployment training, am of opinion National Youth Administration program very much more extravagant.

That is signed by the supervisor of naval shipbuilding in the twelfth naval district.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not now. I want to say this to the gentleman, whom I know is interested in education, that in San Jose, Calif., one of the leading educators, one of the finest superintendents of education in the State of California, had this to say of N. Y. A. in that section:

Before the war, over in the technical high school we had as fine a sheet-metal lay-out as any school ever had, and an excellent mill cabinet shop, but I'll be damned if the National Youth Administration didn't come to San Jose and, under the rottenest teachers that I ever saw in my life, set up two classes in sheet metal and mill cabinet. I got hold of the actual figures for running those classes, and the costs of instruction, materials, and overhead were exactly four times our costs. In addition to that they paid the kids to go to school.

We had a meeting with the labor leaders in San Jose, and they put the heat on and put it on hard. There isn't a labor union in town that won't fight the National Youth Administration. There are practically 100 percent of the school people who will fight the National Youth Administration.

If we want a Federal school system supported entirely by Federal funds and run by the New Deal gang, just give them money enough to run this National Youth Administration program.

That letter is signed by the city superintendent of schools, who is my good personal friend and whose opinion I value highly.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not just now; I have some more facts to give the gentleman from Georgia and my colleague from California.

In addition to the wires received from the naval supervisors of shipbuilding on the Pacific coast, I wired to several of the leading shipyards on the Pacific coast, the yards that are actually engaged in the production of ships for our Navy and for the Maritime Commission. I am going to place them in the RECORD. I got exactly the same type of replies from them. I asked those shipyards what in their opinion was the value of the N. Y. A. training program as far as ship construction was concerned, and in each instance they said it was of little or no value and had proven entirely unsatisfactory.

Here are the wires. Read them yourselves and then try and prove that the N. Y. A. training program is essential to the war production effort:

Since March 1942 we have been receiving very few people from National Youth Administration. For last 6 months out of a total of 6,000 people hired, 290 came from National Youth Administration. I feel that it is probably a good thing during a depression, but not necessary at this time. Best wishes.

ASSOCIATED SHIPBUILDERS,
Seattle, Wash.

We believe National Youth Administration has largely duplicated existing public trade schools and the result has been negligible as far as shipbuilding is concerned.

PRESIDENT, SEATTLE-TACOMA
SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION,
Seattle, Wash.

The Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation is building large numbers of destroyers and auxiliary carriers for the Navy.

Regret that I am unable to give you any information on the National Youth Administration training program as a whole. I am not familiar with their activities. A survey of our employment records shows that approximately 1.3 percent of our employees have at some time attended National Youth Administration schools. This would indicate that the National Youth Administration training program has been of little value to this plant. Regards.

LAKE WASHINGTON SHIPYARDS,
Houghton, Wash.

Now we move farther south:

For your information as to value of National Youth Administration training program as far as our operations are concerned I do not know of any benefits to our program.

MOORE DRYDOCK CO.,
Oakland, Calif.

The Moore yard is one of the largest in the San Francisco Bay area and employs in the neighborhood of 40,000 men.

The National Youth Administration training program is an unknown quantity to us and has not contributed anything constructive so far as we know. It is my opinion that our present training program sponsored by city, State, and the Government agencies we are under contract to are quite sufficient and much more desirable, and anything done by the National Youth Administration would only tend to introduce undesirable elements.

VICE PRESIDENT, WESTERN PIPE & STEEL,
South San Francisco, Calif.

Now from Los Angeles:

This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of June 24 relative to our experience with the National Youth Administration training program.

The National Youth Administration has never attempted to utilize this yard for their training purposes and we can offer no comment as to whether or not it has been beneficial in other yards in this area.

LOS ANGELES SHIPBUILDING &
DRYDOCK CORPORATION.

Mr. Speaker, these are factual statements that I have received from reputable shipbuilding companies on the Pacific coast within the last week. Let us blow aside the smoke screen of nonexpendability which the N. Y. A. has drawn around itself and look at the facts.

It seems to me it boils down to this: How long are we going to keep these "gimme" boys on the pay roll down there? We will never have a better chance than we have right now to give the "gimme" boys the gate. The Senate amendment should be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have only 2 minutes because I feel very strongly about this particular problem. Most of my life work has been spent in working with young people. I have seen the N. Y. A. go through its student-training program, through the days of the emergency and, now, in my opinion, it is making a very real contribution to the war effort. I hope very sincerely that we decide this not on the basis of personal or political bias, but on the basis of sincere judgment. The question is whether or not the Congress is going to tell the American people that it places the men and women of this country at least on a par with the spending of money. I think that is one of the basic issues involved.

I am sorry that my colleague from California did not yield because I had a couple of figures I would like to have given him. I am wondering if he is aware of the fact that the Hunter's Point Shipbuilding Co., at San Francisco, Calif., has asked the National Youth Administration for 200 of its trained employes every month during the coming year? I am wondering if he is aware of the fact that at the present time the Kaiser shipyards at Richmond, Calif., is employing 1,600 trained welders taken from the ranks of the National Youth Administration?

I realize that there is considerable controversy over the National Youth Administration on the part of educational leaders. Their opinion is far from being unanimous. I have here a letter signed by 15 of the leading educators of America stating that the N. Y. A. has operated its out-of-school program principally in rural areas where vocational-school-training facilities are not generally available. At present 1,000 young people are made available daily for the Victory program. This letter states further that no matter whether one believes in the N. Y. A. or its structure, the need for trained people will be so great next year that any agency which trains for war production or aids students to continue essential education must not be abandoned at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time allotted me, may I call attention especially to one phase of this N. Y. A. program. Time does not permit me to discuss in detail the activities of that organization. Let me say at the outset that those of you who are so determined to eliminate the N. Y. A. and who are using that word "economy" as the excuse for so doing will have a real opportunity to vote for economy in a few minutes when I bring in a conference report on the annual Interior Department appropriation bill. We had nearly 6 weeks' hearings on that bill and your House committee brought that measure to this House reduced 60 percent below what it took to operate this same Department during the current year. This is not the time to discuss what happened to the Interior bill at the other end of the Capitol. Suffice to say that my committee is battling to slash and save every dollar humanly possible. My record of over 16 years for rigid economy in government speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to direct my remarks to the shops program of the National Youth Administration. I take the position that if the N. Y. A. is not vitally essential to the war effort, then let us kick it all out. That yardstick should apply not only to the N. Y. A. but to all other agencies and set-ups. But on the other hand, if N. Y. A. is actually training thousands of young men and women to do vital jobs in connection with the war effort, it would be utterly absurd to abolish it now when industries are crying for trained workers in so many fields of endeavor.

Then I submit in all candor that it is fair to say that the National Youth Administration should be continued for one reason and one reason only, because of the service which this agency is rendering and is in a position to further render in the war. I have here some official figures. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] in his blast at the N. Y. A. a few moments ago said: "Let us stick to the facts." Here are some facts worth considering: Last year the N. Y. A. trained over 400,000 young men and women in skilled war-production work. Each 7 to 8 weeks during the year it turned out 16,000 welders, 24,000 machine operators, 11,000 aircraft and other sheet-metal workers, 6,500 radio assembly workers, and so forth. It has, in fact, been turning out these persons at the rate of more than 1,000 a day during the past year, and, at the present moment, even with the limitations under which it works, this number is increasing each week.

It was able, by virtue of having to do this, to put together a training structure made up of 1,500 shops, located in 510 different communities, of 40,000 work stations with 4,300 experienced supervisors—and a capacity to train 500,000 to 600,000 war-production workers within the next year. Since it has been suggested Members stick to the facts, let me say these are hard, cold facts that cannot be successfully controverted. Yet, this is the program we are called upon today to dismantle and destroy. It just does not make sense.

As Members well know, this Congress has just approved a plane construction program never before dreamed of in this or any other country. Regardless of what we may do, we will fall far short of the need for trained, skilled workers. So it is no answer to say that other agencies can train all of the needed workers. The N. Y. A. is, of course, not supposed to make critical materials for the war effort in mass production. It is strictly a training program, yet its 1,500 well-equipped shops are being called upon in many instances to make critical materials for many of the shipyards of the country. In the outside lobby of the House is a display of several specimens made in N. Y. A. shops throughout the entire country. I have several small gadgets, cogs, tools, and other materials turned out by these shops for the war effort. I hold in my hand a small piece of steel scrap. It was sent to the N. Y. A. with the urgent request that 10-millimeter bullets be made therefrom in considerable quantities. Here is the finished bullet made by N. Y. A. It might be a shock to some of you critics to learn how many such critically important war materials are now being turned out by the N. Y. A. boys and girls.

I am very proud of those shops and what they are actually doing. I recently

visited one of the best N. Y. A. shops in my State and was really amazed at the excellent training it is giving. For example, it is teaching a lot of young girls and women to become welders. It is of course easy to scoff and jest, but I say to you in all seriousness that the determination of some to stop this valuable training program, merely because it is a part of the New Deal which some seem so bent on destroying, is no jesting matter. A visit to one of those modern, well-equipped N. Y. A. shops would open your eyes. For instance, I hold here a small delicate cog made by the N. Y. A., the material of which cost about 6 cents, so I am told. It cannot be bought on the open market.

It is very vitally important to the war effort and the trained force of N. Y. A. is prepared to turn them out in large numbers on short notice. Certainly this part of the N. Y. A. can amply justify its existence. Then again, I hold here what is called a cross head. The Brooklyn Navy Yard needs them now, and N. Y. A. is supplying them promptly. If the N. Y. A. does not make these critical parts and is not permitted to train young men and women to make them then a tremendous job is going to fall elsewhere.

I do not pretend to say that the N. Y. A. has not made mistakes, but as the gentleman from Georgia said awhile ago, it has eliminated in a large measure those things for which it was justly criticized, and is now rendering a real worth-while service to the all-important program of winning the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I was in very serious doubt as to how I was going to vote on this matter until I reviewed the facts as to the operations of the N. Y. A. in my own home city of Boston. Let me give you these figures:

In the N. Y. A. centers there are 43 work stations for machines with 129 possible enrollments and 20 enrollees. In the vocational schools there are 480 work stations, with 1,440 possible enrollments and 598 pupils.

In the N. Y. A. centers there are 34 work stations for welding, with 102 possible enrollments and only 30 students, on the average. In the vocational-school system there are 116 work stations, with 348 possible enrollments and 94 students actually at work.

You can go through the entire list, covering every industrial city in the State of Massachusetts, and you will get exactly the same type of showing.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago this House voted seventy-one and one-half billion dollars for our Army. A tremendous sum of money that staggers the imagination. But there was scarcely a dissenting vote in the entire body to the appropriation of this gigantic amount. Why should there be? Is there a single Member of this House who would not lend his most vigorous support to any measure serving to strengthen our boys out there on the battle fronts? Whether it be with MacArthur, in Guadalcanal or Eisenhower in north Africa or Stilwell in China, our boys out there are offering their lives that democracy may live. Our job, here, back home, is to give them every support, every encouragement, every material assistance that they need. And we will do just that. If need be they can have more and more until the would-be world dictators are smashed.

But the support that our fighting men need involves more than money. Perhaps most important of all, they need bullets, guns, planes, ships, tanks, jeeps, and thousands of other items of fighting equipment. We have appropriated the money to buy them. That is not enough. We have got to see to it that they are made and delivered and that the trained manpower is available to produce them. And no single item is more important in making fighting equipment than skilled workmen. It does not require just men and women. It requires men and women whose hands are trained to operate turret lathes, drill presses, shapers, planers, and dozens of other complicated pieces of machinery.

There is now pending before this House legislation continuing an agency which has for the past several years been backing up our fighting men. Young men, too young to serve in the armed forces; young men unable to serve because of physical disabilities; young girls; sisters and wives of men in the fighting services; all have been trained by this agency to back up our soldiers and sailors. Their unskilled hands have been trained to operate the lathes and shapers, the welding equipment, the micrometers and tools out of which are forged guns and planes and ships.

It is now our responsibility to pass on the bill calling for the continuation of the National Youth Administration. We have voted the $71,500,000,000 to equip our fighting men. Will we now view favorably an appropriation to maintain the N. Y. A. program of providing the skilled hands without which our $71,500,000,000 appropriation for equipment might become so much paper? The request of the N. Y. A. is for a sum of money which is six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount recently appropriated to the Army. The smallness of the sum alone does not warrant its passage. It is rather the fact that through such a comparatively small amount of money over a quarter of a million new trained war workers will be added during this fiscal year to our war-production lines that justifies our favorable consideration.

I have had the pleasure of visiting those N. Y. A. training units located in the district which I have the honor to represent. I have seen the shops operating 24 hours per day in their production of new war workers. I have seen young boys and girls walk into the shops of Lawrence and Lynn, timid, ill at ease, afraid of the machines, lacking the most elementary knowledge of shop work. I have seen them labor 8 hours per day over their lathes and millers and planers under the careful supervision of their veteran supervisors. I have seen after the first month the development of confidence, the appearance of the shop-wise attitude, the pride in workmanship, and the general growth of self-reliance. I have seen at the end of the second month the new worker, trained and straining at the leash to get out into a war job. I have seen them leave for jobs in war plants. And I have seen the letters which the war plants have poured into my office commending the efficiency and thoroughness of the N. Y. A. training in these shops.

I have seen all of these things, and I can think of no greater material assistance to our fighting boys at the front than the work of the N. Y. A. in providing the skilled hands which make the guns that drove the Germans out of north Africa and the Japs out of the Aleutians. They are even now, while receiving this training, turning out essential submarine parts in all of these shops for the United States Navy. I know boys and girls from my district who are now working in the Remington Arms plant in Lowell, at General Electric in Lynn, at the Portsmouth Navy Yard, N. H., and at the Boston Navy Yard. At the Remington plant in Lowell, they are turning out guns and ammunition; at the General Electric plant in Lynn they are turning out every conceivable type of war equipment; and at the navy yards they are working on airplane carriers, destroyers, and battleships. They are backing up the boys at the front because the N. Y. A. took them in hand and gave to them the skills and training necessary to make the fighting equipment. In Lawrence, since the start of the fiscal year, more than 600 young boys and girls have passed through the N. Y. A. training unit to enter the war factories and in Lynn the figure exceeds 500.

This is backing up our fighting men. This is giving them the support that they need. This is giving them the stuff with which to give us another Midway victory, another Tunisian conquest, and another series of raids on Berlin and Tokyo. Other steps are necessary to back up our loved ones who are doing the fighting for us. But let us take them one by one. We have appropriated a tremendous sum of money that the Army may purchase every bit of fighting equipment needed. Is it not in order to appropriate this comparatively minor sum that the hands required to make this fighting equipment may be trained?

It is my intent to vote for the N. Y. A. appropriation. I shall vote for it with the same purpose and determination with which I voted for the $71,500,000,000 Army appropriation. Because I know each is dependent upon the other. Because I know that without the skilled workers to make the goods, the Army will not be able to spend its money for the purpose intended. And, it is my sincere conviction that this House, voting on the N. Y. A. bill with the same patriotism, impartiality, and nonpartisanship with which it voted for the Army bill, will give

to the N. Y. A. the same overwhelming support that we have and shall continue to give to any and all measures designed to strengthen our fighting men.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the salvation of our Government and the perpetuity of our institutions now unfortunately depend upon our production program. In my opinion the National Youth Administration has made a great contribution to that program. Many efforts have been made to minimize the contribution which National Youth Administration has made to the prosecution of the war effort. The training of more than a half million boys and girls in mechanical skills, which have been of inestimable value to industry in its effort to meet the enormous production schedules which have been set and which of necessity must be met, is a contribution which is well worth while. Certainly those in charge of the program have made mistakes. Certainly the program has not been in all respects a complete success, and the officers of the agency have not done all things well, but there never was a time in the history of America when there was a greater need for skilled workmen, and this peacetime agency quickly embarked upon a wartime program, and thousands of young men and women have been trained to do vital war work. Our manpower shortage will no doubt become more acute if this war continues. There is still a great shortage of skilled workmen, and there is still a crying need for more training. The great crisis is upon us and if we interfere with or cripple this agency of the Government, we do so at our peril.

I am advised that in my own State of North Carolina there are approximately 1,800 boys and girls in training in National Youth Administration centers. They are taught how to run lathes, read blueprints, and many other arts and skills which are badly needed in the successful prosecution of the great and cruel conflict in which we are now engaged. They are learning to be welders, and many girls are now engaged in welding, and each girl is taking the place of an able-bodied workman. They are being trained in the intricacies of radio and many other war-related industries. I am advised that 4,831 trained youths, going from National Youth Administration, have been added to industry's rolls by North Carolina alone.

The Asheville project provided 576 of these youths; the Charlotte master project, 899; the Durham master project, 1,014, and the Greenville master project, 2,342.

In addition to the foregoing youths who entered industry each of these centers provided youths trained in mechanical skills who went into the armed forces. In the 8-month period these skilled and trained workers numbered 353. I understand that out of every 100 men inducted into the armed services, 63 are assigned to duties requiring specialized training. These 63 specialists cannot be obtained through induction centers, but the Army still needs and must have them.

The National Youth Administration program should be continued and the facilities now available should be used, and this agency should not be liquidated. In the period immediately following the end of this war, in that period when we will be rebuilding the world, skilled and trained workers will be needed in countless numbers, and for that period we must now prepare.

I hope that this House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment and thereby continue the worth-while activities of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, while there is some difference of opinion in regard to the N. Y. A. in my district, this agency, in my opinion, has amply justified its existence and has been of great assistance to many young men and women in being trained for work that has been beneficial in our war effort. Many of the schools and colleges in Louisiana were able to provide means for young men and women to continue their education, which they would not have otherwise been able to do, and especially in one of the important towns of my district, Rayne, La., there has been established a magnificent center whose facilities have served a large and important section providing training for hundreds of boys and girls who are now engaged in war work. I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams requesting the continuance of the N. Y. A. from my constituents as well as from others throughout my State, and was particularly impressed by the endorsement of Mr. Andrew Higgins, of the Higgins Shipbuilding Corporation, of New Orleans, who strongly advocated the continuance of the N. Y. A., saying that he had hundreds of people in his organization trained by the N. Y. A. who were able to give splendid work in his important shipbuilding and landing-boat plants, and that he recommended an opportunity for boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 18 to be provided with facilities for training for war work and in war industries.

I believe that this House should concur in the conference report allocating funds for the continuance of the N. Y. A. program, and I ask your support for the same.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] describe this as perhaps an endeavor by certain ones of us to oppose all administration policies. Let me refer to Senate Document 54. Who do we find signing this document? Would the gentleman from Georgia say that WALTER F. GEORGE is not a good Democrat, that CARTER GLASS is not a good Democrat, that KENNETH MCKELLAR is not a good Democrat, and that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is not a good Democrat? Do you make any such claim about Senator BYRD?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I will not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is misrepresenting the position of the Senator from Georgia [Senator GEORGE], who is supporting this legislation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Most of these gentlemen signed the document dated May 24, in which they advocated eliminating the National Youth Administration as a non-essential expenditure of the taxpayers' money at this time. Consequently, it is far-fetched to claim that this is an endeavor by certain ones of us because of political reasons to throw this unnecessary bureau out of the window of our governmental structure.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, in the words of a country editor back in my district, now is the time to lop off a dead branch of the New Deal tree, and at the same time save $43,000,000 for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some letters I have received on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today a new method of tax collection is imposed on the people of America: Twenty percent of their wages and salaries is to be deducted at the source in order to make a partial payment on the terrific cost of carrying on this war. Even so, the expected income to the Federal Government this year will be no more than one-third of the anticipated expenditures. Higher taxes next year will be inevitable. For this reason, it becomes doubly imperative that we make every effort to cut Federal expenditures in every way possible so long as that restriction will not interfere with the efficient conduct of the war, and of our Government here at home.

The N. Y. A. was undoubtedly set up to serve some real need, but the justification for its continuance has long since passed. In my opinion, this is one of the agencies we can just as well dispense with at this time and it ought to be promptly liquidated.

In the first place, the training program of the N. Y. A. is duplicated many times by other agencies of the Federal Government. The Byrd committee reported that the purpose of the N. Y. A. was duplicated and overlapped at least six times by the training programs in other Government bureaus. This in addition to the fact that American taxpayers are already paying large sums to

private industry for a training program within our war plants. In the second place, the administrative overhead of this agency is all out of proportion to the results accomplished and cannot be justified by any comparison at this time.

In my home city of South Bend, Ind., we have a large N. Y. A. resident training center. It is composed of some 10 or more separate buildings and occupies many acres. During my last trip home I learned that there are now some 125 trainees enrolled at that center, of whom 22 are boys and 103 are girls. These trainees are drawn from the northern half of Indiana and from the State of Illinois as well. In fact, it has been necessary to send solicitors out into the country to encourage youth to attend the center in order to keep the enrollment at anything approaching capacity.

Although the resident center at South Bend serves as the headquarters for Fort Wayne and Gary, Ind., it is shocking to note the tremendous administrative expense at this South Bend center. Administrators, including the project manager, personnel officers, typists, and so forth, call for $14,460 a year. Supervisory employees, including cooks, recreational directors, maintenance men, custodians, night watchmen, and so forth, call for another $20,820. Personnel assigned to the maintenance and operation of the shops, including foremen, have a pay roll of $13,700, making a total of $48,980 a year in salaries over and above the amounts paid to the trainees during the course of their instruction. This South Bend resident center was erected and equipped in 1941, at a cost which the N. Y. A. reports to me as $219,000.

I inquired about the N. Y. A. of a representative of the largest high school in South Bend. This public school has a vocational department doing very much the same type of training as the N. Y. A. center, located only 4 miles away. Let me read to you from the letter which has come to me from that representative of South Bend Central Junior-Senior High School:

> The school city of South Bend, of course, operates a war production training program of its own. * * * This program has at all times been more extensive and more varied than the National Youth Administration program. * * * We have adequate equipment and ample training stations to run a much larger program than the demand calls for at the present time. The school city of South Bend has courses that parallel all the courses being offered at the National Youth Administration center and in all cases the school city is better equipped for doing the job.
>
> It is becoming more of a problem to recruit young people for the center. One reason for this difficulty lies in the fact that industry is now hiring people, at 65 and 75 cents an hour, and then sending them to training. In most such cases these people do not need the residence feature that the National Youth Administration center offers and usually enter the training offered by the school city of South Bend. In my judgment it will be increasingly more difficult to obtain enrollments in large enough numbers to make it practical to keep the National Youth Administration open.

The judgment of the writer of that letter has been proven correct. It is increasingly difficult to obtain enrollees to make it practical or even justifiable to attempt to continue the operation of this N. Y. A. resident center. As this gentleman further writes in his letter:

> Although many National Youth Administration centers have received some criticism, we believe that the South Bend National Youth Administration Residence Center has been operated most efficiently and will probably have students for another 6 months. After that time, if the war continues, it will probably be a struggle to round up enough trainees to operate the center.

A representative of the Marshall County Public Schools in Plymouth, Ind., writes as follows:

> There was a time when the National Youth Administration served a very laudable purpose and if its activities were limited to the original program. I would find no objection to it. I understand, however, that this proposed appropriation eliminates the provision for the cooperation with the public schools of the country as well as removing the age limits. It may be possible that there would be no misuse of this power on the part of the National Youth Administration, but it carries with it the possibility of the setting up of a dual system of education without any consideration to local needs or local control.
>
> I believe the Federal Government can, and should, assist financially in the support of public education in those sections that are unable to offer educational opportunities of a type needed to develop good American citizens, but I am unalterably opposed to Federal control. We have too much of it now in connection with vocational education. I am a member of the Indiana State board of education and am in a position to know something of the red tape involved in securing funds for vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, and trades and industry.
>
> It is a dangerous practice in a democracy when there is too much Federal dictation and Federal control over public schools. I trust that Congress will either eliminate entirely the appropriation for the National Youth Administration or transfer its training facilities to the public schools.
>
> Any consideration you give to this matter I am sure will be greatly appreciated by the school people of Indiana.

A representative of the Michigan City public schools writes as follows:

> Since the National Youth Administration is only a name instead of a fact anymore, with the changes that have been made on age limits, this will mean that all this money will be spent on the National Youth Administration as an educational or training agency which duplicates and parallels the work being done in public high schools over the United States. The program of national defense training which has been carried by the high schools is sufficient evidence in itself, I believe, both as to the magnitude and the efficiency of the job that they are able to tackle and carry through successfully. This appropriation which is being requested for continuance of the so-called National Youth Administration merely means in the final analysis that it will be used very largely to provide a large number of jobs and salaries to carry out a work which can be done at much less cost and just as efficiently with facilities already established and working. A consequence of this will be not only that money will be siphoned from the regular education program into these channels but it will mean the establishment of a federalized system of public education with no State or local control. We have already seen enough evidence in other areas of the danger in such an organization.
>
> I trust that you will lend your efforts to defeating the appropriation now being requested for the National Youth Administration for the next fiscal year.

A representative of the school, city of Elkhart, Ind., writes as follows:

> The appropriation of these funds is wasteful and can serve no purpose except to establish a federally dominated youth program which will duplicate the efforts of the public schools and tend to divert funds from them, which can only lead to the weakening of our national system of education. * * * This community, and I believe most public communities, are able to more effectively train youth in the locally established public-school systems for war or peacetime projects.
>
> Your opposition to the above appropriation and your support for more Federal funds for local public schools will result in strengthening one of the finest systems of education in the world which is making a very honest effort to faithfully train boys and girls of America in our democratic way of life.

I inquired of the personnel management of the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, operated by the War Department in my district, and employing upwards of some 15,000 trained workers, both men and women. I asked what, if any, experience the plant had had with employment of N. Y. A. trainees. They wrote me as follows:

> A reply to your letter of March 17, has been delayed, because our records were not marked for easy identification of employees who might have had training by the National Youth Administration.
>
> We contacted the National Youth Administration office in South Bend, and on Saturday last, a representative called and presented a long list of names, and picked out the names of certain individuals who had been employed here in the past or were employed at the present time. The total number that the National Youth Administration identified was 12. Of the 12, 6 are still employed. Since the National Youth Administration has never given, and I do not see how they could give a course in shell loading, none of the individuals had any training which was directly applicable to the job they held here. Upon further check, our records indicate that the training received by 3 or 4 persons consisted of a short course in sewing machine operation.

Note that the total number of these many thousands of workers, identified as having been trained by the N. Y. A. center, adds up to the grand sum of 12, of whom 6 were still employed in that ordnance plant.

The plant manager of a large war industry in the District writes me as follows:

> The city vocational schools have given us more assistance than any of the Federal projects. Vocational schools will train for us individuals or groups for specified occupations provided, of course, that these schools have the proper equipment.
>
> We have obtained quite a number of trained workers from the vocational schools, but so far as the National Youth Administration is concerned, we have not received any assistance from them. * * *
>
> Looking over the entire training program, which includes National Youth Administra-

tion and several others, it looks to us as though a lot of money is being spent foolishly, and we are glad that you are interested in this subject, especially since appropriations are being requested to continue these projects.

We feel, Bob, that industry can train its own help much better than any outside agency. We have been doing this within our own plant and have met with much success.

In closing, I am firmly of the opinion that the facilities of our public schools are ample to train our youth for war industry, and they are doing this job much more efficiently and much more in keeping with the principles and the ideals of our American way of life.

I hope that the proposal to provide $47,800,000 for the continuance of this depression-born agency will be defeated and that we will provide for its speedy liquidation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 120, noes 144.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 197, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—176

Abernethy	Folger	McGranery
Allen, La.	Forand	McMillan
Anderson, N. Mex.	Fulbright	McMurray
	Gavagan	Madden
Bates, Ky.	Gibson	Magnuson
Beckworth	Gordon	Maloney
Bennett, Mo.	Gorski	Manasco
Bloom	Granger	Mansfield, Mont.
Boren	Grant, Ala.	
Boykin	Gregory	Marcantonio
Bradley, Pa.	Hagen	May
Brooks	Hale	Mills
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Morrison, La.
Bryson	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Bulwinkle	Harris, Ark.	Murphy
Burchill, N. Y.	Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.
Burdick	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Burgin	Hays	Myers
Camp	Heffernan	Norrell
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Norton
Cannon, Mo.	Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.
Celler	Hoeven	O'Brien, Mich.
Chapman	Hull	O'Konski
Clark	Jackson	O'Toole
Coffee	Jarman	Outland
Colmer	Johnson, Calvin D.	Pace
Cooley		Patman
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Patton
Courtney		Peterson, Fla.
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Ga.
Creal	Judd	Poage
Crosser	Kee	Price
Cullen	Keefe	Priest
Cunningham	Kefauver	Rabaut
Curley	Kelley	Ramspeck
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Randolph
Davis	Kerr	Rankin
Dawson	Kirwan	Richards
Delaney	Kleberg	Rivers
Dickstein	Klein	Robinson, Utah
Dilweg	Lane	Rogers, Calif.
Dingell	Larcade	Rogers, Mass.
Douglas	Lea	Rohrbough
Durham	Lemke	Rowan
Eberharter	Luce	Sabath
Feighan	Ludlow	Sadowski
Fellows	Lynch	Sauthoff
Fernandez	McCord	Scanlon
Flannagan	McCormack	Schiffler
Fogarty	McGehee	Schuetz
Scott	Stewart	Wene
Sikes	Talle	Whelchel, Ga.
Simpson, Ill.	Tarver	White
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Tex.	Whitten
Smith, W. Va.	Vincent, Ky.	Wickersham
Snyder	Walter	Winstead
Somers, N. Y.	Wasielewski	Wolverton, N. J.
Sparkman	Weaver	Worley
Spence	Weiss	Wright
Steagall	Welch	Zimmerman

NAYS—197

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Miller, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Monkiewicz
	Gilchrist	Monroney
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Mott
Andrews	Gillie	Mruk
Angell	Goodwin	Mundt
Arends	Gossett	Newsome
Arnold	Graham	Norman
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Griffiths	O'Neal
Barrett	Gross	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne	Pittenger
Beall	Halleck	Ploeser
Bell	Hancock	Poulson
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Powers
Bishop	Heidinger	Ramey
Blackney	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hobbs	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robertson
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Rockwell
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Wash.	Rodgers, Pa.
Busbey	Hope	Rowe
Butler	Horan	Sasscer
Canfield	Howell	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Jeffrey	Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Short
Carter	Jennings	Simpson, Pa.
Case	Jensen	Slaughter
Chenoweth	Johnson, Anton J.	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield		Smith, Va.
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Clason	Johnson, J. Leroy	Springer
Clevenger		Stanley
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Luther A.	Starnes, Ala.
Cole, N. Y.		Stearns, N. H.
Compton	Jones	Stefan
Costello	Jonkman	Stevenson
Cravens	Kean	Stockman
Crawford	Kearney	Sullivan
Curtis	Kilday	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Kinzer	Sumners, Tex.
Dewey	Knutson	Sundstrom
Dies	Kunkel	Taber
Dirksen	LaFollette	Talbot
Disney	Lambertson	Taylor
Ditter	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Lanham	Thomason
Dondero	LeCompte	Tibbott
Doughton	LeFevre	Towe
Dworshak	Lewis	Troutman
Eaton	McCowen	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	McGregor	Vursell
Ellis	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Ellison, Md.	McLean	Ward
Ellsworth	McWilliams	Weichel, Ohio
Elmer	Maas	West
Elston, Ohio	Mahon	Wheat
Engel	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Mason	Wilson
Gale	Merrow	Winter
Gamble	Michener	Wolcott
Gathings	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Woodrum, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fish

NOT VOTING—57

Andresen, August H.	Gallagher	Merritt
	Gifford	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Green	Nichols
Barry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Connor
Bender		O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Leary
Buckley		Pfeifer
Byrne	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Capozzoli	Hébert	Plumley
Cochran	Holifield	Pracht
Culkin	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Drewry	Johnson, Ward	Rolph
Fay	Kennedy	Russell
Fitzpatrick	Kilburn	Shafer
Ford	King	Sheppard
Fulmer	Lesinski	Sheridan
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Treadway	Vinson, Ga.	Willey
Van Zandt	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr Merritt for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan, against.

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARNESS. If he had been present, he would have voted no. I withdraw my vote, and vote "present."

Mr. DIES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 30.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the several votes on the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ask for a further conference upon the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to ask for a further conference.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by the dean of the Capital press on this fighting Congress. The Public Printer informs me that the extra cost will be $252, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks made on the bill today certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the north Pacific region. The article is over the usual amount, and the Public Printer informs me that it will cost an additional $171. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a verse from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New York, Hon. SOL BLOOM, on the National Radio Forum, conducted by the Washington Evening Star, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix immediately following the extension just granted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, over the National Radio Forum conducted by the Washington Evening Star, over WMAL, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Hon. Joseph E. Davies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered over C. B. S. Tuesday evening, June 29, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1109. An act to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, disagreed to by the House; asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, 11, 19, 27, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 80, 81, 89, 90, 92, 93, 136, 137, 145, 146, 152, 179, 182, 188, 195, and 196.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 59, 60, 82, 151, 178, and 199; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,052,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$811,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$866,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$700,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$530,000, and in addition thereto, the unexpended balances for this purpose contained in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, are continued available during the fiscal year 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$217,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$786,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$29,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$697,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,835"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$36,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$182,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,238,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,657,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 17 of said amendment, strike out "$600" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Oklahoma, including pay of the superintendent of the agency and of necessary employees, and pay of tribal officers; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and repair and operation of automobiles, $170,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided*, That of the said sum herein appropriated $7,500 is hereby made available for traveling and other expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, when engaged on business of the tribe, including supplies and equipment, not to exceed $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the collection of any income due the Osage Tribe of Indians or the enrolled members thereof where such income is not deposited to the credit of the said Osage tribal funds account or to the credit of the proper member's account."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$67,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$93,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$63,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$177,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,187,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$492,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$43,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$87,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,925"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$310,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,143,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$64,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$680,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$61,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$722,880"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$63,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$533,380"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$629,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$322,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,860,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$317,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$84,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$337,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 176: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$186,110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$155,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$293,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$464,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$740,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 15, 85, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 142, 149, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 169, 172, 173, 174, 184, 190, 192, 194, 200, and 201.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to amendments Nos. 1, 102, 106, and 116),
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. 1: Appropriates $1,052,015 for salaries, office of the Secretary, instead of $1,028,560, as proposed by the House, and $1,072,270, as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $23,455 above the House figure will provide $3,200 for an administrative assistant for the Assistant Secretary, $15,000 for the Division of Information, and $5,255 for the Division of Power.

No. 2: Appropriates $108,620, as proposed by the House, instead of $139,470, as proposed by the Senate, for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, relating to the Grazing Service: Appropriates $866,700 for salaries and expenses instead of $856,700, as proposed by the House and $882,700, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $10,000 over the House figure being provided for fire-suppression work; provides $75,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $78,000, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and maintenance of range improvements; and appropriates $9,000 for leasing of grazing lands, instead of $8,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 7: Appropriates $530,000 and unexpended balances of prior appropriations for fire protection of forests (national defense), instead of $700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11, relating to contingent expenses: Provides for a reduction of $5,000 in the stationery supplies allowance for the National Park Service, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $500 for the purchase of books, instead of $400, as proposed by the House, and $600, as proposed by the Senate; and allows an additional allocation of $4,500 for the purchase of books from funds available to the Bureau of Mines, as proposed by the House, instead of $6,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 12, 13, and 14, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates $217,500, instead of $167,500, as proposed by the House, and $237,500, as proposed by the Senate, of which $85,000 is specifically provided for the Bureau of Mines and $25,000 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

No. 16: Appropriates $875,000, instead of $850,000, as proposed by the House, and $895,000, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

No. 17: Appropriates $786,300 for salaries, instead of $778,300, as proposed by the House, and $790,300, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18: Appropriates $450,000 for surveying public lands, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 19: Appropriates $345,000 for salaries and expenses, branch field examination, as proposed by the House, instead of $350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 20: Appropriates $29,500 for fire suppression in Alaska, instead of $29,000, as proposed by the House, and $30,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 21: Appropriates $285,000 for certain Oregon and California timber lands, instead of $270,000, as proposed by the House, and $290,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 22: Appropriates $697,800 for departmental personal services, instead of $692,860, as proposed by the House, and $704,620, as proposed by the Senate, the increase in the House figure being provided for a so-called "liaison group" stationed in the District of Columbia.

No. 23: Appropriates $50,000 for travel and other expenses, instead of $49,000, as proposed by the House, and $51,320, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, relating to industrial assistance: Appropriates $412,500 for preservation of timber, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $425,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $140,000 for expenses incidental to the sale of timber, instead of $135,000, as proposed by the House, and $145,000, as proposed by the Senate; $85,000 for inspection of mines on Indian lands, instead of $80,000, as proposed by the House and $90,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $600,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $660,000, as proposed by the Senate, for agriculture and stock raising; and strikes out the provision of the House placing a limitation on departmental personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Appropriates $95,000 for the development of water supply, instead of $90,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, relating to the operation, maintenance, and repair of Indian irrigation systems: Appropriates $237,750 for the operation and maintenance of numerous small irrigation projects, instead of $220,000, as proposed by the House, and $255,500, as proposed by the Senate; provides $40,415 for "miscellaneous projects", instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $55,830, as proposed by the Senate; and further provides $68,835 for general administration of Indian irrigation projects, instead of $66,500, as proposed by the House, and $71,170, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriations for the operation and maintenance of additional irrigation projects specifically appropriated for, are provided as follows:

Project	*Amount*
San Carlos, Ariz	$345,000
Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz	27,495
Yuma Reservation, Calif	11,500
Fort Hall, Idaho	47,925
Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont	15,500
Fort Peck, Mont	12,535
Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont	24,925
Flathead Reservation, Mont	235,000
Crow Reservation, Mont	46,500
Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes, Colorado	56,000
Wapato system, Yakima Reservation, Wash	183,490
Wind River Reservation, Wyo	48,000

No. 61: Appropriates $70,000 for protection of project works (national defense) instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $2,302,000 for the construction and repair and enlargement of the several Indian irrigation systems enumerated in said amendments.

Nos. 74 and 75, relating to Indian education: Appropriates $5,864,665, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,894,205, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House providing that $22,190 shall be payable from tribal funds for the tuition of Chippewa Indian children.

No. 76: Appropriates $1,238,800 for education of natives in Alaska, instead of $1,233,800, as proposed by the House, and $1,245,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $5,000 in the House figure representing additional funds for relief purposes.

No. 77: Appropriates $5,657,300 for conservation of health among Indians, instead of $5,642,300, as proposed by the House, and $5,666,300, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 78: Appropriates $575,000 for medical relief in Alaska, instead of $570,680, as proposed by the House, and $580,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 79: Appropriates $2,785,000 for general support and administration of Indian property, instead of $2,785,200, as proposed by the House, and $2,780,400, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $4,600 in the sum proposed by the Senate being provided to pay the salary of the tribal attorney for the Osage Indians.

No. 80: Appropriates $700,000 for relief of Indians, as proposed by the House, instead of $825,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 81: Appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $90,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the reindeer service in Alaska.

No. 82: Appropriates not to exceed $2,000 from tribal funds for expenses incidental to the sale of timber on the Choctaw-Chickasaw Sanatorium Reserve, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 83: Provides for expenses of tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, with the exception that the salary of the chief, Creek Nation, is fixed at $1,200, as proposed by the House, instead of $600, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 84: Appropriates $170,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $185,000, as proposed by the House for support of the Osage Agency, Oklahoma. The language proposed by the Senate has been approved with the following amendments: The language specifically providing for the tribal attorney and his stenographer has been eliminated. Funds for the salary of the tribal attorney have been added to the gratuity item for support and administration and reference to the stenographer is unnecessary as authority for the employment of necessary personnel is contained in the paragraph as approved by the conferees. Funds for the salary of the superintendent are provided for under this tribal fund appropriation.

No. 86: Appropriates $950,000 for roads, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,200,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, and 95, relating to the operation and maintenance of reclamation projects: Appropriates, in lieu of the sums propcsed by the House, and the Senate, the following amounts for the projects set forth below:

Project	*Amount*
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif	$67,500
Boise, Idaho	93,600
Minidoka, Idaho	16,500
Rio Grande, New Mex.-Tex	90,000
Owyhee, Oregon	180,000
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif	130,000
Yakima, Wash	248,000
Riverton, Wyo	63,000
Shoshone, Wyo	16,200

No. 102: Appropriates $350,000 for investigations, reclamation fund, instead of $275,000, as proposed by the House, and $700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 106: Appropriates $200,000 for investigations of the Colorado River Basin, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 116: Appropriates $350,000 for investigations from the general fund, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House, and $800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No. 122: Provides $52,500 for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles, instead of $35,000, as proposed by the House, and $70,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 123: Appropriates $177,570 for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of $173,000 as proposed by the House, and $182,140, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 124 and 125, relating to geological surveys: Appropriates $1,187,500, instead of $880,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,380,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provides $492,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 126 and 127, relating to mineral resources of Alaska: Appropriates $150,000, instead of $74,000, as proposed by the House, and $198,365, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $43,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 128 and 129, relating to the classification of lands: Appropriates $225,000, instead of $95,000, as proposed by the House, and $275,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $55,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 130, 131 and 132, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates a total of $310,425 for this purpose, instead of $295,000, as proposed by the House, and $325,855, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 133 and 134, relating to mineral leasing: Appropriates $475,000, instead of $339,600, as proposed by the House, and $550,325, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 135: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 136 and 137: Appropriates $67,765 for salaries and expenses, instead of $68,765, as proposed by the Senate; of which $56,000 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $57,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 138 and 139, relating to operating mine rescue cars and stations: Appropriates $680,700, instead of $673,200, as proposed by the House, and $688,200, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $64,600 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 140 and 141, relating to coal-mine inspections and investigations: Appropriates $722,880, instead of $718,380, as proposed by the House, and $727,380, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $61,950 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 143 and 144, relating to testing fuel: Appropriates $375,000, instead of $340,000, as proposed by the House, and $380,455, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $63,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 145 and 146, relating to mineral mining investigations: Appropriates $440,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $443,245, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $30,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 147 and 148, relating to oil and gas investigations: Appropriates $533,380, instead of $328,380, as proposed by the House, and $538,380, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $42,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 150 and 151, relating to mining experiment stations: Appropriates $629,500, instead of $550,000, as proposed by the House, and $704,500, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $22,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 152: Appropriates $110,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $114,500, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Nos. 153 and 154, relating to economics of mineral industries: Appropriates $475,650, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the House, and $501,300, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $322,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 164: Appropriates $490,000 for production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, etc. instead of $430,000, as proposed by the House, and $495,875, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 165, 166, 167, and 168, relating to investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits: Appropriates $1,860,000 for investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits, instead of $478,500, as proposed by the House, and $1,960,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that $52,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; and that $317,000 shall be available to the Geological Survey, of which $19,800 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 170 and 171, relating to investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals: Appropriates $3,900,000, instead of $2,475,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,010,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that $84,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia. The conferees recommend that not to exceed $40,000 of the sum provided for this purpose be used for exploratory and other work in connection with the Coaldale coal deposits of Esmeralda County, Nev.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

No. 175: Appropriates $337,500, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $375,000, as proposed by the Senate, for departmental personal services.

No. 176. Appropriates $186,110, for regional headquarters, instead of $161,110, as proposed by the House, and $245,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 177: Appropriates $23,000, for general expenses, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the House, and $26,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 178: Appropriates $1,876,200, as proposed by the Senate, for national parks, the increase of $15,000 over the House figure being to provide for maintenance of the proposed Big Bend National Park, Tex.

No. 179: Strikes out the provision of the Senate appropriating $25,000 for the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry.

No. 180: Appropriates $155,000 for forest protection and fire prevention, instead of $140,000, as proposed by the House, and $170,000, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

No. 181: Appropriates $293,540 for fishery industries instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and $470,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 182: Appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the House instead of $84,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the fishery market news service.

No. 183: Appropriates $464,500 for Alaska fisheries, instead of $459,000, as proposed by the House, and $470,000, as proposed by the Senate

No. 185: Appropriates $175,000 for biological investigations, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and $225,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 186: Appropriates $750,000, for control of predatory animals, instead of $740,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 187: Appropriates $140,000 for enforcement of Alaska game law, instead of $130,000, as proposed by the House, and $152,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 188 and 189, relating to maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: Appropriates $530,000, instead of $540,000, as proposed by the House, and $620,315, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to acquire land for the Charles Sheldon antelope range in Humboldt County, Nev., and provides $40,000 to lower the level of a lake in the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge and to divert the excess water of such lake to Lake Lawtonka.

No. 191: Appropriates $1,000,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 193: Appropriates $740,660 for departmental personal services, instead of $700,000,

as proposed by the House, and $816,546, as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

No. 195: Appropriates $168,820, as proposed by the House, instead of $174,620, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of the Governor and other employees, the reduction of $5,800 in the Senate amount being due to the elimination of the salary of the Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands.

No. 196: Appropriates $37,640, as proposed by the House, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate for expenses of the agricultural experiment station.

No. 197: Appropriates $140,000 for defraying the deficit in the Treasury of the municipal government of Saint Croix, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS

No. 198: Provides $5,000 for attendance at meetings by officers and employees of the Bureau of Mines.

No. 199: Inserts the provision of the Senate with reference to the Jackson Hole National Monument.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 15. Relating to the amount of the unobligated balance of the appropriation "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system", to be available in the fiscal year 1944 for expenses of marketing and operation of transmission facilities, and administrative costs in connection therewith.

No. 85. Relating to the purchase of United States Treasury War bonds for members of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100 and 101. Relating to the following reclamation projects under the reclamation fund: Boise project, Idaho, Payette Division; Deschutes project, Oregon; Klamath project, Oregon-California; Riverton project, Wyoming; and Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain Division.

Nos. 103 and 104. Relating to administrative expenses in connection with the projects included in amendments Nos. 96-101, inclusive.

No. 105. Total, reclamation fund.

No. 107. Provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to Congress prior to December 31, 1943, on expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocations of such expenditures between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities in Boulder City.

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, and 115. Relating to the following reclamation projects under the general fund: Gila project, Arizona; Central Valley project, California; Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado; Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch; Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma; Tucumcari project, New Mexico; and Yakima project, Washington, Roza Division.

Nos. 117 and 118. Relating to administrative expenses in connection with the projects included in amendments Nos. 108-115, inclusive.

No. 119. Total, general fund, construction.

No. 120. Relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

No. 121. Relating to services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese, who are in the control of the Federal Government, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons.

No. 142. Relating to the protection of mineral resources and facilities (national defense).

No. 149. Relating to the purchase of land, Bartlesville, Okla.

Nos. 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, and 160. Relating to investigation of raw material resources for steel production (national defense).

No. 161. Relating to gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense).

Nos. 162 and 163. Relating to manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research (national defense).

No. 169. Relating to magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense).

No. 172. Relating to a drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense).

No. 173. Relating to the sale of any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and provides that the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No. 174. Total, Bureau of Mines.

No. 184. Relating to fur-resources investigations, and the purchase of land, buildings, and other privately owned property at the United States Rabbit Experiment Station, Fontana, Calif.

Nos. 190 and 192. Totals relating to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

No. 194. Relating to plans and specifications for vessels or contract personal services for the preparation thereof in connection with activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

No. 200. Makes legal obligations incurred after June 30, 1943, and prior to enactment of bill into law.

No. 201. Changes a section number.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to amendments Nos. 1, 102, 106, and 116),
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 2719, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1944, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I will make a very brief statement.

While there has not been time to check all the items in the report which has been agreed upon, I feel perfectly safe in saying to the Members in connection with the amendments we have agreed upon and which are in this report before the House, that the amount of the bill is considerably below the Budget estimate figures. The House conferees have insisted on bringing this bill back to the House below the Budget figures from the very beginning, and that is what we are doing today.

We were unable to persuade the Senate conferees to agree with us in this desire altogether, and there are 47 items that we cannot agree upon. The bill as it passed the Senate, as the Members will recall, is $20,749,060 in excess of the Budget estimates. As it passed the House the bill was nearly $10,000,000 under the Budget estimates. The Senate added $55,000,000 to the House bill. There are 47 amendments in disagreement, as I said a moment ago, of which 29 are in actual disagreement. These amendments are primarily construction projects inserted by the Senate, without Budget estimates, or with an estimate for only a portion of the amount contained in the bill. We will discuss those items in disagreement after the conference report is acted upon.

I think there is no controversy as to the conference report proper at all.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman advise those of us who are interested in these construction projects whether or not any of them have been agreed to by the House and Senate, or are they all still in disagreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. None of the reclamation projects has been agreed upon. They are all in disagreement at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And the report so shows that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 15: Page 9, line 10, strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$3,287,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 23 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he is in charge of the time and can move the previous question at any time he desires. However, the debate on this particular amendment is limited to 23 minutes.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15 to provide this extra

$87,000 asked for by the Bonneville Administration.

The development on the Columbia River has been one of the greatest pieces of progressive development ever instituted by the Government of the United States. We now have on that great stream two hydroelectric power dams that are not only supplying electricity for our war effort but also for the surrounding country.

The Bonneville Administration has asked for this amount in order to carry on its usual program. I know this was cut down on the theory that we could abolish certain regional offices and concentrate all this work at one place. Whenever you do that you will increase rather than decrease the cost of administering that great project. It will cost more to send people back and forth to these various regions than it will to maintain these regional offices; besides, you would not take a single person off the pay roll. It will cost more to send those people back and forth and do the telephoning, telegraphing, and travel, and to carry on the other expenses of decentralizing these various branches of this agency than it would to appropriate the amount asked for by the Senate, asked for by the Bonneville Administration, and provided by the Senate amendment.

The Bonneville Administration is a long way from where I live, it is true; but the principle is exactly the same. I have seen the same effort made to cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not know of anything you could do that would hamper the T. V. A. more than to abolish its regional offices, because, as I said, it would increase rather than diminish the cost of administering and operating that great enterprise.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The amount carried in the Senate amendment, you say, is to be allocated for the purpose of operating the regional offices on projects already in existence?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It is not to carry on explorations or other activities?

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, there are some explorations that are still being carried on from the central office. But there are a great many phases of this work that will probably be carried on by these regional offices, if these regional offices remain; there is also work that must be carried on from the central office, but, as I said, it would cost more to carry all this work on from the central office than it would from these regional offices.

So, instead of bringing about economy, in my opinion, the adoption of the House provision, and turning down the Senate amendment, would not only cripple the Bonneville administration but it would also increase the cost in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that my motion will be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be more appropriate for those opposing this appropriation to make a statement and to tell us just what they have in mind.

Let me clarify the issue: The $87,000 which is involved, was authorized by the Budget. It was requested by the Bonneville Administration. It is not a new appropriation; it is merely the reallocation of funds already appropriated for carrying on the everyday work of the Bonneville Administration. You understand that the Bonneville Administration has control over both the Bonneville project and the Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River. These two great projects now are furnishing the electricity which will provide 30 percent of the aluminum which we are using in the United States in our war effort. We would not be meeting with the success that we are meeting now on foreign battlefields if it were not for the aluminum that is being manufactured right today in these aluminum plants on the Columbia River using Bonneville power.

This item of $87,000 in issue is a minor sum when compared to the amount involved in the great war industries on the Columbia River, the great projects that are being carried forward and the immense investment which the Federal Government itself has not only in the two hydro projects themselves but in the war industries using this hydro power which are manufacturing ships, airplanes, airplane parts, and various other war materials in which aluminum and electricity is used.

It seems to me we would be following a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy to make cuts or try to curtail the ordinary expenses in this great war industry.

This is not a local problem. It strikes at the heart of the operation of one arm of the great war projects in America today which means the success or failure in the manufacture of aluminum for airships.

If you take the airplanes out of the air today our success in the war would stop; it would mean defeat in the Solomon Islands; it would mean defeat in Guadalcanal; it would mean defeat in Attu Island; and it would mean defeat on every battlefield in which the armed forces of America are fighting today. If MacArthur had had bombers and fighter planes he would have held the Philippines.

Yet, if the motion by the committee before us now prevails, if you agree with the recommendation of the committee to strike out $87,000, that is the result. And bear in mind this is not a new appropriation; it is merely the reallocation of funds already appropriated needed for carrying on the ordinary operations of these projects.

These plants are in successful operation and are bringing into the coffers of the Federal Government millions of dollars a year; these projects are paying investments; there is no boondoggling involved; they represent fundamental, sound financial investments which are paying their own way. Millions of dollars are coming from their operation and going into the United States Treasury every year. The Bonneville Administrator estimates this expenditure of $3,287,000 will bring into the United States Treasury $15,000,000.

The $87,000 involved is a minor amount. Most of this fund is to be used for the field offices to take care of the work in the large territory in the Northwest, which is supplied with electricity from these two great hydroelectric plants, Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

You understand there is a grid system of transmission facilities which extend throughout Oregon and Washington and a part of the State of Idaho, and extends down and connects with California, so that if California's power is cut off in an emergency, this great pool of electricity will be available. These field offices are for the purpose of coordinating the different branches of this great industry and keeping it working to win the war.

I do hope that you, my colleagues, here today will not cripple this great industry, so vital in the war effort, and strike at the heart of a great war endeavor, and that you will not deny the Bonneville Administration the $87,000 so necessary to carry on its ordinary activities.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House on May 20, I called to the attention of the House the part these hydroelectric plants or the Columbia are playing in the war effort. I want again to recall to you these facts.

The facts are that when our Nation entered this war, we were ill prepared to fight a modern war. Such wars are based on highly developed electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Through the operations of international cartels, during the period from 1920 to 1941, this Nation was relegated to an inferior position in this field of activity. Those of us who have investigated this matter early knew that Germany was expanding such industries by 1,000 percent of the capacity available in 1933.

It is hard to realize how this Nation would have been able to cope with the existing situation without the early provision for Federal hydropower. It is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the situation that our Nation's expenditure of blood and treasure would have been far greater if we had no early expanded electrical capacity, so as to make electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes early available.

At least 75 percent of the light metals going into our air program comes from the Federal power plants in the Pacific Northwest, in California, the Western States, and the Southeast. The largest portion of these light-metal requirements comes from the western plants. Appropriation provisions for these western plants comes within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. It has been stated on several occasions that "preparedness depends on foresight." Without the foresight of this committee, our country would have been ill-prepared.

When the factual history of our war effort is written the work of this committee will stand out as an outstanding example of vision. The sad part of the story is that the men in the war agencies did not have vision or make full use of the authority and funds that Congress provided. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies on the light metal, rubber, mineral, and power problems when it passed the Thomas Act and provided funds for Federal hydro plants and the necessary investigations and processes connected therewith. What is more remarkable still, this vision was exercised in the midst of highly conflicting points of view growing out of the public-private power controversy. These controversies, from my observation point, are secondary to the proper utilization of our resources, both in peace and war. I pointed out the basic facts on the power, metal, and rubber situation when I addressed this House in May 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, page 5786. This was 8 days before the President addressed both Houses on the emergency and what lay ahead.

From this observation point it can be plainly seen that the prime industries of the future will be those engaged in the production of electrochemicals and electrometals. Airplanes and our future commerce will not be possible without such productivity. In addition, we, as the arsenal for the world, are drawing on our own resources at a rate higher than any of us can visualize. We must find substitutes, if we are to hold our own as a first-class nation.

It is clear that to Congress belongs the task of post-war planning. In the consideration of such planning this House will find that they will have to consider two approaches to the resources phase. These approaches will be concerned with an inventory and use of the national resources that should be dedicated to future new competitive commercial uses, and secondly, such planning must cover necessary substitutions for those resources entering the depletion cycle.

Energy and power will play an important part in such future planning. Base metal electroproduction must come from low-cost power. The post-war unemployment problem is definitely tied up with adequate and proper resource utilization.

I deem it advisable for the membership of this House to be fully acquainted with the war-power developments in the Axis countries of Norway, and especially in Japan. We on the Pacific coast are especially interested in what Japan has and will be doing. Such an investigation will bring out the advanced preparations of all of these countries to secure world domination.

The South American situation also needs close study. That continent has nearly 50,000,000 horsepower of potential hydropower which is largely unused. This South American power is extremely high class on account of great falls and heavy, steady rainfalls. In the hands of unfriendly competitors, it can become a threat to our position. Nearly half of this South American potential power lies in Brazil in close proximity to high-quality and extensive mineral deposits. Another highly important study should cover the depletion of our own resources and an inventory of what we have and what we need. The growing pains experienced by our war agencies bespeak the necessity of a worth-while inventory.

I have been impressed particularly by these agencies' part in the shipbuilding program now being carried on by Henry J. Kaiser in the Pacific Northwest region. I doubt if there is any question in anyone's mind as to the importance of the Kaiser shipyards.

I think too many of us have not realized the importance of electric power in ship production. We hear of ship production always in terms of the large number of workers required. We usually hear of ship production in terms of astronomical man-hour figures, but it is quite apparent to anyone who delves into the subject that the modern, high-speed shipbuilding, which may prove the salvation of the United Nations is at least equally dependent upon high-speed electrically operated tools, such as heavy-duty cranes, presses, drills, lathes, and particularly the electric welding arc. These tools have been the instruments through which ship fabrication has been reduced from the World War No. 1 record of 236 days to less than 10 days at present in some cases. The yards in my district lead the country in ship production speed.

One kilowatt of electric power is necessary to make every five shipyard workers effective. A yard employing 50,000 men must have at least 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. If the electricity is not available, the 50,000 men must work under the obsolete methods of 25 years ago.

The figures given by Department of the Interior officials to the Appropriations Committee show that the Northwest region as a whole, and particularly the area around the city of Portland where the Kaiser shipyards are located would be a power shortage area if it were not for Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, and for the system of transmission lines and substations through which the electric power from those two dams is transmitted to the industrial sections.

The power companies established in the Portland area have for several years been dependent upon Columbia River power which has been made available to them. Without this power they would be unable to meet the rapidly growing needs of their normal market, to say nothing of the added demands for power placed upon them by the shipyard developments. In view of this fact I am convinced that the present is no time to deny the reasonable request of the Department of the Interior for the use of funds for operation and maintenance.

On the basis of the committee's evidence I believe the Department of the Interior has been cooperating with existing privately owned utility systems in the region. It is pouring its power without stint into practically all of these systems. Through these interconnections Columbia River power is being made available not only to the shipyards in the Portland area but in the Puget Sound area as well.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following excerpts from the hearings, page 470, showing the operations of the Bonneville agencies:

The vital role being played by the Administration in the war program is indicated by the fact that the region will be producing about 30 percent of the total aluminum pig capacity of the Nation, utilizing more than 625,000 kilowatts of power, which is more than the ultimate capacity of Bonneville Dam when completed—518,400 kilowatts; an aluminum rolling mill capable of producing 240,000,000 pounds of aluminum sheet annually, and using approximately 50,000 kilowatts of power; production of tremendous tonnage of new ships, 1 shipyard alone turning out 113 Liberty ships during 1942, with a dead-weight tonnage of over 1,000,000 tons; a steel-rolling mill capable of producing 72,000 tons of steel annually, requiring 14,000 kilowatts of power; the production of magnesium requiring 57,000 kilowatts of power; and many other essential products, such as calcium carbide, sodium chlorate, and ferroalloys. In addition, many other types of industries which are not direct customers of Bonneville have developed in the region in the war production effort, all of which development would have been impossible had not these power projects been built by the Federal Government. The war strategy has also required the construction of many airports, Army camps, naval stations, and other similar establishments of the War and Navy Departments in this area. The Administration has undertaken the servicing of all these activities, including defense housing projects, which have been necessary because of the tremendous increase in the number of defense workers required for this expanded production program.

As a result of recommendations made by the Administration for the acceleration of construction of electrical facilities in the region in anticipation of the present crisis, Bonneville Dam, which was scheduled for completion in 1946, will now be completed in 1943, and installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam has been advanced so that six units will be in operation by February 1944, in addition to two Shasta units loaned to Grand Coulee for the duration of the war. Three more generating units have been authorized at Grand Coulee by Congress, but their completion date thus far is indefinite due to priority difficulties.

The present rated generating capacity at these two dams of 626,000 kilowatts will be increased by the end of the calendar year 1943 to more than 1,200,000 kilowatts—approximately 100-percent increase in capacity during this calendar year. The increasing tempo of the Administration's part in the war effort is reflected in its power deliveries since 1940:

Year	Kilowatt-hours	Increase over previous year
1940	354, 208, 000	
1941	1, 568, 728, 000	1, 214, 520, 000
1942	3, 939, 600, 000	2, 370, 872, 000
1943 [1]	7, 637, 800, 000	3, 698, 200, 000
1944 [1]	9, 647, 533, 000	2, 009, 733, 000

[1] Estimated.

To meet these large increases in load, a rapid expansion of transmission facilities to take the tremendous quantities of power from the generating plants to the load centers was required. The construction of electrical facilities, accelerated in 1941 in anticipation of these new loads, was interrupted

upon the declaration of war in order to conserve critical material. Only such lines and substation requirements were continued as were necessary to maintain minimum service to war plants. The rapid expansion of these facilities is best illustrated by the following data:

Fiscal year—	Mile-years of line in operation	Substations	Kilovolt-ampere-years capacity
1940	52.1	3	14,910
1941	614.6	25	265,020
1942	1,403.6	34	840,625
1943 [1]	2,228.9	50	1,639,369

[1] This includes only projects authorized as of Jan. 1, 1943.

* * * * *

FINANCIAL STATUS

The accomplishments of the Administration and the effect of contracts and new commitments are being reflected in the revenues being returned to the Treasury. A summary of actual revenues received to June 30, 1942, with estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, follows:

1940, actual	$367,900
1941, actual	1,874,645
1942, actual	6,160,368
1943, estimated	12,003,519
1944, estimated	18,007,166
Estimated total June 30, 1944	37,413,598

The Bonneville Agency, which is under consideration, operates the transmission facilities, markets the power, and collects the revenues. The Corps of Engineers, another agency, operates the Bonneville generating plant. Its power costs have been allocated as provided by law. The Grand Coulee plant is operated by another agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not completed, and its first costs have not been allocated as provided in the reclamation law. Therefore in approaching a pay-out cost determination we can deal with absolute figures as far as Bonneville power plant and Bonneville Power Administration are concerned and estimated figures for Grand Coulee. This will be close enough for the purposes at hand.

I will not deal with this over-all figure by combining the figures given in the hearings with citation thereto. The figures I am covering apply to the fiscal year 1944 as given in the record. Revenues and expenses are given for other years also, but for brevity I will cover the 1 year:

The gross revenue given on p. 480 is	$18,085,500
Operating and depreciation expenses, Bonneville Power Administration alone, p. 481	4,271,990
Net Bonneville Power Administration operating income, p. 481	13,813,510
Interest on Bonneville Power Administration Federal investment, p. 481	2,145,696
Net income available for power cost and surplus, and operating expenses at generating stations, p. 481	11,667,814
The operating expenses at stations, p. 521	1,344,675
Net for interest and amortization of 2 dam plants	10,323,139

The only item that need be covered to complete the over-all pay-out calculation is the interest and amortization of the plant costs allocated to power. This is given on page 518 of the hearings, and when considered with the generating plant operating expenses I have just cited, shows surplus over-all charges of all kinds of $3,267,000 for the fiscal year 1944. These figures definitely answer the question of returns as given from the balance sheet figures submitted by the Administrator.

I must add a word of caution at this point, and that is not to take random figures scattered throughout the hearings. The only correct approach is via the balance sheet route as given on pages 480 and 518 of the record.

The real control must not be lost in any discussion. This control is the requirement of the basic act that requires rate reviews every 5 years to insure a balance sheet return to the Federal Treasury. It is mandatory for the Administrator to charge rates which will insure a full return.

I need to point out that the War Production Board has not used these facilities to their fullest extent. If they had we would have had more planes in the hands of General MacArthur.

The Department of the Interior is asking for no new appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration in 1944. It is asking only for congressional approval to reallocate $3,287,000 of moneys already appropriated so that the Bonneville Administration can carry on its operation and management functions effectively during the next fiscal year.

Such funds are to be used primarily for the purpose of transmitting power to war industries in the Pacific Northwest with a combined metal-plant valuation in the neighborhood of $300,000,000. Those plants are all being operated by private enterprise and their combined value is roughly equal in amount to the total investment thus far in Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Federal electric power transmission system which takes the power from those dams to market.

I should like to point out that power, when it is made in the generators at Grand Coulee Dam and at Bonneville Dam, is of little value to anyone. There are no big cities close to either of those dams. There are no industries located at either of those dams. Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is of value only when it can be delivered to the industrial centers and the military zones of the Northwest.

That is what the Department of the Interior, through the Bonneville Power Administration, is doing, and that is the purpose of the requested funds.

I am informed that 95 percent of all Bonneville and Grand Coulee power will be delivered to war industries during the next fiscal year. These war enterprises include pig aluminum plants capable of producing more than 600,000,000 pounds of raw metal annually, one of the largest sheet-rolling mills in the country, a new magnesium metal plant with 800 electric furnaces, several chemical plants devoted to the manufacture of explosives and other war materials, a number of alloy plants which make materials vital in the production of armor plate and other hard-steel products, and at least one dozen military installations such as Army and Navy airfields, depots, and encampments. All of these enterprises are war enterprises; and all of them require electric power which they would be unable to receive if it were not for the Federal development of the Columbia River. For the delivery of power to all of these enterprises and to others which will be established during the fiscal year 1944, the Bonneville Administration will collect more than $15,000,000—perhaps as much as $20,000,000—which will be paid into the Treasury of the United States. These power sales will more than double the volume of sales by the Bonneville Administration during the past 12 months.

The Bonneville Administrator has testified before the Appropriations Committee that he will require $3,287,000 to operate his agency. More than 10 percent of that money is required for armed guards to protect the system against accident and sabotage.

According to the Bonneville Administrator's figures 3,287,000 operating dollars will put into the United States Treasury more than $15,000,000.

That sounds like good business. I urge the approval of this item in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] such time as he may wish.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that this House was satisfied with this bill when it went through. We gave the Bonneville Power Administration $3,200,000 for the purpose of carrying on its work. We listened to the testimony of Dr. Raver, who is head of the Bonneville Power Administration, and we listened to other witnesses from the Bonneville Power Authority and we thought then and we think now that the amount of money provided in the bill was ample to carry on that very splendid project. The failure to restore the amount carried in the Senate amendment, $87,000, is certainly not going to cripple that great project.

By the way, I visited the Bonneville project a few months ago and they are doing a very fine piece of work. The appropriation the House gave them is not going to hamper them in any way. Dr. Raver testified before our committee a short time ago that they had sale for all the power they were producing there. I saw some of the great industrial plants that were being operated by that power. They are very fine plants and I want to say to the membership of the House, having listened to all the testimony that was presented, having visited this great plant, I believe they are amply provided for by the terms of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 44, noes 72.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 113, nays 223, answered "present" 1, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—113

Abernethy	Gossett	Morrison, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Granger	Mott
Angell	Grant, Ala.	Murdock
Barrett	Gregory	Murphy
Bland	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Boykin	Hale	Newsome
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Norman
Brooks	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bulwinkle	Heidinger	O'Connor
Burchill, N. Y.	Hendricks	Outland
Burdick	Hinshaw	Patman
Camp	Hobbs	Patton
Carson, Ohio	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Coffee	Holmes, Wash.	Philbin
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Pittenger
Cooley	Hull	Poage
Cooper	Jackson	Price
Costello	Johnson, J. Leroy	Priest
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramey
Creal	Judd	Randolph
Crosser	Kefauver	Rankin
Curley	Kelley	Richards
D'Alesandro	Klein	Rivers
Davis	LaFollette	Robinson, Utah
Dawson	Larcade	Sadowski
Delaney	Lemke	Sauthoff
Dingell	Lynch	Scanlon
Dworshak	McCord	Sparkman
Ellsworth	McGranery	Spence
Feighan	McKenzie	Stefan
Fernandez	Madden	Stockman
Flannagan	Magnuson	Sullivan
Fogarty	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	Mansfield, Mont.	Welch
Gavagan	Marcantonio	White
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Wickersham
Gordon	Mills	Winstead
Gore	Mitchell	Wolverton, N. J.
		Wright

NAYS—223

Allen, Ill.	Burgin	Dondero
Allen, La.	Busbey	Doughton
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Douglas
Anderson, Calif.	Canfield	Durham
Andrews	Cannon, Fla.	Eaton
Arends	Carlson, Kans.	Eberharter
Arnold	Carter	Elliott
Auchincloss	Case	Ellis
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Ellison, Md.
Bates, Mass.	Chapman	Elston, Ohio
Beall	Chenoweth	Engel
Beckworth	Chiperfield	Fellows
Bell	Church	Fenton
Bender	Clark	Fish
Bennett, Mich.	Clason	Fisher
Bennett, Mo.	Cleveneger	Forand
Bishop	Compton	Gale
Blackney	Cox	Gamble
Bloom	Cravens	Gathings
Bolton	Crawford	Gavin
Boren	Cunningham	Gerlach
Brehm	Day	Gibson
Brown, Ga.	Dewey	Gilchrist
Brown, Ohio	Dickstein	Gillette
Bryson	Dies	Gillie
Buffet	Dilweg	Goodwin
Burch, Va.	Disney	Gorski
	Domengeaux	Graham
Grant, Ind.	Luce	Scott
Gwynne	Ludlow	Short
Halleck	McCormack	Sikes
Hancock	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Hare	McGehee	Simpson, Pa.
Harris, Va.	McGregor	Slaughter
Hays	McLean	Smith, Maine
Herter	McWilliams	Smith, Ohio
Hill	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Smith, W. Va.
Hoffman	Martin, Mass	Smith, Wis.
Holmes, Mass.	Merrow	Somers, N. Y.
Hope	Michener	Springer
Howell	Miller, Conn.	Stanley
Jarman	Miller, Mo.	Steagall
Jeffrey	Miller, Pa.	Stewart
Jenkins	Mills	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Monkiewicz	Sumners, Tex.
Jensen	Monroney	Sundstrom
Johnson, Anton J	Mruk	Talbot
	Mundt	Talle
Johnson, Calvin D.	Murray, Wis.	Tarver
	Norrell	Taylor
Johnson, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Konski	Thomason
	O'Toole	Tibbott
Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Towe
Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Troutman
Jonkman	Poulson	Vorys, Ohio
Kean	Powers	Vursell
Kearney	Ramspeck	Walter
Kee	Reece, Tenn.	Ward
Keefe	Reed, Ill.	Wasielewski
Kerr	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel, Ohio
Kilday	Rees, Kans.	Wene
Kinzer	Rizley	West
Kirwan	Robertson	Wheat
Kleberg	Rockwell	Whelchel, Ga.
Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.	Whitten
Kunkel	Rogers, Calif.	Whittington
Lambertson	Rogers, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Landis	Rohrbough	Willey
Lane	Sabath	Wilson
Lanham	Sasscer	Winter
Lea	Satterfield	Wolcott
LeCompte	Schiffler	Woodruff, Mich.
LeFevre	Schuetz	Zimmerman
Lewis	Schwabe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gross

NOT VOTING—96

Andresen, August H.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Baldwin, Md.	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Barden	Harris, Ark.	Pracht
Barry	Hart	Rabaut
Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Robsion, Ky.
Bonner	Hébert	Rolph
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Rowan
Buckley	Holifield	Rowe
Byrne	Izac	Russell
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Shafer
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cochran	Keogh	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Snyder
Colmer	King	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	Lesinski	Stearns, N. H.
Cullen	McMillan	Stevenson
Curtis	McMurray	Taber
Dirksen	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Maloney	Tolan
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Treadway
Elmer	Mason	Van Zandt
Fay	May	Vincent, Ky.
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Ford	Morrison, N. C.	Wadsworth
Fulbright	Myers	Weaver
Fulmer	Nichols	Weiss
Furlong	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.
Gifford	O'Hara	Worley
Green	O'Leary	
Griffiths	O'Neal	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer	
	Phillips	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cannon of Missouri for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. King with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. May with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Fay with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Gross.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON and Mr. STEWART changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 85: Page 55, line 21, add: "That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to the official roll of said tribe on the date of the approval of this Act, and pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the accrued interest in the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Said bonds shall be purchased and registered in the name of each enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe and when issued shall be held in trust for such Shoshone Indian by the United States to the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be delivered to the owner thereof free from such trust. Said bond shall not be sold or encumbered in any manner by the Shoshone owner nor shall said bond become liable, payable, or subject to any debt or debts contracted by the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity, said bond, if not devised or bequeathed by will, shall descend to his or her heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law, subject to the existing trust. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant permission to the county chairman

of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "On page 55, line 21, strike out the word 'Interior' and insert in lieu thereof 'Treasury'; and in the same line after the word 'authorized' insert 'and directed.' "

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 96 to 105, inclusive, be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 96: Page 66, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Construction: For continuation of construction, and for general investigations and administrative expenses, of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the reclamation fund in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation", under the head "Administrative provisions and limitations", but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth, all to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, and to remain available until expended."

Amendment No. 97: Page 66, line 20, insert "Boise project, Idaho, Fayette division, $500,000."

Amendment No. 98: Page 66, line 21, insert "Deschutes project, Oregon, $250,000."

Amendment No. 99: Page 66, line 22, insert "Klamath project, Oregon-California, $420,000."

Amendment No. 100: Pages 66, line 23, insert "Riverton project, Wyoming, $500,000."

Amendment No. 101: Page 66, line 24, insert "Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain division, $350,000."

Amendment No. 103: Page 67, line 17, strike out "$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$70,000."

Amendment No. 104: Page 67, line 18, strike out "$65,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$175,000."

Amendment No. 105: page 67, line 19, strike out "$1,388,500' and insert in lieu thereof "$4,084,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in connection with this matter that after conferring with the Members who are interested in some of these projects we have decided to consider them en bloc. I may say that the House conferees have been willing for the most part to go along where there is a Budget estimate for these projects. In some instances we have thought that we could cut a little below the Budget estimate. In this instance there is only one project that has a Budget estimate. Therefore the committee felt justified in insisting on its disagreement to them.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me, too, that all of these projects—I think I am correct in saying all—have stop-orders against them issued by the War Production Board. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. That is true, with the possible exception of one. There may be one of these projects where the stop-order has been lifted.

Mr. CARTER. I think that is true. The stop-order has been lifted or partially lifted; but as to the others, they have stop-orders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I think I should further add that all of these projects are commendable projects. I think they would be desirable, probably the finest thing that we could think of for a post-war program. It occurs to me that if either the stop-orders should be lifted or Budget estimates secured by the time we return in September, then the Deficiency Committee certainly will consider and may well consider these projects favorably. I think I may say that it will consider all of these projects for which stop-orders may be lifted. I am a member of that Deficiency Committee, and I think I know how the members feel about anything that will produce more food. We are not opposed to the projects; I want to make that perfectly plain. I am very strongly for reclamation projects, even though I have none in my own district. The truth about this is that we have neither Budget estimates nor War Production Board approval for these projects with the possible exception of one.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that I concur in what the gentleman says in regard to these projects that lack Budget estimates and lack removal of the stop-orders. Even if we do recess, we are going to be back here in September. If those stop-orders are removed and Budget estimates are obtained, the projects can be presented at once to the deficiency committee and we can consider them in an orderly way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the purpose of the stop-orders? Materials?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. The purpose of the stop-order is to conserve critical materials. When the War Production Board says there is a sufficient supply of those critical materials to carry on these reclamation projects, then we can go on with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may also add in that connection that the War Production Board has been lifting these stop-orders on many of the reclamation projects, on some of them at least, but not those in this particular group. As they get the information they are removing the stop-orders. But our committee has made it a point to either have a Budget estimate or approval of the War Production Board and I hope the House of Representatives will back this committee in that position. We either have got to do that or else we must take all of them, whether they have stop-orders or whether they have the approval of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona who has been in the forefront of the fight for reclamation projects in his State. I commend him very highly on that and I have usually voted with him on those things.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. I have been fighting for reclamation projects not only in my State but also outside of my State wherever they might be in the western part of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is quite reassuring to me to have the assurance of the two gentlemen in charge of the bill that some stop orders are now being lifted and that these worthy food projects may be considered a little later. However, I want to say in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that we have not yet discovered how serious this food shortage business is. In my opinion, we are holding too sacredly to Budget estimates. Every one of these projects has been O. K.'d, if not formally tentatively at least, by Donald Nelson and by Chester Davis. I believe we are making a mistake if we do not begin at once, not in 60 days from now, to make available facilities for additional food production.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman understand that Donald Nelson has approved a number of these projects here, the stop orders have been removed, and we are declining to give them consideration?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think Donald Nelson wants more food produced, and he wants it done on these very projects. Chester Davis took a more positive stand.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that we have been proceeding in an orderly way; and if the War Production Board has removed some of these stop orders, if they have given consideration to the removal of others, on any project on which the stop order is removed, it will receive the very serious consideration of this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say that when this bill was originally considered by the House we called a representative of the War Production Board before the committee and pointed out the necessity for growing more food. We urged that they reconsider all of these

reclamation projects to see whether or not they would have critical materials with which to finish them.

May I point out to you that irrespective of what we may do, even though we may make every dollar available, as long as those stop orders are not lifted there is not a chance in the world of getting those reclamation projects finished.

We are trying to be helpful. If you will read the hearings of the House committee you will find that we devoted many pages to this important subject of producing more food. If the House will permit us to go along in an orderly way, we think we shall be able to work it out to the satisfaction of a great many Members of the House. We believe this is the way to do it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is also interested in the only reclamation project in Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is one statement I should like to have cleared up. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] said that we could consider additional irrigation and reclamation expenditures later when the War Production Board determined that strategic materials were available. I call your attention to a letter written to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, United States Senator, in response to a letter he wrote to Donald Nelson on the 8th of June. The answer includes this language, and I quote:

> The grade of steel from which reinforcing bars are rolled is not considered critical at this time, and with the essentiality established, the tonnage you require should be readily available from (1) current stocks, (2) producers of rail-steel bars, or (3) producers of billet steel using top cuts, discard, etc.
>
> The facilities of producers and fabricators are not now being fully employed, due primarily to the gradual completion of the war construction program. We can foresee no appreciable change in this situation for the duration.

So there are enough strategic materials, ample labor, and sufficient equipment to proceed with these irrigation and reclamation projects now. The new War Food Administrator is favorable toward a program that would insure completion of the projects as provided in the Senate amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that that letter has been a very valuable letter in assisting the Bureau of the Budget and the members of the committee. As a result of that letter, to some extent, the project in which the gentleman is interested, the Lugert-Altus project, the only one in Oklahoma, got a Budget estimate for $1,500,000. I think I am safe in saying to the gentleman that the committee would be willing to go along with that Budget estimate, but there is an additional sum of $435,000 above the Budget estimate. I think that money could be expended admirably. I think it is one of the finest reclamation projects in the United States. I doubt that there is any other project that can exceed it in any way on the basis of money expended. However, as chairman of the subcommittee I cannot be in the position of saying simply because this is an outstanding project and because my friend and a good many of my friends from Oklahoma are so interested in it, that I must insist on going above the Budget estimates for my own State, but that I am unwilling to go above the Budget estimates for many other projects throughout the country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Of course, I am just as interested in the whole food program throughout the United States as I am in my district. As a matter of fact, it is true that this project in Oklahoma, which is the only one in that State, does require less strategic material to complete and does provide more irrigation, per acre cost, than any other project. However, I am in favor of the completion of all of them.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] said that if the Budget did approve the amount requested he would be willing to accept the Budget estimate. Permit me to state that I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget dated June 26 in reply to one I wrote them several days prior thereto, showing that the Bureau of the Budget has approved the Lugert-Altus project for the full $1,985,000, which reads as follows:

> In reply to your letter of June 16, 1943, please note in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, fiscal year 1944 (H. R. 2719), now before Congress, there is an item of $1,985,000 for the Lugert-Altus project of Oklahoma. This amount should provide sufficient funds to complete all the construction work which you mentioned in your letter.
>
> HAROLD D. SMITH,
> *Director.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is a very nice letter, and I commend the gentleman on getting it, but it is not a Budget estimate. It mentions the information which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] mentioned in his letter. That is not a Budget estimate. The Bureau of the Budget does not send Budget estimates up here in that manner. I have read the letter to the conferees, and we are glad to have the information it contains, but we have taken the position that we must proceed in an orderly manner. I want to be helpful to the gentleman, but I hope he will not insist on placing me in the embarrassing position of going above Budget estimates. I may say that I have talked with the sponsor, Senator AUSTIN, over the telephone, and he was perfectly willing to go along when I explained the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment No. 107: On page 70, line 16, after "set forth", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress prior to December 31, 1943, on expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocations of such expenditures between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities in Boulder City (and whether such allocation should be retroactive)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of said amendment after the word "City", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 10.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments 108 to 120, inclusive, be considered together.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The House is proceeding at a considerable disadvantage. It is late, we have been through a long day, and we are now asked to consider a number of amendments en bloc, when we have not had an opportunity to have the report of the conferees before us. It is practically impossible for Members to follow the procedure with a large number of amendments being considered en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I made this request after conferring with several Members who are especially interested in these particular projects. The committee had not planned to do this. We are doing it as a matter of accommodation to those interested, and if they do not want to consider it in that way, it is all right with the members of the committee. We are simply trying to accommodate Members.

Mr. CASE. It is evident from the report now that we are not going to get a recess this week, we must go over until next week, and I cannot understand the reason for prolonging the session as late as we are doing it, if we cannot get away this week. If the House were to adjourn at this time, the report of the conferees could be printed in the RECORD, and we would know what we are doing, but when a large number of amendments are proposed to be considered en bloc, and in between the intervening numbers there was a group of amendments accepted in the original report of the conferees, and it is extremely difficult to follow the procedure. Unless there is some further reason given why it is necessary to proceed in this way, I think we should not go on.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The exact recommendation is made with reference to every one of these projects, namely, that the House conferees continue to insist, and therefore it ought to be very simple to follow the procedure. It is a very simple motion.

Mr. CASE. In the preceding request the gentleman made, I notice that the

request was made that we proceed from 96 to 106 or 107, whatever it was, and then I find that somewhere in between there are some amendments in the original report which was read from the Clerk's desk, but which no Member had a chance to read or to consult so as to be sure what amendments are in the request.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that one amendment included in the list of the gentleman from Oklahoma is numbered 120, on which there is a disagreement? One hundred and twenty covers the $4,000,000 to implement the Wheeler-Case law, covering all of these small projects.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Montana knows that those small projects should not be considered en bloc with the large ones.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what I say. It should not be included, and therefore I shall object.

Mr. CASE. What is the intention of the committee on conference about procedure tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would hope that we could complete the bill, but if not, that we could go along as far as possible.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. We are not legislating intelligently.

Mr. CASE. We cannot complete this conference report tonight.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no use sitting here until 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This bill was supposed to be passed and sent to the President on Wednesday. It carries a large appropriation for the Department of the Interior, and it may be impossible to finish the bill this evening. If it would be more agreeable I am willing to withdraw No. 120 from the list. I am inclined to think that this particular amendment ought not to be included in this bloc. I simply did that because it was suggested I do so and I will modify my motion to that extent.

Mr. CASE. I ask the gentleman what estimate he has made of the time we may adjourn tonight, if we proceed further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have not made any estimate. I am trying to expedite matters.

Mr. CASE. Is there any prospect that we could get through in the next 20 minutes? If there is, there will be some sense in proceeding, but if we are to go along until 9 or 10 o'clock tonight, it does not seem sensible to proceed further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is a matter that is up to this House, but I am willing to work until 9 o'clock tonight if necessary.

Mr. CASE. If we are going to have a session here tomorrow and Monday, what is the use? I see the distinguished majority leader on the floor, and I wonder if he could give us any idea about the prospect for adjournment tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman is aware, I have always tried to conduct the affairs of the House, to transact the business of the House, with a minimum of hardship to each and every one of us, because the minimum is tremendous for all of us. I realize that. I suggest to the gentleman that we go along for awhile and see just what develops. There is a conference going on now, I am anxious to find out just what the result of that conference might be. That is something that I expect to know within a reasonable time.

Mr. CASE. If we are waiting for the other conference, if there is any prospect of getting it, then I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall object to including amendment No. 110 in that block, because a great many Members are interested in that amendment, which is with reference to the transmission line from Shasta Dam to Oroville, Calif.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Then we might as well withdraw them all if that is going to be the attitude.

Mr. RANKIN. That is going to be my attitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 108: Page 71, line 23, after the word "Arizona", insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 108.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 109: Page 71, line 24, strike out "Not to exceed $200,000 from unexpended balances of appropriations", and insert "*Provided*, That this appropriation and appropriations heretofore made."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 109.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 110: Page 72, line 8, at the end of the line strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "Kennett division, $15,374,000, of which $1,900,000 shall be available for the construction of the Shasta Dam-Oroville transmission line and terminal facilities; Friant division, $10,640,000; and Delta division, $2,686,000; in all, $28,700,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees direct me to insist on the disagreement of the House, and I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 110.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 110.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important propositions that has come before the Congress at this session.

This amendment means more to the people of northern and central California than any other provision that has been offered, in my opinion, at this session of Congress.

We have just completed building the Shasta Dam and one other dam in the Central Valley. This bill provides for the building of a power line, a high-power line, down to Oroville, Calif. As you all know, Sacramento is the capital of California, one of the great cities of the far West. They have their own municipal light and power system. They are entitled to the same treatment accorded the people of Nashville, Tenn., Tupelo, Miss., or any other place in the T. V. A. area or elsewhere.

The Administration is tremendously interested in having this built by the Department of the Interior. In other words, the Administration is interested in owning this line as a part of the Central Valley project.

If you kill this amendment, then you shut the door of hope in the faces of the people of that section of California. You will say to those people, "Although we have spent 75 or 80 million dollars building that tremendous power dam that should be used for the people of California, you will now have to pay tribute to the private-power monopoly if you get the benefits of this great national project at all." Today the people of that section of California are overcharged $45,000,000 a year for their electricity, as I showed by the tables I placed in the RECORD on yesterday. Southern California, in the Los Angeles area, is served by Boulder Dam. They have the lowest power rates in the West, outside of Washington and Oregon. But here where we built this great dam, supposedly for the benefit of the public, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that has been overriding the law with reference to the Hetch Hetchy power for San Francisco, is turning heaven and earth in order to prevent the building of this line. They want to monopolize this power.

The people in that area are entitled to the same treatment we are receiving in the Tennessee Valley area. They are entitled to the same treatment people are receiving along the Columbia River. We should adopt this motion and provide this power line which the administration wants and says is vitally necessary to carry out the program instituted in the Central Valley.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is this the project about which the President wrote a letter expressly urging and hoping that the appropriation would be made to put it into operation?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. The President wrote that letter and sent it to me by messenger on yesterday. In that letter he says, "To stop the Government's construction through lack of funds would result in delaying the completion of the

line and hence the utilization for war purposes of Shasta power."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In his letter he said it is necessary and important as a part of the war effort, did he not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. He said I definitely believe that the appropriation should be made so that this piece of wartime construction may be completed.

Down in that Oroville area we have war projects that are going to need this Shasta Dam power. But this private concern is trying to get between us, trying to get between the United States Government, between the people of Sacramento, between the people of California and this great wealth of power that we already own, in order to monopolize it.

I hope that my motion will be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have always gone along with him almost blindly on the power question, but there is a great deal more involved in his amendment than the power question.

What the gentleman is asking, when he makes his motion to recede and concur in the entire amendment, involves a great deal more and I am sure he does not mean to say what he has asked, because nobody who is interested in this question is going to ask for several million dollars above what the Budget requested. He does not mean to make that request, I am sure; he does not want this House to give $28,700,000 to one project when the fact is that they already have at least $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 more than they were able to spend last year. The gentleman does not mean that, I am sure.

I have gone along with the gentleman from Mississippi, but I am not willing to go along and to give one project, the Central Valley project, many millions of dollars more than they really need simply in order to carry that one item to which the gentleman from Missippi refers.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The thing that I am wondering about, even though we make the appropriation requested for the purpose of building these transmission lines, is that there are only two metals that are suitable for use in transmission lines, one is copper and the other is aluminum. We are now taking the pennies of the school children in order to try to increase the supply of copper, and we are melting down our kettles to make aluminum available for airplanes. Where is the metal going to come from for these transmission lines?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure the gentleman from California can answer the gentleman's question better than I can and I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] 5 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, whether or not we authorize this appropriation, the copper is going to be consumed; the transmission lines will be built by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. or they will be built by the United States Government, so whether we vote the Rankin motion up or down, there will be no saving of critical materials in either event. That issue is not involved.

The Government of the United States, through an appropriate agency, has indicated that it is necessary for this project to go forward; that the building of these transmission lines is imperative and that the allocation of the critical materials needed, be promptly made. There is no question but what the transmission lines should be built and should be built right now. The project falls in the classification of war projects, so declared.

Let me point out this important fact to the House: This dam which has been referred to, is the third largest dam in the world. It is not built where people are living in great numbers; it is built back up in the high mountains, in the wilderness, where there is no market for electricity at all. We have already spent in excess of a hundred million dollars on the various phases of this project. One of the most important features of the project has to do with the production of electrical energy. What kind of businessmen are we going to turn out to be, if we, as the board of directors of this great country of ours, provide for the building of a great project consisting of a dam and generators high up in the mountains and then fail to make any provision whatsoever for the bringing of that electricity down to the load centers where it can be put into use by the people who are waiting so hungrily for it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman has just made the statement that we have spent millions of dollars. He does not mean that, does he?

Mr. GEARHART. Precisely so. The project is going to cost $325,000,000, according to the estimates of today. Already the Government has appropriated and we have already spent on the project upward of a hundred million dollars.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us who is going to pay this $300,000,000 plus?

Mr. GEARHART. The project will be financed in the usual way. The money will be appropriated, as we are appropriating it today, and then, in accordance with the established policies of the Government, a portion will be recaptured and, to that extent the Treasury will be reimbursed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who is going to pay for the transmission lines?

Mr. GEARHART. The people who consume the electricity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What people?

Mr. GEARHART. We, the people of the United States, those who live in the area that will be served.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of us?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; all of us who fall in that category.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why do not the consumers pay for it?

Mr. GEARHART. Of course, the consumers will. The electricity is not going to be given away. It will be sold. Of course, the electrical energy will be disposed of in the market

Mr. Speaker, I come from a county that does not expect to get a single kilowatt-hour of this electricity. I come from a section of the State hundreds of miles to the south of where this electricity will be consumed. I live in a section of the great Central Valley wherein the only benefit that we shall obtain from the project shall be in the form of irrigation water. It is water that the people I represent are primarily interested in. We who live hundreds of miles south of the Shasta Dam are interested in the proper development of electrical generation and distribution in the far North, as it is the profitable sale of electrical energy that will make the project economically feasible.

If we cannot develop this electric energy on the project and sell it at a profit the water will be so expensive for the people that I am trying to get it for that they will not be able to pay the price. In the event that an appropriation for the construction of these transmission lines is not made and the project is compelled to sell its electrical energy at a loss to the P. G. & E., at whose mercy the project will then be, the hopes and aspirations of the farmers I am seeking to serve are dashed. As it is water and water alone that we hope to secure through the development of the Central Valley project, we who live hundreds of miles away fight for electric generators and power lines and steam stand-by plants make the fight for power. It is the only way we can get the water at a price we can afford to pay.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the best way to protect the Nation's investment in the Shasta Dam project is not to get this power down to the consuming centers so the electricity can be sold?

Mr. GEARHART. Of course. All we ask is an opportunity to bring this electricity from this dam in the wilderness over the Government-owned electric wires down to where it can be sold. If the Rankin motion fails, the management, the control of the Central Valley water project will pass into the hands of

a private corporation, to be in effect absorbed into its vast system. Is that to be the unhappy culmination of that for which we have so long labored, so long dreamed, and prayed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I am not interested in attempting to take this project out of consideration in line with other projects that may be of importance, but I have a profound conviction that the Senate position on this amendment is correct and I must assert my belief in that and express, by supporting this motion, the hope that the House conferees will agree with the Senate's position.

The gentleman who preceded me, my colleague from California [Mr. GEARHART], was asked the question as to who would pay for this transmission line. A part of the answer to that question certainly is that unless this transmission line is constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in order that we may get the power generated at this great dam to market over the people's line we shall be compelled to go through the hands of the one power company that controls and dominates all of northern and central California and we shall not be in a position to get the kind of returns upon the public investment which we ought to get.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who is going to pay for the building of the transmission line? Will it be the people all over the country or will the cost be included in the charge to the actual consumers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is a charge against the project, I will say to the gentleman, to be paid back over a period of years.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it going to be paid back by all Americans?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. By those who use the power.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Or will the people who use the power pay for it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The cost is going to be paid out of project revenues, which means of course, ultimately by the consumer.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Every dollar for the construction of this transmission line will be paid for out of the the revenue derived from the sale of the electricity generated; it will not cost the rest of us a dollar.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It has been stated here, and correctly stated, that our main concern is increased farm production. A great deal of this power is going to be required for furnishing the farms of California with the power they are going to need in their work with an additional amount available for the public power consumers, as the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, in the city of Sacramento. In a statement made before the Senate committee by the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation he had this to say as to what would happen in case we failed to appropriate this money for this transmission line to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

He quoted from a report of the Senate committee of last year and said that failure to provide for the Bureau of Reclamation to build this line would amount to "The adoption of a policy which contemplates that all of the power both firm and fluctuating generated at Shasta and Bryant Dams shall be sold when produced to but one customer which is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co."

Mr. Speaker, obviously the thing to assure the proper distribution of this power is for this line to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. Otherwise the power cannot be taken from the dam except over the lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., this private company. The building of this line is the only way to put this investment of the American people in this whole project on a basis where it can be conducted according to sound business principles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would not be here except for the parliamentary situation that confronts us. Some of our colleagues are very much interested in the construction of a transmission line from the Shasta substation to Oroville, Calif., at a cost of $1,900,000. It is one thing for you to instruct your committee today, but to adopt the amendment that is before us now is entirely another thing.

This is an enormous project estimated to cost in the final analysis $333,665,100. There has been expended on this project as of July 1, 1943, a total of $139,211,220.

Your House committee recommended in the beginning that the bill provide a total of $11,500,000 for the Central Valley project containing a number of items; but if you adopt the amendment before you at this time you not only tell this committee to go back to the Senate conferees and allow the transmission line which will cost $1,900,000 but you tell this committee to go back over there and raise the amount that you provided in your bill from $10,500,000 to the total sum of $28,700,000, $4,000,300 over the Bureau of the Budget estimate as filed in the Senate.

Our bill provided for $10,500,000. We had a Budget estimate of $16,400,000. When the bill got to the Senate there was a supplemental Budget estimate filed over there of $8,000,000. Mr. Speaker, they have not only allowed the total Budget estimates, but they have gone $4,000,300 in excess of that. In order to construct one little insignificant transmission line costing $1,900,000 I do not believe you are going to instruct your committee to go back to conference and surrender to the tune of $28,700,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that what I am interested in and what the Administration is interested in primarily is this transmission line and I propose to modify my amendment limiting it to that one section of the provision.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that the President did not authorize all of this construction. The President did endorse the transmission line, but, sir, you are not only asking for the transmission line but you are asking for all of these.

May I say in conclusion and with reference to the transmission line that the evidence before our committee was that the power would be sold to a certain power company, whether the power was delivered at the Shasta substation or at Oroville, and the committee did not see how, if there was not some remuneration to the Government for the construction of the transmission line, it could go that far, but that is a matter for you to instruct us on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will offer that amendment after this one, unless the pending amendment is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret after many votes in favor of Central Valley to have to start in and vote against Central Valley. I think the worst thing that could happen is for this House to start taking this action now. I am in full sympathy with the whole Central Valley project and I hope the whole $300,000,000 is finally spent; but I say to you that the Bureau of Reclamation has before the Senate an outline of a complete food program that involves many projects. The only hope for that food program to go through is for all of it to be taken together as one program.

Already we have passed an amendment relating to a project in Arizona. There remain projects in Colorado, Idaho, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Washington, and $4,000,000 worth of small projects. We are either going to have a food program that includes the whole thing or we might as well face the possibility that we get nothing. I would a whole lot rather this House take the position that it wants to go along eventually with the Senate for a real program and not try to pick these projects out piecemeal and decide upon them in that way.

I point out also that this request for $1,900,000 is not all by a long ways that is in this bill. There are $28,000,000 for

this project and only $1,900,000 of it for power lines. It is not fair for us to look at it in that way. Remember also when you talk about the consumers paying it back, they pay back for this power line, yes; but the other items in the bill involve a great deal of money, some of which comes out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says he is a sincere friend of the great Central Valley project.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am too, and have been from its inception. Do I understand the gentleman to say now that if the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is voted down there will be another and better opportunity for all of these items of reclamation for production of war food to go to conference and be worked out in an orderly fashion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I think we all recognize that the Senate conferees have been insisting that all these projects go through as one connected program for the development of the food program of this world. We realize that the United States is going to have to devote some time to food. The Senate conferees have been insisting that the entire group of projects be supported.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in agreement with the gentleman about the food program completely, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is a bit confusing—at least it is to me—to understand how I am going to forward that by agreeing to a motion which, in effect, puts the House on record as insisting upon its former position, which includes none of the items.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I understand the confusion. I feel just as badly as the gentleman does, but I recognize that this motion is not going to prevail, because you cannot carry it on this sort of an appeal, to just give one thing for Central Valley for power only, when the country needs food and needs lots of food, and needs it from Oklahoma, needs it from Idaho, needs it from Colorado, and needs it from all these little projects the gentleman from Montana included.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose all these amendments were included together and you were instructed to go back and still resist them. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he would now favor the $4,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Definitely; of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. All of the others that are included in this?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Surely, and so do the Senate conferees.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If this is voted down, that is what the gentleman will do?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is what I tried to do a while ago, when I tried to loop them together, from 96 to 120.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know there is a great need for war industries in California that will be served by this power?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly, but I also recognize there is a project in the gentleman's State. They ought all to be taken together in an attempt to provide a well-rounded program.

I want to say in behalf of the members of the congressional delegation from California that they have been extremely fair on this project. They have not tried to crowd the thing through. I think we ought to recognize that fact. I am deeply sorry that the gentleman from Mississippi, who is solely interested in public power, should have jeopardized the food program by trying to ask for separate votes on these amendments. I say to the House that we need to try to stand together and get a decent food program. Eventually we can hope to accomplish it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know whether I quite understood the gentleman correctly. Is it his idea that if we further insist on the House position the gentleman's committee intends to compromise with the Senate on the basis of Budget estimates?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am sorry, I am not on the committee. I simply know that the Senate conferees have taken one position on the entire group in furtherance of a program laid down by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation for food for this country for war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the effort to get this money for this transmission line, and I should like to spend just a moment in answering the argument the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] just delivered.

The Central Valley water project, as the gentleman knows and as all of you know, is primarily a water project and consists of the Shasta Dam in the northern part of the Sacramento Valley, impounding the water from that valley, and by various types of works transmitting the water to the San Joaquin Valley, which has a great shortage of water but a lot of fertile land. If we build this dam up to the required height, the height provided in the reports of the Army engineers and in their recommendations, we shall only then be in a position to furnish the water to the arid land in the San Joaquin Valley that will produce the foods the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the rest of us want.

The thing we must get in our minds and thoroughly understand is this: The power features of this project are only a byproduct. The main thing is to get that water transmitted from the Sacramento Valley to the other valley. The way we can make money out of this project and make it pay for itself, getting back those millions of dollars, is to allow the water on the way down to the San Joaquin Valley to pass through the power plants. We have the generators to be installed at the Keswick Dam, which is 25 miles below the Shasta Dam. By installing these and completing the Shasta Dam we will then be in a position to have water to send to the San Joaquin Valley. This water can be passed through the Keswick Dam generators, and in this way, by selling the electricity thus generated, we can get back some money to help pay for the enormous cost of this project. This will help materially to reduce the cost of the water to the growers down in the San Joaquin Valley.

Another very important reason why I am particularly interested in this project is this particular situation: In Sacramento, which is the largest city in the Sacramento Valley, they have created a public-utility district. They voted enough bonds to buy and they have condemned the distributing system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the city of Sacramento and the surrounding territory, which comprises the Sacramento utility district. The price which was placed upon the distributing system by the Railroad Commission of California is within the amount of money that the utility district has. We are very anxious to have this power line go on down to Oroville, which is only 90 miles from Sacramento, and have the juice run through the public-owned line. If you do not do that, we must pass all the juice through the lines of the private power company, the P. G. & E.

Now the P. G. & E. have come there, and they state they are willing to save us a million five hundred thousand dollars, and everyone knows that a public-utility company is not out to give away a million or more dollars.

Mr. CARTER. If we turn it over to the Pacific Gas at Oroville, they still have their power there.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oroville, yes, but I want to see the public transmission line built as near Sacramento as possible. I know that the transmission line now contemplated does not go clear to the city of Sacramento, but if it goes over halfway now we will then be in position in the near future to get it into Sacramento when the Sacramento utility district gets into operation.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. And in case this is built, it would be merely a duplication, a parallel line?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There is no existing line now, so it will not be a duplication.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The gentleman says that we would get the power down through private industry, if this line is not built.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. If the public line is not built, the present private utility will take the electricity down in some such circuitous way through their line. They are asking right now to build additional power lines in California.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Government does not build this line and turns it over to a private company, it will have to use the same amount of material, and if the Government does it, it gets the material without paying tribute.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. We want this program carried out in accordance with the plan of the President and the request of the Interior Department, and if we do, we will reap some of the benefits that will come from the development of this electricity as a byproduct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand that that transmission line is to be built by the Government and brought there to private stations at Oroville, maintained by the P. G. & E., and that they in turn will distribute it to the consumer?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes; to the consumers or to the Sacramento utility district when its operations start.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What is the point of the Government bringing a transmission line to a private company and having them distribute the power?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The Interior Department does not feel that they can ask for enough money now to supply the transmission line all the way to Sacramento now, and they want to take the first step and bring it down as near as possible to the biggest block of consumers in that area, 150,000 to 200,000 people, who will be served by the Sacramento utility district, when its operations start, which will be soon.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Then, so in the final analysis the P. G. & E. Co. is getting the power brought to them, to their own distributing station, and selling it to the people.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. No; it would be sold to the Sacramento consumers by the Government, but it probably would, at first, be transmitted a part of the way from Shasta Dam to Sacramento over private wires. But ultimately it would be transmitted the entire distance over publicly owned lines. This proposed transmission line is only the first segment of the whole public transmission line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to the debate that has been going on. Yesterday evening, just about this hour, we voted in this House $300,000,000 to house people. What for? It was in the interest of the war effort and nothing else. And here we are squabbling over twenty-four million or twenty-five million dollars that all goes to reclamation projects to help win the war and feed the people. I for one think it is a d—— shame, and I mean just that, and I do not mean anything else. The time has come, if we are going to win this war, to face realities as they really are. We hear different ones talking about power. Some of the same Members who talked here today were not interested in power in 1939, when by record vote, they voted to turn over from the Forestry Department into the National Park System King's Canyon National Park, and when they voted that they voted to lock up a second Boulder Dam. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] talking about power, and he was one of the boys who voted to lock up that second Boulder Dam. Here is the true picture of the situation. The money allotted here by the Bureau of the Budget, I believe properly allocated to the project, is sufficient to get all of its features started whether located on the northern end of the project or the southern end, but I say to you that we have been talking about power for all these years when we should have been talking about the production of food and to increase food production, and the only way you will increase food production is in reclamation projects all over the United States, and you will increase food production in the Central Valley and on down in the San Joaquin Valley by getting water to 285,000 acres that lie south of the Friant Dam that are thirsty for water and that will produce a million tons of foodstuffs annually. We have been talking about power, and the railroad commission in the State of California just recently issued a statement that there is a surplus of power in the State of California at the present time, and no one can deny that. I say to you about the transmission lines that are in this bill, at the present time the only people that could distribute this power to the people of California are the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. They are the only people who can buy power and use it, and they have the facilities to take care of it, and we need perhaps an additional 25 miles of line to be built.

But the P. G. & E. will build their own lines, because they have to buy the power at the Shasta substation. The Department of the Interior has offered them a contract to sell the power at the power site, and they are the only people who have bid for the power.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I notice in this section there are $10,640,000 for the Friant division. Is the gentleman against that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am for that.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you for the transmission line, $1,900,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; because we do not need them at the present time.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you realize that both of them must stand or fall on this one vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I know that last year the gentleman was for power and not for water for the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. GEARHART. You know that is not true. I am talking here for irrigation and irrigation alone.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Read your remarks of last year. The question was put to you. You were asked whether you wanted power or water, and you said you would take the transmission line.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is a neighbor of California. For many years I have watched with deep solicitude the development of the great Central Valley in my neighboring State. It is a magnificent engineering conception with which I first became acquainted while on the staff of the University of California at Berkeley 14 years ago. I am for this development as much as any Californian on this floor. I feel today, however, that it is an unfortunate motion that is before us. I believe if we will vote down the well-intentioned motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi since he may not be able to withdraw it, and if we send all this group of amendments on irrigation projects in disagreement back to conference, that the conferees, with more time and calmer judgment, will work this thing out to the advantage of all, including all these projects taken together, which will add tremendously to our food-production possibilities. From the known stand of Donald Nelson and Chester Davis on these projects, it is likely Budget estimates may yet be had on them.

I am just as much in favor of this power line, which is included, as the gentleman from Mississippi or anyone from California. I would like to see that included because it is a small but strategic part of that great project which, in its entirety, will take many, many years to complete, but which can be completed in part quickly in order to add to the food production so sadly needed at this time. Anxious as I am about this key power line, I am not willing to sacrifice all of these other food projects for this one. That is why I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] which might have some such adverse effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN], 3 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to clear the atmosphere a little on this matter, so I will attempt in a short time to do that very thing.

The facts are that the P. G. & E. has contracted for all the power and all the energy that is developed at Shasta Dam, at the Shasta powerhouse. That contract carries on until 6 months after the war. The committee is willing that the Government build the line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation, a distance

of about 25 miles, which will cost around $400,000. The committee is opposed to having the Government build this line from Shasta substation to Oroville, a distance of about 70 miles, at a cost of $1,500,000.

The facts are the P. G. & E. will build that line with their own money and they are now ready to do that and furnish this power to the people who need it in California. The P. G. & E. is selling energy for about 3 cents a kilowatt. I think you will all agree that is quite reasonable.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Three cents a kilowatt for what? For domestic use or for manufacturing?

Mr. JENSEN. For domestic use.

Mr. WHITE. What about manufacturing use?

Mr. JENSEN. It is less.

Mr. WHITE. How much less?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know exactly what it is. I do not remember now.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think 1 cent a kilowatt for manufacturing use in our war industries is excessive when it is generated for 2½ mills a kilowatt?

Mr. JENSEN. Nobody out there is complaining about the cost of their current.

Mr. WHITE. I happen to be one of the members of an investigating committee which investigated the Hetch Hetchy and the P. G. & E. They bought power for 8 mills and retailed it for 40 mills in San Francisco, and San Francisco paid back more than they got from the P. G. & E. for the little part they used.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. The fact of the matter is that the Government is in too much business already. If you want the Government to get into more business, all right, vote for this amendment; but if you want the Government to stay out of business and let private industry run its business, here is a chance to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, when we reach page 86, I intend to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments 154½ to and including 160. In connection with the motion I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House two press releases from the War Production Board. One release is dated April 29, 1943, and is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
April 24, 1943.

Warning that "we will never have enough of anything until the war ends," H. G. Batcheller, Director af the War Production Board Steel Division, tonight pointed out that the current supply of steel is considerably less than demand, and that substantial cuts are being made in the amounts of steel requested by claimant agencies for use during the third quarter of 1943.

In a speech before the annual conference of the National Open Hearth Committee, and the Blast Furnace and Raw Materials Committee, of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Batcheller revealed the specific percentage reductions in major claimant agency requests for steel which the Steel Division has recommended to the War Production Board Requirements Committee.

Commenting on the reductions in requests for steel, Mr. Batcheller laid particular emphasis on the fact that stories and rumors to the effect that shifts in munitions production would result in a freer supply of steel, were completely untrue. They are, in fact, a direct threat to higher industrial production, he said.

Both production and distribution must be flexible enough to permit rapid shifts from one weapon to another, Mr. Batcheller declared. The problem of making enough steel of the right kind at the right time in the face of changing conditions dictated by military strategy and battlefield experience has been and will remain highly complex. This does not permit an easing of restrictions on less essential use of steel, he continued.

"If anything is certain in this war," he declared, "it is the immensity of the twin task of producing enough steel to win the war and of finding ways of distributing enough steel and other industrial products to rebuild the world and win the peace. Never before has the steel industry, and the country which it serves, faced a job so important."

Total requests by the 16 claimant agencies for the third quarter, Mr. Batcheller said, amounted to about 21,000,000 tons of finished carbon steel. Available for allocation will be approximately 15,000,000 tons.

"While I cannot give you specific tonnage figures for the individual claimant agencies, since the final decision has not yet been made by the War Production Board Requirement Committee, I can indicate to you in approximate terms the extent to which the requests for steel will have to be revised downward.

"The recommendations made to the Requirement Committee by the Steel Division, which may be adjusted slightly, give the following picture:

"The War Department's request for carbon steel to be delivered during July, August, and September of this year will havt to be cut by about 14 percent. And its request for alloys will have to be trimmed by about one-sixth.

"The amount of carbon steel which the Steel Division has recommended for allocation to the Navy Department during the third quarter is 20 percent less than the stated requirement. And the Navy, like the Army, will probably have to get along with one-sixth less alloy steel during the third quarter than it requested.

"Similarly, the Steel Division has recommended a reduction of about 22 percent in Maritime Commission requests for carbon steel, 32 percent in the Lend-Lease Administration requests, and 40 percent in the Office of Defense Transportation request.

"It is difficult to make these reductions when we know that many of the requirements are not overstatements," the Steel Division Director added.

"The steel could be used in the full amounts asked for if we could provide it. The plain fact is that we cannot, and therefore must distribute the steel we have in the places that need it most.

"You can see how much happier our position would be if you gentlemen could give us more steel out of existing equipment, while at the same time doing all in your own power to bring into production the new capacity provided under the expansion program.

"The War Production Board, the Steel Division, and the steel industry do not want to interfere with the strategic objectives of any of the Government agencies which are doing their best on all fronts—military, political, and economic—to shorten this war and bring Germany and Japan to their knees. But the available supply of steel is simply less than the well-considered claimant agency demands."

Reviewing some of the accomplishments of the steel industry under wartime pressure, Mr. Batcheller said that plate production in March had set an all-time record of 1,167,679 tons, which permitted, among other things, a record-breaking month for merchant ship production.

New production records are being made in alloy steel—the aristocrat of material for war-making—with 1,264,679 net tons produced in March "as a result of the steel industry's efforts to provide the greatest volume of the richest alloy steels available to any armed force in this war."

Complacency, however, Mr. Batcheller warned, would be a serious danger.

"Remember," he warned, "we have hardly begun to fight, to lose lives, and use steel on a major scale in either Europe or Asia, and the dangers of war do not take into account rated capacities.

"All that counts is production, more production, and still more production. That is what we need. In the Steel Division, we know that more steel production is what we will get. We know that you will not let us down."

The other release is dated June 28, 1943, and is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
June 28, 1943.

Cooperation of 2,000 of the largest manufacturing consumers of steel is being enlisted by the Steel Division, working with the 12 War Production Board regional offices, to achieve a better distribution of third and fourth quarter production, H. G. Batcheller, director of the division, said today.

This effort—in effect, a campaign to "Share the Steel"—is one part of the drive announced yesterday by the War Production Board to obtain an extra 2,000,000 tons of steel during the last 6 months of 1943.

Steel Division officials, thoroughly familiar with steel products and steel operations, are being sent by the Washington office of the steel division to War Production Board regional offices throughout the United States. These men, aided by regional office representatives in each area, will work with consumers to see if steel supplies on hand will permit the elimination or deferment of third and fourth quarter orders on producers' books without interfering with authorized schedules.

If this move is successful, additional allotments can be authorized immediately for other war users of steel with the production space thus obtained on steel producers' books.

"This is completely a cooperative movement," Mr. Batcheller said, "and upon its success will depend in large measure the attainment of our objective of making available additional steel for the last half of this year.

"We are sending all steel producers a chart of the regional offices, and the Steel Division personnel detailed to each for the purpose of this campaign. It will be most helpful if producers send copies of the chart to their district sales offices, so that they will be able to give their best aid to the Steel Division men who will be working with consumers in their respective territories."

Mr. Batcheller, in explaining the necessity for the "Share the Steel" campaign, said that for the third quarter of 1943 the various claimant agencies presented allotment requests totaling about 23,500,000 tons of carbon and alloy steel, against an estimated supply of 16,250,000 tons. As a result, all requests had to be reduced to a considerable degree, and many of the agencies were unable to allot steel for some important programs.

"Additional steel can very profitably be used for urgent war needs if it becomes available," Mr. Batcheller said.

"Therefore, effort is being made to see that every possible ton of steel is produced during the third and fourth quarters. In addition to this, an organized compaign is being conducted to obtain the cooperation of a number of the larger steel consumers in reducing third- and fourth-quarter orders on books of producers where these orders can be eliminated or deferred without interfering with authorized programs If this move is successful, additional allotments will be authorized immediately to provide orders for any production space thus obtained."

Senate amendment No. 160 provides $2,750,000 for an investigation of raw material resources for steel production; whereas, the House bill appropriated only $149,000 and the House bill restricted the investigation to a certain particular area of the country. The Senate amendment is in accord with the recommendation of the Boykin Committee, which was authorized by the House to investigate the steel shortage, and it is likewise in accord with the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines. Certainly no one will attempt to underrate the importance of the investigation sought to be provided for in the Senate amendments, and I hope that on tomorrow the House will approve my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, which provide the necessary money for this very important investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the two press releases referred to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here about the sale of this power. In fact, my colleague from California said that he wanted this power transported down to Oroville, where it would be sold. That shows a woeful lack of understanding of the present situation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Not now. If I have time later I will yield.

I have in my hand the proposed contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Department of the Interior, and it provides for the delivery and the measuring and the paying for all of this power at the substation, which is just 25 miles from the Shasta Dam.

A power line by the Government should be built from the Shasta substation to the powerhouse, to be sure. Why, Mr. Speaker, you are not building a power line for the Interior Department. You are building it for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and they are willing to build that power line themselves.

Section 10 of this proposed contract between the Department of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. provides for place of delivery of the electric power and energy contracted hereunder to be delivered to the company at its Shasta substation.

The contract provides further on that——

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield.

Mr. GEARHART. That is not a contract; it is nothing but a piece of paper.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California declines to yield.

Mr. CARTER. I declined to yield to the gentleman and his statement is that it is not a contract. I did not say that it was a contract. I said it was a contract that they are considering at the present time and the contract will be entered into; it is the Department of the Interior's own proposal. This came from the attorneys of the Interior Department.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. And is it not a fact that the Interior Department power director said that that contract would be entered into?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; they told us when they appeared before the committee that this contract would be entered into within 3 weeks.

The question here for this House to decide today is whether or not we want to put up the money, $1,900,000, to build a power line which, according to the terms of this contract is to be leased to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to say this power line should continue on beyond this substation. I have a map here that I regret you will be unable to see very well; some of you will be able to see it. This part of the map indicates the Shasta power plant, and the Shasta substation is about 20 miles southwest. There is indicated on the map the proposed line. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. already has a power line running down there, and they tell me that for the greater part of the year the entire Shasta power is never going to go to Oroville, that they are going to use that line—this power line shown on the map—to bring in the power from the other substations and they cannot accept, and they made this plain to the Department of the Interior, they cannot accept delivery of all of the power at Oroville. They expect to develop 150,000 kilowatts with installation at the Shasta Dam sometime next year. That power cannot all be transmitted over this line, and the sane, sensible, businesslike thing to do today is to let this power company build the power line and then let us just join the line across there, and a connecting line to their own transmission line and let them build, and let the Treasury of the United States be saved to the extent of $1,900,000. Mr. Speaker, when this Central Valley project first started out it was estimated by the Department of the Interior to cost $160,000,000. We heard the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] say a few minutes ago that it was expected now that it would cost $325,000,000. Mr. Speaker, I happen to own property down in the part of the State that is supposed to be served by this power and I am one of those who is going to have to pay this tax. I thought that we might be able to carry a burden of $160,000,000, but they put on this and that and the other thing until the cost, as has been stated here, is now to be $325,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California 3 additional minutes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The contract which the gentleman from California has referred to, of course, was made because there was no transmission line over which you could deliver the power, over which the juice could be sent; that was why it was entered into, was it not?

Mr. CARTER. This is the contract which is pending right now.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I know; but the basis of the discussion for the contract is because they have no line over which the energy could be transmitted now.

Mr. CARTER. Under the terms of this contract the Department of the Interior wants to build this transmission line.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is the reason back of it, is it not?

Mr CARTER. Then they want to turn it over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., according to the terms of the contract.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. How do they propose to connect with the Sacramento transmission?

Mr. CARTER. They can bring it down either route.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for the purpose of withdrawing a motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and offer another motion, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his motion.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to inquire whether or not under the rules of the House the gentleman has the right to withdraw a motion should such action be objected to.

The SPEAKER. In the House that may be done.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 110 with an amendment to strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "$15,374,000," of which $1,900,000 shall be available for the construction of the Shasta-Oroville transmission line and terminal facility.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. As I understood the reading of the amend-

ment it was to strike out $11,500,000. I do not know where in the Senate amendment there are such figures as $11,500,000. I am unable to find them in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. The Senate amendment was to strike out $11,500,000 and insert $15,374,000. I am following the Senate amendment exactly down to the point that involves this Shasta transmission line.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the motion.

The Clerk again read the motion.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment cannot possibly be considered because there is no $11,500,000. That has been stricken by the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Senate struck out the figures $11,500,000 and inserted the language quoted in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. My motion includes the language of the Senate amendment down to and including the word "facility" in line 12.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Do I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi is attempting to strike something out of the bill that was stricken out in the Senate?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has held and now holds that the gentleman from Mississippi has made a proper motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will take these 2 minutes to explain again that this is for the construction of the transmission line. I do not care what the contract that was submitted showed, I have a letter from the President saying that this proposition is necessary. There is more involved than the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] indicates.

This line ought to be built and it ought to be built now, for then, as the President has said in his letter, it will be a part of that great project to be used for the benefit of the people of that section of the country for all time to come.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, naturally I would jump at an opportunity of getting some more money, but I want to have some respect from my colleagues who are on this subcommittee. After a very severe fight in the subcommittee they were willing to permit but $11,500,000 to go into this bill. One of the arguments they used against me was that the Bureau of Reclamation had a $12,000,000 carry-over. They said that if additional sums could be justified they would be willing to grant them. So I am going to go back into conference and see if I cannot persuade my colleagues to increase the sum and take my chances along with the rest of the boys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I promised the gentleman from Idaho 2 minutes. I now yield to him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 42, noes 138.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 145

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given until midnight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 145.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to me and my answer to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROWE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAGNUSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. DREWRY, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would not address the House at this late hour and I ask that that time be not insisted upon by the audience.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], who got quite up in the air some months ago about the question of air supremacy, has now broadened her caustic comments to take in the whole field of foreign affairs. In a prepared speech delivered here a few days ago, she condemned the President and the State Department for not having a foreign policy, coined for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some rather startling new words, and made the front pages of the newspapers across the Nation. Unlike another new Member here who has offered in short and sufficient prose what may be one of our first steps toward post-war peace organization, the delightful gentlewoman has enshrouded her thoughts in a maze of beautifully constructed, though contradictory, sentences and left us dizzy in our mental effort to follow her around the circle. We—as she—always met ourselves coming back.

I had the pleasure of hearing only the latter part of the gentlelady's eloquent speech last Thursday, else I should have been constrained to say a few words then in my puzzlement. But next day when the RECORD came from the press I, always delighting in the gentlewoman's clever vocabulary, read her whole talk very carefully only to find myself more confused than ever as to what path she follows in her search for the end of the rainbow where rests international cooperation and everlasting peace.

The gentlewoman took care to read to us the ordinary Webster's Collegiate Dictionary definition of the good, simple, homely, understandable word "policy." But she confused us by adding to her list of brain children the words "globlindness" and "globalliances" which do not appear in any dictionary. This list, which began when she spoke of "globaloney" in her maiden effort here, continues to grow with the addition of "WPAism," "poppa-fix-ism," "mama-do-good-ism," and "dazzledust." Mr. Speaker, statesmanship has a new language. Unconcernedly she adds in her address:

> It is the trick of politicians in high places today to raise a terrible dust of words * * * and then to complain that the people do not see.

Imagine the gentlewoman, of all people, charging anyone with raising a dust of words. She reminded us that "the Greeks invented the painless trick of the maze to drive ordinary men insane."

May I make so bold as to say to the charming lady that she has invented a maze of words which will most surely drive ordinary men mad should they make the futile effort to harmonize and

interpret them. With the genius of the accomplished playwright she is, she in her story led us through the labyrinth of her thoughts and held us in suspense awaiting a logical conclusion. Then she left us with no key to the puzzle she had made.

My first difficulty in attempting to understand the gentlewoman's global thinking came some weeks ago when she championed United States "sovereignty of the skies"—applying, of course, to our own territory—as against "freedom of the air" over every nation. Her argument as to the air may have been well and good had she not blithely tripped through her speech with no indicated understanding of the fact that air traffic is controlled by airports and not primarily by the air above them. She did not apply this principle to our interests. If she had she would have come to the inescapable realization that since Great Britain has air bases all over the world, some built with lend-lease funds, and the United States has not, a policy of air freedom would benefit the United States more than Britain.

As I have remarked, the theme of the lady's address is condemnation—of persons and policies. She condemns both isolationists whom she calls "unconverted interventionists" and interventionists whom she calls "renegade isolationists." She takes her own post in the vast no-man's land of the in-between.

In a breath, the gentlewoman condemns the Neutrality Act of the prewar period and the President for signing it. She well knows, though, that when the act was passed, 99 percent of the people of the United States wanted to stay out of war and that meant neutrality. The President in signing the act and following the will of the people was only doing what she said in her speech last week a President should do. In that address she said:

> In foreign affairs, as in all else, it is for the President of the United States to be the servant of the people, not their master, and certainly not their Delphic oracle.

I am led to believe from the remarks the gentlewoman herself made in a political speech to the Republicans of Wisconsin the other day that she herself would have voted for the Neutrality Act had she been here.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman be good enough to quote the words in which I said I would have voted for the Neutrality Act in case I had been here? I do not think the gentleman will find those words.

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not say that. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon. I stated it was indicated from her speech in Wisconsin. I am going to quote what the gentlewoman said in Wisconsin, according to the Washington Herald of Monday. If the Washington Herald and some of the other newspapers are mistaken, it is their mistake and not mine. I am sure the lady, who has had a large experience in the publishing field, knows that newspapers in quoting speeches of this kind are usually correct. This is what the gentlewoman said:

> If an isolationist is or was a man who wanted to stay out of the war, then I was and am an isolationist.

Although I had often heard that the gentlewoman from Connecticut belonged to the interventionist group, she indicated in her remarks in Wisconsin that she belonged with the great majority of Americans who wanted to stay out of war—before Pearl Harbor. She was quoted as saying:

> If an isolationist is or was a man who wanted to stay out of the war, then I was and am an isolationist, and so I believe was everybody in the United States before Pearl Harbor.

The lady has thus added to our bewilderment as to what she really stands for.

It is true that the Congresswoman says that she supports the Fulbright resolution. So do I. However, she certainly is out of tune with the obvious when she intimates that the President and the State Department do not look with favor on the principles embodied in this resolution. Into the speech, adding her endorsement to this move, the gentlewoman has injected a bitter, partisan tone which heretofore has been omitted from our discussions of this momentous step in our foreign policy. This resolution was not offered as expressing the sentiment of either party, but as expressing the wishes of the people. To date our talk of peace here has not been divided by this aisle, and there was no division in the committee which unanimously approved this resolution. The gentlewoman knows well enough that had this resolution come here as a proposal from the President and not through the independent channels of the House, the membership on the left-hand side of the aisle would have decried it as an effort on the part of the administration to dictate to the legislative branch and a desire to involve us forever in affairs from which we could better absent ourselves. The battle between the two parties then would have been on. The President and the Secretary of State know well enough that such a measure has its best chance of succeeding here if it comes offered as a free expression of the will of the people.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. Would the gentleman care to make a free expression on the floor of this House about how he feels about an Anglo-American alliance?

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentlewoman will just wait a minute or two, I shall try to touch on that.

The gentlewoman declares that all the other nations—European and Asiatic—have foreign policies and why therefore cannot we have one? She does not speak of the difficulty of maintaining a definite and clear-cut foreign policy under the form of government we have. She does not say that any effective foreign policy must be supported by treaties with foreign governments and that such treaties must be ratified by the Senate. She does not say that the minority party seeks always some broad surface in which to bore holes and scuttle any policy which an administration offers. The story is too well known for me to argue further here the cause of the League of Nations, but history will testify eternally that this Nation under the great Democrat Wilson had and tried to carry out the first concrete plan to preserve the peace of the world. And history tells too that organized opposition comprised chiefly of members of the opposition party in the Senate shattered his dream and the dream of the world.

The gentlelady says quite positively that we have no foreign policy. Then contrariwise she says that we have adopted the foreign policy of Britain, with whose interests she says ours are inseparably tied. She even grudgingly admits that that course was right insofar as self-defense at least was concerned.

Britain at least, she concedes then, has a foreign policy. And she says:

> I do not for one minute object to Great Britain's pursuing her own interests with vigor and selfishness so long as she is threatened and the world is threatened by the possibility of recurrent American isolation. * * * So long as high officials of this Government continue to make windy words and sentiments and vague principles such as the four freedoms, a substitute for the hard but patriotic business of statesmanship, Great Britain cannot do otherwise.

The lady does not care to mention that the "four freedoms" are supposed to be the basis of Britain's foreign policy now and that Churchill was joint enunciator of those principles. And she perhaps has forgotten what she said in her first speech here:

> Let us pity and not condemn Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill that they find themselves, like us, floundering in a sea of uncertainty. Let us try to understand that in such a situation they have no choice but to indulge in monumental generalities and noble catch-alls like the Atlantic Charter and virtuous platitudes like the "four freedoms."

She contends that the President and Secretary of State have made mistakes, and she cries out for mortals who cannot err to guide us. Let me emphasize that she said on this floor that America wants men who have a positive foreign policy and—

> Cannot possibly make a mistake about a thing as serious to the United States as the passage of the Neutrality Act.

O perfect man, who cannot possibly make a mistake, float not forever on the far horizon, remain not forever in the dream of the enthusiast, dwell not forever in the song of the poet, but come and make thy home among the children of men.

Finally the gentlewoman espouses a military alliance with Great Britain. The following are her words:

> I believe that the American foundation stone of American foreign policy ought to be a military alliance or nonaggression pact with Britain.

Surely the gentlewoman does not suggest that this alliance should be proposed

now by the President, because a little further along in her speech she says:

> We canot enter into a basic alliance with the British Empire if to do so would provoke the reasonable enmity of or suspicion of other peoples such as the Russians and the Chinese.

Is it not reasonable to say that such an alliance with Great Britain at the present time would without doubt create certain suspicions in the minds of the Russians and Chinese and possibly others of the United Nations?

Only a few weeks ago the gentlewoman said on the floor of this House:

> There is a vast area of specific war and peace aims which can never be clarified, stated, or proposed, and certainly not enjoined upon the world until we know what goes on in the mind of Joseph Stalin. * * * Not until we know whether we are to meet and confer with iron-hearted Stalin or like-minded men on the Vistula, or on the Rhine, or on the Seine, or at the Great Wall of China, or on the Yellow River, or in Tokyo, can we or our allies realistically plan a post-war world.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LUCE. When that speech about what went on in the mind of Stalin was delivered on the floor of this House it was before I had seen the picture called Mission to Moscow.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I ask the gentlewoman, since she has seen that picture, has she changed her mind?

Mrs. LUCE. No, but since I have seen that picture I am under the impression that the President, who gave it his approval, did know what went on in the mind of Stalin. He and Mr. Joseph Davies seemed to know perfectly well what was going on, on the basis of which, perhaps, they could form a foreign policy toward Russia. Unless, of course, the picture itself were untruthful?

Mr. RICHARDS. Then if the gentlewoman found out from that picture that the President and the Secretary of State know what is going on in the mind of Stalin, possibly from that picture her mind was enlightened also as to what is going on in the mind of Stalin. Does the gentlewoman contend or admit that she knows what is going on in the mind of the silent man in the Kremlin today? (The gentlewoman does not answer.)

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman. He is a most able Member of the House. We have heard a great deal about foreign policy. Does not the gentleman believe that the foreign policy of this country will be determined by the boys who come back from the battle fronts and not by us who are here?

Mr. RICHARDS. Emphatically.

According to the gentlewoman's own words, it would not be wise for the United States to move far in the international alliance field during the progress of this war until we know what Stalin and other Allied leaders seek to accomplish for their own nations after this war is won. Has the gentlewoman now access to the thoughts of the silent man in the Kremlin and the aims of those who rule or tomorrow will rule the banks of the Vistula and the Rhine and the Seine and the Great Wall and the Yellow River and the Japanese Empire?

Like the gentlewoman, I am in favor of the Fulbright resolution. I am in favor of international cooperation. But I am not in favor of an alliance with Great Britain on the basis of the Churchill doctrine—"We will hold what we have." The lady well knows that any successful international cooperative body to preserve the peace must include other nations beside Great Britain and must be founded on a basis of give and take. If, on that basis, Great Britain will enter such a world body alongside the United States after this war is won, it will be a success. If the Empire proposes, as has been her custom, to dominate such a body, the wishful dream of the predominant majority of our people will never materialize.

It is noted that the gentlewoman was generous enough to admit that the administration has established a definite foreign policy insofar as the Western Hemisphere is concerned. She might well have said too that this good-neighbor policy of the President and Secretary Hull has cemented the peacetime ties of friendship between us and our South American and Central American neighbors tighter than they have ever been before. It also has borne rich fruits for us in this war as it has brought to our side many smaller nations that would not be there were it not for this policy. May I add that in establishing this policy the President and Secretary of State had to overcome various antagonisms brought about by the foreign policy of preceding Republican administrations.

We then—by the gentlelady's generous admission—have a Western Hemisphere policy. But, she says, our foreign thinking stops at the water's edge. The millions who have sons abroad welding our foreign policy into actions do not think so. And neither do I. Our foreign policy toward Europe and Asia today is one known to all and which—unlike the lady's speeches—all can comprehend. It is a two-edged sword held up between us and the totalitarian darkness. For our allies it promises friendship and assistance. For our enemies it has but one message: unconditional surrender. For all the world it offers hope. Nothing further can be added now nor needs to be. To adopt now a policy of post-war alliance with Great Britain or any other single power could only engender suspicion in the minds of other nations fighting in the common cause. The Fulbright resolution—itself as simple and direct as our fight-and-befriend policy—should be taken up now and passed by this House. Not at the dictates of the President, as an administration policy, but as the spontaneous, concrete, and unanimous opinion of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. It commits us only to a course to which we and all other nations can subscribe. We have, in fact, war alliances now in effect with all the nations of the world who, like us, oppose the Axis. To support them we have pooled all our resources, including the blood of our people. In fairness to these allies and in consideration of our own vital interests, the people of this country cannot afford now to perfect further alliances with any one nation. The people are, however, emphatically in favor of the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

Those words, "a just and lasting peace," have mocked us through the years and grown dull and trite with indiscriminate and wishful use. Now again we stand at a point from which—if we follow the straight path of realism instead of chasing will-o'-the-wisps of fancy—we may renew their meaning.

Mr. Speaker, may I, in closing, say to the versatile and brilliant gentlewoman from Connecticut that if she really wishes to see the Fulbright resolution passed by this House, if she really believes that the United States should initiate a program of international cooperation to insure a just and lasting peace, then it would be better, far better, for the gentlewoman not to reopen here old partisan wounds as to mistakes made in years gone by; for after all both Democrats and Republicans are only human and have made mistakes. Now we are all fighting together for the existence of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HENRY FORD—80 YEARS OLD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, to live fourscore years is an honor. To live honorably for 80 years is a distinction. To live nobly and usefully for 80 years is an achievement. We know many men who are old, and by custom we respect them. Some men are old at 50, either in mind or body, but to live 80 years and still retain the vigor of youth and the vision of the prophets is the reward for sobriety, moderation, and following Divine guidance.

He has broken his lance in defense of truth, yet with unfailing courage has caught up another and charged on. When all about him was chaos and the day seemed lost, he forged order out of

that chaos. When his adversary thought he had been defeated, he arose again to make victory certain. Now, in the closing days of his eightieth year, he endured a great personal loss—the passing of his only son—yet he stood erect and bore that sorrow with a fortitude earned out of his own experience. This is Henry Ford.

Our Nation's history is a story of the deeds of great men. Out of every crisis has risen a great leader, but we are often so blinded by the crisis that we cannot see the leader until his days are done. We live on the rising and falling tides of the present while he bridges the flood alone, leaving a path for those who follow. Because he had vision, we call him great. What makes a man great? A beloved American poet found the answer in this message from a father to his son:

How big was Alexander, Pa,
That people called him great?
Was he like old Goliath, tall
His spear a hundredweight?

Was he so large that he could stand
Like some tall steeple high,
And while his feet were on the ground
His hands could touch the sky?

Oh, no, my child, about as large
As I or Uncle James
'Twas not his stature made him great,
But greatness of his name.

Stature does not make a man great. In that matchless volume of ageless literature, the Bible, we read that:

There were giants in the earth in those days.

These were physical giants. Goliath was one of them, but he was destroyed by a boy who had a new idea. There also were in those days giants of vision. They charted the course their weaker brothers could follow. The ideas born in their minds were not plans for destruction but for progress, and because they succeeded they were called prophets.

There are giants in the earth in these days too, and because they succeed and do good we call them great. Such a man is Henry Ford, but to call him a prophet would be displeasing to him. To call him a giant would be a travesty on his physical stature. But to call him great does not do justice to his record. We must instead look upon him as a tradition, because as long as men travel, as long as men and machines combine their energies to produce the things people need from the soil or in the factory, there will always be the tradition of Henry Ford.

Born a humble man who acquired but a meager education, he has never lost the common touch. Every thought he has had from the time he first conceived a new form of transportation until this moment when he is looking to the future, has been for the betterment of what we know as the common man.

That he has accumulated wealth through his genius is only incidental. Mr. Ford is a wealthy man, but the greatness of his wealth consists of the good he has done and is doing. He has always used his wealth to better the lot of his fellow men. As one who has known him personally these many years and has resided all his life in the vicinity where Mr. Ford lives, I can say that the good he has done for untold multitudes will never be fully known until he walks with us no more. There has never been a time when he has used his wealth to gain the power wealth can bring. He has not wanted power. His thought has been to use wealth as a raw material out of which men and women can receive the necessities of life, and in view of his deep spiritual convictions, it is only natural that his attitude toward wealth has been patterned after a portion of the old Psalm:

Therefore I love the Commandments above gold, yea above fine gold.

I wish I could tell you what Mr. Ford has in his mind as he looks into the future. To do so would be to take on the mantle of the prophet. But no man will have that pleasure, for only Henry Ford knows what path the Henry Ford tradition will follow next. What those who know him can tell you is that the mind of this genius is looking 10, 15 and 20 years beyond the war. He is looking at the peace he loves when men will live by the fruits of their labors and when the strength of nations will be measured by the alms they share rather than by the arms they bear.

But while the nations are at war, there is no man who will give or who has given more of his knowledge and resources to win the struggle and the peace than Henry Ford. He hates war, but he hates tyranny more. In order that the men who wear the uniform of our country may be better equipped to achieve success, preserve a government of freedom and justice, and return safely to their homes, he is trying to build the safest tank, the most powerful airplane engine, and the best bomber in the world.

To speed that day Mr. Ford has given an empire to his government. It began in an alley barn. It was born of a small gasoline motor that later became the heart of a horseless carriage. It grew into the automobile and around it has grown the greatest expanse of an industry the world has ever known. Standing alone in the midst of this great productive force is the monument to Mr. Ford's genius—the Ford Motor Co. with its far-flung plants and vast sources of raw materials. This great enterprise is now pledged completely to the war effort from the single soybean in the laboratory to the massive slabs of white-hot steel that will soon be shaped into weapons.

Mr. Ford believed that he had completed the active period of his life with his company and that he could withdraw into the silent recesses of his experimental laboratories to lay the foundation stones of a better future for men. But, "Man proposes while God disposes," and the Almighty in His wisdom removed his only son whom he trusted implicitly to carry on the Ford tradition. There was no one to fill the vacant chair, so at four-score years and for the second time he assumed the presidency of his company. That he must pilot this vast dominion through the greatest war in history when once before he thought he had helped arm the Nation for a war to end all wars, is tragedy heaped on tragedy.

Time has dealt kindly with Henry Ford. He is as alert and vigorous today, hastening from one war machine to another, as he was those many years ago when he and Mrs. Ford bolted an old water pipe and flywheel to the kitchen sink and made a gasoline motor.

The years are rolling swiftly over the muddled seas of circumstance in our time, but after them follows an ever-widening wake of confidence. The dark hours have passed and the dawn is near. When the full light of victory throws off the mantle of death and destruction, there will be giants standing there in our day as in the days of the prophets. Among them will stand the quiet man from Bagley Avenue, Detroit, who tinkered at his lathe, made a motor run, and changed the course of empires.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman has expressed the feelings of every good Detroiter, of every good citizen of the city of Detroit, in what he has said here this afternoon about that other important citizen of our city. He is a man we all respect and hold very highly. He is a man who has been able in the Second World War to come out and make a great contribution again that will add greatly to the victory that will be ours. I only wish the gentleman had also expressed the fact that it was Henry Ford, when he was struggling to put over this great automobile program, who won a great fight with the Wall Street interests that tried to strangle him just when he was getting on his feet. For the first time that anyone was able to do it, he defeated the Wall Street interests and was able to show to the rest of the industrialists that he was greater than the financiers of that great district.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a beautiful and proper tribute, one much deserved, to a great man. I could not add to it if I wished. I feel, however, that this thought is pertinent, that the duty we have before us in this day and hour is to retain an economic system that will make possible more Henry Fords.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I congratulate the gentleman for his eloquent and beautiful tribute to a really great American.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order may be put over until Monday next in case the House is still in session at that time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FREEDOM FROM WANT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am using, as the basis of my discussion this afternoon, one of the President's "four freedoms," freedom from want. The American people face a serious situation in my opinion with regard to the production, distribution, and supply of food. Unless the supply of food is substantially increased, and a more satisfactory plan of distribution adopted in the near future, the food problem will be critical. It seems obvious that a policy of rolling back retail food prices supported by subsidy payments from the Federal Treasury will not solve the question. This does not mean we should not have ceilings where they are needed to prevent runaway prices but subsidies will not increase the supply of food which, after all, is the most important thing. Neither will subsidies bring about a better distribution or prevent inflation. I believe that payment of hundreds of million of dollars in subsidies to roll-back prices on a few rationed food items will not cut down to any appreciable amount the cost of living for the average consumer. Our people should understand that funds used for payment of subsidies to reduce the cost of foods will, after all, be paid in bonds and future taxes that will be charged to our children, our grandchildren, as well as to the soldiers abroad; because this generation will never be able to pay a very great share of the huge indebtedness that is being incurred now.

Mr. Speaker, in order to have freedom from want, the most important need is a program and policy that will encourage and provide for a maximum production and supply of food. Provision must be made whereby this supply is fairly and equitably distributed. Mr. Speaker, I think we have learned from our recent experience that all activities dealing with production and distribution of food, as well as of price adjustment and control of food should be placed under one head with power and authority to carry out a definite, well-organized, well-rounded and far-reaching program. We are advised that there are about nine agencies in our Government with divided authority attempting to deal with the question of production and distribution and control of food. There ought to be one agency with final authority to determine these questions.

Mr. Speaker, it must be recognized that food is one of the most important factors in our war program. There must be a greater realization on the part of officials in high places that the farmer and the producer are among the most important of our war workers and they should be placed on a level of recognition with men and women engaged in other industries contributing directly to the prosecution of the war. It has been said that a vehicle must run on all four wheels. The production of food is one of the most important of those wheels. The farmer must be assured, beginning right now, that he will have an adequate supply of farm machinery, equipment, repairs and other things that contribute to increased production. He must be relieved of the many controls and rules and regulations and red tape that are hampering and slowing him down. Furthermore, those who are responsible for the administration of such program and those who act in an advisory capacity must be individuals with broad, practical experience in dealing with food production and distribution. In my judgment, we have too many theorists and experimenters dealing with this problem. This is a most important task.

We should be reminded that, after all, the farmer gets less than 50 percent of the amount paid for food by the ultimate consumer. With reference to a good many food items, he gets as little as 10 percent. The remainder, of course, goes into processing, marketing, transportation, wholesale, and retail expenses. When you think in terms of prices at the corner grocer, remember the amount you pay is not the amount that goes to the man who produces the food. Let me remind you also that in my community, and likewise throughout the country, farmers are working 12, 14, 16 hours a day in the hot summer weather in an attempt to meet the demand for increased supply of food not only for our armed forces and ourselves but for people in other parts of the world as well. It is not only the head of the family that is doing this work but also mother and all the children who have not gone to war. They are on the job from sunrise until sunset. The situation on the farm is much different from what is found in our cities where people work definite hours and then have hours for relaxation and amusements. As a general rule you will find the farmer stays pretty close to his task and that he is doing his work under a lot of handicaps and without a lot of conveniences that are afforded folks in other lines of work. My appeal this afternoon is not to give the farmers or any other group any advantages to which they are not entitled as individuals, but we had better make sure that no stone is left unturned to see that the great food producers of our country are given a chance to do everything possible to meet the challenge of preventing a scarcity of food in this country. Let us see to it, so far as we are concerned, that our obligations with respect to this problem are fully discharged.

Mr. Speaker, we need a definite and constructive farm policy. That policy should be part of an over-all food program coordinated with our domestic and foreign program. Our food production and distribution program must be examined from the standpoint of seeing to it that our production and distribution shall be at the very maximum that can be done by the people of this country. Right now the farmers of America are producing far more food per capita than anywhere else in the whole world. That production, in view of the demands of the present, as well as of the future, will have to be increased.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is entitled to receive for his products a price based on the cost of production when compared with the things he is required to buy in order to maintain a fair standard of living. Retail price ceilings should be regulated at a place where a farmer can afford to produce at the maximum of his efforts taking into account labor and other costs, and sufficient to stimulate and not hamper production. The farmer is not demanding excessive or run-away prices for his products.

Mr. Speaker, rationing of food should be done only in accordance with the supply that can be obtained under such rationing program. It should be at a balance of consumption with production and should not be higher than the available supply of the products rationed. Those in charge of the food program should see to it that the foods are equitably distributed and as far as possible economically handled so that no advantage will be taken of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that in my judgment a maximum production of farm products, including grains, dairy products, meats, and other foods, will do more to help defeat inflationary conditions in this country than any other proposal that can be offered. Certainly, we must ration food wherever necessary. Fix retail ceilings when and where required, but, above all things, stimulate the production and flow of food with a minimum of regulations, Executive orders, and requirements of various kinds.

Mr. Speaker, those in power and authority ought to work over, reexamine, and simplify the entire food situation. Then they should inaugurate a food production, distribution, and control program in line with the suggestions I have just made. Such program and policy should be carried out with practical judgment and common sense. An appeal should be made to the American people for their cooperation. They should be given to understand that it is a definite part of an over-all program in bringing this war to a victorious conclusion and of winning the peace thereafter. The results will be farther reaching, in my opinion, than they are now. We must have an over-all food policy. The American people must know about such policy and have sufficient interest and confidence in it to help carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I want to pay my respect to Hon. Chester Davis, who recently resigned his position as Food Administrator. Mr. Davis was a capable, conscientious public servant. I regret very much that he deemed it wise to take such action.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1130. An act to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly

enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 1, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Friday, July 2, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

528. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers reported to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

529. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

530. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

531. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of investigation of the contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission and the Navy Department relative to the sale of five vessels to the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., under agreement dated July 11, 1930; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGRANERY: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 145. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until January 1, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 346. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; with amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 273. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz (Medical Corps), United States Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 383. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; with amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt; with amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman; with amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton; with amendment (Rept. No. 633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Bucey; with amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Silvia; with amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; with amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3091. A bill relating to challenges in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3092. A bill to establish the method of selection of jurors in district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3093. A bill to establish standards fo selection of jurors to serve in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3094. A bill relating to employment and reemployment benefits of members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3095. A bill to increase the compensation of employees of the United States in the Territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3096. A bill to amend title 2, chapter 1, section 2a (a), as amended, relating to apportionment and number of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 3097. A bill to amend title 2, chapter 1, section 2a (a) and section 2b, as amended, relating to apportionment and number of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 283. Resolution authorizing the printing of 43,500 extra copies of the historical record of "America's Fighting Congress"; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1828. By SCHUETZ: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States to cast a ballot in national elections, at least insofar as candidates will be voted for by an entire State; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

1829. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Lena L. Jones and 320 other citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1830. By Mr. GILLETTE: Resolution adopted by City Council of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration center in Lycoming County, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1831. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Nettie Haworth and 44 other citizens of Tonganoxie and McLouth, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Hiram A. Spry, of Munith, Mich., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to compensation in connection with the loss of his leg due to causes arising out of service in the United States Navy in 1918; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1833. Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1834. Also, petition of the American Stock Yards Association of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the price of livestock and the ceilings of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1835. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to our country in defense of their flag and all it represents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1836. Also, petition of Lucille J. Butler, of Payson, Utah, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the dedication of this quiet moment at the beginning of the day we would that all voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. Show us the false glamour of things that too often deceive with their gaudy glitter. O Thou who art the life and the light, dawn upon our darkened minds; make us pure in heart, in motive, in thought, in action, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere.

Save us from being driven by the logic of our minds to a mere belief in Thee and yet living our days in spiritual poverty, oblivious to those deep streams of eternal help where the soul is refreshed and made sufficient for the evil of the day. As servants of the Commonwealth may we be diligent enough to seek the truth, honest enough to follow the gleam wherever it may lead, brave enough to proclaim it and defend it even though men may revile us and persecute us and say all manner of evil against us falsely. May all life, private and public, be to us as a sacrament. Make Thou our bodies Thy temples and our hearts Thy altars where the sacred flame is ever burning. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill; and concurred therein with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to Senate amendment numbered 19; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24 and 30 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 90)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $70,916.86 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Floyd Poland and sundry other citizens of Round Pond, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, by members of the First Christian Church, of Ottawa, Kans., praying for the adoption of measures to protect members of the armed forces from vices around training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition signed by members of the Woodland Methodist Church, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery,

Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, favoring retention of the Office of Price Administration as a unit to control the rationing and prices of all commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., favoring the stabilization of food and commodity prices so as to halt the rising cost of living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the mayor and council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the taking of such measures as may be necessary to reduce the price of food and commodities to the September 15, 1942, levels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Michigan Stream Control Commission, protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to create a division of water pollution control within the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to provide a permanent means of aiding civilian defense workers who are war casualties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery, Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, protesting against the use of the Little Steel formula as a basis of wage increases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the City Council of Lincoln Park, Mich., favoring amendment of the Social Security Act allowing municipalities if they so elect to participate in Social Security benefits for the benefit of their employees who are working in utilities or for the different phases and functions of municipal governments; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Coldsprings Township, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to eliminate poll taxes in the election of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Elks Lodge No. 544, of Benton Harbor, Mich., favoring the release of Jews from Axis territories; that Palestine be kept open to Jews, and that a sanctuary be established for refugees in allied and neutral countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Charlevoix, Mich., praying for the enactment of House bill 2032, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Kalkaska County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing Federal aid for snow removal programs in Michigan in what is commonly known as Snow Belt; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution by members of Detroit (Mich.) Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, favoring the enactment of legislation to pay substitute employees in the Postal Service a graduated scale of pay commensurate with the hourly rates of pay of regular employees based on length of service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery, Cereal, and Food Workers Division, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsing the Presidential veto of the so-called Smith-Connally labor bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for fair play and not persecution of civil servants and endorsing the integrity and work of Goodwin B. Watson, an analyst for the foreign broadcast intelligence service under the Government; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

A resolution of the Senate of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 72

"Whereas for the second time within the past month the Missouri River and its tributaries in the great State of Missouri have destroyed homes and places of business, laid waste to growing crops, flooded fertile farm lands, demolished important bridges, and washed away long stretches of valuable Missouri highways; and

"Whereas this destruction has brought great financial losses to this heretofore prosperous and energetic people who live in these fertile valleys and in the cities adjacent to these important streams; and

"Whereas unless some prompt and concerted effort is made to restore and rehabilitate these homes, these places of business, and these important highways, and unless some aid is given in the replanting of the crops in these fertile valleys, this State and this Nation will suffer an enormous loss: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Missouri, That we call upon the Members of Congress and those in high places in Washington, D. C., to act at once in this emergency by throwing the great resources of our National Government behind a substantial rehabilitation program, making it possible for these homes to be rebuilt, these places of business to be restored, these farm lands to be recultivated, and these highways and these bridges to be replaced; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, to Missouri's Senators and Members of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board, urging their prompt and individual attention to this most important matter."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAII

Mr. TYDINGS presented copies of reports of committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on various bills and resolutions pending before those two legislative bodies, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF CROP-INSURANCE PROGRAM—TELEGRAM FROM JAMES G. PATTON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate continues to insist upon continuation of the crop-insurance program. I regard it as one of the most important features of the national farm program and one which should not be abandoned until the program has had a fair chance to show what it can accomplish.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks and to have properly referred, a telegram from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, also urging continuance of the crop-insurance program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *June 30, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Farmers Union urges you to protest and requests that a protest from our organization be made on the floor of the Senate against the unreasonable position of a majority in the House of Representatives on crop insurance, and that full responsibility for making next year's increased wheat production goals unattainable be placed upon the groups and individuals assassinating crop insurance and crippling other farm programs. It is fake economy to abolish crop insurance now. It will be impossible to attain the 16,000,000-acre increase needed next year in wheat if farmers are denied insurance protection and asked to gamble the economic security of their families. The assassins of crop insurance know what they are doing and must stand in public judgment for it. National Farmers Union has always supported crop insurance as needed protection for the people who supply the Nation's bread. The war now makes it essential to national interest and more urgently needed than ever before. It is desired by everyone except greedy interests who are willing to disregard national welfare to expose small people to economic ruin and enthrone themselves high on the corpses.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

RESOLUTION OF WATERBURY (CONN.) LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Waterbury (Conn.) Lithuanian-American Council, embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held on June 27, 1943, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Senator JOHN DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting held at Waterbury, Conn., on June 27, 1943, under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., an organization newly created by the union of all Lithuanian groups anxious for a free and democratic Lithuania, with the purpose of lending all possible aid to the United States toward the successful prosecution of the war, and with the added aim of fostering a just and lasting peace amongst nations, the following resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of the 1,500 delegates and members there assembled.

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania is the struggling victim of an unprovoked invasion and occupation at the hands of Nazi tyrants,

"Whereas, the people of Lithuania have persevered and remained loyal to the principles of freedom and democracy upon which their nation was built; and still resist every attempt made to subjugate them or to assimilate them into a foreign state; and

"Whereas the loyal hearts of our relatives and countrymen again appeal to the leadership of the United States and her allies for inspiration and deliverance from the heavy oppressor's yoke: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That we affirm our complete support of the cause of the United States

and the policies of its leaders in their efforts to restore a world of free peoples; and

"*Resolved*, That we favor a peace wherein Lithuania, and the other peoples comprising the Baltic States, will be granted the territorial integrity and the freedoms promised them under the tenets of the Atlantic Charter, and

"*Resolved*, That we unite in our efforts to establish the Lithuanian state, restoring her to her place as a free, democratic, and independent nation safe from the hands of the Axis aggressors.

"*Be it finally resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Connecticut Members of both Houses of Congress."

CLARENCE V. BALANDA,
Chairman.
MARCELLE ANDRIKIS,
Secretary.

RELIEF OF FOOD INDUSTRY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have a telegram which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *July 2, 1943.*
Senator ED. H. MOORE:

Before taking your well earned vacation please help relieve food industry of present chaos. It cannot continue under present death-dealing restrictions until you reconvene.

WATSON ROGERS,
Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association.

I read my answer to that telegram, as follows:

JULY 2, 1943.

WATSON ROGERS,
Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association,
Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Your telegram states the positive truth. This Congress should not recess until there should have been established definitely a program for food administration. To quote Senator VANDENBERG, "The food program needs a Baruch committee" like the one that functioned in rubber. Continued chaotic operation will have repercussions that will be unbearable. It is dangerous to leave the situation as is.

E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following reports of committees during the last recess of the Senate:

From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 1294. A bill to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 381).

From the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with an amendment (Rept. No. 382).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 383); and

S. 763. A bill exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 384).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 1940. A bill prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 385).

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday I was advised that House Joint Resolution 144 which passed the House without opposition, and had come out of the Agricultural Committee of that body in the same way, had been messaged to the Senate. I was mistaken. The joint resolution has now been sent to the Senate by the House, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, through its chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], has authorized me, in his name, to report the joint resolution to the Senate and to recommend its passage. I, therefore, report the joint resolution, without amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will state, if any Senator desires an explanation of the measure, that it applies only to burley and flue-cured tobacco. It is approved and recommended by the growers and by the Department of Agriculture, and is necessary in order that the quota system may be continued and made applicable to the crop of 1944–45. In view of the efforts which are being made to increase food production, in some respects that might interfere temporarily with the growing of tobacco in the States affected. As I have said, the measure is recommended and desired by the tobacco interests, and by the Department of Agriculture, and it is really a very essential measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky if this is the same joint resolution to which he referred and which in part he explained yesterday?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the same joint resolution. I was then a little premature in trying to have it considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the explanation. Does the joint resolution refer to tobacco alone?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all, and there are only two classes of tobacco which it affects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky requesting a consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking unanimous consent for its present consideration upon the unanimous report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TAFT. I only suggest that it seems to me, if we are to undertake legislation, there should be a quorum called.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no opposition to the joint resolution, and, if it is agreeable to the Senate, I thought we could dispose of it.

What I should like to do as soon as we can get a quorum is to call the calendar; there is nothing else ready for consideration, although I see the Senator from Tennessee is present with a conference report. I am merely trying to facilitate business while we are waiting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on July 1, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 495. A bill to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 1026. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Lamkin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1300. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1301. A bill providing an exemption, in the case of certain motor vehicles, from the use tax imposed by section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bill 1302, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SMITH introduced Senate Joint Resolution 71, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMPILATION OF LIST OF TAXPAYERS RELIEVED FROM LIABILITY UNDER CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, for several weeks we have been feverishly working on appropriation bills, and have been so busy considering the many details involved that we may have lost sight of the shocking totals of all the bills. The over-all total is considerably more than $100,000,000,000. That is an enormous sum of money. All of it is money that the Government does not possess. Congress will have to find all of that money somewhere, sometime, and with the present tax rates almost to the point of confiscation, it is going to be no easy job for the Members who sit in future sessions of this Congress to provide funds to liquidate the enormous debt which we are passing on to ourselves and our posterity.

After this appropriation fever subsides and Congress comes to the sobering task of beating the barren bushes in vain search of revenue I can visualize some perservering Member with a good memory prying open the Ruml-plan tomb for the purpose of recovering that $6,500,000,000 of accrued income taxes that were canceled when this Congress enacted the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, commonly known as the Ruml tax cancelation plan, or the Ruml Santa Claus act. When that Ruml plan was under discussion there was much difference of opinion on various provisions of the bill, and especially the tax cancelation or tax-forgiveness feature. While I favored that part of the bill which provided for withholding tax payments at the source on wages and salaries, yet I vigorously opposed the provisions which canceled income taxes due the Government. I did not consider the cancelation of taxes to be necessary, economically sound, practical, equitable, or even desired by the rank and file of our taxpaying citizens. Some argued that the bill would be of most benefit to the large masses of our low-income citizens, but to me it looked like the bill provided for handing out large gifts from a deep debt-ridden Treasury to a group of political contractors and war profiteers, and thus be far more beneficial to large-income groups than to small-income groups.

But, Mr. President, the argument is over, and it will not be necessary for any of us to be in the dark much longer regarding who will reap the greatest benefits from the Ruml tax cancelation law, because it is now in operation and the reports are coming into the Treasury and the facts are being recorded. Many of our men in military service have asked me to look up the record and get the facts for them in order that they may scan the list of beneficiaries to find out how the canceled taxes of those who stayed safely at home and made enormous war profits compares with the meager benefits accruing to the boys who were forced to give up their business careers and go forth to risk their lives on the battlefields of the world to save this Nation and preserve our profit system of business enterprise. These soldier boys know that they were included in the tax cancelation plan, but they want to compare their meager gains with the gains of the war profiteers who stayed at home and reaped enormous profits while our boys were fighting and dying to protect this country. In order to obtain this information for these soldiers, and others who may be interested, I am today introducing a bill which will authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to compile and publish a public document listing the names, addresses, and amounts of all individuals who had their income taxes canceled under the terms of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. I am of the opinion, Mr. President, that when our full citizenship becomes entirely familiar with the true facts regarding the cancelation of an estimated $6,500,000,000 of income taxes due the Government at a time like this when our Government is in such urgent need of money that many of our good citizens who did not know the facts at the time the law was passed will not want to become beneficiaries of such useless public generosity and they will demand repeal of the law. Also when our people encounter the red tape and complicated system of reports which they must fill out and file periodically, I anticipate many of them will be further inclined to ask repeal of the law.

But, Mr. President, if no great public demand does develop for repeal of the tax cancelation part of the Ruml tax plan, I anticipate that as our public debt continues to increase and our tax revenue begins to dwindle, that in the not far distant future a tax-troubled Congress, frantically searching for revenue, will dig up the records on this tax cancelation bill of 1943 and enact legislation designed to recapture this estimated $6,500,000,000 of canceled taxes, or as much of it as then can be located. At that time the information which will be contained in the public record provided for in the bill I am today introducing, will be useful to Members of Congress. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for reference to the appropriate committee and ask consent that it be received and printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1302) to provide for the compilation and publication of a list showing the names and addresses of taxpayers relieved from liability for the payment of taxes under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 and the amounts of taxes from which such taxpayers are relieved from liability for payment was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to provide for the compilation and publication as a public document, at the earliest practicable date, of a list containing the names and addresses, listed alphabetically by names, of all taxpayers who, under the provisions of section 6 of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, are relieved of liability for the payment of any amount of tax. Such list shall contain, opposite the name of each taxpayer listed, figures showing the amount of tax from which, under the provisions of such section, he is relieved from liability for payment.

SEC. 2. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENT

Mr. DANAHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMERICA'S POST-WAR PLAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself, I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution and request that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That this Congress favors (1) the prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation by the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests.

RELOCATION CENTERS FOR JAPANESE

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 166), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is respectfully requested to issue an Executive order (1) directing the War Relocation Authority to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose of segregating persons of Japanese ancestry in relocation centers, whose loyalty to the United States is questionable or who are known to be disloyal, from those whose loyalty to the United States has been established, and for the purpose of establishing additional safeguards against sabotage by such persons; and (2) directing the appropriate agency of the Government to issue a full and complete authoritative public statement concerning conditions in relocation centers, and plans with respect to future operation of centers and the movement of persons of Japanese ancestry interned therein.

INSPECTIONS OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 167), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 65, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing inspections of the Military Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, is hereby increased by $7,000.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF ST. JOSEPH COLLEGE

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him during the commencement exercises at St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn., on June 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY TO HAMPTON BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce, delivered by him at Hampton Beach, N. H., on June 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon on June 15,

1943, at the annual meeting of the Kansas Institute of Inter-American Relations which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prohibition" published in the May 20, 1943, edition of the Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRITICAL CORN SITUATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on April 7, last, I took occasion to detain the Senate for a few moments to call the attention of its Members and that of the country to an alarming situation in respect to the corn which was frozen on the farms in the cribs and bins and warehouses. I said at that time that I was extremely alarmed with respect to the condition existing and asked that something be done about it by those in governmental agencies in Washington who had control of the situation. On June 18 I again discussed the same question before the Senate, and once more called attention to the seriousness of the situation with respect to the failure of the corn refineries of the country to obtain corn with which to produce many things necessary for the war effort.

Mr. President, on June 29 I am advised that the American Maize plant at Roby, Ind., has closed; the Corn Products plant at Pekin, Ill., has closed; the Clinton Starch plant at Clinton, Iowa, has closed; the Anheuser-Busch plant at St. Louis, Mo., has closed, and that four more plants will close by the end of this week if they are unable to obtain corn, namely, the Kansas City plant of the Corn Products Co., the Hubinger plant at Keokuk, Iowa, the National Starch plant at Indianapolis, Ind., and Penick and Ford, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

In the New York Times of June 29 I find the following:

Executives of two major corn refining companies said today the industry probably would have to close completely the latter part of July.

Their comments were made as Midwestern States awaited supplies of corn requisitioned in elevators last week by the War Food Administration, supplies which they said were only one-fourth the 20,000,000 bushels originally believed available.

DWINDLING OUTPUT

George M. Moffett, president of Corn Products Refining Co., whose big Pekin, Ill., plant closed last week because it lacked corn, said the approximately 5,000,000 bushels taken would have to be divided among the segments of his industry, the dry (breakfast food, etc.) processing plants and eastern livestock feeders.

Moffett said he expected "complete exhaustion" of corn supplies of the industry—including requisitioned grain—by about July 17.

Theodore Sander, Jr., president of American Maize-Products Co., said that while his plant at Roby, Ind., had been promised 675,000 bushels of corn and hoped to resume operations the morning of July 7, that would mean at best a 3 weeks' run.

"For the long term," Sander said, "we will find ourselves in the same position as last week." The Roby plant was forced to close last week and has received none of the requisitioned corn so far, he added. Also closed is the Clinton Co. factory at Clinton, Iowa.

On June 17, Mr. C. W. Kitchen, the Deputy Director of the Food Administration, wrote the Senator from Illinois a letter, in which, among other things, he said:

Corn is not flowing to market but is being kept on the farm and is being fed to hogs and other livestock. This is only natural, as the corn when sent to market is worth $1.07 maximum (Chicago price), whereas it is worth anywhere from $1.35 to $1.60 when fed to hogs.

This situation places all of the commercial users of corn in a position of competing, without success, for corn in the hands of the farmer.

In these circumstances the proper balance between animal production and industrial or commercial uses of corn is not maintained. The problem is of serious concern to the Administration and every effort is being made to work out a solution which will permit these essential industries to continue to operate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator think there is any solution except by restoring the balance between the price of corn and the price of meat?

Mr. LUCAS. That certainly must be done, and it can be done in only one of two ways: The Administration must either increase the price of corn to the farmer or it must roll back the price of meat.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, I admit that it has the plenary power to seize the corn on the farms in the hands of the farmers, but if anyone has an idea in his mind of doing that I hope he will get rid of it quickly because, in my opinion, nothing more unfortunate could happen than that such an effort should be made.

Mr. LUCAS. I heartily concur in the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin with respect to the requisitioning of any corn on the farms. It is my understanding that the Administration did requisition some 20,000,000 bushels of corn in the terminal elevators.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. And it was agreeable to the industry which owned the corn that such be done, but if the Administration has any thought of attempting to requisition the corn on the farms, binned there, which now belongs to the farmers, I hope it will forget about it, and the sooner it forgets, the better.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What I cannot understand is why this situation is permitted to drift day after day and week after week, with essential and important industries threatened with shut down, or actually shutting down, when every one admits the problem is present, but no one does anything about it. I think it is symptomatic of the entire confusion in the conduct of the war on the domestic front.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my only reason for rising is once more to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the deplorable and desperate situation in which we find ourselves as a result of the failure to do something with respect to the release of this corn. I have made the argument before, and I make it again, and I challenge any one on the floor of the Senate or any one in the departments to show me that if the producer of corn was given an additional price incentive, so far as the market is concerned, it would be inflationary. They just cannot do it. The price of corn stands in a peculiar and respectable position of its own so far as inflation is concerned, and it is a tragic error to say that raising the price of corn would be inflationary in its effect, thereby causing other people to ask for higher prices in connection with other commodities.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. First, let me say that I am in entire agreement with the thought just expressed by the Senator from Illinois. At the moment the ceiling price of corn, interpreted in connection with the price fixed on pork, $13.75 Chicago, would normally reflect a price on corn approximately 25 cents a bushel higher than the ceiling price on corn.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. It certainly could not be inflationary, as the Senator has said, to admit that the price of corn as reflected in the price of pork is reflected on the same basis in the prices of some other commodities or manufactured products.

Mr. LUCAS. It cannot be inflationary in the case of pork, it cannot be inflationary in the case of beef, it cannot be inflationary in the case of poultry, it cannot be inflationary in the case of lamb, because all those commodities are so far beyond parity that a substantial increase in cost will in nowise bring on inflation.

Mr. BUTLER. It simply amounts to this, that a farmer with corn to sell can net approximately $1.35 for it, basis Chicago, if he sells it in the form of pork, and he is being asked to sell it at $1.07 in some other form.

Mr. LUCAS. The letter from the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration says that the minimum the farmer can get for it by turning it into pigs is $1.35, and the maximum is $1.60. That is the situation we find, and under those circumstances we cannot blame the farmer for holding the corn.

Mr. President, a message came from the Department of Agriculture, issued by the War Food Administration, urging farmers to market the corn. I wish to read the message into the RECORD. It is as follows:

The War Food Administration today urged farmers to market promptly corn they would not need to carry their livestock until the 1943 crop is available, and at the same time took steps to remove any fears that such prompt marketings might result in financial sacrifice. The action was designed to make more corn available to essential war industries and to feeders in deficit areas. The volume of corn still on farms is probably over 800,000,000 bushels but farmers with surplus corn have been hesitating to market it.

To remove any hesitancy by farmers to market corn, the War Food Administration today announced that any farmer who, between July 1 and August 10, inclusive, sells

and delivers his corn to a country elevator acting as agent for Commodity Credit Corporation, would be eligible to receive immediately the applicable ceiling price, and later, if ceiling prices are increased on or before October 31, to receive a supplementary payment equal to the difference between the price ceiling in effect at the time he sold and the highest applicable ceiling price between the date of such sale and October 31.

Officials pointed out that the new offer does not imply any impending change in corn price ceilings. The action was taken, they said, solely to offset the effect of widespread rumors that corn ceilings will be raised. These rumors have contributed to the current holding back of corn by farmers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator from Illinois know who dreamed that one? [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know who is responsible for it, but it may be, Mr. President, that I am one of those responsible for spreading the rumor that there was hope the ceiling on corn would be removed and that the price of corn could go higher.

Mr. President, this is not anything new. As I stated a moment ago, I have been discussing this matter for the last 3 months. I have been agitating this problem for 6 months by requesting that something be done to remove the ceiling on corn.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator think that would move the farmers to market any of their corn?

Mr. LUCAS. From the standpoint of the war effort, I hope that it will, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma. I am in favor of any kind of an order which will induce the farmers to move the corn, any type of persuasion which will induce them to move it, because I see in these industries a great loss of manpower, a great loss of food, and a great loss of effort toward the winning of the war so long as their supply of corn is held down. Candidly speaking, I do not think this order will have any serious or material benefit toward the moving of the corn from the farms.

Mr. President, I wish to take the time of the Senate to read into the RECORD some telegrams and letters which are coming to my office from my State. The corn-products industry alone in the State of Illinois employs 9,000 persons. They are very well paid employees. Many are technical men. These agencies advise me that their inventory of corn will absolutely be gone, used up in the grinding, sometime before the 1st day of August, unless they can obtain some relief somewhere. Everything that has been done so far toward getting the farmer to move the corn from the farm to the local elevator has failed. The calling of loans was one thing which was tried. The farmer at the present time has plenty of money. He does not have to sell the corn if he has a loan on it. He is in a position to go to his bank and borrow sufficient money to pay off the Government loan, and thereby keep his corn.

The requisitioning of corn in the terminal elevators was discussed awhile ago, but that would mean only a drop in the bucket in keeping the mills grinding corn steadily as they have over a period of years, and especially since we went into the war.

I read a telegram from Otto Beich of Paul F. Beich Co., of Bloomington, Ill.:

Our plant, which produces 30 percent to 40 percent for the Army and Navy and 25 percent for war industry workers is threatened with shut-down due to lack of corn at various corn-sirup refining plants. Please use your influence to have ceilings set that will again encourage farmers to deliver corn to elevators.

Mr. President, the Beich Co. is a very responsible institution, located at Bloomington, Ill. From 30 to 40 percent of the product which it makes is candy bars which goes to the boys in the Army and the Navy. The armed services are vitally interested in this product. I have had the matter up with the Quartermaster General. The boys at the front would rather have candy bars which are made in this country than almost anything else which is sent over to them in the way of foods.

I read a telegram from the Allied Mills, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:

Present price ceilings corn continues to freeze corn movement from farms. Complete removal corn ceilings would move corn from farms into consuming channels and thus largely relieve the critical corn situation. Much of industry dependent upon corn is threatened with complete shut-downs which also includes our corporation engaged in the production of mixed feed for livestock and poultry. These suspensions of operations will result in pyramiding feed shortages. Hopeful that Congress will not adjourn until some action taken.

And so forth.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like the Senator to make an estimate of the time the present probable supply of corn would last if the ceiling price were raised, so as to supply the industries which need it, together with the present consumption of feed to livestock.

Mr. LUCAS. In answer to that query let me say to the able Senator that at the present time there are from 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels of corn in cribs on farms.

Mr. DAVIS. Nine hundred and fifty million bushels.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago I read a statement from the Food Administrator who said there were 800,000,000 bushels. I have heard there were 900,000,000 bushels. It is only an estimate which can be obtained from the men in the field. We are safe in saying that close to 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn is now in the cribs on the farms. Any appreciable amount which could be immediately moved would take care of the situation between now and the time when the next corn crop is harvested, which will begin sometime around the middle of September or first of October. It is estimated that all it would take is approximately 200,000,000 bushels of corn to tide us over in the emergency before the next crop comes along.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. MOORE. Does not the Senator think that the proper thing to do is to raise the ceiling price on corn?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been trying to get the ceiling price of corn raised for months, I will say, because, as I have said time and time again, and I now repeat, the rise of the price of corn is not an inflationary movement at the present time.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Culinart Products Co. which is interested in this question. I have also a letter from the Williamson Candy Co., of Chicago, which is interested in it. I have also a letter from a very responsible citizen in the State of Illinois, who writes as follows:

The corn products industry, as you know, is essential to the productivity of the textile manufacturers, papermakers, aluminum and steel foundries, bakeries, sirup mixers, confectioners, baking powder manufacturers, and others. I have been advised that a large part of the corn products industry will be compelled to suspend operations in the near future due to inability to obtain corn. The shortage of corn is said to have been brought about by the high price of pork. I am advised that corn fed on the farm is priced at $1.40 a bushel, while the ceiling price on corn, when sold on the open market, is $1.05. Consequently, very little corn is moving for industrial purposes.

These statements seem to present urgent reasons for careful inquiry into the problem presented by the corn products industry. It is suggested by good authority that if the Government would release corn held in the cribs and take steps to suppress alleged black markets in corn, the situation would be alleviated to some extent.

Mr. President, I wish once more to call to the attention of the Senate something concerning the corn program about which the farmer knows, but which the country in general does not know. The price of corn has been pegged by Executive order below parity. It cannot be raised to parity unless through legislation. It does not make much difference what Senators say; apparently corn is not going to parity price by regulation. On the other hand, the Congress passed a law, which the President signed, in which it was provided that the corn which was taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation on defaulted loans would not be sold to processors for less than parity price. As an example, let us say 1,000 bushels of corn belong to farmer A. He cannot sell that corn to the corn processor at other than the pegged price, which is under parity. There is another lot of a thousand bushels of corn, let us say, which has been taken over on a default loan, and which is located in the same yard around the little elevator in my section of the country. The Government owns that corn. It cannot be sold for less than parity. That is the irony of the situation in which we find ourselves. The Congress is doing one thing under the law with respect to corn refiners and the executive branch by decree is doing another thing with respect to the corn which the farmers own. This wholly indefensible position is one of the roots of the trouble.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. What is the parity price of corn?

Mr. LUCAS. Information from the Department of Agriculture is that the parity price of corn as of June 15 was $1.05 per bushel. The price of corn today under Executive order is under parity. It is a few cents below.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator receive notice today that the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the War Food Administration—as I recall, it was the Commodity Credit Corporation—had made the suggestion and offer that it would pay the difference between the present price ceiling and any subsequent higher price ceiling that might be fixed?

Mr. LUCAS. The answer is yes. I received that notice and read it into the RECORD a few moments ago, before the able Senator arrived in the Chamber.

Mr. GEORGE. I was interested to know whether the able Senator had received the notice.

Mr. LUCAS. The notice is now a part of the RECORD. I said I hoped that such a plea to the American farmer would have results, but I feared it would not. In other words, I want to see the corn moved into marketing channels under any kind of persuasive methods the departments can use; but careful reading and analysis of the order lead me to believe that very little corn will flow into the market, although I am told by the officials of the Department of Agriculture that they have had their men in the field and they have made inquiries along that line, and they believe the order will produce some corn.

The thought I desire to leave with the Senate is—and I hope I am wrong; I hope the order will produce the desired results—that the processors and refineries cannot operate much longer with the temporary measures which are being used in connection with the attempt to alleviate the shortage of corn on the market. It is necessary to begin to plan to do something drastic and constructive now if the processors and refiners are to continue to obtain the corn they need in order to keep the giant industry going.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, certainly some of the processing industries and some of the refineries are actually closed down.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I presume the Senator has the notice from Mr. Vinson stating that maybe and perhaps the price of corn would be raised. He did not promise that it would be raised, but indicated that if the farmers would release the corn, perhaps the price would be raised, and therefore he hoped the farmers would release the corn.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. He said the one reason why he did not promise any relief was that he was afraid the farmers would hold the corn until the price was advanced. But, although he left the matter open, he thought perhaps there might be some increase in price. Does the Senator recall just what the parity price of corn is?

Mr. LUCAS. Information from the Department of Agriculture is that, as of June 15, the parity price of corn was $1.05 a bushel.

The argument I have made from the beginning is that the price of corn is pegged a few cents below parity. That is the point. I read into the RECORD a moment ago the article to which the Senator has referred, and I had a colloquy about it with various other Senators.

Mr. SMITH. I have received letters every day this week calling attention to various industrial plants which have closed down their operations for lack of corn. Unless something is done in the next 10 days, or earlier, it will be too late.

It seems to me this body should take some action to authorize the relief to which the farmers are entitled. I think the Senate should take some action in reference to corn. It has come as a surprise to me and, I know, to other Senators that all the industries that are engaged in the use of corn or its byproducts are essential to the welfare not only of civilians but of the war effort. Instead of relying on the action of the bureaus, I think it is up to Congress to take some action which will relieve the situation.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know if the Senator has any suggestion as to what would relieve the situation. I, myself, am interested in the corn problem.

Mr. LUCAS. As I said at the beginning of the debate, in answer to the able Senator from Wisconsin, we have to do one of two things: Either roll back the prices of beef and hogs and sheep and poultry, or increase the price of corn. The ratio is all out of proportion, and it has been from the beginning. I have never been able to understand, let me say to the Senator from Delaware, why it has been necessary to have this impasse on corn all this time.

The feeders of poultry want corn. The feeders of hogs can buy it at $1.35 and still make money on their hogs; and so it goes. The processers are crying for it at the present time. Unless they get it their plants will have to shut down.

As I said a moment ago, corn stands in a peculiar and very respectable position of its own. The defense-plant worker will never ask for an additional increase in pay if the price of corn is raised. The man who receives a straight salary and the white-collar man, who is hit harder than any other group because of the war, cannot ask for additional pay because the price of corn is raised. The prices of the commodities he now buys, in the production of which corn is used, are fixed at far above parity, and no logical reason can be supplied for an increase.

Therefore, as I view the situation, a rise in the price of corn could not in anywise affect any of the prices which now are fixed by the Government for the various necessities of life.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Commodity Credit Corporation has practically no corn of its own, as I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. It has no corn at all, to speak of. The last time I made inquiry there, they had approximately 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels on hand. That amount can be ground almost overnight.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand they have moved it.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct; I doubt if they have any corn at the present time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator have any idea of the amount of corn required to complete the development of the cattle and hogs now partially developed? Are any figures on that subject available?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know about that, let me say to the Senator. At the moment, I am primarily interested in the corn refineries that cannot get the corn they must have. The hogs are getting the corn they need. In other words, the farmer takes the corn, for which he can get only $1.07 in Chicago, and feeds it to the hogs. Through this method the farmer gets a minimum of $1.35 for the bushel of corn that is used to feed the hogs, the maximum reaching as high as $1.60 a bushel.

Mr. TUNNELL. The farmer has to feed the hogs no matter what the price is.

Mr. LUCAS. Corn is being fed to the hogs because of the price of hogs.

Let me say to the Senator that I live in the heart of the Corn Belt. I have farm lands. There are no hogs to speak of on the farms, except a few the tenants raise for their own home consumption. We in that section are strictly commercial producers of corn, and we dispose of the corn through the elevators. We do not feed the corn to the hogs on the farms. We dispose of the corn to the elevators. The corn is then transported to other sections where it is fed to hogs and cattle.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, I judge, there are no hogs to speak of in the Senator's section; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. No; the section where I live and the several counties surrounding are not considered hog country.

Mr. TUNNELL. Are the farmers there holding their corn now, or has it been sold?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell the Senator what individual farmers have done, but I know that 800,000,000 bushels of corn are now being held by the farmers in the commercial corn producing areas of the country.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know whether there is any way to ascertain how much of the corn is held by the men who have to feed it to their hogs and poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that 800,000,000 bushels of corn are available for marketing purposes. Whether it would go to the feeding of hogs or what not, if it got into the marketing channels, I do not know, but all that is needed to

enable the corn refineries to continue operating until the next crop of corn comes on the market is between 160,000,000 and 200,000,000 bushels of the 800,000,000 bushels of corn now held on the farms.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Senator's solution of the problem would be to raise the ceiling price of corn.

Mr. LUCAS. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said on the subject of corn refineries. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram which states an even more outrageous case, evidencing the idiotic mismanagement indulged in in handling this situation. I refer to the matter of processing corn for human consumption. Corn meal is one of the most nutritious and beneficial elements of food for human consumption that the mind of man can conceive of. I have received a telegram which I should like to read into the RECORD, if the Senator will permit me to trespass on his time. It illustrates the whole problem.

The telegram is from the Staley Milling Co., of North Kansas City, Mo., which is across the river from Kansas City, in one of the richest corn producing areas in the whole civilized world.

The telegram states:

Our plant for manufacture of corn meal for human consumption will shut down July 2 for lack of white corn. We have twice telegraphed George D. Bradley, regional director, Commodity Credit Corporation, Chicago, for supplies, but no response.

This concern produces corn meal strictly for human consumption.

The Government seized last week approximately 33,000 bushels white corn or about 9 days' supply at Stratton Elevator, St. Joseph, Mo., which was then and is now owned by us. Against much of this we had made sales of corn meal. Now we have to default on contracts and shut our plant for want of supplies while our customers go without corn bread. What is the good of tieing up that corn while people go without food? The corn can go out of condition very readily if left in storage and if it goes bad who is going to stand the loss, the Government that seized it or Staley Milling Co.? Deterioration can occur quickly at this season. We have asked Bradley, Commodity Credit Corporation, Chicago, to release that corn to us immediately. We can guarantee that we shall grind and ship every pound of it within 10 days after we receive it. We have asked him otherwise to furnish us 3,700 bushels white corn daily for manufacture of corn meal for human consumption. Will you please use your influence that we may be allocated white corn from our own inventory in Stratton Elevator, St. Joseph, Mo., and against which we hold warehouse receipts or that we are supplied 3,700 bushels daily from other sources?

This is the reason I am trespassing on the Senator's time to read the telegram:

This corn situation has now been in an unpardonable mess for months and it is time that errors are acknowledged and corrected. Corn values are out of line and should be brought into balance without further delay or the corn ceiling should be removed. Everything here at home seems to be going from bad to worse. Please act.

STALEY MILLING CO.
THOMAS W. STALEY.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the facts are inescapable. The handling of this whole situation is one of the worst botches in recorded history. To any reasonable man, to undertake to fix the price of corn without at the same time fixing the prices of live hogs and of every other possible use of corn would necessarily involve the situation which has developed. It seems to me that there is absolutely no excuse for indulging in such practices in the O. P. A., and possibly in some of the other governmental agencies which do not know any more about corn than to create a situation of that kind. The situation which has developed is what any reasonable man could have foreseen.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a letter which I received from the Consolidated Biscuit Co., of Chicago, Ill.; also a letter from the Union Starch & Refining Co., of Granite City, Ill., in which it is stated:

It is our understanding now that some corn will be released to our industry, of which we will receive our share in proportion to our grind, and that enough corn will be available to keep us grinding until about July 17.

I have received a letter from the Paisley Products Co., Inc., manufacturers of adhesives, in Chicago, Ill. Among other things, the letter states:

It is apparent that the various Government agencies are attempting to obtain corn for industrial processors, but the methods employed at the present time are makeshift, and we do not believe any permanent settling of this important matter can be had until a long-range plan is perfected which will equalize the differences in prices between the corn markets and meat prices.

I have also received a letter from Confections, Inc., of Chicago, Ill. Among other things, the letter states:

This situation is becoming far more serious than it was when we wired you on June 11. The large corn products plant in Pekin, Ill., closed on June 23, and it is reported that other refineries will probably be closing this week or the early part of next week. There is no question but what, if some quick action is not taken, it will result in the closing of many cookie, candy, and other food manufacturing plants. Even if the plants should close for only a short period of time, it still would be extremely serious, because if labor should be laid off for short periods of time because of these shut-downs there is no doubt but what it would be extremely difficult to replace a lot of these workers that might not report back for work.

As you know, a very large percentage of confections are being consumed in various camps by the servicemen, by certain governmental departments, and in defense plants throughout the entire United States.

You can also appreciate that this situation is particularly serious so far as the State of Illinois is concerned because Illinois produces approximately 33⅓ percent of the entire tonnage of confections.

Mr. President, the situation with reference to corn has become so acute that telegrams on the subject continue to pour in on me. Even while I have been speaking a number of telegrams from important industries in my State have been placed on my desk. They emphasize the necessity for prompt action being taken. The first, a telegram from W. D. Walker, president, Arcady Farms Milling Co., of Chicago, Ill., reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our corn supply very low; will be exhausted in week or 10 days. We must buy and use corn if we are to continue making feeds for chickens, turkeys, hogs, dairy cows, and cattle, which form a vital part of the food-production program. Recent Commodity Corporation requisitioning of corn in terminal elevators has made none available to us, as all stocks so required are being given to wet and dry corn processors and no corn is being offered or sold by farmers. Latest War Food Administration guarantee price to farmers to October 31 will not move any corn off farms. We urge you to work for and insist on removal of ceiling price on corn as only possible adequate way to handle this critical situation. Any other action will only afford small temporary help.

W. D. WALKER,
President, Arcady Farms Milling Co.

Another one is from the Advance Aluminum Casting Corporation, of Chicago, and reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 2, 1493.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your assistance in bringing to an early and satisfactory conclusion the critical position confronting the corn-products industry will enable us as a user of corn products in the manufacture of essential aluminum castings for all branches of the armed forces, more especially aircraft, to fulfill these vital Government orders which are now seriously threatened because of the lack of corn made available to all corn-products producers.

ADVANCE ALUMINUM
CASTINGS CORPORATION.

Another, from James Moore, of Mount Vernon, Ill., reads as follows:

MOUNT VERNON, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
Washington. D. C.:

Corn situation terrible. Relieve pressure by removing ceiling. Very necessary.

JAMES MOORE.

Another telegram is from Joe Schafer & Sons Seed Manufacturers, of Springfield, Ill., and reads as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *July 2, 1943.*

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
Washington. D. C.:

We urgently request relief from serious prevailing corn shortage. Please do all possible to force corn into distribution.

JOE SCHAFER & SONS
FEED MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Do any of the Senator's correspondents suggest a remedy for this very critical situation? Do any of them suggest suspending the ceiling price on corn for a certain period of time, until sufficient corn can be obtained for industrial and other uses?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know that any of them have made any concrete suggestions as to what should be done. Two or 3 weeks ago I made the suggestion on the floor of the Senate that if the ceiling price of corn were suspended for a certain time, say until September 15, when the new crop comes in, with the understanding that it would then be placed back at parity price, there would be no question that plenty of corn would flow through the regular channels. That is in line with what the Senator is now suggesting.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it would be a very wise policy to pursue, in view of the fact that the situation is becoming far more critical. I am receiving telegrams and letters on the subject, but I am making no progress whatever in obtaining relief.

Mr. LUCAS. I am making just as much progress as is the Senator from Louisiana; but I intend to continue to talk about the corn situation until we can have something constructive done through the various agencies of government which are handling the problem or through proper legislation by the Congress.

While I am on my feet, let me say that I regret very much that a man of the fine character, integrity, and ability of Chester Davis should have resigned from the position of Food Administrator. He has unusual administrative qualifications. His successor is Judge Marvin Jones. While I know that Mr. Jones is new at the job, I also know that he has a wide range of knowledge of agricultural problems. He has unusual sympathy with the farmer. I hope he will use his vast knowledge to take the corn situation in hand. I know that he realizes the great emergency which exists. The agencies of government which are handling the problem should not leave it for a single moment until it is solved. I hope that the order which has been issued will solve the problem, but I fear it will not. In the meantime, I implore the agencies of government to lay down some fundamentals in connection with this problem between now and July 17, which will solve it once and for all.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has just referred to the appointment by the President of Marvin Jones, of Texas, to succeed Chester Davis. The Senator has referred to Mr. Jones in highly complimentary terms. The Senator will recall that for 6 years both he and I were members of the House Committee on Agriculture, presided over by that distinguished Texan, Marvin Jones. I wish to endorse what the Senator has said about him. If I know a real man, it is Marvin Jones. His understanding of agricultural problems is exceeded by that of no other man in the country today. In addition, he is a practical man, with an understanding heart. He is a humanitarian. He wants to do the right thing in the right way. If any man can help to solve the corn problem, and has the purpose in his heart to do so, it is Marvin Jones. More power to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate very much the Senator's statement, as I know Mr. Jones will, coming from the Senator from New Hampshire, good Republican as he is. That is the kind of spirit which we ought to have in the Senate. Such a spirit would perhaps aid Federal administrators such as Mr. Jones to cooperate with us in solving this problem.

There are many men here who, in my judgment, know agriculture. They are men who have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for many years. There are men who have served on the Agriculture Committee of the House who know agriculture. They know the problems of agriculture in their own sections of the country. If these gentlemen would once in a whole sit down with the best minds in agriculture in both the Senate and the House and get their viewpoints on the subject, perhaps we might get a little further along in the solution of these problems.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make a comment, which I think is typical. Looking at the whole matter of the war effort as it exists now, and in its broad national aspects, the greatest thing which could happen to the country would be for each of us who is charged with the responsibility of legislation to keep in mind the doctrine that the whole is greater than any part thereof.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would go all the way with the Senator from New Hampshire on that excellent statement. During the great emergency through which we are passing I have tried to do the very thing which the Senator from New Hampshire has said. I have tried to overlook the small things which occur in the Congress in order to go along and keep down the quibbling and the quarreling which we constantly see.

The people back home, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, do not like the results of what we in Congress are doing. It is sometimes difficult to compromise, to give and take, and on tremendously important problems I do not believe in it. I think we should not do so on great and fundamental problems. However, there are too many little things on which, it seems to me, we spend too much time in the Congress, working against one another and creating confusion and chaos, but I have tried to go along as harmoniously as possible in the war effort, to the end that we close this ghastly war as soon as possible. I know that is what everyone wants.

I have before me a letter from J. R. Short Milling Co., cereal millers, of Chicago, Ill., in which they say:

> The situation is a serious one, of course. The problem is how best to secure a movement from the farms so as to protect the important industries which are being affected. We know that there are many difficult points involved in correcting what appear to be serious mistakes in the earlier handling of the situation.

I have here a telegram from R. M. Field, president of American Feed Manufacturers Association, Inc., a letter from Wagner Baking Corporation, and a letter from Container Corporation of America, Chicago.

Here is a letter from the W. T. Rawleigh Co., of Freeport, Ill., in which, among other things they say:

> It seems there has been a great deal of discussion in Washington and making suggestions as to how to correct the corn situation, but the fact remains that nothing which will correct the situation has been done about it.

I also have before me a letter from the Pilsen Brewing Co., as well as a letter from Dixie Mills Co., East St. Louis, Ill. So it goes, Mr. President.

In conclusion, I wish to apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for taking all this time, because I know he has an important conference report which he desires to submit. But the corn situation is just as important to the war effort, to the industries, to the laboring man, and to the farmer, as are many things which we have been discussing during the past few days. I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate these facts, these telegrams, and these letters. I appreciate the cooperation of the many Senators who have joined with me in the debate, and I thank the Senate for listening to me.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the senior Senator from Illinois in the discussion of the farm situation as it relates to corn. I have received a very large number of telegrams and letters from business and professional men in every section of the State of Pennsylvania petitioning Congress to do something to relieve the present corn situation.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to urge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to consider this question, and report back to the Senate a plan to enable those who so desperately need it an opportunity to buy corn so that they may continue with their business.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by

the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement Senate amendment No. 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Brooks	Langer	Stewart
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Truman
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether, in all good faith, he thinks that the conference report he has just submitted changes in any essential degree whatever the issue which has already been three times decided by the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, it does not; so far as the three alleged Communists are concerned, it is not changed at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee used the term "alleged," because that presents, in the Senator's own statement, the whole issue in this matter. They are not convicted Communists, they are alleged by a subcommittee of a committee of the House of Representatives to be Communists. I simply wanted to make the issue clear that, after the Senate has three times—an unprecedented procedure, so far as I know, from such investigation as I have been able to make—rejected three conference reports from the great Committee on Appropriations on an essential question of principle, the conferees have come back with exactly the same thing on which the Senate has three times expressed itself.

Mr. President, if the Senator prefers to proceed and to have me take the floor later in my own time, I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose I explain what the committee has done, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor so that the Senator may argue the matter again.

Mr. President, this is the fourth conference report which has been made on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill carrying salaries for various officers and employees of the Government. There are only two items remaining undisposed of, as all Senators know. The first one is amendment No. 5, on page 3, line 16, of the bill, and the conferees have agreed on the following language in reference to the President's fund of $83,000,000:

No part of such fund—

That is unexpended balances and an appropriation of $25,000,000 of new money, making in all $83,000,000—

No part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, to finance a function or project for which function or project a Budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives, or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies.

Mr. President, the conferees believed that no one could reasonably object to this proviso. If a budget was sent in and denied either by both Committees on Appropriations, or by the Congress itself, surely no money otherwise appropriated by the Congress should be used for this purpose. I am quite sure the President himself would not use his fund for any such purpose anyway after the Congress had turned a bill down which had been submitted by the Budget Director, and I urge Senators to vote for this report. It seems that many Senators whether friendly to the President or unfriendly to him could vote for this limitation or restriction.

After very careful consideration the conferees unanimously adopted the provision. In my judgment, it does not injuriously affect the appropriation, except to a limited extent. Let us take, for instance, the National Resources Planning Board, for which a Budget estimate was sent to Congress and rejected by both Houses; none of the money could be used for that Board. Let us take almost any case in which an appropriation has been asked, and the Congress has refused it. Under the provision, money would not be available, and should not be available, for such a purpose. I do not believe the President himself would think it should be made available when an application has been made to the Congress for the money, and the Congress has refused it, or the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses have declined to grant it. I am sure that under such circumstances the President would not want to use the fund for a purpose for which the Congress had already denied an appropriation.

Mr. President, I need not say anything further about that. The provision has been agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the agreement reached by the conferees prohibits transfer of funds from any source to an agency for which the Congress itself has refused directly to make appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, except for the words "from any source." It applies only to the $83,000,000 carried in the pending bill.

Mr. WHITE. It would prohibit the transfer of funds from that source to a

governmental agency when Congress had refused to make appropriations for such agency?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel that when a Budget estimate has been made for an appropriation and Congress, as a Congress, has refused to make the appropriation, no President would deliberately fly in the face of the Congress by transferring funds for that purpose from his general fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that to be absolutely true.

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only have no ground for believing that the present Chief Executive would do that, but I have a very distinct belief that he would not. But there is some ambiguity in the language at the end of the provision. I read:

> No part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation dened after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives—

It is perfectly clear to that point. But now comes the phrase "or by the Committee on Appropriations of both bodies."

Could that be interpreted to mean that even when the two Appropriations Committees had denied an appropriation of a budget estimate, or any such item, and the Congress afterward appropriated the amount, or increased the amount, notwithstanding the subsequent action of the Congress as a whole, if the committees had turned the matter down, the payment could not be made?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand what the House meant by that language, it is that if someone on the floor offered an amendment which had been submitted and turned down by the two committees, it would apply to that also, That is their purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, then, it is the Senator's interpretation that both the Houses of Congress might override their Committees on Appropriations and insert an item in a bill and make it a part of the law, but the President would be denied the right to transfer such funds if the committees had turned it down, notwithstanding the action of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding of the language. The House was adamant in the matter and would not take it out of the bill. Every Member of the conference, both on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, has agreed to it, and, therefore, it is before us. The Senator knows as much about the insertion of language as anyone else does.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not quarreling with the Senator from Tennessee; I am trying to find out what the provision means. If the Senator's interpretation of the intent of the House be correct, it makes the Committees on Appropriations superior to Congress, because it makes it impossible for the President to use a fund which the Congress would have included, overriding the Committees on Appropriations, under that language, if the committees themselves refuse to report an item, notwithstanding that Congress put it in.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is a very far-fetched construction of the language. The Senator may attempt by some ratiocination with which I am not familiar to make it mean something different from what it says, and that it means to put the two Committees on Appropriations of the Congress above the Congress. I do not think it does, and if it does, then the Senator is responsible for it, because it referred originally to the "appropriate committees of the two Houses," and the Senator asked that it be changed to refer to the two Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is incorrect in that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator told me so. I do not know whether I am incorrect or not. I understand language ordinarily.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I asked was, and if the Senator's memory serves him correctly he will recall that I asked, that the last clause be eliminated entirely

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator came to me afterwards and asked that that be done, but at first he said he supposed it meant the two Appropriations Committees. My recollection is that he put a memorandum on the copy I had to that effect, and I did what he suggested, thinking it would probably lead the Senator to withdraw his opposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Budget Bureau makes no recommendations to any committee except the Appropriations Committees, and the use of the words "Budget recommendations made to the appropriate committees" would have no meaning, because we know that no other committee receives Budget estimates except the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House inserted this language, and we either have to accept it or reject it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that and I am not arguing against the conference report, I am not urging any Senator to vote against it, but I think it is a preposterous situation when the House insists on language which can be interpreted to mean, according to the Senator's own interpretation, that if the two Appropriations Committees of the two Houses have turned down a recommendation of the Budget, and the two Houses subsequently insert it in a bill, what is provided for cannot be done because the two committees have previously turned it down.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator can make any interpretation of it he desires, but this report has been brought here for the fourth time. I do not believe the President of the United States would object to the provision, I do not believe any real friend of the President would object to it. I think it is a perfectly proper limitation, and when the two Houses have voted against a provision, the President should not think of attempting to override them by using a secret fund that is given to him for certain purposes.

Mr. President, I now come to the next part of the program, in which every Senator is very much interested. As we all known, the House has made an investigation of certain men, now working for the Government, who entertained, or were believed to entertain, communistic principles.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that during the debate on this question on a former occasion it was asserted that the investigation was a star-chamber proceeding, that there was no trial, that the Bill of Rights was ravished——

Mr. McKELLAR. That every word in the Constitution was ravished.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that these men did have a trial, that they were brought before the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A subcommittee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, a subcommittee. They had a hearing, and testified, and made their attitude known, and the matter was investigated, then the committee believed they should be removed from the roll. Is that true?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, and a part of the evidence is the evidence of the three men themselves. There are 380 pages of the evidence. I hold a copy of it in my hand.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. This discussion has now reached such a point that I wish to ask the Senator whether he would object to a quorum being called.

Mr. McKELLAR. We just had a quorum call.

Mr. HOLMAN. But observe the attendance in the Senate, I believe that if the Members of the Senate were present and should now listen to what the Senator is saying, we would be able to dispose of this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much, but there is quite a fair attendance of Members of the Senate at this time, and I am willing to proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are the Senator's "boys" here?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I have not counted them. I hope there are enough Senators present to agree to the conference report, and I now propose to tell why I believe we should agree to it.

Mr. President, at the very beginning, when the question was first argued on the floor of the Senate, I said that I did not approve the method adopted by the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator when other Senators on the floor cease to debate other subjects long enough to prevent me from continuing. I cannot give the facts of the situation with so much noise in the Senate. I regret the present situation very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. The salaries of how many employees of the Federal Government are affected by the pending measure?

Mr. McKELLAR. Several thousand employees are affected. I hope the Senator will wait a moment and I shall tell him who some of them are.

Mr. ANDREWS. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The second amendment, the one now in question, denying funds to Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett was agreed to by the conference in exactly the same language that has been before the Senate heretofore.

Mr. President, I fear in the previous conferences I have not been able properly to defend this part of the report, and I am going to try with my colleagues to defend it at this time.

There were two objections raised heretofore to it and they were the principal objections and which objections cannot now be raised. The first of these was that the House had never voted on it by record vote except the first time when the vote was more than 5 to 1 in favor of the amendment. Since the last conference the House has voted on it and the vote was 301 to 71 and thus for a second time the House has overwhelmingly voted to sustain its amendment. That, Mr. President, shows that the House is adamant with respect to the question, and that we are not going to get a bill unless we yield to the House.

The other objection heretofore raised was that the House acted on secret testimony, and therefore the men were being condemned without a trial. We have arranged very carefully that these men shall be tried when their names come to the Senate for confirmation in the regular way. That fact, of confirmation by the Senate of their nomination, guarantees them every right. I should be willing to have the Senate pass on my fitness or my qualifications, whether I were guilty or not guilty of some charge made against me. I think the Senate is an honest, upright body, and I think even a Communist would obtain a fair trial from the Senate.

I may say that the House has had published the evidence and I have asked that a copy of the hearing or evidence be laid on the desk of every Senator. It will be seen that the whole matter was gone into thoroughly by the House committee and upon that evidence this amendment was adopted by the House. These three men were called before the committee and each had an opportunity to defend himself. Dr. Watson was charged by the Dies committee, as shown in these hearings, with having belonged to many subversive organizations, beginning with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, and going down to Social Work Today.

Representative POWERS asked:

Do you specifically deny having any activity or sympathies as charged in this letter with any or all of these organizations, beginning with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, and going down to Social Work Today.

Dr. WATSON. I have had some contact, I think, with each of these organizations.

Representative POWERS. With which ones?

Dr. WATSON. With every one of them, in that I have joined with them in some enterprise or other.

Representative POWERS. Knowing the character of the organizations at the time you joined in with them?

Dr. WATSON. Ordinarily not.

Representative POWERS. My question is, In any case did you know the character of the organization?

Dr. WATSON. Yes; in many cases I knew the character of the organization and did not judge it to be a subversive organization.

Again, Representative POWERS:

As to all these 13 organizations the Committee on Un-American Activities has branded as either Communist or front organizations for the Communist Party, did you ever publicly repudiate any of these organizations after you had had any connection with them?

Dr. WATSON. I do not think I either endorsed or repudiated them.

I shall not go into all the testimony, but I will say that the testimony shows that Mr. Watson belonged, as I recall, to 13 Communist or subversive organizations or clubs. He associated with Communists. He admitted that he associated with Communists. He admitted that he belonged to communistic organizations, and it was upon his evidence, I recall, that the committee based its findings, for there is no other evidence in the hearings except that of the three men—Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett—together with exhibits to their testimony. They themselves made their cases. They were heard, and upon their own statements the House adopted this provision.

The two other accused persons were just as bad or worse. Mr. Dodd said his home was used for a Communist meeting and he was present. Dr. Lovett joined so many Communist and subversive organizations that he hardly knew them all. I think there were probably 50 or 100.

The proof—and it is their own proof too—shows that all three of these gentlemen are much more interested in communism or communistic teachings and associations than they are in the American Government, and I frankly say from my examination of the testimony that I think all three are wholly unworthy to be working for our Government. On the other hand, I have heretofore stated I think it was unfortunate that the House pursued the plan of getting rid of them it has followed, but the House pursued that plan honestly and fearlessly and it will not agree to the bill without that provision being included in it. The House has modified its original position by inserting the language:

Until November 1 they can stay where they are but they cannot be paid out of this fund after November 15 unless the President shall send their names to the Senate and they be confirmed by the Senate.

Certainly that will give these men every fair opportunity to be justly dealt with.

I may say that Mr. Watson holds a very important place in one of the departments. I think he takes part in the handling of some of our foreign mail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In respect to the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee that Mr. Watson belonged to 13 communistic organizations, I call attention to page 10 of the hearings, which the Senator from Tennessee has just handed me, and which I have seen today for the first time, and read from Mr. Watson's testimony as follows:

I think there is no organization in the list which has been charged by the Department of Justice as a subversive organization. I certainly have never been a member or sponsor of any organization known by me to be Communist in origin or control.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. According to his own testimony, he was simply an innocent person who joined these communistic—or shall I call them something else?—well, I will call them what the committee called them—communistic organizations, subversive organizations. He was simply an innocent person who was brought into them without knowing what they were. There were 13 of them.

I call attention to what was said on page 13:

Representative POWERS. As to all these 13 organizations the Committee on Un-American Activities has branded as either Communist or front organizations for the Communist Party, did you ever publicly repudiate any of these organizations after you had had any connection with them?

And this is Mr. Watson's answer, Senators:

No. I do not think I either endorsed or repudiated them.

That was Mr. Watson's testimony. I shall not go into the testimony of the others. Mr. Dodd, however, did the same thing. He belonged to such organizations without knowing what they were. A meeting was held in his own house in New York City, where a great number of persons gathered, and the Communist Party paid for the food and the drink and the other expenses.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, I am interested in what the Senator from Tennessee has to say. He holds a brief, apparently, for the House committee on the action it took, and is trying to defend it, and to urge upon us the principle and the duty to support the conference report in its present form.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOBEY. But my memory goes back to the other day when the distinguished Senator stood on the floor of the Senate and at the beginning of his remarks said dogmatically—and he pounded the desk when he said it—"I do not

approve of this method of handling the matter."

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not.

Mr. TOBEY. And yet the Senator is now using his best offices, his forensic talent, his histrionic talent, and his attractive personality——

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. To seduce us to vote for this "stuff" here.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to answer the question. I will tell the Senator why I made that statement. It was argued here by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], whom I love very dearly, that these men had not had a fair show, that they were being condemned without hearing, that we were cutting them off without a trial. It developed that a trial had taken place, or a committee had investigated them, and then the Senator from Missouri said that it was a secret matter, and that the House had published the hearings only a few days ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in a moment. Let me finish my answer to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. It had been argued here that these men were not Communists. As I understood, it was argued here that so far as the record shows they were pure and undefiled.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator, when he mentions my name, certainly does not mean to say that I ever argued that they were pure and undefiled?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I said there was no evidence before the Senate which justified us in overriding the Constitution of the United States by bringing a bill of attainder against men in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a second?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The words "pure and undefiled" intrigue me. I have a little knowledge of the Scriptures, gained in my earlier days—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is to be congratulated.

Mr. TOBEY. I think so. The Scriptures say:

> He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone * * *.

I apply that to all of us when it comes to saying "pure and undefiled."

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. President, as I have said, the fact, as brought out in the hearing, is that Dr. Dodd was associated with many organizations, that he entertained communistic or subversive organizations in his own house in New York and the parties were paid for by the Communist Party.

When it comes to Dr. Lovett, as I have said, Dr. Lovett belongs to so many Communist organizations and so many Communist-front organizations that he could count only about 100 of them. That was all he could count. If there were any Communist or Communist-front organizations that Dr. Lovett did not belong to, it was by accident, not by design, because he found all that could be found, so the committee said.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the Senator has completely shifted the issue from the position he originally took on the matter and now is proposing to try de novo in the Senate the merits of the proposition, I will answer that in my own time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But on the statement the Senator made a moment ago about bridge and cocktail parties, let me say I have a very low opinion of young Dodd, and have an even lower opinion of old man Dodd, the recently deceased former Ambassador to Germany.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know either of them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The most I know of them is newspaper hearsay; but, even so, does the Senator contend that if any individual, any citizen of the United States, chooses to give a cocktail party or a tea party or a dinner or anything else for a man, the mere fact that the man for whom the party is given has had charges preferred against him indicates any subversive intention on the part of the person providing the entertainment? It does not seem to me to be fair to say that a man advocates subversion of the sovereignty of the United States, which is the charge brought in this case, because he gave a cocktail party for a man such as Harry Bridges. So far as I am concerned, I adhere to the belief that Harry Bridges should be deported.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us not get into the Bridges case. We have enough cases before us now.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have enough "bridges" to cross.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed so, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe Harry Bridges should be deported. I think there are technical grounds on which deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges can be well founded. However, a number of persons in the United States for whose judgment I have great respect hold the contrary view.

To say that a man is guilty of a crime for which he should be subjected to a practical bill of attainder because he entertained the contrary view on the Harry Bridges case seems to me to be absolutely unfair.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just one moment. I am undertaking to make an explanation of the committee's report. I shall ask Senators to wait until I make the explanation, and then I shall answer any questions which may be asked by Senators.

Mr. TOBEY. The only reason why I desire to ask the question I have in mind is because the discussion has now reached Dr. Lovett, and the Senator is making serious charges against him. What I have to say is very pertinent to that part of the Senator's address.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the graciousness on the Senator's part.

Let me point out that this morning, about half an hour after the opening of the session, I approached the Senator from Tennessee and asked him if the matter in connection with the three alleged Communists was to be brought up. He assured me it was. Then, in his zeal for converts, he passed to me the 380-page booklet I now hold in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not put it that way. I am here representing the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have had four conferences about this matter. Our committee has acted as honestly, as fairly, and as justly as we knew how. I am not interested in these men. I do not know them.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no zeal about that.

Mr. TOBEY. Certainly the Senator gave me this booklet to convince me; did he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can be convinced or not convinced, as he likes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if I may address my remarks to the Senator from Tennessee for a moment, in connection with the booklet he handed me, let me say that I opened it by chance. I could not have gone through it all in half an hour; but, merely by chance, I opened it at page 183. I call the Senator's attention to the testimony appearing at the top of the page. Representative KEEFE was questioning Dr. Lovett. The testimony is as follows:

> Representative KEEFE. You were a member of that, were you not?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. I was; yes—Friends of the Soviet Union.

I read further from the testimony:

> Representative KEEFE. Well, let me call your attention to this, which perhaps will recall—a meeting which was held at the Ashland Boulevard Auditorium on Tuesday, March 5, 1935. This document is headed "Call to Action. War Threatens the Soviet Union. Militarist Japan and Fascist Germany Forging Robbers' Ring to Attack. Defend the Soviet Union," and so on and so on. "Come Hear Robert Morss Lovett."

What for? To hear him defend the conduct of the Soviet Union. I read further from the testimony:

> Representative KEEFE. You felt that the Soviet Union was going to be attacked by the Fascist states in Europe: Germany, Japan, and Italy?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. It seemed probable at that time.

He anticipated it. I point out that what he did was to foresee coming events; he saw them casting their shadows before. He saw better than some of the rest of us did.

I read further from the testimony:

Mr. LOVETT. * * * I believe that the existence of the Soviet Union, as proved today, is of enormous importance in determining the history of the world and in directing that history to the ultimate benefit of mankind, and I am not ashamed of any action that I have ever taken in defending the Soviet Union.

Now, I say to the Senator from Tennessee that the point I make in my comment to him is that Mr. Lovett is only one of about 130,000,000 people. He was a little ahead of the rest of us. He defended the Soviet Union. He foresaw that Germany and Italy would attack the Soviet Union, as they have.

Today we are defending the Soviet Union. Only the other day I was in the Emanuel Episcopal Church, in Boston, and side by side in the chancel of the church were the flag of the United States and the flag of the Soviet Union.

Today, Soviet Russia is our ally. Perhaps history will reveal Soviet Russia as our best defender.

I am as opposed to communism as any other Senator can be. I am in no sense defending it; what is in my heart is a deep aversion to this branch of Congress sanctioning the procedure proposed in the conference report, a procedure which some of our best legal minds hold to be a bill of attainder in essence and effect at least.

What is the crime in Mr. Lovett's faith in the Soviet Union as a buffer to Fascist influence if he believes in it? This is a free country, and he is following the dictates of his own conscience in those matters.

I do not think the Senator is correct in his position against a man who is defending the Soviet Union against the Fascist states and point out that today the American people are defending the Soviet Union and praising the great fight its armed forces are making against the Axis Powers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may go on, unless there is something very unusual which Senators wish to ask, I hope I shall be permitted to present the committee's side of the matter for a moment. Every time I get started, I am interrupted by some other Senator before I can proceed. I am sure Senators will feel it is fair to let me make my statement.

I say the House had a basis for what it has done. It had so much basis that it voted on the matter twice, and the last time was just a day or two ago. On the last vote the House voted 4½ to 1 in favor of retaining its position.

The question in which I am interested is not one of the guilt or innocence of the men. I do not know anything about whether the three men are guilty or innocent. But I do know, from having read the testimony, that the statements of the three men, as given by themselves, justify the House in the position it has taken to get rid of them. I do not think men having such views——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to wait for a moment, please, until I can complete the statement of my thought. I will yield to the Senator later; I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has requested that he not be interrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House had before it the statements of the three men. After reading them, if I had my way, if I were their employer I certainly would not retain them as servants of this Government. I still do not agree with the method the House has used; but the House has taken that course of its own accord, and the matter was in conference.

I am merely saying that the House had a reason for what it did. No Senator can read this pamphlet of 380 pages without coming to the conclusion that the House had a pretty sound reason for its action in not wanting them to work for the United States Government.

That brings me to another aspect of this matter. Here are three men, charged by the House of Representatives, a body coequal with this body with various of subversive principles and practices. Some have said that they are not subversive. Why belong to all these subversive organizations if there is not at least to some extent a kindred feeling? All of us have heard, ever since we were children, that "birds of a feather flock together." These men have been flocking. They have been members of those organizations. The Dies committee has reported that they belonged to such organizations, and it has never been denied. The three men do not deny it.

They hold important positions. One is Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands. Another holds a very important position as translator of documents coming here from foreign countries. I do not know what the duties of the third are. But, be that as it may, here are three men. Some Senators call them the Three Communists. Others have called them the Three Black Crows. Some Senators have asked me about the Three Musketeers, and others about the Three Privateers. Whatever may be said of them, I am not condemning them. They may come before the Senate for confirmation if their nominations are submitted. I wish to give them a fair deal. I am impressed with the idea, from their own testimony under oath, that they have been going in very bad company. No wonder the House has taken the position which it assumes.

Mr. President, those are not the only three persons involved in this bill. The very first provision in the bill is for the pay of the House and Senate pages. We have deprived them of their salaries up to this point. Why have we deprived them of their salaries? In order to prevent three alleged Communists from being let out of the Government service on the basis of their own admissions.

Let me say to the Senate that the pages are as fine a group of young boys as I have ever known. Even if only one of them was involved, I would vote to give him his salary, the three Communists to the contrary notwithstanding; constitutional questions notwithstanding. I believe that what the House has done is perfectly constitutional. I repeat I think it is the wrong way to reach the objective; but if the House has no right to deny an appropriation to pay the salary of any officer of the Government, I do not know what the Constitution means. However that may be, here are these page boys, and the page boys in the House of Representatives. We are denying those boys their pay, while we are protecting three Communists who are holding Communist meetings, one of them in his own house.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Alleged Communists.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says "alleged Communists." I intend to use the word "alleged" in each instance, although they themselves were not particular about using the word, if the Senator will read their testimony.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have tried to observe the Senator's injunction against interruption, but the Senator says, "If the Senator will read their testimony." I should be glad to read it, if I were given an opportunity to read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to furnish the Senator with a copy of the testimony [handing a document to Mr. CLARK of Missouri].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am called on to vote now.

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony was sent to the Senator several days ago at his office.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has never been sent to me, and I have never seen it. I refuse to vote on the basis of evidence which I have never seen.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is not asking for any evidence to vote against the pages. He is simply telling the pages, "We are not going to appropriate for you." He is not asking for evidence about them. He is asking for evidence about three alleged Communists.

Mr. President, I would rather vote for any one of these boys, who are as fine a group of young men as I have ever seen, than to preserve some right or alleged right of three Communists.

I should like to say one thing further about the three alleged Communists. Every right they have under the law is preserved to them, because they are to be appointed by the President, and this body will pass on them. I know that the Senate will pass on them fairly.

Whom else are we voting against? It is not a question merely of voting for Communists. Some Senators seem to be determined to vote for the three Communists. It is not only proposed that we vote for Communists, but that we vote against the page boys in the Senate, and the page boys in the House of Representatives.

Whom else are we asked to vote against? We are asked to vote against the pay of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. We are asked to vote against the fund of $83,000,000 for the President of the United States when we vote against the conference report. He has no fund today. Why? Because the conference report has not been agreed

to. He would not have a right to use a dollar of the $83,000,000 appropriation carried in this bill, because the fund expired on June 30.

We are asked to vote against the War Production Board in the Office for Emergency Management, the appropriation for which is $4,597,000. The War Production Board is handling the production of war materials in America. We are asked to turn it down. Why? Because it is desired to protect three alleged Communists. We do not give a hang about having the War Production Board function for the benefit of our country if it interferes in the slightest degree with supposed right under the Constitution of three alleged Communists.

That is not all. The War Shipping Administration is one of the most important functions of the Government. It is necessary to provide the money in order that shipping activities of the country may be carried on. But no; to Hades with that part of our war effort if we can save these three at-heart Communists. Throw it out the window. We refuse to approve the conference report, and, therefore, it gets no money. Why? Because it is desired to protect the positions of three alleged Communists.

We are asked to vote against the Office of Price Administration. The bill carries an appropriation of $3,000,000 for that activity, whose purposes are so worthy that both Houses of Congress have several times agreed to appropriations for its maintenance. But while the Office of Price Administration may be a war effort, we are to turn it down. Why? Because, forsooth, three alleged Communists, flocking with Communists and subversive organizations, are not treated exactly as the Senate thinks they ought to be treated.

I do not know how we ought to go about solving the problem under the Constitution and laws of this country. I am in doubt. The House has gone a long way. I do not approve of the action of the House, but it has taken action under its constitutional right to allow or withhold appropriations. It does not make any difference about the Office of Price Administration. That can go out of the window. We want to save the jobs of three alleged Communists. If we save them, to Hades with the others.

Another important function of government against which we are asked to vote is the Public Health Service, under the Federal Security Agency. What is more important to the civilian population than the Public Health Service and the training of nurses? That goes by the board.

The next is an appropriation—a small one, it is true—for the Freedman's Hospital. It may be said, "Oh, well, a hospital has no place against three alleged Communists. Oh, no. Let us save the Communists, but let the hospital go to Hades. Let us save the three Communists. Let us save their jobs. It is not a question of Communists themselves, but the saving of their jobs. Let us save their jobs."

I come next to the appropriation for Howard University. Howard University is a very worthy colored institution in Washington. I believe it is the largest of its kind in the world. There is an appropriation in this bill for $229,500 for a power plant to be constructed this summer so that those associated with Howard University may keep warm next winter. However, in effect it is said, "Oh, no; kick these citizens—the pupils and teachers in this great university—out of the window, or kick out the appropriations?" Why? Because we must protect the jobs of three Communists—alleged Communists, excuse me—alleged Communists in the employ of the Government.

I next come to the Federal Works Agency—Public Buildings Administration, for which an appropriation is provided of $1,203,800. Shall we appropriate for it? It is being said that we should appropriate for it if it were not that these three alleged Communists must be considered. Unless we cut out the provision with respect to these three alleged Communists these other institutions can go by the board. We do not care. Why should we worry about such things as the Public Buildings Administration, or Howard University?

I come next to what is even of more importance, it seems to me, namely, the Veterans' Administration. An appropriation is recommended of half a million dollars to be used as a revolving fund. The veterans who fought our battles need it. But we are told, "Oh no, you made a mistake. You got into the wrong groove. We must turn that down, of course." Why?

In another part of the bill is a provision which requires a fair and just investigation and ruling on three alleged Communists. My heavens, when something is proposed to be done with respect to three alleged Communists, it does not make any difference about the soldiers who fought for us! Oh, no. What comes of the appropriation for them? Pitch it out the window. That is what we have done already. Three times we have pitched it out the window.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Four times.

Mr. McKELLAR. Four times. And this is an attempt to get through these appropriations. Much is said about being prejudiced against these three men. I am not prejudiced against them. I am talking about the facts concerning them as disclosed by their own evidence. What I am interested in are the university, in the veterans, and in faithful employees, and various governmental agencies.

I now come to the District of Columbia. Here in our midst are 3,500 school teachers in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, whose salaries are being denied. Why? We could not allow the salaries of school teachers to be paid unless we keep three alleged Communists in office. We must keep them in office. Does that make sense to anybody here?

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator asking me whether the argument which he is making makes sense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Not to me. I think it is a splendid example of reductio ad absurdum, if the Senator asks me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I think his statement would apply to the arguments made in favor of keeping the three men in office, however.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I was a little bit worried over the position taken by the Senator who said that these men had a right to their opinions. He said also that our Government was honoring the Soviet Government. I wonder if the implications were that these men were attempting to substitute communism for our form of Government in America, and that our friendship for Russia meant that we would adopt the Russian form of government?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what was meant. I am astounded at the arguments which are made by some Senators who seem to favor three alleged Communists, and to turn their backs on worthy people and institutions. I am frank to say that it does not make any sense to me.

In the District of Columbia there are 3,500 school teachers, and 2,000 others who are to be deprived of their salaries. They are right here in our midst. Why are they to be deprived of their salaries? Merely because charges have been made by the House of Representatives against three alleged Communists, who are to be turned over to the Senate and the President to be tried.

Mr. SMITH. I do not like the implication that because Russia is helping us in this war, we are therefore accepting Russia's government. That is what I am protesting against.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly right. I am proud of the position Russia is taking in this war.

Mr. SMITH. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. I admire what she has done. But, as God is my judge, I am not in favor of Russia's communistic government, or any other form of communistic government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Then the Senator from Tennessee and Lovett are thinking exactly alike, because on page 186 of the hearings, Mr. Lovett said:

> I don't know that. In the letterheads, let me say, that represent these various organizations there will be found many persons like myself who were not Communists but who participated in the organization along with Communists for a common object.

That is exactly what the United States is doing now in this war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, Mr. President. Every man may have his own views about it. I am not complaining about any view which has been stated here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should look for a moment at the wording of this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not say the Senate is to pass upon whether the occupants of these three positions in the Government should in good faith be made subject to confirmation by the Senate. If the Senate in good faith should desire to make these three positions such that in the future their occupants should be confirmed by this body, that is one thing. But Senators will note that the wording of the amendment is that no money shall ever be paid from any appropriations to these three men for any services except—and near the end of the amendment there is a provision as follows:

> That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services as a member of a jury.

And so forth. This body is asked to go on record in saying that these three men may be jurors in the United States and receive payment for such services.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a lawer who had a Communist client should wish to have Communists on his jury, I could easily see how he would like to have on the jury men like the three alleged Communists whom we have been discussing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator believe that the Senate should vote to allow these men to serve on a jury but not allow them to serve in some other capacity in the employ of the Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know why the House did it, but I see no reason why the Senate cannot aid the House in enacting a law providing that three men who are charged with offenses against the Government itself—subversive tendencies and subversive acts—I see no reason why the Senate cannot look into that and give them a fair deal. I am sure from the votes already had it would be very much inclined to give them a fair deal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I see this situation, it is not at all a matter of defending three men; it is a question of whether the method we are asked to adopt is correct, democratic, and constitutional. If we in good faith decide these three positions to be such that those who hold them should be confirmed, then I would favor such legislation, but we know why this provision is put in this particular bill. There are provisions in this bill and in other bills to the effect that an employee must make an affidavit that he is not a Communist and does not advocate overthrowing the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true; both Houses of Congress have adopted such a provision, but in spite of that, it is contended that the Senate should not pass on the qualifications of these three men, their ability, and whether they make good servants of the people.

Mr. President, I want to say that the next appropriation is for the Health Department of the District of Columbia, and for the courts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I waited until the Senator yielded to other Senators, before interrupting him. I have listened with the utmost interest to the very eloquent argument of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in presenting the reasons why the Senate should recede from its disagreement to the House amendment. He stated that he was representing the Appropriations Committee in making his very able argument. I hope the Senator before he sits down will take a few minutes to tell me and the other Senators here who have voted with the majority on at least three different occasions what arguments he used in the conference committee room to convince the House conferees that the Senate was sincere in taking the position it has taken at least three times?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only I, but every other member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate used every argument which was possible. One of our arguments was that Senators did not believe that this was the proper method of attacking this particular problem; that it might be attacked by impeachment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the Senator take the time to call to the attention of the House conferees the classic and eloquent argument of one of their own members, Hon. SAM HOBBS, who on the floor of the House, in support of his contention that this is a bill of attainder, made an argument which, in my opinion, is unanswerable? Did the Senator call that to the attention of the House conferees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, the Senator from Tennessee did. I did not agree with Mr. HOBBS, but, as the Senator has stated, he made an eloquent appeal to stand by the Constitution. I admire and respect him, but I do not agree with him in his argument that this amendment is unconstitutional. When we want to make an argument in favor of something we want very much to do it is a good thing to stand by the Constitution, but occasionally I think the Constitution is used a little carelessly. There is no constitutional question here.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator knows SAM HOBBS; I am sure he knows the ability of SAM HOBBS as a lawyer. Does the Senator believe that SAM HOBBS is the type of man who would argue the unconstitutionality of a proposition unless he was thoroughly convinced of the soundness and correctness of his position.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think Mr. HOBBS is one of the most sincere and one of the finest men I know. He is a fine lawyer. I do not think he is always right. I think the Senator from Utah is a sincere, upright, and splendid Senator——

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I do not always believe as he does and he does not always believe as I do, and he does not believe as I do on this matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. I always regret when I have to disagree with the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I reciprocate the Senator's statement, but when it comes to a question of whether we are to pay employees of the Government who have committed no act hurtful to anyone, or are to deny nearly $143,000,000 of appropriations in order to save three salaries, argument along the lines of constitutional interpretation under the circumstances of this case, do not particularly appeal to me. As everyone knows, I am a sticker for the Constitution, but I do not believe this report violates that great instrument in any way. If I did, I would vote against the report.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My position on this question is that when we violate the Constitution of the United States, when in this body we vote a bill of attainder, then, in my opinion, we hold at naught that for which American boys on the battlefronts of the world today are fighting. We do America, and we do American citizens, an irreparable damage when we violate the Constitution, and if for a few days or a week or I may say even 6 months, the page boys to whom the Senator referred, and all other employees of the Government were denied their salaries, it would be better, in my opinion, to do even that than to cause the irreparable damage which would be brought about by violating under the dome of the Capitol the bill of attainder clause of the Constitution. By agreeing to the House amendment we do just that, in my humble opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course if I believed that this was a bill of attainder, or if it was violative of the Constitution of the United States, I would vote against the conference report just as the Senator has done. I am not complaining of that vote. I would vote that way, too, if I believed as the Senator does; but I do not believe that this is a bill of attainder. I do not believe that the two Houses of Congress have not a right to deny salary to any employee if they want to do so. I think it is a bad method, but I do not think it is unconstitutional at all. If I did think it was unconstitutional, I would stand by my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, and if the Senator from Utah puts it on that ground, then he ought to vote against the conference report. I do not think it is unconstitutional.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Senator read the Supreme Court citations in the Hobbs speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator, after reading those citations, could come on this floor and tell the Senate that this is not a bill of attainder, I should be very much surprised.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator might be surprised; all of us are surprised at times; it is now too late to examine these citations, but I think that this is not a bill of attainder, and I do not think it is unconstitutional. I think it was an unhappy way of disposing of the matter until the provision was put in that these men should be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. That was a complete protection to them.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to refer briefly to some of the others affected by the appropriations in this bill. There are a number of insane people provided for by the bill. Insane people do not amount to anything in the eyes of the Congress; we should turn them down because we want to protect the jobs of three alleged Communists.

Next is the militia. Well, of course, we do not need the militia in this war. We will merely tell them to go to grass—I could use another word, but I will not do so—and tell the old soldiers to go to Hades, and tell all the others, "You cannot contest with the jobs of three men who are charged with being Communists. We will uphold any point, we will vote against anybody, even the worthy pages here, in order to preserve three positions for three alleged Communists."

Mr. President, I am about through, but there are some more employees affected by this bill.

Next is the Department of Agriculture. They have an appropriation. The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, salaries and expenses of agricultural experiment stations, vocational schools in the Virgin Islands, where one of these men is employed. We are undertaking to appropriate money for them, but we cannot do it, we cannot approve a conference report which gives a fair deal and a fair trial to three men charged with communism. Oh, no; we should rise above it, we should give these three alleged Communists preference over probably 100,000 of our own citizens who do not believe in communism. We prefer to aid and support and keep in jobs the alleged Communists rather than serve our own people.

Next is the Department of Justice. We must not give anything to the Department of Justice. That will never do in the world, because these Communists come first. They come before judges, they come before the salaries and expenses of the Land Division, salaries and expenses of district attorneys, salaries and expenses of marshals, salaries and expenses of bailiffs. Oh, we will not bother with them, we want to protect the jobs of the three alleged Communists.

Next is penal and correctional institutions. We would not want to appropriate for them. One of these three men might get into one of these penal and correctional institutions one of these days, and we want to save them.

We come next to the Post Office Department. It makes no difference whether our boys get letters or not; oh, no, turn them down, disregard them, we have to save the places of three alleged Communists. And there is the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General.

The Department of State: We should not bother about the Department of State when we have the jobs of three alleged Communists to deal with.

Treasury Department: Of course, the Treasury Department has nothing to do anyway. We should not want the Treasury Department now. There is no necessity for bonds—oh, no. We are in a war it is true, and we need all the money we can get, as it looks to most people, but not now. Oh, no, we must protect these alleged Communists.

Next is the judiciary, then the executive offices of the President, the National Board of Economic Welfare, the Selective Service System, grants to States for the Employment Service. We must not take care of that. We must look after these three alleged Communists. We must see that they are tried in a way peculiar to them.

Salaries and expenses of the War Planning Power Commission, War Production Board, independent establishments, Civil Service Commission. Oh, no. What do we need with the Civil Service Commission? These three men are probably under the civil service already, and we do not need to give them any more money.

Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, National Labor Relations Board: Well, the National Labor Relations Board does not need any money. At any rate, whether they need it or not, we will not give it to them, as long as these places of three admitted, alleged Communists are at stake.

Veterans' Administration: Listen to this, Veterans' Administration, $6,775,000. Oh, we will not give it to them; oh no, no, no. To Hades with the Veterans' Administration. We will not give it to them.

Federal Security Agency, Howard University, Federal Works Agency: Oh, we will give them nothing. Turn them down. Vote against this report, and turn it down, send it back to conference for the fifth or sixth time, whatever it is. Of course, the members of the Appropriations Committee have nothing to do but to go to conference. They have nothing to do but to work. That does not make any difference. Turn them down, let them go.

Salaries and expenses, Public Buildings and Grounds in the District of Columbia—total, work agencies, $3,812,000. Do not give them money. They are home people, they are people against whom, so far as we know, no charges have been brought. Why give them anything? Save the money, save the jobs for three alleged Communists.

I believe that takes in most of the appropriations, $143,000,000 for all the departments of the Government, or virtually all of them.

Mr. President, with this presentation I wish to make a plea to the Senate to ratify the report. These appropriations will not be made otherwise, because the House has just voted on the matter again—4½ to 1—and unless the report is agreed to, we will have no bill. I leave the matter with the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think that nearly everyone who knows the Senator from Tennessee and myself is aware of the deep affection which has existed between us for lo these many years, since the Senator from Tennessee first came to the House of Representatives and I was a little boy.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will concede that was a long time ago, I imagine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was a long time ago, when I was a little boy and when the Senator from Tennessee first entered on his long and invaluable service in the Congress of the United States. The Senator remembers me as a small boy, and I remember him as one of the most brilliant prospects for legislative service to enter the House in many, many years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was not the Senator from Missouri parliamentarian about the time I served in the House, a good many years ago?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I thought.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. However, I feel it incumbent on me to say that, with all my affection and respect for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I think we have just listened to the most specious, the most illogical, the most outrageous argument from his mouth that it has ever been my pleasure, or my burden, to hear on the floor of either branch of Congress.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has undertaken to make an issue between the page boys on the floor of the House and the Senate, and the violation of the whole theory and principle of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. I do not yield to the Senator from Tennessee or anyone else in my affection for the boys who serve as pages in the Senate or the House. When I was a small boy myself I knew intimately some of the pages, who have since risen to great heights, but I do not think the question of the continuation of the pay of the pages in the Senate or the House of Representatives for a day or two is any justification for the application of lynch law in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Then the Senator from Tennessee undertakes to say that if one believes to any extent whatever in the principle of the education of colored people, as has been heretofore evidenced by Federal support of Howard University, he must then agree to violate the Constitution of the United States by bringing in a bill of attainder.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator does not want to do me an injustice. I have never said anything like that. I said quite the contrary. I said that if I believed that the provisions in the pending report were violative of the Constitution, I should be opposed to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator did say that, but let me say to the Senator that he has out-Magellaned Magellan. Magellan is supposed to have circumnavigated the globe only once. In connection with the very bill we are considering, the Senator from Tennessee has gone twice around the globe.

The Senator started out by making the best speech made on the whole controversy in the Senate, when he presented the amendment of the Senate committee to strike out this House provision. Then the Senator came back to the Senate to obtain consent for a provision which he said was necessary in order to obtain agreement on the conference report. Then he came back with another conference report. We have had so many of them that, although I have a very accurate memory, I have almost lost track of them. The Senator from Tennessee really has not only gone around the globe twice; he is back on the other side of the globe now, because he is asking the Senate to sit as a jury or as a court of judgment on matters which have never been presented to it.

Let me say before I pass on to something else, that the Senator from Tennessee a moment ago held up a pamphlet which I had never before seen. He claims it contains evidence to sustain the position taken by the House. I have never before seen it. The Senator never sent it to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I asked that a copy be sent to every Senator, and I have been advised since that a copy was sent to every Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have never seen the pamphlet to which he refers; and if I had seen it, I would not pay the slightest attention to it, because I would not convict a dog unless I had an opportunity personally to hear the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. The document contains the testimony of the three individuals themselves.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me a moment, I will say that I should like to have the opportunity of reading the evidence, and hearing the testimony, and asking any questions I may desire to ask. I will say that I have never had the opportunity of reading this bulky pamphlet to which the Senator has referred. It must contain 175 pages.

Mr. LANGER. Three hundred and eighty pages.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; 380 pages.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would take me at least a day and a half to read it. I have never seen it before. But if I had, Mr. President, it would not change my view in the very least. I would not convict a dog on that sort of testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It contains the testimony of the three men themselves. They did the testifying. The Senator says that he would not convict or pass upon a case presented by the three men themselves and by nobody else. They are the only ones who testified, the only three witnesses who appeared.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Senator in charge of the bill made the motion that the committee amendment eliminating the House provision be agreed to, he himself said—I do not think I misquote the Senator from Tennessee, though I do not have the RECORD immediately before me—that he did not believe in such star-chamber proceedings; that nothing had been presented——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That nothing had been presented to the Senate committee which would justify him in arriving at such a conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; I said that I did not believe that the method pursued by the House was the best method to be pursued in reaching this result, but I did not say that I——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that the Senator is conducting himself as a witness. Let me ask the Senator, at the time the appropriation bill was first considered in the Senate, had the Senator seen any evidence which justified him in excluding these men from office?

Mr. McKELLAR. I had seen this very document.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then the Senator made one of the most eloquent speeches against the inclusion of the House provision I have ever heard in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; my position is the same as it has been all the time, all the way through. The Senator did not hear me when I spoke before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I heard the Senator speak, and I backed him up so far as I could.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator would not want to do me an injustice, but he is doing me an injustice, because I took the position that in view of the fact that the Senate had stricken out this provision, I would not agree to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. I am referring now to the time when the Senator himself proposed that the Senate disagree to the House provision. He made that proposal in his capacity as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was my duty to do so. The Senate had stricken out the provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator made a very eloquent speech on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not yield on the proposal until I had brought it back to the Senate, but when I found that there was utterly no chance to have any bill, that all other persons and institutions provided for in the appropriation bill would be injured and deprived of that which was justly coming to them, when the House was adamant on the subject, I took the position I did. I have been in enough conferences with the House to know something about them. I see one of the House Members standing on the floor of the Senate now. He is one of the finest Members of the House, Representative RABAUT, and he will verify what I say—he cannot say it on the Senate floor, but he knows it to be true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I happen to have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator yielded to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator wants to pay a tribute to LOUIS RABAUT I will be very glad to join in it, although I think as a singer his services are much better than they are in his capacity as a conferee on this particular matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not like the way he stood out for the House provision, but not only Representative RABAUT but every other conferee on the part of the House stood out for the House provision, and if we are to have a bill the only way we can have it is to agree to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Tennessee very courteously asked me not to make a speech in his time, and I now ask him not to make a speech in mine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the whole argument which has been made in this boxing of the compass, this double boxing of the compass——

Mr. McKELLAR. Make it fivefold or tenfold.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This circumnavigation of the globe in which the Senator from Tennessee has been indulging—the only justification the Senator has offered for a change in his own position is that he says it is an issue between three individuals whom the Senator does not like very much and whom I do not like any better——

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. I do not either. I never saw any one of the three. The Senator says that the issue is between them and Howard University, or the Veterans' Bureau, or the little page boys in the House and Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee knows that he now has under consideration, and his committee has under consideration, a second deficiency bill which will be considered by the Senate before this session ends, and must necessarily be considered before this session ends, and when that second deficiency measure comes before the Senate every item in the urgent deficiency bill, except controverted legislative provisions, will be in order on the second deficiency appropriation bill.

I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is my full intention when he brings before the Senate the second deficiency appropriation bill, to offer all the bona fide appropriation provisions of the pending bill to the second deficiency appropriation bill, and if that should be adopted by the Senate, these outrageous,

infamous legislative provisions would be subject to a point of order by any Representative or Senator in either House of the Congress.

So the Senator is absolutely unfair in my opinion—I do not mean that in any opprobrious sense—the Senator is absolutely erroneous when he states that to provide funds to pay the salaries of the page boys in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States, or to provide funds for Howard University, or for the Veterans' Administration, or for any of the other functions which the Senator in his long speech enumerated, it is necessary for us to yield to the House of Representatives on a great constitutional point, a matter of fair trial for anyone, as provided by the Constitution of the United States. I say that when he says that, the Senator is talking beside the point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. If the House of Representatives is so insistent in its attitude that these three men, for none of whom I hold any special brief whatever, have been guilty of subversion, the House has a process provided by the Constitution of the United States, cumbersome to be sure, but nevertheless deadly in its effect, of instituting a procedure by impeachment, and if the House of Representatives feels strongly enough to institute impeachment proceedings, and such proceedings come to the Senate, I will hear them as a judge; I will be sworn on my own oath, not my ordinary oath as a Senator, but my special oath as a judge of the court of impeachment, which I have taken several times.

When that happens, I will listen to the evidence and make up my own mind according to my oath as a judge. But I am not willing, and I will never be willing, either now or hereafter, to vote to convict a man practically on a bill of attainder, without giving him an opportunity to appear before me, not before some subcommittee of the House, and to have an opportunity to hear the evidence and cross-examine the witnesses against him.

Mr. President, when this matter first came in, the Senator from Tennessee very frankly admitted there was not any difference between the present issue and the issue which has been presented several times before the Senate, except for the insistence of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate has to yield because the House is insistent.

I have pointed out the way in which the Senate can act, in which event the House could not refuse to act without taking the responsibility for defeating all the items in both the urgent deficiency bill and the second deficiency bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I greatly regret that the Senator from Missouri is not a member of the conference committee, as it is so easy for him to tell us how the matter could be handled. Let me say that the very matter the Senator has presented has been thoroughly considered on all sides, and we were informed by the committee that no bill would pass that did not contain——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if that be true, I am in favor of meeting that issue head on, and letting the House of Representatives take the responsibility.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have met it head on, all the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I have listened today to the eloquent defense of the Senator from Tennessee of Howard University and the Veterans' Bureau and the page boys, I have wondered who actually presented the case of the Senate in the conference. Of course, I was not there.

Mr. President, let me say further that I was present night before last when the Senator from Tennessee attacked the majority leader and the minority whip on the theory of not standing behind the Appropriations Committee. I thought my memory was correct at that time, but I did not wish to inject myself into the debate to the extent of asking the Senator from Tennessee about the matter. However, it seemed to me that I remembered that just a few days before, when the matter of the National Resources Planning Board was before the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee himself led the raid on the position of his own committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator should be fair.

The committee was evenly divided in that case; and under the circumstances I gave notice, in accordance with the rules of the committee, of the position I would take. But the vote in the committee was evenly divided. The matter was lost on a tie vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. President, yesterday it was necessary for me to be absent from the Senate for several hours because my oldest boy was leaving to report to the Marine Corps, in which he had enlisted sometime previously. Consequently, I was late in reaching the Chamber for a vote, and was not permitted to participate in the debate.

What was my shock and chagrin and surprise to learn that my dear friend the Senator from Tennessee, who had lectured us all, and who has lectured us so often on the theory of standing behind the Appropriations Committee, and who had repudiated the majority leader and the majority whip, not to mention such small fry as myself, because we do not always stand behind the Appropriations Committee—what was my surprise, chagrin, and shock to find out that during my absence—and I would have called attention to the matter if it had been possible for me to be on the floor at that time—my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee had not only participated but was one of the ringleaders in the attempt to ride over the Appropriations Committee on the matter of the O. W. I.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say this matter is not one which involves the prestige of the Appropriations Committee. I believe in standing by the Appropriations Committee when it is right. I believe in riding over it when it is wrong. I believe that as to any other committee.

Mr. President, I say the Senate has acted on this same question on four different occasions, and that as a matter of decent self-respect, not to mention respect for the constitutional processes which have made this Government great, the Senate should adhere to its position, and should reject the conference report. If the House wants to take the responsibility of denying the page boys and Howard University and the Veterans' Bureau and the other agencies mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, it should have the responsibility for doing so placed right in its lap.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I say it is not necessary to pursue even such a policy as that; because, if the Senate will put in the second deficiency bill, which the Senate will have to consider before the session ends, every item of appropriation contained in the urgent deficiency bill which is not subject, in the House of Representatives, to a point of order as an original proposition, the House will not be able to get away with the position it has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Brooks	Langer	Stewart
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Truman
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TOBEY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President has just vetoed the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and the message has been read in the House of Representatives.

Serious differences regarding the inflation-control problem between the Executive and Congress, as well as between various executive departments, threaten a break-down of the entire program so necessary to success on the home front. Since there is no difference as to the end sought, it should be possible to reach some agreement on methods. In the passage of the Commodity Credit bill Congress did not prohibit subsidies, but simply provided that a program involving the expenditure of vast sums of money should not be undertaken without first securing authorization from Congress. The President has seen fit to veto this bill, but from a reading of the message it seems to me that he does not insist upon any right to expend unlimited sums without constitutional restraints, for in the message itself he says:

I sincerely hope that if the Congress cannot agree before its recess on legislation which will remove the serious defects in this bill it will pass a joint resolution continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and providing the increase in borrowing power until the Congress has time to agree upon an appropriate measure. The officials of the executive departments will welcome an opportunity to furnish information and be of assistance.

It seems to me that, regardless of the action the House may take on this veto message, the Senate should postpone immediate consideration of the bill and defer consideration, at least temporarily, pending an immediate attempt to reach an agreement at least on a temporary program for the remainder of 1943. I feel convinced that an agreement could easily be reached before Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, when the Congress will probably take a recess. I think it is extremely important that we make an attempt to do so. It seems to me that we should undertake a conciliatory move to agree with the executive department for the purpose of avoiding an irreparable breach.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senate that we cannot tell yet what the House of Representatives will do with the veto. It is now preparing to vote on it. If the House sustains the veto, I am satisfied that a continuing resolution will be presented with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I have every reason to believe that we can come to an understanding with reference to the situation discussed by the President in his veto message. That would take care of the situation until the recess is over, if one is taken.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—48

Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Moore	Walsh
Danaher	Nye	Wherry
Davis	O'Daniel	White
Eastland	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—32

Aiken	Chandler	Guffey
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Barkley	Downey	Kilgore
Bone	Ferguson	La Follette
Burton	Gerry	Langer
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Truman
Maloney	Overton	Tunnell
Mead	Radcliffe	Wagner
Millikin	Shipstead	Wallgren
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Murray	Tobey	

NOT VOTING—16

Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Green	Wheeler
Bushfield	Hatch	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	
Ellender	McNary	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, in explanation of the vote which I cast a few moments ago on the conference report, and in explanation of similar votes which I cast when this matter was previously before the Senate, I desire to quote one sentence from the constitution of the State of Wyoming. It reads as follows:

Absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of freemen exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerk of the committee tells me that there is no validating clause in the bill which will reach back to the 1st of the month, and that the last amendment which was agreed to should have been insisted upon. I ask that the vote by which the Senate receded be reconsidered, and that the Senate further insist on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DESIGNATING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read a letter.

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House adhered to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1109. An act to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

CONFUSION IN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say that the recent resignation of Chester C. Davis as War Food Administrator has once again brought to light the serious and inexcusable confusion which attends the food-production effort of this Nation. Any concerted continuation of the administrative chaos which now marks this program can serve only to undermine the confidence of our people, leave our food-production program in a state of intolerable disorganization, and bring immeasurable damage to the war effort of this Nation and to that of our allies.

On all sides we see a multiplication of regulations and restrictions often inconsistent with each other. To meet new situations we have seen new boards, agencies, and departments piled up. This type of regulation can only foster uncertainty and encourage violations, willful or otherwise, of laws and orders.

Admitting for the moment that prosecution of the present war involves vastly more details and consequences than did the last war, and that there must inevitably be a greater degree of regulation, it does not follow that administration must be inefficient. It has been one of our sources of national pride that the business and other organizations of the country knew how to handle quickly big jobs. Certainly in the midst of our most critical war we must not lose this ability or permit it to be taken from us by default.

It is only too true that the present administrative machinery is cumbersome, wasteful, dilatory, inefficient, and confused. The net result has been less domestic production, and more acute shortages of necessities. First, we saw gasoline and fuels run low. Next we saw rubber practically disappear. Now we are witnessing an increasing food shortage. We must be vitally concerned that proper steps are taken quickly to alleviate these situations.

Early in the war the administration realized that manufacturers could not be permitted to bid against each other for raw materials and resources without restraint. We also realized that consumers must not be permitted to hoard or use foods and other necessities to the detriment of other consumers. We also realized that the needs of the armed forces must be met first.

On these premises, agencies were set up to devise regulations along functional lines. Control of production was centralized; control of distribution was centralized; control of prices, labor conditions, imports, and transportation likewise was centralized. New and untried agencies were reared to exercise such controls.

In remarkably short time, these agencies came into conflict with one another. This was inevitable because there was no perfect, no consistent administrative plan. Men newly given administrative powers inevitably tried to operate a segment of government with the complete disregard of other segments, in much the same manner as they had been accustomed to operate an independent business. It is probably only fair to add, that these men operated with the best of intentions and patriotism, as they understood the functions of their agencies.

However, the lack of a plan of administration has become more evident at every turn. Each agency now realizes that it cannot accomplish its purpose because some vital bit of authority has been withheld, or else it exists in an unrelated independent agency. Effective liaison between the agencies is now practically nonexistent.

As drains on manpower and resources became increasingly severe, so shortages were accentuated. Where a few shortages became most critical, the administration created still further agencies. We saw the creation of a few commodity czars. Mr. Ickes was given the unpleasant task of trying to straighten out the fuel mess. I might add that I think Mr. Ickes is a very fine administrator. Mr. Jeffers was given the less attractive job of producing more rubber. More recently, Mr. Wickard, Mr. Davis, and now Mr. Marvin Jones have been given the more spectacular, though inevitably more complex assignment of increasing production of food.

While these appointments seemed necessary to some persons at the time, we are now faced with the realization that their creation is inconsistent with existing agencies. To use a hackneyed illustration, administrations which had been set up functionally along horizontal lines were suddenly upset by organizations set up along vertical lines. Each new czar cut squarely across the maze of existing agencies.

These appointments are but further evidence of poor preceding organization and the lack of understanding of proper administration. They are intrinsically inconsistent and must create increasing confusion the longer they are in operation. The preceding agencies were set up to coordinate; the czars are set up to break coordination. This hit-or-miss makeshift adoption of expedients can lead but to one of two results. If the czars do not operate ruthlessly and without regard for other programs, their programs will be submerged by the existing agencies. If they do operate ambitiously, their programs throw out all coordination and wreck the work of the functional agencies. Both results mean more confusion, more waste and delay.

The administration must have a wiser plan than this. A saner approach must be taken toward simplification. And this must be done quickly.

In the case of food, as Mr. Hoover pointed out, there are at least nine different independent agencies operating, competing, I might say, in the fields of production and distribution. With regard to other commodities, there may be more or less. A commodity czar has, therefore, an almost impossible assignment, unless the administrative set-up is efficient and effective.

The confusion and overlapping among the present agencies is just as bad domestically as it is in foreign fields. However, since the volume and type of materials produced abroad which we now need is much smaller than domestic production, this field offers the easier area of first simplification of administration.

The controversy between my good friends Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jesse Jones points clearly to me the need for simplification and consolidation of administration in foreign fields. Anyone familiar with functions performed by several other agencies in the foreign field must realize that there are many other fundamental differences of opinion, and operations at cross purposes, which, fortunately, have not burst into the open quite so violently.

I am convinced that the dispute between Vice President WALLACE and Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, must be resolved by giving one or the other right of way. But I am just as convinced that this is only a partial answer to the muddled situation in foreign production and procurement. Allowing either one supremacy of operations does not, in the least, tend to reduce friction with other agencies. For instance, it would not at all aid foreign production of foodstuffs, which is now being purchased through an entirely different procurement corporation, in the Department of Agriculture, and is not related at all to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation group of corporations under the control of Mr. Jones.

Considering for a moment longer the various administrative agencies concerned with foreign production, procurement, and distribution of food, the number which I can call to mind is absurdly high, and many have apparently inconsistent interests and policies.

There are at least 19 different departments, boards, or agencies actively engaged in promoting or regulating foreign production. The mere recital of their names will be sufficient to illustrate the cross purposes and confusion which attend their efforts. There is the Department of State, 4 divisions of the Department of Agriculture—Foreign Agricultural Relations, Commodity Credit Corporation, Committee on Foreign Importation and Subcommittee of Combined Food Board; Combined Food Boards, Army, Navy, Department of Commerce; R. F. C. subsidiary corporations; Office of Price Administration, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Lehman's Post-War Rehabilitation, War Production Board, material czars—Ickes, Jeffers, and Jones—and Board of Economic Warfare.

I am not certain that I have included all of the more important agencies presently functioning in foreign procurement or production or for other purposes. At any rate, the illustrations I have cited

are sufficient to prove my point, which is that there is abundant operation at cross purposes, and it is likely that foreign production and flow of materials is thereby falling far short of what could be expected.

Mr. President, you and I and all the rest of the American people are paying extravagantly for this situation; generations yet to come will still pay. We owe it to ourselves and those who follow us to bring order out of this chaos.

Mr. President, the American people in all walks of life are growing restive and disturbed at the spectacle of the administrative chaos which I have just outlined. Only yesterday the two outstanding farm organizations in my State—the Pennsylvania State Association of Cooperative Organizations and the Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations—went on record as demanding the concentration of all regulatory powers in one authority in Washington, the abandonment of social experimentation at the expense of agriculture, and the abandonment of any program of subsidy-financed roll-backs on agricultural food prices. Pointing to the mismanagement, the ill-defined administrative program of the Government, the divided authority and responsibility which now attend this program, these organizations flatly stated that this Nation will be faced with a great shortage of food next winter.

Mr. President, it is a cardinal principle of public administration that authority must be commensurate with responsibility in a given position. This principle is conspicuous by its absence in nearly all the programs of the present administration. The letter of resignation submitted to the President by Mr. Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, made specific mention of this fact, and only yesterday another example of conflicting authority and divided responsibility, to which I have previously referred, caused a not inconsiderable disagreement between two men well up in the administration's policy-making hierarchy.

These concerted denials of the fundamental principles of public administration by this Government can only lead to further bickering, further tension, and further chaos, and since nearly all these governmental programs are directly related to the prosecution of the war, and to the welfare of our armed forces and our civilian population, a wholesome respect for the millions of people who support the Government demands a realinement of these administrative programs on the basis of recognized principles of public administration, which, incidentally, are also the principles of efficiency and economy.

Mr. President, there is no more vital program now confronting this Government than the program of food production. It is imperative and urgent that that program be reorganized and set properly in motion on the basis of recognized administrative principles. The immediate need, therefore, is to place the entire food program—production, rationing, marketing, and every other aspect of that program—under a coherent and clearly defined administrative set-up, and, what is more, to give to the administrators concerned all the authority necessary to meet the responsibilities which their respective positions entail. If this step is not immediately forthcoming, no man can say what proportions the impending food crisis may attain.

Mr. President, there are a number of capable and experienced men who could bring order out of the chaos which now surrounds the entire food program, if they could but be assured of appointment on these sound and necessary bases. Probably the most outstanding man for this particular job is former President Herbert Hoover. In view of my long association with the man, I hesitate to inject his name into this picture, but it is a widely recognized fact that Mr. Hoover commands a broad knowledge of the food-production problems not only of this country but of the rest of the world as well. The broad experience which he has achieved, both as Food Administrator during the last war and as a public servant for a great number of years, eminently qualifies him for this all-important position. I call upon the administration to make use of the ability and experience of such men as Mr. Hoover in this hour of peril to our Nation's food-production program and to our Nation's over-all war effort.

Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the June 30 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer as an indication of the widespread public resentment which has grown up in protest to the present administrative arrangement of our Government, and as an indication of the widespread public acceptance of those reasonable and reliable methods of overcoming these shortcomings which have been put forward by Mr. Hoover and other qualified observers, and I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST END FOOD CRISIS

When Chester C. Davis was appointed 3 months ago to head the new agency of War Food Administration, the Inquirer remarked that it was by no means sure that the answer had been found to the grave national problem.

Under the terms of the new set-up the danger of divided authority was evident. This has now come to pass. With declining production, faulty distribution, prices soaring beyond reason, conflicting official policies, and a bunch of Government agencies working at cross purposes, the food situation has gotten into such a muddle that Mr. Davis has been impelled to throw up his hands and quit.

Mr. Davis' letter of resignation, it is now belatedly disclosed, had lain on the President's desk ever since June 16, and was still awaiting acceptance, unknown to the Senate, on the very day that body was discussing and voting an end to the administration's program of future food subsidies and decreeing that existing subsidy payments should be put under Mr. Davis' control.

In this letter Mr. Davis declared that he could no longer assume a great public responsibility while the actual authority for food policies was "being exercised elsewhere."

His other strong reason for resigning was his conscientious inability to support and carry out the program of broad general subsidies instituted by President Roosevelt. He doesn't believe that such subsidies will control inflation unless accompanied by tax and savings programs to curb excess buying power "and by tight control and management of the food supply."

Mr. Davis is not alone, among food experts, in opposing such broad, general subsidies, for rolling back prices, as the administration advocates. His insistence, also, on unified food control, possessing authority fully commensurate with the vast responsibility, is backed up by an impressive body of informed opinion.

In renewing his forceful plea for consolidation of existing conflicting agencies into an adequate, over-all food administration, Herbert Hoover, whose expert knowledge will not be questioned, pointedly remarks that we need neither a "food czar nor an Angel Gabriel. We need a manager, not a dictator."

As for subsidies, Mr. Hoover declares that the Nation's gravest problem on the home front can be solved without them "and all the sins and faults that lie in them." He impressively warns that the continuation of "this administrative chaos threatens the food to our cities, the food to our armies, the food to our allies, and the relief of post-war famine—in fact, the whole war effort."

This ominous threat can and must be averted. It will not be averted if the administration continues to depend on a maze of agencies, pulling in various directions and getting farther and farther from the goal of abundant food for all the people at fair prices.

There is no hope of improvement through the change of Food Administrators that took place yesterday, if we are to judge from the inaugural remarks of Marvin Jones as Mr. Davis' successor.

Mr. Jones states that he assumes office with no new or additional powers. He merely expects to do the best job he can "with the tools at hand." And they are pretty poor tools, as experience has shown.

It is now doubly evident that if the food muddle is ever to be cleared up it will have to be done by Congress. The way is opened by the Fulmer bill, which would give the Food Administrator control of prices and rationing as well as of production and distribution of food.

If this puts the noses of the Office of Price Administration and half a dozen other departments or agencies out of joint, that will be just too bad. But such centralization of every factor in America's food problem is imperative if our home folk, our fighting men, and our allies are to get enough to eat.

Let's have some action before an intolerably bad situation becomes immeasurably worse.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the present administrative programs will be overhauled, in the public interest and in conformity with recognized administrative principles. If these necessary steps are not voluntarily taken by the administration I shall not hesitate to recommend that the Congress undertake to achieve these necessary improvements by law.

ACQUISITION OF CORN BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the question of the corn supply has become so

acute that I have had a joint resolution prepared which I ask consent to introduce. Whether the Senate will consent to its immediate consideration or whether it shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and the clerk will read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive, imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency, all such agencies which exercise any functions with respect to the buying, selling, storage, or use of corn are hereby authorized to acquire corn, wherever obtainable, at any price not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, I think a resolution of that importance probably should not be taken up on the spur of the moment.

Mr. SMITH. My only reason for asking for immediate consideration is that there is not a more acute question before the American people today than the corn question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that; I am familiar with it not only in my section but in other sections, and it is a question which should have attention, but it is very easy to do the wrong thing hastily in seeking to correct a situation which should be corrected. I think the joint resolution should lie on the table for the present, and a little later in the day perhaps we may better be able to determine what should be done with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator from South Carolina will agree to that, because I should like to get through the matter I have risen to take up.

Mr. SMITH. I have done what I can to get this question settled. We talk and talk and talk while people suffer. We just pour out gas, and that is about all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have his joint resolution referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH. No, let it lie on the table, to be taken up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay consideration of the conference report on the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill, but before proceeding to consideration of that report I wish to say that the Senate has much unfinished business before it, including appropriation bills, and I desire to find an opening today, if possible, for a call of the calendar, so that we may dispose of unobjected-to bills. I hope Senators who desire to make speeches on extraneous subjects which are not before the Senate will refrain from making them until we shall have disposed of necessary business.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 12, 15, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment with the following proviso inserted at the end thereof: ": *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$595,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That this program shall end June 30, 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,328,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"None of the moneys appropriated by this Act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,093,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert $47,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committe of conference report in disagreement amendments numberd 19, 24, and 30.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the Senate is considering the report on House bill 2935.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is, Mr. President. Let me say that there are three divisions which will be taken up separately. First there are the items as to which there was no difference between the House and Senate conferees, and which were adopted by the House.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am concerned with several of the items, but I am particularly concerned with what I understand is the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and called the Virginia amendment, because it originated in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator calls it the Virginia amendment. It was simply offered by a representative from Virginia. Of course, Virginia is for the amendment, but a number of States are very much interested in it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not mean to be offensive. I said that I call it the Virginia amendment. I thought Virginia might have some pride in it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator seems to infer that it relates only to the State of Virginia. A great many States are interested in the same amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say that it relates not only to the State of Virginia but to every State in the Union, including my own. That is why I am particularly concerned with it.

Will the Senator from Nevada tell what happened with respect to that particular amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It will be recalled that the Senate struck out the language on page 53 of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I made that motion myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. And in conference the Senate conferees agreed with the House conferees to restore the language, but to strike therefrom the parenthetical clause "in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act," and we did so because that language was purely redundant and was not necessary to give force and effect to the whole amendment. The spirit of the amendment and the spirit of the law are carried out without that clause. The Senate conferees agreed that the clause be stricken.

Let me say further that that matter was before the Appropriations Committee, and the action which was taken was urged in a note received from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who has not been able to attend the meeting. The note of the Senator from Virginia was presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. It is proposed in the report to restore the language of the House, minus the parenthetical clause "in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the pending motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wanted the Senate to understand that the pending motion is that the Senate adopt the report.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that.

Mr. McCARRAN. The conference report must either be adopted or rejected as it stands.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that. The vote the Senate is about to take deals with this particular amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. And because I do not clearly understand what the purpose of the amendment is, or what it would do, I wish to discuss it briefly for the RECORD. I want the RECORD to be clear, and to try to reinforce what seems to be the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee who has the bill in charge.

The Social Security Act now requires State agencies administering child-welfare services, public assistance, and unemployment compensation to establish systems of personnel administration on a merit basis. This requirement seems to me to be desirable. I should not like to see it changed. I believe the public interest is better served if public employees are under a merit system.

During 1939 when revision of the Social Security Act had careful and thorough consideration, Congress, wisely, I think, extended the merit principle which applies to Federal employees, to employees of State agencies administering child-welfare services and the social-security programs, by requiring these State agencies to establish and maintain merit systems.

Also, and wisely I think, Congress provided that the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor and the Social Security Board, which agencies are charged with the Federal responsibility of these programs, should have no jurisdiction over the appointment, tenure of office, or compensation of individuals appointed by the States in accordance with their merit systems. The judgment of the State officials who are responsible for the administration of these programs, rather than the judgment of Federal officials, is thereby made to govern in the application of their merit system to individual State employees. I should not like to see this provision changed.

Without much consideration, so far as the record of the hearings discloses, it was proposed by the House that language be included in this appropriation bill, which reads as follows:

> None of the moneys appropriated by this act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

I must say that I do not know what was intended to be accomplished by this language. It might be construed as not changing but merely as emphasizing the provisions already in the law. If that is so, I think the language is surplusage, and should come out of this appropriation bill. It can only serve to confuse the administration of the present law, which was enacted after mature consideration, and may result in a modification of the present operation of the merit systems, and may further accentuate the loss of many of the nonpolitical professional and technical persons who are so necessary in the operation of these programs, and who stay in the public service largely because of a feeling of security.

These programs touch the lives of millions of our people in times of distress. If the proposed language was intended to relieve the State agencies from the requirement of actually maintaining a sound merit system, if it was intended that the Federal Government should have no power to withhold Federal funds, regardless of the methods used in the selection of personnel by these State agencies, whether in accordance with this merit system or not, this language, in my opinion, should be taken out of the appropriation bill.

The Social Security Act gives the Children's Bureau and the Social Security Board the power, and imposes on them the duty, to see that such merit systems are not merely established but that they are actually maintained. So long as State personnel are employed, paid, and dismissed in accordance with the State's own merit system, these Federal agencies are already specifically denied, under existing law, authority with reference to the appointment, compensation, or tenure of office of individuals. This seems necessary, but sufficient to guarantee the integrity of State administration. It does not seem proper or desirable to say to these Federal agencies, "You may not withhold funds appropriated for grants to States, even though the States fail or refuse to select or pay their employees in accordance with their own merit system." If that is what the proposed language means, it seems to me to be clearly undesirable, and, in my opinion, should be taken out of the bill.

The Social Security Board has the responsibility for certifying grants to the States in amounts which the Board finds necessary for the proper and efficient administration of these programs. If the proposed language is intended to permit the payment of salaries for personal services on any scale which is fixed by the State in its merit-system plan, the Social Security Board could not discharge the responsibility which the basic Social Security Act places on it. It would have to certify, for example, if the State should so provide, that salaries of $5,000 per annum for typists are necessary for proper and efficient administration of the State law. If that is the intention of the proposed language, the whole basis for the grant of administrative funds for unemployment compensation under Title III of the Social Security Act, which are paid 100 percent from Federal funds, would be destroyed.

I have seen no evidence from the record of the hearings that either the Children's Bureau or the Social Security Board has failed properly to administer the laws for which it is responsible, nor have I seen any evidence that any action on the part of either of these agencies in that regard has adversely affected the States' administration of child-welfare services, public assistance, or unemployment compensation. On the contrary, I am informed that these merit systems are the product of agreements reached as a result of joint Federal and State action, and that generally they are operating satisfactorily, and have the support and approval of the State agencies administering the programs. It seems unjustified to me that such a major decision as this should be taken by the Congress without giving full and free opportunity for a public hearing at which various interested groups may express their opinions upon the operation of the present law, the

proposed amendment, and the desirability and effect of the change.

It appears that some friction has arisen in one State. I do not believe that the inclusion of the proposed language, the possible change of the substantive national law, without hearing or thorough consideration of the implications of the change, is the way to meet the difficulty, if any difficulty exists.

I am opposed to any change which would weaken the application of the merit principle to public service, and particularly to any action which would weaken its application to these social-security programs. The best administration possible is none too good for these programs which deal with human misery, and in my opinion there is no better assurance of good administration than the assurance that the merit principle will be applied, established, and maintained in dealing with hiring, firing, and compensating the people who administer them.

The 1939 merit system amendment to the Social Security Act has resulted in greatly extending the application of the merit principle to the public services in the States. In my opinion, it would be an unfortunate and backward step for Congress now to pass any law which would be likely to reverse that trend. The provision included in the appropriation bill, if interpreted broadly, may result in giving States complete latitude to inject political considerations into the administration of our social-security laws. The administration of social security has been kept free from partisan political influences, and should be kept free from such influences.

If the proposed language does not change the present law, it is not necessary, and may confuse the administration of the present law. If it does change the present law, it changes it, in my opinion, by weakening it, and perhaps even nullifying it. In either event, I am opposed to the inclusion of the proposed language.

VISIT BY VETERANS OF NORTH AFRICAN CAMPAIGN—EXTENSION OF LEAVE

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield briefly to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there are now in the Senate gallery some 36 soldiers, veterans of the north African campaign. Most of them come from the State of New Mexico. There are some from the States of Tennessee, Washington, Pennsylvania, Kansas, and California. They have done their duty overseas; and they are temporarily in the country, and are visiting the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the announcement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I move that all Senators in the Chamber rise and pay tribute to these veterans of the north African campaign.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I second the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and all Members of the Senate present and all other persons in the Chamber rose and applauded the north African campaign veterans in the gallery.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I understand these boys have leave for only 4 days. Some of them will not be able to see their relatives, and they will be in the Army for quite awhile. I wonder if Senators will not write to General McNarney, who I believe has charge of the matter, to see if their leave cannot be extended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that I learned only this morning that the boys have been given a 4-day furlough to visit their relatives. Everyone who knows the geography of the United States must realize that a boy from California cannot go to California and return in 4 days, that the 28 boys from New Mexico cannot go to New Mexico and return in 4 days. These boys were inducted into the service on the 6th of January 1941 and have been in the service ever since. They have been in Europe, doing their duty and following orders. If they are ordered aboard ship tomorrow, they will go, and will make no complaint. However, I feel it is only reasonable that they be allowed more than a 4-day furlough. If we are to lose the war because 28 boys from New Mexico are not in northern Africa, we are in bad shape. I believe it is proper, and I hope other Members of the Senate will join me in a reasonable request that a reasonable extension of their furloughs be granted. If the request cannot be complied with, I assure the Senate that the boys will not complain.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New Mexico in his tribute to these members of the American expeditionary force to north Africa; and with him, I express the hope that the War Department may be able to permit them to have sufficient time to visit their homes and their loved ones.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

NEED FOR POST-WAR PLANNING AND ACTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, our immediate duty today is to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least possible loss of life. Our immediate duty is to win the war, to do the job in the shortest possible time, and enable the boys who are our guests in the gallery at this hour to return home to stay. Our lasting obligation is to make sure that peace, the fruit of victory, is not lost. It cannot be endured that all in vain our finest and our bravest shall molder in the jungle or lie buried beneath the burning sands.

The victories of war will be barren if we fail to win the peace. Last time our failure to win the peace brought tragedy to us and to millions of others. This time such a failure might well prove the end of our civilization and the death of all our race.

If there is to be hope of peace there must be a collective world security system, with an organization of the peace-loving nations with power to adjudicate and enforce its decrees. To this end, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and I introduced on March 16 last Senate Resolution 114, to advise the President to take the initiative in summoning representatives of the United Nations to meetings, to form an organization, and set up machinery for settlement of international disputes without resort to war, to provide for United Nations military force for the immediate suppression of any future attempt at military aggression by any nation, and to require every member nation of the organization to commit itself to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

There are some who say that we should wait and take no steps at this time looking to the establishment of such an organization. Wait for what? For war weariness and disillusionment, economic rivalry, nationalistic feelings and pressing domestic problems to make impossible the formation of an association of nations to secure an enduring peace? Wait for the return of that isolationism which allowed us to be swept into two terrible wars?

There is a time for all things—for planting and for harvesting, for planning and for execution. Ideas and plans need time to grow and be nurtured, just as crops need time to grow and to ripen. Deliberate and well-considered plans have a far better chance of success than hasty and ill-considered schemes. If we wait until peace comes to plan for peace, our plans will be found wanting. If we take no forward step until we have a perfect plan we shall make no move at all; the rush of events will overwhelm us.

The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States did not have a perfect constitution in mind on the day of their assembly. If they had waited upon that miracle, our present form of government would never have come into being.

We must plan and build the machinery and organization for peace, or peace will catch us unprepared.

The United Nations await America's decision. We cannot afford to delay in giving it. The consequences of delay are too dreadful. This horror of war, this fate of death for our youth, of broken bodies and disordered minds, must not face us again.

The Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Ohio, and I do not criticize the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for having taken no action upon Senate Resolution 114. We appreciate how momentous is the purpose and import of the

resolution, and that it has required time properly and wisely to consider the transcendent question the resolution presents.

We do feel, however, that when Congress reassembles in September after the recess the committee should act upon the resolution. We feel that the Senate has a right to look to the committee for leadership and advice in the matter. We feel that the Senate must begin now to chart its course and make its plans to play its part in the building of a just and enduring peace. Action by the Senate on the resolution would remove the doubts and uncertainties in the minds of the other United Nations as to what part, if any, the United States will take in an organization for peace, and would clarify the situation and keep open and unimpeded the pathway to peace. Such action by the Senate would remove any doubts that failure on the part of the Senate to act might cause the Chief Executive to entertain, and would greatly fortify and strengthen his hand in all his efforts toward the building of an orderly world.

During the recess of the Senate my associates and I will endeavor to carry to the people of the country the message of the resolution and the compelling need for its passage by the Senate. We shall do this in the hope that the people will make definite and clear their desire for favorable and expeditious action by the Senate on the resolution and their determination to sustain and support the Senate in such action.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the expression of the Senator from Alabama.

It is now nearly 4 months since Senate Resolution 114 was introduced and shortly afterward referred to a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. The resolution seeks to have the Senate define the kind of post-war foreign policy it is prepared to support.

That is a subject of vital importance to every one of the 135,000,000 people in the United States, for American foreign policy in the next decade may well determine whether we are now fighting the last World War or whether this conflict is merely a prelude to a greater and more destructive World War No. 3.

We four who introduced the resolution, realizing the tremendous importance of this subject and its many ramifications, have not pressed the Foreign Relations Committee for action. We do not intend now to reflect in any way on that committee. We believe that all the time necessary should be devoted to this subject by the committee.

However, we believe that 6 or 7 months should be sufficient time for the committee to deliberate, and it is our purpose today simply to serve notice on the individual Members of the Senate that a month after the Senate reconvenes, following the recess this summer, about mid-October, we intend to press for action on this subject by the Foreign Relations Committee and by the Senate.

Too long delay can be as fatal on this issue as too hasty action. The peace also can be lost because of too little, too late.

Mr. President, all of us recognize the all-important role which the Senate plays in determining American foreign policy under our Constitution. The people of America realize it, and they are looking to the Senate for some indication as to what its position on this issue is now and is likely to be when a peace treaty is presented here for ratification.

Next to winning the war itself there is no more important task facing the United States today than the doing of all we can do as a nation to make the peace after this war a permanent peace. I know I need not dwell on that fact in a Senate which has just finished appropriating the staggering sum of $100,000,000,000 to finance our war effort in the next year.

I do not believe there is any controversy in America or in the Senate over whether the United States should and will collaborate to maintain peace after this war. We are unanimous on the objective. Our differences arise over the methods and machinery for our collaboration, over the question as to just what kind of post-war program the United States, with its great influence and power, should support.

Shall our support be thrown behind a United Nations organization with authority and power to stop future aggressions, or behind another League of Nations depending on action by individual nations to achieve its objectives? Or shall we seek the sort of tri-partite alliance recommended by Walter Lippmann in his recent book? Or shall our policy be simply one of cooperation in such joint attempts of the nations to maintain peace as we may approve at the time, but without any binding commitments?

Those and similar questions are being asked today by the American people. The officials in our own State Department charged with responsibility for post-war planning must be asking themselves the same questions.

Mr. President, there is only one body that can furnish the answers. That body is the United States Senate.

There are many reasons why a full and free debate in the Senate upon this entire subject is needed and would be helpful. I should like to mention only one.

The President conducts all negotiations with foreign powers. He certainly is preparing now, and may, if fortune favors our cause, have to proceed soon to negotiate some sort of peace settlement in Europe. Any settlement that he negotiates will have to be submitted to the Senate. Yet, today the President has not the slightest indication of the degree of American participation in peace-maintenance machinery which the Senate might approve. If today he had to enter upon such negotiations, he would do so under a fearful handicap, operating always under the nagging fear that while he might propose or accept certain lines of action, the Senate might refuse to ratify them. That fear also would operate upon our allies in such negotiations, inevitably leading them to give less weight to American suggestions than they otherwise would give.

The most tragic thing that could happen after this war would be for the President of the United States to collaborate in working out a peace settlement which the Senate subsequently refused to ratify. Nothing else would deal such a blow to the hopes of all mankind, and nothing else would be more likely to set the stage for World War No. 3.

Mr. President, we in the Senate owe it to the people, to future generations, and, above all, to our gallant fighting men to make clear to the Executive, to our own people, and to the world the general direction in which we believe international machinery to maintain peace should proceed, and how far we are willing to proceed in that direction.

The home front is in bad shape today because Congress and the President have not thus far been able to agree on several basic domestic war policies. How much more tragic if the same sort of disagreement should wreck our chances of a lasting peace.

This one reason alone, in my opinion, is sufficient to make it imperative that the Senate debate this issue fully, and that it record its approval or disapproval of various methods and varying degrees of collaboration after the war.

I realize that the past 6 months have been extremely busy ones, but I hope the Members of the Senate will find time during the recess to discuss with the people and to think through their own positions on the all-important question of what America's post-war foreign policy shall be.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to join with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], in saying a word in support of Senate resolution 114.

I am glad that there are in the gallery men from the front line who I believe have an interest in precisely the subject now being discussed.

To those who fight and win this war, whether they die in it or live through it, the Senate owes one special duty.

It is our sacred duty not only to do all we can to help them win the war but also to make sure that their efforts, their sacrifices, and their victory shall not be in vain. Without their victory, complete in both hemispheres, there can be no lasting peace and no independence of opportunity. Equally, without a just and lasting peace, their victory will be futile.

Nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace.

Much more, they cannot blunder into a just, a lasting, and a living peace. By a living peace I mean a peace with machinery to modify its terms from time to time to meet changing conditions. The establishment of the peace the world deserves calls upon this Congress, at once, for hard work, high courage, and well-planned, determined, constructive action.

Let us, therefore, dedicate the coming recess and the weeks following it to this

duty. Those on the firing line are doing more than their full share to plan and win the war. We cannot ask them also to plan and build the peace. They have the right to expect us to plan and build a peace worthy of their success in war.

To this end, I suggest three lines of thought and a course of procedure:

Congress is a trustee for the interests of the United States of America, both in war and in peace. Today those interests depend directly upon the military, economic, social, political, and spiritual progress of both America and the world.

First, we must, therefore, establish stability, prosperity, and freedom of opportunity within our borders. Each government in the world owes a similar duty to its own people. The success of these internal efforts is, in turn, important to all who have external contact with them.

Second. Likewise the nations in each natural region of nations, such as the region of the Americas or of central Europe or of the Far East, have a special responsibility for stability, prosperity, and freedom of opportunity within their respective regions. The interests of the world will be well served by reserving as many issues as possible for settlement within the respective regions.

Third. Finally, procedures must be established by which world-wide and interregional issues can be brought to reasonable conclusions without war and those conclusions can be enforced without question.

At the same time that we thus seek peace and independence, we find that science, business, agriculture, labor, education, the professions, art, and religion offer to civilization greater economic improvements than man has ever known. If there be post-war peace and opportunity for private initiative, the production of new wealth can be comparatively unlimited. Examples are the measureless advances being made in transportation by aviation, in communication by radio, and in medicine by sulfa drugs. Other examples are electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, electric welding, plastics, wood, glass, soybeans and other agricultural products to be grown for industry as well as for food.

It remains for man to end wasteful destruction and to encourage constructive initiative and fair competition. It remains for man to secure peace, provide stability, open the door of independent opportunity and attract the investment of private capital with all possible assurance of integrity and fairness in relation to competition and the protection of public interests.

This calls for prompt personal conferences among representatives of private as well as public enterprise at home and then abroad. It calls for laying the foundations before blueprinting the superstructure, and there should be no delay. It calls especially for study and agreements on principles and procedure.

Within the field of Government there is now, and there has been for some time, a need that meetings be initiated by the Government of the United States, first between its legislators and the leaders of its executive departments, and then among the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture. These should be followed by meetings with like leaders from the United Nations. The need calls now for the meeting of minds not only as to the production and distribution of wartime and post-war food, but also as to monetary problems, aviation, raw materials, relief and rehabilitation of occupied territory, temporary administration of occupied territory, the increase of post-war industry and agricultural production, distribution, and consumption, the private financing of enterprises and the employment of labor with special attention to the period of conversion from a governmentally financed economy of war to a privately financed and freer economy in time of peace.

Our Nation and all nations will benefit if each of us will seek frankly and vigorously its full and fair share of post-war opportunity—no less and also no more. Each is entitled to prompt substantial justice secured by orderly peaceful procedure.

As nations and individuals, we all are endowed with certain talents by the same Divine Power. It is for us neither to bury those talents nor to fight over them; it is for us to serve ourselves and each other by developing them. That is the golden rule of international law and the golden opportunity of international understanding.

To this end, I commend respectfully to the Senate during the coming recess and the weeks to follow it the terms of Senate Resolution 114—a resolution to win the peace, introduced on March 16, 1943, by Senators BALL, HATCH, HILL, and myself. I hope that, based upon its terms, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will soon report a resolution of national policy

The Nation is doing its full part on the firing line, the production line, the farm, the financial, and the home front. It is time for the Senate to do its full part to lead the way to a constructive, positive, constitutional American policy of internal, regional, and international action based upon the experience of the past and the facts of the present, designed to safeguard America against further wars of the world and to lead the way to a just, a lasting, and a living peace.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Reed
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Austin	Hayden	Reynolds
Ball	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Smith
Bridges	Langer	Stewart
Brooks	Lodge	Taft
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	Maloney	Tydings
Chandler	Maybank	Vandenberg
Chavez	Mead	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wagner
Connally	Moore	Wallgren
Danaher	Murdock	Walsh
Davis	Murray	Wheeler
Downey	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	
Guffey	Radcliffe	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, due to the fact that I had to be on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the war agencies bill, I was unable to attend the conference on the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, the conference report on which, I understand, is now before the Senate. I am very sorry that there was this unavoidable conflict, because there are several matters in this bill regarding which I have strong opinions.

I particularly wish to call attention to amendment No. 5 which added these words to the bill:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of a practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

That provision is added to the appropriation for the Children's Bureau and relates to the care of child-bearing women with funds which are appropriated by the act. The effect of the amendment is to make it possible for child-bearing women who are treated under the provisions of the act to have the services not only of obstetricians and of osteopaths but of chiropractors and midwives.

Mr. President, I fully appreciate the place of these various practitioners in our scheme of things, and I am saying nothing whatsoever in criticism of them. In general, I will be found to be a believer in the rights of the States and opposed to trespassing on them; but I submit that in cases where Federal funds are being employed the Federal Government has a right to impose a precept or standard without being accused of violating the rights of the States.

In this particular case the Children's Bureau desires to give the women who need care the very best possible care. I have in my hand a memorandum prepared by Dr. Martha M. Eliot, of the Children's Bureau, and I should like to read a few words of it to the Senate. This is what she says:

This proviso, which was stricken out by the Senate, has been reinserted by the House and a second proviso added along the same lines. This proviso will require the State health agencies responsible for maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of servicemen to pay Federal funds to any practitioner licensed to practice obstetrics in the States.

I interrupt the reading at this point to say that the statement has been made in good faith that this provision did not open the way to chiropractors and midwives. It was thought that it was limited entirely to osteopaths, but this is what Dr. Eliot says:

This means:

1. In 19 States chiropractors are legally permitted to care for women in childbirth though they are not permitted to practice surgery and usually may not give drugs.

2. In 19 States untrained midwives are licensed to practice midwifery though none are permitted to give drugs or practice surgery. By definition in Webster's New International Dictionary obstetrics and midwifery are synonymous.

3. In 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics and yet are forbidden to administer drugs or practice surgery.

Chiropractors are not permitted to practice in any hospital approved by the State health agencies to conduct obstetric service. Osteopaths are accepted as members of the staffs of less than 5 percent of hospitals that care for women in childbirth.

The modern practice of obstetrics requires skill in the use of drugs to save life, such as the new highly effective sulfa drugs for the treatment of infection, pituitrin, or ergonovine to control hemorrhage, or anesthetics or analgesics to relieve pain.

It is not our desire to prevent any woman from going to any practitioner she wishes to go to, but in the expenditure of Federal funds under this program the Federal Government should not permit its funds to be used to purchase care for wives of our men in the armed forces which is of inferior quality. If this proviso goes through, the Federal Government will have, for the first time, gone on record as in favor of preventing a Federal agency from setting standards of medical care purchased by Federal funds. Has the Congress considered what such action may mean with respect to the standards established by the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, and United States Civil Service Commission?

Finally, this is a matter obviously that should not be decided by the Congress until after public hearings have been held. It should not be included in an appropriation act.

(It is expected that approximately 200,000 wives of servicemen will be provided care during this coming year.)

In many cases the State laws relating to the licensing of doctors of medicine do not specifically mention obstetrics, yet such doctors of medicine are legally permitted to practice obstetrics. The same holds true for osteopathy and chiropractic in many States. The fact, therefore, that chiropractors are not specifically authorized to practice obstetrics does not mean that they are not legally entitled to practice obstetrics under the general provisions of their license. As a matter of fact, they are legally practicing obstetrics in many States.

Mr. President, there is no question here about denying to any woman the right to have any kind of medical care she wants with her own money, but when we are administering a Federal program, with Federal funds, I believe the same Federal standard that is applied with regard to medical care in every other branch of the Federal service which concerns itself with medical care should be applied to the women of the Nation, particularly to the wives of the soldiers. In my opinion, it would not be right to expose them to a degree of medical care which is inferior to that which is received by their husbands.

Mr. President, I am very sorry the amendment was agreed to, and I realize that if I had been here perhaps some of the Members of the Senate might have listened to me on this subject, but I could not be present because of the conference to which I have referred. I merely want the RECORD to show that I believe this is a harmful amendment in the form in which it is now written.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very able statement on this amendment which has just been made by the Senator from Massachusetts. In my opinion, this matter obviously should not have been decided by Congress until public hearings had been held on it, and it should not be included in an appropriation act. I realize the difficulties involved in attempting to defeat a conference report because of this matter, but it is important enough to do so if the Senate feels as I do about it.

In the discussion on the floor of the House yesterday it appears that an effort was made to undertake to differentiate between the practice of midwifery and the practice of obstetrics, and to show that the proviso would not apply to the practice of midwifery. But the definition in Webster's International Dictionary indicates that the terms are synonymous, that there is no difference between them.

All of us are anxious that the soldiers' wives be given the best possible treatment, and all of us are anxious to permit the wife of a soldier, or any other woman in the United States who is assisted by Federal funds, the right to select her own doctor, but in many States, as indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts, the men whom they may select are not permitted to use drugs or perform surgical operations, and in my opinion, the provision in question would do irreparable harm to the services performed by the Children's Bureau, and their fine work in saving the lives of little children.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that if this provision goes into the law a great many women will be in a position to receive medical care below the present State standards, because the practice in many of the States is not specifically to authorize certain persons to practice obstetrics, but providing Federal funds, with this provision attached, would practically constitute a directive to force obstetrical cases into the hands of persons who do not now take them?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator's statement is correct. I think this is a bad amendment. When this matter was before the Senate, the Senate struck out the provision originally contained in the House bill. In that action the Senate was correct. I regret exceedingly that our conferees permitted the House conferees to cause them to reinsert the language. It is my definite conviction that it will cause very great harm to child welfare work in the States, and to the State health bureaus, and that some bill should be passed forthwith to clarify the situation. It should be handled carefully, after public hearings, and with a clear understanding of the problem. An appropriation bill is not the place for such a provision. Perhaps we can clear the matter up before it is too late, and before too much harm is done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator will recall, the Senate struck out this proviso. The motion now is that the Senate recede and surrender its position, and thus agree to the proviso?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I think there is no such vote to be taken by the Senate. I think the question will come before us in the vote on the conference report itself, on the motion to adopt the conference report.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President.

Mr. McCARRAN. The motion is to agree to the conference report, and the Senate will either vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. HILL. There are three separate amendments to vote on, are there not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. But this amendment is not one on which a separate vote is to be taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that the Senate conferees yielded with respect to this amendment, and it is a part of the conference report. The House language remains in the bill.

Mr. HILL. How many amendments were there in the bill, does the Senator recall offhand?

Mr. McCARRAN. About 30.

Mr. HILL. And all but three are included in the report?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. The motion now is to adopt the report as it comes from conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to two matters contained in the report. First, I wish to associate myself with everything which was said by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] with regard to the so-called Virginia amendment. As one of those instrumental in helping to secure the original provisions in the Social Security Act, I think it would be an unfortunate step backward to strike down the merit principle in the administration of the various phases of the social-security program which have to do with the unfortunate persons who are in need of assistance.

I am not prone to criticize all State administrations, but, on the other hand, Mr. President, it must be clear to any person that they are not in all instances

above reproach, and if by any chance political machines get hold of the personnel dealing with the unfortunate in this country, they wield an enormous power, and there is great temptation to abuse it. There have been instances of that kind, some of which are probably fresh in the minds of Senators. So I think it is a step in the wrong direction and a false application of the so-called doctrine of States' rights to say that the Federal Government, when it is putting up a large portion or all the money for administrative costs, should not at least be enabled to say, as the Government is now able to say, that persons employed in those services should be appointed as the result of the application of the merit principle.

There is ample safeguard in the present statute against any undue exercise of power by the Federal agencies over any of the personnel, over their tenure of office, or other similar matters, but when it comes to the question, pure and simple, of saying whether those employed shall be selected on such a basis as to be sure that they are properly qualified to be in charge of the programs and to be ministering to the unfortunate people who are to be the beneficiaries, I do not think it is a sound or proper application of the principle of States' rights to deny the Government the right of selection.

Mr. President, I trust that I shall be proven wrong, but I fear that the enactment of the proposed legislation repealing, as I view it does, the merit principle in the administration of the so-called security laws, will lead to situations which will be unfortunate, and for which the Congress will some day have to hang its head in shame.

I also wish to associate myself, if I may be permitted to do so, in what has been said by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with regard to the legislation affecting the administration of the child-welfare and obstetrical programs under the Children's Bureau. The unfortunate situation which would be created if we yield on this proposition will be that in some States persons who are not permitted under statutes of those States to practice in the welfare hospitals will, as a matter of right, be entitled to minister to the wives of servicemen who are to receive the benefits of this statute during the period of their pregnancy and delivery. We will then have the anomalous situation of persons who are denied by State laws the right to administer drugs which are essential in the modern practice of obstetrics, as a matter of right ministering to the wives of exservicemen. We will have such a situation, Mr. President, that persons who are denied the right to practice surgery will, as a matter of right, be enabled to assume charge of the wives of servicemen, and other women, and every Senator who knows anything about modern obstetrics knows that surgery is often essential in order to save the lives of both mother and child at the time of delivery.

Mr. President, I say that to yield on this matter is a step backward in modern practice of obstetrics, and it is unfair to the servicemen, who are preparing to give their lives for their country, if necessary, that their wives, who are pregnant, and who are to be delivered in their absence, shall not have the benefit of the finest standards and the finest care that money can procure.

Yet in this false application of the so-called doctrine of States' rights such a situation will be created that the Congress will have done that very thing. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I want no part of it. I want no father of a child born while the father is overseas fighting for his country to point his finger at me and say, "You are responsible for the death of my wife and child in my absence, because a man was permitted to minister to her at her time of need who was not properly equipped, who was not licensed to use drugs, who was not licensed to practice surgery."

Mr. President, I say that such a thing would be an outrage.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I simply wish to impose upon the time of the Senator to express myself as being in complete agreement with the statement he has just made and with the views earlier expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kentucky.

I had supposed that when we struck out this provision in committee the matter had been disposed of, and, because so much emphasis was laid on the matter in committee, I very deeply regret that the conferees on the part of the Senate have brought this language back to us and have made it necessary for us to vote the entire report up or down in order to meet the situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to find out what there is in the proposed legislation which undertakes to authorize a person in the State of Vermont, for example, to practice obstetrics who does not qualify under the State requirement? Is there anything in the bill which would permit that to be done?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President. What happens is that in 19 States, for example, persons who secure licenses to practice certain of the healing arts, or cults, may, without its being contrary to State law, minister to a woman who is to be delivered of a child.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But in many of those States the same person is barred from using or administering drugs which now are recognized to be required in the usual practice of modern, scientific obstetrics, and in most of the States such persons are barred from practicing surgery; whereas, as every Senator should know, surgery often is necessary in order to save the life of the mother or the life of the child, or of both.

But with this provision in the law, the patient may say, "I desire to have this person take care of me," and the language would prevent the Children's Bureau from setting up any standard which would prevent such person from taking care of the woman, even though barred by State law from using drugs or practicing surgery.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand that the proviso concerning which the Senator is addressing the Senate reads as follows:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

Is that the language?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the proviso to which I am referring. It will create the confusion I have mentioned. In other words, there was a very legitimate and, I think, sincere misunderstanding about the facts. The statement was flatly made on the floor of the House that this proviso would not permit unqualified persons to practice. But I am informed that view is not correct, because of the situation I have stated.

In other words, certain of the State laws forbid certain types of healing-art practitioners to use drugs or practice surgery; and yet their license under the State law pertaining to the healing arts will permit them to practice obstetrics.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to say that if I vote to support the conference report, I shall do so on the theory that this proviso does not attempt to regulate the practice of medicine or of obstetrics at all, but relates only to, and bears upon, the option of the patient to have the benefit of the grant, provided the patient does not thereby set in force a violation of the standards of the State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator can vote for it on any grounds he chooses. I simply want to make it clear that so far as I am concerned, when the Federal Government is furnishing the money to take care of the wives of servicemen who could not otherwise take care of themselves, I do not want to see created a situation whereby the wives of servicemen during pregnancy and childbirth may be administered to by persons who are forbidden by the States to use drugs essential to modern obstetrics, and are denied, under State laws, the right to practice surgery which is often essential in order to save the life of the mother or of the child, or both.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator agree with me that the proviso does not add anything; gives no extra protection and does not cure the situation in any way whatsoever so far as the language the House put in the bill is concerned?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it does not.

Mr. HILL. It does not help the situation in connection with the objection which we feel toward the language which the House inserted in the bill. It does

not help anything. If anything it makes it worse.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it makes it worse.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator; if anything, it makes it worse.

Mr. President, in reference to what the Senator from Vermont has said, let me say that in 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics; yet they are forbidden the use of drugs and the practice of surgery. Modern obstetrics requires the administration of certain drugs and, in many cases, requires the practice of surgery. What the Senate sought to do, and the position the Senate took in striking out the language, was to make sure that the wives of veterans who are now in our armed forces would have the proper kind of medical care and properly accredited physicians when they were in pregnancy and when obstetrics had to be practiced.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order to let me respond to the last remark of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks. They clarify the issue for me; and I judge from them that the purpose is to raise the standard above the public policy which is declared by the State in each of the 11 States to which the Senator referred. I could not try to do that as a legislator of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The question is not one of raising the standard insofar as it applies to the people of the States for whom the States have assumed responsibility. To illustrate the matter as I see it, let me say that we have veterans' hospitals throughout the country. They are located in the different States. In many of those veterans' hospitals the standards are different from those the State might have in, let us say, a charity hospital within the State.

When the Federal Government is paying all the expenses, when the Federal Government assumes the entire responsibility and obligation in the matter, and when the persons involved, as in the case under consideration, are the wives of veterans who are now in the armed forces of our country, I do not think there is any reason why the Federal Government should be bound down by the law or standard of a State which does not meet the needs, as we know them to exist. That is what we are doing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is confusion, it seems to me, in the thinking on this question. The language referred to will not have anything to do with the standards of the States. The program is a Federal program. It has been determined by the Federal Government that it will extend aid to the wives of ex-service men who otherwise cannot afford proper care when they are pregnant and are to be delivered. All the Federal Government has been seeking to do is to make sure that the wives shall have the best possible type of care.

So far as I know, there is no requirement in any State that any person shall go to a physician to be delivered of a child. A pregnant mother could attempt to deliver herself, if she sought to do so, without violating the law. She might be delivered by a friend or a neighbor. She would not violate any law if she did so.

All that is sought is to make certain when we are extending care in the name of the Federal Government to the wives of ex-service men that only persons who are in a position to utilize the finest possible standards and to give the best possible care shall be permitted to administer to those women. In other words, we want to say that if in the State of X, some person who by State law is not permitted to use drugs or practice surgery, is entitled under the State law to administer to women in pregnancy who may wish to come to him for delivery, he shall not be permitted to do so in the case of the wives of servicemen who are being treated at Federal expense.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am heartily in accord with the idea of high standards in this excellent undertaking. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that in many localities in various States there is a great scarcity of practicing physicians and surgeons. They have gone into the armed forces. I should like to ask a question for my own information. What would be the situation in such a community in the case of the delivery of a child if a physician were not available and the expectant mother should call in a midwife? Would she be entitled to that service at the expense of this fund?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under the present law the Children's Bureau has the right to set up standards for persons who are eligible to be paid out of Federal moneys so far as this program is concerned. Personally I believe that the dearth of physicians and surgeons has been seized upon as a means of striking down the standards which have been established. I am satisfied that those who are administering the program are just as determined as is anyone else to see that women are afforded proper service, and they will see that they get it. I do not think there is a scintilla of evidence before either of the committees to show that any person eligible for obstetrical care under this program has been denied proper care because of these standards. There has been considerable general talk about the scarcity of physicians, which everyone knows is true; but, so far as I know, not one scintilla or shred of evidence has been presented to show that because of the high standards required, any service has been denied to any woman eligible for it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps I can contribute to the reply to the question of the Senator from West Virginia. It is my understanding that under the present arrangement the Director of the Children's Bureau may take cognizance of those areas where there is a great shortage of licensed physicians. I have not the record before me, but I have been told that in sparsely settled areas where there are very few physicians some of these funds have occasionally been made available for that purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is my understanding of the situation. Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the subcommittee, if his recollection does not bear me out, that no evidence was presented to show that these standards had resulted in the wives of any ex-servicemen, or other persons who might be eligible, being denied proper care?

Mr. LODGE. I know of no evidence to that effect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whether there was such evidence before the committee or not, I think it is a matter of very general knowledge, particularly in States where there are small towns and counties remote from railroads, that there is a great scarcity of practicing physicians. Thousands of them have gone into the armed services. Whether there was any evidence before the committee or not, we know that to be a fact that there is a scarcity, and that there may be cases—I have been told of such cases—in which doctors are not available at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is one thing to say that doctors are not available and it is another thing to say that any person eligible for care under the Federal program, which is all we are concerned about, has been denied assistance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is what I want to get at. I think the burden of proof is upon those who wish to tear down the standards and who wish to say, by an explicit statutory provision, that women entitled to assistance and care, including the wives of ex-servicemen and others, are to be denied the highest standards of service. The burden is upon those who are advocating this proposal to show that there has been any lack of attention to the particular group which is involved. Everyone knows that there is a shortage of doctors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understand the language of the proviso in the House bill, it would prevent discrimination among persons who are licensed within the State to practice obstetrics. It has no relationship to those who are not licensed. So, if a woman wished to do so she could employ a midwife who is not licensed in the State, if that were the course she desired to pursue. So far as the proviso is concerned, it would not prevent the use of these funds for the employment of any person whom a woman wished to have administer to her,

provided there were no discriminations among those who are licensed in the State.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that I do not think this touches anyone outside those who are licensed within the State. There is no provision that the money may not be expended in cases where midwives, who may not be licensed by the State, are employed. A midwife may be subject to some State law. All this provision does is to prohibit discrimination among those licensed within the State.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Apparently the Senator feels that I am opposing the purpose which he is advocating. I am not. I am trying to find out what the practical results may be. The able Senator from Kentucky has enlightened me very much. I am trying to find out what the result of the scarcity of doctors might be. As I understand what has been said, if a midwife may act upon an occasion of that kind, she may act for the soldier's wife under this provision. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. She would not be permitted to do so without a special exception to the standards which have been established.

Mr. BARKLEY. She might be prohibited by regulations of the War Department; but, as I understand, this prohibition does affect that situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a doctor were not available would this provision prevent a woman from receiving help?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not if she wanted to obtain help from any other person; but, under the present regulations, a person who did not meet the standards which had been set up could not be paid any money out of this fund unless an exception had been made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a doctor were not available, and the wife of a soldier had to resort to a midwife, she could not have that help, or rather, the midwife could not be paid. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. She could not be paid unless the woman herself paid for the services.

The Senator must understand that this program is being conducted through the State agencies with Federal money. The program has been in operation for some time. A large number of persons have been given this aid. There is not one scintilla of evidence that I know of that any person has been denied aid; but now it is proposed that these standards shall be torn down by statute, and that the regulations shall be set aside. The resultant situation will be as I have outlined it. At the present time, even those who are denied by State laws permission to administer the drugs which are now recognized as a part of modern obstetrical practice may practice indiscriminately, including even persons who are denied the right by State law to practice surgery. Under the language of the conference report the Children's Bureau would be helpless in denying those persons the right to serve in the cases for which they are responsible. I say that the result of such a situation would be unfortunate. Women might be crippled for life. I do not wish to be responsible, even in part, for it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the proposed action is taken—and I insist that it ought not to be, because it would be a very great mistake—it would put the Federal Government on record as using these sums to purchase care of an inferior quality for the wives of our men in the armed forces. The child welfare and maternal care which have been afforded during the past 7 years have changed the United States from a country with one of the highest death rates in childbirth to a country with one of the lowest rates in the world. It would be a grievous backward step to accept this proposal. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do. I think it is very unfortunate that the Senate should even consider yielding on this proposal, because I think we should live to regret it. We should have cases presented to us which would bring tears to our eyes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government maintains high standards in its Army hospitals, Navy hospitals, Public Health hospitals, and veterans' hospitals.

The Federal Government maintains high standards in all instances in which it is in any way responsible for medical care or service. Why make an exception of the wives of the men in our armed forces, and adopt a low standard which would permit incompetent and unqualified persons to practice on the wives of our men?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would the Senator even think it possible to consider for a moment that the Congress would provide that persons who may not administer drugs and who may not practice surgery should be permitted to take charge of the wounded soldiers when they come back from the front?

Mr. HILL. Of course, no Senator would agree to that; yet it is proposed to apply that same principle to the wives of the men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is proposed to apply it to the wives of those who are not financially able to buy the highest type of service for themselves.

Mr. HILL. Not only to their wives, but to their helpless children. I wish to associate myself with all the Senator has said concerning this provision. So far as I am concerned I will not vote to go along with this proposal. I will vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So will I, Mr. President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator began his remarks, but I have listened with a great deal of interest since I returned to the Chamber. It is my understanding that if the conference report is adopted it will mean putting our Government on record in favor of lowering the standard of treatment and medical care for which the Government agrees to pay for the wives of the men in our armed services.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it can have no other result.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to endorse what I have heard the Senator say. When the time comes I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator desire me to yield, or does he wish to obtain the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to have the Senator yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has a misconception of the whole proposal. The language in question provides, with regard to the qualification of those who may practice obstetrics, that State laws which license physicians or others engaged in the practice of obstetrics shall apply, and that no one not licensed by the State shall practice obstetrics or receive any money under the terms of this bill. That is the provision in the bill. That is all it does. It refers the matter to the States. If the Senator wishes to say that by their statutes the States of the Union have lowered their standards, then I have no argument. As a matter of fact, the States have been solicitous and meticulous to assure that the standards for practicing physicians are maintained.

With regard to a practicing physician who is an osteopath, no osteopath may practice medicine or obstetrics in any State of the Union unless he shall have first been licensed by the State to practice obstetrics; and he could not have been licensed by the State to practice obstetrics unless he could administer drugs, and perform the necessary surgery attendant upon an obstetrical case.

Before an osteopath may be admitted to practice in any State of the Union he must have taken the required training in medicine. There are 19 States which license osteopaths. No State in the Union licenses chiropractors to perform obstetrical services.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not understand——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, allow me to finish. I shall take but a moment. I do not like Senators to be misled in this matter.

The Census Bureau reported to me today that it has no case on record in the United States in which a birth certificate has been issued by a chiropractor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I disagree with the analysis of the situation as made by the Senator from Nevada. My information comes from Dr. Elliott, who has been administering this program for many years. The Senator's statement is true so far as actual licensing is concerned. However, the fact is—and there has been much beating of the devil around the stump in this debate—that in many States there

is no legal prohibition against the practice of obstetrics by persons who are unable to administer drugs or perform surgery. Under the terms of the House provision and the proviso, such persons would be entitled to participate in this program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the first place, in no State of the Union may an osteopath be admitted to practice obstetrics unless he can administer drugs or perform the necessary surgical operations which may be attendant upon an obstetrical case. That is the first point.

Secondly, when he is licensed to practice obstetrics he has complied with the State law, and falls squarely under the proviso that no one not licensed under a State law may practice obstetrics.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, 19 States permit midwives to attend women at the time of childbirth. Under the dictionary definitions, midwifery and obstetrics are interchangeable and synonymous terms. Those who will have to interpret the law, if the provision in the conference report is enacted, are convinced that they will be forced to permit such persons to attend cases which the Congress had said should have consideration because the husbands of the wives are in the armed forces. There is no use in quibbling over words. These are the facts. These are the interpretations which have been placed on this language by those who will be charged with the administration of the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I gladly yield to the able Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know of no State which by its laws permits a midwife to practice obstetrics. She may attend and minister in an obstetrical case, but I know of no State which by statute permits a midwife to practice obstetrics.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, unfortunately those who would have to administer the law take a different view from that taken by the Senator from Nevada. They feel that as a result they would be forced to allow persons who cannot practice surgery, and who cannot administer the drugs which are required in the modern scientific practice of obstetrics, to minister to the wives of ex-service men who may be in need. In the light of those circumstances I say that the Senate should not go on record in favor of taking any such action.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am unable to state with any authority the facts applicable to any State other than the State of California. It has been represented to me that not one State in the Union permits the practice of obstetrics by chiropractors or midwives. I was so informed by a person in authority, but I cannot vouch for it. As I understand the issue which will arise in California should this proposal be enacted into law, it is the desire of the people there who will administer the law to prevent osteopaths from practicing obstetrics.

Mr. President, I have made some investigation of that question. I am informed, and I believe authoritatively, that in order to become an osteopath one must have had 6 years of medical and surgical training, and that in the opinion of practically all medical men osteopaths are well qualified to practice obstetrics.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend the Senator from California permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does my friend realize that in 11 States osteopaths are permitted to practice obstetrics, yet they are forbidden to administer drugs or practice surgery? Osteopaths are accepted as members of the staffs of less than 5 percent of the hospitals in the United States caring for women in childbirth cases.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know whether those statements are correct or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the statement of the Senator from Kentucky does not conform to the facts regarding the administration of drugs. When an osteopath is admitted to practice obstetrics under a State law, I know of no State which does not require that he pass the tests to administer drugs, or perform the necessary attendant surgical operation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I quote the statement of Dr. Martha Eliot, of the Children's Bureau, and she says that is the fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am told very positively that it is the desire of those who will administer this law to have the provision so framed as to enable them to prevent the practice of osteopathy in obstetrical cases. I am convinced from personal conversations with physicians in California that osteopaths can successfully and properly perform that service and should be allowed to do so.

As I stated in a prior address upon the floor of the Senate, there is not a sufficient number of doctors of any kind to care adequately for the women in child birth in California, and if the law were so framed as to allow its administrators to prevent the practice of obstetrics by osteopaths in the State of California it would be an unparalleled calamity for us. While I do not speak with any degree of authority about other subjects, as I read this proposal, the rules of safety and well-being will be well preserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Butler
Andrews	Bridges	Byrd
Austin	Brooks	Capper
Ball	Buck	Caraway
Barkley	Burton	Chandler
Chavez	McFarland	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Shipstead
Connally	Maloney	Smith
Danaher	Maybank	Stewart
Downey	Mead	Taft
Eastland	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	Murdock	Truman
Guffey	Murray	Tunnell
Gurney	Nye	Tydings
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Holman	Overton	Wagner
Kilgore	Pepper	Wallgren
La Follette	Radcliffe	Walsh
Langer	Reed	Wheeler
Lodge	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Reynolds	White
McCarran	Robertson	Willis
McClellan	Russell	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was on the conference committee which agreed to the provision now in controversy, and I am unwilling that a vote should be taken without stating to the Senate, as briefly as I can, my understanding of the propositions involved and my reasons for giving support thereto.

As has been pointed out by previous speakers, there are two provisos. One has been discussed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I think he pointed out a fact with respect to the first proviso which has been generally overlooked.

The proviso merely states, paraphrasing it, that no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminates between persons licensed to practice obstetrics in any State and under any State law.

So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to giving to any agency of the Federal Government authority to embark upon a campaign directed against any authorized practitioner of obstetrics in any State of this Union, for I believe it is a legitimate and proper function and responsibility of the several States to determine the qualifications of those within their borders who are to practice upon the bodies and the health of the citizens of the several States. So I have no difficulty with the first proviso.

The second proviso is as follows:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with.

There again is recognized the authority, the responsibility, and the obligations of the several States of this Union to fix their standards and to require that anyone who undertakes to practice within those States shall comply with the laws of the States.

As a very practical proposition, what confronts us? The evidence before the committee, I think, was not directed to this particular point, but it has a bearing on the point. The evidence before the committee was that there are many sections in this country where there are not to be found today persons with medical training.

The evidence before the committee was that there are many sections of the

country where persons with medical training are today not to be found. I suspect every Senator has had come to his desk in recent days appeals from hospitals, from public health services, from practicing physicians protesting against what they thought was a provision that civilian doctors could be moved about from the centers to the rural sections of the United States. That fear, in my opinion, sprang from the fact that there was introduced and presented to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee a proposal that the Public Health Service and the military authorities might move the doctors in their services wheresoever they pleased within the United States, and it also sprang even more from a part of that proposal which was that the authorities might enter into contracts with civilian doctors under which civilian doctors would be paid $250 a month if they would move out into areas not now enjoying medical service, as these areas might be designated. That is the testimony before the Appropriations Committee, and that is a fact which is corroborated by the correspondence which I believe comes to every Senator.

Throughout large parts of the country there are insufficient doctors; there are not a sufficient number of doctors to attend to disease, to attend to injuries, to serve in obstetrical cases.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator not recognize local self-rule to be an ancient practice in our several States and a part of the policy which has been recognized for over a century?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Vermont that Maine stands with Vermont in support of that principle.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. And is not that principle carried out to the very twigs of the tree of democracy by having a good old town meeting vote the necessary appropriation to invite a doctor to come to the town and serve it, sometimes only a part of the time, and sometimes to come there and reside?

Mr. WHITE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I will yield to the Senator, but I shall not yield again because I wish to conclude, for I know Senators desire to vote on the question.

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot see that the viewpoint of those who are opposed to this amendment is any indication that it is the purpose of the amendment to trespass upon States' rights. Our view is that we should not contribute toward the lower standards of States which will not comply.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I understand the Senator's view.

Mr. MALONEY. In no way do we propose to trespass on the rights of the States.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the Senator's views.

Now what confronts the Senate as a practical proposition? We shall have obstetrical cases, not of the wives of the soldiers of the country alone, but of womenkind scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land—in our urban centers and in our rural communities. There is no prohibition in Federal law against the choice by a woman of the practitioner she desires to have attend her. She may employ a midwife, she may employ a chiropractor, she may employ an osteopath. The result of the defeat of this proposition would be that she will pay the expense alone, and she will receive no contribution from the Federal Government unless she selected an attendant approved by Washington.

Mr. President, if the result in treatment is the same, why are we going to deprive a woman living in a rural community of the financial aid which she will sorely need in these days which lie ahead of us? That seems to me to be the real issue here, and it is because of these considerations that I propose to vote for the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate realizes the full signfficance of the vote which is about to be taken. The motion pending is to adopt the conference report. The conference report presented to the Senate cannot be amended. If the Senate votes to reject the motion it throws out the entire conference report; it throws the whole matter back into chaos, if I may so call it, or confusion for days again. The vote is not a vote on the amendment alone. A yea vote or a nay vote at this time does not affect the amendment alone; it affects the entire conference report, consisting of some 27 amendments, which have been agreed to after long hours of conference, which were voted on and agreed to by the House, and now are before the Senate. I hope the vote on the question will be "yea," because the vote is on the conference report as a whole, and not on amendment numbered 5.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am somewhat confused about the Army regulations with respect to the practice of obstetrics in connection with the wives of servicemen. Can the Senator inform me whether the regulations, if there are any now in force, require that the laws of the various States shall be complied with, or that only those who are licensed by the States may administer to women in obstetrical cases?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot give definite information on the subject. I do not think the Army now recognizes chiropractors or osteopaths.

Mr. BARKLEY. I read the amendment awhile ago and undertook to interpret it. I read only the House language, which has been modified by the conferees to provide in effect, it seems to me, that whatever is done about the matter, the State laws shall be complied with.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would mean that if a woman went to someone not licensed within the State, while she would have a perfect right to do so, and might pay for the service herself, none of the money appropriated by this bill could be used to pay such an obstetrician.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a correct interpretation.

Mr. President, let me say again that Senators should remember that they are not voting on the one item alone but on the whole conference report, and if they vote to reject the whole conference report they throw it back for consideration by the conferees, or back into the House, as the case may be.

Just one more expression and I shall have concluded. If the amendment does anything, it emphasizes that the greatest care will be taken because certainly the States of the Union and the medical organizations in the States have seen to it that the greatest possible safeguard shall be thrown around women with respect to those who under the laws of the States may practice in confinement cases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words in conclusion. This is not an issue of States' rights. The program is a wholly operated and paid-for Federal program, so far as the obstetrical care of the wives of the men in the armed forces of the United States are concerned. It is a joint Federal and State program, so far as maternal care generally is concerned. No State has to accept a dollar of this money if it does not desire to do so. All that the Children's Bureau has sought to do in the administration of this program is to assure the indigent mothers, on the one side, and the wives of men in the armed services of the United States, on the other, that they shall in their time of trial, at childbirth, have the best possible care that modern science can afford and money can buy.

Mr. President, I say that it is a shocking thing, even in order to secure the adoption of a conference report, that the Senate of the United States should go on record in favor of lowering the standards of care for the wives of the men who are on the battle fronts. I say we can afford to reject this report. I say we should send it back to conference. I say the time has come when the Senate of the United States should assert its rights as a coordinate branch of Government. Our conferees have been doing nothing in the last 24 or 48 hours but coming in and telling us that they cannot do anything because the House is adamant. Is the House the only legislative body? Do we not have some rights in these matters? Are we not entitled to have the House agree to some of our proposals? Yet nothing has been recommended to us except recession and recession. Why do we receive such recommendations in order to bring about an agreement?

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, if this practice is continued over any long period of time the Senate will become a vermiform appendage of the legislative branch of the Government. The Senate will descend into a secondary

position, because all the House will have to do will be to hold baek the appropriation bills until the closing days or weeks of the fiscal year, and then say the Senate must agree in order to provide the necessary appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what was being discussed when the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was holding hearings, I asked the Surgeon General of the United States if he would express his opinion. We had a short discussion off the record.

The Secretary of War wrote a letter to the Appropriations Committee in connection with the Department of Labor appropriation bill. It may not be appropriate to read the letter at this time, when the Senate is considering another matter, but I ask unanimous consent to read it. It was written to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYBANK. The letter is as follows:

Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GLASS: With reference to a request from the Department of Labor, relative to H. R. 2935, the following is submitted:

The Surgeon General, when he appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, stated, in substance, relative to the above bill, that in his opinion no one should be employed as a physician, unless he is a graduate of a regular medical school and eligible to practice medicine in the majority of the States of the Union This statement expresses the views of the War Department.

Inasmuch as it has been requested that this report be expedited, it is submitted without a determination by the Bureau of the Budget as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours.

I requested that information because of the large number of telegrams and letters I had received from the medical profession of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I say that if it is a perversion of the doctrine of States' rights to have this program, it certainly would be a perversion of the doctrine of State's rights to provide a program which would not take care of the wives of former service men now in the Army of the United States. I say that a vote for the conference report will be a vote to lower the standard of service the wives of servicemen will receive; it will be a vote to endanger the lives of the wives and the unborn children of men in the armed services of the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator in reply to the assertion he made a moment ago that the Senate is always yielding and seems to be getting into the position of always giving in to the House, that in the conference the House conferees yielded on 26 points, and the Senate conferees on only 4.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, perhaps I should have qualified my statement by saying that we are getting into a position of yielding to the House on legislative amendments which, under the House rule, if a special rule for them had not been brought in, would have been subject to a point of order in the House in the first place. The matter is being decided here without hearings, without consideration by the committee having jurisdiction of the effect on substantive law.

Mr. President, I say we should protect the wives of veterans in the armed forces of the country against inferior service at the time of their need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I do not know how either Senator would vote if present. I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—42

Andrews	Danaher	Reynolds
Austin	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Brewster	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	McCarran	Taft
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla
Burton	McKellar	Truman
Butler	Moore	Tunnell
Byrd	O'Daniel	Tydings
Capper	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Caraway	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Reed	Wherry
Connally	Revercomb	White

NAYS—32

Aiken	Langer	Pepper
Ball	Lodge	Radcliffe
Chandler	Lucas	Shipstead
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gerry	Mead	Wagner
Guffey	Millikin	Wallgren
Hill	Murdock	Wheeler
Kilgore	Murray	Willis
La Follette	Nye	

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	George	McNary
Barbour	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Glass	Tobey
Bone	Green	Wiley
Bushfield	Hatch	Wilson
Clark, Idaho	Hayden	
Davis	Johnson, Calif.	

So the report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2935, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
July 1, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and insert at the end thereof, before the period, the following: ": *Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person"; and

That the House insist upon its amendment to Senate amendment No. 19 and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24 and 30 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is Senate amendment numbered 19?

Mr. McCARRAN. Senate amendment numbered 19 is called the labor amendment.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator explain exactly what has been done?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provision came over from the House in the form of an amendment which had been placed in the bill on the floor of the House. The amendment inserted in the bill on the floor of the House was stricken out by the Senate, and was taken to conference. In conference an agreement was reached, after long study, as follows:

The first part of the amendment, as it now stands before the Senate, is the House language which was placed in the bill by a vote of the House when the bill was first before the House:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

To that the conferees agreed, with a proviso, as follows:

> *Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall h ve been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person.

The Senate will recall the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Nevada, in charge of the bill. It was the desire of the committee to have the question go to conference so that it might be settled in conference. It was the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to stabilize labor conditions for the duration of the war. Many views have been expressed, some laying blame on the National Labor Relations Board, and others laying blame elsewhere. We believe that when agreements are now in existence, regardless of whom the agreements may favor, the agreements should be frozen, if I may use that term, or at least stabilized, for the duration of the war, and not disrupted by confusion, misunderstanding, elections, or what not. The Senate Appropriations Committee sought to have the question settled in conference; and the form in which the language is now before the Senate represents our attempt to solve this perplexing problem.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words against the amendment.

I am a member of the Truman committee, which went into the Kaiser shipyard case in Portland, which is the basis for the language inserted by the House.

In the Portland shipyard case Kaiser entered a closed-shop union agreement with the American Federation of Labor building trades department, when he had 66 men employed. That closed-shop contract forced every man to join the union, pay an initiation fee, and pay dues. It would now cover 20,000 employees.

Mr. Kaiser testified that in that shipyard the labor turn-over is 20 percent a month, or 240 percent a year. Obviously there is something wrong with the labor-relations picture at that plant.

The American Federation of Labor sponsored this language, destroying a vital part of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, simply to stop the application of that law in this one case. If we adopt this provision we say that any contractor or employer may sign a contract with the union business agent, and if he can keep that contract from being attacked for 3 months, it will hold; it does not matter whether he signed it when there were no employees in his plant.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act is designed to protect the rights of workingmen in their jobs. All that the unions which are fighting over this particular clause are interested in—and they both admitted it before our committee—is not the welfare of the men doing the work, but the right of the unions to control the particular jobs and collect dues. It seems to me that the Senate would be departing from an important principle if it should abandon its position of protecting the rights of employees in their jobs and say that for the sake of a so-called stability, which results in a 240 percent labor turn-over annually, we are to freeze these men to any sort of labor contract, regardless of how it was entered into. Such action would legalize any kind of a "sweetheart" labor contract.

I hope the Senate will reject this proposal and send it back to conference to see if a provision can be drafted which would bring about stability, but would protect the workingman against such abuses as have occurred on a great many construction projects during this war.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that I may correct a mistake in my statement, I ask to be recognized now.

I made the statement that this provision would tend to stabilize labor relations for the duration of the war. In that statement I was in error, because this bill is an appropriation bill, which runs for only 1 year. But in the interim the Congress hopes that legislation may be enacted which will stabilize labor relations for the duration of the war. I merely wished to correct my statement, because the appropriation bill runs for only 1 year.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject this amendment. I think it is a vicious piece of legislation to attach to an appropriation bill. It would virtually repeal the Wagner Act and would not stabilize anything. I believe it would result in more trouble than good.

My colleague from Minnesota has stated correctly the evidence which was collected by the special committee of which I am the chairman. We heard all sides of the controversy, and this amendment is merely the result of the desire on the part of the American Federation of Labor on the west coast to maintain an agreement which was entered into by a very small number of men employed in the plant of Mr. Kaiser. It is not a proper amendment to be put on an appropriation bill at this time. I sincerely hope that the Senate will reject it and send it back for further consideration by the conference committee. I also sincerely hope that the Senate will never accept it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the so-called Truman committee, who is one of its most active members.

I concur entirely with the statement of facts which has been made, but I think other facts were brought out before the committee which are very relevant to the situation.

We are confronted by what I think was said at one time by a distinguished member of the opposition party to be a condition and not a theory. We are confronted by a condition brought about by agitation in shipyards and in other war activities, as a result of which labor production has been very seriously impaired. That was the testimony repeatedly of Mr. Kaiser before our committee. He begged us for any action which would end this continuing controversy in connection with his plants.

I do not agree at all that this amendment refers solely to the Kaiser difficulty. As a matter of fact, in shipyards along the Gulf and eastern coasts already there are pending or proposed applications which will open up the same question, and throw our entire labor relationships on those coasts into a chaos similar to that which we so much deplore.

Nor do I say that the amendment has any reference to the American Federation of Labor, because in my State of Maine the C. I. O. recently won a shipyard election which resulted in throwing out the A. F. of L. union and the A. F. of L. union there is under the same inhibition that is applied in this case.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if the basic and fundamental situation back of this controversy is not the struggle between the various racketeers of labor for the harvest of dues and initiation fees imposed upon the workers?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will let the Senator from Oregon phrase the situation as he wishes. The Senator from Minnesota said it was rather clearly indicated before our committee that there was a contest as to who should control.

Mr. HOLMAN. Control what and for what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. The receipt of funds. It seems clear to me that at this crisis the Senate should not be primarily concerned with whether one or another group shall receive the dues. We should rather direct ourselves in this

crisis to what will conduce to stability in our labor relations, and I believe that no one can successfully challenge the statement that by the adoption of this language we shall in some measure end this continuing controversy. I trust the Senate may find itself to be in agreement with the conferees by the adoption of the amendment which, whether it be to the advantage of one or another of the labor groups, will certainly be to the advantage of our boys who are on the fighting fronts, as well as to the great productive machinery which we are seeking to bring into action.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REED. I hope my colleagues will not be too impatient. We will reach a vote soon enough. This is a very important matter of vital concern in labor legislation and in all labor controversies throughout the country.

I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee which heard the evidence of labor leaders on both sides. Frankly, Mr. President, this is a fight between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. for control of the dues collected from laboring men. That was frankly stated. Neither side denied it.

I was not a Member of the Senate when the Wagner Act was passed. If I had been I would have voted for it. The Wagner Act provided a method of organizing for collective bargaining, as well as selecting agencies to represent the men through their vote. The pending amendment would virtually repeal or nullify the Wagner Act, so far as the organizing of the men, or the right of men to vote for their collective-bargaining agencies is concerned.

I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the proposed amendment has no place in an appropriation bill. In the committee I objected to the amendment adopted by the House for the benefit of the A. F. of L. I object again. I do not think the addition made in conference improves the situation a particle. As I recall, I told the distinguished and able Senator from Nevada as much. At least, if I did not tell him, I should have told him. I believe, Mr. President, that the amendment, if adopted, will be hurtful to labor, will be a restriction upon the right of collective bargaining, and of the right of the men to establish their own bargaining agencies. The amendment should be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the proposed amendment concerning closed-shop agreements would practically repeal the Labor Relations Act. We were very careful in drafting the act to insure that a closed shop could only be agreed upon between the workers and the management after a majority of the workers, by a vote, agreed to the establishment of a closed shop. That is the law, and I have it right here before me.

In this particular instance, it is my understanding that when the manager, the owner, made an agreement with the labor leader, there were only about 30 men in that particular plant. After that, approximately 30,000 men came into this particular plant without having the opportunity of determining the question of whether they desired to belong to the union, or whether they were in favor of a closed shop. That is one of the very things which we provided for in the Labor Relations Act. We wanted to be sure that the workers would have a right to determine the question of whether they wanted a closed shop, and whether they wanted a union.

What occurred in this particular instance was that after these 30 men agreed to belong to a union, every worker who came to this particular plant—I understand that there are three or four plants in all—was required to sign a union contract, and a closed-shop agreement, without ever having the question determined by the worker as to whether he wanted that kind of an arrangement. The proposed legislation would dispose of the Labor Relations Act insofar as such closed-shop agreements are concerned for a period of a year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator contend there was any overreaching in the arrangement between the men and Mr. Kaiser?

Mr. WAGNER. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator if he believes there was any overreaching in the arrangement between the men and Mr. Kaiser, or whether it was a fair and square agreement into which they entered?

Mr. WAGNER. What I say is that where 30,000 workers enter a plant, then I think, when there is such a substantial number they should have the right, under a democratic system of government, to determine whether they want to belong to a union and whether they want a closed shop. That is so in this case.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not significant that the situation in this case was the result of the stabilization agreement on the west coast, by which the Government determined all wages, hours, and working conditions? It asked the shipowners in that case to enter into this agreement, and in the case of the Bethlehem shipyard compelled the acceptance of the closed shop, and Mr. Kaiser merely followed what was the Government's policy, as he testified before us, did what the Government asked him to do, and the workers did the same thing. It certainly has a great bearing on the fairness and the reasons for the arrangement.

Mr. WAGNER. The Bethlehem Steel case, as I understand it, is one in which the workers themselves agreed that they wanted a closed shop, and wanted to belong to a certain union.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Bethlehem Steel Co. did not agree they wanted a closed shop, but the Government compelled the Bethlehem Steel Co. to enter into that arrangement, and Mr. Kaiser simply followed suit. Those are the facts.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know whether the Government did, under the Labor Relations Act, compel it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think if the Senator will examine the record of that case, as testified to before our committee, he will find what I have said to be accurate.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not defending anyone or disagreeing with anyone. We have been talking about democracy. We passed the Labor Relations Act because we wanted to do away with company unions. No one objects to that, but what is proposed here will in effect authorize a company union.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we do not do something soon, and this labor chaos continues, we will not have any democracy.

Mr. WAGNER. The same thing may be said about our Congressional elections next year. There will be a division, I suppose, and it might be urged that we should not have an election because we may not stabilize conditions. No one would agree to that.

I think the best way to handle this matter is in the democratic way. Let the workers decide whether or not they want a union, and if they do want a union, what union, and whether they want a closed shop, and have that all decided—just as under the Connally-Smith Act it will be decided with reference to strikes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in labor stabilization during the war?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; at any time.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator proposes is the reverse, then, is it not?

Mr. WAGNER. No; it is not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why is it not?

Mr. WAGNER. I am for deciding in the democratic way. I say the workers themselves should determine whether they want a closed shop or not. That is what we were discussing when the Connally-Smith bill was before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not notice that the Senator was very enthusiastic in supporting that.

Mr. WAGNER. I was not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then why quote it now as a great authority? I was not in sympathy with some of the provisions of the act but I supported it to stabilize war-labor conditions. However, I am not standing here quoting it now as any authority.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from New York whether there is not the right on the part of workingmen to organize their own collective bargaining agencies?

Mr. WAGNER. That is how we happened to pass the Labor Relations Act, and give them that right.

Mr. REED. And there is nothing more important to the laboring man than the preservation of that right.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator agrees with what I said, or I at least agree with his understanding, that the adoption of this rider upon an appropriation bill will have the effect of practically nullifying the Wagner Labor Act, so far as the right of workers to select their own bargaining agency is concerned.

Mr. WAGNER. That is so, so far as the question of the closed shop is concerned.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Several Senators referred to this proviso as being aimed at stabilizing labor relations. I should like to reemphasize that the case out of which this proviso arose, the Kaiser yard at Portland, is a beautiful example of instability of labor relations, because that yard shows a 20-percent labor turn-over every month, 240 percent a year, indicating, obviously, that the 20,000 employees now employed do not like to work under a closed-shop contract negotiated when there were only 60 employees.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, they never had an opportunity to determine the question, because the workers never had the chance for an election to determine that very question, and that is the thing we were discussing when we had the Labor Relations Act before us. There were only 12 votes against it in this body. The two things we emphasized were, first, the right of collective bargaining; and second, the question of a closed shop—there there could not be a closed shop unless a majority of the workers agreed to it. That is the law today, and that was a protection to the workers against the so-called company unions.

The provision we are discussing can easily be used for the company union purpose, as it has been, so far as the past is concerned. All an employer would have to do would be to get together one or two individuals and decide upon a closed shop and a certain union, a company union, and then a worker could enter only after being compelled to sign such an agreement. Employees would have no rights in the matter. That is one of the things about which we were so much concerned at the time we drafted the act.

The Senator fram Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] was chairman of the committee which reported the bill, and I should like to read from the report he made to the Senate on this very question. I read from the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on the National Labor Relations Act:

> The bill does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they may be illegal; it does not interfere with the status quo on this debatable subject but leaves the way open to such agreements as might now legally be consummated, with two exceptions about to be noted.

This is the important thing we brought up at that time:

> While today an employer may negotiate such an agreement even with a minority union, the bill provides that an employer shall be allowed to make a closed-shop contract only with a labor organization that represents the majority of employees in the collective bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made.

That was the point we had in mind when we passed the act, and now it is being nullified by the adoption of this particular amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator in his statement a moment ago, said in effect, that the American Federation of Labor was the same as a company union.

Mr. WAGNER. No, I did not; I do not and I did not.

Mr. BRIDGES. What did the Senator say? He said, in effect, you might as well have a company union as have the American Federation of Labor representing the workers.

Mr. WAGNER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. What did the Senator say?

Mr. WAGNER. I said that today, if this proposal shall be adopted, an employer could get together with only one man and agree upon a contract and a closed shop, and then employ his labor, 1,000 or 2,000, and those workers would have to join a particular union and enter into a closed-shop agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator may not agree with me——

Mr. BRIDGES. I know what the Senator said a few moments ago. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. WAGNER. That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When this union was formed, the Senator says, there were only 60 workers?

Mr. WAGNER. Not the union; when this particular plant was formed, there were 30 or 60, I have forgotten which, a very small number.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did they vote to join a union?

Mr. WAGNER. No; an agreement was made with a certain organization, I have forgotten the name——

Mr. BALL. There were 66 employees, furnished by the Building Trades Department of the A. F. of L. They were already members of a union.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were they members of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. WAGNER. They probably were; I do not know.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did they have a right to make a contract with the employer at that time?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; they did.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then they agreed to a closed shop; they agreed to wages and working conditions, I assume?

Mr. WAGNER. I assume so; yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As the workers came to this plant they were required to join the union. Were they free to decide whether they wanted to join the union? Were they free to decide whether they wanted to have a closed shop or not?

Mr. WAGNER. I understand not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I never heard of an industrial plant to which a worker came who wanted to obtain employment, in which he was given a choice with respect to joining a union or not, or with respect to the shop being a closed shop or not. The worker had to accept the regulations and the rules as they existed when he went there.

May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have the matter clear in my mind so far as I have gone. Let us say that more workers came into this plant. They all joined the union. How many elections are there to be had with respect to the question of whether the plant is to be a closed shop or not, or with respect to what union shall be in control?

Mr. WAGNER. There should certainly be a substantial number of workers engaged before a decision is made of that question among the workers. Does the Senator think that a decision on the part of 60 workers should be binding on 30,000 workers? Does the Senator think that 60 workers is a sufficient number to determine the question as to whether the shop should be a closed shop or not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What I have in mind is this: There is jurisdictional strife between various unions. They proselyte among the members belonging to other unions. Strikes and disturbances result, because, for example, one union desires to break in where another union has control. It makes no difference to me, or to the average citizen, or the average worker either, to what union he belongs.

Mr. WAGNER. It makes no difference to me, either.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The chances are that he will be protected in his job and in his work whatever the union to which he belongs. Suppose a controversy arises. The A. F. of L. makes an attack upon a plant to try to proselyte among the workers where the C. I. O. is in control. In another part of the country we may have the reverse condition obtaining. The result is jurisdictional strife. This procedure causes a great deal of disturbance. So far as I am concerned, I shall try as I have heretofore tried, to support legislation for the protection of labor. But we see competition existing between various unions with respect to collection of dues. Sometimes the main thing seems to be the collection of dues; who shall get the dough.

Mr. WAGNER. After the Labor Relations Act was passed the lower courts held it to be unconstitutional, and company unions increased to include about 45 percent of all the workers. When the Supreme Court finally decided the law to be constitutional the company unions had to disband. So we had elections

in the different plants all over the country. There are about 6,000,000 workers in the American Federation of Labor, and about 5,000,000, I think, in the C. I. O. There are over a 1,000,000 in the railway workers' organizations, and they, of course, are opposed to company unions, for their conditions of labor are stabilized.

When elections were proposed to be held all over the country, it was said that they would unstabilize conditions. The contrary, Mr. President, was true. The workers had the opportunity to decide in the elections which were held whether they wanted any union or not, and in some cases they declared by their votes against any union. The elections, however, resulted in producing stability. By them the workers were given the democratic right which we are claiming for ourselves here. I do not think any Senator will contend that 60 men should enter into a contract by which 30,000 men are compelled to belong to a particular union and to have a closed shop. I do not think that is the democratic way of doing things.

Mr. President, I had not intended to say so much on this question, but discussion of it was extended. I think the way to handle the situation is by legislation. I believe the whole matter should be brought out and discussed. Let us decide the question as to whether we want to go back to the old days of company unions or not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not think that question has anything to do with the matter under discussion.

Mr. WAGNER. I will say to the Senator that I think it does.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I cannot understand the view taken by the Senator. Under the law as it is the men have the right to form unions. The question, however, is whether an election shall occur every 2 or 3 months.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I did not say that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Or every 6 months.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I did not say an election should take place every 6 months. I say an election should occur when a representative number of workers are engaged in a particular plant. When 30,000 workers are employed in one plant, surely it cannot be contended that 60 men shall speak for them. It would be much better, it seems to me, to have an election to determine the question as to whether they want a union or do not want a union.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator knows very well that the idea seems to persist for one union to attack another and to proselyte among its members. I do not think that is a legitimate procedure.

Mr. WAGNER. We found that it was the democratic way to do. The company-union system previously existed, which the workers did not like and which they resented.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to ask the Senator where he would stop in the matter of holding elections. The Senator said that 60 men should not control the actions of 30,000 men. I agree with the Senator in that respect under ordinary conditions; but today we are under war conditions and are doing many extraordinary things. At what point would the Senator say an election should occur? Should the election occur when there were 1,000 men in the plant, 2,000 men in the plant, 3,000 men, or where along the line should it occur?

Mr. WAGNER. I would say it should occur when there was a substantial number of workers engaged in the plant.

Mr. HAWKES. How often does the Senator think elections should occur? I myself have been through proceedings of this kind, and I can tell the Senator how an election upsets a plant.

Mr. WAGNER. I would not have an election more than once a year.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well. But where would the Senator stop? When a plant is growing in the number of workers employed by it from 60 to 30,000, when would the Senator have the election occur, at the time of employment of 10,000 men, 20,000 men, or when? How often would the Senator have elections occur in relation to the number of men employed?

Mr. WAGNER. I would not have an election occur when only 60 men were employed. Such things happened in the old days, and that is why we passed the Labor Relations Act. The Senator knows something about company unions, I am sure.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes, I know something about company unions, and about all kinds of unions, and I am in favor of all of them when they conduct themselves properly and with due regard to private property and to enterprise.

Mr. WAGNER. So am I.

Mr. HAWKES. But I desire to know where the Senator would stop in the matter of having elections, because every time an election occurs it results in disturbing the equilibrium of the workers in the plant for many weeks. They are talking about it before election, during election, and after election. I am in favor of trying to bring unity of action between labor and capital and management, so that our production lines may be kept going to the full extent of our ability, so that we may as speedily as possible win the war.

Mr. WAGNER. So am I. I am very anxious to have that brought about.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes, I know the Senator is.

Mr. WAGNER. But I want it done in the democratic way.

Mr. HAWKES. But can the Senator tell me at what point and when he would have elections? The Senator raised a very interesting point when he said that a decision made by 60 men should not be controlling over 30,000 men. Where would the Senator start to have elections, and where would he end them?

Mr. WAGNER. The plant in question began with 60 men, and had 60 men for a period of about 3 months, and then a large group of employees came into the plant, and within a comparatively short time there were 15,000 or 20,000 workers in that plant. That would be the time to give the workers the opportunity to decide the question. They may not want a union at all.

Mr. HAWKES. But the Senator is in favor of having as few elections as possible under the existing conditions?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. WAGNER. I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I was seeking the floor in my own right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I simply want to ask the Senator a question in connection with the case he has in mind. Were the 60 men the only men working in the plant at the time when the election was held?

Mr. WAGNER. I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the war came, and, naturally, new employees went into the plant by the thousands, until a tremendous number of employees were working in a plant in which only 60 had formerly worked. Did each of the men who went into the plant have to join the union in accordance with the decision of the original 60 men?

Mr. WAGNER. I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. It might have been that many of them did not want to join the union, or did want to join the union. The point I make is that if the Senator wants the Wagner Labor Relations Act to remain in effect, it seems to me he should give consideration to the fact that all 30,000 of the men who went to work in that plant were forced to join a union which they might not have wanted to join, because the Wagner Act compelled them to comply with the agreement which was in existence when only 60 men were working in the plant.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no; the Wagner Act does not do anything of the kind.

Mr. TYDINGS. If a majority of the 60 men had decided to join the union, the great number who subsequently were employed would have to join the union.

Mr. WAGNER. The act provides that there can be a closed shop only when a majority of the workers——

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, a majority. I am asking for information. If only 60 men were working in the plant at the time when the election was held, and if a majority of them voted for the union and the closed shop, it would be impossible to employ any more men in the plant unless the employer employed them under the closed-shop contract; would it not?

Mr. WAGNER. That may be true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, what right did the 30,000 new employees have to say whether they wanted to belong to the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., or to no union at all?

Mr. WAGNER. Because under the Wagner Act they could decide.

Mr. TYDINGS. But in that event it would be necessary to hold an election every month.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes. Let me explain to the Senator. First, there were 60 men in the plant; then, let us say, a thousand men; then 2,000, then 10,000,

then 16,000, then 20,000, then 30,000; but all the men who came in day after day would have—it would be a violation of law if they did not; and I do not say this critically—to come in under the terms under which the 60 men originally working at the plant had decided by majority vote to work. There is no escape from it.

Mr. WAGNER. Under the act, the majority of the workers has to decide the question whether they want a closed shop.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator; but I do not believe I have made my position plain. At the time when the election was held, a majority of the employees was 31, because only 60 men were working in the plant at the time. By majority vote, they decided to have an agreement for a closed shop. The Senator concedes that; does he not?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I want to understand. The next day there were 40 or 140 more men who wanted to go to work in the plant. How could they obtain employment in the plant without complying with the agreement already in existence? How could they secure employment in the plant, when labor and management had previously agreed, at a time when there were only 60 employees in the plant, that no one could work there without joining in the agreement?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; they could have an election.

Mr. TYDINGS. When? Could there be an election when, let us say, 100 additional men came in? That could not be done. Apparently the 160 men were satisfied. Would there be an election after the number of employees totaled 360?

The point I make is that when we pass a law declaring a labor policy, and when management and labor agree to the policy, all the new men who come in the plant are bound by the law and the policy established under it. That is one of the weaknesses of the law, if there is a weakness to it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I happen to come from the district in which seems to be located the plant where the unjustified things occurred. The very question asked by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] indicates the situation of a monopoly on the issuing of permits by which men can earn their daily bread. The situation has reached such a point that men must buy a permit to work. That is the wording of it—a permit to work. It results in racketeering at the expense of the men who work; and every one of the thousands upon thousands of men who work have to buy from the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. a permit to work. That results in graft which makes Al Capone look like a child in kindergarten. [Laughter.]

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I would not know about what the Senator has said as to that particular case; I think most labor leaders are very honest and faithful. But I will answer the Senator by saying this: Rather than have the men complain, why not give them the right to hold an election to determine the matter?

Mr. HOLMAN. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us suppose they hold an election. Let us suppose 60 percent of the men vote to join union A, and 40 percent of them vote to join union B. As a result of the election, union A would be the bargaining agent. Let us suppose that 6 months afterward the employees who prefer union B are in the majority, and want another election? Let me ask the Senator if they would not be as much entitled to have an election then, and if their situation would not just as much warrant the holding of an election, as the situation the Senator has described would warrant the holding of one?

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no; the laws must be reasonably construed. There could not be an election every 2 or 3 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the democratic way must be used.

Mr. WAGNER. It would be necessary to wait a year or so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the law does not provide any term, I may say to the Senator. It is perfectly possible that if the A. F. of L. union had first been selected as the bargaining agent, and thereafter there was an election, by the election the employees might decide to select the C. I. O. union as the bargaining agent; and later they might turn back, and select the A. F. of L. union as their bargaining agent.

Mr. WAGNER. As a matter of fact the A. F. of L. has been very successful in the elections, particularly as against company unions; and by means of the act company unions have been practically eliminated. However, now I am afraid they may come back again. I hope not.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to say a word on this matter. I sat on the Committee on Education and Labor for 6 months hearing complaints against the National Labor Relations Act of 1939. The act should have been amended long ago. One of the greatest abuses occurs under the power to order an election when the Board wants to hold one. I heard of case after case in which the Board was so strongly C. I. O., in its early days, that it deliberately postponed the holding of an election until the C. I. O. had extended its election practices to get what it thought would be a majority in the plant. To my mind there is no doubt that the Wagner Labor Relations Act should be amended to provide exactly when and how elections should be held; for instance, not more often than every 3 years, and at specified times.

From the beginning, there has been abuse in connection with the matter of when the Board could and could not order an election.

I might agree with the Senator from New York that, as a basic principle, at regular, stated intervals there should be an election to determine to which union the men wished to belong. But let me point out that during the war we have suspended the rule, and we have witnessed a condition in which nearly every plant in the country is unionized, and a particular union controls the plant; and if it is not a closed shop, it is a maintenance-of-membership shop in which the union retains control.

On top of the Wagner Act, we have imposed a principle of stability in every plant in the country. Under the Connally-Smith bill which the Congress recently passed, we provide that if the Government takes over the plant, everything shall remain exactly as it was when the Government took it over; and the War Labor Board has been ordering the inclusion of maintenance-of-membership clauses in nearly every contract.

What is the justification for doing that? It is not provided for in the Wagner Act itself. The members of the Labor Board say, "We must maintain conditions in this plant stable. If this union controls today, we insist that the contract provide that every man maintain his membership in that union," making it absolutely impossible for another union to obtain a majority in that plant.

In other words, the maintenance-of-membership clause of the War Labor Board can be justified only on the principle of stabilizing union control as it is when the hearing is held before the War Labor Board. It seems to me that this provision does no more than that. It says in effect, for example, that it recognizes an existing condition in which the A. F. of L. has a contract and in which the majority of the men are members of the A. F. of L. It seems to me that when the National Labor Relations Board comes into the picture and tries to change that situation by ordering an election, it only makes trouble.

This is not the only case. There are other cases throughout the country in which elections have been ordered at a particular time and have resulted only in more labor trouble and bitter fighting. I believe that for this year at least—and this is good for only a year—we might well adopt the principle of stabilization of union control in the plants where particular unions are now in control. I do not believe any policy would contribute as strongly toward the prevention of strikes—and the most liberal source of strikes is interunion disputes—as would the adoption of this kind of an amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion

of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. BALL (and other Senators) asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the roll call is started, the yeas having been ordered, let me ask the Senator from Nevada, in view of the lateness of the hour, whether he wishes to have a vote on this particular amendment before a recess is taken?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to conclude action on this amendment and one other, which will require only a short time. The other matter is a motion to recede from one other amendment which was in dispute between the two Houses. Then the National Youth Administration amendment may go over until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entitrely satisfactory.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, a vote "yea" is a vote in favor of the provision of the House, as amended and agreed to by the Senate conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope no misunderstanding will prevail as to this amendment——

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, may I say a few words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am voting on this question purely as a war measure. I shall vote "yea." I am in hearty agreement with what the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has said, that this provision would apply to more than merely the Kaiser shipyards. It would apply to labor situations all over the country. In my opinion, for the period of 1 year, it would aid in maintaining peace in labor relations.

Someday Congress will consider very deliberately the sacred right to work. It will consider the right to work without obtaining a permit. It will consider making it possible for laboring men to be free, to have their own units or unions, and to have collective bargaining without having to belong to a union in order to work and earn a living.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Kaiser shipyard is not involved in the pending question any more than is any other plant in the United States. The C. I. O. is not involved, and the A. F. of L. is not involved. No particular union is involved, as will be seen if Senators will read the language of the provision which was adopted by the House in the form of an amendment on the floor of the House, and concurred in by the conferees:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

What is a complaint case? It has been developed before the Senate Appropriations Committee that a complaint case is a case filed by the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, the National Labor Relations Board may not file complaint case after complaint case and keep a plant in turmoil when it has had notice of an election and an agreement under which the plant is operating. If such a complaint case arises more than 3 months after the agreement has been entered into, then the National Labor Relations Board is precluded by this amendment from filing the complaint case. There is no question about that.

The purpose of this provision is to stabilize labor relations. Whether the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. has the plant makes no difference to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or to the Senate. Whatever has been done is done. This amendment would not permit the National Labor Relations Board to hold a case for more than 3 months and then say, "We will order another election." That is all there is to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 19. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—40

Austin	McCarran	Shipstead
Brewster	McClellan	Stewart
Bridges	McFarland	Taft
Buck	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Maloney	Tydings
Byrd	Millikin	Vandenberg
Chavez	Moore	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Connally	Overton	Wheeler
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Wherry
Gerry	Revercomb	White
Gurney	Reynolds	Willis
Hawkes	Robertson	
Hayden	Scrugham	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Holman	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Reed
Barkley	La Follette	Russell
Burton	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Wallgren
Guffey	Murdock	
Hill	Murray	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Davis	McNary
Bailey	Eastland	Nye
Bankhead	Ellender	O'Daniel
Barbour	George	Smith
Bilbo	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Green	Tobey
Bushfield	Hatch	Wiley
Caraway	Johnson, Calif	Wilson
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 24.

Let me say for the information of the Senate that amendment numbered 24 would provide that all appointments involving salaries of $4,500 or more made by the President under the appropriation bill shall be confirmed by the Senate. The House was adamant on this amendment, and would not recede. I am now moving that the Senate recede from the amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the limitation relates solely to the War Manpower Commission. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it applies to everything in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Under the paragraph limiting it to the War Manpower Commission, it would be limited to that agency.

Mr. BARKLEY. The law already applies to the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could not understand the Senator from Kentucky. The amendment which I am asking the Senate to vote upon would apply to appointments made in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At the present time all appointments in the War Manpower Commission must be confirmed by the Senate. Would the motion of the Senator be in effect to accede to the position of the House in this matter, to do away with the necessity in the future for the Senate to confirm appointments to the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the law as it existed until the 30th of June last, appointments to the War Manpower Commission were subject to senatorial confirmation. The House refused to go along with that provision on this occasion. My motion now is that the Senate recede from the Senate amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the motion of the Senator from Nevada prevails then we will be changing the law which has been in effect for the past year.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, but the provision went into an appropriation bill last year.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would change the prevailing law?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; not the prevailing law, because what the Senator has in mind as the prevailing law expired on the 30th of June at midnight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Day before yesterday.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays, and pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not intend to allow the existing law to be repealed in this fashion without a record vote. If I could have a record vote on the question I would withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not asked if there was a sufficient seconding of the request. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the motion to recede?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to recede from the amendment of the Senate numbered 24.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AUSTIN (when his name was called). A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not understand how the question arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is to recede from the amendment of the Senate by which confirmation was required of certain appointees covered under the appropriations covered in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I vote "nay."

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

I also announce the following general pairs: the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—19

Aiken	Hill	Scrugham
Ball	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Langer	Tunnell
Buck	McCarran	Wagner
Ferguson	Murray	White
Guffey	Pepper	
Hayden	Radcliffe	

NAYS—39

Austin	Holman	Revercomb
Brewster	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bridges	Lucas	Robertson
Burton	McClellan	Stewart
Butler	McFarland	Taft
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Murdock	Wheeler
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Hawkes	Reed	Willis

NOT VOTING—38

Andrews	Downey	Nye
Bailey	Eastland	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Ellender	Overton
Barbour	George	Russell
Bilbo	Gillette	Smith
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Green	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hatch	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Van Nuys
Chandler	Lodge	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wilson
Davis	Mead	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion to recede from Senate amendment No. 24 was rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think no greater tribute could be paid to the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] than that which has just been paid him by the vote of his colleagues on the floor of the Senate. This amendment being his pet amendment, he having fostered and promoted a bill through the Senate which carries the very provision, which is now pending in the House. I, indeed, take no umbrage at the vote against my motion.

Mr. TRUMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate rejected the motion of the Senator from Nevada be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks,

announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has just sent to the Senate, House Joint Resolution 147, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a result of the sustaining of the President's veto of House bill 2869. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the Vice President's desk until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the President of the United States wants to veto the action of the Congress, that is his privilege, but he is certainly not entitled to have the status of the Commodity Credit Corporation maintained by any expedition of action in either brancn of Congress. Therefore, I object to the request, which is obviously designed for the purpose of expediting the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago a delegation from the House and Senate of the United States made a trip to Canada on the invitation of certain members of the Canadian Parliament. The delegation was headed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] were the other Senators making the trip. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was appointed a member of the Senate delegation, but was unable to leave Washington because of his official duties here. The members of the House delegation were Mr. BLOOM, of New York, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, Mr. EATON, of New Jersey, and Mr. VORYS of Ohio.

There was a conference participated in by the members of the delegation from the Congress of the United States, members of the Canadian Parliament, members of the British Parliament, and members of certain other parliaments of members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The Speaker of the Senate of Canada, the Honorable Thomas Vien, has written a letter to the Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, with regard to our delegation and the conference. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE, CANADA,
SPEAKER'S CHAMBERS,
Ottawa, June 28, 1943.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALSEY: I have duly received a resolution of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America (First Session), pursuant to the invitation tendered by myself as the Speaker of the Senate of Canada and Joint-President of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada Branch, authorizing four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives to attend the meeting to be held in Ottawa, during the conference of the Canadian Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, with Delegates of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and Bermuda.

We have had the pleasure of receiving three of the Senators and four Congressmen who had been designated by their honours the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

At our sitting, this morning, we have read this resolution into our records, and I am directed to express to you, and through you, to their honours the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, our high appreciation of the honour which has been conveyed to us for the first time in our Parliamentary history of delegating Members of your Congress to attend joint sittings of our Empire Parliamentary Association. It is a token of our association as United Nations in this war, and of our common task in re-establishing the world on a peace basis when we shall have won final victory.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Very faithfully yours,
THOMAS VIEN,
Speaker of the Senate of Canada.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there is a very important bill on the calendar which I think can be disposed of in a few moments, because I believe it is not controversial. The bill is House bill 2936, which would authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the housing in connection with national defense." The bill deals with the so-called community facility section of the act, providing money for sewers, water mains, reservoirs, child day-care centers, construction of schools, school maintenance, and so forth. The funds of the Federal Works Agency in this connection are now depleted. It is very important that the bill be passed at the earliest possible moment, so that the House may have a chance to act upon it. The Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have reported an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], concerning this measure?

Mr. MALONEY. I have not, but I should like to point out that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor, is also a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did speak to me briefly yesterday about the bill. He seemed quite satisfied with the action taken, when I told him that the bill had been amended at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio to make provision that if Senate bill 1130, the so-called Thomas bill, shall pass the House none of the increase granted shall be used for grants for the operation of child day-care centers and maintenance of education.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It must be obvious that the passage of the bill would certainly be very detrimental to the interest of the enactment of the bill which the Senate has already passed, and in view of the fact that the Senator has not conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor concerning his desire to bring this bill up, I ask him to let it go over until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to make one further suggestion, if I may. I certainly do not care to press the bill if there is any objection. The Senator understands that there is probably no matter of greater importance than the child day-care centers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am being confronted with situations of that kind all the time.

Mr. MALONEY. I withdraw the request.

SUPERWEAPON, STORY OF RADAR (S. DOC. NO. 89)

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed as a Senate document the articles written by John M. Hightower, for the Associated Press, on Radar, the superweapon recognized as a miracle performer.

Radar is the most revolutionary military device of this war, and was kept a secret until its accomplishments became daily featured news stories. It represents the greatest technical advance in warfare since the original evolution of the military uses of aircraft.

These articles are most informative and a tribute to the ingeniousness of the United States Navy in recognizing the possibilities of Radar and the application of its great effectiveness. The same instruments that are applied to detect the approach of airplanes and surface ships, with but minor changes, are also applicable to many other military uses, therefore making it one of the most useful and far-reaching developments of this war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed as a Senate document.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of a measure on the calendar, and if there is objection I shall certainly not undertake to press for its consideration. The bill is an emergency measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 386, Senate bill 1286, to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by flood in 1943. The bill was favorably reported, without amendment, from the Committee on Commerce, and, as I stated, is now on the calendar.

I make the request at this late hour, Mr. President, only because if the measure is to be acted on at all, if anything is to be accomplished by such relief legislation, it is necessary that it be done at the very earliest possible moment. It is necessary that the authorization measure be passed in order that if it is to be done at all, the item may be included in the appropriation bill now pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely wish to add my request to that of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I come from one of the States badly damaged by the floods of this year. The Senator's bill has been favorably reported from the Committee on Commerce, and I join with the Senator in the request for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senate that tomorrow at the hour of reconvening it is hoped that we may proceed to a conclusion of what is known as the N. Y. A. amendment by considering, discussing, and voting upon it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators I wish to make this observation. I have been asked by many Senators whether the Senate will be in session on Monday. The Fourth of July falls on Sunday, and on Monday throughout the Nation there will probably be observations of the Fourth of July. In view of the fact, however, that the War Production Board and all other Government agencies have urged all factories and plants producing essential materials to work on holidays, and in view of the legislative situation, I feel it my duty to advise the Senate that unless something transpires between now and the adjournment or recess tomorrow night, it is very likely that we will be compelled to hold a session on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope we will, because four appropriation bills have not as yet been finally acted on, and we certainly ought to stay here until we act on those bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that fact. It is largely in view of that situation that I wanted to advise Senators so they may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish to indicate my complete approval of the decision taken by the Senator from Kentucky. I think we should work on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Several citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President may be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified immediately.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, July 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Lillian R. Carson, Essex.
Catherine H. Wiggerman, Maurice.

LOUISIANA

Ernest T. Cutter, Robeline.

MISSISSIPPI

Hall W. Wilson, Natchez.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Fred Coates, Provo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James D. Clark, O. S. A., of the faculty of St. Rita High School, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O God, mightier than all the forces of arms, crowning with victory the defense of those who trust in Thee, stretch forth Thy hand in mercy to us Thy servants. On this day set apart to honor the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, we are mindful that none has ever had recourse to Thee through the Sacred Heart of Thy Son in vain. Animated by this confidence, we fly to Thee for strength and consolation, groaning as we are beneath the cross of war.

Fortify all of us who fight, whether at home or abroad, for truth and justice and the freedoms which are the birthright of all human beings. In particular, keep in Thy loving, guiding care our President, all Members of this Congress, their beloved families, and all whom they represent. Comfort all who are separated from those they love by the cross of war. Ease the worry and the anxiety of fathers and mothers concerned with the well-being of their children. Give hope to broken hearts. Teach them who mourn the martyred heroes of this war that "we have not here a lasting city," but look for one to come where we shall be reunited to those whom we have loved and lost a while.

Protect our noble and brave men and women who bear the brunt of battle on land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. Bring them back nobler still than when they went forth to battle, because they have learned to serve and to sacrifice. Bring them back blessed with victory and peace through Jesus Christ our Lord. And may the blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit descend upon us and these United States and remain forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, tucked away in an inconspicuous place in the morning papers is the most important news item that has appeared in many years. It brought instant and complete relief to those of us who have been seriously concerned about the vast expenditures of our Government and the accumulation of the most colossal debt in the history of our country. But, Mr. Speaker, the momentous announcement of that great financier, genius, statesman, humanitarian, liberal, reformer, and chicken raiser, Harold Ickes, has shown us how baseless are our fears and how niggardly Congress has been in restricting appropriations to a few hundred billions of dollars. Versatile Ickes has solved the riddle of how much this country is worth. In this morning's newspaper the Secretary advises us that the wealth of the United States is $12,023,000,000,000, which is the equivalent of $89,000 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. I am not only happy for the Nation and for my financially distressed colleagues in the House, but it is only human that I feel a sense of personal relief to know that I, my wife, and three children are now worth $445,000. My only complaint of the Secretary is that he has withheld from a troubled Congress and Nation this all-important information. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Nation that in this dark and troubled hour there should appear upon the horizon a stupendous intellect and a $12,000,000,000,000 heart to bring hope, consolation, and encouragement to suffering humanity. I now suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Vice President WALLACE revise his plan so as to provide everyone in the world with 12 gallons of milk each day.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules at any time between now and the time that the House takes its recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. STARNES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the Baltimore Sun relative to the cattle situation in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a recent address given by the Governor of Ohio, Hon. John W. Bricker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

OPERATIONS OF THE O. P. A.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, some of us the other day voted to put in charge of the policy-making departments of O P. A. men who have had practical experience and knowledge of the particular department in which they exercise control. In further substantiation of our vote and that we need practical men in these departments, may I read to you an article that appeared in my local paper entitled "Bushels of Spuds Found on Dump; O. P. A. Is Puzzled":

BUSHELS OF SPUDS FOUND ON DUMP; OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION IS PUZZLED

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 30.—New potatoes, piled knee deep over an area 12 feet square, were found on a dump in the western section of Columbus today.

James Huffman, chief counsel here for the Office of Price Administration, said he was "very puzzled" and assigned investigators to the case.

The potatoes arrived at the dump either last night or early today, Huffman said, but where they came from or why they were discarded was more than he could figure out.

"Maybe some wholesaler told his help to clean out the basement and he was taken too literally," Huffman said. "Darned if I know."

Word of the windfall spread through the area and the potatoes vanished swiftly.

TWO REMARKABLE FAMILIES

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my district, which is Westmoreland County, Pa., there are two remarkable families, one in New Kensington and the other in Monessen.

In New Kensington, the aluminum city, there is the Semanski family that has eight sons in the service at this moment. There are six in the Army, one in the Coast Guard, and one in the Navy; three of those in the Army are serving overseas.

In the city of Monessen, Pa., a steel city, there is the Hubans family, that also has eight sons in the service; five in the Army, one in the Coast Guard, and two in the Navy; three of those in the Army are serving overseas.

I wish to pay my tribute to these families and to wish one thing for the father, mother, and brothers and sisters, that they may return safely soon.

JAMES B. M. McNALLY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the other day the President appointed and the Senate ratified for United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, Mr. James B. M. McNally. I feel that the President is to be complimented upon that appointment, because Mr. McNally is one of the outstanding members of the New York bar and was endorsed by all the bar associations for the office. He has been practicing in New York for the past 20 years. He is one of the greatest trial lawyers we have at the New York bar, and I am certain that his tenure of office as district attorney for the southern district of New York will be marked with that same character and that force and efficiency which he has demonstrated in his private practice.

A graduate of Fordham University Law School, he later became a professor of law at St. Johns University in Brooklyn. As a private practitioner he won the respect of bench and bar. He leaves a lucrative private practice to enter public service.

I had the pleasure of serving with him as a delegate to the constitutional convention of New York State in 1938, where he distinguished himself.

I have no doubt that he will equal and indeed surpass the records of his predecessors in office.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Julius H. Altman, president of Chapter No. 5, American War Dads, at a meeting in Enid, Okla., and to include an editorial from the Enid Daily Eagle. My second request is to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEN. PATRICK HURLEY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I hail from Oklahoma. Oklahoma is one of the Western States which once had a member of the Cabinet. That member of the Cabinet of yesteryear is one of today's outstanding warriors. He was born near my district in the then Indian Territory. He was Secretary of War under President Hoover's administration, Hon. Patrick Hurley, of Oklahoma.

When this global war started he laid aside his political toga and reached for his sword and has been making battle trying to win this war. We Oklahomans are really proud of him. Mr. Speaker, this distinguished gentleman was recently the guest of the Oklahoma delegation, after having traveled many, many thousands of miles encircling the globe through enemy-infested territory.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. Pat Hurley is typical of the child brought into this world without means; his parents died at an early age, leaving him with nothing but an ambition and a determination which has paid big dividends many, many a time. Mr. Hurley practiced law in Oklahoma; at one time, attorney for the Choctaw Tribe of Indians; made his way in the oil industry, all before his coming to Washington; he has been prominent in politics, but he shelved all partisanism during this global conflict and again answered the call of his country. He stands for America first.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

SCARCITY OF MEAT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article therein from the New York Times of this morning entitled "Roosevelt Maintains His Lead in the South."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of a communication I received from the United Nations Committee of Maryland which reads as follows:

UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE
OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., July 1, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: In the light of the sentiment in favor of the Fulbright Resolution, is it not possible to have the House take affirmative action before adjournment? In the name of the Maryland Committee of the United Nations Association and its distinguished sponsorship, we earnestly urge that you take whatever steps are feasible to this end.

With kind personal greetings,
Cordially yours,
MORRIS S. LAZARON,
Executive Vice Chairman.

RACE RIOTS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution for the appointment of a select committee of this House to investigate the recent race riots in Detroit and Los Angeles, and to find out the causes behind those riots. In my opinion they were not entirely spontaneous; they were created by certain groups that are interested in stirring up dissension in this country. I think that in Detroit it was the remnants of the Ku Klux Klan, the Gerald Smith followers, and other subversive forces that were responsible for the riots. It is vitally important, in my opinion, that we go into this question thoroughly, so that we can uncover the instigators, and thus prevent a recurrence in other cities.

I hope that when the resolution comes before the House it will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SHORTAGE OF BUTTER

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, since the first settler came to this country and brought with him several cows, it has been the custom of the rural housewife to take her surplus butter—the few pounds it may amount to each week—and use it down at the community store or with her neighbors as a medium of exchange. In fact, along with eggs and chickens, in some sections of this country, it has almost become legal tender.

Now, I am informed by the O. P. A. that the rural housewife can no longer sell her butter; she can no longer take her butter down to the local store and barter it for that little piece of gingham which she may need without getting from them the O. P. A. stamps or points. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this action on the part of the O. P. A. is tending to curtail the production of butter in this country. I say to you that in my own district there are hundreds of thousands of pounds of butter that will not be produced and put into the channels of trade for local consumption if this order is carried out. This community trading in so-called country butter does not in any way interfere with the regulation of commercial or creamery butter or butter substitutes, but, to the contrary, is a boon to the country or local consumer and producer alike. If encouraged, it will greatly reduce the butter shortage in this country, while if, on the other hand, this local trading is curtailed or stopped, we can expect a butter famine. Mr. Speaker, when is O. P. A. going to learn the hard practical facts of life?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio speech I made last night and the other to extend my remarks and to include a brief editorial from the New York World, New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE]?

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY GOES WITH POWER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, responsibility must go with power. As a result of events in recent days, the press has been saying that the Congress is taking over control and direction of the domestic front at the present time. If that be true, our responsibility cannot be fully discharged by simply turning down proposals of the Executive. I am not going to argue the question as to whether the Congress can or cannot write a better program on the domestic

problems of the country than has been so far proposed, but I do say we have to write one if we take the responsibility of turning down the one proposed by the President.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement recently appearing in the Boston Post by Hon. Joseph B. Ely, former distinguished Governor of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF VEHICLE USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, to impose a motor vehicle use tax upon automobile owners of this Nation, who, under existing O. P. A. regulations, are not able to use their cars, is a gross miscarriage of justice, which in my opinion Congress never intended to permit when it enacted this particular tax.

For that reason, I am proposing an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which will provide for a rebate on motor vehicle stamp taxes in all cases where the use of motor vehicles has been curtailed 50 percent from normal use as a result of regulations of the O. P. A. Proposals have been made heretofore to suspend the operation of this indefensible tax, but no action has been taken and no remedial measures adopted. Therefore, in order to deal justly with millions of American car owners, I am asking Congress to authorize rebate of this unjustifiable tax, and urge early consideration of the measure.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESS SHOULD ASSUME ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that almost everyone recognizes the fact that responsibility goes with power. And now is the time for the Congress to assume its responsibility. I for one have no desire to shirk that responsibility and I would like to have the opportunity to vote for an act which would make unlawful every policy-making order, directive, or regulation issued by the departments. Let the departments administer the law and quit making regulations which the present Supreme Court holds have the force of law.

We have heard this morning and yesterday about the shortage of beef, about the seizure of beef; we have heard about the shortage of butter and the rules and regulations which prevent the manufacture of butter. We know something also about the shortage of corn which is needed for poultry and dairy feed throughout the country. If there is anyone in this country who reads the papers who is aware of the result of some of the O. P. A. and W. P. B. orders who does not think he can write a policy which would be less harmful than the ones we have I would like to know where he lives. Why not write the policy ourselves? That is our duty. And while we are determining policy why not acknowledge that the laws of nature are still in existence, that the law of supply and demand still acts, that neither we nor the bureaucrats have control over rain or sunshine?

More than 2 years ago, in November of 1940, a bill was introduced by me which would have done much to stabilize prices and prevent inflation. Some day the principles of that bill will be put into law. Why not consider it now?

SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, now that a week has passed and some heads that were rather warm have cooled off, I should like the RECORD to show that I regret exceedingly that the hysteria of some of the Members of this House last week, 1 week ago today, prevented my being here at the moment to vote against the majority. Had I been here I would have taken great pleasure in voting against the majority, to sustain the President's veto.

OUR PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was certainly amusing to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], who was not here to vote on the proposition, talk about the rest of us having hysteria in forcing the passage of the antistrike bill over the veto. We at least had our hysteria at the right place, here in the House, the place to which we were all elected and for which we are being paid.

We rendered a great service to the American people in the passage of that salutary measure—and there was really no hysteria manifested.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, while the House was crippling our public power program, we were advised by the local papers that the Government of the United States is being overcharged at least $150,000 a year for electricity in the War Department's Pentagon Building.

This is exactly what we were trying to prevent in California yesterday. It is what the power monopoly is driving at.

It is what the Power Trust is driving at in Oregon and in Washington, that is, to cripple this public power program in order to plunder the people with exorbitant overcharges, as they are doing in many States now.

In my speech day before yesterday, which you will find on page 6844 of the RECORD of that day, I inserted the figures showing that the American people were overcharged more than a billion dollars for their electricity in 1942; and I broke those overcharges down by States.

For instance the people of Tennessee used 4,833,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity last year and paid $40,183,000 for it.

The people of Massachusetts used 4,322,000,000 kilowatt-hours and paid $113,448,000 for it.

The people of Texas used 4,716,000,000 kilowatt-hours and paid $95,196,000 for it.

Yet here we have Members refusing to develop the water power of this Nation, refusing to back up our public power program that is sound and that would protect the American people against such overcharges.

I wish I had time to make the comparisons for every State in the Union. But I refer you to the tables I inserted on June 30. They speak for themselves. If the people who pay these overcharges knew the facts there would be such a ground swell of protest that Congress would not dare permit these injustices to continue. The people of every State should have their rates reduced to the T. V. A. rates as reflected in the figures for the State of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INFLATION

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the spiral of inflation is the most prominent subject before the American people today. The cost of the World War was $32,000,000,000, of which $13,500,000,000 was inflation. The same rate in this war would have an inflationary value as of this date of $28,000,000,000. By the end of this year, 1943, at the same rate as the World War, the inflation bill to the American public would be $70,000,000,000. This is a matter that should have the attention of this Congress. The people cannot stand these prices. Some peg must be placed to stop inflation. The President has suggested a program with which I have attempted to cooperate. If Congress does not approve the President's plan, at least it should suggest one of its own.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio address delivered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, July 1, 1943, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 1, 1943:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for the purpose of considering the two Senate amendments still in disagreement en bloc.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the following: *"Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 98 and 99.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] only for the purpose of offering a motion.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language passed by the House (lines 13 to 24 on page 76 and lines 1 and 2 on page 77) and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

"Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518; 55 Stat. 255–256) $3,500,000, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the language of the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia that it is not relevant to the subject matter. The motion is offered in part in lieu of language which has not been stricken from the bill and in regard to which the two Houses are not in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I think that technically the point of order is good. I ask unanimous consent to have the opportunity to restate the amendment. It will be observed by the Chair that while it does strike out the House language, it immediately reinserts it word for word. It is not in substance a striking out of a single word in the House language, except that it inserts an amendment word for word that incorporates the House language with the suggested changes.

The SPEAKER. That does not cure the situation. As the matter stands, the gentleman has offered a motion to strike out certain language that the two Houses have agreed to. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion that the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$7,718,748", and insert "$3,500,000", and in lieu of the matter stricken by Senate amendment numbered 99 beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 21, page 76, and ending with the figures "1943" on page 77, and insert "together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$7,818,748" and insert "$3,500,000" and in lieu of the matter stricken insert "together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion of the gentleman now submitted on amendment numbered 98 and point out that the objective of the motion of the gentleman would be accomplished by insisting on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment, because he proposes to strike out the amount in the Senate amendment and immediately reinsert the figures stated in the House bill. As far as his amendment to Senate amendment numbered 99 is concerned, he proposes to reappropriate an unexpended balance which is a separate matter, with which that amendment does not deal. It is not relevant to amendment numbered 99, which strikes out the proviso providing for the liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold that the first part of the gentleman's motion would be in order, but he is compelled to hold that the second part is not germane. Does the gentleman desire to offer another amendment?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment with an amendment as follows——

The SPEAKER. Which Senate amendment?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, the two amendments being considered together, to move to insist on one and recede on the other, inasmuch as they are being considered together?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to concur——

Mr. PACE. In the $3,500,000.

The SPEAKER. To recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 98?

Mr. PACE. No; I desire to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 98, on the $3,500,000, and concur in the Senate amendment numbered 99. The motion would be to insist on the House position on amendment numbered 98, and recede and concur on the Senate amendment numbered 99.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. PACE of Georgia: Mr. PACE moves that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 98, and recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 99.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the amendments has been debated in the House on several different occasions. The House has had 3 votes upon it, 2 roll calls, and 1 standing vote on the subject matter involved. On the

last roll call the vote was 233 to 135 to sustain the House position. I do not believe that the House desires that the entire subject matter be discussed here again by men who have heretofore made speeches upon it and I now move the previous question.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he moves the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to order the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 113, noes 16.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Barden	Harness, Ind.	O'Leary
Barry	Hays	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Plumley
Buckley	Holifield	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Price
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Rowe
Cochran	Kilburn	Russell
Culkin	King	Shafer
Domengeaux	Lea	Sheridan
Drewry	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Fay	McKenzie	Stevenson
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Tolan
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Treadway
Fulmer	Mason	Van Zandt
Furlong	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Morrison, La.	Wasielewski
Gifford	Morrison, N. C.	West
Green	Norton	
Hall,	O'Brien, Ill.	
Edwin Arthur	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 111 to 119, inclusive, may be considered en bloc and that the House further insist upon its disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, there are so many of these items that we want to dispose of as many of them en bloc as possible. I do want to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, however, that there are two or three Members on this side who would like to be heard briefly on some of these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assure the gentleman from California that those Members who wish to be heard will have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CARTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 111: Page 72, line 15, insert "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $3,600,000."

Amendment No. 112: Page 72, line 17, insert "Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, $4,100,000."

Amendment No. 113: Page 72, line 18, insert "Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,985,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902."

Amendment No. 114: Page 72, line 22, insert "Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $1,200,000."

Amendment No. 115: Page 72, line 23, insert "Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,415,000."

Amendment No. 117: Page 73, line 11, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$275,000."

Amendment No. 118: Page 73, line 12, strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

Amendment No. 119: Page 73, line 13, strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$43,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments Nos. 111 to 119, inclusive.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, when I appeared before the Subcommittee on the Appropriation for the Interior Department, the gentleman from Oklahoma expressed complete approval of our project—the Colorado-Big Thompson. This is not a new project and does not bring into cultivation any new land, nor is it a development at the expense of the Federal Government. This is a conservancy district that is bonded for the entire amount necessary to complete the project, and the Federal Government is only making a loan to the district for the completion of the project and will be reimbursed for the entire cost.

In appearing before the subcommittee, I stated that more than 300,000 acres of cultivated land would be affected by this modified program now being considered in this appropriation act. One hundred thousand acre-feet of water, all for supplemental use, can be transferred from the western side of the Rocky Mountains to the eastern side when the tunnel is finished and a dam constructed on the Colorado River. This farm land is in a high state of cultivation and produces critical war crops necessary for the prosecution of the war. Our farmers have the machinery and they are experienced and ready to meet the program as outlined by the Department of Agriculture for the production of the very crops which today are so vitally needed in the prosecution of this war.

When the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Grover B. Hill, appeared before this subcommittee, he said:

> Regardless of how much food we will produce it will not be enough. Even though we could produce twice as much food as we will be able to produce, we could use it all.

While the War Production Board has placed a stop order on the use of critical material for the continuation of this project, we now find that they are reconsidering the matter and that the War Food Administrator has given his approval that this irrigation project be allowed enough steel and other critical materials to finish the temporary or modified plan.

The President, himself, in a letter to Governor Vivian, of Colorado, said:

> Thank you for the information which you provided in your letter of May 12 concerning the Colorado-Big Thompson project in your State. I am informed that the application for permission to resume work on the modified plan mentioned in your letter is now before the War Production Board. The War Food Administrator has recommended the resumption of work, and I hope that the Board will soon find it possible to revoke the stop order. The Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation has been requested to advise you immediately upon receipt of work that the War Production Board has acted.

Only this morning I received a copy of a letter from the Director of the Steel Division of the War Production Board in which he states, and I quote:

> The grade of steel from which reinforcing bars are rolled is not considered critical at this time, and with the essentiality established, the tonnage you require should be readily available from (1) current stocks, (2) producers of rail-steel bars, or (3) producers of billet steel using top cuts, discard, etc.
>
> The facilities of producers and fabricators are not now being fully employed, due primarily to the gradual completion of the war construction program. We can foresee no appreciable change in this situation for the duration.

From this it can readily be understood why we are insisting that our subcommittee approve the appropriation for $3,600,000 for the Colorado Big-Thompson project and I trust the House will support this Senate amendment.

So steel for our western projects is available and there is no excuse for not beginning work on these projects.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say the President is for this project?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely. He is for the finishing of all 17 projects in the West that are necessary for the production of food for the war effort.

Mr. GRANGER. And the War Food Administration is for it?

Mr. HILL. The War Food Administration.

Mr. GRANGER. And Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely.

Mr. GRANGER. And the Senate of the United States?

Mr. HILL. And the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GRANGER. Well, what is holding it up?

Mr. HILL. I think that this House will act favorably on these amendments.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The House is not holding it up, I want the gentleman to know, because we have favored those projects which have a Budget estimate, and yours is one of them.

Mr. HILL. That is right. I understand the House favors these reclamation projects that have Budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. That is true.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, history reveals that protein was one of the important factors contributing to the failure of Germany to successfully prosecute World War No. 1. The supply of protein foods in this country now during World War No. 2, both for animal and human consumption, is one of our most acute and serious problems. Are we going to face a food problem in this country that will give us a food supply of not enough too soon? The Senate has shown wisdom in endeavoring to set aside moneys to be expended for developing a sane and safe food program for this country. We are going to have to increase production in order to face this emergency. We have the word last night of Elmer Davis, who said we are going to have to increase our production from 350,000,000 to 385,000,000 acres of food-producing lands this year. There are two ways to bring about that expansion. The first is to till and plow the arid regions of the Rocky Mountain Plains area and throw that section of country back into a second Dust Bowl, or there is the program of bringing water upon productive lands that will in turn produce those commodities of high protein value that are so badly needed in this war effort and at the same time increase the badly needed acreage.

Secondly, nor is it going to be sufficient to produce food only for the war emergency. There is going to be a terrific demand for food for at least 2 years post-war and that program is being talked of today very seriously by individuals who are interested in keeping this program from coming to the place of not enough too soon.

The Senate of the United States is right in placing $1,415,000 for the appropriation for the completion of the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division. This project itself has one very unique characteristic attached to it; it is going to throw new lands into production that are capable of producing the vital proteins necessary; and secondly, it will bring into production land that will accommodate approximately 1,000 families recently dislocated by the purchase by the Army of 10,500 irrigated acres of land. This acreage has been put out of production for the erection of an ordnance plant. The completion of this project would bring these families dislocated by such action back into producing foodstuffs.

I urge your serious consideration in placing before you the necessity of the completion of this project substantiated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Agriculture Department, which said it could be done in 1 year, and that is why it has been recommended.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fine presentation he made before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Interior.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. As he will remember, we had no Budget estimate when this bill was under consideration by the committee for that item.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. We listened to the gentleman from Washington with a great deal of interest and he has a fine project. Since that time the Budget has, through the gentleman's efforts, given us an estimate on this project of $865,000.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Which the House agreed to. So, I think the gentleman probably is just a little out of order when he gives the Senate the whole credit. Certainly the gentleman is deserving of a little credit himself.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentleman. But the Senate made the recommendation and in the face of the fact that it could be completed in 1 year. In other words, the Budget Bureau estimate was based on a 2-year program rather than 1 year as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation. That is why the appropriation should remain $1,415,000 as recommended by the Senate. I urge the House to recognize that important fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, since the budget was prepared by the Department of the Interior with the provisions for the appropriation items carried in this bill and since it was passed, on the basis of the Budget estimate when it came to the House, a new emergency has arisen in this country—a food emergency, and it is getting worse every minute.

We are coasting along now with the things from the gardens and we will probably get by this fall with the harvest coming along, and we may do pretty well through Christmas, but I want to tell the House that when next January, February, and March roll around, the people of the United States are not going to be eating. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who got up on the floor of the House yesterday and said that the cattle of the West should be seized and brought to New York to feed his hungry constituents, is not going to be the only one you will hear from on this floor before we settle this food emergency.

The Senate, in its wisdom, in taking up this bill, has put in a few items to prepare land and to bring water on land, so that it can produce food as well as increase production on the lands already under irrigation.

We have one item in this bill for the Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, to resume work that has been shut down. I know about the Anderson Ranch and I know about the situation in Idaho. I know that this project deals with one of the finest of the various irrigation sections of the country. I know it deals with a section of the country where President Roosevelt, during his tour through the West, stopped and put in a whole day and saw the immense amount of food and dairy products that are being produced from this land.

I know that the land in this district is short of water. I know that they cannot produce dairy products in the fall when the pastures dry up. I know there is not enough moisture to put the sugar in the sugar beets in the fall, and they must have more water if we are going to have more cream and butter, sugar, and beef.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are dealing with here. I want to say to the conferees who are insisting that these reclamation items be sent back to the Senate that they should join hands with the Senate in its efforts to bring back these small appropriation items that we must have in order to produce the food so the people of this country may eat. That is the question involved here in these reclamation items. There can be no doubt, as far as production in the West is concerned, that we need these reclamation districts in order to feed the people of the United States, to maintain the men in the Army and the Navy, and supply our allies. This country has been and is being stripped bare; we have sent so much food out of the country that when next spring rolls around we are not going to eat unless we do something about the food situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conferees, instead of riding the Senate, will agree to these items and join with the Senate in putting them in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 120. Page 73, line 15:

"WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

"For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, including not to exceed $220,000 for surveys, investigations, and administrative

expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia), all as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y, 590z), $4,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my remarks especially to the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior.

As the committee well knows, these projects, in disagreement, were commenced under the Case-Wheeler Act and were partially financed by W. P. A. and C. C. C. Since those two organizations have gone out of existence, and the War Production Board's stop order was issued these projects have been standing in an uncompleted condition. With particular reference to the one in my district known as the Newton project, which, by the way, is the smallest of the projects considered in the amendment 120 now in disagreement, I want the committee to take my word for it respecting the condition of this project because I have been on the ground myself within the last month. The project is half completed, all the strategic material has already been put into the project; the equipment is still on the ground, being cared for by watchmen and by mechanics to keep the equipment in repair. Trained men are already there to operate the equipment. It will take $275,000 to complete this small project in a fertile valley that will produce anywhere from 18 to 25 tons of sugar beets per acre, and will produce other vital food crops that are so necessary at this time. It seems to me that with the call being made on this country to increase food production acreage from 255,000,000 to 380,000,000 acres, according to Mr. Davis, they have got to depend upon a portion of the increased acreage from irrigation and reclamation projects such as are here being discussed and appropriation for which are embraced in this bill. I hope the committee will look with favor upon this as a war food emergency program. I do not believe the committee should stand on any rule it might have adopted previously that because there is no Budget estimate for some of these projects they should not be completed. It seems to me it is a waste of money to let these projects stand in their present uncompleted state. It is the part of wisdom and good business sense to complete these projects. In my particular case 200 families can be placed upon profitable farms, who, in turn, would aid in the production of food that is so badly needed at the present time.

The Newton project was recommended as one necessary in the production-of-food program by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Food Administrator, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and funds were provided by the Senate. At this point I desire to put into the RECORD a telegram just received from the State engineer of Utah which reads as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. WALTER K. GRANGER,
House Office Building:

Newton Dam unsafe. My nonstorage order in force. Temporary repairs exceeding $21,000 deemed unwise burden on water users. For production food urge you secure construction stop-order release for new permanent dam now partly constructed.

ED H. WATSON.

Members of the House and the committee, I emphasize that here is a project vitally needed in the production of food, half completed, needs very little strategic material, all equipment necessary to build it is now on the ground, men are already available who have been trained to operate this machinery. Is there any reason, in spite of the fact that there has not been a Budget estimate for it, why it should not be completed?

If we wait until fall for this appropriation, as the chairman indicated, it will simply mean putting off the production of food, as far as this project is concerned, another additional year. If we are sincere in our belief that there is a shortage of food, our sincerity will be tested in a case of this kind, and I am sure there are other projects in the same category deserving the same consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur, but I have confidence in the good judgment of the subcommittee that they will see to it that appropriations are made available for these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned in the item which is in dispute designated as amendment No. 120, providing $4,000,000 for water conservation and utilization projects. This, as the gentleman from Utah has so well said, is designed to take care of small irrigation projects which have been begun and carried on under what is known as the Case-Wheeler Act permitting construction of small irrigation projects which but for that act would be impossible. This $4,000,000 embraces $300,000 for the completion of what is known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 project.

Buffalo Rapids project is perhaps the first of its kind in the Great Plains States for farm stabilization and water conservation utilization program. Its purpose is to reclaim semiarid lands and rehabilitate many droughted-out farmers. The cost of the project is about $1,840,000—approximately $740,000 is reimbursable. A lot of this work was done by the Work Projects Administration. This project No. 2 includes units known as the Terry, Fallon, and Fallon prelift. All are pumping units served by power from Fort Peck and with water pumped from the Yellowstone River. Construction began in September 1940. It is said authoritatively that this project will reclaim 11,000 acres approximately. In connection with the urgent necessity for the increased production of food in the coming years, it seems to me that it is imperative that this project be completed. I do not need to again remind the House, as I have done time after time for the past year and half, we are going to be short of food. We have taken upon ourselves not only to feed this country including our Army, Navy and civilian population but likewise through lend-lease and our good neighbor policy we have taken on the burden of feeding other nations as well.

My understanding is that the former Food Administrator, Chester Davis, approved the completion of this project in connection with the necessity for increasing our food production for the year 1944. I have also been informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has likewise recommended its completion as quickly as possible.

There is no denying the fact that the only place to which we can turn today for an increase of food production is to the small irrigation projects of the Western States. There we can secure a large acreage of land that will produce alfalfa, wheat, sugar beets, potatoes, beans, and all that sort of food at a lower cost than any place else. I realize the position the committee has taken; I realize they are trying to economize. I further realize that our distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has always been a very good friend of irrigation and reclamation projects. I also know there are many others on this committee who feel the same way as he does about it. I am not going to make any preferential motion to have this $4,000,000 included because I am a little bit fearful in view of what happened here yesterday that such motion would be voted down. I am going to rely upon our chairman and upon the members of the committee to realize the full necessity of creating and bringing into production a larger acreage of land for the production of the crops we will need next year in our war effort. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma will help us on this matter—at least I am hopeful of it.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, written in the Senate, covers irrigation projects in many States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the hard task that the conferees have on their hands. They have been patient and tireless. I concur with the gentleman from Montana that perhaps a vote on this particular item, amendment No. 120, would not be wise. At this stage of the proceedings, with the fiscal year already at a close, there is a strong tendency in the House to follow the conferees. A vote would not be a true test of the merits of this item. That means, then, that the only thing we can

do is to appeal to the gentlemen on the conference committee.

This $4,000,000 item, represented by amendment No. 20, will be spent on a number of small irrigation projects in eight different States, and it will do more to increase the production of food than any other $4,000,000 you could spend.

Right now we have in my district 3,000 prisoners being moved in waiting to do worth-while work that will help this Nation with its necessary economy. War prisoners should be put to work on permanent worth-while improvements.

We should not take this Budget trouble too seriously. We have had busy times here, but do you realize that every item that comes to the Senate or House is channeled through the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget, too, has been busy. Consequently many worth-while things have been presented by the Food Administration, by the Bureau of Reclamation, and by the War Production Board that have not been heard in detail by the Bureau of the Budget. Eventually Budget will O. K. this item.

The passage of this amendment will provide two projects in my State. One of them has the steel and the other critical materials lying on the ground. Do you think construction ought to go ahead? I know that if the right presentation could be made to the Bureau of the Budget, and it has time to reach it it would say, "Go ahead." I think that is what the conferees ought to do. I believe that they will be well satisfied with their effort if they decide this question on the basis of more food. The conferees should resolve any doubt in favor of more food production.

I want to call as my witness Mr. Donald Nelson, and I hope the members of the committee will follow me in this. This is a letter from Donald Nelson dated June 29 and states:

> At the request of the Food Administrator, then Mr. Chester C. Davis, the War Production Board has been giving consideration to a number of irrigation projects which would increase food production.
>
> We have not completed our study of the projects with the War Food Administrator.

All must realize there has been a change of Food Administrators, consequently the stubborn insistence of the conferees that this clear through the Budget cannot be met before this House recesses and time is of the essence.

Going on with Mr. Donald Nelson's letter, he says this:

> It would be my suggestion that appropriation be made by the Congress for those projects which they consider necessary, and just as soon as manpower and materials can be made available we shall be glad to give proper consideration to them.

Why not follow Mr. Nelson and appropriate this money?

The War Production Board says, "We will wait on the Budget," the Budget says, "We will wait on War Production Board," and Congress says, "We will wait on the Budget." So we go around in a vicious circle and the food program is retarded. The public rightly demands action on the food front.

I want to read what Chester Davis had to say on June 7, 1943:

> Our present food-production resources in established areas already are operating at capacity; therefore, the only means of increasing the output would be through development which will permit more intensive cultivation. Through the development of additional irrigation acreage, production of these foods can be increased in certain and stable amounts without in any way sacrificing the output of other essential crops and livestock products.

I believe anyone familiar with this problem will agree that to wait until next fall to appropriate this same amount of money that the House conferees say that they are willing to appropriate is a tragic mistake. Time is of the essence in growing food. Time is of the essence in building these projects and preparing the ground. To fail to act now means the loss of an entire crop year.

I appeal to the conferees to do the patriotic thing and accept amendment No. 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to offer a preferential motion for exactly the same reason as stated by the gentleman who has just left the floor and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. I am willing to leave this matter of small reclamation projects in the hands of the conferees, having yesterday the assurance of the gentleman in charge of the bill that they will take this important matter under advisement at the earliest possible moment.

I do want to stress again the need for haste, just as the gentleman who left the floor a moment ago indicated. I think the illustration I am about to use is an apt figure of speech. In modern war the first great assault by a mechanized force is usually referred to as the panzer attack and is a large-scale effort. After this large-scale attack, no less important is the mopping-up process of many smaller efforts. For many years, at least for four decades, the United States Government has been, through the Reclamation Bureau, waging relentless war upon the so-called Great American Desert. The building of such huge dams as Roosevelt Dam in my State, Elephant Butte Dam nearby, down to Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee, were the panzer attacks.

Mr. Speaker, we have done much in this way, but such big projects involve huge sums and long-range planning. In recent years we have changed our method of attack and have begun a mopping-up process through small irrigation projects under the Wheeler-Case Act. Many of these in eight or more States make possible a maximum of food production in a minimum of time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to point out that if we wait until fall to appropriate this money, and the House conferees are agreed that it will probably be appropriated in the fall, we lose 1 crop year.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true. It is said that these projects fall within about eight States. I do not believe any of them falls within my State, but I do know there are many of these that are now half-completed projects. There is one project in my State on which $10,000,000 has already been spent. The storage dam is there, the diversion dam is there, 18 miles of canal are there, everything is there excepting the twig ends of canals—that is, laterals to put water on thousands of acres of desert land. This should be put to use at once, and it could be done without the outlay of much money, and it could be done quickly, in time to produce additional food this year in a country where we grow crops for 12 months in the year.

We produce alfalfa, for instance, all year round, getting five and six cuttings in a 12-month period. That is the possibility of some of these uncompleted projects. I ask the committee, the conferees especially, to help us along with this mopping-up process in this war on the desert, for that is exactly the most feasible way to get this food-production program enlarged as it must be.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Did the gentleman notice in the press yesterday where Mr. Davis said that next year's program would call for probably 380,000,000 acres, an increase of 30,000,000 acres of cultivated ground?

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not notice that in the press, but I do know that Chester Davis, as well as Donald Nelson, is strongly in favor of these very projects. It is only a matter of red tape that we do not have the Budget estimates to back them now.

Mr. GRANGER. They have made that acreage basis on the theory that these projects are going to be completed and used in the production of food.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to tell the committee that not only for the duration of this war but for many years after the war we are going to have need for food production, more than we can possibly produce with the acreage now in cultivation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the colloquy between the chairman of this Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], which occurred yesterday when we began discussing reclamation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I think I should further add that all of these projects are commendable projects. I think they would be desirable, probably the finest thing that we could think of for a post-war program. It occurs to me that if either the stop orders should be lifted or Budget estimates secured by the time we return in September, then the deficiency committee certainly will consider and may well consider these projects favorably. I think I may say that it will consider all of these projects for which stop orders may be lifted. I am a member of that deficiency committee, and I think I know how the members feel about anything that will produce more food. We are not opposed to the projects; I want to make that perfectly plain. I am very strongly for reclamation projects, even though I have none in my own district. The truth about this is that we have neither Budget estimates nor War Production Board approval for these projects with the possible exception of one.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that I concur in what the gentleman says in regard to these projects that lack Budget estimates and lack removal of the stop orders. Even if we do recess, we are going to be back here in September. If those stop orders are removed and Budget estimates are obtained, the projects can be presented at once to the deficiency committee and we can consider them in an orderly way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] and I are naturally extremely anxious that there be included in this bill sufficient funds for the Tucumcari project. However, we are entirely happy to follow the pattern established by our colleagues in suggesting that this matter should be well handled by our conferees as it has been in the past.

I do think we ought to bear in mind that there is a very serious problem confronting this country now when we come to a decision as to how additional acreage is going to be put in cultivation. There will be a temptation shortly to go out and rip up the new sod that is being grown in the Dust Bowl areas. I think this House ought to have that problem firmly in mind to make sure that when this new land is brought into cultivation it not be the type of land that results ultimately in dust bowls but be one of these irrigated areas.

I spent the early part of my lifetime on the Plains of the Dakotas. I saw that country turned up, fine buffalo grass ripped out, and western South Dakota develop very quickly into a great dusty area where formerly it had been a fine cattle country.

I lived to go down and be a neighbor to the high plains countries of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. There I saw that same thing repeated. The minute that prices got good, the minute the land got valuable, it was ripped up and "the plow that broke the Plains" resulted in the development of the great dust areas.

Just a few months ago I drove through the corner of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas and saw there the 300,000 acres that this Government has placed under fence, land that was once a desperate-looking Dust Bowl. I am happy to say to this House that as a result of legislation passed by the Congress when I was not a Member of it—I am not trying, therefore, to take any credit for it—these 300,000 acres are back in grass. The Dust Bowl has vanished. The area has been saved.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that we farmers from the cities helped materially in having that brought about.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am very happy to acknowledge it. I am happy to say that the support for it came from both sides of the aisle. It was a fine piece of legislation, of which we are all proud.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I suggest to the gentleman that he has placed his finger on a very important feature of this whole business. By all means we must not plow up this grassland. The best way to increase the productive area is, just as the gentleman says, to increase our irrigated lands and leave the grasslands alone, and not make them again a place for the winds to lift their soil into the heavens and carry it from the Great Plains States down as far as the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. As a friend and near neighbor of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, I wish to join with him in expressing the hope that the conferees will do something about the Tucumcari project, because I regard it as one of the most deserving in the West. I have personal knowledge of the situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman, who is a fine neighbor and a fine friend of that country.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I wish to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on the splendid reclamation talk he has been making. I assure him that the reclamation-minded Representatives from California, despite what was said yesterday, will support him to a man, I think.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman. I assure the gentleman that the action I took yesterday was not based upon a desire to defeat any of the projects in California. As I tried to explain, the conference report must come back on a basis that can be accepted by the House. If it carries merely a recommendation to include large sums of money without an entire well-rounded group program, it has no possibility of success. I want to see brought back to this House a conference report that represents something that will be accepted by the House, and that can happen only when our conferees come back well satisfied with the work they have done.

I plead with this House to bear in mind that the temptation will be ahead of us to take this new land that has been brought under grass again and rip it up and quickly plant it to crops, because it can be more quickly handled than any other part. But if we do that, we have destroyed the very thing we have worked for for years. This House must take the position that it will keep in grass these areas upon which the Government has spent millions of dollars to develop top soil again.

It has required many years of hard work; it must not be passed over with a wartime program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BILL—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the veto message of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be read at 2:30 today and brought up for consideration and action by the House at that time.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of getting more food for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our friends overseas is of primary importance at this time. The recent floods in the Middle West, not to mention early frosts and other destructive agents, have lessened our already limited prospects for food production this year. It becomes constantly more evident that additional land must be placed under cultivation in addition to making, insofar as is possible, our presently cultivated lands produce more. We have two choices—either to plow up more dry land, such as was done in sections of Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma, during and following the last World War, or to get more land under irrigation. The dust storms and other serious consequences, both to the land and to health, that followed the plowing up of the Dust Bowl should not be repeated. The alternative answer to our food problems must be more storage facilities for water to be used for irrigation.

Stop orders have involved a serious delay in the development of 877,500 acres of new land and 2,085,000 acres of presently cultivated land for which a supplemental water supply is needed.

The item in the bill having to do with completing small reservoirs and dams promises the quickest and the cheapest answer to the question of increasing our food production. During the depression and under the Case-Wheeler Act, W. P. A. and C. C. C. labor was used in the construction of many small dams and reservoirs in the Rocky Mountain area. These reservoirs are partially completed. They are of no value now and unless they are cared for soon, much of the work that has been done will be permanently lost. Already the War Food Administration has approved some of these projects to alleviate the food shortages. The necessary materials to complete the work is, in many instances, on the ground and labor is available.

To assist in the immediate completion of these smaller irrigation projects, the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House has unanimously reported out two bills to permit the expenditure of appropriated money in lieu of "services, labor, materials, and other property" under the Case-Wheeler Act.

It is my hope that the conference committee will reconsider its action and agree to the amount approved by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before moving the previous question I desire to make a brief statement with reference to this particular amendment. Several Members have said that the chairman of this subcommittee has in the past favored an appropriation under the Case-Wheeler Act. These statements are true and correct and absolutely in keeping with the RECORD. I think I am not violating any rules or secrets of the committee when I say that the other members of the conference committee also realize the importance of this great problem under the Case-Wheeler Act, which will provide an additional water supply in arid and semi-arid areas. My own State of Oklahoma, especially in the western and northwestern portions, is tremendously interested in this item, but, as I am sure you gentlemen know, there is no Budget estimate for this item nor is there a recommendation by the War Production Board. As Members also know these projects have been handicapped by the loss of the C. C. C. and the W. P. A. labor, and as Members also will recall, these projects are considered feasible only with the W. P. A. and C. C. C. aid. Let me read from the testimony with reference to this particular item, so that Members may understand the position of the House conferees. Here is a statement in the record of the hearings by the Acting Commisisoner of Reclamation with reference to this particular item:

These projects contemplated the use of contributed labor from the Work Projects Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, and are set up upon the theory that the water users can pay the allocation that the President makes out of this lump sum appropriation. Projects of this kind are now handicapped, of course, by reason of the fact that Work Projects Administration labor has disappeared and Civilian Conservation Corps labor has disappeared. In the place of those two in some cases we have C. C. S. camps—that is the conscientious objectors—and we are planning on the establishment of conscientious objectors' camps on the Mancos project about the 1st of July.

In addition to that, there is legislation pending now in the Congress authorizing taking into consideration the necessity for the growing of more foodstuffs to win the war which, if passed, will make many of these projects, and possibly all of them, financially feasible. The committee hopes that such legislation will pass, and we will then have a green light on these particular projects.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. In lieu of the C. C. C. camp labor and the W. P. A. labor, the Army has already moved into the area of these projects prisoners of war, prison labor, and they are ready and unless this committee acts, the months and years will roll by.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I am sure he knows my personal appreciation of this program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the Bureau of Reclamation has recommended what is known as the Buffalo Rapids No. 2 in eastern Montana to be completed upon the theory that it is in the course of completion now, and that it will bring into production in the neighborhood of 11,000 acres? I think that was recommended by the Reclamation Bureau, and likewise by Mr. Chester Davis, the Food Administrator, who was familiar with the area, having lived in Montana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is more familiar with the recommendations than I am, but if the gentleman says that that recommendation has been made I am sure that it has been made, because the House must depend upon the gentleman's statement. I am of opinion, however, that that recommendation has been made to another committee at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was informed that what I stated occurred.

Mr. MURDOCK. Confirming what the chairman said a few minutes ago that legislation is now pending which would authorize further appropriations for these much-needed food projects, I may say that the House Reclamation Committee has already reported out favorably H. R. 3018 and H. R. 3019, and similar or identical bills have been reported out by a committee of the Senate, so they are in process of enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the extreme urgency of providing funds for the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and for the development, completion, and expansion of irrigation and reclamation projects in the West. These projects are of vital importance at this time for the reason that they offer the surest and quickest means and method of providing more food and fiber so badly needed to supply not only our present needs, but to build a stock-pile for post-war requirements. In providing food for ourselves and for nations that will be dependent upon us when the war is over, we must never be accused of providing too little, too late.

The fate of many human beings depends upon our foresight and judgment. In this connection, I wish to call attention to the possibilities of production from the developed and undeveloped irrigation projects of Wyoming.

Under these projects, new virgin land is available and awaits only proper development to produce in great quantities. The Eden Valley project in Sweetwater County, Wyo., may be developed to add an additional 8,500 acres of productive lands in 1944.

The Riverton project will add 52,000 acres for 1944, and the Shoshone-Heart Mountain project will add approximately 26,000 acres for 1944.

We have all come suddenly face to face with the startling fact that there is a shortage of food and fiber and that every available acre must be made to produce if we are to meet the demands of our civilian population, our armed forces, and at the same time, meet the requirements of lend-lease.

These irrigation projects provide the surest method of supplying these needs, and support of these appropriations to continue their development is mandatory upon us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 121: Page 74, line 14, insert "Services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese who are in the control of the Federal Government may be utilized in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 142. Page 82, line 7, insert: "Protection of mineral resources and facilities (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines, independently or in cooperation with

other agencies, public or private, to initiate and augment measures to prevent subversive activities from interfering with the extraction and processing of minerals, including not to exceed $35,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed $5,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; not to exceed $3,500 for printing and binding; purchase of special apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior,' $475,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 142 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In line 6 of said amendment strike out '$35,000' and insert '$30,000.'

"In line 8 of said amendment strike out '$5,000' and insert '$4,500.'

"In line 12 of said amendment strike out '$3,500' and insert '$3,250.'

"In line 17 of said amendment strike out '$475,000' and insert '$400,000'."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 149: Page 84, line 12, insert "Purchase of land, etc., Bartlesville, Okla.: For the purchase of land in Bartlesville, Okla., which land may be acquired as an addition to the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines, and the purchase or construction of fences, temporary storage sheds, and other necessary structures, to remain available until expended, $30,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 149.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 154½ to 160, inclusive, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 154½: Page 86, line 5, strike out the word "western."

Amendment No. 155: Page 86, line 9, strike out the word "coking."

Amendment No. 156: Page 86, line 11, insert "pilot plant construction and operation to utilize more fully found resources and."

Amendment No. 157: Page 86, line 15, insert the word "purchase" after the word "expenses."

Amendment No. 158: Page 86, line 16, strike out the word "two" and insert "twenty-five."

Amendment No. 159: Page 86, line 17, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$38,000."

Amendment No. 160: Page 86, line 24, strike out "$149,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 154½ to 160, inclusive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments 154½ to 160, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 154½ to 160, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that this is a very important item. Without undertaking to discuss in detail the very acute steel shortage, I think I am safe in saying that no one will question the fact that we are now in a very distressing situation. Everyone seems to admit that there is a very definite shortage of steel.

Some 10 months ago this House created the Boykin committee and authorized that committee to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining just what could be done to increase our supply of steel. The committee has worked very earnestly for the past 10 months and the committee believes that $2,750,000 is needed to the end that the Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the interested agencies in the several States, might conduct an exploratory investigation for the purpose of obtaining information which might lead to a further production of raw materials used in the manufacture of steel. The Bureau of Mines likewise feels that $2,750,000 can well be used and is badly needed in the conduct of the investigation recommended by the Boykin committee. The House committee, instead of providing a sufficient sum for the investigation in the 26 States in which there is real reason to believe that very valuable deposits of strategic materials may be found, restricted the appropriation to a very small sum—only $149,000—and restricted the investigation to a very limited area of the country.

The chairman of the committee has just offered an amendment, striking out the word "western," the effect of which is to lift the limitation upon the area in which the investigation is to be conducted. My motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will make available the funds deemed necessary by the Boykin committee, the Bureau of Mines, and by the Senate. Even this is a rather small amount of money when you take into consideration the importance of the work and the necessity for an increased production of steel.

The Governors of several of the States have been greatly interested in this matter. I know that the Governor of my own State, Hon. J. Melville Broughton, has taken a great interest in the proposed investigation. He recently appeared before the Boykin committee and made a very splendid statement. I am advised that the State of Alabama has appropriated $100,000 to be used in connection with the investigation contemplated. The proposed investigation, contemplated by this appropriation, now embraces a very large area of this country and yet, under the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma, to insist upon the position of the House, a very small and wholly inadequate amount of money will be made available. Seven or eight hundred thousand dollars, or even a million dollars, is not sufficient and I do not believe that this House should ignore the recommendations of the Boykin committee and the Bureau of Mines. We should make available every dollar needed to do the job. The Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the various States, should be authorized and equipped to obtain full and complete information regarding the deposits of minerals which might be used in the manufacture of steel. The information acquired will be made available to private industries in the hope and in the belief that private business will develop mining possibilities.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I should not take issue with the gentleman and I would not take issue if it were not for the fact that we have been spending millions of dollars investigating these natural resources of ours and many small concerns, modest in size, concerns which have metal deposits, have made applications to the R. F. C. for loans and it seems to me that they got no consideration at all. The fight that is going on between a couple of fellows in this administration today is due in part to the very thing that the gentleman is asking about and that I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not all the more reason why this Congress should authorize this investigation?

Mr. JENSEN. I agree perfectly with the gentleman; only what good does it do to give them a lot of money if, when the investigations are made, they will not let the mines be opened for development?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his generosity in permitting me to proceed.

I reiterate, the House created this Boykin committee and authorized it to do a job. The enthusiastic and able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] and the members of his committee have discharged and are discharging their duties well and the members of this committee feel and be-

lieve that $2,750,000 should be made available for this investigation. The Bureau of Mines and the Senate of the United States approve the sum of $2,750,000. If this amount is needed it should be made available immediately.

I am not a miner. I do not speak the language of the miner. The fact is, I do not know anything about mining, but I do know that we ought to be thinking of the future of this country and planning for that future. Only by thinking of and planning for the future shall we be able to influence and to direct the destinies of this great Republic. Steel is needed and will be needed badly in the winning of this war. We should, of course, think of the present and yet, at the same time, we should think of the future. Steel is needed in war and likewise it will be needed in the days of peace.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Budget Bureau only approved $300,000?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not concerned about what the Budget Bureau did. This $2,750,000 has been approved by the Boykin committee, it has been approved by the Bureau of Mines, and it has been approved by the Senate and I have no information to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget looks with disfavor upon the amount sought to be made available. Of course, the routine procedure is to submit proposed appropriations to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of determining whether or not it is in line with the President's program. Just because this larger item was not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget does not mean that Congress cannot take action upon it. Our chief concern is the winning of this war and in the winning of the war we will need steel. In the war the world is being destroyed and in the days of peace we will need great stores of steel to rebuild the world which is now being destroyed. Only by a lack of foresight will we fail to prepare for the full development of our own resources.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making about the same speech which I made before the committee and which is in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope very much that the gentleman will vote for my motion. I am in dead earnest about this matter. If we fail to provide sufficient funds I do not believe that we are giving sufficient consideration to the recommendation of our own committee and I do not believe that in this important matter we will be treating America right. This is not a partisan proposition. Neither is it a personal nor a sectional problem. It is a national problem and a problem of great magnitude.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentleman from North Carolina willing to leave this matter to the judgment of the able chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. COOLEY. I have great respect for the ability and the integrity of the gentleman from Oklahoma but he is rather economy minded and sometimes "tight-fisted" when it comes to spending money. I am afraid that he has not considered the importance of the item we are discussing.

Mr. JENSEN. I know he is but he has done a wonderful job.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree. The gentleman from Oklahoma has done a wonderful job and I am not criticizing him.

Mr. JENSEN. And he is also thinking about what is going to be done with this item.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the many outstanding and fine qualities of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He is a statesman of great ability and I know that he is in every respect trustworthy.

This is not a matter which affects my native State of North Carolina any more than it does a number of other States in the Union but I do think that it is tremendously important and I do not believe that just a few hundred thousand dollars will be sufficient. I hope that a full and complete job will be done and that sufficient money will be provided. I believe that valuable deposits can be located in various sections of this country. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the adoption of my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Boykin committee on steel shortages referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The appropriation to be made in this bill through Senate amendments 154½ to 156, inclusive, in the interest of national defense, provides for the investigation of raw-material resources and the establishment of pilot plants where necessary for the development of steel production.

It is a well-known fact that there are many high-grade ore deposits scattered throughout the country in large commercial quantities that can be made readily available for the production of steel if we will take the initiative in providing for the early stages of development.

Steel, and more steel, is the crying need of our war-production effort today. That little group of steel masters who have held the entire steel industry of this Nation in a tight grip, centralized within 700 miles of this Capitol Building, have misled the Nation to protect their own selfish interests. Before this war started they owned the mines, the blast furnaces, the mills, and even the shipbuilding plants of the country. And months after we were engaged in the war they had the audacity to carry full-page newspaper advertisements to the effect that there was no steel shortage.

The shortage of steel in this country today is almost as crippling in its effect as the shortage of food. The steel shortage is a bottleneck that must be broken, and only the Congress of the United States is able to break that bottleneck because of the power the steel masters of this country now wield.

The shortage of steel has become so serious that the War Production Board took the initiative to call the situation to the country's attention by issuing a statement concerning our requirements for July, August, and September of this year. During this third quarter the 16 claimant agencies of the Government require 21,000,000 tons of finished carbon steel, and it is estimated there will only be 15,000,000 tons available for allocation. The War Department's requirements have been reduced 14 percent, while their requirements for alloys will be cut 16 percent. The Navy Department's requirements are being cut 20 percent, and alloys have been cut the same as the Army's. The Maritime Commission requirements are being cut 22 percent, Lend-Lease 32 percent, and the Office of Defense Transportation 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious and critical situation brought upon this Nation by the centralization of the steel industry in the hands of a small group of men. This situation cannot be permitted to continue.

Steel is the backbone of our war effort and our national economy in times of peace. Steel, steel, and more steel is the crying need of our war production effort today. Not alone is steel the main requirement for mechanized warfare, but it is needed in every other phase of our war production.

More and more steel is needed to build ships.

The shortage of steel today is responsible for the shortage of housing in large areas where war industries have brought about great shifts in our population. The filth and squalor in which the men and women in many of our war factories and their families now live slows down their production.

The shortage of steel today is in large measure responsible for our transportation problems. It has caused many war workers to have to travel 50 and 60 miles daily to and from their employment because of lack of housing adjacent to their work. This in turn has created problems of transportation difficult to cope with.

The shortage of steel has stopped the completion of large hydroelectric power plants, which in turn would save huge quantities of fast diminishing oil supplies, now so urgently required by our military and naval forces.

And, Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress representing a rural district is aware of the fact that the farmers in his district have been hamstrung in their desire to increase food production because they cannot purchase necessary farm machinery and equipment. Indeed, they cannot even purchase parts to repair and replace worn equipment already in their possession. This is due to the steel shortage.

We cannot face this issue with complacency. This war will not be over tomorrow, next week, or next month. Until the last shot is fired we must use every

means at our command to furnish the materials necessary to win the war.

The decentralization of the steel industry must be accomplished. It is the one industry of this Nation that must, in fact, be distributed over the Nation. We can no longer trust the fate of the Nation in the hands of a small group of men who are primarily interested in protecting their post-war interests. We must save the Nation first and then develop our national economy on a national scale with steel manufactured throughout the Nation where the ores are available. The decentralization of the steel industry will aid this development.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: In addition to the figures which he has just quoted to the House, which reveal a very distressing situation with respect to steel shortage, if it is not a fact that the steel necessary for the manufacture of farm implements in this country has been cut below necessary demands by 62 percent?

Mr. WELCH. Until very recently the allocation of steel for farm machinery and farm implements was only 22 percent of the allocation of steel for that purpose during the years 1941 and 1942. Recently they have increased the percentage, but there is still a critical shortage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this preferential motion prevails. I do not like to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma or with my distinguished colleague from Iowa but I want to see both of them lose this afternoon. I want to see my friend from California and my friend from North Carolina prevail in their preferential motion.

Mr. Speaker, in the district I have the honor to represent there are literally billions of tons of low-grade iron ore which up to this time they have not been able to find a way to make commercially usable because the expense is too great. The result is that 80 percent of the iron ore that is being used in this country to make steel comes from the district I represent. It is known as a high-grade ore. There are people who say that in only a very short time we will not have any of this high-grade ore left, taking it out at the rate of 90,000,000 tons a year and shipping it down the Lakes to make this steel for war purposes and the commercial purposes of this country.

These experiments ought to be continued. The University of Minnesota is conducting experiments. As I understand these amendments, the Federal Government will cooperate in still further experiments so that the low-grade ores can be utilized and made of commercial value to this country.

I hope the preferential motion is agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, may extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject Posters Work for Victory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Cooley motion because, in my opinion, if we allow only the $149,000 provided in the House bill, we might as well junk the whole program. Take my district, for instance. Some of the first iron ore produced in this country was produced in southwest Virginia. We had blast furnaces there prior to the Revolutionary War. As late as the nineties we had eight blast furnaces running in the southwestern part of Virginia; today we do not have a single one. I believe that if a proper investigation could be made of our iron deposits in the southwestern part of Virginia, in a few years these old blast furnaces would be reopened and put in operation. The problem has been that no one in that section has had the money to make the right kind of investigation. It takes money to investigate these deposits. If we only had the money available today to make a real investigation of our iron deposits, to do the right kind of prospecting, I believe the investigation would show that we have sufficient ore to justify the reopening of our furnaces and that in a short while southwestern Virginia could be producing thousands of tons of ore each month. If the investigation shows, as I believe it will, that we have the ore, then I do not think we will have any trouble in finding the capital.

The Senate included $2,750,000 for this purpose, which will be a sufficient fund to investigate the possibilities of our known iron deposits scattered over different sections of this country. I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to recede and concur in the Senate amendments in order to give the Bureau of Mines sufficient funds to make an honest investigation of the possibility of our iron deposits. It is time we found out in this country just what iron deposits we have. Our national security demands that we have this information. Give us the money so we can obtain the information.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the following statement which appears in a letter from Mr. R. R. Sayers, written under date of June 10, 1943, to Mr. Allen Forsberg:

> An over-all program of this character involving the total expenditure of $2,540,000 would definitely improve the country's position with respect to raw resources for iron and steel manufacture.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think that is a correct statement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to this floor some 10 years ago we have had the problems of the farmer before us. If there is anything that has made it difficult for the farmer it has been the cost of his implements and the iron tools he uses on the farm. There has been a practical monopoly of machinery and things made of iron that are used in agricultural production. I have seen many a farmer go to the machinery houses and sign up interest bearing notes to buy a set of machinery that put him so hopelessly in debt that he ended up finally by losing his farm. I believe the root of agriculture's problem can be found in the unfair overcharges made for the iron and steel that goes into the machinery he uses to produce his crops and the food this country so desperately needs. Anybody who has seen the price of a binder jump from $175 to $350, anybody who has seen a mowing machine go from $45 to $110 and stay there, anybody who has seen nails go up, anybody who has seen all kinds of tools, plow points, and so forth, rise, anybody who knows anything about agriculture at all knows what has been done to the farmer by the iron producers and the Steel Trust.

We have an opportunity here to utilize the steel and iron deposits. In the State I have the honor to represent, Idaho, we have proven an important deposit of iron. We have harnessed the great rivers out there and are generating huge quantities of power. The power is there, the iron is there, all we need is an investigation and study and laboratory tests that will put that iron to use in order to lighten the heavy financial load carried by the farmer who is now compelled to patronize the present monopolies and the Steel Trust throughout the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I concur in everything that the gentleman from Idaho has said. I want to also add that we have large iron deposits in the State of Montana that need exploration and not only that but development. We have iron enough in my State, in my opinion, to meet the demand for iron a long time to come.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fine statement he is making. I would also like to point out the fact that a great portion of the demand for steel now comes from the western area, particularly along the Pacific coast in which are located these great shipyards. We have deposits in Oregon, Washington, and California that ought to be explored and in Idaho and in that part of the country.

Mr. WHITE. I know where there are mountains of iron in the great State of Washington, I know where there are great deposits of iron in the State of Idaho.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I also point out to the gentleman that in the district of my colleague from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] there is the greatest deposit of coke-burning coal known in the entire world and that is 22 miles from the tidewater flats of Puget Sound.

Mr. WHITE. We not only have the iron on hand ready to be mined in the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and all over the Northwest, but we have the power. We have the developed and undeveloped waterpower of the great Columbia River and its tributaries. We have an almost unlimited amount of potential power to smelt the iron and fabricate and make the things that the farmer needs to break the grip of this monopoly that has done more to cause the problem and the difficulty of the farmer than anything else, this problem and difficulty that we have been trying for 10 years to solve but have not been successful.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman has a lot of influence with the R. F. C. and with Mr. Jesse Jones, also with the Metals Reserve Board and the metal chief on the W. P B. I will tell the gentleman what I want him to do, and I may say I am in favor of this amount. I want him to go down there and get them to take the lid off of the money that is keeping these mines from being developed.

Mr. WHITE. I may remind the gentleman that we are dealing here with a policy of the Bureau of Mines and the Department of the Interior. We are considering the Interior Department bill. I hope that the conferees will go along with the Senate and give us this appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; and get the R. F. C. to go along with it, too.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Barden	Domengeaux	Furlong
Barry	Drewry	Gallagher
Bradley, Mich.	Fay	Gifford
Capozzoli	Fitzpatrick	Green
Cochran	Ford	Hall,
Culkin	Fulmer	Edwin Arthur
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield, Tex.	Robsion, Ky.
Hébert	Mason	Rowe
Holifield	Merritt	Russell
Izac	Morrison, N. C.	Shafer
Johnson, Ward	Norton	Sheridan
Kennedy	O'Brien, Ill.	Stevenson
Kilburn	O'Hara	Tolan
King	O'Leary	Treadway
Lambertson	Phillips	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Plumley	Vinson, Ga.
Maloney	Pracht	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 249)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

H. R. 2869, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, is before me. This measure will become law only over my strenuous objection and protest.

The Congress is aware of my deep interest in the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was created by me under Executive order issued October 16, 1933, to meet a grave and critical emergency. It has proved to be useful not only in an emergency, but under other conditions. It has an essential function to perform in our war-food production program. It should and must be continued.

But this is not a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is a bill to hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation. It places new and unwarranted restrictions on the use of its funds and on the powers heretofore given to the administration to stabilize the cost of living. These restrictions would prevent our giving to farmers the assistance they need in carrying out our new food-production programs, so essential to feed our citizens and our soldiers. They would make it impossible for us to stop the rising cost of living.

As the measure now stands this is an inflation bill, a high-cost-of-living bill, a food shortage bill.

There is, for instance, a provision in section 6 (a) which prohibits the establishment of a maximum price for any raw or processed agricultural commodity which will reflect to the producers thereof a price less than the support price heretofore or hereafter announced by the War Food Administrator, or less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942.

I have tried to analyze this section and to translate it into common-sense English. Frankly, I do not know what it means.

If the provision merely means that if the support price is higher than the maximum price established under the act of October 2, 1942, the commodity must be purchased from the producer at the support price or the farmer must be paid the difference between the support price and the maximum price, the provision would serve no purpose. That is now, as I understand it, the law.

If, on the other hand, despite language which looks the other way, the provision were construed to mean that the maximum price must be fixed so as to yield to the producer the support price without the payment of any subsidy, the provision would require the immediate upward adjustments in the ceiling prices for many basic food products. Prices for dry edible beans, cheese, canned vegetables, sugar, and, in some markets, fluid milk would immediately go up because the support prices for these products are higher than their present ceiling prices.

If the provision were so construed, it would not only immediately increase the cost of living but it would make it impossible for us to adopt support programs needed to increase production without causing a still further rise in the cost of living. Undoubtedly if we must in each case weigh the advantages of a support program against the disadvantages of an increase in the cost of living, many support programs which might otherwise be adopted will be rejected, and other support programs, although finally adopted, will inevitably be delayed.

Section 6 (b) of the bill prohibits, with specified exceptions, the making of any subsidy or other payment other than those which have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, if such a payment is designed either (1) to reduce or roll back maximum and support prices or (2) as a substitute for increasing maximum prices or support prices, unless such payments are specifically authorized by the Congress. The specified exceptions are rigidly limited. Subsidies or other payments can be made until the end of the current crop year on any agricultural commodity other than milk or livestock if, prior to June 15, 1943, the Government was committed to make them. Wheat can be sold for feeding purposes at not less than the parity price for corn. Maximum and support prices on domestic fats and oils and oil seeds can be adjusted as necessary to assure adequate production.

Section 7 seeks to subject to the War Food Administration's control all the powers given under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act in respect to the purchase, sale, storage, and use of foods. I am sure that the War Food Administration is amply capable of handling such a task. But even its hands are shackled by the imposition of rigid restrictions which were included neither in the original Price Control Act nor in the act of October 2, 1942.

Section 7 provides that purchases can be made only at prices which reflect to the farmer not less than the maximum price provided in the act of October 2, 1942, or the announced support price, whichever is the higher. No purchases can be made for the purpose of reducing any maximum price. No purchases can be made for the purpose of resale at a loss unless made under a program announced prior to July 1, 1943. Even under preexisting commitments, the Government is not authorized to make purchases which will involve losses in excess of $150,000,000. It apparently prohibits any purchase and sale program involving any loss for the 1944 crop.

Commodities purchased are not to be sold for less than the maximum price limitations provided in the act of October 2, 1942, or contrary to section 2 (f) of the Price Control Act. It is far from clear that this last restriction does not nullify the exception in section 6 permitting wheat to be sold for feed at the corn parity price.

It is not clear whether the restrictions in sections 6 and 7 are cumulative or whether the Congress wished to draw a distinction between direct subsidies and trading losses resulting from the purchase and resale of foods.

Reputable lawyers could, I am advised, argue that section 6 completely nullifies section 7. If I should agree, then the bill would be even more inflationary. If I should take the contrary view, I may be sure that I will be accused of misconstruing the law.

Many other serious complications and difficulties in administering and construing the bill have been brought to my attention. But if I attempted to deal with all of them here my message would become as complicated and confused as the language of the bill itself.

When farm prices were low, in time of peace, no one in either branch of Government ever suggested that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be forbidden to take losses in its operations. Now, in the critical emergency of war, it is proposed to tie the corporation's hands in ways undreamed of in less strenuous days.

No matter how this measure is interpreted, it will have a devastating effect upon our economy and our war effort about which I believe the Congress and the American people ought clearly to be warned.

1. This bill blacks out the program to reduce the cost of living. In other words, it completely outlaws the recent reductions in the price of meat and butter which we instituted in order to help get the cost of living back down from the height to which it has risen in recent months.

By this measure, the Congress will compel every housewife to pay 5 cents a pound more for every piece of butter that goes on her table, and to pay higher prices for every pork chop, every ounce of beef, every slice of ham or bacon which goes to feed her family.

2. This measure will make it virtually impossible to institute any additional measures to reduce the cost of living or even to hold the line.

3. The bill denies to the Executive any power to purchase farm products for resale at a loss or to make incentive payments to obtain increased production of foodstuffs without the approval of the Congress. I do not believe that the Congress has had an opportunity to know or to consider how seriously it may cripple our entire food program.

It is proper for the Congress to set the limits within which our food programs must operate and the principles to which they must conform. But there is not time to submit each specific food program for congressional approval. Crops will not wait for congressional debate. To require specific approval of each specific program is in effect a prohibition.

In order to obtain a greater production of important war foods it may be necessary to establish special incentives for our farmers. We are asking our agricultural producers to change their farming methods and to grow new crops to which they are unaccustomed and which we need greatly in place of the old crops to which they are accustomed and which we may not need so greatly. It may often be difficult for the War Food Administrator to decide just how great an incentive is required for this purpose. This bill does not prevent the continued use of generous incentive payments to obtain strategic war materials other than food. Yet food is as important as any other strategic war material.

This measure, however, would mean that every additional dollar paid to the farmer to get the extra war crops we need to feed our soldiers abroad would reduce the purchasing power of the limited allowances of their wives and children at home.

Such a restrictive measure would serve only to set the soldier, the worker, and the unorganized consumer at war with the farmer.

The original price control act gave the Government certain powers to regulate prices. In the summer of last year I informed the Congress that the administration could not control the cost of living and prevent inflation unless it was given more adequate power to stabilize wages and food prices. Thereafter the Congress passed the act of October 2, 1942, which authorized me to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living so far as practicable on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

The measure now before me virtually nullifies the Act of October 2, 1942. This Government cannot effectively stabilize the cost of living if it cannot stabilize the cost of necessary foods. As a matter of fact this measure even takes from the Government powers which it was given under the first Price Control Act.

As the danger of inflation grows, the Congress would by this bill put new shackles on those whose duty it is to fight inflation. The fight against inflation cannot be won that way.

To get our economy to work I realize that we cannot rigidly freeze all prices or all wages. In some cases we must pay higher prices to producers to get the extra war production which we need because that extra production costs more to produce. We must likewise put more money in the worker's pay envelope when he works longer hours or when he does more skilled or efficient work, or when his pay is insufficient to keep him on a decent subsistence level. But with a well-balanced combination of measures we must keep wage rates and consumers' food prices from rising if we wish to hold down living costs.

Our wage stabilization program is and must be dependent on the stabilization of the cost of living. This is expressly recognized in the Act of October 2, 1942. The Little Steel formula was based on the fact that there had been a rise of approximately 15 percent in the cost of living between January 1941 and May 1942, for which rise workers could be compensated by wage increases.

The cost of living is now about 8 percent above the level of May, 1942, and about 6 percent above last September. There has been an increase in the average worker's weekly pay check since September. This increase has come primarily through longer hours and through the shift of workers into war industries from lower-paid civilian occupations, although increases in wage rates to correct inequities have played a part. But there are many workers who have enjoyed no increase in earnings.

It is too easy to act on the assumption that all consumers have surplus purchasing power; and that the high earnings of some workers in munitions plants are enjoyed by every worker's family. This easy assumption overlooks the 4,000,000 wage workers still earning less than 40 cents per hour, and millions of others whose incomes are almost as low. It ignores the fact that more than 4,000,000 families have not had an increase of more than 5 percent in their income during the last 18 months. It further ignores the millions of salaried, white-collar workers—the school teachers, the clergymen, the State, county, and city officials, the policemen, the firemen, the clerks—whose salaries have remained low, but whose living standards are being cruelly and inequitably slashed by higher food prices. It equally ignores others on fixed incomes—the dependent mother of the soldier boy with her scant $37 per month, the widow living off the proceeds of her husband's insurance policy, and the old-age pensioner.

These millions are entitled to be protected against skyrocketing food costs. It is my duty to guard them against the ravages of inflation—and I shall guard them unless the Congress shackles my hand.

These unorganized millions must not become the forgotten men and women of our war economy.

The plea has been urged on behalf of industrial workers that if the cost of living is not cut to September, or even to May 1942, levels, wage rates should be raised to compensate. But to raise wages because living costs have risen will be at best only a temporary solution. Raising wage rates increases the cost of production, both of war goods and of the goods whose prices make up the cost of living. It also increases consumers' spending power. The combined effect of increased spending power and increased production cost is inevitably a further rise in the cost of living; and at the same time the money cost of the war increases. In short, to give people more money because prices are rising does not cure the evil, but makes it worse. This is precisely what is meant by the inflationary spiral.

To prevent this spiral of rising costs and prices we must hold firm to the stabilization of wage rates. But to do this, we must assure workers that they can get a fair share of available goods on

legitimate markets, and at prices "so far as practicable on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15," as prescribed by the act of October 2.

Whatever theoretical choices may conceivably be open to us, practically we will have only two. We must keep the cost of living more nearly in line with the level prescribed in the law or we will not be able to hold the wage line or protect the millions of men and women living on low salaries and small fixed incomes. If wages rise, the cost of living will not stand where it is; it will go up and the inflationary spiral will gain strength.

I do not think that a reduction of all living costs or wage increases to the September level is practicable. We all must be prepared in total war to accept a substantial cut in our accustomed standards of living. But we must definitely stop the rising trend of living and push back the price to consumers of important key commodities in the family market basket.

When I talk of important key commodities I do not mean fur coats, or tailored suits or caviar. I mean the necessities of life, things like bread, milk, butter, sugar, coffee, ordinary meats, fats, and canned foods, things that plain working folk must have. We must not only keep the prices of these necessities down, but we must increase, when we can, the supply which helps relieve the pressures for higher prices and helps reduce the temptations of the black markets. With the improvement in the war against the submarine we may even be able soon to remove sugar and possibly later, coffee from the ration list. But we cannot hope in a period of total war to increase the supply of all necessities sufficiently to relieve the price situation.

To reduce the price of key necessities or even to hold some of them at present levels, we either will have to reduce producers' prices and distributors' margins or we will have to use subsidies.

That does not mean that we can achieve stabilization by subsidies alone, without firm price and wage policies, adequate fiscal measures, and positive programs to assure that adequate supplies of essentials at legitimate prices will be available in the legitimate markets.

But the experience of other countries like Canada and England does demonstrate that limited subsidies can and must be effectively used as a key weapon to control inflation.

The alternative to such action would be more costly to the Treasury and to the people. If we do not take the course of action I have suggested, we shall be charged with having failed to stabilize the cost of living, as the act of October 2, 1942, directed us to do, and there will be increasing demands from the workers of the Nation for a drastic modification of the Little Steel formula.

If a 10-percent over-all increase in wages should occur as a consequence of our failure to stabilize living costs, that added cost of labor alone would cause an increase of not less than 4½ percent in the general level of prices. That would increase our annual war costs approximately $4,500,000,000. For we are spending one hundred billion per annum for war and every rise of 1 percent in the prices the Government pays, adds approximately one billion to the Government's war expenditures. I say approximately because some of the expenditures would not automatically be increased. A 10-percent wage increase would, moreover, increase the cost of living by at least 4½ percent and would cost consumers at least $4,000,000,000 a year.

And, what is more, if we should have to abandon the hold-the-line order and allow wages to rise we would have no assurance that we would be able to hold living costs stable even at a higher level. Rising costs would continue to press against the price and wage levels and these would be forced higher still. Rising wages would add to the excess purchasing power, and an enlarged inflationary gap would make the fiscal task of absorbing excess purchasing power by higher taxes and enforced savings unmanageable. Those with meager wages and small fixed incomes would be ground below the margin of fair subsistence.

I need not tell the Congress the devastation which will be wrought, far and wide, on the farmer, the worker, and the businessman, if the fires of inflation ever get out of control. The farmers will never forget the deflation following the last war and the sufferings they then endured.

To protect the farmer it is not necessary to oppress the consumer. The way to protect the farmer is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the farmer what he should get for his products and to sell those products at a loss if need be to keep the cost of living down. That may be a subsidy, but that is the only way to avoid inflation which will be ruinous to farmer and consumer alike. If we prohibit subsidies and allow the cost of living to rise, as this bill does, whatever support prices we make to the farmer will be nullified by the inflation of all prices and all costs.

I have just been informed that the preliminary figures indicate that between May 15 and June 15 there was a decrease of 1 percent in food prices. This is the first decline in the food price index in more than a year. This bill would wipe out that decline and start anew a rise in the cost of living. I cannot by signing it share the responsibility for that rise and its disastrous consequences.

Those in command of our war economy like those in command of our armies must be endowed with adequate authority to meet emergency situations as they arise.

Subsidies to help hold down living costs and at the same time protect the farmer should be applied only in strictly limited and clearly defined circumstances. Such subsidies should be confined to goods essential to the maintenance of a reasonable wartime standard of living for the people. Wherever the grant of subsidies at flat rates would involve gross windfall profits for low-cost producers, processors, or distributors, they should be granted on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers.

I do not intend to permit farm prices and farm incomes to be depressed. Today the aggregate net income of farmers like that of the workers is larger than ever before. As a result of my recommendation of September 7, 1942, that a floor be established for farm prices, Congress by the act of October 2, 1942, guaranteed to farmers 90 percent of parity on most farm products during the war and for at least 2 crop years thereafter—a guaranty given to no other group. If further payments to farmers are necessary to enable them to make the added outlays required to increase the production of war crops, those payments should and will be made.

But unless the Congress leaves with the executive branch the means of seeing to it that further increases in producers' prices do not increase the cost of living, the executive branch cannot accept responsibility for holding the wage line or for stopping the inflationary spiral.

If I am to hold the line, my hands must be left reasonably free to hold it even-handedly.

In this task of saving our free economy, Congress and the Executive must work together, as a team. H. R. 2869 marks a definite retreat from economic stability toward uncontrolled inflation. That retreat cannot be made with my approval.

I sincerely hope that if the Congress cannot agree before its recess on legislation which will remove the serious defects in this bill, it will pass a joint resolution continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and providing the increase in borrowing power until the Congress has time to agree upon an appropriate measure. The officials of the executive departments will welcome an opportunity to furnish information and be of assistance.

I return the bill without my signature.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to enter into an extended discussion of the matter before the House. Let me say that any layman or lawyer who will read section 2 of the first price-control bill will readily understand that the purpose of that section was to authorize the Price Administrator to pay subsidies or to buy and sell, use, and store commodities for one purpose—and one purpose only—to secure an adequate supply of commodities for the war program. It was not the intention of Congress—I think I speak for those who are responsible for the legislation—that that section should be used as it has been used or for the purpose of preventing inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to pursue this discussion further. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] that the message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What will be the situation with respect to the veto message if this motion does not carry?

The SPEAKER. If the motion is rejected, the question will then be on whether or not the House will on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 200, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—184

Abernethy	Gore	O'Toole
Allen, La.	Gorski	Outland
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gossett	Pace
	Granger	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Patton
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Hagen	Peterson, Ga.
Bloom	Hare	Pfeifer
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Poage
Boykin	Harris, Ark.	Price
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Va.	Priest
Brooks	Hart	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Ramspeck
Bryson	Heffernan	Randolph
Buckley	Hendricks	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Richards
Burch, Va.	Hoch	Rivers
Burchill, N. Y.	Jackson	Robertson
Burdick	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Calif.
Byrne		Rowan
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.		Sadowski
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer
Chapman	Kee	Satterfield
Clark	Kefauver	Scanlon
Coffee	Kelley	Schuetz
Colmer	Keogh	Sheppard
Cooley	Kerr	Sikes
Cooper	Kilday	Slaughter
Costello	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	LaFollette	Snyder
Cravens	Lane	Somers, N.Y.
Creal	Lanham	Sparkman
Crosser	Larcade	Spence
Cullen	Lea	Starnes, Ala.
Curley	Lemke	Steagall
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Sullivan
Davis	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Dawson	McCord	Tarver
Delaney	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Dickstein	McGranery	Thomason
Dies	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Dilweg	McMurray	Voorhis, Calif.
Dingell	Madden	Walter
Domengeaux	Magnuson	Ward
Doughton	Mahon	Wasielewski
Durham	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Eberharter		Weiss
Elliott	Marcantonio	Welch
Ellison, Md.	May	Wene
Feighan	Mills	Whelchel, Ga.
Fernandez	Monroney	White
Fisher	Murdock	Whitten
Flannagan	Murphy	Whittington
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Folger	Myers	Winstead
Forand	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Fulbright	Norrell	Worley
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gibson	O'Connor	Zimmerman
Gordon	O'Neal	

NAYS—200

Allen, Ill.	Gilchrist	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Miller, Pa.
	Gillie	Monkiewicz
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Morrison, La.
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Mott
	Grant, Ind.	Mruk
Andrews	Griffiths	Mundt
Angell	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Arends	Gwynne	Newsome
Arnold	Hale	Norman
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.		O'Konski
Barrett	Halleck	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Hancock	Pittenger
Beall	Hartley	Ploeser
Bell	Heidinger	Poulson
Bender	Herter	Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Ramey
Bennett, Mo.	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bland	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Boren	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Brehm	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Howell	Rohrbough
Busbey	Hull	Rolph
Butler	Jeffrey	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jenkins	Schiffler
Cannon, Mo.	Jennings	Schwabe
Carlson, Kans.	Jensen	Scott
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Anton J.	Short
Carter		Simpson, Ill.
Case	Johnson, Calvin D.	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth		Smith, Maine
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Church	Johnson, J. Leroy	Smith, Wis.
Clason		Springer
Clevenger	Jones	Stanley
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Stearns, N. H.
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Stefan
Compton	Kean	Stewart
Crawford	Kearney	Stockman
Cunningham	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Kinzer	Sundstrom
Day	Kleberg	Taber
Dewey	Knutson	Talbot
Dirksen	Kunkel	Talle
Disney	Lambertson	Taylor
Ditter	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	LeCompte	Tibbott
Douglas	LeFevre	Towe
Dworshak	Lewis	Troutman
Eaton	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	McCowen	Vursell
Ellsworth	McGehee	Wadsworth
Elmer	McGregor	Weichel, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	McKenzie	West
Engel	McLean	Wheat
Fellows	McWilliams	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Maas	Willey
Fish	Manasco	Wilson
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Wolcott
Gathings	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gavin	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—47

Barden	Harness, Ind.	O'Leary
Barry	Hébert	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Plumley
Capozzoli	Izac	Pracht
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Culkin	Kennedy	Rowe
Drewry	Kilburn	Russell
Fay	King	Shafer
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Sheridan
Ford	Maloney	Stevenson
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Furlong	Mason	Treadway
Gallagher	Merritt	Van Zandt
Gifford	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Green	Norton	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.	
	O'Hara	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Pracht against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Ward Johnson against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. COX changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this measure has had as thorough study by the Congress as any measure coming within my knowledge in recent times. It was approved by the House, and by the Senate, and, after long study, in conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman from Alabama the right to address the House; and if so, has anyone else the right to have the same amount of time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized and controls 1 hour. He is privileged to move the previous question at any time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the wishes of the House, and to the votes in the House, and in the interest of expediency, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 154, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—228

Abernethy	Beall	Canfield
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Cannon, Fla.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Cannon, Mo.
	Bennett, Mich.	Carlson, Kans.
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mo.	Carson, Ohio
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Case
	Blackney	Chenoweth
Andrews	Bolton	Chiperfield
Angell	Boren	Church
Arends	Boykin	Clason
Arnold	Brehm	Clevenger
Auchincloss	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Baldwin, N.Y.	Buffett	Colmer
Barrett	Busbey	Compton
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Costello

Cox	Jeffrey	Ploeser
Crawford	Jenkins	Poage
Cunningham	Jennings	Poulson
Curtis	Jensen	Ramey
Day	Johnson,	Rankin
Dewey	Anton J.	Reece, Tenn.
Dirksen	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Disney	Calvin D.	Reed, N. Y.
Ditter	Johnson, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Domengeaux	Johnson,	Rizley
Dondero	J. Leroy	Rockwell
Douglas	Johnson,	Rodgers, Pa.
Dworshak	Luther A.	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Jones	Rohrbough
Elliott	Jonkman	Rolph
Ellis	Judd	Sauthoff
Ellsworth	Kean	Schiffler
Elmer	Kearney	Schwabe
Elston, Ohio	Keefe	Scott
Engel	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Fellows	Kinzer	Simpson, Pa.
Fenton	Kleberg	Slaughter
Fernandez	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Fish	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Fisher	LaFollette	Smith, Wis.
Gale	Lambertson	Springer
Gamble	Landis	Stanley
Gathings	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Gavin	Lea	Steagall
Gearhart	LeCompte	Stearns, N. H.
Gerlach	Lemke	Stefan
Gilchrist	Lewis	Stewart
Gillette	Luce	Stockman
Gillie	McCowen	Sumner, Ill.
Goodwin	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Gossett	McGregor	Sundstrom
Graham	McKenzie	Taber
Grant, Ala.	McLean	Talbot
Grant, Ind.	McWilliams	Talle
Griffiths	Maas	Taylor
Gross	Manasco	Thomas, N. J.
Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Towe
Hale	Merrow	Troutman
Hall,	Michener	Vorys, Ohio
Leonard W.	Miller, Mo.	Vursell
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Wadsworth
Hancock	Miller Pa.	Welchel, Ohio
Hartley	Mills	West
Heidinger	Monkiewicz	Wheat
Herter	Morrison, La.	Whelchel, Ga.
Hess	Mott	Whitten
Hill	Mruk	Whittington
Hinshaw	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Hoeven	Murray, Wis.	Willey
Hoffman	Newsome	Wilson
Holmes, Mass.	Norman	Winstead
Holmes, Wash.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Hope	O'Connor	Wolcott
Horan	O'Konski	Wolfenden, Pa.
Howell	Peterson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hull	Philbin	
Jarman	Pittenger	

NAYS—154

Allen, La.	Dilweg	Kirwan
Anderson,	Dingell	Klein
N. Mex.	Doughton	Lane
Bates, Ky.	Durham	Larcade
Beckworth	Eberharter	Ludlow
Bland	Ellison, Md.	Lynch
Bloom	Feighan	McCord
Bonner	Flannagan	McCormack
Bradley, Pa.	Fogarty	McGranery
Brooks	Folger	McMillan
Bryson	Forand	McMurray
Buckley	Fulbright	Madden
Bulwinkle	Gavagan	Magnuson
Burch, Va.	Gibson	Mahon
Burchill, N. Y.	Gordon	Mansfield,
Burdick	Gore	Mont.
Burgin	Gorski	Marcantonio
Byrne	Granger	May
Camp	Gregory	Miller, Conn.
Carter	Hare	Monroney
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Chapman	Harris, Ark.	Murphy
Clark	Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.
Coffee	Hart	Myers
Cooley	Hays	Nichols
Cooper	Heffernan	Norrell
Courtney	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Cravens	Hobbs	O'Neal
Creal	Hoch	O'Toole
Crosser	Jackson	Outland
Cullen	Johnson,	Pace
Curley	Lyndon B.	Patman
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Patton
Davis	Kee	Peterson, Fla.
Dawson	Kefauver	Pfeifer
Delaney	Kelley	Powers
Dickstein	Keogh	Price
Dies	Kerr	Priest
Rabaut	Sheppard	Ward
Ramspeck	Sikes	Wesielewski
Randolph	Smith, Va.	Weaver
Richards	Smith, W. Va.	Weiss
Rivers	Snyder	Welch
Robertson	Somers, N. Y.	Wene
Robinson, Utah	Sparkman	White
Rogers, Calif.	Spence	Wickersham
Rowan	Sullivan	Wolverton, N. J.
Sabath	Tarver	Woodrum, Va.
Sadowski	Thomas, Tex.	Worley
Sasscer	Thomason	Wright
Satterfield	Vincent, Ky.	Zimmerman
Scanlon	Voorhis, Calif.	
Schuetz	Walter	

NOT VOTING—49

Barden	Harness, Ind.	O'Hara
Barry	Hébert	O'Leary
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Phillips
Capozzoli	Izac	Plumley
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Pracht
Culkin	Kennedy	Robsion, Ky.
Drewry	Kilburn	Rowe
Fay	King	Russell
Fitzpatrick	LeFevre	Shafer
Ford	Lesinski	Sheridan
Fulmer	Maloney	Short
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	Stevenson
Gallagher	Mason	Tolan
Gifford	Merritt	Treadway
Green	Morrison, N. C.	Van Zandt
Hall,	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Short and Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Plumley for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Phillips and Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Kilburn and Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Pracht and Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan and Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Merritt against.

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. FISHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. McGEHEE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill together with the accompanying papers is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered printed, and the Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment No. 61 to said bill.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration is an item that originally had a Budget estimate of $150,000 when we brought the Interior bill into the House on May 20 this year. In the meantime a supplemental estimate of $150,000 was furnished, which the House did not have before it to consider. Now the Budget estimate for this item is $300,000. The Senate allowed this Budget estimate and $2,450,000 for good measure, or eight times more than the Budget estimate. I say without fear of contradiction that the Bureau of Mines never had a better friend than this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. There was never any division of objective throughout the consideration of this bill on any item. The entire subcommittee on both sides of the aisle had only one objective before them, and that was, How could we help with funds absolutely necessary to carry on the war effort, and uphold the Army, Navy, and marines with the necessary tools and equipment to do the job, and fulfill the requirements for food for victory?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I have only 3 minutes. There is a Budget estimate of $300,000. Your conferees have measured and will approach the differences between the House and the Senate with a constructive point of view to meet the demand of the war on the home and battle fronts. I want to say that I stand ready and willing to raise my sights above the Budget estimate. I yield to no man as far as being economy-minded is concerned, and the desire to save money.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I cannot yield. I do not intend to be parsimonious with what the Bureau of Mines needs. I think we should have orderly procedure. I am willing to go considerably above the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget. I think, however, that we should set an amount that they can spend wisely and judiciously in connection with all of the other Bureau of

Mines items which will demand their manpower, effort, and resources. With this approach that I, as one of the most economy-minded men on the committee, am willing to give them, I am sure the House will trust this subcommittee, a friend of the Bureau of Mines, to do an adequate job in conferring with Senate conferees to reach a satisfactory conclusion on this amendment that will help to win the war and feed our Army, Navy, Marines, and our people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the observations of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], and I am sorry that I disagree with his viewpoint in connection with the proposal offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I ask him, and I wish he would answer this question, What is the worth-while program in connection with the production and development of strategic materials, which the Bureau of Mines or the Federal Government could accomplish with something less than $150,000?

What effective exploration for critical minerals could be developed? I believe it would be so meager as to be absolutely nullified from the standpoint of valuable results.

I call attention of the House to the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 88, page A3182, in which I set forth the picture as I saw it from the standpoint of the 18 strategic or critical war materials, which are found in the United States. I believe the Members from the various States might be interested in these deposits and their locations.

The State of California has 9 of these strategic or critical materials; the State of Nevada has 6 of these needed minerals; North Carolina has 6; Arizona, 7; Virginia, 5; Colorado, 5; New York, 4; Idaho, 4; Montana, 3; Tennessee, 3; Utah, 3; Oregon, 3; New Mexico, 3; Arkansas, 3; Maryland, 3; Ohio, 2; Illinois, 2; Washington, 2; Georgia, 2; New Hampshire, 2; South Dakota, 2; Maine, 2. In the States of Nebraska, Vermont, Minnesota, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Wyoming, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Alabama, Massachusetts, West Virginia, Texas, Connecticut, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Missouri there is at least one of these strategic materials which we need to explore and possibly develop.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] did not reply to my query as to what sort of development or production program, taking the over-all picture of the United States as a whole, could be soundly gone into with the insufficient fund of less than $150,000. I believe that he feels we must do the task on a much more expanded scale.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], if the gentleman from West Virginia will permit, if when this $149,000 was agreed upon by the House committee it was not the intention at that time to conduct a very limited investigation on western steel production, and if the House committee has not agreed to strike out the word "western" and to extend the investigation throughout the country, but at the same time has refused to provide adequate funds to do the job?

Mr. JONES. When the House had it there was only a Budget estimate of $150,000. Since that time a supplementary estimate for $150,000 came up since the hearing and since we considered it on the floor. So that we did not have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is a fact that the broader program, calling for $750,000, has never been submitted to the Budget.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; $150,000 was submitted to the Budget and allowed.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about $2,750,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully decline to yield for further colloquy between the two gentlemen.

The geologists have found deposits of 18 critical and strategic minerals within the continental limits of the United States, as follows:

Aluminum: New York, Tennessee, and North Carolina.

Antimony: Idaho, California, Nebraska.

Asbestos: Vermont, Arizona, Maryland.

Cadmium: Byproduct of zinc. Produced in plants of Colorado, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Montana, Maryland, Ohio, Oklahoma, Idaho, New Jersey, Utah.

Cryolite: Ivigtut, Greenland.

Chromium: California, Oregon, Montana, Washington, Wyoming; also Kenai Peninsula in Alaska.

Fluorspar: Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado.

Graphite: New York, Nevada, Rhode Island, Georgia.

Iodine: California.

Manganese: Low grade, Alabama, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico; high grade, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia.

Mercury: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Texas.

Mica: North Carolina, New Hampshire, Connecticut, South Dakota, Maine, Virginia, New York.

Nickel: Colorado, North Carolina, Nevada.

Platinum: California, Oregon, also Alaska.

Quartz crystal: New Hampshire, Arizona, California, North Carolina, Virginia, Maine, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Tennessee.

Tin: South Dakota, New Mexico, Virginia, North Carolina.

Titanium: Virginia, Arkansas, California.

Tungsten: Nevada, Arkansas, California.

Vanadium: Arizona, Colorado, Utah.

One of the sad commentaries on our preparation of America for the world struggle in which we are now engaged, was the fact that we had failed to develop a synthetic process for making rubber and gasoline and these other substitutes which we find we should have furthered in order to more successfully prosecute the war on the home front, as well as the fighting zones. Money spent on research is well spent and excellent dividends are paid, far beyond the extent involved in the initial money. Eventually Germany will be the loser in this conflict, but we find her advanced in some items over the United States in the fashion in which she has processed gasoline and rubber and other materials. Necessity caused her to dig deep. Perhaps we thought our abundance would always take care of our needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] such time as he may desire.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith an excerpt from the testimony of James A. Emory before the Ways and Means Committee on the Bituminous Coal Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion made by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] primarily because I am hopeful that by a survey of this character, which cannot be adequate unless the gentleman's motion is adopted, there may be additional information secured about the extent of mineral deposits, notably of iron ore deposits throughout the country.

It was only a few weeks ago that Mr. Batchelder, of the War Production Board, told the Open Hearth Association that there never would be enough steel to meet our war needs. Every claimant agency has been cut about 30 percent under its own estimate of its requirements as far as the consumption of steel is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is going to anticipate some of the things I am about to say if I have time.

Mr. JENSEN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he does not realize that no matter how much we appropriated, even if we appropriated a billion dollars, it would not help the situation any if they did not take the lid off——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I heard what the gentleman said earlier in the day, and I think he is quite right. I think my remarks will bolster his position if I can go ahead.

The job that we have to do—and when I say "we" I mean the Congress, the War Production Board, and everybody else—is first to produce enough steel to win

the war. Second, and only second, to worry about how it is going to be distributed afterward.

I am fearful, however, that certain counsels have prevailed within the W. P. B. which have put first concern on the possibility of an excess of post-war capacity of production in this country instead of on the maximum production at the present time when it is so desperately needed.

We ought not to have to reduce the demands for steel for agriculture or the Army or the Navy if it is possible to get a supply large enough to meet these demands. I believe it can be made possible. Personally, I believe that the possibility of production is much more and that we could achieve a much larger production than has heretofore appeared.

There has been insistent and stubborn resistance, in my judgment, to the expansion and output of raw materials in the metals field, and notably in steel. I believe the basic reason for this steel shortage is the failure to expand and decentralize the steel industry as much as it could be done. We have gone along feeling that the collection of scrap would meet the demands for making of steel. I hope it will. But the industry at present can only use high-grade scrap, and it is a question whether the supply will be enough.

Now, sponge iron can be made, and I am not talking as a metallurgist now, but it is a proven fact that it can be made from low-grade iron ore, and it can be used on a tremendous scale under the Anderson process, and is being used right now by our enemy, Japan, at this moment, which has a huge plant in Manchuria turning out a million tons of steel per year by the use of sponge iron. Sponge iron is a substitute for scrap.

Some time ago, before Pearl Harbor, we were told that we did not need a capacity in this country of more than 90,000,000 tons. This was in the Gano Dunn report. But soon after Pearl Harbor the War Production Board came along and said that we needed an additional 10,000,000-ton capacity, and we were going to get it over a 2-, 3-, or 4-year period. On July 24, 1942, the steel branch of the War Production Board came out and said they had underestimated and that we would need still more capacity. But we just do not have it. The key to the situation, in my judgment, is to put an end to the resistance to expansion of the sponge-iron industry and to expansion of steel production therefrom. The sponge-iron industry can go ahead and develop and produce throughout peacetime, and if it did it would mean the decentralization of the steel industry, which would go into many parts of this country, especially the west coast. That is not what the Steel Trust wants. But it would be a very good thing for the United States. In our Pacific coast section of the country we should have had a steel industry developed years ago and would have but for the opposition of entrenched interests.

Now just to summarize: There is grave danger of at least a shortage of scrap; the Mesabi Range iron is not going to last forever; sponge iron can be substituted for scrap, and by this process low-grade ores can be used. There has been opposition to expansion of steel production, which might be partially removed at least by a survey of how much can be provided by the use of low-grade iron-ore deposits which exist in many parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much the motion will prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of the Senate amendments, on the basis of our committee investigation into the steel-shortage situation of which I have the honor to be chairman.

For the past 10 months we have been investigating several phases of this tremendous situation. Our work at this point has only begun. Facts of great importance, however, have already been brought to light. This information was summarized in our interim report to this Congress on December 16, 1942, from which I quote:

> Your committee has found that the supply of steel is woefully short of the requirements, as set forth each month by the service agencies (i. e., the Maritime Shipbuilding, the Navy, and the War Department). Notwithstanding the many drastic War Production Board limitation orders issued since Pearl Harbor—each of which prohibit the use of steel in the manufacture of hundreds of items—the shortage still persists.
>
> The magnitude of this shortage is so serious that any public statement of actual figures is impossible at this time, for such information would be of real aid to the enemy.
>
> During the 6 months of your inquiry the supply has never come even close to meeting the demand for steel, as indicated by the requirements which the service agencies set forth is necessary for their monthly production needs.
>
> Instead, all three service agencies are regularly compelled to curtail their schedules and war production and to pare down their requirements figure to the total amount of steel which the steel mills are producing.

Recently the War Production Board has come forth in published statements which reveal in tons the magnitude of the shortage under which our war-production effort must labor. I refer to the W. P. B. release No. 76104, printed in the RECORD just yesterday by my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. This release clearly indicates that for the third quarter these agencies requested 21,000,000 tons. The industry, however, is capable of turning out but 15,000,000 tons. What that means on an annual basis is a shortage above 20,000,000 tons. This shortage of steel is at present being distributed over each of the agencies, so that each must be "cut back." Each is compelled to carry on its production effort with less steel than it requires; for example, the W. P. B. states:

First. The War Department for July, August, and September of this year will have to be cut back 14 percent.

Second. The Navy Department during the same period is cut back 20 percent.

Third. Maritime shipbuilding is cut back 22 percent.

Fourth. Lend-Lease Administration requests are cut back 32 percent.

Fifth. Office of Defense Transportation requests, 40 percent.

I am not able to confirm yesterday's report that the over-all allowance for farm machinery will be 20 percent under the 1940–41 level.

To date, the Axis has set no date for the ending of this war. The United Nations intend carrying on for an unconditional surrender. High-ranking officials indicate we are in for a long war and that there is no ground for the current optimistic talk about being in a comfortable position. In fact, we should have been stock-piling this basic metal 5 and 6 years ago, when the steel furnaces were operating at 50 percent of capacity.

As there is no telling how long the war will last, or what form our changing military strategy will take, our committee members would rather play safe. We see no basis for the overconfidence that grows from inspired publicity.

Fortunately there is good iron ore in 26 States of the Union. But in the last two decades the small independent iron and steel producing companies have been crowded out of business, and the mines have closed down. From time to time some independent fellow has proposed to build a small plant to exploit local ores. But then he has found himself up against this situation; if he is to borrow money and attract investment he has to have at his command an assured supply of ore of a certain quality that will last for 20 to 40 years. He needs to be certain that he has selected a site for operations where adequate supply is accessible.

Satisfactory and complete information, such as cautious investors require, is hard to get. The bigger companies already have this valuable information but they are keeping it under their hats. What is needed is responsible and complete data on available tonnage and complete analyses of quality made by impartial engineers and freely available to all who may require it.

Only the Government is in a position to provide this information. The United States Bureau of Mines has some experience in doing this iron exploration work, and it can contract out as much of it as may be necessary to accomplish the work expeditiously.

If small plants set up for use during the war are to be of long-term value in the years of peace to come they will need beforehand the best information that can be given by impartial experts. First know you are right, then go ahead—that is a motto that fits this situation. And we want to be in a position to go ahead good and strong on this proposition.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama advise us how much he feels is necessary in order to carry out his recommendation?

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we need exactly what the Senate has already approved, $2,750,000. The Senate voted for that amount. Governors,

Departments of Conservation, and other bodies and officials concerned with developing these resources in the 26 states, have requested this help. and I think all the Congressmen and Senators, from these 26 states favor it. And we have had about 8 or 10 governors up here who have told us that they could get the investigation under way, and that they could get private capital to develop the wonderful resources of these states as a part of our entire war effort.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Would it be possible to make the investigation in all of the States?

Mr. BOYKIN. They can commence in all of the States where they have this low-grade iron ore. There is low-grade iron ore in all of the 26 States which we are satisfied is much better than the ore Japan has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak the sentiment, not only of every member of this subcommittee, but every Member of the House of Representatives, when I say that we appreciate the very fine, sacrificial, tireless efforts that the gentleman from Alabama and his committee investigating the steel situation have put forth and the service they have rendered.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me add further that this committee is also interested in the subject matter that he is discussing. I might say, and I hope that the Members will forgive me if I am revealing any secrets, that the subcommittee agreed to go considerably higher than the Budget estimate during its conference with the Senate conferees. Would the gentleman from Alabama be willing to leave the matter to this subcommittee to see if we cannot work out a satisfactory arrangement with them?

Mr. BOYKIN. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma advise us what kind of an arrangement they may be able to work out?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course. I cannot commit the conferees.

Mr. BOYKIN. I have every confidence in the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Every member of the committee is tremendously interested in this matter and I hope the gentleman will prevail upon the gentleman from North Carolina to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees might be guided by the advice of the Director of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BOYKIN. I certainly do; and I believe we should have this full amount.

Mr. COOLEY. The Bureau of Mines has considered this particular program, which was worked out by the Steel Investigating Committee, and they agree with this Committee's findings and recommendations. The Bureau thinks this money is needed.

Mr. BOYKIN. The amendments before us today will make it possible to increase greatly our iron and steel production. For in at least 26 States there will be reliable surveys by subsurface drillings, prosecuted by money appropriated to the Bureau of Mines. This money is to be expended, however, in close cooperation with the respective States, whose officials may be more thoroughly familiar with these properties and in a position to obtain the maximum local cooperation.

And your committee, which is pledged to continue its efforts to get more steel, will keep in touch with Members whose districts are concerned. It will act in a liaison capacity to see that this work is done expeditiously and in the cooperative manner intended by the Congress.

These amendments are not the cure-all—this is only a beginning. It is a step in the right direction. It is the first step that must be made. It will provide a reliable stock pile of information on our most essential metal, iron and steel, the master metal of war and peacetime.

I hope the Members will vote to give us the full amount.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, a neighbor of mine, for any reasonable request.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the expiration of the other special orders heretofore entered, I may be privileged to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within a very few moments I hope to move the previous question. I believe one other Member has asked for brief time to speak. I think, however, I should make a brief statement before I yield to him.

As the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee, stated when this bill first came to the House committee there was a Budget estimate for $150,000. The Bureau of Mines did not ask this committee for $1,250,000 or for $2,750,000, or for $300,000 which is now the Budget estimate; the Bureau of Mines asked our committee for $150,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot for the time being. After I complete my statement I will yield.

If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, complained to the Bureau of Mines because they had not asked for sufficient funds for this work. There was a considerable discussion and some of it was off the record, but the hearings will disclose that we were complaining and even intimating that a supplemental Budget estimate should be obtained. The Members who have addressed this body have been very kind and said generally that we have been interested and fair, but some have seemed to feel that we have been very, very "tight" with reference to the Bureau of Mines and with reference to other items. I did not take any exception to the statement of my dear friend from North Carolina that I am one of the "tightest" Members of this House; I took it as a compliment.

Mr. COOLEY. I intended to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. As far as the Bureau of Mines is concerned, however, let me say that this committee has probably offered to go further above the Budget estimate than on any other item in the bill. As I say, a supplemental estimate was requested and we finally got a supplemental estimate not for $2,750,000 but for another $150,000, and the committee was willing to give the Bureau of Mines more than they asked for. We believed it was important.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman's committee objected to the failure of the Bureau of Mines to seek an amount which, in his judgment, was adequate, why is he complaining now and not attempting to secure this larger amount?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, I am not complaining now at all; I want to tell the gentleman that the committee did give the Bureau of Mines substantially what it asked for. This was one of the very few items that our committee did not cut substantially below the Budget estimates. After 6 weeks of hearings your subcommittee was able to bring this bill in here nearly $10,000,000 below Budget estimates and about $60,000,000 below what it took to operate the department for the current year. You approved that overwhelmingly and passed this bill without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," within less time than any Interior Department bill has ever been passed in this House or in the history of the Congress; so the committee felt that you approved its action in trying to economize on these matters. Then the bill went to the Senate, and the supplemental estimate arrived in the Senate, and they increased the Budget estimate to $2,750,000. Then we had a conference with the Senate, and, as was indicated a while ago, the committee has been anxious to agree on a sum substantially higher than the amount of both Budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think we ought to compromise an impor-

tant proposition like this, and does not the gentleman think that we ought to follow the feelings of the Bureau of Mines? Here is a letter from Mr. Sayre, which has not been read into the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman had considerable time; I do not know why he has not read it into the RECORD. He has my permission to put it into the RECORD now.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to call it to the attention of the House. They mention the figure here $2,450,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But that is not the figure they mentioned when talked to this committee across the table.

Mr. COOLEY. That is dated June 10.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That was afterward.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is impugning the motives of the Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not impugning anything. I am telling you that we had 6 weeks of hearings and we indicated to the Bureau of Mines that they should ask for more money if it was necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask one other question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that at that time the Bureau of Mines had intended to make an investigation only in one section of the country, out in the western section?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is hardly a fair statement. We have not stricken out anything. We simply ask for permission to go back to conference and reach an agreement there. Again I say to the House, Are you going to stand by this committee and give us an opportunity to go back and work out a fair and reasonable agreement with the Senate or are you going to repudiate this committee and say, after all of the hearings, that we do not know anything about what the situation is? We do not claim to have all the information but we do have some information, and I think we are entitled to work out a compromise with the Senate conferees.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this opportunity to go by without paying my tribute to the eminent fairness of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to bring his attention to one matter and I think he will agree with me upon this: The United States Bureau of Mines for many, many years studied the necessity for finding ways in which coal could be used to manufacture gasoline. They went at it step by step, then all at once, within the last few months, they have seen the necessity for a great program of this type. I think that is what the gentleman from North Carolina is attempting to bring out here, that is, that piece-meal the figures the gentleman uses are correct as of June 10 of this year. That is the early picture, but they come in with this new estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This House hopes to recess some of these days. Some say it might be about the evening of July 10. I hope that is correct. Of course, the events of the day may move that up by 2, 3, or 4 weeks, I do not know, but in case this House does takes a recess until September, we will be back here then. The Deficiency Committee of this Congress that meets nearly every day in the year and has met nearly every day since a year ago last September is in session and I have found that the Bureau of Mines, the Members of Congress and others, know the way to the Deficiency Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee and I think I know the feeling of the committee about this important matter. If this is not sufficient to take care of the situation the Bureau of Mines will know a lot more definitely about it by September, they will be back here and they will be asking maybe for more than the amount you are asking for now, and if they can show it is for the war effort you know they will get every dollar for which they ask.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assume that the gentleman believes this is a worth-while program?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I certainly do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the committee does?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; or else we would not have asked for a supplemental estimate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why not agree with the Senate and get it over with? If it is not worth while we ought to cut it out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say there are $55,000,000 worth of worthwhile projects in this bill, every dollar of which, in my judgment, would be a worth-while proposition in any kind of a program, especially a post-war program; but this committee is unwilling to go along on $55,000,000 added to the Senate in this bill simply because it may be desirable. I can think of some worthwhile projects in my district and they have to do with the war effort. I have had telephone calls from my own State complaining bitterly about some of the items in this bill. They charge this committee with being "tight."

I am simply trying to do my duty as I see it toward the war effort. I have voted for every dollar for the war effort, but, as to other appropriations, we have to be a little more careful in trying to stay within the Budget estimates. That is not possible perhaps, and the gentleman knows this is about the only item in this bill that the committee has indicated a willingness to go over the Budget estimate. I call on the members of my committee to say whether that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we were asking the gentleman to fight the Senate on this matter, that would be another story, but here is a majority of the House telling the gentleman what the Senate says is O. K. That ought to settle it all the quicker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman assumes this is a majority of the House, then the gentlemen is correct, but if the gentleman will remember, there was another item yesterday and I was told that 90 percent of the Members of the House were for it, but when the vote was taken the House stood by the committee 3 to 1 and I feel, perhaps, the House may do the same thing on this amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. The first estimate made to the gentleman's committee by the Bureau of Mines the gentleman said was $150,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. KELLEY. That was not to embrace all of the exploratory work that was to be done in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. There are other items in this bill, of course, for the Bureau of Mines to make investigations with reference to other strategic metals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended, as of June 30, 1943, by striking out "June 30, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1943."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$2,650,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,150,000,000."

SEC. 3. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SEC. 4. Section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase."

SEC. 5. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has read an uncorrected copy of the joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent to modify the joint resolution by

striking out "$3,150,000,000" in line 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Andrews	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Barry	Hartley	Powers
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Pracht
Burch, Va.	Holifield	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Izac	Rowe
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Russell
Culkin	Kennedy	Shafer
Elmer	Kilburn	Sheridan
Fay	King	Simpson, Pa.
Fernandez	Lesinski	Slaughter
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Stevenson
Fulbright	Mason	Tolan
Fulmer	Merritt	Treadway
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Murphy	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Nichols	West
Green	O'Brien, Ill.	
Gwynne	O'Hara	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary	
	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the 1st of January 1944. There is nothing in the joint resolution to which the Executive's objection was directed. There is no objection on the part of the Committee on Banking and Currency to the consideration of this proposed legislation. The provisions of this joint resolution represent the unanimous views of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with only one exception.

The amount of authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation is increased $350,000,000. It is $150,000,000 less than was provided in the House bill. The amount was raised to $1,000,000,000 in the Senate and the amount agreed upon in conference was $750,000,000.

The resolution embraces two minor amendments to the Federal Reserve Act, as to which there is no objection whatever in the committee, and it is acceptable to the Federal Reserve officials.

Another provision of the resolution was taken from the original House bill and provides that any services rendered by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Lend-Lease Administration or to other Government agencies shall be conducted without loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that the Corporation shall be reimbursed for all funds expended, for the cost of administration and other expenses.

The resolution is a simple plan to take care of the situation that arises by reason of the action on the legislation which was dealt with this afternoon in connection with the message of the Chief Executive.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, needless to say I am somewhat reluctantly for this resolution, but I will say that under the circumstances it is the best thing we can do and the only just and equitable thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I realize it is necessary to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but may I ask the gentleman why it is necessary to extend it for 6 months when we shall be back here in less than 90 days?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that if we extend it until October 1 it would give us only perhaps 10 days after the recess to lay out a program for 1944. We are giving them the 6 months so that there will be ample opportunity after the 13th of September, when we are expected to be back here, to lay out a comprehensive program for the 1944 crop year.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman think this is the minimum time, then, that we are safe in making this extension?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I would think so. There is no particular harm in giving them that. The time is purely arbitrary. In the bill that was vetoed we had extended the time to 2 years. We cut this down to 6 months. It seems that that will allow them to carry out any program this year. We cannot stop it whether we like it or not. The bill has been vetoed and we have not overridden the veto, so under this joint resolution we cannot stop subsidies, to pay roll-backs, and reduce maximum prices. However, it is to be hoped that the President—and, of course, he will do as he said in his message—will not promulgate any extensive program along that line any more than is absolutely necessary to accomplish what he considers to be the purposes of the act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this resolution is passed, is there a possibility that the Commodity Credit Corporation or the administration can commit the country to billions of dollars of expenditures for 1944?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think under the language of the act there is nothing to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from committing the country to a program limited only by the availability of their funds. It was for that reason that we cut this amount down to $350,000,000 instead of giving them $750,000,000, which was in the original bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is as far as they can go?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe there is that much limitation in the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know how long the gentleman expects to speak on this proposition, but if he is about ready to quit I wish he would not quit until he goes into this a little more fully and explains it. There are many Members of the Congress who have not been able to follow this matter intelligently through its ramifications. It is a very important matter. We tried to override the President's veto on this matter. To me this has been one of the most intricate and controversial matters I have ever experienced in Congress. I think the gentleman in his own wise and sagacious way ought to take 2 or 3 minutes and tell us exactly what this does or does not do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, nothing can be gained by post mortems. Many of us regret very much that the President vetoed the bill. We regret also that we were unable to override the veto. But he did veto it and we did not override his veto and so we have brought back in this resolution all of the noncontroversial features of the bill which was reported out of the House committee, which is an extension of the time, but we extend the time only to December 31, 1943, instead of June 30, 1945, as was in the original bill.

The original bill provided for an increase in their loaning facilities of $750,000,000. Because we have shortened the period, we have cut the amount down to $350,000,000, making a total of $3,000,000,000 available to the Commodity Credit Corporation for all purposes.

The chairman has explained the other noncontroversial features. There is nothing in this bill which will prohibit the subsidizing of roll-backs or the maintenance of maximum prices by subsidies, because the President vetoed that prohibition and this House has sustained the veto. Of course, it would be simply folly for us to incorporate another prohibition against roll-backs and subsidies or maintaining prices, only to have it go to the White House and have it vetoed again. We, as legislators, have to be realistic, and the only reason I am going along with this resolution is because the Commodity Credit Corporation has got to continue to function. When the time ever comes that we stop the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we shall have to set some period for liquidation. At the present time they are doing hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of business every day, and they have total commitments on their books of $2,650,000,000. So it is not just

possible or practicable at this time to cut the head off of the Commodity Credit Corporation and run the chance of their having to liquidate, which might involve hundreds of thousands of dollars of losses to the Federal Government.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I would like the gentleman to explain why if this resolution is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, which is one-fourth of the period in the original bill, the funds are limited to $350,000,000 instead of one-quarter of the amount originally fixed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars was a compromise between the $1,000,000,000 that the Senate gave them and the $500,000,000 that the House gave them. One-fourth of that maximum would have been $250,000,000. Perhaps all you can say for the other $100,000,000 is that we threw it in for good measure.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. A vote against this resolution would deprive the country of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it would not stop inflation or roll-backs, because it would be possible to pursue this program with other funds. Is that not correct? I am talking about the effect of a negative vote of any Member. If a Member votes against the resolution he votes against the Commodity Credit Corporation and he does not vote to stop roll-backs or subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, because those functions under the present interpretation of existing law could be transferred to the War Food Administrator or the Office of Price Administration, and the roll-back program would continue.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the committee considered the possibility of placing any limitation whatsoever on the amount of this money which might be used in this roll-back food-subsidy program which appeals to many of us as being simply a scheme to charge this year's grocery bills to the taxpayers of future generations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have the gentleman's point in mind. We have to be very careful not to do anything which will result in another veto. It is hoped that somewhere along the line some restriction will be placed in the bill. I do not know where that will be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear on this resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without any restrictions whatever on the use of the funds appropriated to it for the payment of subsidies.

The whole program of subsidies is viciously inflationary. Every dollar used for the payment of subsidies is a dollar of inflation, for it represents just that much Government printed money. In proof of this, one needs but look at the enormous volume of dollars that is being created in the financing of Government costs through the deposit of Government securities in the banking system.

The effects of subsidies are deceptive. Outwardly they can give the appearance of holding the cost of living down. But this effect must inevitably be to raise prices, undermine the whole economy and drive our people into further regimentation.

I think it is a great mistake to rush this resolution through as is being done. Surely we could have taken enough time to at least try to write into this bill some restrictions on the payment of subsidies.

I too want to go home. I have a son who is about to leave for the service and am, therefore, very anxious to get home to be with him as much as possible before he leaves. But I consider this bill so very important that I am willing to forego this desire in just as great measure as possible in order to do what I believe to be my duty with respect to this bill.

This may well be a crumbling of the last line of defense against inflation, and I want the record to show that I have done all I possibly can to hold it.

I must vote against this resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, by a substantial majority in both Houses, extended the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and wrote into the bill an inhibition against roll-backs and the payment of subsidies out of the Public Treasury to pay the food bill, which is nothing but a dole and hand-out for millions of people who are receiving the highest wages and salaries ever paid in the history of any nation.

The bill as passed by the Congress adequately provided for support prices for farm products and for an adequate program for increased production of food and fiber products for our armed forces and our civilian population. This action of the President in vetoing the bill places the burden of paying for the food we eat on the taxpayers and the future taxpayers of this country. It means that our 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, many of whom are only receiving $50 per month, must pay the food bill when they come home, through increased taxation for those who are now working in defense plants and other branches of the Government and receiving wages in many instances of $100 per week and more.

It is encouraging that a vast majority of the Members of the House, by their votes, refused to be a party to passing this food bill on to future generations. It is extremely unfortunate however, that the Chief Executive yielded to the pressure of a few vociferous so-called leaders of organized labor from the industrial sections of the East, and the political patronage group who see in the subsidy program a chance to use the taxpayers' money to play politics and further their own political interests. It is unjust to the American farmer and the producer, and a gross injustice to the boys in the service and to their children who must pay the increased tax bill, for subsidies which may well amount to billions. The President and his advisers have refused to accept any limitations on the amount that may be expended under the subsidy program.

This resolution, which we are now about to vote on, becomes necessary because of the President's veto. Of course, it is necessary to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am hopeful that when the bill reaches the other body they will put a specific limitation in the resolution as to the amount that may be expended for subsidies, and that the resolution, if returned here with express limitations on the amount that may be expended, will receive the same courageous support of a vast majority of this House as was exhibited today in an effort to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the President's message little or nothing was said as to who will pay the taxes for the subsidy program. Every benefit which the country receives carries with it a responsibility, and somebody is going to have to pay the cost of this program. I recall that recently the President said that if he did not get his subsidy roll-back program, it would be the fault of the Congress, and that the resulting inflation would be the fault of the Congress. It looks as if he is going to get his subsidy and his roll-back program.

The people will get the taxes to pay for it from some place, and if the program then fails, and the hold-the-line policy trips on itself and turns out to be an inflation policy, it seems to me that the fault would then not be the fault of the Congress of the United States, but the fault of the President of the United States. He has asked for this program. He has asked for the power to impose subsidies and roll-backs. Subsidies will lead to more subsidies, and roll-backs to more roll-backs, and all of that will lead to greater and greater taxes that the public will pay. The responsibility is now on the President of the United States, as to whether the program succeeds or fails.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic waste of manpower and money is legalized theft. For the last several days the Congress has been working feverishly to pass the various appropriation bills, carrying deficiency funds for the fiscal year that ended at midnight last Wednesday, June 30, and new funds to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year. While I do not wish to detain the House,

I do not believe there will be a more appropriate time to consider the over-all picture of Federal receipts and expenditures. We have been so occupied with individual bills and individual items of appropriation that, understandably, we may fail to see the forest for the trees, so to speak.

Not all the appropriation bills having become law, and there having been so many changes, in the House, in the Senate and in conference committees, with respect to various items, it is impossible to say at the moment just how much money has been spent for the last fiscal year and how much has been appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year. We do know, however, that it is an astronomical sum, so large that I do not believe the Director of the Budget himself has a true mental grasp of the size, not even the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of our overworked Committee on Appropriations.

We also know that the expenditures exceed the receipts. The financial record of the past fiscal year will probably show that the total receipts will be around $21,000,000,000 and the expenditures close to $76,000,000,000. In other words, in spite of the heavy tax burden on the people, less than 30 percent of the cost of the Federal Government is defrayed by current revenue. Most of the expenditures come from borowings, which themselves represent an additional charge.

The American people are faced with still further increases in their Federal taxes. They recognize that war is costly. They recognize that all must contribute in accordance with his ability for early and complete victory. As in the beginning of our Republic the signers of the Declaration of Independence courageously pledged their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor" to freedom's cause, so today the American people pledge their all. There is not an American citizen, worthy of the name American, who is not willing to pay whatever taxes may be necessary to finance the war.

But, Mr. Speaker—and it is an important but—the American people have a right to insist that there be an elimination of waste, and they do insist. They insist that we, their representatives, eliminate all items of expenditure not essential. We cannot afford much more than that which can be clearly shown to be essential to the war effort. It is our duty to save every dollar that can be saved.

While some progress was made during these last several months for economies, there is indeed much to be done. For the first time in years there has been at least a beginning for eliminating nonessential spending. But it is only a beginning. In our consideration of the appropriation bills during these past few weeks it has been significant that many agencies and bureaus have resisted, in some instances successfully, the efforts of the House to eliminate them entirely or appreciably reduce their normal operations. They all claim activities essential to the war.

Whenever a so-called war agency requests a certain amount of money to carry on its work, we are naturally hesitant to deny that agency any part of the money it requests. There will be those who will accuse us of obstructing or hindering the war effort. We will be accused of "playing politics." However that may be, I am personally convinced that there should be a closer examination of the expenditures of the war agencies and that such examination will show many places where there can be a substantial saving of money, materials, time, and manpower. Surely it is recognized that an agency directly connected with the war effort and designed to serve a very useful purpose can become so large and so cumbersome that it proves to be a hindrance rather than a help.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] filed its report last month on the subject of "Federal personnel." I earnestly recommend a careful reading of this report by every Member of Congress. The facts presented in the report make it clear why those who have business to transact with the Federal Government find it so difficult to locate the party in authority and why there are so many Government employees who, upon the occasion of our visits to departments and agencies, seem to have so little to do.

On November 11, 1918, when the armistice of World War No. 1 was declared, the number of employees in the executive branch of the Government was 917,760. In April of this year the number was 3,008,519. I cannot believe, I simply do not believe, that there is such a great difference between this war and the last war that almost 4 times as many civilian employees are necessary in the executive branch of the Government. In the last war the ratio was 1 civilian Government employee to every 5 soldiers, but in this war the ratio is 1 to every 2½ soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, if the expansion of Federal employees continues as it has over the past year and a half, it will be no gross exaggeration to say that before the end of the war there will be more civilian Government employees than soldiers. It is an alarming situation, particularly considering the fact that workers are needed for the farms, in the factories and in so many occupations absolutely essential for the successful functioning of our national economic life.

The monthly pay roll of the executive branch of the Government approximates $600,000,000. In 1 year the American people pay over $7,000,000,000 in salaries alone to people serving in a civilian capacity in the various departments and agencies.

The more I think about these startling facts the deeper becomes my personal conviction that it would be a distinct contribution for early victory if a substantial number of these employees were removed from the Federal pay roll. Not only would it represent a saving in dollars; not only would it represent a saving in manpower; it would also serve to remove some of the duplications and red-tape now hindering the entire war effort.

To be a bit facetious, it would perhaps be helpful if instead of the standing Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers we substituted a standing Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Employees. I can assure you that the new committee would have considerably more work than the existing committee, with due respect to its distinguished members.

Some of you may recall that during my previous service in the House I protested on several occasions on this floor against the tendency of Federal employees to make extensive trips at Government expense, ostensibly on official business, but, in my judgment, for purely personal pleasure. I have also protested against abuses of the franking privilege. It is more or less characteristic of a bureaucrat not to have any concern whatsoever about expenses. We are today confronted with one of the largest, one of the most expensive, one of the most wasteful, and one of the most dangerous bureaucracies the world has ever seen.

Excluding the War and Navy Departments, the travel and communication expenditures of the executive branch for this past fiscal year has been estimated as exceeding $100,000,000. The average citizen finds it difficult to obtain train accommodations. He has been asked to refrain from traveling and is glad to do so, with the knowledge that in time of war our soldiers must and should have preference. The average citizen has also been asked not to make long-distance calls unless absolutely necessary. He has willingly responded to the appeal.

I shall not take the time of the House with details, but it is very significant that there have been increases in train expenses, telephone calls, airplane accommodations, telegrams, mail, and so forth, in agencies which are engaged in work strictly of a nonmilitary character and which, in many respects, have a very remote connection with the war itself.

There is one other feature of the existing Federal bureaucracy to which I should like to direct your attention, where not only can economies be realized but a real hindrance to the war effort removed. I refer to the numerous reports and questionnaires which the various agencies submit to businessmen, who are endeavoring to produce as rapidly as possible the materials needed by our armed forces and who are faced with a shortage of manpower. Literally thousands of men are diverted from their war production work to answering questionnaires which serve no useful purpose, except perhaps to satisfy the curiosity of some bureaucrat or perhaps to find something to keep himself occupied.

The Byrd committee report of last February shows that a total of 7,025 separate reports and questionnaires were required by 48 agencies to be answered, and this figure does not include the requests for further information that may be sent out by letter. The inquiry into

this matter has brought to light some interesting data.

One corporation has stated that it costs them approximately $90,000 a year just to file the Federal reports requested of them. The Eastman Kodak Co. employs 84 persons, 3,224 hours a week, to complete 409 reports for each quarter. And there is the amusing but pathetic case of a farmer who had to fill out a two-page report to get a pair of rubber boots. He was informed that if he lost the boots he was subject to a $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, the waste of time, money, and manpower in connection with needless Government reports and questionnaires is in itself enormous, not to speak of the burden it places on American business. Many companies have been obliged to hire personnel to do nothing more than try to answer the reports and questionnaires they receive from Washington. The questionnaires themselves are so technical and so complicated that I seriously doubt that the people who prepared the form really knew what information they wanted. They only knew they wanted to ask some questions and they thought it would add to the importance of the questions they suspected as being of some value to someone sometime if they couched them in the most involved language.

All this is bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, but it isn't all that could and should be said. The people are ready to bear the burden of the cost of war. They will do everything, anything. But they are not willing to have their money wasted. It amounts to legalized theft. Unless we deal with this problem courageously and promptly, while we win the war abroad we may lose our freedom here at home to a bureaucratic government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of this bill now under consideration, my remarks on the profits of corporations in war industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, shifting the grocery bills of civilians earning high wages to the shoulders of the soldiers who are fighting this war does not look like a wise policy. In my opinion, it is not in keeping with American ideals and traditions. I sincerely regret that President Roosevelt has insisted by his veto message of a few hours ago that this country be put in position of having to pay for its everyday food bills out of the pockets of tomorrow's taxpayers who, as we all well realize, will be largely the selfsame men and women who are today serving the colors of the United States in the armed services on every sea and continent. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that President Roosevelt will find that the percentage of civilians who desire to mooch their food from the taxes of future taxpayers is gratifyingly small and that his scheme of deferring until some future date the pay day for meeting today's living costs will not prove to be any more popular than it is equitable or sound.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens have found out that the New Deal Santa Claus has an unpleasant but inevitable habit of calling back with due bills for the gilded presents which he leaves on the doorsteps of the people. Even the good and the faithful who have rewarded this policy of synthetic largess by voting for a third term for the man who promoted it are beginning to look with suspicion on the theory that you should never pay today anything which can be put off until tomorrow. Of all New Deal schemes to deceive the people into thinking they are getting something for nothing this proposed program of price roll-backs coupled with cash subsidies is the most shallow and shocking since it in actuality commits the servicemen fighting for $50 a month to pay part of the household expenses of the war worker earning in excess of $500 per month in many cases. It is the same principle as putting a tax on the chauffeur's beer to help buy champagne for the owner of the automobile.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, since the President has vetoed the legislation, and since it is necessary to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time, we must now vote for the committee recommendation for a 6 months' extension of this act, and it would be futile to write in the same prohibitions against subsidies which the President has just today vetoed. We must bow to the inevitable. It is stimulating, however, to realize that a vast majority of this House has just voted to override that Presidential veto, and while the veto was sustained by a small margin, it is encouraging to know that Congress as a whole remains opposed to this program of mortgaging the future in order to revel in the present. Had just a few more Democratic Members of this House manifested the courage just demonstrated by some of them in refusing to yield to Presidential pressure and patronage we would have overridden this veto which not only is grossly unfair to American servicemen and to future generations, but which is likewise unjust to the farmers and producers of this Republic. It is indeed unfortunate that the political pressure of a few vociferous leaders of eastern labor unions, and the urging of Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, should shackle upon this country a proposal as unsound and as unsavory as the food-subsidy program which the President will now be able to promote despite the emphatic and repeated opposition of the vast majority of Congress. We may get some hope from the fact that the emergency extension we are about to vote provides only 25 percent of the funds carried in the original 2-year extension and that Congress at the end of this year will again have an opportunity to reflect the people's wishes in this matter.

May I add the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate which will get this legislation tomorrow may in its wisdom place some limitations upon the percentage of these funds which can be frittered away in this grandiose experiment of food subsidization? Unless this is done, either other far more important services of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be curtailed or else commitments may be made which will force Congress to pass a deficiency appropriation to pay obligations incurred by the Government. I expect to discuss this suggestion with several Senators tonight and I sincerely hope that something along the lines of my suggestion may finally be incorporated in this legislation.

Somebody must pay for the food we eat. Is it to be the people who eat it, in true American style, or is it to be future taxpayers who must then shoulder the burden of our grocery bills in addition to their own costs of living and the carrying and amortization charges of a national debt which threatens to approximate $300,000,000,000? Congress has said, "The lease we can do is to pay for our own grocery bills." The President has said, in substance, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow is far away and others must then pay the bills." Mr. Speaker, that is the issue bluntly put. Either we pay or others must. The President has even refused to accept the compromise proposed by Senator AIKEN of Vermont whereby something akin to the stamp plan would be provided so that those whose incomes have not risen during the war would have their costs of living adjusted accordingly. Under the President's program the favored laborer in the shipyards earning $150 per week will receive the same benefits as the white-collar worker or the laborer in civilian circles whose incomes may have received no substantial increases. The President's proposal will provide manna for the profligate wastrel as handsomely as for the poor widow. It is a give-away scheme for rich and poor alike, for the just and the unjust, for the rich and the needy, and it gayly ignores the realistic fact that what is given away today must be added to the already alarming tax burdens confronting those who must pay it all back tomorrow.

One more word and I am through, Mr. Speaker. I listened attentively to every word of the President's veto message. It was long on vote appeal and short on economics. As a fourth-term lure it may have had merit, but as a fact-tallying message it was disappointing. Most surprising of all, however, was its condemnation of the very inflationary spirals which it creates. The excess purchasing power which the food-subsidy program keeps from being drained off for the necessities of life will be spent for nonessentials, thus adding to the inflationary trends. It increases the already staggering national debt and excessive national debt is the mother of inflation. It means that bonds purchased to buy bombers must be used to pay butter subsidies instead. It helps create a tidal wave of extra private purchasing power which will press harder against the floodgates now shaking from the push of inflationary movements. It means that while we have pay-as-you-go taxation we

have eat-and-postpone-paying household economics; this may enable us to buy enough aspirin today to pay for the headaches of tomorrow but it is far from a sound approach to anything seeking to prevent future disasters. The President's veto message indicates he believes these price roll-backs and food subsidies will eliminate the necessity of any further wage increases, that they will provide parity prices for producers, that they will equalize the costs of living between workers enjoying huge wage increases and those receiving none, and that they will prevent inflation. It will indeed be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to watch developments between now and December 31 to see how nearly the President has gaged the future and now that he has the program upon which he has insisted the country has a right to expect that he will produce the results which have been promised.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter from a farmer in my district written to the Gazette and Daily Newspaper of York, Pa., which ought to furnish some light and information to this House. It is headed "An Answer" and states:

AN ANSWER

EDITOR THE GAZETTE AND DAILY:

It's easy to see that pigheadedness and stubborn stupidity are not confined only to Congress.

It seems as if some of our private citizens have just a little more than their fair share of it.

It certainly does not hurt the morale of the farmers a bit to have someone to stand up for us once in awhile, like Senator GEORGE did. It makes us feel as if we have not been entirely deserted.

As far as subsidy payments are concerned, we would not accept such bribes anyway, even if Congress would try to impose them upon us.

When we bought our farm we bought it so we would have a way to work and earn an honest living, not just so we would have an excuse to live off of the Government, which, by the way, is supposed to be the servant of the people and must be financed by the people.

In plain words, those subsidy payments would have to be paid to the Government by the people in the form of higher taxes, so why not give the farmers a square deal once? Let them get fair prices for their crops and save the people the cost of administering such a program?

As for inflation, why didn't they think about that when the national debt was jumping from 16 billion to 65 billion dollars in 9 years of peace times? Why don't they worry about inflation when the labor racketeers are yelling for more pay? How did labor live through the last war, when they were not getting paid as much as they are now and the farmers were getting $3 a bushel for wheat? You holler about production of food. How could the people be damned to starvation by overproduction of food when they have more money to buy it with now than they ever had? I haven't heard anyone complain as much about food prices as the fact that they couldn't get a lot of things.

Just try to imagine what shape our country would be in now if all of us farmers would have listened to the preachings of the agents of destruction who tried to make us destroy our crops and produce less. Gives you an empty feeling under the short ribs, doesn't it?

So you don't like Congress, eh? Well, just you march ahead toward dictatorship, if you want to. We farmers will not be with you.

WALTER I. KUNKLE.

DOVER, PA., *June 28, 1943.*

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day we were not able to muster a sufficient number of votes to pass this bill, the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill, over the President's veto, notwithstanding a very substantial majority of this body has indicated its disapproval and disrespect for the President's roll-back subsidy program.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of assuring each of my colleagues that I have made every effort to try to furnish the food to win this war. We still hear about price instead of production. We need a "prince of production" to furnish this food. No "prince of scarcity" will ever accomplish the task. If in their wisdom the Members of this body want to put into effect a program that is going to hurt the war-food program, it will be their own responsibility. We are taking the recommendation of the people who want to roll the prices back from the same point at which they were placed by the same people who want to roll them back. In a few months time, I am sure, there are going to be a lot of people in this country who will say, "I thought that they had rolled prices back." Or "Where is the food to roll back the prices on?"

They talk about feeding the people of occupied countries and those in the war zones under lend-lease, upon milk solids. The only way you can get milk solids is as a byproduct of butter fat, and in order to get enough of it and meet the requirements of lend-lease is to stimulate milk production. We need four times the amount of milk solids we are now producing. Yet we are faced with a butter roll-back that will provide less milk solids.

When we are not able to obtain enough milk solids, they are willing to take a chance of rolling back the price of butter, sabotage the whole war food program in order to meet the demands of a few groups.

Here is an industry, the dairy industry, that represents 20 percent of the Nation's farm income. The only time we hear anything about inflation is when the low-income groups are being considered, or when the American farmer is in the picture. This administration provided $700,000,000 to one and one-half million Federal employees who are receiving anywhere from $2,900 to $12,000 a year. You did not hear a word about inflation from Mr. Byrnes, Br. Brown, or any other of the Government economists when that group was being considered and it is pretty hard to figure out the distinction. We roll back one group of producers obtaining less than 40 cents per hour, and help pay the grocery bill for people getting $1 an hour to thousands a year. Remember there are no calories in a roll-back.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is one of the fairest-minded men I have ever heard discuss any public question and I would like to ask him if we have not, by congressional action, directed the President to try to keep prices at the September 1942 level?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. By what authority or legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. By the act of Congress in October.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I want to answer the gentleman's question if I may. There has been no mandate from Congress by legislation to do this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of July 2, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the parade of our Republican colleagues to the Well of the House in their futile efforts to reply to the great message which accompanied the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation, demonstrates how devastatingly the Chief Executive disposed of the contentions of those who seek to sabotage the administration's program to effectively control the cost of living and prevent runaway inflation. It will take more than their feeble speeches to answer the indictment contained in the President's message insofar as the thoughts of the American consumer are concerned.

Under the unanimous consent I have received, I am including in my remarks an editorial published in today's Philadelphia Record, which sets forth in plain language what millions of American citizens are thinking regarding the failure of Congress to meet its responsibilities to the American people:

CONGRESS ON ITS RAMPAGE IS HITLER'S COLLABORATOR

Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes has made a powerful appeal to striking miners to return to work.

He declared that on the eve of the greatest military campaign in history, "every muscle, every sinew, every ounce of blood and guts

that we have must be pledged to a single purpose."

Somebody ought to make a speech like that to Congress.

For Congress, in effect, is on strike against the war effort.

It is sabotaging the home front just as surely as the man who makes faulty shell casings is sabotaging the fighting front.

Everywhere the military forces of the United States and our allies are on the march, forward.

We are smashing ahead in a two-pronged drive in the southwest Pacific. We are laying waste German factories by air in Europe.

But Congress is heading the home front for a retreat that may completely smash our domestic economy.

That rout must be halted where it started, in Congress. Or thousands of lives will be sacrificed as the war is dragged on by collapse of the production front at home.

Action of Congress to forbid use of subsidies to reduce retail food prices combined the worst features of a strike and absenteeism.

Vote in the House against the subsidy program, backed by the War Labor Board as well as the President, was 160 to 32—showing absenteeism of about 60 percent. Vote in the Senate was 62 to 13—showing absenteeism of about one-third.

By this action, Congress was shouting "No" in a vacuum. It has no plan of its own, save appointment of a food czar who could only carry out the "no, no, no" policies of Congress itself.

Wall Street knows what this action of Congress means. You don't fool Wall Street very often. Commodity prices soared yesterday because traders knew Congress was out to wreck the administration's program to control inflation. Oats went up to a 23-year peak. Cotton was up 85 cents a bale, wheat was up nearly 2 cents a bushel.

The smart boys in Wall Street know what happens to the consumer when food prices rise. Traders can make money in an inflationary period; the consumer is sure to lose.

There are some sound, honest men in Congress, but they seem today to be a pitiful minority. The majority of both Houses is on the loose, gambling for political gains at the expense of the war. Killing of subsidies is only one example.

Congress has slashed the appropriation for the Office of War Information, passed the Smith-Connally antistrike bill over the President's veto, hamstrung the administration's food plans by attacking the Farm Security Administration. Because of congressional delay a dozen vital war agencies were left at the end of the fiscal year yesterday without a cent of emergency funds.

An unholy alliance of reactionary Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats, bellwethered by the McCormick-Patterson press is out to "get" the President. It may get him, politically. But by doing so, it will wreck the home front, perhaps delay victory for years.

Congress may think it can enjoy the luxury of obstructionist opposition because victory is almost won. Military leaders know better.

Lieutenant General Somervell, commanding the Army Service Forces, has just warned that a lag in production of equipment urgently needed by the Army threatens the whole strategy and tactical plans of the war.

We are now so short of weapons and matériel, he said, that we have been forced to take some of the equipment being used to train our Army in this country and send it abroad for combat use. Earlier, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson reported that production for the Army ground forces in May, scheduled to rise 2 percent, actually declined 3½ percent.

May was the month when Congress was beginning its attacks on the subsidy plan and laying the ground work for its attack on labor.

Hitler and Goebbels have long boasted that this country, under the stress of war, would fall apart internally.

Congress, by opening the gates on inflation, by its blind opposition to anything the President proposes, is doing its best to make our enemy's predictions come true.

Congress must call off its strike against the war. It must get behind the President and vote for victory.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR PROFITS OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 29, I discussed excess labor costs on war production. Today, I want to discuss excess corporation profits on war-production contracts. Before I do so, I would like to repeat what I said in my remarks of last Tuesday:

I believe in the capitalistic form of government. I believe in the profits system. I believe that a corporation or an individual engaged in any type of business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit, including an amount set aside as a surplus to act as a cushion against another depression and reconversion to peacetime industry. I do not believe that any company or individual is entitled to excess profits on an investment. No corporation nor individual should be permitted to take a 20 percent profit on an investment when that profit is paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been lowered as low as $500 and bond buyers who are receiving a low interest rate on the money they are lending to their Government for wartime expenses.

If there is any one thing that will give state socialism or communism a foothold in this country, it is the abuse of the profits system by those corporate or individual interests who are in the minority and who wring excess war profits from the toil and sweat of the worker, whether that worker is in a job where he is being paid a comparatively unjust wage or whether he takes the role of a taxpayer with a low exemption or a bond buyer lending his hard-earned money to the Government at a low rate of interest. If there is any one thing that will set the returning soldier against his Government it is excess profits paid to corporations or individuals on invested capital and excess wages paid to labor while he, the soldier, was compelled to accept a mere pittance for the services he rendered to his country.

If there is any one thing that will set the worker against his Government it is being frozen at a wage which is so low as to be incompatible with the rising cost of living while his fellow worker, doing the same type of work, is receiving an excess wage which cannot be justified on any ground. The returned serviceman and the low-paid worker knows that when the war is over he must toil and sweat the rest of his life to pay a tax on his diminishing income so his Government can pay the principal and interest on the bonds issued, to pay such excess corporation, or individual profits and such excess labor costs. Millions of workers who have worked and toiled faithfully for a fair wage and thousands of businessmen and millions of stockholders who have taken a small, if any, profit will be penalized and will have to pay for the greed of those in the ranks of both labor and industry who have in some way been successful in wringing excessive war profits from the taxpayers through their Government. I repeat, if socialism or communism gets a foothold in this country, it is because of these wartime profiteers in the ranks of both labor and industry.

SUMMARY OF OVER-ALL PICTURE OF COMPANIES WHOSE PLANTS I VISITED

Factory pay rolls of the companies whose plants I visited and whose reports I was able to obtain, including General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and General Electric, but excluding Government arsenals, show an aggregated pay roll for the calendar year of 1942 of $2,316,041,747. The total number of employees working in these plants aggregated 850,522. The annual average earning, per employee, for the calendar year of 1942 was $2,725. The total number of hours worked for the calendar year was 1,706,484,931 while the average amount paid for each hour was $1.35. While factories were on a 48-hour basis, lay-offs, because of lack of material, absenteeism, sick leave, vacation leave and other causes brought the actual number of hours worked down to an average of 38.6 hours per week for the year.

SPOT CHECK ON CORPORATION PROFITS

In the discussion of this problem, may I say again that to the extent to which a corporation, or individual, is engaged in war-production, to that extent the corporate or individual pay roll is a public pay roll and the profits statement is a statement to which the public is entitled to see because that pay roll and those profits are paid for by the taxpayer and the bond buyer.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing into the RECORD, as Exhibit A, a study I made of 48 corporations who are engaged in war production. In addition to the name of the corporation, this table gives the following information on corporation earnings for the years 1941 and 1942: First, income and excess-profits taxes paid; second, depreciation deducted; third, net income after taxes; fourth, the earnings per share of common stock after taxes; fifth, the market value per share of common stock; sixth, the earnings after taxes per $1 market value of common stock in terms of percentages.

The market value for 1941 was taken from the stock market report of January 16, 1942, and the market value for 1942 was taken from the stock market report of January 16, 1943. All stock reports were taken from the New York Times.

In making a study of these earnings and particularly in the returns on market values, one must take into consideration the fact that the 1942 earnings helped to increase the market value of that same stock in 1943. In other words,

while there may not have been any increase in the physical value of the corporation profits there was an increase in the market value of the stock. The New York Times report on averages on 50 stocks show that such stock sold for an average of $77.10 on January 16, 1942, and $84.17 on January 8, 1943, or an increase in the market value of the stock in 1943 over 1942 of 9.17 percent.

While I visited some of the companies whose figures I am giving in this table, the information in the table was taken from information on file in the Congressional Library and not from information which the companies furnished me. I have similar information on these same companies for 1939 and 1940.

TAXES AS A PART OF PRODUCTION COSTS

These 48 companies who were engaged primarily in war production paid during 1941 and 1942, $2,766,559,000 in Federal income and excess-profits taxes, not including social security or unemployment taxes. Taxes, of course, are figured in as an item in the cost of production. In view of the fact that these companies were practically 100 percent on war production, the fact is that these companies first collected this amount of tax from the Government as a part of the cost of production and then paid the money back into the Treasury as taxes. Nevertheless, it is a cost item of production. It is only when one takes into consideration the fact that here we have 48 corporations paying in 2 years nearly $3,000,000,000 in taxes and the further fact that there are literally thousands of companies in war production paying similar taxes that we can begin to appreciate the increased war costs due to taxes. What happens is that the Government pays these sums out of the Treasury as war costs and then they are paid back into the Treasury as taxes.

The above figures do not include millions of dollars paid by these companies for social security, unemployment-insurance taxes, State corporation and real-estate taxes and other taxes which likewise come out of the Federal Treasury in the cost of production but, of course, do not come back into the Federal Treasury.

DEPRECIATION

These 48 corporations charged off during the years 1941 and 1942 $769,049,000 in depreciation.

NET INCOME

The study shows that the net income, after taxes, of these 48 corporations for the year 1941 was $872,378,000 and for 1942 was $705,206,000 or a total of $1,577,584,000 after taxes, for this 2-year period.

So we find that taxes, depreciation, and net earnings for these 48 corporations aggregated a total for 1941 and 1942 of $5,113,192,000.

In view of the fact that there are some 300,000 contracts and subcontracts held by thousands of corporations and business concerns, large and small, we can appreciate that taxes, depreciation, and earnings constitute a tremendous sum in trying to break down the total war-production cost.

INDIVIDUAL EARNINGS OF CORPORATIONS

In studying this table one finds the following information of interest. The net percentage earned after taxes per dollar market value of the stock of the 48 corporations was as follows:

In 1941, 1 earned less than 5 percent; 7 earned from 5 to 10 percent; 18 earned from 10 to 15 percent; 6 earned from 15 to 20 percent; 2 earned from 20 to 25 percent; 5 earned from 25 to 30 percent; 3 earned from 30 to 35 percent; 3 earned from 35 to 40 percent; 3 earned from 40 to 53.21 percent.

In 1942, 4 earned 5 percent or less; 16 earned from 5 to 10 percent; 10 earned from 10 to 15 percent; 6 earned from 15 to 20 percent; 5 earned from 20 to 25 percent; 1 earned from 25 to 30 percent; 1 earned from 30 to 35 percent; 1 earned from 35 to 40 percent; 3 earned from 40 to 53.88 percent; 1, no report for 1942.

This study further shows that in 1941 that of the 48 corporations surveyed, 8 earned less than 10 percent; 24 earned from 10 to 20 percent; 16 earned from 20 to 53.21 percent.

In 1942, 20 earned less than 10 percent; 16 earned from 10 to 20 percent; 11 earned from 20 to 53.88 percent; 1, no report for 1942.

These are nearly all large- or medium-sized corporations whose stock is quoted on the stock market. It gives one a birds-eye picture of the profits taken by this class of corporation.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CORPORATIONS

There is another type of corporation which takes excessive profits far in excess of those taken by the 48 corporations named in the table. It is the type of a corporation which has a small, in fact an extremely small, capital stock and paid in surplus but whose principal capital was or is being furnished by the Government either direct or through the Defense Plant Corporation. We find these corporations earning a profit on a large Government capital but distributing that profit to a small group of stockholders who have very little capital invested. Jack & Heintz, Inc., gives a good illustration of this type of corporation. The following is their set-up.

JACK & HEINTZ, INC.

This company was organized in November 1940 with a capital stock structure consisting of 100 shares no-par stock for which four stockholders paid in $5 per share. They also paid in $99,500 in surplus. Thus we have four individual stockholders who have paid in $100,000 in capital and surplus.

The total cost of defense plants, machinery, and equipment furnished by the Defense Plant Corporation as of October 31, 1942, was $7,477,100. Earnings for the calendar year of 1941, before taxes, were $932,024 and after taxes $289,089. Earnings for the year 1942 before taxes were $7,740,829 and after taxes $1,740,829. The earnings before taxes were 7,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus and after taxes 1,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus.

Thus in 1942, after setting aside $173,680 for depreciation and obsolescence; after paying the three top officers $116,645 each; after giving a Christmas bonus of $944,300; after paying wages that, according to their statement, averaged an annual rate of $5,172 per employee, as shown in my statement to the House on Tuesday, and after paying $6,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes, this company showed a total 1942 earning of $1,740,839 on an invested capital and paid-in surplus of $100,000. The total pay roll for 1942 was $8,886,000 while the annual sales for the year were $23,661,000. This company has an exceptionally good production and low-cost record.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CORPORATION PLUS MANAGEMENT FEES SPELL EXCESS PROFITS

Another class of corporations are those which, like the preceding case, have an extremely small paid-in capital and paid-in surplus; have practically no property nor capital of their own to start with; whose capital is furnished by the Government through the Defense Plant Corporation or otherwise, but who take not only an excessive profit on their small capital investment but take in addition a management fee which adds to the cost and excess profits. The following is an illustration of a class of corporations which combines these two features, that is, capital furnished by the Government plus management fees paid to the owners of the company through another corporation:

THE HIGH STANDARDS MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

This company was organized in 1926. The amount of capital stock issued and outstanding is 5,000 shares of a par value of $5 per share, or $25,000. Approximately 4,700 shares are owned by one family. The stockholders, in addition, contributed cash capital in the amount of $17,775, and on December 31, 1940, the company had an earned surplus of $22,685. Thus on December 31, 1940, this company had a capital stock, paid in and earned surplus of $65,660, according to the figures furnished me.

The amount of money furnished by the Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation, as of December 31, 1942, was $6,696,628, including $3,473,000 furnished by the British and taken over by the United States under lend-lease. This company had a total sales in 1942 of $50,771,000, with a net profit before renegotiation and before taxes of $30,496,000. The net profit before taxes and before renegotiation was 60 percent of the sales. After refunding $23,775,000 in renegotiation and after paying approximately $4,800,000 in taxes, this company showed a net profit in 1942 of $1,888,918 on a paid-in capital, paid-in surplus, and earned surplus of $65,660 as of December 31, 1940.

The earnings per share of stock after deductions, including taxes and renego-

tiation, was $377.78 in 1942. The amount paid in per share of stock was $5. This is 7,500 percent on the par value of the stock or nearly 3,000 percent of the paid-in capital, earned and paid-in surplus.

The chief officers of the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., are also members and owners of the Dixwell Corporation. The Dixwell Corporation has a contract with the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., by which the former manages and engineers the entire business of the latter under an agreement whereby the High Standards Corporation pays the Dixwell Corporation 6 percent of its gross sales. Under this agreement, the High Standards Manufacturing Co., Inc., in 1942 paid the Dixwell Corporation as management and engineering fees 6 percent on $50,771,000 gross sales, or $3,091,000. In the renegotiation $1,453,000 of the Dixwell Corporation originally indicated 1942 fees of $3,091,000 was disallowed. This company had made an exceptionally fine record in the low-cost production of .50-caliber machine guns.

I want to give another illustration of excess profits which is self-explanatory:

CONTINENTAL MOTORS CORPORATION

This company has 3,000,000 shares of common stock, authorized and issued, par value $1 per share, or $3,000,000. Its total sales for the year 1942 was $139,500,000, of which $98,154,000 were subject to renegotiation and $41,350,000, because of technical reasons, was not subject to renegotiation. This company made a net profit, before taxes and before renegotiation, of $36,690,000, of which $24,426,000 was subject to renegotiation and $12,264,000 was not. Thirty-six million six hundred and ninety thousand dollars is 12 times the par value and 3½ times the market value of the stock as that market value was given on June 16, 1942—$4.06 per share.

In addition to the reduction of prices in the amount of $39,000,000 it refunded in renegotiation in 1942, $13,126,000. The total profit before taxes but after renegotiation was $23,564,000. After paying $13,000,000 in taxes they had left, after renegotiation and taxes, $5,564,000. This is 182 percent of the par value of their stock or 44.8 percent of the market value of their stock as that market value was shown in the New York Times on January 16, 1943.

The above case illustrates how excessive profits are taken in hundreds of cases. Those in charge of renegotiation of war contracts have many similar cases they are working on.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF WAR DEPARTMENT PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Mr. Maurice Karker, Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, testified before the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the recent bill—see page 501 of the hearings—that 10 percent of the corporations subject to renegotiation were decidedly not cooperative and that 90 percent were willing to face the facts of the statute and the facts of profit realization. He stated that the 10 percent will go to any length to avoid exposure of the facts:

One-third of the businesses that have been renegotiated up to now have not made excessive profits in 1942. Probably one-half of the remaining 67 percent are loud in their opposition, and in their effort to avoid coming to grips with the problem.

Mr. Karker gives the profits on a certain machine tool company—page 503 of the hearings—and I quote:

In the days before the war their sales were $7,500,000 and their profits, before payment of taxes, were about $1,850,000. This represents a profit of about 25 percent before the payment of taxes. * * * In 1942 they did a $50,000,000 business. Thirty million dollars' worth of that business was not renegotiable because it was largely with the Defense Plant Corporation, which you have not included in the statute. Twenty million dollars of the business was renegotiable because it was business with departments which are covered by the statute. On the $30,000,000 volume of business, which was not renegotiable, their margin of profit increased from 25 percent in the base years to 38 percent in 1942. On the $20,000,000 worth of business over which we now have jurisdiction they made as much profit as they did on the nonrenegotiable portion—38 percent. On the $50,000,000 worth of total 1942 business they made a profit of 38 percent—38 cents out of every dollar—and it is their contention that that profit is not excessive.

RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT CASES

While the War Department cooperated in every way, and while those in charge of renegotiation were eager to help me all they could, they were naturally reluctant in giving out facts regarding individual cases. I did not insist upon this information except in cases where I already had the information and where I wanted to verify the facts. In order to avoid any possibility of embarrassment, and at the request of the War Department, I am not giving the names of these companies but use a case designation. Seven of the companies discussed here have, as a result of renegotiation, repaid to the Government $257,560,000 and have made price reductions representing an additional savings to the Government of a substantially larger sum.

In this connection, I desire to point out that the renegotiation statute was developed and had its origin in the War Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], concerned as we all were with the problem of controlling excessive profits while we speeded up the war program, originally proposed "renegotiation" as a law and offered the amendment that initiated the statute.

It was during the hearings which the subcommittee conducted on the items for the War Department in the sixth supplemental defense bill in March last year. The problem, as seen by the gentleman from South Dakota, was to find some device that would permit the expeditious letting of contracts and yet preserve for the Government the right to review costs and eliminate excessive profits.

He has stated that the need for the legislation was brought to his attention by a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Bethlehem Shipbuilding case, handed down in February of 1942, a case growing out of World War No. 1, in which the Court held that after papers of final settlement had been issued, the Government could not recover any part of the price paid regardless of how unconscionable the profits that had been made, except, of course, such as might have been recovered through taxation.

So the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] proposed language that would require an agreement for a renegotiation before final settlement and payment on a war contract. He submitted the idea to two witnesses who appeared before us on that bill, Major General Reybold, chief of engineers, in charge of construction, and Colonel Kutz, who appeared in behalf of the Ordnance items in the bill. Both expressed interest in the proposal. The committee decided, however, that the matter should not be reported in the bill but be presented by its author when the bill went to the floor of the House since the amendment was legislative in character.

The sixth supplemental bill went to the floor and was passed by the House on a Saturday afternoon, March 28, 1942. Time had been fixed and debate was limited before the point in the bill was reached where the amendment would come. Consequently the author's explanation of his amendment was brief and came so far ahead of the offering of the amendment that later the newspapers said it was accepted without debate.

In the form first offered, the amendment provided that no part of the funds appropriated in the bill could be used to pay that portion of a contract price known as final payment or final settlement to a contractor who had failed to file "a renegotiation agreement" satisfactory to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy, as the case might be.

A point of order was made that the language constituted legislation by imposing additional duties on a Government official, the Secretary concerned. The gentleman from South Dakota had anticipated that so he had prepared an alternative form which he immediately offered. This barred use of the funds to make final settlement payments to contractors who failed to file an agreement to renegotiate profits in excess of 6 percent. Curbing of war profits was in the air at the time, due to exposures by the Naval Affairs Committee. The amendment was adopted on a division vote, 70 to 8, and went to the Senate.

The next day the papers headlined the 6-percent curb on war profits and few of them caught the new word "renegotiation" which had been introduced into legislation dealing with excessive war

profits. The author of the amendment explained its purpose to the Senate committee that considered the bill, and stated that he recognized the 6-percent clause was difficult of application, but that he had to put in a rigid formula to avoid a point of order. The Senate committee understood, asked the War Department to draft the details to make renegotiation a part of all contracts. The expanded amendment became section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental Defense Act of 1942, approved April 28, 1942, placing contracts of the War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission under its provisions.

In October contracts placed by the Treasury Department were added and a few other amendments were made, based upon experience in the workings of the act, and renegotiation of war contracts became section 801 of the Revenue Act of 1942, approved October 21, 1942.

The other day when the House passed the Army appropriation bill for fiscal 1944, the gentleman from South Dakota offered a further amendment to the act, bringing war contracts placed by such agencies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as Defense Plant and Defense Supplies, under the renegotiation statute. That addition grew out of testimony developed in our hearings, such as that I have already mentioned. It was accepted by the House and subsequently agreed to in conference with the Senate.

I have taken the time to give this history of the renegotiation statute because it occupies such a large place in our current efforts to control and prevent excessive war profits, and because its modest beginnings have tended to obscure its far-reaching importance. We all agree that the renegotiation procedure has some difficulties, but it has permitted the placing of contracts to go ahead full speed and yet preserve for the Government and for the people a check on excessive profits. Let us see how it has worked.

FIFTY-FOUR COMPANIES I STUDIED EITHER HAVE BEEN OR WILL BE RENEGOTIATED

Out of the 54 companies of which I made a study, including the 48 contained in exhibit A, 31 companies have been renegotiated while 23 are assigned for renegotiation but not yet completed.

I have commented specifically on three of these companies by name. I now wish to give the facts on five more companies who have been renegotiated but whose names I have been requested by the War Department not to publish.

CASE C

This company had sales of $48,000,000 and their profit before taxes and before renegotiations was over $18,000,000, or 37½ percent of their gross sales. This profit, before taxes and before renegotiation, was approximately 100 percent of the capital stock and earned surplus. After refunding more than $6,500,000 on renegotiation and paying nearly $8,500,000 in taxes, this company had left a net profit of $3,200,000, or nearly 16 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus.

CASE D

This company had sales of approximately $450,000,000, and their profit before taxes and before renegotiation was $125,000,000, or 28 percent of the gross sales. After refunding $65,000,000 in renegotiation and paying $45,000,000 in taxes, this company had $13,600,000 left on an invested capital and earned surplus of approximately $37,000,000. This company increased its surplus more than $8,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

CASE E

This company had sales of approximately $127,000,000. Their profit before taxes and renegotiation was $35,000,000 or approximately 27½ percent of the gross sales. In addition, approximately $10,000,000 was earned on cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts making the total profit $45,000,000. After refunding $14,000,000 in renegotiation and paying $24,000,000 in taxes, this company had left approximately $7,000,000 profit, or approximately 37 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus of approximately $20,000,000.

CASE F

This company had sales of approximately $370,000,000 with a profit before refund and before taxes of $120,000,000, or 32 percent of the gross sales. The gross profit was 20 percent larger than the invested capital and earned surplus. After refunding over $93,000,000 in renegotiation and after paying over $20,000,000 in taxes, the company had left over $7,500,000. This company increased its surplus more than $15,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

CASE G

This company had sales of approximately $65,000,000 with a profit before renegotiation and before taxes of over $18,000,000, or 28 percent of the gross sales, on an invested capital and earned surplus of $26,000,000. After refunding $9,500,000 in renegotiation and after paying $6,500,000 in taxes, this company showed a profit of approximately $3,000,000.

AMOUNT RECOVERED BY RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. Karker, Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, testified before our committee that renegotiations conducted by the War Department in the period between April 28, 1942, and May 1, 1943 have resulted in the elimination of excess profits in an estimated amount of $1,866,000,000. Of this amount $698,000,000 represents recovery of excess profits realized and $1,168,000,000 represents price reductions for future deliveries on existing contracts.

He further said that this does not, however, measure the full effect of this law. In the renegotiation of these contracts, we are able to determine what the prices of new contracts should be and learn which prices are excessive and the savings on new contracts let will exceed the amount of refunds and reductions on existing contracts.

This, of course, does not take into consideration Navy and other contracts which are being renegotiated.

No one can study the individual cases such as I have given in illustrations above without coming to the conclusion that while some of the excess profits would have been recovered by taxation, a great deal of such profits will not be recovered unless these contracts are renegotiated and refunds made.

CONCLUSION

In concluding my remarks, I want to issue a word of warning. The fact that a corporation finds itself with excess profits does not necessarily mean that that corporation has been guilty of wrongdoing. Corporations, like individuals in making contracts for war supplies, protect themselves by insisting that the unit price be large enough to protect them from loss. This is particularly true when a corporation is making an article which they have never made before. Let me give you an illustration.

In going through one of the large plants I found that the original contract for a definite number of shells contained a unit price of $16.80 per shell. Against this unit price had to be charged the tools and dies to make a shell, the cost of educating labor, change-over in factory, and so forth, as this company was operating on its own capital. The company took successive contracts to make the same shell, each contract being voluntarily lowered until the last contract price was $6.70 to make the same shell which was made through the original contract for $16.80. Charging off of equipment, education of labor, and so forth, enabled them to make this reduction which they did voluntarily. Some companies, however, would have offered to make these shells at $8.40 per shell instead of $16.80. The public would have thought that they had obtained a very good price when, as a matter of fact, the company would have been making excessive profits despite the fact that they had reduced the cost of the shell 50 percent. I am merely using this as an illustration. Many companies find themselves with excessive profits on their hands which they are willing, as Mr. Karker testified, to refund. Others do so reluctantly, while others oppose renegotiation violently.

May I repeat again that regardless as to how efficient a company may be, how good they are at production, they have no right to make excess war profiits when those profits are paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been lowered as low as $500, by bond buyers who are investing their hard-earned money in low-interest bonds.

Not one has a right to make excess profits when the public debt incurred to pay those excess profits must be paid by returning servicemen and others after the war out of any income they may earn.

EXHIBIT A

Figures show amounts allotted for taxes, depreciation, net income, earnings per share of common stock, market value per share of common stock, and percentage of earnings per $1 of market value of stock for selected corporations receiving contracts for ordnance from the United States Government for 1941 and 1942

[Unless otherwise indicated, figures are for calendar year. Market values were taken from the stock market report of the New York Times]

Corporation	Taxes (thousands)	Depreciation (thousands)	Net income [1] (thousands)	Earnings per share of common stock [1]	Market value per share of common stock	Earnings per $1 of market value (percent)
E. I. du Pont de Nemours Corporation, Wilmington, Del.:						
1941	$103,190	$26,441	$90,401	$7.44	$134.50	5.53
1942	99,800	32,141	63,941	5.07	136.00	3.72
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation, Pueblo, Colo.:						
1941	2,982	1,339	2,580	[2] 4.53	16.50	27.45
1942	729	1,729	787	[2] 1.40	15.0625	9.28
Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.:						
1941	28,230	8,709	21,588	8.57	137.25	6.24
1942	39,130	10,915	21,184	8.41	149.50	5.62
Chrysler Corporation, Detroit, Mich.:						
1941	28,700	25,126	40,114	9.22	48.375	19.05
1942	35,418	27,423	15,529	3.57	69.875	5.10
Continental Motors Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.:						
1941	3,250	285	3,232	1.08	3.625	29.79
1942	18,000	694	5,473	1.82	4.0625	44.8
Crucible Steel Co. of America, Harrison, N. J.:						
1941	15,022	2,620	7,439	12.96	34.25	37.83
1942	34,257	4,791	4,865	7.26	34.00	21.35
Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.:						
1941	9,192	3,541	7,784	4.14	39.50	10.48
1942 (12 months ending Feb. 1, 1943)	----------	----------	7,130	3.79	41.25	9.187
American Brake Shoe & Foundry, Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	3,300	1,823	3,195	3.56	33.00	10.78
1942	6,967	2,227	2,991	3.22	30.50	10.557
American Car & Foundry Co., New York, N. Y.:						
1941 [3]	2,194	2,955	8,161	5.23	31.75	16.47
1942 [3]	38,507	5,134	9,275	[2] 12.09	26.50	45.62
Bendix Aviation Corporation, Bendix, N. J.:						
1941	23,445	1,428	18,267	6.30	38.25	16.47
1942	45,666	2,033	12,464	5.90	35.00	16.857
American Can Co., New York, N. Y.:						
1941	18,700	7,523	18,846	6.45	63.75	10.11
1942	12,575	7,545	12,867	4.03	75.50	5.337
American Locomotive Co., Schenectady, N. Y.:						
1941	4,090	1,390	5,629	4.12	9.625	42.80
1942	23,600	2,775	5,052	3.37	8.50	39.64
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.:						
1941	3,969	2,140	4,241	2.86	26.25	10.89
1942	2,223	1,927	2,964	1.95	32.50	6.00
Baldwin Locomotive Works, Eddystone, Pa.:						
1941	8,296	1,855	3,975	3.71	14.00	2.65
1942	13,683	1,407	4,516	2.94	12.225	24.04
Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Pa.:						
1941	108,961	24,105	34,457	9.35	64.75	14.44
1942	184,704	22,768	25,388	6.32	113.50	5.568
Hercules Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.:						
1941	14,163	5,566	6,099	4.23	71.50	5.91
1942	20,513	4,847	5,547	3.81	74.75	5.096
International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	17,421	7,259	30,635	5.87	48.50	12.10
1942	20,878	7,314	26,747	4.95	164.00	3.018
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.:						
1941	257,619	53,161	201,653	4.45	33.00	13.48
1942	134,501	59,163	163,652	3.55	45.00	7.88
General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.:						
1941	120,000	20,955	57,197	1.99	28.25	7.04
1942	193,000	23,119	45,081	1.56	32.275	4.833
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio:						
1941 [4]	14,262	8,711	11,262	4.37	14.375	30.4
1942 [4]	19,162	10,307	12,481	5.04	26.225	19.21
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.:						
1941	22,142	19,885	15,500	10.23	24.00	18.20
1942	31,900	22,361	10,142	4.60	20.875	22.03
Otis Elevator Co., Yonkers, N. Y.:						
1941	1,663	----------	2,590	1.10	12.50	8.8
1942	6,295	----------	2,573	1.09	17.50	6.22
National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio:						
1941	1,653	1,209	3,257	2.00	12.50	16.00
1942	6,950	1,593	3,137	1.93	19.625	9.834
Pressed Steel Car Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	364	351	813	1.09	7.75	14.06
1942	5,800	384	1,729	2.18	7.225	30.17
Pullman, Inc., Hammond, Ind.:						
1941	5,168	12,831	10,919	3.31	25.25	13.10
1942	32,117	12,963	10,361	3.14	27.875	11.26
Servel Inc., Evansville, Ind.:						
1941 [5]	1,291	410	2,737	1.54	5.75	26.78
1942 [5]	205	459	1,053	.61	10.875	5.6
Savage Arms Corporation, Utica, N. Y.:						
1941	11,655	294	3,427	5.11	18.625	27.43
1942	12,388	461	1,642	2.45	10.0625	24.34
The Sperry Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y.:						
1941	19,400	----------	8,282	4.11	30.125	13.64
1942	23,242	----------	5,778	1.79	27.06	6.6
Philco Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa.:						
1941	5,823	1,643	2,514	1.83	10.25	17.85
1942	6,400	1,753	2,210	1.61	15.00	10.73
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Springfield, Mass.:						
1941	40,571	7,519	23,118	7.21	80.00	9.01
1942	49,602	9,943	17,367	5.42	82.225	6.59

[1] After taxes. [2] June 30. [3] Dec. 31. [4] Fiscal years ending Apr. 30. [5] Feb. 26, 1943. [6] Fiscal year ending Oct. 31.

Figures show amounts allotted for taxes, depreciation, net income, earnings per share of common stock, market value per share of common stock, and percentage of earnings per $1 of market value of stock for selected corporations receiving contracts for ordnance from the U. S. Government for 1941 and 1942—Continued

Corporation	Taxes (thousands)	Depreciation (thousands)	Net income (thousands)	Earnings per share of common stock	Market value per share of common stock	Earnings per $1 of market value (percent)
United States Steel Corporation (including Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co.), New York, N. Y.:						
1941	$191,502	$86,756	$149,090	$10.45	$54.125	19.30
1942	228,001	91,765	107,406	5.35	50.50	10.59
Link-Belt Co., Indianapolis, Ind.:						
1941	4,741	510	2,913	3.95	33.00	11.36
1942	10,222	923	3,479	4.64	35.50	13.07
Mesta Machine Co., West Homestead, Pa.:						
1941	3,665	399	3,608	3.61	29.00	12.44
1942	6,354	429	3,626	3.63	27.50	13.2
Diamond T Motor Car Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	2,727	136	1,365	3.24	9.00	36.00
1942	7,685	266	2,044	4.85	9.00	53.88
Borg-Warner Corporation (including Norge Products and Norge Refrigerator), Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	15,464	1,752	7,475	3.20	22.375	14.30
1942	18,204	2,516	7,216	3.09	28.00	11.0
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., La Porte, Ind.:						
1941	8,600	1,343	5,744	3.23	29.75	10.91
1942	21,400	1,619	5,924	3.34	27.875	11.98
Briggs & Stratton Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis.:						
1941	1,500	97	1,155	3.89	27.50	14.14
1942	5,370	108	1,784	6.00	33.50	17.91
American Type Founders, Inc., Elizabeth, N. J.:						
1941 [1]	84	241	301	.53	4.875	10.87
1942 [1]	395	246	810	1.43	7.225	19.79
Crown Cork & Seal Co., Baltimore, Md.:						
1941	2,089	1,592	2,930	4.68	18.00	26.00
1942	2,742	1,695	1,459	1.84	19.00	9.68
General Steel Castings Corporation, Eddystone, Pa.:						
1941	4,750	1,207	3,266	5.84	76.875	7.59
1942	8,492	1,220	2,003	3.07	67.50	4.56
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulatory Co., Minneapolis, Minn.:						
1941	4,302	583	2,737	4.20	37.25	11.27
1942	14,833	624	2,868	4.29	59.50	7.21
Mullins Manufacturing Corporation, Warren, Ohio: 9 months ending Sept. 30	1,095	379	692	0.99	2.75	36.00
National Supply Co., Ambridge, Pa.:						
1941	5,584	1,966	6,082	3.06	5.75	53.21
1942	10,396	2,129	4,108	1.66	6.25	26.56
Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	13,100	1,952	4,067	2.64	5.875	44.54
1942	12,114	1,804	1,749	0.86	6.875	12.52
Stewart-Warner Corporation, Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	4,586	1,388	1,657	1.30	5.75	22.60
1942	19,400	2,683	1,590	1.25	7.0625	17.69
United Engineering & Foundry Co., New York City:						
1941	4,308	320	3,309	3.96	31.50	12.57
1942	8,963	562	3,105	3.71	27.00	13.74
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., Chicago, Ill.:						
1941	1,350	303	2,027	4.28	13.25	32.30
1942	1,018	----------	1,592	3.28	14.00	23.42
Republic Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.:						
1941	46,250	13,350	24,038	3.87	18.25	21.20
1942	69,250	16,557	17,155	2.67	15.275	17.47
Total	2,766,599	769,049	1,577,584	----------	----------	----------

[1] Fiscal year ending Mar. 31.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitude and statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee regarding the motion which I made to recede and concur in the Senate amendments I desire to withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws his motion.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 161: Page 87, line 11, insert "Gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense): For necessary expenses without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, for pilot-scale tests on the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores, including laboratory research and maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; purchase or lease of land or buildings; construction and equipment of buildings; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms, or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $9,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $200 for printing and binding, books of reference and periodicals; purchase not to exceed $2,775 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while employed; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", $400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to carry out projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161 and concur in the same.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next two amendments may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that amendments numbered 162 and 163 be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 162: Strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000."

Amendment No. 163: Strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,900,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment 163.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am very reluctant to take the time of the House at this late hour on this matter but I should like to direct the attention of the conferees particularly to what is involved in the amendment adopted by the Senate. This is one case in which the subcommittee did not grant the estimate of the Budget nor of the Bureau of Mines. The Budget estimate, as I understand it, called for $1,000,000 for work in the manganese experimental plants of the Bureau of Mines. The House committee allowed $900,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The Senate raised that to $1,900,000; in other words raised it by $1,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That also is correct.

Mr. CASE. I understand that the major part of the raise was for operation of the plant of the Bureau of Mines at Chamberlain, S. Dak., and was made upon the recommendation of the Bureau. I recognize that with the lateness of the hour what I might say here is not going to be heard very patiently; so, I am not going to resist the motion that has been made but shall prepare a memorandum on this matter for each of the conferees, ask their careful consideration of it, and ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point with that memorandum.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MEMORANDUM ON MANGANESE ITEM

Please keep these facts in mind:

1. Manganese is essential to the making of steel, and is our No. 1 problem in tonnage of wartime imports.

2. The Chamberlain deposit is the largest in the United States, large enough to supply all our demands for hundreds of years to come, if developed.

3. The Bureau of Mines already has a plant there with months of experimentation behind it.

4. That plant will be idle, the proving of large scale production possibilities will stop, unless funds are provided to go ahead.

5. The Bureau recommends going ahead.

The importance of manganese is known to everyone. Every ton of steel requires 14 pounds of it. We have passed all kinds of legislation and taken expensive steps to insure a supply—from abroad. I distinctly remember one bill that authorized $200,000,000 for cargo ships and the principal argument for them was to haul manganese. Ships that took critical material, men, and time. Ships that could be sunk.

The enormous size of the manganese deposit in the bluffs of the Missouri River in the vicinity of Chamberlain is recognized by all authorities. Dr. Dean, assistant director of the Bureau of Mines, at page 721 of the hearings before your subcommittee this year, said:

"In Chamberlain, S. Dak., we have a manganese deposit of such enormous extent that it would supply manganese for an unlimited number of years, but it is a very low-grade deposits."

And at page 779 he said:

"It is very important that we have in a completely worked out and proper shape the processes by which we can use such large deposits as those in Chamberlain, S. Dak., and a large deposit at Artillery Peak, Calif., Batesville, Ark., and so on."

The Bureau of Mines and the Metals Reserve Company have been exploring the field and experimenting in the field for two seasons. Two proposals for operation in the field have been considered—and were under consideration at the time the Budget estimates were prepared. Neither was far enough along for a decision to be reached at that time. Otherwise, I believe, there would have been a Budget estimate for what is now proposed. From a memorandum by Dr. Sayers, director of the Bureau, under date of June 5, I quote:

"An estimate has been made that a commercial plant capable of treating 20,000 tons of shale per day to produce 175 tons of 61-percent manganese sinter and 200 tons of pig iron on a daily basis might produce the manganese sinter for about $40 per ton. The complete plant of this size would cost from eight and one-half to nine million dollars."

And then he says:

"Before risking an expenditure of this size, it would appear that the next logical step would be the construction and operation of semicommercial plants on a scale that would recover 50 tons of nodules per day from some 1,300 wet long tons of shale and produce about 12 tons of sinter assaying 61 percent manganese, an operation about one-fifteenth that indicated above."

And this is Dr. Sayers' estimate of the cost:

"The cost of construction, equipment, and 12 months' operation using the Bureau of Mines' equipment now stored at Chamberlain as a nucleus, would approximate $900,000. A credit of about $200,000 might be derived from sale of products. If this be deducted, a net of $700,000 would result."

It should be noted, however, that a paragraph in the bill would put proceeds from Bureau sales in the general fund of the Treasury, so that while the net cost might be only $700,000, the full amount of $900,000 should be provided here. If the conferees think it wise to reduce the item, however, the project could be divided, as indicated in this final sentence of Dr. Sayers' letter:

"A sum of $625,000 should be reserved for the mining, milling, calcining, and matte smelting operations in South Dakota, and $275,000 would be needed at some point where suitable power and other requirements for the matte refining step are available."

At the matte smelting stage we would have a manganese product for which there is a definite demand and what could be done with it is known to everyone in the steel industry. To carry forward this work at Chamberlain to that point is the very least that should be done.

Remember—

1. This deposit alone can supply all our needs when the process proposed is demonstrated on this semicommercial scale.

2. Two years of specific research and an experimental plant representing several hundred thousand dollars will be put on the shelf if funds for continued operation are not provided.

3. The reason why a Budget request was not made on this item is that at the time Budget requests were being prepared, an $8,000,000 project was under consideration and only lately has it been determined that it would be better to proceed on the smaller scale here proposed.

Knowing that the conferees on the Interior bill believe in the proving and developing of our own resources, and believing that they will see the possibility of eventual enormous savings and contribution to our war effort through continuation of this project, I leave the matter in their hands with confidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendments 162 and 163.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 169: Page 91, line 21, insert:

"Magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense): For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for the conduct of investigations and development of methods for the recovery of magnesium from domestic raw materials, including naturally occurring brines, salt deposits, dolomite, magnesite, and brucite, by hydrometallurgy, direct reduction, and electrolytic methods, including laboratory research; maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores for metallurgical tests; purchase or lease of land; construction and equipment of buildings to house pilot plants, including employment by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $750 for printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; books of reference and periodicals; special wearing apparel and equipment for protection of employees while employed; and the operation, maintenance, and repair of three passenger-carrying automobiles; $525,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to operate said plants in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 24 of said amendment strike out "$525,000" and insert "$225,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 172: Page 93, line 23, insert: "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense): For all expenses necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, to construct, operate, and maintain, independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, a drainage tunnel, including lateral tunnels, to drain mining land in the Leadville, Colo., mining district, including the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or donation of lands rights-of-way, or other interests in lands, or other property; the engagement by contract or otherwise at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of individuals, firms, or corporations, necessary to design and construct the tunnel; purchase, not to

exceed $2,700, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, which may be used for transporting employees from their homes to temporary locations of employment; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of emloyees while engaged in their work; not to exceed $13,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and other items of expenditure otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior'; $1,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 172 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 21 of said amendment, strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,400,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this body may know the purpose of this appropriation of funds for this tunnel to unwater mines at Leadville, Colo., I wish to make a brief statement.

In March of this year, the Director of the Zinc Division of the War Production Board met with the two Colorado Senators and me to discuss the problem of making available more zinc for war purposes.

It seems that our zinc smelting facilities are adequate to take care of military and essential civilian requirements, but to keep these smelters operating to capacity, it now is necessary to import two-fifths of our total zinc concentrates. In 1944, about one-half of our requirements would have to be met by imports. The zinc ore reserves upon which this country has been depending are very low and in many districts are running out at the present rate of use. New supplies must be found therefore, that will start producing within the space of a year and a half.

The Leadville district, in the past, was one of the best producers of lead and zinc in the United States. Operations were stopped there in 1930, because of the cost of pumping excessive water and the low prices for metals. This tunnel will drain out the water and make accessible potential ore resources that remain to be mined.

From 1860 to 1935—according to U. S. Bureau of Mines statistical reports—there have been mined over 20,000,000 tons of ore including the following amounts of the strategic ores:

Zinc, 694,160 tons, valued at $94,900,871.

Lead, 1,011,505 tons, valued at $92,001,866.

Copper, 48,967 tons, valued at $14,560,187.

Manganese, 936,024 tons, valued at $4,103,952.

Since the Leadville area is so highly mineralized, it is estimated that the drainage afforded by the tunnel will open up 720,000 tons of recoverable zinc ore, which runs 16-percent zinc. At the present time, a very large part of our zinc comes from Canada, Australia, Mexico, South America, and Africa, and therefore, the opening up of domestic mines will help to relieve the shipping problem and remove our dependence upon the dwindling supplies of these countries.

The project has been carefully gone over by the Board of Economic Warfare, the Mining Division of the War Production Board, and by the Bureau of Mines.

The tunnel is to be 2½ miles long with laterals of a total of a little over a mile in length branching from the main shaft. The tunnel will be drilled through solid rock which will make the cost of upkeep very small.

An attempt to get Reconstruction Finance funds was made, but this method of financing would not be possible in sufficient time for the mines to get into production and be of any help in our war effort. Titles are held by hundreds of persons, and there are many conflicting and contested claims. The R. F. C. would not make a loan until a great amount of work clearing such titles had been done, and the legal proceedings necessary would take many months. Any such difficulty is removed by making a direct appropriation, which is the only feasible way of getting this vital metal into the factories.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 173: Page 96, line 4, insert "The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Tresaury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 173 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after the word "authorize", add the following: ", during the fiscal year 1944."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 174: Page 96, line 10, strike out "$8,640,225" and insert "$18,742,600."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment. This is the total for the Bureau of Mines.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 184: Page 106, line 9, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$115,000, including not to exceed $11,300 for the purchase of the land, buildings, and other privately owned property at the United States Rabbit Experiment Station at Fontana, Calif."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 184.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 190: Page 109, line 1, strike out "$4,147,350" and insert "$4,873,205."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,456,390."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 192: Page 109, line 18, strike out "$4,897,350" and insert "$6,123,205."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,456,390."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 194: Page 110, line 7, after the word "outfits" insert "plans and specifications for vessels, or for contract personal services for the preparation thereof."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 200: Page 118, line 17, insert the following: "SEC. 9. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 201: Page 119, line 1, strike out "8" and insert "10."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in connection with the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments which are still in disagreement and request a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, FITZPATRICK, KIRWAN, NORRELL, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was granted leave of absence, for 1 day, on account of attending a funeral.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to Mr. Davies from the Oil Controller of Canada regarding oil and gasoline rationing there. They have a very much better system than we have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a cablegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] be permitted to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1109. An act to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Saturday, July 3, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

532. A letter from the Chairman, United State Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the estimates of and justification for personnel requirements of the Tariff Commission for the fiscal quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

533. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 163 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended by the acts of June 28, 1940, and December 8, 1942, and referring to his letter to the Congress dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1242. An act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; without amendment (Rept. No. 642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2801. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; with amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 3103. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Maumee River and tributaries, Indiana and Ohio, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3104. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3105. A bill providing for rebates of motor vehicle use stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 3106. A bill to restore former basis of compensation and allowances of postmasters and postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3107. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3108. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3110. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution authorizing the making without avoidable delay of agreements between the United States and the several United Nations to secure and maintain law, order, and peace among the nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Res. 284. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 285. Resolution to authorize the appropriation of $5,000 for the investigation to be undertaken under the provisions of House Resolution 262; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DIES:
H. Res. 286. Resolution to establish an inter-Government committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. Res. 287. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate the causes of and forces behind the recent race riots; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:
H. R. 3111. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:
H. R. 3112. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Werner A. S. Ohls, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 3113. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Gust Haller, of Palmer, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:
H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Ruth Coe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:
H. R. 3115. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Hinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:
H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Emmett Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1837. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Anna Craik, Thief River Falls, Minn., and 25 other signers from that community, urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1838. By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of the Sons of the Revolution concerning the use of our flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1839. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Murry Leach, vice president and general manager of Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., Dallas, Tex., opposing House bill 2100; to the Committee on Patents.

1840. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the students at Michigan State Normal College and friends or members of the Alpha Chapter of the International Council for Exceptional Children, asking for the enactment of House bill 496; to the Committee on Education.

1841. By Mr. LANE: Resolution of Mayor W. A. Bennett and City Council of Worcester, Mass., concerning a more equitable distribution of gasoline and fuel oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1842. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by H. J. Hart, of Tillamook, Oreg., and 34 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs, it is Thy might which hath made and preserved us a nation. Standing this day on the threshold of an immortal date which has engraved itself forever on the fast-hurrying years and whose scarlet threads are woven into the grateful memory of every true patriot of the Republic, we lift our joyful praise for the American dream—the dream of a land where the people rule, of a state which is the instrument of the common good, of a union which finds room for the richness of diversity.

In this solemn hour of the supreme test of America's faith, when determined foes deny, defy, and would defile the very conceptions and aspirations which to us, nurtured in liberty, make life precious and sacred, may this Nation under God have a new birth of freedom. If the way to victory is long and difficult and at crimson cost, still keep our wills steadfast and our faith strong as was the faith of our fathers when they built this Nation of our love and prayer. May our flag, born in the tragedy of strife, be an inspiring symbol to all the world that out of today's death and night shall rise the dawn of an ampler life for all mankind. May we bear our full part in freedom's crowning hour that we may tell our sons and daughters who will live in the light of the new day, "I saw the power of darkness put to flight. I saw the morning break!" We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Friday, July 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION AT OTTAWA, CANADA

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate who were appointed under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, adopted by the Senate on June 18, 1943, excepting one Member who was unable to leave Washington because of his official duties here, attended the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada Branch, during the period June 26 to June 30, as guests of that association. All of the Members of the House of Representatives who were appointed under this resolution, which was adopted by the House of Representatives on June 22, also attended that meeting.

Delegations from the United Kingdom Parliament and from the legislative bodies of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda also participated.

The subject of study and informal discussion was the qualification and capacity of democracies to win the war and to attain peace that will prevail throughout the world.

The discussions were marked by eagerness for information, candor of expression, and friendly understanding.

No obligations were sought or undertaken, but consequences of high value in mutual understanding were realized.

The hospitality for which Canadians are famous was greatly appreciated by all their guests.

The Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, in the House of Commons debates of Tuesday, June 29, 1943—volume LXXXI, No. 99, page 4217—referred to that conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of that House of Commons Record, pages 4217 and 4218, containing the remarks of the Prime Minister of Canada and those of the leader of the opposition, Mr. Gordon Graydon, as well as those of the member from Rosetown-Biggar, Mr. M. J. Coldwell, who, by the way, called on us afterward here in Washington, and the member from Lethbridge, Mr. J. H. Blackmore.

I concur in the opinion of the Prime Minister of Canada that "the resolution itself will in time become an historic document," and I believe that this first meeting of Members of the Congress of the United States with members of the Empire Parliamentary Association is the beginning of a relationship among those bodies—which are closest to the people of the democracies—having endless possibilities of understanding and achievement.

On our return to Washington the Congress was honored by a visit from the following members of the Empire Parliamentary Association on June 30 and July 1:

The Right Honorable Viscount Stansgate, P. C., D. S. O., D. F. C., leader of United Kingdom delegation—William Wedgwood Benn; Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, K. B. E., M. P., deputy leader of the United Kingdom delegation; the Right Honorable Sir Percy Harris, Bt., M. P.; Sir Howard d'Egville, K. B. E., LL. D., editor of the publications of the Empire Parliamentary Association and secretary of the United Kingdom branch of the association, representing the United Kingdom.

The Honorable Thomas Vien, K. C., Speaker of the Senate of Canada; Mr. John G. Diefenbaker, K. C., M. P.; Mr. M. J. Coldwell, M. P.; Mr. Lionel Chevier, K. C., M. P.; all of the Dominion of Canada branch.

David Oliver Watkins, M. P., leader of the Australian delegation.

Leonard George Lowry, M. P., leader of the New Zealand delegation.

William Philip Endean, LLB., M. P., member of the New Zealand delegation.

Honorable S. Jones, Minister of Defense of New Zealand.

Honorable Sir Stanley Spurling, M. I. C., Kt., leader of delegation from Bermuda; and his associate, H. D. Butterfield, M. H. A., Pembroke representative in the House of Assembly of Bermuda.

The compliment of their visit to the Congress of the United States is further evidence of the intention of the democracies to cultivate a more perfect union for the prosecution of the war and the attainment of lasting peace.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Without objection, the excerpts from the House of Commons debates of the Parliament of Canada will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCATION

OTTAWA MEETINGS—DELEGATION FROM UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Rt. Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it would, I think be in keeping with the wishes of honorable members were I to make a brief reference to the conference concluded today by the Empire Parliamentary Association. The meetings were attended by delegations from the Parliaments of the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand and from the Legislative Assembly of Bermuda, as well as by many honorable members of our own Parliament. The proceedings throughout were of a high order and demonstrated the value of the free expression and interchange of ideas among the nations of the Commonwealth which the conference had been formed to promote.

The conference will be particularly memorable because of the attendance, yesterday and today, of a distinguished delegation of visitors from the two Houses of the Congress of the United States. The delegation, comprising Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, was appointed by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, accepting the invitation of the Canadian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association. The resolution itself will, in time, become an historic document. It is a signal honor paid to Canada and to the Empire Parliamentary Association by the Congress of the United States The resolution is also of historic significance, as adding another bond to those which already join the nations of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States in the common defense of free institutions.

The House will, I am confident, wish to record its appreciation of the visit, at a time of war, of our distinguised fellow parliamentarians from other nations of the Commonwealth, and its satisfaction that Canada should have been the place of the meeting for the first time of a delegation from the United States Congress with the Empire Parliamentary Association. In this meeting we can see the development of the understanding, friendship, and good will on which even now is being laid the enduring foundations of a new world order.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (leader of the opposition) Mr. Speaker, I am glad at this point to associate myself and the members of the party which I have the honor to lead with the sentiments which have been voiced so eloquently by the Prime Minister. The meetings of the Empire Parliamentary Association which concluded today have been memorable in character. They have served a most useful purpose and in future will be looked upon as having been of great value, not only in relation to the problems which may arise during the war period through which we are passing, but also in relation to the tangled problems which the nations and Governments of the British Empire, the United States, and others will have to solve in the post-war period.

In my opinion the meeting of representatives of the people rather than the heads of government is an occasion of which we should take cognizance. If permanent peace is to come, the common man of each nation must learn to respect and to understand the common man of all the other nations. These meetings have brought forth a new feeling and have generated a new spirit which will be of great value in the days that lie ahead. I wish to echo the words of welcome extended by the Prime Minister to the delegates from the various parts of the British Commonwealth and also from the United States. We view with a great deal of interest the renewal of the acquaintanceship, friendship, and brotherhood among those who met together.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our party I should like to add an expression of appreciation that this conference has been held in Canada. To those of us who visited Great Britain some 18 months ago it was indeed a pleasure to welcome such a delegation to Canada. There is not much that one can say, except that conferences of this kind, participated in by what we might term the rank and file of our legislative bodies, including on this occasion representatives of the Congress of the United States, can bring nothing but good to the United Nations and to the world. I hope that it will be the first of many such conferences.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge). Mr. Speaker, the members of my party rejoice along with other Canadians in the fact that we have laid the foundation for the development of good will between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. The conferences which have just been held were epoch making in their significance. I do not believe I have ever attended meetings at which such frankness, candor, and good will were displayed. I am grateful indeed to those who arranged the conference and to those who have taken part in the meetings.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 121, 149, 161, 184, 194, 200, and 201 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 85 and 142 to the bill and concurred therein, each with amendments; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 107, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendments to Senate amendments numbered 85, 107, 142, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, and 174 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

VISIT BY VETERANS OF NORTH AFRICAN CAMPAIGN—EXTENSION OF LEAVE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of announcing to the Senate the presence in the Senate gallery of a group of veterans of the African campaign. There were some 36 in the group, 28 of whom were from New Mexico.

At that time the Senate paid tribute to that particular group of soldiers, and expressed its desire that if it were possible, consistent with orderly methods and procedure, they be allowed a little longer furlough than what was granted originally. The boys were allowed only 4 days to visit their relatives. Of course, everyone knows it is impossible for a soldier to go from Washington, D. C., to California or New Mexico in 4 days. The desire was expressed that the furloughs be extended. However, it appears that that cannot be done, which has disappointed not only the Senators, but the boys as well.

Several Senators have addressed a short letter to the boys, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1943.

To the Boys of the Eight-hundred and Fourth Tank Destroyer Battalion:

Every possible effort has been made to bring about such action as would result in satisfying your desires. The proceedings in the Senate of the United States yesterday manifests beyond words the feelings and attitude of that body in this matter.

Although it is not difficult to realize the more than keen disappointment which you men have experienced, yet there is not the semblance of a doubt in our minds that you will carry on in the same high spirit which you have heretofore demonstrated throughout the months of suffering and hardships which have been your lot. Your mothers and fathers, as well as yourselves, would want it this way.

With hearty good wishes for your well being, we remain,

Cordially yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
New Mexico.
LISTER HILL,
Alabama.
JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Pennsylvania.
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Kansas.
MON C. WALLGREN,
Washington.
CHAN GURNEY,
South Dakota.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters and statements, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

A statement from the Executive Office of the President, submitting, pursuant to law,

an estimate of personnel requirements for the White House office for the quarter ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters and statements from various departments and agencies, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows: National Resources Planning Board; Office for Emergency Management; American Battle Monuments Commission; Federal Works Agency; Bureau of Selective Service (War Manpower Commission); National Labor Relations Board; Office of Censorship; Office of Price Administration; United States Tariff Commission; Navy Department; War Manpower Commission, including constituent agencies except Bureau of Selective Service; and The National Archives.

REPORT OF CANAL ZONE BIOLOGICAL AREA (S. Doc. No. 91)

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Canal Zone Biological Area, transmitting a report of that biological area for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed.

MONTHLY REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD ON WAGE STABILIZATION

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130, the third monthly report of the Board on wage stabilization with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

SALE OF FIVE VESSELS BY SHIPPING BOARD FOR ACCOUNT OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, submitting a report on the sale by the United States Shipping Board of five vessels to the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co. and the subsequent purchase of said five vessels from that company by the United States Maritime Commission for account of the Navy Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (5) and Agriculture (6) and the Executive Office of the President (War Production Board); which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Whereas on March 10, 1943, there were presented to the Congress of the United States two plans devised by the National Resources Planning Board, which plans make proposals for fundamental changes in almost every phase of the American way of life; and

"Whereas these plans have been transmitted to the Congress with the request that they be given consideration during the present session of the Congress; and

"Whereas millions of American citizens who would be vitally affected if these plans were to be adopted into legislation are absent from their homes at this time as members of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or in associated services, and during such absence are unable effectively to express their views on this subject; and

"Whereas it would be manifestly unfair to enact into law during their absence any plan designed to change that same system of government which our citizens in the armed forces are fighting to preserve; and

"Whereas the task of winning all of the wars in which we are presently engaged is so gigantic that it requires the concentrated effort of every citizen; and

"Whereas this is not the time for the people or the Congress to be distracted by the injection of controversial proposals concerning theoretical social gains from the single purpose of winning the war: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American government as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights, at least until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been brought home, demobilized, and given an opportunity to express their views; and be it

"*Resolved further*, That copies of this preamble and resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress and to each of the Senators and Representatives therein from the State of Illinois and to the legislatures of all other States of the Union, that those of the same view may take similar action."

A resolution adopted at Washington, D. C., by the executive committee of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers, favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 2561, to amend section 12-B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted at Washington, D. C., by the executive committee of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers, commending the foreign policy of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at Washington, D. C., by the executive committee of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers, favoring the establishment of an international news exchange in connection with any peace plan which may be adopted at the conclusion of the present world conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Cambria County Dental Society, Johnstown, Pa., favoring the prompt enactment of pending legislation to establish a pharmacy corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. McCARRAN presented a resolution adopted by the State Board of Education and the State Board for Vocational Education of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the State of Nevada has a sound system of education under the guidance of the State board of education and the supervision of the State department of education; and

Whereas its established public schools are under the control of local school boards and boards of education elected by and responsible to the qualified electorate in accordance with the established principles of democracy; and

Whereas these schools are concerned with educating citizens for a democracy who can live happy and useful liwes; and

Whereas the established system of public education in the State of Nevada is the recognized, proper, and accepted channel for education and training of youth: Now, therefore, the undersigned members of the State board of education and the State board for vocational education, meeting at Carson City, Nev., this 14th day of June 1943, do hereby

Resolve, That they are unalterably opposed to Federal encroachment in the field of education in the State of Nevada through Federal legislation or appropriations to the National Youth Administration or any other Federal board or commission or agency for the purpose of setting up any dual educational or training program for youths; be it further

Resolved, That the undersigned are definitely opposed to the establishment of a federalized system of public education.

State Board of Education: J. C. Kinnear, president; E. P. Carville; Walter R. Bracken; Ott F. Heizer; John J. Hunter; N. E. Wilson; Mildred Bray, executive secretary.

State Board for Vocational Education; J. C. Kinnear, president; E. P. Carville; Walter R. Bracken; Ott F. Heizer; John J. Hunter; Duane Mack; Ed C. Peterson; N. E. Wilson; Mildred Bray, executive secretary.

RESOLUTION OF WATERBURY, CONN., LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. MALONEY Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received embodying a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council at Waterbury, Conn., on June 27, 1943, signed by Clarence V. Balanda, chairman of the council, and Marcelle Andrikis, secretary.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting held at Waterbury, Conn., on June 27, 1943, under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., an organization newly created by

the union of all Lithuanian groups anxious for a free and democratic Lithuania, with the purpose of lending all possible aid to the United States toward the successful prosecution of the war, and with the added aim of fostering a just and lasting peace amongst nations, the following resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of the 1,500 delegates and members there assembled.

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania is the struggling victim of an unprovoked invasion and occupation at the hands of Nazi tyrants; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania have persevered and remained loyal to the principles of freedom and democracy upon which their nation was built; and still resist every attempt made to subjugate them or to assimilate them into a foreign state; and

"Whereas the loyal hearts of our relatives and countrymen again appeal to the leadership of the United States and her allies for inspiration and deliverance from the heavy oppressor's yoke: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That we affirm our complete support of the cause of the United States and the policies of its leaders in their efforts to restore a world of free peoples; and

"*Resolved*, That we favor a peace wherein Lithuania, and the other peoples comprising the Baltic states, will be granted the territorial integrity and the freedoms promised them under the tenets of the Atlantic Charter; and

"*Resolved*, That we unite in our efforts to establish the Lithuanian state, restoring her to her place as a free, democratic, and independent nation safe from the hands of the Axis aggressors; be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Connecticut Members of both Houses of Congress."

CLARENCE V. BALANDA,
Chairman.
MARCELLE ANDRIKIS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS—PROPOSED WORLD GOVERNMENT

Mr. BROOKS presented a letter with an accompanying resolution adopted by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1943.

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith copy of resolutions unanimously adopted by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at our twenty-fourth annual encampment held in Chicago, Ill., June 24–27, 1943.

Yours sincerely,

EARL SOUTHARD,
Past Department Commander.

Whereas the United States is engaged in a horrible global war to preserve our national independence declared in 1776, to maintain our free economic system and our traditional American way of life; and

Whereas the proponents of world government in the United States, instead of directing their attention and energies to the winning of the war, continue to use the war in a mad drive for a commitment of our Government to a post-war new world order; and

Whereas the proponents of world government agree that if their scheme becomes a reality, the United States must surrender her sovereignty, must surrender her control of her defense forces, must surrender her right to enact tariff laws, must surrender her right to coin money and regulate the value thereof, must surrender her high living standards and accept for her citizens a lower standard of living and a greater tax burden; and

Whereas if we become a part of world government by thus surrendering our sovereignty we would be returning to the same condition of servitude in which we were prior to 1776 and the galling chains our Revolutionary forbears broke would again be forged around us; and

Whereas our founding fathers, whom the world has praised for their patriotism and wisdom, believed and hoped that the admirable system which they founded and bequeathed to us would serve us and endure for all time, but the proponents of world government maintain that the work of our founding fathers was but folly, that our constitutional and representative form of government is a failure and that the glories of the Republic of the United States have faded and have come to an end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in annual encampment assembled this 24th day of June 1943 in Chicago, Ill., That we denounce the proponents of world government for their weakening of the war effort to our people and their breeding of disunity and confusion in attempting to use the war to bring about a surrender of our Republic to a new, supreme sovereign world government, that we call upon all persons interested in writing a lasting peace to postpone discussion of peace plans until after our fighting men have returned from the battle fronts of the world and can participate in discussion and decisions on plans and terms of the peace which they won, and that we request the officers of the Government of the United States to formulate plans for peace which will not imperil our American sovereignty, our American rights, our American independence, our American standard of living, and our American tradition and without the commitment of our Government except as directed by the vote of our people.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 166. Resolution relating to segregation of loyal and disloyal Japanese in relocation centers and plans for future operation of such centers; without amendment.

GASOLINE AND FUEL OIL SHORTAGES—ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 59)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I submit herewith a further report of the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel-Oil Shortages. Although our committee, composed of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and myself, has not held hearings since its report to the Senate on February 22, 1943, we have kept very closely in touch with the situation, and our studies have continued. We have met with representatives of the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War, and from time to time discussed the oil situation with officials of the Office of Price Administration and those engaged in the oil industry and representatives of the Army and Navy.

The oil situation, which is so disturbing to the eastern section of our country, and which causes great inconvenience, and in some instances severe hardship, is still very serious. The demands of our armed forces, and those of our allies, and the need to keep their armed equipment in constant operation, and our planes in the air, make almost everything else secondary. Today as never before the armed forces depend for their very life lines on essential civilian activities at home. From the standpoint of actual war needs we see no great danger, but we do foresee further inconvenience on the part of our civilian population. It is conceivable that our future successes in the European theater of war and on the seas may give us considerable relief. We view that prospect with optimism, but must take into account the vicissitudes of war. We must plan for the worst and we hope for the best.

It is the opinion of the committee that our people will patriotically respond to the situation, and make such sacrifices as are proven necessary, for so long as the war lasts and for so long as there is an oil shortage.

I hope that Members of the Senate will have the opportunity to read this report, which attempts to give an overall picture of the situation from the viewpoint of the entire country and not of a particular section.

For the satisfaction it gives me and the members of our committee, and because it is so much deserved, I want publicly to express my appreciation to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, for the assistance which we have received from him and his committee and the members of his staff. I particularly want to express our gratitude to Mr. Rudolph Halley, who has been of invaluable assistance to us, and who has carried much of the burden of our study and activities, and to his associate, Mr. T. Peter Ansberry. These men are members of the staff of the Truman committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Connecticut will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on July 2, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 832. A bill relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1109. A bill to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or

historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of Mabel K. Young:

S. 1304. A bill for the relief of the G. Fava Fruit Co.; and

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of T. Brooks Alford; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced bill 1307, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 1308. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution paying tribute to Francis Scott Key, author of our national anthem; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1943, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL LABOR CODE

Mr. BREWSTER. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a national labor code governing operations and procedure for labor unions. I also request that an explanatory statement regarding the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1307) to provide for a national labor code governing operations and procedure for labor unions, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The statement presented by Mr. BREWSTER in connection with the bill is as follows:

This bill is perhaps unique as a bill regulating labor in that it has been originated and sponsored by responsible labor leaders who have given their lives to union activities.

It is further unique in not creating a new Federal agency for its administration or enlarging the power or responsibility of any existing Federal agency, but rather places the responsibility for its enforcement in the hands of any single interested union member who finds his rights violated by the officials whom he has chosen to represent him.

The bill is not especially designed for war conditions although it is believed it will conduce to labor peace which is the prime requisite in production at the present critical time. Because it is not designed especially for war conditions, it recognizes and provides for the right to strike but this is conditioned by my expectation that before this legislation can receive appropriate consideration after the recess, the Congress will have considered and enacted legislation dealing with the obligation of every individual citizen of the country during time of war, and that this legislation will eliminate any controversy as to the right or opportunity of any individuals to refuse to cooperate in the war effort in which our country is engaged.

The bill is concerned with the general conditions under which labor union activities may be carried on. The country has come to recognize that labor unions like many other associations are now affected with a public interest in whose orderly conduct the public has an interest exactly as they do in the conduct of corporations and associations of many other kinds.

While its provisions may seem restrictive, it will yet be found that 75 percent of the unions in this country now declare most of these rights and obligations in their constitutions and bylaws and that practically all of the unions have at least 75 percent of the provisions in their constitution or bylaws.

Queries may then be made as to why any legal enactment is necessary. The answer is found in the failure in many instances of the officials to observe the restrictions of their constitutions or bylaws and the very great practical difficulties in the way of enforcement of their rights by members of the obligations of the officers.

Removal of the delinquent or transgressing officials would seem to be a simple remedy but this is rendered rather difficult when in many instances conventions of international unions are omitted for many years at a time.

It is the considered opinion of the close students of the labor problem, both within and without organized labor, that many of the evils which have greatly aroused the public in recent years would be eliminated if orderly methods of procedure were laid down by law and there was provision by which these procedures could be enforced without the necessity of running to Washington for redress.

The bill is being introduced at this time, prior to the recess, in order that there may be opportunity for consideration by all interested during the summer with the hope that it may be possible to secure hearings on the proposed legislation before the Committee on Education and Labor during the fall when a representative presentation can be made as to the conditions and the reasons that lead some students of the situation to believe action along this line may be helpful.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, be printed in the usual form and in the RECORD and that following it there be printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement prepared by me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY, for himself and Mr. BUTLER, is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 147

Amendment intended to be proposed by Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator BUTLER to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes:

"SEC. 6. The authority conferred by section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and by all other provisions of law to make subsidy payments with respect to food and to purchase food for the purpose of sale at a loss shall, after the date of the enactment of this act, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the necessary maximum production or utilization of food for the armed services, for essential civilian needs, for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, and for war relief purposes: *Provided*, That such subsidy payments shall be made only to and such purchases shall be made only from producers of the commodity from which such food is derived: *Provided further*, That, until the President recommends and the Congress approves a larger amount, the aggregate cost of such subsidy operations shall not exceed $175,000,000.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall not affect in any way (1) the carrying out of subsidy programs which have been announced or subsidy commitments which have been made prior to July 1, 1943, except roll-back programs with respect to milk and livestock and their products, which may not be continued beyond July 31, 1943; (2) the making of such adjustments in the maximum prices for competitive domestic fats and vegetable oils and oilseeds, and the carrying out of such subsidy operations in connection therewith, as may be necessary to bring about or maintain adequate production or utilization for the war effort; (3) the selling of wheat for feeding purposes, if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, as otherwise provided by law; (4) the payment to shippers of commodities or others of increased costs, resulting from the war emergency, in connection with the transportation of any commodity; and (5) programs or operations undertaken with respect to commodities produced outside the continental United States."

The explanatory statement submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY is as follows:

It is not sufficient to maintain ceilings on food products and keep the cost of living down. It is necessary also to make certain that there is a sufficient supply of food.

The extension of the commodity-credit bill in the form approved by the House and the roll-back program announced by Office of Price Administration will not provide sufficient food. The reason is plain: neither the producers of livestock nor the little packers are able to meet the cost of production under this plan. Little packing houses are closing. The liquidation of the small packer will make it impossible for the big cities and the people generally to obtain the meat supplies they need. The liquidation of these packers will also make it difficult for the armed forces to obtain their supply. Moreover, it will result in further concentrating the meat-packing industry in the hands of the big packers.

The roll-back upon the producer must be prevented at all costs if the production of agricultural commodities is to be maintained at the rate necessary for war purposes. If the roll-back is not stopped, producers of livestock and other agricultural commodities

will go out of business just as the little packers have been going out of business. No farmer, no processor can operate at less than the cost of production. Therefore, we must take the steps necessary to guarantee at least that rate.

Since the House of Representatives has sustained the President's veto, and since the President has invited the cooperation of Congress, there is only one course left open now, and that is to authorize the subsidies to be paid at the source where alone they can guarantee the supply of food that is needed. This can be done through an amendment similar to that which I offered last Friday and which was approved by the Senate. Such a modification is now being presented by Senator BUTLER and myself. We have discussed the matter with Prentiss Brown and others, and I believe that a solution may possibly be worked out along this line.

The proposal to be offered by us makes it possible to prevent any rise in the cost of living so far as food is concerned and, at the same time, it will not obstruct the production and distribution of food, as the present program does. It will allow the normal operation of all branches of the food industry, and, in our opinion, if properly administered, will require the payment of only minimum subsidies. Of equal importance, it will prevent the roll-back upon the producer which, if permitted to continue, will certainly result in the destruction of the capacity of American agriculture to produce.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LABOR UNION INITIATION FEES AND DUES

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, following some observations by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], a debate ensued wherein, through the courtesy of the junior Senator from Maine, I was permitted to interrupt as follows:

Mr. HOLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if the basic and fundamental situation back of this controversy is not the struggle between the various racketeers of labor for the harvest of dues and initiation fees imposed upon the workers?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will let the Senator from Oregon phrase the situation as he wishes. The Senator from Minnesota said it was rather clearly indicated before our committee that there was a contest as to who should control.

Mr. HOLMAN. Control what and for what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. The receipt of funds. It seems clear to me that at this crisis the Senate should not be primarily concerned with whether one or another group shall receive the dues.

Further in the debate the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] yielded to me, when I remarked as follows:

Mr. HOLMAN. I happen to come from the district in which seems to be located the plant where the unjustified things occurred. The very question asked by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] indicates the situation of a monopoly on the issuing of permits by which men can earn their daily bread. The situation has reached such a point that men must buy a permit to work. That is the wording of it—a permit to work. It results in racketeering at the expense of the men who work; and every one of the thousands upon thousands of men who work have to buy from the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. a permit to work. That results in graft which makes Al Capone look like a child in kindergarten.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to extend my thoughts on this subject.

In my opinion the Senate Committee on Education and Labor should proceed at once to report remedial amendments to the National Labor Relations Act which experience under it now demands.

The National Labor Relations Act, as it now reads and is administered, permits, and encourages racketeering of a most vicious and un-American character; and the victims of this racketeering are the very workingmen whom I am sure it was the purpose of the Congress to protect. By means of force and violence, citizens—both employees and employers—are intimidated by legalized gangsters so that many good American citizens no longer are permitted to engage in free enterprise either by the use of their labor or capital; but must submit to regimentation and exploitation by racketeers, who exercise a control over the persons, activities, and earnings of the workers and of the capital and commercial operations of the employers. Moreover, under the National Labor Relations Act the racketeers of labor have amassed great sums of money from the sale of "permits to work," so-called initiation fees and dues, by extracting these enforced and piratical fees from the savings and earned wages of the workers.

All this is wrong and immoral, in my opinion, and it is my earnest hope that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor will offer promptly the reformatory amendments which the existing chaotic and un-American situation demands. The present law, in effect, sets up labor bosses, or strike masters, or racketeers, who are parasites on the earnings of the workers, and an effective force in controlling and curtailing the freedom and liberty of American citizens.

Is it not possible now, with the knowledge gained from 8 years of experience under the National Labor Relations Act, to save the good features of it and yet reform the mischief-making provisions contained in it, or the administration of it, so that American workmen can be protected from exploitation not only from grasping employers and improper working conditions, but also from intimidation through fear of beat-up squads in the employ of the racketeers, and from the piratical exactions of the racketeers?

CONDITIONS IN COAL MINING—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address regarding the coal situation delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Solid Fuels Administrator for War, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT OR HITLER, WHICH?—ARTICLE FROM THE WICHITA PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt or Hitler, Which?" from the Wichita Plain Dealer of June 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE THOMAS S. SMITH, COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR CONNECTICUT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Herbert E. Gaston, and editorials from the Hartford Times and the Hartford Courant, in tribute to the late Thomas S. Smith, Collector of Internal Revenue for Connecticut, which appear in the Appendix.]

INFLATION AND WAR BONDS—LETTER BY ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter dealing with the effect of inflation on the value of War bonds, addressed to Senator LUCAS by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, published in the June 29, 1943, issue of the Herald-American, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE ARMED FORCES WONDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE TORONTO DAILY STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What the Armed Forces Wonder," from the Toronto Daily Star of May 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTHLY PAYMENTS TO DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a schedule of the monthly payments to dependents of enlisted men, prepared by the War Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

PERMANENT STAFF OF EXPERTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there is an editorial dealing with the need of having a small permanent staff of experts attached to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, so that prior to the time appropriation bills come to the committees for consideration, examinations and surveys may be made and pertinent information secured, which will not only save time but furnish the Appropriations Committees with information which they should have and must have if they are to function smoothly and efficiently.

As the result of an investigation into governmental activities authorized by the Senate some time ago, bills have been introduced by Senators on the other side of the Chamber to accomplish this purpose, and I have also introduced one. There has not been sufficient time during the present session to give that matter consideration, but I hope that when the Senate reconvenes after the recess legislation will be enacted which will permit the Appropriations Committees to employ, let us say, three experts in the Senate and three in the House, and one jointly, which will compose a standing group which can pursue studies and investigations for the Appropriations Committees,

so that wherever possible we may effect economies and efficiency in the appropriation of public moneys.

I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks the editorial from today's Washington Post may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS HELP

One reason for the failure of Congress to get all appropriations passed before the beginning of the new fiscal year is the enormous size of these spending bills. Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee estimates that the total outlay to be authorized by Congress this year will approximate $115,000,000,000. Last year Congress broke all previous records by appropriating 147 billions. To approve expenditures on this scale is a gigantic undertaking, which leaves many legislators with a feeling of confusion and helplessness.

The war thus explains the failure of Congress to meet its primary responsibility, but it falls a long way short of justifying that failure. Congress, as well as other agencies of Government and private industry, ought to be prepared to meet emergencies. It should be able to adjust its procedures to the demands of wartime. Because it did not manifest the flexibility which it demands of other agencies contributing to the war effort, the new fiscal year began with 4 regular departments and 17 war agencies lacking funds.

This experience should convince the most conservative Member that Congress needs new tools to speed up its work. Possibly this log jam at the end of the fiscal year might have been avoided if the House had shown more dispatch in sending supply bills to the Senate. But in any event Congress ought to realize that it cannot intelligently appropriate $100,000,000,000 a year, or even a fraction of that sum, without expert assistance. That lesson as to tax legislation was learned many years ago when the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was set up. But no action whatever has been taken on Senator TYDINGS' resolution to create a similar body of experts to serve both the Senate and House in making appropriations. A permanent joint committee on appropriations would save legislators from much drudgery, give Congress as a whole a better picture of the Government's requirements, and probably save taxpayers enormous sums. Why doesn't Congress lighten its burden by hastening to put this reform into effect?

Senator TYDINGS' resolution points to only one of many ways in which Congress could be made to operate more efficiently. Reduction in the number of committees, particularly in the House, seems to meet with the approval of everyone, except a few committee members. Certainly, too, there is need for better organization and leadership to keep both Houses working on major bills of national interest. Nevertheless, it would be naive to assume that any reforms of this sort can be imposed on Congress from without. Congressmen are notoriously jealous of their own rules and prerogatives. The best hope of modernizing its procedure seems to lie in the appointment of a joint committee of its own Members to study the subject thoroughly and report definite recommendations back to Congress.

FOOD SUBSIDIES—LETTER FROM ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an extremely able letter written to the President of the United States by Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, in which he expresses the opposition of the Grange to food subsidies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1943.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the winning of the war and the establishment of a sound and enduring peace depends so largely upon an adequate food supply, any policy that restricts or stifles production should not be tolerated. The situation with which we are confronted calls for the maximum production of foodstuffs.

It is also our duty to do all in our power to halt the drift toward inflation. If we are to prevent inflation, we must remove the cause instead of treating the symptoms. There are two chief causes of inflation. The first is the pressure of excess income on an insufficient supply of consumer goods, and the second is the loss of confidence in the Government's ability to pay its obligations in dollars having the same purchasing power as the dollar it borrowed.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

On the basis of today's prices, we have an annual income of approximately $40,000,000,000 in excess of the consumer goods available. Assuming that half this sum will go into savings, we still have the serious problem of an excess income of some $20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a billion and a half to $2,000,000,000 per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high production cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised which is effective enough to reach only these high-cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high-cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low-cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high-cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production. On the other hand, when used in connection with subsidies, it increases the gap at the other end because the Government has to borrow the money paid in subsidies and most of this is borrowed from banks. This increases our national spendable income. The subsidy therefore defeats itself. The present plan attempts the impossible by putting economic law into reverse. Higher prices encourage production and discourage consumption. The subsidy program encourages consumption, and to the extent that the subsidies fail to reach the producers they discourage production.

After everything reasonable has been done to increase production, including a compensatory price, if the supply will not meet the demand, the next step is to reduce the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways. First, by increased taxes and increased savings, or both. Second, by rationing. Where goods are scarce, rationing should be applied so that the supply will be divided equitably. Commodities can be rationed to produce a surplus which can be used to hold prices at reasonable levels without the use of ceilings; although ceilings to prevent profiteering may be necessary in some instances. Ceilings should be used for no other purpose.

If we do not take practical steps to close our fast-increasing inflationary gap, plain economics will do it for us, as has always occurred in the past. More and more goods will flow through black markets at higher prices, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar until it comes into balance with the supply. That is inflation.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on government outgo, how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any government can endure, and that is that the people must support the government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the government to support the people cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound, butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late thirties. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply.

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food prices at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest on earth.

In England they have practically closed the inflationary gap, largely by taxation. Three years ago there were 7,000 people with a net income in excess of $25,000 after paying taxes. Last year this group was reduced to 80. At the other end of the line, England has sales taxes ranging from 12 to 72 percent of the retail price.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1, we exported to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately $730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus, England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from America, which are under complete control. She does not include such home-grown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should also be noted that England is having a serious time with black markets. She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison, plus $20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties, prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that black markets are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

We therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps, but rather that our course should be based upon the sound economics necessary to maintain a maximum food supply, for we have no one but ourselves to look to for aid.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
ALBERT S. GOSS, *Master*.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed consideration of the message of the House of Representatives announcing its action on the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 24, and 30 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am about to make the motion that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30, but I think there should be a quorum of the Senate present when I make the motion, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Reed
Austin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lucas	Stewart
Burton	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	Maloney	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair states for the information of the Senate that on yesterday the Senate disposed of amendments numbered 19 and 24 to the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency bill. Senate amendment 30 is now before the Senate for approval or disapproval.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TYDINGS. Vote!

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. At this time, Mr. President, I ask to have read a resolution adopted by the State Board of Education of the State of Nevada and endorsed by the State board of vocational education on the subject of the National Youth Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the State of Nevada has a sound system of education under the guidance of the State board of education and the supervision of the State department of education; and

Whereas its established public schools are under the control of local school boards and boards of education elected by and responsible to the qualified electorate in accordance with the established principles of democracy; and

Whereas these schools are concerned with educating citizens for a democracy who can live happy and useful lives; and

Whereas the established system of public education in the State of Nevada is the recognized proper, and accepted channel for education and training of youth: Now, therefore, the undersigned members of the State board of education and the State board for vocational education, meeting at Carson City, Nev., this 14th day of June 1943, do hereby

Resolve, That they are unalterably opposed to Federal encroachment in the field of education in the State of Nevada through Federal legislation or appropriations to the National Youth Administration or any other Federal board or commission or agency for the purpose of setting up any dual educational or training program for youths; be it further

Resolved, That the undersigned are definitely opposed to the establishment of a federalized system of public education.

State Board of Education: J. C. Kinnear, president; E. P. Carville; Walter R. Bracken; Ott F. Heizer; John J. Hunter; N. E. Wilson; Mildred Bray, executive secretary.

State Board for Vocational Education: J. C. Kinnear, president; E. P. Carville; Walter R. Bracken; Ott F. Heizer; John J. Hunter; Duane Mack; Ed. C. Peterson; N. E. Wilson; Mildred Bray, executive secretary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a word of explanation as to the vote. The Senate will recall that when House bill 2935, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, was before the House in the first instance, the House refused to make appropriation for the National Youth Administration, save and except sufficient to liquidate it. The bill came to the Senate and came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee placed in the bill an amendment carrying approximately $47,000,000 for the National Youth Administration. The full committee refused to adopt the subcommittee's amendment. The bill was reported to the Senate without any recommendation for an appropriation for the National Youth Administration. The Senate then considered an amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] carrying approximately $48,000,000 to retain the National Youth Administration. The Senate agreed to the amendment, and it went to conference. The House conferees took the amendment back to the House. The House has voted against the amendment by a substantial majority.

The matter now comes before the Senate in connection with the question of the adoption of the conference report. The motion is that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30. In other words, the motion is to recede from the appropriation of $48,000,000 voted on the floor of the Senate for the National Youth Administration.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, as has been said by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to include the amendment in the appropriation bill. The full committee voted it out by a vote of 13 to 12, as I remember.

Thereafter, the amendment was placed before the Senate, and the Senate voted for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. By a vote of 41 to 37.

Mr. TRUMAN. As the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland says, the vote was 41 to 37.

The amendment was taken to the House. The vote in the House was 197 to 176; in other words, the amendment was rejected by a margin of 21 votes in the House. I was in the House when the vote was taken.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the first time the House had had any formal consideration of the matter; was it not?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was not presented there until the conference report came before the House; was it?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct. Both the House subcommittee and the Senate subcommittee voted for it; but the full House Appropriations Committee voted it out. The House did not have a chance to vote on it, under the House rule applying in the case.

Therefore, the first time the matter had been brought to the attention of the House for a vote was when the conferees presented the amendment to the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If I correctly understand the figures the Senator has stated, they mean that a shift of 11 votes in the House would have changed the situation; is that correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. A shift of two votes in the Senate would have changed the result; would it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes. Senators will have an opportunity to shift their votes today, if they wish to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how many shifts are we working on now? [Laughter.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that at the present time the principal operations of the N. Y. A. are in the war effort. I hold in my hand a compilation of statements from war industries relative to what the N. Y. A. has been doing to train young men and young women who have gone into war industries, the young women to take the place of men who have become members of the armed forces. The compilation comprises several pages. I shall not ask to have it read, nor shall I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. I do request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the list of firms, and the towns in which they are located, which have stated that the N. Y. A. has been of assistance to them in their war effort. The list covers nearly the whole United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aetna Steel Products, Pottsville, Pa.; Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.; American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.; Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.; Brandt Warner Manufacturing Co., York, Pa.; Carrier Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; C. G. Conn., Ltd., Elkhart, Ind.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Elizabeth City, N. J.; Crucible Steel Co. of America, Harrison, N. J.; Culver Aircraft Corporation, Wichita, Kans.; Curtiss-Wright Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Dravo Corporation, Wilmington, Del.; Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation, North Chicago, Ill.; Fellows Gear Shaper Co., Springfield, Vt.; Ford Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.; General Electric X-Ray Corporation; Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co., West Springfield, Mass.; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.; Higgins Industries, Inc., New Orleans, La.; Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.; International Harvester Co., St. Paul, Minn.; J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.; Jones & Lamson Machine Co., Springfield, Vt.; Richmond Shipyard No. 1, Richmond, Calif.; Keuffel & Easer Co., Hoboken, N. J.; Liberty Aircraft Products Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y.; Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.; North American Aviation, Inc., Dallas, Tex.; Parachute Co. of Utah, Manti, Utah; Pioneer Parachute Co., Inc., Manchester, Conn.; Piper Aircraft Corporation, Lock Haven, Pa.; Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co., Stamford, Conn.

Precision Engineering Co., Duluth, Minn.; Precision Tool & Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Schneider Machine & Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.; Standard Heater & Oil Equipment Co., Jersey City, N. J.; St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Studebaker Corporation, South Bend, Ind.; Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.; United States Air Conditioning Corporation, Minneapolis, Minn.; U. S. Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Walsh Holyoke Steam Boiler Works, Inc., Holyoke, Mass.; Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; William Bros. Boiler & Manufacturing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., Holyoke, Mass.; York Corrugating Co., York, Pa.; Air King Products Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. B. Equipment Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Ardco Manufacturing Co., North Bergen, N. J.; Associated Manufacturers, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa; B. & C. Machine Shops, Worcester, Mass.; Barclay Manufacturing Co., Inc., West New York, N. J.; Banthin Engineering & Manufacturing, Inc., Bridgeport, Conn.; R. H. Bouligny, Inc., Charlotte, N. C.; Brown Shipbuilding Co., Houston, Tex.; Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis.; Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans.; Chicago Electric Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Charles F. Clark, Chicago, Ill.; Clinton Square Auto Supply Co., Newark, N. J.; C. A. Coffey, York, Pa.; Cone Automatic Machine Co., Inc., Windsor, Vt.; Columbia Aircraft Corporation, Valley Stream, N. Y.; Dalkin Co., Chicago, Ill.; The David Bell Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Louis F. Dow Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Ford Bros., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Gardiner-Warring Co., Inc., Florence, Ala.

Albert Given Manufacturing Co., East Chicago, Ill.; David Goldberg, Uniontown, Pa.; D. Grandinetti Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Charles Harris Plumbing & Heating Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Herzog Iron Works, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.; Alfred Hofmann & Co., West New York, N. J.; Jerald Sulky Co., Waterloo, Iowa; A. A. Johnson Machine Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; K-H Machine Works, Union City, N. J.; Kieley & Mueller, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; James A. Kiley Co., Somerville, Mass.; Knapp Bros. Manufacturing Co., Joliet, Ill.; L. O. Koven & Bro., Inc., Jersey City, N. J.; Laister-Kauffmann Aircraft Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Jacques Kreisler Manufacturing Corporation, North Bergen, N. J.; M & L Motor Supply Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Mall Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Midwestern Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Miele Iron Works, Union, N. J.; Models, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; New Monarch Machine & Stamping Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.; Pneumatic Drop Hammer Co., Braintree, Mass.; Pneumatic Scale Corporation, Ltd., North Quincy, Mass.; Rankin's Tent & Awning Co., Waterloo, Iowa; Research & Engineering Co., Carburetors, Agawan, Mass.; Rockford Bolt & Steel Co., Rockford, Ill.; Savannah Machine & Foundry Co., Savannah, Ga.; Robert L. Stedman, Oyster Bay, N. Y.; Tirrell Silk Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.; West Duluth Business Men's Club, Duluth, Minn.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I desire to emphasize the fact that the N. Y. A. now is doing a job in the war effort which I believe should not at this time be curtailed. If the N. Y. A. is liquidated on the basis on which the House has appropriated the money for liquidation, about $97,000,000 worth of equipment which is being used every day to train youths will be entirely out of use.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised by some of those in the front rank of the vocational-education movement in Maryland—and the same situation may be true in other States—that they feel that if the N. Y. A. is liquidated, they are fully competent, able, and equipped to give the identical training which the N. Y. A. has been giving. The vocational-education authorities in my State claim that they have been giving the same training.

My concern is not with the need for the training, but with the question whether or not the vocational-education authorities are as well equipped to give such training as is the N. Y. A. Secondly, if the N. Y. A. is liquidated, that much more equipment will be made available to the vocational-education authorities, without any additional charge on the Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Would not a considerable amount of time be required to take over and reorganize the schools under the vocational-education program? The principal complaint which has been made in connection with the vocational-educational program is that in some schools the training has not been available for the reason that in many States the program could not be carried on through the vocational-education organization because there were not a sufficient number of teachers with the necessary amount of technical education. Would it not be wiser to continue this activity until the emergency is over, and then let the vocational-education agencies take it over?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. First of all, when the emergency is over, there will be a new emergency. The N. Y. A. was created during the depression, as a depression agency to take care of the youth of the country who either could not obtain employment, or by force of circumstances were denied the normal opportunities for obtaining an education. That emergency has passed. Now we are in the war emergency, and the whole activity is translated into a war activity. I am sure that the Senator knows enough about human nature to appreciate that when this war effort is over there will be an-

other emergency, into which it will be claimed that the N. Y. A. will fit.

As to the delays which it is argued would result in organizing the vocational education work, that argument has no foundation. As I understand, the vocational education facilities are already in being, and have been in being for years. They are provided for by appropriations made by Congress. No reorganization would be necessary. The vocational education agencies are already equipped to go ahead with the N. Y. A. program where the N. Y. A. drops it. The vocational education set-up would take on an additional duty. Vocational education teachers have assured me that they are fully equipped and fully staffed to do this work, except perhaps for some increase which might be necessary in the event the whole program were transferred to vocational education. They are already doing it just as well as, if not better than, N. Y. A.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make response to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. If the vocational education set-up was in existence when the first emergency of which the Senator spoke arose, apparently it was unable, because of existing restrictions placed upon it by the various States—not by the Federal Government—to take care of the program at that time. If the National Youth Administration took care of the emergency arising at that time, and if it is taking care of the present emergency up to its capacity, why destroy it?

A future emergency may arise.

Take the shipbuilding industry. We have good yards and bad yards, but it has been the policy to try to keep all the yards operating, and to bring the bad ones up to the standard of the good ones. Would it not be better to hold the ship steady, and not have a sudden disruption through a conversion at this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is a certain plausibility to what the Senator says; but I do not believe the facts support his argument. For example, Baltimore is one of the most congested industrial areas in the country. At first the vocational education operations there were absolutely stagnated, because of a lack of equipment, which was the result, in part, of a lack of knowledge of just what the training requirements would be, and a lack of certain facilities. The National Youth Administration was confronted with the same problems. Considerable mechanical equipment is needed for training, and the National Youth Administration has such equipment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. TRUMAN. When the National Youth Administration was cut one-third a considerable amount of machines and mechanical equipment was offered to the vocational-education authorities, and they could take only about one-third of it. The vocational-education organizations are not equipped to take over the machinery and carry on the program unless the whole N. Y. A. organization is taken over and an appropriation is made for that purpose. If that were done the investment in the N. Y. A. would be thrown away and the organization would be torn up at a time when we need it worse than we have ever needed it in the history of the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that his over-all observation does not hold true in all categories. Much of the equipment which N. Y. A. has is critical machinery which industry itself needs.

Mr. TRUMAN. Much of the machinery which the N. Y. A. ceased using has not been taken over. It is still in storage.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not talking about vocational education for the moment. Industry itself needs presses, lathes, and other equipment. In many cases the War Production Board has been unable to furnish industry with the amount of machinery which it needs in order to produce the requirements for war.

Mr. TRUMAN. Then, why does not industry take over the machinery which the N. Y. A. wishes to turn over and which is in storage?

Mr. TYDINGS. Some of that machinery may not be suitable, or perhaps the N. Y. A. would not release it.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is ready for release.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not mention any names, but I happen to know of a case in which a great deal of machinery was not in use when the order came out to cut down the N. Y. A. by one-third. The machinery was then in storage. The organization which had the machinery in storage, feeling that a demand would come to turn the machinery over to the vocational education authorities, or to some other agency, immediately drew all that machinery, which had been idle, out of storage, set it up, and started to operate it for the first time.

The Senator is a very human and a very likable man, and I am sure that he knows enough about human nature to appreciate that quite often an agency will not want something which the Government has in great abundance until it is about to be taken away.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then it will claim that it would be ruined if the facilities were taken away and that the country would be devastated. So it puts the facilities into operation to hold on to them until such time as the furore subsides. That is what happened, to my certain knowledge, in several cases in which N. Y. A. machinery was not being utilized. When it was thought that it might be taken away the N. Y. A. officials immediately sent word down the line to utilize the machinery or it would be taken away. Thereby it made converts for the cause.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I am not condoning any errors which the National Youth Administration or any other organization may have made. What I am saying to the distinguished Senator is that there is no doubt that for the past year and a half this organization has been of tremendous help and has been an asset in the war effort. I do not think that the organizations in the list which I have submitted for the RECORD would make such statements as they have made unless they were absolutely true.

I based my first fight on this question before the Senate on the statements of Kaiser, Higgins, and the Aluminum Co. of America. I have added to that list the names of nearly 100 other industrial firms all over the United States. If we disrupt this organization, which is exactly what would happen if the liquidation program should go through as proposed by the House, we shall be absolutely throwing away one of the greatest assets which industry now needs.

Mr. President, I was never more in earnest in my life than I am when I make that statement. I have had a great deal of discussion of the situation with representatives of the industrial firms whose names are on the list which I have submitted.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I trust that the contention put forth so ably by my distinguished colleague from Missouri will be approved by the Senate. I think that so far as it applies to a large city, such as Baltimore, many vocational training institutions are available for applicants who can pass a certain formal educational test. However, so far as smaller communities are concerned, in many instances they depend entirely upon the mobility of the National Youth Administration, which can pick up its isolated machine tools and units and move them from a place where the training is no longer needed to one where the training really can do some good.

With reference to the use of machines, the large industries of America cannot use the machines which the N. Y. A. is now using, because in most instances the machines for school practice are a little different and less modern than the machines for actual work in the plants. The machines are of different types. They are older, and while they are adequate in many respects in making the student and the machine acquainted, they are not wanted by the General Electric Co., the Bethlehem Co., or any of the other large companies. So they are doing the only work they can do and that is work in connection with the N. Y. A.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator state for the information of the Senate how this list of approximately 100 industrial institutions endorsing the N. Y. A. was secured? Was it secured through the Senator's own efforts? Was it secured by him as chairman of the Truman committee, which has done very commendable work in connection with the war effort, or was it secured by the administration?

Mr. TRUMAN. A great many of the names on the list at which the Senator

from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was looking came from the N. Y. A. itself, at my request. A great many of them came to me directly as chairman of the special committee.

Mr. WILLIS. When we create an institution of this kind to establish an educational and training program are we not confronted by the situation that it sends out a great deal of propaganda concerning its own usefulness in an effort to perpetuate itself? Are we not confronted by that situation at the present time?

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not think so in this instance. If I did think so, I would not be in favor of it. I do not believe these industries are interested in propaganda. They are interested in securing help which can do the work.

Mr. WILLIS. We have all been approached by representatives of the N. Y. A. and urged to use our votes to maintain and perpetuate this Administration, which was set up for emergency purposes.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the case with every appropriation bill which comes before the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. If I am correctly informed, teachers in vocational schools are required to have a very high degree of theoretical training in addition to practical training in the particular vocation, whereas in the schools under discussion practical artisans can be used to increase the number of instructors. I know that at the present time in my State there is a shortage of certified school teachers, and I believe a similar condition is prevalent throughout the United States.

If we must train school teachers, they cannot take up the program on the day it is taken out of the hands of the N. Y. A., as has been suggested. I have been at all times a great believer in vocational training of all kinds, but we must yield to practical considerations in an emergency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In response to the comment of my colleague from Indiana, I certainly would not be in favor of any organization which did not believe in itself. I think it is safe to assume that all these agencies believe in the usefulness of the work which they are doing. I am sure the Senator from Indiana would not be in favor of any other kind of an organization. I think it is always safe to assume that an organization wants to continue; but that is not our problem. I am sure the Senator from Indiana will not vote against the N. Y. A. merely because it wants to continue in existence. He will consider whether it is rendering the extremely useful service to which the Senator from Missouri has referred.

The Senator from Maryland referred to the question of urgency, and intimated that emergencies are perennial. I am sure we recognize that; but I am also sure that the Senator from Maryland will not question the fact that the country is now in an emergency vitally related to manpower and trained help.

It is intimated that the N. Y. A. has changed the age limit, so that it will no longer be a national youth organization but a national grandfathers' organization. That is not against it if the grandfathers are in need of training. In my own section the facilities are readily convertible, and girls, as well as boys, are now being trained.

Mr. TYDINGS. Also women.

Mr. BREWSTER. Also women.

The Senator has said that there may be another emergency. I see it very clearly because following the close of the last war the rehabilitation of the returning soldiers became one of our greatest responsibilities. In my own State a great vocational training unit was built up. I made earnest endeavors in order to maintain the million-dollar investment to provide vocational training for our youth. It was not successful because the traditional educational system was not in sympathy with the movement. I worked very zealously. The investment was dissipated.

When the present war emergency arose, we began to realize that the lack of trained mechanics was the tragedy of our war effort. We had plenty of white-collar workers.

In the large centers vocational training has perhaps been successful. In my area it is not. The N. Y. A. has performed a most valuable service. I hope the Senate will not feel that the time has yet come for us to recede and concur. I believe that the House, upon further consideration of the conference report will perhaps find arguments which will persuade 11 Representatives, rather than 2 Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Missouri stated that in connection with his committee work he had received many letters praising the work of the N. Y. A. However, it is only fair to say, for what it is worth, that the communications which he has placed in the RECORD while duplicating in part those which he received, perhaps are excerpts from letters received by the N. Y. A. itself, and it is perfectly within its rights in submitting those to sustain its case.

Mr. TRUMAN. I made that statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to ask the Senator a question. The N. Y. A. program deals with those who are within the draft age. At what point in their training do they get into the class which might be deferred, which would not be possible without such N. Y. A. training?

Mr. TRUMAN. They never get to that point in the N. Y. A. training program. They get to that point only when they become indispensable to industry. The complaint of all the industries with which we have come in contact has been that their top men are being drafted. I do not think a great deal of attention has been paid to deferment in any of the industrial plants. I am glad that that is so.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator has brought that out, because I did not know the facts, and I was asking for information. However, all of us have received complaints that the program—not in its genesis, perhaps, but in its revelation, so to speak—is being indirectly used to siphon some men out of their military responsibilities.

Mr. TRUMAN. I can furnish the distinguished Senator with some very interesting figures and statements from such firms as the Curtiss-Wright Engine Corporation, the Pratt-Whitney Engine Manufacturing Co., and the Henry Ford Motor Co. as to the number of people who have been taken out of key positions who they consider should have been deferred in the draft.

I wish to say to the Senator that I do not think the draft has been interfered with at all by this program.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will be fair enough to admit, however, that holding a position, even though it is not a key position in a defense plant producing articles which are greatly needed, is quite often the means by which a person obtains deferment from military service. I do not say that it is a universal rule, but I say that there are thousands of cases of deferments being granted because men were working in an essential war plant.

I have been impressed by the Senator's viewpoint, but a part of my concern is that I do not want young men to take advantage of the N. Y. A. merely for the purpose of evading military service, thereby necessitating the calling of other young men.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; I wish to say to the able Senator from Maryland that if I thought any such program as that was in progress, I should not now be on my feet. I wish to say further that now most of the trainees are girls and women.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true, but let me say to the Senator that no doubt there are abundant cases of the N. Y. A. being made the medium for men to escape military service, which has resulted in the quota having to be made up by other young men who in the nature of things might not have been called so soon.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not think so.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In response to the Senator from Maryland, let me say that I had a record from my State earlier in the program, when they were taking a great number of young men, showing that the Navy Department had more than 700 applications from young men taking the mechanical training of the N. Y. A., and in each case the Navy asked them to complete the N. Y. A. course so that they could be used for mechanical work in the Navy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not doubt that. I think it would be silly and foolish and untrue for any Senator to undertake to say that the N. Y. A. has not done some good for the youth of America and the war effort, even before the war. As a matter of fact, if I should walk out of the Capitol and give the first 10 men I saw a $5 bill, if I had the $50 to start with, I could come back and argue that I had done much good. But we are not arguing whether or not a thing does good;

we are arguing whether or not on an over-all consideration, as a part of the whole war program, at a time such as this, with taxes and debts increasing and a great demand for men, by the acid test, all those things considered, the N. Y. A. can justify its existence. That is the only ground on which it ought to be judged. To say that it has done no good at all would be silly.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the only ground upon which I am presenting the case to the Senate. I think the N. Y. A. is of sufficient importance that it should be continued until the training program is well over the hump.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wish to say a word or two in justice to the N. Y. A. The report of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures referred to Delaware as having only 16 people taking advantage of this program. Since the vote I have taken some pains to find out a little more about it. I find that the statement in the report is not at all a fair picture of the situation as it now is. There are in excess of 100 in Delaware taking the training at this time; and 277 have taken the course. There are a large number from Delaware, particularly from the north end of the State, who take their training in Philadelphia. So that the figures as to Delaware do not indicate the number of people from Delaware who are receiving the benefits.

Both the fact that people go from Delaware to Pennsylvania to obtain the training, and the fact that that figure 16 does not now represent the number of those now being trained, there being more than a hundred, I thought should be stated in justice to the N. Y. A.

Other than that, I find that large companies employing many workers, such as the Dravo Corporation, and the Sun Shipbuilding Co., are using large numbers of these people, many of them from the State of Delaware.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I merely wanted to say before the debate is concluded that it would be grossly unfair if even the slightest inference was left in the RECORD that N. Y. A. was used to keep people out of military service; in fact, it is used for the direct opposite, as is shown by the fact that the Signal Corps and other agencies of the armed forces are recruiting from the N. Y. A.; they are taking graduates from N. Y. A. training courses directly into the service. Furthermore, of all the training programs, the N. Y. A. training program is the only one of 7 weeks' duration, and so, if it defers them for the period of training, it is only for 7 weeks. We know that there are other training programs under which a student is deferred for a year or 2 years, but that is not so of the N. Y. A. They are training, as the Senator has said, young girls and boys who are in deferred categories. So I should dislike to see this debate close with even an indirect inference—and I am glad the distinguished Senator made his stand very plain—that there is any deferment in the N. Y. A. program. Of course, after N. Y. A. trainees graduate and become keymen in industry, if industry and the draft board agree that they are keymen, that, in my judgment, is a pretty good recommendation for the training provided by N. Y. A.

Mr. TRUMAN. I, too, think it is.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. After I make a statement, then I shall be glad to yield. I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] for his contribution to the debate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may reply to the Senator from Delaware with some facts before he leaves the Chamber?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. The report of the Byrd committee shows that in Delaware the total number of work stations is 24; the number in use is 24, and the number of youths under active assignment is 16. So there are 16 youths being trained on assignment to 24 stations in the highly populated State of Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, may I reply to the statement of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. It was my purpose in rising to say that that is not the true state of the situation at all, but that there are more than a hundred being trained in Delaware at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Alabama, and I yield first to him.

Mr. HILL. I want to call attention to and emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senators who have been advocating the cause of the N. Y. A. here this morning, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who offered the amendment to continue the work of the N. Y. A., the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are all members of the so-called Truman committee. As members of that committee they have visited many plants and many war industries.

They have had an opportunity to see at first hand the work of the N. Y. A., and the need for its work. It is not always, when the Senate has a problem before it or a question to decide, that there are Members of the Senate who can testify from first-hand knowledge and from first-hand information gathered as these members of the Truman committee can testify on this matter of the N. Y. A. They themselves have personally seen the workings of the N. Y. A.; they have seen the results of the N. Y. A. training, and have seen the present need for the N. Y. A.

I wish to say a further word. Yesterday the Senate took four votes on questions in disagreement with the House of Representatives. We voted on the conference report on the deficiency bill, we voted on the labor amendment, we voted on the confirmation proposal, and we had another vote on the conference report on the security bill. We had four votes on questions in which the Senate was in disagreement with the House, as I have stated. To reiterate, to make it certain, we first had a vote on the adoption of the conference report on the emergency deficiency bill, we then had a vote on the adoption of the conference report on the pending bill, that part of the bill which had been agreed upon by the conferees, we then had a vote on the labor amendment, and we then had a vote on the so-called McKellar amendment.

On three out of those four questions on which we voted, which involved disagreement with the House of Representatives, we surrendered, we marched down the hill, we accepted the fiat of the House. The only one in which we did not accept the fiat of the House was on the amendment relating to confirmation of employees.

I know there were good reasons for that amendment, although I do not agree with them, and I voted against the amendment, but there will be some who will say that the Senate surrendered to the House on every proposition except that one.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may say so, whether the Senator yielded or did not yield has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of the question before the Senate. I shall not take advantage of the Senator's kindness in yielding, but I should like to ask him, before I start to read, whether I may read about half a column from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to show that there are two sides, according to the manufacturers themselves, as to the efficiency of the National Youth Administration program. I should like to comment on what I read, which is why I wish to refer to these messages.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have no objection. I want all the facts in the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. ANDERSON, a Member of the House of Representatives from California, was a member of the subcommittee which investigated certain phases of training, and the like, on the west coast. The subcommittee went from California to Oregon, and into Washington, as I recall, and they made a report to the Naval Affairs Committee of the House on February 15. I read now one of the lines from the committee report:

> Your committee considered the various types of training, such as the so-called public-school program and the National Youth Administration program, both of which were found to be unsatisfactory. The in-plant training of new employees, conducted by a majority of the shipyards, appears to be the most satisfactory method.

That is a part of the report. Now I continue:

National Youth Administration training program in this area understood to be on relatively small scale and has not heretofore been brought to attention this office in any way. A check of experience at principal shipyards here shows that only a few hundred new employees, principally welders, were received from this training program during the past year.

That is from one of the large shipbuilding companies. Continuing further, here is another report, from a manufacturer himself in the Los Angeles area:

My opinion is that for new naval ship construction the National Youth Administration program has proved to be of little if any value and is not now in this area a factor in training for ship construction.

Here is another one from the San Francisco Bay area:

Re your inquiry effectiveness of National Youth Administration training program, this agency has not been of any material assistance in either preemployment or advanced shipbuilding training programs in this area. Principal cause for lack of effectiveness due to policy of agency that program must be built around production, which precluded more general utilization of their excellent equipment as was necessary in shipbuilding training programs. In comparing results of National Youth Administration limited training program and cost of same with that of State-financed preemployment training, am of opinion National Youth Administration program very much more extravagant.

I shall not impose on the Senator's kindness, but there follow many other telegrams and many other reports, from the Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation and others, all along the West coast, to the same general tenor.

Mr. President, that does not mean that there are not other concerns which take a different view.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Bethlehem Co. and the Kaiser organization, in the same neighborhood, take an entirely different view.

Mr. TYDINGS. These messages show that many concerns feel that the efficiency return does not justify the dollar invested under the National Youth Administration program, as contrasted with other training programs.

In conclusion, neither the Senator nor I would wipe out all training programs. The question is, Could we not utilize some of the existing agencies to better advantage than by keeping a depression-born bureau in existence through this new emergency so that it will be on its feet to dive overboard at the next emergency, and when that is ended, back into another, and thus become a perpetual part of our Government, when it was created originally for the purpose of aiding youth during a period of depression?

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. I should like to say that so far as the Pacific Northwest is concerned, the gentlemen who filed those reports certainly did not make a very good study of that area, because the N. Y. A. has done an outstanding job in that particular section in training young men to work for subcontractors for the Boeing airplane plant, and for the Bremerton Navy Yard. Some of the other shipbuilding companies which the Senator mentioned started operations only a short time ago, and they have not done any too good a job themselves, and in my opinion are not in any position to criticize anyone who had N. Y. A. training.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say I did not wish to read all these telegrams, and I shall not do so even now, but to illustrate, let me read one:

We believe National Youth Administration has largely duplicated existing public trade schools and the result has been negligible as far as shipbuilding is concerned.

PRESIDENT, SEATTLE-TACOMA SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION,
Seattle, Wash.

There is one in the RECORD from the Lake Washington Shipyard, Houghton, Wash., in similar vein. There is one from the Moore Drydock Co., of Oakland, Calif. There is one from the vice president of the Western Pipe & Steel Co., of San Francisco, Calif. There is one from the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corporation. There is one from the Associated Shipbuilders, of Seattle, Wash. There are also others.

If the Senator will bear with me, this does not mean that other people do not feel differently about this matter.

Mr. TRUMAN. I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I wish to make is that the reports by the men who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of the program are not all on one side, but they report on both sides.

Mr. WALLGREN. I admit that most of these young men did not go into the shipbuilding industry. The drain, the special drain, on the N. Y. A., was made by the Boeing airplane plant, as well as subcontractors for that plant, and there is much activity in the area concerned. I suppose the N. Y. A. was not able to furnish as many men as the shipbuilding companies would like to have had in their shipyards.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more, and then I shall not interrupt him again?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am perfectly happy to have the Senator from Maryland interrupt me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I had not intended to read this letter, because it has a certain amusing note in it, but I think it is pertinent. I have before me a communication from a man who, I am advised, is one of the educational leaders in California. It reads as follows, and I think we will all enjoy it even if we do not agree with the writer:

Before the war, over in the technical high school we had as fine a sheet-metal lay-out as any school ever had, and an excellent mill cabinet shop, but I'll be damned if the National Youth Administration didn't come to San Jose and, under the rottenest teachers that I ever saw in my life, set up two classes in sheet metal and mill cabinet. I got hold of the actual figures for running those classes, and the costs of instruction, material, and overhead were exactly four times our costs. In addition to that, they paid the kids to go to school.

We had a meeting with the labor leaders in San Jose, and they put the heat on and put it on hard. There isn't a labor union in town that won't fight the National Youth Administration. There are practically 100 percent of the school people who will fight the National Youth Administration.

If we want a Federal school system supported entirely by Federal funds and run by the New Deal administration, just give them money enough to run this National Youth Administration program.

I think we can discount some of the heat in that letter, and take a little amusement out of it on these hot summer days, but it seems to me there is a strain of real good common sense in the protest of this particular teacher.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, we would naturally expect the able and distinguished Senator from Maryland to feel the way he does, and I am very sure the letter he read, while it is as amusing as it can be, is written by a bitter opponent of everything which has been done by the N. Y. A.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the writer did say that it costs probably four times as much per trainee under the N. Y. A. as it does under the other system.

Mr. TRUMAN. The writer makes a wild statement, but he does not offer any proof, and I have no doubt that he is a good neighbor of Herbert Hoover.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not true that we find opposition in public schools to practically anything in the way of teaching or training by the Federal Government?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should say that I did not read the entire communication.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I should like to read into the RECORD at this time, and I hope my friend the Senator from Maryland will listen to it, a portion of an editorial published in the Times-Leader, the Evening News, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., under date of June 30, 1943. It is an independent newspaper with very strong Republican leanings. The editorial is entitled "No Apologies for N. Y. A. Here." I read as follows:

The evolution of National Youth Administration provides an unusually interesting chapter in local history. When Hitler started to march, the need for trained people was foreseen and plans were laid for an intensified shop program. Buildings were occupied in Wilkes-Barre, Pittston, Nanticoke, and Hazleton. Since 1941, the National Youth Administration program has been devoted exclusively to preparing Americans for jobs in defense industries. After Pearl Harbor, the program was accelerated and today Wilkes-Barre has 700 in training, Nanticoke 450, Hazleton 330, and Pittston 160.

Graduates have gone from these shops to the American Car & Foundry Co. at Berwick, the Vulcan Iron Works, Wilkes-Barre Carriage Co., West Pittston Iron Works, Keystone Aircraft Co. at Pittston, Bethlehem Steel, Henry Kaiser's shipyards, and a score of nationally known concerns. More than 30,000 young people have been trained by National Youth Administration since the program was launched. Many of the trainees employed the knowledge to special advantage when they entered the Nation's armed forces.

Perhaps the achievements of National Youth Administration locally have been so outstanding because politics have not been allowed to interfere. The organization has been endorsed by industries that have been aided and by the chambers of commerce of Wilkes-Barre, Pittston, and Pottsville, among other places.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial in full may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO APOLOGIES FOR NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION HERE

The National Youth Administration, more familiarly known as N. Y. A., is under heavy fire in Washington at the present time as the forces of economy in government are determined to eliminate the agency. This newspaper is in sympathy with any move to reduce Government expenditures in view of the heavy war burdens on the taxpayers, but it is not entirely persuaded that National Youth Administration has outlived its usefulness. We base this conclusion solely on local observation and analysis.

If National Youth Administration were purely a relief agency, it would have no justification for existence at the present time. When the program was launched locally in 1936, the 1,200 young men on its rolls were engaged in the construction of playfields, roads, and sidewalks, as well as in the repair of public property, pest eradication, and similar types of work. But today all that is changed. National Youth Administration now devotes itself almost exclusively to the training of war workers.

The evolution of National Youth Administration provides an unusually interesting chapter in local history. When Hitler started to march, the need for trained people was foreseen and plans were laid for an intensified shop program. Buildings were occupied in Wilkes-Barre, Pittston, Nanticoke, and Hazelton. Since 1941, the National Youth Administration program has been devoted exclusively to preparing Americans for jobs in defense industries. After Pearl Harbor, the program was accelerated and today Wilkes-Barre has 700 in training, Nanticoke 450, Hazelton 330 and Pittston 160.

Graduates have gone from these shops to the American Car & Foundry Co. at Berwick, the Vulcan Iron Works, Wilkes-Barre Carriage Co., West Pittston Iron Works, Keystone Aircraft Co. at Pittston, Bethlehem Steel, Henry Kaiser's shipyards, and a score of nationally known concerns. More than 30,000 young people have been trained by National Youth Administration since the program was launched. Many of the trainees employed the knowledge to special advantage when they entered the Nation's armed forces.

Perhaps the achievements of National Youth Administration locally have been so outstanding because politics have not been allowed to interfere. The organization has been endorsed by industries that have been aided and by the Chambers of Commerce of Wilkes-Barre, Pittston, and Pottsville, among other places.

There is another angle to the National Youth Administration program that is of interest to this community. That is the pay roll for the regular staff and the trainees, amounting to $28,000 a month, no small matter in local economy. In return, the Government benefits not only by the training of the workers, but it receives the products that are made, including such items as tool boxes for ordnance, cartridge containers for mortars, air-raid-shelter signs, Victory-garden signs, mobile medical units, office furniture, shots for shell, and hundreds of other things.

National Youth Administration has interesting possibilities for the future. It is in a position to lend invaluable assistance to industrial development locally by training workers for jobs.

It is well to bear these things in mind in passing judgment on National Youth Administration. Undoubtedly, there have been many abuses nationally and it is a temptation to eliminate the $46,000,000 the program costs from the Budget. Yet, from a local viewpoint, the record is not one that requires apologies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to be sure if I correctly understand the situation as it now confronts the Senate relative to the N. Y. A. amendment. The proposal to continue the N. Y. A. is offered in the amendment of the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], by which I infer that provision for its continuation is not contained in the appropriation bill to which the Senator from Missouri offers his amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. I will ask the Chair to state the parliamentary situation in respect to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). The question before the Senate is the motion made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the Senate recede from Senate amendment numbered 30. Senate amendment numbered 30 was the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. Therefore the motion to recede from Senate amendment numbered 30 is a motion to abandon the position of the Senate and to liquidate the N. Y. A.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Chair. What I meant, Mr. President, was that, although the question comes up now on a motion to recede from Senate amendment numbered 30, the fundamental issue is this: The existing appropriation bill before the Senate does not contain a provision for the continuation of the N. Y. A., and if the N. Y. A. is to be continued the bill should be amended so as to provide for the continuation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes. A vote "yea" on the motion made by the Senator from Nevada is a vote to liquidate the N. Y. A. A vote "nay" is a vote to send the amendment back for further conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say that this matter was taken up and discussed quite thoroughly in conference for the greater part of an afternoon. The Senator from Missouri, who was a member of the conference committee, will bear evidence to the fact that I bled and nearly died for the retention of this amendment, but the House conferees took it back to the House in disagreement, and the House voted it out, and now I have made the motion to keep it out.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I shall state what I am getting at, and I desire to establish the facts. A great many persons who are engaged in vocational training under the State departments of education have protested against the Truman amendment and against the continuation of the N. Y. A. I wish it to be clear in the RECORD that if the Truman amendment is not adopted, or if the N. Y. A. is not continued, it will not result in diminishing by a single dime the money which the appropriation bill carries, and other appropriation bills may carry or have carried, to support the vocational educational program carried on under the State departments of education. In other words, the amendment simply makes provision with respect to an existing vocational facility. This is additional training which is being made available to the boys and girls in the country by the N. Y. A. program. So its continuity does not diminish any of the other vocational programs which are being carried on in the country. Is that not correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct in his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Furthermore, Mr. President, if the motion to recede is agreed to by the Senate and the N. Y. A. is discontinued, does any other provision of the appropriation bill provide for the transfer of the N. Y. A. equipment and all the facilities which it has to any other vocational agencies which are now carrying on vocational training?

Mr. TRUMAN. It does not. It provides for only immediate liquidation of the N. Y. A. and it appropriates $3,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. So, Mr. President, if the motion to recede prevails, and the N. Y. A. is discontinued, the vocational schools over the country have no assurance that they will obtain this equipment, or that they will receive the money which we are hoping may be provided by this amendment for the N. Y. A. So the question presented to us is whether we will have more use of available training equipment, more training facilities provided for the youth of the country, or less. It is not a question de novo as to what is the best way to use the country's training equipment or to set up a training program. It is merely a question of whether we shall have what we now have and the N. Y. A. or whether we shall have only the non-N. Y. A. training, and shall eliminate completely the N. Y. A. program and the facilities it has employed. I ask the Senator from Missouri if that statement is a fair one.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the Senator's statement is an extremely fair one.

Mr. PEPPER. The last question I shall ask the able junior Senator from Missouri is this: Does any other item in the appropriation bill which the Truman amendment proposes to amend provide any other opportunity for boys and girls to work their way through schools and colleges?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am sure none does.

Mr. PEPPER. So the amendment of the able junior Senator from Missouri provides two things, I take it: First, a continuation of the vocational education program which the N. Y. A. has been conducting and the continued use of N. Y. A. equipment for training purposes, all of which is for trades essential to the war effort; and, second, a chance to a poor boy or girl to get a job, while

in high school or college, to help work his way through.

If the motion to recede from the amendment is agreed to, in my State of Florida 1,600 boys and girls, as has been made known to my honorable colleague and myself, who have been given an opportunity to work their way through school will not be given such opportunity during the next school year which is looming upon the horizon.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the able Senator that there are other programs which do help put young people through college. Both the Army and the Navy have programs under way at the present time, and so has the Office of Education, I believe, under Mr. Studebaker. However, they do not reach the same class of persons that is reached by the N. Y. A.

Mr. PEPPER. The information I have received, Mr. President, from Mr. Aubrey Williams is that the Army and Navy programs do not apply to the boys and girls who are getting this training. Either they are girls and are not eligible for the Army and Navy V–12 program, or they are not physically able to pass the test required for participation in the Army and Navy programs, and are not eligible on that score. If I am not mistaken, the program of the Office of Education extends only loans, not work opportunities, to boys and girls taking the ordinary school and college courses. I am not referring to vocational training. I am referring to ordinary school training.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is a loan program, and it is a different program.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, following the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, yesterday the House passed House Joint Resolution 147 extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months. It had been my hope that the Senate could consider the resolution and act on it, without first referring it to the committee which has jurisdiction. After conference on the matter it is obvious that it is impossible to do so, but that the resolution should be referred to the committee, to be reported from the committee to the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House Joint Resolution 147 is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me make the further statement that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, desires me to announce that he is calling a meeting of the Committee at 4 o'clock this afternoon in the District of Columbia Committee room.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it comes to my mind that a resolution of the same import, or dealing with the same matter, was submitted yesterday by the Senator from South Carolina. Should it not be referred to the same committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, because it deals with the matters with which the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Office of Price Administration are dealing.

Mr. WHITE. I wondered if the matter had been discussed with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have discussed it with the Senator, but I do not want to make that request in his absence.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. McCARRAN's motion that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, let me say I am endeavoring to conclude my remarks. I had no intention of taking up so much of the time of the Senate; but, as the Senate is well aware, I have yielded most of my time to other Senators in order to permit them to make statements in my time. I am very anxious that the Senate proceed to vote, and that it vote against the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, while the Senator from Florida is present, let me say that six training agencies are provided for and financed under the very bill now before the Senate, and those six training agencies receive appropriations totaling in excess of $150,000,000 for the training of youth for the very activities to which the Senator has referred. One of them provides not only means whereby the youth may pay his way but standard wages for payment to him when working in industry. The name of that service is "Training Within Industry Service." It carries an appropriation of $1,147,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the able Senator will yield to me, I should like to suggest that the subject to which he has just adverted is not the one which was in my mind. I have referred, not to training in industry, but to the ordinary boy or girl who goes to high school and takes the ordinary high-school course, not a vocational course, and, through the N. Y. A., gets a chance to do 4, 5, 6, or 7 dollars worth of work a month, and the ordinary boy or girl who, desiring to go to college and take an ordinary A. B. or B. S. course, gets a work opportunity to take the general course leading to a general degree, through the N. Y. A. I say to my able friend, the Senator from Nevada, that I am very much confused if there is any other program which allows the opportunity the N. Y. A. now allows.

Mr. McCARRAN. At the present time enrollment at the colleges is rapidly being curtailed. The work opportunity for the youth who can go to college exists. Let me say that the six agencies provide opportunities for the youth, whether he is in college or out of college, in various ways. For instance, there are apprentice and training services, and otherwise. That training is under the industry or apprentice to industry program. Another agency provides vocational training for war-production work. Another one provides vocational training for rural war-production work. Another one provides engineering, science, management, and war training under the United States Office of Education.

Then comes the N. Y. A., the United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor and supplies for labor, and so on. Every one of the agencies, either in this bill or in other bills, carries large appropriations.

The amendment is merely an attempt to maintain an agency that is duplicating all the way through.

Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the report of the Byrd committee, which he has mentioned:

> Total number of work stations, 24; number in use, 24; number of youths under active assignment, 16.

That means that there are teachers for each one of the 24 set-ups; a work station may be a lathe, it may be a stamp, it may be anything at all. Each one of those counts as a project. The total number is 24. There are either 1 or 2 teachers for each one of those, but only 16 youths are receiving training.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have twice explained that matter, and I shall be very glad to do so again. While that statement does show the situation stated, the facts do not sustain it. The number of pupils in the State now taking the course is 77. There are 37 taking the course in Philadelphia. So the figures 16 and 24 do not represent a true picture of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Reed
Austin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lucas	Smith
Burton	McCarran	Stewart
Bushfield	McClellan	Taft
Butler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Maloney	Truman
Caraway	Maybank	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Van Nuys
Danaher	Moore	Wagner
Davis	Murdock	Wallgren
Downey	Murray	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30 to House bill 2935. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is Senate amendment numbered 30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate amendment numbered 30 relates to the N. Y. A. A vote for the motion is a vote to liquidate the N. Y. A.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber. Has the roll call begun?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has begun.

The Chief Clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is absent because of illness. If the Senator from New Mexico were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is detained in one of the Government departments on business pertaining to his State. I am advised that if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea."

I also announce the following pairs: the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK]; and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "yea," has a pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "yea," has a pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who would vote "yea," has a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bridges	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Holman	Reynolds
Buck	McCarran	Robertson
Burton	McClellan	Shipstead
Butler	McFarland	Smith
Byrd	McKellar	Stewart
Chavez	Maloney	Taft
Connally	Millikin	Tydings
Danaher	Moore	Vandenberg
Davis	Nye	Walsh
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wherry
Gurney	Reed	Willis

NAYS—33

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Austin	Kilgore	Russell
Barkley	La Follette	Scrugham
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Maybank	Truman
Downey	Mead	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murdock	Wagner
George	Murray	Wallgren
Guffey	O'Mahoney	White

NOT VOTING—24

Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Lodge
Bankhead	Eastland	McNary
Barbour	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Glass	Tobey
Bone	Green	Tunnell
Bushfield	Hatch	Wiley
Chandler	Johnson, Calif.	Wilson

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 24, agree to the further conference requested by the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 322, which is the point at which the last call of the calendar ended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

ACQUISITION OF CORN BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 71, relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies. The Members of the Senate do not seem to be thoroughly familiar with the joint resolution. I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from South Carolina that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has asked that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the question of the jurisdiction over the joint resolution to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred is one which I wish to discuss with him. I do not know that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the subject of the acquisition of corn is not a proper one to come before that committee, I do not know what is. Corn is an agricultural product.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, corn is an agricultural product, but the purchase of corn and its storage by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the only agency of the Government purchasing corn, or the only agency which has purchased corn, except agencies, such as the War Department, which buy it for use to feed horses, and so forth, is a matter which affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Today, before the Senator came into the Chamber, or while he was temporarily called from it on important business, the Senate referred to the Banking and Currency Committee the resolution passed by the House yesterday, following the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. That committee is meeting this afternoon to consider that subject. I think that this resolution ought to go to the same committee, because the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Office of Price Administration at this time are the only two agencies of the Government dealing with prices or with the purchase of corn except those agencies which buy it for use, such as the War Department, and I am satisfied that the Senator did not mean by his resolution to require the War Department, in buying corn for feeding horses of the cavalry, to pay a stipulated price.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the committee of which I am chairman has had hearings and discussed the confused situation which exists in relation to corn. Before the committee a judge from the State of Texas made a very clear presentation of the question. Regardless of who handles it after it is made, corn is an agricultural product, and those interested want to know what is going to be done about it.

So far as I am concerned, I am speaking for the Corn Belt. In my section practically the only purchases of corn we make is of corn in the liquid form. We do not make very much corn, but I maintain that the agricultural committee is the proper committee to consider what shall be done with the distribution of this exceedingly necessary commodity.

If it comes to a question of who buys it, and who sells it, that is outside the domain of the committee. What we want to do is to bring some order out of the present intolerable chaos. Of course, the Senate will have to decide to which committee the resolution shall be referred. So far as I am concerned personally, I have not any interest in the production of commercial corn, but I do sympathize with those who have been gerrymandered and rationed by every bureaucrat who saw fit to put his mouth into this business. I wish I had brought the statement of the judge from Texas to whom I referred with me, and read it to the Senate. He told an interesting story.

Now, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Kentucky, that the Senate proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning where it was left off on June 15. Is that the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina object?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the joint resolution is of vital importance. There are thousands of institutions and industries which will have to close if they cannot be afforded some relief in the present corn situation. I do not care to stand here and argue the question at length. It is up to those who are interested in the corn question to decide what they want done with the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. Of course, the motion of the Senator from South Carolina——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar. That request is pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the request put and acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I think I shall object for a moment. I think it would not take very long to dispose of the motion of the Senator from South Carolina. In my opinion, it is an important motion, and I believe it should be adopted. It refers the question of an agricultural price to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator wants to object to my request, he can object, and I wish he would do so if he is going to object. He may not have another opportunity to object or to agree, either, if he does not object now. I do not think it will take very long to dispose of the calendar, although I cannot give any assurance of that sort. There are many bills on the calendar in securing the passage of which Senators are interested. I am not trying to shut off the Senate's decision on the question of where the joint resolution should go. I want to make a brief observation about it before it is acted on, and the Senate, of course, can do as it pleases with it, as is its right, anyway.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, does the Senator mean to take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my request, to take up the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall not object to that. The Senator from South Carolina can make his motion after the calendar shall have been disposed of.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to state for the benefit of those who have suffered because of this corn situation that I am proceeding as chairman of the committee because I have been requested to make some effort to have this matter straightened out.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator feels that obligation, he can object to the unanimous consent agreement, or if he prefers he can take up the other matter after the call of the calendar.

Mr. SMITH. I dislike to object to the consideration of the calendar, but the joint resolution involves a matter of great importance. My mail is filled with protests, and there is not a Senator who has not received mail about the confusion in the corn situation. Cattle feeders, hog feeders, chicken feeders cannot get corn, and corn cannot be obtained to be ground at the mill for human consumption. I think it is a matter of as much importance as the N. Y. A. Therefore, I am making the request for those interested in the corn situation that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so that it may be printed and distributed and those who are anxious to have it defeated may get their forces in line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina object to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH. I object; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move, therefore, if the Senator from South Carolina objects to the call of the calendar, that Joint Resolution No. 71 be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to say a word before I yield to any Senator about that.

I am as much interested in relieving the corn situation as is the Senator from South Carolina, or any other Senator. When I was at home last week the scarcity of corn was called to my attention. The corn situation is just as acute there as it is anywhere else.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator think that the Banking and Currency Committee is more competent and more capable of considering this question than is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I do not think it is any more capable, but I will say to the Senator that at present the purchase and the storing of corn are being engaged in only by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I want to get rid of.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Commodity Credit Corporation was created under a law sponsored and written and brought before the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The only agency of Government which has anything to do with the price of corn is the Office of Price Administration, which was likewise created under legislation sponsored by the Banking and Currency Committee. The joint resolution which the Senator has introduced would bind every department of the Government that is buying corn and feeding a mule or a horse, to buy it at the price of $1.40.

Mr. SMITH. The joint resolution says "not to exceed $1.40."

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. I do not care where the joint resolution goes, so far as I am personally concerned; but when we establish a bureau by Congress as soon as somebody is appointed to head it, we begin to denounce him as a bureaucrat.

If we do not want any bureaucrats, we should stop establishing the bureaus——

Mr. SMITH. Let the Senator offer a resolution to do away with bureaus, and I will vote for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is an expert on resolutions; let him offer it. If I or anyone else should offer a resolution to abolish all the bureaus of the Government which have been established by Congress, the Senator would not vote for it.

Mr. SMITH. There are some which have sense and some have not. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The same is true of all groups of men—except the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. And it is certainly true of this body. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to get into a personal controversy with the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senate can do what it sees fit, but it is a little strange that a joint resolution is brought in providing that all the departments of the Government which buy corn for any purpose——

Mr. SMITH. No, it does not refer to every department of the Government; it is every department that is messing the thing up.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is indulging in——

Mr. SMITH. Read the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; I will read it. I hope Senators will pay attention to it.

Mr. SMITH. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. It reads:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency, all such agencies which exercise any functions with respect to the buying, selling, storage, or use of corn are hereby authorized to acquire corn, wherever obtainable, at any price not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

If that does not include all agencies of the Government which buy for any purpose, I do not understand the English language.

Mr. SMITH. They are the ones who are "playing the devil" with us.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senate desires to send the resolution to a committee which has not had any jurisdiction and has not brought in the legislation dealing with the O. P. A., and the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has engaged in the purchase of corn and the storage of corn, it can do so, but certainly the Senate should not take the jurisdiction away from the committee which sponsored the legislation without knowing what it is doing.

I do not wish to take any more time of the Senate in discussing the matter. If it wants to reject the motion I have made, it will be in order for the Senator from South Carolina to move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I should like to have the Senate know what the resolution is and what it means before a vote is taken.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has read it, and Senators know what it means. I make a motion——

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already moved.

Mr. SMITH. I moved before the Senator did.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not have the floor at the time he moved.

Mr. SMITH. I did. I made a motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I demand a vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not have the floor, and his motion was not in order at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation as he understands it. At the time when the Senator from South Carolina made his motion the Senate was then considering a unanimous consent request of the Senator from Kentucky, and the motion of the Senator from South Carolina was not entertained. As the Chair now understands, Senate Joint Resolution 71 lies on the table. It is necessary first to have a motion to proceed to its consideration, before moving to send it anywhere. Therefore the Chair will entertain a motion, or, if there is no objection, the Chair will entertain a motion to refer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky moves that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SMITH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH. What did the Chair say, that I was not in order when I moved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not say the Senator from South Carolina was not in order. The Chair stated that at the time the motion was made there was pending before the Senate a request for unanimous consent on the part of the Senator from Kentucky, and the Chair asked if there was any objection to it.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to have the stenographic report of what was said.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I move as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make a point of order that a motion to substitute in the case of reference to a committee is not in order. The only way to get at the matter is to defeat the original motion, then the other would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the motion of the Senator from South Carolina is not in order, and the motion before the Senate is to refer Senate Joint Resolution 71 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SMITH. I knew the thing would be gerrymandered. Let us vote on it. If the Senate wants to send it to the Committee on Banking and Currency it is all right with me.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, we have had a great deal of price legislation affecting agricultural products handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and with all due respect to the members of that committee, I think it cannot be denied that the prices of food and agricultural products are in a mess so bad that it endangers not only the war effort, but is embarrassing and affecting living conditions in the United States.

I have often been curious why these pieces of agricultural legislation have been sidetracked to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The joint resolution under discussion may not be perfect as it is offered, but the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I think, understands agricultural problems better than any other committee of the Congress, and if that is not the case, the Senate should change the personnel of the committee. They deal with questions of agriculture and agricultural prices. I repeat, the history of agricultural legislation since the outbreak of the war has not indicated success, as is universally admitted all over the country.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can hold hearings, just as any other committee can, and if there is anything wrong with the joint resolution it can be perfected, but I say—and I do not think I shall be accused of undue pride when I say it—that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate has been more industrious in following and holding hearings on this type of legislation than any other committee that has had anything to do with legislative matters.

Mr. President, I think it would be a tragedy to have this joint resolution go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and thus continue the confusion which is driving the country to hysteria.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I appreciate that the Committee on Banking and Currency considered the legislation involving the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I submit to the Senate that that committee is not the one which should consider legislation fixing the prices of agricultural products. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was created for the purpose of dealing with agricultural problems, but in recent years the practice has been to take away from that committee everything having to do with fixing prices of agricultural products—hogs, corn, wheat, and everything else—and to send it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Of course, we have to deal with a situation as we find it, and perhaps the farmers are not right in this particular, but there has been, and there is at the present time, among the farmers, a feeling that the banking houses are fixing the prices of their products rather than the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and the House of Representatives. If the desire is to build up distrust among the farmers, the thing to do is to send all legislation affecting them to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is unfortunate, to my mind, that the farmers should have a prejudice against the little bankers of the country and all others, but, as I have stated before, it is not a question what we think their attitude should be; the point is that there is a feeling that the banking groups are fixing agricultural prices, and the Committee on Banking and Currency is not the committee by which farm legislation should be handled.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would have been confusing and it would have been utterly unthinkable to pass separate legislation dealing with price control on different products and to set up separate Government agencies to handle the different products. If we had done so, there could have been no coordination. There has been too little already in the matter of the price structure. When the bill relating to O. P. A. came from the Banking and Currency Committee it included everything that consumers buy or purchase. That explains why in the enactment of the legislation it was felt impossible to divide the measure so as to have separate jurisdiction with respect to different commodities. Incidentally, of course, agricultural products, which are very important, were handled like thousands of other products. If it had been only a question of dealing with one agricultural situation, or with the products of the farm, there might have been some force in what the Senator has said; but we were trying to pass an over-all law which would enable someone to set up the price

structure for everything the American people produce or buy. Whether wise decisions were made with respect to every case is open to dispute. With all the confusion which has existed in the O. P. A. and in connection with its jurisdiction and administration, the situation would have been infinitely worse if there had been no law on the subject at all, because we would now be in the midst of a run-away inflation, which would be as disastrous in the long run as the one we had at the end of the last war.

I do not think the Banking and Currency Committee has made any effort to rob the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of jurisdiction over agricultural subjects. We dealt with an over-all subject, and that over-all subject included farm products, and for that reason the legislation included them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I agree with everything the Senator from Kentucky has said. The fact is, however, that the joint resolution in question deals only with the price of corn. In view of that fact, I think the situation in the case now under discussion is different from that referred to by the Senator.

Mr. President, I have great confidence in the Administrator of O. P. A., former Senator Brown. I had greater confidence in Mr. Leon Henderson than many others had. I think he did what he thought was right, but he had a very difficult job to perform. I certainly would not recommend to any friend of mine that he take the job which Mr. Brown now has.

Mr. President, the corn farmers, those who raise chickens, those who raise hogs, and those who raise cattle, as well as all others in the country who know anything about the subject, recognize the fact that there has been and there still is a general dissatisfaction over the price of corn and the inability to procure corn with which to feed hogs, chickens, and other animals.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I have been able to discover, there is no general dissatisfaction with respect to the price among even the processors of corn. The difficulty now—and that is what the Senator seeks to correct—is that corn cannot be obtained. When I was at home some days ago I was asked if I could not induce the Commodity Credit Corporation to allocate one carload of corn for the purchasers of corn in the western end of my State. It is largely because of inability to obtain corn that the present situation has arisen.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I think I know something about corn and the raising of corn, and that I know something with respect to the situation in the Middle West. While I was not reared in a corn district, yet I have relatives who live in the corn district. My wife was born and raised in the corn district. When I went to college I sold books throughout the Corn Belt to farmers living there. So I know something about corn.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the Senator is a corn farmer on his wife's side. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the country would be better off if other Senators were similarly related to the production of corn. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I recall what a Russian said to the Senator from Kentucky when he told him he was a farmer boy. The Russian said to the Senator, "I suppose you are such a farmer as Leo Tolstoy was." [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. Witnesses who have appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have stated that the ceiling price on corn was $1.07 or $1.05 a bushel, and by converting it into hogs they receive $1.37.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Therefore, a farmer would naturally say, "I am going to convert my corn into meat." Then came the roll-back, and I do not know where the devil the farmer is now.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has stated the situation exactly as it is. The farmers all through the Middle West and in the eastern section of my State, where corn is raised, are feeding it to the hogs, and are raising more hogs today by several million than were ever raised before in the history of the United States. Governor Dewey the other day said farmers in the Middle West should kill off their hogs so the farmers in New York would be able to buy corn which is produced in the Middle West. Mr. President, there are, after all, some individuals in the Middle West who think they should look after themselves, rather than look after the interests of the people of New York. But some persons who live in New York seem to have the idea that the whole world revolves around New York, and that no one in the world is worth saving aside from the people of New York City and the State of New York. Some of us, however, who live beyond the Hudson River feel there are at least certain other sections of the country which deserve a little sympathy.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I desire to ask a question with respect to price fixing. The history of merchandising, and of production and distribution, establishes that the price charged by the processor is based upon the price of the raw material. The processor takes his profit and sells his commodity to the distributor, who takes his profit. The commodity then goes to the customer, who pays the original price paid for the raw material, plus the profit all down the line.

That has always seemed to me to be a sensible way to handle the matter of price. If the price of the raw material had been first fixed sufficiently high on farm products to induce the farmer to produce in plenty, then on that basis the price fixing machinery could have laid down the whole formula step by step down the line to the consumer, and there would not have been the confusion, the going forward one day and the going back the next day, which we now have.

If the Senate will send the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the price on corn shall be fixed by law, corn will flow to the markets. Such action may prove to be a very valuable example to follow when passing future legislation with respect to prices of products.

I think the fixing of the price to the producer will prove to be a satisfactory arrangement. It will induce the farmer to produce more corn next year. The same statement applies to other crops. We must begin at the source of production in order to receive a sufficient supply. After the price has been fixed at the source of production, then it should prove very easy, as it has in the past, to fix the price on the finished product down through the various stages to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. The reason we have inflation in respect to farm products is that we do not produce enough farm products. There is a shortage of certain farm products. Those who wish to purchase them have the money to buy, but by reason of the fact that corn production and wheat production have been kept down, inflation with respect to those particular commodities has resulted.

Mr. President, we are getting away from the immediate subject of discussion. I think the farmers of the country would wish to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has been established for the purpose of looking after agricultural interests. I had not until this moment seen the joint resolution. I do not know whether it provides the proper answer or not. But I do say that in the interest of unity in the country the bill should be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Unity will not be helped, in my judgment, by referring the measure to the Committee on Banking and Currency, when the farmers of the country expect the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to look after their problems. When a measure dealing with the over-all situation was framed and sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the first place it might have been argued that it belonged there. Whatever the reason for sending it there may have been, I say that a measure dealing with a specific farm problem should go to the committee which deals with farm problems, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Some time ago I spoke to a manufacturer who uses a great deal of corn in the manufacture of various products. He told me that he had closed down one of his factories, and would be obliged to close down other factories unless he could obtain corn. He is interested in keeping the price of corn as low as possible; but he said that, in his opinion, the price of corn had to be raised, because if it were not raised he was sure he would not get any corn. The products of his company go into the manufacture of munitions and many other articles needed for war purposes. Unless the price of corn is raised, corn will

be kept on the farms and will be fed to the hogs, because the farmers will not be foolish enough to kill off their hogs and sell the corn to someone else who will make money out of it. No one else would do that if he could get more for his corn by feeding it to his hogs. That is merely human nature; it is what everyone else is doing.

The farmer will not sell his corn under those circumstances. If we want corn produced and put on the market we must give the farmer a price for it sufficiently high to make him prefer to sell it, rather than feed it to his hogs and make more money in that way.

I hope the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so that such a study will be made there, and so that the agriculturists will know that, instead of shunting the resolution off to the Committee on Banking and Currency, it will go to a committee which they feel, and rightly so, represents the farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not wish to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana on the subject of corn, as differentiated from any other agricultural commodity or any other type of commodity; but I should like to refresh his recollection that when the Congress passed the Price Control Act and made it applicable to all commodities, Congress set up standards which the Administrator could have followed. Had he followed them, the program would not have resulted in the distress which now confronts the country in so many particulars. The Administrator would have had an opportunity to raise the level generally, including general production and including a reasonable margin of profit. However, that was not done.

Mr. President, with that prefatory statement, let me ask the Senator from Montana if he thinks that in the event some agricultural commodity other than corn should be in distress, the Senate should also provide that that such commodity should not be subject to being handled under the Price Control Act, but should refer its disposition and handling to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? Would the Senator advocate that?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly would. I think anything having to do with the prices of agricultural products should go, at least for consideration, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, let me inquire if the Senator would feel that we properly should take out of the Price Control Act all agricultural commodities, including the processed articles, and should turn their handling over to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHEELER. I think commodities such as corn should be given consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I go further, and take exactly the position taken and advocated the other day by another Member of the Senate: I think the Congress should have put the food administration program under one individual, instead of leaving it under the O. P. A. and other agencies. I think the people from one end of the country to the other have confidence in Mr. Davis. If he had been given authority to handle the food situation, I think even the manufacturers and the businessmen, as well as the farmers, would have had confidence in him and in the program. I think a great mistake was made when the program was not turned over to Mr. Davis and when Mr. Davis was not given full authority. I do not say that because I have known Mr. Davis for a long time or because he came from my State. He was a Republican. He has never been a particular supporter of mine, so far as I know. He was secretary of agriculture for my State. He went to the Middle West, and he has been interested in agricultural problems for a great many years.

If there is one man in the country in whom the farmers of the West, the Middle West, and the Northwest have confidence it is Mr. Davis. They do not have confidence in the O. P. A. at this particular time. It is extremely necessary that the farmers have confidence in their Government and in those who are manipulating the prices of their products; and, likewise, it is necessary that the business interests of the country have confidence in them.

I know Mr. Marvin Jones, who took Mr. Davis' position. I have known him for a number of years. I have a very high regard for him. However, I say without fear of contradiction, that, so far as the farming interests in the Middle West and the West are concerned, they would have had far more confidence if Mr. Davis had remained in that position and had been able to have authority over farm products. Now, not only is Mr. Jones being put in but I am told that some young persons being put under him as his principal advisers have only recently graduated from Harvard University, and know no more about farming than does any young fellow who was born and raised in New York or Boston, and never saw a farm in his life.

The people are very much upset and disturbed, because they feel the farmers are not getting a square deal. If the resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and then were reported to the Senate from the committee, if the Senate then felt that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had not done the right thing or had acted too much in favor of the farmers or the corn producers, of course the Senate could vote down the committee's recommendation.

However, I am speaking now of trying to get the farmers to have confidence in their Government and in the handling of their products. I do not believe the Senate is helping the situation by having the Committee on Banking and Currency pass on the price of hogs and corn and the feeding of cattle, because the average person on the farms believes that the Committee on Banking and Currency deals with banking and currency matters only. I appreciate the fact that one who entertains that belief is not correct in it.

Nevertheless, the farmers believe that the Senate Committe on Agriculture and Forestry knows more about farm prices than does the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has had more experience in dealing with them. The farmers would have the same feeling if the joint resolution were proposed to be sent to the Committee on Interstate Commerce or to almost any other Senate committee.

For that reason, I think the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the matter is a simple one. I assume every Member of the Senate knows how he desires to vote on it. I did not want to enter a debate on the general agricultural question. I am anxious to have the Senate vote on the pending motion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized before the vote is taken.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his forthright statements. Obviously, he is very earnest in his position, and I dislike to stand in opposition to his point of view at any time. However, when he is guilty of a fallacy and, when in answer to my questions, the fallacy is so perfectly apparent, I feel bound to call attention to the general legislative and historical situation.

The proposition before the Senate is one which would submit to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a basis for excising from the Emergency Price Control Act and the Office of Price Administration an important commodity, and would authorize the committee to fix the specific price on that one commodity. What is the Senate to do, Mr. President, if, item by item, it follows such a course?

The situation is not novel.

When the calendar was called on June 15 I objected to the consideration of Calendar 287, which is Senate bill 1088, under the terms of which a special price would have been fixed for a certain described type of cotton, with a proviso at the conclusion of Senate bill 1088 that "no maximum price for cotton shall be established or maintained under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order or a price below the price specified in this paragraph."

It was cotton on June 15. It is corn today. Tomorrow it will be some other agricultural commodity.

Mr. President, the Congress should not be asked to emasculate a general price-control act in favor of a series of specific commodities merely because enough Senators get together in each instance to take a particular commodity out of the operation of a general law.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

There have been such defects of administration, and there was such complete departure from the philosophy and principle of the original Price Control Act, that legislation which could and

should have been made to work has become complex and diffuse in its operation. There have been overlapping and conflicting orders, and details beyond description. I sympathize, of course, with those who find themselves involved in the maze.

When Mr. Leon Henderson came before the Committee on Banking and Currency last August or September, when we had before us the stabilization bill which became the act of October 2, 1942, the record will show that I asked him a series of questions. I asked him if there were any particulars in which, from his experience, that far under the act of June 30, 1942, he found that the Congress had failed to implement him in whatever particulars were necessary, and he said "no," except with reference to rent control. With that exception there were no particulars in which he felt that additional implementation was required.

There were other questions to that effect. I was trying to establish, and I think I succeeded in establishing, a foundation in the record to show that the law was adequate.

When Mr. Prentiss Brown came before us only 2 or 3 weeks ago, in connection with House joint resolution 147, after recounting the fact that he had been a member of the committee when I examined Mr. Henderson, and the fact that he had then had 5 or 6 months of administrative experience under O. P. A., I asked him if he felt that he required further implementation of the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, to enable him to accomplish the duties which the Congress had prescribed, with which he was certainly thoroughly familiar, having been a leading Member of this body at the time the law was enacted. He said no.

Mr. President, it boils down to this: If the act is adequate, if the philosophy and genius out of which it was evolved are equal to the occasion, it follows that the fault lies in administration. Therefore, from the fallacy—as I see it—of the thinking of the Senator from Montana would follow the disruption of an act which is well-conceived and legislatively well-written, but poorly administered.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, when I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Connecticut I always question whether I am right.

If the joint resolution were to come before us for a vote without reference to a committee, I would hesitate, and would vote against it, because I would not want to vote on a proposal to change the law without hearings before some committee.

If the joint resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that would not mean that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would make the final determination. The Senator agrees, as I think every other Member of the Senate will agree, that the whole corn situation has stirred up a great deal of resentment among farmers and among the people generally.

When farm organizations and farmers get into trouble with reference to legislation which affects them, to whom do they appeal? Would they think of appealing to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate? Not at all. They go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They are appealing to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to do something about the situation.

The joint resolution was not introduced because the Senator from South Carolina raises corn for commercial purposes, because he has stated that all the corn which is raised in his section of the country goes into liquid refreshment. [Laughter.] Consequently he is not interested in it from the same standpoint as farmers in the Middle West and Northwest are interested.

The farmers of the Middle West have appealed to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to look into the situation. If the joint resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that committee would give the farmers an opportunity to be heard. It would listen to their story, and then whatever conclusion was reached by the committee would be reported to the Senate. If the Senate should feel that the report was not correct, it could vote it down.

I am asking merely that the joint resolution be referred to the only committee to which the farmers feel they can go. The committee which was set up to hear their troubles is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps I can simplify this situation. When I moved that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency I had two things in mind: First, that the joint resolution was within the jurisdiction of that committee; secondly, that committee has been called to meet at 4 o'clock this afternoon on another matter, but it could consider this question if it were referred to it. I understand that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is not to meet until next Monday.

If there is any virtue in the joint resolution, I assume it was introduced for the purpose of obtaining legislation. If we are to go through with our program of taking a recess next week, it is questionable whether there will be time to obtain consideration of the joint resolution in both Houses. The Committee on Banking and Currency cannot even consider it when it meets at 4 o'clock if we are to consume all afternoon in debating it.

In order that the Senate may not be compelled to continue the debate as to where the joint resolution should go, and without yielding my opinion as to where it ought to go, I withdraw my motion, because the Committee on Banking and Currency is to meet very shortly, and before it meets I should like to have the calendar called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky is withdrawn.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me say by way of conclusion of my own comments that——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall yield the floor in a moment.

If we are to act piecemeal on this problem—today on Senate Joint Resolution 71, tomorrow on the cotton relief program in Senate bill 1088, and Monday on beef, we shall never get anywhere. Certainly there is no more important predicament confronting the consumers than the lack of an adequate meat supply, at a time, anomalously, when the animal population of the country is at the highest peak in history. Certainly there is something wrong with the administration of the whole business. There can be no doubt about it. In my opinion it is fallacious to say that we should consider items individually, item by item, and take them out of the general Price Control Act.

I thank Senators for their forbearance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that Senate Joint Resolution 71 be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to refer Senate Joint Resolution 71 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the situation which has prompted this controversy. The Senate is spending its time debating the question of reference of the joint resolution. When such a measure is introduced, the responsibility lies squarely at the door of the administration.

All the facts which are now known concerning the imbalance between the price of corn and the price of corn translated into meat have been known for weeks; and yet for some unknown reason, a reason which I am unable to ascertain, there has been a stubborn refusal to face the facts and to readjust the relationship between the price of corn and the price of meat. Such readjustment is a purely administrative or ministerial act, which should have been performed weeks ago. Unless such action is taken soon, many important industries will be forced to close.

Unless it is taken soon, much of the corn which should be available for other purposes will have been translated into meat. I cannot understand why those who are responsible for the prices of products should not recognize the facts and act according to them. If they find the Congress attempting to deal with this problem, even though it may not be following a proper method of dealing with it, it will be because of the utter break-down and the failure of the administrative arm of the Government to discharge its responsibilities under the law.

I hope, Mr. President, that before many days have passed there will be a realization on the part of those who are responsible for this situation that they must discharge their responsibility and take the only action which can be taken which will cure it, namely, to restore the normal relationship between the price of corn and the price of meat.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator has said. One of the reasons why I have urged that this joint resolution go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that we will get someone before the committee and see if we cannot put a bur under his tail and cause something to be done about the situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish the Senator complete success in his efforts to put the bur in the proper place. But a few days ago I attended a meeting of Senators from some of the corn-producing States, an unofficial meeting, it is true. We sat there all afternoon and talked over the situiation with some of the representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation. No one questioned what the facts were, but nothing has occurred since then, and in the meantime the situation has grown progressively worse.

There is such a thing, Mr. President, as stubbornness which becomes stupidity, and I think we have arrived at that point so far as the failure of the executive branch of the Government is concerned in discharging its responsibilities in connection with the problem now confronting us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall not consume much of the time of the Senate, but I assure my able and distinguished colleague from Connecticut that in the vote which we are about to take there is no possibility of any reflection on him or any other member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In my estimation, some of the members of that committee are among the ablest Members of this body. However, Mr. President, there is a psychology in this situation which perhaps is the most important factor. The farmers of the country, and particularly the corn farmers, have felt that they have been neglected and scorned, and that their interests have been ignored.

There is one committee of this body whose verdict, from the standpoint of psychology, will be accepted by the farmers. That is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This situation is serious, not only to the farmer but to everyone who depends on farm products to keep his industry in operation.

In the last 2 or 3 days I have received thousands of telegrams from Kansas industries which must have corn products to enable them to continue operations, asking that before the Senate takes a recess some action be taken to insure the corn farmer that he will receive some consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. I attended the meeting to which he referred, which was a meeting called by Corn Belt Senators for the purpose of considering the problem of freeing corn, as well as to establish proper relationships and feeding ratios between cattle, hogs, and poultry.

The Senator will remember that the only solution which the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation offered was that he had about 10,000,000 bushels of corn which he might be able to free. No solution has been offered by the Commodity Credit Corporation. They do not have a solution, except the one which he gave. That was off the record and I cannot reveal it here, because I want to keep faith with the Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

However, if we send this Senate joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the problem apparently will not be solved. That is all there is to it. The Commodity Credit Corporation program will not supply corn. Industry wants corn. The feeders of cattle want corn. The people who feed poultry want corn. We have 2,000,000 more cattle than we have had at any time in 15 years. We have 200,000,000 bushels of corn, more than any June carry-over down through the years. But because of the administration's failure in the matter of the production of food and in getting these commodities together, the program has failed absolutely.

This country is facing not only a meat famine, but soon we shall be facing starvation. I will say to my colleague from Connecticut that if it takes piecemeal tactics to get food production, I am in favor of that procedure. Certainly the administration has failed with the price structure itself. If it takes today to handle corn, we will handle corn today; and when next Monday comes, if that is when we are to handle beef, I will be here to handle beef, because I have a bushel of telegrams demanding that the Senate not take a recess until this problem is settled.

I did not have any lunch this noon. I am not worrying about the committee meeting at 4 o'clock. They are probably holding a most important conference. I say the most important problem confronting the Nation today is the question of food, and we will only be living up to our responsibility to the people of the country and to our armed forces abroad if we remain here on the job, if that is necessary, the next 2 months, in order to get this question of food settled, so that we can eliminate the food problem with which we are faced today.

I am not sure the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can do any better than the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have the highest regard for every member of the Banking and Currency Committee, including its able chairman.

Certainly it is no reflection on my esteemed colleague from Connecticut, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I feel that the joint resolution should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because this will be a new avenue. This is a question of food production, and certainly a question pertaining to food production should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We cannot separate them. It is not merely a question of price, because the price indirectly affects the production of food. As the senior Senator from Montana has said, this is strictly an agricultural problem. We have had no relief from the Committee on Banking and Currency because, I believe, the hands of the members of that committee are tied by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I, for one, in order to take a new turn, should like to see the joint resolution go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to see if something cannot be done with the food situation, which needs to be solved before the Senate takes a summer recess.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator spoke about sending the resolution back to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. No, I meant to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator to be in favor of sending it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than sending it back to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. Rather than sending it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been as interested in the corn situation as has any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but it has never been before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. I correct my statement, and ask that the joint resolution be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to refer Senate Joint Resolution 71 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 322, at which point we ended consideration of bills at the last call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 322.

PAYMENT FOR UNIFORMS OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1113) to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850j, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows: "When first commissioned pursuant to this act officers shall be paid a uniform allowance of $150 if commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve, and of $250 if commissioned as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided,* That any officer who has heretofore received the cash uniform gratuity of $150 provided in section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1180) shall not be entitled to this uniform allowance."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective as of August 4, 1942.

PAYMENT OF A UNIFORM GRATUITY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

The bill (S. 1132) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratiuity to certain officers recalled to active duty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting between sections 310 and 311 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 855i) a new section 310a, to read as follows:

"SEC. 310a. Commissioned and warrant officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve without pay shall, upon first reporting for active duty (other than for physical examination) in time of war or national emergency pursuant to orders of competent authority, be paid the sum of $250 as a uniform allowance for the purchase of required uniforms in lieu of any other uniform gratuity allowed by law: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from this allowance the amount of any uniform gratuity paid such officer within the 4 years immediately preceding his recall to active duty."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of September 8, 1939.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN YORKTOWN NAVAL MINE DEPOT RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1170) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip or parcel of land of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, York County, Va., containing 8.03 acres, more or less, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF MARITIME REGULATIONS

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide a penalty for willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAYING OF THE CAPITOL CORNERSTONE

The bill (S. 1076) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol in the District of Columbia.

J. C. MUNN

The bill (S. 425) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn for the amount of the obligations incurred by him as guardian of William Taylor Hicks, on the recommendation of a representative of the Veterans' Administration, in providing medical and nursing services, food, household furniture, and other necessities for his said ward, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim a sum not to exceed $171.75. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $171.75, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ROBERT NORHEIM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 199) for the relief of Robert Norheim, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to insert "$202.68", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Norheim, of Dickinson, N. Dak., the sum of $202.68, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for accrued sick leave earned while employed by the United States Department of Agriculture, his request for substitution of sick leave for annual leave, during an illness which was contracted after his resignation had been submitted but before the effective date thereof, having been denied because the Department of Agriculture had not approved the revocation of such resignation prior to its effective date: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. Calendar No. 333.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask what became of Calendar No. 331, Senate bill 637?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was passed over on objection of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator desire an explanation of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like an explanation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the bill referred to Calendar 331, Senate bill 637?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REED. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed over.

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 636) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "employee" in section 40 of the act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 750), as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 790), is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'employee' includes all civil employees of the United States, including postmasters of all classes, and of the Panama Railroad Co. and all persons, other than independent contractors and their employees, employed on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin, subsequent to September 7, 1916, in operations conducted pursuant to the act entitled 'An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin,' approved March 28, 1908, as amended, or any other act relating to tribal timber and logging operations on the Menominee Reservation."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1004) to relieve newspaper and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

ADJUSTMENT OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS

The bill (H. R. 6) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust title to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administrative custody, or control, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has charge of this bill. It was considered

by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the Senate is aware, for many years the Department of Agriculture has carried on relatively large land acquisition programs in connection with which there have occurred typographical errors in deeds, erroneous surveys of tract boundaries, and so forth, resulting in land which it was not intended to take being taken by the Government. This bill is to make adjustments required because of erroneous surveys and for other reasons.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, and I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 327) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control, after having considered the same, report thereon favorably with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

An explanation of the bill is contained in the House Report No. 406 which is attached hereto and titled "Exhibit A."

EXHIBIT A

[H. Rept. No. 406, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6), to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of Agriculture, as will be noted from the following letter from the Acting Secretary:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 3, 1942.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed for the consideration of Congress a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control." The need for the legislation arises out of the following circumstances:

For many years the Department of Agriculture has carried on relatively large land-acquisition programs under the authority of various acts of Congress, including among others the Weeks forestry law (36 Stat. 961) and the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 522). In connection with these programs, experience has shown that occasional mistakes will inevitably occur both in direct purchase and condemnation cases. Typographical errors in deeds to the United States and condemnation pleadings, erroneous surveys of tract boundaries, and mistakes in abstracting titles are typical of the errors which occur. Sometimes the result is that the United States takes a title which it did not intend to take and which its grantor did not intend to convey, although the land may have been owned by the grantor. In other instances, land owned by a third party is inadvertently described in a deed or condemnation proceeding and a cloud is thus cast upon his title. In these cases, obviously, full equity requires that the interest of the United States should be relinquished to the proper parties. In addition, in some cases not involving mistakes it is occasionally desirable to revest title in the Government's grantor. For example, sometimes a deed to the United States is executed and recorded before the title is approved by the Attorney General and it subsequently proves impossible to comply with the requirements of the Attorney General so as to complete the acquisition by direct purchase. In such a case it may be more in the public interest to drop the acquisition and revest the title rather than institute condemnation proceedings. There are other less numerous circumstances under which extinguishment of the record interest of the United States would be equitable and desirable, but those mentioned will serve to illustrate the general problem with which this Department is concerned.

To cope with this problem adequately we believe that a general law similar to the enclosed draft, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim the interest of the United States under certain conditions, would be highly desirable. Although such authority already exists under some of the land-acquisition programs of this Department, it does not exist with respect to all such programs. In the past, where such authority does not exist, the Secretary has executed disclaimers of title, or in some cases special legislation relinquishing the interest of the United States has been obtained. Neither of these procedures, however, has been satisfactory. Disclaimers are of doubtful legal effect. To obtain special legislation is necessarily cumbersome and burdensome to the private parties involved, to the Department, and to Congress. That there is need for general legislation on this subject, therefore, seems clear.

A brief analysis of the proposed bill may be helpful. It will be noted first that the bill is drawn so as to be applicable to all lands acquired by the United States which are subject to the administration, custody, or control of the Secretary of Agriculture. Although, as indicated above, the authority which the bill would confer already exists with respect to some of the land-acquisition programs of this Department, either by express provision or by necessary implication, it is thought desirable to phrase the suggested legislation in general terms so as to avoid the possibility of inadvertently omitting some land-acquisition programs.

The bill would authorize the Secretary to quitclaim the interest of the United States in land subject to his administration upon either of two findings by him. One is a finding that title to the land is legally insufficient for the purposes for which it was acquired. This finding must be coupled with the fact that no consideration has been paid by the United States for the land involved. Upon such finding a reconveyance could be made where it is discovered after a deed has been taken that title cannot be cleared so as to complete the transaction by direct purchase and it is administratively preferable to drop the acquisition rather than resort to condemnation proceedings. The second is a finding that the title was acquired by mistake, misunderstanding, error, or inadvertence. The bill further provides, in effect, that if the quitclaim deed is in favor of the person from whom the United States acquired title, or his successor in interest, the United States shall be made whole for any consideration paid by it for the land being reconveyed. This means that the consideration given, whether cash or other property, would be required to be returned if possible. Otherwise, the value equivalent of the consideration as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, either in cash or property, would be required to be paid or given to the United States. On the other hand, if the quitclaim deed is in favor of a third party whose title has been wrongfully clouded restitution of any consideration paid by the United States, of course, would not be a condition precedent to the execution and delivery of such deed. The reason for this is obvious. The bill also would limit the authority to quitclaim to a period of 10 years after the acquisition by the United States of the land involved. It is believed that this is sufficient time to allow for the adjustment of titles in cases of claims made in good faith. To allow a longer period of time or to omit any time limitation would invite demands for restoration of titles based on old claims when the officers of the Government who conducted the original transactions are no longer in the Government service or their recollection of the circumstances has become hazy, and when the detailed records relating to such transactions may have become lost or destroyed.

It is believed that the proposed bill adequately safeguards the interest of the United States and that it provides a proper remedy for the problem discussed above. Its favorable consideration by Congress is, therefore, recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Acting Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FEDERAL AID TO STATE OR TERRITORIAL SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' HOMES

The bill (S. 861) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I note that it was reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN].

Mr. WALLGREN. I shall be glad to explain the bill.

Under the law, all States or Territories which have established, or which shall establish, State homes for disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States who served in the Civil War or in any previous or subsequent war who are disabled by age, disease, or otherwise, and by reason of such disability are incapable of earning a living, provided such disability was not incurred in service against the United States, shall be paid for every such disabled soldier or sailor who may be admitted and cared for in such home at the rate of $240 per annum.

We had before the committee a bill providing that this amount be increased to $540, but the committee recommended that it be reduced to $300 or $25 a month

additional for each disabled soldier or sailor in these homes.

The present law further provides that the number of such persons for whose care any State or Territory shall receive payment shall be ascertained by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under such regulations as he may prescribe, but the State or Territorial homes shall be exclusively under the control of the respective State or Territorial authorities, and the Administrator shall not have or assume any management or control of such homes.

This bill provides an increase of only $60 a year for each soldier and sailor in these homes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$540" and insert "$300," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States," approved August 27, 1888, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 24, sec. 134), is amended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof "$240 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300 per annum."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to payments with respect to the care given to disabled soldiers and sailors on and after the first day of the month next following the month during which this act is enacted: *Provided*, That said payments shall be made regardless of whether said veteran may be receiving domiciliary care or hospitalization in said home and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration for medical, hospital, and domiciliary care shall be available for this purpose: *Provided further*, That no payment to a State or Territory under this act shall be made for any period prior to the date upon which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines that the veteran on whose account such payment is requested is eligible for such care in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOANS TO FARMERS FOR CROP PRODUCTION AND HARVESTING

The bill (S. 715) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. DANAHER asked that the bill go over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope there will be no objection to this bill. It has been approved by all those who have jurisdiction over the subject matter. If a farmer who had given a lien on his crop to the Government for production should lose his animals, his horses and mules, his crop being already pledged, he could get no credit, and therefore the Government stood to lose what it had loaned and the farmer to lose his crop. The committee thought it was wise to provide that the Government could advance money to replace the stock.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. Would the bill forgive the indebtedness or would it extend the time of the loan?

Mr. SMITH. It would increase the amount that may be loaned to the farmer with his crop as security.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would not release the indebtedness?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not withdraw my objection. Let the bill be marked "over," please. This bill increases the authorized loans to individual farmers from $400 to $1,000 apiece. It calls for an appropriation of $75,000,000. There are at present 28 credit agencies through which farmers may obtain credit. The Farm Security Administration that has been debated on this floor within the last week may make loans to farmers situated just as those contemplated to be aided by this bill are situated. It is the kind of thing that ought to be gone into thoroughly. The bill should have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency which has dealt with all other credit advances to farmers on whatever basis. If it is coming from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a sample of the way the other bills which go there may be handled, perhaps our objection is fully justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, before the bill goes over, I wish the Senate to understand just what is being done. In connection with the seed loans for about 8 or 10 years, in God's part of the country the farmers have repaid 92 percent, including interest, and 72 percent, including interest, where there have been total crop failures. It is the only source of credit to those who cannot give anything but their prospective crops as a guaranty. It has been a godsend to those who have no financial standing and the manner in which they have repaid the loans is a challenge to the great Banking and Currency Committee. I wish we had some other committees as powerful and as wise as the Banking and Currency Committee. I know that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is composed of men who consider the farmer; but he is out of the picture; he is disregarded both by the administration and by this body. If the farmers were as well organized as labor is, we would have a time here.

I did not recommend the bill, but I would have done so, I think, if I had had the wisdom that some of the other members of the committee had. This bill was sent down by the administrators having to do with the loan program, who said that if the farmer should lose his mules and his horses, he could not buy others, for he did not have anything with which to buy, as he had pledged his credit to the Government. There is a provision in the bill under which the Commodity Credit Corporation will take into consideration the proposed increase from $400 to $1,000.

I think the Seed Loan Act is one of the most meritorious laws Congress has ever passed, and I was hoping this bill would be passed before a recess was taken by Congress, for I consider the seed loan as the greatest boon to the helpless man who has not capital that has been afforded by this body. Then to have a Senator say that it did not go to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I thank God it did not.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1140) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "annum" and the period, to strike out "The additional position created by this act shall exist only during the present war and for 6 months thereafter", and to insert "The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 758) to amend section 3 (c), Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing a uniform allowance for certain officers in the Army of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

Mr. DANAHER. Who objected?

Mr. SMITH. A member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I suppose. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not know the ground for the passage of the

bill, and if there is no explanation, I should like to have it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALLGREN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 344, Senate bill 758. When the bill was reached on the calendar the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] asked that it be passed over. I have since spoken to him, and he explained that the only reason why he asked that the bill go over was that there was no Senator present at the moment to explain the bill. I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 758) to amend section 3 (c), Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing a uniform allowance for certain officers in the Army of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsection (c) of section 3 of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, the existing law provides an allowance of $250 for any officer of the Army on active duty on April 3, 1939, or thereafter accepted for active duty, in the grade of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, or captain, and entitled to the pay of the first, second, or third pay periods on April 3, 1939, or at the time of such acceptance for active duty, except, any graduate of the Untied States Military Academy.

It is the opinion of your committee that the existing law operates as a discrimination against graduates of the United States Military Academy.

It is the practice that the cadet in the academy have deducted $14 each month from his pay during the period of service as a cadet for the purpose of creating a uniform fund which will be available to him when he graduates. However, this is considered a personal fund, and frequently a cadet expends a part of this money, and when the time comes to graduate he finds himself without sufficient money. The bill merely proposes to give to him the same right that is given to any other man who becomes an officer, the right to enjoy a uniform allowance of $250 a year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal sbsection (c) of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to authorize a uniform allowance for certain graduates of the United States Military Academy."

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO JAMES EDWARD WEST

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, who is James Edward West?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. It is merely a bill in keeping with long practice of our Government, asking that the President be authorized to present a gold medal to James Edward West for his valuable and long service to the Boy Scouts of America. There could be no objection to the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to James Edward West, Chief Scout of the Boy Scouts in America, in recognition of his services to the youth of the Nation.

RELIEF OF SPRINGDALE, UTAH

The bill (H. R. 2527) to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This bill merely corrects a description of title so that the little town of Springdale, Utah, will be able to get the same amount of water it has been using for some time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It does not involve an appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. None at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TITLE TO SALINE LANDS TO EDWARD HOLDEN

The bill (H. R. 2047) to correct an error and to confirm as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (H. R. 1397) to authorize the exchange of certain patented land in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (S. 878) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942," and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Committee on Civil Service, to whom was referred Senate bill 878, to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942," and for other purposes, considered it, reported it favorably thereon with amendments, and recommended the passage of the bill as amended.

The first section of S. 878 provides that former employees of the Government who were retired under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act prior to the enactment of the amendatory act of January 24, 1942, shall have their annuities recomputed on the basis provided in such amendatory act in all cases in which such a recomputation would result in increases in the amounts of such annuities.

Although earlier amendments to the Retirement Act changing the methods of computing annuities have provided for recomputation of annuities in the case of persons already retired, the amendments contained in the act of January 24, 1942, failed to contain such a provision. As a result, persons retiring after January 24, 1942, are entitled to have their annuities computed and paid on a more liberal basis than those who retired prior to that date. This discriminatory treatment would be eliminated by the enactment of S. 878.

Section 2 of the bill provides that all annuity payments made under the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be increased by 15 percent during the period beginning on the date of enactment of the bill and ending on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as may be prescribed by the Congress. Each annuitant would be paid only such increase as would not cause his aggregate annunity payments—exclusive of additional annuity voluntarily purchased by the employee—to exceed a rate of $2,500 per annum.

Under an amendment recommended by the committee, retirement and pension benefits payable from the policemen's and firemen's relief fund of the District of Columbia would be similarly increased.

The purpose of this section is to aid retired Government personnel, who are dependent for a livelihood upon annuities computed on the basis of methods established, and compensation earned, during normal times, to meet increased costs of living during the wartime emergency.

Section 3 provides that the provisions of the bill shall not operate to decrease the annuity of any person, and further, that the increases authorized under the bill shall not begin to accrue until the date of its enactment.

COST OF THE BILL

The recomputations authorized in the first section of the bill would result in an over-all cost to the Government of approximately $14,000,000, while the estimated cost of the increases authorized under section 2 would be approximately

$11,000,000 per year during the period within which the section is in effect. The latter figure does not include the cost of extending the provisions of section 2 to retired District of Columbia police and firemen, no estimates as to such cost having been presented to the committee.

Mr. WHITE. It has just come to my recollection and notice that I was requested to ask that this bill go over if it was reached on the call of the calendar today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears objection.

Mr. DOWNEY. Just a moment. Will the Senator withhold his objection until I can hear what he said?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. What was the statement made by the Senator?

Mr. WHITE. I said that it had just come to my recollection that I had been requested to ask that the bill go over if it was reached on the call of the calendar today. I know nothing of the reasons of the Senator making the request, but the request has been made to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears objection, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, during the call of the calendar, when Senate bill 878 was reached I objected to its consideration, in the understanding that I was so doing at the request of an absent Senator. Since then I have been informed that I was in error as to the attitude of the Sentaor to whom I referred. I desire to have the RECORD show now that neither I nor the Senator for whom I thought I was speaking objects to the bill.

FRANK BORAH

The bill (H. R. 1081) for the relief of Frank Borah was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JENNIE WALKER

The bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of Jennie Walker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. P. WOOLSEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 841) for the relief of J. P. Woolsey, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$598.70" and to insert "$500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Woolsey, of Madison, Wis., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained by him as the result of a collision between his automobile and a United States Army motor vehicle on May 22, 1941, at Lake Deton, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION TO SPECIAL COUNSEL IN CASE OF THE UNITED STATES v. THE STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1049) to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to add at the end of the bill a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to John W. Preston, of Los Angeles, Calif., and the sum of $10,000 to Annette Abbott Adams, of Los Angeles, Calif., as additional compensation for services rendered by them between October 1, 1935, and September 30, 1941, as special counsel and assistant special counsel, respectively, for the United States in the action of United States against the Standard Oil Co. of California for an accounting and to quiet title to sections 16 and 36, township 30 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, located in the Elk Hill oil fields in California: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESTERN MARYLAND DAIRY, INC.

The bill (S. 560) for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Western Maryland Dairy, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $3,082.63, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for loss and damage to personal property resulting from a collision which occurred when a truck and tank trailer belonging to such company was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of routes 26 and 27 in Taylorsville, Md., on December 5, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EL PASO ELECTRIC CO.

The bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of El Paso Electric Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE HENRY BARTOLE AND VERNON WAYNE TENNYSON

The bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson was considered, ordered a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT N. BECKERT

The bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of Robert N. Beckert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN RHODEN

The bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of John Rhoden was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDDIE PERCLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 770) for the relief of Eddie Percle, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the name "June", to strike out "29" and insert "27", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Eddie Percle, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his wife, Mrs. Octavie Landry Percle, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 27, 1940, near Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, La.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERTRUDE RICKETTS

The bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT F. PULLIAM

The bill (H. R. 1557) for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT P. SICK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1874) for the relief of Robert P. Sick, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the

words "sum of", to strike out "$1,500" and to insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF JOHN C. SHAW, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1101) to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, the sum of $27,467.97, in full satisfaction of the claims of said decedent against the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and its successors, including the United States of America, arising out of the certain contract dated May 24, 1920, between Sydney C. McLouth, of Marine City, Mich., party of the first part, and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, acting for and on behalf of the United States of America, party of the second part, including particularly, without limitation on the foregoing generality, the obligation of said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to adjust and pay the subcontract of said deceased with Ingram-Day Lumber Co. under article 2 of said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH FOXWORTH AND ETHEL HABERFELD

The bill (H. R. 1712) for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I dislike very much to raise any question, particularly in the absence of the author of a bill, but if any Senator present can give an explanation of the bill I should like to have one. If not, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears objection, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 45) to further amend section 37, Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization thereon and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to have an explanation of that bill before it is acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If no explanation can be given at this time, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1257) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT G. A. R. CONVENTION, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The bill (H. R. 2683) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PHARMACY CORPS IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. I do not see present at the moment the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee from which the bill was reported. In the absence of an explanation I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I asked for an explanation.

Mr. GURNEY. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who reported the bill from the committee, is not present at the moment. The Committee on Military Affairs considered this subject thoroughly not more than three or four days ago. Representatives of the War Department appeared before the committee and had no objection to the bill.

The bill would establish a Pharmacy Corps in the Army. It would increase the number of Regular Army officers who will receive commissions in the Pharmacy Corps by 12, but would not, of course, bring any more officers into the Army, because there are thousands of officers in the Medical Administrative Corps of the Army of the United States at the moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice the statement in the report that the War Department is not in favor of the measure.

Mr. GURNEY. That may be, but General White, who is in charge of personnel of the War Department, made a very good statement before the committee. He explained thoroughly that the bill would not result in disturbing the Army organization at all. All the druggists of the United States are in favor of the bill, and General White said the Army would not object to its passage. I am sure the evidence given to the committee made us all feel that the bill was very much worth while.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is the bill confined solely to the Army?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; I am sure it is confined solely to the Army.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope there will be no objection to the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, after the enacting clause, to strike out the following:

That (a) the first sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out "the Medical Administrative Corps" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Pharmacy Corps."

(b) The second sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The number of officers of the Medical Corps shall be 1,424, and of the Pharmacy Corps, 72."

(c) The third sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after 3 years' service, to the grade of captain after 6 years' service, to the grade of major after 12 years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after 20 years' service, and to the grade of colonel after 26 years' service."

(d) The last sentence of the third paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of future promotion, any person so appointed in the Medical or Dental Corps shall be considered as having had, on the date of appointment, service equal to that

of the junior officer of his grade and corps now in the Regular Army; and in the Veterinary or Pharmacy Corps sufficient service to bring him to his grade under the rules established in this section."

SEC. 2. The last two sentences of section 24c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "Existing laws providing for the examination of officers for promotion are hereby repealed, except those relating to physical examination, which shall continue to be required for promotion to all grades below that of brigadier general, and except also those governing the examination of officers of the Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Corps. Officers of said four corps shall be examined in accordance with laws governing examination of officers of the Medical Corps."

SEC. 3. The fourth sentence of section 24e of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between ages of 21 and 32 years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring 4 years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe."

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby established in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the "Pharmacy Corps." The Pharmacy Corps shall consist of 72 officers in grades from colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive. Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps, except as hereinafter provided for transfer thereto, shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between the ages of 21 and 32 years who are graduates of recognized schools of colleges of pharmacy requiring 4 years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after 3 years' service, to the grade of captain after 6 years' service, to the grade of major after 12 years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after 20 years' service, and to the grade of colonel after 26 years' service: *Provided*, That officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the Medical Administrative Corps on the date of enactment of this act shall be transferred to the Pharmacy Corps and commissioned in grade in such corps in addition to the 72 officers authorized for the corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 11, after "SEC.", to strike out "4" and insert "2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps."

ENLARGEMENT OF ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 413) to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That in order to enlarge the Arlington National Cemetery to meet the greatly increased future needs created by the unprecedented enrollment in the armed forces of the United States in the war in which it is now engaged, the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation from time to time as may be in the interest of the United States, all the remaining privately owned land lying between the present boundaries of the Arlington Reservation and the Lee Boulevard on the west, north, and east extended to its connection with Arlington Memorial Bridge and Washington Boulevard on the west, south, and east extended to its connection with Arlington Memorial Bridge; and the necessary appropriations are hereby authorized.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized, with the approval of the President of the United States, to transfer to the Arlington National Cemetery any other lands within their respective jurisdictions lying within the boundaries as set forth in section 1.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, this bill not only has the approval of the military authorities, and the Commisison of Fine Arts, but is urgently requested by them. It would authorize the President to purchase, in order to enlarge the Arlington National Cemetery, additional lands which have been sought for a long period of time. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes."

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY UNDER JURISDICTION OF WAR DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1156) to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That during the period of the present war the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to dispose of by sale, grant, exchange, or lease, any land or interest therein, or improvements, under his jurisdiction, to the extent that the same may be necessary, for the following purposes, to wit: The location or relocation of roads, highways, railroads, utilities, oil, gas, water, and sewer-pipe lines, electrical transmission and distribution lines, telephone and telegraph lines and other utilities, or easements or rights-of-way therefor: *Provided*, That this authority does not apply to such tracts of land as have been reserved from the public domain for use of the War Department: *And provided further*, That such disposition shall be made only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will be in the public interest and will not substantially injure the interests of the United States. Property acquired by the United States by exchange may be occupied, used, and improved prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority contained in this act shall be in addition to and shall not supersede any authority previously conferred upon the War Department to dispose of property or to grant any leasehold or other interest therein. The proceeds from sales, grants, and leases made hereunder shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to have that bill go over until I can ascertain what it provides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to?

Mr. GEORGE. No. I simply ask that the bill, as amended, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago Senate bill 1156 was passed over at the request of the senior Senator from Georgia. I ask the Senator if he will not withdraw his request that the bill go over, so that it may be considered. I make the suggestion for this reason:

The matter is a rather urgent one. I am very sorry the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is not present. However, I was a member of the subcommittee which acted on the bill. The purpose of the bill is to grant authority to the Secretary of War to dispose of lands or interests therein by sale, grant, exchange, or lease for the location or relocation of roads, highways, railroads, utilities, oil, gas, water and sewer pipe lines, electrical transmission and distribution lines, telephone and telegraph lines, and other utilities, or easements, or rights-of-way therefor.

In the camps, in some of the Government construction pursuant to the war policies, the War Department has been very much delayed because it could not obtain rights-of-way for transmission lines. Cases with respect to numerous camps are pending.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, since I asked that the bill be passed over, I have had occasion to look at it. I see that its scope was limited by the committee, and that the bill is confined practically to the granting of easements or rights-of-way for utilities, and so forth. I have no objection.

The reason why I objected was that there are some bills seeking by piecemeal to authorize certain other departments to dispose of surplus property and I had the impression that the bill was one of them. Obviously, sound public policy would demand that bills of that kind be considered in connection with consideration of a comprehensive policy and program, and not be dealt with peacemeal.

I have no objection to the bill, and I withdraw the objection I previously stated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection of the Senator from Georgia is

withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection. The amendment has already been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1156) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 275) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That those unselected and unpatented odd-numbered sections within the indemnity limits of the Oregon and California Railroad land grant authorized by the act of July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239), as amended by the act of April 10, 1869 (16 Stat. 47), which were included within the boundaries of national forests by proclamations of the President of the United States issued under the dates of June 17, 1892, September 28, 1893, October 5, 1906, January 25, 1907, March 1, 1907, and March 2, 1907, shall continue to be administered as national-forest lands by the Secretary of Agriculture subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national forests: *Provided*, That those certain revenues heretofore derived from said lands and placed in special deposit by agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and all revenues derived from the use or occupancy of said lands or the sale of the natural resources thereof after July 1, 1943, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and shall be distributed annually in specific conformity with the provisions of title II of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and said lands shall not hereafter be subject to the provisions of any other laws or parts of laws which otherwise prescribe the disposal or distribution of receipts from lands of the United States. No part of said lands or of the resources thereof shall be subject to exchange under the provisions of any law applicable to national forest lands or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF FOR FLOOD DESTRUCTION AND DAMAGE

The bill (S. 1286) to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to the bill, but I think the administration of the bill should be placed in the hands of the Farm Security Administration, rather than in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Farm Security Administration is the agency of Government charged with rehabilitation of farms. It has the staff, the personnel, and the procedure for doing work of the kind proposed.

The author of the bill is not now present in the Chamber. A day or two ago a colloquy took place between him and another Member of the Senate, and I made the suggestion that perhaps in the bill the words "Farm Security Administration" should be substituted in lieu of the words "Secretary of Agriculture." The author of the bill interposed no objection.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: Strike out the words "Secretary of Agriculture," wherever they appear in the bill, and in lieu thereof insert the words "the Farm Security Administration."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. It seems to me the bill provides for much more extensive treatment than the treatment provided for the sufferers from floods in the Ohio River Valley at the time of the disastrous floods there, and that the bill provides for a policy different from the one we have been following with reference to such measures. I object to the present consideration of the bill and ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation 'Flood control, general', made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of Section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities on any lands affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out on said lands by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting on such lands of any crops which are essential to the war effort, without the imposition of any penalty or the withholding of any benefit, soil conservation, or other agricultural payments.

"SEC. 4. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
BENNETT C. CLARK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before moving that the Senate agree to the conference report, I desire to make a brief explanation.

The result of the conference is that all the provisions which were incorporated in the Senate bill are incorporated in the conference report, with the exception of the Truman amendment relating to rehabilitation of railroads.

The two amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] relating to making provision to aid the farmers, were agreed to in conference. One of those amendments suspends all quotas. The other amendment provides for priorities and allocations in reference to machinery and other equipment necessary to conduct farming operations in the flooded area.

With respect to the railroad amendment, the Senate conferees undertook to maintain that provision in the bill. We held conferences for 2 days, but the House conferees remained adamant, and would not agree to it.

It was pointed out that under the present law relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the R. F. C. now has the authority to make loans to railroads for this and other purposes. There is some slight distinction between the existing law and the amendments proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. There has been considerable discussion about what the present law is, and how it differs from the Truman amendment. I have a verbal report submitted to me by Mr. John D. Goodloe, general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I should like to present to the Senate in explanation of the existing law.

Quoting from Mr. Goodloe's statement:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation now has authority under section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, to make loans, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to railroads for various purposes and would be authorized under that section to make loans to railroads for the purposes specified in the Truman amendment.

The Truman amendment, however, would limit the rate of interest that Reconstruction Finance Corporation could charge on such rehabilitation loans to 3 percent per annum—

As a matter of fact, the Truman amendment provided that loans should be made at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum.

Continuing the quotation from Mr. Goodle's statement:

Whereas the rate usually charged on railroad loans is 4 percent per annum. Under the present act the rate to be charged is in the discretion of the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the existing law the R. F. C. may make loans to railroads at a rate lower than 3 percent, or at a rate higher than 3 percent.

The Truman amendment does not contain the requirements made in section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, namely, that the loans be "fully and adequately secured."

However, the Truman amendment did provide for security acceptable to the R. F. C.—

and that the Interstate Commerce Commission must certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in connection with such loans that the railroad is able to meet fixed charges and does not need reorganization through judicial proceedings.

The conferees representing the Senate insisted upon the amendment more as a directive to the R. F. C. to make loans to railroads which had been damaged by the floods, in order that transportation of war matériel and troops might be resumed as soon as possible. It was an effort in the interest of the war, and not in the interest of the railroads. However, I regret that the House conferees took another view, and would not agree to the Truman amendment.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the conferees agreed upon everything with the exception of the Truman amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. That is true. I so stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 to the bill and concurred therein with amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 2714, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
July 3, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and concur therein with amendments as follows: In lieu of the number inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert "306"; and after section 304 of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 305. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 61.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain what the effect will be?

Mr. McKELLAR. The effect is that unless that provision is in the bill—the Senator will remember that it was put in late yesterday afternoon and sent to the House, and the House has now agreed to it—various Government employees will not be paid for the time between July 1 and the time when the President signs the bill. With that provision in it, they will be paid from the first of the month.

Mr. DANAHER. An admirable result, in which I concur. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

The bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense" was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the objection? I should like to proceed for a few minutes on the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well, Mr. President; I withhold my objection.

Mr. MALONEY. I desire to explain that the bill provides for the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 for the work of the Federal Works Agency under the section of the Lanham Act providing community facilities — water, sewers, schools, day-care centers, and similar facilities which are important and extremely necessary in areas where heavy war industries are located.

I remind the Senate that a few days ago the Senate passed a bill providing for an additional $400,000,000 for new war housing in defense-industry areas. That housing cannot be utilized until the facilities to which I have referred are made available. The bill has passed the House. It is not my bill, but a House measure. It provides for nothing new but funds. Funds under the law have been depleted. I think they are practically exhausted. A great many projects which have been approved are pending. I am fearful that if the bill goes over through the recess very great harm will be done to the war-industry centers, to the housing program, and to those without homes. The situation is already deplorable insofar as housing is concerned.

An amendment was attached to the bill in committee, and the bill was reported unanimously. The amendment may make it necessary for the bill to go to conference. In a few days Congress may take a recess for the summer. I think it is extremely important that the Senate pass the bill now. I think it will be a little dangerous for the bill to be delayed even for so much as a day longer.

The question in the mind of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], if I may be somewhat presumptuous, has relation to another proposal which provides that the Office of Education shall supervise day-care centers and the maintenance and operation of schools. That bill was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], was passed a few days ago by the Senate, and has gone to the House of Representatives. I remind the Senator and the Senate that in the bill provision was made, by an amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, that if the other bill does pass none of the funds proposed to be appropriated under the bill now under discussion could be used for those purposes.

I wish I could prevail upon the able Senator from Wisconsin to withdraw his objection. I have no direct personal interest in the matter, but it is very important.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan, in commenting upon this bill, I believe, has said:

We therefore recommend that the act be further amended so that all funds for school

construction and maintenance and operation be channeled through the United States Office of Education and in turn through the State departments of education. They are the legal and constitutional educational agencies.

Mr. MALONEY. That matter was discussed in the committee, Mr. President, and the letter just read by the Senator from Michigan is partially, at least, prompted by the fact that in the State of Michigan there is great need for additional school facilities, and that it so happens that there is a particular location in which a total of five school districts are involved, and that matter requires some action on the part of State authorities.

We discussed it in committee; and it was my understanding that the Federal Works Agency authorities said the matter either had been or, I think, would be satisfactorily adjusted. They were sure there would be no further or great difficulty.

The committee did not feel that at this period in the war, and the war program, it would be wise to interfere with the present situation. It was felt that a further delay might be caused by interrupting the program now. There was a certain amount of confusion as the work was first undertaken, some time back, insofar as schools are concerned.

However, as a member of the committee, I felt, and I thought other Senators felt, that we would best serve the program and the country by going along under the existing system for the balance of the war. This is a war program. The Senator from Maine, particularly, concurred in that view, and I think he originated the suggestion in the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The feeling of the department of public instruction in the State of Michigan is that the habit of the Federal Works Agency in dealing directly with school districts in connection with these grants has rather serious permanent implications. I quote one further sentence from the letter from the superintendent of public instruction:

It is our feeling that this kind of procedure will eventually affect administration, supervision, operation, and even the instructional programs in the schools.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not feel as the Senator seems to feel.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I discussed this question at some length with the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan and the Commissioner of Education of Maine, who was here with him. I know something of the circumstances with which they deal. There has undoubtedly been occasion for criticism as to delays, and also as to the administration of the program. They allege that to undertake at this juncture to alter the system would not result in confusion or delay. However, I think we had considerable doubt on that question, and therefore felt, as the Senator from Connecticut states, that it would be wiser to allow the present situation to continue.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am left in somewhat of a quandary by the statement of my eminent friend. I judge he failed to convince the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Michigan of the validity of the view which he announces to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is quite correct. I think the two gentlemen to whom I refer feel very strongly on the question. They speak from the standpoint of an educator concerned over the introduction of another authority into the educational field. We have the same question presented in this case as we had presented in connection with the vocational training problem. The question is whether or not the proposal is warranted under the circumstances which exist today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Everything seems to be drifting in the direction of Federal control of education; and I think that every step that even looks in that direction should be examined microscopically.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that that is the view of the committee with regard to this particular bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think this is just as good a time as any to make a frank statement about the issues which are involved in this measure. I am referring to Calendar No. 387, House bill 2936, which provides an amendment to the Lanham Act increasing the funds available for title II, or the so-called communities' facilities section of the act.

Some time ago the Senate decided by a majority vote, after long debate, that the Lanham Act and all measures pertinent thereto should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I remember that controversy very well. I helped to initiate the controversy or, rather, I was in second place. The Vice President preceded me.

Prior to the time of that incident, at least some of the legislation had been considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not deny that.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand. I merely want to make the matter clear. In that particular instance, at the request of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the measure was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I was opposed, and the Vice President yielded to the request of the Senator from Louisiana. The matter was submitted to the Senate. There were tie votes on three occasions. On each occasion the Vice President dissolved the tie vote by voting in favor of referring the matter to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Vice President, without solicitation on my part, and without any reason for which I am familiar, this time referred this particular bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will give me a chance I will come to that matter, because we should consider the whole picture. However, as I stated, after a contest, the Senate decided, by motion and a roll-call vote, to refer Lanham Act measures to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and they have been going there ever since that time.

In that connection, let me point out that a day or two ago the Senate passed a measure increasing to $400,000,000 the authorization for construction under title I of the Lanham Act. That measure had been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. Because of the situation which had developed as a result of war conditions, and the fact that women with children were working in industry, a need arose throughout the country for taking care of children in day nurseries and in schools while their mothers were at work in industry. The program to meet that need was handled under the W. P. A. As usual, under the W. P. A., direct contacts and direct grants were made to school districts and to nonprivate welfare and charitable organizations, and there was built up a system which in part was taking care of the problem, although to a woefully inadequte extent. Then the President ordered the W. P. A. closed and liquidated. After the liquidation of the W. P. A. the Public Works Administration took up the organization, with the same personnel, under funds available under title II of the Lanham Act, and in that way the organization was continued after the liquidation of W. P. A.

Some weeks ago an attempt was made by the Senator from Arizona to attach to an appropriation bill an amendment to provide funds to carry on the work. The amendment was voted down or went out on a point of order—I forget which. Subsequently, the Senator from Arizona introduced a legislative authorization bill and, naturally, it was sent to the Committee on Education and Labor because that committee had been exercising continuous jurisdiction over Lanham Act legislation since last year, when the Senate determined the issue. The committee held considerable hearings. It went into the whole situation. The Senator from Utah introduced a bill, Senate bill 1230, and this matter was thrashed out in the hearings and in the meetings of the committee. The committee came to the conclusion unanimously, as I recall, after considering all the questions involved, that it was much better to follow the pattern of the traditional Federal-State-aid joint program in this matter in order that the States might have more to say about the program, in order that they might have a more comprehensive program, and in order that the making of direct grants by the Federal Government to the school district or the particular agency involved might be terminated. The bill came to the floor of the Senate and was considered. The issues were thrashed out and the Senate passed the bill.

Then the measure now under discussion came over from the House. I did not know anything about it. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah did. The next thing I heard was that the bill had been referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and that hearings were being held before that committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Wisconsin that his time has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed, and to conclude his remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senate was operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have requested unanimous consent that I may conclude my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is no such thing under the Senate rules as reserving the right to object.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not want to be forced to object to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, which is certainly a reasonable one. However, I respectfully point out to him that all the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have been summoned to a special committee meeting to be held at 4 o'clock. Some of us are interested in the four bills which remain on the calendar. Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin that it would be agreeable, I am sure, if the Senator were granted a reasonably brief extension of his remarks. Unquestionably, we all desire to cooperate with him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am sorry I cannot yield under the circumstances.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I decline to yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has just made a unanimous-consent request. I have a right to comment on it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield the floor until I can have an opportunity to proceed, and then I shall complete what I have to say.

Mr. MALONEY. I have no desire to delay the Senator. I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the bill will go over under objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over on objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin know that at the earliest opportunity I shall move to bring up the bill. I do that against my natural inclinations, but because of the great importance of the bill I feel I should do so.

While I have the floor let me say that insofar as community facilities are concerned, at least for the most part, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers has as much right to jurisdiction as does the Committee on Education and Labor.

The questions with which the Senator from Wisconsin is concerned involve a small part of the bill. The others are extremely important.

Regarding the Senator's observation that there is a desire to give the State Boards of Education more control over State matters than is now proposed, I say to the Senator that in my judgment that is not the case, although I appreciate his sincerity, that the purpose is to give the Office of Education, the Federal agency, greater control over these matters, and that such will be the result if the program the Committee on Education and Labor has in mind prevails.

USE OF PORTION OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR PARKING OF MOTOR VEHICLES

The bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over until I can look into it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make an explanation of the bill? It is not my bill but it comes from the committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. I withhold it, but I may renew it.

Mr. MALONEY. That is satisfactory, of course, and I merely desire to make a brief statement in regard to the bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives.

It provides that for the period of the war the Washington Terminal Co. shall be authorized to use a part of the Capitol Grounds adjoining the railroad station, the Union Station, for parking purposes. Such parking lands would be available to the public for passenger cars.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that include the area between the Capitol and the station?

Mr. MALONEY. It includes a small area adjoining the station, but not land between the Capitol and the station.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to know definitely where the land is.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not undeveloped land between Massachusetts Avenue and the station on the other side of Massachusetts Avenue which is owned by the Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should have no objection if it is beyond Massachusetts Avenue, but if it contemplates the use of the area between the Capitol or the Senate Office Building and the front of the station, I should object.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say it will be done with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, who recommended to the committee that the bill be passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the only land involved is the land which lies immediately east of the Union Station. I should not even call it a part of the Capitol Grounds. It is not only north of Massachusetts Avenue, but north of the next street, California Street, beyond Massachusetts Avenue. It is a parking lot, and I think in no place does it come south of the front of the Union Station. So it does not in any way involve what would be regarded as the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those circumstances I have no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. It is land which was owned originally by the terminal company.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill, H. R. 3020, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. FRANK MEADOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of J. Frank Meador, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated" to strike out:

> And in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of $2,500 to J. Frank Meador, of Atlanta, Georgia, for personal injuries received as the result of being struck by a bicycle being operated by a special delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on June 20, 1942.

And insert:

> To J. Frank Meador, of Atlanta, Ga., (1) the sum of $500 in a lump sum as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and (2) the sum of $100 per month for each month beginning with the month in which this act is enacted and ending with the twentieth month for which such payments of $100 are made or the month preceding the month of death of the said J. Frank Meador, whichever may be the earlier; the payment of such sums to be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said J. Frank Meador as the result of having been struck by a bicycle operated by a special-delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on June 20, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 386) thereon. A little later I should like to call it up and have it con-

sidered, if I may. It is the last appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives with regard to the amendments of the Senate numbered 98 and 99 to the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia contemplate making a motion now?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are only three or four more bills on the calendar. Some of us have to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I hope that we may be able to finish the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no idea how long the remaining bills on the calendar may take, and I have been waiting for about 2 hours to have action taken relating to the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it will take 5 minutes to conclude the consideration of the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; I withhold the motion for a few moments, but if there is to be debate on calendar bills, I shall be compelled to insist that the matter relating to the Agricultural Department appropriations be considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FORFEITURE OF PAY OF PERSONS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1250) to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 1, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied, after separation from the service, any right, benefit, or privilege granted by law, solely by reason of a venereal disease contracted by him either before or during service in the armed forces; and no record thereof made by the War or Navy Department shall be revealed to any person not in that department or to any other governmental department, bureau or agency, except with the consent of such person.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 557; 10 U. S. C. 847b; 34 U. S. C. 882b), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied, after separation from the service, any right, benefit, or privilege granted by law, solely by reason of a venereal disease contracted by him either before or during service in the armed forces; and no record thereof made by the War or Navy Department shall be revealed to any person not in that department or to any other governmental department, bureau or agency, except with the consent of such person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have just been notified by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] that he has withdrawn all objection to Order 349, Senate bill 878.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, regular order, please.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

SALE OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The bill (H. R. 1294) to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. HOLMAN asked that the bill go over.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not hear objection to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said "over."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I also objected to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Michigan will withhold his objection until I can make an explanation of the bill which, I may say, is considered important by the War Production Board?

The War Production Board has asked the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to undertake to secure the passage of this bill at the earliest possible moment. I think it is proper to say here that they anticipate a more serious copper shortage than has been experienced up to this time. They are going to ask the people of the country to dig pretty deep and not only give them scrap copper but copper which might be useful, although not necessary, to the owners. The War Production Board officials and the administration have felt that, when it is asking the public to dig deep for this very necessary scrap, provision should be made to acquire——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the bill apply only to scrap?

Mr. MALONEY. It applies to governmental equipment, but it makes no direct order. Originally, when the bill was proposed, the intent behind it was to requisition air-conditioning equipment which would be placed in war plants so as to keep an even temperature in the construction of certain airplane parts. The War Production Board, however, has been able to acquire the kind of equipment it needs for that purpose. I do not think the bill would be before the Senate now except for the fact that officials of the War Production Board appeared before the committee and told us of the serious copper shortage and urged us to have the bill passed and to make it possible for the President to authorize Government departments to sell metals and other equipment, not necessary to the departments, which are badly needed for war purposes. The bill has had careful study at the hands of the committee, and it was unanimously reported.

Mr. FERGUSON. My reason for objecting was that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a bill now before it which covers the sale and transfer of personal property by the Federal Government.

Mr. MALONEY. This has no relationship to that. It is intended to be confined solely to the scrap drive which is about to be undertaken by the Government. Originally its sponsors had air-conditioning equipment in mind, but the need in that respect, I have been advised by Mr. Wilson, of the War Production Board, has been satisfied.

Mr. FERGUSON. With that explanation, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is a much broader bill than my friend from Connecticut describes. It provides that during the continuance of the present hostilities, the President may determine that any equipment, materials, or supplies now owned by the Government may be sold at not less than the scrap value of such property.

I shall have to ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MALONEY. It does not say that the property may be sold; it says that—

The President may authorize the head of the agency having control thereof—

And so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. I am obliged to ask that the bill go over. I give notice now that while I am on this floor there will not be a piecemeal disposition made of the vast investment of the Government in various kinds of property without somebody knowing what policy is to be followed. Under this bill any equipment, any material, any supplies may be by any agency declared to be surplus and sold to nongovernmental agencies. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that, with the explanation of the Senator from Georgia, I, too, want the bill to go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLMAN. Over.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, everything is happening to me in the late hours of this afternoon. I wonder if I can get the Senator to withhold his objection until I attempt to explain the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. May I explain why I desire to object?

Mr. MALONEY. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let me assist the Senator. I know nothing about this bill.

Mr. MALONEY. That is what I feared.

Mr. HOLMAN. I attempted to read it a few moments ago. I am a member of the Committee on Immigration. From the date on the bill, as I recall it, it passed the House 3 months ago. There has been no meeting of the Committee on Immigration recently, only one meeting in 6 months. I take it, from my hurried perusal of the bill, that it relaxes the immigration laws.

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all.

Mr. HOLMAN. Anyway, I do not like the idea of coming in with this back-door approach in considering a bill relaxing immigration laws in the hurried moments of the closing of the session of the Senate. Before I should want the bill considered by the small number of Senators now present, I should ask for a quorum, and have a larger attendance.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sure I can overcome the Senator's objection, because the bill is not what he fears it to be.

Mr. HOLMAN. As a member of the Committee on Immigration, I should know. At this hour I should not have to be guessing.

Mr. MALONEY. I will explain to the Senator, if he will give me time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

Mr. MALONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, insofar as I am concerned, the RECORD is going to be clear. We are going to take a recess in a few days, and I shall not accept the indictment, which I am certain was not intended as directed at me, by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. This is not my bill.

House bill 2207 in its present form has nothing to do with immigration. The fact that it comes here without a committee meeting is due to the urgent appeal of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. The purpose of the bill is to protect young men who have served in the armed forces of our country and who, in a spirit of carelessness or recklessness or thoughtlessness in peacetime, deserted or were charged with desertion and were court-martialed. The bill makes provision that upon their reenlistment, their return to the service, their lost citizenship shall be restored. That is the entire and only purpose of the bill, and because I was anxious to give protection to these young men, who have mended their ways and paid the penalty for their offense and returned to fight for their country, I urged the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Immigration to give me permission, as a member of a subcommittee of three, I being chairman, and the other members being the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], to poll the committee. The committee was polled by the clerk of the Committee on Immigration, and I did obtain the unanimous permission of the Senate to report the bill up until midnight of night before last. That is how it comes here without a committee meeting. I have no personal interest in the bill beyond a natural interest in these young men who should have their citizenship restored under circumstances which I have outlined.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has asked that this bill go over. I wish to say that at the earliest opportunity I shall call up Senate bill 1279.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN MARRIED MEN FROM SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with Senate bill 763, that an editorial from the Boston Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINAL DECISION

Senator WHEELER speaks the mind of the majority of married men, with children, when he says that they do not know from one day to another where they stand. Ever since selective service was put into effect the threat of drafting married men has hung over their heads like the sword of Damocles. With homes to pay for, young children to raise and jobs to hang on to, they have been harried and worried. They are no less patriotic than other men in their desire to serve their country. But they have responsibilities on the home front, which raises the question whether they should be taken until the last single man has gone. It would be a relief to them if the Government, as represented by selective service and the Manpower Commission, would come to a definite conclusion so that they would know where they stand.

SALARY FOR THE COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC ROADS AND THE COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The bill (H. R. 1940) prescribing the salary for the Commissioners of Public Roads and the Commissioners of Public Buildings, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2481, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
July 2, 1943.

Resolved, That the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I was unavoidably absent when Order of Business 334, House bill 1004, was called, and I find that objection was raised and that the bill went over. I find also that a very brief explanation could accomplish elimination of the objection. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to yield to the Senator, but there are three or four other bills in the same situation, and if I yielded for one I should feel obligated to yield for the others.

Mr. NYE. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may state, with respect to order 334, House bill 1004, that the Senator from West Virginia objected to the consideration of the bill. Since hearing a very clear explanation of the purpose of the bill from the able Senator from North Dakota, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is the general supply bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year which commenced day before yesterday. I am sure that all Senators realize the importance of enacting the general appropriation bills for the maintenance of all the departments of the Government at the earliest possible time.

When the agricultural appropriation bill came to the Senate from the other body, it had been mangled and cut to pieces on the floor of the House to such an extent that it was necessary for the Senate to adopt 134 amendments. That was an unprecedented number of amendments, and naturally caused long hours of conference on the bill.

All the amendments have been brought to a conclusion, except amendments numbered 98 and 99, which deal with the subject of Federal crop insurance.

Senators who did me the honor to listen to my statement on the floor when the motion was made that the Senate recede from its crop insurance amendments will recall that I stated then frankly that I was opposed to the entire philosophy of repealing in effect an act of Congress by a rider on an appropriation bill; that I was a strong advocate of crop insurance, but that in my judgment nothing possibly could be gained by continuing to insist further upon the Senate's position in this matter, and that the Senate had a great deal to lose by continuing to insist upon the amendments.

I undertook then to point out that the Senate conferees had prevailed upon the House conferees to carry the amendments back for three separate votes upon

the floor, and that the position of the Senate lost ground on every vote which was taken in the other body.

Mr. President, I think that I am reasonably stubborn in undertaking to defend the views of the Senate upon its various amendments. So long as the position which has been assumed by the Senate gains ground in votes taken in the House, I am perfectly willing to continue to fight until we have ultimately gained our objective. But when the position of the Senate loses from 18 to 20 votes upon every separate vote which is taken in the other body, and when finally the position of the Senate cannot be sustained by a sufficient number of Members on the floor of the other body even to require a yea and nay vote on the question, it is futile any longer to insist upon the provisions of the Senate in the bill.

So, therefore, when I made the motion to recede, I stated that in my opinion there was nothing further to be gained by insisting upon the amendments. I made that motion with the utmost reluctance, because I believe in the entire theory and philosophy of crop insurance. Coupled with that motion I requested another conference with the House conferees. The House conferees had indicated in conference that we had exhausted the entire field of discussion on crop insurance, and that a further conference on that matter would serve no useful purpose.

When the message of the Senate was received in the House of Representatives the House did not agree to the conference requested on the part of the Senate. On the contrary all efforts being made by the small guard in that body which was still devoted to the cause of crop insurance having been defeated and voted down, the House merely adhered to its amendments, and returned the papers to the Senate without agreeing to discuss the matter further in conference.

Mr. President, that is the position in which we find ourselves now. If I thought that there was the remotest possibility of gaining the continuation of crop insurance in the bill I would be the last to favor recession from the Senate amendments. I would not favor the recession of the Senate did I not believe that some of the matters which we have gained, after two or three record votes on the floor of the House, will be gravely endangered if we continue to insist upon the Senate's position, and require the House to pass an entirely new bill, because that is the only thing the House proposes to do. We have been advised that no continuing resolution will be introduced; that an entirely new bill will be introduced striking down some of the things for which the Senate has been contending for weeks, and we will be compelled to fight the whole matter over again, item by item, and I say, Mr. President, in the present temper of the Congress, not only in the House but in the Senate, we would gravely endanger the positions we have won only after two or three record votes have been taken thereon in both bodies.

Mr. President, the action proposed to be taken will not result in repeal of the crop insurance law. There will be other opportunities on other occasions for those who believe in crop insurance, as I do, to attempt to sponsor that cause without endangering the entire agricultural appropriation bill.

So I say, Mr. President, that in my judgment, as one who believes in crop insurance and yet is devoted to the broader cause of agriculture in this country, the Senate has nothing further to gain by insisting upon its position, but that by continuing to persist in our efforts with respect to this one item and this one bureau we stand to lose a great deal in respect to all the activities of the Department of Agriculture to which the farmers of the Nation are looking.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. NYE. The Senator has declared that the proposed action does not necessarily write "finis" to crop insurance. I understand the Senator's meaning. But I wonder if he is aware of the difficulty that lies ahead if new crop insurance is to be written on winter wheat which will be produced in Kansas and elsewhere, and which must be planted this fall. It will perhaps be impossible to fathom the difficulty, after the contemplated recess, of enacting legislation in time to afford insurance before the winter wheat crop is planted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that danger, but I said that in my judgment there will be deficiency appropriation bills and other appropriation bills which will of necessity require the attention of the Congress immediately upon the Congress reassembling after the recess which it is proposed to take.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I will testify to the very good faith of the Senator from Georgia, who has led our conferees in the almost impossible fight in which we have been engaged with the House conferees. I think I speak fairly when I say that every Senate conferee entertains an opinion not unlike that expressed by the Senator from Georgia. There is with us all a determination that when we are free of this dead line of the fiscal year which handicaps us now, when we are free from the danger of jeopardizing the advantageous things which have been written into the agricultural supply bill for 1944, there will be a readiness and a willingness when the first deficiency bill is presented, following the recess, to make a renewal of our efforts to restore full and complete life to the crop-insurance provisions.

With that explanation, Mr. President, in the absence of some demonstration of reason why we should continue this futile and hopeless effort of the moment, I shall be inclined to support the chairman of our subcommittee in the motion he has made, or is about to make. I hesitate in doing it, because I feel that we will surrender to a condition which is not going to be at all improved by reason of our surrender. Such a surrender will give notice to the House of Representatives that all it needs to do in the future to accomplish its purposes, or the purposes of some few Members of the House, will be to continue to hold the supply bills until the last minute, send them over to the Senate in time for brief hearings, then confront the Senate with a deadline at the end of one fiscal year and the beginning of a new fiscal year, and place the Senate in a hopeless position so far as concerns dealing intelligently with the supply bills. But I hope that we may remedy the situation in other ways.

Mr. President, as I said, I shall be inclined to go along with the Senator from Georgia in his motion. I do it with apologies to one and all who have come to recognize in crop insurance the institution that can mean so much to individual farmers, so much to the Government of the United States, and which in this hour for the wheat farmer constitutes about the only assurance, the only protection that he has left from the Government, in an hour when the Government is asking the farmer to increase by 18,000,000 acres the plantings of wheat to meet the present food emergency.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I was necessarily out of the Senate Chamber when the Senator from Georgia began to speak, but I understand that the motion made by the Senator deals entirely with crop insurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Connecticut is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, my State has no direct concern with this problem at present, but I have constantly supported the crop insurance program, because I have felt that the farmers were entitled, as are the other industries of the country, to have the chance to purchase insurance protection.

I represent in part a great insurance State, and I read somewhere within the past few days that there was opposition to this proposal on the part of an insurance lobby. I think that was a serious mistake. I do not think that the insurance interests have opposed this program. Insofar as I am concerned and within my knowledge there is no such opposition.

Industrialists are able to buy the kind of insurance they need for the protection of their business. I know that until we work out a proper plan there will be some additional cost to the Government, but there should be a further chance to establish an actuarial basis on which to provide the necessary protection for these stricken farmers. Of course, I shall follow the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator from Georgia. I am almost always happy to follow his leadership. In the present instance, although feeling badly about it, and a little reluctant, I will follow his suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no one could be more reluctant than the Senator from Georgia to make the motion. No one could be unhappier than the Senator from Georgia to see the Federal Security Agency insurance plan passed over.

I desire to say to the Senator from Connecticut that in the years I have been a Member of this body the Senator from Connecticut, representing a great industrial State, has shown a peculiar comprehension of the problems of agricultural States, and at times has voted in the interest of the farmers of the Nation, and to promote their welfare, when it would have seemed to be even against his own political interest to do so. There is no more broad-minded or nationally minded Member of this body than the Senator from Connecticut, and I appreciate the effort he has made in connection with the appropriation bills to assist the farmers of the country.

Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the realistic attitude of the senior Senator from North Dakota. He is a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. No member of the committee is more diligent in his attendance on the committee meetings, and certainly there is no more valuable member of the subcommittee dealing with agricultural appropriations than the Senator from North Dakota. I deeply regret that the other day we were apart in our position on crop insurance, because I think that was the first time in the 10 years the Senator from North Dakota and I have served on the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations that we have ever differed on any vote in the committee.

Mr. President, I think that shows as nonpartisan an approach to the problems of agriculture as it would be possible for any group of men to take.

I am reluctant in this matter. I am heartsick to make a motion to recede; but I believe the broad general purposes of agriculture which are served by the provisions of the bill are so important that it is necessary even to endanger the matter of crop insurance, which certainly is entitled to further experiment and trial.

I can assure the Senator from North Dakota and all other Senators who are interested in the matter that so far as I, as a member of the Appropriation Committee and of the subcommittee of that committee dealing with agricultural appropriations, am concerned, I shall be glad to support with all the power in my being any other legislation designed to prevent crop insurance from being abandoned.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Let me ask the Senator if he has the slightest reason to believe that following the anticipated recess, the Senate will not be faced with the same prospect regarding the matter that has prevailed in the past in the consideration of such matters?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion the Appropriations Committee is almost unanimous in this matter. A majority of the members of the committee have expressed themselves overwhelmingly, and were supported by the entire committee, in running the steam roller over the Senator from Georgia, the other day, when he moved to recede on the amendments. Certainly I am as interested in the amendments as is any other Member of the Senate. However, when we realize that the Farm Security Administration item and other items of the bill will be endangered by continued resistance, if it should prove necessary to write a new bill, and in view of the fact that the House would not even accept the Senate's invitation to a conference, I cannot see that the Senate has a thing to gain by refusing to recede.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede on its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am anxious to understand the Senator's position relative to contracts which have been entered into for a particular period. Of course, I realize from what has been said that the contracts contain the qualifying clause that their application depends upon the making of the necessary appropriations by Congress. However, if a farmer did not want 1-year crop insurance, but was induced to take it because of the 3-year term, what is the Senator's opinion regarding the right to terminate the contract before the 3 years have elapsed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no question that any crop planted after the 30th of June will not have any insurance under the act.

Mr. LANGER. Despite the fact that the insurance was taken out for 3 years? If the insurance does not apply after the 30th of June, a farmer who took out a 3-year insurance contract just a year ago will have 2 years of his insurance abrogated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true. Of course, I think the farmers generally prefer a 1-year contract.

Nevertheless, a farmer who, in fact, preferred a 3-year contract and took out a 3-year contract a year ago will undoubtedly have 2 years of his insurance practically abrogated by the proposed action, unless we can provide relief for him in some other way.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask whether the Senator obtained an opinion from the Attorney General of the United States relative to whether the 3-year contracts would be binding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not. I did not seek such an opinion, because in my opinion it is very clear from the terms of the contract that such contracts are not binding after the 30th of June, under the circumstances. The contract contains a provision, on its face, that the application of the entire contract depends upon the making of the necessary appropriations by Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, can the Senator give any opinion why the House conferees would not take the amendments back to the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only reason I can give is that the conferees on the part of the House were unanimous in their determination to do crop insurance to death by any means at their control. I do not believe they would hesitate for a moment—yea, I believe some of them, at least, would be delighted—to use this matter as an excuse for killing the entire appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. The position of the conferees, as stated in page after page of the RECORD of the debate on the several occasions when the bill was taken back before the House, was that under the crop-insurance program money had been lost. Of course, not many farmers have yet come under the program. Those of us who are familiar with the situation know that some years will be required before many farmers will come under it. However, in the debate and in the conference it was stated time after time that $41,000,000 had been lost under the program. I think that is a mere bagatelle for such a program; but the conferees on the part of the House seem to think it is a very great calamity. Of course, it is true that $41,000,000 has been lost in dealing with crop insurance.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the Senator's suggestion that if the program had also included insurance for tobacco, peanuts, and other of the basic products in addition to wheat and cotton, the House would have receded?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think so; because, if the Senator will read the yea and nay vote, he will find that the Members of the House coming from areas where tobacco, cotton, and peanuts are planted voted almost unanimously to retain crop insurance. We might as well be frank about the matter. The man who killed crop insurance is a Representative from the State of Illinois. I understand he represents a district largely devoted to the production of corn. He was unremitting and persistent in his fight against crop insurance; and he had his fellow conferees, without regard to party lines, entirely with him in the considerations in the conference and in the House.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. I desire to say that although I shall vote that the conference report be rejected, nevertheless I appreciate the reasonableness of the Senator's attitude in presenting the matter to the Senate as he has done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the hour is late. This is an important question. About an hour ago I suggested to the Senator from Georgia that I desired to discuss this question. I definitely disagree with him and with the Senator from North Dakota upon some important questions—not on the question of farm-crop insurance, because we are agreed upon that, but as to the situation of the Senate in relation to this question.

Mr. President, this is not legislative procedure. This is legislative lynching, and I will not be a party to a lynching, even if the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Georgia are willing to be. I suggested to the Senator from Georgia that I would be very happy if he could secure an agreement to bring this matter up when the Senate meets on Monday. I have a great affection for the Senator from Georgia. He is a fine gentleman. I had hoped that he would agree. He did not.

This is an important matter. I think it ought to be discussed in the presence of as many Members of this body as we can assemble at this hour of the day. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum, although I am perfectly willing to forego that course if we may have an agreement to bring this question up when the Senate convenes on Monday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Reed
Austin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lucas	Stewart
Burton	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	Maloney	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All those in favor——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, how many Senators did the Chair announce as having answered to their names?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names.

Mr. REED. Of course, I accept the dictum of the Chair, with many reservations. Seventy-seven Senators have not answered to their names, and that many Senators are not present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not desire to enter into an argument with the distinguished Senator from Kansas. He has taken the tally of the clerk on that question.

Mr. REED. I am quite familiar with that practice, Mr. President.

I shall not discuss the merits of farm-crop insurance. I think the subject has been well covered. I am trying to find out whether this body has left any dignity, or any disposition to assert its dignity as a coordinate branch of the Congress. That is one issue which is involved.

Another issue which is involved is quite important to the people of the country. When the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation was before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee he told us that in order to produce wheat, both for food and feed, 18,000,000 acres were needed in addition to what was planted last year.

Mr. President, the chances of getting that much additional wheat planted are very poor at best. The removal of crop insurance is the final blow to the wheat farmer and may make it utterly impossible to increase wheat acreage in anything like the degree desired by the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administrator.

Let me call attention to what has occurred to the wheat farmer in this bill. Heretofore he has been given consideration in soil-conservation payments. That consideration has been removed. He is given the prospect of parity payments to be collected in about 2 years. Finally, the prospect of crop insurance is sought to be taken away from him.

Mr. President, wheat today is selling at 24 cents a bushel below parity. We are asking the wheat farmers to increase their acreage 18,000,000 acres, and we are taking everything away from them which can be taken away from them. I certainly do not intend to share any part of that responsibility.

The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota can delude themselves with hope if they wish to do so; but I challenge their statement that if we take the action suggested by the Senator from Georgia and recede from our position there is any reasonable prospect of ever coming back to crop insurance and particularly that statement that this provision would not repeal the crop insurance act.

Mr. President, allow me to read the language of the bill in which the Senator from Georgia, with the encouragement of the Senator from North Dakota, moves that we concur. This is the House language which the Senate struck out, with respect to which the Senate amendment is in controversy. It would kill crop insurance. The language is as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

Mr. President, I wish to impress upon the Members of this body that that language, should it become law with the concurrence of the Senate, would kill the crop insurance program. There would be nothing doing after July 31 of this year. There is no use in deluding ourselves or fooling ourselves about it. It would be out.

Let me go back to the wheat situation for a moment. I come from the principal wheat-producing State in the country. If 18,000,000 acres of wheat in addition to the present wheat planting are to be secured, 5,000,000 acres will have to come from Kansas. Five million additional acres will have to come from Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, and the Panhandle of Texas; and the Northwest spring wheat area will have to produce about 5,000,000 acres more, leaving about 3,000,000 to be scattered over the country.

I believe I am familiar with wheat crops and wheat prices. I wish to give warning that wheat must be planted principally beginning in the later half of September and continuing through a part of October.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree entirely with the philosophy of the Senator from Kansas on the subject of crop insurance, but we are now facing a practical situation. The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota have agreed with the Senator from Kansas in his philosophy of crop insurance.

Mr. REED. I assure my friend the Senator from New Mexico that I do not agree with them as to the parliamentary situation. I shall try to demonstrate the correctness of my view.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Are we to go up against a stone wall again and not have an appropriation bill, or are we to continue the stalemate?

Mr. REED. I will discuss those questions a little later.

Mr. President, I believe that under the most favorable circumstances it would be impossible to secure the entire additional acreage which is desired. Certainly in the face of these discouraging circumstances and situations, the chances for obtaining additional acreage are very greatly lessened.

I now return to the parliamentary situation. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that a year ago at this time we were in very much the same situation with respect to the agricultural appropriation bill that we are in at the present time. The Senate, through its committee on conference, was deadlocked with the House, and a continuing resolution was passed to take care of the situation until the differences between the two Houses could be resolved. I am sure the Senator from Georgia will agree to that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. President, I agree to the statement; but the Senator has not stated an analogous case, because there were no items in that bill, on which the House had voted on five separate occasions, as it has done with respect to crop insurance. As to the items which were voted on last year two

or three times, the position of the Senate gained votes each time, whereas on the crop-insurance provision the House supporters of crop insurance have weakened each time. On the last occasion there was a smaller vote than there had been at any other time. So there is no analogy between the two cases.

Mr. NYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I notice the period of which the Senator from Kansas speaks, but he levels something of an indictment at the Senator from Georgia and myself which I must resist.

Mr. REED. Not more than of being faint-hearted.

Mr. NYE. It will be recalled that day before yesterday the Senator from Kansas and I appealed to the Senate with all the power we had at our command to resist the motion for the Senate to recede from its position and agree to the House position, and be done with the crop insurance.

At that time I declared on the floor that I had reason to feel—and I did—that if we would send the matter back to the House just once more we would encounter a far different result than that which had theretofore ensued. I have not been able to deliver my part of the bargain. If I remember rightly, the Senator from South Carolina announced later publicly that if my assurances were not fulfilled there was going to be a hanging or a shooting. I have not encountered the Senator all this live-long day. I do not know whether I have evaded him or he has been evading me, but the fact is that after we did get the matter back to the House as a result of our appeals, the House make a weaker showing in support of crop insurance than at any time. That can be explained, I understand, and I am not ready to accept as fair the manner in which the issue was presented to the House; but the fact is that we were worse off after the last appearance of this issue in the House than we were before.

Mr. REED. Undoubtedly. Of course, the House took the vote yesterday morning, early in the day, and the manager of the bill on the part of the House moved the previous question and shut off discussion. The efforts, of course, were futile in the House.

Let me go back to the history of the bill. I think the Senator from Georgia overstated a little about the number of votes in the House, but there have been several, there is no doubt, and the crop insurance advocates there have been at a serious disadvantage. It would be useless for me to say I have doubt that they sounded the actual sentiment of the House. I do have that doubt, but there is the official return.

I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia that the parliamentary situation as to this bill is so much different this year from what it was last as to justify a precipitate retreat on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, of course, the Senator has a right to form his own opinion, but if the Senator cannot see any difference in the parliamentary situation when the House was willing last year at least to agree to the request for a conference, and this year will not even go into a conference on the matter, I fear there would be absolutely no hope of persuading the Senator in any degree, if he cannot see any difference in the situation when the House was at least willing to confer and when they would not accept an invitation to confer, but sent the matter back to the Senate with almost an implied hope that it would kill the whole bill.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Georgia, I think, has emphasized what I shall now proceed to discuss, that is, the parliamentary situation of the bill.

The provision as to crop insurance is not an Executive order, as some of these matters we have been discussing are. It was established by the action of the two Houses of Congress. It was included in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Both Houses concurred. There has been no legislative action since on the matter.

If anyone had proposed to repeal the crop insurance law I doubt if he would have gotten a respectable hearing in either House. Certainly he would not have in the Senate, and I doubt if he would in the House. Yet here is the Committee on Appropriations, and a minority of the Committee on Appropriations at that, which reports on an appropriation bill a provision which in effect is a repeal of a crop insurance law which had been enacted after due consideration by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, when that came to the Senate, the Senate struck out the part of the bill which I read, that no part of the appropriation could be used after July 1 to continue crop insurance in effect.

What is our situation? There are about 487,000 farmers who hold wheat crop insurance contracts running for a period of 3 years. The first 3-year contract was written last year. All wheat contracts are now on a 3-year basis. What the Congress of the United States is doing is walking out, after 1 year, on these farmers who hold 3-year contracts.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has the Senator from Kansas yielded the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask as a parliamentary inquiry whether the Senator has yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Did the Senator from Kansas yield the floor?

Mr. REED. I am making the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last point of no quorum suggested by the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the Senate declines to adjourn.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senate having transacted business, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Reed
Austin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Buck	Lucas	Stewart
Burton	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McKellar	Truman
Caraway	Maloney	Tunnell
Chavez	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Guffey	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize the difficulties of the situation at this hour, when the Committee on Banking and Currency is in session working on another important matter dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have been endeavoring to ascertain if it would be possible to agree on an hour on Monday at which the Senate would vote on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that not later than at 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, with the understanding that the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the Senator's motion without further debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the second deficiency appropriation bill is ready, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has an item he wants added to it. I was in hope the Senate might take up the bill by unanimous consent this afternoon. The report of the Appropriations Committee on the bill is unanimous. No controversial matter is contained in the bill. I should like to add to the unanimous-consent request that after the motion of the Senator from Georgia is disposed of, the second deficiency bill be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has requested unanimous consent that at not later than 1 o'clock on Monday the Senate proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think 1 o'clock is too soon. Is the Senator willing to modify his request by asking that the vote be had at 2 o'clock, instead? Crop insurance is very important to North Dakota.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize that; but on Monday we are likely

to be pressed for time. All Members of the Senate want to clean up the matters that have been hanging over from day to day. One hour on Monday will really be all the time that will be needed for consideration of the matter. I am asking that the vote go over until then because of the importance of the legislation being considered by other committees and because of the lateness of the hour. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the statement of the majority leader, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the vote on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the second deficiency bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the floor when the Senate reconvenes on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator desire to take more than 30 minutes?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I shall not take more than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has made a unanimous-consent request which the Chair has not put. His request is that immediately following consideration of the motion of the Senator from Georgia, on Monday, the Senate proceed to consider the second deficiency bill. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has requested that when the Senate reconvenes on Monday next, he be recognized and have the floor, with the understanding that he will not consume more than half the time before the vote.

Mr. REED. I assure the Senate I shall not take that much time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not object to having the Senator from Kansas make a speech on Monday; but when the Senate reconvenes on Monday, the Presiding Officer may not be the same as the present Presiding Officer; and, under the rule, it is within the discretion of the Presiding Officer to recognize a Senator. The procedure requested by the Senator represents a very bad practice. I shall not object, but I serve notice that I think it is a bad practice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I repeat my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we can accommodate any Senators who desire to speak within the hour, without having a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas withdraw his request?

Mr. REED. No. I do not understand that it is desired that I withdraw it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I did not ask the Senator to withdraw his request. However, several Senators have asked me whether it would be possible for them to speak during the hour. I think we shall be able to accommodate any Senators who desire to speak at that time. So far as I know, no other Senator desires to speak in favor of the motion, except perhaps I may want to speak for about 3 minutes. I do not think there will be any difficulty in accommodating Senators who desire to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kansas is agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, 11, 19, 27, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 80, 81, 89, 90, 92, 93, 136, 137, 145, 146, 152, 179, 182, 188, 195, and 196.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 59, 60, 82, 151, 178, and 199; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,052,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$811,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$866,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$700,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$530,000, and in addition thereto, the unexpended balances for this purpose contained in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, are continued available during the fiscal year 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$217,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$786,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disageement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$29,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$697,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,835"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$36,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$182,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,238,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,657,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 17 of said amendment, strike out "$600" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas prduction on the Osage Reservation, Okla., including pay of the superintendent of the agency and of necessary employees, and pay of tribal officers; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and repair and operation of automobiles, $170,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided*, That of the said sum herein appropriated $7,500 is hereby made available for traveling and other expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, when engaged on business of the tribe, including supplies and equipment, not to exceed $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the collection of any income due the Osage Tribe of Indians or the enrolled members thereof where such income is not deposited to the credit of the said Osage tribal funds account or to the credit of the proper member's account."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$67,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$93,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$63,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$177,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,187,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$492,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$43,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$87,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,925"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$310,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,143,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$64,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$680,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$61,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$722,880"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$63,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$533,380"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$629,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$322,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,860,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$317,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$84,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$337,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 176: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$186,110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$155,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$293,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$464,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$740,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment,

as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 15, 85, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 142, 149, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 169, 172, 173, 174, 184, 190, 192, 194, 200, and 201.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to amendments Nos. 1, 102, 106, and 116),
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what is the matter now before the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have submitted a conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill. The report covers all matters so far as the conferees have gone. I shall shortly ask that the Senate insist on its amendments in disagreement, so that a further conference may be held on them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the conference report embrace the item of $1,900,000 for a power line?

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not. That item is still in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Can the Senator tell me if the item pertaining to manganese in the State of South Dakota has been agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it is still in disagreement.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope the conferees will agree to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have labored diligently in that direction, and shall continue to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2719, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
July 2, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 121, 149, 161, 184, 194, 200, and 201 to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 85 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In line 22 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "Interior" and insert "Treasury"; and in the same line, after "authorized", insert "and directed";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 107 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "City", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 10;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 6 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$35,000" and insert "$30,000";

In line 8 of said amendment strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,500";

In line 12 of said amendment strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,250"; and

In line 17 of said amendment strike out "$475,000" and insert "$400,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 24 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$525,000" and insert "$225,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 21 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,400,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "authorized", insert a comma and "during the fiscal year 1944,";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$4,456,390";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$5,456,390"; and

That the House insist upon its amendments to Senate amendments numbered 85, 107, 142, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, and 174 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the three or four House amendments agreed to by the conferees be agreed to by the Senate. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 85, 107, 142, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on the amendments remaining in disagreement, agree to the further conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

INCREASE IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, during the course of the afternoon while the calendar was being called Senate bill 878, Calendar 349, was reached, and a full explanation of the bill was made by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Only one objection to the bill was heard, and that came from the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who has now stated his willingness to withdraw his objection. I believe that the bill should be passed by unanimous consent today, because it must go to the House of Representatives. It affects the retirement annuities of civil-service employees. It was reported unanimously by the Civil Service Committee. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 878) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended", approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a proposed temporary 15-percent increase in all Government annuities for the duration of the war.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask whether that should not set a precedent for the same sort of treatment in respect to pensions and disability allowances?

Mr. DOWNEY. What kind of pensions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I mean veterans' pensions and disability allowances to veterans. Why are they not entitled to the same 15-percent increase which is proposed for civil-service annuitants, if there is to be such action?

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is much more able, because of his greater experience and intellect, to draw that conclusion for himself. I may say, as he knows, that we have increased by 15 percent the compensation of Government employees; and in view of that fact, it was the unanimous conclusion, both of the House of Representatives and of our committee, that we should increase by 15 percent the retirement annuities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot quarrel with that conclusion; but I am simply raising the question as to whether or not we are inviting a precedent which involves a far broader ultimate expenditure and application than is even remotely embraced within the pending bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that for several hours I argued unavailingly for an increase in

pension payments by the United States Government, and was turned down, as the Senator will recall, by a large majority of the Senate. So while I might hope for further consideration of that subject, I doubt if it could be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know whether it should be done or not. All I am saying is that it seems to me that if it is done for one group, it is certainly entirely logical and consistent that it should be done on a far broader scale. I am merely wondering whether this rather summary action which is proposed this afternoon is not the first logical step in the direction of an infinitely broader program.

Mr. DOWNEY. I cannot answer the distinguished Senator further than I have answered him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator say that he hopes so?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that this question has been under investigation by both Houses of Congress for many months, and there have been extensive committee hearings. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry. How much of an appropriation would be required?

Mr. DOWNEY. There are two provisions in the bill. One provides for a 15-percent increase in retirement annuities, and the other provides that employees who had retired before 1942 may take advantage of the present somewhat higher scale of pensions. The two combined sections would increase governmental expenditures by about $25,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, today we passed over a bill providing for an increase in the allotments and allowances for dependents of members of the armed services. I do not believe that we should give quicker consideration to annuities for former civil-service employees. Therefore, I believe that we had better let this bill go over until after we have at least taken care of the soldiers.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before the Senator makes objection, let me point out to him that there is no logical connection between the two bills. The bill to which the distinguished Senator has just referred relates to allowances by the Government to the dependents of military men.

Mr. GURNEY. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I do not think there is any connection between the two bills. I feel that the servicemen should be given a preferred position. If we allow this bill to go through tonight, then, of course, we shall be allotting to the servicemen and their dependents a secondary position.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator give me any reason why a disabled veteran of World War No. 1, with service-connected disability, should not have consideration at least comparable to that accorded a civil-service annuitant?

Mr. GURNEY. I join with the Senator in saying that that is an additional objection.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan does not understand the statement of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know that he is speaking about something else. I am adding something to it. The further we go the worse it becomes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I desire to offer some perfecting amendments to the bill, relating to the time when the bill shall go into effect. I may not be present when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] again seeks consideration of the bill, and I should like to have the perfecting amendments made a part of the bill by unanimous consent. May the clerk read the perfecting amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the words "on the" it is proposed to strike out "date of enactment" and insert in lieu thereof "effective date"; and at the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the 1st day of the second calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California for the present consideration of the bill for the purpose of agreeing to the perfecting amendments?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 878) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendments offered by the Senator from California.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made to the further consideration of the bill, it will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION TO BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO REPORT HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 147 DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate—which I hope is imminent—the Banking and Currency Committee may be authorized to report House Joint Resolution 147, which is now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS FROM PAYMENT OF SECOND-CLASS APPLICATION FEES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, when Calendar 334, House bill 1004, was called this afternoon I was unavoidably absent. Objection was made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the consideration of the bill. He has since withdrawn his objection.

House bill 1004 is a companion bill to Senate bill 207, which I introduced on January 7. Since the Senator from West Virginia has withdrawn his objection, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1004) to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREST PERPETUATION AND EXTENSION

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar I objected to the consideration of calendar No. 371, Senate bill 45. After a further study of the bill and a clear understanding of it, I now wish to withdraw my objection, and ask that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 45) to further amend section 3 of Public Law Numbered 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "That section 3 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; secs. 563 ff., title 16, U. S. C.) as amended, is amended to" and insert in lieu thereof "That section 3 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566) is amended to"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "growing forests from losses by fire and other causes. There" and insert "growing forests from losses by fire. There", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend such portions of the appropriations authorized herein as he deems advisable to study the effects of tax laws, methods, and practices upon forest perpetuation, to cooperate with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies in such investigations and in devising tax laws designed to encourage the conservation and growing of timber, and to investigate and promote practical methods of insuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not

more than $9,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566)."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Ellen S. Woodward, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Social Security Board for the term expiring August 13, 1949 (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of James T. Black and Lester G. Graham be passed over, and that the remainder of the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nominations of James T. Black and Lester G. Graham, which will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

HOMER C. CHAPMAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during the call of the calendar a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency took place which caused some Senators to be absent from the Chamber. Before the call had ended I spoke to the acting minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and to the majority leader, with respect to an item on the calendar, being calendar 43, Senate bill 617. It is a small bill, to which I am sure there will be no objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 617) for the relief of Homer C. Chapman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] had some objection to this bill. Has the Senator from Wyoming conferred with him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I conferred with him before I moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 617) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Homer C. Chapman, recruit, infantry unassigned, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States for disability incurred in the service in line of duty.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 3 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

Donald H. Roney, of California, to be senior labor market analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

Edwin E. Knott, of Missouri, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington area office.

Paul F. Murphy, of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the New Castle area office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Louis Emerson Hibbs
John Ernest Dahlquist
Ray Wehnes Barker
Thomas Guerdon Hearn
Raymond Godfrey Lehman
Lester Thomas Miller
Thomas James Hanley, Jr.
Charles Egbert Branshaw

To be brigadier generals

Frederick Mixon Harris
Edward John McGaw
Robert Nicholas Young
Thomas Edward Lewis
Peter Powell Rodes
William Henry Tunner
Casper Ball Rucker
Harold Arthur Bartron
George Hendricks Beverley
Paul Boyle Kelly
Walter Raymond Peck
Percy James Carroll
Dabney Otey Elliott
Oliver Boone Bucher
Alfred Warrington Marriner
Hobart Raymond Gay
Robert Bruce McBride, Jr.
Robert William Crichlow, Jr.
Clarence Peyton Kane
Edward Harrison Alexander
Clyde Lloyd Hyssong
Kenneth George Althaus
Lester Amiel Daugherty
Frank August Heileman
Richard Emmel Nugent
Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler
John Leonard Pierce
Myron Ray Wood
Henning Linden
Joseph Edward Bastion
Edward Wrenne Timberlake
Byron Elihu Gates
William Pinckney Bledsoe
Philip Hayes
Ross Gordon Hoyt
Frank Lewis Culin, Jr.
George Francis Schulgen
Walter Alexander Dumas
Frank Seymoure Ross
Roger Maxwell Ramey
Hugh Johnston Knerr
Ned Schramm
John Caraway Arrowsmith
Earl Seeley Hoag
Julius Cecil Holmes

To be a major general

William Henry Harrison

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Richard B. Sims, Canton.

MAINE

Harold Wayne Allen, Columbia Falls.

NEBRASKA

Orion E. Jerner, Lincoln.
David W. Way, Syracuse.
Charles O. Kocina, Verdigre.
Norris G. Nordstrom, Wausa.
Catherine M. McIntyre, Winside.

NEW YORK

Don J. Herrington, Cato.
Dorothy G. Mooney, Cicero.
Howard G. McGee, Copake.
W. Franklin Moore, Freeville.
Alice C. Lewis, Gilboa.
Clarence M. Krum, Grahamsville.
Arley V. Joslyn, Grand Gorge.

Jennie Young, Howes Cave.
Willard C. Schadt, Jeffersonville.
Francis E. Hughes, La Fargeville.
Iva B. Locke, Lafayette.
William J. Holbert, Morrisville.
Roy Blanchard, Oneida.
Julia M. Gurnett, Watkins Glen.
Donald R. Widrick, Whitesboro.

PUERTO RICO

Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta.
Leonidos M. Lopez, Camuy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Lord, we pray Thee to be unto us that hidden fountain of strength that shall enable us to pluck out of life's mysteries the greatest and most abiding faith. Interfused with Thy spirit, our souls will feel the higher and more blessed enchantments of reality. While existence is written in a wounded world, life eternal is to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.

O Spirit of the Most High, come from behind energy and matter and sin and breathe upon our hopes and our wills and cause them to live. Stay our tempers, chasten our thoughts and reign in our hearts in the fullness of Thy grace. Bless our whole family of citizens that they may not be led along false paths and be with them in their questions and problems, dispelling all fears. We pray that the Congress may rejoice our country's heart by doing the wise and splendid things for all our people. It is grandly true that Thou art our Father and as such we come to Thee for guidance and blessings to rest upon our President, our Speaker, and all Members of this legislative body; may they always create and uphold freedom and good will among all the strata of human strife and passion. For life, for sunup, for sundown, for toil and for rest we thank Thee in the name of Him who is our Elder Brother and Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of Friday, July 2, 1943, was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. In the consideration of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, on the manganese amendments numbered 162 and 163, the Clerk read the Journal as recording the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] moved to insist upon the House's disagreement and that the House insisted. The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, on page 7144 of July 2, 1943, reports Mr. Johnson as stating:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 162 and 163 and concur in the same.

On the following page after the gentleman from Oklahoma had moved the previous question the Speaker stated as recorded in the RECORD:

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur.

Then the RECORD states that the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD is in error and will be corrected.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I am aware that the Speaker on other occasions has ruled that where there is a conflict in the report the Journal controls. And, much as I regret it, I must admit that the statement in the Journal accords with my understanding of the motion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, as is evident from my remarks on the amendment at the time. Of course, I do not object to the approval of the Journal, but I should like to express the hope that the report of the action as given in the RECORD will be prophetic of the action that will be taken when the conferees meet again. The manganese amendment is very meritorious.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have a request?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected on this point in accordance with the statement in the controlling Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there have been a number of informal meetings in the Treasury between our officials and treasury representatives of foreign governments, at which many plans and projects for international monetary and credit cooperation have been discussed. These meetings, I am told, are the forerunner of an official international monetary and credit conference that will take place here in Washington during the summer months when Congress will probably be in recess.

I believe many of my fellow Members are as desirous as am I to accept our share in post-war rehabilitation but, like myself, will want to keep fully informed as to what may be our country's responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully offer the suggestion that the Chair appoint a small committee of Members who will make it their business to be present in Washington at the time of the monetary conferences I have mentioned and that they be authorized to attend all such meetings as observers, and from time to time furnish the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader with reports of proceedings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Francis Callery on the subject of contract negotiation in the aircraft industry before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday of next week and the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, immediately after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX ON INCOME OF $1,800 OR LESS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3089, which would exempt from the payment of income tax all individuals who have an income of $1,800 or less, and who have received less than a 20-percent increase in their income since 1941.

We have heard much said about the white-collar workers who have received no increase in their pay, and we know that it is necessary to give these people relief in some way. There have been proposals made, such as food stamps and roll-back in prices, but I think the simplest and least expensive way would be to exempt these people from the payment of income tax.

You heard in the President's message that we have 4,000,000 families in the United States who have had not over a 5-percent raise in their income in the last 2 or 3 years. This bill would give these people what would amount to a small increase in pay, or be equal to a roll-back in the prices of the necessities of life.

I made this same proposal when I tried to amend the tax law, and I am now bringing the proposition to you in the form of a bill. I hope that the Members of the House will give this matter their serious consideration.

THE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been in conference with Mr. Bruce F. Hardy, of Scottsburg, Ind., a distinguished farm leader of the Middle West, who has been spending a few days here in Washington. I wish every Member of Congress could have heard his comments on the food situation as a result of his own personal observations.

I will give you a brief summary of what he had to say:

Food shortages, bad as they are at present, have only begun to make themselves felt. Because of 8 years of relatively good crops, including last year's record breaker, people have been led to believe we could never have a shortage of food in this country. Good crop weather was largely responsible for this long period of good crops. Yet we have meat rationing with more hogs and cattle on the farms than ever before; corn product plants closed with almost a thousand million bushels of corn in storage. Our dairy, poultry, and other livestock farmers are having great difficulties to secure feeds for their animals to produce maximum and efficient results.

Bungling by Washington idealistic dreamers in trying to solve the food problem is apparent to all. The triple cover-up "Wickard to Davis to Jones" only adds to the confusion since it is well known that none of these were permitted to establish and carry out a national food policy. Food policies have been conceived by swivel-chair theorists such as Cohen, Ezekiel, and others, while responsibility for their execution was passed to the administration by the White House.

Farmers want no subsidies or roll-backs, but feel that as producers of vital war necessities they should not be penalized because they do not blindly follow the administration in its senseless food policies. Our consuming public will wake up with a start before snow flies again, with the realization that it takes more than directives from city-bred White House advisers to direct wartime production and distribution of food products.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE VOTE ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FOOD SITUATION IN THE LAST WAR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened several times today to different gentlemen speaking about the President's inflationary program, as they term the food-control program. Let me call the attention of those gentlemen to the fact that I was in the last war. I came home, and what did I find? I was practicing law when I left for the war and had to start practicing again upon my return. I found that in my own city cotton yarn No. 60, which is now selling at 60 cents a pound, was $3.65 a pound. I found coffee in my own town when I wanted to buy it priced at 75 cents a pound. I found bacon at 60 cents a pound; sugar 30 cents per pound. Gentlemen forget what the American people had to pay for food during the last war and after the last war. They should be grateful for the program of this administration. I call their attention now, briefly, to what one great man said some years ago when he had addressed Congress. He said:

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

That was said by President Lincoln in his message to the Congress in December 1862. I hope and pray that our speech and conduct these days will light us down to honor to the last generation.

CANNING SITUATION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on June 21 I had the privilege of addressing this House in connection with grade labeling, referring particularly to the canned-foods industry in California. I stated at that time that 10 percent of the Nation's agricultural products are produced in California. California is making an outstanding contribution to the war effort; not only food but war materials as well.

This morning I am much disturbed by contents of a telegram setting forth conditions facing the canning industry in my State. I would like to read this telegram which comes from the California Conserving Co. of San Francisco:

The canning crops in California in many instances have already been grown and canned. Others will start to be processed within the next few weeks. The Office of Price Administration has given us no price at which we can sell this merchandise. Warehouses are full and financing becoming more difficult. Unless Office of Price Administration can be forced into action it will cause price losses to growers and canners, as it will be impossible to put up the pack. Urge upon you that we must have action on this. Congress is the only one that can do it and for the welfare of the Nation it should not adjourn until it does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a short poem written by a constituent of mine, now in the armed forces, as a tribute to his mother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a father who is regularly wasting his wages getting drunk and wrecking his home always blames the suffering of his family on someone else. After making economic whoopee for more than 10 years, the New Deal is likewise trying to make someone else the goat.

Trouble for a spendthrift does not begin when his debts come due. His trouble becomes certain when he spends the borrowed money. The deficit spending which makes inflation began 12 years ago. Mr. Roosevelt said in 1932:

If a nation * * * extends its taxing to the limit * * * and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

President Roosevelt pledged himself to stop the deficits that create inflation and bankruptcy. Has he kept that promise? A $118,000,000,000 increase in the Government debt is the factual answer.

Yesterday President Roosevelt's veto message expressed concern about the cost of living. His words about inflation should be measured against his actions of the past 10 years. There is no other yardstick.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two radio addresses I made last night over two different stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALE was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted by the Sons of the Revolution of New York State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement taken from a speech I delivered over the Mutual network last night.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to re-

vise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Antigo Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF CURRENCY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief address by a constituent at Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the first inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram and I also ask permission to extend my remarks in one other instance and include a letter from Mr. Brown, head of the Office of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CORN CRISIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, corn is no longer a problem; it is a crisis. The manufacturers are sending wires and letters frantically appealing for corn. Feeders are clamoring for corn; industrial processors, many of whom have already closed their operations, are clamoring for corn. This thing is a crisis that must be met. I have discussed the thing with various authorities in government and have urged immediate action to meet the dilemma in which industry, feeders, feed manufacturers, and others presently find themselves.

It occurs to me there are two approaches to this problem. One is the modification of the corn ceiling, but they must go further than that. There must be some relief from corn consumption in the form of feeding heavy livestock; something must be done to induce the movement of heavy hogs and beef cattle to market. The thing will not wait and I am anxious and hopeful that the War Food Administrator will go into the question at once.

An order was issued this week that, in my judgment, will not meet the problem. It will not induce corn into the market. The order provides that where corn is brought to the market between July 1 and August 10 the Commodity Credit Corporation, through its country elevators as agents, gives assurance to the producers of such corn that they will be protected against any rise in the price of corn up to October 31. This, however, is nullified by the next paragraph in the order which states that no increase in the ceiling price of corn is contemplated. Unless action is taken forthwith, not only corn processors and feed manufacturers will be in dire straits but textile mills, bakers, candy manufacturers, and a host of others as well. The time for action is now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Disabled American Veterans Magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SUMNERS of Texas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] called attention to the fact that the Constitution vests the legislative power of the United States in the two Houses of Congress. When he said Congress he meant the two Houses of Congress.

About a week ago Friday this House took action which brought congratulatory messages by wire and letter, but since that time over at the other end of the corridor a veto has been put on that economy legislation for which the House was so highly praised. It occurs to me that perhaps the gentleman from Texas may be somewhat mistaken in saying that the legislative powers rest in the two Houses of Congress. It seems that we might better obtain the attitude of the other body and learn what they want us to do before we take action. I understand this question of firing the fellows with left wing ideas is coming up again today. I for one intend to vote to keep them off the Federal pay roll, inasmuch as our economy drive has been defeated by the Senate and the House accepted that defeat. Those who voted to accept it and who were congratulated might well notify those who wrote them of the final result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert therein a very brief and very appreciative statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada and the leaders of the opposition parties concerning the recent Interparliamentary Conference and the delegation from our Congress which was invited and attended the conference in Ottawa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES, INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 284), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $12,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on S. 1134, a bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of Section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities on any lands affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed cut on said lands by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting on such lands of any crops which are essential to the war effort, without the imposition of any penalty or the withholding of any benefit, soil conservation, or other agricultural payments.

"SEC. 4. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations."

And the House agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the part of the House.
JOHN H. OVERTON,
BENNETT C. CLARK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such an amendment, namely:

AMENDMENT

The Senate bill included H. R. 3010 with the committee amendment reported by the House Committee on Flood Control. In addition to including the provisions of the House bill, section 2 authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to aid in the rehabilitation, including the necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, to make loans not to exceed at any one time $25,000,000, at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent, upon such terms and conditions and with such security as the Corporation may prescribe. Under existing law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such loans to railroads upon the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission when such railroads are unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or from the public, but requires adequate security, and the rate of interest is left to the discretion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which Corporation is authorized to make the loans at a rate in excess of or less than 3 percent. The loans heretofore made are generally at the rate of 4 percent, although other loans are made to railroads at rates of interest less than 3 percent. The proposed section eliminated the requirement of adequate security and eliminated other requirements of existing law. There is adequate existing law to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans to railroads. The proposed section 2 would have changed existing law. The section was eliminated in conference.

Section 4 of the Senate bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend quota provisions on any lands affected by floods in 1943. All quota provisions have been suspended except the provisions on cotton and tobacco. It is too late to plant either cotton or tobacco for 1943. The proposed section 4 does not, therefore, change existing law. It was agreed to with an amendment that no penalty would be imposed for exceeding the quotas and that no benefit soil conservation or other agricultural payment would be withheld for exceeding the quotas in 1943.

Section 5 of the said Senate bill directed the War Production Board and every other governmental agency having jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment to provide the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods. The said section is in accord with the policy that has been adopted by the War Production Board; in fact, the War Production Board has provided for the actual shipment of farm machinery and equipment into all areas where requests have been made, affected by the floods in 1943. No change is made, therefore, by this amendment in the existing law or regulations.

The House struck out all after the enacting clause in said Senate 1134 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill with the committee amendment as reported by the Committee on Flood Control.

The conference report agrees to the provisions of the House bill as passed by the House, which had been previously included in the bill. It eliminates section 2 of the Senate bill with respect to rehabilitation loans to railroads. It includes section 4 of the Senate bill with respect to quotas with the amendments eliminating penalties and making secure benefit payments. It also retains section 5 of the bill providing for priorities for farm machinery and equipment in flooded areas.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the Senate bill included H. R. 3010, reported by the Committee on Flood Control. The bill was considered in the Senate before it was considered in the House. In addition to the provisions of the House bill the Senate bill included a provision authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans not to exceed $25,000,000 for the rehabilitation of railroads to pay for the raising of their tracks and to make improvements above the flood plane where they were damaged or destroyed by flood in 1943. It provided that those loans should be made upon such security as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might prescribe and at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent. Under existing law rehabilitation loans to railroads are authorized, but they are required to be made, Mr. Speaker, upon adequate security and after approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission and after it had been shown to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that such loans could not be obtained from private sources. The existing law is sufficient for railroads that need rehabilitation funds.

The provision in the Senate bill would have changed existing law and would have eliminated the requirement for adequate and full security, and would have eliminated the provision that the railroads must obtain the funds from private sources if they were available. The provision for loans to railroads is section 2 of the Senate bill. In addition to the elimination of the requirement for adequate security and the requirement that the railroads must show that they were unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms from banking channels or from the public, the section provided for a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made many loans to railroads. I understand that the aggregate of these loans is about one-half billion dollars. The rate of interest for loans for rehabilitation is generally 4 percent. Large loans have been made to railroads for equipment. I am advised that the rates of interest on these loans vary. In some cases the rate is less than 3 percent.

Under existing law the matter of rates is for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is not the province of the Committee on Flood Control to provide for financing railroads, farms, or other properties. Such is the function of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The loan provision has no place in a flood control bill. The Committee on Flood

Control conducted extensive hearings. There was no showing before the Committee on Flood Control to justify the loans. The proposed section for rehabilitation loans to enable railroads to relocate and elevate their tracks above the flood plane and to repair and rebuild bridges at a rate not to exceed 3 per cent interest would have changed the existing law with respect to loans to railroads. It would have eliminated many of the restrictions imposed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation upon railroads. I am advised that loans were not made to railroads until the salaries of officials were readjusted and in many cases reduced. If the rate of interest for $25,000,000 is made less than 4 percent, the railroads that are paying more than 3 percent with adequate security could well afford to ask Congress to reduce the rates of interest.

Again, the authorization of $10,000,000 is to repair flood-control works that may protect railroads, farms, and cities. All classes of property are given equal treatment. No loans are provided for farms or for city property. The Disaster Loan Corporation makes provision for such loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its discretion may make the rates of interest for rehabilitation loans 3 percent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may charge 4 percent or less. It may charge 3 percent, more or less. In all the circumstances it was deemed unwise to change the existing law, especially with regard to the requirement for adequate security and the rates of interest. Section 2 of the bill, as it passed the Senate, which provided for rehabilitation loans to railroads, was therefore eliminated in conference.

The bill as agreed to is set forth in the conference report. It is the House bill, also embraced in the Senate bill, with the farm quota and machinery provisions of the Senate bill, which are really existing law, and regulations.

The Senate bill contained a provision, which is section 4, that authorized the suspension of quotas on flooded lands for the year 1943. That is existing law except on cotton and tobacco and it is entirely too late for any cotton or tobacco to be planted. This provision of the bill, as I say, is in accordance with existing law and with the existing regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

There was another provision in the Senate bill, which is section 5, that authorized and directed the War Production Board to make available for the flooded areas repairs and replacement for machinery and equipment damaged or destroyed by the floods in 1943. The War Production Board advised that those provisions have already been made and that shipments have been made into the area as requested, so that provision of the Senate bill is in accordance with existing law and existing regulations. The conference report therefore embraces the bill as it passed the House in the identical language as it passed the House, with a repetition of existing law and regulations as to quotas on farm machinery, which in my judgment are wholly unnecessary and only repeat.

The provision with respect to loans to railroads was not according to existing law and is eliminated. The provision suspending quotas, without eliminating benefit payments, and the provision for the shipment of farm machinery and farm machinery repair parts into the flooded areas are according to existing law and regulations, and, while unnecessary, are retained.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Are we to understand that the bill as it comes from the conferees is in its original House form?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the exception of the two provisions to which I referred, both of which are provided for by existing law and are unnecessary in my personal opinion, but to agree to the main provisions which are the House bill they were retained in the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. At any rate there is no new provision contrary to existing law or broadening existing law as it affects the railroads?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right. The bill is substantially as it passed the House. The gentleman will recall that when the bill was considered in the House we struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and the House bill was substituted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Can the gentleman state whether or not the bill in the form now proposed will restrict the use of these funds to the repair of destroyed levees or whether it will permit the building of such additional levees or such other emergency steps as the Chief of Engineers may determine to be necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the bill as it comes from the conference committee retains the exact language of the House bill, and that language was written into the Senate bill. It provides $10,000,000 to repair, restore, and strengthen levees and other flood-control works, which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods. It is only applicable where the Federal Government has constructed levees or other flood-control works or where the local interests have constructed levees or other flood-control works, and for such repairs or restorations as are necessary. There is a provision that pertains for the first time to strengthening the levees or other flood-control works that are built in the future to take the place of those destroyed, or other works that may be needed in the nature of repairs or minor improvements to existing works.

Mr. CASE. When I appeared before the gentleman's committee in the course of my testimony and other testimony, attention was drawn to cases where there were no existing levees, and, if I remember correctly, the division engineer testified that in many cases the levees that had been built by local communities were entirely inadequate, were not long enough, or were not high enough in some instances.

In some places there were no levees. The increasing of the velocity of the stream by reason of other river improvements created flood damage where there had been no need for levees before. If the bill is restricted to strengthening existing levees, it does not do anything for those areas where there were no levees previously.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All levees and other flood-control works are treated exactly alike. It has been the policy of the Committee on Flood Control to approve projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers rather than to turn over to either the Executive or to the Chief of Engineers lump-sum appropriations to enable them to expend the money at their discretion. If there are no existing works the policy is for those works to be authorized. The Flood Control Committee hopes to report a bill later on this session to provide for improvements where there are no works at this time, but this bill is for the repair of existing works and for emergency purposes.

Mr. CASE: The testimony before the gentleman's committee, and I do not refer to mine alone but to others, pointed out that to protect existing levees some new levees were necessary; that the straightening of the channel in certain cases had speeded up the water so that a mere strengthening of existing levees alone would not meet the needs of the situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are cases where local people—and cases where the Federal Government has aided in the construction through the Work Projects Administration—have constructed levees that were utterly inadequate. The only provision that Congress can make is to repair those levees, strengthen the part where they are built, and do whatever is necessary to strengthen, then secure an authorization later on to rebuild, the entire levee line.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman's committee contemplate considering further legislation to take care of the deficiencies in the flood-control system as revealed by the testimony before his committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I so stated when this bill was under consideration. The committee has conducted hearings and plans to report a comprehensive bill. The gentleman will recall that there are no appropriations for national flood control for the next fiscal year. We hope to report a bill to provide for such cases as he has mentioned and for other works that the Chief of Engineers recommends and to provide for their construction as soon as funds are made available.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Do part of these funds go to clean up debris and help build fences and clean up the areas that have been flooded?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; this bill has only to do with flood-control work. There is existing legislation providing for disaster loans to farmers and for the

rehabilitation of farmers where they need livestock that has been destroyed.

Mr. BISHOP. How about drainage ditches that would be appropriate to drain such areas?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If there are no flood works, no. What may be called, and are sometimes called, drainage districts are included in this bill if the levees or other flood-control works are damaged or destroyed, along the rivers or other streams.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman tell me the effect of the proviso starting in line 17, page 2?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Tell me the effect of the proviso starting in line 17, page 2, of the bill: "The funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from unobligated funds," and so forth.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand now that the gentleman refers to the Senate bill, line 17, page 2. As stated, when this bill was before the House, that proviso excepted from funds that might be allotted payment of $250,000 to the city of Hartford, Conn., and funds that have been allotted for the construction of projects in Louisiana authorized by the act of August 1941. Those provisions, wholly unnecessary, in my judgment, merely affirm existing law on the two propositions as provided by the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of 1944, in my personal judgment being unjustifiable, and do not contain any new legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is the same item of $252,000 that was in a bill recently passed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. It is the exception carried in the War Department civil appropriation bill. It should not have been in the House bill, because I think all projects ought to be treated exactly alike, and handled and construed as provided by law, but it does not change existing law, and only unnecessarily repeats.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, and his committee of managers on the part of the House, on the excellent bill that they have brought back from conference. It is practical, it is workable, and it answers an imperative need. I appreciate the reference in the report to the incorporation of provisions from my bill as a part of the measure. Only those who have actually visited the scenes of devastation along the banks of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and their tributaries can appreciate the destruction wrought by the recent recurring floods. It exceeds anything suffered within the memory of this generation.

The assistance of the Federal Government provided for in this bill must be made available immediately. There is hardly a day to lose. The measure formulated by the gentleman from Mississippi and his committee, as it passed the House and as he brings it back practically intact from conference, will provide for the more urgent needs. Under it no new construction can be built. That must wait the Public Works program at the close of the war. But it provides for essential repairs of existing facilities. The destruction has been so great and so widespread that unless the Government does come to the rescue of this productive section in the Middle West, it will be impossible with local means and facilities to take care of the situation.

There has been no authorization for the expenditure of money provided at this session of the Congress that means so much in proportion to the amount involved as this measure does in providing for the rehabilitation of agriculture and the restoration of production in the heart of the breadbasket of the Nation. It is directly associated with the war effort in the protection of an area which under normal conditions produces vastly in excess of its quota of the Nation's food.

I am especially gratified that provision is made for strengthening and raising preexisting levees. Heretofore, under the statute, money could not be expended to increase the height of levees beyond their preflood status. Under this bill as reported it will be possible to increase the height of such works to a point indicated by actual flood experience as necessary to provide complete protection.

I am glad to have had an opportunity to collaborate with the gentleman and his committee and trust we can secure prompt and favorable action under the authorization of the pending bill when the last deficiency appropriation bill is returned from the Senate.

In addition to the money provided for repair of levees, an authorization for an appropriation of $15,000,000 has been added by Senator CLARK of Missouri to the deficiency bill for loans for farmers in flood devastated areas to enable them to resume production. I was able to change this authorization to a direct appropriation in conference between the House and Senate and the money will be available at once through the Farm Security Administration.

While Federal assistance is limited to repairs during the war, extensive and comprehensive plans for permanent flood control are being drafted to include reservoirs, dams, levees, and channel improvements, on which surplus labor will be employed during the post-war period.

In this connection, I include as of particular interest to those sections drained by the Missouri River, a letter just received from Major General Reybold:

JULY 1, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: The Department has received your letter of May 29, 1943, with reference to improvements on the Missouri River. Accompanying letters express the opinion that improvements for navigation conflict with those for flood control and comment upon the effectiveness of reservoirs for flood-control purposes. It is urged that levee protection along the Missouri River be provided as early as possible. In your letter you ask for information on these subjects and for the comments of the Department on these remarks about flood-control reservoirs.

The Department has made extensive investigations of the navigation and flood-control problems in the Missouri River Basin and has recommended improvements to Congress for the solution of a number of those problems. Navigation improvements which have been authorized by Congress and constructed by this Department have been successful by providing a channel in a definitely fixed location in the flood plain of the river. The Fort Peck Reservoir, recently completed in the headwaters of the basin, now provides a regulated minimum flow in the channel to insure sufficient depth for navigation purposes and, in addition, provides storage capacity which reduces substantially the flood flows downstream.

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941, authorize the construction of a number of flood-control works throughout the Missouri River Basin, of which the more important are a comprehensive plan of reservoirs for flood control and other purposes and systems of levees and other protective works between Sioux City and Kansas City and at the Kansas Citys. The Department is now making additional investigations of the need for further improvements for flood control in this basin, and such further improvements as may be recommended as a result of those investigations will be submitted to Congress at the earliest practicable date. The improvements both for navigation and flood control so far accomplished have constituted the first step for the development of the Missouri River for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial purposes.

Before the Missouri River Valley was settled the river during floods overflowed the channel banks and spread out over the flood plain, which thus served as a reservoir temporarily holding back a large portion of the flood waters until the waters in the lower part of the valley receded. As settlement of the valley progressed there has been a continuous encroachment by the works of man on the flood plain which reduced this temporary reservoir capacity and increased flood heights all along the river. These man-made works include highways, railroads, bridges, levees, and many other types of structures which have become of increasing importance to the economic progress of the valley. This has created the problem not only of overcoming the loss of natural storage in the valley but also of providing adequate flood protection for the encroachments upon that natural storage wherever such protection is economically and physically feasible.

Adequate flood protection in the Missouri Valley cannot be provided by levees alone, but it can be satisfactorily accomplished by a balanced plan of storage reservoirs, levees, and channel improvements. In some of the reservoirs it will be possible to utilize the water resources at those sites for the development of hydroelectric power without sacrificing the usefulness of the reservoirs for the necessary storage of water for flood-control purposes. The improvements now authorized for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the basin form an essential first unit of the overall development needed for the control of the many water problems which exist in this basin. When completed, those improvements will afford a substantial degree of flood protection for many of the areas which have been damaged so heavily during past floods.

As you are undoubtedly aware, existing policies on wartime construction established by higher authority preclude the initiation of construction of additional public-works improvements during the war, unless a definite showing can be made by the Federal war agency directly concerned with the facilities to be protected that the construction work is essential to the war effort. The purpose of these limitations is, of course, to conserve critical materials, construction equipment, and manpower for the successful prosecution of the war.

You may be assured that the Department is prepared to undertake the further accomplishment of the adopted plan of reservoirs and local protection works for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin as soon as the existing limitations on public-works construction are removed, subject to the availability of authorizations and funds.

I am pleased to state that section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, authorizes the Secretary of War to allot from flood-control appropriations not to exceed $1,000,000 for any one fiscal year, to be expended in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work destroyed by flood. The Department's district engineers in the Missouri River area are now making investigations of the levees damaged by the recent floods on the Missouri River to determine the need for Federal assistance in repair work under this authority. I may assure you that the Department will assist as much as possible in the restoration of the levees damaged by the recent floods on the Missouri River within the limits of the existing authority and available funds.

Although the preliminary estimates of the division and district engineers in the areas where the recent disastrous floods occurred indicate that the total costs of essential repairs to existing flood control works damaged by those floods will far exceed the authorization and funds now available to the Department for such repairs, I may assure you that the Department will assist as much as possible in the restoration of the levees along the Missouri River.

As you know, legislation has recently been introduced in Congress which, if enacted, would provide additional authorization for the Department to accomplish the work now required to repair flood-control structures damaged by the recent floods in the central and southwestern parts of the country. That legislation is contained in the bills S. 1134, House Joint Resolution 132, H. R. 3010, and other bills.

The enclosures which were enclosed with your letter are returned herewith as requested.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain sections 2, 3, 4 of the report in connection with the farm land situation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have already explained that. The bill as reported by the conferees contains a provision that quotas shall not be applicable, on lands affected by floods in 1943, and that quotas for said year shall be suspended without prejudice.

Mr. STEFAN. The quota program will not apply to those lands?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not apply for the year 1943. The provision is wholly unnecesary because quotas do not apply except in the case of cotton and tobacco anyway, and it is too late to plant cotton or tobacco.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman anticipates an appropriation to carry on this work and that will come to us in the form of a deficiency bill, as explained by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional assistant secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The committee went into the matter rather carefully and reported the bill unanimously.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why do they need any more assistant secretaries of the Interior? It seems to me they have enough.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The work has been greatly increased recently. The duties of Coordinator of Fisheries have recently been placed upon the Secretary. Also, more than 200,000 licenses have already been issued under the Explosives Act we passed. The problems of the war have brought additional problems in the various territories. The coal situation has also added a number of duties. The Committee on the Public Lands is a rather conservative committee. We went into this matter rather thoroughly and decided that the additional position is needed, but we limited it to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. TABER. It is limited, then; it is temporary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give details as to what he means when he says the work has materially increased in the Territories?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am more familiar with Alaska than the other Territories or possessions. I am not a member of the Committee on the Territories. I know that in Alaska in connection with certain lands on which there were leases the leases have had to be suspended and the people have had to move out of certain areas. I am not familiar with the other Territories and possessions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for instance?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am not familiar with them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has no information on them?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is to be the salary of this assistant secretary of the Interior?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Nine thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is his title to be Assistant Secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. We say there shall be no rank as between the assistant secretaries.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. He is to be an assistant secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

STATUE OF SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul V. Bartlett, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that under this bill there is to be no cost to the Government?

Mr. O'TOOLE. There will be a cost of about $10,000 for the pedestal and to landscape the grounds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where is this statue to be located?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield, it is to be located on Judiciary Square in the city of Washington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman kindly give the House the benefit of his knowledge about the proposal?

Mr. BULWINKLE. This is a very interesting matter. Mr. Justice Groner, of the Court of Appeals, requested that I introduce this bill.

In 1923 the American Bar Association was invited to be the guest of the English bar in London. At that time the American Bar Association was going to present a statue of Sir William Blackstone to the bar of England. Mr. Paul W. Bartlett, a famous sculptor, was selected to do the statue. However, the plaster cast he took over there was found to be a little large, so he had another cast made. Mr. Bartlett died after he completed the second statue. Mrs. Bartlett, at her own expense, took the first plaster cast to a foundry in Belgium and had the statue cast in bronze and brought it back to the United States. She wanted to give to the United States this heroic statue of Sir William Blackstone. It cost

her something over $25,000, I understand. Justice Groner, Chief Justice Stone, and others have been very much interested in having the United States accept this statue. It will cost about $10,000 for the pedestal and for landscaping the grounds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept, on behalf of the United States, the bronze statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, as a gift from Mrs. Paul W. Bartlett, and, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, to provide for the erection of such statue at a suitable location on the north side of Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for carrying out the provisions of this act, including the procurement of a suitable pedestal for such statue.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, under the special order previously agreed to, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 2714 and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Baldwin, Md.	Green	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall,	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Edwin A.	O'Hara
Barry	Hart	O'Leary
Boykin	Hébert	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Phillips
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Plumley
Capozzoli	Johnson,	Poage
Cochran	Ward	Pracht
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Culkin	Kennedy	Russell
Dawson	Kilburn	Sasscer
Dickstein	King	Satterfield
Drewry	Kleberg	Shafer
Eaton	Lesinski	Snyder
Elmer	McCormack	Stevenson
Fay	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Tolan
Ford	Maloney	Treadway
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Furlong	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	May	Wadsworth
Gerlach	Merritt	Ward
Gifford	Merrow	
Gillie	Miller, Penn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 360 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings, under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanmious consent to extend the remarks I made upon the conference report today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill; that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 30; that the Senate further insists upon its amendment numbered 24, disagreed to by the House, agrees to a further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Executive Office of the President (War Production Board).

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes" having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement Senate amendment No. 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended as to each of such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

No. 5. The original House bill carried provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943, and to this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocations to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make the exemptions made applicable by the Senate to the War and Navy Departments likewise applicable to the Department of State and the Office of Strategic Services. To this the Senate added exemption for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All other Federal agencies remained subject to the proposed Senate lar guage as subsequently modified. The conference agreement omits the House restrictions relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration and substitutes, for the original proposed Senate general restrictive language as modified by the House and again by the Senate, the following limitation: "*Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies."

No. 60. The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morss Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons prior to that date have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61. Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the Section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal year 1944, retroactive to July 1, 1943.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is satisfactory to nobody, but, I trust, acceptable to everybody. If I were free to write it, I would write it differently. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] were writing it he would indite a still different version. In fact, any Member of either the House or the Senate conferees, and, so far as I am aware, any Member of either the House or the Senate, if he were writing this conference report as he would prefer to have it, would write it quite differently, and the likelihood is that no two transcripts would agree. The conference report meets the wishes of nobody in every respect, and therein lies its virtue; it is a compromise on which, with mutual concessions, all of us can unite.

There are only two points of variance: One relates to control of the President's fund. Under the limitations imposed by the two Houses in the original draft of the bill, the fund would have been, to all practical intents and purposes, practically inoperative. Now it goes without saying that an emergency fund at the disposal of the Commander in Chief, from which allocations can be made in emergencies or in secret war operations, is indispensable in modern warfare. No war has been fought in modern times by any country without such provision. It follows, then, that limitations hampering the use of the fund are to that extent inimical to the successful prosecution of the war, and the committee of conference report back a provision under which restrictions on the use of the fund are limited to objects for which estimates by the Bureau of the Budget have been denied by the two Houses or the respective Committees on Appropriation thereof.

The second item—and the item perhaps more directly in the public eye—is that denying salaries to three Federal employees charged with subversive affiliations. On this item the two Houses have disagreed diametrically and emphatically. Each has repeatedly sustained its position by record votes and perfervid oratory both in conference and on the floor.

May I briefly address myself to those Members of the House who insist that the House refuse to compose the differences on this item by mutual concessions. I appreciate the position that they take; but, Mr. Speaker, there is a very ancient document—too frequently overlooked in these hectic days—called the Constitution of the United States. In that majestic document provision is made whereby the Senate of the United States is constituted a part of the Government of the United States, and on terms of equality with the House. The Senate has voted five separate times on roll call that it will not accept the House language, and on one of those calls the vote stood 68 to 0.

And when it is noted that the House has also voted three times just as emphatically that it will not recede from its position, we have what amounts to the irresistible force meeting the immovable object.

Now it was for just such situations that the machinery of conference was devised. Committees representing both Houses meet around a table in conference for the purpose of securing an agreement; meet and discuss the issues in order to harmonize the differences between the two bodies, meet in an effort to reach a compromise on which both Houses will undertake to agree. That has been the course followed in this all but historic instance. We have met in conference in an endeavor to reach common ground on which we might formulate a measure satisfactory to all concerned—and especially satisfactory to the forgotten and uncompensated employees of the Government waiting a check for salary now 2 days past due.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Senate leaves the House in a very ridiculous position. We have taken 400 pages of testimony and exhibits on these three gentlemen. The Senate never took one shred of testimony of either Mr. Dodd or Mr. Watson, and only the statement of Secretary Ickes with respect to Mr. Lovett, and so after all of the testimony heard by a distinguished special committee of this House, I confess the Senate does leave us in a very difficult position. I cannot reconcile myself to it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I confess, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in much the same frame of mind as the gentleman from Illinois. I agree that much of the disagreement is apparently due to lack of information on the subject in dispute between the two Houses. For example, it has been frequently insisted in debate that these three men have not had an opportunity to present their side of the case, that they have not been given a fair trial, that they have not had their day in court.

In order to dispell any such erroneous impression it is only necessary to turn to pages 119, 157, and 199 of the hearings which I shall not take the time of the House to read but in which the three men themselves respectively assure the subcommittee of their appreciation of the courtesy accorded them and the opportunity afforded them to present every possible argument and evidence in their own behalf. To any who entertain any doubt as to the fairness and integrity of the proceedings, let me recommend even a cursory perusal of the printed transcript of the hearings which are available to all on request. All three of these men, without exception, told the committee they had been treated with every consideration, that they had been given every facility and had fully presented their case and that they appreciated the courtesy shown them by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the House language should stand. I am at a loss to understand why anyone at all familiar with the situation should not be willing to accept it. But the Senate has settled convictions to the contrary and has not hesitated to express them and under the Constitution they have that right. Ours is a bicameral system of government. The two Houses have equal voice in all legislative matters, and the Senate has but exercised its legitimate prerogatives.

So let us be practical for a minute. The House seeks the dismissal of these three men. How can that objective be accomplished? Not by defeating this report. That would leave them in office.

If you reject this conference report they retain their jobs undisturbed.

But if you agree to this conference report you adopt a plan under which these

men will be removed from office before the 15th of next November unless appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

You may take your choice. I know the alternative is not exactly to our liking, but we face a situation—do you want to take them out or do you want to leave them in. If you reject this report, you leave them in, and if you agree to it, you adopt the only available method of removing them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, your conferees have brought in here a unanimous report. The items in difference that have not been composed are, as stated to you by the chairman of the committee, amendment numbered 5 and amendments numbered 60 and 61. The amendment numbered 5 relates to the President's emergency fund. The language frankly is a compromise. It will permit the President to use the funds for necessary war activities without enlarging the use of it so much on other things than war activities. I believe we have done the best we could on it. The items that the House put in, the Farm Security and the National Resources Planning Board, have been taken care of by the independent offices appropriation bill and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

As to amendments 60 and 61, which provide for taking off the pay roll of the United States three men—Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett—the first two are in that agency of the Federal Communications Commission which was classified by the three leaders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Leahy, Admiral King, and General Marshall—in a communication which was in the press yesterday and which was brought before the committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission, as an agency that is a menace to the war effort. It was recommended by them that that agency be dispensed with and that the activity that it was presently performing be turned over to the Military Establishments. If any more proof of the kind of a job that those gentlemen were doing was needed, that would be it.

It is to be regretted that we have not been able to come to an agreement with the Senate that would throw them off the roll immediately. It was apparent from the examination they were given before the Kerr committee—and that represents 385 pages of testimony—that the first loyalty of those men was not to the United States of America, and the committee felt that they should go off the pay roll. I feel that they should go off the pay roll. But we have got to have legislation that the Senate will agree to. After long struggle, after four or five votes in the House and four or five in the Senate, we have come to this situation: They go off the roll unless before the 15th of November their names are sent to the Senate and the Senate confirms them.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a minute. It seems incredible that the President, with the picture that I have presented, with the indictment of the division that those men are active in, by military authorities, would present their names to the Senate for confirmation. It seems incredible that the Senate could confirm them with the situation that is presented. I am confident that they will go off the roll for good on the 15th day of November.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a moment. I feel that it is of the utmost importance that we pass legislation that will ultimately provide for taking them off the roll. Those men have been given a fair hearing. They have been given every opportunity to present their case.

I believe that this conference report should now be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, before we consider the urgent deficiency bill, I think at least one Member of this House ought to rise in opposition to the amendment which concerns three individuals. I do not want it to go down that the Senate was the only body which had concern for our American processes of individual liberty.

Not that I expect this opposition to do much good, but I want the RECORD to show that not everyone in this House sat by slack-jawed and pads clapping in agreement when charges were passed off as truth. There are many of us here who well realize the danger to our traditions in this Kerr amendment.

In the first place, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] rose on a point of personal privilege and in defending himself proceeded to blacken the character of 39 other individuals who had nothing whatever to do with the case. His statements were full of many misstatements. True to the tradition of his committee there had been no hearings, no fairness, no chance for defense. As a matter of fact, there had not even been any prior investigation. Men that he said should be thrown off the Government pay roll were not even on it. One of them had been a paratrooper for 6 months. A simple phone call would have disclosed that.

And since no one, not even the House of Representatives, can take a Dies charge at face value, the House set up an investigating committee to investigate the work of an investigating committee.

In the second place, the Kerr committee completely disregarded precedents—and I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a long list of precedents for procedure for committees like the Kerr committee. Congress has been trying to throw individuals off the Government pay roll since way back in 1787 and there is an established method for procedure in such cases with prosecuting and defense attorneys, with open hearings and open transcripts of all those hearings and charges made available to the accused, and all that sort of thing. Completely disregarding these precedents of procedure, the Kerr committee made its report after secret meetings and unpublished findings. With this lack of information the House voted. Later, after repeated insistence, the hearings were belatedly published.

But the Senate smelled a slight odor of ancient tombs in which liberty had been buried, and turned the matter down.

And now, in the third place, there has come forth a typical politician's weasel compromise. The matter having become too hot to handle has all been tossed in the lap of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. And this compromise has been concocted by a House of Representatives which claims it is reasserting its own responsibility.

By its action on these three individuals, the House will certainly not gain in prestige nor in public respect.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistenly voted against the so-called Kerr amendment denying certain employees of the executive department their salaries, I want to say that I think the House should approve the report of the conferees. I cannot believe that if these men are unfit to serve their country that the President, in the first place, would appoint them. Neither do I believe that the Senate would confirm such an appointment in the event the President so acted.

As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has so well said, "the Senate is an integral part of the Congress." Now, in analogous situations, the Senate would have the last say. Suppose that the alleged acts of these men amounted to impeachable offenses, and suppose that their classification were such, which is not a fact, that they could be impeached, it would be the duty of the House of Representatives to present the articles of impeachment to the Senate. Thereafter it would be the duty of the Senate to determine the guilt or innocence of the men so sought to be impeached after full hearing. Therefore, as I have said, in analogous situations the Senate would have the last say. Accordingly, it is my contention that we should not try to force our judgment upon the judgment of the Senate of the United States in this instance, and accordingly I am going to vote for the report of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have signed this conference report, and I am going along with it. I am going along with it for several reasons.

I am supporting it, first, because I believe that it offers the only foreseeable possibility of enacting this bill into law

at this time and thereby providing the funds that are essential to many people on the Federal pay rolls and to the various Federal agencies provided for in this urgent deficiency bill.

On four successive occasions the Senate has voted down proposals that have been made for resolving the items in dispute, including almost the identical proposition that is now before us. It was only last evening on the fifth attempt that an affirmative vote was obtained in the Senate for that proposition. The acceptance of this report at this time will dispose of the entire bill.

Secondly, I am supporting the report because, from my standpoint, there has been an improvement in respect to the language affecting the use of the President's emergency fund.

If I were writing the language, I should prefer more restrictive language than that now in the bill. There has been clear indication in both the Senate and the House that the abuse of these funds in the past in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget must cease. The limiting language included in the bill at this time is at least a step in the right direction in that it reflects the determination in this respect of both Houses.

Finally I am supporting the report because it includes, in my judgment, the most satisfactory agreement obtainable in respect to the three Federal employees whom the Kerr committee and the House as a whole have determined should be eliminated from the Federal pay roll.

A concession is, of course, involved insofar as the House is concerned. On the other hand, if accepted, the agreement specifically provides that all three employees in question shall definitely go off the Federal pay roll on November 15 unless there is first a reappointment by the President of the United States; and second, confirmation of any reappointment by the Senate of the United States.

In other words, the burden is placed squarely on the shoulders of the President and on the shoulders of the other body. In the absence of affirmative action by both, all three employees will go off the pay rolls on November 15. In a sense the House indicts and the Senate tries.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Suppose they are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Would that put them in an unimpeachable class?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question. I agree with the gentleman from New York in the light of the testimony developed by the Kerr committee that it is highly improbable that reappointment and confirmation of the three employees in question could take place. If it should take place surely the House is entirely free, surely any Member of the House is entirely free to take any appropriate action either collectively or individually.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is true, is it not, that if these men were to be impeached the House would present the articles of impeachment, which would have to be filed with the Senate, and then the Senate would decide the guilt or innocence of these individuals?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct. The proposal before us is somewhat analogous to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, would it not be fair to assume that if these gentlemen are subject to impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate that the House and the other body should proceed now with the impeachment, rather than go through this delay to November 15?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, there is no impeachment here. Nothing is involved except fitness to remain on the Federal pay rolls. Postponement to November 15 will certainly provide more than ample opportunity for the other body to consider the 380 pages of evidence of the Kerr committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, if this situation is understood by the House I do not believe that we will have very many votes against the conference report. After all, we are a conference committee delegated to fight for what the House adopts, and to try to do the best we can where there is a disagreement. We cannot force the Senate to do what we say, no matter how much we may want them to do it and no matter how strong we are for what we want them to do. They are a sovereign body and they do not have to do what we wish. And in the same way the reverse is true.

We have now come to a situation where the conferees have fought vigorously because of the attitude of this House, and the Senate has voted four times "no," and one time for that which we are now presenting to you. The situation stands now that the Senate declines to do exactly what the House wishes it to do.

I think there is an old line of precedents that the body which proposes a new proposition, such as this, must yield. When both sides find themselves irreconcilably in disagreement, there is certainly the precedent that the House which proposes the change is the one that must recede. In other words, as we are now in such a situation and the Senate has stood pat, there would not be anything left according to precedent but for the House to recede. If we do not choose to do that, the result is the same, because the bill cannot pass and therefore we get nothing out of it at all as to this amendment. Under those conditions, therefore, we bring back to the House something that is very fair and very sensible, it seems to me. The two things in controversy are, first, that if any funds are denied in an appropriation for any specific purpose the President cannot use emergency funds for that purpose. That is an agreement between us and it seems to me there should be no question about that.

As far as these three men are concerned, we are in this situation under the proposed agreement of the conference: That these men go off the pay roll in accordance with the wishes of the House, on November 15, unless their names are certified to the Senate and the Senate confirms those names. That is fair to the Senate; that gives the Senate a chance to go into the matter, to determine for themselves whether they have had a fair trial; and that is what they have objected to, that the Senators have had no opportunity to weigh the testimony. In an impeachment proceeding, of course, the indictment is filed by the House and those impeached are tried by the Senate. This proceeding is very similar.

If you will examine the bill you will see there are many agencies here that are affected by this bill. It covers such items as salaries of pages, clerks, and Government employees; $122,000,000 of that kind of pay is being held up at this time. There is no use of our being hard-headed and saying that the Senate must do what we say. After all, the Senate does not have to follow our recommendation; but there are others involved; these men and women who are being denied their pay because of the fact that we have not acted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, if the conference report is adopted, if these men are nominated and confirmed by the Senate before November 15, they are changed in their classification from inferior officials, are they not? In other words, under those conditions, their position is changed so they could be removed only by impeachment. They have an entirely different status.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think under the circumstances of the disagreement we must consider the fact that we are confronted with a situation where we are punishing Government employees who are being denied money that they need, and need very badly, and that their just pay is being held up because of the delay in passing this bill. We should pass the conference report unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have always supported the Dies committee and supported the report of the Kerr committee. The Senate action is perfectly indefensible even according to their own standards, for when one of their number opposes a nominee for personal reasons and without evidence he goes out. That is perfectly inconsistent

with the Senate's action on the men here who have been investigated. Too, some one erred in not getting the Kerr committee report to the Senate Members earlier.

But, regardless of that, as I have watched the proceedings of these conferences I am convinced that this is the best we can do. If anybody had watched the Senate yesterday, watched the Senator from Tennessee trying to defend this conference report from all the assaults that were made on it, they would have wondered how he ever got it through. I think therefore we should accept this as the very best proposition possible for an agreement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of confidence in the conferees on this bill. I also appreciate that a great many Members here are anxious to get home on the recess, but there is a principle involved here that goes deeper than just the fate of these three men. The principle involved here is whether or not people whose ideology is inimical to our republican form of government should be retained on the Federal pay roll. This is a fundamental principle of Americanism and we cannot get away from it. I followed the record of these men for years before I was ever a Member of Congress and I want to say that, knowing their records as I do, I would rather stay here all summer than relinquish my position in voting these men off the pay roll. Here and now if we adopt this conference report we are going to find that these three men—Dodd, Watson, and Lovett—will resign before November 15, and then where are you? I care not what position any Member of this House may take, but as for myself I cannot vote for the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from Florida and other gentlemen who are opening fire on the adoption of this conference report are experienced and wise legislators. They know that in many, many instances—in fact in most instances—legislation is a matter of compromise. Somewhere along the line there must be a meeting of minds. They know that when the zero hour arrives at the end of a fiscal year, with appropriation measures in a bad log jam, a give-and-take process of compromise must necessarily be invoked or vital appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year would fail, resulting in indescribable confusion and distress.

Such a situation has now arisen. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. The zero hour in respect to this important appropriation bill is now at hand. The end of the current fiscal year has come and we are floundering in uncertainty. The sensible thing to do, the reasonable thing for reasonable men and women to do, is to agree to this conference report and allow this bill to become a law.

If it does not become a law, what will be the result? A great number of Government employes, both in Washington and in the field, will continue to be without their salaries, and in these days when high costs have forced hand-to-mouth living, thousands upon thousands of these Government workers will find themselves financially embarrassed immediately. The bill carries $122,000,000 to pay the salaries of these employees. Surely we should do all we can to save these faithful Government workers from this inconvenience and suffering. Included in the total who would be affected are the District of Columbia school teachers.

The bill carries $609,000 for the training of nurses for the United States Public Health Service, and that important activity will be paralyzed unless the bill passes. It carries $2,000,000 for custodial employees of Government buildings, all over the country, in your district and mine, who are paid meagerly at the best and who will suffer intensely if their pay is denied. It carries the money for the Bituminous Coal Act, a vital activity. It is the bill that provides the money to loan to soldiers while they are being rehabilitated, and if those loans are stopped or interfered with for any appreciable time there undoubtedly will be deep resentment. If this bill does not pass, the President will have no emergency fund—no fund he can draw upon to meet any desperately emergent situation that might unexpectedly arise. That is an unthinkable situation in the midst of a great war.

Now let us pause for a moment to analyze the proposal before us and see if it is not a reasonable basis of agreement. It is true that the three gentlemen whom the House thought should be dismissed immediately from the Government rolls, Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, will not be dismissed immediately but will be given a lease of life until November 15 next. If by that time the President has not reappointed them and the Senate has not confirmed them they will go off of the rolls automatically. What, after all, is unreasonable about that proposition? What danger to the public interest could possibly be involved in carrying out this proposal? It should be remembered that these three men have never been found guilty of subversive activity. What the House found them guilty of was anti-American indoctrination and not subversive activity. The difference between the two is as wide as the Gulf of Mexico. What Judge KERR's able committee, in which we all have complete confidence, said to these men was:

> We don't like your philosophy and we don't believe that men of your type of thinking should be in the public service of the United States.

That was all. And to that the House agreed. And we who approve this conference report point out that before these men can remain on the pay roll it will be necessary for them under this conference agreement to jump two big hurdles. No one knows whether they can jump either hurdle. The first hurdle is reappointment by the President. The second hurdle is confirmation by the Senate. As strongly as I approve the judgment of the House in the original instance, I am not averse to having the cases of these three men reviewed by the President and the Senate. We of the House have been busy men and our consideration of the cases has necessarily been of limited duration and extent. We believe that further review by the President and the Senate is unnecessary to establish the unsuitability of these persons for Government service but to my way of thinking it is in the interest of a liberality of justice and fair play that such a further review be allowed. I do not expect it to change the result one particle. The three accused are men of high intelligence and I do not think for a moment that anyone even imagines that they will engage or attempt to engage in any subversive activities between now and November 15. If they should do so the F. B. I. would catch up with them. The F. B. I. acts when action is required and it is not bound by any 4½ months' deferment agreement.

No one disapproves more heartily than I do the McKellar bill requiring Senate confirmation of an army of Government employees and I will never vote for it. But the proposition before us is not the McKellar bill. It is a specific proposal for a specific purpose, which is to break the appropriations log jam with which we are presently confronted, to give the departmental workers the pay to which they are entitled and to permit the Government to function. I appeal to you as sensible men and women to adopt this conference agreement both because it is a reasonable agreement and because it is the only way out of a very serious dilemma.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for being so kind as to give me 4 minutes when there are so many Members who wish time on this motion.

We have an amazing situation here this afternoon. I believe I can properly say that many Members stood here in this well and told you they believed that these men should be fired; and they said it had been determined definitely that they were not loyal to the United States, but still they asked us to enter into a compromise. You cannot compromise the flag of the United States.

As far as the Senate's being a part of this Congress is concerned, I have known that for a very long time, from the time I was in grammar school; but the House is also a part of this Congress. Why should we knuckle to the Senate just because they will not accept what we have given to them? They have been very arbitrary and inconsistent from the beginning. In the first place when this amendment came to them they voted unanimously to reject it. In the second place, when we sent this compromise back to them they voted again to reject it, but we gained votes. So they

were willing to go a little further. Finally, they have accepted this compromise, which is very inconsistent, because in first rejecting this amendment they told us we should not interfere with an executive department of the Government. Then they turned right around and accepted a proposition giving them the right to confirm these men, which is interfering.

As I see it, there is no reason why these men should be appointed by the President; there is no reason why the Senate should confirm them, and there is no reason why any Member speaking of this compromise should tell us that this means if we do not accept this compromise that we will not have a bill. Yes; we do need a vacation; I need one just as much as anybody, but I am willing to stay here until Christmas Day to get these men out. Every one of us knows that the Dies committee and the Kerr committee have investigated these men and have determined that they are subversive. When these men stand here and admit they are not loyal to the United States there is no reason why we should accept any compromise and keep these men on the pay roll.

I want to say just one other thing. It has just come to me from a Member on the Republican side that some of the Republicans think it is very smart to adopt this compromise and put the whole thing in the lap of the President. You are playing politics with something dangerous if you vote that way. You Democrats are playing politics if you back them up.

We have voted twice on this measure. On the first occasion we voted to expel these men 318 to 62, and on the second occasion 301 to 71. The Senate has voted the third time and has finally accepted this compromise. I believe if we send it back again they will accept the amendment.

I say again I am not willing to compromise. We should send this back, and we will get a bill passed if we are willing to stay here long enough to get rid of these subversive influences in the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as one who disagreed with the findings of the Kerr committee, I believe we should adopt this compromise because a half loaf is better than no loaf at all. I disagreed with the findings of that committee with reference to these three men because I felt that they were determined to be guilty by mere association and that the proceedings were not legal or judicial and were violative of the Constitution which precludes bills of attainder.

I believe the compromise should be adopted. I said half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, although I am somewhat of the opinion that this is not even half a loaf. These men—Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett—in a way have been "lynch lawed." On straight principle, no one should vote for this compromise. But we have to be pragmatic. The deficiency appropriation bill which we are presently considering must pass. Otherwise, the salaries of thousands of thousands of persons will be held up. Appropriations for various departments will be prevented. Those departments cannot function. We must be practical.

The Constitution precludes a bill of attainder either by the Federal or the State Government.

We brought charges against these three men; we tried these three men; we punished these three men. That is not a judicial method of trial. It is a star-chamber proceeding. No legislator can exercise the offices of prosecutor, judge, jury, and sheriff at the same time.

We thereby disregard all the safeguards of a fair trial.

In cases of impeachment the lower House acts as prosecutor and the Senate acts as judge. There is a sharp demarcation between the one who brings the charges and the one who hears the charges.

The proceedings against these three men are illegal; otherwise we could just as well attempt to oust the President or the Vice President or a member of the Cabinet by just cutting off his salary.

Time will not permit going into the details of the charges against these men. The gravamen of one of the charges is that because they were associated and/or indirectly, or directly, connected with subversive or communistic organizations, they are, in turn, communistic or subversives. In other words, they were made guilty by association. That is a new method of trial and judgment. Wendell Willkie recently represented a Communist in the Supreme Court. Did that representation make him a Communist? Daniel Webster acted as attorney for many criminals. Did that make him a criminal? Former Chief Justice Hughes represented, in his New York office when he was a lawyer, many corporate malefactors guilty of violation of the anti-trust laws? Did that make him an offender? An eminent colonel was assigned to represent the Nazi saboteurs recently in Washington before the Supreme Court. Did that make of him a saboteur or a Nazi?

Frequently Members of the House and Senate are called upon to address gatherings or to write for certain publications. Busy as they are, they are unable at times to investigate thoroughly the make-up and the nature of these groups. Sometimes they are sucked in innocently. They find out, after the event, that they have addressed a group or written for a publication that may have been maintained by some Fascist and/or communistic elements. Is the Senator or Congressman thus innocently siphoned into an unfortunate situation to be called Fascist or Communist?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the opposition in the other body to the language that we placed in this bill is on the ground that it is unconstitutional for us to do what we did. Now we find the Senate says that while it is unconstitutional to take these radicals off the pay roll today, on the 15th of November doing the selfsame thing will be constitutional.

As to the charges that they have not had a day in court, may I say that I am the last person in the world who would deprive any citizen of his day in court, but it certainly seems to me that these people are not entitled to a trial in every tribunal of the land. We have confidence in the Kerr committee. I do not think a more careful committee could have been selected, and I am perfectly willing to follow the recommendation of that committee.

I want to say a word to the Democrats, but I do not want the Members on the left side of the aisle to listen to what I have to say. I have become so all-fired mad at being compelled to apologize for people on the public pay roll who are masquerading as Democrats that it seems to me this is the time to show the people who are responsible for these employees that we do not want to be embarrassed any longer. If you took this whole crowd of starry-eyed political nonentities and placed them in the most sparsely settled county in the United States, their combined influence would not be sufficient to elect anyone dog-catcher.

Why do we who have fought year in and year out for the principles of Thomas Jefferson have to adopt this group who stand for nothing except their own selfish ends? It is time that we eliminate the greatest liability our great party has to contend with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against the amendment to strike these men from the pay roll when it was first presented and I have voted that way all along. I had hoped that the House conferees might agree to the original Senate position. Of course, we must get legislation passed eventually and I realize that possibly something has to be worked out to meet the position on both sides of the Capitol.

My fear about this compromise is, and I am inclined to vote against it on this theory, that the Senate has passed a bill requiring Senate confirmation of all employees who earn more than $4,500 per year. An amendment to that effect has been placed on two appropriation bills when they come back from the Senate. I fear that by agreeing to this compromise we will be impliedly recognizing that all employees of the Federal Government who earn a substantial amount should be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I hope that the chairman of the committee in the time remaining to the committee will state whether or not this is any implied recognition of that principle because if it is I think it would be a very dangerous vote on the part of the House to agree to this compromise. I believe the Senate confirmation bill is bad legislation and not in the public interest.

Unless that matter is cleared up by the chairman of the committee and we have a legislative expression that we are not recognizing Senate confirmation I shall be forced to vote against the compromise.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have consistently opposed the Kerr amendment. I feel this compromise brings no honor to either the Senate or the House. To vote for this compromise is to vote that these men be discharged from the pay roll on November 15 instead of June 30. The date does not make any difference; whether or not these people hold a job for 5 more months does not make any difference; what does make a difference is that to discharge them from the pay roll violates every principle of elementary democracy; it is an unconstitutional act, and it has the earmarks of fascism. Further, this so-called compromise is an invasion of the power of the Executive to appoint. I therefore oppose the compromise for the same reasons I have opposed the discharge of these three employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this will be impliedly recognizing that all employees of the Federal Government earning substantial amounts shall be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, that is, by the adoption of this conference report. If this is getting a foot in the door I shall have to vote against the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It has no relation whatever to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to this House as earnestly as I can: As a member of the Kerr committee, who has served long and earnestly on that committee and done his level best, I plead with you to accept this conference report. I assure you that as far as I am concerned this is no compromise of principle. The basis upon which the Kerr committee was set up was that we would go through the evidence and recommend those people whom we thought to be unfit for public service. We have done that in these three cases. I am entirely willing to believe that when Members of this House and of the Kerr committee go before the proper Senate committees they will be able to convince those committees that these men are still unfit for public service. I have not lost faith in representative government, either in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. In just a minute.

Let me say that I have taken the time to go to the office of the Kerr committee and review every case that is in its files. If some of you would spend that much time in such unpleasant work you would understand why I am so keenly interested in this.

I think that while it is true that there are men who need to be condemned, there are also men who need to be exonerated. It is just as important that a free and responsive government should try to provide justice and free the innocent as that it should seek to convict the guilty.

There is on the Dies list one man, Thomas Arthur Bisson, whose only crime is that he lived much of his lifetime as a missionary for the Methodist Church in China. When that man came back to this country, when the invasion of China made it impossible for him to remain there in his work, he went to a rally promoted by the Friends of China and made an eloquent plea for the people he had been serving. His name got tangled up with the organization and he is today on a blacklist. I say to you he does not belong there.

One of the editors of Time magazine has written your committee and made the strongest possible plea in behalf of this individual. I want to clear him by the same sort of legislative process we have been working on, and which this conference report would continue.

On that list there is a young man, David Karr, whose only crime is that he wrote a series of newspaper articles exposing the establishment of a German-American Bund in New York City. Somehow those articles were too hot for the New York press to publish, and they got into the hands of one of his friends, and, innocently, they were taken down to the Daily Worker and printed there at that time. The young man received no pay for his work. He did not know his articles were going to be printed in the Daily Worker. Today he is criticized because he at that early time, 4 years ago, condemned and exposed the German-American Bund. Was he wrong? Should his case not be heard and settled as we are here proposing?

In addition, there is a young man—and his name is Joseph Facci; the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] knows him—whose only crime is that he was an anti-Mussolini Italian in California. He opposed Mussolini all the way through. For that he became listed with anti-Fascist groups whose purposes were not of the best.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I decline to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New Mexico, instead of talking about these three who have been convicted, is talking about some who are not involved in this amendment. I should like to have him discuss the cases before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will proceed in order.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. When I see three names of that nature that I know should be cleared, I say to you that I want this Congress to establish a policy that can carry on and that will permit our committee to work. We have condemned three men. I think we have condemned them properly, but I do not think the job has been done in this Government.

There was a man, Karl Borders, who was head of the rent section of O. P. A., whose record as far as public life is concerned was that he belonged to and was secretary of a certain League of Industrial Democracy in Chicago, an organization working for "a social order based on production for use and not for profit." He worked in Soviet Russia for several years. That individual became head of the rent control division of O. P. A. He is today the head of the O. P. A. in Hawaii at $8,000 per year. Is it any wonder that we have had some trouble on the profit situation within O. P. A.? Is it any wonder that there have been complaints on the rent section of O. P. A.?

Let me point out to you that a few days ago there was a controversy over a certain Negro, Doxey Wilkerson, who resigned from O. P. A. to go out and spend his life as a Communist lecturer. It was asserted that people in O. P. A. were surprised that he had become a Communist lecturer and that no one had any idea of his Communist leanings. They should not have been surprised because the Department of Justice on May 15, 1943, over the signature of John Edgar Hoover sent to his employers a reminder that in February of 1942 the F. B. I. had established the fact that he was a Communist, and in their memorandum of May 15 they said, "He is now reported getting ready to become a Communist lecturer."

Here is what the F. B. I. said about him:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYEE INVESTIGATIONS

Under date of May 21, 1942, I made available to Mr. Edwin D. Dickinson, formerly Special Assistant to the Attorney General, a copy of the report of Special Agent G. W. Hall, dated March 7, 1942, at Washington, D. C., which reflected this Bureau's investigation of Doxey Alphonso Wilkerson, an employee of the Federal Security Agency, conducted under the provisions of Public Law No. 135, Seventy-seventh Congress.

As will be observed from a review of that report, considerable information was reported showing Wilkerson's activities with various organizations heretofore declared subversive by the Department of Justice with respect to these types of cases. As further shown, one confidential source related that Wilkerson was a member of the Communist Party and worked directly out of the national office in New York City. This person stated, however, that Wilkerson did not belong to the Communist Party in the District of Columbia in an effort to hide his party connections.

The results of this investigation were made available to the Federal Security Agency on

March 26, 1942, and that agency advised by letter, dated December 9, 1942, that "we find nothing to show that the above employee has engaged in activities which might properly be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government. Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action."

In this regard and as of possible interest to the committee the Washington field office of this Bureau recently received information from a highly confidential source that Doxey Wilkerson contemplates resigning his position with the Federal Security Agency in order that he might devote his full time to Communist Party work in Baltimore, Md.

Very truly yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

Think of that. The report of the F. B. I. as early as March 7, 1942, had indicated the nature of Wilkerson's beliefs. The memorandum had listed directly the Communist Party, which the Attorney General of the United States found to be subversive, and six other organizations which he had classified as fronts for subversive movements.

What do you suppose the agency affected did about that? Why, it cleared Wilkerson, of course. On December 9, 1942, the Assistant Administrator ruled:

We find nothing to show that the above employee has engaged in activities which might properly be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government. Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation was so notified.

That was a strange action, for on July 9, 1942, the special investigation of the Wilkerson case had caused a letter to be sent to the subversive personnel committee of the agency which read:

The majority of confidential informants advised that Wilkerson consistently follows the Communist party line and if he is not a member of the party is at least a fellow traveler. He was president of the American Federation of Teachers when the Communists were in control.

That is not a report of the Dies committee or the Kerr committee. That is from Wilkerson's own agency. And the report closed with these highly important observations:

Confidential informant T-34 advised that Wilkerson is a member of the Communist Party working out of the national office on the Communist Party in New York. Other informants stated that they observed Wilkerson at a Communist meeting in the Press Building on September 21, 1941. He seems to be closely tied up with Communist activity in the District of Columbia.

What do you suppose happened then? Exactly nothing. Wilkerson was invited in for a hearing within his Department and allowed to lecture on the beauties of socialism and the advantages of life in a Communist state, and that was all.

But you can observe from the letter of the F. B. I. on May 15, 1943, that it was not satisfied. J. Edgar Hoover was still after Professor Wilkerson. He told the Department again that Wilkerson was about to resign to devote his full time to Communist Party work. That was serious, and the head of the F. B. I. had a right to expect that the agency would act.

What happened? The matter was routed around the office and on June 19, only a few days before he actually resigned to work for the Communists, he was again cleared with this report:

Our committee of course could not establish conclusively that Wilkerson was not subversive—it is impossible to establish that conclusively about anyone. But the evidence available to the committee was not such as to show he was subversive or disloyal.

That gives us a complete and clear index to the workings of the interdepartmental committee and the special white-washing committees set up within the departments. They have made a farce of the entire proceedings and their verdicts cannot be trusted. Evidence? Why, they had it by the barrel. If time permitted, I could read it to you by the running yard, but it should be enough to let the official warning of the F. B. I. stand, particularly when Wilkerson proved the accuracy of the F. B. I. charges by doing exactly what J. Edgar Hoover said he was planning to do.

Very well, but what of the United States Civil Service Commission which is supposed to screen these applicants for public positions. I wondered how carefully it had acted.

Let me give you its report on the Wilkerson case as it came to me a day or two ago:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1943.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: You requested for use as a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations a report from the Commission on the case of Mr. Doxey A. Wilkerson. Mr. Wilkerson recently resigned from employment with the Office of Price Administration.

The records of the Commission show that Mr. Wilkerson was approved for appointment in a temporary position in the Consumers' Division, Office of Price Administration, on June 29, 1942. This employment was on a per diem basis, the title of the position being "Consultant." The authority used for appointment was a provision designated as paragraph 13 of section 1 of schedule A of Civil Service Rules. Appointments under this provision are excepted from examination and are not regarded as being in the regular civil service. The provision is for the purpose of enabling Government agencies to make temporary, part time, or intermittent appointment of professional, scientific, or technical experts for consultation purposes. Investigations are not made for appointments under this authority unless requested by the employing agency.

Mr. Wilkerson's temporary appointment, effected as above, was extended on the following dates: July 9, 1942, August 21, 1942, September 21, 1942, and November 9, 1942.

On March 27, 1943, the Civil Service Commission approved Mr. Wilkerson's appointment as an Education Specialist at a salary of $3,800 per annum in the Office of Price Administration. This appointment was authorized for what is known as war-service employment. It does not confer civil-service status but authorizes employment for the duration of the war and not to exceed 6 months thereafter. The appointment approved on March 27, 1943, was made subject to investigation. Under agreement between the Civil Service Commission and the Office for Emergency Manangement responsibility for character investigation for appointees of constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Manangement is for the central administrative services of the Office for Emergency Management. The Civil Service Commission passes on reports of such investigations when received. No such report has been received on the Wilkerson case.

It is understood that you are interested in a report on the case of Mr. Karl Borders and that a written request for this report will be forwarded to the Commission either by yourself or through the office of Congressman KERR, chairman of the subcommittee. The Commission has an investigation report on the Borders case and the information is being put in shape for forwarding.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

I say if the departments will not do the job of checking these people, it is necessary for some committee to work, and if you do not adopt this compromise you are going to find out that the Kerr committee cannot work and no other committee of Congress can work.

I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and their colleagues on the deficiency committee who have stood up and fought hard for what the Kerr committee tried to do. They have done their best to get this matter the way that you wanted it, but they could not, and they had to take something that I think is satisfactory because I am convinced that when the record of these men is made plain to the Senate you are not going to have any trouble with the situation there. What changed the recent votes on this matter in the Senate? The fact that the Kerr committee hearings were published and the Senators could read them. That same thing will happen again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the language of the report which was signed by the gentleman from New Mexico states that they are unfit to continue in Federal employ?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes; and I think they are unfit. I want to get them off as quickly as I can, and as nearly as I can see it, the first day is the 15th of November. So adopt the conference report and make that possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] addressed himself a moment ago to the Democrats. He assumed a rather apologetic vein. I am going to address myself to the Republicans. I say the Republican Party need not make any apology for its opposition to any third-party movement. I want to call a witness or two to the stand right now. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] could ever be

questioned. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] could ever be questioned. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] could ever be questioned. I shall make no profession as to my own position. I supported, as did my three colleagues on this committee, the Kerr committee. We have urged that the evidence be brought in, which we think was sufficient upon which to base the findings that have been made. We in no way repudiate the action of that committee. We in no way condone the conduct of these three men. However, we have reached a very practical problem. My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—and there is no man in the House for whom I have a greater regard or warmer affection—asks whether the findings were not that those men should not continue in public service. We still say so. We have not changed our opinion on that.

We have gotten to the point, however, where we must face the practical problem as to the best way to get rid of them. Oh, the easy thing to say is that we will wait until next Christmas if necessary to get rid of these men. That is not the answer to this problem. The question is whether—when controversies present themselves, and reasonable men, honest men, find that there are differences of opinion, something in the nature of irreconcilable differences of opinion—whether each side is willing to give some ground in order to reach a workable conclusion. I wonder whether the constitutional convention would have brought forth the document which it did, had there not been men in that body who realized that compromise must be reached.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I believe the constitutional convention was a convention of great compromises—not the compromising of principle but the compromising of means by which principle might be sustained. I am now addressing my Republican friends, just as my friend addressed the Democrats. I am pleading to the Republicans. The four Republicans who sat on this conference committee were just as positive in their denunciation of those agencies that have been dangerous to the way of American life and our constitutional government as any man in the House. We are just as much opposed to these men as you are. We are not condoning their conduct. We are asking you, however, to have faith in us. We have used the best means we have at our command for carrying out the work of the Kerr committee and the findings of that body. We plead for your endorsement and approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution forbids the passing by Congress of any legislation that inflicts punishment without judicial trial. Legislative inquisitions, no matter how fair, honest, and able the committees that conduct them, are not judicial trials. Neither is confirmation by the Senate, nor its refusal to confirm. Nothing but a trial in a court of law satisfies the mandate of the Constitution.

The Congress has no more right to remove Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from office in November than now.

The granting to the sentenced trio of the possibility of another hearing before a Senate committee falls just as short of giving them a trial in court as did the hearings held by the Dies and Kerr committees of the House. Nor would it be a judicial trial if an inquisition before a Senate committee, or even before the Senate itself, were certain. No hearing, investigation, or trial which could be conducted by the Congress, or either House thereof, nor any part of either, could possibly be a judicial trial. Any such procedure would, of course, be legislative action—not judicial. The Constitution says:

> The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

No possible procedure in either of the other two coordinate branches of our Government can be a judicial procedure. It may be, and frequently is, a perfectly judicious procedure, but none can be judicial unless conducted in that branch of our Government in which all judicial power of the United States is vested. Therefore, multiplying the number of nonjudicial trials is as absurd as trying to make three—or a dozen—wrongs constitute a right.

In the second place, the Congress has no more constitutional power to invade the province of the Executive authority by requiring the Chief Executive to submit the appointments of certain named employees in the executive branch of our Government to the Senate for confirmation, vel non—the right to appoint whom was vested by act of Congress in subordinate officials of the executive branch—than it has to remove them from office by more direct legislative action.

So, neither postponing the date of execution nor the grant of the possibility of another nonjudicial trial adds any color or semblance of constitutionality to this latest proposal. Nor is the invasion of the province of the Executive power cured by attempting to force the Chief Executive to submit these names for the advice and consent of the Senate.

May I again call your attention to some of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that support these contentions? Here they are: *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall. 277); *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333); *Myers* v. *U. S.* (272 U. S. 52); *U. S.* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483); *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 602); *Morgan* v. *T. V. A.* (115 Fed. (2d) 990), in which certiorari was denied in 61 Supreme Court Report 806.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the House will adopt this conference report. I think it has been shown here that every member of this conference committee has supported and is supporting the Kerr committee. Every member of this conference feels just as keenly about the merits and the importance of the Kerr amendment as any Member of this House can feel. But, after all, it is a condition and not a theory that we are confronted with. I would like for just a minute, if you will bear with me, to review the history of this thing. Let me say, if I may be pardoned for being a little personal, that the first amendment ever written into any Federal law, seeking to keep Communists off the pay roll or take them off, was an amendment of which I was the author, and was put into the W. P. A. bill which our investigating committee reported to this House. That is how I feel about it; how strongly I feel about it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not much time.

Mr. HOBBS. That was the abolition of an entire project or class; was it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That was an amendment that provided that nobody could draw pay unless he signed a statement saying that he was not a Communist. It was a sweeping amendment, and it did clean off a lot of people from the rolls.

Let us go back a moment and see where we are. When we first came in at the beginning of this session and started to have amendments put on appropriation bills taking off the Federal pay roll certain individuals because charges had been preferred against them by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], what did the membership of the House say about it? You remember what we said? We said, "That is all right. If they are unfit to serve, let us take them off, but we want some evidence of that. These men are entitled to a day in court. Let us have an orderly procedure, bring us an orderly record, and then we will vote on it." I think that was a tenable position, and we set up the Kerr committee, composed of splendid gentlemen, men of fine attainment who have worked honestly and sincerely and brought in a report on which practically all of us agree.

We voted them off the pay roll. Now, let us try to be fair and let us examine our own position a little. We could not take this action just by a simple resolution of the House of Representatives. It must be concurred in by the Senate of the United States. I do not think we can express so much amazement that a United States Senator said just

what you and I said. What did we do? We carried this bill to the Senate. We said "Senator, here are three men. We have looked into it and they are unfit for service. Will you please sign on the dotted line and turn them out?" "Well," the Senator said, "gentlemen, that is very interesting. Who are they?" "Here are their names. We have looked into it. Do not worry about it. They are unfit for service. The Kerr committee looked into it." The Senator said, "Well, maybe they did, but I do not know anything about it and before I put my name on the dotted line to take a man off the pay roll because he is unfit for public service I want to know what I am doing."

Now, if we want to be fair, that is not an entirely reasonable position. The first time the Senate voted on that, 60 to 0, that is the way it stood. They did not have a line of evidence, not the scratch of a pen in any shape or form except that the House had taken this action, and the Senate was called upon to concur.

Now, what happened? We were able to get that evidence into the hands of a few Senators, and they examined it, and almost without exception they concurred in the action of the House. I do not have the remotest fear that as to these three men mentioned in this report, when the Senate has the facts—and it should be our purpose to give them the facts between now and November 15—they will be just as much interested in taking unfit people off the Federal pay roll as you and I and the House of Representatives.

We certainly have no right to assume that we have a corner on all the patriotism or the zeal for cleaning up the public service at this end of the Capitol. We did put quite a problem on the doorstep of the gentlemen of the Senate when we asked them to accept our action without any examination whatsoever. Now, if the House adopts this conference report, then two things must happen if these men stay on the public pay roll. The President has to send their names to Congress. I cannot possibly think he would do that, but sometimes things have happened that I did not think could happen. But if it did happen, I am confident that when this House and the Kerr committee and those of us who are interested lay the facts, as we have them in the records, on the desks of the Senators involved, the confirmation of these gentlemen will never come about. If that comes about, then we will have carried into execution the judgment of the Kerr committee.

Now, what is the other alternative? Vote down this conference report. If you do, where are you? These gentlemen stay on the pay roll.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does the Kerr committee report suggest what should be done with these men?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, sir; take them off the pay roll.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The report itself recommends that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Take them off the pay roll. That is what we all want to see done. That is what ought to be done. If it is not done here, I think every Member of this House ought to stand fast until it is done. I believe it will be done.

Now, if we turn down the conference report, those gentlemen stay on the pay roll. The conferees will have to go back. The deficiency subcommittee will have to reintroduce a bill for all of these department deficiencies and bring it in without the Kerr amendment and get it passed in a week or 10 days, and then all the work of the Kerr committee is gone. You have to start all over again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wish to make my position clear. I am opposed to removing these men from the pay roll, and I believe the date when they go off the pay roll makes no difference. Therefore, I shall oppose this so-called compromise.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think in the interest of good government this is the most wholesome thing the Congress can do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question.

Mr. HENDRICKS. A privileged motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not in order, because the Senate has already acted upon the conference report.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-eight Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred eighty-four Members are present, a quorum.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 61: On page 49, line 10, strike out "305" and insert "304."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 61, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert 306, and after section 304 of the bill, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 305. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is made necessary by the fact that we were unable to pass the bill in time to make the 1944 funds in the bill available on the 1st day of the fiscal year. This amendment merely makes the 1944 money retroactive to the 1st day of the fiscal year.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) "making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 26, 30, and 31; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment, and restore the matter stricken out by said

amendment, amended to read as follows: "sum not less than $56,000,000 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of $155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such persons shall be qualified by experience in business, industry or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,091,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$33,222,504"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and not more than $2,750,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch for the following functions only: Office of the Director, including book and magazine coordination sections; Office of Program Coordination; News Bureau; Bureau of Special Services; Radio Bureau; Motion Picture Bureau, not exceeding $50,000; and for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of organization units herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in organization units herewith reduced or eliminated, not exceeding "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment before the word "within" insert the words "to the public"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$89,267,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$203,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 11, 24, 25, 32, 33, and 34.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: The Senate amendment provides that section 3741 of the Revised Statutes need not be applicable to operations of the Board of Economic Warfare outside continental United States. The Senate recedes.

Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the Office of Price Administration: Appropriates $155,000,000, instead of $130,000,000 as proposed by the House and $177,335,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides that not less than $56,000,000, instead of $59,551,042 as proposed by the House, shall be set apart exclusively for direct obligations of local war-price and rationing boards, strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, for the purchase of commodities or services for the purpose of securing compliance with the law; makes available for traveling expenses, not to exceed $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $8,925,659 as proposed by the Senate; accepts the Senate amendment striking out the House limitation with respect to use of the appropriation, directly or indirectly, for preparing or carrying out any subsidy program; accepts the Senate amendment striking out the House provision prohibiting use of the appropriation for rollbacks on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity; the House bill contains a limitation on use of the Office of Price Administration appropriation prohibiting payment of salary to any person who engages in or directs the formulation of price policy, price ceiling, or maximum price with respect to any article or commodity unless such person has had not less than 5 years of continuous actual business experience in the particular line of business to which the price relates; the Senate struck out this limitation; the conference agreement restores the prohibition modified so as to provide that the appropriation shall not be used for the salary of any person who directs the formulation of a price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce.

No. 10: The House bill contained a limitation on the funds for the Office of Strategic Services prohibiting their use for the salary of any person who at the time of employment thereunder is in the active armed forces of the United States. The Senate struck out this provision and the House accepts the Senate amendment.

No. 12: Appropriates $30,735,000 for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, instead of $30,785,000 as proposed by the Senate and $30,685,000 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 13 and 14, relating to the National War Labor Board: Appropriates $14,091,300, instead of $13,841,300 as proposed by the House and $14,341,900 as proposed by the Senate; and allows $1,369,613 for travel as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,350,000 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, relating to the Office of War Information: Appropriates $33,222,504, instead of $35,037,593 as proposed by the Senate and $28,972,504 as proposed by the House; allocates $24,000,000 to the Overseas Operations Branch, instead of $25,003,590 as proposed by the Senate and $22,500,000 as proposed by the House; allocates $2,750,000 for the Domestic Operations Branch, instead of $3,561,499 as proposed by the Senate and nothing as proposed by the House; retains the bureau earmarking for the Domestic Operations Branch proposed by the Senate modified so as to include the Book and Magazine Coordination Sections but to omit the amount earmarked proposed by the Senate except not to exceed $50,000 for the Motion Picture Bureau and not to exceed $500,000 for liquidation expenses; permits the use of not more than $75,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House, for temporary empolyment in the United States without regard to civil service and classification law; limits travel within the United States to not to exceed $400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House; limits printing and binding expenses within the continental United States to $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House; makes not to exceed $175,000 available for entertainment expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $145,000 as proposed by the House; and inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate prohibiting use of the funds of the Office of War Information for prepartion or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States modified so as to relate the prohibition to "public distribution."

Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to the War Production Board: Appropriates $89,267,720, instead of $88,200,000 as proposed by the House and $89,335,440 as proposed by the Senate; makes $203,720 available for salaries for the Information Division, instead of $136,000 as proposed by the House and $271,440 as proposed by the Senate; and makes a technical correction in the citation of a statute.

No. 29: Appropriates $48,170,000 as proposed by the House instead of $43,170,000 as proposed by the Senate for the War Relocation Authority.

Nos. 30 and 31: Makes technical corrections in the general provisions applicable to the constituent units of the Office for Emergency Management.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 2: Relating to the use of the funds of the Board of Economic Warfare. The managers on the part of the House will move to accept the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 11: Relating to the Office of Civilian Defense. The Senate amendment continues available in 1944 not to exceed $13,359,600 of the unexpended balance of funds heretofore

appropriated for procurement of protective equipment for civilian defense and allows $400,000 for administrative expenses. The House managers will move to accept the Senate amendment providing $10,500,000 of such balance and $700,000 for administrative expense.

No. 24: Relating to the Office of War Information. The Senate amendment prohibits supplementation from any other source of the funds carried in the bill. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 25: Appropriating $138,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of War Mobilization. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 32: The Senate amendment makes the funds in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, available to carry out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 33 and 34: The Senate amendment prohibits use of any of the funds in the bill for the payment of any persons in any of the war agencies included in the bill receiving a salary of $4,500 or more unless such persons have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House managers will move further to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the executive office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the significant feature of the conference report is the unanimity with which it is approved and with which it is supported by all members of the conference committees, both of the House and of the Senate.

In securing agreement of something like a score of men on a bill covering the widest possible range of war activities, it is reasonable to suppose there would be a wide divergence of opinion on many of the items included in such a report. It is particularly notable, therefore, that without a single exception all managers, both those on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate, are in complete agreement on every item presented in the report. All have subscribed to the report and all have announced their intention to support it, and every item in it, on the floor here this afternoon.

This is a very difficult bill and a bill of exceptional importance. It bears the same direct relation to the successful prosecution of the war as that borne by bills providing for armament. It has required more exhaustive and exhausting attention than any bill considered by the Committee on Appropriations within my memory. We opened hearing on the estimates immediately on our return to Washington following the brief Easter recess, and devoted 5 solid weeks to hearings, Saturdays and holidays.

The clerk of the committee, Mr. Sheild, who has so efficiently served the committee and the Congress for considerably in excess of a third of a century, is authority for the statement that it is the most difficult bill reported out by the committee during his long legislative experience. And the fact that all members of the conference committee, all of them veterans of long experience in the House, after extensive and intensive study of the estimates and the evidence have agreed on this report is sufficient to suggest that other Members of the House who may have had less opportunity to study the bill should consider it with some care and circumspection before taking exception to the carefully considered conclusions finally adopted by unanimous approval of the conferees.

The bill is extensive in its application as well as in the appropriations recommended. It provides for 18 war agencies, all of which have been so thoroughly studied and debated in the passage of the bill that I shall not impose on the time of the House to again discuss them, but shall digress long enough to mention 3 which have been the subject of especial interest and criticism.

The Office of Price Administration, for which the House provided $130,000,000 and the Senate $177,000,000, is recommended in the conference report for an appropriation of $155,000,000. The provisions denying funds for subsidies and roll-backs are omitted due to the vote in the House yesterday sustaining a veto of similar provisions in the Commodity Credit bill. The requirement that certain employees have 5 years' experience was modified to require, within the judgment of the Administrator, such employees be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce.

The appropriation for the Office of War Information, fixed by the House at $29,000,000, with no provision for the Domestic Operations Branch, and by the Senate at $35,000,000 with $3,500,000 for domestic operations, is compromised in the conference report at $33,000,000, with an allocation of $2,750,000 for domestic operations. The specific allocations provided by the Senate are omitted in the appropriation recommended in the conference report, and the item is earmarked as to activities rather than amounts.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I am interested in knowing whether or not your committee recommends the continuation of the publication by the Division of Public Inquiries of the Office of War Information of a bulletin which, I believe, is known here as the Government War Manual. It has been published throughout the country, and I believe they have been charging a dollar for it. Is provision made for it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We provided in the report, as the gentleman will note when it is available, a prohibition against their preparing any pamphlet or literature for public distribution in the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. This cannot be published then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill prohibits public distribution. I believe it can be distributed for Government use.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Further answering the gentleman from Arkansas, I may say that this manual has never been printed for public distribution; it is only for distribution to Members of Congress. The other copies are for sale and are not therefore for public distribution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the provision in this bill, I doubt that it can be distributed either for sale or gratuitously to the public. We have an express prohibition against the public distribution of pamphlets or literature in the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. Then this manual cannot in the future be published and distributed to Members of Congress or other Government employees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not for public distribution.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Only for their own use and benefit and information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not deny them the right to distribute publications within the Department itself and to agencies which they serve. To have done that would have prevented them from circulating orders and information essential to the discharge of their duties; but we do prohibit distribution to the public.

Mr. NORRELL. As far as this manual is concerned then it would be possible if they saw fit to continue the publication of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I doubt if it will be available to the public.

Mr. NORRELL. But will be for the exclusive use of Members of Congress and Government employees?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. And for sale.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will be available for all Government agencies.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will it not be available to the public for sale?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I doubt if that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, in the domestic branch of the Office of War Information we accepted the Senate amendment to the extent that we recommend an appropriation of $2,750,000 for domestic operations, but eliminate the provision of the Senate earmarking specific amounts for specific purposes. The conference report proposes to earmark services and activities, but not amounts of money for each, with the exception of the motion picture bureau, for which we specified $50,000.

For the War Relocation Authority the report restored the $5,000,000 reduction of the Senate and retained the figure provided by the House. It appears that the reduction by the Senate of the amount provided for the War Relocation Authority was made on the theory that we are treating the evacuees a little bit too leniently and providing for them a little too luxuriously. As a matter of fact we are providing for them only as required to under the Geneva Agreement.

It is also evident that the cut was made on the theory that by reducing the appropriation they would prevent further release of evacuees from the relocation centers. That, as will be readily understood, was a misapprehension, for unless sufficient money is provided to keep these people in the centers they must be released.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the bill as it now stands contemplates keeping those Japanese as they have been kept thus far and not releasing them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill provides sufficient money to take care of those who are to be held in the relocation centers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for that assurance because my people have great apprehension regarding the number of Japs being released from the relocation camps.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report covers the appropriations for all of the so-called war agencies.

The major items in difference were the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Information. A compromise has been worked out and I propose to discuss this compromise. I do not propose to discuss anything that was not in dispute.

The amount of money allowed for the Office of Price Administration in this bill is $155,000,000. I am going to be perfectly frank. This is more than the House allowed, but it is $22,000,000 less than the Senate allowed. It is $10,000,000 less than the House Appropriations Committee allowed. On the other hand, it comes to exactly the figure I thought they needed after I had spent a long time listening to the hearings and analyzing them very carefully.

I do not want to be responsible for turning this agency loose to go to work unless it has money enough to do a decent job. It has money enough, in my opinion, with that figure to do a decent job. They will need it if they do the job and do it right. They are going to require a very large additional sum of money to operate the local offices and provide the help there with pay as they should be provided with pay. On the other hand, they can save a very large sum of money by getting rid of those long hairs in the Department who have messed up the price and rationing situation so terribly for the last 12 months.

They have not been cleaned out and they must be cleaned out if that office is to operate successfully, whether they operate by means of price control or by means of subsidy. They will have to clean out a large number of the district and regional offices and close most of them. It is expected that they will because those officers have been a menace to the administration of the law.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will after I have finished, because I only have a few moments left.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to talk about the regional offices.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have not included the amendment with reference to subsidy. This is the picture with reference to subsidies: That was in the bill providing for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The House refused to override the veto. Under the circumstances, this bill would go to the White House, it would be vetoed, the bill would not be passed over the veto, and we would be in just the same shape that we are in so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation matter is concerned.

At present here is the situation on prices and subsidies. The thing has been provided for in the commodity Credit Corporation extension resolution that was passed by the House without a record vote yesterday. I believe that it is dangerous, I believe that it is highly inflationary, and I believe that any program of price control is going to result in terrific inflation and terrific distress just so long as it is carried on by the same bungling type of administration that the long hairs have provided in the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can get a successful administration or that we can prevent inflation so long as the long hairs are in a position to decide anything.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], which is in the bill, with revision, in amendment No. 8, and the Clerk has read it, and we have it here available for information, will result in putting people in charge of the formulation of policies on price control and rationing who are experienced business people and who will know enough to handle it and get rid of the long hairs in key positions.

With reference to O. W. I., the provision for the Foreign Service is in the hands of an outfit that at the present time has too much help for its own good and for proper administration. It has very many people in there who should be eliminated from the roll because they are not proper. We have compromised on that at $24,000,000 which, in my opinion, is too high.

With reference to the Domestic Branch as against an estimate of $8,000,000, a House committee recommendation of $5,500,000, and the House action of nothing, we have compromised on $2,750,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The O. W. I. has for the fiscal year 1943, $8,850,000?

Mr. TABER. That is true. The $2,750,000, in my opinion, is too much. On the other hand, we have got to get to a compromise on things if we are going to get legislation. We have eliminated entirely all propaganda in the United States. There are some sections in the O. W. I. that, in my opinion, could be eliminated or cut down very materially. It will be up to Mr. Hoyt, the new Director of the Domestic Branch, to coordinate this situation and clean it up. I believe that our compromise has had to be made not on the basis of need but on the basis of providing some jobs for some of those fellows who are in there. I hope that Mr. Hoyt, the new Director, will take that into consideration when it comes to cleaning that situation up and that he will eliminate those who are absolutely worthless and get rid of them. That is what he has to do if he is going to make a success of it, there is no other way. I have yielded on this $2,750,000 largely as a result of the importunings of the gentleman from Indiana, who has been a great compromiser, but I still think it is up to Mr. Hoyt to save at least a million and a half out of that $2,750,000 if he cleans the thing up and gets rid of the unnecessary help, as I believe he should.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman constantly referred to the word "compromise."

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. I would suggest that the gentleman change that word to "capitulation."

Mr. TABER. It is not a capitulation.

Mr. GAVIN. Most of this is.

Mr. TABER. There are some things this agency needs to do. It needs to go over all of the releases of Government departments and cut out nine-tenths of their crazy publications. It needs to eliminate as far as it can by supervision the unnecessary sending out of articles. For instance, right this day 1 Member

showed me 12 duplicate articles sent out by one bureau addressed to the same man at the same address, from the same unit. That kind of business must stop, and this agency is the one that is supposed to stop it. They also should cut out nine-tenths of the governmental propaganda that is going on. It is absolutely worthless and a menace to the Government.

In addition to cutting out their own publications, it is the duty of O. W. I. to prevent the publication of propaganda and other useless and wasteful publications. This they are not doing. I believe that if they would use their money intelligently and cut out that kind of material they would make a good record. The other things they need to do are to give out the news that needs to be given out with reference to the war, to get rid of these conflicting statements, and see that the news is given to the people promptly and accurately so that they will know what is going on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Governor MORRISON.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the grandest things I ever expect to witness was this House by practically a unanimous vote appropriating $29,000,000,000 to the Navy Department and a little later $71,000,000,000 to the War Department to furnish the resources with which our combat forces can carry our Government to victory.

It is almost incomprehensible that the very same personnel composing this House could descend on other occasions to the smallest wrangles, partisan in character, and sometimes sectional in character, over very little things.

During the last war—I remember it so well, and went through its sufferings, not as a soldier, for I was an old man then—the great President, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Hoover, afterward President, and Barney Baruch pretty well conducted our economic fight, and were criticized and abused throughout it. Now they are lauded every day in the press of the country which is criticizing current affairs. As a man of my party, I thought the last war was gloriously conducted by the able triumvirate I mentioned, but it does not approach the wisdom and success with which we are now conducting our difficulties through this trouble. We have much better managed inflation; we have much better managed prices; we have much better managed supplies and the rationing of food. I think that, instead of our little quarrels, if we would search ourselves, we would find that a great deal of it was partisan, a great deal of it growing out of a man's idea that he can conduct anything better than somebody else is doing it. There are more people about Washington attending to everybody else's business than I ever saw in my life. The legislative branch of the Government wants to attend to the business of the executive or administrative branch of the Government, it seems to me, and all the men in authority have either long hair or curiously made heads, in the opinion of some of us, while there is a tendency on the part of some of the executives to think Congress is something it ought not to be. As a matter of fact, we are doing very well. Let us search ourselves and divest ourselves of every vestige of partisanship and class consciousness and get under the flag and go through our difficulties in unity, as near as we can, recognizing that the responsibility of the lawmaking power is to legislate and that of the administrative branch is to execute and administer. When it is over, I imagine we are going to find that some of these so-called bureaucrats are as good as we are and that they have rendered a great service to the American people.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the effort to terminate the domestic activities of O. W. I., it is consistent to make it a matter of record that this bipartisan move has no connection with the resignation of Gardner Cowles, Jr., of Iowa, as director of the domestic bureau. Mr. Cowles agreed to stay until June 1943, and no longer, when he was drafted by the President personally 1 year ago. His resignation and the selection of Palmer Hoyt, of Oregon, as his successor were announced before the O. W. I. appropriation came out of committee.

During his year here Mr. Cowles was one of the forces for sanity in O. W. I. Members will recall that he was opposed to the radical pamphleteers in O. W. I. They fought him back, but it is of lasting credit to Mr. Cowles that he succeeded in divorcing a dozen or more of them from the O. W. I. pay roll. Perhaps a checkup would reveal that they were immediately hired by some other New Deal agency, for that seems to be the procedure when any reforms in personnel in any given bureau are accomplished. Our war effort would be speeded up if men like Gardner Cowles, Jr., were held here and given more authority to do a job.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a former newspaper man well acquainted with the handling of news matter prior to the formation of O. W. I. and afterward, I wish to show briefly why the newspaper industry and the people of this country need a good, strong, well-managed domestic branch of the Office of War Information.

Newspapers received their news of the war from four different sources, the Army, the Navy, the Office of War Information, and such news as we pick up with our own reporters. The Office of Censorship through the censorship code governs the news we develop in our own communities. The O. W. I. coordinates and delivers the news from 102 different Government agencies which, prior to O. W. I., were sending out gobs and reams of useless and utterly worthless releases. We found in many instances, before the O. W. I. was formed, sharply varying stories on identical subjects being issued the same day. I recall distinctly printing in the newspaper I published before I came here, on the front page one day a story quoting the President as saying there was no need to worry about rubber, and in the column next to it, under the same size head, we quoted Leon Henderson as saying there not rubber enough to run 3 weeks. What were the people to believe?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the domestic branch of the Office of War Information is badly needed and should be strongly supported.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity as I did on a previous question to say that despite my great admiration for some of the gentlemen who attacked O. W. I., and despite my respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am convinced that the amount of the appropriation in this instance for the domestic functions of O. W. I. is inadequate, and I call the attention of those throughout the country in the Civilian Defense set-up to the fact that once this cut is made in the appropriation, the many things that they have used time after time so helpfully, will be denied them, because of the action of this House. I shall vote for the conference report, but I regret the cut in the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to state that I, too, regret very much that the appropriation for the O. W. I. and the O. P. A. have been cut so drastically. Coming from the district I do, composed mainly of consumers, and speaking particularly of the O. P. A., we feel that the O. P. A. is doing a fine job to control prices and keep the cost of living down. I am afraid that this cut may make their job much more difficult, perhaps impossible.

At this time I would like to make mention of one amendment that I am glad to see modified, which would have provided that policy-making officials of the O. P. A. must have at least 5 years' experience in the particular business or industry in which they are making rules as employees of the O. P. A. I agree that there may have been too many long-haired theorists and professors in the O. P. A., but I think it would be too much to ask that a man who has had particular experience in a given field should have had at least 5 years' experience in that field. I think the amendment as now written is much better, leaving it to the Administrator to decide whether the policy-making official has had some experience in business. That may possibly do away with a lot of the theory that has crept in in the writing of the regulations which has had the effect of forcing many small businesses out of existence. It seems to have been the policy of some of the people in the O. P. A. to deliberately go out of their way to put people out of business. I hope that will

be corrected. However, I hope they will not go to the other extreme and take in a large number of representatives of big business who will attempt to put into effect the policies of their firms or industries. They should have people from all fields and all types of business, whose purpose it will be to carry out the President's "hold the line" order and also to see that the small businessman may be kept in business.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, there is a newspaper published in the city of New York known as the New York Post. I very seldom read it, but when I do have occasion to look at it I find it is one newspaper in New York that 365 days out of the year is damning the Congress of the United States. It is one newspaper that from the earliest day has advocated every bit of legislation and every act that has precipitated the war, and that has urged full compliance with all of the New Deal orders, and so on, and have damned and criticized anybody who dared to find any fault with the New Deal. Yet I find this to be the fact.

In accordance with and confirmed by a telephone conversation which I had with Harry N. Bitner, Chief of the Printing and Publishing Section of the W. P. A., these facts came to me yesterday: That on May 17, 1943, W. B. Chandler, then Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of the W. P. A., directed a letter to W. John Logan, Chief of the Compliance Section of the W. P. B., advising him of the violation of the New York Post of W. P. B. regulation in respect to the excessive use of newsprint during the first quarter of 1943. On May 21, 1943, Harry N. Bitner, who succeeded Mr. Chandler as Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of W. P. B., wrote to the Chief of the Compliance Section making inquiry as to the disposition of the complaint filed on May 17. Inquiry was made again on June 21, of M. S. Vernon, Deputy Director of the Compliance Section of the W. P. B. for information as to the disposition of the complaint filed. On June 20 Mr. Bitner was advised by a letter from the Chief of the Compliance Section that the investigation of this matter had not yet been completed, that information had been requested from the director of the regional office of the Compliance Section in New York, and no further information was available.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the third quarter of the year. During the first quarter of this year the Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of the W. P. B. directed a complaint to the Compliance Section of that organization advising it of a violation of the law and the orders of the W. P. B. by this New Deal New York Post newspaper, the newspaper that has been damning Congress and everybody else who dared to oppose anything that the New Deal advocated, and yet we find that newspaper is perhaps the only newspaper in the country that has violated the orders of the W. P. B. in the excessive use of newsprint. Now, I asked the Compliance Section of the W. P. B. since this complaint was filed with it on May 17, 1943, and since repeated demands have been made upon it by the Printing and Publishing Section of the W. P. B. for information, what are you going to do about this complaint? Are you going to ignore it, simply because the New York Post is 100-percent New Deal newspaper? Does the constant adherence to the philosophy of the New Deal immunize a newspaper from prosecution for violation of the plain orders of the W. P. B.? I hope these questions will come to the attention of the gentlemen down in the Compliance Section, and that they will tell the Congress and the people what has held up their prosecution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the intensive lobbying campaign staged by the O. P. A. during the past 48 hours against the so-called grade-labeling amendment which was adopted by both Houses as a rider to the O. P. A. appropriation bill, I deem it advisable, as the author of the amendment, to make a statement clarifying the purpose and objective of it. The O. P. A. is trying to raise a smoke screen and to cause confusion for legitimate industries in the country. The sole objective of the amendment is to stop the O. P. A. from issuing regulations which compel changes in business practices or methods of distribution for commodities and articles of merchandise.

Section 2 (h) of the price-control law of January 30, 1942, provides:

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

The amendment which was offered by me to the O. P. A. appropriation is H. R. 2968, reads as follows:

> *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.

Referring first to the provision of the price-control law of January 30, 1942, which prohibits the O. P. A. from compelling changes in business practices and methods of distribution, we all know that this agency has consistently sought by regulation and order to violate the spirit of the law and to compel industries to depart from the customary methods of distribution of food and other articles. The policy makers in the O. P. A. are determined, as a reform measure, to standardize and grade label all foods and manufactured articles necessary for civilian use. O. P. A. regulations in this respect also attempt to do way with trade names and brands and to limit the choice of articles or food for civilian demand.

My amendment will permit legitimate business in the United States to continue their operations as in the past—using customary business practices and methods of distribution when it comes to grade labeling, brands, and trade marks, and prohibits the O. P. A. from promulgating or enforcing new regulations in this respect unless the industry affected by the new regulation is in agreement.

The lumber industry will continue to use the customary grades established by the industry and its trade, and there is nothing to the claim of the O. P. A. that all historic grades used in the past will be thrown out. Canners of fruits and vegetables will continue to operate under their historic brands and trade names, and manufacturers of hosiery, wearing apparel, and other foods and products, will be permitted to continue as in the past, without being standardized by a reform policy of the O. P. A.

The Office of Price Administration will confine its pricing policy to legitimate and customary grades, brands, and trade-marks of food and articles, and it will be prohibited in its attempt to standardize articles of food for human use and consumption. I trust that this explanation of the amendment will clear up the confusion caused by the O. P. A., and that this agency will hereafter follow the law as intended by Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman explain whether or not the amendment, part of which he has just read and of which he is the author, is broad enough to cover log price ceilings and grades in the lumber industry? I have received a great many telegrams from lumbermen in my district complaining that they have been advised by the legal department of O. P. A. that it does, and they will have to do away with all these grades in lumber, which will demoralize the whole industry. One of the telegrams to which I refer reads as follows:

> PORTLAND, OREG., *July 2, 1943.*
> Congressman HOMER ANGELL,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> House-Senate conference report on War Agencies Appropriations Act has inserted in pending bill covering Office of Price Administration following clause: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities, or articles." We have been advised Office of Price Administration legal department has interpreted phrase, "or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles," as including logs, lumber, and plywood. Elimination of Office of Price Administration log grade enforcement would mean virtual repeal of log price ceiling. Inflationary log prices, coupled with chaotic condition in lumber industry would result. This, in turn, would drastically increase plywood production cost and necessitate immediate upward revision of plywood prices. Furthermore, if Office of Price Administration enforcement of plywood sales on basis of long-established grades is eliminated, confusion and possible upgrading will occur. We believe intent of conference committee was to limit their report to foods and wearing apparel and certainly was not intended to in-

clude the lumber and logging industries. We strongly urge you to immediately call on House conference committee members or take up on floor of Senate if necessary, suggesting that above clause be amended to specifically state that plywood, logs, and lumber are not to be defined as "other processed or manufactured commodities or articles." The conference report will be submitted to both House and Senate for adoption today, Saturday; hence, imperative action be taken to prevent inadvertent enactment of law which would seriously embarrass lumber industry.

THE M. & M. WOODWORKING CO.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. My amendment, which has been adopted by both Houses, and which is not involved in this conference report, has nothing to do with pricing. All it seeks to do is to compel the O. P. A. to live up to the price-control law which was passed in January 1942, and it permits the lumber industry to maintain the grades that existed prior to the establishment of the O. P. A., upon which grades the O. P. A. will have to establish a price ceiling.

Mr. ANGELL. As I understand it, this amendment is not in disagreement at this time and under the parliamentary procedure it is not possible to offer an amendment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is not possible to offer an amendment because it has been concurred in by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. NORMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. NORMAN. The gentleman thinks it would still be possible to have different ceiling prices for different qualities or grades or species of lumber just as we now have?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And just as you had prior to the O. P. A. My amendment simply prohibits the O. P. A. from going on with its reform program, contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is it not true that the present methods and grades used in the lumber industry have been there a long time and that they are the usual trade practices, and therefore not affected by this amendment, as claimed by the O. P. A.?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There can be no question about what the gentleman has said.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The War Production Board has jurisdiction over this standardization matter rather than the O. P. A. All they have to do is to fix the prices after the standards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in whatever may be the final disposition of this conference report I strongly counsel against any further cut in the appropriation for the Office of War Information. In my opinion that office already has been cut altogether too deeply. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a few minutes ago stated to the House that the conferees are asking you to appropriate $2,750,000 to carry on the domestic branch of the Office of War Information during the fiscal year 1944.

I call attention to the fact that while the gentleman has correctly stated the over-all appropriation recommended for that branch, $500,000 of that amount is for liquidation purposes, which reduces the appropriation for operating purposes to the irreducible minimum of $2,250,000. How in the world it will be possible to carry on the essential functions of the domestic branch of the Office of War Information on that amount I do not know. I hope a kind Providence will point out to Elmer Davis how it can be done.

Let us trace the history of the Office of War Information and see how drastically its appropriation has been cut. In the fiscal year 1943 just closed the domestic branch of the Office of War Information had $8,800,000 as its operating fund. For the fiscal year 1944 upon which we are entering the Bureau of the Budget allowed the Office of War Information $8,500,000 for its domestic operating branch. Our Subcommittee on Deficiencies recommended $5,500,000, which was a drastic cut. The House struck out the appropriation for the domestic branch entirely. The Senate reinserted an appropriation of $3,561,000 and in conference we obtained an agreement of $2,750,000, of which, as stated above, $500,000 is to pay liquidating bills on services of the domestic branch that are being closed out under the diminished appropriation. The actual amount allowed the domestic branch for operation in the fiscal year 1944 is $6,550,000 less than that branch had during the fiscal year 1943 just ended.

I am one of those who think that Elmer Davis is not getting a square deal. With splendid zeal he has applied all of the faculties of his brilliant mind in an indefatigable effort to do a good job. If ever a man went to superlative lengths in trying to serve his country conscientiously and well, that man is Elmer Davis. The very nature of his position makes it a maelstrom of conflicting forces and I doubt whether there is a man alive who could do a better job of harnessing the heterogeneous elements and making them work together than Elmer Davis has done. He has a fine vision and has done a great amount of good in many directions, notably in extending United Nations propaganda into Axis countries and he is capable of doing a great deal more toward winning the war if he is given half a chance. Just now criticism of him is at flood tide, much of it politically inspired, but I know something about the earnestness that motivates him and I predict that if he is given the support he ought to have, or anything like it, he will make a record of useful service in these crucial times that he and his family and friends may look upon with pride in the years to come.

Amid the trials and tribulations that surround Mr. Davis he reminds me of the patriarch Job, who also was on the hot spot most of the time. I think it is safe to say that Elmer has more troubles than Job ever had boils—painful, festering troubles. Like Job, he is gifted with patience that is as resilient as a No. 1 grade of rubber, and after every rebuff he bounces back smiling. The Biblical Encyclopedia, page 217, in discussing the Book of Job says:

All that we know of the author is that he was a literary genius with a rich and original mind.

That reminds me of Elmer Davis. Discussing the purpose of the Book of Job, the same authority says:

The book is a saga with a historical foundation based on a figure of long ago. The popular story or prose part teaches that despite our wariness Satan overcomes us, but God will reward us in the end.

This leads to some hope that Elmer Davis will come out all right in the end. Satan is landing on him with some stiff uppercuts now, but his time may be coming.

I plead with you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, to be fair to Elmer Davis. He is handling a big job efficiently and in a big way, and he needs our consolation to take his mind off of the boils.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the compromises, so-called, but in reality complete capitulation on these various amendments involving O. P. A. In the first place, this conference report provides for the acceptance of Senate amendment No. 7 relative to the House antisubsidy provision. Only yesterday by a majority of 74 the House indicated that it is opposed to the use of Federal subsidies for rolling back food prices. On various other occasions the House has taken similar action.

Another reason I am opposed to this increase of $25,000,000 above the amount recommended by the House for the administration of O. P. A. is because during the current year the O. P. A. has had approximately 50,000 employees, and under this proposal brought in by the conference committee the O. P. A. will probably be permitted to expand its personnel an additional 10,000. I am opposed to those concessions which are in conflict with the desire of the House to curb expansion of bureaucratic activities which are a direct threat to the war effort on the home front.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an address that I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] 2 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this conference report. Before coming to the main point of my remarks I want to say that I particularly favor the better treatment given herein to O. W. I. and O. P. A. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said something about curbing the powers of the long hairs, whatever he meant by that. Can it be that the gentleman thinks that unless an administrator of one of these vital war agencies is picked from the Republican Party or from big business, he is utterly incompetent? Those in charge of O. P. A. have an almost superhuman task to carry on regardless of their party affiliations or their business experience and connection. O. P. A. needs help more in the local districts. I find that it is being poorly administered in some places because they do not have the help which they need out in the localities where it must be administered. I am sorry that more was not furnished for out there.

However, I rose chiefly to commend the committee and especially the chairman of that committee for his assurance given me a moment ago in regard to the sufficiency of funds to keep properly the Japanese who are interned in concentration camps and in relocation camps.

In my State there are two large relocation camps. We did not ask that they be located in Arizona but we do ask that they be properly managed. There have been a great many complaints that those Japs have been given better care than they should have been given. I trust that in this bill enough money has been appropriated to take care of those people in a proper manner according to international law and treaty conventions. That is all we ask to be done for them and all which ought to be done.

On the other hand, a great many of my people are complaining that there are too many dangerous Japanese being turned loose. Congress must furnish enough funds to keep all these people who need to be kept for the safety of our country. That is why I asked the chairman a moment ago if there were sufficient funds in this appropriation to take care of all Japanese who ought to be in relocation camps. Candidly, I do not want them in Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my position on the pending conference report. I am not satisfied with the capitulation of the House conferees on two items for the O. P. A., nor their capitulation on the O. W. I. program.

I realize, however, there come times when there must be a certain amount of compromise in order to get any legislation through, particularly at certain stages of its consideration and at the end of a session.

The Senate restored a portion of the funds asked for the domestic operations branch of the O. W. I. The House conferees succeeded in obtaining a reduction from the amount which the Senate approved. During the past fiscal year the domestic operation branch of the O. W. I. used a little more than $8,500,000 for its operation. It did seek to censor the press; it did indulge in propaganda activities on the domestic front. Of the sum of $2,700,000 which is provided for O. W. I. for the fiscal year 1944, a half million dollars is for liquidation purposes. Three branches have been entirely eliminated; the most objectionable features of the domestic branch of the O. W. I. have been completely eliminated.

It has been my privilege to discuss with the newly appointed Director of the Domestic Operations Branch of the O. W. I., Mr. E. P. Hoyt of Oregon, what his policy is to be. This gentleman's character and ability have been ably defended by the Senators from Oregon and also by the Representatives from that great State.

Mr. Hoyt has been one of the bitterest critics of the censorship efforts in the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. His statements concerning this effort have been brought to the attention of the public through the press of the Nation.

As a reputable Republican newspaperman of long experience and a newspaperman who has successful practical experience in the newspaper field, he has assured the leadership of the House, both Democratic and Republican; the conferees for the House; and he has assured me personally that he is opposed to press censorship of domestic policies or domestic issues and there will be no attempt at censorship under his administration. He furthermore stated he was opposed to tinging or coloring domestic news and that there would be none under his administration. He is a decent, honorable man, and I take him at his word. I hope that Mr. Elmer Davis, a brilliant man in the radio and the newspaper field, and a member of the American Labor Party of New York City, will permit Mr. E. P. Hoyt, a reputable, outstanding Republican newspaperman and an outstanding American from the State of Oregon, operate the Domestic Operation Branch of the O. W. I. so that it will not attempt to censor the press nor attempt to propagandize the people of this country along class and socialistic lines, such as was done during the past 12 months.

I yield now to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I agree with every word the gentleman from Alabama has said with reference to Mr. Hoyt, who has become the head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I.

Mr. Hoyt, as the gentleman from Alabama has stated, is the publisher of the Portland Oregonian in my district, a man of outstanding qualifications, with long experience in the newspaper profession, and I am certain from my own acquaintance of long standing with him that he will perform his duties as he indicated to the gentleman from Alabama. I am sure his only desire is to advance the war effort and make available to the public all the news free from propaganda and unadulterated with political considerations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the previous question is ordered on the adoption of a conference report, would it be in order to offer a preferential motion to recommit the bill for further disagreement to specific amendments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I only yielded time to the gentleman for the purpose of debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that I am merely making a parliamentary inquiry. I made no motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, the Chair states that it would be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress must pursue his legislative responsibility in his own way. I recognize that in a bicameral legislative system there come times when it is necessary to compromise. I believe, however, that sometimes the gentle art of compromise becomes a little too facile. The great issues which have marked the history of the Republic have been met in most cases by determination and courage not to compromise.

I regret exceedingly that I must depart from the position taken by the very able gentlemen who compromised the different committee items with respect to this bill.

An amendment was submitted on the floor of this House and was adopted by a substantial vote, which reduced the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration by $30,000,000. There has been a compromise on that and $20,000,000 has been restored. I believe that is an indefensible action, in my own judgment at least, and so I cannot go along with the suggestions from the conference committee. The people demand retrenchment. I am persuaded that greater efficiency in O. P. A. will enable them to perform their responsibilities with $130,000,000.

The second amendment on which the conferees yielded, or yielded substantially, was that provision which would require 5 years of business experience on the part of the executive price directors and the officials under him who actually formulate price policies. As is now being provided, that becomes a discretionary power lodged in the Administrator and in my considered judgment, although restrictive, has limited the possibilities of bringing more business experience into the Office of Price Administration. I was rather amazed at the paucity of the testimony before the Senate Committee on those two items. The House approved this proposal by a vote of 188 to 144. The testimony is incontrovertible that scores of price executives came direct from academic halls to O. P. A. No effort has been made to controvert that statement. It is now proposed to recede on this position and per-

mit the condition to continue. It remains no longer a bureaucracy but a neocracy, which according to definition is Government by untried or inexperienced hands. Too many business enterprises have already suspended operations and too many are in danger of suspending business in the near future to blink this condition and I must keep the record straight on this point. But the conferees have yielded.

The third amendment on which there was compromise was that which related to subsidies and roll-backs. You will recall that we interdicted the use of any funds for anyone who was engaged in the preparation or calculation of subsidies. The Senate I think probably took the position that the House ought to recede on that item in view of the action taken on the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That, however, had been enacted by both Houses and was vetoed, although a very distinct majority of the Members of this House voted to override the veto. There will therefore be no further opportunity before the recess to record ourselves on that issue unless it should come in the form of a Senate amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill now being considered by the other body.

There are three items in the conference report with which I am not satisfied and so, in accord with the ruling just made by the Speaker that a privileged motion will be in order to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees, such a motion will be made when the previous question is ordered on the conference report. I speak only for myself. I cannot go along with this action.

If the language of these amendments is deemed to be faulty, then an effort should be made to concur with other language which sets forth the clear intent of this body and is at the same time calculated to meet Senate favor. There is no evidence of such action before us.

If it be argued that the Senate will accept no other position, then it should be made quite clear that the House is a patient body, devoted to its convictions and willing to take the time necessary to translate such convictions into law.

I was not a little astonished at the meagerness of the testimony on all of these items before the Senate committee as indicated in the hearings. Virtually on the statement of the Administrator alone was the House position reversed.

In the light of these circumstances I deem it a clear duty to submit the privileged motion to instruct further disagreement on the part of those who represent the House in this conference.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill which we are considering now should have been the law several days ago. The fact that it is not the law, however, is no fault of the House of Representatives. There is no need, however, to follow that observation any further. The fact remains that there are a great many important activities in this bill; agencies and departments vitally necessary in the conduct of the war which are out of funds, and there is every reason for the greatest expedition in the consideration of this bill.

A great many amendments were inserted in the bill by the Senate. The House conferees had a number of meetings. They worked hard to uphold the position of the House, and the result we bring you is the best we could get. It is a compromise of the differences between the two bodies, a compromise of the judgments between the Members of the two bodies, and that is what most important legislation is in the last analysis. We have our opinion, the other body has its opinion; we try to get together on them.

With reference to the matter about which the gentleman from Illinois spoke, to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees: This will simply tie it up so tight you could not drive a wedge into it. It may be, of course, that you do not care anything about the recess; maybe we should beat our breasts and wave the flag and say: "Let's stay in Washington." I do not feel that way about it. In my judgment the best thing that can be done for the good of this country is to let the men who have been working here days and weeks and months and years get away from this Capital a little and rejuvenate themselves, go back and talk to their constituents a little. I think that is a fine contribution to the war effort, because I see men on the floor of this House—not all of them perhaps, but a great many of them—who are having to work far too hard. It is time we get away from here; we ought to have some concern for getting away from here, and we ought to do it in the interest of the country's business.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I want to say this with reference to the subsidy amendment: That I am opposed to subsidies, but after the vote on yesterday I see no way of preventing subsidies for the time being until the Committee on Banking and Currency can bring in other legislation with reference to that subject.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. TABER. And for that reason my vote today against the motion which the gentleman from Illinois will make will not be because I am in favor of subsidies but because I believe that this is a stopgap and that we must go along with it until such action as I have indicated can be taken.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is eminently correct. To write that provision in this bill would mean that the bill would come back here without agreement from the other body or if both bodies agreed, it would come back under a veto.

As to O. P. A., the bill as it came from the committee recommended $165,000,000 for O. P. A., under a unanimous report of the House committee, but the House in its judgment cut that to $130,000,000. The Senate raised it to $177,000,000. We compromised the amount at $155,000,000. With the $155,000,000 we shall not be able to give any additional help to the local boards; we shall not be able to carry on the organization even at its present strength, because the $155,000,000 will be $5,000,000 less than the annual amount it takes to carry their organization at their present level. So what you are doing is stream-lining O. P. A. to a basis $5,000,000 under its present level. Personally, I think they can do it; I believe Prentiss Brown will do it, but we must bear in mind the further fact that the committee was notified and the country was notified there were seven additional rationing programs that seemed to be inevitable in the future.

If we are going to have this medium to try to control prices, and to ration commodities that are on the rationing list, then the worst thing that the Congress can do is to refuse to implement it by the necessary personnel to carry it out. I believe the conferees have done the best they could here and in the interest of expediting this legislation and in the interest of getting the money to these agencies that need it, I hope the House will support the conferees who are unanimous, everyone of us, in supporting it, and adopt the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves to recommit the conference report with instructions to the House conferees to insist on House disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 8.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am; yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 42, noes 94.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, then, on the ground a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 241, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—99

Andersen, H. Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Busbey
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mo.	Cannon, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Carlson, Kans.
Arends	Boren	Carson, Ohio
Barrett	Brehm	Chiperfield
	Brown, Ohio	Church
	Buffett	Clevenger

Cole, Mo.	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Cox	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Cravens	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Crawford	Johnson,	Rizley
Cunningham	Anton J.	Rockwell
Curtis	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.
Day	Jonkman	Schwabe
Dirksen	Keefe	Short
Dworshak	Kinzer	Simpson, Ill.
Ellis	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Gathings	Lewis	Springer
Gavin	McCowen	Stefan
Gilchrist	McGehee	Stewart
Graham	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Grant, Ind.	McWilliams	Talbot
Griffiths	Maas	Taile
Gross	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Gwynne	Miller, Mo.	Vursell
Hagen	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel, Ohio
Hale	Mundt	West
Harness, Ind.	Murray, Wis.	Wheat
Heidinger	Norman	Willey
Hoeven	Norrell	Wilson
Hoffman	Pace	Winter
Hope	Pittenger	Wolcott
Horan	Ploeser	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—241

Abernethy	Fulbright	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Gale	May
Allen, La.	Gamble	Merrow
Anderson,	Gavagan	Michener
N. Mex.	Gearhart	Miller, Conn.
Andrews	Gibson	Mills
Angell	Gillette	Monkiewicz
Arnold	Goodwin	Monroney
Auchincloss	Gordon	Morrison, La.
Bates, Mass.	Gore	Morrison, N. C.
Beall	Gorski	Mott
Beckworth	Gossett	Mruk
Bell	Granger	Murdock
Bender	Grant, Ala.	Murphy
Blackney	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Bland	Halleck	Myers
Bloom	Hancock	Newsome
Bolton	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	O'Connor
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Ark.	O'Konski
Brooks	Harris, Va.	O'Neal
Brown, Ga.	Hartley	Outland
Bryson	Hays	Patman
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Patton
Burch, Va.	Herter	Peterson, Fla.
Burchill, N. Y.	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Burdick	Hill	Pfeifer
Burgin	Hinshaw	Poulson
Butler	Hobbs	Powers
Camp	Hoch	Price
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Priest
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Rabaut
Carter	Hull	Ramey
Case	Jackson	Ramspeck
Celler	Jarman	Randolph
Chapman	Jeffrey	Rankin
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Johnson,	Richards
Clason	Luther A.	Rivers
Coffee	Johnson,	Robertson
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Compton	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Calif.
Cooley	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	Judd	Rohrbough
Courtney	Kearney	Rolph
Creal	Kee	Rowan
Crosser	Kefauver	Rowe
Cullen	Kelley	Sabath
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Sadowski
Davis	Kerr	Sauthoff
Delaney	Kilday	Scanlon
Dewey	Kirwan	Schuetz
Dies	Klein	Scott
Dilweg	Kunkel	Sheridan
Dingell	LaFollette	Simpson, Pa.
Disney	Lambertson	Slaughter
Ditter	Lane	Smith, Maine
Domengeaux	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Larcade	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas	LeCompte	Sparkman
Durham	LeFevre	Spence
Eberharter	Lemke	Stanley
Elliott	Luce	Starnes, Ala.
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Steagall
Ellsworth	Lynch	Stearns, N. H.
Engel	McCord	Stockman
Feighan	McGranery	Sullivan
Fellows	McLean	Taber
Fenton	McMillan	Tarver
Fernandez	Madden	Taylor
Fisher	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Manasco	Thomason
Fogarty	Mansfield,	Towe
Folger	Mont.	Troutman
Forand	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio	White	Wolfenden, Pa.
Walter	Whitten	Wolverton, N. J.
Wasielewski	Whittington	Woodrum, Va.
Weaver	Wickersham	Wright
Weiss	Wigglesworth	Zimmerman
Wene	Winstead	

NOT VOTING—91

Baldwin, Md.	Hall,	O'Hara
Baldwin, N. Y.	Leonard W.	O'Leary
Barden	Hart	O'Toole
Barry	Hébert	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Heffernan	Phillips
Boykin	Holifield	Plumley
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Poage
Buckley	Johnson,	Pracht
Byrne	Calvin D.	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Johnson,	Russell
Cochran	J. Leroy	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ward	Satterfield
Costello	Kean	Schiffler
Culkin	Kennedy	Shafer
Curley	Kilburn	Sheppard
Dawson	King	Sikes
Dickstein	Kleberg	Snyder
Drewry	Lesinski	Stevenson
Eaton	McCormack	Sumners, Tex.
Elmer	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Fay	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Fish	Magnuson	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Treadway
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Fulmer	Mason	Vincent, Ky.
Furlong	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Miller, Pa.	Wadsworth
Gerlach	Nichols	Ward
Gifford	Norton	Welch
Gillie	O'Brien, Ill.	Whelchel, Ga.
Green	O'Brien, N. Y.	Worley
Hall,		
Edwin Arthur		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Schiffler.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kean.

Mr. McMurray with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Sundstrom.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Ward with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Barry with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: On page 6, line 9, insert the following:

"No part of any funds appropriated or made available herein to the Board of Economic Warfare shall be used after August 15, 1943, directly or indirectly for the procurement of services, supplies, or equipment outside the United States except for the purpose of executing economic programs or policies formally approved in writing by a majority of the Board and such writing has been filed with the Secretary of State prior to any such expenditure."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "executing" insert the word "general."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: On page 19, line 24, insert the following: "Civilian Defense: Not to exceed $13,359,600 of th unexpended balance of $100,000,000 contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for the same objects and purposes, including the obligations chargeable to said appropriation, and subject to the same conditions and limitations: *Provided*, That the total amount available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed $400,000.

"The appropriations herein made for the Office of Civilian Defense shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any Federal source."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, strike out the figure "$13,359,600" and insert "$10,500,000," and in line 8 of said amendment strike out the figure "$400,000" and insert "$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 30, line 15, insert the following: "The appropriation herein made for the Office of War Information shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 30, line 19, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Mobilization, including salary of the Director at $15,000 per annum; salaries of two Assistant Directors at $9,000 per annum each; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; and printing and binding, $138,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32: On page 41, line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 102. On the effective date of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943, (1) the amounts appropriated in the first, second, and fourth paragraphs under the heading "Vocational rehabilitation" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be consolidated into one fund and shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943; except that not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in providing rehabilitation for disabled residents of the District of Columbia, including printing and binding, travel and subsistence; and (2) the amount appropriated in the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Vocational rehabilitation' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943, and for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1559, 1560)."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 43, line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Amendment No. 34: Page 43, line 18, strike out "203" and insert "204."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes, at the conclusion of which I shall yield 2 minutes each to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and then move the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, this is the proposition to require confirmation by the Senate of all persons receiving salaries in excess of $4,500. Such a provision would hardly be practical at this time for the reason that it would involve minutiae delaying the war effort, particularly if the Congress is in recess during the several weeks immediately ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that any person receiving any money that is provided for salaries in this bill and receiving a salary over $4,500 must be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This provision is so drawn and so worded that it is absolutely impossible of administration. It is so drawn that it would put these agencies all out of business in that every one of those receiving a salary as large as that would be off the rolls until they were nominated and confirmed—a proposition that is absolutely impossible in view of the impending recess of Congress. It would be a dangerous thing to do, and I do not see how the House could join in doing it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the Civil Service Committee, which has a bill relating to this subject under consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed a general bill dealing with the subject of Senate confirmation. It passed about 2 or 3 weeks ago. I have publicly announced that in due time the House Committee on the Civil Service will give everybody who is interested an opportunity to be heard on the legislation. Certainly we ought not to legislate on such a far-reaching problem as this by a rider on an appropriation bill. I hope the House will vote to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, that we shall have a chance to vote on this matter at some other day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia did not give that kind of an assurance. He said that his committee was going to give this matter very thorough consideration. Whether there will be a vote on it the Chair does not know.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we disagree with the Senate, can we get any legislation at all?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer such a question.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 29, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—302

Abernethy	Dirksen	Jensen
Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Domengeaux	Anton J.
Andersen,	Dondero	Johnson, Ind.
H. Carl	Doughton	Johnson,
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas	Luther A.
Anderson,	Dworshak	Johnson,
N. Mex.	Elliott	Lyndon B.
Andrews	Ellis	Johnson, Okla.
Angell	Ellison, Md.	Jones
Arends	Elsworth	Jonkman
Arnold	Elston, Ohio	Judd
Auchincloss	Engel	Kearney
Barrett	Feighan	Kee
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Keefe
Beall	Fernandez	Keogh
Beckworth	Fisher	Kerr
Bender	Flannagan	Kilday
Bennett, Mich.	Fogarty	Kinzer
Bennett, Mo.	Folger	Kirwan
Bishop	Forand	Klein
Blackney	Fulbright	Knutson
Bloom	Gale	Kunkel
Bolton	Gamble	LaFollette
Brehm	Gavagan	Lambertson
Brooks	Gearhart	Landis
Brown, Ga.	Gibson	Lane
Brown, Ohio	Gilchrist	Lanham
Bryson	Gillette	Larcade
Bulwinkle	Goodwin	Lea
Burchill, N. Y.	Gordon	LeCompte
Burdick	Gore	LeFevre
Burgin	Gorski	Lemke
Busbey	Gossett	Lewis, Ohio
Butler	Graham	Luce
Camp	Granger	Ludlow
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	Lynch
Cannon, Fla.	Grant, Ind.	McCord
Cannon, Mo.	Gregory	McCowen
Carlson, Kans.	Griffiths	McGregor
Carson, Ohio	Gross	McLean
Carter	Gwynne	McMillan
Case	Hagen	McWilliams
Celler	Hale	Maas
Chapman	Halleck	Madden
Chenoweth	Hancock	Mahon
Chiperfield	Hare	Manasco
Church	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield,
Clason	Harness, Ind.	Mont.
Clevenger	Harris, Ark.	Marcantonio
Coffee	Harris, Va.	Martin, Iowa
Cole, Mo.	Hartley	Martin, Mass.
Colmer	Hays	May
Compton	Hendricks	Merrow
Cooley	Herter	Michener
Cooper	Hess	Miller, Conn.
Costello	Hill	Miller, Mo.
Courtney	Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.
Cox	Hobbs	Mills
Cravens	Hoeven	Monkiewicz
Creal	Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.
Crosser	Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, N. C.
Cullen	Hope	Mruk
Cunningham	Horan	Murdock
Curtis	Howell	Murphy
D'Alesandro	Hull	Murray, Wis.
Day	Jackson	Newsome
Delaney	Jarman	Norman
Dewey	Jeffrey	Norrell
Dilweg	Jenkins	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell	Jennings	O'Connor

O'Neal	Rowe	Taylor
Outland	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Patman	Sadowski	Thomason
Patton	Sauthoff	Tibbott
Peterson, Ga.	Schiffler	Towe
Pfeifer	Schuetz	Troutman
Pittenger	Schwabe	Voorhis, Calif.
Ploeser	Scott	Vorys, Ohio
Poulson	Short	Vursell
Powers	Sikes	Wasielewski
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Weaver
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Welchel, Ohio
Rabaut	Slaughter	Welch
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wene
Ramspeck	Smith, W. Va.	Wheat
Randolph	Smith, Wis.	Whelchel, Ga.
Reece, Tenn.	Somers, N. Y.	Whitten
Reed, Ill.	Sparkman	Whittington
Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wickersham
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Wigglesworth
Richards	Stanley	Willey
Rivers	Starnes, Ala.	Wilson
Rizley	Steagall	Winstead
Robertson	Stearns, N. H.	Winter
Robinson, Utah	Stefan	Wolcott
Rockwell	Stockman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rodgers, Pa.	Sullivan	Wolverton, N. J.
Rogers, Calif.	Sumner, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Rogers, Mass.	Taber	Woodrum, Va.
Rohrbough	Talbot	Wright
Rolph	Talle	Zimmerman
Rowan	Tarver	

NAYS—29

Bell	Johnson, Calvin D.	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Kelley	Rankin
Bradley, Pa.	McGehee	Scanlon
Crawford	McGranery	Sheridan
Davis	Mott	Smith, Ohio
Eberharter	Mundt	Stewart
Gathings	Murray, Tenn.	Vincent, Ky.
Heidinger	Myers	Weiss
Hoch	Pace	White
Hoffman		Worley

NOT VOTING—99

Andresen, August H.	Furlong	Monroney
Baldwin, Md.	Gallagher	Nichols
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Norton
Barden	Gerlach	O'Brien, Ill.
Barry	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Gillie	O'Hara
Bland	Green	O'Konski
Bonner	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Philbin
Buckley	Hébert	Phillips
Buffett	Heffernan	Plumley
Burch, Va.	Holifield	Poage
Byrne	Izac	Pracht
Capozzoli	Johnson, J. Leroy	Robsion, Ky.
Clark	Johnson, Ward	Russell
Cochran	Kean	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Kefauver	Satterfield
Culkin	Kennedy	Shafer
Curley	Kilburn	Sheppard
Dawson	King	Smith, Va.
Dickstein	Kleberg	Snyder
Dies	Lesinski	Stevenson
Disney	McCormack	Sumners, Tex.
Drewry	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Durham	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Magnuson	Tolan
Elmer	Maloney	Treadway
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Fellows	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Fish	Merritt	Wadsworth
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Pa.	Walter
Ford		Ward
Fulmer		West

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Russell with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Barry with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. West with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. KELLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. HOCH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EBERHARTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. DAY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the two conference reports have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House be authorized to sign the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the House may in the meantime have adjourned before the bill has received the signature of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; and

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes."

INDUCTION OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "satisfactorily."
Page 1, line 6, strike out "normal."
Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "perform satisfactorily" and insert "pursue."
Page 2, line 9, strike out "satisfactorily."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please tell us what these amendments are?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided that the students in the last half of year should pursue satisfactorily

their course of training. The word "satisfactorily" was inserted by the House with the idea in view that some boy who might be excused from military service by getting to school would soldier on the job. The Senate struck that out. It leaves it so that if he pursues the course of study at all he may be excused from military service.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He is supposed to be up in his studies anyway?

Mr. MAY. Yes. It was suggested to me that there were no high schools in the country that do not require the student to study satisfactorily, else he would be kicked out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the only change?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SESSION ON MONDAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that there will be a session of the House on Monday next, and that business as usual will be enacted.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION TO INVESTIGATE IMPROVEMENT OF COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 262, which I send to the desk and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make an investigation of the plans for the improvement of the Columbia River and its tributaries for utilization of its waters for reclamation, flood control, navigation, and hydro-electric power generation, and the cost and effect of proposed water storage in Lake Pend Oreille in the State of Idaho.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Idaho", insert "and Flathead Lake in the State of Montana."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. A controversy has arisen between the people of Montana and Idaho with the Bonneville Power Authority over the use to be made of the water resources of the tributaries of the Columbia River. The dispute has been brought to a head by the proposal to leave out beneficial projects, in both Montana and Idaho, and make storage projects in Flathead Lake in Montana and Lake Pend d'Oreille in Idaho. This would destroy large areas of producing farm land and endanger the transportation on the transcontinental railroads crossing the area.

It is proposed to rush these projects through as a war measure when the utilities section of the W. P. B. say they are not necessary and would make a heavy drain on the critical materials needed in war production. After the Rules Committee heard the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], and others, and no opposition was interposed, we came to the conclusion that we should report the resolution favorably, which action was unanimous.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 262 introduced by the gentleman from Idaho, for the purpose of investigating the facilities from an irrigation and power point of view of Lake Pend Oreille in Idaho and Flathead Lake in Montana. The reason for this proposed investigation is to bring to the attention of the Congress all the facts which can be ascertained about that region, because in recent weeks the Bonneville administration and the Army engineers have shown great interest in those particular localities.

This investigation, I think, is both necessary and worth while and in order to explain my position in this matter I should like to tell the Congress what has been developing in the Flathead region of Montana. About 3 months ago I began to receive letters from various organizations and individuals in that part of my State asking me what truth there was in rumors to the effect that Flathead Lake was to be raised. I inquired among the various Government agencies in Washington which might have an interest in that particular possibility and found out, so I thought, that there was nothing being considered in that area. However, the rumors kept growing, the letters kept increasing, and finally on May 19 a representative of the State of Montana came to Washington for the purpose of meeting with the Army engineers and the Bonneville Power Authority about the possibility of raising the level of Flathead Lake. I attended the meeting with this representative, Mr. Al Winkler, chairman of the Montana Highway Commission, and in attendance also were Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Authority; Mr. Arthur Goldschmidt, Acting Director of Power; Gen. Warren T. Hannum and Col. Richard Parks, of the Army engineers; and Senator MURRAY. It was brought out at that meeting definitely and for the first time that the Army engineers had investigated the area around Flathead Lake with the idea of raising its level from 2,893 feet, which is the present height, to 2,910 feet by 1945 and 2,930 feet ultimately. According to General Hannum this was necessary to supply surplus energy for Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and was a wartime necessity.

I pointed out at that meeting that if the proposed raising of Flathead Lake were to go through that it would mean that such towns as Somers, Elmo, Dayton, Big Fork, and parts of Polson and Kalispell, as well as much rich agricultural land and many lake residences, would be inundated. Dr. Raver claimed that it was a good idea to bring about a raising of Flathead Lake so that Montana could develop the power for future industrial development. That may be so; I am not in a position to say because I do not have the necessary technical knowledge, but I felt then, and I feel now, that it would not be wise to put such a program into operation because of the fact that the area which would derive the greatest benefits would be downstream, which areas have expanded tremendously from an industrial point of view since the start of the present conflict. I also pointed out to Dr. Raver that Montana was being drained of much of its natural resources as well as its manpower during the course of the present conflict. I am quite certain from what I said that Dr. Raver and the other assembled gentlemen were aware of my opposition to this proposal, but I felt there was a distinct possibility of this matter being pushed through under the guise of war necessity. This will explain to my colleagues why I have been asking questions about the Flathead when Army appropriations were being considered by this body. However, out of this meeting came an agreement that a hearing would be held by members of the Army engineers and the Bonneville Authority at Helena, the State capital of Montana, on June 1, and at Kalispell, the largest town in the affected area, on June 3. After investigating the matter further and getting what information I could I filed a telegram of protest against the proposed raising of Flathead Lake before the meetings at Helena and at Kalispell. Before and at the time of the Kalispell meeting the people of Montana were distinctly worried and expressions of support of the people of the Flathead against the proposed raising of the lake came from all sections of the State.

Places like Miles City, 600 miles away, Billings, 450 miles away, Great Falls, Butte, Helena, Hamilton, Missoula, and many other cities sent in their protests and also sent delegations. There was not one voice in Montana raised in support of the proposal of the Army Engineers and the Bonneville Authority to raise Flathead Lake, and at the meeting held in Kalispell on June 3, 3,000 people jammed the high-school auditorium and many hundreds more took in the proceedings from the outside by means of

loudspeakers. There was a tenseness in the air which the Federal authorities were well aware of, and at times there were possibilities that the audience would get out of hand. Those people were there representing their homes and the things which they held best in life. They were prepared to fight to the limit of their ability to protect their lake and their valley. They were determined to have the same valley for their sons, who number in excess of 3,000, when they came back from service in the armed forces of the United States. They were determined to save their towns, to preserve their lumber industries, to keep the 50,000 acres of farm land which the lake would inundate if raised, in production. They were united in their opposition, and they made their opposition known in unmistakable terms. The result of this meeting was that the Authority decided to look elsewhere for power development, and on June 7, after we had found out what we could about what had occurred at Kalispell, I called Dr. Raver on the phone and asked him to call a meeting of the advisory board to meet with the Montana congressional delegation the next morning to discuss developments on the Flathead Lake project.

Dr. Raver was very much disinclined to assemble such a meeting, stating that he was leaving town in the afternoon and believed it was an imposition to ask the other members of the board to meet on such short notice due to the fact that "during the war emergency it has been determined that the Flathead project is out." I insisted on the meeting, stating that the matter was of tremendous importance to Montana, to which Dr. Raver replied, "As far as Montana is concerned, they are not going ahead with the project there anyway, so they shouldn't be worried." He further stated that this information "had been cleared with everybody on the advisory board already."

However, since newspaper releases carried the information that work was to begin July 1, I felt that a telephone conversation was not sufficient assurance that the project was called off, and I therefore insisted that the board and the congressional delegation meet together, at which time all the cards could be laid on the table and final disposition made of the proposal. Accordingly, Dr. Raver agreed to a meeting Tuesday, June 8, at 10 o'clock, in his office. At that meeting Senators WHEELER and MURRAY and Congressman O'CONNOR and I met with Dr. Raver and Arthur Goldschmidt, of the Bonneville Advisory Board, and at that conference we were given a copy of the telegram which had been sent to Mr. Marlett, Dr. Raver's executive assistant, and on the basis of that telegram and Dr. Raver's answers to our queries, we notified the press and radio of western Montana as follows:

Senators WHEELER and MURRAY and Congressmen O'CONNOR and MANSFIELD held a conference with Dr. Raver and Arthur Goldschmidt of the Bonneville Advisory Board and were informed by them that because of the loss in lumber, agricultural products, and the disruption of other war activities which would be occasioned by the raising of the waters of the Flathead Lake the Army Engineers and the Bonneville Advisory Board have concluded that other alternatives for securing additional water necessary for power for war purposes should be explored elsewhere at this time; that the Army Engineers are being requested to hold a public hearing at Lake Pend Oreille for the construction of a low dam at Albeni Falls for the storage of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water. As a result of our conference we feel that the question of raising Flathead Lake as has been proposed is ended. The Montana delegation called attention to the fact that there were power sites on the South Fork and North Fork of the Flathead River which together in their opinion would be ample to provide for the entire run-off of the Flathead Basin. It is our understanding that these projects will be investigated. The delegation also called attention to the possibility of securing additional power at Fort Peck, Canyon Ferry, Little Big Horn, and the Yellowstone River.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
MIKE MANSFIELD.

We felt the matter had been settled but we kept getting letters from the State about the fears of the people who wanted a definite answer about this project. After concluding the Flathead hearings the authorities decided to hold a public hearing to consider the raising of Lake Pend Oreille. In the meantime I had communicated with Dr. Raver again and asked him a number of questions. I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include a letter which I wrote to Dr. Raver on May 29 and his reply to me of June 12, 9 days after the hearing at Kalispell was concluded:

MAY 29, 1943.

DR. PAUL RAVER,
Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. RAVER: There are a number of questions that have occurred to me in connection with the proposed raising of the level of Flathead Lake, Mont., which I am listing below, and to which I would appreciate your sending me specific and detailed answers at your earliest convenience:

1. What is the cost of power from Grand Coulee now?
2. What is the cost of power from Kerr Dam now?
3. What will the cost of power from Kerr Dam be if the proposed project is completed?
4. With regard to the use of generators at Grand Coulee now, what is the present capacity? How much is utilized? How many more generators are needed?
5. What is the power capacity of Grand Coulee now? What will be its capacity if Flathead Lake is raised to its various proposed levels?
6. What is the status of Lake Pend Oreille at the present time in the matter of power?
7. What is the war necessity for raising Flathead?
8. What compensation will the people receive who will be forced to give up their homes, lands, and businesses?
9. What industrial development will take place in Montana if Flathead is raised?
10. What other possibilities for securing power are there?
11. Why can't Hungry Horse be developed now? If it were, would it not furnish the necessary needed water flow and power? What assurance would we have that it would be developed after the war?

I would be very grateful if I could have the answers to these questions at your very earliest convenience and any additional information you have with reference to this project.

With best personal wishes,
Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 12, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Upon receipt of your letter of May 26, 1943, I forwarded a request to Col. R. Park, Seattle district engineer, Corps of Engineers, War Department, to forward to you such data as he has available. Of course, a considerable amount of information was submitted for the record at the hearings held in Kalispell, Mont., and I believe this record is still in process of preparation.

As you know, this administration markets the power from the Bonneville project and the Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River to various war plants throughout the Pacific Northwest. We have a transmission system of some 2,700 miles of high-voltage lines and stations interconnecting these projects and serving the principal load areas in the region. The Bonneville-Grand Coulee power system is interconnected with all other major utility systems in the States of Oregon and Washington and indirectly with the systems of Montana, Utah, and Idaho.

Early this year joint studies of the War Production Board and this administration indicated the need for providing additional power resources for war production in 1944 and 1945. A program for development of such power resources was considered by the Bonneville Advisory Board at its meeting on March 12-13, 1943, in Washington, D. C. This board, which is composed of representatives of the Secretary of War, Federal Power Commission, Secretary of Agriculture, and Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (a) of the Bonneville Act of 1937, adopted a resolution at its meeting on March 12-13, 1943, embracing a program for development of additional power supplies for war production in 1944 and 1945. A copy of the board's resolution is enclosed.

You will note from paragraph 6 of the resolution that the board recommended that the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in cooperation with engineers of other agencies, undertake an immediate investigation and determine upon an appropriate plan to develop 3,000,000 acre-feet of additional water storage in the headwaters of the Columbia River which can be used for increasing the power output of generators installed and to be installed at the Grand Coulee and Bonneville plants. The board's original resolution designated this water storage to be developed at Lake Pend Oreille. However, when the matter was submitted to the War Production Board we were requested to extend our investigation to include Flathead Lake, Mont., as a possible place for the storage of the additional 3,000,000 acre-feet of water.

The Corps of Engineers, War Department, completed its report and submitted its findings to the Bonneville Advisory Board at a meeting held May 17-19, 1943, in Washington, D. C. In addition to members of the Bonneville Advisory Board being present, representatives of the War Production Board also attended these meetings. After a full consideration of the report submitted by the Corps of Engineers, War Department, which embodied four possible plans for development of the 3,000,000 acre-feet of additional water storage, the Bonneville Advisory Board concluded that the plan requiring the least amount of critical materials, the least amount of time, and consistent with the long-range development of the Columbia River Basin, was that which called for raising the level of Flathead Lake, Mont., by raising the Kerr

Dam at the outlet of this lake some 17 feet initially and 37 feet ultimately. A copy of the Board's resolution adopted on May 19, 1943, recommending this project is enclosed.

Following the Board meeting in Washington, D. C., representatives of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, and of this Administration held a meeting with Gov. Sam C. Ford, of Montana, and his State water-conservation board at Helena, Mont., on June 1, 1943, to discuss the project. A public hearing was then held at Kalispell, Mont., beginning June 3, 1943, and extending through June 5, 1943. As a result of further information developed at the hearings, the Corps of Engineers, War Department, the Bonneville Advisory Board, and the War Production Board have concluded that other alternatives for securing additional power necessary for war purposes should be further explored. In this connection a public hearing will be held on the proposal to store the water at Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, in the near future. Enclosed is a copy of a telegram forwarded to the Honorable Sam C. Ford, Governor of Montana, on June 7, 1943, containing this information.

Your letter of May 29, 1943, requested information on certain questions. I shall attempt to answer your questions in the order numbered in your letter:

1. No determination of cost of power at Grand Coulee has been made. It will be subject to allocation of cost between power, irrigation, flood control, and navigation.

2. We have no information on cost of power at Kerr Dam.

3. Cost of power at Kerr Dam should be slightly decreased because of increased head on the turbines resulting from raising the dam and because of available water storage to prime up more power. It is presumed that cost of storage in Flathead Lake will be allocated largely to downstream power developments.

4. Present capacity at Grand Coulee, including generating units borrowed from the Shasta project, is 533,900 kilowatts. The average use of generating capacity for the period from August 1, 1942, to February 28, 1943, inclusive, is 91.7 percent. Two generating units borrowed from the Shasta project, having a capacity of 85,000 kilowatts each, have recently been placed in service at Grand Coulee. This additional capacity is rapidly being absorbed by additional war loads, and three additional units rated at 108,000 kilowatts each are needed as soon as they can be manufactured and installed.

5. The prime power capacity at Grand Coulee, after completion of installation of units now under construction, is 680,000 kilowatts. Three million acre-feet at Flathead Lake will increase this to 760,000 kilowatts. Of course, as new generating units are installed, more capacity would become firm power as a result of the water storage. The incremental firm power at Grand Coulee, based upon 3,000,000 acre-feet of storage at Flathead Lake would amount to 172,000 kilowatts upon installation of three more generators at Grand Coulee and would increase further with additional installation of generators and additional water storage. At Bonneville Dam, 3,000,000 acre-feet of water storage would firm up 45,000 kilowatts.

6. The present status of Pend Oreille Lake is natural. No development of storage has been made.

7. The war necessity for raising Flathead Lake is to create storage upstream from Grand Coulee in order to increase the available energy with present installations at Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

8. Compensation for loss of homes, lands, and business will be determined under the usual procedure of right of eminent domain or Federal condemnation proceedings and provisions of the Second War Powers Act.

9. Raising Flathead Lake will have no immediate effect on industrial development in Montana, as no additional power will be made directly available in that region at this time. Additional power can be made available immediately in the region from Grand Coulee by replacement of power transmitted to Montana over Washington Water Power Co. and Montana Power Co. transmission lines. Later, additional power for industrial development can be made available in Montana by installing additional generators at Kerr Dam, constructing the Hungry Horse project and constructing high voltage transmission lines from the Columbia River plants to Montana.

10. Installation of additional units at Grand Coulee and Rock Island and one additional unit at Kerr Dam are possible measures for increasing power supply in the region.

11. The Hungry Horse development will create approximately 500,000 acre-feet of storage, which is inadequate for present requirements, would require excessive use of critical materials, and would require some 2½ to 3 years to construct. The only assurance for post-war construction of this project would be congressional authorization and appropriations.

If there is any additional material you require, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

Attached to his letter was a copy of the minutes of the Bonneville Advisory Board of May 19, 1943, and in those minutes is the statement:

Whereas the representatives of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in cooperation with engineers of other Federal agencies have completed the engineering investigations in accordance with the aforementioned request and have reviewed with the Board their findings and recommendations covering four alternative storage projects found to be feasible, namely: Raising of Kerr Dam at Flathead Lake; construction of Big Rock Dam at Flathead Lake; construction of the Albeni Falls Dam at Lake Pend Oreille to create 2,000,000 acre-feet of storage, combined with raising Flathead Lake 3 feet and lowering the lake outlet 6 feet to provide 1,000,000 additional acre-feet of storage, with a total of 3,000,000 acre-feet for this combination; and construction of Box Canyon Dam on the Pend Oreille River; all of which are completely summarized in "Definite project report for obtaining 3,000,000 acre-feet of storage in Clark Fork Basin, Washington-Idaho-Montana," as prepared by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, under date of May 12, 1943.

The reason I have read this excerpt from the minutes is because of the fact that the proposal to look elsewhere after the Flathead hearings, referred to looking into the possibility of building a low dam at Albeni Falls in Idaho. You will note from the minutes of the Bonneville Advisory Board that the Albeni Falls Dam would create 2,000,000 acre-feet of storage and that with it would be combined an additional 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage through the raising of Flathead Lake 3 feet and lowering the lake outlet 6 feet.

This, of course, could not but arouse the fears of the people in western Montana because we all know the tie-up between the two, based on the advisory board's recommendation. Consequently we felt that we were still in hot water despite the assurances which had been given to us by the various people whom we had contacted. Even a 3-foot raise in Flathead Lake would inundate some of our towns, destroy much of our agricultural land, and create a precedent by means of which the lake could be raised to a higher level at some future date.

After the Idaho hearings I received copies of papers from home. On the 22d and 23d of June these papers contained front-page articles which state that the Bonneville Administration is still hopeful of raising Flathead Lake and, according to the Daily Missoulian of the latter date, Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen of Idaho had stated that Dr. Raver had advised the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman WHITE, that because of the War Production Board's disapproval of the Albeni Falls project wartime development would be limited to increased storage of water in Flathead Lake.

I am sorry that time does not allow me to go into more detail. I hope I have drawn a fairly comprehensive picture as this matter exists in my State. I want to say again, as I have many times in the past, that I am unalterably opposed to any proposition to raise the level of the largest inland fresh-water lake in the United States. I want to call to the attention of the Congress that if the raising of Flathead is allowed to go through, it will directly affect 25,000 people, and indirectly 50,000, or one-tenth of the population in my State. The rights of the tribe of Flathead Indians who live in this region will also be involved.

We know that critical materials are being produced in that region and we must recognize the fact that the large lumber industry in that area, as well as the thousands of acres of productive agricultural land are just as important and just as vital to the furtherance of the war effort as any other factors one can bring out. We are going to face hard times in this country from the standpoint of food and to me it would be folly to take this acreage out of production at this time. There are other sites which could be developed: the Hungry Horse, of the south fork of the Flathead; the Cabinet Gorge on the Idaho-Montana line; the West Robinson Dam up in British Columbia, as well as many more which could be constructed with perhaps more critical material but certainly with a less devastating effect upon the western part of Montana. There are a good many things that we have to consider but to me the human equation is of paramount importance. I want these towns to continue to grow and prosper. I want these lands to continue to produce. I want these farms to continue to yield for the benefit of our Nation, and I want these people who have made their homes in the western part of our State to be assured of the security which is theirs by right, I want their sons and daughters serving in the armed forces of the United States to come back to that valley and to enjoy its fruits and its splendors. I want to see that scenic area, the most beautiful in the United States, kept intact not only for the people of the State of Montana but for the people of all the United States. I want to see this fear and worry dissipated

and definite assurance given to these people that no action is contemplated or will be taken by the Bonneville Administration or the Army engineers to raise our lake and to create a condition which will cause nothing but dissension, chaos, and unrest. This uncertainty, this threat implied because of a lack of a definitive statement from Washington, has already stopped development, not only on property directly affected but that indirectly as well. Business has practically stopped except for the barest necessities of life. The sooner a clear-cut statement is forthcoming as to future policies and guaranties that no changes will be made the better it will be for all concerned. The successive rising-stage program spells ruin for thousands and severe financial losses to many more and would drive the present residents of Lake and Flathead Counties to the tops of the mountains or else out of the country and destroy their confidence in our Government at a time that it is badly needed. Because of these factors, and I believe in them with my whole heart and soul, I urge the Congress to authorize this committee to look into this matter so that our way of life and our homes will be preserved for us and this uncertainty done away with, once and for all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen between the people of Montana and Idaho with the Bonneville Power Authority over the best use to be made of the water resources of the tributaries of the Columbia River. The dispute has been intensified by the proposal to leave out beneficial projects in both Montana and Idaho, and make storage projects in Flathead Lake in Montana and Lake Pend Oreille in Idoho, thereby destroying large areas of producing farm land endangering the transportation on the transcontinental railroads crossing the area. It is proposed to rush these projects through as a war measure when the utilities section of the W. P. B. say they are not necessary and would make a heavy drain on the critical materials needed in war production.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am much pleased with the House's action on this resolution. I am a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee who unanimously passed this resolution, and I was one of those who appeared before the Rules Committee on its behalf.

One of the things which we lack is a Federal policy that provided for the settling of disputes between States over controversies arising in the development of rivers that flow over, through, or between one or more States on their way from mountainous watersheds to the sea.

This is a matter that not only permits, but demands a Federal and intrastate interest. It is a proper concern and function of the Congress. We all recall the southwestern conflict that raged for a while over the development of the Colorado River. Some headway was made last winter when the Republic River compact was achieved between the States of Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado.

Now, we find differences arising between the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, over the complete and orderly development of the Columbia River. It is to be sincerely hoped that this committee can make some contribution toward the achieving of a compact and aid in the progress of evolving a Federal pattern that may, in the future, anticipate these interstate disputes and dissolve these differences as they arise.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House passed a resolution which was approved by the Rules Committee and likewise by the House providing for the appointment by the Chairman of a special committee of the Irrigation Committee to investigate the proposal to raise the level of Flathead Lake in Montana by raising the height of what is known as the Kerr Dam. The attempt to raise Flathead Lake is clearly an attempted violation of the sovereignty of the great State of Montana and we are all proud of the manner in which our Montana people resisted such an unheard-of effort to invade and destroy the rights and property of the people of Montana.

Apparently it was of little consequence to those responsible for that idea that hundreds and hundreds of homes would be destroyed; that the beautiful city of Kalispell would be isolated if not inundated; that some 50,000 acres of the most fertile farm land in America would be inundated; that lumber mills and millions of feet of valuable timber would be forever and irreplaceably lost; that the scenic wonderfulness of Flathead Lake, a great national asset and beauty spot, would be seriously marred; and that the cost to the State of Montana in property loss, resources lost, highway replacement costs, plus the cost of litigation involved would be tremendous and staggering to the imagination. And all for what purpose? As I have said, and now say again, simply to take from the State of Montana one of its greatest natural assets for the benefit of another State.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the Flathead Indians would also stand to suffer greatly by such a transaction, and I think all will agree that the Indian has been treated shabbily enough in the past without this further thrusting of the Indian down the economic scale. What is known as the Kerr Dam was constructed on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The Montana Power Co. pays a royalty to the Indians of $175,000 per annum for the use of the Indian property. Should the Government take this dam the Indians would be deprived of this royalty unless compensation was secured from the Congress of the United States, and in view of past experience in getting appropriations for Indians I would say that it would be a man's job to secure this compensation.

Nor do I think we should overlook the fact that no less than 70,000,000 board feet of lumber is produced annually in this section, which production gives employment to about 750 persons and that pay rolls, and so forth, totaled almost $3,000,000 in 1942.

The people of the northwest section cannot understand why the Bonneville Power Administration and the Army Engineers instead of endeavoring to make a storage reservoir out of Flathead Lake, did not look to Fort Peck. A world of power could be developed at Fort Peck if power generators were secured for the latter place. The development of additional power at Fort Peck could be had at very little cost. We of Montana cannot understand why, if additional power is needed in the Northwest, Fort Peck is being overlooked.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 285), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 262, incurred by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and legal, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order next week for the House to consider conference reports on the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times on the cost of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on how the recent coal strike appeared to the soldiers in north Africa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Ohio was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter from the officers and crew of the *Booker T. Washington.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by the senator from Puerto Rico, Hon. Vicente Geigel-Polanco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAGEN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two places—in one to include an editorial, and in the other an outline of victory garden program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Providence Evening Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars on the transportation problem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the other special orders I may address the House today for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two short resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and at the conclusion of my remarks to include a joint letter from the Secretaries of War and Navy addressed to the President of the United States on February 8, and also a letter from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, signed by Admiral Leahy, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy on February 1, with a suggested Executive order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF OUR LIBERTIES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes about the defense of our liberties—not by our armed forces abroad but by ourselves at home.

I think we have no right to send men out to fight and to die for liberty if we are not ready at least to speak for liberty at home when it is in danger.

The decision of the Supreme Court on May 10, in connection with radio broadcasting, has done something to one of our liberties. Either it has begun to destroy a specific part of American liberty or it has redefined the word until it has no meaning for true Americans. Look at our United States Supreme Court today and you will know why Jesus wept.

If we are honest with ourselves, we will all admit that our liberties have been jeopardized. Some of us think the danger is serious, others are complacent. But no one in this Chamber believes that our solicitude for freedom is, in the elegant words of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, "hooey." Mr. Fly, as Chairman of the F. C. C., has been authorized by the Supreme Court to take charge of all radio programs in the United States. There is, to be sure, a statute which forbids Mr. Fly to interfere with the services and the pleasures which radio brings to the American people. But the Supreme Court has explained the law away. It has gone beyond Mr. Fly's bid for power over the business of broadcasting and has given him and the Communications Commission, supreme and unlimited power over programs as well.

We are in the midst of a war for liberty. If I were to inform this body that a company, a battalion, or a regiment had been lost unnecessarily—by ignorance or neglect—every Member, regardless of party, would cry out for court martial of the guilty, or for impeachment. By the Supreme Court decision we have lost more than a battalion of fighters for liberty. We have begun to lose what we fight for—since you cannot lose one civil right without endangering all civil liberty. And there is no one to impeach for ignorance and neglect—no one except ourselves. In the miserable loophole left—the almost invisible loophole through which a tiny ray of light still shines—the Court itself has challenged us, saying that "the responsibility belongs to the Congress." All we are guilty of is not taking our responsibility—and acting wisely upon it.

I do not know whether all of you have read the decision of May 10. Perhaps the headlines repeated the old words about the Court curbing the networks. Curbing has become a friendly word—almost like checking abuses—not at all like destroying freedom. Perhaps you have thought it only natural that the networks should protest—after all, they lost the decision. Perhaps you have heard many times that Congress meant the F. C.C. to be something more that a traffic officer of the radio waves. The sharp outlines of objects are dulled by familiarity—we hear a phrase so often that it ceases to have meaning. And when five members of the Court deliver a decision we assume that all is right with the world. It does not seem possible that in the midst of a war to bring freedom to the world one of our own basic freedoms should be destroyed. It hardly seems necessary to worry about it. Mr. Fly would be glad if we did not worry about freedom. The fuss about freedom is all "hooey," says Mr. Fly. Maybe it is, to him. Maybe freedom is also "hooey." But millions of men and women are in the armed services of this country, and many of them will die—at this very moment some of them are dying—for freedom. We have the right to be concerned.

Is it true that the Federal Communications Commission has been given authority over radio programs? Can the Commission actually prevent a radio station from putting on a comedian whose humor it does not appreciate? Or a commentator whose philosophy it does not share? It seems improbable. But it is so.

Let me go back to the business of the traffic cop. You may know that before 1927 there was a totally unregulated scramble for the air waves, one station overlapped another and broadcasting might have been destroyed if some traffic regulations had not been put into force. These regulations were not made for the benefit of the broadcasters. They were set up for the advantage of the American people—and Congress imposed regulation of the traffic in accordance with public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The five judges who gave the May 10 decision say that the act of Congress "does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of the traffic." The act, says the Court, "puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic."

You and I, Mr. Speaker, are not familiar with the intricate problems of broadcasting, but we do know about traffic officers. And we know what English words mean. Let us, then, imagine that we have been made special traffic officers in the meaning of the Supreme Court's decision.

We do not merely see to it that east-west traffic moves on a green light, while north-south stands still on red. We are not restricted to preventing speed maniacs from cutting out of line, jamming ahead of other drivers into wrong lanes of traffic. No. The Supreme Court says to us "You are now a Federal bureau. You are to have the burden of determining the composition of the traffic."

So, as good Federal bureaucrats we do nothing openly at first—we let common people drive blue cars or green ones,

limousines or roadsters—but on the side we confine station wagons to truck roads. Then we announce that only 10 percent of the commercial vehicles owned by one company may operate on one day. We deny driving licenses to women drivers, we refuse the road to cars bought on the installment plan, and finally we get tired of all these half measures and determine the composition of the traffic once for all—we drive all privately owned vehicles off the road entirely.

It sounds preposterous. But apply it to radio. The F. C. C. is authorized to decide what radio shall be. It may begin by changing the business methods of the stations—but it has the power to go farther—and power never lies around unused. Mr. Fly, it is reported, is satisfied with his victory over American broadcasting. His appetite for dictating the composition of the programs may be dormant. But the power is there. This month and next, nothing may change. But if a station thinks the people in its neighbeorhood want comedy at night and the F. C. C. thinks the people ought to have lectures—the F. C. C. has the last word. The comedian will be kept off the highways of the air. If a woman commentator disagrees with someone's policy on regimenting women, the woman—or the station on which she appears—will be warned and, by one means or another, will be shunted off the air. And as the appetite for tyranny grows, someone, today's F. C. C. or its successor tomorrow, will also determine the traffic for good and all, and we will have no private radio—which means no free radio.

That sounds ominous. To a minority of the Supreme Court it seems even lacking in common sense. If the Congress meant to interfere with the business arrangements of the highways—not to mention the composition of the traffic—it would have said so. The minority says with some irony that "the subject is one of such scope and importance as to warrant explicit mention." But, of course, Congress did not mean to let any traffic officer determine the composition of the traffic—not on the highway—and not on the air waves.

If the American people were informed today that after the war a Federal agency will tell them what size and color and type of car to buy, they would march on Warshington and demand, from us, redress of grievances. We are a long-suffering people, but we are not so stupified as to let all our freedom go by default. Why is it, then, that our folks at home have not protested against destruction of their liberty to hear whatever they want on the air?

I hope we will not delude ourselves, gentlemen, into thinking the people do not care. They care intensely. For 20 years American radio has given the American people a greater range, a finer standard, of information and entertainment than any other people of the world has enjoyed—and this has been done without taxing the people, without propagandizing the people. In short, it has been American—and it has been free. The lives of millions of us are in an orbit which radio touches—in important ways—at every hour of the day, from the moment it gives us crop information in the morning through the news of the day, the music and the plays and the war messages of the evening to the music which sends us to sleep at night.

No one can tamper with the legitimate entertainment of a democratic people and survive. The reason we have not been denounced is that the American people do not know what has happened. They are not interested in networks and affiliated stations. They are interested in programs, in Fibber McGee and Fred Allen, in Raymond Gram Swing and Toscanini and the Man Behind the Gun. They do not know that these are threatened. They imagine that some complicated contracts between networks and stations will be altered. They have not been told that the composition of the traffic will be determined in Washington by the Federal Communications Commission. And if they have heard that the networks can find no defense against this tyranny, they have also heard Mr. Fly say "hooey."

I do not know how you can be too solicitous of liberty. If you think liberty was created, once for all, in 1776, and all we have to do is enjoy it, then you may retire into your cave and wait until the war is over and other men have fought and died for liberty. For liberty is like our daily bread, and is our daily bread, because we live by it, and it must be created again and again, and watched over and protected. And in defense of liberty we who do not run the risk of death in action have an obligation to those who do. We must see to it that liberty is not diminished when they return.

I challenge Mr. Fly to say to our armed services that while they were away he has taken radio away from the people. Let him tell them that he will decide what the composition of the radio traffic will be when they get back, and if they will politely petition him to let them hear Jack Benny or Invitation to Learning, he and the F. C. C. will listen to their request, and grant it if they happen to feel so inclined. For the court says the commissioners have expansive powers. The court places no restriction upon them.

But we—as part of the Congress of the United States—we can restrict the Commission. We can restore freedom to radio under the regulations and restrictions we have always imposed.

We must not let the defense of American liberty fall into the hands of one party. We must not, by default, let ourselves become the party of its enemies. If we do not fight, if we are silent, we are betraying liberty, and it shall not be forgiven us.

The liberty of a people is made up of many things—some great, some trifling. And the attack upon liberty always begins with the little things, those hardly worth fighting for. The attack on free radio is almost invisible now; it is concealed under legal terms. It seems concerned only with insignificant business details.

But the stake is a great one; it is even greater than the people's rights in radio. The stake is freedom.

An outpost has been taken. If we react promptly we can throw the enemy back and punish him for his arrogance. We have the weapons, it is our right to make laws, to define powers, to protect liberty. I hope we will have the courage and intelligence to do our duty.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think that under the decision of the Supreme Court, to which he has referred, it is possible for the Federal Communications Commission to deny to any political party the right to use the airways?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is one of the ablest lawyers in this House and I am neither a lawyer nor the son of a lawyer, but I can, I think, understand fairly well the English language. The gentleman almost answers his own question. I think it has such broad and expansive powers that it could do that very thing.

The Court has shown us the way. We have the solemn obligation of writing a law so clear that it will forever do away with the shabby generalizations by which authority is usurped. In place of "the composition of the traffic" we can write the exact phrases by which the powers of the F. C. C. will be described. If we want to protect liberty in America, we must make the laws precise and practical, by which radio can continue to function as one of the most powerful engines of democracy ever invented by the mind of man.

JOINT LETTER OF THE SECRETARIES OF WAR AND NAVY TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 8, 1943.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join with the United States Chiefs of Staff in recommending that you promulgate the attached Executive order transferring from the Federal Communications Commission to the Department of War certain radio intelligence functions.

Through radio intelligence activities, the military forces of the United States and our allies obtain military information of the utmost importance. Radio intelligence is an important military weapon.

Participation by the Federal Communications Commission in radio intelligence should be discontinued, because:

Since radio intelligence develops information as to the movements and dispositions of the enemy, it is essential, for reasons of coordination and security, that there be full military control;

Since the responsibility for military action rests with the armed forces, the responsibility for obtaining the technical information governing that action must also be in the armed forces;

Military activities have been hampered by severe shortages of trained personnel and critical equipment essential to radio intelligence.

The Secretary of the Navy, on September 11, 1942, requested the Joint Chiefs of Staff to

study the problem of responsibility and security of radio intelligence. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made a thorough and comprehensive study, and their response (based on that study) is attached hereto. They, as well as the responsible military commanders in the field, are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security and related activities must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter from Admiral Leahy recommending this action.

Yours respectfully,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.
FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, February 1, 1943.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated September 11, 1942, on the subject of responsibility for the conduct of security of military communications activities, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had made a thorough and comprehensive study of the problems referred to therein in which full consideration has been given to the views of the military and naval commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence. A summary of the findings is given in the following paragraphs.

In general, radio intelligence is the method of determining the enemy's plans and dispositions through observation of his radio communications. The facilities used for this are also used to assist our own forces through monitoring of communications channels to enforce security standards and to render assistance to our own craft.

Both the Army and Navy are engaged in radio intelligence and related activities. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission has set up an elaborate system of its own which is engaged in:

(a) The location of enemy units at sea and abroad;

(b) The interception of enemy army, navy, and diplomatic traffic;

(c) The location of clandestine stations;

(d) The giving of bearing aids to lost planes;

(e) The maintenance of a "marine watch" at distress frequencies; and

(f) The monitoring of military radio circuits.

These activities of the Federal Communications Commission are constantly expanding and are a substantial drain upon available material and personnel.

Radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio-intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information accumulated through special processes by the armed forces, including exchanges of military information with our allies, knowledge of present and proposed disposition of forces, and other special information which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission. Moreover, information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, use of nonsecure methods of reporting and correlation, and the necessarily close relationship of Federal Communications Commission military-intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work.

Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasimilitary radio-intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

Since the Army's present need for personnel and equipment in the field of radio intelligence is greater than that of the Navy, all of the radio-intelligence facilities of the Federal Communications Commission should forthwith be transferred to the Army entirely. The personnel of the Federal Communications Commission heretofore engaged in radio intelligence should be made available initially as civilian employees of the Army, pending decision by the Army as to which shall be placed in military status, which replaced by military personnel and which would be best retained in the Army as civilian employees.

The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, therefore, request the Secretaries of War and Navy to join in a recommendation to the President that he transfer to the Army personnel and equipment now used by the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence. A proposed Executive order is enclosed.

From the standpoint of the present problem, the promulgation of this Executive order would leave the Federal Communications Commission in the radio field, with the responsibility for monitoring, processing, and disseminating foreign voice, news, and propaganda broadcasts (its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service), the monitoring and inspection of stations licensed under the Communications Act of 1934, all necessary licensing procedures, including revocation and suspension, and the institution of prosecutions of licensed stations and operators for violations of treaty, statute, or regulations.

The Army and Navy (in accordance with divisions of function between themselves) would have full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of military radio intelligence as described in the present report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY,
Admiral, United States Navy, Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

EXECUTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRING RADIO INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS TO THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me by Title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence and, particularly, in the conduct of direction-finding activities; the location of enemy radio transmissions abroad and at sea; the interception of radio traffic of foreign countries (excluding voice broadcasting); the detection, location, and suppression of clandestine or illegal stations both abroad and within the limits of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the areas occupied by its armed forces; the giving of radio and direction-finding navigational aids to vessels and aircraft; the monitoring of United States Army and Navy communications circuits and the maintenance of distress frequency watches, are transferred to the Departments of War and Navy in accordance with distribution of functions established between them.

2. All records and property (including radio transmitting and receiving equipment) and all personnel of the Federal Communications Commission used primarily in the performance and administration of the functions transferred by this order are transferred to the War Department for use in the performance and administration of functions transferred by this order; but any personnel so transferred who are found by the War Department to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the performance and administration of such functions, powers, and duties shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service. So far as possible, personnel transferred who are found qualified therefor shall be placed in a military status.

3. So much of the unexpended balance of the appropriations or other funds available, including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, to the Federal Communications Commission in the exercise of functions transferred by this order as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, shall determine, shall be transferred to the War Department for use in connection with the exercise of functions so transferred. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidations of obligations incurred against such appropriations or other funds prior to the transfer.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1943.*

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES AS AFFECTING THE CATTLE GROWER AND THE FARMER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks of opposition to a roll-back-subsidy law.

During the few months that I have been privileged to be a Member of this great body much has been said about the problem of the farmer, but much needs to be said about his problem, and much needs to be done about it—wisely done.

The question of the so-called roll-back-subsidy meat program also has engaged the attention of this body on a number of occasions. It is almost presumptuous to attempt to add anything concerning it to that which has been said. But I feel impelled to speak to the issue a few minutes on behalf of the men and women and boys and girls whom I represent and whose interests have not been brought specifically to the attention of the Congress.

In a very real sense the fate of this Nation and of the world depends upon the American farmer. From his efforts and devotion to duty must come the food and clothing for our armed forces, for our war workers, for our civilian population in every walk of life. From the land that he tills must come many of the products which are needed to keep our munitions plants and war factories operating, to speed the day of our victory,

From the storehouses which he fills must go out the foodstuffs to sustain the whole world, our allies, the soon-to-be-liberated peoples of Europe, and the East and, yes, to our enemies when they have laid down the sword. America is the arsenal for democracy. The American farmer is the world's hope against the stalking specter of famine.

The American farmers have been challenged as no group was ever challenged in history. With less manpower, with very much less farm machinery and scarce supplies of every kind, with acute shortages of feeds and fertilizers, in the face of unfavoring elements he has been called upon to produce more than ever has been produced anywhere, any time. Our experts tell us that we shall perhaps not reach the food goals set for the year. If this be true the fault is not the farmers'. The effort of our farmers to discharge their awful responsibility since this Nation entered the war has honored their calling for all time to come.

A famous American once said: "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land." In this hour when many cities of the world are in smoking ruins, when agony and disease and famine hang over the globe like a pall, and civilization is pushed back almost to the Dark Ages by the military dreams of madmen, our farmers hold a very large part of our hope for success in this war of liberation, and of our hope for the peace which will follow.

Yes; the American farmer has done his part. He is doing his part now. What have we, his Government, his chosen representatives in Congress, done to assist him? What incentive have we given him to spur his efforts?

The losses of perhaps 8,000,000 acres of crops from destructive rains and overflow in large areas of the Corn Belt cannot be made good at this late hour. The Corn Belt has its optimum time of planting not only corn but sorghums, millett, garden vegetables, and other food crops. I cannot conceive that the enthusiasm of our farmers is as high as it was. They are rapidly becoming disillusioned as a result of the continued bugling of the farm-labor situation and the disparity between fixed costs and the prices their finished products bring them. Nor are city people rushing to the nearby fields en masse to help save the farmers' crops. He is largely left to his own resources.

And now there has come to plague him this so-called roll-back subsidy program. Every livestock grower in this Nation, big or little, is opposed to it. Every livestock grower, big or little, has been injured by it. The evil effects of this proposed plan are not speculative. They can be demonstrated.

The farmer is asked to produce meat at less than the cost of production. Those who favor the subsidy contend that the subsidy payments to the processor will guarantee to the farmer that he will be paid a price for meat which will insure a reasonable profit. But the facts speak for themselves. Even should the plan work beyond the fondest dream of its sponsors the subsidies would be inadequate. The loss to the producer already, due to the effect on the market caused by the confusion of multiple plans and regulations, has reached a sum of from twenty to thirty dollars an animal. The facts speak for themselves. The livestock markets over the length and breadth of this Nation have collapsed. The armed forces as well as civilians are faced with dire shortages of meat, particularly beef.

On Wednesday, June 16, in the city of Chicago, cattle arriving at 20 leading livestock centers totaled 29,000 head, the smallest for June in the last 15 years. Receipts for the corresponding day last year were 51,000 head. And the situation in Chicago is typical of a Nation-wide situation. Market operations in my own State are paralyzed. It is so with my neighboring States. On a recent day there were but a scant 700 animals offered on the great market at Fort Worth, Tex.

Price-ceiling experiments tracing back to the Roman Empire have a record of uninterrupted failure as a method of preventing inflation or keeping down the cost of living.

Inflation should be attacked on two fronts, first by adopting policies that will result in the greatest possible food production, thus increasing supplies, and second, by syphoning off buying power through taxation, thus reducing the demand.

No industry stands alone in wartime or at any other time. All are interrelated and interdependent. It is folly to expect farmers to produce at a loss for the benefit of consumers, and subsidizing is not an answer to the problem. It is a scheme which is basically unsound and un-American.

As I understand, the estimated cost of the subsidies will be billions of dollars. The maximum saving to consumers is estimated at only millions of dollars—on the basis of average civilian meat allowances and average roll-backs per pound. This taxation will be paid in large part by the farmers, the owners of land. When the Government decides to crack down on inflation and hold the line they crack down on the farmer, granting to other groups concessions unparalleled in economic history.

Farm labor will continue to go to the war plants until a sufficient inducement is given them to remain and work on the farms. This is, of course, true of the livestock growers and their labor.

In my district there is located a vast naval armament plant. There the workers are paid $5 to $25 a day. The average earning of the farmer of my district is scarcely $2.50 a day. The result of this inequality is obvious. Labor from the farms and ranches will flock to this plant and similar defense plants to seek the greater financial reward.

The meat program has been very confusing to the growers. In April the packers industry, together with livestock men, formed a meat council of 101 associations to consider price-and-supply conditions. The outcome of their recommendations was creation in May of a 12-man War Meat Board composed of representatives of the armed forces, the War Food Administration, and the O. P. A., with meat packers serving as consultants.

Before this new meat board could start work, the O. P. A. ignored demands of the meat industry to give the board a chance and ordered meat prices rolled back 10 percent on June 21. There can be no question but that the subsidy would hamper the meat board in its job of managing the wartime meat supply from day to day so as to keep demand and supply in balance.

I submit to you that what we need in the meat program is every inducement to the increasing of the meat supplies—to increased production of livestock. We have paid premiums to labor in the form of wage increases again and again during this war period because we wanted to get the various jobs of manufacturing and construction done in the shortest possible time and in the best possible way. We shall have to do the same thing for the farmer and the livestock grower and in the meat industry. We do not need subsidies. We do need better controls over shipments of livestock to markets and improvement of allocation of available supplies. We do need, and I repeat it, every possible inducement and stimulation to increased production.

So much has been said here, so much has appeared in the Nation's press, the condition is so generally understood, that there is little I can add about the terrible menace of the black market. But very surely this subsidy plan would further divert the supply of the Nation's meat into these illegal channels.

Conservative estimates place at more than 20 percent the amount of the Nation's meat which flows into and through this black-market channel. These "meatleggers" take their trucks direct to the farm and buy every available animal. Delivery is made at night and they slaughter where they may, regardless of sanitation and menace to health—by the road, in the woods, in dirty barns and sheds. The black market in meat not only disrupts the effort to distribute available supplies but constitutes a menace of the gravest degree to our Nation's health.

Price ceilings and subsidies on meat simply cannot solve the black-market problem. The experience of this Nation with alcohol in the prohibition era attests the fact. When the American people want something badly enough, it will be supplied them at a price. There is an enormous appetite for meat in this country. Packers estimate they could sell 20,000,000,000 pounds this year if they could get it. The public demands the meat and it will not be supplied them at less than the cost of production. No matter how many laws are passed or how many directives are issued and regulations promulgated, the price of a much-desired product cannot be beaten down below the cost of production by Government enforcement agencies or official fiats.

But I will leave the economics and the theories of this new attempt to solve the food problem to the professors. I personally am greatly concerned with the ill effect of this subsidy program in my own State and in my own district. The

farmers and livestock growers that I represent are, for the most part, the little men of the business. When these Government experts publish their imposing statistics my people are found in the lower brackets of operations and income. These are the people of the rocky barren mountain farms and ranches, the 1-room homes, the ill-clad, ill-fed, and underprivileged families—the stricken people of depression days. They deserve the plaudits of all who love mankind for the courage and determination which enabled them to survive that dreadful period. They have come back a little way now from those dark days. They begin to find the going underfoot a little firmer. They hope and plan for a slightly better world for themselves and, particularly, for their children. They are among the stanchest citizens of our country. From their ranks come the best citizens, the bravest soldiers. I will match their patriotism against that of any people in the world.

They are toil-worn men, men who have had little pleasure in life. They have seen only hard work and very little return. Life holds little else for them. Their hope is for their children. In Oklahoma and in my district the Future Farmers of America and the 4–H Clubs are the two great organizations which are devoted to preparing and assisting the children of my people to enter upon the more tolerable and abundant life which their parents have not known.

Only in this generation has the educational principle, "We learn to do by doing," been effectively employed in the teching of agriculture in our public-school system. Establishment of the teaching of vocational agriculture in the common schools came with the enactment by Congress of the Smith-Hughes bill, extending financial aid in that undertaking.

The establishment of vocational teaching of agriculture in our consolidated schools and rural high schools opened a new era in the agricultural development of America. Under it was formed the voluntary farm boys' organization known as the Future Farmers of America.

F. F. A. chapters now have some 10,000 boys enrolled in the State of Oklahoma. These boys actually learn by doing. They have more than three-quarters of a million dollars of their own money invested in livestock, crops, machinery, buildings, and other equipment in the State. They learn to farm by farming, under direction of trained instructors. Approximately 50,000 Oklahoma boys have passed through the F. F. A. chapters of the State to adult age. More than 96 percent of Oklahoma boys studying vocational agriculture in the commmon school system voluntarily became members of the Future Farmers of America.

In regional and national competition, Oklahoma F. F. A. boys have taken an unusual share of honors. Repeatedly, they have shown themselves masters of the business of farming and stock raising. Proudly we greet the annual return of groups of F. F. A. boys bringing home trophies of their contests in the arenas of America. I honor this fine organization of farm youth, and pay tribute to them and to their leaders for their earnest application to their chosen work, and for the outstanding results they have achieved. We recognize in them the leadership of tomorrow in agriculture and livestock culture. I congratulate them upon, not only their achievements in competition, but also upon the astonishing unfolding of their personalities which accompanies their studies and practices in F. F. A.

I am especially proud to salute the achievement of an 18-year-old Future Farmer of my home county, Ray Tucker, of Antlers, who became the first eastern Oklahoma farm youth to receive the Governor's trophy awarded for outstanding achievement in farming, when he was so honored at a banquet in Stillwater, Okla., on the occasion of the seventeenth annual State F. F. A. convention held Friday, April 23. I commend him for the ability and courage he has shown in taking over active management of the 1,500-acre ranch formerly operated by his father who died about a year ago.

I believe the creed of the Future Farmers of America is worth repeating here:

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith not born of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence or begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and commuity which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

The Future Farmers of America have supported the war effort with great energy and telling efficiency. They have invested $193,145.17 in War bonds and stamps. They have collected 7,453,384 pounds of scrap metal. They have collected 295,425 pounds of rubber. They have collected 132,081 pounds of scrap paper. They have collected 21,989 pounds of rags. They have collected 25,256 burlaps bags for making sand barricades. They have turned over their farm repair shops for the vitally necessary work of repairing farm machinery in the State. Many of their number, of course, have joined the various branches of the armed service.

Perhaps, more significantly for the purpose of this discussion, they have met the Nation's request for a 9-percent increase in the production of livestock this year. And remember that they hold most of this livestock now, at the mercy of the market chaos caused by the confusion in the field of meat regulation.

I have here a statement from Mr. J. B. Perky, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Oklahoma, who is largely responsible for the direction of the program of the Future Farmers of America in my State. He says:

Confusion, doubt, and fear have gripped Oklahoma livestock farmers since the hold-the-line order in April. The reduction of more than 50 percent in numbers of cattle marketed in Oklahoma during the current week, as compared to the same week a year ago, attests the validity of this statement. Prices in Oklahoma's only terminal market broke from $1 to $2 during the week ending June 19, and a further break would have resulted had not the marketward movement practically ceased. The same condition exists at all other Midwest markets.

Livestock farmers were asked to increase beef production. They have done this short-handed and largely on borrowed capital. They must consider their creditors when contemplating sales.

Serious, also, is the pending liquidation of cow herds. Liquidation is inevitable because of the high cost and scarcity of labor, protein supplements, hay, and grain. Herds cannot be wintered on present prices of labor and feed, when farmers are to bear the brunt of the roll-back proposed.

Feeders are unable to plan dry-lot operations for next fall. This will seriously affect the fate of our Oklahoma calf crop. The confusion is pathetic. Instead of an incentive being given to livestock farmers in the form of a fair price, they are expected to turn their cattle to a market regulated without regard to their plight.

A 10-year livestock improvement program of the Future Farmers of America in Oklahoma is definitely imperiled.

And I wish to salute that other great organization that is doing so much for the farm youth of my State, my district, and my home county. I wish to salute the 51,000 boys and girls, 4–H Club members, in the State of Oklahoma and their leaders; the 9,588 members in my district, the 460 in my home county of Pushmataha.

The author, Pearl Buck, in one of her recent books quotes the Chinese poet, Wang Wei, who lived 4,000 years ago, and was asked what is the most worthwhile thing in life. He answered:

I am old,
Nothing interests me now;
Moreover, I am not very intelligent,
And my ideas
Have never traveled farther than my feet.
You ask me
What is the supreme happiness here below?
It is listening to the song of a little girl
As she goes down the road
After having asked me the way.

4–H Club leaders in Oklahoma and in the Nation are teaching farm youth the way—the way to better homes, to better farms, to better lives.

The purpose of 4–H Clubs this year has been to expand the wartime 4–H Club program with a view of assisting 4–H Club members in making a maximum contribution to the war effort. Only those projects and activities that will contribute to the war effort have been

retained and nonessential contests and State activities have been eliminated.

In the wartime program the 4–H Club members' theme is "Produce and Conserve." Every 4–H Club member who enlists in the 4–H Victory project commits himself to carry out the following objectives: First. To purchase War bonds and stamps. According to a recent report, the 4–H Club members in Oklahoma personally own $438,758 in War bonds and stamps.

Second. They have agreed to assist with any Government approved scrap drive. According to 1942 reports 4–H Club members collected 13,440,689 pounds of scrap metal; gathered 326,223 pounds of paper, burlap and old rags; and collected 1,196,978 pounds of scrap rubber.

Third. They have agreed to assist in alleviating the farm and home labor problems by doing certain specified work in the home and on the farm. For example, the younger club boys and girls will drive tractors in place of older brothers who have gone into the service. The girls have taken on new responsibilities by planning the family canning budget, by planning and serving nutritious meals, and by taking full responsibility for the home garden. Reports show that in Oklahoma 9,270 club members are taking the full responsibility for the care and management of the home poultry flock.

In addition to carrying out the objectives of the 4–H victory project, 4–H Club members have committed themselves to carry out one or more production or conservation projects. Particular emphasis has been placed upon the meat production, poultry, dairying and dairy production, and gardening. Since January 1 of this year, livestock club members have fed out and marketed 2,940 calves, 9,487 pigs, and 1,323 lambs, which figures only represent a portion of the livestock being produced this year by 4–H Club members. In the poultry club, 9,317 members own 277,826 head of poultry. In the 4–H dairy project 4–H Club members own and care for 3,126 producing animals, along with 3,393 heifers not yet in production, or a total of 6,519 dairy animals. There is a greater interest in the production of gardens this year than ever before. Records show that 40,107 4–H Club members are growing victory gardens.

4–H Club girls are redoubling their efforts this year to can and conserve all the fruits, vegetables, and meats possible in order to release the maximum amount of food possible to our fighting men in the armed services and to our allies as well.

The boys and girls of the Oklahoma 4–H Clubs are nov engaged in a great buy-a-bomber campaign, promoting the sale of War bonds and stamps. A huge squadron of four-engine bombers bearing the name of each county whose 4–H Club members sell $300,000 in War bonds and stamps during this campaign this summer will join the show when the boys go back to bomb Berlin and Tokyo.

According to officials of the State and national War bond offices, Oklahoma's 4–H buy-a-bomber campaign is the largest campaign of its kind yet undertaken during the war. Already 11 of these bombers have been purchased by the boys and girls in this great drive.

One of the most valuable programs to the war effort undertaken by the 4–H Clubs of Oklahoma is the farm-to-market livestock project. This is a project of State-wide scope, sponsored by the Extension Service of the Oklahoma A. & M. College and supervised by the county agents for farm boys and girls, 10 to 20 years of age, who are interested in the production, management, feeding, and marketing of calves, pigs, and lambs. The objectives of the program are:

First. To encourage practical methods of feeding market classes of livestock to meet county farm goals without regard to premiums or prizes.

Second. To asist farm boys and girls in making a real contribution to the food-for-freedom program.

Third. To emphasize the use of home-grown feeds and pastures through the feeding of livestock produced on the home farm or other available classes of feeder animals that may be purchased at current prices.

Fourth. To offer to the young feeders an opportunity to accompany their livestock to market to observe and study marketing practices and procedures.

Fifth. To train farm boys and girls who participate in the project to keep accurate production and marketing records.

This project is intended to assist young farmers to establish themselves in the practical production of market livestock as an integral part of their farming operations. They will be encouraged to keep quality heifers, gilts, and ewes for the purpose of producing high-quality livestock for the market.

Yes; these young patriots of the Future Farmers of America and the 4–H Clubs are making a tremendous contribution to victory. The contribution they will make to the peace which follows will be tremendous. These boys and girls, young men and young women, are keeping the faith. Let us keep faith with them. In this hour when one of the chief problems of economy and finance is how to siphon off the excess buying power in the hands of our citizens, let us not plunge these young people into bankruptcy and despair and throw upon the scrap heap the fine work of a generation of farm youth by making them supply our meat at less than the cost of production. Let us stand firm on the action we have heretofore taken. Let us remember with that anonymous farmer-poet that—

The king may rule over land and sea,
The lord may live right loyally
The soldier rides in pomp and pride,
The sailor roams oe'r ocean wide;
But this or that, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The writer thinks: The poet sings,
The craftsmen fashion wondrous things;
The doctor heals, the lawyer pleads,
The miner follows the precious leads;
But this or that, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The merchant he may buy and sell,
The teacher do his duty well;
But man may toil through busy days,
Or man may stroll through pleasant ways;
From king to beggar, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The farmer's trade is one of worth;
He's partner with the sky and earth,
He's partner with the sun and rain;
And no man loses for his gain;
And men may rise and men may fall,
But the farmer must feed them all.

God bless the man who sows the wheat,
Who finds us milk and fruit and meat;
May his purse be heavy, his heart be light,
His cattle and corn and all go right;
God bless the seed his hand let fall,
For the farmer must feed them all.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. GRANT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GASOLINE RESTRICTIONS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today in the House to investigate the gasoline situation.

Mr. Speaker, from the daily press we read that the District Commissioners have refused to turn the Police Department over to the O. P. A. to carry on a huge entrapment program directed against motorists. What is the authority under which these snoopers set out upon a program of indicriminae detention of the Nation's motorists? Is every man who drives a car these days presumed in the eyes of O. P. A. to be guilty of violating its countless rules and regulations?

What has happened to the doctrine that a man is presumed to be innocent until he has been tried and proven guilty? From whence comes this new-fangled idea that every man who drives a car is guilty until he explains to the satisfaction of an O. P. A. snooper the fact that he is on legitimate business?

What has happened to our constitutional guaranty against unreasonable search and seizure if every man on the O. P. A. pay roll assumes the right to station himself at the street corner and stop our citizens in their ordinary pursuits of life and demand to know the whys and the wherefore of their use of an automobile?

This same un-American program is creeping into the Middle West. Praise the Lord, for the courage of a man like acting Governor Goodland, of Wisconsin, who warned that he would not tolerate this invasion of the rights of American citizens by the O. P. A. in the State of Wisconsin.

We have not heard much for several days concerning the threatened spread of the O. P. A. ban on what they call pleasure driving to the Middle West, but many people in my section of the country are concerned lest the O. P. A. is quietly preparing to swoop down and crack down upon them.

If further restrictions in the use of gasoline in the Midwest are justified, our people will be ready and willing to accept them, but no justification whatever has been shown for any such action, and I

feel that we ought to get at the bottom of all of these uncertainties and threats.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the petroleum situation, particularly as it affects the Midwest. Let us have a fair and complete and impartial investigation and really get at the bottom of this thing. Is it a shortage of rubber or of gasoline or of transportation? Or is the Middle West to be a happy hunting ground for further bureaucratic regimentation of a free people?

Let us have a man of the caliber of Mr. Bernard Baruch head a committee to investigate this matter thoroughly and report to the American people. If the situation calls for further restrictions, our people are ready and willing to accept the verdict. If it does not, let us cut out all the clamor and all the threats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND, for 10 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2714. An act making apropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts;

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; and

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, July 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting in according with Public Law 49 and Budget Circular No. 421, the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements (Budget Bureau No. 80-R001) for the White House Office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

535. A letter from the Chief Clerk, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the American Battle Monuments Commission for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, which was submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

536. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting information required in compliance with Budget Circular No. 421, of May 31, 1943, for the purpose of making the determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

537 A letter from the Administrative Officer, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

538. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report covering the personnel requirements of this agency for the quarter ending September ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

539. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements on Form Budget Bureau No. 80-R001 prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of this agency during the quarter beginning July 1, 1943, and ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

540. A letter from the Acting Director, the Office of Censorship, transmitting proposed personnel limitations for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

541. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

542. A letter from the Chairman, National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, in compliance with section 11 of Public Law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 7, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

543. A letter from the acting executive officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting its estimate for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, of its minimum personnel requirements to perform its duties under Public, No. 284, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 482), approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

544. A letter from the Chairman and Administrator, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of his letter, with attachments, of even date to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the period ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

545. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 284. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report from the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation pursuant to House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 383, Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 285. Resolution authorizing the appropriation of $5,000 for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 262; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; without amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWITH: Committee on Claims. S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle; without amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter; without amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs; without amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin; without amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of John T. Shirley; without amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Clare A. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson; with amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson; with amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira; with amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3117. A bill to provide that the tax upon the use of motor vehicles shall not be applicable after July 1, 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3118. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work on Lytle and Cajon Creeks, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3119. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3120. A bill to provide for the issuance of a United States flag to the nearest relative of a member of the Army of the United States who dies in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to amend section 5 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to cause an investigation and report to be made with respect to the existing petroleum situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 288. Resolution to provide for additional compensation for Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 289. Resolution authorizing appointment of a special committee to study ceiling prices on hogs and corn, in order to curb inflation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation which has for its purposes any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3121 (by request). A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3122 (by request). A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninetta M. Porcella*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Samuel Stacey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Anthony Sammartino; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Paul H. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Drapery Hardware Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1843. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1844. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Geneva Rossignol and 6 others, of Caribou; L. S. Ginn and 28 others, of Caribou; and Mabel D. Russell and 24 others, of Danforth, Maine, in regard to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1845. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1846. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 21 residents of Bad Axe, Mich., urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages during the war in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of war materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1847. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Blanche A. Gasler and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1848. Also, petition of Daisie Cox and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. Also, petition of Minnie Traut and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1850. Also, petition of Grace I. Stewart and 11 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1851. Also, petition of Ruth Brakefield and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1852. Also, petition of Margaret Hoover and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1853. Also, petition of H. E. McVay and 18 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1854. Also, petition of Mrs. D. H. Schedin and 18 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1855. Also, petition of Myra I. Evans and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1856. Also, petition of Ida Olive and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1857. Also, petition of Mrs. E. J. Dumphy and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war

by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1858. Also, petition of Carrie J. Krons and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1859. Also, petition of Mrs. George Setters and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1860. Also, petition of F. B. Peach and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1861. Also, petition of Otto Richter and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1862. Also, petition of Ted A. Carlson and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1863. Also, petition of Peter A. Jersell and 58 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1864. Also, petition of Lillie Memhard and 17 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1865. Also, petition of Mamie C. Nood and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1866. Also, petition of Gertrude Hofsteater and 15 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1867. Also, petition of Elizabeth Morston and 19 other residents in Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1868. Also, petition of Sarah L. Peterson and 19 other residents in Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1869. Also, petition of Mrs. M. J. Kinkade and 19 other residents of Opportunity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1870. Also, petition of Rev. Luther A. Plankenhorn and 19 other residents of Opportunity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1871. Also, petition of Frida Hokom and 43 other residents of Veradale, Opportunity, and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1872. Also, petition of Mrs. George L. Dibble and 19 other residents of Winthrop and Pateros, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1873. Also, petition of Mrs. William Wolfrum and 19 other residents of Davenport, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1874. Also, petition of Laura McKinnon and 19 other residents of Davenport, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1875. Also, petition of Harry J. Johnson and 12 other residents of Entiat, Wash., favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1876. Also, petition of Sarah M. Humphreys and 15 other residents of Leavenworth and Wenatchee, Wash., favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1877. Also, petition of Mrs. A. J. Dusser and five other residents of Newport, Wash., favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1878. Also, petition of Mamie A. Davis and nine other residents of Newport, Wash., favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1879. Also, petition of Grace B. Gildea and 19 other residents of Newport favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1880. Also, petition of Elva Naoma Hamilton and 16 other residents of Mansfield favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1881. Also, petition of J. D. Dudley and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1882. Also, petition of Cora I. Miller and 68 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1883. Also, petition of Anna Slack and 29 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1884. Also, petition of Jack Knutwon and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1885. Also, petition of Grace Manley and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1886. Also, petition of J. Fred Ulery and 41 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1887. Also, petition of Ida M. Black and 28 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. Also, petition of Jessie Patrick and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1889. Also, petition of Olive M. Buttles and 17 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1890. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Pearl Danner and 19 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. Also, petition of Hazel J. Reed and 28 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. Also, petition of H. C. Barrigan and 15 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1893. Also, petition of R. J. Carlson and 32 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1894. Also, petition of Robert Lincoln Kelley and 35 other residents of Waterville, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1895. Also, petition of Nona Andre and 23 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1896. Also, petition of R. D. Bishop and 17 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1897. Also, petition of Jessie M. Snodgrass and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1898. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Herr and 33 other residents of Pateros, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1899. Also, petition of Virginia Layton and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. Also, petition of Effie M. Johnson and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1901. Also, petition of Selma Hitchen and 37 other residents of Spokane, requesting Congress to stop the sale of intoxicating drinks in Army camps and around them; and to make provision to clean up adjacent cities, if the constituted authorities do not, thus keeping temptation from our men and boys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, on the birthday of national independence we confess our dependence upon Thee. Without Thee we are lost in spite of the overwhelming might of our material arms.

We thank Thee for those pilgrims of faith who came hither in their frail barque across mountainous seas and who stepped upon strange shores with the salutation to a new world, "In the name of God. Amen." The Nation here established, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal has acknowledged that Name above every name and reverenced it, has built its altars, reared its temples, and raised its steeples, emblems of a faith that points to the skies and wings its sure and certain way to God. Make that faith of the fathers, we pray, real to us in these tempestuous days. Save us from a freedom of speech so empty that we have nothing worth saying, from a freedom of worship so futile that we have no God to adore, from freedom from want and fear with no creative idea as to how to use our plenty or our security for the redemption of our social order and for the salvation of our own souls. Let all that is low and unworthy in us sink to the depths. Let all that is high and fine in us rise to greet the morn of a new day confident that the best is yet to be. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Saturday, July 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 1, 1943:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

On July 3, 1943:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, and 32 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school

students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and it was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99, relating to Federal crop insurance, to the agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 2481.

Under the order of the Senate of Saturday last, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

The Chair also calls attention to the fact that a vote shall be taken on the motion of the Senator from Georgia at not later than 1 o'clock p. m. today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I presume the Senator from Alabama is about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. I am about to make the suggestion that no quorum is present.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as a vote is to be taken at 1 o'clock, I doubt if there will be much time left after a quorum is secured.

Mr. REED. Let me say for the RECORD that the crop-insurance program is one of the relatively unimportant things I intend to discuss this morning. I propose to discuss the whole wheat situation and its relation to food and feed for next year, and I certainly desire more Senators in the Chamber than are now present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Downey
Austin	Capper	Ellender
Barkley	Caraway	Ferguson
Bone	Chavez	George
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	Gerry
Brooks	Connally	Guffey
Burton	Danaher	Gurney
Butler	Davis	Hawkes
Hayden	Murdock	Taft
Hill	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Holman	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Kilgore	Overton	Tydings
La Follette	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
Langer	Reed	Van Nuys
McCarran	Revercomb	Wagner
McClellan	Reynolds	Wallgren
McFarland	Robertson	Walsh
McKellar	Russell	Wheeler
Maloney	Scrugham	Wherry
Maybank	Shipstead	White
Millikin	Smith	Wiley
Moore	Stewart	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I request that my colleagues not ask me to yield for any purpose, and I make the request solely because of the limitation on my time due to the agreement to vote at 1 o'clock.

I wish to say to the Senate also that while crop insurance is important, it is relatively unimportant in the light of the various phases of the wheat and feed and food situation which I shall develop. If in the course of my remarks it should seem that I do not know as much as I should know about the work of the conferees, nothing I say is to be taken as critical of their candor and good faith. If there is any lack of knowledge on my part, it is probably my own fault. But the situation which has developed has been startling to me.

Wheat will be harvested in 1943 from approximately 52,000,000 acres. It is part of the announced program of the War Foods Administration, first indicated by Chester C. Davis, to ask wheat farmers to harvest 70,000,000 acres in 1944, which is an addition of 18,000,000 acres. It is broadly indicated that of the increase in acreage, 10,000,000 are to be planted in the Hard Winter Wheat Belt, embracing the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado, Panhandle of Texas; 5,000,000 acres in the Hard Spring-wheat area, covering the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; and the other 3,000,000 acres in the Soft Winter wheat area in Missouri and east of the Mississippi River, together with some increased acreage in Washington and Oregon.

In order to provide the wheat farmers with an incentive to plant the increased acreage, the following steps are being taken:

First. The latest figures available, June 15, 1943, show that the farm price of wheat is $1.24. Parity price for wheat is $1.45 a bushel. The wheat farmer is receiving 21 cents less than parity. While there is no ceiling price on wheat, the price of wheat is held down by ceilings on flour and bread prices. These ceilings have been fixed by the O. P. A. in direct violation of the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942. It is the intention of the O. P. A. to continue to hold down the price of wheat. This is encouragement No. 1 to the wheat farmer to increase his acreage.

Second. Under the appropriation bill as written by the House and insisted upon by the House conferees, the wheat farmer is to be deprived of any participation in the crop benefits under the Soil Conservation Act. This is encouragement No. 2, and takes 9 cents a bushel from the wheat farmer for next year as compared with this year.

Third. Notwithstanding the fact that wheat is now 21 cents below parity, the House left out provision for parity payments. The Senate Committee on Appropriations inserted the provision and then receded. This is encouragement No. 3.

Fourth. The House insists upon outlawing the wheat-crop-insurance program.

This program was established by an act of Congress in 1938. Beginning in 1939 and continuing to 1942, wheat-insurance contracts were written on a 1-year basis. The results were not satisfactory and in 1942, 3-year term contracts were made. Four hundred and eighty-seven thousand 3-year term wheat contracts were written in 1942 by important wheat-producing States. They are:

	Insured farms
Nebraska	67,074
Kansas	42,165
Ohio	40,862
Michigan	32,253
Indiana	32,022
Missouri	30,016
Illinois	29,601
Oklahoma	22,975
Minnesota	20,747
North Dakota	13,800
Texas	9,785
South Dakota	9,553
Pennsylvania	7,086
Colorado	4,138
Maryland	2,448

It is now proposed that the Federal Government walk out on the 487,000 farmers who hold these contracts. The House is insisting upon liquidating the crop-insurance program as of July 31, 1943—this month.

If all these policies are followed, there is no chance to secure the increased acreage of wheat desired for both food and feed. From the additional 18,000,000 acres, if planted and harvested, it would be expected to obtain upward of 200,000,000 bushels, in addition to the crop from the normal acreage. This increase is the largest asked of any important class of farmers contributing to the war effort.

The agricultural appropriation bill, as passed by the House, was a lame affair. The Senate Appropriations Committee so amended it as to make a better bill. The House conferees are now insisting upon tearing it to pieces so far as the wheat farmer is concerned.

I have no intention of agreeing that the wheat farmer shall be forced to play the role of Czechoslovakia in a Munich appeasement conference in order to satisfy the prejudices of some of the House conferees. This is an attempt at legislative dictatorship, in violation of all the rules of legislative fair play. Twice the Senate overwhelmingly insisted, by a yea-and-nay vote, upon retaining the crop-insurance program.

I do not want to place too much stress upon the wheat-crop-insurance phase of the situation. It is important, but not the only important element. In fact, I doubt if it is immediately the most important item in the situation. The holding of the price of wheat below parity, which is being done, and which the O. P. A. intends to continue to do, is the most discouraging feature. The only point I make about the crop-insurance factor is that it can easily qualify as the last straw laid upon the wheat farmer, which broke his back.

The House threatens failure of the appropriation bill unless the Senate recedes. So far as the Senate is concerned, I shall ask that the bill be returned to the House with the Senate amendment, and let the House bear the entire responsibility of failure with respect to the bill if it should fail. That is where the responsibility belongs.

Mr. President, I shall now summarize the present wheat situation, and the action of the Congress. I have caused a brief statement to be prepared and distributed on the desks of my colleagues. I hope they may follow me, because the question under discussion is one of the most important to come before the Senate.

Let us review briefly what Congress had done to the wheat grower, in face of the fact that his Government is going to ask him to plant from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 more acres to wheat this fall and next spring.

Of all the major staple crops, wheat alone now is selling below parity.

Through ceilings on flour and bread, the administration has served notice on the wheat grower that the price of wheat is to be held around 85 percent of parity.

There has been written into the appropriation bill a prohibition against any parity payments on the wheat crop to be harvested in 1944. The bill now prohibits any crop payments being made on wheat harvested in 1944. These two payments this year would amount to 23 cents a bushel.

In other words, Congress has notified the wheat grower that he is to receive 23 cents a bushel less for his 1944 wheat than he would receive under the A. A. A. and appropriations made under it for the crop harvested in 1943. So Congress is penalizing the wheat grower 23 cents a bushel for growing wheat, while at the same time asking him to grow more wheat.

That already has been done.

Now it is proposed, by the motion offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that Congress shall also take from 487,000 wheat growers the crop insurance for which they had signed up during the past year, under what they understood was a 3-year insurance contract.

Judging from past experience, and from statistics as to the amount of land that can be put into wheat, the bulk of the fifteen to twenty million increase in wheat acreage must be planted in the Great Plains area, five or more million acres in my own State of Kansas.

This is the high risk wheat-growing area of the United States. Any farmer who plants wheat in this area knows that he faces the prospect of not getting a crop.

The wheat grower has been getting some measure of protection in past years. If he were in compliance, he knew he would get 9 cents a bushel on his average yield on his acreage allotment, in the form of a crop payment. That has been taken away from him.

He was entitled to about 14 cents a bushel in the form of parity payments, if wheat remained at 85 percent of parity or less. That has already been taken away from him.

He could take crop insurance, by paying premiums based on the record of his farm, up to 75 percent of his normal crop yields. It is proposed to take that away from him.

And through price ceilings on wheat products Congress threatens him that under no conditions shall he receive more than 85 percent of parity for what crop he does raise. Certainly he will receive no higher price if the present Government policies are carried out.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the consuming States that their supply of this most important of all foods for next year is threatened. Instead of from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres more under these conditions, the production is likely to be less. Wheat represents one of the most serious problems facing the people of the country, and I challenge the attention of the consuming States as well as the wheat-producing States to the possibilities contained in the situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to second everything the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has said. If there is anything about which I know it is the production of wheat. That was my grandfather's business, it was my father's business, and it has been almost the major part of my business in the Northwest.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that in the last World War the farmer received $2.26 a bushel for his wheat at Minneapolis. Today, at Stanley, N. Dak., the farmers are receiving $1.17 a bushel. One of the reasons why the farmers in North Dakota are raising wheat is because during the last 2 years they have had exceptionally large crops. If normal conditions return, instead of having bumper crops such as were had last year, when the farmers had practically 2 years' crops in one because of the large yield per acre, what will happen? As the Senator from Kansas has said, all the safeguards and inducements the farmers had to raise wheat have been taken away from them during the last few months. The result is that the farmers will try to raise something else. They will raise more corn. Corn can be raised in the Northwest at much less cost per acre than wheat. It does not cost as much to produce the corn. Of course, corn will be fed to the livestock. The farmers can get their land in better shape if they raise corn, instead of wheat. Less labor is required to raise corn, rather than wheat.

However, that is not all. The farmers in the Northwest will raise more barley and oats. Now there is an incentive for them to raise flax; the farmers are offered a premium to raise it. The farmers will raise more soybeans and will put more land into the production of sugarbeets. The result will be that the country will suffer from lack of wheat.

The farmers in that section are equipped with the machinery with which to raise wheat. Yet, by taking away the incentives, by not giving the wheat farmers the kind of deal that is given to those who raise other crops, the result will simply be that millions of acres of land that formerly have been planted in wheat will not now be planted in wheat. There will be a decrease rather than an additional 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 acres planted in wheat, as the Department of Agriculture and other governmental departments are requesting at the present time.

I call attention to the further fact that, although some Senators may think the farmers can obtain loans on their wheat, from personal experience I know that frequently a farmer can borrow on only approximately half of his wheat, because of spoilage caused by the labor shortage. In the past year in my State much of the wheat that the farmers had in shocks in the fields was soaked with rain. A great many times as the combines have gone through the fields they have left the crop in windrows. The result was that when the rains came the grain that was on the field in windrows was beaten down into the ground, and when the pickups of the combines came along again they missed a part of it. A great deal of the wheat sprouted in the windrows and in the shocks them-

selves; and I know that in the eastern part of the State, for instance, in Ransom County, farmers lost about 25 cents a bushel.

In addition, such wheat contains an exceptionally large amount of moisture. If the moisture content is even one-eighth of 1 percent above the amount allowed under Government regulations, the result is that when the farmer stores his wheat he is unable to get a loan on it, and he has to have the wheat in storage on his farm moved in order to keep it from heating.

The result is that after the farmers have had several years' experience of that sort and have found that they are unable to obtain the loan value on their wheat, they will raise some crop that does not entail so much risk.

Another element enters into the picture. No one knows better than does the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who now is in the Chamber, that when the drought occurred in 1933, the first year I was Governor of the State of North Dakota, for a distance of 726 miles along the Great Northern Railroad, through North Dakota and Montana, not one carload of wheat was shipped. There was a total drought. Much the same situation existed in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937. In 1938 we had a fair crop. However, the wheat farmers stuck it out on the farms, relying upon the Federal Government. They did not move away to cities or to vastly congested areas, but they stayed there, relying upon being able to secure all the various kinds of assistance that the distinguished Senator from Kansas has just told us is now being taken away from them. They relied upon having those aids kept in full force and effect.

That is not all. The average small farmer has been able to go to his bank and say to the banker, "I need a little money to get my crop through," and the banker would lend him the money. However, under present conditions, if we take away crop insurance, the banker will not have as much inducement to lend money to the farmer. Formerly the banker would ask the farmer, "Are you covered by insurance?" If the farmer said he was, the banker knew he could lend him money, because he knew if hail or rust occurred, the farmer would have some insurance, so that he would be able to repay at least a part, if not all, the loan.

If crop insurance is discontinued, if the motion of the Senator from Georgia prevails, if the conference report is not sent back to conference, the result will be that the small farmers will likely not be able to borrow money from the banks, as mortgaging on the crop itself is forbidden by law in some States. In North Dakota, because there we have a State hail insurance system operated by the State of North Dakota itself, the farmers will be able to obtain hail insurance without paying very large premiums to the private hail insurance companies.

I call attention to the fact that in my State, for example, the people have time and again overwhelmingly voted in favor of State-owned hail insurance operations because they knew that under such a system the premiums they would have to pay would be approximately one-third the amount of the premiums they would otherwise have to pay to private hail insurance companies.

A Senator came to me the other day and said that crop insurance was "socialistic." I called his attention to the fact that when the crop insurance law was adopted by Congress not a single company was engaged in that business. Years ago, in 1917, 1918, and 1919, there was a company in Pittsburgh, Pa., that wrote insurance covering the same causes of crop loss which are covered by the Federal Government. That company went broke; and in the States of North Dakota and Montana many claims were brought against that Pittsburgh company to make it pay for the losses. They quit business after the lawsuits were brought. All through the 1920's there was no place in the entire United States where the farmer could go and get insurance against drought, rust, grasshoppers, frost, or excessive heat. For the first time in the history of America the United States Government stepped in and helped the small farmers who had to have protection.

I can readily understand how some wealthy operator who plants thousands of acres of crops, and who is rich enough to take a loss 1 year can practically carry his own insurance, would not be affected by the elimination of crop insurance. However, if Federal crop insurance on wheat is taken away, the net result will be that small farmers all over the great Northwest will not take the risk. They will find some other crop to seed. If they cannot do that, they will let part of their land lie idle. The result will be a tremendous shortage of food.

I am very sorry that the various measures which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has mentioned will apparently be in effect unless this conference report is rejected. I do not know of anything that can be done about this terribly outrageous situation, unless we now refuse to agree to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and again send this question back to conference.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only has the House refused to permit crop insurance, but, as the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, it has eliminated the parity payments. In addition, the O. P. A. is holding down the price of wheat by a ceiling on the price of flour. So in 1944 the farmer cannot expect to receive more than about 85 cents a bushel for his wheat. The result will be either one of two things. Under the Price Control Act the Government will have to let the price of wheat go to parity, and if it lets it go to parity, the price of wheat will rise to about $1.45. The only reason it has not been permitted to go to parity, and the subterfuge which has been used to keep it below that price is that it is said that we are allowing the farmers parity payments, and that parity payments ought to be taken into consideration. So the price of wheat has been kept down. If the parity payments are taken away, there is no excuse whatever for preventing the price of wheat going to parity. I do not know how, under the law, the Government can prevent it.

If the price of wheat were allowed to go to parity, I would not complain particularly about repealing the parity payments; but what I am afraid of is that the farmer will not receive the parity price, and that the price ceiling on flour will be maintained, which will keep the price of wheat down around 85 cents. If that is done, we can rest assured that there will not be the increased production of wheat which the administration says we must have, not only during the war, but as a backlog to feed the world after the war is over.

We hear much said about policing and feeding the world. We had better give our attention to what is likely to happen in the United States and to the problem of feeding and policing the people of the United States when we become short of food when the farmers are not paid a sufficiently high price for wheat and other products to justify raising them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we cannot solve the problem by letting the price of wheat go to parity. As the Senator knows, there are thousands of small farmers in the Northwest. Unless they can have crop insurance, where are they to obtain the funds?

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator says about crop insurance. I am told that only about 3,000 farmers in Montana have received the benefit of it. I am speaking of something of far greater importance than crop insurance. I agree with the Senator that crop insurance should be provided. I do not object if some private company wishes to write it; but no private company will take the chance. The only agency which can do so is the Government.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] called attention to the point which I particularly wish to emphasize. I think many Members of the Senate have overlooked it. On the one hand, there is a ceiling on the price of flour. On the other hand, the parity payments are being repealed. The Government will have to do one of two things. Either it must allow the price of wheat to go to parity, which is about $1.45, or it must give subsidies to the farmers by some scheme of which we know nothing at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will remember that about 2 months ago we were discussing the question of wheat. At that time we had before us the index price on farm machinery. I ask the Senator to recollect if it is not true that during the last World War the prices of farm machinery rose to their greatest height, and since that time, up to the present time, they have never gone down. The farmer who today buys farm machinery is paying more for it than he paid during the last war; and instead of receiving $2.26 in Minneapolis for his

wheat, he is receiving $1.17 at Stanley, N. Dak.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe the Senator probably is correct. I have not the figures as to farm machinery; but I know that during the depression, when the farmer could not obtain an adequate price for wheat, the prices of farm machinery did not go down to a degree comparable with the reduction in the price of wheat. The prices of farm machinery have remained high, because of the fact that the manufacturers of farm machinery can keep the prices up by closing the factories during a depression, when there is little demand for farm machinery and the farmers cannot buy it. However, there is nothing to keep the price of wheat up.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not wish to cut the Senator short, but I promised to yield to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who also wishes to discuss the question of crop insurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the agreement the Senate must vote at 1 o'clock. So far the only time that has been used has been taken by Senators who oppose the motion of the Senator from Georgia. If the Senator from North Dakota has concluded, he cannot yield time to another Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I have taken my 15 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes. I voted against this motion the other day. If the situation were normal, I would do so again. However, the situation is now such that the House conferees, I am informed, will not even go back into conference on this question. I understand that the House will not even consider a continuing resolution making appropriations available for the Department of Agriculture. That is an arbitrary and unreasonable attitude to take, but there is nothing we can do about it. If this bill is not passed, the result will be an entirely new appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, which might be, and probably would be, worse than this one. In view of that situation, I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I have always been in favor of crop insurance. I helped to enact the original law, and I have been for it ever since. I am for it now. However, as Grover Cleveland once said, we are confronted with a condition, and not a theory. The condition does not exist solely in this Chamber.

For the reasons which I have explained, I shall vote to recede from the Senate position. It seems to me that that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that he is no stronger a believer in crop insurance that am I. As I have heretofore pointed out, the House voted on this question on five separate occasions, and the position of the Senate has lost ground on each vote. Finally, it was impossible for the supporters of crop insurance to rally one-fifth of the House membership so as to enable the small guard still supporting crop insurance to obtain a record vote in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. The Senator from Georgia has been a valiant soldier in behalf of crop insurance. He is just as strong a supporter of crop insurance as I am. However, in the face of the existing situation, for which we are not responsible, it seems to me that the only thing we can do, in order not to risk making the situation even worse, is to agree to the Senator's motion.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Congress has gone far enough—in fact has already gone too far—in its attempts to punish the farmer for producing the food which is so badly needed in order to win this war and insure the peace.

Under directives, orders, and regulations from the O. P. A. the cattle raisers, the dairymen, and the poultry raisers are being steadily driven out of business, just at the time when more meat, more milk, more chickens, and more eggs are needed.

We are told, and in fact we know positively, that our people must shift from a meat diet to a cereal diet. That means that we shall need wheat and still more wheat. The War Food Administration knows this. Notice was served by Chester C. Davis, before he was forced to resign, that the wheat acreage must be increased this fall and next spring by some sixteen or eighteen million acres.

In the face of this need for more wheat acreage and more wheat, what has the Congress done to date to encourage wheat production? I list some of the actions taken to discourage wheat planting, while calling upon farmers as a patriotic duty to plant more wheat.

First. After Congress several times enacted into law the declaration that the wheat grower is entitled to parity price for wheat, it allowed the O. P. A. to fix price ceilings on flour, which means that the price of wheat is to be held at around 85 percent of parity.

Second. The Congress, in the appropriation act for the present fiscal year, has taken away from the wheat grower the agricultural crop payments which he has been allowed in past years, and to which he plainly is entitled under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Third. The Congress, in the same appropriation bill, has taken away the parity payments to which the wheat grower plainly is entitled under the law.

The effect of refusing appropriations or authorizations for these payments is to penalize the wheat grower around 23 cents a bushel, in the face of the fact that O. P. A. will not allow him to obtain the 23 cents a bushel in the market place.

Fourth. Now this Congress is proposing, through the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to cancel some 487,000 wheat crop-insurance contracts which still have 2 years to run, and to prevent the writing of any more insurance contracts on the additional sixteen or eighteen million acres of wheat desired to be planted. This in spite of the fact that the law providing for wheat crop insurance remains in effect.

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate, as well as by Senators off the floor, to the effect that certain agencies of the Federal Government have not followed the law in their operations. What is it that the Senate is now asked to do by the Senator from Georgia, if not to ignore the wheat crop-insurance law? That law says that the wheat growers are entitled to crop insurance. The pending motion would take that insurance away from them, not through repealing the act, but by sneaking out the back door and taking away appropriations for administering the act.

The Congress has seen the executive branch of the Government manhandle the corn situation so badly that producers of chickens, cattle, and hogs are unable to obtain corn with which to feed their animals and fowls.

I ask, Does the the Congress want to create a similar situation in regard to wheat? In my judgment, the Senate certainly is on the way toward creating just that kind of a situation in regard to wheat. I sincerely trust that the motion will be voted down, and by a strong enough vote to require the crop-insurance amendments to be taken to a yea-and-nay vote in the House, where I hope by this time there is a better understanding of the situation.

CATTLE INDUSTRY THREATENED WITH BANKRUPTCY

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram I have just received from W. K. Waugh and J. Y. Waugh, well-known cattlemen of Eskridge, Kans. It is very brief, and reads as follows:

> Unless some sane solution adopted on beef situation at once, am afraid entire cattle industry will be bankrupt this fall.

This is a good time for the Senate to use calm judgment on all matters affecting food production, and put a stop to this punishment of farmers.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, I am supporting the motion of the Senator from Georgia to recede, because if we prolong this consideration and accomplish finally a complete disagreement and the inauguration of new legislation to sustain the Department of Agriculture, the Senate may well find itself losing some of the exceedingly important advantages which have been accomplished for the farmer in the pending agricultural appropriation bill.

I should not support the motion were it not for the fact that I stand thoroughly convinced that we cannot possibly again get the subject of crop insurance fairly before the House of Representatives. To do anything other than to recede would be to engage in the most hopeless kind of an enterprise. I say this, agreeing thoroughly, as I do, with what my colleague the Senator from Kansas has had to say about the dire problem which the wheat farmer faces at this time.

Mr. President, the House has again declined to permit the crop-insurance item to be dealt with fairly in that body. There is just one answer to the House of Representatives, as I see it, and I shall take advantage of the situation which will present itself later in the day when

we shall have to deal with the final deficiency bill. When that bill is presented I shall offer an amendment to the deficiency bill repealing the action which I presume the Congress will have taken by that time on crop insurance, writing into the deficiency bill the appropriations necessary to continue the crop-insurance administration. I shall do this with the anticipation that there will be no way by which the House of Representatives can escape a clean-cut facing of the issue.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there has been no firmer supporter of the effort to work out the problem of insuring crops of the farmers of this country than I. In my opinion, it holds great promise, and I feel that it is a tragedy that it should be stricken down at this time. However, because of the substantial and material gains in behalf of the farmers generally, which were made by the Senate in conference over the House bill, I feel that it would be a great mistake for us at this time to carry on a futile fight for this amendment. I believe it would be futile because the House has now reached the point where it declines even to grant our request for a conference.

I desired to make this brief statement in order that there could be no misunderstanding of my vote in favor of the motion offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last Saturday afternoon I stated, for reasons which I assigned at that time, that in my opinion the Senate had a great deal to lose and nothing to gain by further insisting on the crop-insurance provision in the pending bill. I shall gladly support the amendment which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] proposes to offer.

I wish to point out to Senators who might have been disturbed by the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] that there was a slight error in the Senator's statement. In the first place, the statement was made that the farmers still have the guaranty of 90 percent of parity on loans. I was under the impression that in legislation enacted last year we had raised the loan value to 90 percent of parity.

In addition, Mr. President, under the price Control Act, as I understand it, if the English language means anything, no price level may be put on any commodity processed in whole or in part from agricultural commodities which would defeat parity in the market place. The wheat farmer is in no different category from the cotton farmer, the corn farmer, the tobacco farmer, or the rice farmer with respect to next year's program. Under the program carried in the bill for next year, none of the acreage allotment payments will be made to any farmer. So there has been no discrimination against the wheat farmer in that respect. Mr. President, I believe it would be the part of wisdom for the Senate to recede on this item. I make that statement as one who believes that crop insurance has not had a fair trial and as one who would like to see the program continued. I hope it can be done in some other bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, further debate on the pending motion is precluded. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill making appropriations for the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question before the Senate is on receding from the Senate amendment making provision for crop insurance, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And that is the question on which the Senate is now voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, if a Senator favors crop insurance, his vote should be "nay"——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the debate on this issue had closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call is in progress, and debate is not in order. The clerk will resume calling the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—44

Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bone	Hayden	Reynolds
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Scrugham
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Caraway	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McFarland	Tydings
Danaher	McKellar	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
Ellender	Nye	Wallgren
George	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Gerry	Overton	White
Gurney	Radcliffe	

NAYS—23

Aiken	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Murdock	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	Wiley
Guffey	Robertson	Willis
Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Barbour	Chandler
Austin	Bilbo	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Brewster	Eastland
Ball	Buck	Gillette
Bankhead	Bushfield	Glass

Green	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Hatch	Mead	Tobey
Johnson, Calif.	Moore	Truman
Lodge	Murray	Wilson
Lucas	Pepper	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 92)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $800,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION AND OFFICE OF BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL (S. Doc. No. 93)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior and Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $1,100,000 and $65,000, respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 163 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under statutory authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE AT POST OFFICES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches or stations serving military and Navy personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters from various departments and agencies, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Executive Office (Executive Mansion and Grounds);
Office of Defense Transportation;
National War Labor Board;
United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration;
Board of Investigation and Research (Transportation Act of 1940);
Smaller War Plants Corporation;
Smithsonian Institution (and National Gallery of Art); and
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Eugene E. Norton and sundry other citizens of Gorham, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Marion, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS FROM AKRON, OHIO—DECORATIONS FOR MOTHERS WHOSE SONS MAKE THE SUPREME SACRIFICE

Mr. BURTON presented resolutions adopted by members of the American Slovak Political Club and Aerie No. 55, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, both of Akron, Ohio, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide, through legislative action, for a suitable decoration to be awarded free to the mothers of all those in the armed forces who make the supreme sacrifice for their country

Whereas there is now no provision for a congressional decoration to be awarded to those mothers of America whose sons make the supreme sacrifice for their country; and

Whereas the members of the American Slovak Political Club of Akron, Ohio, feel that provision should be made by Congress to issue a suitable decoration and to award the same free to all such mothers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the American Slovak Political Club of Akron, Ohio:

SECTION I. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to provide for the issuance of a suitable decoration and the means whereby the same may be awarded free to the mothers of this country whose sons make the supreme sacrifice.

SEC. II. That the secretary of said American Slovak Political Club, of Akron, Ohio, be and the same is authorized to certify copies of this resolution to the Honorable ED ROWE, Congressman from the Fourteenth District; Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, our Ohio Senators; the Akron Beacon-Journal, and the Summit County Democrat.

ANDY JAROS, *President.*
JOHN JAVORNIK, *Secretary.*

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide through legislative action, for a suitable decoration to be awarded free to the mothers of all those in the armed forces who make the supreme sacrifice for their country

Whereas there is now no provision for a congressional decoration to be awarded to those mothers of America whose sons make the supreme sacrifice for their country; and

Whereas the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Akron Aerie No. 555, of Akron, Ohio, feel that provision should be made by Congress to issue a suitable decoration and to award the same free to all such mothers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Akron Aerie No. 555, the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Akron, Ohio:

SECTION I. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to provide for the issuance of a suitable decoration and the means whereby the same may be awarded free to the mothers of this country whose sons make the supreme sacrifice.

SEC. II. That the secretary of said Fraternal Order of Eagles, Akron Aerie No. 555, be and the same is authorized and directed to certify copies of this resolution to the Honorable ED. ROWE, Congressman from the Fourteenth District; Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, our Ohio Senators; the Eagle Magazine; and M. L. Brown, secretary of the Ohio State Aerie.

JOHN PODA, *Chairman.*
HOWARD A. KIRBY, *President.*
ROBERT H. MAXON, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF NORWALK, CONN.—RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have a letter under date of July 3 from Honorable Le Roy D. Downs, a former Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut, now comptroller of the city of Norwalk, Conn., reporting that on July 2 there was a largely attended mass meeting of citizens of Norwalk who adopted a resolution. I ask that the resolution appear in the RECORD in full at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the citizens of Norwalk, in a meeting assembled, protest against the ban on driving to local beaches. We believe in gas rationing; but when we have been sold the amount of gas to which we are entitled under our A card allotment, then we should be permitted to use this gas for the healthful purpose of driving to our local beaches and waters; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this protest be sent to: Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss Brown, Fuel Administrator Harold Ickes, State Office of Price Administration Director Chester Bowles, Senators Francis T. Maloney and John A. Danaher, and Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have, under date of July 2, a letter from the Connecticut Conference on Social and Labor Legislation, of New Haven, attaching an open letter addressed to my colleague and to me, bearing the signatures of many who have subscribed to the sentiments expressed in the open letter.

I ask unanimous consent that both the letter of transmittal and the open letter, with the names signatory thereto, be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, as follows:

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL AND LABOR LEGISLATION,
New Haven, Conn., July 2, 1943.

Senator JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: I enclose herewith an open letter addressed to you and Senator MALONEY, signed by approximately 235 leading citizens of Connecticut.

We trust that you will use your influence as member of the Judiciary Committee to bring this poll-tax bill, H. R. 7, to the floor of the Senate. We would like this action in the next few days if possible.

Signatures for this letter are still coming in; but due to the need for immediate action, we are forwarding those received to date.

Yours truly,

ETHEL H. FAUST,
Acting Secretary.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SENATORS FROM CONNECTICUT

DEAR SENATORS DANAHER AND MALONEY: The poll tax, which is levied in seven Southern States as a prerequisite for voting, is an unqualified evil. It places an unjust barrier between millions of Negro and white citizens and the voting booth. It is a direct curtailment of democratic rights and, as such, must be abhorrent to us at all times. But this is doubly so in time of war when the Nation's struggle against fascism and nazi-ism needs the maximum devotion and initiative of all the people.

The Connecticut Conference on Social and Labor Legislation has for many years campaigned for poll-tax repeal. We have noted with joy that in the Seventy-eighth Congress the House of Representatives has already voted by 265 to 110 to abolish the poll tax We believe it is greatly to the credit of our State that all six Connecticut Representatives voted for House Resolution No. 7.

This matter now rests with the Senate. We are not unmindful that last year when the shocking filibuster against this legislation developed in the Senate you voted for the motion to limit debate.

This year there are already indications that another filibuster is contemplated. It is our deepest belief that, in the interests of American democracy in time of war, nothing must be allowed to prevent passage of this legislation.

We wish to urge upon you to use your great influence both with the Judiciary Committee and with the Senate as a whole to insure passage of the bill without delay. We feel that extended hearings in the Senate are unnecessary since the bill is, we understand, substantially identical with the one presented last year. We ask you to aid, to the utmost of your ability, in giving leadership to this nonpartisan and absolutely vital campaign. We know that your influence is great; and we, therefore, express our hope that your attitude in this matter will not be one of acquiesence but of active leadership.

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE ON
SOCIAL AND LABOR LEGISLATION,
New Haven, Conn.

SIGNERS OF OPEN LETTER TO CONNECTICUT SENATORS FOR THE REPEAL OF THE POLL TAX: TO JULY 2, 1943

Andover: Mrs. John F. Phelps, teacher; David Yeomano, audit engineer, State Capitol. Ansonia: Francis J. Bollard; Rev. Salvatore Lo Presti. Bridgeport: Mrs. Minnie Cederholm, job discrimination conference; Leigh Danenberg, publisher, Bridgeport Herald; Oliver L. Arsenault, president, and Frank Fazekas, business agent, Local 203, U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.); Leon Fleischer; Rev. Fred Hoskins; Frank Kennell, teacher; Ruth Kennell; Edyth Lively; Henry J. McAden; Rev. Robert Peters; Raymond Riggs; Rev. William Sullivan; Attorney Arthur B. Weiss; Rev. Ronald Wells. Bridgewater: George D. Pratt, dairy farmer. Bristol: Albert DeCapua, president, U. E. R. M. W. A., No. 260. Brookfield: William McFee, writer. Chaplin: Rev. Walter E. Lanphear; Rev. F. Waldo Savage. Cobalt: Luva M. Mead, teacher; Mrs. C. Weaver Squires. Colchester: Julia H. Bartman, principal, Bacon Academy. Columbia: Mrs. Joseph W. Waterson. Danbury: Rev. Harry Adams Hersey; Rabbi Jerome R. Malino. Danielson: Rev. Henry A Coolidge; Rev. Harold E. Craw. Darien: Marguerite Tjader Harris, editor, Direction magazine; Mrs. Paul J. Soley. Ellington: Hyman Pashell. Fairfield: Mrs. Elizabeth T. Cuffee. Gaylordsville: Peter Blume; Matthew Josephson, historian; Rev. Charles W. Simpson. Greenwich: Mrs. William Darrach; Lillian Gotera; Rustico Gotera; Louis Scala, teacher; Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Baker Lewis. Groton: Edward J. Breault; Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Dembo. Hartford: Ben Abrams; Mildred Aslin, director of activities, Colt Local; Linda M. Ballette; Walter E. Batterson; John Anthony Barbagallo, president, U. F. W. A., No. 135; Prof. T. H. Bissonette; Julia Louise D'Agostino, health and physical education director; Ruth M. Dadourian; James C. Eagan, executive member, U. E. R. M. W. A., No. 251; Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn; Clifton H. Hert, D. D. S.; Rev. George I. H. Jackson; Eleanor Hope Johnson, Ph. D.; Mrs. Sylvia Meisner; Mabel Robbins; Rockwell Harmon Potter, dean, Hartford Theological Seminary; Primrose Woolverton, general secretary, Y. W. C. A. Hebron: Harriett C. Johnson; Nicholas C. Johnson; Rev. Harold R. Keen; Clarissa Pendleton; Susan Pendleton, reporter, Hartford Times; Helen Earle Sellers, State legislature, 1941–43. Kent: Christine R. Bull, secretary to headmaster, South Kent School. Mansfield Center: Mr. and Mrs. Jack Cantor, farmer; Virginia Wallace Wolffe; Wm. B. Wolffe, Jr. Middlebury: Louise Balkley Dillingham; Rev. William H. McCance. Middletown: Rev. J. J. Banks; Rev. Arthur E. Paterson; Charles Coleman Sellers, bibliographical librarian, Wesleyan. New Britain: Rabbi Harry Zwilling. New Canaan: Everett F. Pierce. New Haven: Sam Abrams, business agent, Journeymen Tailors Union; Deborah Cynthia Baldwin; Prof. John S. Brubacher; Rev. J. G. Butler; Clarence B. Carter, New Haven Conference to End Discrimination; Fay Coppleman, medical social worker; Rev. Robert C. Denton; Prof. George Dahl; Helen B. DeNoyan; Nannie Elliott; Dr. and Mrs. Frank Engel; Rev. R. A. G. Foster; Mrs. Alice E. Howell, Yale department of education; E. W. Ireland, president, New Haven State Teachers College; Dr. Bernard L. Kartin; Miriam Keningsberg, social worker; Prof. Raymond Kennedy; Saul Kreas, business agent, Painters Union (A. F. L.); Dr. Paul H. Lavietes; Laura Belle McCoy, alderman, nineteenth ward; Lillian Mermin, assistant secretary, committee on the hygiene of housing; Prof. J. C. Neff; J. Wayne Newton, State secretary, International Workers Order; Dr. John P. Peters; Rev. John B. Pharr; Walter H. Prehn; Rev. Francis P. Randall; Mrs. Sophie Rostonzeff; Nathan Sherman, editor, Union Times; Mrs. Wesley A. Sturges; Rev. W. Teague; Samuel Tourtellotte; Rev. Henry D. Trinkaus; Allan A. Twichell, secretary, committee on the hygiene of housing; Mrs. William Urbach, State chairman, public affairs, Y. W. C. A.; Frances Rhoades Weigand; Rev. C. Lawson Willard; Prof. Harold Williamson; Prof. C. E. A. Winslow; Roberta Yerkes; Mr. Bernard Siegel, research assistant, Institute of Human Relations; Charlotte Siegal, medical social worker. New London: Charles A. Beh, financial secretary-treasurer, Bricklayers Union, No. 10; Rev. Oliver W. Bell; Prof. E. A. Burdick; Fred J. Butler, trustee and executive committee, Local 30, Carpenters Union (A. F. L.); Prof. M. Robert Cobbledick; Rev. Gilbert Coffee; Paul DeLeon, Barbers Union; Stephan Hegarty; Dr. Dorothea Scoville; Rev. J. VanCatledge, Jr.; William F. Fargo, business agent, Carpenters Union, No. 30; Frank Ferri, president, Bricklayers Union, No. 10; Rev. A. A. Garvin; Raymond Gentilella, president, Barbers Union, No. 330; Paul J. Grohocki, president, Local 379; George A. Nocery, recording secretary, Printers Union, Local 1122; Prof. Josephine Hunter Ray; Prof. John Perry Seward; Daniel Chamberlain Small, Youth Welfare League; William F. Totten, president, New London Central Labor Council. New Milford: A. C. Worley, editor, New Milford Times; Ruth Erickson; Eleanor Stevenson. Newtown: Alice P. Davidson, librarian. North Franklin: Julius Schiller, farmer. Norwalk: Rev. Sewell Emerson; Lillian Fischler; George Seldes, editor, In Fact; Rev. Arthur T. Tedcastle; John D. Nolan, director, Norwich Taxpayers Association; Rev. Earl E. Story, superintendent, Norwich District Methodist Church; Francis R. Sullivan, schoolman. Old Greenwich: J. L. Carwin, M. D. Plainville: Rev. Theodore Dixon; Ralph Corlette, president, Ramez Youth Progressive Club. Poquonock: Thomas F. Connor, community committee. Ridgefield: Mrs. Gunnar Michelsen. Scotland: Winifred R. Sloane. Seymour: Rev. Harold J. Edwards; Rev. Elsie F. Stowe. Shelton: Fred Guttman, president, Textile Union. Stamford: Harriet K. Brey; Allen Hackett; Norman Twiddy, D. D., superintendent, New York District Methodist Church; Mildred Wilcox, general secretary, Y. W. C. A. Storrs: Prof. Eric W. Carlson; Prof. George R. Hilton; Hildegarde Hilton; Prof. William R. Clark; Prof. Walter Landauer; Prof. Henry G. Stetler. Stratford: Rev. Stanley Sellick; Rev. Theodore N. Johnson. Torrington: Rev. Stephan L. Kiser; Rev. Adam A. Tangarone. Washington: Rev. Wilbur S. Deming. Waterbury: Hampton Steward, president, Young Republican Club; Rev. John C. Walker. Westport: Helen Keller. Willimantic: Martha Bartlett, assistant librarian, Teachers College; Prof. Herman Beckert; Celia Belman, singer; Selina Bernstein; Prof. Ruth J. Bradley; Elizabeth E. Caichidi; Hattie F. Cohen; Tatania Juzak; Katherine Keelor, supervisor of training, Teachers College; Helena F. Miller, dean, Teachers College; Iona M. Martin; Mrs. James Meade; Frederick Noble, superintendent, training schools, Teachers College; Prof. Pauline Peters; Norma Rathbun, librarian; Mary A. Quinn, retired teacher; Prof. Katherine L. Sears; George T. Shafer, president, Teachers College; Prof. Eugene H. Sloane; Prof. Mary P. Wickware, University of Connecticut; Prof. C. Frances Willey; Laura M. Willey; Prof. J. Eugene Smith; Norma Walker; Evelyn Walker, textile worker; Bernice Woodworth, textile worker; Joseph Somers, machinist; Prof. Robert Wickware. Wilson: Sylvia R. Bloom, high-school teacher. North Windham: Sophie Landeck, teacher. Windham Center: Eve Bogan Smith; Silas B. Weeks, F. S. A. administrator; Mrs. Silas B. Weeks. Windsor: Ellen M. Ashley; Ida I. Browne, secretary to superintendent of schools; Catherine M. Craig, teacher; Rev. Donald H. Dorchester; Marian K. Faller, music supervisor, public schools; Clarence L. Fitch; Daniel Howard, superintendent of schools emeritus; M. Elizabeth Lee, teacher; Elsie M. Owen, teacher; Lawrence C. Parker; Earle S. Russell, superintendent of schools; Clifford S. Sawyer; Fern Stowe; Mary Wilson. Winsted: Frederic Drew Bond.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. HATCH), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1272. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; without amendment.

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2794. A bill to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 388).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1396. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 389).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 789. A bill to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 390);

S. 881. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 391);

S. 1223. A bill to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; without amendment (Rept. No. 392);

S. 1224. A bill to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications; without amendment (Rept. No. 393);

H. R. 2828. A bill to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 394);

H. R. 2988. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 395); and

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of Saint Elizabeths Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 396).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies; with amendments (Rept. No. 397).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1309 (by request). A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; and

S. 1310 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1311. A bill to remove restrictions on Indian property now held in trust by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1312. A bill to prohibit producers and distributors of motion-picture films engaged in interstate commerce from owning, controlling, managing, operating, or having any interest in motion-picture theaters in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1313. A bill to amend section 1 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1314, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1315. A bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. McKELLAR introduced Senate bill 1316, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

ALLOWANCE OF STATE INCOME TAX AS CREDIT AGAINST FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to amend part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide for the allowance of amounts of income tax imposed by States as a credit against Federal income tax, and for other purposes.

I may state the purpose of the bill. There are 13 States in which no State income tax prevails. The result is that persons who live in States which have State income-tax laws move into the States which have none. The purpose of the bill is to allow amounts of any tax imposed by a State as a credit against Federal income tax.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1314) to amend part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide for the allowance of amounts of income tax imposed by States as a credit against Federal income tax, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the bill I have just introduced I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me by Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service, together with the statement attached thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, July 3, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request, we have prepared and are enclosing a manuscript in which we have set forth the rates applied to incomes of $10,000 or more by those States which levy a tax on individual incomes. We have also listed therein the States which do not levy this tax.

With reference to the information presented, however, we are unable to assure you that no item thereof has been altered by legislation adopted in 1943 sessions of the State legislatures. Not having received a complete record of the statues adopted by each of the States whose legislatures convened in 1943, we accordingly cannot be certain that any State, not hitherto imposing a tax on individual incomes, has not adopted this form of tax in 1943, nor whether one has been abandoned by any of the States whose rates are presented. The rates which are included were applicable until January 1943; and in only a few instances have we obtained the 1943 statutes which have enabled us to cite the rate levied for 1943.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

LIST OF STATES HAVING NO INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

STATES LEVYING A TAX ON INDIVIDUAL INCOMES—RATES ON INCOMES OVER $10,000

Alabama: 3.2 percent on the first $5,000 and 5 percent on the remainder.

Arizona: 2.1 percent on the first $9,000 and 4½ percent on the remainder.

Arkansas: 2.4 percent on the first $10,000, 4 percent on the next $14,000, and 5 percent on the excess over $25,000.

California: 1.5 percent on the first $10,000, 3 percent on the next $5,000, 4 percent on the next $5,000, 5 percent on the next $5,000, 6 percent on the next $5,000, 7 percent on the next $10,000, 8 percent on the next $10,000, 9 percent on the next $10,000, 10 percent on the next $10,000, 11 percent on the next $10,000, 12 percent on the next $20,000, 13 percent on the next $50,000, 14 percent on the next $100,000, and 15 percent on the remainder.

Colorado: 6 percent plus a surtax of 2 percent on investment income.

Delaware: 3 percent plus 1 percent withheld on gross incomes for 1943 and 1944.

Georgia: 5 percent on the first $10,000, 6 percent on $10,000 to $20,000, and 7 percent on incomes over $20,000.

Idaho: 2.9 percent on the first $5,000 and 8 percent on the remainder.

Iowa: 3 percent on the first $5,000; 5 percent on the remainder; less a deduction of 50 percent from the tax due for 1942 and 1943.

Kansas: 4 percent.

Kentucky: 5 percent.

Louisiana: 2 percent on the first $10,000; 4 percent on the next $40,000; 6 percent on the excess over $50,000.

Maryland: 5 percent on investment incomes; 2 percent on other incomes; less a deduction of 33⅓ percent from the total tax due.

Massachusetts: 6 percent on income from securities, debts, intangibles; 1½ percent on income from annuities; 1½ percent on other incomes; plus 13 percent of the total tax due.

Minnesota: 8 percent on incomes of $9,000 to $12,500; 9 percent on incomes of $12,500 to $20,000; 10 percent on incomes over $20,000.

Mississippi: 3.2 percent on the first $10,000; 5½ percent on the next $5,000; 6½ percent on the next $10,000; 7 percent on the excess over $25,000.

Missouri: 4 percent; less a deduction of $135.

Montana: 2 percent on the first $6,000; 4 percent on the remainder.

New Hampshire: $3.35 per $100 of investment income. This tax is "levied at the average rate of taxation, as near as may be, levied on other property in the State." The above rate applied in 1941.

New Mexico: 2 percent on incomes of $10,000 to $20,000; 3 percent on incomes of $20,000 to $100,000; 4 percent on incomes over $100,000.

New York: 7 percent less a deduction of 25 percent from the total tax due.

North Carolina: 7 percent.

North Dakota: 12½ percent on incomes of $10,000 to $15,000; 15 percent on incomes over $15,000.

Oklahoma: 4.5 percent on the first $8,000; 9 percent on the remainder.

Oregon: 5.8 percent on the first $4,000; 7 percent on the remainder; plus a surtax of 2 percent provided the total does not exceed 8 percent.

South Carolina: 5 percent.

South Dakota: 1½ percent on the first $7,000; 3 percent on the next $8,000; 4 percent on the next $25,000; 5 percent on the next $100,000; 6 percent on the remainder.

Tennessee: 6 percent on investment income only.

Utah: 2½ percent on the first $4,000; 5 percent on the remainder.

Vermont: 4 percent on investment income; 2 percent on other income.

Virginia: 3 percent.

Wisconsin: 2.8 percent on the first $10,000; 5½ percent on the next $1,000; 6 percent

on the next $1,000; 7 percent on the remainder.

Source: Commerce Clearing House, State Tax Guide Service.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

SALE OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 392, House bill 1294 to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HANDLING OF LEND-LEASE CARGOES BY WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 168), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the handling of lend-lease cargoes by the War Shipping Administration. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem necessary and desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution shall be payable from funds heretofore made available for payment of the expenses of such committee.

APPEAL TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP FROM JASPER COUNTY (S. C.) DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution from Jasper County, S. C., which I wish to have read by the clerk, and then printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the South has always been the mainstay of the Democratic Party; and

Whereas in recent years the national leaders of our party have departed so from its policies and principles that it can now be recognized only by its name; and

Whereas the National Democratic Party is using the name, which is almost sacred to southern people, to hold them in line and at the same time carrying out principles and policies that are detrimental to the South: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we hereby call upon the southern leaders of our party to issue an ultimatum, in no uncertain terms, to the National Democratic Party and the national administration demanding that the policies and principles of the national administration that are detrimental to the South be abandoned, and upon their failure to heed that our leaders take whatever steps that may be necessary, regardless of how drastic, to lead us out of this intolerable situation.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Governor, lieutenant-governor, speaker of the house, State chairman, and all Members of Congress from South Carolina, and that a copy be given to the press.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to state, for the benefit of those who are interested in this resolution, that it is an illustration of the glorious character of the people of South Carolina.

SHIPBUILDING RECORD OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a foreign broadcast delivered by him on the shipbuilding record of the United States Maritime Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR SETTLEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Raise a Question," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate of Saturday last, the Chair now lays before the Senate House bill 3030, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate carries very substantial increases over the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will offer an explanation and justification for the increases.

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as all the increases are due to Budget estimates which have been sent in since the bill passed the House, I think it would probably be better to discuss the reasons for each amendment as it is reached. Will that be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. WHITE. That will be perfectly agreeable.

TRIBUTE TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND JESSE JONES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in 1941 Arkansas had a bonded highway indebtedness of $136,000,000. In view of the high interest rate, the obligations carried, it became most desirable, if not imperative, that the indebtedness be refunded. Under an act of the General Assembly of Arkansas in 1941, a refunding board was created and authority given to refund these highway bonds.

With the invaluable cooperation and assistance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the able direction of the Honorable Jesse Jones, this refunding program was carried out, to the very great benefit of the State of Arkansas, and I may say, incidentally, that the operation resulted in a net profit of more than $4,000,000 to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In recognition of the valuable aid and assistance given by Mr. Jones and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to our State, the refunding board recently adopted a resolution expressing its gratitude for this splendid service and assistance. I find that a copy of the resolution appeared in the issue of the Bond Buyer of June 26, 1943, in an article entitled "Jesse Jones' Aid to Arkansas Acknowledged by Bond Refunding Board." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and I wish to say that I join in the sentiments and gratitude expressed in the resolution with respect to the splendid services of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of Mr. Jones in connection with this transaction.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESSE JONES' AID TO ARKANSAS ACKNOWLEDGED BY BOND REFUNDING BOARD

Recognition of the part played by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones in the refinancing of the $136,000,000 highway indebtedness of the State of Arkansas was officially recorded in the records of the State refunding board at its last full meeting held at Little Rock on June 11, 1943.

Gov. Homer M. Adkins sends us a copy of a resolution adopted at that meeting, which, he writes, "expressed the attitude of all our people."

The resolution reads, in full, as follows:

"Whereas the original Refunding Board of the State of Arkansas, created by the general assembly of 1941, will be dissolved on June 30, 1943, and will be replaced by a board of smaller membership to carry on the operations of the refunding act of 1941; and

"Whereas during the tenure of the original board the State of Arkansas refunded bonded indebtedness in a manner reacting to the lasting benefit of the State's 2,000,000 people and to the improvement of the reputation of the State outside its borders; and

"Whereas Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones was indispensable to the various agencies, officials, groups, and individuals of Arkansas having a part in the refunding operation; and

"Whereas at a time when Arkansas' financial integrity and future stability were factors to be considered by financial houses throughout the land, Secretary Jones shrewdly and fairly appraised our State, its natural resources, its industrial possibilities, and the profound loyalty, intelligence, and moral character of its citizens, and thereupon recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it interest itself in the financing of the refunding operation; and

"Whereas to a large degree because of the nationally recognized stature of Secretary Jones, and his proven business acumen, his recommendation paved the way for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase Arkansas' new refunding bonds at an interest rate which has saved and will continue to save the taxpayers of the State approximately $1,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas Secretary Jones' trust in Arkansas and Arkansas people and his appraisal of the State's assets, both developed and undeveloped, has been confirmed by events of the past 2½ years, not the least significant of which was the turning of the entire refunding bond issue by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to private banking concerns at a profit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of approximately $4,000,000: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Refunding Board of the State of Arkansas, in meeting this 11th day of June 1943, That Secretary Jones be informed by the Board that the State of Arkansas and its 2,000,000 people recognize the debt of gratitude owed him and will everlastingly consider him one of the great benefactors of the State; and be it further

"Resolved, That Secretary Jones be reassured that the people of Arkansas will continue to direct their every effort toward justifying his confidence and faith in the State of Arkansas."

LOANS MADE BY AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in pursuance of my studies upon the subject of loans made by agricultural agencies, I requested the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, to provide me with the record of experience of the various agencies in the liquidation of loans, to ascertain how many of such payments were bona fide liquidations, and how many, if any, were made with money borrowed from other lending agencies. The Department has forwarded to me a letter containing the information covering the portion of the liquidations examined. I believe this information will be of value to the Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Kansas City, Mo., June 26, 1943.

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIS: As you were informed on June 5 by Mr. Paul H. Appleby, the question in your letter of June 1 to Secretary Wickard, relative to the sources of funds used in repaying farm indebtedness, has been referred to us so that we might provide you with any available figures applicable to loans made by the institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Most of the data we have apply to long-term Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans which are made on the security of farm mortgages. Starting with January 1, 1942, we have made careful studies of the source of funds used to pay loans in full. During 1942 a total of 102,856 Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans in the amount of $147,166,193 were paid in full. The following data show the percentage of the total number of loans paid from various sources:

Percent of total number of loans paid in full

Principal source of funds used for repayment:	
Income from farm operations	54
Sale of farm	19
Income from nonfarm occupations	11
Sale of timber, minerals, and farm chattels	8
Refinancing by other lending agencies	4
All other sources	4
All sources	100

You will note that farm and nonfarm income account for the greatest proportion of pay-offs and that refinancing accounts for only 4 percent of the total.

A small proportion of the loans paid in full from funds derived from sale of the farm represents sales which were financed by other lending agencies. Our data on this point cover only the last 6 months of 1942. Of the total loans paid in full from funds derived from the sale of the farm during this period, approximately 22 percent represents cases in which the money was borrowed by the purchaser from another lending agency.

You may be interested also in the trend of paid-in-full loans over the past 5 years. The following data show the trend both in number of loans and in dollar amount:

NUMBER OF LOANS PAID IN FULL

Year	Federal land banks	Land Bank Commissioner	Total	Percent paid in full to total outstanding at beginning of each year
1938	11,068	10,903	21,971	2.0
1939	13,718	13,267	26,985	2.5
1940	15,778	14,545	30,323	2.9
1941	25,407	24,704	50,111	4.8
1942	51,240	51,616	102,856	10.1

AMOUNT OF LOANS PAID IN FULL

1938	$25,881,316	$13,601,528	$39,482,844	1.4
1939	34,165,239	15,493,401	49,658,640	1.8
1940	36,733,513	14,996,515	51,730,028	2.0
1941	56,119,296	23,369,042	79,488,338	3.2
1942	101,298,823	45,867,370	147,166,193	6.2

Although statistics directly related to the source of repayments of production credit association loans are not available, we have some information which indicates that a very small portion of the cash repayments have been made from loans obtained elsewhere.

Last year a survey was made of 74 of the 529 production credit associations, which included 6 or 7 typical associations in each of the 12 farm credit districts. The purpose of the survey was to study turn-over in membership. As of July 1, 1941, the 74 selected associations had 36,571 active members, and 1 year later the survey disclosed that 8,267 of these members no longer had outstanding loans. The reasons why these members were no longer borrowing were broken down into classifications such as "quit farming," "moved out of territory," "deceased," "able to operate on own funds," and "financing elsewhere."

The survey showed that 54 percent were not borrowing because they were able to operate on their own funds. Only 1,614, or 4.4 percent of the 36,571 members covered by the survey, were financing their credit needs elsewhere. These included members who had completely repaid their production credit association loans from income and also those who had refinanced the unpaid balance elsewhere. We do not have the number or the amount of the loans refinanced.

The production credit associations during 1942 made loans amounting to $477,714,567, of which $84,970,947 constituted renewals, leaving cash advances of $392,743,620. Cash repayments during the year amounted to $395,281,233, or 100.7 percent of the cash advances.

We shall be glad to provide any further available information that you may desire.

Sincerely,

A. G. BLACK, *Governor.*

RELIEF OF FARMERS DAMAGED BY FLOODS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to offer an amendment to the pending deficiency appropriation bill when the proper time comes, but I shall be governed entirely in that respect by the wishes of the Senator from Tennessee. Several days ago I discussed on the floor of the Senate and introduced Senate bill 1286, to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943. I had previously offered the measure as an amendment when the flood control bill was pending in the Senate. At the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. OVERTON] in charge of the bill, I withdrew the amendment, and offered it as a separate bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and favorably reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator read to the Senate the language of the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, I have not. I was not going to offer it as an amendment. I was going to ask the Senator from Tennessee, as soon as I completed my statement, if he had any objection to temporarily laying aside the appropriation bill for the purpose of permitting, if unanimous consent can be obtained, consideration of this bill authorizing an appropriation, with the idea of making it in order as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will consideration of the measure take long?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not wish to delay the consideration of the appropriation bill in the least.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the understanding that the appropriation measure again will be laid before the Senate, I am willing to accede to the Senator's request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senate in all fairness that after the bill had been reported—it had been twice before the Senate—objection was made to it. I have discussed the matter with Senators who objected, and I find that they do not object at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered so that it may be in order as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Missouri has conferred with at least two Senators on this side of the Chamber who had previously voiced objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And their objection is removed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Their objection is removed, with the understanding that I make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1286) to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, before the word "rehabilitation", to insert the word "temporary", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement with respect to the bill because it presents a rather unusual proposition. The bill provides for a direct appropriation for rehabilitation of land which has been removed from production by reason of the floods which have occurred in certain areas of the United States this year after the planting had been done, or in some cases before planting had been done, and which destroyed the fencing, the agricultural implements, and other necessities for the production of a crop this year.

The bill proceeds entirely on the theory that this appropriation should be made, not as a measure of benefit to the farmers involved, but as a measure of restoration of crop production in some of the very richest agricultural lands in the United States, in order that production may not be any more diminished this year than is absolutely inevitable. In other words, Mr. President, on much of this overflowed land it is still possible, with proper aid from the Government, to make a crop of corn, or soybeans, or other very vital agricultural elements, but it cannot be done without direct Government aid at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to know if it is the intention of the Senator from Missouri that the Secretary of Agriculture, through his various subdivisions and bureaus, shall administer this appropriation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say that it is, and I will say to the Senator from Connecticut further that I made inquiry of the Disaster Loan Corporation, in fact, of every governmental agency I could think of, and all of them recognized the very vital necessity for the restoration of production in the flooded area, but none of them felt that under existing conditions they had exact authority to administer it, and it seemed to me that the only place where the administration of the act could be placed was in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. It is the purpose of the Senator further, as I understand, to rehabilitate farmers in the matter of producing crops this year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And for this year only. The measure in terms is limited to this year. I will say further that the report of the committee specifically states that the proposed action is not intended to be a precedent, and that it is only recommended by the committee for the reason that the serious emergency of a food shortage, due to our great war effort, and our obligations to our allies and to our civilian population, as well as our armed forces, makes it necessary for the Government to use every possible measure to bring about the increase and the maintenance of our maximum production this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose that in the course of administration the Secretary of Agriculture, through his agents, shall try to rehabilitate the farmers who can make a crop this year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly the purpose of the measure, and its only purpose. I will say further to the Senator from Connecticut that if I had known how to make more specific the standards necessary to attain the aim which he has himself just stated, I should have been very happy to do so. In view of the fact that if anything is to be done this year it must be done immediately, it seemed to me that the only thing which could be done under the circumstances was to make it discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, but I have indicated in the committee's report, which I personally wrote, that it is the purpose to use this as an emergency measure only and simply for the restoration of production on this valuable agricultural land.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, a reading of the bill will disclose that no standards are being prescribed by the Congress as to just how the fund is to be administered. Under the circumstances it seemed to me advisable, in the light of the explanation of the Senator from Missouri, to set forth briefly by means of this colloquy a legislative recital of the purposes the Senator has in mind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appreciate the questions asked by the Senator from Connecticut, and I realize that the bill is not so specific as I myself should like to have it. If it were possible, I would go into more detail as to the particular situations which have occurred by reason of the recent floods.

Mr. President, the bill itself applies to all flood situations in the United States, but I happen to have particular knowledge of the flood situation in the Missouri Valley, where there have occurred three separate and distinct floods this year, each one of which in itself was greater than any we have had since 1903, a period of 40 years. The whole aim of the bill is to see that much of the richest agricultural land in the United States shall not be retired from production for this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose that any of the funds to be appropriated shall be limited in allotment to a given farmer?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not. My theory is that the Secretary of Agriculture should be permitted to use the funds to the maximum extent necessary to restore production. I can say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my State the best estimates I have been able to obtain, and they are necessarily preliminary estimates, are that damage in excess of $40,000,000 has been suffered this year because of floods.

It is not the purpose of the bill, assuming that the bill were in itself sufficient, to authorize the expenditure of $40,000,000. The purpose is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to restore production, insofar as it may be possible to do so this year, in any area where floods have interfered with the production of foodstuffs.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one other question, if the Senator will further yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Assuming that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that certain kinds and amounts of farm machinery are necessary on certain farms, is it the Senator's purpose to have such farm machinery, which might have a life of many years, nevertheless purchased and granted to the particular farmer, without charge, and without any ultimate recompense to the Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that under the provisions of the measure the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to impose such conditions as may be necessary in connection with the use of the money. That might include conditions as to the use of agricultural machinery or conditions as to the making of terms, when terms may be made. I say to the Senator from Connecticut that the proposal is not intended as an outright gift to anyone, but simply as a measure of protection to production in that very rich agricultural area.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I objected to consideration of the bill the other day, on the call of the calendar, because of the fact that the language of the bill left the situation wide open. It seems to me Congress should create some standards by which the Secretary of Agriculture would be guided in his administration of the allotment of the $15,000,000. I grant the laudability of the purpose of the Senator from Missouri, that the production loans the farmers should have this year shall be made to them, because of the impending food shortage. Because I share the feeling of the Senator from Missouri that such production is desirable, I have withdrawn my objection to consideration of the bill, in the hope that what has been said here will be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture as a guide in the administration of the grant, for, obviously, otherwise it would have no strings attached to it, and no other base by which the administration could be guided.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I desire briefly to express the hope that the proposal of the Senator from Missouri will prevail. I doubt that many Senators have his appreciation of the current farm situation in the Middle West, in the Missouri Valley, and the valleys of the other rivers which have just suffered such serious floods. At this hour much of the very rich farmland of that area is still under water. Much of the fertile land has been deteriorated by the floods, and the harmful effect continues. My colleague is quite correct in the assumption that there will be a serious need for additional farm equipment for those engaged in agriculture in that section of the country. I make this statement now, particularly in the hope that I may impress upon those who will have charge of the matter the need of making available at the earliest possible moment farm equipment, farm tools, and the other things which are so urgently required by the farmers of the stricken areas. What is now going on, or not going on, will, in my judgment—and I hope I am in error—add to a food shortage which I fear will come upon us some months hence. I do not think many persons have a very clear understanding of the food situation. I do not know what Congress can do about it at this particular hour; but I know that some of the agencies of Government can do something about it. One of the things with which I am most concerned is that the equipment, the tools, the fences, and the seed, if necessary, and every other possible bit of help be provided for the farmers now so that they may be enabled to feed their countrymen, and perhaps be enabled, although I am not so optimistic about this, to help feed the people of the stricken countries of Europe which we shall take over, or release from bondage, in the successful advance of our armed forces.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I desire to say a few words on the subject of threatened danger to food production. I have just this morning returned from the State of Wisconsin. What has been said suggests to my mind that there has been a fulfillment of the prophecy made on the floor of the Senate some months ago that a tragic loss of food would result if the Government failed to make available adequate machinery and manpower. Because we have had cold weather we in Wisconsin can say that only approximately 10 percent of the pea crop which has ripened up to date has been lost. But, Mr. President, I am sorry to say that some of the skim milk of Wisconsin is flowing into the sewers because there was not made available the capacity to take care of the production.

However, as has been said by the Senator from Connecticut, this is merely the beginning of the tragedy. Unless Congress can cause persons in authority somewhere to comprehend the picture, the tragedy will be multiplied many times.

Something has been said by the Senator about the lack of machinery. Until about two years and a half ago the farmers of the Middle West had been experiencing very poor prices. This poor-price period extended over a period of two decades. As a result, the machinery they had been accumulating was partially worn out. Then what has been called the prosperous era came upon them. Now they cannot buy machinery. Let me cite an instance. Saturday morning and afternoon, in my home city, farmers came from the neighborhood of Fall Creek, in the adjoining county. They came in groups in the morning and in the afternoon. What were they asking for? They said, "Senator, you have got to get out of the Army a man who can do the welding to repair the farm machinery in the Fall Creek area." That is all they asked for. In other words, the men have been drained off the farms and from the villages, and all the farm machinery the farmers have accumulated in 10, 20, or 30 years is wearing out. All they ask is to have someone to keep it going. They asserted, "Unless we can get a welder in this area"—and it is a great production area—"we will not be able to pull through. Our crop will spoil."

If this soldier-welder could only be released on furlough until after the silos have been filled in the fall, they could make a go of it. The farmers say, "We are raising a big crop, but much of it will go to waste unless machinery is made available."

Mr. President, that is the machinery side of the picture. In the State of Wisconsin, unless some help is given by way of providing manpower for the farmers and for the canners, the 10 percent of the pea crop of which I have spoken, which has already been lost up to date, will be multiplied many times. I repeat what I said 2 weeks ago, that this year Wisconsin should harvest from 40 to 45 percent of the pea crop of the Nation; and yet there has been no one in charge who has seen the over-all need. As a result we have been stalemated.

What is needed? There must be someone, somewhere, who senses the need of doing the job, and knows how to do it.

Weeks ago I took up the question with Mr. McNutt. The result has been an attempt to get somewhere. I spoke on the floor of the Senate and illustrated my contention by citing the fact that in Tunisia the government officials harvested the crop to preserve it for our boys and for the Tunisians. In north Africa there were some brains in the picture. But here in American we piddle and fool around. What we need is someone who can sense the serious challenge to the food supply of the Nation.

First, the farmer must have manpower. Farmer after farmer in my State has told me, "We have not the manpower to harvest the crops which are coming on." Think of that. Ordinarily we might say that that is the farmer's concern. It is not now. It is the Nation's concern. If we are to feed the boys in service we must have manpower.

To whom are we to turn? If in Tunisia the Army did the job, why, in God's name, can we not get the boys from the camps here to do the job?

Secondly, the farmers must have machinery. If they cannot get new machinery they must have men who can repair the old machinery. That is not simply to aid the farmer. It is for the Nation.

Machinery is a part of the production line. In big business we provide machines for the manufacture of ammunition and weapons. There is no more important munition than food, so we must have machinery on the food front. In Wisconsin we must have manpower to go into the canneries and other plants which produce the food. What is typical of my State is typical of many other States. There is a lack of authority and vision on the part of some Government officials. We must get under this problem at once, or the tragedy which will follow will be of such large proportions that millions of our people will begin to see red, and when the people on the home front see red we must beware lest the morale break. Listen to the words of one of Wisconsin's harassed citizens:

I will tell you straight from the shoulder, Senator, that unless something is done to relieve the manpower shortage during the late packs the canning industry will hesitate in contracting a vast amount of acreage for the season of 1944, for they are sick and tired of hearing promises from the officials who are in charge of the food program, and by the way, who do not know what the inside of a canning factory looks like, and I doubt very much if they know the difference between a can of peas and a can of beans.

We are tired of having theorists tell us what to do, and it is time that someone is put in charge of this food program who knows what the conditions are in the field and who has brains enough to know what to do to solve the many problems which we have. It is just impossible to have someone sit behind his desk in Washington and try to formulate a plan which is workable for the entire canning industry throughout the United States. Each State has its own problems, and even within States we have our different problems, so how in hell can anyone in Washington make one definite rule and regulation which will govern the entire country?

Mr. President, I trust that these words will have some effect, and that the appropriate authority will take action.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to support the plea which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has made in behalf of the passage of Senate bill 1286. Let me add to what the Senator from Missouri has stated that the floods which occurred in May of this year in eastern Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas were the highest for 99 years. Rivers rose to a higher point than they had reached since 1844.

Several weeks ago the Governor of Oklahoma and representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri came to Washington to obtain relief. In company with other Senators, I went with them to call on the Bureau of Public Roads, and on the W. P. B., in the interest of priorities. Finally we went to Mr. Chester Davis, who at that time was War Food Administrator, and discussed possible means of obtaining relief. I have no doubt that those agencies have gone into action to the best of their ability.

About a month ago I went to Kansas to attend the funeral of a late Member of the Kansas delegation. On my return, in passing through the center of the State, I saw more water in the Missouri River Valley than I had ever seen before, along the Missouri-Pacific Railroad from Jefferson City nearly to St. Louis. For the second time in less than 2 months, the Missouri River had reached record heights. In my own home county in Kansas, in the month of May the rainfall was 20 inches, a remarkable fall of rain. There had been nothing like it previously in our history.

I hope that the bill of the senior Senator from Missouri will pass without any dissent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the pending measure, and I hope that it will be passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I thank Senators who have spoken in favor of the bill. May we have a vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay a vote on the bill. However, I think the bill is so vague that in view of the present condition in the Department of Agriculture there should be a clarifying amendment. Senators are aware of the fact that the Farm Security Administration has been the agency in the Department which has heretofore undertaken to afford relief to areas which were affected by flood, drought, or the ravages of insects. I do not insist that we should write into the bill the name of the Farm Security Administration; but in view of the fact that the Farm Security Administration has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the Administrator of War Food Production and Distribution, certainly there should be some language in the bill which would obviate the creation of an entirely new bureau or agency in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will suggest an amendment I shall be very glad to accept it. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that as the bill was first drawn the authority was vested in the Food Administrator. Then, after consultation with all the agencies involved, including the Disaster Loan Corporation, the Federal Security Administration, and every other agency I could think of, it was decided that the Secretary of Agriculture was the proper administrative authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no doubt as to that. I agree with that statement. I think the Secretary of Agriculture is the appropriate authority, because he is the head of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not wish to create any new administrative agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to suggest that the bill be amended by providing that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized, through any existing agency or bureau, to provide relief to any such farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall be very glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I move that in line 6, after the word "authorized", the words "to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Alabama, although I am under obligation to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that if this measure requires an undue length of time, I am bound to withdraw it.

Mr. HILL. When the bill was under consideration a few days ago I made a suggestion about the use of the Farm Security Administration, because that would make it definite and specific. The Senator from Georgia has called attention to the fact that the Farm Security Administration is now under the War Food Administration. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia were written into the bill, could the Secretary of Agriculture make use of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think he could, because it is all within the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Is the War Food Administrator under the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will not press that question, because the division of authority between the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator is in a very nebulous state. I have never been able to determine exactly where the authority of one ceases and the authority of the other begins, but they are both in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has stated that the Farm Security Administration is the agency which has the duty and responsibility of rehabilitation of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has heretofore engaged in this specific work in flooded areas.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. It provided relief in Alabama.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Farm Security Administration rather disclaimed any authority in this particular kind of work, and therefore it was necessary to make the authority broad, or even, as the Senator from Georgia has properly said, vague. If I could have made it any more specific, I certainly would have done so. If any one agency of the Government had claimed specific jurisdiction, I would have drawn the bill so as to confer jurisdiction on such agency; but what I was interested in was in having something done, and putting the responsibility somewhere. The proper thing to do seemed to be to confer the authority upon the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than to undertake to pass a measure which might later be said to have conferred jurisdiction on

some agency which should not have jurisdiction.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, under the language of his amendment, the Senator from Georgia does not have any doubt that the Secretary of Agriculture could use the Farm Security Administration for carrying out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think he could, and I believe he probably should utilize it.

Mr. HILL. That is my thought.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my understanding is that the modification suggested by the Senator from Georgia has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further admendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1286) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I assume that we have now returned to the consideration of the second deficiency appropriation bill. While the matter is fresh in the minds of Senators, out of order I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to be inserted at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations, and for that purpose, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $15,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative—House of Representatives," on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount, which is hereby authorized, to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $10,000; to enable the committee to perform the additional duties required of it by section 204 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 30, 1943, $10,000, in all, $20,000, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Working capital and congressional printing and binding: For an additional amount for working capital and congressional printing and binding, fiscal year 1944, $17,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be returned to the Treasury as an unexpended balance not later than 12 months after the close of the fiscal year 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to insert:

Working capital and congressional printing and binding 1943: The amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register is hereby increased to $430,000 for the fiscal year 1943: *Provided*, That no increase is thereby made in the existing appropriation for working capital and congressional printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

For payment to Preston L. George, Bjarne J. Sigurdsen, Harry E. Padgett, and Lester A. Wells, messengers on night duty during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, $600 each; in all, $2,400, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—National Resources Planning Board," on page 4, line 6, after the numerals "$29,500", to insert "$42,500", and in line 11, before the word "shall", to strike out "$37,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies", on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Salaries and expenses: For the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, in carrying out the functions thereof as created by the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 849 and 852), as further amended by the act of May 21, 1943 (Public Law 53), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, fiscal year 1944, $65,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for obligation unless and until there shall have been enacted an extension of said act for a period beyond August 24, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

War-area child-care (national defense): For payments to States, local public authorities, and nonprofit private agencies as provided by Public, No. — (S. 1130, 78th Cong.), for expenditure in accordance with State plans, submitted and approved as provided in that act, for day care and extended school services for children of mothers employed in industries essential to the prosecution of the war, fiscal year 1944, $20,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses of the Federal Security Agency (and other Federal agencies on transfer thereto) necessary for carrying out the foregoing program of war-area child-care, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, including actual transportation and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation in an advisory capacity to the Federal Security Administrator; and printing and binding (not to exceed $30,000), fiscal year 1944, $450,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchases from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 14, to insert:

The sums appropriated in the two preceding paragraphs shall not be available for obligation until the enactment of the bill (S. 1130 of the 78th Cong.) entitled "An act to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 6, after line 20, to insert:

War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534, and 1541), $75,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $3,375,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for obligation until the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2936 of the 78th Cong.) entitled "An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert:

Public Roads Administration, Inter-American Highway (Costa Rica): For surveys and construction of the Inter-American Highway (provided for by the act of December 26, 1941 (Public Law 375), but without regard to the provisions thereof), within the borders of the Republic of Costa Rica between Cartago and San Isidro del General, and necessary expenses incident thereto, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am curious about the language, if I may call it to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee, contained in the amendment. This apparently is an appropriation to build a sector of the International Highway in Costa Rica at our expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And it is identified by the words:

Provided for by the act of December 26, 1941, * * * but without regard to the provisions thereof.

Just what are we getting out from under by that language?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me examine it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refer to the language on page 7, in lines 18, 19, and 20. We identify the act under which the appropriation is authorized, and then promptly climb out from under it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read the explanation furnished by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Certain sections of the Inter-American Highway, from Laredo, Tex., to the Panama Canal, have been completed with funds provided by the governments of the Central American countries and with funds contributed by the United States, including appropriations made available under the provisions of Public Law 375 (77th Cong.), approved December 26, 1941, which authorized the appropriation of $20,000,000 for expenditure on the survey and construction of the highway, provided that at least one-third of the costs would be assumed by each of the countries involved.

In June 1942 the Army ordered the construction of pioneer roads to connect completed sections of the Inter-American Highway so that a passable road would be available at the earliest possible date for war purposes. The rough terrain in a 58-mile stretch between Cartago and San Isidro del General in the highest part of the mountains in Costa Rica does not admit of adequate traffic solution by the construction of a pioneer road and the Public Roads Administration proposes to proceed with the construction of this stretch of road as soon as the necessary funds are appropriated.

The Department of State advises that the country of Costa Rica is financially unable to contribute toward the cost of construction on this particular section which, because of its extraordinarily rough terrain, will be the most costly section along the entire route of the Inter-American Highway.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation is required to meet contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1944, and its approval is recommended.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the complete use of the road will be prevented until this construction is completed. There are very high mountains in the uncompleted section of the road, and unless it is built much of the road for which we have already spent a great deal of money will be useless in time of war. It is regarded as very important that the road be completed.

In view of all the money which we have already spent—and we have spent some very large sums of money on this road—I myself believe that we should have it completed at the earliest possible moment, and the only way in which we can do so is by an expenditure of the amount recommended of $12,000,000. That is the whole truth of the matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am still asking about what the language means. From the Senator's explanation I assume that Public Law 375 would require from Costa Rica a contribution, and the purpose of this amendment is to omit it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is to omit it because the State Department has advised that Costa Rica is financially unable to contribute to the cost of the proposed construction. As the Senator will agree, $12,000,000 is a very considerable sum to expend in order to complete and make passable the road from the Panama Canal to the United States. For that reason that amendment is offered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then further in the bill on page 17 we are implementing the recent treaty signed with Panama by paying the $2,500,000 cost of a substantial portion of the International Highway in Panama.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I assume that we are now dropping any pretense that this is a partnership expenditure in this International Highway and that we are, as usual, paying the whole bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are not paying the whole bill we are paying a very large part of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wanted to be sure the record was straight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. President, has the amendment on page 7, line 16, been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 7, after line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940 (42 U. S. C., ch. 9), as amended, and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), $150,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for obligation until the date of enactment of legislation authorizing the appropriation of such additional funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 11, to insert:

Not exceeding $7,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation made available until June 30, 1943, under the heading "Emergency fund for the President, defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is continued available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 17, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PUBLIC WELFARE

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For an additional amount for support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, fiscal year 1943, $68,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 23, to insert:

JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments, including costs, rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 90, together with such further sum as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment, $2,916.86.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 6, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 13, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Development of civil landing areas: For completion of landing area construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, $8,832,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $8,632,000 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

For the Bituminous Coal Division, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828–849), as further amended by the act of May 21, 1943 (Public Law 53), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, including not to exceed $1,000 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $500 for the purchase and exchange of newspapers, lawbooks, reference books, and periodicals, fiscal year 1944, $1,100,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available unless and until there shall have been enacted an extension of said act for a period beyond August 24, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 20, to insert:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Patrick Henry National Monument: For completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill, and including all expenses incidental to such acquisition, to be known as the Patrick Henry National Monument, in accordance with the provisions of

the acts of August 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 652), and January 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 18), fiscal year 1944, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 14, in line 13, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 82, and"; and line 15, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$10,628.05" and insert "$19,605.37."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard," on page 14, line 24, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 81, and", and on page 15, line 2, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$882.88" and insert "$1,025.58."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department", on page 17, after line 20, to insert:

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Salaries and expenses, deposit of withheld taxes: For all necessary expenses, fiscal year 1944, incident to the deposit of withheld taxes in Government depositories pursuant to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $113,000 for printing and binding; and reimbursement to Federal Reserve banks for printing and other necessary expenses, $800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 20, to insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Rivers and harbors: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, to be available until expended, $7,095,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to call the attention of the able Senator from Tennessee to the language authorizing the $7,000,000 appropriation to the Corps of Engineers. It reads:

And for the prosecution of projects heretofore authorized, including the objects and purposes and subject to the conditions specified under this head—

And so forth. This appears to be a blanket appropriation which could be expended upon any project heretofore authorized even though the Congress declined to make an appropriation for it. As the language stands, is not that the fact?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is the same language that has been constantly used in all these bills for many years. In the use of that language we simply followed the regular form. We had General Reybold before us, and that language was submitted by the Department.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator will find that heretofore we have sometimes used language somewhat more restrictive than that. Let me give the Senator an example. We authorized, for instance, an appropriation for the Florida ship canal, and then the Senate declined to make the appropriation. Can a part of the $7,000,00 be used for that purpose under this language?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the hearings have been printed, but that was exactly the question I asked General Reybold in the hearings before this amendment was agreed to by the committee. He said that it would not be so used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. He may have said it would not, but I am asking if it could not?

Mr. McKELLAR. He said it could not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would not that be the prosecution of a project heretofore authorized?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. I may say that in the committee I raised precisely the same question the Senator from Michigan now raises on the floor, that some of this work would have to be done on the Intracoastal Canal from some point in Texas to a point in Florida near the proposed Florida Canal, and I asked specifically if any of the money was to be used on the Florida Canal. I was told by General Reybold it would not be so used. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] was present at the hearings, and I think it was agreed by everyone there that there was no purpose, and there was no possibility of the money being used for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Michigan. I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if that is not correct?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct. The testimony shows that the sole purpose of the amendment is to provide funds for the completion of the existing Intracoastal Canal and to widen and deepen the existing channel—not to extend it—running from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex. Most of the work on the Florida end of it has been done. There remained to be done only a little work east of the Mississippi in the vicinity of New Orleans, and that will be completed, according to the testimony, as I recall, by July 15.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not objecting to that expenditure; I am simply raising the question——

Mr. OVERTON. I am undertaking further to answer the Senator. I call attention of the Senator from Michigan to the statement in the report made by the committee that—

This amount is necessary to complete the authorized work on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, between Carrabelle, Fla., and Corpus Christi, Tex.

Therefore that binds the appropriation to be utilized solely for that purpose. The testimony is that none of it will be used for the Florida barge canal or ship canal, and the report of the committee limits it to the widening and deepening of this channel between Carrabelle and Corpus Christi.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Louisiana will concede, will he not, that under the language, "and for the prosecution of projects hertofore authorized" this appropriation can be used for anything heretofore authorized regardless of whether Congress has declined to pursue the authorization with an appropriation or not? Is not that true, under this language?

Mr. OVERTON. I made the same observation which the Senator has made, but I was advised by the clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee that this was the language uniformly used in making appropriations of this character, and that the limitation embodied in the report of the committee restricts the purposes for which the appropriation may be expended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think it will be appropriate at this time and may help the Senator if I should read from page 25 of the hearings before the committee:

Senator McKELLAR. Senator Overton, may I inquire if this appropriation affects the question of whether there will be a Florida canal.

Senator OVERTON. Oh, no, indeed; absolutely not. This has nothing at all to do with the Florida Canal. It takes the Gulf Intracoastal Canal as it now is and deepens it and widens it and straightens out some of the bends, but it has nothing whatsoever to do, I assure you, with extending the Gulf Intracoastal Canal across Florida.

Senator McKELLAR. I am glad to hear you say that because I am sure there would be great opposition on the floor.

Senator OVERTON. I am very glad you brought that out.

Senator McKELLAR. If it was just suggested that this $7,000,000 was to be used for that purpose, the item would be no doubt——

At that point I interrupted:

Senator OVERTON. I will ask General Reybold to make a statement on that.

Senator McKELLAR. All right.

Senator OVERTON. Are any funds contemplated to be appropriated under this amendment to be used toward the construction of what is known as the Florida barge canal?

General REYBOLD. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Or any approach to it?

General REYBOLD. No, sir.

Senator McCARRAN. The Intercoastal Canal, when completed, if I understand it right—an approach to the Florida barge canal—that is, it would lead into and facilitate the transportation through the Florida barge canal when it is constructed.

General REYBOLD. The funds now requested are to be applied to the existing Intracoastal Waterway between Corpus Christi, Tex., and Carrabelle, Fla.

Senator TYDINGS. It is nothing new; it is simply an improvement of the old.

General REYBOLD. That is correct.

Senator TYDINGS. It is not a provision for a new project in any manner, shape, or form.

General REYBOLD. Except as modified by straightening out bends and deepening and widening an existing waterway.

Senator TYDINGS. Oh, yes.

General REYBOLD. And taking into consideration.

I do not know what is meant by that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with the recital by the able Senator from

Tennessee of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, and assuming that what the Senator has said is an authentic disclosure of this totally unlimited language, and the ends for which the money is to be spent, I am content to rest upon the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator will be perfectly safe in doing so, because I know that after giving testimony of that kind to a committee of the Congress no official of the Government would ever violate General Reybold's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning on page 18, line 21, and ending on page 19, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 4, to insert:

Flood control, general: For the prosecution of a dam and reservoir project on Mosquito Creek, Ohio, authorized by the acts of June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941, $4,385,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this appropriation is necessary by reason of a peculiar situation at Youngstown, Ohio. At that place, as I recall, approximately 92 percent of the steel produced in this country is manufactured, and when there is a flood—as there was last winter, which came within an inch or half an inch of the top of the dam—if the dam should be broken the production of steel would be stopped for quite a while.

In order to correct that condition it is necessary to build another dam and improve the present one, which will have two effects. First, it will prevent the accumulation of too much water, during a flood in the wintertime, and in the summertime it will prevent a scarcity of water. It is necessary to have both dams in order to bring about that result. Senators can readily appreciate that, in a community such as Youngstown, where so much of the steel of the country is manufactured, we cannot afford to leave it to chance, but we must protect the production of steel. That is why the amendment was offered.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the committee, presented the situation to the committee, and the amendment was agreed to, although we changed the wording of the provision so as to appropriate the actual money out of the Treasury, because it was doubted that there would be sufficient money in the unexpended balance.

If the Senator from Ohio wishes to explain further, I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I merely wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for his interest in this project, and his clear statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee a general question, not related to the immediate amendment.

I have heard that the bill carries somewhere in it a preliminary appropriation for the expenses of the American section of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is, I wish to say that I am in utter ignorance of it. Someone has put something over on me if there is anything like that in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have been looking to see if someone has put something over on me, too, and I cannot find it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have conferred with the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Everard Smith, who is one of the most experienced men in the matter of appropriations of whom I know, and he tells me he does not know of anything like that, and I am sure if such a matter had been brought before the committee I would have remembered something about it. I have no recollection of any such thing, and do not believe it is in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

Flood control, general (emergency fund): For the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods, in accordance with the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes" (S. 1134, 78th Cong.), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading Title II—Judgments and authorized claims — property damage claims," on page 20, after line 19, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 83, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Federal Works Agency, $2,313.67;
Department of Agriculture, $92.40;
Department of Commerce, $97.78;
Navy Department, $3,651.10;
In all, $6,154.95.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts," on page 21, after line 23, to insert:

(b) For the payment of judgments, including cost of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by United States district courts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damages caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925 (46 U. S. C. 781–789), and which was certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress in Senate Document No. 80 under the Navy Department, $6,688.72, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as and where specified in such judgments or as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 11, to insert:

(c) For payment of the judgments rendered against the United States by the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, Charlotte Division, pursuant to the law entitled "Conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims against the United States of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, Radiator Special Co., and the R. and W. Motor Lines, Inc.," approved October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 958), and certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress in Senate Document No. 78 under the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, $19,864.80.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the bottom of page 22, line 24, after the figures "$19,-864.80", I desire to offer the amendment I send to the desk, to perfect the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 22, after the figures in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following "together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as and where specified in such judgments or as provided by law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 25, before the word "None", to strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, before the word "Payment", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 23, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 79 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all the other amendments, down to section 302, are amendments relating to audited claims, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc. The Government has to pay the claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the amendments referred to are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 23, after "Public Buildings Administration", to strike out "$64,-260.63" and insert "$100,393.28."

On page 23, after line 18, to insert:

Veterans' Administration, $1,293.13.

On page 23, after line 23, to insert:

Post Office Department, $364,423.43.

On page 23, at the end of line 25, in the item for the Treasury Department, to strike out "$2,622.42" and insert "$71,986.31."

On page 24, at the end of line 1, in the item for the War Department, to strike out "$132,709.28" and insert "$147,991.38."

On page 24, line 2, after the words "In all", to strike out "$232,578.66" and insert "$719,064.86."

On page 33, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 204. (b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1940 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 84, Seventy-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

The Judiciary: For fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, $25.

Independent offices: For Securities and Exchange Commission, $24.06.

For motor transport regulation, Interstate Commerce Commission, $44.13.

For salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission, $47.14.

For administrative expenses, Public Works Administration, $7.07.

For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration, $72.80.

For operating supplies for public buildings, Public Buildings Administration, $497.31.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $119.20.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $20.55.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $12.50.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 50 cents.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, $550.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, $3.65.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), $380.69.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $325.64.

For land utilization and retirement of submarginal land, Department of Agriculture, $480.

For liquidation and management of resettlement projects, Department of Agriculture, $249.50.

For loans to farmers in drought- and storm-stricken areas, emergency relief, $23.27.

Department of Commerce: For Civil Aeronautics Authority fund, $6,920.

For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $1,737.50.

For increase of compensation, Department of Commerce, $69.50.

For salaries, Patent Office, $1,248.34.

Department of the Interior: For migratory bird conservation fund, Department of the Interior (receipt limitation), $288.40.

For Indian school support, $93.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $23.71.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, Lands Division, Department of Justice, $15.

For salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth, Department of Justice, $13.52.

Navy Department: For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $29,254.

For rebuilding and repairing stations, etc., Coast Guard, $20.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $1,673.49.

For aviation, Navy, $33,766.56.

For aviation, 1938 contracts, Navy, $585.60.

For miscellaneous expenses, Navy, $1.35.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $1.05.

For contingent expenses, Coast Guard (Navy), $15.78.

For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, Coast Guard (Navy), $60.69.

Treasury Department: For collecting the internal revenue, $24.92.

War Department: For clothing and equipage, Army, $62.40.

For Signal Service of the Army, $36,492.91.

For citizens' military training camps, $1.62.

For travel of the Army, $45.75.

For Army transportation, $125.28.

For pay of the Army, $7.18.

For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, $36.99.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $1,676.49.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act March 31, 1933), $37.30.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act June 19, 1934), $40.61.

For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer from emergency conservation work to War, act June 19, 1934), $9.58.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act February 9, 1937), $20.16.

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $117,251.89, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

On page 38, line 8, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 85, and"; and in line 9, after the numerals "227", to strike out "$5,857.99" and insert "$5,973.67."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General Provisions," on page 39, line 6, after the word "appropriations", to strike out "contained herein" and insert "in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment, but I yield to the Senator from Arizona, who wishes to offer one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General fund, construction: For continuation of construction of the following project in not to exceed the following amount, to be expended from the general fund of the Treasury in the same manner and for the same objects as specified for projects in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, under the caption, "Bureau of Reclamation," fiscal year 1944, to remain available until expended, and to be reimbursable under reclamation law:

Central Valley project, California, $1,900,000, which amount shall be available for the construction of the Shasta Dam-Oroville transmission line and terminal facilities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate that we expect to go into conference on the Interior Department appropriation bill at 3 o'clock this afternoon, and I am offering this amendment as a means of more quickly arriving at a conclusion or adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on that bill.

As the bill passed the Senate, in accordance with the action taken by the Senate a year ago in respect to this transmission line, if the Government of the United States is going to spend some $300,000,000 for construction of a great reclamation project, to be paid for in large part by the sale of power, it was thought we should have more than one customer for the power. The only way to get more than one customer for the power is to be able to transmit the power down into the heart of California.

My own judgment is that in the end probably the great utility there, the Pacifice Gas & Electric Co., will be the purchaser of 85 or 90 percent of the power. Nevertheless, the Department of the Interior would be in a better bargaining position if it were able to transmit some power into the power market.

Mr. President, in the Interior Department appropriation bill the Senate adopted a provision in these identical words, but unfortunately a parliamentary situation developed in the House whereby the House had no opportunity to vote upon it as a separate, substantive proposition. If it can be voted on in connection with the pending bill, it will be taken out of the other bill as an issue. If not, we shall have much controversy with the House, and delay, until the House votes on the matter as a separate proposition. It seemed to me that procedure I have suggested would be the simplest way to dispose of the matter.

Mr. NYE. Will the Senator yield just long enough so that, as a member of the conference committee, I may express the hope that the Senate will give consent to the procedure the Senator has suggested?

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this matter should have an entirely different consideration from what will be given to it under the procedure proposed. This is a matter which has been before the Senate for 2 years. Last year the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate specifically wrote into the report a provision that the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Interior Department, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which is the public-service company of the State of California, should immediately, in the spirit of the war emergency, get together, and that a contract should be worked out so that the power which would be generated at Shasta Dam might be utilized as speedily as possible.

At that time it was considered that 225,000 kilowatts would be produced at Shasta Dam. Since that time the War Production Board has limited the production from the Shasta Reservoir to 150,000 kilowatts. Up to the present time no power has been generated at Shasta Dam. The record discloses, and it is practically undisputed, that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the public service company for the State of California, has tried time after time to negotiate a contract with the War Department in the spirit of the direction by the Congress of the United States. The record shows that the Interior Department has jumped back and forth, from one excuse to another. At no time was the contract entered into. In my judgment the contract might well have been entered into, and I speak now of my own judgment based on the record as made before the Appropriations Committee between the Interior Department and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a long time ago, and it should have been made a long time ago.

Provision is made in the bill that when power is generated at the Shasta Dam a 25-mile line shall be built to convey the power from the Shasta Dam to what is known as the Shasta substation. While the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able to construct the line from the Shasta substation to the Oroville substation, the Reclamation Bureau is determined to spend $1,900,000 of the Government's money to build that line notwithstanding the fact that the Shasta substation and the Oroville substation, 75 miles apart, are both the property of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the only agency which has a transmission system which can utilize the power which is to be generated at the Shasta Dam.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able, and offers to take all the power which may be generated at the Shasta Dam, and the Interior Department engineers testified before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that the rates which are charged and the rates which are proposed to be charged by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the distribution of the Shasta power are as low as they could feasibly be made by the Interior Department were the Interior Department to be the distributing agency.

Mr. President, the House Appropriations Committee refused to appropriate the item of $1,900,000 for the construction of this power line between the Shasta substation and the Oroville substation. The item is in conference, in dispute between the two Houses. Although the conference report has not been returned to the Senate for the Senate's approbation or rejection, now it is proposed to take the item out of the Interior Department appropriation bill, where it properly belongs, if it belongs anywhere, and to place it in the pending deficiency appropriation bill. Mr. President, I say in all fairness, that is not a fair way to deal with the question. The Senate committee has not studied the subject. It has not been presented as fully to the Senate as it should be. The Senate should not now be called upon to vote upon an item of this kind, of such vital importance, in a deficiency appropriation bill, and I certainly shall oppose the proposal to the full extent of my ability.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have some recollection of the discussion of this matter in the committee, although it is far from clear in my mind. May I ask the Senator from Nevada, was not this matter under consideration in the last Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter was under consideration in a slightly different form, but the same principle was involved.

Mr. WHITE. The substance was the same?

Mr. McCARRAN. The same principle was involved. The matter was under consideration in the appropriation bill then current, the 1942–43 appropriation bill, and as a result the Appropriations Committee wrote a provision into the measure that the Interior Department and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. should immediately, because of the emergency, agree on a contract, and it was further provided that if any advantage should accrue to one of the contracting agencies arrangements should be entered into whereby the advantage should not continue in effect, and that recoupment should be made to the party disadvantaged.

Mr. WHITE. Was the matter considered before the Appropriations Committee when the Interior Department appropriation bill was prepared this year?

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter was again before the Appropriations Committee when the committee was considering the Interior Department appropriation bill. The matter was considered by the subcommittee. A voluminous record of evidence was taken as to why the contract called for by the Congress had not been executed, as to the merits of the item, as to whether or not the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was ready and willing to construct this line, as to how much power would be generated, as to who would handle the power—everything was gone into at length before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and the Senate adopted the item without any notice whatever being taken, although a vote was had on the item in the Appropriations Committee. The item was inserted in the bill by a vote of the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate voted to retain it in the bill. The House again refused to appropriate for the item.

Mr. WHITE. Do I correctly understand that the matter is now in conference between the two Houses?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is now in conference as an unsettled question between the House of Representatives and the Senate on the appropriation bill. Now when the matter is still in conference it is proposed to pick it out of the appropriation bill, where it was considered by all concerned, and to place it in another and different bill.

Mr. WHITE. Is the amendment now offered recommended by the committee, or is it sponsired by the Senator from Arizona on his own responsibility.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this morning the Senate conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill held a meeting to consider what our action should be with respect to the conference we are to hold with conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. But the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has not authorized the offering of the amendment to this particular bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I wish to state that the conferees on the part of the Senate held a meeting this morning, realizing that if we could not get this controversial matter out of the conference report, it was very likely that the Interior Department bill would be tied up for a long time. Our difficulty is that when the vote was taken in the House on the proposal, it was not on the text which the Senate adopted. The motion was made in this way: There was a Budget estimate of $24,000,000 for the Central Valley project; the proponents of the motion in the House proposed to reduce that to $15,000,000, of which $1,900,000 should be for the transmision line.

So far as I could learn, many Members of the House who were favorable to appropriating the full amount for the project might have been opposed to the present proposal, or they might have been favorable to it. However, when the amount to be appropriated for the entire project was reduced from $24,000,000 to $15,000,000, of course they would not agree to anything. So the matter is complicated in that way.

What we hope to do is to ask the House to vote separately on the item for the particular transmission line. So far as I am concerned, and I desire to be very frank, if the House of Representatives by majority of vote refuses to appropriate money for the transmission line we shall have to eliminate it from the pending deficiency bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May not the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill reach an agreement identical with the proposal the Senator now is advancing?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure they will not.

Mr. WHITE. Could they not do so if they saw fit?

Mr. HAYDEN. I suppose that by unanimous consent, which is not obtainable, the matter could be brought to a separate vote in the House. However, the parliamentary tangle in the other body makes it impossible to have this proposition considered in any manner on its merits, other than as the Senate conferees now request. I was instructed to offer the amendment on behalf of the conferees.

Let me say that I have no quarrel at all with the statement made by the Senator from Nevada with respect to the main facts. However, I disagree with him in this respect: There was very violent disagreement in the testimony before the committee as to who was responsible for the failure to come to an accord as Congress directed last year. The power company says it is the fault of the Secretary of the Interior. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior say it is the fault of the power company. I do not know whose the fault is.

We repeat our request in our committee report, urging them to get together if they can.

I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada a question, if I may. Does he concede that if nothing is done about the construction of the transmission line, there then will be but one purchaser for the power?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not any more than if the line is constructed. There is now only one purchaser for the power. That is conceded by everyone. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has all the distribution lines for the entire Central Valley region of California. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the only agency that can take the power when it is generated at the Shasta Dam.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, that is violently disputed by the Interior Department, who say that if they are permitted to take the power to central California they can find a number of purchasers for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator will concede that the Interior Department have not a single line with which to carry a kilowatt of the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. They never will have unless we appropriate the money.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are not proposing to do that now, but only to appropriate for a tie line between two substations.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It struck me as a rather extraordinary situation that there should be included in one appropriation bill an amendment substantially similar to this one, and then, because that appropriation bill has not made satisfactory progress either in the other body or in the conference, that a similar proposition should be inserted in a second appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me point out the situation. Suppose the Senate refuses to adopt the item now referred to. The item is still in the appropriation bill. Suppose the Senate agrees to the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona. The item is still in the appropriation bill. The conferees have no power to take the item out of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. We can take it out instantly if we want to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why do you not do so now?

Mr. HAYDEN. We want the House of Representatives to pass on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; the House of Representatives has on two occasions passed on the item. The House Appropriations Committee refused to submit the item to the House in the first instance. Secondly, when it went back the other day, the House voted on it; and this item was included in the motion made by the——

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the Senator another question. There was no vote in the House to insert the matter, when the bill was originally reported. The vote had a few days ago was to cut the amount from the $24,000,000 authorized by the Bureau of the Budget to $15,000,000, of which $1,500,000 would be allowed for the transmission line. Those who wanted the full amount voted "no"—not against the transmission line, but against the amount of money proposed for the project. Unfortunately, that is the way it happened. The only way I know to handle the matter is to take the item out of the Interior Department appropriation and let the House vote on it separately as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to read from the report, if I may do so. Meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I challenge the right of the conference committee to take an item out of a bill submitted to it in conference and resubmit it to one of the Houses in connection with an entirely different bill on an entirely different subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Congress has passed a special act authorizing the construction of the Central Valley project, including power plants, transmission lines, irrigation works, and every other phase, so this amendment is in order because it is authorized by law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been adopted by the Senate and is pending in conference. No matter what the Senate may do with this item now, it will still be in conference on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the conferees on the bill can recede at any time the conference committee is in session. The Chair further holds that the item is now in order on the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me long enough to offer an amendment which I think is of very great importance to every Senator. It will take only a moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. So long as I do not lose the floor, I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assure the Senator that he will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] may offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which is legislative in character. Probably it can be put in the bill only by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that it may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION: Upon the application within 60 days of any State or State board of vocational education, or county or county board of education, any building, accessory, equipment, tools, or machinery of any type heretofore in use by the National Youth Administration and located in such State and county shall be transferred by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to any such applicant without compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have just been conferring with Senators, and there seems to be another way by which the issue between the two Houses might be settled. Not very much can happen between now and the time when the Congress will reconvene after Labor Day, at which time the Department of the Interior can submit a budget estimate to Congress containing this text. There will

be a deficiency bill, on which that budget estimate will be in order. We can debate it, and it can be voted on in both Houses as a separate item. Under those circumstances I desire to withdraw my amendment and yield in the conference report, with the distinct understanding that the matter will be handled in that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senate will agree to that arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona is withdrawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Office of War Information: The second paragraph under the caption "Office of War Information" contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not prevent the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, for insertion at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this an amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator identify the particular place in the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will have to be inserted in the proper place. May the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FISCAL YEAR 1944—WAR DEPARTMENT—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Military Establishment and for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year 1944 may be used for carrying into effect the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law —, 78th Cong.).

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this has just been sent down by the War Department. It seems on its face to be proper, but we will take it to conference and work it out there.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear what the Senator said. What is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. It permits settlement, by the authority of the Secretary of War, of claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or for personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is there any limit on the claims?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. That is why I said I would take it to conference. There seems to be no limit as to the first paragraph of it. For that reason I concluded that I would ask only that it go to conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator will scrutinize it very carefully. It seems to me it would be a grave mistake to give unlimited authority for this purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what I thought about it and why I suggested that it be taken to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope the amendment will be agreed to because otherwise, as I understand, such claims, however meritorious they may be, have to be taken up by special bills. We would have a flood of relief bills to take care of such claims.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Louisiana has said, I venture to say, has become a reality with many of us in respect to claims of this nature now coming into our respective offices. I had assumed there was authority under the law to settle such claims up to a certain amount. Does the Senator know whether there is a law providing for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; there is such a law applying to amounts from $500 to $1,000.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, that is a small jurisdiction and limited authority. I quite agree that something of this nature should be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

United States Soldiers' Home: For an additional amount for the maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1944, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), $80,820.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this request comes from the Soldiers' Home, and is presented by General Coleman, the Governor of the nome. He submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has not sent in a formal estimate, but we had the testimony of General Coleman before us a short time ago, and I am quite sure a considerable saving can be made by granting this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Department of Agriculture, Federal crop insurance, administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 6, 1938, and as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518; 55 Stat. as amended), fiscal year 1944, $4,318,748, and the proviso contained under this caption in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1944 is hereby repealed.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, for days the Senate has listened to a discussion concerning the inability on the part of the Senate to obtain a fair reaction from the House of Representatives to the subject of crop insurance. I shall detain the Senate no longer than to invite attention to the fact that earlier in the day, when the crop-insurance item was under consideration, I gave notice of my intention to move as I have now moved. At that time the chairman of the Senate conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill indicated that he would urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that concludes the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3030) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 26, 30, and 31; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment, and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "sum not less than $56,000,000 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of $155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience in business, industry or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,091,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$33,222,504"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and not more than $2,750,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch for the following functions only: Office of the Director, including book and magazine coordination sections; Office of Program Coordination; News Bureau; Bureau of Special Services; Radio Bureau; Motion Picture Bureau, not exceeding $50,000; and for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of organization units herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in organization units herewith reduced or eliminated, not exceeding $500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment before the word "within" insert the words "to the public"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$89,267,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$203,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments number 2, 11, 24, 25, 32, 33, and 34.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2968 which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
July 3, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, and 32 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "executing" insert "general."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$13,359,600" and insert "$10,500,000"; and in line 8 of said amendment strike out "$400,000" and insert "$700,000"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to said bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 2 and 11.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 33 and 34, ask a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 147.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

REORGANIZATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution proposing to amend the rules of the Senate by a reorganization of the committee structure of this body.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] was kind enough to place in the RECORD an article written by me for the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly. The proposed revision of the rules and reorganization of the committee structure is intended to carry out one of the suggestions I made in that article, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A3368.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 169) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out paragraph 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"Committee on Agriculture, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities, the establishment, maintenance, and control of credit facilities for farmers and farm cooperative organizations.

"Committee on Armed Forces, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the Military and Naval

Establishments, including the increase or reduction of commissioned officers and enlisted men, their pay, pensions, allowances, and benefits; to the development of land, air, and naval armaments, the militia, and the public defense.

"Committee on Finance and Monetary Affairs, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the raising of revenue and the bonded debt of the United States, the maintenance of the national currency, and the regulation of banking and credit.

"Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations.

"Committee on the Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to the administration of all United States Territories and island possessions; the admission of States; relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes; the administration and transfer of public lands, public buildings, and occupied or improved grounds of the United States; the development and conservation of natural resources, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and flood control; construction and maintenance of roads and other public works; and the Postal Service.

"Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to patents, copyrights, and trade-marks, and the regulation of commerce among the several States.

"Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal law, and the maintenance of the courts and the civil liberties of citizens.

"Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of 12 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to immigration and naturalization, wages and standards of labor, conditions of employment, collective bargaining between management and labor, social security and welfare, and the civil service.

"Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 24 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters relating to appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, to consist of 12 Senators, which shall as deemed necessary examine the accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, and commissions of the Government; the manner of keeping such accounts; the economy and justness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; and to which shall be referred all matters relating to the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; the economy and accountability of public officers; and the abolishmen' of useless offices.

"Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, to consist of 24 Senators, to which shall be referred all matters touching the rules and order of business of the Senate, the expenditure of the contingent fund of the Senate, printing, privileges and elections, the Library of Congress; and which committee shall be responsible for the proper enrollment of bills.

"Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 15 Senators.

"2. All standing committees shall have power to act jointly with the corresponding committee of the House of Representatives.

"3. No Senator shall at any time be a member of more than one standing committee other than the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia, or the Committee on Claims."

Resolved further, That paragraphs Nos. 2 and 3 shall be numbered 4 and 5, respectively.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the broad purposes of the proposed amendment to rule XXV are:

First. To increase the efficiency of the committee organization.

Second. To fix more definitely responsibility for primary formulation of legislative policy.

Third. To improve the machinery for legislative-executive coperation on governmental policy and provide specialized and informed channels through which the Congress can exercise its policy-making function on a continuous and sustained basis.

In the interest of increased efficiency, the amendment would reduce the size of the substantive policy committees. The amendment provides that each of these committees shall have a membership of 12 Senators. It would limit each Senator to membership on only 1 such committee and thus concentrate his energies on the work of that 1 committee. It would empower joint action with corresponding committees of the House of Representatives.

To fix more precisely the responsibility for the formulation and guidance of legislative policy, it would outline the jurisdiction of each committee in the rule, regroup present duplicating jurisdictions scattered among many committees and reduce the total number of committees.

The fixing of primary legislative responsibility for each of the broad phases of governmental policy and the definite assignment of such responsibility to a given committee, would provide more clearly defined channels of contact and cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

The general effects of the amendment are as follows:

First. It would reduce the number of standing committees from the present 33 to 13.

Second. Of this number eight would constitute a group of substantive policy committees, five would constitute a group of more or less administrative function.

Third. The eight substantive policy committees would be: Agriculture; Armed Forces; Finance and Monetary Affairs; Foreign Relations; Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works; Interstate Commerce; Judiciary; Labor and Public Welfare.

Fourth. The five committees of administrative or executive function would be: Appropriations; Expenditures in Executive Departments; Rules and Administration of the Senate; Claims; District of Columbia.

Fifth. It would limit each Senator to membership on only one of the substantive policy committees.

Sixth. It would place no limitation on a Senator's privilege to serve on other committees.

Seventh. It would authorize all committees to act jointly with corresponding committees of the House of Representatives.

In respect to specific committees, the noteworthy effects of the amendment would be:

First. To strike "Forestry" from name of Committee on Agriculture and leave the question of jurisdiction of agriculture over forestry to be determined as the occasion arises.

Second. To give the Committee on Agriculture clear authority to deal with matters of farm credit.

Third. To combine the present jurisdiction of Military and Naval Affairs Committees.

Fourth. To give the Committee on Armed Forces jurisdiction over matters affecting veterans of the armed forces.

Fifth. To combine related jurisdictions of present Finance and Banking and Currency Committees in one Committee on Finance and Monetary Affairs.

Sixth. To leave status of Foreign Relations Committee unchanged.

Seventh. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Territories and Insular Affairs, Indian Affairs, Public Lands and Surveys, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Interoceanic Canals under one Committee on Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.

Eighth. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Interstate Commerce, Manufactures, and Patents in one Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Ninth. To leave status of Committee on the Judiciary unchanged.

Tenth. To combine jurisdictions of present Committees on Education and Labor, Immigration, Civil Service, with present social security jurisdiction of Finance Committee under one Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Eleventh. To leave the status and size of Appropriations Committee unchanged.

Twelfth. To expand the membership of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments from the present number of 7 to 12.

Thirteenth. To combine the functions of the present Committees on Audit and Control of Contingent Expenditures, Rules, Printing, Enrolled Bills, Privileges and Elections, Library, under one Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, with an enlarged membership of 24.

Fourteenth. To leave unchanged the present rule on Committee on Claims and Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I have not served in this body for these many years without realizing the grave difficulties involved in any attempt to reorganize its committee structure, but I do say that, in the face of the enormous problems and the complex subject matter with which the Congress is now confronted, and with which it will be confronted in the post-war period, I think no person familiar with the situation in the Senate today can deny that there is a pressing need for committee reorganization and for the streamlining of the legislative branch of the Government if it is to survive in the

struggle for power which is bound to continue.

I realize that the moment it is suggested that one committee shall be combined with another immediately the question of the chairmanship is involved, and also other matters; but Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that there is no more important problem befor the Congress of the United States than the question of trying to reorganize its procedure and to strengthen its committee structure in order that it may stand on a more equal footing with the executive arm of the Government.

I think no Senator who has served on many committees—and I am now as guilty as almost any other Senator with regard to the number of committees on which I try to serve—can help having noticed, especially during the last few months, and perhaps the last several years, the growing tendency of Senators to find it impossible to attend meetings of the important committees because of committee conflicts.

When I first entered this body one could turn to the Congressional Directory and find the meeting days of the important committees of the Senate. They met only on the days thus specified, and there was no conflict. Now, under the pressure of business and of the complexities of our economic society, the time has come when such committees meet almost continuously, and it is not at all unusual to have a Senator appear in a committee room—and I am not complaining about it—with at least four or five proxies in his pocket. That is not the way in which committees should function. I do not criticize Senators for the practice; under the present situation, it is inevitable. Hardly a day has gone by during the present long and arduous session of the Congress when I have not had to decide which one of the several very important committees I would attend on a particular day because of the nearly continuous work of the great committees of the Senate.

I say that if each Senator were confined to only one important committee it would be possible for him to attend its meetings. It would result in his becoming more expert upon the subject matter to which that committee would give its attention, and thus the work of the committees would be improved. In my judgment, we could discharge our responsibility with very much greater efficiency, and we would have committees more constantly in touch with the executive departments of the Government. Confronted as we are with the necessity of the delegation of large portions of legislative power to the executive arm of the Government, these committees would be in a position to make certain that the power was being exercised as the Congress intended it should be exercised.

Today, however, because the committee organization of the Senate has just grown, much like Topsy, executive departments cannot discharge their responsibility of keeping committees of Congress informed by merely going to one committee. Many of the departments have to go to a number of committees, and it has been demonstrated in situations created by the war, when we have had several committees, each one with equal rights of jurisdiction, inquiring into the same subject matter at the same time.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. MALONEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Maine, then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHITE. In the Senator's suggestion, has he undertaken to deal with the question of quorums of the several committees, the question of proxies, and the question of polling committees? Those are matters which I think demand the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not attempted to deal with those questions. There is a rule touching the question of quorums. My proposal is merely suggestive in character. I submit it in all humility to the serious consideration of my colleagues. I do not claim that it is anything but a suggestion, but I do say in all seriousness that it is a matter of vital importance in the survival of representative government in our democracy.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the very last sentence of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and say that I share his opinion. I do not know that I would approve of his suggested plan in its entirety, but rather than do nothing about it, I would, on the basis of the explanation he has made, accept his plan without seeing it. He has wisely recognized the fact that as such a plan is considered, Senators would be confronted with the necessity of giving up chairmanships of important committees, and that that presents a kind of sacrifice. I have not been a Member of the Senate for so long a time as has the Senator from Wisconsin, but I have been here for a longer period of time than most Members of the Senate now on the floor, and so strongly feel the need for such a step that I would sacrifice whatever seniority positions I hold on committees and start over again on any or all of them. I am merely echoing the language and views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. President, as I say that I believe that we cannot much longer proceed with any hope of approaching perfection unless we make some such changes as the Senator outlines. I want to be among those to compliment and congratulate him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the generous, statesmanlike statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut concerning his willingness to sacrifice any privileges which he may enjoy under the present system is in keeping with his entire record of service as a Senator. I am sorry to say that I am not in a position to offer upon this altar of sacrifice some important chairmanship I might occupy, but I would be willing to yield up my membership on any committeee if by making such a move I could help to bring real consideration to this vital problem, which I believe confronts the Senate and the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as a part of my remarks a table which would show the effect on present jurisdiction over proposed legislation in the various committees were the rule I am suggesting to be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

The following table indicates the effect of the proposed amendment on the commonly accepted jurisdictions of the present standing committees of the Senate:

Present committee	Committee under amendment
Agriculture and Forestry	Agriculture.
Appropriations	Appropriations.
Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Banking and Currency	Finance and Monetary Affairs.
Civil Service	Labor and Public Welfare.
Claims	Claims.
Commerce	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
District of Columbia	District of Columbia.
Education and Labor	Labor and Public Welfare.
Enrolled Bills	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Expenditures in the Executive Departments.	Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Finance	Finance and Monetary Affairs. Armed Forces (veterans' jurisdiction). Labor and Public Welfare (social security jurisdiction).
Foreign Relations	Foreign Relations.
Immigration	Labor and Public Welfare.
Indian Affairs	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Interoceanic Canals	Do.
Interstate Commerce	Interstate Commerce.
Irrigation and Reclamation.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Judiciary	Judiciary.
Library	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Manufactures	Interstate Commerce.
Military Affairs	Armed Forces.
Mines and Mining	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Naval Affairs	Armed Forces.
Patents	Interstate Commerce.
Pensions	Armed Forces.
Post Offices and Post Roads.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Printing	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Privileges and Elections	Do.
Public Buildings and Grounds.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.
Public Lands and Surveys.	Do.
Rules	Rules and Administration of the Senate.
Territories and Insular Affairs.	Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA (REPT. NO. 398)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, from the Committee on Education and Labor, under Senate Resolution 266 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, extended by Senate Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, part V of the subcommittee's report entitled "The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935-39."

I wish to make a brief statement on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 of the

Seventy-fourth Congress, I have just submitted part V of the report on Employers' Association and Collective Bargaining in California, which is an analysis of the organization of resistance to collective bargaining in California, 1935 to 1939.

I also ask unanimous consent that a collection of excerpts from part V, constituting the introduction and the conclusions of this volume, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at their conclusion. I do this so that the Members of the Senate may have a readily available outline of the subject matter treated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the volume submitted today is the fifth volume of a 10-volume report based upon this committee's final field investigation into undue interferences with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. The volume discusses the major developments in labor relations and the employers' association movement in California, following the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, as they concern organized employer interference with the rights of labor. It is a summary account of the inter-relationships of various movements and techniques which had as their purpose the curtailment of the exercise of labor's rights. The remaining parts of the report dealing in detail with particular phases will be submitted as they become available.

The Members of the Senate who were here during the last term of Congress will recall that the senior Senator from Utah and I introduced a bill called the Oppressive Labor Practices Act. This act would have proscribed as criminal offenses labor espionage, professional strike-breaking, the use of industrial munitions, certain abuses of private police systems, antiunion vigilantism, blacklisting, employer agreements to refrain from collective bargaining, so-called yellow-dog practices, organized employer coercion of employers or employees to prevent them from practicing collective bargaining, and conspiratorial action by employers and employers' associations to carry on these practices. The report submitted here today renews our committee's recommendation of this type of legislation and provides a convincing case history of the national necessity for striking down by national act not only oppressive labor practices but its organized and conspiratorial culmination.

No Member of Congress would have to go beyond the pages of the report submitted today to find complete and adequate reasons for the adoption of the legislative recommendation which this committee has urged. The national policy for collective bargaining will never be secure in California or elsewhere so long as the belligerent employers' associations of the sort revealed in this report, can carry on the practices outlined in the Oppressive Labor Practices Act without fear of severe sanctions. This report makes it clear for all who would read that this is not a theory but a fact.

Such legislation as that recommended and proven as necessary in the report submitted today is long overdue. Some of the practices described have been sharply condemned by various congressional investigating committees for nearly half a century. As the 12 reports of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor under Senate Resolution 266 discloses in overwhelming detail, they have continued in recent years to be a substantial interference with the progress of industrial democracy. No one who is familiar with the 80 volumes of record of the committee's investigation, which includes 30,000 pages of public testimony and exhibits, can gainsay that fact.

These oppressive labor practices constitute invasions of civil rights by predatory interests that cannot be condoned even by the boldest spokesman for brutality and industrial autocracy. They have been uniformly condemned as pernicious activities by all who presume any knowledge of industrial relations and public morals. The Senate itself concurred in this opinion when it passed the forerunner of the bill recommended here in 1940.

For decade after decade similar proposals to outlaw these practices have been presented to the Congress. They have failed of passage not because of any criticism of their merits but because the legislature was too easily diverted as the more spectacular revelations of these sordid activities grew cold in the public mind. Now that we are for the time being in an era of comparative industrial peace due to the single-minded devotion of the vast majority of employers and employees to the job of winning the war, we should not forget these manifestations of evil that will surely poison the stream of industrial labor relations and thwart the rights of labor when we return to normal peacetime relationships. We should seize the first opportunity to strike down these oppressive labor practices and write "finis" to a long and bitter chapter of American history.

Certain groups in Congress seem to be in a mood to legislate concerning labor. It is important that Congress move to reassure the men and women who labor that their organizations and their efforts to exercise their rights and better their economic position will be preserved from private attack and aggression from this day forward. Now, as last year, I believe that labor should be assured that the Nation is not going to yield to those forces in Congress and out who have been seeking to subvert, eliminate, or substantially weaken the national guaranty of collective bargaining.

The present emergency is the occasion used by antilabor groups to deprive labor of its rights. There was a day when it was considered popular and statesmanlike to legislate for the protection of labor's rights. Now the winds that blow through the mail, over the telegraph, over the radio, and in the great newspaper organs have created in some minds a contrary impression. I say that unless we in the Congress have the intestinal fortitude in this time of peril and crisis to defend and promote the institutions and doctrines that symbolize our democracy, we will be guilty of losing the war on the home front. If we continue to indicate that it is our intention or design to refuse protection to the growth of bona fide trade-unionism and industrial democracy, we deprive the Nation of one of its greatest sources of internal and spiritual strength—a feeling on the part of workingmen that they are truly defending a democracy.

The legislative recommendation contained in this report should be adopted now as a substantial measure of protection to that form of democratic society we are dedicated to preserve. Such an act would symbolize as nothing else the stake of millions upon millions of men and women of labor in the democracy we are striving to defend from totalitarian aggression. At a time when labor is being urged or compelled by public pressure to give up its right to strike, when its wages are frozen by directive, when the living standards of the families represented are seriously threatened by increased living costs, when it is tied to its job by governmental order, when it is subject to continued vilification and abuse by those who knowingly or unknowingly would destroy our precious unity, labor needs an assurance of its place in the industrialized society of the future.

Favorable action on the legislation recommended would serve as a basic foundation for our post-war labor policy. Let us not deceive ourselves that industrial democracy is so soundly rooted in the hearts and minds of 100 percent of the employers of this Nation that it needs no legal charter. True, we have made great strides in the last decade. But, history will show that after the First World War the advocates of industrial absolutism took advantage of the economic stringencies and reaction that followed to attack the trade-union movement with every weapon in the arsenal of organized antiunionism. Trade unions were all but destroyed as a vital functioning institution. These same groups refused to accept section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act; they fought the adoption of the N. L. R. A. and violated it with impunity; there are still large areas of employment in many parts of the Nation to which collective bargaining has not yet extended. We can be sure that without such a law as the act proposed, the forces of industrial autocracy, individual and collective, inhibited only by the gentle administrative restraints of the National Labor Relations Act, will continue to seize upon the post-war period to turn back the march of industrial democracy and return to industrial absolutism in industry upon industry, State after State. The heinous practices that this recommendation would make criminal offenses against the United States are the main weapons by which this warfare against unions would be waged.

I expect to continue to urge the legislation recommended in this report until it is placed upon the statute books. I expect to seek to amend any legislation that comes on the floor of this body dealing with our permanent national labor policy to include the measure recommended.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM PART V OF A REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE ORGANIZATION OF RESISTANCE TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA (1935–39)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong., 2d sess.),[1] the committee herein submits a general analysis of a program of conspiratorial interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, conducted by powerful employers' associations in California in the years 1935 to 1939, inclusive. This is part V of a report consisting of the following 10 parts:

Part I. General Introduction.

Part II. Organized Antiunionism in California Industry Prior to the Passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Part III. The Disadvantaged Status of Unorganized Labor in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part IV. Employers' Associations and Their Labor Policies in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part V. The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935–39.

Part VI. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the Los Angeles Area, 1935–39.

Part VII. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1935–39.

Part VIII. The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.—Its Reorganization, Policies, and Significance, 1935–39.

Part IX. The Origin and Promotion of Recent Legislation in California Limiting Labor's Civil Rights.

Part X. Conclusions and Recommendations.

The scope and background of the investigation upon which this and other parts of the report are based are described in part I, which constitutes a general introduction. As indicated, in the three preceding parts of this report the committee discussed the past history and importance in employer-employee relationships of urban employers' associations in the two metropolitan centers, San Francisco and Los Angeles; the structure and problems of California agriculture; and the origin, function, and labor policies of associations of agricultural employers in California. This part discusses the major developments in labor relations and the employers' association movement in California in recent years, when the overshadowing factors were an invigorated trade-union movement and the National Labor Relations Act. This and subsequent parts of the report constitute a comprehensive study of the response in an important economic region of the United States to the fundamental change in national policy represented by the National Labor Relations Act.

In this region the committee uncovered a sustained and complex program of organized resistance on the part of leading industrial and financial elements among employers' organizations to the policy of the act and to the organizations of employees which invoked its protection.

The story in California is one of great complexity. It involves all the organizations which have been discussed in preceding parts of the report and unfolds against the background of those basic economic problems, principally in agriculture, which have been examined there. Traditional attitudes and old devices were employed by the employers' organizations to forestall the unionization of their employees or render their unions ineffectual. At the same time, new circumstances called for the development of new techniques and, in some cases, compelled a shift from the old tradition of refusing to bargain collectively. Typically, this new development required a highly organized campaign to consolidate various groups of employers and the general public into ever-increasing pyramids of powerful opposition to a realistic effectuation of the national labor policy.

Topically, the story has three principal divisions: the activities of employers' associations in San Francisco, the activities of employers' associations in Los Angeles, and the activities of employer groups and the Associated Farmers in agriculture. In none of these three spheres, however, did the action proceed independently. The most important movements affected the region as a whole, and the employers' associations throughout the period sought for State-wide and coast-wide unity of purpose and action. Out of the highly developed integration between industry and agriculture, a close relationship between the activities of widely separated employer groups resulted.[2] In certain instances, notably in the legislative sphere, the old antiunion employers' associations and the new—urban and agricultural—combined all their efforts to curb the rising tide of unionism.

Chronologically, the period falls into two parts. The first dates from the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in July 1935 to the Supreme Court decisions in April 1937 holding it constitutional. During this time the long-existent antiunion associations, heretofore described in part II and part IV, practically ignored the law as a restraint. But they were acutely affected by the struggles of employees, encouraged by its passage, to secure the benefits it promised. Against these efforts to organize, they utilized the old devices of repression wherever they were practicable. In many situations they found them less and less adequate to their needs.

The second period follows the Supreme Court decisions upholding the act. Almost at once the antiunion employer groups sought to organize some semblance of support for their policies from nonindustrial groups, such as organizations of citizens, women, farmers, or the general public. Without that support they felt helpless before the law. With it they might defy, evade, or counteract the law and its inherent public policy with varying degrees of impunity. To secure this support they subsidized or created organizations among these groups, always concealing their own participation, and turned to the resources of modern public-relations experts. To some extent, they also fostered employee organizations opposed to the standard nationally affiliated labor unions. Traces of this so-called third-party technique may be found, it is true, prior to 1937, particularly in such creations as the Citizens' Association of the Salinas Valley[3] and in some of the aspects of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc.[4] But it was only after the National Labor Relations Act had been upheld that such practices commanded the universal and whole-hearted support of the leaders of the antiunion movement throughout the State.

Naturally, such attempts to secure the support of groups not directly related to the issue of collective bargaining in industry had a broad political aspect. As early as the fall of 1938 the leading elements in the employers' association movement sought by every possible method of propaganda to induce the general public to vote drastic legislative restrictions upon the activities of labor unions. The attempt was made then in all three Coastal States but succeeded only in Oregon.[5]

Repeated attempts have followed. Finally, in the spring of 1941, long after this committee's investigation had been concluded, the California State Legislature, over the veto of Gov. Culbert Olson, passed a law prohibiting the use of the secondary boycott. The enforcement of this act was suspended and made subject to a recent public referendum in accordance with procedure under the California legal system. It was approved in the fall elections of 1942 by a close vote. The end of that trend is not in sight. Current legislative proposals concerning labor unions in both the National and State spheres indicate that it is only beginning. Hence, it is important that its genesis and significance in at least one State be fully appreciated because of its bearing upon our national labor policy.

The importance of industrialized agriculture in the economy of California[6] adds a factor to the pattern of labor relations there during this period which has not been remarked by the committee in its studies elsewhere. Since the National Labor Relations Act expressly exempts "agricultural laborers," one of California's most important groups of wage earners was not affected substantially by the Federal guaranty of collective bargaining. The mere existence of such a large body of unprotected wage earners engaged in the production of commodities which move in interstate commerce, side by side with those who found their rights protected by the Federal Government, presents a serious problem. Few have ever contended that the conditions of employment in agriculture do not bear some of the same characteristics as those which stimulated union organization in industry, and there finally won acceptance for

[1] A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was appointed by the chairman June 6, 1936, under S. Res. 266 which reads in part as follows: "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation of violations of the right of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively." The limit of expenditures under this resolution was extended by various resolutions in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congs.

[2] This type of relationship has been discussed in previous parts of this report. For the industrial interest in California agriculture, see part III, pp. 388–393. See also part IV for the following: Structure and control of "area" and "commodity" employers' associations, pp. 417–418; Western Growers Protective Association, pp. 438–468; Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, Inc., pp. 468–490; Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc., pp. 498–522; Farm Labor Service of Arizona, pp. 522–537; associations in the citrus industry, pp. 538–553; California Processors and Growers, Inc., an association in the canning industry, pp. 554–572; promotion, organization, financing, and control of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., pp. 573–616; origin and policy of the Agricultural Producers' Labor Committee, pp. 639–640; organizational framework of the California State Chamber of Commerce, pp. 650–651.

[3] For the discussion of the role played by the Citizens' Association of the Salinas Valley in the Salinas strike of 1936, see part VIII of this report, sec. 3, ch. 2, subsecs. A–2 and B–4.

[4] For a résumé of the activities of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., in 1934–35, see part IV of this report, pp. 617–636. The period 1936–39 is treated in part VIII.

[5] See part IX of this report, sec. 2, ch. 6.

[6] See pt. II of this report, pp. 67–69; see also pt. III.

the process of collective bargaining. In California at least, the sweeping agricultural exemption in the National Labor Relations Act seemed, from the workers' point of view, an arbitrary inconsistency. In turn, it rendered highly unsettled the entire range of employer-employee relationships in both industry and agriculture.

Aside from the apparent injustice of the exemption, it provided a refuge and base of operations for that philosophy of hostility to unionism which had for so long animated the belligerent employers' associations in California. Many of the largest employers and industrial interests in the State had both industrial and agricultural employees. Toward the former, the National Labor Relations Act required an attitude of fair dealing and recognition; toward the latter, the same employer could direct, without restraint, all those devices of antiunionism which had become traditional in so-called open-shop circles. The war against unions in agriculture was carried on as ruthlessly as ever, but now it assumed a new significance for the city unions. Employer mechanisms, set up ostensibly to fight the agricultural union but inspired by interests which straddled both industry and agriculture, began an attack through publicity, propaganda, threats of economic pressure, and outright strikebreaking tactics upon the spread of urban unionism.[7] The symbol of the embattled farmer was created by certain industrial interests to mask attacks, inconsistent with the policy of the National Labor Relations Act, on trade-unionism. In short, the limited coverage of the National Labor Relations Act through the exemption of agricultural labor became a serious threat to its successful application in its own limited sphere.

That situation, now apparent in the analysis of labor relations in a single State has great meaning for a nation in which great sections and regions are still predominantly agricultural. Indeed, the whole destiny of the national labor policy may be resolved by the attitudes of areas dominated by agricultural populations, as reflected in national legislation and along the picket line. The action of both organized and incipient antiunionism in this sphere will become increasingly significant.

This, in general, is the scope of part V and the succeeding parts of the report. The parts to follow will treat Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the agricultural developments separately and generally, in chronological fashion. At the outset, however, it is important to emphasize that it is the committee's objective to present the picture of this economic region as a whole, particularly as it concerns the reaction of its leading employer groups to the principles of collective bargaining as embodied in the National Labor Relations Act between the date of its passage and the year 1940, when our normal national trends were arranged more and more in the perspective of national defense. For that purpose, part V will draw only the broad outlines of a picture which will be presented in detail in the parts following. It will stress the relationship between the major developments, offering only a summary analysis of events for the region and the period. This treatment will necessarily be chronological and dynamic, leaving an analytical examination of the record and the evidence to the subsequent parts.

A bird's-eye view of the period reveals certain lines of force around which the pattern of events is arranged. Without an understanding of the development of the union organizing movement and the direction it followed, the period is, of course, unintelligible. In a region where the dominant employer groups were opposed to the very concept of unionization, the unions necessarily had to be built one upon the other, each finding the support of another in some industry related to its own, and in turn reaching out to stimulate and encourage the organization of employees in some other industry yet unorganized. Isolated and alone, few if any of the unions felt certain of survival in an atmosphere dominated by the antiunion attitudes of powerful employers' associations.

Reciprocal sympathetic action among unions is observable in other parts of the country, but the unusual intensity which it attained in California is attributable at least in part to the long dominance of the local or regional antiunion employers' associations. It has been pointed out in Part II of this report that the inclusive antiunion employers' association has a long history in California, and has shaped labor relations in that State almost from its beginnings. This history demonstrated that a single union in a single industry could easily fall prey to a hostile employers' association capable of turning the massed economic strength of an entire community against it. Employers engaged in collective bargaining might be compelled, even against their own interest, by the economic and social coercion which such an association could exert, to disrupt or avoid successful union relations and join the massed ranks of antiunionism. If employers with whom the unions secured collective-bargaining relations retained their membership in associations so avowedly hostile to unionism, it was natural for the unions to assume that their declarations of good will were not to be trusted. Under such circumstances, it is unrealistic to regard the support which the unions gave each other as capricious or misguided sympathetic action. Rather, it was conduct they felt to be necessary if their struggle against the antiunion employers' associations for the permanent enjoyment of their rights was to be successful.

The origin of this interlocking process of union organization lay in unions of certain types of transportation workers. Of these, the waterfront and teamsters' unions were the most important. It has already been noted that in the San Francisco strike of 1934 the longshoremen's union refused to return to work until the demands of all of the other marine unions were met.[8] Following 1934, the longshoremen lent their aid to the organizing of warehousemen. Other city unions, in such businesses as the food markets, retail stores and the like, readily followed. The longshoremen and warehousemen then went back a step further from the waterfront to the employees of the mills, factories, and food processing plants whose products passed ultimately through the warehouses to the port. In this strategy the truck drivers were of the greatest importance, constituting a vital link in the union structure and reaching back from the port or railhead even into the fields. In San Francisco in 1934 the truck drivers, enrolled in the Teamsters' Union, supported the longshoremen, thus assuring the success of the strike; in Los Angeles in 1936 the longshoremen supported the teamsters, thereby launching the first powerful union organization in that citadel of antiunionism.

The support which these unions gave to one another, as they reached back along the lines of processing and handling to the point of production, was far from negligible. For example, if the warehousemen struck in a contest with their own employers, the longshoremen might refuse to handle goods from the warehouses on strike, teamsters might refuse to load goods from such warehouses, sailors to man the ships in which they were placed. Conversely, warehousemen or mill employees might refuse to accept goods from trucks operated by strikebreaking truck drivers. A solid union front at one point in the process of marketing made it extremely difficult for employers nearer the raw materials to maintain an antiunion policy. The justification for this boycott technique was the general hostility of the dominant employer groups, acting in concert, toward unionism. The danger of the technique was the ease with which it could be applied. At the outset, however, before the National Labor Relations Act was recognized as valid, it is doubtful indeed whether the organization of employees could have been extended beyond the water front if this form of boycott had not been frequently applied. Even now, the on-the-ground organization of agricultural workers in the atmosphere of organized antiunionism that marks many of California's rural areas may continue to be relatively impossible if sympathetic tactics are barred and the exemption of agricultural workers from national protection is continued. Hence, the various political battles that have raged over the tactics of secondary boycott and "hot cargo" (refusal to handle goods processed, cultivated, or previously handled by employers deemed unfair to labor) involve, among other issues, the effort of organized antiunionism in California's agricultural industry to free itself from any possible restraint inherent in this sympathetic action by urban unions.

The unions, of course, have lent other aid to each other. Acting together in local trade-union councils, through State federations and the great internationals, voting funds for organization drives, and sending organizers to the unorganized, the California locals built up unions throughout industry. The boycott technique was but one of many devices used for the support of employees struggling to obtain collective bargaining, but it was the device most hated and feared by the employers, and most publicized.

As this pattern of organizing from the waterfront back into industry became apparent, it came to be designated in hostile quarters as the "March Inland." This dramatic term emphasized the fact that beyond the packing and processing plants, which felt the stirrings of organization in 1936, lay the land, with its thousands of miserable and underpaid agricultural workers. Here was a field from which organization had been excluded by vigilantism and terror after the violent strikes of 1933. Unaided and alone, the agricultural workers, who lacked funds, permanent homes, community life, and continuity of employment, were not likely to be able to form strong trade-unions and exercise their collective-bargaining rights. With the support of powerful and well-financed unions in the transportation and processing industries, however, successful unions of agricultural workers were not inconceivable. Certainly, their union funds would have to be supplied by established unions in industry. This fact found recognition in the efforts of the California State Federation of Labor in 1936 to finance an organizing drive in agriculture,[9] and may be observed today in the structure of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, whose processing and

[7] For a discussion of industry's role in reviving the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1; for the background of the farmers' boycott against San Francisco, see pt. VIII, sec. 3, ch. 6, subsec. H; for a discussion of the Farmers' Transportation Association formed to prevent the spread of the teamsters' union organizing drive in southern California, see pt. VIII, sec. 4, ch. 5; for an account of the activities of the Associated Farmers in aiding the processing industry during the Stockton cannery strike of 1937, see pt. VIII, sec. 3, ch. 3.

[8] See pt. II of this report, p. 121.

[9] See statement of Edward Vandeleur, pt. 60, p. 22057.

packing locals necessarily finance the attempts to organize the field workers.

The boycott threat to "unfair" employers could be an even more powerful measure of support than financial aid. No widespread boycott of agricultural products has ever been attempted by the urban unions of California, but the fear of it runs as an undercurrent in the thinking of the closely knit antiunion organizations of the State. Indeed, it may be suggested that undue concentrations on this potential threat led the employers' associations to seize upon it themselves, and to apply it in reverse, stimulating the agricultural producers to threaten a boycott of their urban customers as a penalty for not curbing the spread of unionism.

Such, in general, was the pattern of the union organizing campaign in the period under discussion, 1935–39. Against this pattern, it is easier to clarify the major developments in the employers' association movement.

The employers' associations naturally concentrated their opposition upon the dynamic points of stimulus and strength to the union movement, namely, the longshoremen in San Francisco and the teamsters in Los Angeles. Beginning early in 1935, the Waterfront Employers Association of San Francisco and the Industrial Association of San Francisco sought to discover some means of curbing and ultimately destroying the power of the water-front unions. Gradually a grandiose scheme of locking out longshoremen in all the principal ports of the Pacific coast was evolved. Conferences with this end in view were held among the representatives of the leading employers' associations in the coast ports. Failure to secure unity among the shipping lines prevented this scheme from being realized, but it was the underlying element in the plans of the employers' association movement until the water-front strike, which began on October 28, 1936, and ended on February 4, 1937.[10]

While the employers' associations were thus laying plans for destroying the power of the longshoremen's union through a sheer test of strength, the union sought to fortify itself by reaching out into the warehouse and processing industries. This organizing campaign affected those agricultural interests which owned both warehouses and processing plants.

Beginning in 1936, the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., was reorganized as the union drive swung into this new sphere.[11] The motive for this reorganization was ostensibly related to the possibility of a renewed union effort among agricultural workers. But it is notable that the driving force behind the reorganization was the California Packing Corporation, whose terminals and warehouses were at that time feeling the effects of the organizing efforts of the longshoremen and warehousemen and the employer groups affiliated with the old industrial association, which was dedicated to blocking the rising tide of unionism. The Associated Farmers was not reorganized by the dirt farmers nor by the great agricultural employers' associations which have been delineated and described in part IV. It was reorganized under the impetus of officials of the California Packing Corporation after it had been kept alive through the summer and fall of 1935 by financial subsidies from the Industrial Association of San Francisco. It was not until later that the Associated Farmers was able to enlist the support of the agricultural employers' associations. It has never succeeded in getting a broad mass support from the smaller farmers of California. These circumstances surrounding the reorganization of the Associated Farmers point to the conclusion that it was reorganized in the interest of the industrial employers to serve as an auxiliary in their anticipated contest with a growing trade-unionism which was then being inspired by the gains of water-front unions and the broad response of all labor to the guaranties of the National Labor Relations Act. The later activities of the Associated Farmers add considerable support to this thesis.

This conclusion is further borne out by the history of the employers' association movement in southern California during these years. There the Merchants and Manufacturers Association was reorganized in 1936 in an effort to stem the organizing drive of the Teamsters Union.[12] Finding the traditional methods of opposition comparatively ineffective in 1936 and 1937, the Los Angeles employers' associations then turned to the Associated Farmers, pouring money into its coffers and enlisting its support and the support of allied farm groups against the organization of the truckers of southern California. Here again the urban employers' associations established and maintained this purported farmers' organization as an auxiliary in their own conflict.[13]

Although organized from above and supported financially by industrial or semi-industrial interests, the Associated Farmers nevertheless made a definite appeal to the agriculturists of California, which group included many individuals or enterprises actually participating in or closely associated with various forms of urban industry. By magnifying the possibility that the march inland would result in the organization of agricultural workers and by playing upon a traditional fear of this possibility among California agriculturists, the Associated Farmers' movement managed to secure a considerable degree of local agrarian support. This support is capture by taking an aggressive leadership whenever strikes or organizing drives were threatened in specific rural localities.[14] The utility of such aggressive employer leadership in local strikes was readily perceived by the agricultural employers' associations. They lent their financial aid to the State organization of the Associated Farmers, and assisted and supported the formation of local units among the smaller farmers. Mere skeleton committees for most of the time, the county units of the Associated Farmers blossomed into activity and increased their membership whenever the organization of agricultural employees threatened. Similarly, at the instigation of the processors and packers, or their associations, they assumed a strikebreaking and vigilante role with respect to the organization of canning and processing employees.[15] The State organization, the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., was responsible for the formation of the local county units. It provided the leadership, gave direction to local policy, and lent expert advice and assistance according to prescribed union-breaking tactics whenever there was local trouble. But there was a wide difference between these local units of the Associated Farmers and the State-wide organization, whose functions also included public relations, legislative pressure, and the coordination of local policy with the larger sphere of interest. The State organization had the further duty of securing finances, which it did from the industrial interests and, later, increasingly from the agricultural employer's associations, representing the real parties in interest in most of the important struggles against the organization of field and processing labor.[16]

As the unions grew in numbers, the employers' associations began to see the need of wider public support. The public-relations theme was first stressed at a conference of leading west coast employers and employers' assocation executives held in February 1936 at Del Monte, Calif., under the auspices of the National Association of Manufacturers.[17] Favorable public opinion meant not only support for the employers' associations in their respective measures, but also added strength for their attempt to curb unionism through State and local legislation. The State organization of the Associated Farmers was a device characteristic of this new trend.[18] It represented itself as a mass organization of farmers opposing the unionization of agricultural laborers, the fixing of minimum wages for agricultural labor, the building of housing by Federal Government agencies for agricultural workers, and governmental intervention in the regulation of labor supply. In its legislative activities, however, the organization represented the farmers in name only. As has been observed, the local units had little real membership, and stirred into activity only when strikes threatened their respective localities. The entire legislative policy and the propaganda which surrounded it lay completely in the hands of the leaders of the State organization, working in close harmony with the industrial leaders. Among the various puppet organizations which the employers' associations set up to sway public and legislative opinion, the Associated Farmers alone was State-wide in scope. Other groups, serving a local antiunion function and having repressive legislative objectives at Sacramento, were set up on a regional or local basis.

The most spectacular use of this technique on a purely local scale occurred in the Los Angeles area following the success of the teamsters' union in 1937 and the validation of the National Labor Relations Act. The Merchants and Manufacturers Associa-

[10] For an analysis of the events leading up to the coast-wide water-front strike of 1936–37 and an account of the strike, see chs. IV and V of the memorandum, pt. 76, pp. 27867–27926; for a briefer account, see pt. VII, sec. 1, ch. 3.

[11] For a discussion of the reorganization of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1.

[12] For an account of the reorganization of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association and the event leading up to it, see pt. VI of this report, sec. 1, ch. 1.

[13] See pt. VIII of this report, sec. 4, chs. 3, 4, and 5, for an account of the role of the Associated Farmers in the campaign against the Teamsters' Union, in southern California.

[14] See pt. VIII of this report for the following: Associated Farmers of Contra Costa County and the organized prevention of employee association, sec. 3, ch. 1; Salinas lettuce packers' strike of 1936, sec. 3, ch. 2, subsecs. A–3 and B–4; Stockton cannery strike of 1937, sec. 3, ch. 3, subsec. B–4; Associated Farmers of Stanislaus County, sec. 3, ch. 4; Associated Farmers of Yolo County and the apricot pickers' strike of 1937, sec. 3, ch. 5; Associated Farmers of Sutter and Yuba Counties—the Marysville strike of 1939, sec. 3, ch. 7; Associated Farmers of the lower San Joaquin Valley and the Madera County cotton strike of 1939, sec. 3, ch. 8, subsec. D.

[15] For a discussion of the relationship between the Associated Farmers and the California Processors & Growers, Inc., and the strikebreaking and vigilante tactics pursued by the Associated Farmers of San Joaquin County during the Stockton cannery strike in April 1937, see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 3, ch. 3.

[16] For an account of the financing of the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., and the reasons which motivated various groups to contribute to the organization, see pt. VIII of this report, sec. 1, ch. 1.

[17] This Pacific Coast Economic Conference is discussed in ch. 3 of sec. 1 of this part V of the report, pp. 724–733.

[18] The State legislative activities of the Associated Farmers are discussed in part VIII of this report, sec. 2, ch. 4. The part played by the State organization and its county units in securing the adoption of local antipicketing ordinances is described in part IX, sec. 1.

tion, long the "fighting tool" of the Los Angeles open-shop movement, became only one of a galaxy of organizations. A new streamlined organization, euphoniously termed Southern Californians, Inc.,[19] became the holding company and directing genius of the Neutral Thousands,[20] its successor, the Employees Advisory Service,[21] and the Farmers' Transportation Association,[22] as well as the Merchants and Manufacturers Association and its ancillary trade groups. Employers, employees, consumers, farmers, and the general public were taught the antiunion gospel by the appropriate organization. But propaganda was not the end, only the beginning. It was designed to create an attitude of mind that permitted varying types of interference with union organization and collective bargaining. Old-style devices were combined with new strategies to defeat unionism. There was company-union promotion on a mass scale, far-reaching and novel solidification of allied employer groups, the enactment of local laws restricting ordinary union activity, unusual levels of cooperation with local law-enforcement officials, and an intensive cultivation of "community" opinion on behalf of the "open shop."

The organized employer groups in San Francisco became less concerned with obstructing any semblance of collective bargaining by employers with their employees. Their objective became rather a tightened coordination of employer groups for the use of "pressure tactics" within the framework of collective bargaining that would preserve substantially their economic advantage.

All of these employer groups in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the rural areas found that the promotion of political action favorable to their position and adverse to trade-unionism was an attractive sphere of joint action. Regardless of the degree of observance or lip service paid to the national labor policy, these powerful organized groups were disposed to shackle the trade-union movement by law in some fashion. The great campaign to enact proposition No. 1, the antiunion initiative of 1938, was a climax of this combined effort.

These, in general, are the lines of development which featured the antiunion activities of organized employer groups during the period 1935–39.

CONCLUSION

The period 1935–39, taken as a whole, reveals a totally unnecessary amount of conflict and strife in labor relations in California. It is true, of course, that any period marked by so rapid an increase in union organization and the adjustment of employers to the practice of collective bargaining will show considerable friction, minor clashes, and excesses on both sides. Nevertheless, California displayed not only these minor disturbances of a healthy and changing social organism, but also a deeply implanted pathological condition. The root of the malady was organized antiunionism, finding expression in the all-inclusive antiunion employers' association. To condemn such associations is not a reflection upon other types of socially useful employers' organizations, nor an attack upon the constitutional rights which employers share with all other members of the body politic to associate together for their mutual interest. It is merely a recognition of an institutional abuse which society must curb. The all-inclusive antiunion employers' association finds no counterpart on the labor side. No one has ever discovered an association of workingmen formed for the express and avowed purpose of denying to their employers enjoyment of the right to organize and associate together for economic purposes. Such an organization of workers is inconceivable, and yet exactly the same concept among employers has long been a recognized reality. In California the antiunion associations achieved greater influence than is common, and have lingered longer as a dangerous and disturbing factor in labor relations.

In the preceding discussion, the outstanding instruments of organized antiunionism have been identified and the strategy and tactics of their activities in opposing union organization and collective bargaining during the 5-year period (1935–39, inclusive) have been outlined. It is a sad commentary upon our industrial democracy that since the adoption in 1935 of a national labor policy favoring collective bargaining, California employers have pooled millions of dollars to finance organized and systematic interference with the civil liberties of labor.

In exhibit B of the appendix, six of these major organizations have been listed with their income for this 5-year period.[1] These organizations include the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Los Angeles; Southern Californians, Inc.; the Industrial Association of San Francisco; the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., and its county units; the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California; and the Committee for Peace in Employment Relations.

Scattered throughout the succeeding parts of the report, which treat their operations in detail, there are references to additional funds collected for the purpose of obstructing the growth of unionism and collective bargaining. A grand total of the income of all employers' associations in California would far exceed the total of $3,272,048 which is charged to the six major organizations listed for the period 1935–39, inclusive. While these organizations may boast of functions other than the governance of employer-employee relationships according to the precepts of antiunionism, that major activity colored their entire operations.

Of course, these organizations were but the creatures of the corporations, business houses, and individuals that financed them. While some of these contributors assumed the more active roles in the work of a particular belligerent employers' association, none who contributed with a knowledge of its purpose and activities can escape the joint responsibility for its maintenance.

In exhibit C of the appendix, there is a list of responsible business firms whose contributions largely have made possible the operations of these major belligerent employers' associations in California since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act.[2] The amounts of their contributions to the major organizations listed in exhibit B are noted. This table does not purport to include all of those who made contributions to any of the six organizations selected; such a table would have been unduly cumbersome. A more completely detailed analysis of the contributors to each of these associations is contained in later parts of this report. For purposes of comparison there has been included in a sixth column the contributions of the listed firms to the National Association of Manufacturers from 1933 through 1937.

Perhaps the history of each firm's contribution to these various funds will disclose varying reasons; i. e., the attitude of a given manager, the influence of a good customer, the desire to maintain solid relations with influential elements in the business community, et cetera. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that the maintenance of organized antiunionism in California was the direct result of a conscious act of supporting and participating in a conspiracy to prevent or obstruct the development of collective bargaining by lending financial support to a "belligerent" employers' association. Whatever the identity of the prime movers and actors in the formation and maintenance of these conspiracies, and they will be noted later, those who furnish the sinews for this war on civil liberties cannot escape their share of the responsibility.

The effects of the National Labor Relations Act in California must be assessed in the light of the implacable opposition to it from such antiunion employers' association. Through economic and social pressure, publicity, and wholesale public deception, these associations have waged relentless war on the principles of this act. Oftentimes they coerced those who desired to comply with it, deluding and confusing others as to its objectives and benefits.

It is here important to emphasize the role of the antiunion association in preventing the business community from accepting the processes of collective bargaining. Had these associations been dissolved or their efforts diverted into proper channels in 1935, after the passage of the act, it is safe to say that labor relations in California would have had a more peaceful course—at least they would have been consonant with our national labor policy.

Viewing the period as a whole, it may be said that the act has not completely shielded organizations of employees from the devices and assaults of the antiunion employers' associations. Time and again the unions have had to resort to the self-help of strikes and other economic action in order to secure collective bargaining or protect their members. The language of such action appears to have been more readily understood by these belligerent employers' associations than the mandate of a Federal statute. Nevertheless, the statute held out the hope which led employees to organize and assert their rights as members of an economic democracy. The increasing defection of sensible employers and employer groups from the ranks of antiunion belligerency can, at least indirectly, be attributed to the statute. That a greater area of California's industry is today covered by the practice of collective bargaining than ever before is in large measure the fruit of the act.

But the act has not yet overcome a principal obstacle to free collective bargaining, namely, the antiunion employers' association. This fact calls for some public action supplementary to the administrative method and penalties established in the National Labor Relations Act. Organized antiunionism taking the form of the "belligerent" employers' association, is a challenge now to our Government and our free society which cannot be ignored. These organizations cannot be indulged by the gentle measures and limited procedures of that legislation. A deliberate conspiracy to violate the law of the land in wholesale fashion must be stamped out for the subversive attitude which it represents.

---

[19] For an account of the events leading up to the formation of Southern Californians, Inc., and its subsequent activities, see part VI of this report, sec. 3, Second Reorganization of the Los Angeles "Open Shop" Movement in 1937, especially ch. 1, Creation of Southern Californians, Inc., ch. 2, General Description of Southern Californians, Inc., and ch. 4, Function and Activities of Southern Californians, Inc.

[20] For a description of The Neutral Thousands, see part VI of this report, sec. 4, Activities of Los Angeles Employers' Associations, ch. 1, Promotion of The Neutral Thousands, and ch. 2, Propaganda Campaign of Los Angeles Employers' Associations.

[21] For an account of the sponsorship of the Employees Advisory Service by Southern Californians, Inc., see Part VI of this report, sec. 4, ch. 3, subsec. J.

[22] The formation and activities of the Farmers Transportation Association are described in Part VIII of this report, sec. 4, ch. 5.

[1] See the appendix to this pt. V of the report, p. 784.

[2] See the appendix to this pt. V of the report, pp. 784–787.

Previous to its California inquiry, the committee had investigated the labor policies and practices of employers' associations in the metal-trades industry,[3] the Cleveland industrial area,[4] the Little Steel companies,[5] and, finally, the National Association of Manufacturers.[6] In California the committee was able to extend its examination to many outstanding examples of various types of antiunion associations. It was possible to observe not only their individual impact on labor relations in their particular area of concern, but also to view the over-all facts of their interrelation. It was this California experience that confirmed the committee's feeling that it was necessary to expand the concrete recommendations for legislation which it had previously submitted to the Congress.

Upon its return from California, the committee conducted an intensive review of its previous recommendations for legislation, in the light of disclosures concerning organized antiunionism in California. Its previous recommendations took the form of the so-called Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1939 which passed the Senate in the spring of 1940 but was not acted upon by the House before the end of the session.[7] The proposed act of 1939 was directed to the creation of criminal sanctions, to be enforced by the Department of Justice on recommendation from the Department of Labor, for specific types of antiunion practices. The practices to be proscribed were labor espionage, professional strikebreaking, the use of industrial munitions, and certain abuses of private police systems. The practices defined were to be outlawed whether carried on by individuals or groups.

The process of amplification of the former proposal, in the light of the California experience, was completed and has taken concrete form in the proposed Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942.[8] This proposal is an amplification of the previous recommendation in three distinct phases.

First, it adds to the specific oppressive labor practices other than those prescribed in the previous bill; namely, labor espionage, professional strikebreaking, use of industrial munitions, and abuse of private police systems. The new practices prescribed include: vigilantism, blacklisting, employer agreements to refrain from collective bargaining, so-called yellow-dog practices, and coercion of employers or employees to prevent them from practicing collective bargaining. Some of these practices, carried on by employers singly and collectively in California, were a direct inspiration for these provisions.

The second phase of the amplification concerns the application of the concept of conspiracy to participation in the entire coterie of oppressive labor practices. This part of the measure goes to the heart of organized antiunionism and the conduct of "belligerent" employers' association, such as was evident in California. It was designed expressly to take advantage of the ordinary and accepted theories of Anglo-American jurisprudence to extend the responsibility for criminal acts, not only to the people who physically commit them, but also to those who knowingly plan, assist, or make possible their execution. The law of criminal conspiracy in this country has been developed to the point that it could be extremely useful in proceeding against organized antiunion activity which is determined to be criminal in character. Employers in California who carried on the oppressive labor practices outlined in the proposed legislation customarily did so pursuant to a plan through the mechanism of an organization. Indeed, the essence of the operations of "belligerent" employers' associations in California was the highly organized way in which they carried on mass assaults on the exercise of labor's rights. To such action the law of criminal conspiracy is properly applicable, when the practices conducted by such organized groups are criminal in character, according to the law of the land. Yet, by use of the law of criminal conspiracy, the punishment of the innocent with the guilty can be avoided. Innocents and dupes must be protected even if their views are not in accord with public policy so long as their deliberate acts are not in violation of the law.

The third phase of this amplification was a natural outgrowth of the second phase which was carefully designed to permit legitimate employers' associations of a negotiatory character to operate and perform their useful service. It was a provision requiring the registration and regular filing of information with the National Labor Relations Board by all organized employer groups dealing in labor relations. The observations in this report of the committee concerning the course of the development of employers' associations in California indicate the basis for such a provision. Employers' associations may be belligerent in character, regularly acting pursuant to a policy of hostility to collective bargaining and the exercise of the rights of labor: tomorrow, due to various sets of circumstances, that policy may change and the employers' associations may become negotiatory in character and spirit. Yet, sometime in the future there may be a danger of reversion to the early policy. Therefore, it is desirable to accept the negotiatory employers' association as a proper and desirable exercise of the rights of employers. But it is also desirable to compel it to submit regularly information with which it will be possible to detect the drift of the organization to unlawful conspiratorial practices.

One would not have to go beyond the pages of this part of the report on California to find complete and adequate reasons for the passage of this oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942. The national policy for collective bargaining will never be secured in California so long as the belligerent employers' association, carrying on the practices outlined in the proposed act, can function without fear of severe sanctions. This report makes it clear for all who would read that this is not a theory but a fact.

Therefore, the committee urges that its legislative recommendation in the form of the oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1942 be studied and appraised in the light of recent California history, as summarized in this volume. It may well be that collective bargaining as a national policy is accepted in some areas of the country and that organized antiunionism in those areas no loger exists. But we do not know and dare not conjecture that California, in the years 1935 through 1939, does not and will not have its counterparts in other areas of the Nation. It is a commonly known and widely accepted fact that many other sections of the country are even less sophisticated about democratic labor relations than California, which may be relatively progressive in many aspects. Indeed, in some areas industrial absolutism is still the order of the day. When confronted by the necessities and realities of industrial democracy, the spirit of antiunionism in those areas may well take even cruder forms of organized antiunionism than has been apparent in California in the years since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. In any event, the California case history stands as demonstrable proof of the necessity for striking down by national action not only oppressive labor practices but their organized and conspiratorial fulmination.

It is safe to say that the principle of collective bargaining will never be secure in California so long as the present bitter conflict continues in its agriculture. So long as collective bargaining is excluded from industrialized agriculture in California, the whole principle of collective bargaining will remain in jeopardy. Our analysis demonstrates that the antiunion association now has its firmest support in the agricultural industry where, through organizational, financial, and economic ties, it continues to menace urban and industrial unions and deprive agricultural workers of their civil rights. This condition cannot be improved unless some statutory protection is extended to the exercise by agricultural employees of the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining, as part III of this report makes abundantly clear, is not the sole answer to California's agricultural problem. It must be supplemented by other measures, such as the organization of the labor market, various types of direct economic assistance to the worker if necessary, the restoration of political rights, and the provision of some degree of economic security. If a beginning can be made in these things while, at the same time, collective bargaining in agriculture is encouraged and protected, the cloud may lift from the future of California's labor relations, industrial and rural.

Yet another ally of organized antiunionism must be appraised on the basis of the California investigation. It is the susceptibility of law-enforcement officials to organized pressures within a community, which may result in the prostitution of law enforcement to antiunion policies. That type of abuse appears all too often in the record of California labor history.

This is not to say that law-enforcement officials should not discharge the responsibilities of their high office in enforcing the laws against violence, property damage, and breach of the public peace. It is to say that law-enforcement officials, in discharging their functions, must be ever wary to avoid becoming the cat's paw of either employer or employee. For these officials to become the willing or unwitting agents of organized antiunionism is to open the door to flagrant injustice and give reason for a most unfortunate disrespect to law and authority. The public should be ever wary of this perversion of police power. It is oftentimes a harbinger of local political tyranny that holds all civil liberty in contempt. Indeed, the best and surest protection against most of the excesses of organized antiunionism, as typified by the belligerent employers' association, is the good sense and vigilance of the general public.

Quite realistically, the forces that seek to maintain industrial autocracy have come to realize in recent years that public opinion is the final arbiter. In times past, they have been able to attack trade-unionism and collective bargaining with a "public be damned" attitude. Now all that is different, and the principal emphasis is upon the "third party" technique. Organized antiunionism will seek indirectly, through public opinion and

---

[3] S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 4 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part I, The National Metal Trades Association.

[4] S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 5 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) Labor Policies of Employers' Association, Part II, The Associated Industries of Cleveland.

[5] S. Rept. No. 151 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part IV, The Little Steel Strike and Citizens' The Little Steel Strike and Citizens' Committees.

[6] S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 6 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), Labor Policies of Employers' Associations Part III. The National Association of Manufacturers.

[7] This bill, called S. 1970 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) was passed on May 27, 1940.

[8] S. 2435. For the text of the bill as introduced and the statement of Senator LA FOLLETTE accompanying the introduction, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 1942, vol. 88, no. 69, pp. 3308-3316.

the acts of public officials in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, to turn the tide that has been running so strongly against it in the last decade. The anti-picketing ordinances, Proposition No. 1 in 1938, and other legislation such as the recently enacted "hot cargo" bill are illustrations of organized efforts toward legislative restriction of trade-union rights and activities. The trend of this legislative drive, if it becomes an undiscriminating wave, will sweep away the rights of labor under color of law at the prompting of organized anti-unionism. In the final analysis, it is a keen sense of justice, a constant attempt by the public to be fair, a sharp sense for recognizing misleading propaganda, and added public support of democratic institutions and practices that are the best hope for a stabilized system of collective bargaining in California.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
United States Senator.
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senator.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Austin	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The able senior Senator from Ohio and I have reported the joint resolution. The Senator from Ohio is familiar with it. I would ask him to explain it, in addition to explaining some amendments he proposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Senator from Ohio is recognized, I desire to make a very brief statement with reference to the parliamentary status of the measure. I was not present in the Senate, because I had not returned to the city, when the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill was taken up several weeks ago, and the question of subsidies was injected into it. As originally introduced, the measure provided simply for an extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an increase in the borrowing power of the Corporation; but, as everyone knows, it later became complicated with the question of subsidies; and the President vetoed the bill last week, and the House sustained the veto. Nothing can be gained by going into the bill that was vetoed, or by going into the veto. The House sustained the veto, and it became necessary, unless the Commodity Credit Corporation was to expire, to extend its life.

The House by a joint resolution provided simply for extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January of next year, practically 6 months from now, and increasing the amount of its borrowing power from $2,650,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, an increase of $350,000,000, on the theory that between now and January, Congress would have time and opportunity to work out more permanent legislation, and probably from the experience which would be gathered between now and that date would be able to devise a wiser solution of this very complex and difficult problem.

Personally, I should prefer to have the House joint resolution, which is simple, extending the life of the Corporation until January, passed by the Senate. But the Banking and Currency Committee, in session Saturday afternoon and evening, adopted an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio, with some modifications suggested in the committee, placing certain limitations with respect to the amount of money which might be available between now and January 1 for the purposes which have been under discussion. The amendment, which is in the bill, I think amply safeguards the situation with respect to all corporations, both the R. F. C., the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Office of Price Administration, and all others, involved in the enforcement of ceilings and the administration of subsidies. I am informed by those who are responsible and who will be responsible for the enforcement and administration of the act that it can be made to work under the amendments which have been agreed to in the committee and which have been subsequently discussed.

That is all I care to say at this time. I understand the Senator from Ohio desires to explain the amendments which he sponsored and which the committee adopted in the session on Saturday.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The House did not include subsidies in its proposition; did it?

Mr. BARKLEY. The House joint resolution simply provides for an extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January. The House did not say anything in the resolution about subsidies; but I may say to the Senator that the theory upon which the Senate committee amended the joint resolution is that without such an amendment the Commodity Credit Corporation would have unlimited power to exercise the right to contract for subsidies, whereas the amendment which was agreed to would limit the amount which could be used for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. My understanding was that the House passed the resolution extending the time and giving the Commodity Credit Corporation certain funds with which to operate, without referring to subsidies.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; the resolution made no reference to subsidies. But, I will say to the Senator, that does not mean no subsidies would be made. As we all know, without specific authority beyond that already given by laws governing the Commodity Credit Corporation heretofore enacted, payments have been made with respect to subsidies for certain commodities. The amendment offered and agreed to in the committee would limit the amount which could be expended for subsidies.

Mr. SMITH. But it does authorize subsidies; does it?

Mr. BARKLEY. No more than they have heretofore been authorized. It simply limits them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the risk of being repetitious, let me inquire whether I am to understand from the Senator's explanation that if the Senate committee amendment is not agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation can engage in the subsidy business without any limitation, but that if the Senate committee amendment is agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation can engage in the subsidy business only within the limitations of the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was the theory of those who sponsored the amendment that, without it, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be without restriction as to the scope of its subsidy activities but that with the amendment in the joint resolution, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be limited according to the terms of the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, to state the matter in another way, if one were opposed to all subsidies, and felt that even the emergent circumstances set forth would not incline him to depart from that position, the only way he could register his views would be to vote against the House joint resolution without the Senate committee amendment or to vote against the House resolution even with the Senate committee amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if anyone were unalterably opposed to voting for anything that carried a subsidy, either by definition or by implication, the only way he could accomplish his own purpose would be to vote against everything.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But to do that would be to cause the Commodity Credit Corporation, which everyone admits is doing constructive work, to go completely cut of business.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to ask a question merely for information. If the

Senate accepts the joint resolution as sent over by the House, would the administration be permitted to proceed with subsidies as it has heretofore?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so. I think that is the interpretation we are bound to place on the mere continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it is continued in the same way in which it has heretofore operated, with additional funds provided.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the Senator's understanding that the subsidy program as authorized to date by Congress has affected the production of the needed critical materials, either mineral, food, or otherwise?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say that insofar as Congress has specifically authorized subsidies, one of the objects would be to obtain not only critical materials but ample production of any necessary commodity, whether it be a mineral or an agricultural product, that would bring about the desired result.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is the general understanding of those of us who have been especially interested in this legislation—and the leader himself and I are members of the committee which handled the legislation under which the program is being followed—that the subsidy program in general, if not definitely, is for the purpose of increasing production where it is needed, and not for the purpose of decreasing prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there are two objectives in any program of this sort. One is to provide an incentive for increasing production, and the other is to keep the cost of living from getting out of hand by a method which would prevent what we call the continuing spiral, so as to prevent it getting out of hand, where it could not be controlled, not only as to prices, but as to wages and other things which must be taken into consideration in respect to any increase in cost to the consumer of the commodities which he is compelled to buy. There are two prongs to the question, and it is difficult to separate them entirely.

Mr. BUTLER. The amendment intended to be proposed to the joint resolution as it is now before us is for the purpose of making it definite that the subsidy program should not be put into reverse, so to speak, and its purpose made to reduce prices instead of to increase production.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to which amendment the Senator is referring. If he is referring to the committee amendment——

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator is referring to subparagraph (f) on page 5, which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] proposed when the question was before us earlier.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is in the amendment adopted by the committee. I do not care to go into the details of the amendment because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was on the conference committee representing the Senate in connection with the bill which was vetoed, and who has had numerous conferences with the administrators of various agencies which will administer the law, will undoubtedly give an explanation of the amendment which he proposed and which the committee accepted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. When we recently voted on this question the Senate very definitely voted against subsidies and roll-backs. The bill then went to the House, and after a conference it went to the President, who vetoed the bill as it passed the Senate. Then it came back to the House, and the House refused to override the Presidential veto. The House was then confronted with the expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate is confronted with that question today.

As I see the picture, the Congress definitely took a position against roll-backs and subsidies. As I see it, following the Presidential veto and the refusal of the House to override it, today the Senate finds itself in this position: We can adopt the House joint resolution as it comes to us from the House. In that form it has nothing to do with subsidies. Or we can adopt the Taft amendment, which not only authorizes subsidies on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but also subsidies by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the only limit being $350,000,000 up until January 1, 1944.

In view of the congressional policy already voted on, would it not be more consistent to pass the House joint resolution as it came to us from the House, putting ourselves in the position of saying to the executive department, "If you still want to continue your subsidies and roll-backs, even in the face of what the Congress has done, and take full responsibility for them, all right"? In my opinion, if we should vote today to pass the House joint resolution as it came to us, the Senate would find itself in that position, and in my opinion we could thus avoid consenting to either roll-backs or subsidies.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that I agreed with his position, and so voted in the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know the Senator did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I still think that the simpler and better way would be to pass the House joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, with an increase in the amount of money which it may borrow and use.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators who cooperated with him took the position, as sponsors of the amendment, that a simple joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation would place no limitation with respect to the amount of money which might be spent, or the commitments which might be made in regard to subsidies. Desiring to place a limitation on the amount, and on the time element involved in subsidies, the committee adopted the amendment over the vote of the Senator from Utah and myself, and other Senators who were in the minority. Of course it is true that the Congress could take the position that it has declared against subsidies. It declared against subsidies in such language and under such terms that the President was compelled to veto the bill. The House has refused to override that veto. Therefore the responsibility now rests on the Executive to carry out his program during the period of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not feel that it is necessary for Congress completely to wash its hands of the problem merely because the Presidential veto was not overridden. I say that without yielding my position that it would be better to pass the House joint resolution without amendment. However, if it desired to restrict the exercise of the power of the President and the Commodity Credit Corporation, acting under the R. F. C., to pay out money or to contract for the payment of money on subsidies, this amendment accomplishes that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], which does not involve the Senator from Kentucky. Has the Senator from Kentucky concluded?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have concluded. I yield the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah what his understanding is as to where the President would get the funds to continue any subsidy program, were we to pass simply the language which came over from the House in House Joint Resolution 147.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Executive could declare anything either a critical or strategic material, and then tell the Loan Administrator, Hon. Jesse Jones, "I want $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000, or any amount you can dig up under the law. I am going ahead with these subsidies, now that I have declared this material to be strategic or critical."

Mr. DANAHER. So the only limitation in the mind of the Senator from Utah, as I gather from his answer, is the authorized borrowing power of the R. F. C.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I think that whatever the R. F. C. or its subsidiaries can dig up constitutes the only limit on the President's program of subsidies.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am hopeful that the Senator will not only thank me, but will agree with me.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree with the Senator from Utah to the extent that were we not to impose some limitation, we would open the door wide, without the slightest limitation whatever, provided only that section 2 (e) of the original Emergency Price Control Act were to be construed as the Senator from Utah says it might be construed.

I do not share that particular view, because I think there are two limitations contained in section 2 (e) of the original Emergency Price Control Act. But, Mr. President, because of the very view which the Senator has expressed, many of us

have had fears which resulted in the adoption by the committee of the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Incidentally, it represents the consensus of many views, which fact has resulted in a majority of the committee adopting and thereafter recommending the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. When the Senator says "we open the door," does he not mean the door is already open? Under the present law the door is open now, and the only limit on the width of space the door is open is provided by the ability of the R. F. C. to obtain money to supply for the subsidy program. I ask the Senator if I am not correct in my statement that today that is the only limitation under the law as construed by the executive department, namely, the ability of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to dig up the money?

Mr. DANAHER. Answering the question of the Senator specifically, I will say that so far as the money limitation is concerned, the answer is "Yes." However, Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in a general explanation of the committee amendment. Quite the contrary, I believe that is the function of the Senator from Ohio, who, in my judgment, is entitled to the support of the committee and of the Senate in what he has to say. I interrogated the Senator from Utah merely on the point he first emphasized, in order that the entire limits of the situation might be before us. I thank the Senate for the opportunity of speaking.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Ohio about to explain the joint resolution before we go ahead?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the joint resolution itself hardly requires explanation. What I should like to explain are the amendments as presented by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Very little of the measure as it came from the House is left.

Mr. TAFT. It is all here except section 4.

Mr. GEORGE. What I meant was that what the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has inserted is far longer in sections and subsections than what has been left of the original House text.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct, but it seems to me that the proper way to proceed is to consider the committee amendments, one after another. There are three committee amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment was in the original bill previously passed and was contained in the conference report as adopted by both Houses. However, since the passage of that bill and the veto, we have received very strenuous objection from the Federal Reserve, the senior Senator from Virginia, and the Comptroller of the Currency. The purpose of the proposed section was that the provision that banks cannot loan to their own officers should not apply when 100 percent of the loan was guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and was entirely an obligation of the United States. In effect, such a loan was one by the United States to one of the officers of the bank, instead of to the bank. However, the Federal Reserve Board feels they have steadily tightened the rules relating to the loaning of money by the banks to their own officers and directors, and therefore they regard the House language as a backward step. The committee on the whole felt it was desirable that the section be eliminated, since its importance would not justify action contrary to the general policy upon which the Federal Reserve Board has been insisting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 2, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

(a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided*, That in any case in which a commodity is domestically produced, the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by this subsection shall be exercised with respect to importations of such commodity only to the extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor. Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, when requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed $350,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation, when requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or purchase commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(e) The President may transfer any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (c) hereof for use under paragraph (d), or any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (d) for use under paragraph (c). The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may exercise any of the powers conferred herein through any of its subsidiary corporations.

(f) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers, or the sale of feed wheat, as authorized by existing law; and no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the legislative history of this measure is clear. The Congress passed a bill prohibiting subsidies, prohibiting in particular the roll-back subsidies on meat and butter, which have occasioned the greatest controversy. That bill was sent to the President. The President vetoed it, and returned it to the House of Representatives, where the veto was sustained. The President suggested in his message that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued; that if there were time to work out a further compromise measure on subsidies, Congress should do so; if not, Congress should simply pass a joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The President suggested that representatives of the executive departments would be glad to confer with Congress regarding the development of what might be called a compromise policy.

That policy, Mr. President, has been carried out. We have asked the representatives of the executive department to come before the committee. We have conferred with Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Brown, Jesse Jones, and with Mr. Hutson, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, who also acts as representative of Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator. We have tried to work out a policy in which I myself do not believe, but which it seems to me we are called upon to adopt if we are to deal at all constructively with the situation.

It is suggested that Congress should say, "It is the responsibility of the executive department; go ahead, spend $2,000,000,000, $3,000,000,000, or whatever you may want to spend; that is your responsibility; we have no responsibility."

Mr. President, we have not taken that position in any instance involving the appropriation of money during the present session. We have seriously assumed the responsibility of seeing to it that money is not spent by the executive department in greater sums than we desire to have it spent. It seems to me we have just as much responsibility to limit the amount of money which may be required for subsidies as we have to limit the amount of money which may be required by way of appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the Senator point out any control or restriction which we exert on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the financing, say, of the Bureau of Economic Warfare, or of any other agency that the R. F. C. want to finance or any plants they may want to build? I do not recall any except a limitation of the obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may create.

Mr. TAFT. We have, however, limited them as to what they may do in the case of plants having directly to do with the war effort. We have given them, I think, much too broad powers, if you please, and we are in this box today because Congress has passed laws which were not regarded as money laws, but simply laws giving general powers to this Government corporation.

My real interest in this bill is found in the first clause of section 5.

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss—

Which, of course, is another method of paying subsidies, in effect—

> or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

The purpose of that provision is to reverse the burden of proof. If we can once do that, then, when the money runs out, whatever money may be provided, not another cent can be spent until the corporation comes back to the Congress and asks for additional money, just as the Departments have to do in the case of every other appropriation with which Congress has to deal.

We have got ourselves in this position by passing laws granting powers which are too broad. As it stands today, the Commodity Credit Corporation can pay subsidies; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can pay subsidies. There may be some question as to the legality of the manner in which they paid the roll-back subsidies, but they have a legal argument to support them, and I do not know who can question their actual carrying out of the policy which they have announced.

So it seems to me, unless we have some such provision, if we should adopt the House joint resolution, in effect, saying, "All right, Mr. President, we have no further interest; do as you please," there is nothing, so far as I can see, when we return to Washington after the recess, that will prevent our being committed to a subsidy burden of $2,000,000,000, or $3,000,000,000, or any other figure.

Not only that, but I do not believe anybody will ever come to Congress again and ask for money for subsidies; the question will never be before us, for the simple reason that there will be no reason for such a request. Under existing laws, the executive authority can act and freely spend the money they want on subsidies. That is a procedure I want to have stopped.

I was disappointed when Mr. Byrnes last Saturday appealed to the Banking and Currency Committee to do just that: "Leave it to us; we will handle it all right," because it seems to me to show a desire to go ahead and continue an unlimited subsidy as the executive department might desire. Since then, however, I have been informed that Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Brown approve the joint resolution which is now before the Senate, with one or two amendments, which I shall later suggest, and that they personally will recommend the approval of the joint resolution to the President.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In line with what the Senator from Ohio was saying as to the effect of the committee proposal, if adopted, in limiting the amount which could be spent on any particular subsidy program, take, for example, the proposed roll-back program on meat, which in part becomes effective today, as I understand, and which, if the pending measure should pass would continue in effect until December 31. Does the Senator think it would be possible then to discontinue the roll-back program until additional money was appropriated?

Mr. TAFT. It is just as possible to discontinue it on the 1st of January as it is to discontinue it today. It can be discontinued by simply raising the price of meat to the consumer, or, in the case of butter, by raising the price of butter to the consumer. It can be discontinued at any time. There is no difference between discontinuing it tomorrow and discontinuing it the 1st of January, so far as I can see.

But my own feeling as to the continuance of the subsidy program is this: If when we return here in October we find, through the operation of subsidy programs and other policies the Government has succeeded without serious interference with production and that prices that are approximately on the same level, it is probable that Congress will approve a continuation of the subsidy program.

If, on the other hand, as I fear, when we return, in spite of the subsidy program, prices have increased 1 percent a month, as they have been increasing, it will make clear that the subsidy program, after all, cannot accomplish that purpose, and it may also become clear that even if that purpose is accomplished it has interfered with the production of essential foodstuffs. In effect this measure says "You may continue this program until the 1st of January, but if the R. F. C. wishes to continue the program it must come back to Congress and ask for additional authority to go on in the year 1944." If we do not pass this measure, they can go on indefinitely, and not only that, they can extend it to every other agricultural product, and gradually expand the subsidy program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming, who, I think, was first on his feet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of confusion with respect to the discussion of roll-backs because the interpretation of the meaning of that word has not been the same by all persons who have taken part in the discussion. When the representatives of the producers ask for the abandonment of the roll-back program what they are concerned about is not that the cost of living shall not be reduced; it is simply that the returns of the producer of agricultural commodities shall not be reduced below the cost of production.

In the hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, which was held Saturday afternoon, and which I was privileged to attend, former Senator Brown, speaking for the O. P. A., said, if I understood him correctly, that it was not the purpose of O. P. A. to operate the subsidy program in such fashion as to reduce the return to the producers. The amendment which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I offered last Saturday and asked to have lie on the desk, and which was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee and rejected, was intended to bring about the objective of stopping a roll-back on the producer. We offered the amendment in the belief that it was absolutely essential to guarantee to the producers of agricultural commodities that their returns shall not be touched if we hope to

obtain the agricultural commodities which are necessary to feed the consumers.

Now I ask the Senator would there be any objection to the inclusion in the committee amendment of language which would write into the law the announcement which has been made by those who will have in charge the administration of this proposed act?

I call attention to the fact that when I presented the original amendment last week, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Burke, the Assistant O. P. A. Administrator, in which he stated that the price cut on meat and milk of 10 percent was not intended to deprive the producer of the returns he was then getting.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the difficulty with the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and the amendment which they are considering offering today, is that it provides that the carrying out of existing subsidy programs may be completed, except that roll-back programs with respect to milk and livestock and their products shall not be continued beyond July 31, 1943.

That was the exact provision contained in the bill which was passed by both Houses, and it was the exact provision which brought about the veto of the bill. Consequently, if it is inserted in the pending bill, there is no question whatever that the President will veto the bill, and, as we probably will have left Washington by that time, it will mean the destruction of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I cannot see any justifiable reason for Congress undertaking to repass the same bill which was previously passed. As I understand, the Senator says that what Mr. Brown stated was that there was no intention to roll the price back on the producer. He said in so many words that that was not the purpose, and we have provided on page 5, line 6, that "no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment—the greatest difficulty has arisen because the roll-back subsidy on meat was most ineptly carried out, and that undoubtedly had the effect not only of rolling back on the producer, where the roll-back was supposed to stop, but it went on to the price of cattle.

I do not think that is a necessary incident to a roll-back program, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] offered an amendment, and he told the Senate when the bill was here before that he offered it as an amendment to a committee amendment similar to that now under consideration. We have provided that every possible step shall be taken to accomplish the purpose we indicated. That is not difficult in the case of something on which a price is fixed, like butter. There has not been any trouble on the part of the producer of butter, as I understand, except in the case of the small farmer cited by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]——

Mr. AIKEN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. In which case the original price fixed, as in the case of cattle, is more difficult to handle, and yet Mr. Jones and Mr. Brown themselves say they can make suitable regulations to prevent any such result. But if we merely try to accomplish the object by saying there shall be no roll-back program, and that the meat and butter programs shall terminate on the 1st of August, the inevitable result, of course, will be a veto. There is no question about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio about the provision that no reduction shall be made to producers of livestock and producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back, and so on. How does he intend that that provision shall be enforced? I should like to have him tell us how it could be enforced. Suppose the big packing houses go to a farmer and say "The market for cattle has gone down, therefore we have to pay you 3 cents a pound less than we did 2 months ago." That might be the direct result of the roll-back but how is anyone to prove it? How is a provision that there shall be no reduction to the farmer or producer because of a roll-back to be enforced?

Mr. TAFT. I am really not advised how it can be done, and so long as there is a variable price, it is a difficult thing. How are we to assure the producer that he is getting what he is entitled to out of the present price of meat without any roll-back? It is as difficult a problem as to see that he gets the benefit of the roll-back. He would get it if we got a tight enough margin on the processor and saw that he did not have an excess of definite margins.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator from Ohio that the roll-back on meat was announced while there was a fairly rapid falling market for livestock. All grades of stock were falling then, and cattle and hogs were coming into the market in quantities, so that for the first time the amount coming to the market was equal to or exceeded that of the previous year. It is a very serious question whether, if the administration had not announced this roll-back program and checked that flow of stock into the market, the price would not have been lower today than it is, with the roll-back in effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the argument made by the Senator from Vermont is interesting, but wholly irrelevant, because if the amendment shall be rejected the roll-back will continue just the same, except that it will not have the protection we have tried to put into the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to ask the Senator from Ohio a question similar to that propounded by the Senator from Vermont, because I confess that, to my mind, it is rather difficult to understand how the provision on page 5, beginning in line 6, to which the Senator referred, can be enforced. Let me read it:

> No reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers of livestock and the producers of dairy products on account of any reduction or roll-back in the price of any commodity with respect to which subsidy payments are made.

And so forth. That would have been an understandable amendment if we had retained the provision of the amendment which I originally proposed, namely, that subsidies should be paid only to producers. But that is out.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I are not wedded to any particular language to prevent this roll-back upon the producer, and since the committee has adopted this language, open to criticism though it may be, for the express purpose of preventing a loss to the producer, let me ask the Senator whether there will be any objection to the substitution, for the language I have just read, of a sentence somewhat as follows:

> Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor the Commodity Credit Corporation shall adopt any subsidy program unless convinced that such program will not result in reducing the prices to the producers of agricultural commodities.

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be entirely acceptable language. I think it carries out exactly the purpose of this section, and if the Senator thinks the language stronger it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the consent of my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I shall move a perfecting amendment, to strike out the words to which I have referred, and substitute the phraseology I have just dictated on the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator proposes to strike out from line 6 to line 13?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; putting a period after the word "law," and beginning a new sentence on page 5, line 6, and then introducing a new sentence to take the place of the remainder of line 6, all of line 7, all of line 8, and all of line 9, down to the word "made" in line 10, substituting in lieu thereof the language which the Official Reporter will have to read to me, since I did not have it written.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield to me, I call his attention to the fact that while the language he would strike out deals only with livestock and dairy products, upon which there has been a subsidy program inaugurated, the language which he would substitute deals with all sorts of agricultural products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but every statement which has been made to me by those who represent the Commodity

Credit Corporation, the O. P. A., and the Office of War Mobilization, agrees that there should be no reduction of the price to the producer of any agricultural product. I am sure from telephone conversations which I have had within the last hour that the Senator will find no substantial disagreement with the language which I have suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not expressing any disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I am not certain whether everyone understands that the language which the Senator offers as a substitute covering all agricultural products is in the place of language in the bill which deals with only two products.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have the language of the Senator's amendment again read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will consult the Official Reporter. Let the Official Reporter read the language.

The Official Reporter [Mr. Rhodes] read as follows:

Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor the Commodity Credit Corporation shall adopt any subsidy program unless convinced that such program will not result in reducing the prices to the producers of agricultural commodities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator from Wyoming think that that language is stronger than the directive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it shall issue suitable regulations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not striking out that language; it remains in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator add except merely to say that the officials of the R. F. C. and C. C. C. must be convinced that they are not going to do something that they say they are not going to do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to write into the law and make clear that the Congress understands that that is what is intended, and I am substituting my proposal for language which obviously is unenforceable, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has clearly pointed out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the able Senator from Wyoming will give about 10 extra minutes of his notable ability and agility with the English language to work on this thing, I am sure he will devise something better than a mandate that the officials in question shall convince themselves that they shall not do what they say they will not do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For the moment, Mr. President, I am satisfied with the acceptance by the spokesman for the Committee on Banking and Currency of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the effect of the amendment is the same as the language of the bill, except that it extends the prohibition with respect to livestock and dairy products to all commodities. I am perfectly willing, and I think all members of the committee would be willing to accept that extension. I think it should be pointed out that it does not prohibit possible roll-backs of agricultural prices such as, for instance, prices of fresh vegetables, but it prohibits the use of subsidies to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Which I think is a perfectly sound principle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if the language now in the bill does not do exactly what the Senator wants to do for livestock and dairy products?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; if the Senator from Ohio will permit me to occupy the floor in his time, it does not do so effectively. It is true it announces that policy, but it is perfectly impossible of enforcement. The price which is paid to the producers of livestock is under the language of the bill a matter which is altogether beyond the control of the R. F. C. In my proposed substitute I provide that whatever is within the control of the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be dealt with in their judgment in such a manner as not to bring about reduction in prices.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is the Senator's objection based on the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not included in the language of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my objection is that the provision "and no reduction shall be made in the price paid to the producers" is unenforceable, because it is not the action of the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation under the language of the committee amendment as it is now drafted, which would control the price. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] just said, my amendment declares that no subsidy program shall be adopted for the purpose of reducing the price. It makes effective the objective which is not effective under the language of the measure reported by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if he has any assurance from the representatives of the executive department, Mr. Brown, Mr. Byrnes, and others, that they do not intend to embark upon further subsidies—an extension of the subsidy program.

Mr. TAFT. They have given me no assurance of that kind. In fact, the money provided for in the measure would probably authorize some additional subsidy programs broad enough to cover the existing program. The Senator will remember that the program for meat and butter will cost about $450,000,000, according to former estimates, which would be $225,000,000 for 6 months.

On the other hand, it is necessary to commit one's self ahead to some extent, so that the $350,000,000 not only covers the actual expenditures during the next 6 months, but must cover a month or two beyond that time, because the program cannot simply be arbitrarily terminated even on the first of a given month. It must be worked in with the crop season and the assurance given by the producers.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I ask the question is that the appropriation made in the bill amounts to $525,000,000 for the 6-month period. That is $1,050,000,000 a year. The administration spokesmen or supporters who came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry testified that they thought the whole program of rolling back prices of everything would cost the Government approximately $2,000,000,000 a year. The Senator will also recall that one of the reasons given by the President for vetoing the bill which was passed by Congress was that he would be unable to extend the program further if that bill became law. That is why I asked if the committee had any assurance at all that even were the so-called compromise amendment adopted, the administration did not intend to go ahead with the whole program for which it had originally planned, and a part of which it had put into effect without the consent of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. The Government cannot go ahead with the full program of $2,000,000,000, to which the Senator from Vermont refers, because the committee amendment provides that no further commitment shall be entered into beyond the dollars which are stated in it, and that is $350,000,000, plus $175,000,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or approximately $525,000,000 to the 1st of January. As a matter of fact, under the circumstances I think that amount must do them for about 9 months. I would say that the program here presented of $525,000,000 was equivalent to a total subsidy program on an annual basis of approximately $700,000,000, as I figure it, because the $175,000,000, for instance, granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation represents practically the entire subsidy for the whole crop year 1943 on beans and oils and various other products.

The officials in charge of the program have asked us to let them go ahead with respect to the whole 1944 crop, which they figure would cost about $175,000,000 on an annual basis for the entire year. The R. F. C. program I think would probably operate on the basis of the $350,000,000 proposed to be provided, which would amount, approximately, to from $550,000,000 to $650,000,000 a year, and I do not see how the agencies involved can go further than that, or get anywhere near the $2,000,000,000 figure to which the Senator has referred, without specific further authorization from Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The primary purpose of the joint resolution passed by the House, which we are considering, is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit

Corporation until January 1. In view of that limitation of time, unless the Congress shall again act, the Commodity Credit Corporation, after January 1, would again expire. As I understand, the effect of the committee amendment, beginning with section 5, is to place a limitation or restriction on existing law until January 1, with respect to the payment of roll-back subsidies to reduce the cost of commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. It places a restriction on all subsidies of all kinds. It does not attempt to distinguish between different kinds, except insofar as the language for the protection of the producer is concerned. It imposes a general limitation on all kinds of subsidies, so that the next time the question comes up the President cannot veto the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me understand clearly one further matter. We agree, do we not, that whatever authority now exists under the law, if any, for roll-back subsidies is contained in section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act. Is not that the Senator's interpretation of it?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It might be accomplished in another way, I may say to the Senator, I think.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But does not the O. P. A. claim authority under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act for the program now in effect?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is not that the source of the authority?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is the source of the authority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming that the committee amendment is agreed to, and that the joint resolution as thus amended is passed, would not the authority under section 2 (e) be in effect after the first of January?

Mr. TAFT. No; section 5 says very clearly, "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e)."

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the amendment would limit the time.

Mr. TAFT. There is no limitation of time. The first provision of section 5 is all-inclusive, for all time to come: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e)," they shall not do any of those things, without provision by Congress of express authority. Then we provide express authority only for the year 1943.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask a further question, in order to clear up the matter: Is it the Senator's interpretation of the committee amendment that, by enacting section 5, Congress would repeal all authority under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act, except such as was then conferred by section 5?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct—or by future acts of Congress. In other words, Congress would place section 2 (e) in exactly the condition in which it intended it to be, I think—an authorization bill which could not be carried out without further appropriation by Congress. Congress would revise section 2 (e) in that way, so that in the future Congress would have to appropriate money in order to carry out the provisions of section 2 (e). Otherwise, there would be no money with which to carry out its purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, by agreeing to the amendment, the Senate will definitely give legislative sanction to this kind of a roll-back program, whereas at present there is some question about whether such authority actually exists under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct in that there is an interesting legal question. There is no practical question. As a practical matter, there is a roll-back subsidy today, and it will continue indefinitely unless Congress sees fit to take action to stop it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree; and the Congress must take responsibility for continuing the existing authority, if there is any. If there is not, then by the amendment the Senator asks the Senate to grant authority to legalize what is being done. That is the position in which we find ourselves. I should like to see limitations imposed, if the proposed action is taken. However, since I do not favor the principle, since I think it is a mistake and is something that will lead into a program over which Congress will not have control, and which will go on and on, I oppose the proposal. I do not want to discover that, by having voted for the committee amendments, I have put myself in such a position that later it can be said that I gave my sanction, by vote, for the creation of the system for 6 months.

Mr. TAFT. I would say that the Senator cannot escape responsibility for it. He gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $15,000,000,000, with practically unlimited right to spend the money. Congress passed the Price Control Act with section 2 (e) in a vague and general form, and without absolutely definite provision that more money must be appropriated. Therefore, he cannot escape responsibility for the granting of the powers the Senate has carelessly granted to the Executive. The Senate's job today is to recall some of those powers and to assume some of the responsibility the Congress should have assumed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further observation?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When the Senator said that I could not escape responsibility because of the situation——

Mr. TAFT. I was speaking of the Senate as a whole, not of the Senator from Arkansas in particular.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not now want to give my approval to what the Senator says was a mistake Congress made when it did not make the provisions more specific. I would not agree to a proposal to remove any question about the authority, and to vote in favor of the principle.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, that authority for roll-back subsidies is provided by section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, and, as he suggested, by other methods which he did not detail. Whether the Senator had in mind that he did not wish to reveal the other methods, for fear they might be used, of course, I do not know. [Laughter.]

It is true that there is legal authority for what has been done. Regarding the authority, there may be legal dispute, without which the legal profession would have to go out of business, for it could not continue to live without the existence of disputes requiring interpretation of the law. However, I think all will agree that, regardless of what may be the authority under section 2 (e) or under any other general legislation, all the committee amendment would do would be to restrict or modify the authority; and we all understand that the modification is proposed to any authority heretofore conferred on the agencies to engage in the program without limit. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not familiar with what went on in the committee room. I have listened to the debate today in the hope of gaining sufficient information to enable me to vote intelligently. I have listened to what the Senator from Ohio has said in his colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas. I rise to ask why the date of January 1, 1944, was selected for ending subsidies, rather than August 1, or September 1, 1943.

Mr. TAFT. For the reason that the joint resolution the House passed and sent to the Senate runs to December 31, 1943. The House selected a 6 months' period, and we tried to work out the figures accordingly.

Furthermore, we thought that if Congress reconvened on the 15th of September, as I understand is intended, it might be rather difficult to obtain any legislation for a month or 6 weeks, and it might well be November before any further legislation could be enacted.

Mr. TYDINGS. My purpose in inquiring of the Senator was that I thought perhaps the O. P. A. had made some commitments in advance which would require Congress in good faith to provide for such a term.

Mr. TAFT. There was no special significance in the date selected, so far as I know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I should like to say that it was recognized in the House that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation could well be extended for 6 months, let us say; because if the extension were made only to the 1st of September or the 1st of October, Congress then would be faced with the necessity of extending its life again, and the program would be extended with the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I desire to ascertain is whether the subsidies of the O. P. A. has inaugurated should not be considered in connection with the desire to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the 1st of January. Why should not the Congress provide for termination of both within 6 months, and end them? Unless the O. P. A. has made commitments which we might feel morally bind the Government to continue the program until January 1, 1944, it seems to me that the logical and forthright way to end the subsidy business, if we want to end it, is to fix a date, say August 1, 1944, rather than to have 5 extra months.

Mr. TAFT. As I pointed out, if we were to terminate it at that date, the bill would be vetoed. The reason the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was vetoed was that we terminated the roll-back subsidies on the 1st day of August. I do not see any escape from the perfectly logical conclusion. Whether the period be 4 months or 6 months, or whether the amount be $250,000,000, $300,000,000, or $350,000,000, is not important. The Banking and Currency Committee has finally agreed on these dates with representatives of the executive department in an effort to obtain an agreement, as suggested by the President. Perhaps we have been somewhat liberal. I am willing to be liberal if I can once establish the principle that when this money runs out, whenever it is, the administration will have to come back to Congress and ask for authority to continue the program. Then we shall be in a position in which the President's veto will make no difference; and Congress can decide, by a majority vote, what program it wishes to continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the force of the Senator's position. In other words, his position is that, all things considered, this is the best we can do in the effort to bring about what we want.

Mr. TAFT. And considering the powers which we have already granted in such liberal profusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. My fear is that in going along with that philosophy we shall have incubated the subsidy idea to such an extent that when we arrive at January 1, when it is to end, there will be a demand all over the country that it be continued, and even enlarged and extended.

Mr. TAFT. What does the Senator think is the present effect in the country at large? It is that the Congress, by refusing to override the President's veto, has authorized subsidies. That is the reaction throughout the Nation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Congress assumes the responsibility. Why? Because two-thirds of the House could not be mustered to override the President's veto. Today the people at large consider that Congress has authorized subsidies. If we simply say, "All right; we will go along and continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, and give you exactly what is asked for," the people will have that opinion in even greater degree than they have it today.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's observations give me the opportunity to say that, of course, roll-backs in prices can be achieved without any subsidies. The O. P. A. now has the authority to roll back prices. Obviously they ought not to be rolled back if the relationship between prices and wages will not justify it. They ought to be rolled back when the relationship between prices and wages shows that the prices of one or more commodities are too high. We gave the O. P. A. the authority to keep prices and wages in line. I dislike to depart from what I think was an honest approach to this problem by saying, "Yes; you may do as you wish." It will be said, "If we can do it for agriculture we can do it for labor; we ought to give labor a subsidy." If we get into the subsidy business, God knows where we will ever emerge. I wish we could have limited it. Even in view of what the Senator has said, which I think makes sense, as a practical consideration I wish we could have limited it to the 1st of August 1944, and ended all commitments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to point out why there would be unlimited money if we should not act. We have authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow $3,000,000,000. That is a revolving fund. The corporation had a large amount of cotton. It has gradually sold that cotton. As soon as that money comes back it is available for other purchases. It is available for purchases at a loss, and for indirect subsidies. According to the figures I have, the R. F. C. is even better supplied. It has been authorized to borrow $15,750,000,000. Practically all of that amount is committed. Nevertheless, that money is all rolling in again. People are paying off the loans which the R. F. C. has made to them. So if out of $15,000,000,000 which it has had $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 comes in, that represents only the normal course of its operations. That whole sum is again available to use for subsidies, or indirect financing of this kind of purchases.

So with the powers we have given that agency, we have opened the doors wide. If we do not take some action, I cannot see any limit to the size of the subsidy program. If we should have a program equivalent to that of England, it would require more than $2,500,000,000 the first year. Unless our control were stronger, the second year it would require $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 a year.

So I am interested in stopping it now, and letting Congress determine, if the administration decides to ask for any extension of the program, whether it will grant such extension.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to to make a comment which is somewhat in the nature of an inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I understood the Senator from Arkansas to say a few moments ago that he objected to the pending committee amendment because he is opposed to the roll-back since he thinks it is probably not warranted by law, and that if we should adopt the committee amendment, it would be more or less of a ratification of the application and principle of the roll-back. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas is in favor of the joint resolution as it passed the House, which would merely extend the existing statute for a period of time. We all know that under the existing statute the roll-back has been put into operation. So if we were to vote for the House measure as it came over from the House, and should be entirely silent as to the matter of the roll-back, would there not be a ratification or endorsement, by inference, at least, of the principle of a roll-back?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator does not maintain that the roll-back was put into operation under the Commodity Credit Corporation law, does he? If there is any authority for it, as the Senator from Ohio has said, it emanates from section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act, and not the Commodity Credit Corporation Act.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I realize that the Senator from Arkansas does not believe that the authority to apply roll-backs exists.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During these debates many Senators have said so on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Assuming that the Senator is correct——

Mr. McCLELLAN. The sponsor of the bill which we are now discussing has taken that position on the floor of the Senate. So I am taking the position that if that be true, if those who take that position are correct—and I rather subscribe to it—if we by law actually authorize it, there will no longer be any question about the authority to do the thing.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Are we not really authorizing it when we vote for the joint resolution as it comes over from the House, which would continue the existing law? We know what has been done under existing law. We know that the program of the roll-back has been put into operation. If we vote for the joint resolution as it comes over from the House, and are entirely silent on the question which his been raised as to authority for a roll-back, might not that reasonably be construed as a ratification or endorsement of the principle?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not any more so than if I should vote to continue the R. F. C., because the authority for the program, it is contended, is in another law. The R. F. C. is only the agency through which the authority contained in the other law is exercised.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But if in our vote we should be entirely silent in regard to the question of legality and should merely continue the existing law, I think it might reasonably be assumed that by inference we should be ratifying or accepting the program of the roll-back. We might as well approve expressly the principle as to do so by implication.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think so. I can assure the Senator that he will find, by looking at the RECORD, that I have voted, when I had the opportunity, to try to stop subsidies. I have actually met my responsibility, according to my contentions in that respect. The Chief Executive has done what he conceived to be his duty. We do not agree. Congress did not override his veto. He contended that he had the authority all the time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Suppose I direct my inquiry not only to the Senator from Arkansas, but to the Senate as a whole. If the Senate merely accepts the House joint resolution, it seems to me that there is an acceptance of the idea of subsidies, because we know what is being done, and what will probably be done in the future if the House joint resolution prevails. Whether we pass the House version or the committee amendment we will be accepting the principle of the roll-back unless we state expressly to the contrary. I would rather be direct than indirect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not agree with the Senator, because there is no authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act for roll-backs. The Commodity Credit Corporation is only the agency which is used as a means to the end.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have said all I intend to say.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. If the Senate should fail to take any action whatsoever, save to authorize the further continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in his judgment would there be any way to prevent the administration from inaugurating with respect to all other commodities roll-back subsidies similar to those which are now employed in connection with butter and meat?

Mr. TAFT. I can see no way by which to limit the amount of money which may be spent on such subsidies.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Much as I am opposed to that type of roll-back subsidy, if I vote only to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation I may return after the recess and find that the administration has extended the policy of roll-back subsidies without limit.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. There is one other thought which it seems to me should be conjoined with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, and that is that limitations contained in sections 5 (c) and 5 (d) would operate constantly on every single dime proposed to be appropriated by the joint resolution. Is that not so?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio if it is his considered and final opinion that a total of $525,000,000 is necessary for the 6 months' period?

Mr. TAFT. It is my considered opinion that $175,000,000 is absolutely necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation. My amendment as it was offered in the committee provided $250,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was suggested that the amount should be somewhat larger, and the committee, by a rather substantial vote, decided that it should be. I did not care particularly. I was more concerned with the principle than with the amount. The program actually presented to us could be taken care of with a sum between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So anything beyond that figure is an invitation to a further expansion of the very system which we hold under suspicion.

Mr. TAFT. It would make it possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection it ought to be stated that the price control Administrator stated that the program contemplated by these figures up to this time could be roughly figured at $268,000,000, and that probably $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 more would be necessary during the period, which would run the figure somewhat above the $300,000,000 mark. It would probably reach $318,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is in addition to the $175,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So, in order to be on sound ground, the committee fixed the maximum at $350,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. As I have said before, some subsidies are well justified. For instance, a subsidy for feed costs for dairy products is probably justified. We can never be sure when an emergency will arise, when a justifiable subsidy may be called for. As I have said, I do not know that $350,000,000 is exactly the figure should be, but I do not think the difference is material.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before taking my seat I wish only to say that I have a number of minor amendments which were suggested almost entirely by the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to its powers. I will offer them before the amendment is voted on, but I will not do so at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio mind telling us now what the amendments are?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to show them to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Are they technical corrections?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to take them up with the Senator. I intend to describe them later. I prefer to postpone offering them for the time being.

Mr. AIKEN. Before the Senator takes his seat may I ask him whether he considers that his amendment would limit the life of subsidies to a 6-month period, as the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be limited?

Mr. TAFT. It would limit subsidies except that if money is definitely allocated for subsidies before the 1st of January, in case of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they may be carried out after the 1st of January. In other words, it is intended to cover commitments beyond the 1st of January, within the sum specified.

Mr. AIKEN. Supposing commitments were made covering the next growing season, 1944?

Mr. TAFT. That is a question to be dealt with by one of the amendments which I shall explain later.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I find myself in much the same position of embarrassment as to what the Senator from Ohio and other Senators have pointed out. I shall not discuss the details of the joint resolution.

In my own mind I am thoroughly convinced that a general system of subsidies is dangerous to the economy of the country. I know very well that the slogan has been that it has worked very well in England and, therefore, it ought to work in the United States. I am convinced that it cannot work here as it has worked in England. I am convinced of that, and I hope I shall at least give a little gleam of an idea to Members who do me the honor of listening to me.

I wish to return to what I consider was the source of the subsidy idea, as well as many other foreign and domestic policies of this administration.

The administration's insistence on a food subsidy as an instrument of anti-inflation policy or price control is due mainly to the influence of British example and doctrine. The inner circle in Washington, made up of those who constantly see the President and advise him on policy and grand strategy—Harry Hopkins, Justice Frankfurter, and his former star pupils in the Harvard Law School, now his protégés in strategic Government positions, and the New Deal brain trust—this group is the real American Cabinet and War Council. It is they who formulate what are called "directives" which are passed on to the appropriate heads in the Army, Navy, and various other governmental agencies of wartime control. The latter translate these directives and policy decisions of the inner circle into grand strategy for the conduct of the war on the global front and for the conduct of the Nation's war efforts on the domestic front. This inner circle has as its intellectual pivots Justice Frankfurter in Washington and Prof. Harold J. Laski in London. The two governing characteristics of this inner circle are their strong tendencies to what, for brevity, may be called socialism and inflation, or cheap money, and to following recent and current British thought and experience.

Two recent or current examples of the working of this international team in the realm of higher American policy-making may be seen in our Treasury's announced plan for post-war monetary policy,

roughly paralleling, with minor differences, that of Lord Keynes, and in the administrations' insistent demands for the use of a food subsidy as an instrument of anti-inflation policy. Recently, Prof. Benjamin Anderson, in a public address on the Pacific coast, raised what was virtually a lone voice crying in the wilderness against both the Keynes or British Treasury, and the Morgenthau or American Treasury, schemes for post-war monetary management. Professor Anderson made the elementary point that the essence of both schemes or plans was cheap money and a rubber dollar.

In the case of food and price control or so-called antiinflation policy, the Washington inner circle shows again its dependence on British thinking and experimentation. The inner circle insists that food subsidies are the golden key to price stability, the sovereign panacea against inflation. That is what the whole policy is based upon. Their chief reason for such insistence on the use of food subsidies is the British example. Their reasoning is simple: if it has worked well for Britain, it must work well for us. The fallacy inheres in an obvious difference between the British and the American situations, a difference generally overlooked in press and radio discussions of the problem, and a difference which will be bluntly stated at this time. Incidentally, Washington, for propaganda reasons, wishes to have as little as possible mention of this difference. But, when Washington persistently invokes the British example in support of its demand for the use of the food subsidy, Washington must expect to have opponents invoke certain facts which are obvious on any comparison of the American and British situations.

Briefly, here is the big difference between America and Britain in all economic, fiscal, and monetary matters: Britain has a Santa Claus and America has not. Because Britain has a food Santa Claus, the British Government can give to British food growers and to food consumers, as an incentive to larger production by the food growers and as a preventive of higher food costs for workers with its corollary of higher wages, a money subsidy without creating an inflationary danger, provided such money subsidy does not exceed the value of the groceries which the American Santa Claus, officially known as lend-lease, gives the British Government in the same period.

Here are the facts: Last year we gave the British around two and one-half million tons of food worth about $800,000,000. I read a statement in the press some time ago that it was more than that, but this is the last figure I have. This was about one-tenth of the total British food consumption. Now we are committed to keeping up these food deliveries as well as to giving Stalin three and one-tenth million tons, or over a billion dollars' worth of groceries. The British Government sold these $800,000,000 worth of groceries to the British people, thus taking that much cash from the people. That is anti-inflationary. According to Lord Woolton, the British food czar, the British Government in the same period used about $500,000,000 of the $800,000,000 it took in for the sale of American food to subsidize British food production and distribution, thereby keeping British food prices down and British food production up. Obviously, for a government to take in $800,000,000 from its own people for food which did not cost it a penny and to pay out $500,000,000 as a bonus or incentive to food production and preventive of food-price rise, is not inflationary. Quite the opposite. The British Government took in $300,000,000 more in money than it put out. Thus the British food subsidy was in no sense inflationary. The reason why it was not inflationary was that an American Santa Claus gave the British people $800,000,000 worth of groceries.

If a foreign Santa Claus would give the United States a billion dollars worth of groceries, which our Government forthwith sold to our people, taking a billion dollars in cash out of their pockets, our Government could then turn around and give back to American food growers and distributors a billion dollars to keep output up and prices down, as did the British Government. But if the United States Government pumps another billion dollars of money created by the commercial banks creating bank credit to buy Government bonds into the money stream to subsidize either food producers or food buyers, it is fairly certain that this injection of new money into the food market will prove inflationary, since it will be offset by no corresponding windfall of additional food.

The economic case against a food subsidy for the United States is irrefutable either on the basis of theoretical analysis or practical experimentation. The strongest point in this case is that the subsidy method is more expensive and less efficient and less just than the free-market method for bringing supply into balance with demand. We saw that in the last war. The subsidy method undertakes to induce food producers, processors, and distributors to produce, process, and distribute more without the incentive of a higher market price.

To operate a subsidy system you need an army of Government agents and mountains of paper work, investigation, control, and policing. Suppose the farmer is paid a cash bonus for producing more than he produced last year; then each farmer's statement must be checked and double-checked by special investigators. If the farmer is paid a bonus on what he sells, the administrative costs will still be enormous. Such subsidies, to produce appreciable results in the way of increased output, would have to be astronomical in total amount. A governmental subsidy of a few cents a pound on butter would have little effect on total output. Nor would it enable the poor man to compete with the rich patron of the food bootlegger for the available scarce supply. In the bootleg market the rich consumer is prepared to bid not 3 or 5 or even 10 cents more a pound, but 20 or 30 cents.

A food subsidy, to get results, that is, increased output above present levels, would have to be fabulous in total amount and hence wildly inflationary unless entirely successful in achieving a corresponding increase in output. A subsidy big enough to induce increased food output would present staggering administrative and enforcement problems. Such problems can only be solved by a totalitarian dictatorship proceeding along lines now well established by the Soviet and Nazi precedents in similar government undertakings. To toss a few hundred millions of Government money into the present food markets as a supposed inducement to greater output and preventive of higher prices would be a futile gesture.

It must be clearly understood that any government undertaking to operate a substitute system for the law of supply and demand or for the free market is bound to break down unless conducted with the utter thoroughness and ruthlessness of the totalitarian states. The reason why, as explained at length, is that the British seem to furnish an example, refuting the generalization just stated; the British economy is being, and has been now for over a decade, heavily subsidized by the United States through our purchase of over $15,000,000,000 of gold from 1933 to 1941 and now by lease-lend. To control prices and production, to control otherwise than through the free market, the state must either bribe or coerce. Trying to bribe with cash subsidies, to succeed, must be wildly inflationary—unless, as in the case of Britain, of course, it is possible to get a huge subsidy from abroad free gratis. To coerce larger output requires inevitably a set-up like that of Soviet Russia. A mild regime of attempted price and production control must break down for much the same reasons prohibition broke down. Effective enforcement is impossible under such a mild regime.

Right now millions of tons of meat are sold to restaurants and hotels above the ceiling prices. The procedure is simple and almost detection-proof. The meat is Government inspected. The quantities delivered are sold at the ceiling price, as is attested by a bill of sale and a check in payment—all for the O. P. A. record. But an additional sum is paid in cash by the buyer to the seller on delivery.

Once traffic in food develops along bootleg lines, the chief losers are primary producers and ultimate consumers and those distributors, storekeepers, or restaurant keepers who, as a practical matter or for moral scruples, cannot or will not indulge in such transactions. There are just two ways to eliminate bootlegging: One is the free market, and the other is the totalitarian way, with an omnipresent Gestapo. A few hundred million dollars subsidy to food growers, processors, and consumers, however dispensed or administered, simply would not touch the roots of the food bootleg market.

A great many monetary, fiscal, and economic measures taken by the British Government over the past 10 years, or since the New Deal jumped the price of gold 70 percent, from $20.67 to $35 an

ounce, have been either inflationary or socialistic or both. Yet these measures have not had inflationary results or sequels, nor have they required the controls and disciplines which usually go with drastic ventures in state socialism. The popular notion in America, especially in conservative circles or among the so-called best people who have a great cult of Britain, is that such measures when taken by the British are sound or conservative and are neither inflationary nor socialistic in character. The real explanation is almost never stated, and it is apparently understood by very few Americans.

The explanation is that now for a decade the United States has been playing Santa Claus to the British Empire to the tune of around a billion dollars a year. This we did for 7 years by the purchase of over $10,000,000,000 of gold from the British Empire, the producer of two-thirds of the yearly output of gold of the entire world, and for the past 2 years by lend-lease. By stepping up the price of gold 70 percent and purchasing $15,000,000,000 of gold from 1933 to 1942, two-thirds of which we bought from the British Empire, and by selling American foodstuffs and raw materials some 20 to 30 percent below the prices of the 1920's, we made a present to the British Empire each year of several hundred million dollars. This subsidy enabled the British to enjoy the boons of inflation and socialism without undergoing the usual consequences or paying the usual costs. It is all very simple when one stops to consider what actually happened. If one borrows money to go on a spending spree one soon runs into the troubles of anyone who gets head over heels in debt. But if one has a spending spree on a succession of gifts or legacies by friends or relatives one obviously experiences none of the troubles of the embarrassed debtor or the spendthrift.

The American Santa Claus has made inflation and state socialism safe and practically without cost for the British economy. It does not follow, however, that the same measures and policies can be carried out by a nation like the United States without a corresponding subsidy from abroad and without the costs and consequences which such measures and policies normally involve.

The British have got away with inflation and socialistic measures without the usual costs and sequels, simply because the United States has been subsidizing the British economy for the past 10 years to the tune of several hundred million dollars a year through purchases of gold at 70 percent more than it is worth (or costs to produce) and, more recently, through outright gifts in the form of lease-lend.

To point this out is not to criticize our gold-buying policy, lease-lend, or the inflationary and socialistic policies and practices which our subsidies made safe and easy for the British. It is merely to state an obvious, though little recognized fact. The moral is that America cannot imitate the British in inflationary and socialistic policies and practices with the same results or lack of results encountered in the British experiments with inflation and socialism since 1932. If we go in for such policies and practices, we must expect to be obliged to use the same procedures which similar policies and practices have imposed on Soviet Russia, where they did not have their state investment and socialism program subsidized by foreign gifts. A foreign subsidy to enable the United States to go in for inflation and socialism as Britain has done without suffering the usual consequences, would have to be three times as large as the billion dollar a year subsidy we have been giving the British Empire since we started paying $35 an ounce for gold instead of $20.67.

We are three times as large in population. But we, instead of receiving a subsidy from foreign sources, are committed to feeding and financing the British, Russian, and Chinese Empires during an indefinite period of war and post-war world reconstruction. With these commitments, our Government cannot give money subsidies to producers and consumers without inviting the direst evils of inflation. With these commitments, our country cannot continue paying high prices to labor or keep high profits and raise or even maintain present living standards. The British Government, thanks to the subsidies of the American high price in buying gold and low price in selling food, was abl to come out of the depression, not by lowering costs and the selling price of British exports, but by raising British living standards and improving British housing. Even during the present war, thanks to American lease-lend, the British Government has been able to improve the diet of the poorest half of the British population.

While it is the Keynes and Laskis in Britain who best explain or rationalize the inflationary and socialistic tendencies in British policy since 1933, it has been the Baldwins, Chamberlains, and Churchills, or the most traditional of Tories, who have had the direction of public affairs while these policies have been carried out. These conservative leaders have been neither inflationists nor Socialists. They have been hard-headed British imperialists. They merely perceived the dispositions of American policy and made obvious adjustments. I admire the British for their astuteness, and for many other qualities they possess. There was no use trying to lower British production costs with a view to expanding exports to America.

A protectionist American Congress would raise the tariff to offset any reduction of British production costs. Americans did not want to buy British manufactures cheap. They wanted to sell American food products cheap and buy British gold dear. Now they want to give away American food products. The proper British adjustment was to sell American gold for 70 percent more than it was worth and to buy cheap or to receive as a gift American groceries. This required, among other things, inflationary and socialist policies in Britain in order to increase British purchasing and consuming power. It has raised American taxes and public debt and raised British living standards. It has been sound for British capitalism, or at least safe, so far, because, thanks to our subsidies, inflation there has not taken.

In the long run these developments are calculated to lessen the recently growing economic superiority of the United States over Britain. This leveling process, as between Britain and America is grand for Britain. It will be accelerated to whatever extent American policymakers, under the influence of British thought and example, attempt to imitate British measures of a socialistic or inflationary nature. For, while inflationary and socialistic policies enabled Britain to make adjustment to American policies of buying gold dear and selling food cheap, and now giving it away, the same or similar policies followed by our Government are justified by no such necessity of making adjustment to the policy of a powerful foreign nation, and are subsidized by no such gifts as our gold-buying and lease-lend operations involved.

If, in pursuing a grandiose program of world uplift and socialism, the United States resorts to inflation, by giving money subsidies to producers and consumers, instead of relying, as did socialist Russia, on harsh discipline, compulsion, and purges, it is a foregone conclusion that resort to prolonged inflation will wreck the American capitalist economy without, at the same time, building a strong self-sufficient socialist economy. Briefly, what was sound for Britain will not be sound or feasible for the United States, because, in international economic relations, the United States is not, like Britain, the recipient of foreign subsidies, but is trying to be the subsidizer of half the globe. A subsidy-receiving national economy must inflate to make satisfactory adjustment to the receipt from abroad of a subsidy. Such inflation is not inflationary in its effects but merely a matter of adjustment.

A subsidy-giving national economy cannot inflate without disastrous consequences. The formula for subsidy giving is not inflation but self-denial and harsh discipline. But British long-run interests will be well served if current developments result in a leveling down of America and a leveling up of Britain for the post-war economic race. Nothing will better insure this post-war result than an American attempt to imitate certain inflationary procedures recently used with success and without inflationary sequels by the British.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 9, on page 2.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated. The amendment is merely to cast into proper language the amendment I discussed earlier in the afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 6, following the word "law", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the

word "products" in line 13, and between lines 13 and 14 to insert the following new subsection:

(g) No subsidy program shall be undertaken or continued with respect to any agricultural commodity either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, if in its opinion such program will result in any reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Corporation shall each issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity as a result of any such subsidy program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield to me, let me say that I think if he will modify his amendment by striking out the word "such" in the last line he will strengthen it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator, and I modify my amendment in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the modification, I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming on what basis he determines the prices below which no reduction would be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They would be the prices existing at the time when the program went into effect.. It must necessarily be so. Much as I should like to go back to the basis stated in the bill which was vetoed, because of the notice I have received on the floor this afternoon that any attempt to do so would result in a veto, I now am working on the basis of the old theory that one-tenth of a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat, I should like to ask him a further question. If we are to provide for the price as of the date of the enactment of the joint resolution, that price may be below the support price already offered by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. For example, if my recollection is correct, and I am stating this from memory, the Secretary of Agriculture offered a support price for hogs, at Chicago, of $13.75 per hundred pounds. On the 15th of June, which is the date for the figures given in the last issue of the official publication of the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Prices, dated June 29, and stamped as received in my office on July 1, the price of hogs in Chicago was $13.60, already 15 cents below the support price offered by the Secretary of Agriculture, as I recall the figures. Let me inquire of the Senator from Wyoming whether he would further reduce that price, or would retain the market price of that date or of some other date, and disregard the support price already offered to increase production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, I think the support price is a matter of procedure and accepted policy at the present time, and would not be affected. The Senator from Kansas well knows that I did not agree with the philosophy or the method of procedure which was outlined in the Emergency Price Control Act. I felt that very different steps should have been taken. However, they were not taken.

I offer the amendment to the amendment in the belief that it is an improvement over the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming whether he is willing to turn his livestock producers over to the tender mercies of the O. P. A.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. REED. Or whether he thinks his livestock producers, any more than those of Kansas, would care to be turned over to the tender mercies of the O. P. A.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The Senator and I still agree.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In reading the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, I notice he leaves the question of whether there will be a reduction in price to the opinion of the O. P. A. or the R. F. C.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no other way to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Wyoming that the officials of the executive department maintained, when they announced the roll-back subsidy on meat and dairy products, that prices to the farmers would not be reduced?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my opinion is that the amendment would result in an improvement over the present position. I have in mind that the President in his veto message used the following sentence:

I do not intend to permit farm prices and farm incomes to be depressed.

I may feel, and I do feel, that this method is the incorrect approach to the problem. However, we are confronted by the substantial fact that the House of Representatives declined to override the President's veto. Therefore, as I see the situation from a practical point of view, I have no recourse but to do the best I can do now to obtain acceptance of modifications which will tend to improve the situation and which will make it more and more clear that the intent of Congress and the intent of the Executive is that the matter shall be administered in such fashion as not to depress farm prices and thereby curtail the opportunity of the producer to produce.

I am hopeful that it will still dawn upon those who are handling the program that a much better method of maintaining production can be followed than the one which is being followed by these programs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming will recall that in the message the President delivered to this body on Labor Day of last year, he offered an alternative method of determining prices of farm products. The plan offered was that the prices should be either the parity price or the highest price paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942.

I am also sure the Senator from Wyoming will remember that the administrative agencies undertook to reduce prices which already were below the maximum price paid between January 1 and September 15. I happen to have in my office an analysis of that situation. Not anticipating that the matter would come up this afternoon, I do not happen to have the analysis at hand, but I am quite sure I have correctly stated the situation, namely, that some of the so-called price roll-back orders are reducing farm prices which already are below the prices which should be maintained under the President's message of Labor Day of last year. How are the livestock producers and how are the farmers to secure protection under circumstances such as those, when the President holds out a program under which it is easy to determine maximum prices, and then his own administrative agencies reduce prices which already are below that maximum?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a few brief statements which I think will contribute toward the interpretation of the problems which may face the administrators of the law a little later.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now, as for the subsidy problem. It is another one of those deals where they don't tell the whole truth. Either that or they do not know. If Congress allows the meat industry to be subsidized, it is the beginning of the ruination of the whole economy of this country. It seems simple offhand to subsidize the packer so as to maintain present live prices. If the subsidy program as proposed is allowed to go through, we will immediately have ordered maximum live prices on the various grades of livestock, because otherwise it would be impossible to determine what the cost of the subsidy program would be because the packers, knowing that they were being subsidized, would not care what price they paid for livestock. So maximum live prices would be absolutely necessary, and when maximum live prices are placed on livestock, then follows allocation to the packer.

The livestock industry has made a mistake in the past by talking about the price of livestock rather than cost of production. The Corn Belt feeder is the only individual contributing to our war effort who is asked to produce his product and sell it below cost of production.

	Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Lot 5	Lot 6	Lot 7
Number head	72	195	108	146	416	123	196
Total purchase weight—pounds	61,730	140,665	127,670	160,120	410,077	146,610	190,072
Average—do	857	721	1,182	1,097	985	1,191	970
Total feeding days	3,220	13,065	7,960	10,320	41,351	8,635	11,407
Gain per day—pounds	2.09	1.9	2.5	2	2.07	2.9	2.02
General overhead—labor including grinding per head	$0.03½	$0.03½	$0.03½	$0.03½	$0.03½	$0.03½	$0.03½
Total labor overhead	$112.70	$457.27	$278.60	$361.20	$1,447.28	$302.22	$399.24
Interest per head	$0.01½	$0.01½	$0.01½	$0.01½	$0.01½	$0.01½	$0.01½
Total interest charge	$48.30	$195.97	$119.40	$159.30	$620.26	$129.52	$171.10
Feeding costs:							
Corn, shelled	$842.00	$3,600.00	$3,055.00	$3,100.00	$14,976.90	$3,521.70	$3,443.00
Corn, ear	$115.28	$458.80	$292.50	$331.00			
Hay:							
Alfalfa	$37.31	$148.56	$94.72	$107.12			
Prairie	$29.25	$116.44	$74.24	$83.96	$1,594.25	$369.91	$475.77
Linseed meal					$1,005.36	$211.78	$262.56
Cotton cake					$970.94	$212.52	$245.44
Linsoy	$156.47	$592.06	$371.18	$503.71			
Molasses					$550.19	$117.67	$148.65
Mineral	$12.24	$59.58	$23.76	$33.00			
Total sale weight—pounds	68,460	165,450	147,520	179,660	490,644	171,650	213,120
Total gain—do	6,730	24,785	19,850	19,540	85,567	25,040	23,048
Total cost gain	$1,353.55	$5,628.69	$4,309.40	$4,674.79	$21,165.18	$5,145.16	$4,864.72
Cost per pound gain	$0.201	$0.227	$0.217	$0.239	$0.247	$0.194	$0.223

Feed cost, lots 1, 2, 3, 4:

Corn, shelled, per bushel	$1.00
Corn, ear, per bushel	1.00
Hay:	
Alfalfa, per ton	18.50
Prairie, per ton	14.50
Linsoy, per ton	57.00
Mineral, per hundredweight	6.00

Food cost on lots 5, 6, 7:

Corn, shelled, per bushel	$0.96¾
Hay, per ton	15.50
Linseed meal, per ton	48.00
Cotton cake, per ton	52.00
Molasses, per ton	29.00

With respect to the Office of Price Administration action to roll back prices on hogs, cattle, and other farm products, I wish to say the only answer is for us farmers to produce less, because our cost has increased. I am willing to work for the boys for nothing but I have to pay my help and my bank. The authorities in Washington have threatened us stockmen with everything they can think of (I hope), and have charged us farmers with causing inflation and the high cost of living. I don't like it and my neighbors around here don't like it. We are working 7 days a week and trying to make enough food but there are so many to eat that I am afraid we won't make it.

It takes the heart out of a man when he comes in dog tired at night and reads about these Washington ideas to roll back farm prices, subsidize the packers, and increase wages to organized labor.

Sorry to bother you, but this is about the picture here and I sincerely believe food production is in danger—or do they want food produced?

HON. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the way the farmers are taking the treatment that they are getting. There is no other class that is getting the kind of deal the farmer is at the present time.

I have 22 gilts bred for June farrow, and I am going to sell them before they show to piggie, and that is the way the most of the farmers in Fair Dale Precinct are going to do. I am the assessor, Victory leader, and committeeman of this precinct. I have contacted 90 farmers in the last 3 days, so I know how they feel.

Most anybody can go to Grand Island and make from 10 to 18 dollars a day in the plant, and labor is impossible to get. Everybody but the farmer gets paid on a cost-plus basis. Farmers' pay is based on a parity that dates back to the time when wages of labor were far less.

I wish I had the time to write you a long letter, but this is what is going to happen. In about 6 to 8 months they are going to wonder where all the meat is that farmers signed up to raise. If the bunch that is running this show want grain instead of meat, that is just what they are going to get.

The price the farmer was getting for his produce was not too high in regard to other classes. It's been too cheap, and when it reached a closer ratio it seemed high to labor who has been used to cheap food. Don't Rosie know labor gets more money to spend than all the farmers together. I mean net money or inflation money, if I must; are not you boys going to do something for us?

I am yours very truly.

SEARLE BROS. RANCH,
Ogallala, Nebr., April 15, 1943.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am mailing you a letter which I wish could be gotten to the heads of the Office of Price Administration, as it very clearly shows the situation out in this country.

I would have sent it direct, but did not think it would ever reach the right parties.

I am very patriotic as the letter suggests and all the cattle folks are, but when we stand to lose the price of our feed and labor and very likely a part of our investment in the cattle, we don't feel like pitching.

Yours very truly,

A. L. SEARLE.

UNION STOCK YARDS,
Denver, Colo., April 13, 1943.

DEAR SIR: Livestock markets have been pretty much upset this week at all points, the result of news emanating from Washington, D. C., most of which came out of Office of Price Administration and from the new food administrator, Chester Davis. The advance of 5 cents per bushel in the price of corn, ordered by Mr. Davis along with his drastic crack-down threats of different things that were being considered to lower the price of beef and pork, naturally has made livestock growers and livestock feeders more uneasy than they have been for some time and justly so. To raise the price of grains and lower the price of livestock cuts pretty sharply into the bank accounts of our meat producers at the moment.

It is our opinion that the well being of the Nation is jeopardized seriously by these intermittent announcements, having to do with meat production and all of which for 8 to 10 months have resulted in a curtailment of production, whereas the needs of the Army, the needs of lend-lease and the needs of the civilian population of our country demand that more meat, not less, be produced.

We feel that the tinkering going on by men who are not familiar with livestock production problems, will only result eventually in a condition that will have to be remedied in some way, or else meat, so sorely needed, simply will not be available.

Having an abiding confidence in the intelligence of the American people as a whole, it is our opinion that necessary corrections will be made as times goes on, with the result that more experienced and practical folks will be at the head of our gigantic factory of meat production in the United States. Therefore we feel like assuring producers that anything working against their interests will be temporary; do not get alarmed; stay in there and pitch; run your plant to capacity, and figure that you are simply doing your part in the interest of the country that we love, even though hampered by rules and regulations not at all practical and not serving the public interest the least bit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who reported the joint resolution, if, in his opinion, there is any authorization in the joint resolution for placing ceiling prices on live animals?

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would authorize placing ceiling prices on live animals. In that respect I think it would not change the power in the present law. Yesterday Mr. Brown, the Price Administrator, appeared before our committee and stated that it was the policy of the administration not to place prices on live animals. I believe that if he were permitted to carry out the program he has in hand he would maintain that policy. If he is driven away from the program which he is conducting he might be forced to seek alternatives to the fixing of prices on live animals.

Mr. BUTLER. It is in anticipation that something like that might develop that I have had inserted in the RECORD a few quotations from the statements to which I have already referred. I invite especial attention to one page covering the complete cost of finishing seven lots of cattle which were on feed. The statement shows the number of days, the feed which was weighed into them, the labor costs, and everything else in connection with the complete transaction. If it is desired, I can obtain affidavits in support of the figures showing

the actual cost of producing beef at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as modified, to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 5 is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in our last conference with Mr. Hutson, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, he asked for certain modifications of language, and one modification of substance. I therefore offer the first amendment which has been requested and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. May the amendment be stated first?

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the word "Corporation" it is proposed to insert "or the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, these amendments are important. Hearing them read, without having them before us, leaves us in a state of uncertainty as to what the amendments actually mean. I suggest to the majority leader and to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that in the interest of intelligent handling of these very important questions the amendments ought to be printed and made available to Senators. We ought not to undertake to vote on them this afternoon. I suggest to the majority leader that we should not undertake to vote on these amendments, or any part of the bill, tonight. The amendments should be made available so that we may have them before us and give them the intelligent consideration which their importance deserves.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this particular amendment is purely technical. There is one other of that nature. There is one amendment of some importance, to which I think the Senator's remarks would apply. I should like to get rid of the technical amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that most of these amendments are purely technical, with one exception. There is one substantive amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it would be agreeable to permit the Senator from Ohio to perfect his amendment with these suggestions and have the entire amendment printed in the final form in which he intends to offer it, so that it may be available to Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not offering any amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator is offering amendments to the committee amendment. It is not as though he were offering an amendment from the floor, which he could perfect as a matter of right.

Mr. REED. That is the point I wish to have made clear. If it is only a question of perfecting the committee amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the committee amendment, or any other amendment to the joint resolution, is adopted, it must go back to the House. Whether the House would feel disposed to act on the amendment without sending it to conference, I have no way of knowing. If it had to go to conference, that would mean some time. It is important to have the joint resolution enacted into law as soon as possible. The Commodity Credit Corporation is now out of business. Its time expired 5 days ago, and technically, it cannot transact any business until its life has been extended.

I do not wish to crowd Senators to vote tonight, although I had hoped that we might dispose of the joint resolution tonight in order to send it to the House as soon as possible, so that it might be acted upon one way or the other.

I am willing to accommodate myself to what the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desire. Two or three Senators have indicated that they wish to make brief observations or propound certain inquiries with respect to the general subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is important that the joint resolution be disposed of at a reasonably early hour tomorrow so that it may reach the House and the House may appoint a conference committee tomorrow, and so that action on the joint resolution may be completed on Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to suggest that if we are not to act tonight, I hope we can meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I should like to propose a limitation on further debate on the joint resolution and all amendments, if that is agreeable.

Mr. AIKEN. What limitation, Mr. President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest 15 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. AIKEN. The joint resolution and any amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution or any amendment. That means that a Senator may speak 15 minutes on the joint resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Ohio tender the amendments which he intends to offer, so that they may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now submit the amendments intended to be proposed by me, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed and lie on the table, and also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT were ordered to be printed and lie on the table, and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out on page 5, lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and on page 6, lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(j) Nothing in this act shall be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination or any restriction of the use of trade and brand names; (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity; (3) as authorizing the Administrator to standardize any commodity, unless the Administrator shall determine, with respect to such standardization, that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity; or (4) as authorizing any order of the Administrator fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were prior to such order, in substantial use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency."

On page 4, line 2, after the word "or", to strike out the word "purchase" and insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

On page 4, lines 13 and 14, after the word "or", to strike out the word "purchase" and insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

On page 4, line 17, after the word "purpose" insert the word "not fulfilled prior to July 1, 1943."

On page 4, at the end of paragraph (d) strike out the period, insert a colon and the following *"Provided,* That commitments in a total additional sum of $175,000,000 may be entered into prior to January 1, 1944, covering 1944 crops."

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that in view of the agreement which has been reached we may suspend at this time. I wonder if we can first dispose of the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which is pending. It is technical in nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, on page 3, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I inquire what has become of the "convincer" amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that amendment was agreed to while the Senator from Michigan was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Because of the consideration of the joint resolution before the Senate I did not make an effort to press for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 71, which was unanimously agreed to by the committee earlier in the day. However, I give notice that immediately upon the disposition of the pending measure tomorrow, I shall ask for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 71.

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when the calendar was called a few days ago,

and Calendar No. 341, Senate Joint Resolution 59 was reached, I asked for an explanation. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the author of the joint resolution, was not present, and no Senator seemed to be in a position to explain the joint resolution.

I have since looked into the subject; and not only have I no objection to the joint resolution, but I think it is an entirely worthy measure. It would simply authorize and request the President to proclaim and Armed Services Honor Day during the year 1943. Therefore, I desire to withdraw the objection which I then urged, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the proposal for the Armed Services Honor Day limited to 1943?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 59.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "the," to strike out "20th" and insert "1st."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, same line, after the word "of", to strike out "June" and insert "August."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Sunday, the 1st day of August 1943, be, and hereby is, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition and the honoring of all men and women who have served or now are serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America.

That the civil, religious, educational, and patriotic authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and that they arrange and hold appropriate ceremonies in their respective communities in honor of all members of the United States of America armed forces and particularly the national defenders from the States and localities in which they reside.

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby are, authorized to recommend participation by military and naval forces under their respective jurisdiction in ceremonies marking the occasion of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent that is consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to prepare and transmit a message to all of our armed forces everywhere and especially to those heroes who have come from the scenes of battle to recover from their wounds or illnesses expressing the Commander in Chief's and the Nation's gratitude and voicing our prayers for a final and complete victory and their safe return to the pursuits of civil life in a world at peace.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the committee has reported certain amendments to the preamble.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that the preamble be eliminated. It is a long preamble, and it has been customary to eliminate long preambles. I do not think a preamble is essential.

Mr. WILEY. The elimination of the preamble is satisfactory to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the preamble is eliminated.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the completion of the pending business the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2936, Calendar 387, an act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Conecticut?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the bill?

Mr. WHITE. May we have an explanation of the purpose of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2936), to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense" and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, allow me to say in answer to the question of the acting minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], that the bill would authorize an additional $200,000,000 under the Lanham Act to be used for community facilities, principally in connection with new housing which the Congress has recently authorized in the amount of $400,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that I have no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to submit an inquiry to the Senator from Connecticut. In the second deficiency appropriation bill which the Senate passed this afternoon there is an item of $75,000,000 for facilities for this matter.

Mr. MALONEY. It is in connection with the proposal and would be available only if this particular bill should pass.

Mr. GEORGE. This is a mere authorization? There is no proposal to appropriate the money at this time?

Mr. MALONEY. The $75,000,000 to which the Senator refers would be available only upon the enactment of this bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I was anxious to understand it clearly because on the Mississippi coast there are many hundreds of units of houses which are actually unoccupied and yet we have continued to appropriate money for additional construction.

Mr. WHITE. Is this the legislative authority for the appropriation of $75,000,000 which the Senate adopted this afternoon? Did that appropriation rest on the assumption that this measure was to pass?

Mr. MALONEY. That is to provide some of the money should this bill pass.

Mr. WHITE. That is, the appropriation was contingent upon the passage of this bill.

Mr. MALONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator is familiar with the objection which I made to the bill. My recollection is that there were objections from other Senators who are not now present. Am I incorrect as to that?

Mr. MALONEY. I want to be sure I understand what the Senator means by his objection. The objection to which I refer, as voiced by the Senator from Michigan, was that he did not want to enlarge the powers of the Federal Department of Education through this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, on the contrary I voiced the objection of the Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction of Michigan to the direct contact of the Federal Works Agency in circulating these funds direct to school districts in Michigan. I quote him literally:

> We therefore recommend that the act be further amended so that all funds for school instruction and maintenance and operation be channeled through the United States Office of Education and in turn through the State Departments of Education.

Mr. MALONEY. That would not take place under this language.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I judge not.

Mr. MALONEY. I myself disagree with that view, I must say to the Senator. This would authorize the Federal Works Agency to continue the program which has been in effect for a long time and would not in any way change it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, it permits the Federal Works Agency to deal directly with school districts.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the educational authorities of the State of Michigan, at least, are fundamentally opposed to the maintenance of that sort of a contact.

Mr. MALONEY. I am not familiar with all the views of the Michigan authorities, but I talked with the man who is superintendent of education, or who

holds an important State position comparable to it, and he explained a situation which exists at Willow Run, which I understand, has been or is about to be adjusted. Beyond that, I do not know the views of the Michigan authorities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why should not these funds at least be channeled through the State educational authorities of the various States even if we want to by-pass the United States Office of Education?

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot answer that question. I presume that the authority to do that rests with the Federal Works Agency. If they do not do that I presume it is because they feel that the matter can be more expeditiously handled through the local authorities, who are entirely familiar with the particular situation and who under ordinary circumstances would be charged with the raising of funds to construct schools which are in whole or in part provided for by this legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Michigan, with the permission of the Senator from Connecticut, that in my opinion the bill which passed the Senate recently, namely, Senate bill 1130, was expected to give the State educational authorities participation in working out a State program which would meet, in my judgment, many of the objections raised in the letter to which the Senator from Michigan has referred.

Mr. MALONEY. So that the Senator from Michigan may be a little more fully informed, let me say that we made provision in the bill which we are discussing to turn the activities over to the United States Office of Education under the so-called Thomas bill, which has already passed the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall not interfere with the Senator's anxiety to pass the bill because I know of the fundamental necessity for the expansion of what we might call municipal facilities in connection with the defense needs. However, I now ask the question if the other Senators who objected to this bill are present?

Mr. MALONEY. The only other Senator I knew had an objection is the Senator from Wisconsin. He just left the Chamber. I know of no other objection. The bill was reported by the committee unanimously, as I recall. It is not my proposal. It is a House bill and I am merely acting in the capacity of chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator object to the amendment which would require the Federal Works Agency to consult the State authorities in the various States?

Mr. MALONEY. That has already been provided. That is the practice of the Federal Works Agency. They do consult the Federal Office of Education and consequently the State authorities.

The Senator from Connecticut would object to any amendment which would compel them to do that, because it might cause some delay. The matter has already been passed upon by the Senate. I assume the Senator from Michigan voted for it. The Thomas bill would do just what the Senator wants done, and it is now before the House. Provision is made in this bill to avoid duplication. Should the so-called Thomas bill become law, the educational and day-care activities now being handled by the Federal Works Agency would be turned over to the Office of Education.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I recall that, and I favored it completely, of course, but it seems to me this is a violation of that method of procedure.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think this bill violates any procedure. It merely authorizes another $200,000,000 to permit the authorities to do what they have been doing from the beginning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there anything about the passage of the Thomas bill which would affect the bill now being discussed?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; it would take out from the Federal Works Agency the operation of Federally-financed educational activities, and would so operate insofar as so-called child day-care centers are concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it would still permit the Federal Works Agency to arrange for the school instruction?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct, and I did not know anyone objected to that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do; but I resign, in the presence of the Senator's presentation of the case.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. An opportunity will be had tomorrow, I understand, to discuss this matter. The Senator does not intend to try to press for action on the bill today?

Mr. MALONEY. No, Mr. President; I asked unanimous consent that the bill might be considered on the completion of the pending business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very sorry I interrupted the Senator. I understood his request was for immediate passage, and I thought it was a rather summary proceeding.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sure the Presiding Officer understood me, and I know the majority leader did.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES IN MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Post Office Department has been designating for some time various postal employees to go to military camps and other places where military and naval personnel are concentrated, to look after the mail at those points. Out of its miscellaneous fund the Department has been paying these men their expenses, which averaged about $2.60 a day. The General Accounting Office had the matter brought to its attention, and held that under the present law such payments could not be made, that an act would be required giving the Department authority to make them. The detailing of these men is a very necessary and proper step for the Department to take. It is the cheapest way in which the matter can be handled.

The Post Office Department has presented a bill which provides that these men may be sent out. The first bill presented allowed a per diem of $6. I told the Department that was entirely too much, and that I would not ask unanimous consent to have a bill passed unless the per diem were reduced. Finally, after several conferences, they presented a bill authorizing allowances at not exceeding $2.50 a day, so as to make them conform with the actual expenses of the employees going to the various camps and doing the work I have indicated.

I should like permission to introduce the bill, and I shall then ask to have it taken up for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval personnel at military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units, at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding $2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices."

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for any payments heretofore made not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to the employees so detailed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that this merely proposes to authorize the Post Office Department for a limited period of time——

Mr. McKELLAR. It is limited to 6 months after the war.

Mr. WHITE. To send out from the main offices of the Post Office Department trained and experienced personnel in order to assist in the handling of mail at the various military posts throughout the country?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is accurate in his statement.

Mr. WHITE. There is a limit upon the per diem and subsistence payments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The second section validates the Post Office Department action in doing this. It does not appropriate any more money. The payments are to be made out of the miscellaneous fund.

Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to say that the bill has not gone to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, because we have not had time, and we would not have time, to have a meeting of the committee and pass upon it. The bill is introduced entirely as a

result of a ruling of the Comptroller General, which I think was handed down either this morning or yesterday, as my memory serves me. That is why I am making the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VISIT BY SENATORS TO THE WAR FRONT

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which has been released to the press. It gives his observations on the contemplated trip of other Senators to the battle front.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was charged by the Senate with the duty of checking on all phases of war production, for the purpose of making certain that we get to the fighting fronts as soon and as economically as possible the weapons, supplies, and facilities needed by our armed forces.

The Congress has a clear duty, for which the people will hold it responsible, to see that results are obtained from the billions of dollars appropriated for the war effort.

To fulfill these obligations, the committee has conducted numerous investigations in this country. Much time and effort were expended by its individual members, outside of their other duties as Senators, in holding interviews, conferences with officials representing industry, labor, and governmental agencies and hearings, both public and private, and in making on-the-ground inspections of plants. Much valuable evidence has been accumulated in this way, and forms the basis for many of the reports which have been filed with the Senate.

The committee is gratified that its efforts and achievements have been accepted by the public as beneficial to the effective prosecution of the war.

This work will be continued but the committee believes that it is not enough just to follow the goods to the country's borders. There must also be assurance that such goods reach the fighting fronts quickly and in good condition, and that they are, in fact, what the fighting forces have asked for and need. Also there must be assurance that the vast sums which are being expended abroad for airfields, harbor, and rail facilities and the like are economically spent to the end that the initial cost be kept to a minimum and that this country obtain therefrom the maximum possible post-war benefit and international good will.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, are going abroad with a group of other Senators during the period when Congress expects to be in recess and most of its Members are enjoying the first chance in several years to attend to their personal affairs. The committee has directed Senators MEAD and BREWSTER to obtain information—and, upon their return, to report to the committee—on the foreign aspects of the various questions which have been the subject of study by the committee, including particularly:

1. Transportation and supply by sea, air, highway, and rail;

2. Landing facilities in foreign areas developed by the United States and the rights of this country in those facilities now and in the post-war period;

3. Administrative activities in foreign fields outside military lines and particularly any confusion of function with respect thereto;

4. Arrangements for the distribution of American supplies among civilian populations;

5. Quality and condition of repair and replacement parts, including engines received from the United States, and quantity or percentage found unusable by reason of faulty manufacture;

6. The function of the Office of War Information.

It is especially important that the Congress acquaint itself now with the arrangements which are being made abroad in the name of the United States by the numerous representatives of the many special agencies authorized to expend funds and to distribute American property. The time to correct mistakes is at their inception. The time to obtain equitable settlements of our post-war rights to use airfields and other properties built and paid for by us is now. We must do our utmost to win the war speedily and also to contribute our full share to a post-war atmosphere that will be conducive to an endurable peace. The committee desires to make certain that proper attention is being given to these matters by those charged with the responsibility for them.

The committee has no jurisdiction over military strategy or tactics and has never addressed inquiries into this field. This practice will be continued.

Upon their return they will render a full report to the committee as to the facts ascertained by them.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committee, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James T. Black to be area director, Dallas area office, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. A few days ago this nomination was passed over at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. The objection is withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lester G. Graham to be senior manpower utilization consultant, El Paso area office, which had previously been passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ellen S. Woodward to be a member of the Social Security Board.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legisative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today. That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 6, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Francis G. Rowland, Childersburg, Ala., in place of F. G. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nora W. Hill, Ramer, Ala., in place of R. F. Cowles, resigned.

ALASKA

Charles H. Hope, Unalaska, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARIZONA

Eva L. Wheeler, Nogales, Ariz., in place of E. D. Miller, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Alonzo D. McAllister, Fayetteville, Ark., in place of A. M. Wilson, deceased.

Donald B. McCluney, Rector, Ark., in place of Martha Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Lora Belle Fearheiley, Linden, Calif., in place of J. A. Drace, resigned.

Alberta Frankamp, Novato, Calif., in place of M. M. Evers. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

Clarence C. Foulk, Pacoima, Calif., in place of J. A. Dinkler, resigned.

June E. James, Robbins, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Orin T. Howard, Santa Cruz, Calif., in place of F. T. Hale, retired.

Adrian A. McMullen, Yuba City, Calif., in place of H. E. Meyers, retired.

COLORADO

Frank H. Buskirk, Montrose, Colo., in place of T. W. Monell, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Fred E. Constantine, Lakeville, Conn., in place of J. J. O'Loughlin, resigned.

GEORGIA

Howard Thompson, Alma, Ga., in place of J. G. Gruber. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

IDAHO

Ferguson Hanmer, Salmon, Idaho, in place of F. A. McCall, resigned.

INDIANA

Chester Wagoner, Flora, Ind., in place of Chester Wagoner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Donald Steinkamp, Holland, Ind., in place of Hugo Steinkamp, resigned.

IOWA

Milo Mochal, Traer, Iowa, in place of E. M. Hyland, resigned.

KANSAS

Alvin W. Gerber, Fowler, Kans., in place of M. H. Dyck, transferred.

Logan N. Green, Garden City, Kans., in place of R. E. Stotts, removed.

Florence T. Harbin, Irving, Kans., in place of C. R. Hollenberg, removed.

LOUISIANA

Vada S. Clements, Ida, La., in place of M. R. James. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alice M. Corey, Mattapoisett, Mass., in place of M. B. H. Ransom, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Gertrude S. Dyson, Becker, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bert H. Myhre, Dexter, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Viola A. Raduenz, Lucan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dorothy C. Tice, Mentor, Minn., in place of Milla Tagley. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh A. Kennedy, Louin, Miss., in place of L. G. Bassett, resigned.

MISSOURI

Joseph H. Lowrie, Gallatin, Mo., in place of D. R. King. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1941.

NEW YORK

Leonard J. McHugh, Depew, N. Y., in place of J. C. English, deceased.

Aaron Feldherr, Greenfield Park, N. Y., in place of Nettie Kass, removed.

Elloy R. Ganey, Jamestown, N. Y., in place of E. R. Ganey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles F. Schreier, Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of C. F. Schreier. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Edward P. Sullivan, Sunmount, N. Y., in place of A. S. Westlake, removed.

John T. Clark, Tuxedo Park, N. Y., in place of J. T. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary P. Carroll, Valley Falls, N. Y., in place of M. A. Sweeney, retired.

Theresa Jaeger, West Nyack, N. Y., in place of Marantha Knapp, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth O. Howard, Ocracoke, N. C. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

Robert O. Andrews, Tryon, N. C., in place of W. H. Stearns, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Luella J. Hokanson, Fort Yates, N. Dak., in place of J. R. Turner, resigned.

Arne M. Sletten, Souris, N. Dak., in place of M. J. Dunbar, resigned.

OHIO

John B. Mannino, Erieside, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

J. C. Bennett, Jr., Tishomingo, Okla., in place of J. C. Bennett, resigned.

OREGON

Gwendolyn H. Stemmerman, Powers, Oreg., in place of V. B. Lay, resigned.

Gerald E. Wright, Wauna, Oreg., in place of W. C. Sorsby, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Peterson, Berwick, Pa., in place of W. L. Shrader, removed.

Jerome E. Southerton, Honesdale, Pa., in place of C. H. Rettew, deceased.

William M. Rees, Linwood, Pa., in place of William Boyle, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Walter B. Kingsley, Allenton, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Raymond L. Battey, Greenville, R. I., in place of R. L. Battey. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Wilkes, Chester, S. C., in place of J. H. Crawford, retired.

Inez C. Wilson, Williamston, S. C., in place of I. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Elsie M. Johnson, Sewanee, Tenn., in place of Theron Myers, removed.

TEXAS

Leander J. Scrivener, Eagle Pass, Tex., in place of M. B. Harper, resigned.

Arley T. McCarson, Ferris, Tex., in place of J. H. Moyers, transferred.

Jack P. Molloy, Uvalde, Tex., in place of J. W. White, retired.

VERMONT

Herbert B. Butler, St. Albans, Vt., in place of H. B. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Louise L. Smith, Greenway, Va., in place of L. M. Wing. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Maude V. Mills, Lynnhaven, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John E. Milan, Norfolk, Va., in place of R. W. Shultice, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary Allen, Filbert, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ethel Calloway, Maybeury, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Frederick Walter Anderson, Hawkins, Wis., in place of J. P. Peterson, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

James T. Black, of Texas, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office.

Lester G. Graham, of Texas, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the El Paso area office.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Ellen S. Woodward to be member for the term expiring August 13, 1949.

POSTMASTERS

PENNSYLVANIA

Emma V. Snyder, Leesport.

Cleona Fritz, Noxen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, with grateful hearts we make known our praise and desires unto Thee at the altar of prayer. We most humbly thank Thee for our beloved country, built on the sacrifices and chivalry woven into the fabric of our national life. At the altar of consecration remind us of the toil and pain of our forefathers whose blood stained the calendar of history that the people might rule under a government of their own choice.

O Lord, God of hosts, hear the prayer of that Virginia patriot who stood in the front door of a new world:

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And finally that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, love, mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, without a humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation. Grant our supplications, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 3, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings; and

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 997. An act to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador; and

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566);

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 275. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 413. An act to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes;

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 636. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States;

S. 758. An act to repeal subsection (c) of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to authorize a uniform allowance for certain graduates of the United States Military Academy;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1076. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol;

S. 1101. An act to provide for payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

S. 1156. An act to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance of the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 85, 107, 142, 169, 172, 173, 190, and 192 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 15, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, and 174 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, agrees to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIGHT TO DECLARE RECESSES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of this week for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Reno Evening Gazette of June 21, 1943, on power generated at Boulder Dam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MOSES TENNENBAUM

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the Private Calendar was called a certain bill was stricken from the calendar on the objection of three Members. I have since discussed the matter with these gentlemen and they offer no objection to my presenting a unanimous-consent request to restore that bill to the calendar.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Hon. Vincente Geigel-Polanco, senator at large of Puerto Rico, on the need for Puerto Rican independence.

This, Mr. Speaker, will take three and four-fifths pages and cost $171.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHO WANTS TO BE PRESIDENT?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF CORN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARENDS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein copy of a letter I addressed to Chairman LEA of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, together with an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the petroleum situation as it affects the whole Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

KEEP AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY FREE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I received in the mail this morning a letter from Mr. Rush Cole, president of the Southern States Industrial Council,

which, as everyone knows, is one of the most reactionary organizations in America, protesting against the Government taking over the coal mines.

This is one of the reactionary organizations that helped put through the Connally-Smith anti-labor, anti-industry bill, the organization, of course, thinking at the time that it only applied to labor. I predicted at the time that among the first to complain against the provisions of the bill would be the reactionary industrialists who were moving heaven and earth to put it through. Yes; these industrialists are now complaining because they find out that under the terms of the bill they will have to take the same medicine they thought they were prescribing for others. Yes, Mr. Industrialist, the dose you compounded for labor, not realizing that the Government doctor could put you on the same prescription, is pretty bitter, and I hope it will only take a few doses for you to realize that a mistake was made in passing this anti-industry, anti-labor legislation.

Let us keep American industry and labor free.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Walter Lippmann on the subject of international agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIZLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Owen L. Scott appearing in yesterday's Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT WASTE IN USE OF UNITED STATES MAIL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand 12 envelopes, each addressed to the same individual at the same factory in Massachusetts, each mailed on the same day and the same hour in Washington by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Each carries the identical four-page pamphlet, advising of the necessity of curtailing of published reports of the Department of Labor and calling attention to the Monthly Labor Review and various articles in it.

Why in the world should the Bureau of Labor Statistics be circularizing the American people?

Why should material sent out be distributed with such waste and carelessness?

No wonder the Post Office Department reported recently that it had been compelled in a single year to carry at the expense of the taxpayer no less than 3,000,000,000 pieces of penalty mail for the bureaucrats.

The sooner the Roosevelt bureaus realize that their work is primarily in the field of government and not in the field of publicity, leaving the latter to normal publicity channels, the sooner we will approach a government in terms of economy and efficiency that the people have a right to demand at this time when the country is fighting for its existence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an interchange of correspondence with the War Department about the rotation of troops.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered at Juneau, Alaska, on June 18, by Col. K. B. Bush, chief of staff, Northwest Service Command.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by L. M. Jones, manager of the Washington Canners' Cooperative, Vancouver, Wash.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NORMAN]?

There was no objection.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, last night at Columbia, S. C., National Commander Roane Waring, of the American Legion, delivered a Fourth of July address in which he charged the Federal Government with usurping States' rights and assuming control over individual citizens never intended by the authors of the Constitution.

The commander accused the Federal Government of creating a gigantic political octopus whose powerful tentacles seek to reach further into the private lives of American citizens, declaring:

> Important as is the war effort, as necessary as it may be to devote our every energy to the successful conclusion of this war, we must be ever mindful that this war is being fought solely to vindicate, sustain, and perpetuate the America of our forefathers. It would be a tragedy to successfully conclude the war, dictate a peace of absolute victory, and then discover that we had lost our freedom and independence at home.

The veterans' leader praised Congress for awakening to its responsibilities, assailed bureaus and political marionettes, and then warned:

> Here in this Government of ours, these so-called master minds of politics, distinguished only by their inexperience and incompetency, but steeped in foreign ideologies, have built a patchwork of bureaucratic directives. With these they seek to pit class against class, business against labor, farmer against consumer, and race against race.

The Federal Government has usurped the rights and obligations of the sovereign States to govern and protect their citizens, charged Commander Waring. Then, stressing that the advent of the war provided an opportunity for the employment at Washington of many more additional theorists and social reformers, he said:

> These groups do not even agree among themselves as to just what type of government they want—the only thing that they can agree upon is that the ideals and doctrines handed down to us by our forefathers are outmoded and should be swept aside.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON CATTLE AND MEAT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend most highly our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WALTER C. PLOESER] on the six-point program he has outlined concerning the meat situation after conferring with all segments of the industry. This program involves ceilings on cattle and meat, on the retailers, the wholesalers, the slaughterers, the feeders, and the producers. He particularly draws attention to the protection that his plan involves for producers and feeders of cattle, including Government assistance where any deficiency exists in the apportionment of the over-all price range from producer to consumer. He provides for the establishment of feeder ceiling prices on all cattle except those graded AAA when dressed, and a ceiling on stocker and feeder cattle and beef calves. I doff my hat to the gentleman from Missouri, who has given us this statesmanlike program to relieve the meat situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and in one to include a radio address by Mr. J. F. Burke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose anybody is glad to have governmental controls over our economy, but I wonder if anybody thought when this war came and when these controls were provided for by Congress that they were going to be popular or that we were going to like them or that they would not inevitably lead to friction and sometimes mistakes and abuses of power that need correction. The fundamental thing to remember, however, is that you cannot fight a total war with everybody doing as they please. You cannot fight a total war unless you gear your Nation to do that job. Our duty is not to complain about things but to attempt to improve them by constructive measures as we are able.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some resolutions adopted by the Department of Oregon Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be said that our synthetic-rubber program has moved along in remarkable fashion. There are two reasons for that. One is that control has been centralized. The other is that a very able, conscientious, experienced, and hard-working business executive has directed that program. I refer to Mr. William Jeffers, a Nebraskan of whom we are all proud.

I understand that the Committee on Agriculture has reported out the Fulmer bill which would put the food program under the control of one executive. I wonder why the majority leadership does not give us an opportunity to pass this bill. Before we got a Rubber Director this Congress passed a bill that was vetoed by the Executive. After much delay and the loss of precious time, the President proceeded to do what the bill provided for. If the passage of this Fulmer bill can serve some part in bringing about an end to the confusion and muddling in the field of food and food production, processing, and distribution, we ought to pass it. So long as the O. P. A. and other executive agencies undo what the Food Administrator is doing the situation becomes more confused and hopeless. Divided authority, cross purposes, ignorance, and lust for power here in Washington are producing empty market baskets.

MEAT AND FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, you may get that beef a little quicker, it may be a little sweeter, there may be a little more of it, if you would just haul off some of your bureaucratic friends who are seizing the corn that should go into cattle. Last week one of those gentlemen sent out an order taking 25,000 bushels of corn from a citizen in an adjoining district. That corn he intended to make into feed for poultry and cows. You like eggs. We ship eggs to New York. Corn also goes in to feed beef. Now, you are not going to get the eggs, the poultry and the beef no matter what you and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] cook up until you let the feeders have corn.

The new dealers have been plowing under, it is time to dig up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the separation of Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from the pay roll is an accomplished fact. Their execution date is now set for November instead of July, and I have no quarrel whatever to make with that decision except that it was, in the opinion of many of us, in favor of a method of doing so that is unconstitutional.

Today I am introducing a bill that I want you to study. I understand that it will be H. R. 3128. This bill will accomplish in a perfectly legal manner the separation from the pay roll not only of these men, but many others who may have been subversive in Government of the United States in their activities, or may have been associated with or members of subversive organizations. I want you to study this because it approaches the problem from a different angle, and makes it unlawful for any one of the subversives to accept employment. It also makes it unlawful for anyone having such authority in the Government to employ them, and it makes not only a felony

of the offense committed by the employer as well as the employee, but it makes this offense also a high crime and misdemeanor, and thus, for the first time, subject to the impeachment power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the disposition of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of food and feeding the Japs in the concentration camps.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia explain this legislation?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This is a bill that permits postal employees who are not included in the act of March 1942 to be permitted to work overtime in the Post Office Department on straight pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is to bring some of the employees up to the same level of pay as others?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. A unanimous report of the committee, and approved by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much as precedes the third proviso therein of section 1 of the act of August 14, 1935, entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. II, title 39, sec. 832), is amended to read as follows: "That when the needs of the service require supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, laborers, watchmen, and messengers, in first- and second-class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters of the post-office inspectors, employees of the Stamped Envelope Agency and employees of the mail-equipment shops; cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, and elevator conductors, paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General; employees of the Air Mail Service; Cost Ascertainment employees (until such time as they shall be transferred to the departmental roll); employees upon the field roll of the Division of Equipment and Supplies and all employees of the Custodial Service except charwomen and charmen and those working part time, to perform service on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That employees who are granted compensatory time on Saturday for work performed the preceding Sunday or the preceding holiday shall be given the benefits of this act on 1 day within 5 working days following the Saturday when such compensatory time was granted: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time, such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed $2,900 per annum, any emoluments received pursuant to the act entitled 'An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service,' approved April 9, 1943, not to be considered as part of the earned basic compensation."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall remain in force only until June 30, 1945, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, and after such amendment ceases to be in force the provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "require", insert "postmasters of the first, second, and third classes."

On page 3, line 2, after the word "time", strike out the following: "such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed $2,900 per annum."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO POSTMASTERS TO ENGAGE IN ESSENTIAL WAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 2922, a bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified Civil Service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purposes of the bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The purpose of the bill is to permit all postmasters to engage in essential war activities during the war emergency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is included under the term "essential war activities"?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This bill would give them the right, after they have completed their work, to return to the position which they occupied at the time they entered such essential work. The bill provides that they may return to their positions as postmasters by giving 40 days' notice after the termination of such essential activities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I presume the purpose is to permit them to go into essential war work, and after the war is over to return to their former positions?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act approved December 6, 1940 (ch. 927, 54 Stat. 1221; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 39a), amending section 3 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1077), so as to authorize the Postmaster General to grant leave of absence without pay to postmasters entering the armed forces of the United States, shall likewise be applicable to postmasters relinquishing their positions to engage in pursuits which shall have been defined by the lawfully constituted authorities as essential activity: *Provided, however*, That a postmaster granted leave to engage in essential activity shall be permitted to resume his office as postmaster only if his application therefor is submitted within 40 days after the termination of such essential activity.

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on four subjects and include therein certain excerpts and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under its previous order, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Chair will cause the bells to be rung 10 minutes before the House is to reassemble.

Accordingly, at 12:35 p. m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1286. An act to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) entitled "An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2 and 11 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments Nos. 33 and 34, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, action on the agricultural appropriation bill has been completed in both the Senate and the House.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the amounts carried in the bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and finally as agreed to in both bodies, direct appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, and contract authorizations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1944

Items	Appropriations for 1943	Budget for 1944	Bill reported to House	Bill as passed House	Bill as passed Senate	Bill as finally enacted
From Federal funds:						
Carried in the bill:						
Direct appropriations	$686,101,585	[1] $947,134,491	$707,040,844	$715,099,662	$875,680,709	$848,295,883
Reappropriations	69,573,935	28,449,655	4,691,210	4,691,210	4,691,210	4,691,210
Total direct appropriations and reappropriations	755,639,520	975,584,146	711,732,054	719,790,872	880,371,919	852,987,093
Corporate funds authorizations	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000	12,322,000
Loan authorizations (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	140,000,000	157,500,000	90,000,000	----------	127,500,000	90,000,000
Contract authorizations	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Grand total, above items	907,961,520	1,145,406,146	814,054,054	732,112,872	1,020,193,919	955,309,093
Not carried in bill: Permanent appropriations	138,557,496	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663	103,132,663
Grand total, all items above	1,046,519,016	1,248,538,809	917,186,717	835,245,535	1,123,326,582	1,058,441,756
Trust funds (not carried in bill) [3]	179,495,310	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860	11,322,860

[1] Net total of Budget estimates from the time bill was pending in Senate, $949,239,199.

[2] Commitments up to full parity for the 1942 crop authorized in the 1943 appropriation act and proposed in the Budget for authorization for the 1943 and 1944 crops. The bill as reported to the House, as passed by the House, and as finally enacted makes no provision for parity payments in connection with the 1943 or 1944 crops. The bill as it passed the Senate authorized full commitments for parity for the 1943 and 1944 crops.

[3] Funds held in trust by, but not belonging to, the United States.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not because I appreciate that this is necessary in order to release some silver to manufacturing concerns engaged in war industries, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

I may say in explanation for the benefit of the Members of the House that in considering the bill we were rather hard-pressed for time. This question of silver now before us affects very vitally not only the war industry at this time, but it affects very deeply and vitally the fundamental economy of a cluster of States in this Union. This product, silver, herein involved, might properly be referred to as the keystone in their economic structure. The committee was disposed, Mr. Speaker, to take sufficient time to analyze this entire problem, to go into it very exhaustively, but we were mindful of the fact that it could not be done at the present time. It was the disposition of the committee to try and limit the number of ounces and the time during which the bill should be effective, but we realized that we could not do so in the few short days remaining prior to the recess. The subcommittee had intended to offer an amendment to the so-called Green bill, but we thought that perhaps we might run into some difficulties with the Senate; so, in the interest of speed and in fulfillment, I may say, of an understanding or an agreement between the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, and I presume with the Speaker but to which neither I as chairman of the subcommittee nor my distinguished chairman of the full committee were parties, we felt obligated to proceed with due dispatch in order to get it out of the way. This entire silver question might, of course, be reviewable sometime during the next year, but it is not very likely. Had the amendment of advancing the expiration prevailed, and had we undertaken to fight it out with the Senate and further delay this matter, this question of silver, so vital to the Nation, might later have been reviewed, but now I do not think it will be; I think it is a settled matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand several factories will have to close down within the next few days unless this bill passes without amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. The War Production Board informed the committee, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of silver available for critical wartime use and other domestic purposes would not last beyond the balance of this month, so it is pressing from that standpoint that we act and not get into difficulties in a conference with the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is there anything in this legislation which amends or changes existing Silver Purchase Acts or silver legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. Not to my knowledge. This, as I understand it, is acceptable in every respect to the silver bloc in the

Senate and likewise acceptable to those Senators from the eastern seaboard where silver is used in the manufacturing business.

Mr. WHITE. What is the price?

Mr. DINGELL. The price will be in accordance with the Silver Purchase Act, 71.11 cents.

Mr. WHITE. It is to be sold at that figure?

Mr. DINGELL. That is the way I understand it. That is provided specifically in the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is the bill that was referred to by the minority leader of the House at the time what was called the Celler amendment was voted on. We who were opposed to the Celler amendment decided not to oppose it upon the ground that later on the Congress would pass the bill that the gentleman has now presented to the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I may say that on this side we have had several bills, one offered by the persistent gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], for which he has pressed continuously throughout this entire session and for which he pressed even in the preceding session. We have had certain other bills introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. REED] a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, also by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON], and there are other bills that have a direct bearing on the subject of silver which could not, of course, be considered at this time. It must be said in deference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that he has been pressing for hearings in connection with this bill for many months, to my knowledge.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is my understanding this bill will be read and will be subject to amendment, providing there is no objection to its consideration under the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, it would be subject to amendment, but the Chair is going to be very frank with the gentleman. If there are going to be amendments offered to this bill the Chair will request the gentleman from Michigan to withdraw his request, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Chair thinks it vitally important that this bill pass immediately, and he thinks it should be passed without amendment. The Chair will accept the responsibility if it is put up to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In order to get this matter straightened out, and I do not want to impede the passage of this bill, would it be in order to read the bill and then offer a pro forma amendment and secure time for making a few remarks in that manner?

The SPEAKER. If the bill is before the House for consideration, amendments may be offered, of course. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio if he would like some time he may reserve the right to object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have already reserved the right to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intended to offer an amendment striking out 71.11 cents, the price fixed in S. 35 at which the Treasury shall sell the silver it holds, and substitute in lieu thereof a price not to exceed 50 cents per fine troy ounce.

I see this has now been made impossible. The Congress stands with a gun to its head and is ordered to pass immediately this bill with practically no debate or consideration.

To treat so important a bill as the one before us in this manner is to me an act of shame.

The price of 71 cents provided in the bill would curtail appreciably the uses of silver for the production of war materials. The price of 50 cents would in comparison increase materially its uses for this purpose.

The Treasury Department has stated this to be a fact and has recommended the price be set at 50 cents and not 71 cents.

It has stated further that no profit would accrue to the Treasury if the silver were sold to war industries at 71 cents an ounce instead of 50 cents, because the price at which it sold silver would come back as a war cost to the Government anyway.

Speaking for the Treasury Department in a letter, dated March 12, 1943, to Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. D. W. Bell, Acting Secretary, said:

> This Department has approved a minimum average price of 50 cents per fine troy ounce as provided in S. 35. This approval was based on the belief that silver now held in the general fund of the Treasury should be made available for war uses without loss to the Treasury, but at a price which will permit the users to continue producing war materials with little or no increase in the cost of producing them. It is the view of this Department that the establishment of a minimum price above an average of 50 cents per fine troy ounce will not result in any benefit to the Government, since the war materials produced with it will cost more, and that cost will ultimately be charged to the Government. It is suggested, therefore, that S. 192 be amended to provide a minimum average price of 50 cents per fine troy ounce. (Hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, 78th Cong., Apr. 28 and 29, 1943, p. 22.)

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, April 6, 1943, stated:

> It is felt that the minimum price of 71.11 cents per ounce will be detrimental to the expansion of the substitution of silver in place of other scarce metals for war uses (ibid., p. 24).

Again on April 26, 1943, in a second letter to Senator WAGNER, Mr. Nelson reiterated what he had previously stated on this point and went further by, in effect, recommending the price be fixed at 50 cents per ounce. He said:

> I would much prefer to have silver released at the lowest price possible, as this will mean that it will be available to a larger group of manufacturers. Therefore, I believe that the high price will restrict the substitution of silver in war equipment (ibid., p. 24).

Capt. R. S. McDowell, Deputy Director, Resources Division, Office of Procurement and Materials, Navy Department, testified for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency April 29, 1943, in precisely the same vein when he said:

> However, as to the use of silver for war production purposes, I would have the personal opinion that the lower price would permit a freer flow of the material (ibid, p. 35).

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, in a letter to Senator WAGNER, March 16, 1943, expressed his opinion to S. 192 which contained a provision for a minimum price of 71.11 cents per ounce for silver sold for war uses. He said:

> It is the opinion of the Navy Department that the numerous provisions of the bill S. 192 would hedge the sale or lease of silver with so many restrictions as to nullify completely the usefulness of the statute. The Navy Department, in view of the above, recommends that the bill S. 192 be reported out unfavorably, and that the bill do not be enacted (ibid, pp. 22 and 23).

Here then is the Treasury recommending that the sale price of Treasury-owned silver for war uses be fixed at 50 cents and not at 71 cents and that the Treasury will not suffer any loss if this is done.

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, the man who is charged with the responsibility of knowing what is best in this case, what is in the greatest interest of the war effort, says to this Congress, Do not make the price of silver 71 cents an ounce, because if you do you will hurt the war effort by withholding war supplies from our boys on the battle front that they ought to have. Make it 50 cents an ounce, he admonishes us, then you will be helping the war effort by providing our brave soldiers with all the available weapons they need to defend their lives and the life of our country.

Captain McDowell, who also holds a highly responsible position in the prosecution of this war, tells us the same thing.

Who wants the price of 71 cents? Why, the domestic silver mining interests and nobody else. Apparently they are more interested in assuring the continuation of their subsidy program than they are in winning the war.

True enough, these selfish interests might not be hurt so much just now if

the price of silver sold to war industries by the Treasury were reduced to 50 cents, because they have an outlet for this silver at a much higher price than this. It is the future they look to. They want to hold on to their subsidy program so that when the war is over they can start right in milking the American people again.

What a silly thing this is we are asked to do here. The people in general have already bought and paid for in full the silver which the Treasury has acquired. This has cost them 50 cents an ounce. Why should they now go through the asinine performance of selling this same silver to war industries at a premium of 21 cents and then turn right around and pay back to those same war industries that premium of 21 cents?

Furthermore, this senseless procedure would be bound to create some inflation. How much we cannot tell, but it could be considerable.

The history of this proposed piece of legislation is a disgrace to the Nation, and, like so many other devious courses pursued in the last few years by selfish groups to secure through legislation means to milk the public, augurs all too ill for the Nation.

But it does not appear to me that the silver mining interests are alone responsible for the delay and cunning that has been practiced in railroading this measure through, as is being done.

Rear Admiral T. J. Kelerher, Office of Procurement Materials, Navy Department, testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency—S. 2768—last October that at that time enough silver for war purposes was available but indicated by the first of 1943 military needs for silver would become pressing.

Senator GREEN, at the hearings on S. 35, S. 192, and S. 1036, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on the 28th of April, this year, more than 2 months ago, stated:

> I am told by reliable authority that the existing stocks are such and that the expected increase of silver available as a result of domestic production or foreign production and import is such that perhaps the stocks will be exhausted in 10 days.

Donald M. Nelson wrote a letter to Mr. WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last March 11, nearly 4 months ago, in which he said:

> The supplies of foreign silver available for war production are being consumed rapidly. Many critical metals can be conserved by the substitution of silver if an assured supply of silver for consumptive uses can be made available. It would be assured by the passage of this bill, which I therefore recommend (ibid, p. 8).

Notwithstanding these claims made months ago by responsible persons that there was then urgent need for the passage of an act giving the Treasury authority to sell of its silver stock, silver for consumptive war uses, nothing was done about it until the present moment when Congress is about to recess.

This procedure has been deliberately framed up so as to slip the bill through with the special provision giving the silver interests the means to continue their pernicious racket.

We are told at this late hour that the war supplies of silver will be exhausted within a week or 10 days, that there must be no delay in examining the bill or amending it, that we must swallow it whole, that if we don't do this we are hindering the war effort.

This is a contemptible procedure. If the shortage of silver for war uses is as critical as is claimed then there has been unforgivable negligence on the part of every person responsible for supplying the silver needs of war industries, to say nothing of the sordid tactics that are being pursued in the manipulation of this bill.

If the testimony offered on this bill by Mr. Bell in behalf of the Treasury, of Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and Captain McDowell of the Navy Department represents true facts, and there is no evidence to the contrary, then we cannot escape the conclusion that the silver interests, by their finagling this measure through the Congress have deliberately hampered and impeded the war effort.

Nor can the Congress escape its responsibility for any damage this act may do to our war effort.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I may say that those who will purchase this silver are perfectly ready and willing to pay 71 cents and a fraction for the silver during the war because they do not care to upset any conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that passed the Senate unanimously. It is a war measure and is urgently needed. I fully agree with those who would like to see silver sold at less than 71.11 cents because much of it was bought by the Treasury at 47 cents, but it is this bill or no bill and if we do not pass this bill as it is drawn we shall not have this legislation. The money that is paid goes into the Treasury at 71.11.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the benefit of the House that the committee in the short time at its disposal delved into the question of the 71.11 cents provided in the bill. The committee considered changing the date in order to give us some leverage for reconsideration of the entire question. More than that, the committee considered the possibility of limiting the amount of silver to be released under this bill. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is cognizant of all facts because he was granted the courtesy by the committee of sitting in our executive session, so he is fully familiar with what went on. There is no disposition on our part to rush anything through. It is an absolute essential under the circumstances to put this bill through without quibbling and to put it through immediately as a war measure.

Now I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I have striven long and arduously for some action on silver. At last we are getting some action. It is not the action which is thoroughly and eminently satisfactory, but, at least, there is some action. It is half a loaf. We must be practical. It is the best we can get under the circumstances now obtaining.

This so-called Green bill should be accepted. It provides for the sale or lease of free silver at 71.11 cents per ounce. The Treasury in most instances paid far less than this amount. The silver purchase acts require the Treasury to pay that amount for domestically mined silver, but most of the silver now stored at West Point was dug out from foreign mines. That foreign silver cost the Treasury on the average of 45 cents per ounce. The amount of silver purchased from foreigners, as of March 1943 was 2,158,000,000 ounces. The amount purchased from Americans as newly mined silver was 501,000,000. Thus, it is discernible that foreigners have gained most from these silver purchase acts. Most of the silver we have at West Point has been purchased from foreigners. Thus, through Silver Purchase legislation, we are creating an artificial price, not only for domestic silver but for foreign silver, the domestic price being 71.11 per ounce and the foreign price that of 45 cents an ounce.

The Treasury under the Green bill, which we will pass this afternoon, must sell the silver to war industries for 71.11 cents per ounce. Thus on the foreign silver, the Government will make an average profit of 26.11 cents. That silver will go into war productions and the public will pay that difference. It is like taking out of one pocket and putting into another. It is, however, inflationary, to the extent of 26.11 cents per ounce. Of course, the silver bloc in the other Chamber would not let the bill go out unless it contained the ceiling price of 71.11 cents. That bloc still wants to maintain the artificial price for silver—prices far beyond the intrinsic value.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are going to pay 71 cents an ounce for this silver, I understand. Is that right?

Mr. CELLER. I am opposed to the paying of 71 cents. In common parlance——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute; are you going to do it?

Mr. CELLER. In common parlance, we have been a bunch of suckers to the foreign silver producers. We have been paying them 45 cents on an average for silver not worth anywhere near that sum.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. Let the gentleman speak for himself when he begins to call people suckers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, then?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How did he get the floor?

The SPEAKER. He got it in a perfectly proper way.

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When are you going to raise the price of corn so our feeders can get some corn and you can get some meat, that you have been squawking about for the last few weeks.

Mr. CELLER. You answer that yourself. I cannot answer it now. Corn has no relation to silver.

We have two kinds of silver, free silver and monetary silver. I have not the figures before me, but roughly, one-half of the 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver that we have is free silver, that is, not used to back up currency. The other half, roughly, is called monetary silver and is used to ground or back up silver certificates in circulation. At the present time, none of the silver can be used for consumptive purposes in war industries. We do use free silver for nonconsumptive purposes. That is a sort of lend-lease affair. The Treasury Department lend-leases the silver in the form of bus bars to hydroelectric and power companies and other public utility corporations for conductivity of electricity, but these bus bars must be returned after the war to the Treasury in the same form, shape and size as they were originally loaned to the public utility corporations. The bus bar is a nonconsumptive use.

This Green bill will now substitute monetary silver for the free silver in the form of bus bars. It will also release the free silver for consumptive purposes and silver will thus be made use of as substitutes for strategic war materials, like tin, copper, chrome, and so forth. It can thus be melted down and be used as an alloy. Such consumptive uses would be impossible without the authority under this bill.

The silver can only be sold or leased by the Treasury when authorized by the President and upon recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board. All operations under the bill expire December 31, 1944.

However, I shall not rest secure, nor stop my campaign unless and until all the silver purchase acts are wiped clean off the statute books. To keep paying 71.11 cents per ounce for all domestically mined silver is just silly. Under these acts we must keep purchasing this silver forever and a day—at least until the amount of silver that the Treasury has equals one-third of all monetary metal. It will be well-nigh impossible for the silver to be purchased to the extent of one-third of a total of the supply of gold and silver. Be advised we have $23,000,000,000 worth of gold stored at Fort Knox as against a little over $2,000,000,000 worth of silver stored at West Point. The ratio must reach 2 to 1, $2 worth of gold to $1 worth of silver. Considering the fact that we have $23,000,000,000 worth of gold, it would take a century to reach that ratio of 2 to 1.

Thus the silver bloc is sitting pretty, unless we rip out the foundations from under it.

Furthermore, to point out the absurdity of the silver situation, there are over 460,000,000 standard silver dollars in circulation. We usually call these cart wheels. Only 63,000,000 of these are in circulation. People just do not want to use them. The balance of the 460,000,000 of these cart wheels are stored away, unused.

Despite all these objections, I still want this bill to pass because at last we will be putting silver in uniform.

It is hoped that the silver subcommittee appointed by Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee will continue after the recess so that my bill to repeal the silver purchase acts may be adequately considered and favorably acted upon.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of this measure and shall vote for it. There is much I would like to say on this subject but as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] says "This is a war measure." I will therefore not delay proceedings very long at this time. However, I cannot let the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] and some of the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] go entirely unchallenged.

The gentleman from Ohio is the bitterest foe of silver whom I know of in this membership. He wants all modern silver legislation repealed. He would demote one of the precious metals, one used since the dawn of civilization as money and recognized by the founders of this Republic, to the status of a mere commodity and stricken entirely from its proud place in our monetary system. At least, that is the way I judge his implied attitude toward the white metal. Be that as it may, he does want our Government-owned silver sold to private industry from the United States Treasury for 50 cents an ounce. Nor do I understand that the gentleman would have such Government silver sold to private parties exclusively for war uses. He would tell you that this silver was purchased, at least some of it, by the Treasury for about 71 cents an ounce.

Granting that assumption for sake of argument, is it a crime then for the United States Government to sell to private parties a thing which it paid for at the rate of 71 cents an ounce for the sale price of 71 cents an ounce? Of course, it is said that this is to go into the war effort. Is it so asinine as the gentleman has declared for the Government to receive at the rate of 71 cents an ounce for its silver going into the war effort when the Government pays 71 cents an ounce? I greatly fear the gentleman's argument will not stand the test of logic in more than one respect. It is one thing for him to say that the Government ought not to pay 71 cents an ounce for silver; it is an entirely different thing for him to advocate selling that same silver to private purchasers for 50 cents an ounce. Nor does it clear the situation to say that 50 cents is the average price paid.

In his ardent desire to wipe out all existing legislation dealing with silver, he is playing in the hands of a class in this country who have usurped the constitutional and sovereign power of issuing money which power and right should belong to the Government only. The gentleman apparently would take from the Treasury now all silver, even that which is held against silver certificates, and thus force the retirement of silver certificates from our monetary system. This, of course, would mean either harmful deflation or the substitution of another kind of paper money in lieu of those silver certificates. This other kind of paper money would, under our present laws, necessarily be a currency founded on an interest-bearing indebtedness. This interest burden would be an additional load upon the back of the taxpayers for the privilege of having private parties furnish us the money which is needed today instead of the constitutional money of the fathers.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has all along contended that silver should be "put into the war effort," with which I agree and have agreed all along, and he implies that the failure to enact his amendment to the Treasury Appropriation Bill is depriving the war effort of the necessary silver. I deny that. I feel that the crippling amendment which the gentleman from New York offered to the Treasury appropriation bill on February 5, would not so much aid the war effort as provide cheap silver for the manufacture of articles for nonessential domestic uses.

A false impression has gotten abroad, especially last year, that a great horde of silver was lying useless and denied to the war effort. I knew positively more than a year ago, that the Secretary of the Treasury and high officials of this Government had all the power necessary to use for war purposes in bus bars and other nonconsumptive ways, such silver in the Treasury as was not needed as backing for our silver certificates. I know further that provision was made months ago for a sufficient amount of silver for consumptive use in the war effort much more than the war requirements called for. In talking, last session, with my colleagues, who are interested in silver, I know that there was a disposition on their part to write into law a year ago, the provisions of the bill now before us. To my knowledge no body in the membership of Congress has had any disposition to deny silver held by the Government out of the war uses. In

fact, we want silver to be used in the war effort, both consumptively and nonconsumptively to the fullest extent necessary for the winning of the war.

What we are objecting to is any attempt to furnish silver at 50 cents an ounce for private uses which are not essential to the war effort. I think it unnecessary and unwise to sell silver for the war effort at less than 71 cents an ounce. I certainly do oppose any effort to strike silver from its rightful place in our monetary system which the fathers of the Republic assigned to it. Mr. Speaker, this bill might have been passed a year ago with my consent. In my judgment it will enable silver to play the part it should play in our war effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell, or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, for purposes, including but not limited to the making of munitions of war and the supplying of civilian needs, and the converting of existing plants to those purposes, any silver held or owned by the United States: *Provided*, That no silver shall be sold under this act at less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided further*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

SEC. 2. This act shall expire on December 31, 1944.

The SPEAKER The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a perfecting amendment to the Wheeler-Case Act, which has passed this House and has been in operation. A good many projects started up, but due to the lack of authority in the present war, they cannot go forward. This simply provides the authority for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, it simply provided that these projects would be built by C. C. C. and P. W. A. labor, which now is out of the question, and this provides a new means.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I may add that this bill, or an identical bill, was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at the time it was reported out. The minority leader will find on questioning any member of that committee, on his side of the aisle, that we felt this a necessary war measure in our food production program. Not only did the Secretary of the Interior recommend that it be passed, but the War Food Administration is strongly back of it. It will enable the Wheeler-Case Act to be transformed into a war act and enable numerous small projects in the semi-arid West to add to the total food-producing areas in the shortest possible time. I trust that the measure may be handled with dispatch. H. R. 3019 is identical with S. 1252. Therefore, I hope in the interest of speed that the Senate bill will be passed in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation as defined in section 4 (b) shall not exceed $2,000,000 for dams and reservoirs in any one project, and that expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet costs allocated to flood control by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department, shall not exceed $500,000 on any one project."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (vii) of subsection 3 (a) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(vii) The part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to flood control as recommended by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department."

SEC. 3. Subsection 3 (b) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) No actual construction of the physical features of a project shall be undertaken unless and until (1) the Secretary has found that lands, or interests in lands, deemed necessary for the construction and operation of the major features of the projects have been secured, or sufficient progress made in their procurement to indicate the probability that all these lands or interests in lands can be secured, with titles and at prices satisfactory to him; and (2) the Secretary has found (i) that water rights adequate for the purposes of the project have been acquired with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, or that such water rights have been initiated and in his judgment can be perfected in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him; and (ii) that such water rights can be utilized for the purposes of the project in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Any part of a project hereunder may be designated as a division of the project by the Secretary if he, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, deems this desirable for orderly and efficient construction or administration. The term 'project', as used in subsection 3 (b) and section 4, shall be deemed to mean also 'division of a project', designated as provided in this subsection. Any project authorized for construction from appropriations under the head 'Water Conservation and Utility Projects' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685), hereinafter called the 1940 water conservation appropriation, may be designated by the Secretary, upon agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, a project under this act and shall thereupon be subject to all the provisions and requirements thereof, except those of subsections 3 (a) and (3) (b)."

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(d) For each project on which construction is commenced or continued under this subsection appropriations heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to section 12 and the unexpended balance of the 1940 water conservation appropriation, in addition to being available for other authorized objects of expenditure, shall be available for expenditure, by the agency to which available, in lieu of the 'services, labor, materials, or other property, including money', authorized to be utilized under section 2 and subsection 5 (b). All expenditures on each such project may be excluded (1) from the project construction costs to the extent the Secretary finds necessary to keep the reimbursable costs within the findings made under subsections 3 (a) (iv), 3 (a) (v), and 3 (a) (vi), and (2) from the costs that but for this subsection would be required to be returned under section 5, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture for the successful prosecution of the project; and as to each such project the limitations on expenditures provided in sections 1 and 9 shall be inoperative. Appropriations made pursuant to section 12 shall be available for expenditures for continuation of construction on any project heretofore undertaken under the 1940 water conservation appropriation, and such expenditures and those from the 1940 water conservation appropriation may be excluded from the costs of any such project in determining the amounts required to be reimbursed, to the extent the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture jointly determine is necessary to keep reimbursable costs within the ability of the water users to repay. No project may be initiated for construction or, if heretofore authorized, continued under this subsection unless the Secretary, following consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, finds that the proposed construction under this subsection is justifiable as an aid in the production of needed agricultural products and the President approves said finding. The utilization of services or labor of prisoners of war under section 2 is authorized, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of said prisoners. From and after the date 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, this subsection shall no longer be of any force or effect except as to projects on which construction has been initiated or continued under this subsection prior to said date."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $300, the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41

U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase or service authorized for the Department of Agriculture under this act or under the 1940 water conservation appropriation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT, REGULAR ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 14, page 3, and insert: "That there is hereby established in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the 'Pharmacy Corps.' The Pharmacy Corps shall consist of seventy-two officers in grades from colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive. Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps, except as hereinafter provided for transfer thereto, shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-two years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring four years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after three years' service, to the grade of captain after six years' service, to the grade of major after twelve years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after twenty years' service, and to the grade of colonel after twenty-six years' service: *Provided*, That officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the Medical Administrative Corps on the date of enactment of this Act shall be transferred to the Pharmacy Corps and commissioned in grade in such corps in addition to the seventy-two officers authorized for the corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain these amendments? As I understand it this bill provides for the addition of some 42.

Mr. MAY. That is the only change that the Senate has made.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he can inform the House when they expect to bring in a bill increasing the allowances for dependents of veterans in this war, particularly the fathers and mothers and children.

Mr. MAY. That bill does not relate in any sense to the pending bill. As a matter of fact, we have not yet taken it up, and it has not been called to our attention. It was introduced in the Senate only last week.

Mr. FISH. Did it not go through the Senate today?

Mr. MAY. If it did, I have had no notice of it, and I have not had time to get my committee together yet.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman will get his committee together before midnight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the pharmacy corps."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may extend his remarks and include an address made at his request by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], July 4, 1943, together with historical notes and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered to the Massachusetts Members of Congress by the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MRS. RENZIE GRAHAM

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on the last call of the Private Calendar, the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham was stricken from the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it may be restored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Chaney on Starving Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include, first, an article by Channing Pollock, and, secondly, an article by John H. Cline, both of which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an address I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I made on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an address by Hon. Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PLOESER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a very fine report on the Women's Army Corps, just created, by Father Casey, of the Women's Army Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the President, one to Mr. Ickes, and a document. I have an estimate from the Public Printer. It is estimated it will require three and one-fifth pages and will cost $144. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a piece of poetry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of June 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances: First, in connection with the Governor of Louisiana, and, in the other, in connection with the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2968), making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, further insist upon the House disagreement to amendments Nos. 33 and 34, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

J. FRANK MEADOR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1334), an act for the relief of J. Frank Meador, with Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows.

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "appropriated," down to and including "1942" in line 10 and insert "to J. Frank Meador, of Atlanta, Ga., (1) the sum of $500 in a lump sum as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act and (2) the sum of $100 per month for each month beginning with the month in which this act is enacted and ending with the twentieth month for which such payments of $100 are made or the month preceding the month of death of the said J. Frank Meador, whichever may be the earlier; the payment of such sums to be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said J. Frank Meador as the result of having been struck by a bicycle operated by a special-delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on June 30, 1942."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to report to the House the untimely, unfortunate, and tragic death of a great soldier, statesman, and patriot, a man of great ability and renown, who was recognized as a brilliant military leader, as a strategist and tactician. I refer to the esteemed and noble Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and commander in chief of the valiant Polish Army. His sudden death in the crash of a British aerial transport cuts short a brilliant and most promising career which held so much substance for the emancipation and future of his beloved country and for the saddened people of Poland. His passing creates a great and unprovided emergency affecting deeply and vitally the councils of the United Nations. The void thus created must and will be filled by a worthy and able successor, worthy of the trust and of the confidence of his own people and of an anxious and bereaved world. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can say that would add one iota of credit or luster to the name, fame, or accomplishment of this great man. It is not my purpose therefore to eulogize General Sikorski whom I was privileged to know, to break bread with, and to discuss subjects of importance. It is my intent to place my humble, verbal wreath in tribute to his memory and to offer a silent yet fervent prayer that God shall grant unto him and all those who perished with him that eternal and heavenly peace which the world cannot give.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join my colleagues in expressing the sorrow of the very many people caused by the passing of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government-in-exile and commander of its armed forces. He died last night when a Liberator plane in which he was traveling crashed shortly after taking off from Gibraltar. The plane crashed into the sea shortly after its take-off; all of the passengers and the crew, except the pilot, were killed. It is pathetic that among the passengers and victims was General Sikorski's daughter, Mrs. Sophia Lesniowska, 26, who was traveling with her father as liaison officer between the London headquarters of the Polish Auxiliary Territorial Service—women's forces—and the Middle East. She was wearing an A. T. S. uniform. Her husband is a prisoner of war in Germany.

General Sikorski had been visiting Polish armed forces in the Middle East and was in Cairo as recently as last Friday.

His death came at a moment when the forces which he had been organizing to fight for the liberation of Poland were at last ready to take part in the offensive they had been planning since September 1939, when their country fell before the German invaders.

General Sikorski, the leader of the Polish Nation-in-exile, was a man worthy of those whom he led, under the White Eagle of Poland. He was the Polish Premier and the commander in chief of all of the Polish armed forces and was a man who has proved his worth in times of hardship and was by destiny the one to whom all the Poles looked forward to to lead his government to the greatness in the times of peace. His voice was that traditional of the freedom-loving Poles and cried aloud at all times: "We fight for our liberty and yours." He had known the hardship of battle and was familiar with the vicissitudes inflicted upon his nation by the German invader under the leadership of the hangman Hitler.

He was born May 20, 1881, in southern Poland, the son of a gentleman farmer. His father died when he was but a child of 3, and at the age of 15 years he started to pay his own education in Krakow and later at Lwow Technical University College. He was a brilliant student of civil engineering and a general of the military arts of the first magnitude.

His whole life was devoted to the cause of Polish independence. He was on a mission to the ancient city of Baghdad where he had inspected the troops of Poland, where he declared they were ready and fit to fight in accordance with their training and ideals. Just 3 hours before the plane on which he died crashed into the sea, he went on the eve of the one hundred and sixty-seventh Independence of the American Colonies a message to the President of the United States in which he expressed the warmest felicitations and friendship of the subjugated but yet unconquered Polish Nation to the people of America, and he expressed his firm conviction that the United States of America will ever be ready to stand by and defend the cause of conquered nations as expressed in the United Nations' pact.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in paying a tribute and honoring the memory of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski who was killed yesterday in an airplane accident along with his staff near Gibraltar. He was commander in chief of the Polish Army and likewise Prime Minister of the exiled Polish Government, at London, England.

General Sikorski appeared twice before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives within the last year at executive sessions and presented to the committee fuller and more detailed information about the eastern European situation than anyone had done since the war began. He was an outstanding statesman and officer or he would not have been both the Prime Minister and the commander in chief of the Polish Government-in-exile. His appearance and comments before the Committee on Foreign Affairs made a great impression upon me. He was a sincere friend of our institutions and of America.

As we know in America this war broke out in Europe back on September 1, 1939, because Great Britain and France guaranteed to uphold the territorial integrity of Poland. That is what General Sikorski likewise was endeavoring to uphold as well as to restore the independence of Poland as a free and sovereign nation.

In view of the fact that the preservation of the territorial integrity of Poland was the origin of the European war, the restoration of Poland's independence and its territorial integrity should be one of its main objectives. I hope that when this war has been won by an all-out victory that there will again be a free and independent Poland based upon its pre-war territorial boundaries for which General Sikorski and the Polish people have fought, sacrificed, and died. I am opposed to a fifth partition of Poland and believe the American people will insist on the restoration of a free and independent Poland with its pre-war boundaries intact. If this is not done then General Sikorski and hundreds of thousands of patriotic Poles will have died in vain and millions of Poles will have endured the misery, suffering, human slavery, and starvation of a conquered nation likewise in vain. The memory of General Sikorski, a gallant soldier and an able statesman, lives on and will inspire and encourage the Polish people to continue the battle to restore a free and independent Poland.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have just learned the sad news of the death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, that great Polish soldier and statesman. The great white Polish eagle, the Polish symbol of freedom, liberty, and democracy, with a heart already overflowing with grief and sorrow, today is further grief stricken with the announcement of the loss of this great patriot and leader who had worked so hard and labored day and night to rebuild the Polish forces in our mutual struggle to defeat the brutal Nazis.

I had the privilege of meeting this splendid soldier on his last visit to the United States, and spent an hour listening to his interesting observations and suggestions for the future peace of the world. He loved and admired our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He highly praised the American citizens for our high ideals and principles, for our inherent burning desire to preserve democracy, freedom, and liberty, for our devotion to the principles of the "four freedoms," and prayed that God would grant our great President and Commander in Chief health and strength to carry through in this world struggle.

He had implicit faith, trust, and confidence in the President and the people of the United States. On behalf of himself and the Polish Nation he fervently expressed the indebtedness and deep gratitude that the poor unfortunate people of Poland felt toward the people of the United States.

And, likewise, it may be said, that President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill reposed implicit faith and confidence in the great Polish general and Prime Minister of Poland. He was one of the great moving spirits in the Allied cause. He at all times possessed that deep, firm, and unwavering conviction that victory for the Allied cause was certain, that Nazi brutality was doomed to failure, and that the future of Poland was that of a noble and glorious nation. He possessed that spark and fighting leadership that knows no defeat. It was around this confident and fighting spirit that the refugees and remnants of the Polish Army gathered and reorganized themselves into a firm and valiant fighting force—the greatest of any of the conquered nations. As if by a miracle, these new Polish fighting forces were organized—12,000 in the Polish Air Corps in England, 30,000 in the Motorized Army Corps in England, 250,000 in the Near East, fully equipped, and in the recent words of the general "spoiling for action." Besides all of this, a reborn Polish Navy that has won the respect of the British naval men for its fearless fighting qualities and its many victorious naval engagements.

Yes; the rebirth of the Polish armed forces was astounding and unbelievable. Although defeated and vanquished by the overwhelming mechanical and numerical superiority of the Nazi hordes in September of 1939, the Poles did not lay down their arms, they did not lose their morale; all who avoided capture by the Nazis or escaped from prison camps arrived in France by way of Hungary and Rumania and entered the army then being rebuilt by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski. After the collapse of France these Polish forces transferred to Scotland and England to continue their feverish work of reorganization. It was from the now famous Polish Eagle Squadron, organized on British soil, that Berlin received its first bombing.

We also read accounts of this valiant air force defending London against enemy attacks and later found that they were the spearhead of the Allied aerial attacks against the Nazi Luftwaffe. Time after time these fighting men of Poland were commended by English officers for their heroic deeds, for their valiant and unconquerable spirit. Ignoring overwhelming odds, refusing to submit to the yoke of tyranny, these Polish forces of freedom and liberty, led by the spirit exhibited by that indomitable leader, General Sikorski, distinguished themselves at Norway, Narvik, Tobruk, in the African campaigns, on the seas, and in the air.

On the Fourth of July, the last message that the general sent shortly before he was killed, was received by President Roosevelt. He said:

> I wish today, on the Fourth of July, to pay my sincere homage to the great American Nation, especially as I am spending it as a guest of the Governor of Gibraltar, where I have met some of your officers. I am convinced that under you, Mr. President, the inspired leader of the American Nation, and in close collaboration with Great Britain, the victory will soon come to the United Nations. This victory will not only crush the enemy, but also bring into being your principles of freedom and justice.

General Sikorski had been visiting the Polish armed forces in the Near East, and was just returning to London. His death came at a moment when the forces which he had been organizing to fight for the liberation of Poland were at last ready to strike, and perhaps play an important part in the coming offensive in Europe. The Polish Army in the Near East is ready. It is reverberating with the spirit of General Sikorski. Yes, "spoiling for action," is the way he described his brave legions. Though General Sikorski is gone, his spirit will lead on. The fighting spirit of Sikorski is imbued in every Pole, no matter where he be, in England, Scotland, Africa, the Near East, Russia, or in Poland. That spirit is the spirit of victory. It is the spirit that can never die. It is the spirit that will make Poland a great and glorious nation again.

General Sikorski was born in Tyszow Narodovy, Galicia, on May 20, 1881, the son of a high-school teacher. His ancestors took part in the campaigns of Napoleon and in the Polish insurrection of 1830.

General Sikorski received his high-school education in Lwow and in 1908 took a degree in civil engineering at Lwow Technical University. He was drafted into the Austrian Army, served the compulsory year, 1905–6, and left the army with the rank of a second lieutenant.

He then took part in the Polish underground independence movement in Galicia, and during the First World War, when Marshal Pilsudski organized the Polish legions in Austria, he became one of the chief aides of the late marshal. He was named a lieutenant colonel and in 1916 became commander of the third regiment of the legions on the Russian-Austrian front in Volhynia with the rank of a colonel.

During the Polish-Ukranian War in 1919 and during the Polish-Russian War in 1920 he was commander of an army corps. One of his exploits was repelling General Budenny's cavalry in the attack on Warsaw in 1920. After the war he was appointed in 1921 chief of the general staff, serving until December 16, 1922, the day the President of the Republic, Gabriel Narutowicz, was assassinated.

With a civil war threatening Poland, General Sikorski was appointed Prime Minister and Minister of Interior and

undertook the task of pacifying the country. His successor on the general staff was Marshal Pilsudski.

PREMIER UNTIL MAY 26, 1923

General Sikorski remained Premier until May 26, 1923. He restored order and succeeded in obtaining the recognition by the great powers of the Russian-Polish line of demarcation. After a vote of censure by the Diet he resigned, taking over command of another army corps.

On February 17, 1924, he was appointed Minister of War and organized the Polish Army. In the spring of 1925 he went to France, where Gen. Maxime Weygand, who served as military adviser to the Polish Army during the Polish-Russian war, became his intimate friend.

He advocated a close Polish-French policy, introducing French methods and armaments in the Polish Army and maintaining close friendship with many French generals and politicians. On November 14, 1925, he resigned as Minister of War and returned to active military service.

When Marshal Pilsudski carried out his coup d'état on May 13, 1926, General Sikorski was commander of the Lwow garrison and chief of the Southeastern Army. He disagreed with Pilsudski's policy and methods. The marshal dismissed him on March 22, 1928.

General Sikorski then went to France, where he wrote books and articles. After his return to Poland he was put under strict surveillance. He wrote many articles in foreign newspapers advocating a Polish-French alliance. In an article published on April 1, 1939, he warned that Germany was seeking to conquer the world.

ESCAPED GERMAN INVADERS

At the outbreak of the German-Polish war General Sikorski applied for active service but was not assigned. After Poland's defeat he fled to Rumania and from there to France. In September 1939, he was appointed chief commander of the Polish Legions. The next day he was made Premier of the Polish "Government of National Union" in exile.

On November 10, 1939, he was appointed generalissimo but kept his post as Premier. In 1941 General Sikorski came to the United States, where he had interviews with President Roosevelt and members of the Cabinet. Last December he made his third trip to the United States to confer with President Roosevelt and also visited Mexico.

At the time of his death Premier Sikorski was working on his two most immediate objectives, the doom of Adolf Hitler and the Axis and the restoration and promotion of friendly ties with Soviet Russia. He believed the defeat of Germany was much closer than many believed.

He was hopeful that normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, broken April 26 by Moscow, would soon be restored. He disclosed in Cairo last Friday that there had been a new move to reestablish diplomatic relations.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the shocking death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and Commander in Chief of the Polish Army, is a great loss to the God-fearing peoples of the world.

May the victory of the United Nations over our common enemies bring a well-earned reward to Poland for its faithfulness to her late leader, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, who gallantly fought for freedom and liberty. May Poland emerge from this war with its boundaries restored.

That was the aim of General Sikorski, and that is the aim of the God-fearing peoples of the world.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and grieved a moment ago to receive from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my first information that the great statesman, General Sikorski, is now lost to the world. I know all of you who have ever had the pleasure of meeting him or who are familiar with his career heartily share this grief and realization of the loss the world has suffered.

Along with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] I sat in those executive sessions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and marveled at the words of that distinguished gentleman as he sat across the table from me perfectly erect, thoroughly determined, and every inch a gentleman. I was so many times impressed that there was not only a great soldier and executive but a distinguished gentleman and patriot who was destined to contribute much to the future of his country and to the future of the world.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great moving spirits in the Allied cause is dead—a champion of freedom for 33 years and more, a Polish statesman and soldier with deep feeling for the tragedy of his homeland under Nazi conquest and with unwavering faith that victory for his cause is certain, and that the victory will be followed by a rebirth of Poland.

We who met and talked with General Wladyslaw Sikorski in Washington a few months ago are shocked to learn that the Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-exile, who was also the commander in chief of its armed forces, was killed last night when his plane crashed while he was on his way back to London from the Middle East.

Accompanying the general to death were other high officers and close associates of the Polish Army, and the general's daughter, who was a member of the Polish Auxiliary Territorial Service.

General Sikorski died in the very hour of fruition for plans long in development for participation of the free Poles in an invasion of Nazi-held Europe. He has been denied by death the opportunity and the privilege of again leading his countrymen into battle for liberty.

As an undergraduate civil engineer in central Poland, under the heel of Austria, he began his career in the cause of freedom, in the first decade of this century. He was the leader of a rifle society working for the liberation of Poland, in 1910. Subject to the Austrian draft at the beginning of the First World War, he obtained a transfer to the Polish legions, and by 1916 he commanded a regiment.

By his patriotic activities he fell into the hands of the Austrian authorities, but he won release and led the Polish war against the Bolsheviks. In 1920 he was in an important command in the battle of Warsaw. In 1921 he became the Polish chief of staff.

When civil war threatened Poland in 1922, Sikorski was made Prime Minister, and while he served in that office Poland's first social insurance law was enacted. Later he became War Minister.

From 1926 to 1939 he was active in the military service of his nation. Then came the invasion of Poland by the hordes of Hitler.

It was lightning war, and Poland soon was overrun by the enemy. General Sikorski succeeded in escaping to England, and when the Polish Government-in-exile was established he was chosen as both Prime Minister and commander in chief.

In that position he traveled from London to Iran, where a large contingent of Polish troops has been stationed, and to Moscow and our Washington.

Now the forces which he has been organizing in the name of Poland to launch an offensive, together with their allied comrades against the Nazi fortifications of Europe, are ready for action; but their leader is dead.

General Sikorski will not be able to join the march to victory, nor will he enjoy the spectacle of a liberated Poland rebuilding for a better future.

But his spirit in death may lead as it would have in the living body of Sikorski. Poles everywhere, and the Allied world, pause this day in sorrow and in tribute to General and Prime Minister Sikorski, but tomorrow the spirit of the fighting Poles, which is the spirit of Sikorski, will move forward again to the battle stations.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise to pay my homage and respect to a great leader, General Sikorski. I have known that man many years; I knew him when Poland was regaining her strength after her other great trial and I know that Poland looked to him in the great trial through which she is now passing. I know that every person who ever knew General Sikorski admired and respected him. It will be difficult to find another man to fill his place, but I know that such a one will rise out of Poland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I too had the privilege of listening to General Sikorski as he talked to us across the table in our committee room. While telling us about the tragedy and suffering of Poland he appeared not only as a splendid soldier but also as a great statesman. I knew then that he was among the many great soldiers and statesmen that have contributed so heroically to the glory of Poland, giving inspiration and courage to the free men fighting fiercely for freedom everywhere in the world. I had an opportunity also to talk with him after the committee meeting. That was an

honor I shall always remember. The weight of his enormous burden was obvious but also was the fighting qualities of a determined soldier.

Mr. Speaker, this morning when I read the sad news of the death of General Sikorski, I realized, as we all do, that we must not pause for an instant in our fighting to bring this war to a victorious close as soon as possible. Yesterday we celebrated our freedom, our independence, our Fourth of July. Today General Sikorski's fight and Poland's fight for freedom, although not a fact at the moment, is certain of accomplishment. They have experienced their Valley Forge. Poland and the Allied Nations have lost some great men. But General Sikorski knew well that Poland and the Allies have many great statesmen, courageous soldiers, heroic men and women who will never give up until the enemy is unconditionally defeated and the torch of freedom is burning brightly on the high altar of peace, inspiring goodwill and faith again in the hearts of men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.)

OVEROPTIMISM OUR REAL WAR DANGER TODAY

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread and a growing danger throughout our Nation. As Representatives of our people we shall fail our duty if we do not take active steps to counteract it. I speak of the grave peril born of the belief that this war is practically won. Such wishful and completely unfounded daydreaming is actually imperiling our armed forces as they prepare to carry the attack to our enemies.

That belief has translated itself into overemphasis of post-war thinking, absenteeism, relaxation, and a general slackening of effort that sent the production of arms and ammunition down for the month of May. All indications are that the figures for June will be none too good. This is in the face of the absolute necessity that our armament program be stepped up and up throughout all of 1943.

Do we lack imagination as a people? Must we wait for the casualty lists to roll in before we will believe that it is going to cost us dearly to crack and penetrate the fortress of Nazi-held Europe and the Jap dominated network of the Pacific. Seventeen million heavily armed enemy fighting men are not going to be wished out of existence. Nor if we listen to the words of a man who is in a position to know, will we hope that our enemies can be brought to submission through bombing alone.

I quote from General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army:

I think it proper to express a word of caution against hasty conclusions or impromptu conceptions regarding the utilization of air power or any special weapon in the conduct of this war. I am convinced more and more each day that only by a proper combination of war-making means can we achieve victory in the shortest possible time and with the greatest economy in life. Pantelleria was an experiment, for which there appeared to be, and proved to be a sound logical basis. However, the situation there was unique as to the character of the island, the quality of the garrison, the complete naval control of the surrounding waters, and the proximity of allied airfields. The victory of Tunisia was favored by overwhelming air power, but the result would have been a stalemate without aggressive ground and naval action.

Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the ground army, with infantry and artillery as important as tanks and antiaircraft, and engineer and signal troops vital to the whole.

Such a closely knit combination of power and driving force cannot be possible if great segments are to fall short of requirements.

I again quote. This time from the Honorable Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War:

The War Department is concerned over the Army production situation.

Production in May of matériel for the ground forces supply program, which was scheduled to rise 2 percent from $1,553,000,000 in April to $1,582,000,000 in May, actually declined 3½ percent to $1,494,000,000.

This 5½ percent failure of production in dollars reflects a much more grave situation when considered in terms of actual arms, ammunition, and equipment which was not delivered to the Army. This means that troops in training must be deprived of critical equipment in order to supply troops being shipped overseas and those already overseas. If this situation continues, even our overseas troops will suffer from shortages of critical equipment.

The Army has the men and the transportation. Industry has the men and materials. Management and labor must deliver the supplies en schedule and as planned, or the opportunity to exploit recent military successes will be lost.

This is the most critical period in military supply. "Too little and too late" now will cost hundreds of thousands of lives tomorrow.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces, commenting on this falling off in production has said:

The overconfidence which caused a great part of the let-down was the result of several factors. Favorable news from the battle fronts caused many to conclude that victory is now just around the corner, and that feeling took some of the fire and determination away from many industrial leaders, workers, and large segments of the public.

It is tragic indeed that this should happen, for the victories which brought about the overconfidence and resultant let-up in production, actually created an increasingly urgent need for the equipment which failed to come off the production line because of the let-down. The Tunisian victory, coming earlier than many conservative estimates held to be possible, speeded up the day of European invasion with all it will require in men, weapons, and matériel. It paved the way for us to sweep the enemy from the Mediterranean. By shortening our supply lines the time needed for each cargo ship to make a delivery was considerably reduced. This was equivalent to adding hundreds of thousands of tons of capacity to our cargo fleets. The vastly increased amount of shipping space thus made available requires that we have the weapons and supplies ready to load into it. If the weapons are not ready, invasion cannot be carried out on schedule, and such a delay means prolonging the war at the needless cost of lives of our troops.

Germany and Japan have been put on the defensive. Put there by the miracle of the combined power of our great production and our military forces. Failure to sustain that miracle—failure to increase it at this moment will be a tragedy. This is the time to surge forward with new vigor and increase of effort. It is not the time to lean back and congratulate ourselves. We must assure a victory that cannot, must not stop short of complete and unconditional surrender of our foes.

Our way is clear; as representatives of our people who must be united in this effort. We must crush these false illusions. If this war is stalemated and prolonged through smug and erroneous concepts of a victory already assured we shall pay a ghastly price. We shall pay with needlessly wasted lives of our fighting men and we shall have lost forever all hope of preserving the fabric of freedom, of enterprise, of labor, of thought, or movement, in short of virtually all freedom and liberty itself.

Too many of us have forgotten those days when Mr. Hitler was beating his breast and crying out to the world that America was weak and that democracy could not fight a successful total war. These words were not words of oratory alone. Knowing the power of the armies that he had built under slavery, he was convinced he was speaking the truth. Since Pearl Harbor we have thrown that lie back into his teeth through a unity that Hitler and his cohorts could not even imagine. But now we must realize that we stand at the very crisis of our effort. Now those sacrifices we were going to be called upon to make are here and very real. For the first time we have seen signs that our home front is seriously lagging in meeting the challenge. If we are the voices of our people we must raise these voices to cry out against this threat. God forbid that the minor triumphs we have accomplished destroy what we have built. I charge you as Members of this great body with the individual duty to combat with every word, thought, and deed this first real threat to our war to victory and freedom.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MCKENZIE and Mr. COMPTON asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members now who have claimed time under special orders. The Chair thinks that in all probability the conference report will be ready around 6:15 or 6:30.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 6 minutes.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS AND THE HOME FRONT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to complete a portion of its work and the Members will go home to their districts. At the outset may I say that I am very far from making one of those familiar speeches just before a time like this when somebody gets up and says: "Mr. Speaker, we ought not to recess until we have taken care of thus-and-so." I can think of several things I would like to see the House do, but I am sure that the most important thing for all the membership of this House is to go home. For my part it has been impossible for me to be in my district since last fall. I know that when I am able to go home it is going to do me a great deal of good. It is going to bring me some basic encouragement just as it always does because I am going to find that fundamentally there is something very solid, very true, and very dependable in the hearts of those people.

It so happens, strangely enough, that the note I most wanted to strike in these few moments is practically the same as that which the gentleman from Alabama just struck except that I want to apply it in a little different way.

It is my conviction that we have not yet learned to act on the problems of our home front as we would do if the fires of this war had burned as deeply into our souls as they will before we are through. I do not think that to a sufficient extent small and minor, petty considerations, wrangling and conflict have been done away with. And I am afraid that to some degree that fact reflects itself in some of the violent conflicts we have seen in various parts of our country in recent weeks. If there is one thing that ought to be overcome so far as every one of us is concerned, and I am not making preachment here to anybody else any more than I am to myself, it is the tendency on the part of economic groups and organizations, political groups and organizations, yes and even Members of Congress, to try to lay the blame for things that go wrong on somebody else. For one thing we have got to see the need of a spirit of unity and comradship among all who truly love this country. And a very good way to start in bringing this about is by each person asking himself the question: "Where have I fallen down and where have I been wrong?" not where the other fellow has been. When Members go home to their districts one of the main things they are going to try to do is to find out what it is that the people most desire.

I think we are going to find certain things. We are going to find, first, the people saying: "We want, more than anything else, a clarification of some of these issues. We do not know quite where we stand on things, and we are not quite certain what the Government's policy is about them."

FUNDAMENTAL ANSWER TO INFLATION

I do not want to prophesy, but I am certain that many of us will come back with the conviction that one of the things the people desire more than anything else is a specific declaration on the part of the Congress as to what the policy of this Government is going to be with regard to the control of inflation and with regard to the stabilization of our economy in this country. I think it would be well for us to ask our people this question: Whether they would prefer, on the one hand, the continuation of a tremendous effort on the part of the O. P. A. to control in intimate detail, as it is now attempting to do, the price levels of this country, or whether they would prefer to see this Congress enact such legislation in the form of taxation plus a compulsory-savings program so as to attack the inflation problem at its root and to be able thereafter to put a stop completely to the sale of bonds to commercial banks for the new money which they create, thus causing inflation and adding immeasurably to the national debt. We have little right, Mr. Speaker, to criticize O. P. A. or other Government agencies when, as some Members have done, the only "remedy" proposed is to so cripple the agency by cutting its appropriation as to render it even more difficult for it or the local boards to handle their job. But we have our choice between attacking this problem at its root in the manner I have described or doing the best we can with an admittedly difficult situation and taking our share of the medicine and the trouble that comes instead of laying it all at somebody else's door.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If those steps were taken, namely, on taxation and savings and the elimination of commercial-bank financing, does the gentleman agree with me that the O. P. A. would be absolutely unnecessary?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman 90 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is close enough.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason I do not make that 100 percent is because the tremendous draft of the war demand on certain commodities might, and, I think, would, in the case of monopolistic control of some commodities, make it necessary to use some means to prevent those particular groups from taking undue advantage and charging far more than they should for the things under their control. Aside from that if you had those things in effect the O. P. A. as a pricing agency would become largely unnecessary. I said that very thing the day we passed the first Price Control Act.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. You would have to have rationing? Under any plan you would have to have rationing of food?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, as long as the war lasts you would have to ration, because as soon as you have a scarcity of commodities which the people need it is the only fair way to get them distributed. Inflation and the increased cost of living are two different things, not the same thing. Increased wages and increased farm prices are not the cause of inflation. The cause of inflation is the fact that there is more money put into circulation than there are consumers' goods to buy with it. These other things are the result.

POLICY FOR FAIR STABILIZATION

In the second place, if those fundamental steps are taken you could achieve a stabilization on the basis of fairness and justice by applying three simple rules: First, tie wages to the cost of living, as has been done successfully in other nations. Say that wages shall not increase unless the cost of living increases, but that there will be an increase in wages if the cost of living increases. In other words, we take the responsibility. Further, we have to make a distinction between those wages which have increased substantially and sometimes very largely, and the income of many other workers and salaried people that have not increased at all. There should be different treatment in these two cases.

As to farm prices, I think we should lay it down as the principle that under no circumstances shall any incentive or subsidy payments be made in lieu of or as a partial substitute for fair and just parity prices in the market to the farmer. But if necessary to gain increased production over and beyond what those prices can make possible for the farmer to produce, or if necessary to secure unusual crops needed for the war, then, beyond that fair parity price or support price or whatever standards might be set, it must be possible to make such payments to the producer himself as will enable him to produce those things but without increased prices to the consumer.

In the third place, as far as the subsidization is concerned—I say this very frankly and as one who voted to sustain the President's veto the other day because I thought that bill was much too broad—I do believe that instead of a broad, generalized subsidy affecting all persons throughout the Nation, many of whom, including people like ourselves, ought to sacrifice some of their standard of living as a very small contribution to this war, it would be much more to the point to say that as to those groups of people whose incomes have not been increased, as, for example, the dependents of soldiers whom we provide with certain allotments—and certainly we are responsible for the purchasing power of that money—and as to a number of other

groups of people, we will make it possible for their purchasing power to be increased per dollar by some adaptation on a sound basis of the stamp plan which we have already worked out and used practically for a long time.

FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I want to say also that I think when we go home we are going to find our people in overwhelming percentage in favor of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which in simple and direct terms states that the United States is not going to make the same mistakes that were made after the last war, but that this time we will keep faith with the men who are fighting and giving their lives and will build a lasting peace in their names.

Mr. Speaker, recently I sent many thousands of copies of a questionnaire out to my district. I got more than 3,200 replies, although people had to make out a very long questionnaire with 33 questions on it, and pay postage on their replies. I put a summary of those replies in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3371.

Among those questions was one where the wording was almost exactly the wording of the Fulbright resolution, although I had never read it. More people answered that question than any other question in the questionnaire. Of those who answered, 96 percent said they were in favor of the United States participating in an international organization and an international machinery after this war for the prevention of future aggression and future wars.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE HOME FRONT?

And now I want to speak generally about our home-front problem.

Times without number we have heard it said that American fighting men are winning the war on the battlefields of the world, but that the war might be lost on the home front.

Times without number we have also heard dark prophecies to the effect that, whereas we are going to win the war in a military sense, we may well lose the peace and hence fail to gain the hopes and ideals for which we now fight.

Why should these things be?

I have thought about it a great deal, and I believe I know the answer. I have suggested it already. We do not yet feel how deep this crisis is. Selfishness still stalks the land; men still contend with one another over small and mean issues; the hand of each group is set against other groups; the old fights and issues we will not leave behind, for they are easy and appealing and familiar. We so far have simply been unwilling to live and think and act as if we stand at one of the greatest—if not the very greatest—turning points in the whole history of the world. Too many of us here at home are acting as if we could take military victory in this war absolutely for granted. And we cannot. Even if we could be certain of military victory we have as yet no solid ground on which to base a belief that we who occupy positions of responsibility at home are going to be completely true to the trust every soldier must put in us to do our part to win the peace and to be prepared to solve by democratic means the domestic problems that will follow after it.

It is too often "the other fellow's fault"—not ours. And we act in too many instances almost as if it were more important to prove the other fellow wrong than for America to be strong and hopeful and united in her hour of greatest trial.

It is strong medicine and there are one or two sentences in it with which I do not agree but I am going to read to the House at this point an editorial which appeared recently in the Saturday Review of Literature. It reads as follows:

There is something curiously paradoxical today in the changed relationship between the book and film world and the everyday world in which Americans live. Once—and not many years ago at that—many of us picked up a book or went to the movies for an hour or two of escape. But the war has reversed that. Today we live in what is actually a world of escape and take a brief dip into reality every now and then in our diversions

When you read on-the-spot reports such as Guadalcanal Diary, by Richard Tregaskis, or Men of Bataan, by John Hersey, or Queens Die Proudly, by W. L. White, or One World, by Wendell Willkie; or even books of fiction such as The Dead Look On, by Gerald Kersh, or The Voice of the Trumpet, by Robert Henriques—when you read these books you are strangely lifted out of the fantastic and unreal world that is America today and plumped into a world of substance and reality, a world where basic values are at stake, where blood is flowing in mounting torrents to keep the meaning of America alive.

The contrast is even more striking with motion pictures—perhaps because the film is a much more compact and dramatically effective vehicle than books. You go to see a film such as In Which We Serve, or Desert Victory, or Prelude to War, and come away dazed and blinking—dazed because your brief excursion into the real world of 1943 has been full of raw stuff; blinking because it is difficult to get adjusted again to the world you actually have to live in and work in. This world is much different from the one you have seen when it took shape on the screen. This world—that is, the American world today—is an incredible world which no word describes so aptly and tragically as the word "escape"—in the sense that we are detached from the needs of the present.

Does "escape" seem too harsh when applied to America? How else would you describe a nation that is in a fight to the death yet thinks it can afford the luxury of interminable wrangling, pulling, tugging? How else would you describe a nation where there are men in Congress who regard as their main enemy not Hitler but the President of the United States, and who count as a supreme triumph anything that will embarrass, hamstring, or obstruct him? How else would you describe a nation where the abolition of Government agencies, regardless of the nature of their work or their urgency on the war front or home front or both, is eagerly sought by the congressional blocs not to expedite the war against Germany and Japan but to expedite the war against a competing political party? How else would you describe a nation where efforts to stabilize wages and prices and taxes are constantly thwarted because each group wants the other group to make whatever sacrifices have to be made; where organized pressure groups are relentlessly grubbing and grabbing whatever they can while the getting is good? And finally, how else would you describe a nation where there are race riots and devastating and irresponsible strikes.

Don't take comfort in the notion that this is the democratic way. This is not the democratic way, unless we are to say that the democratic way is disintegration and insanity. There is always a wide margin in democracy for cleavages and divergences; indeed, in normal times democracy thrives on them. But there comes a time when the margin must shrink, when differences must be subordinated to common resolution in the face of a common danger. To stray far out beyond the margin, to allow what are really minor differences to become magnified and intensified to the point where more important issues are side-tracked or obscured; to obstruct or impede the national welfare because of petty politics or prejudice—all this is inexplicable treason.

Yet the profoundly disturbing reality is that this is the picture of America today—a nation which has yet to grasp the imperatives of the hour. There is no home front in the sense that there is a solid wall of resistance. There is no such wall and we may as well face it. Selfishness, shortsightedness, stubbonness have eaten into the wall and have left big, gaping openings. Armies can win battles and nothing more. It is the nation as a whole which alone can prove its ability to survive.

Can it be that when it comes to a showdown we haven't got what it takes? Can it be that a nation born in the blood of freedom's battle has so far wandered from its heritage as to be ignorant of the bold requirements of continued freedom and self-preservation? Can it be that all these internal explosions will serve only to pave the way for the destruction, demolition, or overthrow of American democracy at home without a single enemy shell, bullet, or bomb touching our shores? If so, we had better call the boys home now, for there is nothing left for them to save.—N. C.

We are fighting this war to preserve the opportunity of people to be free. We are fighting it to build a world wherein the ideas that made Hitler possible, that made Japanese imperialism and deceit possible cannot exist. We are fighting again to keep democracy alive in the world. But it is not democracy to quarrel over position and rank and public approval when the enemy is at the gates.

It is an old, old tradition of Anglo-Saxon peoples that they do not fear in time of common danger to lay aside their quarrels, to give up the indulgence of selfishness or self-will or self-righteousness, and, accepting such leadership as they have, to go forward together with spirit until the danger has been passed. Through the years we have done this. And we have not doubted but that the freedom and peacetime ways we temporarily laid down would be taken up again as soon as the war was won.

So far in this war it has for some reason been different. Many millions of the people of the country have followed the tradition. But they have seen with consternation many others fail to do it. They have sometimes seen Congress fail to do it; they have sometimes seen officials of the executive branch of the Government fail to do it. They have seen one organized economic group after an-

other fail to rise above its own self-interest.

Part of this is due to years through which some Americans have developed habits of thought and action which simply do not fit with the war needs of our Nation. For example, Republican Middle Western William Allen White a few days ago wrote editorially in his Emporia Gazette as follows:

WHO RUNS THE WAR?

It is silly to say New Dealers run this war show. It's run largely by absentee owners of amalgamated industrial wealth, men who either directly or through their employers control small minority blocks, closely organized, that manipulate the physical plants of these trusts. Also, for the most part, these managerial magnates whom one meets in Washington are decent Americans. For the most part, they are giving to the American people superb service. They have great talents. If you touch them in 9 relations of life out of 10, they are kindly, courteous, Christian gentlemen. But in the tenth relation, where it touches their own organization, they are stark mad, ruthless, unchecked by God or man, paranoiacs, in fact, as evil in their designs as Hitler. They are determined to come out of this war victors for their own stockholders. * * * This attitude of the men who control the great commodity industries and who propose to run them according to their own judgment and their own morals does not make a pretty picture for the welfare of the common man. These international combinations of industrial capital are fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous power and no social brains. They hover like the old Silurian reptiles about our decent, more or less Christian, civilization like great dragons in this modern day when dragons are supposed to be dead.

There Editor White puts his finger, I believe, on the reason we are short of metals, short of steel, for instance, and I could document that story if I had time.

Not that Americans today are bad or dishonest or that they do not love their country enough to give their own or their sons' lives for it. It is not that. It is simply that we have not yet learned to love her enough to sacrifice our past short-sightedness and prejudice and selfishness in her cause.

SOMETIMES IT'S NOT THE OTHER FELLOW'S FAULT

Nor will we be doing that until we see—until every economic group and individual, every political organization, and every civic organization sees—that other people are sometimes right; that the people as a whole are almost always right and that on the other hand the group or organization they belong to is sometimes wrong—and so are we as individuals.

WHY BUREAUCRATS?

We have become experts in laying blame on somebody else. The bureaucrats, for example. They have made plenty of mistakes, some of them have been arrogant with Members of Congress, and—what is worse—with the American people. There are probably too many of them in some agencies.

But, after all, without certain governmental controls and direction we could not fight the war at all. We have just got to make the best of the war and its exactions upon us all. And repeatedly I have sat here in the House and listened to Members get up and castigate certain agencies, because they have not done a better job, and then turn right around and propose to cut the appropriation for the agency so severely that it would be quite impossible for them to do a good job. This is neither fair nor responsible action. If an agency is not doing a good enough job, what it needs is better personnel; not worse than what it has. If we are angry about black markets, maybe the O. P. A. needs more competent people to do enforcement work. But the remedy proposed is that they have less people. And then, no doubt, there will be more criticism—a good deal of it justified, perhaps—and more blame put upon O. P. A. when part of the fault lies in a penny-wise, pound-foolish attitude right here.

Furthermore, it is well to remember as I said earlier that the reason we have O. P. A. controlling the whole price economy of America is because of certain things Congress has not done. At present not one Member would dare seriously propose that we do away with O. P. A. So some of us just propose to make it inefficient. Does that make sense?

But there is—there always has been another way. It is to apply the one basic cure for inflation, which is taxes and compulsory saving and appropriate monetary policy. Take constructive action here and then we can talk about sharply curtailing O. P. A.'s functions and reduce the number of bureaucrats safely.

On November 25, 1941, when the original Price Control Act was under consideration, I said this to the House:

In all honesty I must say that if we do nothing to increase the supply of consumer goods and if we do nothing to establish a stable and dependable, not to say a constitutional, monetary system, then an attempt to set up a Government bureau and tell it to control prices and prevent inflation is going to be like telling that bureau to sit on a steam safety valve with the fires at white heat and new fuel being added under the boilers. It is one thing to set up an agency to prevent certain prices from soaring way above all the rest of them. That we probably must do. But it is quite another thing to try to control the whole price level by means of government decisions and rulings.

If, therefore, we want to really prevent inflation, we have got to do things that will attack it in fundamental fashion and which will be as effective in preventing deflation in the future as they are in preventing inflation now. If we could increase the output of goods and bring it up even with the supply of dollars we have to buy goods with, that would be a real answer. And if we could establish a monetary and credit system based on sound principles which would keep the supply of buying power always in line with and geared to the production of goods for sale, then we would have the problem solved—not only for this crisis but for all time to come.

But what, you ask, should be done at a time when real inflation might threaten, when prices did start to go up seriously? Remembering the definitions I have given, there would be two things to do: First, not to create any more new money or credit until increasing production of goods caught up with the money supply, and, second, to levy such taxes as would be effective in reducing the amount of money in circulation so as to bring the prices back to normal. That is very important, for, after all is said and done, this method—balancing money creation and taxes in proper proportion—is the sound way, the only sound way, to prevent inflation and deflation. If we will use this way, we will be building a system that can absolutely prevent deflation after this thing is over. And that is quite as important as preventing inflation now. Under these circumstances all that would be needed in the way of price-control legislation would be, as I have said, a measure enabling ceilings to be put on special prices which, without any sound reason, are jacked up beyond the general level of other prices. That would not be dangerous, and in the emergency it might do a lot of good. And, most important, with the kind of monetary system I have described it would be successful.

Our country is in the midst of a total war which has inevitably twisted our domestic economy completely out of shape. We must expect to employ extraordinary means in at least some instances to achieve the necessary result of girding our Nation to fight this total war successfully. The fundamental things are appropriate taxes and compulsory savings. They can really stop inflation, for they can be used as substitutes for having the banks create the billions of dollars of new money they are now creating. We face a twofold problem. First, we must get full production, especially of food, and we must provide the necessary incentives to get it. Second, we have millions of consumers whose incomes have not increased a bit since the war and to whom we owe a duty to see they do not bear the whole burden of rising living costs. There are, however, right and wrong ways to use subsidies and they are altogether likely to be inflationary in their effect unless used with extreme caution.

I am frank to say I do not like the idea of subsidizing the entire Nation generally out of the Public Treasury. I am not opposed, however, to the use of incentive payments direct to producers to obtain needed production, so long as such payments are never used to hold a price to the farmer below a fair parity price. Nor am I opposed to providing assistance for low-income or fixed-income consumers, such as soldiers dependent on allowances we provided, veterans, old-age pensioners, white-collar workers, and similar groups who have thus far borne the whole weight of increased living costs. But these groups could be fairly dealt with, as I previously pointed out, through some such device as a revival of the stamp plan as a means of meeting this particular need and problem.

Congress may well be correct in opposing some of the proposals of the Executive, but Congress will be dead wrong if it does not substitute therefor a constructive proposal of its own in every case.

HOME-FRONT PROBLEM IS ONE PROBLEM

We need to consider the problem of our home front as a whole—as one problem, not a lot of separate ones.

We need a policy as to wages. I have suggested such a policy. Perhaps someone can improve upon it. But above all we should define a policy.

A policy—a workable and a fair one—as to farm prices is needed. That, too, I have tried to outline very briefly. And we need an answer for consumers; that is, for the lower income consumers.

One policy is to freeze everything. It has been talked of a good deal. I do not see how it can be done, however, short of drafting the whole economy—men and machines, factories, mines, and money—for the service of the Nation. Even that step we should not fear too much if it is needed to save our Nation.

But short of that there are other ways, I believe, to solve the problem. They are not *soft* or easy or popular. But they will work.

I use the specific cases only as examples. But they are taken from the problem that is our No. 1 wartime job on the home front—namely, provision of a fair return to all without letting an inflationary spiral get started.

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

There is something else—something every soldier thinks of when he is not thinking about the war itself and his chance of survival. It is preparation now for the problems of the post-war world. I hoped most earnestly that before the recess we would act to set up a congressional agency to deal with that problem. We have destroyed the National Reserves Planning Board. The problem is squarely in the lap of Congress. To neglect it is not only to risk confusion and Executive dictation as to measures to be taken to meet the economic problems of the post-war period. To neglect it is to break faith with every man in uniform. As soon as we return I believe we will act on this, for I believe we will find the people demanding it.

WHAT HITLER AND THE JAPS WANT

I close where I began. If there is one thing Hitler and the Japanese overlords might wish above all things else, it is strife and conflict among us here in America. Nothing can help them quite so much as our refusal to be as big people—as big in attitude and mind and soul—as the times demand. Nothing can help the enemies of America as much as our failure to sacrifice pettiness and prejudice and selfishness and attachment to that which is small and unimportant. For it is out of people's failure to purge these things from their hearts in the fires of war that there arise fruitless and unnecessary political conflict, riot, and bloodshed in our streets, racial and class antagonisms.

Where have I been wrong?

Where have I failed to do my part?

Wherein have I been less a true patriot than I should have been?

These are the questions that must be asked throughout this land and in this Congress. We must ask them about ourselves, not about other people. This is where we have fallen down.

There will be time to fix blame. There will be time to look to our rights. But that time is not now.

I am not interested in what is past. I am not concerned as to whose fault has caused some of the conflict on our home front. All I want to say today is that every one of us is in part to blame if we have not seen clearly the tremendous issues of this war, if we have not stood so appalled by the vast significance of this world-wide task in which we play a part if we have not learned to look upon every other loyal American as a fellow worker in that task and willingly sacrificed to our country not alone our blood and treasure, but every minor conflict among us, every petty wrangle, every short-sighted or selfish consideration as well, for these things are the roots of our trouble. They are what is wrong with the Home Front.

Millions of men are fighting and dying for this country. Other millions of men and women are working long and tedious hours in the field and factories. Mothers are bearing children, rearing them under the difficulties of wartime to be the Americans of the future.

America's future and America's present hope is in the heart and mind and muscles and skills and hopes and aspirations of the people. These things are real. The problems are real. The terrible danger of this war is real.

And whoever, therefore, fails to work with all his might against every force and every tendency that divides our people or causes conflict among them in these desperate days fails in his duty to his country. I do not speak to others more than to myself. Nor do I believe we will fail. What I do believe is that gradually, throughout this Nation, a new spirit will come out of the very trouble of the time—a spirit as broad as America, and as noble as the ideals that made her strong and free.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HUMANITY MUST NOT BE DENIED THE FRUITS OF VICTORY

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, this is the day on which most of the country has commemorated the Nation's birthday, the Fourth of July having been Sunday. On days like these it is customary to send our greetings to the boys at the battle front. It is proper that we should do so. If I may, however, I should like to suggest that final victory rests here, not there. Here in these Halls final victory will be determined. Here we shall say whether they fight in vain.

"The Congress shall have power," the Constitution says, "to raise and support armies." And so, by the labor and pain of debate, we give birth to a great army. We cheer the boys. We vote them medals. We raise their pay. We brag how well we feed them, nurse them, arm them. We vote dollars in a grand manner. But do we support them? The coming days will tell.

Yesterday I learned that a young major, in truth a boy of 27, had died in gallant action somewhere in the southern seas. He was only one of the eight or possibly ten million men and boys—yes, and girls—of my land who may face enemy fire before the year ends. For what? To avenge?

As they fight, others fall and the mountain of sacrifice grows and grows. Pearl Harbor. Bataan on Pearl Harbor. Guadalcanal on Bataan. Kasserine on Guadalcanal. Attu on Kasserine Pass. And from the enemy prisons word comes that 600 have died who waited in vain for aid to reach the Philippines. Each death cries for more. Vengeance is the cruelest mockery devised in the name of war.

The boy whose death I learned yesterday—what did he die for? To be avenged? No; he died to make mankind itself free from the scourge of war.

"I do not want to die," one boy wrote his mother, "but I shall not mind too much; I shall not care about my dreams if the next crop of boys can have theirs."

Can it be that twice in our generation a crop of youth will die in vain? It is inconceivable. Some counseled isolation. Some intervention. What matters which, now? We armed. War came. These boys give up their dreams and go out to fight. And they do fight. And they die.

Is there one among us who will not do all that he can to see they do not die in vain?

In my part of the West people still living remember when each man was his own law. A day came, however, when a few men said, "The time has come for law and order. We all expect to live here. We are all part of this community." Those men accepted the responsibility of making life and property safe; yes, and of making safe the dreams which young men have. Can we do less when nations come of age? Can we do less when our earth becomes a small world?

The boy of whose death I learned yesterday was only 7 when first I knew him. Must boys forever die at 27 or 17 or 37 because older men fail to translate battle-field victories into agreements that can endure?

When a child learns to walk, he does not skip, dance, and run. He takes one step at a time, a simple step. Should not nations walk together before they run? Let us take simple steps. Let us make simple commitments. Why should we not proceed as men did when they established law and order in a frontier community? They simply said that they would maintain order and that they would provide law and courts of justice. They did not say that changes could never be made. They merely said that ways would be found to handle disputes without bloodshed.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility upon this Congress is not discharged when we pass a draft law nor even when we pass the largest appropriation bills in history. The responsibility upon us to support our armies is to protect the victories they win. To support them is not merely to feed them and arm them; it is to write agreements which will let the nations of the world live without war.

Simple steps have been suggested in resolutions now before the Congress. Let them be explained to our people this summer and let us make clear that they

do not commit this Nation to any vast, involved scheme of national disintegration or international entanglement. The favored proposals, as I understand them, in effect, merely say two things; and in the form to be finally enacted we can make sure they say only two things:

First. That we will join with other nations of good will to maintain order; which means and should mean that anyone who breaks the peace will be punished, including those guilty for today's terrible crime.

Second. That we will join with other nations of like mind to provide law. That means a little machinery. It should not be too complicated, not too elaborate. There should be assurance of a forum for the discussion of problems that threaten the common peace. There should be a place for nations to refer differences they cannot settle alone.

Beyond these things it would not be wise now to go. Our task is not easy. We must not make it more difficult than it is. We must not allow ourselves to focus attention upon points of disagreement; we must apply ourselves to the things we have in common. People work together only when they have a common purpose and when they work on matters in which they find a common interest. Nations will learn to live together in the same way. We must try to succeed.

In our own national development, we took one step at a time. Committees of correspondence acquainted the colonies with each other before they formed the Continental Congress. Independence was maintained under the Articles of Confederation for several years before the Constitution came to form a more perfect union. In the international field, why try to take more than one step at a time?

Mr. Speaker, in venturing to raise my voice on this subject today, I do it in all humility but in all sincerity.

I was part of that other crop of boys who went out to the great adventure in 1917 and 1918, fanatical in our desire to win a war we were told was the war to end war. Scores, yes hundreds, of other men in this body were in that class. We came back, most of us unscarred.

Now we have seen this new generation go out to finish the job we did not. Yes, we have sent them out to do it, and to die if need be in doing it. And it will not be wrong that they have gone again if we finish the job this time. It will not be tragedy if we do our part in the parliaments and the council chambers of the world. The tragedy—and it would be of all the worst, the unforgivable tragedy—if the destruction of this war, the outpouring of wealth, and the sacrifice of young lives should be in vain.

It will be tragedy, Mr. Speaker, only if having paid the costs, humanity is denied the fruits of victory—a world freed from the scourge of war.

WE WILL DISCOVER WHEN WE GO HOME THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL FORCES OF DEMOCRACY ARE COMING UP FROM THE PEOPLE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one or two suggestions to the Members of the House who are going home. It is necessary to go home once in a while and get a contact with the folks who have us hired, to see what the boss has to say. When you get home this time you will be surprised, if you have not been home lately, to discover how smart the boss is, how soundly he is thinking, how clear his notions are with regard to some of the things that need to be done. To me, that is the most fascinating thing connected with this remarkable period in which we are now in responsibility, and the most hopeful.

It seems to me that anybody who has studied the nature of democratic government, the influences which control its policies, and the thing which must guide it, should know that it has been provided in nature clearly that human beings may be free, that they may operate systems of self-government. That was not decided by those who met in the Federal Constitutional Convention; it was decided by God Almighty in the Counsels of Infinite Wisdom. There is nothing accidental about it at all.

The thing that has been provided for the guidance of free people is public opinion. You may think that a great statesman determines public policies. There is definitely a place for leadership, but many of the so-called great statesmen see the thing moving and get in ahead and grab the flag.

Every student of the fundamental forces that control government, that renew democracy, must know that the strength that renews democracy comes from the bottom up, from the body of the people. That fact is fascinating. I am talking about something that we must understand and be respectful to if we are to preserve a democratic government in these involved and complex situations in which human beings now live. We have reached the end when intelligent human beings depend upon the guidance of government by the theories of men. I do not think there is a bit of doubt about it. I have been here 30 years and I have been studying this. As far as I know all other people who have studied the thing have arrived at the same conclusion that operating a great system of democractic government is a practical thing, not a theory. It is a serious business. Governments, like every other thing that human beings can discover on earth, are governed by natural laws. It is strange we do not recognize that as a practical proposition.

The would-be physician goes to school for a long time to learn the laws of God Almighty that govern the human body. There used to be two sorts of doctors when I was a kid. One was the physician, the real doctor, who had studied these laws. When he went out to attend anyone who was sick he tried to find out what was the matter with the sick person. He did not ask what he wanted, but he prescribed that which his examination indicated should be prescribed, and that which was the sort of thing the patient needed, and the sick person took the medicine whether it tasted good or not. He wanted to get well. The quack was the fellow who had a quick, sure, pleasant remedy, no matter what was wrong with the patient. He tried to find out what kind of medicine the patient wanted and he prescribed it. He drove around with a sporty team and wore a silk hat and did lots of advertising, and also gave a lot of dope to keep the people from knowing they were hurting. Of course, there are not many folks here now of the quack class in this body, but I have seen once in a while one or two people in public life who tried to find out what the people wanted and who said to them, "Boys, just give me your support and I will not only give you what you want but I will give you more of the same sort."

The people seem to be catching on to the fact that those operating a system of democratic government have got to determine what is the thing that is needed to be done, and then do it, whether it is easy or not, and must permit statesmen to sit in the councils of the Nation instead of quacks and tell them what they honestly believe, just as they would expect a real doctor to act. We will find some mighty encouraging indications when we go home insofar as the recovery of democratic fitness on the part of the people is concerned. Mighty encouraging it is to those of us who really believe in democratic government, a government by the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 108, 162, and 163.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 96, 99, 154½, 155, and 157; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,270,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,350,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That appropriations heretofore made"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Shasta Dam, reservoir and power plant, $10,900,000; Keswick Dam and power plant, $1,474,000; Friant Dam and Reservoir, $595,000; transmission line to Shasta substation, $400,000; Friant-Kern Canal, $7,000,000; Madera Canal, $1,000,000; Contra Costa Canal, $500,000; Contra Costa laterals, $500,00; and examinations, surveys, and water rights, $200,000; in all, $22,569,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$865,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 9 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "twenty-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,170,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 113, 119, and 156.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

No. 15: Provides that $3,270,000 of the unobligated balance of funds available to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for operating and marketing expenses, instead of $3,200,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,287,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, and 105, relating to construction of reclamation projects from the reclamation fund. Appropriates the following amounts for the projects set forth below.

	Amount
Boise project, Idaho (Payette Division)	$100,000
Deschutes project, Oregon	100,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	420,000
Riverton project, Wyoming	100,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming (Heart Mountain Division)	100,000

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, and 118, relating to construction of reclamation projects, general fund. Appropriates the following amounts for certain projects from the general fund as set forth below:

	Amount
Central Valley project, California	$22,569,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	3,500,000
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch	3,000,000
Tucumcari project, New Mexico	500,000
Yakima project, Washington, Roza Division	865,000

No. 120. Appropriates $64,000 for water conservation and utilization projects, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided, together with the unexpended balance carried over from the fiscal year 1943, will make a total of $5,000,000 available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1944.

Nos. 154½, 155, 157, 158, 159 and 160, relating to investigation of raw material resources for steel production: Appropriates $2,000,000, instead of $149,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 162 and 163, relating to manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research. Appropriates $900,000 as proposed by the House, for manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research, instead of $1,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $20,000 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 174. Corrects total.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Nos. 113 and 119, relating to the appropriation for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, and correcting the total of general fund appropriations.

No. 156, relating to pilot plant construction and operation in connection with raw material resources for steel production.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, what was agreed upon with reference to amendment No. 120, entitled "Water conservation and utility projects"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the gentleman knows, the Senate placed in the bill an item of $4,000,000 for that purpose, without Budget estimates. As the bill passed the House it carried no funds for that purpose. I am glad to report that there is a carry-over of an unexpended balance of $4,936,000 in that fund. The conferees agreed to add $64,000 to make the total of $5,000,000 available for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the balance is reappropriated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is continued available without reappropriation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And if priorities may be secured for the necessary critical materials, these small projects under the Wheeler-Case Act may be completed with that $5,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is my understanding, and there is legislation pending that will make these projects financially feasible.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On the Bonneville proposition, amendment numbered 15—that was agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Three million and seventy thousand dollars was agreed on, but I assume the gentleman is referring to the $87,000 which was in controversy. We allowed $70,000 which seems to be agreeable.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. As I understand, the conferees have agreed to restore $70,000 of the amount that was eliminated, which was recommended by the Budget, for the Bonneville item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Oregon that he made such a good statement on the floor the other day that we yielded to his judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I would like to ask the chairman of the conference committee what is the chairman's understanding of the action of the conferees with regard to the item for the operation of the manganese beneficiation plant covered under amendments 162 and 163?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the gentleman knows, the bill as it passed the House carried an item of $900,000 for the operation of pilot plants which, as I recall, are in that general area. The Senate added $1,000,000. Nine hundred thousand dollars of that was for the Chamberlain, S. Dak., plant. The Senate yielded on that part of it.

Mr. CASE. But the gentleman's first statement was that the $900,000 was for the operation of the manganese plant in that area. I assume he referred to the South Dakota area which he mentioned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well I am sure the great State of South Dakota is in that general area but, of course, I am not in a position to advise the Bureau of Mines how or where to use these funds.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. On amendment No. 122 provision for appropriation of $1,900,000 to build a power line from Shasta Dam down to Oroville, Calif.—what was done with that amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman refers to amendment 110. The Senate yielded on that. I have not examined the record, but the information I have is that that particular amendment was placed in another bill that will be forthcoming tomorrow, the deficiency bill, which will be considered tomorrow. Of course, that does not mean that the House conferees have agreed to it or that there is any gentlemen's understanding about it. The Senate conferees just lifted it out and put it in the deficiency bill.

Mr. RANKIN. It means that the amendment has not been finally disposed of?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; it is not in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not the only amendment that has been defeated by the House and put in another bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are there certain projects that were taken care of by continuing or reappropriation provisions? How about the Gila project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The members found that there was a carry-over, an unexpended balance, for instance, like the important Gila project, in which the gentleman is vitally interested. There is $1,875,000 carry-over that will be made available until it is expended. I repeat that it is a very important project, in which the gentleman's State is vitally concerned.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Referring to amendment No. 120——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman refers to water conservation and utility projects. There is $5,000,000 now available for that purpose, when this bill becomes law.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the language in this bill make it available?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is not necessary, because it is available until expended.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. This is an important matter, as far as the Osage Nation in my district is concerned. I would like to get the mystery of amendment No. 84 on page 53 straightened out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know of no particular mystery about it.

Mr. DISNEY. Perhaps I was unfortunate in my choice of words. The Senate amendment came back here with certain features involved, and then the conferees changed it without any question being raised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman referring to the Osage attorney squabble?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; that is what I wanted to get straightened out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Which side of that controversy does the gentleman wish to take?

Mr. DISNEY. That is not the question. These Indians have their own money and we appropriate it. They want to select their own tribal attorney and they want to pay for it, but the Department has a happy way of making him Assistant Solicitor General, letting the Solicitor General's office pay him, and then taking the money of the Osages and reimbursing the Solicitor General's department, the Department selecting the attorney. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. The Senate amendment that appears in the bill provides that the tribal attorney shall be hired by the tribe. They want to hire him, and that the Indian agent may be hired by the Department. Then I understand the conferees completely reversed that and the conference report provides for the hiring of the agent by the tribe and the attorney by the Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is also correct.

Mr. DISNEY. I want to know, if you care to say for the RECORD, why it was changed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Obviously, it was changed upon the suggestion of the Senate conferees. That being a matter about which I have no information, except letters and telegrams from both factions. Frankly, I do not know what a majority of the Indians want. If the gentleman does, and desires to advise the House at this time, I should be glad to give him the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DISNEY. This was changed by the Senate conferees voluntarily, without any action by the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I will say to my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, like every other item considered in the conference, it met with the approval of both House and Senate conferees. The gentleman understands that this matter was all in the conference report that was adopted by the House several days ago.

Mr. DISNEY. But I understand that it was originally in the bill the way the Indians wanted the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now the gentleman seems to be taking sides. I am sure I do not know what a majority of those Indians really want. It is true that the amendment in question was placed in the bill by the Senate subcommittee which, of course, they have a perfect right to do.

Mr. DISNEY. And it went back and then the Senate conferees proceeded to reverse the thing and change it?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. While it is true that the transmission line from the Shasta power plant and the Shasta substation to Oroville was taken out by the conferees, still there were funds left in this bill for a transmission line extending from the Shasta Dam and the Shasta powerhouse to the Shasta substation in the amount of $400,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. But it was the transmission line to Oroville that was taken out by the House and Senate conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I do not know whether I understood the amount correctly to which reference has been made, but to the Tucumcari project has been added $500,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman from New Mexico that the Tucumcari project has been very generously dealt with, so far as the House conferees are concerned. As the gentleman will recall, there was no budget estimate for this project, which is a very splendid project, one which I understand is about 90 percent finished; it will require little, if any, critical materials to finish it, and for that reason the House felt that it could add $500,000, even though there is no Budget estimate.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is in addition to the carry-over?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is in addition to the carry-over of $656,000, making a total of $1,156,000.

Mr. CARTER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and also the very active and valuable interest of our colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 113: Page 72, line 18, "Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,985,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,650,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction costs of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the reclamation law."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In the event this amount is insufficient, can the gentleman's committee give consideration to the necessity later on of having a deficiency in order to complete this worthwhile project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I might say to the gentleman, my colleague from Oklahoma, in whose district the project is located, who is vitally concerned, that of course the committee knows this is insufficient to finish the project and it is considerably under the Senate figure. The gentleman may recall that in a colloquy with him on the floor a few days ago I advised him I was trying to keep all items within Budget estimates. I also made it plain that I would not ask for a dollar over the estimates for an Oklahoma project if we could hold all the others down to Budget figures. But that was not done in every instance. There are a few exceptions and I am glad to tell him that Lugert-Altus is one of those exceptions. I cannot, of course, give any assurance as to what this committee will do in the future, but I can assure the gentleman that the committee will give the Lugert-Altus project a square deal in the future as it has in the past.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I want to thank the gentleman for adding the $150,000 above the Budget estimate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 119: Page 73, line 13, strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$43,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$32,809,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 156: Page 86, line 11, after the word "including", insert "private plant construction, and operation to utilize more fully sound resources and."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the various votes by which the amendments were disposed of was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we come now to the final passage of this bill. The vote we have just taken rings down the curtain on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned. As I indicated a few minutes ago, there was a complete agreement between Senate and House conferees for the first time during the long, tedious meetings of the conferees. Members of this House will recall that your House subcommittee, after some 5 or 6 weeks of daily hearings, reported a bill to the House nearly $10,000,000 below the Budget estimates. As has happened many times in the past between economy speeches at the other end of the Capitol, that great body added approximately $55,000,000 to the bill, more than $20,000,000 of which was without Budget estimates. It is no secret, but a matter of record, that heretofore, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, in most instances House conferees have talked in vain in an effort to bring the bill back to you within or below Budget estimates. When your House conferees announced that we expected to bring this bill here for final passage below the Budget, there were those who smiled and said it just could not be done. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am glad to report to you that this bill as finally passed by this House is approximately $2,600,000 below Budget estimates.

In making this announcement I desire to give full credit to a loyal subcommittee that has stood by me and worked harmoniously and unselfishly in an effort to accomplish what seemed to be the impossible. I also desire to thank the membership of this House for standing by this committee on every vote despite the pressure groups who endeavored to load the bill down with millions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I desire to compliment the gentleman and would like to ask him what provision was made with regard to the steel investigation. Is my understanding correct that the conferees agreed to $2,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; the gentleman will recall that when he and others raised the question about this item that we assured him that we would compromise on a reasonable figure. That was one of the few items in the bill on which the conferees were willing to go far in excess of the Budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the conferees were justified in doing that, and I congratulate them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the members of the committee as well as the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle for the support they gave their conferees. You stood shoulder to shoulder with us in our fight for the taxpayers of the Nation. The showing made by the committee demonstrates what cooperation, teamwork, and the elimination of

partisan considerations in legislation can accomplish.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the results that the chairman of the committee says have been accomplished were accomplished, and it was due largely to his leadership. In conference with the Senate the usual procedure is for the House conferees to surrender, but under the leadership of the gentleman from Oklahoma the House conferees stood up this time and were able to bring in a very splendid report. I say again it is due largely to his splendid efforts.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 275. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 413. An act to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 636. An act to amend the Act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 758. An act to repeal subsection (c) of Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to authorize a uniform allowance for certain graduates of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1076. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 1101. An act to provide for payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; to the Committtee on Claims.

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1156. An act to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1250 an act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1134. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 6, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, July 6, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

546. A letter from the executive officer, Petroleum Administration for War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Petroleum Administration for War for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, submitted in accordance with Budget Circular No. 421; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

547. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

548. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, National Resources Planning Board, transmitting a copy of the estimates of personnel requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year for the National Resources Planning Board on the form provided by the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

549. A letter from the secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending September 23, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

550. A letter from the administrative officer, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, War Manpower Commission, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

551. A letter from the Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting information concerning their personnel for the ensuing quarter, as required by Circular No. 421 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

552. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

553. A letter from the administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget covering the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the National Gallery of Art for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

554. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds," as provided in Independent Offices Appropriation Act, approved June 26, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2886. A bill to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 666. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 667. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3128. A bill to make it unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States or is or has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 3129. A bill to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3130. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3131. A bill to authorize the issuance of *lapel* buttons to persons who serve in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3132. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfork Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 3133. A bill to permit certain capital expenditures on farms to be deducted in computing net income for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3134. A bill exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3135. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution providing for disposition of equipment and facilities of National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the passage of legislation, notwithstanding a presidential veto, by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected or within 2 years after the expiration of such time, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War II, and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 290. Resolution to provide for the expenses of continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 119, a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the National Council of the Republic of Poland, expressing their deep appreciation of the help that the United States of America has given to the Polish Republic on this day, July 4, 1943; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Henry Grossi; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1902. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Resolution of the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring herein), That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American Government, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights, at least until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been brought home, demobilized, and given an opportunity to express their views; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1903. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. M. A. Bradford and 39 others attending the Baptist county convention at Bangor, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1904. Also, petition of Margaret Ulrich and 40 delegates in attendance at the Indiana Synod of the Presybterian Church, June 14–17, 1943, Third Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1905. Also, petition of Cora A. West, and 40 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1906. Also, petition of George Underwood and 64 citizens of Glenwood, Mich, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1907. Also, petition of Emma Potter and 51 citizens of Dansville, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1908. Also, petition of Herman Bratten and 20 citizens of Brady, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1909. Also, petition of Myrtle Camp and 40 citizens of Watervliet, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the

winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1910. Also, petition of Virginia Pike and 24 citizens of Ione, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1911. Also, petition of Alice May Stuart and 85 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1912. Also, petition of Jennie Jones and 52 citizens of Wenatchee, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1913. Also, petition of Mary C. Woodworth and 60 citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1914. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Jacobson and 64 citizens of Aitkin, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. Also, petition of Mrs. Bert Smith and 55 citizens of Holland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1916. Also, petition of G. S. Summers and 25 citizens of Grafton, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1917. Also, petition of Mrs. Winston D. Goss and 20 citizens of Church Point, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1918. Also, petition of Mrs. J. O. Engle and 23 members of the Loyal Women's Class of the Christian Sunday School, of Burlington, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1919. Also, petition of Grace M. Hamilton and 177 citizens of Wilton, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1920. Also, petition of Elma H. Green and 67 citizens of Westfield, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1921. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Jennie Knapp, of Poughkeepsie, and 82 other residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, stating that they believe by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, and rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1922. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Henry Shadowens, Leone B. Kendall, Mildred Hawes, Ida Ensley, John H. Burkham, and sundry other residents of Dayton, Ohio, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1923. Also, petition of Hotel Gibbons, Dutcher's Grill, College Inn Restaurant, McShane's Restaurant, John Stanko, R. P. Sleight, R. H. Remick, Harry W. Lantz, E. R. Chadwell, Holden Hotel Co., Ed Noll, and sundry citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1924. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. O. V. Collins and 52 residents of Goff, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1925. Also, petition of C. R. White, grocer, and 60 other businessmen of Sabetha, Kans., soliciting and making application to the Appropriations Committee for some definite and decisive action to curtail the recent arbitrary and dictatorial orders of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1926. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of George M. Anderson, of Clay City, Ind., and 78 other signers from that community, urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1927. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Resolution of the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of West Virginia, in convention assembled, expressing opposition to legislation to provide for additional social security insofar as it will involve the payment of pensions to servicemen and retirement pay to men in the Regular services, urging that all veterans' legislation be handled separately from civilian legislation and that all veterans' affairs continue to be administered by Veterans' Administration, and opposing all proposals of a similar nature to consolidate veterans pensions, disability, retirement, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation benefits with civilian benefits as administered under social security laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1928. Also, resolution of approximately 35 citizens of the city of Richwood, W. Va., assembled in the First Methodist Church of said city, as drafted by the Reverend W. Malcolm Fuller and presented by the Reverend E. U. Wills, favoring enactment of House bill 2082, prohibiting for the duration of the war the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all liquors, and urging their Representative to use his influence in having said bill reported and enacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1929. Also, petition of Mrs. Morgan Marks and 19 other residents of Richwood, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1930. Also, petition of Mrs. A. E. Haggerty and 17 other residents of Richwood, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, in order to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1931. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the County Treasurers' Association of California, regarding Japanese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1932. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Administrator of National Housing Agency to grant priorities for additional conversion units for San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1933. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1934. Also, petition of the League of Democratic Women of San Diego County, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Smith-Connally antistrike bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1935. Also, petition of the Petroleum Engineers' Club of Dallas, opposing the enactment of Senate bills 607 and 792, with reference to the petroleum industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid all the voices of this vast and varied world save us from the supreme tragedy of missing Thy call.

As age after age men have heard Thy voice, we, too, can hear it when silence falls and we listen with reverent and obedient hearts. We catch its accents in the whispering wind, in sunlight and moonlight, and in the far flicker of the stars, in all the beauty of the earth and the wonder of the sky: Thou dost speak to us everywhere, for this is our Father's world. In all the roar of the earth's vast work, above all the selfish and noisy cries of class and clan there sounds a Voice divine that knows and feels and cares.

Turning aside for the moment from the violence and turbulence of human strife we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. Rising above the deafening prejudices of our embittered days may we be the hearers and doers of Thy word and of Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, July 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of J. Frank Meador.

The message also announced that the House had further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156 and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 113 and 119 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2922. An act to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 2928. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bone	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wiley
Gurney	Reed	Willis
Hawkes	Revercomb	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business

as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INDEPENDENCE DAY FELICITATIONS FROM NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Polish Ambassador at Washington, addressed to the President of the Senate, enclosing a cable message from London from the National Council of the Polish Republic, conveying its felicitations on American Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent that the letter together with its enclosure may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter, together with the cable message, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L'AMBASSADEUR DE POLOGNE,
À Washington, July 3, 1943.

The Honorable the President of the United States Senate:

The Polish Ambassador has the honor to transmit the enclosed message from the National Council of the Republic of Poland to the United States Senate, received by cable from London on July 3, 1943, evening.

LONDON, *July 3, 1943.*

To the Senate of the United States:

On American Independence Day, the National Council of the Polish Republic sends to the Senate of the United States its most sincere wishes for the great American Nation.

The Polish Nation will never forget the proofs of deep friendship which it has received from the United States Congress.

In their present most difficult trials the Polish people unfailingly believe that the participation in this war of the great American Republic gives the fullest guaranty that the principles of freedom and democracy so profoundly respected by the American people, and upon which alone a durable world peace can be founded, will find their full application in the new post-war order both in the internal life of nations as in international relations.

It fills us with joy that our armed forces, which were the first to oppose agressive greed of the Axis Powers, are fighting today in the Allied ranks alongside the mighty and glorious American Army, and will continue to fight on all world fronts for the common victory.

Prof. STANISLAW GRABSKI,
Chairman of the Polish National Council in London.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS AGENCIES

Letters from various agencies submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice;
Office of Strategic Services;
Office of Economic Stabilization; and
Office of War Mobilization.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present Senate Joint Resolution No. 11 adopted by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois and request that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred. This resolution is a petition to the Congress of the United States "To refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American government as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights" until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been demobilized and have had an opportunity to express their views.

There being no objection, the joint resolution of the Legislature of Illinois was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 11

Whereas on March 10, 1943, there were presented to the Congress of the United States two plans devised by the National Resources Planning Board, which plans make proposals for fundamental changes in almost every phase of the American way of life; and

Whereas these plans have been transmitted to the Congress with the request that they be given consideration during the present session of the Congress; and

Whereas millions of American citizens, who would be vitally affected if these plans were to be adopted into legislation, are absent from their homes at this time as members of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or in associated services, and, during such absence, are unable effectively to express their views on this subject; and

Whereas it would be manifestly unfair to enact into law, during their absence, any plan designed to change that same system of government which our citizens in the armed forces are fighting to preserve; and

Whereas the task of winning all of the wars in which we are presently engaged is so gigantic that it requires the concentrated effort of every citizen; and

Whereas this is not the time for the people or the Congress to be distracted, by the injection of controversial proposals concerning theoretical social gains, from the single purposes of winning the war; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American government, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights, at least until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been brought home, demobilized, and given an opportunity to express their views; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of this preamble and resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives therein from the State of Illinois, and to the legislatures of all other States of the Union, that those of the same view may take similar action.

PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD an editorial from the Stars and Stripes entitled "Prohibition."

There being no objection, the editorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROHIBITION

They're at it again in America, and even as in the days of World War No. 1 we may yet hear that America is dry.

Most of us in the United States armed forces could not be classed as violently opposed to liquor control for most of us believe in moderation. On the other hand, there are few of us who could be included in the group of Americans who felt "the noble experiment" was a huge success.

It is with alarm therefore that we learn of the growing political strength of the anti-liquor crowd in the United States.

Taking advantage of wartime conditions and restrictions the new prohibition group is working night and day for legislation which will give America prohibition in fact if not in name. Using the tactics of the farm bloc, the antiliquor crowd is tacking on amendments to practically every military appropriations measure in a desperate effort to secure prohibition or the nearest thing to it they can force through Congress.

Rationing is playing into their hands and gives them a good excuse, and no opportunity is missed to use this excuse in their effort to limit the production and distribution of liquor of all types.

We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made quick fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2614. A bill to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 399); and

H. R. 2912. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; with an amendment (Rept. No. 400).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 964. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 401).

ADDITIONAL REPORT ON AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS—POULTRY MARKET (PT. 3 OF REPT. 12)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and

the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business, to submit an additional report from that committee relating to the poultry market. The committee held hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress. The hearings involved investigation of the black market and related questions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

Mr. STEWART. I also ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POULTRY MARKET

Recognizing in the complaints of members of the poultry industry the possibility that a black market might be developing which would have a disastrous effect not only upon the supply of food to consumers, but upon the national economy as a whole, the Senate Small Business Committee has conducted a series of hearings on the situation in the poultry market.

Industry testimony pointed to the fact that MPR 268, the Office of Price Administration regulation fixing the price of poultry, was inadequate if the normal flow of poultry from producer to user was to be continued. During the hearings it was brought out that price ceilings were placed on poultry without sufficient examination of the cost of production and with no attempt to follow the general business practices and definitions which had been part of the industry since its inception. Industry members reported that they could not do business under the ceiling and that the retail supply of poultry flowing to consumers through normal channels was at an unprecedented low.

As a result of these recent hearings, the committee makes a series of recommendations covering the following points:

1. The national farm ceiling price level should be adjusted to allow for production costs. This will probably represent an increase to 30 cents per pound from the present average of 28½ cents, making needed adjustments in all regional ceiling prices.

2. This ceiling price cannot be maintained without placing ceilings on the price of hatching eggs and baby chicks. Figures on the cost of production must also allow for current feed costs.

3. Ceilings should be placed at each level of operations and allow a reasonable profit for each function.

4. Allowance should be made to the truck haulers for shrinkage on the way to market.

5. Present price differentials for quick-frozen eviscerated poultry should be reviewed to adjust them to other price ceilings in the industry, and the present definition for such poultry reexamined.

6. The functions of those engaged in the industry should be fixed as of September 15, 1942. Due allowance must be made for changes in population in various areas of heavy in-migration brought about by expansion of war production.

7. A voluntary control of transportation by the industry should be put into effect immediately, in cooperation with the Office of Defense Transportation.

8. A plan for voluntary policing of the industry by its own members should be encouraged by the Office of Price Administration.

9. When the foregoing steps have been taken, the Office of Price Administration should proceed at once to a vigorous enforcement of the regulation to insure that the product flows through normal channels.

This committee has a dual interest in the wartime marketing of poultry. It wishes to see a form of price regulation which will maintain a high level of output and a steady flow of poultry to the armed forces and civilian consumers. It is more directly concerned, however, with the maintenance of our present distribution organization, largely composed of smaller businesses which are indispensable to an orderly marketing of these products. Faulty regulation which drives these products out of normal channels cannot fail to create black markets. The diversion of goods into abnormal channels has already severely reduced the volume of business done in normal channels.

While not advocating price increases to compensate dealers for volume decreases, it was recognized by the members of the committee that prices must be adjusted so that each business concerned with the job of keeping the consumer market supplied with poultry would be able to make a fair profit. Following a study of production costs throughout the Nation, it was deemed that a fair and equitable ceiling price at the farm level would be an average, for the present, of 30 cents per pound. This is to be adjusted upward in regions where necessary. Thus in some areas farm ceilings might be higher than average due to production costs in the region. This adjustment should be so arranged that the serious situation in the feed market would not be aggravated by overexpansion of poultry production. Production should be maintained at a level set by consuming needs and availability of feed.

The Office of Price Administration enforcement officers reported that large numbers of Washington retailers had been charged with selling poultry above the ceiling and that they had reported the poultry as having been bought at black-market prices. While enforcement is going forward steadily, if the man who stays in a legitimate market is forced to close down because he cannot sell at the ceiling price, some means of adjusting the situation must be devised so he can sell at the ceiling with profit and continue to receive his supplies. At the present time legitimate distributors cannot obtain poultry. It was fairly well established by the testimony that the 30-cent price at the farm level was a fair national average under present conditions and is justifiable at this time. No ceiling price can be established without taking into consideration three important cost factors—the price of baby chicks, the price of hatching eggs, and also the cost of feed, the first two of which are not protected by ceilings.

Using 30 cents as the base ceiling price at the farm level, the committee concludes that a proper adjustment in prices can be made by following business practices all along the line so that each function is provided with a reasonable profit. This would necessitate changing the regulation as it relates to the wholesaler and the jobber, and recognizing the established places of these two separate functions of distribution in pricing.

It is recommended that the hauler of live chickens be given a more liberal allowance for shrinkage. Poultry shrinks from 7 to 8 percent in hauls of 125 miles and over, and a definite amount allowable for shrinkage based on a fixed percentage should be set up by the Office of Price Administration.

The committee recommends that both portions of the regulation pertaining to eviscerated and quick frozen poultry shall be reviewed and rewritten so that the definition of eviscerated shall meet with the industry's own understanding of the word, and frozen poultry on the market will actually be frozen and not just packed in ice. The Office of Price Administration should take under careful consideration the processes which produce eviscerated poultry and quick-frozen poultry and when the prices have been adjusted, assure themselves beyond the shadow of a doubt that any price differentials are justified by the production costs of the processes involved. The Office of Price Administration is requested to make a definite attempt to prevent the excessive flow of poultry into the quick-frozen eviscerated market when the consumer demand is for fresh poultry.

The committee, recognizing that one of the difficulties in the present poultry market is the tendency for dealers to change their status in the industry when another status appears to be more profitable, recommends to the Office of Price Administration that an amendment be made to the regulation, to freeze the functions of those engaged in the business as they were on September 15, 1942. It should be set forth that special adjustments of the order are to be made in areas where the population has greatly increased because of the war.

In cooperation with the Office of Defense Transportation, the committee recommends that the plan of controlling transportation of poultry under consideration now by the Office of Defense Transportation shall be put into effect immediately. This plan will establish industry committees which will voluntarily aid in directing the flow of poultry to the market so that each area has transportation for enough poultry to take care of its needs. Properly supervised by the Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration this will prevent the grower in any area from having his poultry hauled beyond the marketing area established prior to September 15, 1942. This also requires the setting up of a means of special adjustment in certain marketing areas.

Representatives of the industry should be encouraged in every way in their proposed attempt to police their own industry in an endeavor to destroy the growing black market. The Office of Price Administration in its enforcement division should avail itself of the aid the industry can give in locating and reporting the violations of the regulation. The committee agrees with the statement of the industry that the average businessman has too great a stake in his business to enter the black market unless he is forced to in order to make a living. The number of violators will be automatically cut down when adjustments are made in the regulation based on the costs of production and operating.

To insure that the product flows through normal channels, the Office of Price Administration should proceed at once to a vigorous enforcement of the new regulation, following the readjustment of the present regulation in accordance with the suggestions indicated above. In the estimation of the committee, continued enforcement of the present regulation will only serve to aggravate the existing situation. To insure early compliance, therefore, the new regulation should be put into effect as soon as possible.

To assist in the drying up of the black market and to secure adequate supplies, the committee advocates that the armed forces requisition poultry found on the black market and pay the ceiling prices for it. The committee has heard frequent testimony in its recent hearings that the armed forces have been unable to get adequate quantities of fresh poultry to meet their current demands. Dealers on the black market who lost money by such requisitioning would be properly penalized without further enforcement in their cases.

Under the Price Act, sellers of merchandise may be licensed in order to conduct their businesses. An arrangement should be entered into whereby a man maintaining a legitimate business can go to the Office of Price Administration with a complaint against anyone offering him merchandise outside the

law, and receive satisfaction. The Office of Price Administration should reserve the right to investigate thoroughly any statements thus brought before it before making a decision against the reported offender.

The Senate Small Business Committee recommends that the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration instruct those members of his organization who are responsible for MPR 268, both in price and enforcement, to review the order and correct its present shortcomings. The committee urges that the changes proposed in the foregoing report should be studied by those responsible for MPR 268 with a view to correcting whatever may be necessary in the regulation so that sufficient poultry may be provided at the proper price to the consumer. It is the hope of the committee that the Price Administrator will meet with these members of his organization to insure that any revision of MPR 268 has his full approval.

The committee urges the Price Administrator to see to it that representatives of industry drawn from each level of operations and all size groups be included in a conference on the new regulation prior to its being promulgated, and that their recommendations carry full weight.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. MEAD):

S. 1317. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WALSH introduced Senate bill 1318, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1319. A bill to amend section 4 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1320. A bill to provide for the treatment of selective service registrants infected with venereal disease; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of Herman Platt; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2922. An act to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 2928. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

DRAFT AGREEMENT FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 170), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to investigate the draft agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration published by the State Department on June 11, 1943, and to report to the Senate whether in its judgment this draft agreement partakes of the nature of a treaty and should be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to accept a suggestion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to any subcommittee thereof?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assume the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations could send the resolution to a subcommittee ultimately, and I hope that might be done, so that the subject might be thoroughly explored, because I think this is the initial preview of methods by which post-war plans are to be made, and we may as well find out precisely what the pattern is to be.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Senate Resolution No. 171, submitted by Mr. BRIDGES, appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION OF PHOSPHATES, MUNITIONS OF WAR CONTAINING PHOSPHATES, AND PHOSPHATIC FERTILIZERS

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the production of phosphates, munitions of war containing prosphates, and phosphatic fertilizers. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem necessary and desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution shall be payable from funds heretofore made available for payment of the expenses of such committee.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY AT ABBOTSFORD, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Independence Day address delivered by him at Abbotsford, Wis., on July 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE AGAINST CHAOS—OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter addressed to the President of the United States by Harry E. Sharkey, published in the column headed "Fact and fancy" in the June 29, 1943, issue of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR POST-WAR POLICY—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Chippewa Herald-Telegram of Chippewa Falls, Wis., commenting on the speech delivered by Senator WILEY at Appleton, Wis., on the subject Our Post-War Policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAKING PROFITEERING OUT OF WAR—AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the program of the American Forum of the Air entitled "Taking Profiteering Out of War," conducted on June 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ORIGIN OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION—ARTICLE BY JUDSON KING

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Judson King entitled "What Is the True Origin of N. R. E. C. A.?" which appears in the Appendix.

WHAT HAPPENED FLAG DAY?—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Happened Flag Day?" published in the New York Journal-American, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POST-WAR OUTLOOK—ARTICLE BY LEWIS HANEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Lewis Haney on the subject of the post-war outlook, published in the Washington Times-Herald for July 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting section 5, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. There are two amendments of a similar nature to be made on the same page.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, line 2, after the word "or", it is proposed to strike out the word "purchase" and insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The second amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, lines 13 and 14, after the word "or", it is proposed to strike out the word "purchase" and

insert "pay losses resulting from the purchase of."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, line 17, after the word "purposes", it is proposed to insert the words "not fulfilled prior to July 1, 1943."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. The amendment is requested by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The language of the committee amendment is:

All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein.

The Commodity Credit Corporation points out that for several years it has been buying commodities in some cases for sale at a loss, and it is almost impossible to go back and count what those losses may be. The $175,000,000 provided to the Commodity Credit Corporation was intended for the period of 6 months, not for the year 1942 and for all of the year 1943. The Commodity Credit Corporation requests therefore that some date be fixed with respect to the use of the $175,000,000. The date provided by the amendment is July 1, 1943.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to ask the Senator to explain the purpose of the amendment. Does it mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation can pay its obligations which were incurred up to the 1st of July.

Mr. TAFT. They must come out of the $175,000,000, unless fulfilled before the 1st of July.

Mr. AIKEN. I have just obtained a copy of the amendment. I still do not understand its exact meaning. I have not had time to study its significance in connection with the original language.

Mr. TAFT. The language in the committee amendment now reads:

All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein.

As modified by my amendment the language will be:

All commitments heretofore made for such purposes not fulfilled prior to July 1, 1943, shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein.

So that if the commitments had been completed and paid for before July 1, they are not counted. There is not a large amount of such commitments in the year 1943. Certainly not over $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 had been spent and spent legally before we even considered the bill. There is an additional sum in the year 1943, but it seems clear that it is meant that the $175,000,000 shall cover the year 1943 after July 1.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator understand that any subsidies on meat or butter had actually been paid prior to July 1 of this year?

Mr. TAFT. This proposal has no relation to the subsidies on meat and butter. It relates only to the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies. The same provision is not made with respect to the R. F. C. In connection with the appropriation of $350,000,000, the R. F. C. must count everything it spent in the year 1943, even though it was prior to July 1.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the subsidies promised by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been authorized by the Congress, and are what some of us call legal subsidies. I have no objection to the amendment so long its purpose is what the Senator from Ohio says it is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, at the end of paragraph (d), it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That commitments in a total additional sum of $175,000,000 may be entered into prior to January 1, 1944, covering 1944 crops."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment was not requested by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, but yesterday Mr. Hutson came before the committee and was very much concerned about the 1944 program. I think I read to the Senate the list of six or seven subsidies which the Commodity Credit Corporation is paying, the largest of which are the subsidies on peanut oil, soybean oil, and cottonseed oil, which cost about $60,000,000 a year. Those subsidies are paid on the basis of the crop year.

It will take approximately $175,000,000 to pay this subsidy, practically all of which will be paid after July 1, on the 1943 crop. Mr. Hutson said that in many cases he must make commitments for the 1944 crop before October 1, 1943. He must let the trade know what he is going to do. He must let them know so that they may make their plans in accordance with his purpose.

Therefore, he requests that Congress now authorize him to proceed in 1944 with the same program he has carried out in 1943. The amendment involves no expansion of the program. Its effect would be similar to that of the contract authorizations for which provision is made in appropriation bills. In such bills we provide for the appropriation of certain sums of money and we authorize a contract to be made for a like sum in the following fiscal year.

That is the purpose of the amendment. It would not increase the scope of the program. It would permit the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation's program—not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's program—during the year 1944 as well as during the year 1943.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio understand that the commitments for this year's crops were made prior to October 1 of last year?

Mr. TAFT. I understand not. Mr. Hutson maintained that they should be made prior to October 1, if they are to have the proper effect in stimulating production and forwarding the plans which are to be made to carry out the programs.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation, if permitted to exercise its own judgment and its own opinion, would be, and I say it is, a very valuable agency of government. However, I am wondering how far ahead it is wise to permit a Government corporation to make such commitments. We are extending the life of the corporation for 6 months, but would be permitting it to make commitments which would run for a year after the life of the agency itself expires, according to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states an objection which I raised. I do not think, however, it is an absolutely conclusive objection against the request made.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe we should take action on the Commodity Credit Corporation as long before January 1 as we can. I believe, too, that most of the Corporation's commitments for this year were made after January 1, although I am not sure about that. I was simply wondering why we should have to commit ourselves so far in advance.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky will explain Mr. Hutson's argument to us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before the Senator from Kentucky proceeds?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio two questions before he takes his seat. I am sure the questions can be answered very briefly. Was there any evidence before the committee that the crops for which the subsidy is earmarked were being produced at a loss, at present prices?

Mr. TAFT. I am somewhat familiar with cottonseed and soybean prices. Those prices rose rather rapidly, and the authorities did all they could to check the rise. If they had permitted the rise to go higher, undoubtedly it would have forced an increase in the price of the products. It was felt that if the price of peanut oil and cottonseed oil, and so forth, were increased, the result would be to force an increase in the price of lard, which is a very important item; and the authorities felt that by holding down those prices they could save a much larger sum in the way of

an increase in the prices of all fats and oils. Whether that opinion was justified, I do not know; but I think it would have been necessary to take very drastic steps to hold down the prices of the various oils if the subsidy had not been provided.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Are these subsidies for the purpose of increasing production in crop categories in which, without the subsidy, at the price which the grower could obtain, it is doubtful whether a sufficient quantity would be available?

Mr. TAFT. I really do not know. I cannot give the Senator an answer to his question. I may say that all the bills on the subject Congress has passed, as well as the bill the President vetoed, contained unlimited authority to proceed with the oil subsidies, a program involving $60,000,000. Even under the bill the President vetoed, 1944 commitments on oil could have been made without any question. I think the others are of a somewhat similar character, but they were not expressly excepted in the bill the President vetoed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in regard to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, I think it should be explained that, of course, it is true that some of the contracts under programs with respect to crops for 1943 have been made since January 1. That was inevitable; the program had to be handled in that way, because until January 1 of this year it was impossible to be certain about what program would be desirable or advisable for the 1943 crops, although in two or three instances, I think, announcement was made prior to January 1 when the program was mapped out, prepared, and probably entered into.

However, Mr. Hutson, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, emphasized the fact that if he were to withhold making any program with respect to the continuance of the 1943 program into the 1944 crop year he would be handicapped; that it was not only desirable but necessary that he be in a position to make the announcements and the arrangements prior to January 1; and he stated that in order that everyone might understand what the program for 1944 crops would be, he would have to begin in September and October to make the arrangements, and even to begin to make them now, so that the producers as well as the processors and others would know what to depend upon for the 1944 crops.

We fixed the amount for authorization for contracts for the 1944 crops at the same figure we allowed in the bill for the 1943 crops. So the proposal is really one for a continuation of the program for the 1943 crops, with no expansion; and if we might assume that the program as it now stands would absorb the whole $175,000,000, and that the same program were to be continued for the 1944 crops, it would not even involve a subsidy on a different sort of crop, because it would simply be carrying the program over into the next year.

Mr. Hutson emphasized the fact that if he had to wait until the first of the year, or even wait until Congress returned from a recess, and tried to correct the situation and give him the authority, it would handicap the Commodity Credit Corporation in arranging its program far enough in advance to enable it, as well as the producers and others interested, to know what to depend upon.

Inasmuch as the proposal is for authority to use the amount of money we are expending this year for the same purpose, it seemed extremely desirable that Mr. Hutson know in advance what he could depend upon in that regard. With the limitations we have fixed, I think there is nothing which any Senator or anyone who is even apprehensive on the whole subject of subsidies need fear in connection with the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, is it the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky that the $175,000,000 requested by the Commodity Credit Corporation for 1944 would be applied only in cases of necessity for increased production, and would be used for incentive payments, and would not apply to or be usable for making commitments for rolling back prices?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator. I think that in the main the Senator's idea is correct. It might be possible in some particular instance that a roll-back would not be rolled back on the producer so as to reduce the price of his product. It might apply to the control of the increase in the cost of living, as well as to the incentive for production.

Mr. TAFT. I think in order to make it perfectly clear I should add to the amendment the words "to continue its 1943 programs." That is all I think we are asked to do. I ask leave to modify my amendment by adding, at the end thereof, following the words "covering 1944 crops," the words "to continue its 1943 programs." In other words, what the Commodity Credit Corporation has committed itself to do in 1943 it may continue in 1944. I think that will reassure the Senator because its programs are, in general, for the purpose of stimulating production.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator what his interpretation of that language would be. Would it mean that if the Commodity Credit Corporation wanted to inaugurate a program as to some crop in 1944 which was not in the program for 1943 because of its elimination for some reason, it would not be permitted to do so?

Mr. TAFT. It could come back to Congress. It is coming back in the fall anyway. The Corporation expires on the 1st of July. It will have to come to Congress by the 15th of September with a bill to continue the Corporation. I distinctly understood from Mr. Hutson that all he was interested in was being able to commit himself to a renewal of the 1943 program might be effected. That uncertain whether the programs were to be renewed in 1944 the success of the 1943 program might be effected. That was the thing he was insistent upon. I feel certain that no objection would be raised on his part to inserting those words, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am raising no objection. I merely wish to obtain the Senator's interpretation of the language.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the amendment been modified?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator to state that under subsection (d), on page 4, the purpose of the subsidy is only to increase production. What does the Senator interpret the words in line 15 on that page to mean? The language is:

> In order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof.

Would not that permit a roll-back if it were felt that the price was too high, just as roll-backs are being put into effect today?

Mr. TAFT. I think the language would permit a roll-back. Frankly, these subsidies are not principally for the purpose of increasing production. They are for the purpose of holding down the prices of commodities. There can be no question that the main program, the program dwelt upon by the President in his veto message, is a program to try to hold prices where they are. I do not think roll-backs are necessary. I think the roll-back programs are most unfortunate. I disagree with the policy which has put them into effect. I voted to abolish them in the other bill; but I think we must recognize that this program is not solely for the purpose of increasing production. It is also for the purpose of holding the general level of prices which now exists, in accordance with the Anti-Inflation Act of 1942. I do not think we can gain anything by avoiding that fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision would permit a roll-back in 1944 up to $175,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Not with the words which I have added, "to continue its 1943 programs," because none of the Commodity Credit Corporation's 1943 programs involves any roll-back. That is the reason I added the words "to continue its 1943 programs," so that the roll-back question would be entirely eliminated so far as 1944 was concerned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions in my time.

The subsidies on peanuts, cottonseed, soybeans, and other sources of oil were not granted for the purpose of rolling back prices. They were granted for the purpose of stopping a price rise.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly. I think that was the purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. Having made that statement, I wish to ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. Henderson fixed the prices of oils at an early date. At first he fixed prices below the existing market prices, which, of course, would have meant bankruptcy to all the processors and purchasers of cottonseed, peanuts, soybeans, and other vegetable-oil-bearing seeds. A great protest arose, and then he moved up the date on which the prices would be frozen, so that the prices approximated existing market prices for most of those products. I speak principally of cottonseed and peanuts.

The purpose of the subsidy is to enable the farmer, not to produce more, but to produce the same amount he was producing at that price. In addition he receives a little subsidy beyond the price which was frozen on that date. However, the O. P. A. did not undertake at any time to control prices by increasing production, which was the common-sense approach to the whole problem. The O. P. A. has always sought to fix prices; and when the prices struck a deathblow to further production, it said "we will pay subsidies." The problem was approached from that single point of view with respect to nearly all prices which have been fixed. There may be some minor exceptions.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely agree with the Senator. I think the policy has laid too much emphasis on inflation control.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know whether the country agrees with me; but I think there should be appointed a single food administrator, who would take every fact into consideration, and would have power over prices. Before increasing prices he should probably be required to sit in a council with others and obtain the general approval of a board. It seems to me that the present set-up has grossly overemphasized the question of inflation control and put it ahead of every other consideration, when it is only one of two or three very important considerations as to each commodity.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator.

What I wish to ask the Senator is, What would be the total amount of subsidies authorized by the joint resolution if this amendment should be approved? On the question of approving the amendment, I think it should be approved. Undoubtedly the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to be able to announce as early as possible to the peanut growers, the soybean growers, and the cotton growers what the next year's program will be, so that intelligent men may cut their cloth to fit the pattern. When we authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the same program for 1944 we are, of course, committing ourselves to the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to subsidies. There is no escape from that conclusion. If they are production subsidies, there is some good common sense in allowing them; but they are not strictly production subsidies. From the beginning the O. P. A. has attempted to do by an indirect method what the Congress aimed to have it do, that is, to stop price rises. It has not acted according to the congressional intent and purpose. It is hardly worth while to discuss the errors of the past. They are many, and they are now firmly imbedded in our economic and political structure. The subsidies affect, and are intended to affect, the economic and political structure. I wish to make that perfectly plain.

I believe, however, that the 1943 subsidies for the production of necessary fats and oils, of which there is or may be a serious shortage at any time, or possibly at all times, should be announced as early as possible. If the O. P. A. had announced the sound policy of putting emphasis on increased production, prices would have taken care of themselves. It could be done even now. We would have to pay some supporting prices in order to enable agricultural producers to exist. However, the O. P. A. will not announce such a policy because it has a different theory. I repeat that past errors have been imbedded in the economic, political, and social structure of America. The only sensible question is, Where are we to go from here, conceding that past errors are imbedded, and that we are not going to correct them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what takes place when a law enacted by Congress conflicts with the theory of those administering the law. The law gives way; does it not?

Mr. GEORGE. The law gives way; and so long as men such as Mr. Ginsburg write the Price Control Act and other acts, the law will always give way, because such laws are written for the purpose of giving way.

I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. With the $175,000,000 additional which, as I have said, should be inserted in the joint resolution, what would be the total amount authorized for subsidy payments or for purchases?

Mr. TAFT. It is difficult to estimate. Of course, subsidies are based on an annual figure. I do not believe that increases at all what might be called the annual figure. It leaves it just as it was. It would be somewhat difficult to interpret the $350,000,000 to the R. F. C. in terms of an annual program. Yesterday I estimated that it should not be doubled in order to determine what the annual R. F. C. authorization would have to be to carry on the program, but perhaps it might be raised to $500,000,000. I believe that yesterday I estimated that the joint resolution would authorize a program costing possibly $700,000,000 annually, including everything. I do not believe that the figure $350,000,000 for the R. F. C. would mean a cost of $700,000,000 for the year. The R. F. C. must also make annual commitments, and it cannot make annual commitments except within the limit of $350,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to propound another question to the Senator from Ohio. Section 2 of the joint resolution would increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $2,650,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, would it not?

Mr. TAFT. As the joint resolution came from the House, $350,000,000 is the total increase in borrowing power. That has no direct relation to the subsidy question. The Senate approved an allowance of a billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation in the first bill which it passed. The Commodity Credit Corporation must have cash in order to buy. A subsidy program which might cost $25,000,000 might easily require the expenditure of $200,000,000 in order to buy the goods necessary to be bought to be sold at a loss. So the total authorization has no relation to the subsidy program.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand, the Senator estimates that the subsidy program, or the purchasing and selling program would cost approximately $700,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. That is my best judgment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot yield, because I do not have the floor. My time has expired. I shall be glad to attempt to answer a question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question of any Senator who can supply the answer. Perhaps the majority leader can do so. I should like to know if the entire $700,000,000 could be used, if necessary, for a roll-back without using any of it for a subsidy for production.

Mr. TAFT. The $175,000,000 is committed to existing programs, which are not roll-backs. So far as the R. F. C. program is concerned, it is used for roll-backs. When I use the figure $750,000,000, I do not mean that we are committed to that amount.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. TAFT. I say that if the R. F. C. should put into effect certain programs, which it could do under the authority of the joint resolution, if we should choose to continue them for the year, I estimate that it might cost $500,000,000 altogether, including the $350,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that the last amendment which he offered does not provide money for roll-backs?

Mr. TAFT. No; the last amendment does not, because it would only authorize the Commodit. Credit Corporation to continue its 1943 programs. Since none of the Commodity Credit Corporation's 1943 programs are for roll-backs, this amendment would not in any way authorize roll-backs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, as modified, to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the pending amendment merely a perfecting amendment or is it an amendment to the committee amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a perfecting amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to speak on this question before it is voted upon. I should like to point out what has been the effect of the roll-back subsidy program so far.

This administration roll-back and subsidy program has already had an adverse effect upon American agriculture. Its proponents claimed there would be no reduction in price to the farmers. That claim has already been refuted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That Bureau publishes prices for farm products on the 15th of each month. On April 15, before the roll-back announcement was made, the price of butterfat was 51.3 cents a pound. On May 15, after the roll-back program had been announced, the price had dropped to 50.6 cents a pound, or a reduction of 1.4 percent.

On June 15, after the roll-back had been put into effect, the price of butterfat had dropped to 49.2 cents a pound, or a reduction of 4.1 percent.

This decline in price cannot be attributed to a seasonal condition, since the Government's floor price of 46 cents for 92-score butter at Chicago was supposedly in effect. What has occurred is that the reduction in price was rolled back on the farmer in spite of administration claims to the contrary.

The average reduction of 4.1 percent in the price of butterfat to the producer does not mean that the price of all farmers is being reduced this amount. It means that a part of them, probably 59 or 60 percent, are getting a subsidy from their processors, while the remainder, about forty-odd percent, are not.

Translated into terms of individual farmers, the number who are not receiving a subsidy will probably exceed 50 percent of the whole, and those who are not receiving it are the smaller farmers upon whom we are told we must depend largely for an increase in our national production.

The effect upon the meat producers is not quite so clear, because the roll-back was announced while there was a fairly rapidly falling market. For instance, on April 1 choice steers were quoted in the Chicago market at 17.38. That price fell week by week until on May 7, the last week before the roll-back was announced, it had fallen to 16.75. When the roll-back program was announced, cattle stock stopped coming into the market in the same quantity they had previously been coming, but the price remained stationary at 16.75 a hundred until the roll-back was put into effect, when the price started going down again in spite of the fact that not much more than half the normal amount of beef cattle was coming into the market.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to add to what the Senator from Vermont has said that the normal effect of a reduced volume of prime steers received on the primary markets would have been to increase the price, and the number of cattle shipped to the market sharply fell off because of the uncertainty as to the price situation. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. It is quite apparent that if the O. P. A. had left the market alone the price would have fallen at least the amount which they ordered it reduced, and presumably more. The market was upset so cattle stopped coming into the market. I think the last week or the week before—I forget which—Mr. Elkington testified before the committee and told us that about 90,000 head of cattle came into the market compared with a normal supply of 150,000. In other words, the shippers were so upset that they did not know whether to ship or not, and so they held their cattle back, and, therefore, there was a very short supply in the market.

Mr. REED. The natural effect of which was to raise the market price, whereas a normal receipt of cattle would have lowered the price probably as much as the O. P. A. was trying to secure.

Mr. AIKEN. With respect to cows on April 2 the price was 14.38 good, all weight. That had fallen to 13.63 on May 7, when the roll-back program was announced. It stayed practically stationary until the roll-back was put into effect, and then the price started down again, as I say, in spite of the short supply coming into the market.

Hogs dropped from $16.10 a hundred down to $14 on June 18, according to the figures which I have. The price now is just about the same. That is about a 13-percent reduction in the price to the farmers since April 1.

Sheep have also gone down. So it is very difficult to tell to what extent the reduced price is due to the O. P. A. roll-backs and to what extent it is due to the seasonal or natural drop in price which had taken place and which was interrupted by O. P. A. regulation.

Mr. President, it seems to me incredible that the executive department either cannot see what it is doing to the low-income farmers of the United States or has completely reversed its professed sympathetic attitude for the poorer people.

According to Department of Labor Bulletin No. 723, of last October, which is the latest I have, only 7 percent of all the farmers of the United States have net money income of $3,000 a year or over. Seven percent more have between $2,000 and $3,000; 8 percent have between $1,500 and $2,000; 10 percent have between $1,000 and $1,500; 16 percent have between $500 and $1,000; 34 percent have between nothing and $500 a year to live on, while 18 percent of all the farm families in this great rich country of ours receive less than no net money income at all with which to support their families after paying the cash expenses of the farm. In other words, according to the labor statistics which were published last October, 68 percent of all farm families had a net money income of less than $1,000 a year. These are people who are being affected by this roll-back in prices; these are the people who are being penalized by the action of the O. P. A. in rolling back prices to the consumer, and so on down the line. It is finally being rolled back upon those least able to stand it.

On the other hand, 64 percent of all the nonfarm families had a net income of $1,500 a year or over. These are the people who would benefit most from the roll-back program. The city family with a net income of $500 or $1,000 or less than $1,500 a year is not buying much tenderloin, which is reduced most in price, and is not buying much butter in these days.

Let us see who pays the cost of this fantastic roll-back and subsidy program. The net income of the United States for this year is estimated at $140,000,000,000. It is further estimated that the taxes paid by individuals will amount to $16,000,000,000, leaving $124,000,000,000. It is further estimated that the ordinary consumer expenses will be about $82,000,000,000. This still leaves $42,000,000,000 of income in the hands of the people. Insurance payments, debt payments and investments in Government bonds are expected to account for $25,000,000,000 more, leaving $17,000,000,000 of excess spending money in the hands of those who have earned it. This $17,000,000,000 is considered by Government officials an inflationary threat against which provision must be made.

The utter fallacy of the administration's roll-back program is shown most clearly by the fact that the excess purchasing power is supposed to be in the hands of those who would derive most of the benefit from the roll-back program. These are the people who, we are told, must pay the increased taxes of the Nation. So what the executive department is proposing to do is to cut the cost of living for these people, these higher-income consumers, and then send them a bill for it.

The net result of this weird program, if it is permitted to go on, will be this: The status of the low-income consumers will be virtually unchanged; half the farmers of the United States will have a sharp reduction in the price they receive for meat and butterfat and other products if the scheme is extended. There will be a decrease in the production of food in the United States. It will be more than a seasonal decrease from now on. There will be an increased threat of inflation due to the fact that the subsidy program will still further increase the spending power of those who already have an excess of

$17,000,000,000, according to Government experts. To counteract this threat, more taxes must be levied upon them. There will be a strong threat toward the creation of monopolies, because in order to qualify for subsidy payments a greater percentage of farmers will be forced to market through the great packing houses.

The subsidies are not given to anyone who processes less than 4,000 pounds of meat or a thousand pounds of butter a month. That cuts out the direct farm-to-market sales: It penalizes the sales from the farm to the local store or to the neighbors.

No representative of any great meat-packing company has asked to appear before the food committee to protest this roll-back subsidy program, because it is playing directly into their hands and will result in virtual elimination of their independent competition.

As Members of Congress, I think it is our plain duty to oppose the establishment of either economic or political monopolies in the United States.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio appears to me to write the subsidy system into the basic law of our land. I do not think we want to do that. The administration went ahead with this roll-back and subsidy program contrary to the wishes of Congress, and it seems to me that rather than approve this violation of the desire of Congress, it is much better to defeat the amendment and to leave the situation as it is now, with Congress on record against such a weird and unworkable program, and leave the executive branch in a position of violating it if it sees fit to continue to do so. Certainly I do not intend to vote to legalize the action which has been taken, and I do not think it should become part of our law.

Mr. President, rather than take any great time now, let me say that I have here a very excellent editorial entitled "The Role of Subsidies," which appeared in the New York Times yesterday. It is worth reading, but I know how much everyone desires to get home, and how every minute counts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Vermont on the amendment has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall take my time on the bill. I ask to have printed in the RECORD along with my remarks the editorial from the New York Times to which I have just referred.

I also have a statement which has been issued by the so-called Big Four farm organizations, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIES

The President's veto message on Friday raised two grave problems: First, what policy Congress and the administration should now adopt with regard to subsidies; and second, what the relationship of the President and Congress will be in dealing with the whole domestic economic problem.

Neither in its arguments nor in its tone was the President's veto message reassuring. Whatever the defects may have been in the bill the President vetoed (and it was altogether proper that he should have drawn attention to these and asked for their correction), it is clear that Congress has been more nearly right on the whole subsidy issue than the President. In the present crisis, it is true, Congress should not attempt to forbid subsidies altogether. Even if there were no such thing as a good subsidy, there would still be such a thing as a subsidy that is the lesser of two evils in a specific situation. Whether a subsidy is more desirable than its alternative is a question that can be answered only for a specific commodity under specific circumstances.

It would not be difficult to show that the specific subsidies that have been most in dispute—the roll-back subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee, and even some subsidies that Congress has quietly accepted, such as that on petroleum—have been either wrong in principle, inconsistent with other policies of the Government, or calculated to do more harm than good in the method of their administration. It was for these reasons among others that Chester C. Davis felt obliged to resign as Food Administrator. His letter to the President did not contain any blanket condemnation of subsidies, but pointed out that the "broad general subsidies" announced by the President would be ineffective "in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply."

Certain general principles should be clear. Subsidies cannot be considered a primary weapon against inflation. They do not in the least deal with its basic causes. The best they can do is temporarily to mitigate certain of its symptoms—always at the risk, which must never be lost to sight, of building up far worse evils in the future. They are at best, therefore, a secondary and minor weapon in the battle against inflation. They play something like the role of dynamite in building a road; and, like dynamite, should be handled only by experts. In no case should they be used as a substitute for genuinely basic measures, but only as a supplement to them. The harm of using subsidies too cautiously would be minute compared with the harm of using them too recklessly.

Yet the President talked in his veto message not only as if he considered subsidies a major weapon in the battle against inflation but almost as if it were the most important single weapon against it. Of Congress' action against subsidies, he declared: "This is an inflation bill, a high cost of living bill, a food shortage bill. * * * It will have a devastating effect upon our economy and our war effort. * * * This measure will make it virtually impossible to institute any additional measures to reduce the cost of living or even to hold the line."

One reason that Congress has been profoundly suspicious of the whole subsidy program is that it has no confidence that the administration will administer it with care and skill and within strictly defined limits. The President's veto message is hardly reassuring in this regard. It is true that the President declared at one point that subsidies "should be applied only in strictly limited and clearly defined circumstances." But he went on to say that Congress must leave with the executive branch "the means of seeing to it that further increases in producers' prices do not increase the cost of living." When one considers that the roll-back of meat and butter prices, according to the calculation of the Office of Price Administration itself, will reduce the cost of living only 1 percent, though this subsidy alone will cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year, one can only imagine the dimensions of a subsidy designed to prevent any further increases in living costs—especially with the administration policy of continuing to boost industrial wages, which have already raced far ahead of increases in living costs.

It was gratifying to find the President suggesting, at the end of his message, that "in this task of saving our free economy, Congress and the Executive must work together as a team." But, with the exception of one or two such lines, the implication of the whole message was that the chief duty of the congressional member of the team was to nod approval, and that if Congress failed to approve the President's subsidy program in its entirety he would place upon it the full blame for any failure in the whole anti-inflation program. Surely a more conciliatory spirit and a more extensive use of consultation and compromise are essential to the conception of working together as a team.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 4.—In a Fourth of July declaration, the four major farm organizations of America restated their unalterable opposition to the administration's subsidy-roll-back program. While asking for continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they suggested that the limit of 6 months be shortened until a reasonable time after the return of the Congress.

They also asked for further limitation on the amount of money which could be used by the administration in forwarding its subsidy program during the recess period.

The organizations opposed the Taft amendment to the House extension resolution on the grounds that it authorized some subsidy programs which to date have not had the sanction of Congress and which they believe to be opposed by a great majority of the American people.

This action by the farm organizations followed a behind-closed-doors meeting of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee late Saturday afternoon which was attended by Messrs. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization; Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator; and Jack B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The statement follows:

"The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, oppose addition of the Taft amendment to the House resolution temporarily extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This amendment savors of congressional approval of the principle of subsidies both to consumers and producers by way of putting a congressional blessing upon administrative acts which may or may not have been legal. Such action, in view of the known majority opposition of both Senate and House to subsidies for roll-backs of retail prices of foods or subsidies in lieu of necessary price adjustments to producers to secure and maintain adequate food production, would be a farcical surrender of a fundamental principle.

"We believe such action would be most distasteful not only to the vast body of hard-working tillers of the soil who are fighting a war on the food front to save American institutions which would be sadly impaired by the imposition of unneeded and unwanted subsidies but also to the majority of American people.

"We ask the Senate to kill the Taft amendment and any other amendment which would permit unrestrained use of subsidies during the congressional recess. We also point out that the 6-month extension of the life of the

Commodity Credit Corporation is unnecessarily long if Congress is of a mind to prevent during its recess the fastening of subsidies upon the American public so thoroughly that the people receiving subsidies may, by the time Congress returns, be afraid to change the situation. For that reason we also hope that the Senate in considering the House resolution will safeguard the expenditure of funds and the use of Government credit to prevent subsidies from becoming an integral part of our economy.

"The sterile formula of subsidies means so many more billion dollars added to our already inflated economy. It means the passing on of our current food bill to be paid by our boys returning home after the war and b future generations. It means the eventual break-down of our entire economic system with its inevitable train of social unrest, chaos, and evolution into dictatorship.

"This should be clearly understood by all:

"1. The subsidy program is the shortest and surest route to credit inflation. Credit inflation is the most dangerous type of inflation. Credit inflation destroys the total value of money.

"2. Subsidy programs in lieu of fair prices are not suited to American needs. They irritate and distress producers. They reduce production.

"3. Subsidy programs help the consumer very little.

"4. Subsidies are a vicious attempt to vassalize great masses of the people making them dependent economically and politically upon 'the centralizing power of government.'

"5. Subsidies have neither prevented inflation nor black markets in England, whose moves are prompted by an economy in reverse of our own.

"6. An argument of sophistry has been advanced to the effect that those opposing subsidies had offered no substitute plan to combat inflation. Well-considered programs have already been offered, and we call attention to the fact that the administration presented its own anti-inflation plan to Congress. That plan became law in January 1942. In September the administration asked for further power, which was granted in the act of October.

In this and other acts Congress has given the administration full authority to stabilize wages and prices. It now remains with Congress to absorb the excess purchasing power of the Nation by immediate and drastic additional taxation.

"The roll-back subsidy program is a desperate effort on the part of the administration to appease the unwarranted demands of labor leaders and to cover up its own failures to use effectively the very broad powers it already possesses to control inflation. It has failed to prevent the worst wage inflation in the history of the Nation. Today we are reaping the consequences in increased production costs, which necessarily require some adjustments in price ceilings.

"Now the administration is embarking upon a colossal debt inflation and thereby avoiding paying fair prices for food in the market place and avoiding the collection of sufficient taxes to drain off the ever-growing volume of excess purchasing power.

"Of all forms of inflation, debt inflation is the most dangerous and disastrous.

"We are now at the crossroads of national policy. There can be no compromise on the question of subsidies in lieu of fair prices in the market place."

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.
ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, The National Grange.
EZRA T. BENSON,
Executive Secretary, The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is not with any thought that my remarks will influence the action or votes of any of my colleagues on the pending measure that I rise, but I feel so deeply about the principles involved in this proposal that I wish to make my position clear for the record.

Obviously, on the surface this is just another day in the United States Senate, but if the pending amendment to this joint resolution shall be passed, we, by so doing shall this day give our sanction, as representatives of the American people, to the doctrine, the principles, and philosophy in the proposal, some will look back on this occasion in the future with great misgivings.

I do not like to find myself in disagreement with the majority of my committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and most unhappy am I to find myself at any time in disagreement with the Chief Executive of this Nation, especially so in times of great peril, when the Nation and the people should be united and concentrating all their energies and strength on the great objective, to win the military victory, and while doing so, to preserve our democracy and our liberties here at home.

I believe men in public life and holding positions of trust who are worthy should, when the challenge comes, be ready, able, and willing to meet it with conviction and courage and do their duty to their country, regardless of whom we may find ourselves in disagreement with. It is for that reason that I wish to make these remarks, and in order that there may be no doubt now or henceforth as to my position on this serious issue.

At the outset, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to disclose that I should like to vote for the House joint resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency which renders worthy service, and which should be continued. When Senate bill 1108 was introduced in the Senate originally to extend the life of this Corporation, and when it was before the Banking and Currency Committee, there was no reference in the bill to subsidies and roll-backs. It was merely a bill to extend the life of this valuable governmental agency. While the bill was pending, this program of roll-back prices and subsidies to support it was announced.

Then in the committee there was placed in the bill an amendment providing that any moneys used for that kind of program should be appropriated by the Congress. I shall not review the entire history of the bill, but because that program had been announced, and, as many of us thought, without legal authority, without law to support it, the Congress undertook in the bill to prohibit the program. After many amendments had been offered, and after running its course, the bill was finally passed by a large majority in both Houses of Congress. It then went to the President, carrying with it the prohibition of a roll-back and subsidy payments to support it. The President, in the exercise of his prerogative, and his duty under his conviction, vetoed the measure. In his message he took the position that he could not share the responsibility which Congress would assume if it passed the bill over his veto.

Mr. President, with equal sincerity and humbleness on my part, I do not wish to share the responsibility of the inauguration or support of this character of program. I shall not place myself in such a position that, when our boys come marching home from the field of honor, where many of their comrades have made the supreme sacrifice to preserve our country, I shall have to look them in the face and blush in shame and admit that while they were fighting, and many dying, I was unwilling to make some sacrifice, to suffer some discomfort as a contribution to the winning of the war; that I voted to charge any part of my grocery bill to them, their children, and future generations.

Here we are today with the greatest national income we have ever had, with a standard of wages higher than ever before in the history of the country, and because the machinery of government we have set up for this emergency, to try to hold the line here at home, has failed, the administration is now asking for subsidies to roll-back prices and to hold down prices. This is acknowledgment of failure on the part of the administration. In spite of the law given to the administrative branch of the Government when the Price Control Act was passed absolutely delegating authority to stabilize prices and wages. They now come back to the Congress and say, "We have failed. With all the authority, we could not do it, and now, in order to cover up our failures, let us roll them all into one, into one great big bundle, a bigger mistake, and call them subsidies." It is then proposed that we pay those subsidies, not from our earnings, not from the greatest income America has ever had, but that we shall charge the bill to our children, and to future generations, and let them pay the bill. This is the remedy offered, to pile up more billions of national debt in the days of our greatest purchasing power and prosperity.

I may not have the whole answer, but I know this remedy is wrong. I know that it cannot be defended a year from now. It cannot be defended tomorrow. It cannot be defended in the presence of the boys when they come home from the fields of battle with their scars and wounds. When they come home they are going to ask you and me, for we are the ones who are responsible, "While we were sacrificing, while we were giving our all, what did you do on the home front? What did you do in the Congress? Are you one of those who failed us and charged to our children a part of your food bill while we were fighting to save the very life and existence of our Nation?"

Mr. President, I shall not be a party to doing anything like that. I cannot vote for the joint resolution, because it will simply result in placing a heavier and unnecessary burden on future generations.

Mr. President, we are told that the roll-back will stop at the processor. It will not stop there. Senators have seen the O. P. A. machinery work, have they not?

How well has it functioned to date? We can begin by saying that it has made fundamental mistakes, and on top of the fundamental mistakes it has made other grave mistakes. It will fail again. The effort to stop the roll-back before it strikes the farmer will be both feeble and futile, if we are to judge its future efficiency by its performance in the past.

It is now proposed to make sure it is given the authority and sanction of law by passing the pending joint resolution, so it may put into force a roll-back which it is going to manage and which it is going to undertake to control. Mr. President, I say that in my humble judgment there is not enough business wisdom in the O. P. A. today. In spite of the high respect and esteem I have for its chief—there is not enough business wisdom in it today to administer what it is proposed that Congress shall authorize it to do, and to be able to keep the roll-back from going against the farmer. That is where it is going to land. I do not want to have any part of the responsibility for such program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Arkansas say that we were authorizing the O. P. A. to put the roll-back into effect? Does not the Senator understand that the O. P. A. has already put the roll-back into effect; that it has an opinion from the Attorney General saying that the laws Congress has passed authorized the O. P. A. to put the roll-back into effect? So how can the Senator say that we are authorizing a roll-back today?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which is now the committee amendment, specifically authorizes the payment of subsidies to control prices. If the O. P. A. already has the authority, as the Senator contends—and the Senator knows it is doubtful, and so do I, though the O. P. A. has taken that position—then why authorize the O. P. A. again to put into effect the roll-back?

Mr. TAFT. The reason for the committee amendment is to limit the O. P. A.'s power to put roll-backs into effect. That is the only reason I am sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The same thing could be done by a simple appropriation for the purpose, without again expressly by law giving authority to pay roll-back subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I think the Senator is mistaken. It cannot be done by a simple appropriation. It cannot be done by a simple law. We tried to prohibit the roll-back by passing a measure, but it is null and void today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator admits that the O. P. A. is putting the program into effect today?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the Senator said that we were proposing by the passage of the joint resolution to authorize the roll-back program which is now in effect. I question the Senator's statement that we are in any sense authorizing today the putting into effect of a roll-back, when it is already in effect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My interpretation of the Senator's amendment, which is now the committee amendment, is that it would authorize the putting into effect of a roll-back; that it places the sanction of the Congress on what is now being done.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I must insist that the Congress to this day never has authorized any subsidy program for roll-backs. We have authorized subsidies for increasing production, but we have never authorized any subsidy program for roll-backs. Not only that, but we have gone on record time and again as opposing it, and that is where we stand today. I think we had better stand right there, instead of authorizing subsidies of this nature and writing them into the law of the land.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. That is exactly my position.

Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the question further. I simply wish to make the record, and I expect to stand by it and to face the fighting men of America when they return home, and my constituents, on that record. I expect to stand on that record when they come back and ask me for an accounting of my stewardship while they fought and risked their lives for us.

Mr. President, there appeared this morning in the Washington Post an article by Merlo Pusey, which I have read. I do not say I subscribe to every view expressed in it. The title of the article is "On One Front We Only Retreat." On the battlefields our boys are not retreating. On the battlefields of our domestic economy the Congress of the United States, in my humble judgment, if it passes the proposed legislation, will start a backward march. It is proposed that we appropriate more than one-half billion dollars for a 6 months' period to feed ourselves in time of the greatest prosperity. That is only the beginning. When the original bill was on the floor of the Senate I said that in my humble judgment we were beginning a $25,000,000,000 mistake if this program was pursued. I make no retraction of that statement. I am sincere about it. For example, we are starting in now. This is the incipiency of it. Look back into the history of the Nation during the past 10 years. How many programs have we begun? How many have we been able to abolish? This thing cannot be ended if we yield now. Let us hold the line on our economic front. I am unwilling to join the retreat.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the article by Merlo Pusey to which I referred, published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARTIME WASHINGTON—ON ONE FRONT WE ONLY RETREAT

(By Merlo Pusey)

"We must be prepared in total war," said President Roosevelt in his message vetoing the bill restricting consumer subsidies, "to accept a substantial cut in our accustomed standards of living." That cliche has been repeated so many times that every American must be familiar with it. But no one seems to take it seriously, least of all the administration itself. On the contrary, the Government is pouring out billions upon billions of dollars to swell corporation profits and increase the purchasing power of the masses in wartime.

After the last war the Nation vowed solemnly that next time no American would be permitted to get rich at home while their fellows were fighting in the mud of Europe. But in the heat of the present battle that good resolution has all but melted away. To be sure, Congress passed an excess-profits tax and feeble efforts have been made to stabilize wages and prices. But the unvarnished truth is that the Government is pouring money into the pockets of certain favored groups more lavishly than it has ever done before.

One of the clearest pictures of what is happening comes from a speech by Representative ENGEL to the House last week. On his recent tour of war plants he found many instances of farmer boys, gasoline-station attendants and drug store clerks earning from $60 to $110 a week in war plants. An assistant foreman in a Government arsenal at $4,000 a year had been lured away by an offer of $11,500 a year. An 18-year-old girl who formerly sold ribbon in a dime store was making $65 a week—more than the base pay of a major in the Army. Machine-gun assemblers are paid as much as $3,740 a year, which is more than the base pay of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, who commands the entire supply system of the Army. Girls learning to mend shoes get $55.80 a week in pay and per diem from the Government, while young men are drafted into the Army at $50 a month, plus food, clothing, and shelter.

Compared with what they were earning before, millions of Americans are getting rich out of the war. At present there is a strong temptation to close our eyes to this fact and rejoice that Mary Smith and Jim Jones have been able to get such good jobs. But we must not forget that the Government is borrowing most of the money required to pay Mary Smith and Jim Jones sixty or a hundred dollars a week. Their high wages are reflected in the cost of tanks, guns, and airplanes that we must have to fight the war. And every cent that is borrowed for this purpose will have to be repaid from taxes. Remember, too, that some of these taxes will have to be paid by the girls who remain in dime stores at $16 a week and by the soldiers who return home to lower-paid jobs when the war is over.

Excess profits paid to corporations with war contracts must also come from the taxpayer's pocket. In a study of 48 corporations doing war work, Mr. ENGEL discovered that 16 were earning from 10 to 20 percent (after taxes) on the market value of their stock; 11 were earning from 20 to 54 percent. War profits are being substantially reduced by renegotiation of contracts and by excess-profits taxes, but apparently the Government has not gone far enough in either direction.

The reckless outpouring of billions in excess wages could be more readily justified if the Government were taking a large part of it back again in taxes. But the final reck-

oning at the end of the fiscal year shows that taxes cover less than one-third of our total spending. In the current year the Administration plans to spend nearly five times as much as it collected in the year just passed. Yet the Treasury has presented no specific plan for new taxes and Congress has originated none of its own.

Instead of going all out for new taxes to slow down the cyclone of inflation, the President is demanding new subsidies that will further increase the purchasing power of war workers and other consumers. In his veto message he attempted to justify these subsidies by saying that the cost of living has gone up about 6 percent since last September. He refused to face the fact that average hourly earnings have also gone up by about 6 percent in the same period, and that average weekly earnings have advanced 12 percent. In other words, take-home wages are expanding twice as fast as the cost of living. Yet the President contends that it is necessary to borrow more money to pay food subsidies in order to keep wages from going up still more.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of this ruinous policy is the fact that it deludes millions of workers into thinking that a new formula for prosperity has been discovered. They see only the exorbitant wages going into their pockets while their Government prates of wartime sacrifices. They do not now realize that these wages can be paid only by mortgaging the future—that they leave us with the choice of back-breaking taxation for many years to come or an explosion that will blow our economic system to pieces.

Instead of using all its powers to correct this illusion, the Government is postponing new taxes and coddling us with consumer subsidies. Instead of requiring sacrifices at home while our men in uniform are fighting and dying abroad, it is imperiling the future by permitting, if not encouraging, a wild dash for the more abundant life on borrowed money. On this front we face grave danger of a ruinous defeat, and precious little is being done about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 authorized subsidies only to increase the production of agricultural commodities. While it is true that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has quoted the Attorney General of the United States as giving it as his opinion that according to the provisions of the Price Control Act of 1942, subsection (e) of section 5, it is legal to pay a roll-back, yet I am quite sure that in the mind of the senior Senator from Ohio he absolutely disagrees. Certainly the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has given us a clear, clean-cut statement relative to his interpretation of the Price Control Act provisions relative to the payment of subsidies. The only interpretation that can be made of subsidy payments, if subsidies are to be paid, is that they are to be made to increase agricultural production, and not to be used as a roll-back, paid as a bonus to the consumer.

Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the senior Senator from Ohio, and I certainly think he has done a tremendous amount of work in his attempt to straighten out the predicament in which we find ourselves. But if we agree to his amendment, according to his own statement, not only will the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation be permitted to use the $500,000,000, but I believe that even in the light of the last amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation can use the whole $700,000,000 for a roll-back and not pay one dime of it as a subsidy to increase agricultural production. That is what has absolutely decided me to vote against the Taft amendment.

I do not want to sanction the payment of subsidies under the theory of doing it to increase agricultural production and pay the taxpayer's money as a roll-back to the consumers.

I am just as interested in the consumer as is the senior Senator from Ohio, but this is illegal and unfair. There is something else I should like to call to the Senate's attention, that subsection (e) of section 5 permits the President to transfer any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (c) thereof for use under paragraph (d), or any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (d) for use under paragraph (c). That means that Mr. Hutson, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be the one who will administer the act and use the money for the purpose of roll-back payments. I have talked to Mr. Hutson. I heard his testimony. I know how he feels about roll-backs, and I know how he feels about the production of food, especially cattle and hogs. Congress is primarily interested in meat, butter, and tobacco when it considers this program; at least, that is what Congress considered when this subject was first considered on June 15. Mr. Hutson says there are too many cattle in the country. Mr. Hutson gave the figures; he stated that there are 78,000,000 cattle in the country today. He said we have 38,000,000 beef cattle; that we have more cattle than we can feed, and, therefore, the only remedy is to narrow the feeding margin so as to force the cattle off the plains, onto the market, and not feed them corn. That was the only solution he offered to the group of Corn-Belt Senators who went to interrogate him, and who were endeavoring to bring about some relief to the men who are feeding cattle, so that we could be sure that replacement cattle would go into the feed lots. That was the only answer Mr. Hutson gave. In face of the fact that a week ago the military authorities lacked 30 percent of the meat they need to meet their requirements, that was his answer. Where will we get the beef cattle to meet civilian needs as well as military needs?

Mr. Hutson's answer is that we have a surplus. If we have a surplus, I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] yesterday suggested the solution. If we have a surplus, let us get the surplus on the market. Let us increase the quotas. Let us cut out the rationing. Let us slaughter the cattle and get the meat where it belongs. That will do more good in the way of reducing the retail price than would be done by all the legislation that is proposed to be written into this measure.

I have received a telegram which I shall read into the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It comes from N. B. Updike, at Omaha, Nebr.:

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 29, 1943.*

HON. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

People out here cannot understand why meat is rationed at all. According to everybody's belief and all dispatches from Washington show there is plenty of hogs and cattle on hand and there no doubt will be more as many people have done what the administration asked them to do, increase their herds, and are still at it. For what reason are packers held down by quotas as to the amount they can kill?

N. B. UPDIKE.

The farmers were told to increase production. As the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] said 2 or 3 days ago when he spoke so ably on the floor of the Senate, the farmers produced 125,000,000 head of hogs, and yet Mr. Hutson says we have 25,000,000 too many, and that therefore they must be brought into the market unfinished. Today a premium is being placed on hogs of less than 200 pounds weight. That is one way to bring them in; but the spread on butchered hogs is being made nearly $1 a hundred, which means this administration is not keeping faith with the farmers whom they asked to produce more hogs.

If we have a surplus of hogs, let us discontinue the rationing, let us remove the quotas, let the cattle and hogs be killed and placed on the market. When that is done production and processing will be increased. That will be a better way of reducing living costs than by any roll-back legislation. We need to get beef to the country through legitimate dealers without restriction. That is what will get more cattle into the markets; it will put more cattle into the feed lots, and we will get the meat which is needed not only for the armed forces but for our civilian population as well.

These shortages do not occur only in Nebraska. I went to the market in Alexandria Saturday night to buy some meat for Sunday. What did I find? The market to which I went had been in existence for 24 years. The man behind the counter said, "Senator, I have no meat. I have not had any for 2 days."

I said, "What is the trouble Don't you have your points?"

He said, "I have 150,000 meat points, but I cannot get a pound of beef in Washington."

Does that solve the problem? Has this administration solved the problem? What we want is meat. If the Senate agrees to the amendment and passes the joint resolution, will we get the meat? Absolutely not. There is no incentive for the producer to produce more meat under the provisions of the statute. Why, the subsidy that is paid gives a bonus to the consumer. That will not produce more meat.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the amendment is rejected. How would that accomplish any of the purposes?

Mr. WHERRY. I should prefer to let the matter go back to the House and have a whole new price structure written. This program has not been authorized, and I should prefer to fasten the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the administration to solve the problem. That is its job. It certainly has not solved it yet; and, believe me, until something is brought forth that is constructive it will not be solved. I will not be a party to authorizing the administration to pay a roll-back under the guise of a subsidy; and I say that a continuation of the policy of Mr. Hutson will not only drive the cattle and hogs off the farms, but it will drive the cattle feeders and the hog feeders out of business, and there will not be any meat 6 months from now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the Senator's attitude that he would prefer to throw the whole responsibility back on the administration, although the Senator thinks the administration has done wrong and will continue to do wrong, rather than to put any limitation on it by the Congress?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the administration has done wrong and will continue to do wrong until Congress asserts itself as to whether it desires to authorize roll-backs under the guise of subsidies. That is where the wrong is, and it must be corrected.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would do is to make at least an effort to have Congress assert itself.

Mr. WHERRY. What the amendment of the Senator would do would be to call upon Congress to authorize illegal acts already done, and I will not be a party to an illegal transaction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment would not do anything of the kind. We face a condition, not a theory. We face a condition in which today the President, regardless of what the law may be, has absolutely complete power to spend billions of dollars in roll-backs and subsidies and to continue every roll-back subsidy. The Senator's position simply is, "All right; he has that actual power. I question his authority. I am going to make a political issue out of it, but I will not attempt in any way to limit, I will not attempt in any way to hold down the amount of money which may be spent. Go ahead. I would prefer to have him spend two or three billion dollars of the people's money rather than to assume a little responsibility for authorizing a limited amount of the subsidy program which we can not in any way prevent."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator's remarks in defense of his program, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that he provided in the appropriation funds for payment of commitments illegally made under section 2, subsection (e), interpreted by the Attorney General as legal, when in reality there was not the authority, and the Senator said so on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. That is my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. Now the Senator is asking me to authorize an illegal act. I will not do it; no, sir. That is the answer. There is no politics about it, for here are two Republicans in debate about it, so there is no politics about it. I should like to offer any constructive solution that can be offered. I should like to see the Congress determine what policy there should be. I brought all that out on June 15. On that day I said, "Let us settle this question. If the administration is going to pay a roll-back under a subsidy, let us settle it once and for all." We will not settle it by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. TAFT. We attempted to settle it. I joined with the Senator. I voted to abolish roll-back subsidies, but the condition of the law is such that we cannot do it. It has been shown that we cannot do it. If the Senator has any more constructive solution than is offered in section 5, I should like to know the solution.

Mr. WHERRY. When I began my remarks I said that I appreciated the Senator's judgment. I have supported most of the legislation which he has sponsored, but on this question we do not agree. Merely because this solution is offered and I disagree with it does not mean that there is not another solution. I think we ought to stay here and not hurry this thing through. It is the most important thing confronting the Senate. We should not adjourn until it is settled properly if it takes all summer. There are other solutions besides the one suggested. Because I do not agree with it does not mean that I would not be constructive in helping to solve the problem in some other way. That does not lessen the responsibility of the administration, either.

In view of the remarks of the senior Senator from Georgia with reference to Mr. Ginsburg continually writing directives which override legislative authority, I think there ought to be some determination of that question. As I have already stated, I will not be a party to such procedure. I dislike to go back home with the confusion which exists here. I should like to go back home and tell the cattle and hog raisers of Nebraska that we have solved this important question. If we continue this program, we shall not solve anything. We shall have only a state of continued confusion.

I mentioned a retailer in Washington. Let me read from the statement of a retailer in Scottsbluff, Nebr. This firm has been in business for 24 years. It is suspending business. That is the picture of thousands and thousands of retail merchants and small butchers throughout the country just because of the confusion and the policy of the administration with regard to meat and food. This is what the advertisement says:

These 23 years of serving people of this community have been most pleasant and we hope to be back to serve you if conditions change, merchandise becomes available, quotas and rationing are discontinued. But continually "being out," limiting quantities, and going through all the red tape that is necessary to do business has caused us to reach this decision, and on Monday morning we will open at 7 a. m. as usual with the intention of closing out our entire stock of merchandise as quickly as possible, allowing large purchases on many items that for the past few months we have had to limit the purchases. Exceptional values will be offered this week to hasten clearance of this stock.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire advertisement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASKETERIA—"QUALITY FOODS FOR LESS"

As we near our twenty-fourth anniversary we wish to announce that we are suspending business for either duration of war or until the many rules, regulations, and laws governing business operations are changed.

Stock up now on many items not rationed but are rumored will be when you use your new ration book.

Matches, the long stick, best quality, Blue Diamond. Soap, fast becoming scarce and some kinds not available now. Breakfast foods now on quota, and what will be next? Flour, Gooches' Best, Omar Wonder, Mother's Best, 48-pound bag, $1.98. Spices; they come from all parts of the world, and many are out now. Macaroni products can be served to save meat.

Canned vegetables and fruits require points—are priced to sell quickly.

Canned milks, now one point for tall can; dozen cans, $1.05.

Catsup, regular 14-ounce bottle, 10 cents.

These 23 years of serving people of this community have been most pleasant, and we hope to be back to serve you if conditions change, merchandise becomes available, quotas and rationing are discontinued. But continually "being out," limiting quantities, and going through all the red tape that is necessary to do business has caused us to reach this decision, and Monday morning we will open at 7 a. m., as usual, with the intention of closing out our entire stock of merchandise as quickly as possible, allowing large purchases on many items that for the past few months we have had to limit purchases. Exceptional values will be offered this week to hasten clearance of this stock.

L. M. BRYAN.

BASKETERIA CLOSING—RED TAPE, CONFUSION ARE GIVEN AS CAUSE

The Basketeria Grocery & Market, prominent in Scottsbluff since its founding in 1919 by the late J. A. Bryan, is suspending operation "for either the duration of the war or until the many rules, regulations, and laws governing business operations are changed." It was one of the city's largest food markets.

An advertisement by the present manager, L. M. Bryan, a son of the founder, in today's Star-Herald calls attention to the fact that the store will open Monday at 7 a. m. as usual, with the intention of closing out the entire stock as soon as possible.

One of the factors in the decision, the announcement says, is the shortage of merchandise.

Privately, Bryan says: "I can't count stamps and read Office of Price Administration bulletins and keep track of the stock at the same time. The shortage of experienced help has been another headache."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude with the reading of a statement from a real cattleman, a man who

knows what he is talking about. This is the statement of a man who knows the cattle situation:

Now with reference to the livestock and meat situation as I see it, at the present moment conditions are becoming more critical every week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nebraska on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall take 15 minutes on the bill.

Continuing with the statement:

Our sales here at the Webb Livestock Commission Co. have been pretty much of a joke inasmuch as our regular feeder buyers from Iowa, Illinois, and eastern Nebraska are just sitting back with their hands folded, doing nothing, and that is not all, they do not intend to do anything until they can see daylight out from under the existing conditions.

The feeder buyers are the men who buy the cattle and take them over into Iowa and feed them, and give us the finished beef. That is where the trouble is. Feeder cattle are not being sold. There is not enough of a spread. Mr. Hutson will not permit a sufficient spread, and cattle are not going to the feed lot.

Continuing with the statement:

Our local butchers and small independent packers over the country are nonexistent any more. We used to have their business and their competition on our markets; now that is eliminated.

In my opinion there is no scarcity of livestock anywhere. It is a case of fumbling rules and regulations to such an extent that people sooner or later will be forced to revolt against such ball-and-chain methods. I believe that if the American public had been put on their honor in the handling of foodstuffs and other commodities that things would have worked out much better than they have under the present set-up. If it was at all workable I am sure we would all be for it, but I also realize, like you do, that it is absolutely not workable and that we are defeating our own purpose here on the home front.

What can be done is very hard to figure out as we are so deep in the muddle now it is not an easy matter, nor will it be an easy matter, to straighten out. The situation as I see it now is becoming intolerable. It is going to take some clear thinking and quick action on the part of our Government to avoid a serious situation in the meat and livestock industries of our Nation.

According to the Texas and Southwestern cattle grazers, we will have the amazing total of 82,500,000 head of cattle by January 1, 1944, which would mean a surplus of 15,400,000 head. If we slaughtered one-half of this surplus it would mean enough meat to feed 200,000,000 people.

Think of it! Fifteen million four hundred thousand head of cattle could be slaughtered, to feed 200,000,000 people; and yet one cannot go to a butcher shop in Washington and get a pound of meat.

I cannot see any help from the Government's subsidy plan whatever. The most important solution to the problem at the present time is to get immediate relief from all the present Office of Price Administration restrictions; encourage feeders to put hogs and cattle in their feed lots—

This is the important point—

with the assurance that they will receive a fair price and a reasonable profit for their efforts.

The letter is signed by James Webb, president of the Webb Commission Co. of Grand Island, Nebr., one of our smart stockmen, a man who feeds and sells thousands of head of cattle a year, and who knows the cattle business as well as all segments of the industry.

I did not mean to get into the question of authority or authorization. I discussed that previously, on the floor of the Senate. Once again I wish to pay my respects to the senior Senator from Ohio and express my esteem for him. Let me say in conclusion that even though we should pass the joint resolution with the Taft amendment, we would not settle the question of production of meat and food. There must be something more than that. The cattle must be taken from the plains to the feed lots, and then brought to slaughter, before the meat can be sold over the counter. If there is a surplus, the only solution is to lift meat quotas, take off the rationing, and allow the beef cattle to be fed. Let us get the meat to the retailer and on to the consumer. If we do, we can save a reduction in price, and it will be more advantageous than any roll-back legislation we could enact.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to join in the general acclaim accorded the senior Senator from Ohio for the statesmanship which he showed in the handling of this particular question.

I have served in this body with the Senator from Ohio for nearly 5 years, and I have watched him grow in stature during that time. I think the Republican Party is wasting a great deal of time trying to find a candidate, looking at Willkie, Governor Dewey, and Governor Bricker, when there are two men in this body, either of whom would make a better candidate than any of the men I have just named. The two men to whom I refer are so nearly balanced in my esteem that on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays I think the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would be the best candidate of the Republican Party for President, and on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays I lean toward the Senator from Ohio. I believe this is Tuesday; therefore on this day I favor the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whom does the Senator favor on Sunday? [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. No Democrat, I assure the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied of that—or on any other day. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Seriously, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is entitled to much credit. I ask him to give me his attention at this time, because I wish to question some of his conclusions. I do not wish to misstate the position of the Senator from Ohio. As I understand his position, it is that, having an Attorney General from whom the White House can obtain any kind of an opinion it desires on any subject, no matter how far removed from the rule of reasonableness such an opinion may be, and having followed such an opinion, the Senator from Ohio now thinks that the better way to go about correcting this illegal procedure—and I agree with the Senator from Ohio as to its illegality—is to enact a measure which, while not undertaking to legalize past acts, would, at least for the next 6 months, make such acts legal. He hopes that in its handling of these questions, if we pass the pending bill the administration will observe the intent of the Congress. Because I disagree with the Senator from Ohio in that premise I desire for a moment to examine seriously the incidents which led up to this situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to point out that in my opinion the one effective control which we can exercise is by means of a money limitation. That is the reason I have laid emphasis upon that feature. I agree that, no matter what words we may write into the law, they may be stretched into something different from what was intended by Congress. There may be some remedies to which we could resort. We might impeach the President, we might impeach the Food Administrator, or we might find some way to get the matter into court. However, I do not think we can get it into court. I can find no way in which to do so. So the remedy which I propose is proposed only after considering other things which it seems to me are not feasible at the present time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Nebraska was not listening to the Senator from Ohio I can only say that he should have been. He missed something.

Allow me to go back to the first thing which started the chain of events leading up to the situation as it is today.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the message of the President of the United States to the Congress on last Labor Day. It is the same copy to which I have referred many times. That was the day on which the President declared a dictatorship in this country unless within 30 days—stating a definite expiration date—unless by October 1 the Congress had taken certain action.

The President had some theories with regard to food prices. Let me read from page 6 of the message wherein he states the formula which he wants offered for the consideration of the Congress. On page 6 appears the following language, which is repeated from page 5:

I ask the Congress to pass legislation under which the President would be specifically authorized to stabilize the cost of living, including the prices of all farm commodities.

I now invite the particular attention of my colleagues of the Senate to the next phrase:

The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher.

That is the President's own suggestion.

A bill was passed by the Congress known as the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942. It contains the following language and direction:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices * * *.

1. The parity price for such commodity * * *.

2. The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

Congress, following the suggestion of the President, was there enacting the President's suggestion into law and defining the rules which should govern prices of farm commodities.

The very first order issued by the President violated the plain mandate of that law. He and his advisers did not observe it sufficiently long to allow more than one sun to go down upon a bill which reflected his own suggestion, a suggestion which Congress wrote into the law. This is not a misstatement. It has been made before. It involves no serious charge.

The senior Senator from Georgia, in response to a question from me a few moments ago, replied that whenever a law passed by this body—the only body constitutionally empowered to pass laws—comes into conflict with a theory held by the President or his advisers, the theory takes precedence over the law. And that is true. The Senator from Georgia also suggested, and accurately, that so long as Dave Ginsburg or his tribe are permitted to write laws and opinions to be read, or at least inserted, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as being read upon the floor, there is probably no remedy for this situation.

Mr. President, I wish to go a little further. In addition to application of the provisions of the law, which prescribes certain limitations below which he could not legally go, in my opinion the Secretary of Agriculture proceeded to offer inducements to increase production by offering support prices. One of those support prices offered by the Secretary of Agriculture was on butter. On November 27, 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a support price for butter of 92-score at Chicago of 46 cents a pound. That is approximately the price which butter was bringing when the O. P. A. crowd of snake doctors started to roll back the price.

I hold in my hand a market page from a newspaper dealing with market prices of butter in Chicago. At Chicago on July 1 of this year No. 2, 92-score butter, which the Secretary of Agriculture had promised to support at 46 cents, was selling at 41.5 cents a pound. The Senator from Ohio, with childlike faith and implicit confidence in the integrity of his fellow man, which he assumes to be equal to his own integrity, assumes that he can get these boys—I almost said "birds"—to obey the law by writing a new definition. I do not believe he is so enthusiastic about that as he is about trying to limit the amount of money. If he can limit the amount of money they may not want to continue in good faith, but if they run out of money he hopes that they will then be good.

Mr. President, much to my regret I sadly state that I have no such faith in the bunch of misfits and incompetents who are running the Office of Food Administration at this time. I have lived a long life. I have never seen a more deplorable, inexcusable, unjustifiable exhibition of incompetency than that of those who at this time are engaged in the administration of the food regulations. I am sorry that I do not share the faith of the Senator from Ohio that if we merely place a limit upon the amount of money they can spend, they will be good. I believe, Mr. President, that when they come to the end of the money they will find some other way in which to do this, because they have no intention of making their Administration conform to the wishes of this body.

That brings me to my conclusion, Mr. President. Along with the necessity for sufficient food production and commonsense administration, there is another important element entering into the equation at this time, and that is a continuation of constitutional government under constitutional limitations in this country. It has been threatened; it is threatened now. More for that reason than any other I shall vote against, first, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, though I am indifferent as to whether it goes into the joint resolution or not, and then, holding as I hold, believing as I believe, that the continuation of our form of government is seriously threatened, I shall vote against the joint resolution. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska when he said there is no more important question before this body than a proper policy on this subject, and if it is necessary to stay here all summer to bring about that desirable end, I am willing to stay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, inserting section 5 in the joint resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bone	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah.
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wiley
Gurney	Reed	Willis
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask that a letter received by me from the War Shipping Administration in reference to the legislation now pending be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 5, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: Section 5 of House Joint Resolution 147, which you reported on behalf of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Saturday, contains certain provisions relating to subsidies. You will recall our communication on this subject dated June 28, 1943, that was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1943, page 6821. Since the question of subsidies is apparently to be the subject of further consideration, we believe it would be well again to call the attention of the Senate to the activities of the War Shipping Administration and to indicate that such activities would not in any way be affected by House Joint Resolution 147, as presently drawn.

The War Shipping Administration is indirectly subsidizing the increased cost of transportation resulting from the war. These indirect subsidies are not handled by payments to shippers or others concerned, but are effected by charging noncompensatory freight and insurance rates. These practices have been heretofore reported to Congress on many occasions. Further, the charging of noncompensatory insurance rates was specifically authorized by Congress in Public 523, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The proposed section 5 recognizes and sanctions the principle of paying increased costs of transportation resulting from war emergency, and specifically authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue its practice in this respect. There is no express reference in the bill to the War Shipping Administration. In our opinion none is necessary, since the War Shipping Administration's subsidy program is not affected by making of subsidy payments merely by charging noncompensatory rates. Section 5 does recognize the soundness of the principle involved by authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to engage in similar activities by direct subsidy payments and thus approves of the general practice in which War Shipping Administration is engaged.

Moreover, the only prohibition in House Joint Resolution 147 is against "payment" of subsidies or the purchase of commodities for resale at reduced prices. Since the War Shipping Administration does not engage in either of these activities, its practice of charging less than compensatory insurance or freight rates would not appear to be prohibited by the proposed legislation.

We would be pleased to have your confirmation of the foregoing.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, my purpose in rising at this time is to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a question or two concerning the amendment offered by him last evening, which was adopted. I know the purpose of the Senator from Wyoming is absolutely to preclude and prohibit any roll-back or subsidy program which will result in a reduction of price to the producer of an agricultural commodity. I was very much interested last evening in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming and adopted by the Senate, but,

in my opinion, it still leaves too much discretion in the Commodity Credit Corporation and in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The amendment reads as follows:

No subsidy program shall be undertaken or continued with respect to any agricultural commodity either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, if in its opinion such program will result in any reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity.

What the Senator from Wyoming wants to do, and I think what a majority of the Senate wants to do, is absolutely to preclude and prohibit any program being adopted by either one of these governmental agencies which will result in a reduction in price to the producer of such a commodity. If that is the purpose of the Senator from Wyoming, as I am sure it is, then I ask him why we should not strike out the language "if in its opinion such program" and insert the simple word "which," so that the amendment would then read:

No subsidy program shall be undertaken or continued with respect to any agricultural commodity, either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by the Commodity Credit Corporation which will result in any reduction in the price to the producers of such commodity.

I should be glad to have the Senator comment on my observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to reply to the Senator's question to the best of my ability. My reason for not using the absolutely mandatory language which the Senator from Utah suggests, and which I think, from one point of view, is wholly desirable, is that I do not see how it could be enforced. When a subsidy program is undertaken, it is undertaken in accordance with the judgment of those who have drafted it. None of these persons are gifted with foresight sufficient to enable them to know what the definite result will be.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that is the unanimous opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That has already been demonstrated by what has happened with respect to the roll-back program, which aroused so much criticism.

Former Senator Prentiss Brown, the present head of the O. P. A., told me personally over the telephone, before the program was announced, that he did not believe it would result in any decrease in the price to the producer. In his absence, the Assistant Administrator wrote me a letter to the same effect.

Their judgment was wrong. I do not think we can adopt statutory language which will give them the gift of foresight, but I feel that the language which has been adopted comes as close as is possible to bringing about an agreement between the Executive and the legislative authorities, written into the law, that the subsidy programs will be administered in such fashion as not to destroy the producing capacity of the farmers and ranchers of the country. That is my opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator for his comments, but I again point out to him that the best we can do, and even the least we can do, is to write into the law the most mandatory language we can write in order to carry out the purpose of the Congress. Even so, when we put into the joint resolution the most mandatory language of which we are capable, then we are still confronted with the defects of judgment on the part of the administrators. So, when the Senator says to me that definite, mandatory language written into the law would not be enforceable, it seems to me that when we not only write into the joint resolution itself language which permits too much discretion on the part of the administrators, and then couple that with defective judgment in administration, we have nothing. Their answer is simply that "In our opinion it would not do," and that brings them within the language of the joint resolution, whereas if we say, "You shall not adopt a program which will result ultimately in a reduction of the price of a commodity to the producer," we certainly then have done the least a legislative body should do to perform its proper function.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nothing we can do by way of amendment to the joint resolution can change, improve, or cause any retrogression, so to speak, of the judgment of the administrators.

I wish to go a step further. While the joint resolution has been under consideration in the Senate and before the Banking and Currency Committee I have had numerous conferences with the officials who will be charged with the responsibility of executing it. I think I am within the proprieties when I say that within the hour I have talked with Marvin Jones, who is the new War Food Administrator. Members of the Senate know Marvin Jones, and are aware that, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, he was a powerful and effective defender of agricultural programs. I know that he is now devoting his energies and his abilities to this specific problem. He has assured me that it is his intention to use every ability he has to work out the problem. He said "Give me a little cooperation, help me in this program, and I think we can work it out."

Mr. President, I am willing to do that. I feel, of course, that the subsidy program is an incorrect and unsound economic approach to the problem. I stated before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that, in my judgment, we should have done, and we should do now, what many of us urged in January of 1942, when the Price Control Act was first under consideration in this body. We failed at that time to take into consideration all the factors which go into the cost of production. As a result, we have permitted such widespread dislocation that producers of agricultural commodities even at this moment do not know where they are to obtain the labor necessary to carry on their work.

Those of us who come from western States, as do the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is sitting near me, find our people under a particularly heavy handicap, because in those mountain States the percentage of men who are rejected in the draft for physical reasons is much lower than it is throughout the country as a whole. In Wyoming, for example, only about 9 percent of those who are drafted for military duty are returned as unfit, whereas the national average is about 37 percent.

The meaning of that, if I may pursue the matter for a moment——

Mr. MURDOCK. My time is limited.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me finish the sentence. The meaning of that is that out of every thousand men who are called for military duty in Wyoming only 90 are returned to the farms and ranches, whereas out of a thousand men drawn from the Nation as a whole 370 are returned. I feel that the proposal now before the Senate does not go to the heart of the problem. I am simply trying to make the best of what seems to me, generally speaking, to be a bad matter. But I shall be perfectly willing to have the Senate adopt the language the Senator from Utah suggests, if from a parliamentary point of view it is possible to do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly my reason in offering it. I think it is consistent with the latter part of the Senator's amendment, and if the Senator from Wyoming has no objection, I move that in the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, to the committee amendment, in subsection (g) of section 5, beginning in line 4, after the comma, the words "if in its opinion such program" be stricken out, and the word "which" inserted in lieu thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Utah that the parliamentary situation is such that it will first be necessary for the Senator to move to reconsider the vote by which the O'Mahoney amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to, after which the Senator may offer his amendment to the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote taken on yesterday by which the so-called O'Mahoney amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now ask unanimous consent to amend the O'Mahoney amendment, in line 4 thereof, after the comma, to strike out the words "if in its opinion such program", and to insert the word "which".

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am sure that what the Senator from Wyoming wants to accomplish is exactly what I wish to accomplish, and by the insertion of the language which has been adopted we make the provision mandatory, and we shall be confronted then, if it shall so happen, only by defective administration.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MIDSHIPMEN AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the quota of midshipmen in the Naval Academy is short by 75 or 100. The Navy Department is desirous of having authority given to the academic board to appoint alternates. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and that the rule with respect to having the bill referred to a committee may be waived.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]? The Chair hears none. The bill will be received and read.

The bill (S. 1318) authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to bring the regiment of midshipmen to full strength, the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, until September 1, 1943, appoint as midshipmen qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board: *Provided*, That any appointment made under this provision of law shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a law similar to that proposed in the bill, is applicable to the Army at the present time. The bill proposes to extend the authority contained in it until September 1 of this year.

I now ask unanimous consent for present consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in the Year 1942.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. TAFT. May I ask how long the Senator thinks the matter proposed by him would interrupt consideration of the joint resolution dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. McFARLAND. I expect to use about 2 minutes' time to discuss the report.

Mr. TAFT. I shall have to object, since we are acting under limitation of debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting section 5, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bone	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wiley
Gurney	Reed	Willis
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, inserting section 5 in the joint resolution.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, may I inquire of the Senator from Ohio if a "yea" vote will be a vote for House Joint Resolution 147 as it is now on our desks?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a "yea" vote will be to include in the joint resolution section 5, which is the committee amendment, as it has been amended.

Mr. BONE. That is the new language in italics, is it?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was going to announce that if my colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS. As I would vote "nay," I withhold my vote.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. Having transferred my pair, I permit my vote to stand.

I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—32

Barkley	Caraway	Guffey
Bone	Chavez	Hayden
Buck	Danaher	Hill
Burton	Downey	Johnson, Colo.

Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
La Follette	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
Lucas	Revercomb	Wagner
McFarland	Russell	Wallgren
Maloney	Scrugham	Walsh
Murdock	Taft	White
Nye	Thomas, Utah	

NAYS—31

Aiken	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	Reynolds	
Gurney	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—33

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Mead
Austin	Davis	Moore
Bailey	Eastland	Murray
Ball	Ellender	Overton
Bankhead	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Reed
Bilbo	Green	Shipstead
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Wilson

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or other provisions of law, neither the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, its subsidiaries, nor any other Government-owned corporation, shall pay any subsidies or purchase any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, or borrow any money to be used for such purpose, nor shall any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress be used for any such purpose except as provided in this section or hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress.

(a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow money and pay to shippers of commodities or others the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to borrow money and to pay subsidies relating to, or purchase for the purpose of selling at a loss, strategic and critical materials necessary to the manufacture of equipment and munitions of war for the United States Government or any of the United Nations, and to subsidize the high-cost production of minerals to increase the production thereof: *Provided*, That in any case in which a commodity is domestically produced the powers granted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by this subsection shall be exercised with respect to importations of such commodity only to the extent that, in the judgment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the domestic production of the commodity is not sufficient to satisfy the demand therefor. Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, wher requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed $350,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or pay losses resulting from the purchase of commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum.

(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation, when requested by the War Food Administrator, is authorized to borrow not to exceed $175,000,000, and to use or allocate any part of said sum prior to January 1, 1944, to pay subsidies or pay losses resulting from the purchase of commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss, in order to obtain the maximum necessary production of such commodities or to prevent price increases thereof. All commitments heretofore made for such purposes not fulfilled prior to July 1, 1943, shall be fulfilled out of the sum authorized herein, and no further commitments shall be entered into hereafter with any producers, processors, manufacturers, or distributors which cannot be fulfilled out of said sum: *Provided*, That commitments in a total additional sum of $175,000,000 may be entered into prior to January 1, 1944, covering 1944 crops to continue its 1943 programs.

(e) The President may transfer any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (c) hereof for use under paragraph (d), or any part of the sum authorized under paragraph (d) for use under paragraph (c). The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may exercise any of the powers conferred herein through any of its subsidiary corporations.

(f) Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers, or the sale of feed wheat, as authorized by existing law.

(g) No subsidy program shall be undertaken or continued with respect to any agricultural commodity either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which will result in any reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall each issue suitable regulations to prevent any such reduction in the price paid to the producers of such commodity as a result of any subsidy program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Nothing in this act shall be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination of trade and brand names; (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity; or (3) as authorizing the Administrator to standardize any commodity, unless the Administrator shall determine, with respect to such standardization, that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity; but no order of the Administrator shall be deemed to require standardization because it fixes maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, if such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in substantial use in the trade or industry affected, or have been established by another Government agency."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and on page 6, lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

(j) Nothing in this act shall be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination or any restriction of the use of trade and brand names; (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity; (3) as authorizing the Administrator to standardize any commodity, unless the Administrator shall determine, with respect to such standardization, that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity; or (4) as authorizing any order of the Administrator fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as the Senate will remember, in one of the appropriation bills we included a very tight provision against grade labeling and the elimination of trade names. The amendment was inserted on the floor of the House. The language used was not very apt for the purpose.

Price Administrator Brown came before the committee and urged that it would seriously hamper his price regulations in a number of trades, regulations for which had already been issued, to many of which there was no objection. He submitted another form of amendment, carrying out the same purpose, but making it perfectly clear that it would not interfere with those regulations, which are proper.

That amendment was submitted to those in the House who drafted the original amendment. It was submitted to the representatives of the canners, who had strenuously objected to the effort to eliminate grade names. The amendment as I now offer it is only slightly different from the committee amendment. The Price Administrator regards it as a distinct improvement for his purposes over the language of the appropriation bill, and it meets with the agreement of all the trades which have been directly interested. Many Senators may have received protests from the lumber industry and others which felt that in some way the adoption of the amendment in the appropriation bill would interfere with their usual standards. This meets their objections in every way.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I am sure the Senator knows that the lumber business relies on grade labeling. If a person in Kansas or Nebraska buys shingles, he finds them graded. By that means he knows exactly what kind of shingles he is buying. He knows whether they will last for 10 years or 20 years. If we wipe out grade labeling in the lumber business we completely demoralize the business. So when I look at this language I confess that I am a little uncertain, because the language seems to be in reverse. It provides:

Nothing in this act shall be construed * * * as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity.

Mr. TAFT. If I may read the amendment which covers the lumber situation, it is slightly different from the committee amendment:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing any order of the Administrator fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency.

The lumber industry wished to be perfectly certain that in prohibiting standardization, specifications and standards which are in general use in the industry would not be prohibited. The amendment as offered meets that requirement.

Mr. BONE. The system in the lumber industry is a perfectly wholesome one. If it were now destroyed, the whole industry would be upset. It is impossible on short notice to tell just what such an amendment would do. I do not know how it would be possible to distinguish the various grades without employing the standards which are now in use.

Mr. TAFT. What is true of the lumber industry is true of many other industries. I myself do not believe the amendment, if adopted, would really in any way interfere with that situation. I do not believe it would in any way interfere with the Price Administrator fixing prices based on existing standards. All we have attempted to provide is that he cannot on his own authority say, "You may make grade A and grade B but you shall not make grade C. You may make grade D and grade E, but you shall not make grade F." I believe that under the amendment he could put a price on grades A, B, C, D, E, and F just as well as he could if the amendment had not been adopted. But since the question has arisen, and it seems possible to straighten it out in the pending joint resolution, I think we have suggested a plan upon which there is general agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language in phrase 3 authorizes the Administrator to standardize any commodity if he finds that no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity

The language in clause 1 specifically prohibits the elimination or restriction of the use of trade and brand names. There is no possibility, is there, that the broad authority in clause 3 "to standardize any commodity" under the circumstances described could extend back to clause 1?

Mr. TAFT. No; absolutely not. The exception that he may standardize commodities is an exception only to the lack of authority to standardize, the prohibition against standardizing. There is no exception to the prohibition against eliminating and restricting the use of trade and brand names, nor is there any exception to the prohibition of requiring the grade labeling of any commodity.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Trade and brand names are definitely outside his jurisdiction?

Mr. TAFT. They are.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that line 6, giving the Administrator the authority to determine with respect to such standards, might give too broad powers in determining the future standardization of commodities.

Mr. TAFT. The word "standardization" which went into the amendment was not thought of or debated particularly. I do not believe there is any great opposition to giving the Administrator the right to standardize. As a matter of fact, if the Administrator does not have the right, the War Production Board has it today as to practically every commodity. So there is no great issue on the question of standardization alone. I can only say that the representatives of the industry with whom I have talked had no objection to making this exception to standardization where it was felt it was absolutely essential to an effective system of fixing prices.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was about to ask how the language in the joint resolution would affect whatever power there would be, but I see the suggestion is offered by way of amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act itself.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. All the powers of the Price Administrator are derived from that act, so it affects only his powers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Now, Mr. President, the question is on agreeing to the joint resolution as amended, is it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate as amended, and open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if any Senator has an amendment which he wishes to offer to the joint resolution, and desires to take any time on it, I should like to have him do so now. I wish merely to state my position on the joint resolution after the consideration of amendments is concluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I find myself in a very awkward position with respect to the pending joint resolution. The Attorney General has held that under the Price Control Act, as amended, subsidies of all kinds are authorized, including the so-called roll-back subsidy. With that decision I am in complete disagreement. Neither according to the letter of the law nor the plain and manifest intent of the Congress was it ever assumed that anything more than subsidies should be resorted to for the purpose of stimulating production.

I have said already during the course of the consideration of this joint resolution, that regardless of the grave mistakes which have been made, which are now imbedded in our economic and political structure, we of course must do the best we can from now on in handling a serious and difficult problem. However, I do not share the views which have been expressed so often upon this floor, and I shall take my time now to make my position clear.

The so-called roll-back subsidies have been applied to butter and to meat and there has been a definite statement that they would or might be applied to coffee.

Mr. President, let us consider coffee. The President has already indicated that coffee is coming into this country in such quantities that the rationing of coffee may be lifted. He is entirely right on that. The imports of coffee in the month of May were equivalent to 165,000,000 roasted pounds, whereas the consumption of coffee in this country averages about 100,000,000 pounds. The stocks of wool in this country today are greater than they have ever been at this particular season during any year in the past. The stocks of cocoa are rapidly increasing. Just off our shores there is almost sufficient sugar to sink us, and it is being brought into the country by tugboats, pushing barges. We have a greater maritime fleet than any other nation ever had at any time. Certainly we have a greater merchant marine than has any other nation. It is now obvious that there is no serious threat of the submarine on our coasts, or along the coasts of Central and South America, or along any of the coasts of the Western Hemisphere. And yet the O. P. A. is talking about subsidizing coffee, applying a roll-back to coffee—the most inexcusable and most unwise suggestion that was ever made by any Federal agency. Does anyone assume, does anyone imagine, that our ships which are going to north Africa and to numerous ports in the southwest Pacific are coming back empty, when they can make greater speed under ballast than they can without cargo or ballast? Does anyone think for a moment, does anyone imagine for a moment, that we cannot bring foodstuffs into this country to support our population which, plus a real stimulating productive subsidy or bonus, would handle the price situation?

If O. P. A. cannot now be induced to turn its main attention to production, leaving the distribution machinery and the law of supply and demand to control prices fairly well, then O. P. A. will not succeed with this subsidy, because the subsidy which it is now providing is definitely inflationary. It has not a single element hostile to or fighting against inflation in the sense of rapidly rising prices.

What happens? There has been written into this measure perhaps an unrealizable hope, but there has been written into it that the producer is to get the same price, that he is not to be touched by any roll-back of any commodity of any food crop. Therefore the farmer, the producer will get the same

price for his product. It is definitely a subsidy for the benefit of the processor, for the middleman. He is going to get all that he got out of it before—purchase money plus the subsidy. Therefore there is going to be the same amount of money put into the streams and channels of commerce.

One thing is going to happen, Mr. President. The debt of the United States is going up. The Secretary of the Treasury must sell more war bonds to pay the food bill because you are now subsidizing the consumer. The subsidization of the consumer has been tried since the days of ancient Rome, and it has resulted in nothing but destruction of the political institutions of the country trying it. This measure itself, the first dose of it, commits the country to subsidies of all descriptions and forms which may, according to estimates, run to $700,000,000. More than that, it commits the Congress now to the continuation of a type of subsidy with respect to the production of food products.

I think the price-control bill contemplated that such subsidies might be offered, and there can be no objection to that; but some of our friends in this country think that we must slavishly and blindly follow the economic policies and practices of Great Britain, when Britain has a wholly different economy. Before the war Great Britain imported from 60 to 80 percent of her food products; in the war Great Britain is yet importing from 30 to 40 percent of her food products. She is a "tight little island," with not one-third of our population. Here within this vast domain we are undertaking to institute roll-backs, subsidies, consumers' subsidies. At a time when everyone who wants to work has a job at a good wage we propose to put off the payment of our grocery bills until next year, and have a part of them paid by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, in initiating this program we are definitely heading toward inflation.

The constantly mounting national debt, increased by subsidies to the consumers, will ultimately shake the last ounce of faith in the integrity of the American dollar; and when that time comes, Mr. President, you will know what inflation is. When the American people lose confidence in their currency and in a great hurry begin to unload it for anything they can get before it goes down, then you will know what inflation means.

Subsidizing the coffee of the American people, subsidizing a product that is fairly flowing into this country now almost at the rate of 2 to 1 of the consumptive capacity of the American people. Subsidizing it for whom? There can be no possible excuse that such a subsidy would be paid for the benefit of our producers, for we do not produce coffee. It could only be paid to the importer, to the distributor, and it will be a long day before the dream and wish and hope of those who have written into this measure the statement that no part of the burden is to be rolled back on the producer will be realized and the producer in America obtains the full benefit. But assuming that he is to get the same price, the processor, the packer, is also to get the same price. Certainly, therefore, the Treasury is to lose the money, the taxpayer is to lose the money. Who is going to pay the tax?

Mr. President, if we now have—and with this statement I am through—$140,000,000,000 of national income, stripped of all duplicating items, if that figure be correct, then about $91,000,000,000 represents the income of people with less than $3,000 of income, and if by taxation we are going to get twelve or fourteen or sixteen billion dollars more out of the American people, we will never be able to get more than a billion and a half dollars out of corporations, another billion and a half dollars, let us say, out of excise taxes, greatly widened and greatly increased, and, therefore, it will be necessary to raise from eight to nine billion dollars of new money out of the individual taxpayer. On whom will the burden fall? If we raise it we might as well be honest about it. It will fall on the poorer class of consumers, on the people whose incomes do not exceed $2,000 or $2,500 or, as a maximum, $3,000 a year.

So we have the Government proposing to increase wages by reducing living costs, and it will increase the wages of certain classes, throwing the burden over on the whole mass of the people, and the white-collar class, whose salaries and wages have not gone up, will pay a great part of the increased burden of the increased wage and of the deferred grocery bills.

Mr. President, I am so conscious that this proposal cannot work and will not work; I am so convinced that it is wrong, that it is unwise from every point of view, that I shall vote as I have already voted on the amendments thus far put into the joint resolution, that is, the amendments in substance relating to subsidies. I shall vote "no" on the final passage of the joint resolution. If the roll shall not be called, I want the RECORD to show that I vote "No" on the joint resolution as a whole. In my opinion it is better to vote "No" and let the consequences rest where they may, than for the Congress officially and formally to ratify a program, initiate a program, if you please, even though it be by way of limitation, with the limits so near the sky that I cannot myself vote for the amendments or for the joint resolution as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to consume any time in a discussion of the question of subsidies. I shall merely state the situation which confronts the Senate.

Unless the pending joint resolution shall be adopted, the Commodity Credit Corporation will cease to exist. As a matter of fact, technically it is out of existence now, and has been since midnight of the 30th of June.

I realize that we may debate indefinitely the question of subsidies, and their propriety and wisdom. I myself personally have never liked subsidies; I do not even enthuse over the word "subsidy." As far back as the days when the ship subsidy bill was before the Congress, I voted against it.

Much can be said on both sides, however, in regard to the white-collar employees of the country whose wages and salaries have not been increased. Any increase in the cost of living falls heavily upon them, and more heavily than upon other classes of workmen whose wages have been increased. I dare say that it would be accurate to state that among all the wage earners and salary earners in the United States, the so-called white-collar worker has had the smallest increase, and in many cases none whatever. The present increase in the cost of living has operated to decrease his wages below what they were when the war started. We all know that neither taxes nor increased wages are equitably distributed among the people of the United States. I doubt whether they can be.

The excuse or reason for subsidies is twofold. One object has been to prevent decreases in the cost of living from being rolled back upon the producer. None of us here is willing to vote for a decrease in the prices of agricultural products. Neither the Administrator of the Food Administration Act, nor anyone associated with him or with the Government, has been willing, by any ceiling placed upon prices, to reduce, or, except in one or two instances, even to freeze the prices of agricultural products. Certainly no one wants to reduce them.

In order to prevent that, the subsidy in part has been invented, or devised, and I doubt very much whether any increased taxes we are required to levy upon the white-collar element of our country will be as burdensome as an increased cost of living, perpetuated by the spiral of inflation, about which we all talk. Therefore, we are confronted with the problem whether we shall continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, which everyone admits is doing a constructive and fine job, or shall adopt the pending joint resolution, continuing it with the limitations which the Senate has seen fit to place upon it. If it should turn out that it is continued without these limitations, of course it could do what it has been doing, without restriction, and it seems to me to be inconsistent on the part of those who are against subsidies at all to say, "We will not vote for any restriction, on the ground that it is an administrative proposition, and we will let the Administrator and the administration take the responsibility."

I do not believe Congress can avoid its responsibility in that way, and, therefore, I think it would be most unfortunate if the joint resolution should be defeated, which would kill the Commodity Credit Corporation entirely, and leave Congress and the whole administration still up in the air, without the consumer or the producer or those who process the things produced knowing what should be done in the interim between now and the 1st of January. Therefore, I hope that the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the joint resolution very briefly. I think that a vote "no" on the pending measure will have no other effect than to destroy the Commodity

Credit Corporation. Those who vote "no" because they are opposed to subsidies are, in my judgment, laboring under a misapprehension. Those who vote "no" because they are fearful that they will place themselves and the Congress on record as favoring or legalizing subsidies are hiding behind nothing.

If the Commodity Credit Corporation joint resolution now before us shall be defeated subsidies will continue, and probably in great volume. Whether or not some men doubt that they are legal seems to me, at this date, to be of little importance. I think it is time that we take a realistic view. As I see it, so far as the proposed legislation is concerned, there is no longer a way to avoid subsidies. As I view the situation, those who are opposed to subsidies, those who are against them because they feel they are extravagant, should wholeheartedly support the pending measure with the Taft amendment attached. The Taft amendment is nothing more or less than a limit on subsidies, a restriction upon those who will administer the law, and a definite limitation on the funds.

The charge is made, on and off the floor, that we are heading into the spending of billions of dollars, that we are, by this action, if the joint resolution shall be approved, advocating subsidies almost without end. Unless the joint resolution shall be passed as it is now before us we may spend those billions, and I foresee inflation, I foresee extravagance, I foresee a heavier burden upon the white-collar worker.

Hearing some of the debate, one would think that we were dealing only with the question of a few cents a pound on butter and a few cents a pound on meat. Such is not at all the case. If prices are permitted to rise in a free and unrestricted price market Senators should find it easy to understand that the increases will go right across the board, that they not only will concern foodstuffs, but will affect furniture and everything else people buy and use. It seems clear to me that when those price rises take place, a rise of wages will be inevitable, and probably all across the board again. I cannot see how it is possible to maintain wage rates or to prevent wage increases if we refuse to permit the price-fixing agency of government to hold down the prices of produce and products.

So I think, Mr. President, we can make a grievous mistake. It is most unfortunate, it seems to me, that those who are most bitterly opposed to subsidies, and look with great dread upon them, refuse to vote for a measure placing a limitation and a restriction on subsidies. There will be little consolation for those who vote against the joint resolution, if it is defeated, in being able to say, "We refused to legalize the subsidy program with which we did not agree. We will place the burden of responsibility upon the administration and the executive branch of the Government."

Wherein can we find consolation in that, when every last one of us knows that under existing law, as it is interpreted by the Attorney General, subsidies are going to continue in increasing volume?

Mr. President, I do not know that the way now proposed to be followed is the right way. I am sorry that we did not have a definite program in the beginning. I am sorry the O. P. A. so long delayed. I am sorry that the Congress was not taken into partnership as the program was undertaken. But, Mr. President, though it may be wrong, it is clear to me at least that it is the lesser of two dangers, perhaps two great dangers, and if the Congress goes home, after striking down this measure, and there is no legislation, let it be clearly understood that no limitation or no restriction will have been placed on subsidies, and by the time we come back we will be deep in a subsidy program. If I am wrong about that, there is another danger. Prices may have gone out of control, the chance to stabilize wages may have been lost, and the damage will have been done. We shall only have the satisfaction of saying, "We voted to refuse to legalize subsidies."

I could find no comfort in that, Mr. President, and I hope the joint resolution will pass.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I utter simply one sentence which I overlooked a moment ago? In the President's message he urged the Congress and the executive branch to get together and work out a program. I think the whole country would like to see that done. I know that we in the Senate, and I think the statement applies to the House, as well as to the country generally, deplore the constant bickering in the midst of war between the executive and the legislative branches.

Mr. TAFT. And, Mr. President, I may add between different members of the executive branch.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I include that statement, between different members of the executive branch.

Mr. President, in the proposed legislation we have attempted to get together, and I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Ohio, who has contributed much to the effort to present a workable program which Congress could enact. We have called in all those interested in the administration of the program. We have called in the R. F. C., the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Office of War Mobilization, the Office of Price Administration, and their legal counsel, and we have sat down together and tried to work out a program which will be acceptable. The measure before us is the result. If we defeat this measure, what assurance have we that any further effort of the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to get together will be successful?

Mr. President, I desired to make that statement because it is true, and because I wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the contribution made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to bring about this result.

INVESTIGATION OF ACCUMULATION OF STRATEGIC WAR MATERIALS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last week I submitted to the Senate a resolution calling for an investigation of the policies and acts in connection with the accumulation of strategic war materials. That Senate resolution provided for an investigation to be made by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof. On the insistence of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The majority leader is now present in the Chamber. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee sits in the Chamber. I am of the opinion that the resolution was referred to the wrong committee, but if we can obtain action from that committee I shall not protest further.

Mr. President, the policies regarding the accumulation of strategic war materials from the very beginning have been a subject which has been dealt with by the Military Affairs Committee. It is true, as the majority leader has stated, that the R. F. C., its various affiliated companies, and the B. E. W., perhaps came into existence through legislation creating them acted on by the Committee on Banking and Currency, but all acts regarding the accumulation of strategic war materials, which is the subject in controversy, have always been handled by the Military Affairs Committee.

We have just witnessed the picture of two outstanding figures in this country, one the Vice-President of the United States, head of the B. E. W., and the other the Secretary of Commerce, head of the R. F. C., each one directing accusations against the other and challenging the other. Let me quote from the statements. Vice President WALLACE, speaking of Mr. Jones, and the R. F. C. or the R. F. C. companies, stated:

> They have been hindering the war effort.

Vice President WALLACE further accused Mr. Jones and the R. F. C. of failure to build up adequate Government stock piles of strategic materials as authorized and directed by the Congress 18 months before Pearl Harbor.

Vice President WALLACE further accused Mr. Jones of misrepresenting facts concerning the Board of Economic Warfare. He further stated that Mr. Jones' attitude was bureaucracy at its worst, and utterly inexcusable in a nation at war.

Let us see what Mr. Jones said about Mr. WALLACE. He said:

> His tirade is so filled with malice, innuendo and half truths, and no truths at all, that considerations of self-respect and common justice to my associates force me to expose his unscrupulous tactics.

He further said:

> This is a falsehood out of whole cloth.

Again he said:

> There is no truth in this.

And so on. Those are some of the statements made by both men. Both men may be wrong. Probably, however, one is wrong and one is right.

Mr. President, this is a serious subject. It concerns the future of this country. It concerns the life of millions of American boys. It concerns the success or

failure of our war program. I believe the American Congress is entitled to know, and I think the American public is entitled to know, who is right and who is wrong, and when the investigation shall have been completed, steps should be taken to correct the condition.

Mr. President, I say the Senate of the United States would be derelict in its duty unless action is taken by it to authorize such an investigation. I request the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to take action with respect to it, so we may have a subcommittee in action during the period of the recess. Let us not try to dodge this issue.

In order that the whole story may be before us, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement in full made by Vice President WALLACE, and the statement in full made by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE, JUNE 29, 1943

Vice President WALLACE today made public a statement originally prepared for the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In releasing this statement he said:

"On June 4 my good friend, Senator MCKELLAR from Tennessee, said certain things about the Board of Economic Warfare on the floor of the Senate which moved me to prepare a statement. After sleeping over the matter for several nights I decided not to make it.

"Milo Perkins, Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, recently appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations to discuss the work of the Board. During his testimony he indicated that, in the interest of unity, he was reluctant to discuss the failure of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to build adequate Government stock piles of strategic materials as authorized and directed by the Congress nearly 18 months before Pearl Harbor.

"Since his appearance before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the effort to misrepresent the facts concerning the work of the Board of Economic Warfare has continued. Some of these misrepresentations which have been called to my attention during the past week have been of such a nature that I have decided to release the statement as originally prepared. I am asking Senator MCKELLAR to make it part of our hearings.

"It seems to me that on a matter such as this, I, and only I, as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, can make the kind of presentation that will set the record straight.

"There are times when the sense of public duty outweighs the natural, personal reluctance to present facts of this nature. This is such a time."

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE AS ORIGINALLY PREPARED FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

On June 4, 1943, the chairman of this committee discussed the work of the Board on the floor of the Senate. His statement contained certain inaccuracies for which the Senator was not responsible. He was basing his comments on testimony which he said Mr. Jesse Jones had given before the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

I realize that when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee made his remarks on the floor of the Senate he felt he had been correctly informed by the Secretary of Commerce. The actual facts are at variance with the information given the Senator, however, and I feel compelled to state the correct information for the record.

Senator MCKELLAR said on June 4: "No congressional appropriation has ever been made for the payment of a single person employed in the Board of Economic Warfare. The Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I happen to be temporarily the head, has never appropriated any money for the Board of Economic Warfare."

On May 30, 1942, the President transmitted for the consideration of Congress an estimate of an appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Economic Warfare for the fiscal year 1943 (Document No. 760, 77th Cong., 2d sess.). After hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, during which we gave detailed testimony, that committee favorably reported H. R. 7319, which contained an item for salaries and expenses of the Board of Economic Warfare (Rept. No. 2295, 77th Cong., 2d sess.). The bill passed the House on June 30, 1942, and was reported by Senator MCKELLAR, for the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on July 10, 1942. The report suggested changes in some other items in the bill but left unchanged the item for salaries and expenses of the Board of Economic Warfare (Senate Rept. No. 1542). The bill as passed by the Senate on July 16, 1942, and approved by the President on July 25, 1942, contained an item in the amount of $12,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Board of Economic Warfare (Public Law No. 678, 77th Cong.). Mr. Perkins was not called upon to testify with regard to the item when it was considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. However, on October 12, 1942, Mr. Perkins appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, with Senator MCKELLAR presiding, to explain the need for certain amendments in the appropriation language, primarily to take care of the payment of living and quarters allowances to employees stationed abroad. These amendments were included in an item entitled "Board of Economic Warfare" in Public, No. 763, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 26, 1942.

In the same statement on the floor of the Senate on June 4, 1943, Senator MCKELLAR said: "Mr. Jesse Jones testified a day or two ago before the so-called economy committee, that Mr. Milo Perkins absolutely ran the entire establishment of 2,620 employees; that his word was law, even over him, Mr. Jesse Jones and that he had received a directive from Mr. Perkins to furnish the money to pay all these employees."

The Board has never obtained money for administrative purposes from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, nor has the Board ever directed Mr. Jesse Jones or any Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary to furnish money to pay the salaries of any of the Board's employees or any of its administrative expenses. All such salaries and expenses are paid from funds appropriated by the Congress to the Board of Economic Warfare.

There have been a few occasions where, in connection with the joint operations of the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation field staffs in foreign countries, arrangements have been worked out jointly for the payment of certain joint staff expenses by either the Board or the Corporation. In these cases reimbursement by the one agency or the other has been made in accordance with established Government procedures.

On June 4 Senator MCKELLAR also said: "The Board of Economic Warfare was not created by the Congress."

The Board of Economic Warfare was established by the President on July 30, 1941, by Executive order, as were other war agencies. From time to time additional functions have been transferred to the Board of Economic Warfare by the President pursuant to authority vested in the President by the Congress, particularly by the First War Powers Act of December 18, 1942 (Public Law No. 354, 77th Cong.). Congress has appropriated the moneys which the Board is using to discharge these responsibilities. Furthermore, Congress has specifically directed in Public Law No. 638, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 30, 1942, that unless the President shall determine otherwise, the Board of Economic Warfare shall administer the export-control law.

It is not enough to make these corrections. The false impression which Mr. Jones created before the Byrd committee is similar to the impression he created in early December before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It is time to prevent further harmful misrepresentations of this nature.

On April 13, 1942, the President vested in the Board of Economic Warfare complete control of all public purchase import operations. Mr. Jones has never been willing to accept that fact. He has instead done much to harass the administrative employees of the Board in their single-minded effort to help shorten this war by securing adequate stocks of strategic materials.

The report of the Truman committee, dated May 6, 1943, has set the proper pattern for dealing with situations of this kind. Two brief paragraphs from that report are of particular relevance:

"Energetic, aggressive men, striving to meet war needs, will tend to clash when their duties bring them into conflict. But destructive, wasteful feuding must be suppressed.

"The task of control and guidance is of utmost importance. Clear leadership in strong hands is required. The influence from above must be always toward unity. Where necessary heads must be knocked together."

The President's order of April 13, 1942, provided for "clear leadership" in programming the import of strategic materials. As a consequence of Mr. Jones' reluctance to accept that leadership there has been too much "destructive, wasteful feuding." The Board of Economic Warfare has tried for over a year now to do its job in spite of the obstructionist tactics Mr. Jones has employed from time to time.

The Congress showed great foresight, very early, in authorizing Government stock piling of strategic materials by passing legislation and by making funds available for this purpose way back in 1939 and 1940. In June of 1939, the Secretary of the Treasury was empowered to purchase and stock pile strategic materials as directed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. This program was comparatively small. Then in the summer of 1940, the Congress made substantial funds available to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for carrying out a program for purchasing and stock piling all critical and strategic materials.

From the summer of 1940 until well past December 7, 1941, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation failed dismally, so far as the import field was concerned, to build the Government stock piles authorized and directed by the Congress nearly 18 months before Pearl Harbor.

During this period, of course, private purchasing of imports continued on a somewhat increased scale due to better business, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation entered into various underwriting agreements with some countries under which we agreed to take surpluses if they were not bought

privately. This seems to us to have been a timid, business-as-usual procedure; at least it was a far cry from the aggressive Government stock piling which the Congress directed and authorized so that this Nation might have a margin of security in its imported raw-materials inventories.

On December 8, 1942, Mr. Perkins and I testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and gave partial evidence of the delays to our work for which we felt Mr. Jones was responsible. We gave testimony on his failure to meet the Office of Production Management's directives to stock pile industrial diamonds and block mica. We gave evidence on the extent to which he had delayed the foreign rubber program and cited specifically his stalling in the gathering of wild rubber in South America and the planting of rubber plantations in Africa and in the planting of cryptostegia for natural rubber in the Caribbean. We also presented evidence on the months of delay in starting a preclusive buying program in European neutral countries to prevent strategic materials from going to the Axis. These delays took place before Pearl Harbor and extended beyond Pearl Harbor right up to the 13th of April 1942, at which time the President transferred import powers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to the Board of Economic Warfare.

The evidence which we presented on December 8, 1942, to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was only partial evidence. It is a matter of public record in hearings on S. 2900.

I now desire to present additional evidence on Government stock piling—commodity by commodity—for consideration by this committee, by the entire Congress, and by the public at large.

I want to point out first that all of our administrative work on imports is done under the broad direction of the War Production Board and in some cases under the broad direction of the War Food Administration. I now feel it my duty to get down to specific cases. For reasons of military security, I shall not include figures which might be of value to the enemy. The figures I am able to use, however, have not been previously presented to the Congress. They appear in the following table which I desire to discuss, commodity by commodity:

Performance record on certain public purchase recommendations issued in 1941

1 Commodity	2 War Production Board (or Office of Production Management) recommendation	3 Import contracts executed before Apr. 13, 1942	4 Import contracts executed as of Dec. 31, 1942	5 Chief countries of origin	6 Chief uses
Beryl ore	Dec. 1, 1941, 3,000 metric tons	300 metric tons	4,118 metric tons	Argentina, Brazil, India, South Africa.	In production of master beryllium-copper alloy.
Castor seeds	Nov. 19, 1941, 178,571 long tons	None	73,799 long tons (spot purchases); 220,000 long tons (future delivery).	Brazil, Central America	Castor oil used as hydraulic-brake fluid.
Cobalt	Nov. 17, 1941, 2,500 short tons of contained cobalt metal.	159 short tons	876 short tons	Canada, Brazil, Belgian Congo.	High-speed-cutting steels.
Corundum	Nov. 18, 1941, 6,000 long tons (subsequently increased).	None	12,000 long tons	South Africa	Abrasive for grinding optical glass and telescope lenses.
Fats and oils (general)	October, November 1941; January, February 1942, 317,499 long tons (subsequently increased).	2,200 long tons (approximate).	276,622 long tons (spot purchases); 500,000 long tons (future delivery).	Africa, Brazil, Canada, Central America, South America, South Pacific.	Edible oils, glycerin (for explosives), manufacture of synthetic rubber, lubricants, paints, tin-plate manufacture.
Palm oil	Oct. 20, 1941, 30,000 long tons	None	23,928 long tons	Belgian Congo, Nigeria	Manufacture of tin plate.
Flax fiber	Oct. 27, 1941, 6,500 short tons	do	8,000 short tons annually for duration.	Canada, Egypt, Peru	Parachute webbing; industrial sewing thread.
Jute	Sept. 5, 1941, 80,000 long tons	1,210 long tons	88,000 long tons	India	Marine cordage, twines and ropes.
Sisal	Sept. 5, 1941, 100,000 short tons (subsequently increased).	33,600 short tons	310,000 short tons	Caribbean area, Africa, Mexico.	Binder twine.
Tantalite	December 1941, Mar. 13, 1942, 1,000,000 pounds.	None	322,000 pounds	Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Nigeria.	Contact points in radio tubes.
Zirconium	Sept. 5, 1941, "reasonable amounts."	do	21,575 short tons	Australia, Brazil	Tracer ammunition, flares, signals, blasting caps.

BERYL ORE

Beryl ore has very important military uses, the outstanding one being its use as an alloy with copper.

On December 1, 1941, the Office of Production Management, the forerunner of the War Production Board, recommended the purchase by Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 3,000 metric tons of beryl ore.

As of April 13, 1942, the day the President transferred import powers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Board of Economic Warfare, one 300-ton contract had been made and no deliveries effected.

As of December 31, 1942, 11 contracts calling for the delivery of 4,118 metric tons of ore from 4 different countries (Argentina, Brazil, India, South Africa) had been made; 640 tons has been delivered. This was done under Board of Economic Warfare directives.

CASTOR SEEDS

The oil extracted from castor seeds is vitally important for war purposes. Among other things, it is used as a hydraulic fluid for jacks and brakes in war machines, as a solvent in paint, and (dehydrated) as a special protecting coating for testing airplane motors. No adequate substitute is known.

On November 19, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended to Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of 178,571 long tons of castor seeds.

As of April 13, 1942, over 4 months after Pearl Harbor, none had been purchased.

As of December 31, 1942, at the direction of the Board of Economic Warfare, spot purchases totaling 73,799 long tons had been made and long-term contracts has been executed for another 220,000 long tons.

COBALT

Cobalt is vitally important to our military effort, its chief use being in high-speed cutting steels.

On November 17, 1941, Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of ores containing 2,500 short tons of cobalt metal.

As of April 13, 1942, contracts had been made by the Metals Reserve Company for the purchase of ores containing only about 159 tons of cobalt metal.

As of December 31, 1942, Government contracts for ore purchases from foreign sources totaled about 876 short tons of cobalt metal. Increased private purchases have now put us in a comfortable supply position.

CORUNDUM

Corundum, vitally important for its use as an abrasive for grinding optical glass and telescope lenses, is obtained almost exclusively from South Africa. There is practically none in the United States, although there are some interesting experiments being carried on now in the southeastern section of the country.

On November 18, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of 6,000 long tons of South African corundum. The recommendation was subsequently increased.

As of April 13, 1942, over 4 months after Pearl Harbor, no purchases had been made.

As of December 31, 1942, there were under contract (one contract, made by Metals Reserve Company in June 1942) 12,000 long tons of South African corundum for delivery during 1943 and 1944. This was done under the Board of Economic Warfare directives.

FATS AND OILS

The fats and oils group includes approximately 25 different products, ranging all the way from sunflower seeds to ouricury nuts and whale oil. These products are critically needed in the war effort for a variety of industrial uses as well as for human consumption.

There is one large group of edible oils, needed for Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and civilian uses.

Another group, which includes babassu nuts, coconuts, palm kernels, muru muru nuts, tucum nuts, and ouricury nuts, contains a high percentage of lauric acid, from which glycerin—used in the manufacture of explosives—is derived. These products are also used for plasticizers (to reduce brittleness) and in the manufacture of soap and synthetic rubber.

Oiticica oil and linseed oil are used as solvents in paints.

There is no adequate substitute for cashew-nut oil, which is used to impregnate and toughen brake linings and for magneto harness coverings.

Neatsfoot oil is used in impregnating leather.

Tallow, seal oil, and whale oil are used in soap-making processes, in the course of which glycerin is produced.

Palm oil is essential in the manufacture of tinplate.

Certain marine engines require rapeseed oil as a lubricant.

Sperm oil is used as a special lubricant for airplane engines (allowing the "cold" breaking in of motors), in the rifling of gun

barrels, and as a high-pressure smokeless lubricant in Diesel engines.

One would think, in view of the critical military urgency of going out to get these imported raw materials, that Mr. Jones would have moved aggressively to build Government stock piles of these fats and oils, and yet here are the facts:

In October 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of approximately 30,000 long tons of various types of fats and oils from foreign sources. In November this total was increased to 208,571 long tons; in January 1942, to 308,571 tons; in February to 317,499 tons. (The total has, since April 13, 1942, been increased much beyond this last figure.)

As of April 13, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had purchased (according to the best information we have) only 2,200 long tons (rapeseed oil); none had arrived in this country. The purchases were all spot; no development program had been even devised. There may be a minor error in this particular figure due to the inadequate commodity accounting records of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but we believe the figure to be substantially accurate. For all practical purposes, however, virtually nothing was done by Mr. Jones to build a Government stock pile of fats and oils even after Pearl Harbor, when the Japs were conquering the Far East, from which we had been getting tremendous supplies.

The Board of Economic Warfare, shortly after it was given its responsibility in the import field, on April 13, 1942, shifted the financing of the fats and oils program to the Commodity Credit Corporation, but retained general administration of it.

As of December 31, 1942:

1. Two hundred and seventy-six thousand six hundred and twenty-two tons of foreign fats and oils had been bought on a spot-purchase basis.

2. The Board of Economic Warfare had negotiated and the Commodity Credit Corporation had entered into development and long-term purchase contracts calling for the delivery of 500,000 tons. Several additional development contracts beyond this total were subsequently negotiated.

3. The private import trade, dealing in fats and oils, which was threatened with extinction because of distortions in the world price structure, was organized into the Emergency Group for Foreign Vegetable Oils, Fats, and Oil-Bearing Materials and its services made use of as an integrated part of the program.

4. Agreements for joint purchasing were made with the British and Canadians, eliminating competitive buying and resulting in a substantial reduction in the prices paid for a number of fats, oils, and oil-bearing materials.

PALM OIL

Since there is no adequate substitute for palm oil, which is used in the manufacture of tin plate, I desire to call special attention to it.

On October 20, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of 30,000 long tons of palm oil.

As of April 13, 1942, none had been purchased.

As of December 31, 1942, purchases (spot) totaled 23,928 long tons. This took place under Board of Economic Warfare directives.

FLAX FIBER

I now want to discuss flax fiber which is used for parachute webbing and which is also used as industrial sewing thread for high-tension purposes.

On October 27, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 6,500 tons of flax.

As of April 13, 1942, the day the President transferred import powers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Board of Economic Warfare, no purchases had been made.

As of December 31, 1942, contracts had been made for approximately 8,000 tons annually from Canada, Peru, and Egypt under Board of Economic Warfare directives.

JUTE

Jute is another commodity which must be imported from aboard.

On September 5, 1941, the Office of Production Management had directed the purchase of 80,000 long tons of jute, nearly all of which comes from India.

As of April 13, 1942, over 4 months after Pearl Harbor, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had done practically nothing to fulfill this important directive, having bought only 1,210 long tons, although the situation in India during this period was highly uncertain.

As of December 31, 1942, the Board of Economic Warfare had arranged for the purchase of the full 80,000 long tons, plus another 8,000 long tons to cover a supplementary directive. Moreover, most of this jute was shipped from Indian ports by the end of 1942.

The Board of Economic Warfare's insistence on maintaining in Calcutta, India, a special agent with a full business background in this industry, has been an important factor in the establishment of this performance record.

SISAL

Sisal is a hard fiber needed particularly in the manufacture of binder twine for the harvesting of our grain crops.

As of September 5, 1941, the Office of Production Management had recommended the purchase of 100,000 short tons of sisal (increased to 250,000 tons on March 18, 1942).

As of April 13, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had purchased only an approximate 33,600 short tons against this urgent directive.

As of December 31, 1942, the Board of Economic Warfare had negotiated contracts for approximately 310,000 short tons, all to be produced by June 1945, and of which 150,000 tons is expected to be produced by the middle of 1943. By December 31, 1942, some 88,000 tons had been delivered.

We lost many of our fibers sources in the Far East to the Japanese. By December 31, 1942, the Board of Economic Warfare had entered into contracts for the development and purchase of a number of hard fibers in Mexico and Caribbean areas as well as in Africa as part of a tremendous development program. We are planning to put 70,000 acres in these crops. Forty thousand acres have already been planted. During a war we have to fight as vigorously to buy goods as we have to fight in peacetime to sell them.

TANTALITE

Tantalite is another strategic material carrying the very highest military priorities. It is used, among other things, for contact points in radio tubes.

In December 1941, there was an exchange of correspondence between the Office of Production Management, the State Department, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which made clear the necessity of increasing substantially United States tantalite imports by public purchase. On March 13, 1942, the War Production Board formally recommended the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 1,000,000 pounds.

As of April 13, 1942, over 4 months after Pearl Harbor, no tantalite had been purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As of December 31, 1942, some 322,000 pounds had been purchased.

This increase has been due in large measure to an aggressive Board of Economic Warfare program of tracing down every possible source of an ore which occurs only in very small and scattered deposits. Most purchases have been in exceedingly small lots.

In order to open up new sources of supply which will permit fulfilling the purchase recommendations we have received from the War Production Board, the Rare Metals Section of the Board of Economic Warfare's Metals and Minerals Division has contacted private producers or Government representatives in Australia, Brazil, South Rhodesia, Argentina, French Equatorial Africa, Nigeria, Portuguese East Africa, India, and Uganda.

It is estimated that, very largely as the result of Board of Economic Warfare efforts, 1943 imports into the United States may be 60 percent above 1942 imports and 10 times the total world production in 1939. This program is typical of the way in which the Board of Economic Warfare fights for every pound of strategic materials as though a soldier's life depended upon it—which, of course, it does.

ZIRCONIUM

I now desire to discuss zirconium which is so important in the manufacture of flares, signals, tracer ammunition, and blasting caps.

On September 5, 1941, Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of reasonable amounts of zirconium from Brazil.

As of April 13, 1942, the day on which the President transferred import powers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Board of Economic Warfare, no purchase contracts had been made under the Office of Production Management directive.

As of December 31, 1942, contracts had been made for the purchase from foreign sources of 21,575 short tons of zirconium ores, of which 16,500 short tons were from Brazil. This was done under Board of Economic Warfare directives.

As previously indicated, I have deliberately given figures of the Board of Economic Warfare accomplishments through December 31, 1942, only, for the purposes of military security. The progress in the foreign field for the first 6 months of 1943 is even more encouraging, considering the difficulties we have faced, than it was during the last 6 months of 1942. As an over-all figure for this committee to bear in mind, I should like to point out that total purchases of imported raw materials subject to Board of Economic Warfare directives will run roughly a billion and one-half dollars for the 1943 fiscal year and slightly over $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1944. Over 200 critically needed strategic materials will be included in these public purchase programs. Contracts will be made in over 30 foreign countries.

Mr. Perkins is in position to give this committee detailed and current information on any imported strategic material in a completely secret and off-the-record discussion if this committee desires to have such facts placed before it in this manner. He can indicate the figures for the full fiscal year 1943 as well as contemplated figures for the 1944 fiscal year. Under no conditions would we make such current information a matter of public record. We are, however, very anxious to inform this committee as to how such vast sums are being spent. I used the word "spent," but imported strategic materials are, of course, sold by subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to our war industries. Public purchase is used to assure adequate supplies. Detailed information has

already been given the House Committee on Appropriations. We want to give the fullest possible information to the Senate committee.

Since the 13th of April, 1942, when full import powers were transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Board of Economic Warfare, tremendous progress has been made in stepping up the procurement of certain strategic materials, shortages of which could not adequately have been foreseen by the Office of Production Management prior to Pearl Harbor. Outstanding among these is the increased production of balsa wood and mahogany, largely in this hemisphere. When the full story can be told, it will be one of the most dramatic successes of the war effort. Our country can be proud of having achieved what seemed to be almost impossible on this front.

Although the President, on April 13, 1942, transferred full control over the programming of imported strategic materials from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Board of Economic Warfare, which operates under broad directives received from the War Production Board, Mr. Jones has never fully accepted that authority. He and his personnel down the line have thrown a great many obstacles in the way of our exercise of the powers given us to carry out our wartime assignments. Some of these obstructionist tactics have been minor and annoying and some have been of major consequence in this gigantic job of waging total war. I now desire to inform this committee and the Congress, and the public at large about some of these delays, which have not yet seen the light of day.

First of all I desire to discuss quinine. Brig. Gen. H. C. Minton has informed us that: "Antimalarial preparations derived from cinchona are, of course, essential to adequate control and treatment of malaria, in conjunction with the accepted synthetic antimalarials."

Far East cinchona bark contains 7 to 10 percent quinine sulfate; Latin America bark about 2 percent.

On April 14, 1942, General MacArthur wired Washington that 2,000,000 seeds of a high grade strain had been brought out of the Philippines on one of the last planes leaving for Australia; adding that they must be planted without delay.

I am sorry to have to inform this committee that Jesse Jones and Will Clayton stalled for months on this program. As I indicated to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last December, there are times when what we need is more fights and fewer shortages.

Lt. Col. Arthur F. Fischer, who brought those seeds from the Philippines to the United States, came to the Board of Economic Warfare with his proposal—to plant the seeds in Costa Rica—on August 24, 1942. Within 3 weeks, the Board of Economic Warfare had worked out a detailed plan and submitted it to the other interested agencies. Reconstruction Finance Corporation representatives at first acquiesced in the proposal when it was discussed with them on September 11 and 29. Under Secretary of War Patterson approved it formally on October 7, 1942.

Then, on October 10, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation notified the Board of Economic Warfare that "the matter requires further consideration." Those "considerations" continued for 4 months. Mr. Jones said that our proposal was post-war planning because of the time it takes for cinchona trees to come to full maturity for profitable stripping. The Fischer trees couldn't be harvested for 2½ years at the earliest; normally 7 years pass before stripping of the bark begins.

During 1941 Mr. Jones may have felt that this would be a short war in which we wouldn't become involved; in any event he did not buy quinine during that period in adequate amounts for Government stock piles; during 1942 he acted as though the war might be over by 1944 if we can take his attitude toward this quinine project as a criterion. A United Press story in the New York Journal of Commerce of February 3, 1942, quotes Jesse Jones as follows: "Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones told the House Banking Committee today that he believed the United States will be getting 'all the rubber we need from the Dutch East Indies' by the end of 1943 despite the present Japanese threat to that area." Mr. Jones may be right, but we dare not take chances and base our imports work on any such optimistic estimate.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Jones may have been considering something else. He takes great pride in the profits of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and some of its subsidiaries, as evidenced by his recent testimony before the Byrd committee. If the cinchona trees which we have been discussing have to be stripped after 2½ years because of desperate military needs for quinine, they will yield about 10,000 ounces of quinine—and a $125,000 loss to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That will mean red ink on the books of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I do not like to assign motives, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion that a possible dollar loss held up this production project. Like many things in total war this project may, of course, prove to be an expensive undertaking in terms of dollars. It seems to us to be a wise investment in terms of saving lives, however.

Whatever his reasons may have been, the facts are that Mr. Jones disregarded the constant proddings by the Board of Economic Warfare, and for a while he ignored the fact that I, as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, had personally investigated the matter and recommended immediate action. His "considerations" continued right on through the battle—with malaria and with the Japs—at Guadalcanal.

It was not until late January 1943 that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finally announced that it would spend some money for this quinine project. For all the full power the President has given the Board of Economic Warfare over imports, we are helpless when Jesse Jones, as our banker, refuses to sign checks in accordance with our directives. Finally, we have won out in all such cases, but the time lost has been precious time which there was no excuse for losing.

There have been many other times, of course, when personnel down the line in both the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Board of Economic Warfare have found themselves in complete agreement and have moved forward together with speed. The situation is better than it was a while back, and Mr. Perkins emphasized this fact in his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Committee.

Colonel Fischer is now in Costa Rica and the quinine project is underway. Some of his seeds have been germinating in the Department of Agriculture's experimental station in Beltsville and are about to be sent to Costa Rica. The rest will be planted there. It will be 1946 before quinine from the seeds brought out of the Philippines by Colonel Fischer can be put to work fighting malaria in the Tropics. Even so, our armed forces may need it desperately by that time if they are still fighting in the malarial regions of the Southwest Pacific.

We and the Army would be quite willing to strip a greater part of the young trees at the end of 2½ years if we have to do so to get quinine for our soldiers, even though the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may lose a little money through not waiting seven years to let the trees mature for the most profitable period of stripping.

In fairness to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation I want to report that on a recent development project in Guatemala, where 300,000,000 cinchona trees for quinine are being planted under Board of Economic Warfare directives, we have thus far had no opposition from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We had previously won our fight in terms of principle on the Fischer project just described and Mr. Jones has not yet opposed us on the much larger project we have worked out in Guatemala.

The other quinine programs of the Board, such as gathering wild cinchona bark in Latin America, have been pushed aggressively by the Board of Economic Warfare, and Army officers are now surveying this work in the foreign field with members of our staff. Even this work, I am sorry to report, was held up by Mr. Jones in the late summer of 1942, some 9 months after Pearl Harbor. I want to submit the following facts:

In February 1943 the Board of Economic Warfare took over the actual import purchase negotiations under Order No. 5, which I signed as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare. Order No. 5 is a part of our formal budget presentation. These negotiations had previously been handled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries. The 1942 record of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's purchases of cinchona bark, under Board of Economic Warfare directives, illustrates why the procedures were changed in the interest of shortening this war.

1. On June 19, 1942, the Board of Economic Warfare gave Defense Supplies Corporation a detailed outline of a program for purchasing Latin-American cinchona bark from United States importers, and directed that it be put into immediate effect. A check-up 5 days later revealed that nothing had been done. The Federal Loan Administrator had "objected to the tone of finality" about the letter of June 19. Another week was lost because Mr. Clayton "has apparently mislaid the directive and requests another copy." That's the way the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was handling the cinchona program for quinine 3 months after we had lost Bataan.

2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation waited 1 month to accept an offer of 25 tons. By that time the particular bark had been sold to Brazil. Another offer for 20 tons was withdrawn—5 weeks after it had been made. Those delays meant the loss of 1,800 ounces of antimalarial alkaloids for United States soldiers fighting in the Tropics. In 3 months the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought just 75 tons of bark. In the following 7 weeks a single Board of Economic Warfare agent got firm commitments for 750 tons for immediate shipment, 1,500 more for future delivery. By this time our Imports Office was better organized than in the spring of 1942 and swinging vigorously into action.

3. The Board of Economic Warfare learned that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was getting firm offers on cinchona bark, but referring them to processors—with whom the importers were then haggling about price—while the bark stayed in Colombia and Ecuador. When the Board of Economic Warfare directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to accept all firm offers the Reconstruction Finance Corporation responded by calling two meetings, each after another 10-day delay. Then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation explained its reluctance. It didn't want to take the risk of financial loss involved in dealing with unknown and possibly "irresponsible" suppliers.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation thus held up the vital quinine program while it objected to the tone of our letters, mislaid papers, forgot about offers, and hand picked its suppliers from the "right kinds of people," instead of making a desperate fight to buy every pound of cinchona bark it could locate from any source whatsoever, regardless of the financial risks involve

QUARTZ CRYSTALS

I now desire to discuss quartz crystals, the use of which is so utterly important to some of our war industries.

For 2 years now Brazilian quartz crystal, essential element in airplane, tank, and sub-

marine radio sets, has been in critically short supply.

During 1941 and early 1942 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agent in Brazil bought 2,000 tons of crystals. He was paid a commission of 1½ percent on his gross purchases, and he bought those crystals without checking to see whether they were of the quality needed and paid for. Over 85 percent of them weren't. The Government lost between two and six million dollars, and we have heard that United States quartz fabricators began raiding museums to get usable crystals.

Shortly after April 13, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation replaced this agent, although it gave him equally lucrative work in New York. But the situation in Brazil wasn't improved. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation had been burnt where it hurt most, by having to take a loss on a hazardous undertaking. The new Reconstruction Finance Corporation agent began eliminating dollar losses the easy way. Not a pound of quartz crystal was purchased by the Metals Reserve Company for 6 months. The Board of Economic Warfare finally had to send a top official to Rio to get the public purchasing resumed. I feel that Board of Economic Warfare personnel should have fought the delaying tactics of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation more vigorously in this instance.

The Board of Economic Warfare finally insisted upon inspection facilities in Rio so that crystals could be tested before payment and shipment. The Army Signal Corps has been of great assistance to us on this project by supplying 20 trained inspectors and the necessary arc lights, inspection baths, polaroid screens, etc. The Army, of course, had a critical military stake in this phase of our work and has cooperated readily and effectively.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation policy had been to keep a staff in Rio—and to wait for the business to come in. When the Board of Economic Warfare sent 100 engineers and qualified purchasing agents into the upcountry areas where the crystals are mined, Reconstruction Finance Corporation representatives in Brazil at first cooperated in supplying purchase money and contracting authority; then they refused to cooperate—on "instructions from Washington." The Board of Economic Warfare set up a purchasing station at outlying Campo Formosa; then we had to move it back to Bahia—so that Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds could be spent through the bank there.

In April 1943 Board of Economic Warfare representatives in Rio advised that restrictions put upon Metals Reserve Company agents' purchasing authority by Reconstruction Finance Corporation were preventing our meeting market prices in our buying there and that purchases were coming to a halt.

The Board of Economic Warfare, therefore, directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to relax its restrictions. Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused, stating that we didn't need quartz enough to pay any more for it. Three weeks later, after advice from their own Brazilian representatives, they reconsidered—and changed their instructions. But not in time to head off the special representative of the Board of Economic Warfare in Brazil. Fed up with Reconstruction Finance Corporation obstruction to his Brazilian program, he arrived in Washington to report. It took his report, plus a morning which I spent with Jesse Jones and Will Clayton, to break this particular logjam. Throughout the period of these bureaucratic, obstructionist tactics on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the need for quartz crystals was critically urgent.

As I previously indicated, the reason Mr. Jones could hold up our quartz crystal and quinine programs is because he signs the checks to pay for the procurement and development of these commodities. To put it differently, he has been able to delay this part of the war effort because of his position as banker for us, notwithstanding the complete delegation of powers over imports which the President gave the Board of Economic Warfare on the 13th of April 1942, following the failure of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to build the Government stock piles of strategic materials which Congress authorized and directed in the summer of 1940.

The delays on the two programs just mentioned were major matters. More annoying, because there are more of them, have been the minor delays which have taken place from time to time throughout this past year. I now desire to discuss some of these, more by way of illustration than by way of presenting any completely documented case:

Since February 1943 the Board of Economic Warfare has been negotiating and drafting all imported materials contracts, getting them executed by the sellers, then sending them to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries for execution. This has been done under order No. 5, to which I referred earlier. The purpose in establishing these new procedures was to eliminate delay and duplication.

Those purposes have been in large measure accomplished—but only in the face of an exasperating rear-guard action by Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials who are still fighting the war with peacetime red tape, corporate technicalities, and with what seems to us to be an unnecessary caution. None of the following obstructionist efforts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is major in itself, but the cumulative effect has been maddening to the businessmen with foreign-trade background who have left lucrative positions in private industry to work for the Board of Economic Warfare at Government salaries for the duration in a patriotic effort to help shorten this war.

The tactics are better illustrated than described. During the past 4 months, for example, one of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries, Metals Reserve Company—

1. Took 4 weeks to execute a group of three metal contracts drafted by the Board of Economic Warfare which the sellers had executed and returned within 10 days.

2. Held a copper contract for 5 weeks because one letter had been left out of one unimportant word and because two minor clauses "could have been more clearly stated." (The seller had supplied the missing letter and had found no difficulty in understanding the two clauses.)

3. Wrote three letters to the Board of Economic Warfare complaining because a form recital clause (without legal effect) referred to the Board of Economic Warfare's "direction" that the contract be entered into. (A similar reference to the War Production Board had always been included by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation draftsmen.)

4. Demanded that a simple 5-ton wash-sale contract for tantalite be broken up into two contracts, so that Reconstruction Finance Corporation attorneys might draft one of the two. The wash-sale technique was used on this small lot in order to provide Government ownership while in transit, as it was necessary to ship the goods by air and the Air Transport Command carries only Government-owned materials.

5. Refused to sign a contract with a Nigerian tantalite producer before the producer signed it—even though the alternative meant a 3-week delay in getting a new mine into production.

6. Refused, on a legal technicality, to honor a directive authorizing the "loan or rental" of equipment to the Brazilian Government because of information from Government representatives in Rio, received subsequent to our directive, that the equipment would be rented, and not loaned.

7. Held a Brazilian tantalite contract for 4 weeks because it had been entered into without a formal approval required by the Secretary of Commerce.

All this, and I want to emphasize it, is bureaucracy at its worst; it is utterly inexcusable in a nation at war.

We are quite willing to rest our case with the Congress and stand on our record. While I realize that the suggestion which I am about to make is not a matter directly before this committee, I should like to express a personal judgment.

It seems to me that we could end this wrangling and improve the administrative efficiency so essential to winning this war if program money were appropriated directly to the Board of Economic Warfare for its purchase and development of all imported strategic materials, just as money is now appropriated directly to us for administrative expenses in connection with our imports work. These difficult wartime jobs cannot be tackled effectively, as pointed out so truly in the report of the Truman committee from which I read in the early part of this statement, without the full power to carry out specific assignments.

The Board of Economic Warfare is a war agency; it is not a part of the permanent machinery of Government. We have recruited what we feel to be an extremely competent group of businessmen and technical engineers with foreign-trade background to carry out our job of importing strategic materials. Shortly after the war is over most of these men will be wanting to get back to their peacetime responsibilities.

For the duration, however, I feel that they should be given adequate latitude for a job which is extremely difficult even under the best of conditions. They should be free from this hamstringing bureaucracy and backdoor complaining of Mr. Jones and his employees. It is my hope that this statement has cleared up any misunderstandings which may have been caused by Mr. Jones' appearance before the Byrd committee.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, July 5, 1943.

HON. CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: June 29, Vice President WALLACE, in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, released to the press a statement prepared for the Senate Committee on Appropriations containing grave charges against me and my associates in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In my 11 years as a Government official, I have consistently refrained from any public criticism of other Government departments, and reluctant as I am to burden the Congress and the public with a detailed reply to Mr. WALLACE, his tirade is so filled with malice, innuendo, half-truths, and no truths at all, that considerations of self-respect and of common justice to my associates force me to expose his unscrupulous tactics.

Mr. WALLACE offers as an excuse for his charges that in my testimony before the Byrd committee I gave it certain misinformation about the Board of Economic Warfare. This is a falsehood out of whole cloth. The truth is that in answer to questions as to the connection between Board of Economic Warfare and Reconstruction Finance Corporation I merely testified that, by Executive Order 9128, issued April 13, 1942, Board of Economic Warfare was given authority to issue directives to Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies with respect to the purchase of critical and strategic materials from abroad.

Mr. WALLACE implied that I testified before the Byrd committee that Reconstruction Finance Corporation had received a directive

to pay employees of the Board of Economic Warfare. There is no truth in this. Both Mr. WALLACE and Milo Perkins, who undoubtedly assisted him in the preparation of his amazing statement, must know this, because Mr. Perkins asked me by letter, June 7, if I had so testified. June 8, I replied by letter that I had not, and gave Mr. Perkins a copy of what I had said about Board of Economic Warfare in my appearance before the Byrd committee.

Mr. WALLACE's statement that I have harassed administrative employees of Board of Economic Warfare in "their single-minded effort to help shorten this war by securing adequate stocks of strategic materials" is as silly and ridiculous as it is false. It is completly refuted by the record, which reveals that of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's foreign purchases and commitments totaling $3,500,000,000 made since the middle of 1940, not more than 10 percent has been acquired under program initiated since Board of Economic Warfare entered the field, April 13, 1942, and that of $1,600,000,000 in foreign materials already paid for by Reconstruction Finance Corporation, less than 5 percent has come from such programs; and this after 15 months during which time Board of Economic Warfare has frantically sent at great expense many "missions" composed mostly of inexperienced men to all parts of the world. Furthermore, the 10 percent initiated since Board of Economic Warfare entered the field would have been undertaken anyway by Reconstruction Finance Corporation under recommendations of the War Production Board, which is the planning and policy-making agency of the Government for war production, and the procurement of strategic materials, and from which agency Board of Economic Warfare gets recommendations for which it gives Reconstruction Finance Corporation directives.

In the war effort, Reconstruction Finance Corporation functions as a service agency, and not as a war policy-making agency. Reconstruction Finance Corporation acts on recommendations of the President, War Production Board, and its predecessor agencies, the State, War and Navy Departments, the Rubber Director, the Maritime Commission, the Petroleum Coordinator for War, and the Board of Economic Warfare.

A very significant thing in this controversy is the fact that not one of these agencies has had reason to complain, nor has any except Board of Economic Warfare ever complained of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's performance in the war effort, which has involved the authorization of expenditures of more than $20,000,000,000.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation began foreign purchases in the summer of 1940, and has complied efficiently and speedily with every request made of it by the President or any war policy-making agency.

Because of the nature of some of the directives from Bureau of Economic Warfare, some of the trades they make and contracts they prepare for execution by Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies without consulting Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it has been necessary to call their attention to errors and poor practices in some of the contracts. Their reluctance to admit anything but infallibility has sometimes required a few days to make the necessary corrections, and sometimes they refuse, but no delay in any important material has been occasioned by Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation has always believed, and after years of experience now believes more strongly than ever, that the maximum production and procurement of materials can be obtained in a minimum of time and at a minimum of expense without resorting to methods bordering on the hysterical.

The foreign purchase program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been conducted under the personal direction of W. L. Clayton, who has had wide experience in the field of foreign trade for many years. He has been assisted by a number of competent men, among them G. Temple Bridgman, Executive Vice President of Metals Reserve Company, who has been a leading figure for many years in the metals trade, both in this country and abroad.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation has felt, and it has learned, that production is best brought out and handled through established and experienced agencies and not by sending great groups of inexperienced men to overrun foreign countries. A few well-selected men, under proper leadership, can accomplish much more in foreign countries, utilizing the citizens of such countries as much as possible, than scores of our own people hastily brought together and sent abroad with little knowledge of what they are to do or of the country to which they are sent.

While generous prices are desirable and often necessary in the war effort, lavish prices do not always increase production. Our immediate efforts in the foreign field should be concentrated on war procurement needs and not on post-war ideologies. Furthermore, it is the unspectacular rather than the spectacular methods, and the quiet rather than the noisy approach, which accomplish the most.

Mr. WALLACE speaks of sending a hundred men to Brazil alone, on a single program. It is our belief that those hundred men, hastily recruited as they were and with little or no familiarity with the work they were to do, have done little more than get in each other's way and substitute confusion for order. That program would be in better shape today if most of those hundred men had stayed at home.

If the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in dealing with private business at home and abroad, when possible, subjects me to Mr. WALLACE's criticism, that cannot be helped. It is my belief that Government should seek to preserve private business, use it wherever possible in the war effort, and operate directly only when necessary.

The statements made by Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Perkins before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in December 1942, and to which the former again refers, were at that time shown to be unjustified and some of them untrue. My answer is contained in the hearings of that committee. My detailed reply to his present accusations is attached.

The President's Executive Order 9128 gave Bureau of Economic Warfare authority to issue directives to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to foreign purchases. That Mr. WALLACE's own Order No. 5, issued while the President was in Casablanca, has equal force is open to serious question.

Under Mr. WALLACE's order No. 5, officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are allegedly given no choice but to sign, without question or inquiry, any contract or make any commitment which Board of Economic Warfare negotiates and prepares and gives a directive for, regardless of the terms and conditions of the contract or the extent of the Government obligation assumed.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its operations are well known to Congress. It is bipartisan by law and in its administration. Its directors are men of character, experience, and ability. They are appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate. Their duties and responsibilities cannot be properly discharged by signing blank checks or executing without careful examination contracts that commit the Government for hundreds of millions of dollars.

The directives Reconstruction Finance Corporation receives from Board of Economic Warfare are signed by Milo Perkins, Morris Rosenthal, or Arthur Paul. At the pleasure of Mr. WALLACE they may be signed by any employee of Board of Economic Warfare whom Mr. WALLACE designates.

These directives are not considered or approved by the members of the Board of Economic Warfare. The members know very little of Board of Economic Warfare operations. To my knowledge, and I am a member of the Board, few, if any, purchase or development contracts have been considered at Board meetings, much less formally approved by the Board.

As for the charge which Mr. WALLACE appears to regard as a major crime, that I have attempted to safeguard the taxpayers' money, I must plead guilty. Squandering the people's money even in wartime is no proof of patriotism. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not pay $2 for something it can buy for $1. Maybe no one does, but the point is that some men know when you can buy it for $1, some don't know, and some don't care as long as they are spending other people's money.

It takes a long time and a lot of hard work to build an organization of men who are competent to trade and to handle vast sums of money properly—particularly public money. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has such an organization, and I am proud of it.

I will appreciate your placing this letter and my accompanying statement in the official RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF JESSE JONES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, IN REPLY TO CHARGES MADE BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE, JUNE 29, 1943, WITH REFERENCE TO THE PURCHASE ABROAD BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC MATERIALS

(In the procurement and development of critical and strategic materials, both at home and abroad, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation operates through subsidiary corporations, such as Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, the United States Commercial Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and Rubber Development Corporation. The Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce largely constitute the board of directors and management of the subsidiary corporations. Therefore, for convenience in this statement, Reconstruction Finance Corporation is used throughout instead of the particular subsidiary involved.)

Mr. WALLACE's statement of June 29, 1943, says: "I now desire to present additional evidence on Government stock piling, commodity by commodity, for consideration by this committee, by the entire Congress, and by the public at large."

That statement indicates an intention to review the entire foreign program. Actually only a few items are mentioned.

The metals will be discussed first.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation is purchasing 37 different metals. Mr. WALLACE confines his discussion to 6, with a reference to 2 others.

The 29 metals which are not mentioned account for 97 percent of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's dollar commitments and 99 percent by weight, and include such major items as aluminum, copper, lead, manganese, tin, and zinc.

Mr. WALLACE's detailed discussion covers beryllium, cobalt, corundum, tantalum, zirconium, and quartz crystal. He also makes reference to testimony previously given before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee

with regard to mica and industrial diamonds, but that testimony was refuted by me at the time.

Mr. WALLACE's charges with respect to the six items which he discusses in detail are answered below.

Many of the statements made are false; others are purposely misleading. The net effect of these statements is to create the impression that failure to obtain these materials in larger quantities, or more promptly, has impeded the war effort. This implication is maliciously false. While the situation on tantalum and corundum has been tight, there has been no shortage, and insofar as beryl, cobalt, quartz crystal, and zirconium are concerned, our stock piles are large and are increasing.

Beryllium: Mr. WALLACE states that although the Office of Production Management recommended Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase 3,000 metric tons of beryl ore in December 1941, only one purchase had been made prior to April 13, 1942. The facts are:

The Office of Production Management recommendation requested that Reconstruction Finance Corporation "consult Mr. Masters, then Chief of the Office of Production Management beryllium branch, as to the details of purchase, ore specifications, etc." On consultation with Mr. Masters, he asked that existing private contracts for importation of beryl ore be completed before Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook purchase. The principal supply was under contract to come to this country until June 1942. At that time Reconstruction Finance Corporation immediately began buying this material, literally as requested by War Production Board.

While imports of beryl ore during 1942 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were relatively small, this was due to two causes beyond our control—a Government embargo on Argentine exports (lifted only in October), and to heavy shipping losses by submarines. Furthermore, as consumers' stocks in this country were fully adequate to cover requirements, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation continued to purchase and hold beryl abroad, for shipment when the risks of sinkings were less, all in accordance with the views of the War Production Board. Improvement in shipping has changed this situation. Our present stock pile of beryl ore in Government hands is large and is still increasing.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation staffs in Washington and in the field handled negotiations for beryllium until February 25, 1943, and there has been no shortage.

Cobalt: Mr. WALLACE refers to the Office of Production Management recommendation of November 17, 1941, for the purchase of materials containing cobalt. He points out that contracts made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation prior to April 13, 1942, covered only 159 tons of cobalt metal. The Office of Production Management recommendation included both domestic and foreign materials. Therefore, the comparison with foreign purchases only, as made by Mr. WALLACE, is deliberately misleading. The facts are—

When the recommendation was made by the Office of Production Management only two foreign sources of cobalt materials were available to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Canada and Burma. The principal foreign producer, Belgian Congo, would not sell to the United States Government for stock pile, but agreed to produce at a maximum rate and import into the United States for its own account. To this date, 15 months after the responsibility has been with the Board of Economic Warfare, no purchase of Belgian Congo cobalt has been made.

Cobalt from Burma had been purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and received prior to April 13, 1942, after which time the supply from Burma was cut off. Canadian cobalt had not been bought because facilities for treatment in the United States were limited—the ore presents serious metallurgical problems—and the War Production Board did not advise purchase. In the spring of 1942, at the request of the War Production Board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation began construction of a plant to treat arsenical cobalt ores and negotiations for cobalt ores were promptly concluded with the Canadian Government.

Because of continued heavy imports from Belgian Congo, stocks of cobalt have been growing steadily. Recently substantial quantities have been obtained from French North Africa, thanks to the armies of the United Nations, and not as the result of anything Board of Economic Warfare has done.

Both the War Production Board and the Combined Raw Materials Board have recently indicated that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase of additional quantities of cobalt is not warranted

Corundum: Mr. WALLACE refers to the Office of Production Management's recommendation for the purchase of 6,000 long tons of South African corundum, made in November 1941. He points out that no contract was made until June 1942. Again this is misleading. The facts are—

Usable corundum for abrasive purposes is largely controlled by a single producer in South Africa. This producer, at the time of the Office of Production Management recommendation, had a contract with the only large consumer in the United States extending to June 30, 1942. With the full approval of the Office of Production Management, therefore, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation contracted for the purchase of this material available after June 30, 1942. Terms had been agreed upon prior to the Board of Economic Warfare's entry into this field.

The entire output of the producer in question has come to the United States since November 1941 (except for a small quantity shipped to the United Kingdom). Whether this material came consigned to a private consumer or to the Government cannot have affected the war effort.

Tantalum: Mr. WALLACE refers to War Production Board recommendations in December 1941 and March 13, 1942, to purchase tantalum. He points out that on April 13, 1942, 4 months after Pearl Harbor, no tantalum ore had been purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The facts are:

The Office of Production Management, under the direction of Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, of which Mr. WALLACE was Chairman, State Department, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation had correspondence relating to purchase of tantalite in December 1941. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was asked to buy material not purchased by private industry. On February 25, 1942, the War Production Board wrote us: "As for the purchase of these ores, it is doubtful whether any large quantity would be offered to our Government for purchase, as industry is buying every pound available."

These quotations made clear that Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, Office of Production Management, and War Production Board were in full agreement as to the policy pursued. On March 13, 1942, the War Production Board, which determines policy, asked that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation proceed forthwith to buy tantalum ore, including a large stock already in the United States. This was promptly done, and on April 16, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation approved a contract for 537,000 pounds of tantalum ore already in the United States, though of foreign origin. Mr. WALLACE makes no mention of that purchase when he speaks of 322,000 pounds purchased as of December 31, 1942.

To date about 85 percent of our supply continues to come from Brazil and Belgian Congo, the two major sources which were well developed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation prior to the activities of the Board of Economic Warfare. Mr. WALLACE'S statement that as a result of the Board of Economic Warfare's activities, United States imports of tantalum in 1943 will be "10 times the total world production in 1939" is of very doubtful accuracy. I am advised that world production in 1939 was at least 50 percent of the present level.

Zirconium: Mr. WALLACE indicates a desire to "discuss zirconium, which is so important in the manufacture of flares, signals, tracer ammunition, and blasting caps."

We are informed by the War Production Board that zirconium is not now being used in the manufacture of flares, signals, or tracer ammunition. About 300 to 400 pounds of zirconium metal goes into blasting caps annually. If these were the real uses for zirconium, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation stock pile would cover requirements for 100,000 years.

The Office of Production Management recommended on September 5, 1941, the purchase of reasonable amounts of zirconium from Brazil. In May 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had arranged with the Brazilian Government to embargo shipment of strategic materials to Axis countries, zirconium being one of these materials. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation agreed to buy all zirconium ore not bought by United States consumers. Because private trade was importing sufficient quantities the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made no purchases, with the War Production Board's knowledge and approval.

On March 13, 1942, the War Production Board recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase 5,000 tons of Australian zircon already in the United States as an incentive to import additional quantities of combined rutile-zircon ores. This was done promptly, the contract being approved on April 11, 1942.

On May 18, 1942, the War Production Board recommended to the Board of Economic Warfare that 15,000 short tons of Brazilian zirconium ore be purchased. This contract was promptly negotiated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Board of Economic Warfare.

It is significant of the war demand for zirconium that none of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation stock pile has been used; that zirconium has been denied shipping priorities (except in the case of combined rutile-zirconium ore, valuable for the rutile contained); and that consumption for metallurgical purposes, the principal expected war use, has dropped to virtually nil.

Quartz crystal: Mr. WALLACE states: "For 2 years now Brazilian quartz crystal, essential element in airplane, tank, and submarine radio sets, has been in critically short supply."

This statement is misleading. There has been no actual shortage. All consuming demands have been met. There is now a large stock pile in Government hands, which is increasing. Reconstruction Finance Corporation sales of quartz crystal to manufacturers during the last 3 months have been the smallest in more than a year, in part because the demand for this material is leveling off, and in part because consumers hold ample stocks.

Morris Rosenthal, head of the Board of Economic Warfare Imports Office, cabled to the Board of Economic Warfare representative in Brazil on May 27 saying, "Stock position here is such that it is not necessary to reach for quartz in Brazil at present;" and on June 26, the Board of Economic Warfare wired its representatives in Argentina that the quartz crystal situation is easier and that therefore the examination of an Argentine deposit was not warranted.

Mr. WALLACE states that during 1941 and early 1942 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agent in Brazil "bought 2,000 tons of crystals * * * without checking to see whether they were of the quality needed and paid for" and that over 85 percent of them were not. Mr. WALLACE says the Government lost between $2,000,000 and $6,000,000. Those statements are largely incorrect, and deliberately misleading.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchases to April 13, 1942, amounted to approximately 1,600 tons. The cost of this material was $7,750,000.

During the period in question, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchased all of the quartz crystal available in Brazil, whether of good grades or poor, under an arrangement with the Brazilian government to prevent any crystals from reaching Axis sources. Instead of more than 85 percent being of no value, however, between 35 and 40 percent of the 1,600 tons are suitable for radio use (which is the normal recovery based on the experience of private importers). It is estimated and our opinion that no loss will be sustained by the Government on the material in question. This result has been brought about by the technical discovery that much material previously considered unusable can be fully utilized. It is therefore fortunate that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought the entire output, good and poor.

Mr. WALLACE refers to a commission of 1½ percent having been paid the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agent on his gross purchases. The following are the facts:

In May 1941, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with the cooperation of the State Department, entered into an over-all purchase agreement with the Brazilian Government covering 12 strategic and critical materials of Brazilian production. Under this agreement the Brazilian Government issued a decree confining the exportation of these materials to the United States, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agreed to purchase all of such materials at prices agreed upon. Due to the fact that considerable quantities of these materials were at that time being exported to Germany, Italy, and Japan, quick action had to be taken in order to stop this traffic. Rather than attempt quickly to set up a buying organization in Brazil, we decided that both time and money could be saved by employing a capable American firm, experienced in the business of importing metals, to handle this business for us. This we did, paying a commission of 1½ percent which was less than we could have done the work for ourselves and is far less than it is costing the Board of Economic Warfare at the present time.

Mr. WALLACE also states that Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused to "relax its restrictions" on the purchase of quartz crystal, because "we didn't need quartz enough to pay more for it."

This statement is not true. Reconstruction Finance Corporation did not refuse to relax its restrictions. It merely asked Board of Economic Warfare for certain information before it acted.

Starting in October 1942, Reconstruction Finance Corporation has purchased in the United States, under Board of Economic Warfare directive, $2,500,000 in scarce equipment for shipment to Brazil to be used in mining quartz, mica, and tantalum, but predominantly for quartz. These minerals have usually been produced by hand labor, but Board of Economic Warfare thought production could be increased by mechanizing operations with bulldozers, tractors, compressors, rock drills, etc. In addition to the aforesaid equipment bought in this country and shipped to Brazil, substantial amounts of such machinery have been bought in Brazil by Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under directive of Board of Economic Warfare.

We are advised that much of this machinery has not been put to work but is lying idle and rusting. Considering that this equipment is vital to our war effort, the loss cannot be measured in terms of wasted money alone. Notwithstanding this and the fact that much of the machinery already on hand is not being used, Board of Economic Warfare continues to direct Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy additional machinery and equipment.

May 12, 1943, Board of Economic Warfare's Brazilian representatives estimated that exports of quartz crystal during the second half of 1943 would average 113 short tons a month. This compares with an average of over 160 tons a month during the first year Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought quartz in Brazil, and before Board of Economic Warfare had sent 100 or more engineers and purchasing agents to Brazil and had directed Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy so much machinery.

Contract delays: Mr. WALLACE refers to the "obstructionist efforts" of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and gives seven examples of the "tactics" employed.

The desire and efforts of Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies to comply with their statutory and administrative responsibilities cannot properly be described as "tactics."

Since February 25, 1943, all negotiations are handled by Board of Economic Warfare. More's the pity. In some cases Reconstruction Finance Corporation is informed of the negotiations as they progress; in other cases Reconstruction Finance Corporation's first knowledge of the contracts is obtained when they are sent by the Board of Economic Warfare to the seller for execution, with a copy to Reconstruction Finance Corporation; in still other cases, Reconstruction Finance Corporation knows nothing of the contracts until after they have been executed by the seller, and are sent to Reconstruction Finance Corporation with a directive for execution.

When a contract comes to Reconstruction Finance Corporation from Board of Economic Warfare, it is examined by our legal and administrative staffs. The directors of Reconstruction Finance Corporation have not felt free to execute contracts, as received from Board of Economic Warfare, with directives, without examination as to the legal effect of the contracts and the obligations assumed by the Government under them. Consequently, where any contract contains provisions which might not give proper protection to the Government, we have given Board of Economic Warfare our views and have awaited their replies before proceeding. In many cases such contracts have contained errors which had to be corrected.

Mr. WALLACE gives seven examples. Two of these examples (1 and 2) we have been unable to identify from the statements as given.

In example No. 3, reference is made to certain correspondence regarding a form recital clause. Regardless of the merits of the question (which was of corporate importance to Reconstruction Finance Corporation), this correspondence caused no delay in signing the contract.

In example No. 4 it is implied that Reconstruction Finance Corporation wished a contract divided into two parts in order to make work for Reconstruction Finance Corporation's attorneys. This statement is ridiculous. Board of Economic Warfare lawyers, no doubt, have time to waste. Not so with Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Reconstruction Finance Corporation sought to provide for the required allocation by the War Production Board, which had been omitted; and also to avoid confusion by separating the foreign purchase, which is under control of Board of Economic Warfare, from the domestic sale with which Board of Economic Warfare has nothing to do.

In example No. 5, Mr. WALLACE speaks of a "3-week delay in getting a new mine into production because Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused to sign the contract until prior signing by the producer." Reconstruction Finance Corporation actually expedited this transaction by authorizing the Board of Economic Warfare representative in London to sign the contract immediately upon its execution by the producer. There was no delay.

In example No. 6, Mr. WALLACE suggests that Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused to honor a directive authorizing the "loan or rental" of equipment to the Brazilian Government because of information that the equipment would be rented and not loaned. This statement is both untrue and misleading. The facts are that a cable from the Board of Economic Warfare's representative in Brazil indicated that this equipment might be given away. Reconstruction Finance Corporation pointed out to Board of Economic Warfare that it lacks authority to give away Government property, and therefore asked for assurance that the equipment would either be sold or rented. This assurance being given, the directive was approved.

In example No. 7, reference is made to a Brazilian contract being delayed for 4 weeks pending "formal approval" required by the Secretary of Commerce. This contract involved a substantial advance payment. Under the law, advance payments can only be made with the approval of the President. The contract had been signed in Brazil, and was approved by the Secretary of Commerce for the President as soon as it was received here.

Reply to Mr. WALLACE's charges relating to materials other than metals follows:

Most of these materials that Mr. WALLACE mentions were, on May 20, 1942, more than 13 months ago, transferred by Board of Economic Warfare to the Department of Agriculture, so that Reconstruction Finance Corporation has had no responsibility concerning them since that time.

Mr. WALLACE's charges concern only 10 of these materials, although Reconstruction Finance Corporation has dealt in 64 such commodities.

Quinine, cinchona bark, and the Fischer project: Mr. WALLACE's statement about quinine and cinchona bark, from which quinine is produced, and about the so-called Fischer project, is full of distortions, omissions, and inaccuracies.

Here are the facts:

QUININE

August 1941 we bought 2,000,000 ounces of quinine, as recommended by Office of Production Management. The next recommendation to buy quinine came in a letter from Morris Rosenthal, Assistant Director of Board of Economic Warfare, which was received by us January 21, 1942, confirming his verbal recommendation of January 15.

Notwithstanding the fact that all Reconstruction Finance Corporation stock-pile recommendations were, by Executive order of the President, to come from War Production Board and not from Board of Economic Warfare, we started negotiations January 15, and were advised January 22, by the Netherlands East Indies Trade Commissioner, that there was no quinine available in Java for prompt delivery, but we were offered 2,000,000 ounces, for shipment 500,000 ounces monthly, March through June 1942. We immediately took the matter up with War Production Board, and were advised that our quinine supply was comfortable, approximately 14,000,000 ounces, or 4 years' requirements, and that further stock piling was unnecessary.

However, February 16 we received another letter from Morris Rosenthal, recommending the purchase of 3,000,000 ounces from the Netherlands East Indies. I immediately conferred with Mr. Donald Nelson, and on his verbal approval we ordered the 3,000,000

ounces for March and April shipments, having been previously advised that there was no quinine available for immediate shipment.

February 26, we were advised by the State Department, that 2,500,000 ounces of quinine in the bark could be bought for prompt shipment from Batavia. We made the purchase within the hour, and later the same day bought an additional 665,000 ounces from another source.

Batavia was occupied by the Japanese 10 days later, and none of the quinine covered by this latter purchase was delivered.

THE FISCHER PROJECT

The project for the planting of cinchona trees in Costa Rica was initiated by the Army through Col. A. F. Fischer. Mr. WALLACE states that the project was proposed to the Board of Economic Warfare on August 24, 1942. The proposal was known to the Board of Economic Warfare at least a full month before that date. On April 9, 1943, 9 months later, the Board of Economic Warfare, after it had finally worked out its plan of operations, first asked the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to establish credit for the initiation of the Colonel Fischer project, and such credit was promptly established. This credit would have been established many months earlier if the Board of Economic Warfare had acted promptly. The fact is that the Board of Economic Warfare did not submit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation even a tentative proposal until October 7, 1942. Our reply of October 10 did not, as Mr. WALLACE asserts, state "the matter requires further consideration," but advised that the "plan will receive prompt consideration." The proposal submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at that time involved the organization, under the auspices of the Board of Economic Warfare, of a cooperative nonprofit association. All financing and responsibility would rest upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Board of Economic Warfare finally abandoned this plan after the State Department had indicated that it could not approve an arrangement under which the operation of the United States Government in a Latin-American country would be concealed in an association purporting to be a cooperative organization. Mr. WALLACE'S statement that the Board of Economic Warfare's proposal was objected to because it would not be profitable is, therefore, false.

CINCHONA BARK

The Board of Economic Warfare's handling of the procurement of cinchona bark has been vacillating as to policy and disorderly in administration. Despite prior promptings by the War Production Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and others interested, the Board of Economic Warfare failed to formulate any plans or issue a directive under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could act until June 19, 1942.

Mr. WALLACE implies that the Board of Economic Warfare was not responsible for cinchona bark procurement until February 25, 1943, when his Order No. 5 became effective. The Board of Economic Warfare reiterated to us again and again after April 13, 1942, that it was responsible for the procurement of cinchona bark down to smallest detail.

The policy finally established by the Board of Economic Warfare directive of June 19, 1942, was abandoned by it in approximately 90 days and a second policy was established by Board of Economic Warfare. During the next 90-day period a third policy was established by Board of Economic Warfare. The three policies overlapped and much confusion resulted. None of the plans recognized that the procurement of cinchona bark, particularly in Latin America where it was not well understood, requires skilled and experienced handling. Those business firms whose background best qualified them to meet the problem were largely ignored by Board of Economic Warfare, and firms with little experience which were called on by Board of Economic Warfare were not given competent guidance by it. The third policy established by Board of Economic Warfare ignores entirely the possibility of aid through private business and substitutes direct purchases in foreign countries by Board of Economic Warfare employees who are, in the main, inexperienced in this field.

In shifting from policy to policy, Board of Economic Warfare has caused confusion and uncertainty among the suppliers of bark in Latin America, several Latin American Governments, and the American importers. A very small quantity of cinchona bark has been produced as a result of Board of Economic Warfare's activities, notwithstanding the time which has elapsed and the money which has been spent.

The principal additional supply of quinine made available to our armed forces since the fall of Java was procured through the splendid services of the American Pharmaceutical Association financed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation acting under directive from the War Production Board. A substantial quantity of quinine in its various forms has been assembled from thousands of domestic stocks, large and small, held by druggists and others throughout the Nation, much of it donated to the Government.

Cordage fibers: Mr. WALLACE states that September 5, 1941, Office of Price Administration recommended the purchase of 100,000 short tons of sisal and as of April 13, 1942, only 33,600 tons had been purchased. The facts are:

Mr. WALLACE'S statements about sisal and other cordage fibers are false in detail and give a distorted picture of the situation. He gives the impression that present supplies result solely from Board of Economic Warfare enterprise, ignoring the fact that all of our present substantial sources of supply were opened by private enterprise and Reconstruction Finance Corporation prior to any participation by Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. WALLACE states that only 33,600 short tons of sisal had been contracted for prior to April 13, 1942. Board of Economic Warfare knows that on December 26, 1941, Reconstruction Finance Corporation contracted for the importation of 23,000 long tons of sisal from British East Africa, 13,000 long tons on April 7, 1942, and 14,500 long tons on April 10, 1942, a total of 55,500 short tons. In addition, Reconstruction Finance Corporation contracted for approximately 22,500 tons of Philippine fiber, of which over one-half was brought from the Philippines before Pearl Harbor. An additional 20,000 tons of cordage fiber were procured for stockpile from private importers and holders. In addition, Reconstruction Finance Corporation negotiated in Mexico the purchase of 210,000 tons of Mexican henequen sisal. These negotiations were commenced in February 1942 and continued to a successful conclusion by representatives of Reconstruction Finance Corporation sent to Mexico for that purpose, without any direction by Board of Economic Warfare.

Thus, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without participation by the Board of Economic Warfare, contracted for a total of 308,000 short tons of cordage fibers, of which a substantial portion was actually delivered during 1941 and 1942. The Board of Economic Warfare's participation in the fiber program subsequent to April 13, 1942, has not resulted in the opening of substantial new sources of fiber, nor has it expedited or increased the quantities of deliveries in any appreciable way. On the contrary, under the Board of Economic Warfare handling, it took from April 13, 1942, to November 1942 before another contract for British East African fiber was ready for execution. During this delay the shippers of African sisal, impatient of the delay in negotiations, shipped large quantities of sisal to Reconstruction Finance Corporation without a contract.

Mr. WALLACE states: "We are planning to put 70,000 acres in these crops (fibers). Forty thousand acres have already been planted."

The clear implication here is that the Board of Economic Warfare is responsible for the planting of these 40,000 acres. This is not true. Late in 1941, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and United Fruit Co. entered into negotiations for the planting of fiber in Costa Rica and Panama. These negotiations culminated in the signing of two contracts on January 30 and February 9, 1942, for the planting of 20,000 acres of abaca fiber in these countries and the construction of the necessary processing plants. Discussions regarding the planting of an additional 20,000 acres were taking place at the time the Board of Economic Warfare entered the field, April 13, 1942. Their intervention in the matter caused negotiations to be so prolonged that it was not until the end of September 1942 that a contract for the planting of these additional 20,000 acres was made.

Castor seeds: Mr. WALLACE states that on November 19, 1941, Office of Production Management recommended to Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of 178,571 long tons of castor seed and that, as of April 13, 1942, none had been purchased. The facts are:

November 19, 1941, Office of Production Management recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation underwrite the purchase of 400,000,000 pounds (178,571 long tons) of castor seeds during the year 1942. Office of Production Management recommended further that the agreement provide for Government purchase on the following conditions:

"1. Government will purchase for stock pile that proportion of the total not taken up by private industry through regular channels of direct purchase, except when a specific purchase will prevent slip (shipment) to Axis countries.

"2. That such purchase will be made under conditions agreeable to Office of Production Management with respect to price and quality."

It was agreed that Brazil's production was adequate to meet the requirements and that castor seeds would be included in our overall purchase agreement with Brazil, made in May 1941.

On December 4, 1941, the State Department cabled the Embassy in Brazil asking the Embassy to ascertain whether the Brazilian authorities would accept in principle an offer to purchase that part of the Brazilian exportable surplus of castor oil and castor seeds for 1942, which was not acquired by private purchasers in the United States, United Kingdom, or other American republics. At the same time an outline of the proposed underwriting agreement with Brazil, covering 400,000,000 pounds of castor seeds, which had been prepared in cooperation with the State Department and Office of Production Management, was submitted to our Embassy in Brazil.

In the meantime investigations disclosed that private interests in this country were buying substantially all of the castor seeds available for export from Brazil.

Following Pearl Harbor, however, American buyers began competing with each other in the Brazilian castor seed market to such an extent that the price rose rapidly and finally reached a point so high that the American importers could not buy without sustaining loss. We were advised of this trend in February 1942, and immediately took up with the War Production Board a proposal that the United States Government, acting through Reconstruction Finance Corporation,

be designated as the sole importer of castor seeds.

On March 28, 1942, Reconstruction Finance Corporation advised the Embassy in Brazil through the State Department that it was willing to purchase the exportable surplus of Brazilian castor seeds up to 200,000 metric tons to be shipped during the next 12 months at a price of $75 per metric ton. Ten days later castor seed was put under General Imports Order M–63 by War Production Board.

Between April 28, 1942, and May 4, 1942, Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized American importers to purchase approximately 28,000 tons of Brazilian castor seeds. These negotiations were conducted without the assistance of the Board of Economic Warfare, although to comply with Executive Order 9128 confirming directives were requested by Reconstruction Finance Corporation and received from the Board of Economic Warfare. Almost immediately thereafter the castor seed program, along with certain other agricultural commodities, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation, which is operated by the Department of Agriculture, and since that time has not been a responsibility of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Palm oil: Mr. WALLACE states that on October 20, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 30,000 long tons of palm oil, and that as of April 13, 1942, none had been purchased. The facts are:

October 20, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended the purchase of 30,000 tons of plantation palm oil, for the purpose of establishing a "stock pile specifically earmarked for the tin-plate industry, to be released only upon recommendation of the Office of Production Management."

It was found that the amount of palm oil used by the tinplate industry constituted only a small percentage of the oil normally imported by this country. It was further ascertained that the tin-plate industry had a year's supply of palm oil on hand (28,000 tons). To assure 2 years' supply for the tinplate industry, the Office of Production Management proposed to restrict the domestic use, and on December 15, 1941, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation confirmed to the Office of Production Management its understanding that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was to do nothing concerning palm oil until further advised.

There were no further stock pile recommendations to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to this commodity. Appreciable quantities of palm oil were being imported by the trade, a monthly average of 12,500 long tons having been imported during the last 6 months of the year 1941 and 8,000 long tons monthly during the first quarter of 1942. In February 1942 the War Production Board placed palm kernels and palm-kernel oil under General Imports Order M–63, but rather than request the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase, the War Production Board granted exemptions to importers which made it unnecessary for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase palm oil.

Jute: Mr. WALLACE states that on September 5, 1941, the Office of Production Management had directed the purchase of 80,000 long tons of jute, and that as of April 13, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had only bought 1,210 long tons. The facts are:

September 5, 1941, the Office of Production Management submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a general request setting forth the commodities to be acquired under public purchase programs. The list includes jute to the extent of 80,000 long tons.

Conferences were held with the industry and Office of Production Management in August and September 1941 in regard to the desirability of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchasing a stock pile of jute. The Schlichter Jute Cordage Co. was experiencing difficulty at that time in obtaining shipping priorities for jute purchases. They were particularly interested in fulfilling orders of jute for electrical insulation, and it was considered essential by the Office of Production Management that an effort be made to obtain shipping space. Consequently, Reconstruction Finance Corporation entered into agreements with the company under which Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchased the jute at cost and resold the same to the company upon arrival in the United States. This procedure enabled the jute to obtain a higher shipping priority. The transactions covered 1,210 long tons.

With the exception of the foregoing transactions, it appeared to the Office of Production Management that there was no need for further Government purchases of jute at that time. Reconstruction Finance Corporation maintained close contact with the Textile Branch of the Office of Production Management and was prepared to make purchases whenever it appeared necessary to the Office of Production Management to take such action. Heavy purchases of jute were being made by the trade during this period and, with the exception of the Schlichter supply, shipments were coming forward in a satisfactory manner. This condition continued until late July 1942. At that time the War Production Board decided to amend the jute order for the purpose of further restricting uses of jute in the United States. It was further recommended that Reconstruction Finance Corporation make public purchases of jute in order to assure a more orderly shipment of the jute and particularly to stabilize prices in India. On August 3, 1942, the Board of Economic Warfare directed Reconstruction Finance Corporation to negotiate for the purchase of approximately 90,000 long tons of jute. Reconstruction Finance Corporation immediately negotiated and executed the contracts.

It is significant that the Board of Economic Warfare did not direct the purchase of jute until 4½ months after it acquired control over foreign purchases. If the situation were as critical as appears in Mr. WALLACE's statement, such direction should have been made immediately after April 13, 1942.

Flax fiber: Mr. WALLACE states that the Office of Production Management recommended on October 27, 1941, that Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase 6,500 tons of flax and that as of April 13, 1942, no purchase had been made. The facts are—

October 27, 1941, the Office of Production Management recommended the purchase by Reconstruction Finance Corporation of a stock pile of flax fiber of 5,000 tons of line and 1,500 tons of tow. In this recommendation it was suggested that we not buy tow except as part of a general trade, and not more than 1,500 tons because plenty of tow was available.

In connection with this recommendation, Office of Production Management also outlined a tentative plan which had been discussed informally with the British. This plan provided for the purchase by Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 25 to 50 percent of the Egyptian crop and that portion of the Canadian crop which was not needed by the British; also, that we buy in South America.

The British offered us 25 percent of the Egyptian crop, but a maximum of 1,500 tons, as a result of discussions with them, the State Department, and the Office of Production Management. Because of the necessity that drafts of the proposed agreement on the Egyptian flax be submitted to and approved by London, substantial time was necessarily consumed in working out the agreement. However, with the exception of final clearance by London, the agreement was approved by all interested parties prior to the Board of Economic Warfare's participation.

During the period of negotiations for Egyptian flax Reconstruction Finance Corporation was also working in cooperation with the State Department and War Production Board in an effort to acquire a portion of the Canadian flax production. A contract covering 4,000 long tons of Peruvian flax per year was concluded early in May 1942 as a result of Reconstruction Finance Corporation negotiations. The negotiations referred to involved a quantity of flax substantially in excess of the amount recommended for stock pile.

Rape-seed oil: Mr. WALLACE states that as of April 13, 1942, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had purchased only 2,200 long tons of rape-seed oil. The facts are:

February 26, 1942, the War Production Board recommended that we purchase and hold for stock pile 5,000 short tons (10,000,000 pounds) of Argentine refined rape-seed oil. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation immediately proceeded to meet this requirement, and before April 13, 1942, had contracted to purchase 2,782 short tons, and by May 5, without the assistance of the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had contracted to purchase a total of 3,900 short tons. No further purchases were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation due to the fact that the fats-and-oils program was transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Fats and oils: Mr. WALLACE says that in October 1941 the Office of Production Management recommended to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the purchase of approximately 30,000 long tons of various types of fats and oils from foreign sources; that by February 1942 this total had been increased to 317,944 tons and that "for all practical purposes virtually nothing was done by Mr. Jones to build a Government stock pile of fats and oils," etc.

Reply is made elsewhere in this statement as to palm oil and rape-seed oil.

Copra and coconut oil: January 13, 1942, the Office of Production Management recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase 100,000 long tons of coconut oil, or the equivalent in copra. This recommendation implemented General Imports Order M–63, which made the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the sole importer of copra and coconut oil.

At the time the recommendation was received, the Philippine Islands, which produced about 85 percent of the copra imported into the United States in 1941 had already been cut off as a source of supply. The Netherlands East Indies, which had provided 10 percent of the imports in 1941, were also in the war theater.

Some stocks were believed to exist in East Africa, but the largest remaining potential source was found to be the South Pacific islands, including Fiji, Samoa, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, and Papeete.

It was estimated that forty to fifty thousand long tons of copra could be lifted in that area in a reasonably short time providing shipping space could be made available, and steps were immediately taken to provide a plan for purchases. Various copra crushing companies on the Pacific coast were immediately contacted, and on February 9 a plan was formuated whereby the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would sell to those companies all copra it was able to purchase in the South Seas. This agreement was signed as of March 2, 1942, and submitted to the War Production Board for consideration and clearance through the Department of Justice on March 9, 1942. Department of Justice reviewed the agreement and approved it in principle on April 10, and the War Production Board returned the agree-

ment on April 15. The agreement was executed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the following day.

Chaotic conditions had prevailed in the islands, shipping space was problematical, and communications were poor. Local governments in both the British and French islands were reported to have taken control of all the available supply. On February 18 the State Department informed us that the entire Fiji and Tonga production had been sold to the British Ministry of Food for an indefinite period and on February 19 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation suggested to the State Department that they discuss with the British authorities the possibility of releasing this copra to the United States.

Conditions were such in the islands controlled by the Free French that no firm offerings could be obtained, and it was found that even in areas under British control suppliers having commitments with American firms were using excuses of every nature to cancel contracts which involved over 15,000 long tons in order to obtain higher prices. This last situation was brought directly to the attention of the British Food Mission in Washington on April 2 with the earnest request that they "make every possible effort to have the authorities in London impress upon the suppliers * * * the advisability of fulfilling their original contractual obligations."

On March 10 it was reported from Ceylon that there were "no significant stocks * * * on hand which (were) not under contract." Investigation developed that there were no available surpluses in India, and further that there were "no current or prospective exportable supplies" in Brazil.

Although exhaustive efforts were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's agent under the agreement with the Pacific coast crushers to obtain firm offers of copra, because of the reasons stated no copra was immediately available.

During the same period, in order to utilize all possible facilities for acquiring copra, the War Production Board with the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation granted exemptions from General Imports Order M-63 to private importers. Under these exemptions a number of contracts for purchase of South Seas copra were arranged by importers who had private buying organizations in the field. The African production available to the United States was accounted for by this means. For example, on February 26, 1942, an authorization was given by the War Production Board to a private firm to lift approximately 3,000 long tons of copra from Portuguese East Africa, and shortly thereafter an authorization was granted covering 2,000 long tons from British East Africa, and later another covering 4,000 tons of "East African copra from other than British territory."

Although our reports show that only about 4,000 tons of copra were purchased by us under the Pacific coast copra purchasing agreement prior to the time the fats and oils program was transferred to the Department of Agriculture, there is little doubt that our actions and conversations with British authorities directly and through the State Department resulted in the acquisition of substantial quantities of copra by private buyers in this country during the first 8 months of 1942.

Babassu oil: Of all the fats and oils needed for the war effort, perhaps the most troublesome from the procurement standpoint is babassu oil and kernels. Although it was not until April 23, 1942, that the War Production Board recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase 75,000 metric tons of babassu kernels for storage and resale in this country, our experience with the babassu problem dates back to December of 1941. At that time the Office of Production Management discussed with us the need for increasing the production of babassu kernels in Brazil, resulting from the fact that with the supply of copra from the Philippines being cut off, a serious shortage of glycerine was imminent, and babassu oil has a high glycerine content. Moreover, the babassu nut grows wild in great quantity in Brazil so that a substantial amount of glycerine was available there if a satisfactory means could be devised for collecting the nuts and separating the kernels from the shells. This problem was extremely difficult of solution because no satisfactory or efficient method had theretofore been developed by which the nuts could be cracked and the kernels removed in the jungle. On the other hand, since the shell of the babassu nut weighs approximately eight times as much as the kernel, and since there are no roads between ports and the area of production, it was almost impossible to transport the nuts themselves out of the jungle in any large quantity. The situation was further complicated by the fact that labor was very short in that part of Brazil and was badly needed in rubber development.

It became apparent immediately that large sums of money and material would be used in any effort to increase the quantity of glycerine derived from this source, with small chance of any compensating results. Conferences were held between representatives of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and War Production Board and other interested agencies. An expert was sent to Brazil to investigate the possibilities of increasing the production of babassu kernels. In addition, the problem was discussed at length with representatives of Brazilian interests who suggested plans for its solution, and General Mills made an exhaustive study of the babassu situation in Brazil as a result of which they made certain general proposals. None of the plans presented was approved by the various Federal agencies concerned, including Board of Economic Warfare. Finally, on May 4, 1942, a meeting was held at which representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare, State, the Department of Commerce, War Production Board, the Department of Agriculture, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation were present. There was considerable difference of opinion expressed concerning the steps that could and should be taken to increase production of babassu kernels and oil in Brazil. However, it was agreed at the meeting that an attempt should be made immediately to negotiate with the Brazilian Government an agreement whereby exports would be permitted only to an agency of the United States Government in consideration of a definite agreement to buy the entire available supply of kernels and oil for a 2-year period at prices as high as permitted under the United States ceiling. At about that time all fats and oils programs were transferred by Board of Economic Warfare to Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WALLACE seeks to give the impression that Board of Economic Warfare has somehow accomplished the impossible.

In view of the vicious attacks made on me by Mr. WALLACE, charging delay, inaction and even obstruction in the war effort, I give below a few of the many examples afforded by our experience with Board of Economic Warfare of their incompetence in the work they are attempting to do.

Mahogany: The mahogany program has been handled almost exclusively by Board of Economic Warfare.

Discussions concerning the program were started by Board of Economic Warfare in June 1942, but it was not until November 7, 1942, that Reconstruction Finance Corporation was directed to make the first of seven contracts for the production of mahogany. The contracting concerns, selected by Board of Economic Warfare, were largely inexperienced in this field.

It is significant that out of seven contracts for a total of 47,000,000 board feet of mahogany, no mahogany has been delivered even at this late date.

An additional contract for a spot purchase of mahogany was entered into with one of these contractors, but only 100,000 board feet of mahogany has been delivered under this contract.

During this period mahogany has continued to be imported by private importers with the aid of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Canadian alcohol: A contract for 6,000,000 to 9,000,000 gallons of Canadian alcohol was negotiated and prepared by the Board of Economic Warfare. This required 7½ months, although the contract was substantially similar to contracts for the purchase of domestic alcohol which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been handling for some time. In 1942 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought 90,000,000 gallons of domestic alcohol and its purchases during 1943 will probably reach 350,000,000 gallons.

Chinese bristles: January 1943, the Board of Economic Warfare started negotiations for additional Chinese bristles. Six months later, despite the urgent need for this critical material, the contract has not been made.

Horse tail and hair: From December 1942 to June 1943, the Board of Economic Warfare held up all new imports of dressed horse tail and mane hair, while the plan previously inaugurated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was under discussion and review. In consequence, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation must now release to the trade a substantial portion of its stock pile in order to make available sufficient supplies to the processors.

Vinyl acetate: The negotiations by the Board of Economic Warfare of a contract with a Canadian concern for vinyl acetate, used in plastics and as an adhesive in the manufacture of shoes in place of rubber cement, took from early January to the middle of March 1943. A final contract for this material is similar to one previously negotiated and executed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which took less than 1 week.

Turkish chrome: Long before the Board of Economic Warfare entered the field, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made a large contract for the purchase of Turkish chrome. Late in 1942 it became apparent that certain amendments to this contract had become necessary because of changed conditions. The Board of Economic Warfare on January 26, 1943, informed us that it would prepare such amendments. To date they have not been submitted.

Mexican mica: In January 1943, before issuance of the Board of Economic Warfare Order No. 5, which was intended to divest the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of authority to negotiate its own contracts, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized the Board of Economic Warfare representatives in Mexico to negotiate a contract for the development of mica resources in that country. In April 1943 a contract was submitted, which even the Board of Economic Warfare agreed was clearly not in line with authority given and, furthermore, was bad business. On June 25, the Board of Economic Warfare submitted a new proposed draft of this contract for comment, which was in more acceptable form. The contract itself, however, has not yet been submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for execution.

Peruvian antimony: The basic terms of a contract for the purchase of Peruvian antimony metal were agreed upon in February 1943. The final contract, however, was only

submitted by the Board of Economic Warfare to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in June 1943, although it did not substantially depart from the terms originally agreed upon.

Cobalt ore: March 5, 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation delivered to the Board of Economic Warfare a draft of a proposed contract for the purchase of cobalt ore. The Board of Economic Warfare made some minor changes in this contract and mailed it to the seller on April 19, 6 weeks later.

Peruvian over-all agreement: The over-all agreement between the Peruvian Government and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation relative to the purchase of strategic materials from Peru expired on September 15, 1942. The Board of Economic Warfare was unwilling to leave to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the negotiation of a renewal of this agreement. The Board of Economic Warfare undertook to do so. They are apparently still negotiating because the renewal has not yet been signed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was engaged for the moment. What was the request made by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is too late for the Senator to object now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to know what the request was.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to tell the Senator. My request was that Vice President WALLACE's statement and the statement made by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no, I would not object to that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought every one was entitled to know what the statements were.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The only trouble with that, Mr. President, is that the Postmaster General might bar the publication from the mails.

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps we can get some one to intercede with the Postmaster General.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Perhaps.

PARTICIPATION OF ALL CLASSES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have seen race riots going on in the country. We have seen stoppages in war work occur. Therefore on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and myself I offer out of order a resolution for an investigation of these subjects, which I ask to have read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 171) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation into race riotings, war stoppages, and the participation of all American citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, in all industrial and other phases of the national war program. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations for legislation or other governmental action designed to promote peace on the home front, in the industries producing war goods, and in the various armed services, thereby assuring the participation of all American citizens in the national war program.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, and to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants (without regard to the civil-service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended), as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services, information facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

(b) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall have the power to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material, data, and testimony taken at such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the need for an investigation, as authorized by the resolution, is supported by many civic groups of this country, including several Negro organizations, such as the National Negro Council; the United Government Employees, headed by Edgar Brown; the National Negro Publishers Association; and the We Are Americans Too Conference. The need for a fair and impartial investigation is also supported by some of the outstanding publications of the country, such as the New York Times. It is further supported by thoughtful individuals everywhere. I personally want the facts ascertained and want fair consideration for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What disposition is requested to be made of the resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rule the resolution should be referred to a standing committee before it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, so as to have a report on the resolution from one of the standing committees. In considering the question of which committee the resolution might be assigned, let me say that probably it would properly go to either the Committee on Education and Labor or the Committee on the Judiciary. I have no particular preference. The Committee on the Judiciary probably would be the better one to handle it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am sufficiently curious about the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire to ask him if it is not a fact that the authority of the Truman committee is so great that its activities might cover the whole field of the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire. As I understand, the basic authority of the Truman committee is such that it might readily be directed by the Senate to inquire into the matters referred to. I know it has been going into the whole field.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask the Senator if he refers to my resolution for an investigation of the quarrel between the Vice President and Jesse Jones or the resolution I more recently have submitted.

Mr. BONE. No; the latter resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator would not attmept to have the Truman committee investigate the former; would he?

Mr. BONE. I referred to the latter resolution the Senator submitted. In view of the fact that the Truman committee has almost unlimited authority, I am wondering whether the Senator would have the committee he suggests encroaching on ground which could be covered by the Truman committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is something the committee to which the resolution has been referred will have to take into consideration.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House Joint Resolution 147, the Commodity Credit Corporation resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair refers to the joint resolution the Senate has been considering yesterday and today.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Radcliffe	Wiley
Gurney	Reed	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the bill vetoed by the President provided for the payment of subsidies on which commitments had been made. I voted for that bill because I wanted to make good the commitments. However, the bill carried a vague, equivocal prohibition of the continuation of that policy.

The Senate now has before it a joint resolution providing that the policy shall be a continuing one. I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into the reasons for my position on the matter. I said yesterday what I had to say about general subsidies. I shall not repeat anything I then said.

The Commodity Credit Corporation should be saved; but I do not like the theory of piling upon it a great many extraneous matters, in absolute contravention and in opposition to the will of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, as expressed less than 3 weeks ago.

I was not able to be present when the vote was taken on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Under the rules I have the right to move a reconsideration of that vote. I now move to reconsider the vote agreeing to the committee amendment inserting section 5 in the joint resolution, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment was agreed to. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote yea. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote nay.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Holman	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Smith
Butler	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Ferguson	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Millikin	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gurney	Reed	Wiley
Hawkes	Reynolds	Willis

NAYS—32

Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Kilgore	Scrugham
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Murdock	Wagner
Danaher	Nye	Wallgren
Downey	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Guffey	Radcliffe	White
Hayden	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Mead
Austin	Davis	Moore
Bailey	Eastland	Murray
Ball	Ellender	Overton
Bankhead	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Green	Tobey
Brewster	Hatch	Truman
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wilson
Byrd	Lodge	
Chandler	McNary	

So Mr. SHIPSTEAD's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
Downey	Nye	Walsh
Guffey	O'Mahoney	White
Hayden	Radcliffe	
Hill	Revercomb	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarran
Bridges	George	McClellan
Brooks	Gerry	McKellar
Butler	Gurney	Maybank
Capper	Hawkes	Millikin
Clark, Mo.	Holman	O'Daniel
Connally	Langer	Reed

Reynolds	Stewart	Wheeler
Robertson	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Van Nuys	Willis

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Mead
Austin	Davis	Moore
Bailey	Eastland	Murray
Ball	Ellender	Overton
Bankhead	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Russell
Bilbo	Green	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Hatch	Tobey
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrd	Lodge	Wilson
Chandler	McNary	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). As heretofore announced, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am informed that, if present, he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. TAFT. I change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—29

Barkley	Kilgore	Scrugham
Bone	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Guffey	Nye	White
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Radcliffe	

NAYS—36

Aiken	Gurney	Reynolds
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wheeler
George	Reed	Wherry
Gerry	Revercomb	Willis

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Moore
Austin	Eastland	Murray
Bailey	Ellender	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Pepper
Bankhead	Glass	Russell
Barbour	Green	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Hatch	Tobey
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bushfield	Lodge	Wilson
Byrd	McNary	
Chandler	Mead	

So the joint resolution was not passed.

Mr. TAFT. I move to reconsider the vote by which House Joint Resolution 147 was rejected.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in favor——

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak 10 minutes on the motion to reconsider. I do not think the Senate understands what it is voting on, and I should like, at least, to have the question discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will withhold his motion for the present?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not object to allowing the Senator from Ohio 10 minutes. If he wishes to have 10 minutes, I will agree to that, but I am not willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Has not the unanimous consent agreement which provided with reference to a vote on the joint resolution now expired, and is the Senator from Ohio not, therefore, free to speak as long as he chooses?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no; a motion to lay on the table is pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is speaking on a motion to lay on the table, and it is necessary to obtain a unanimous consent to enable the Senator from Ohio to proceed. If there is no objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I only have 10 minutes, and I prefer not to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has unanimous consent been given? I did not understand the question had been put. If the Senator from Ohio is permitted to speak, I believe that others who might have an opposite view should also be permitted to speak.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Vermont has a right to object to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not object provided that any Senator on the other side may also speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if he has withdrawn his motion?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no; I have insisted on my motion to lay on the table. It is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears——

Mr. AIKEN. Unless other Senators are given an opportunity to speak, I object. If they are, I shall not object.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Vermont has objected. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Unless it is agreed that both sides shall have an opportunity to speak. I do not want a one-sided discussion over this matter.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I object. I ask for a vote on the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I want order, if I can get it.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is just propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to know exactly what the Senate is voting on at the present time.

Mr. CONNALLY. A motion to table.

Mr. LUCAS. I am asking the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. If the motion to table shall be defeated, will the motion to reconsider be debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the roll call.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER (when Mr. MEAD's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], with whom I have a pair, would, if present, vote as I have voted, and I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Gurney	Reynolds
Bridges	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	Revercomb	

NAYS—33

Barkley	Kilgore	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Scrugham
Burton	Langer	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Murdock	Wagner
Downey	Nye	Wallgren
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Hayden	Radcliffe	White
Hill	Reed	Wiley

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Moore
Austin	Eastland	Murray
Bailey	Ellender	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Pepper
Bankhead	Glass	Russell
Barbour	Green	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Hatch	Tobey
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bushfield	Lodge	Wilson
Byrd	McNary	
Chandler	Mead	

So Mr. McKELLAR's motion to lay on the table Mr. TAFT's motion to reconsider was rejected.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. The subject is now open to debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. AIKEN. Both sides having an equal opportunity to debate? Are they limited as to time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not conscious of a limitation as to time.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont asked whether there was any limit as to time. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday there is a 15-minute limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A 30-minute limitation.

Mr. BARKLEY. A 15-minute limitation on the joint resolution now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a limit of 15 minutes on the joint resolution and 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the debate now on the joint resolution? The joint resolution and its amendments have been debated. The motion now is to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is further consideration of the joint resolution. The Chair rules that the limitation on time still holds.

Mr. AIKEN. I object to giving unanimous consent to the Senator from Ohio——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is not involved.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the time limit?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifteen minutes on the joint resolution and 15 minutes on the amendment, 30 minutes in all.

Mr. GEORGE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is mistaken; it is just 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. If a Senator has already spoken 15 minutes on the joint resolution, can he be heard on the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senator can be heard on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GEORGE. But for only 15 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. But for only 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. So it makes no difference what may have occurred on the joint resolution, the 15 minutes is open to every Senator on the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to reconsider.

Mr. TAFT. I might say, Mr. President, that I did not speak on the joint resolution, so that I may take my time on the joint resolution, as well as on the motion.

I think the Senate voted against House Joint Resolution 147, under a misapprehension. The debate all afternoon has been on the question of subsidies. The Senate removed the question of subsidies from the joint resolution, so it no longer relates in any way to that question. When I saw the same Senators voting against the joint resolution who voted against the subsidies, it seemed to me that they must be under a misapprehension.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is it correct to state that the Attorney General gave an opinion on the House version of the joint resolution, as it came to the Senate, to the effect that subsidies could be indulged in any way?

Mr. TAFT. The Attorney General gave no opinion regarding the pending joint resolution. The Attorney General's opinion which has been referred to in the debate was to the effect that under the Price Control Act, without any further action, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, after the President had decided that certain foods, namely, meat and butter, were strategic materials, could put in a roll-back subsidy in connection with those foodstuffs, or in connection with other foodstuffs.

Mr. STEWART. Any foodstuff?

Mr. TAFT. No; not any foodstuff. The joint resolution as now amended

has no relation whatsoever to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not mention the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not increase or decrease the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make roll-back subsidies. It has nothing whatever to do with the question of subsidies, except in one respect, which I am about to mention.

The only effect of the joint resolution now is to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation expired by limitation of time as of July 1. It is involved with a good many different agricultural programs having nothing to do with subsidies. I am not thoroughly familiar with what they are. Of course, it handles all the loans on wheat and cotton and corn. It has a number of other programs also having nothing to do with subsidies.

Mr. Davis and Mr. Hutson appeared before us when the joint resolution came over to the Senate and had in it nothing but the provision now left in it, and told us that they required a billion dollars more in order to carry on their normal programs.

In a measure passed and sent to the President the Senate authorized a billion dollars more general capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the House, after conference, that amount was reduced to $750,000,000. The joint resolution now before the Senate merely continues the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, and for that reason the total additional capital was cut down to $350,000,000, so that the total capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation is now $3,000,000,000.

The joint resolution has nothing to do with what the Corporation may do in the way of subsidies. After it is passed the Corporation may do with respect to subsidies exactly what it could do before the passage of the joint resolution. In other words, the subsidy question is entirely out of the measure. All we have to consider now is whether we wish to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, and give it $350,000,000 more capital with which to operate, plus the provision regarding grade labeling, which is still in the joint resolution, section 6.

Mr. President, I feel rather embarrassed, because if we had made no fight whatever, if we had offered no amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation joint resolution passed by the House, it would have gone through the Senate without question. There was no fight about it. When the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] joined with me in presenting our amendment, I told him that if we made the fight for that amendment, and if the Senate or the House refused to accept it, I would certainly move to take such action as was necessary, without the inclusion of the provision for subsidies, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation in existence.

I made the motion to reconsider because of the obligation I feel to the Senator from Alabama, as well as the fact that I thought the Senate did not understand what the issue was with respect to the joint resolution after the provisions dealing with subsidies had been removed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Ohio tell us whether he understands, as the law now stands, that the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used for subsidy purposes?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to pay a direct subsidy, but it is authorized to buy for sale at a loss. It has been doing so. The Commodity Credit Corporation has already engaged in the program relating to vegetable oil, which involves a subsidy indirectly. The Commodity Credit Corporation, which has general powers of buying and selling agricultural commodities, can undoubtedly carry on certain kinds of subsidy operations. But the joint resolution neither increases its powers to do so nor decreases them, or affects them in any way except slightly to increase the capital.

Mr. Davis assured us that he needed $1,000,000,000 to handle the business of the Commodity Credit Corporation without paying any subsidies at all. I have no doubt that the case for $350,000,000 is more than adequate for purposes entirely outside the subsidy question.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I will add, Mr. President, that his view and mine concur in that particular, and I should like to point out, in view of the nature of the voting which has taken place this afternoon, that when Senate bill 1108 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Davis appeared before us, and Mr. J. B. Hutson, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as well. Thereafter I introduced, or at least adapted and presented to the committee, and the committee accepted, an amendment which appears as section 5 of the bill as it was reported on June 4 from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 5 as it then appeared in the bill as a committee amendment, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 5. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purposes. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the amendment then offered by me—and it was an adaptation of a bill which had been introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and it also represented the views of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and other Senators—was designed to secure to the farming interests of the country and the public generally the benefits of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but to prevent the use of the increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing authority for subsidy purposes. The amendment at that stage, Mr. President, in no way whatever militated against the operations of the R. F. C. It in no way was involved with the Price Administrator. It was a limitation solely upon the use of the authorized borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation which we were thus increasing.

Mr. President, after the measure was reported to the Senate with that committee amendment attached, request was made by administrators of various of the departments downtown for further hearings on the matter, and we went into hearings in the committee on June 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 16, to be exact. As I recall, everyone who had anything to do with the general over-all food picture and the subsidy situation appeared before the committee at one time or another. Out of that was evolved modification of the original committee amendment, and all the subsequent action of the Senate, and the measure finally went, as we all know, to the White House, and was vetoed, and then our later attempts to adjust and reconcile differences of viewpoint were made.

Now, Mr. President, we are at the stage where if we do not act favorably with reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation will no longer be in existence. I am not certain that the Senate wishes that untoward result. For my own part, I must admit that I do not wish to see the authorized borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation increased for use for subsidy purposes. I was perfectly willing, on the other hand, to reconcile my objection in that particular along the lines of what the committee had hitherto done.

I wanted my own position, Mr. President, with reference to this matter, to be set forth of record.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate has never been in a more unfortunate position than it has been in connection with this whole question ever since it arose. It has been almost impossible, I can say so far as I am personally concerned, for me ever to arrive at a point where I could vote for or against something, and properly and accurately and adequately express myself on the whole complex problem.

So far as I am individually concerned, I have been opposed to the roll-back type of subsidies, but I have never been able to vote and I do not know of a measure which has ever offered me an opportunity to vote against that type of subsidy and for the type of subsidies which I think nearly everyone familiar with the food production crisis recognizes to be absolutely necessary, as it is now being employed, and which may prove to be even more necessary so far as the 1944 crop is concerned, namely, the subsidies offered to the farmers in order to stimulate the production of needed crops.

Mr. President, as I understand, the situation confronting the Senate at this moment is that if we strike down the Commodity Credit Corporation by voting down this naked joint resolution as it came from the House, we will place in jeopardy all the subsidies which have been promised to the farmers, and which would be paid to them by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In view of all the rough going the farmers have had since the beginning of the war, it seems to me that nothing more unfortunate could happen than to announce to them now in the middle of the crop year of 1943, that the Senate of the United States has stricken down the organization through which they would hope to obtain the subsidies they had been promised when they planted the crops.

Furthermore, Mr. President, every person familiar with the instrumentalities which are of effective use in the agricultural arm of the Government recognizes that the Commodity Credit Corporation is one of the most effective and one of the most important instrumentalities from the standpoint of both the Government and the farmer.

While I realize that, under all the circumstances, having marched up the hill and marched down again, I cannot now ever hope to have a chance to express my position on this important and complex problem, I do appeal to my colleagues not to strike down this organization in a blind anger against the policies of the administration which we have been unable to check because we could not muster a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives and pass over the President's veto the bill which would have stopped them.

In this situation let us not strike down this great organization, and say to the farmers of the United States that in the closing hours before the recess the Senate decided it would not even honor the promises which had been made to them when they planted the crops upon which these stimulating subsidies are being paid.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DANAHER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as the situation now exists, I think the Senator from Wisconsin has expressed what is in the minds of most of the Senators in the Chamber, no matter on which side of the question they voted. Certainly, he expressed my own thoughts very clearly.

I rise to ask the able junior Senator from Connecticut if he does not think time would be saved and the idea expressed by himself and the Senator from Wisconsin carried out if a motion were made to recommit the bill with instructions to report it tomorrow, keeping in effect the class of subsidies given on which we all agreed, and for which we can shortly formulate a provision, and barring subsidies to which as a class we are opposed, and have that matter brought in tomorrow, to be voted on after, let us say, an hour's debate by each side. Would not that accomplish the desired result?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Maryland, let me say it is my belief that if the committee were to do that, and if the Senate and the House were to pass such a measure, the President would veto it.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my belief that if the Senate votes favorably on the motion to reconsider, and if thereafter it votes to reopen the question of the third reading of the joint resolution, the measure will be open to further amendment, whereupon the Senate can accept the section which would keep the Commodity Credit Corporation alive and would increase its authorized borrowing power by $350,000,000. If the Senate then were to agree to the original Banking and Currency Committee amendment, it seems to me the Senate would have accomplished what most Senators are anxious to accomplish with reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So, Mr. President, in order that the matter may be clear in the minds of all Members of the Senate, I will read the committee amendment as it was first reported:

SEC. 5. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes", approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or rollback of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Thus, let me say to the Senator from Maryland, we would in nowise whatever interfere with the production subsidies which are guaranteed for the basic commodities, under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, nor would we interfere with that type of production subsidy when the increased production of some commodity other than a basic commodity is called for by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commodity Credit Corporation's funds would be available not only to stimulate production but to increase the opportunity to producers to plant, produce, and market their foodstuffs which the country so badly needs; but we would not utilize any part of the increased buying power to pay subsidies by way of roll-backs.

Mr. President, whatever the law under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be, whether legal or illegal, we would leave that where we find it if the particular course I have suggested is followed.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. SHIPSTEAD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland, if the Senator from Minnesota will pardon me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very much impressed with what the Senator has said. Let me ask him a question. As a matter of practical administration, if the amendment the Senator has read should subsequently be agreed to by the Senate, under the ruling of the Attorney General would it be possible to pay roll-back subsidies?

Mr. DANAHER. I cannot believe, Mr. President, that Mr. Hutson and the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Comptroller General or anyone else would overlook the plain intendment of plain congressional language that says, "You shall not do it."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the original amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, the date "January 1, 1944," was inserted. As I listened to the Senator from Connecticut read the amendment which he proposed to offer, that date was not mentioned, so I understood. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. So the roll-back subsidies which under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would have been permitted until January 1, 1944, would not be permitted at all under the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut; is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. At least so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation's account is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As a practical matter, of course, there are no roll-back Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies, and there is no intention on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation to use any. The trouble with the amendment is it looks as if it is calling for the roll-back

subsidies on coffee, meat, and butter, whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with the roll-back subsidies on meat and butter. Those subsidies are entirely Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidies. So the amendment purports, by limiting the Commodity Credit Corporation, to do something it cannot do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I take it that it is the purpose of the Senator from Connecticut to eliminate the roll-back subsidy under the R. F. C., as referred to by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator from Maryland wants my genuine, sincere, right-down-to-rock-bottom answer on that question, I will say to him that what I really want to do is to get the question before the Senate and let the Senate consider the effect of all that language in the light of the comment of the Senator from Ohio, the views expressed by the Senator from Maryland, and the observations of the Senator from Wisconsin, in which I certainly concur.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should say that while many of us are very anxious to maintain the Commodity Credit Corporation, we are also anxious to get the amendment dealing with roll-back subsidies in such shape that there cannot be any question about where we stand on it.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under these varying propositions, I have not yet had a chance to vote clearly and exactly the way I want to vote. On every vote yet had, I have had to compromise with what I want to do.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator think that, as the joint resolution now stands, the Commodity Credit Corporation can handle any of the subsidies to which the Senate apparently objects?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I think so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator thinks they can; does he?

Mr. DANAHER. I think they can.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call for order. It is actually impossible to hear the private conversation being held on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Wyoming if up to now he has had any difficulty hearing me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For the last 5 minutes it has been impossible to find out what has been going on between the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Kansas, who have been conducting a private conversation in the midst of a great deal of disorder, let me say.

Mr. DANAHER. Some Senators were speaking so loud that I could not even hear the Senator from Minnesota. However, I still thought the Senator from Wyoming could hear me.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota and ask him to restate his question. I ask for the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, if he will cease his conversation. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, prior to making the motion for reconsideration I stated that I desired to eliminate what many Senators considered to be objectionable subsidies. I stated at that time that I wished to save the Commodity Credit Corporation. When the last vote was taken there was a great deal of confusion in the Senate. Several Senators were talking to me, and I voted under a misapprehension, as I understand other Senators did.

The Senator from Connecticut referred to some bill and compared it with the joint resolution, if the joint resolution should remain as it is now, after the elimination of the so-called Taft amendment. In the opinion of the Senator, in view of what he stated about the bill to which he referred—I do not remember the number of the bill—is there anything objectionable in the joint resolution as it now stands?

Mr. DANAHER. When the Senator from Minnesota earlier asked me the same question, I admit that there was some confusion in the Senate generally, and in my mind as well. As the Senator now puts the question, it is perfectly apparent that he is assuming that House Joint Resolution 147 is before the Senate. Actually it is not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has talked about some bill, and he seemed to think it was important. Therefore I asked him the question.

Mr. DANAHER. I was talking about Senate bill 1108, which is the bill which was originally referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency to continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Answering the Senator's question, if we assume that House Joint Resolution 147 is before the Senate, or if Senate bill 1108 should pass, then I will say to the Senator that without the Taft amendment there would be no limitation whatever on the Commodity Credit Corporation, in my opinion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me ask the Senator about House Joint Resolution 147 as it now stands. Has he any objection to it? Can he find any fault with it?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. I do not want to see the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation increased by $350,000,000 without any limitation whatever on the type of subsidy use which may be made of that fund. It seems to me that it ought to be used for production subsidies, in accordance with the general purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is why we have continued the life of that Corporation three times.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator evidently thinks there should be an amendment?

Mr. DANAHER. I do.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator offer such an amendment on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. DANAHER. I will if the motion to reconsider is agreed to, and if the vote by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading is reconsidered. Then the bill will be before us for amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that nothing passed between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Kansas except an undertone suggestion that there was a misunderstanding between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Minnesota. That was all. Further than that, the Senator from Kansas said nothing.

If the Senator from Minnesota will yield to me, I agree that we should straighten out this situation. I have no desire to see the Commodity Credit Corporation put out of business. I am unqualifiedly opposed to the misuse of public funds for subsidy purposes, as they have been used.

I have examined the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, which is section 5 of Senate bill 1108. I think it would serve the purpose. I am definitely and strongly urging the Senate to give this matter further consideration and take time to give it reasonable consideration. For that purpose I assume that the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will have to be agreed to, that we reconsider the vote by which House Joint Resolution 147 was rejected.

I believe that the language of the House is all right as far as it goes; but I think that section 5 of Senate bill 1108, which was read by the Senator from Connecticut, should be added, because it definitely forbids the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for roll-back subsidies.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I hope that the motion to reconsider will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that the Senate has done what it did not intend to do. It has completely stricken down the Commodity Credit Corporation. If the situation remains as it is, with the joint resolution defeated, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be out of business. In order to do anything at all about it, we must reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was defeated. That will reopen the measure for further amendment, provided the vote by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading is also reconsidered.

I am not certain whether we can work out on the floor of the Senate what the Senate really wishes to do, or whether it would be wiser to refer the joint resolution to the committee.

Section 5 was eliminated from the joint resolution before we finally voted on it. That left the joint resolution as it passed the House, except that we eliminated one section of the House language and put in section 6, which really has nothing to

do with subsidies but refers to grade labeling and one or two other matters which probably are desirable, regardless of the subsidy. So I hope, in order that the Senate may function in regard to this subject, it may be given an opportunity to express its viewpoint. Let me say, frankly, that I seriously doubt whether any resolution for a recess will be presented to this body until there has been legislation, or at least until the Senate has declared its viewpoint with respect to the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not think a recess ought to be taken until the Senate has had an opportunity to do so. If, after deliberation, the Senate wishes to eliminate the Commodity Credit Corporation permanently, it has the right to do so. If any controversial amendments are put into the joint resolution as it passed the House, it will be necessary for it to go to conference.

I think I am justified in taking it for granted that this body does not desire, in this confusion, to bring further chaos into the agricultural and economic situation by striking down the Commodity Credit Corporation. So let us reconsider not only the vote by which the joint resolution was defeated, but also the vote by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and work out something which will be sensible. It would be incredible, unthinkable, and to the discredit of the Senate if we should permit ourselves to take a summer recess in the chaotic situation in which the last vote has resulted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Kentucky, as I have frequently done in the past. I am opposed to trying to write an important bill on the floor of the Senate. It cannot safely be done. I think we ought to proceed carefully and intelligently. My opinion is that we ought to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was rejected, and also the vote by which it was ordered to a third reading, so that the joint resolution may go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency tonight and be reported to the Senate tomorrow. In the meantime every Senator can inform himself as to the condition of the joint resolution at this time, and as to the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut will offer in the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, personally I am not concerned with whether we try to write a measure on the floor of the Senate or send the joint resolution back to the committee. We might save time by letting it go back to the committee tonight, and letting the committee mull over it further. In view of the changed situation, I think we ought to confer with those who are to administer the law. I hope we can have a vote on the motion to reconsider, and that the motion will be agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see why the joint resolution cannot be taken care of within the next few minutes. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a useful agency of the Government. We all agree upon that. I think most of us were surprised a few minutes ago when it was voted out of existence.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the Senate has time and again made plain that it does not want roll-back subsidies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think any Senator was more surprised than those who voted to strike it down. I do not think they really intended to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I myself was surprised. Once more I take opportunity to express my opposition to roll-back subsidies. It would be perfectly agreeable to me if the continuing resolution were passed, giving the Commodity Credit Corporation the borrowing power it needs for its ordinary crop incentive program. I do not know whether the amount is $175,000,000, or what it is.

It does not seem to me that it is necessary again to send the joint resolution to the committee. I am sure that Members of the Senate do not want to kill the Commodity Credit Corporation. Why can we not act now and have it over with?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am proceeding on that assumption; but before we can touch the matter at all we must reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was defeated.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then we must reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading so that it may be properly before the Senate for amendment. Personally I do not see any necessity of sending it back to the committee if we can agree on what we ought to do. Time is of some importance.

Mr. President, I wonder if there would be an objection to a unanimous consent request that the vote by which the joint resolution was defeated be reconsidered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Kentucky, but I think there should be a quorum call, because some Senators who might desire to object have stepped out of the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am perfectly willing to have a quorum call. If we could vote on the motion now I am sure we could make some progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading be reconsidered, so that the joint resolution will be back to the amendment stage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of Senators who have discussed the roll-back, and who have expressed their desires that the roll-back upon the producer be prohibited, to the fact that an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, doing precisely that, was adopted as a perfecting amendment to section 5 of the joint resolution as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Inasmuch as the joint resolution is now again before the Senate, if it is not recommitted—and I think it should be recommitted so that the Committee on Banking and Currency may work the matter out—I shall take an opportunity to present such amendment again.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in order to bring the matter to a head, I wish to make a motion. If the motion leads to extended debate I shall withdraw it. I think we have proceeded far enough to know that it is very difficult to get the proposal before the Senate in legal and considered form, as a majority of Senators apparently want it, so that we can vote on the clear-cut issue of continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation on the one hand and limiting or prohibiting roll-back subsidies on the other. Therefore I move that the joint resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with instructions to the committee to report the joint resolution back to the Senate not later than 12 o'clock tomorrow, with a provision in it for the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation and a clean-cut prohibition against roll-back subsidies.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully ask the Senator from Maryland to waive the status of the motion which he has made to the end that I may offer an amendment and allow it to become the pending question. I am sure it would go a long way toward reaching the objective of the Senator from Maryland. Then whatever action the Senate may decide to take on the Senator's motion, at least we shall have some language before us for consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to withdraw my motion if there is a concrete proposal upon which we can vote which approaches what we are attempting to do. I do not wish to vote on any more proposals which fail to give us the opportunity to register what we wish to register, no matter which way we may vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments

shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how far would this amendment get us away from the bill which was vetoed a few days ago?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it seems to me that whether the R. F. C. account is adequate for legal roll-back, or any other subsidy purposes, is beside the point. We do not touch it. This amendment would not impinge upon the R. F. C.'s status in any respect whatsoever. It says that we want the Commodity Credit Corporation kept alive. We are willing to increase its authorized borrowing power by $350,000,000, but we do not want one cent of the Commodity Credit Corporation money used for any other kind of subsidy than the ones already provided for in the statute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask a further question. The joint resolution as it now stands contains the original House language, except that we have stricken out one paragraph with regard to the bank officers. There is no controversy about that provision. We have left in section 6, which has no relationship to subsidies.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no real controversy on that score. In substance, the Senator's language would take the place of section 5, which the Senate has eliminated. While the Senator has probably not offered it at that place, the effect of it would be to take the place of what the Senate rejected in section 5.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut is more or less harmless if we wish so to regard it, but, of course, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not engaging in any roll-back subsidies and has no plans to do so. It is interested in production, and presumably it never will engage in roll-back subsidies. If the President wishes to put any roll-back program into effect all he needs to do is to do it through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, because the proposed amendment would limit only the Commodity Credit Corporation. It would in no way limit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. So, while I must say that there is no particular harm in it, I do not believe it would do any good. Also, it has another defect which I think could be remedied. It would forbid subsidies, but it would not forbid the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy butter, for example, at one price and sell it at a loss, which in effect would be carrying out a roll-back subsidy. That language might be adjusted, but after you get through, where are you? It is proposed to say to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is not the instrument through which the President is carrying out roll-back subsidies, or is proposing to carry out roll-back subsidies, that it shall not carry out any roll-back subsidy.

The amendment would do no great harm if the Senate should adopt it. It would not be cause for a veto because it would not limit the President's power in any way. But I do not see any great advantage in it. If the Senate wishes simply to take another shot at roll-back subsidies, express its opinion, place the provision in the joint resolution and pass it, that will be one way to deal with the situation, but it ought not to do so under any misapprehension that we are prohibiting roll-back subsidies.

As for the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland, it seems to me we have had a clear vote indicating that the Senate is opposed to allowing subsidies if they have to vote on the question of subsidies at all. That is apparently clear, and I do not know what amendment the committee could bring in which would be approved on that subject. The committee has worked on a large number of amendments; it has tried to present a solution. The Senator wants a proposal that absolutely outlaws all roll-back subsidies. We considered such a measure, and the Congress passed it, but the President vetoed it and the veto was upheld by the House of Representatives. So there is no use voting on that again.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree with the Senator. I feel that the President was within his rights in vetoing the bill, and it is evident that Congress, in one House at least, at that time did not want to pass the bill over his veto. But I do not believe because the President vetoed it, it is necessarily right. What I am interested in doing is keeping my position in line with what I think is my responsibility to the country in time of war.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that; the Senator's vote today showed what his position is; but now we have confronted the question whether we shall continue the Commodity Credit Corporation or shall not continue it. That seems to be the only question before the Senate. I do not see any other substantive proposal that will affect the question of subsidies, one way or the other, and it seems to me we ought to vote tonight. If the Senate wishes to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, I do not think it will do any harm, and neither do I think it will do any good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Connecticut, as I read it, will have the effect of killing the programs which the Commodity Credit Corporation has adopted long since with respect to many agricultural commodities and which it has pursued without objection upon the part of anyone in the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The agricultural industry has not complained about the subsidy programs with respect to fats and oils; it has not complained, at least, to the extent of demanding the cessation of the programs which have been carried out with respect to sugar and other commodities. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will, therefore, if adopted, bring about the cessation of certain programs which are definitely in the interest of producing more food.

The practical matter, Mr. President, which confronts us is whether or not we intend by our action in the Senate to kill the whole agricultural program of the Commodity Credit Corporation because we want to kill the roll-backs which were initiated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. What good would it do to kill the programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation when the complaint we make is against a program which was announced by the R. F. C. under the Price Control Act?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator has not read the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. It only prohibits subsidies paid in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices. There are no Commodity Credit Corporation programs which involve any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices. So I think the Senator is mistaken when he thinks the amendment will invalidate any existing program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, this amendment is not the one which the Senator from Connecticut read originally. This is not the amendment which was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, is it?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. There have been several copies of the joint resolution. The one from which this language was taken is the committee amendment appearing in the measure reported June 4, 1943.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a moment further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is difficult for me to hear the Senator, but I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I want to point out to the Senator when we started on this particular debate 40 minutes or so ago that the Commodity Credit Corporation was dead. Now we have the Corporation back to life; now we have a measure on which we can operate. I am not wedded to the words which the Senator criticises. I am not saying that the Senator cannot offer an amendment to include all agencies if he wishes to do so; and I am not saying he cannot by a stroke of the pen make roll-backs or any other type of subsidies come within the language which

has been offered. It lies within his power and province so to do. What I was anxious to do was to get the question before the Senate again in legislative form upon which we could act and thanks to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to reconsider that is what has happened. At least, we are this much further along.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Connecticut has performed a distinct service in bringing the matter to this situation, but I have just had the opportunity of reading the Senator's amendment, and I confess it is not exactly what I understood it to be as I heard him read it.

I was about to propose as a substitute for the Senator's amendment the language which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I proposed yesterday, which was adopted by the Senate and which I believe would effectively put an end to the so-called roll-back upon the producer.

Mr. President, my feeling is that this matter is one of such complexity that it should be returned to the committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Minnesota will bear with me for a moment, let me say that it is obviously impossible to legislate upon the floor of the Senate in the manner in which we desire to legislate. This is a matter of such great complication that it should be given the benefit of renewed consideration by the committee. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the joint resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well; I withhold my motion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I believe the sentiment of the Senate on this question is well understood. We want to save the Commodity Credit Corporation; we want to see it continue as it has been authorized in the past to promote the production of certain necessary critical crops. I think the Senate is now in agreement upon that. So I suggest as an amendment to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the joint resolution be recommitted to the committee with instructions to carry out what appears to be the will of the Senate this afternoon, so that there will be no controversy tomorrow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor. Does he yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I prefer not to yield at the moment. I feel that any instructions from the Senate to the committee should not be given at this time, because this committee knows very well what the mind of the Senate is, and I think it can be trusted to bring in a measure which will present the issues here in a manner which will make a solution of the problem possible. So I should prefer not to offer my motion with any qualifications whatsoever, except one, and that qualification I shall now add, namely, that the committee be instructed to bring in a report at noon tomorrow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to state the situation as I see it, and I want to say, with all due respect to the Senator from Wyoming, and the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland, that I hope the motion will not prevail.

Let us recapitulate for a moment what has been the tortuous course of the proposed legislation. First of all, a measure was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency containing the so-called Taft amendment; in any case, the measure was reported from the committee with the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, but the Senator from Ohio, with the authority of the committee, offered an amendment in substance similar to the one voted down by the Senate today. The Senate refused to accept that amendment. It voted first for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], which prohibited all subsidies. Then it voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], prohibiting roll-back subsidies, so-called, but permitting the types of subsidy which were utilized to increase production.

In that form the measure went to the House, and a measure containing the substance of the Senate's position, the Aiken-Gillette amendment, went to the White House. It was vetoed by the President of the United States and returned to the House of Representatives, where those who were in favor of prohibiting roll-back subsidies could not muster a two-thirds vote to pass the measure, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Then and there those in the House of Representatives and in the Senate who desired to prohibit roll-back subsidies lost the battle. The House recognized that, and passed a simple, naked joint resolution to afford additional borrowing power to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Bear in mind, the Commodity Credit Corporation never has been utilized, and no one has suggested that it would be, to pay any of the roll-back types of subsidy. All that has been done by financing through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some of its subsidiaries.

It seems to me, therefore, that it would be futile to send the joint resolution back to the committee. The committee has twice attempted to insert a compromise provision, and the Senate has twice refused to accept it.

The simple way out of this dilemma, and the one which will come as close as possible to getting us out of the legislative and parliamentary mess in which we now find ourselves, is, in my opinion, to vote down the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, and to pass the House joint resolution without amendment.

Under existing circumstances, there is no way within our power to prevent the Executive from utilizing Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds with which to pay roll-back subsidies. If we inserted a prohibition in the pending joint resolution, it goes without saying, it seems to me, that the President would veto it, and I think it will go without saying that a two-thirds vote could not be mustered in the House of Representatives to pass the measure over his veto. So we would simply march up the hill and march down again.

Since we cannot prohibit roll-back subsidies, it seems to me it would be a tragic mistake to strike down or imperil the type of subsidies we do favor, namely, those provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to strike down that agency itself.

It seems to me, therefore, that in all the circumstances with which we are confronted, the wise, the sound, and the straightforward way out of this situation is to pass the House joint resolution without amendment, and if we wish to renew the fight over the roll-back subsidies when we return after the recess, we will be in a position to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has stated the position I and some other Senators on the Committee on Banking and Currency took, but we were in the minority. I wish to add to that statement the fact that when the House of Representatives saw that situation, regardless of the side they had occupied on the question of subsidies, practically without opposition, practically unanimously, both in the committee and on the floor, they passed this simple joint resolution continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not in anywise criticizing the committee. On the contrary, I think the committee made a genuine and a sincere effort to find some way out of the situation which would restrict and delimit the amount of money available for roll-back subsidies, but the Senate has refused to accept such a proposal; it has voted it down, and, therefore, it would be futile now, it seems to me, to return the joint resolution to the committee and have it bring back a similar proposal to delimit subsidies of the roll-back type and have the Senate vote it down again tomorrow. Likewise, it would be futile to send the joint resolution back to the committee and have the committee bring back a prohibition against the roll-back type of subsidies from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, because I assume the President has not changed his position and would veto such a measure.

Now let us get out of this legislative wilderness in which we have been wandering around for the past several days. Let us pass this clean, naked joint resolution, which continue the type of subsidies which most of us, I think, approve, namely, those tending to increase production. I think we can rest assured that there has been no proposal advanced, and that there will be none advanced, to utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation for the roll-back type of subsidy. Then the measure can this afternoon be on its way to the White House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wherry
George	O'Mahoney	White
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wiley
Guffey	Reed	Willis
Gurney	Revercomb	
Hawkes	Reynolds	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I wish to take this opportunity to concur in the remarks made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with respect to the joint resolution. I have said nothing in connection with this measure, but have listened rather carefully throughout the debate upon it. As the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has so well said, when the Senate struck down section 5, with all the amendments therein, which had placed limitations on the spending power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it did what the majority of the Senate wanted done with respect to the program of roll-backs.

There is nothing in the Commodity Credit Corporation, insofar as its activities are concerned, which deals with the roll-backs in the prices of meats and other commodities the Senate has been discussing for the last 2 or 3 days. So, in my opinion, there is nothing to be gained by sending the measure back to the committee. The committee can report nothing that will be of advantage to the Senate and the country, because regardless of what the committee reports, as has been said time and time again, if the committee reports an amendment which provides that no roll-backs can be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, it reports something which faces a veto by the President of the United States. It seems to me the only one thing we can do under the circumstances, if we want to save the Commodity Credit Corporation, is to pass the measure sent to us by the House, and send it on to the other end of the Avenue for the signature of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am happy that the Senate reconsidered the vote by which it had previously killed the Commodity Credit Corporation. A great number of Senators who voted to kill the Corporation obviously regretted that they had voted in that way, because the Corporation is one of the most important instrumentalities of Government that exists at this moment. Had the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee been sustained, and the motion to reconsider tabled, and were the Senate to take a recess and Senators leave Washington after having stricken down the Commodity Credit Corporation, I undertake to say that we would be back here in less than 10 days' time, and not upon the call of the President either, because the country would understand what the Senate did in striking down a constructive agency such as the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. President, all we can do at this moment is to adopt the language of the House, and clean up this mess as soon as possible. In my judgment we can gain nothing by sending the measure back to the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is much to commend in the suggestion made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], because it will at least give to all parties, those who favor and those who do not favor the roll-back subsidy, an opportunity to vote without a compromising of the basic principle. Even though the hour is late, and I know Senators are tired of considering various proposals, I shall attempt to make one more effort to place on record those who wish to be against roll-back subsidies.

Whether or not the President vetoes the measure is not my concern. It is not the concern of any Member of this body. I myself should like to see the President sign a measure outlawing roll-back subsidies if for no other reason than that I believe that the welfare of the country in no small part depends upon the Congress staying out of a consumers' subsidy program. I do not care how plausible the argument may be, I do not care how hedged about and limited is the program, the door is open, and any man who knows the human side of political institutions knows that we cannot open such a door as that and close it easily, particularly when Congress is in session, and in view of the high state of organization which exists in the respective groups in the country at the present time.

If the Senate adopts the proposal which I shall read shortly, and if the House concurs in it, and the President vetoes it—I should hate to see it vetoed—but my satisfaction would be that I had voted for what I believed was for the best interests of the country. If the President then vetoes it he will have been willing to sacrifice the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to get subsidies of the roll-back character, and I have a feeling that if we are in recess he might consider that as between the two he would rather have the Commodity Credit Corporation even with the roll-back limitation placed upon it.

I was much impressed by what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] said earlier today. Where is the money coming from to pay these roll-back subsidies? These are not peacetimes. The national debt will amount to $300,000,000,000. We are in the middle of the war, with the highest industrial and agricultural income in the history of the Republic. What do we propose to do? We propose not to fix prices in fairness to wages, but to fix prices unfairly in reference to wages—that is the only way they can be fixed higher than the just relationship—and then disguise the benefit for the inequality we have endorsed through the medium of taking out of the left-hand pocket what we have openly put into the right-hand pocket of every taxpayer of the country.

I wish to read three or four observations made when Mr. Brown was before the Committee on Appropriations.

Senator TYDINGS. Suppose, just for the sake of theory and exploration, that all subsidies are denied you for meats. You would still have authority to fix the prices of meat at the source, would you not?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes.

SUBSIDY WOULD NOT ALTER BASIC SET-UP

Senator TYDINGS. So, the subsidy makes it perhaps easier for you to accomplish this, but it does not alter the basic set-up at all?

Mr. BROWN. No; it does not. The question that was presented to us on the subsidy issue was this. On both beef and pork we can roll back at the livestock level, because they are both above parity.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you supply for the record at this point in your testimony what is parity?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. Brown then placed in the record the parity price on meat and the market price of meat as of May 15, 1943, as shown on page 86 of the Senate appropriation hearings.

I continue to read:

Mr. BROWN. That could be done. There is a general feeling, as I think Senator HAYDEN perhaps knows better than anyone else here, that beef is unfairly controlled by the parity concept.

Senator HAYDEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. BROWN. That has been drummed into me for many years. With that in mind, we seriously hesitated and have not rolled back the price of beef at the present level. That was one of the principal factors in it.

Second, the Government has supported a price of $13.75 on hogs. It would be pretty difficult—I do not know just what the moral situation or the good faith situation is—it would be pretty difficult for me to assent to a proposition of that kind—rolling back below that figure—although the corn-hog ratio, that the corn farmers talk about, would indicate that hogs should be considerably below that figure.

Continuing, he said:

We were faced with the proposition, assuming that we had adhered to the President's "hold the line" order, to get back to September 1942, levels, whether we would roll back price levels on those important meat commodities, or perhaps just to ask for a subsidy.

There is the milk in the coconut.

Continuing for one more paragraph, he said:

Senator TAFT and I disagree about this. We perhaps had more to do with writing the price control bill than any other Senators.

He felt that the only kind of subsidy that was justified under the law was a straight payment to the purchaser. I reasoned that exactly the same result comes; that is, encouragement of production, in this present situation. If I am faced with the task of choosing between those limitations and the limitations of the McKellar amendment, relative to the fair and equitable margins and the September 15, 1942, price levels, then I am faced with the proposition that I must either roll back on the meat price at the livestock level or must subsidize. I, under those circumstances, chose a production subsidy. The Attorney General agrees with that view of the situation. That is the thing that was presented to us.

Mr. President, what did the Senate do?

The Senate passed a bill in which it fixed the date of September 15, 1942, as the date on which to freeze wages, and to freeze below a certain level the prices of agricultural commodities and all other prices. That is what the Senate did. The Price Administrator says, "I have the authority to do that." He says that in the case of beef cattle he believes the price level is too low; and from looking at his figures, I think it is. However, the Congress recently allowed the door to be opened in the case of wages, in the effort to bring wages of certain groups up to what was called the Little Steel formula, so as to provide what amounted to a 15-percent increase; and the Congress allowed food prices to be brought up to a certain level, so that neither one will stick its head above that.

By the pending measure, is it proposed that the Senate shall hold the line? No. What is proposed is to have the Senate vote to stick one part of the economic equation above the line, and then disguise it behind a subsidy.

I will not take the responsibility for breaking the line; because, mark you well, Mr. President, before the sun shines next summer, just as certainly as I stand on this floor, if you go to bed with the subsidy issue, you are going to have a shotgun wedding, and stay to bed with it, long after this war is over.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, from what the Senator has said, I assume he would permit price increases in certain instances, would he?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would.

Mr. MALONEY. That would break the line.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; it would not. I would permit them, just as I would permit labor increases wherever a case of unjustifiable hardship could be shown; and if any labor group in the country can show that it is away below the fair line of economic stability, in line with this equation, the Government has already gone on record as in favor of giving them a 15 percent or smaller increase, wherever they can maintain that position.

My point is that Congress should either write the formula over again or should stick by it.

What the Congress would be doing by the pending measure would be to get away over the formula.

Not long ago I was reading something about the history of ancient Rome. I remember that with a sparsely settled population, 360,000 families were subsisting entirely upon the government, through the corn-subsidy equation. Congress is starting out in that way.

Here is another reason why Congress should write the limitation into the measure: The President has said the money in circulation is more than enough to purchase all available goods, and that, therefore, it is necessary to siphon off a great deal of that money so as to bring available purchasing power in line with the amount of articles available for purchase, and thereby not have people bidding against each other and thus helping to drive prices through the ceiling.

However, what is proposed in the case of the pending measure? To the extent that the Congress authorizes subsidies, it puts that much more money in circulation; that is all. Congress would take the amount out of the Public Treasury and give it to someone—to a producer or a processor or a distributor. Congress would give it to him. To that extent there would be that much more money in circulation than there was. Such a move is purely inflationary.

What I am interested in—and I believe many other Senators share my view—is to have a chance to vote on a proposition of forbidding all roll-back subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not understand. How many times does the Senator want to vote on that subject? He has already voted on it twice. Is not that enough? What is the use of having Congress do over again exactly what it has done, and having the measure vetoed, just as the other bill was vetoed? Why not forget it? The Senator is on record. I cannot see the object in passing again the substance of a bill which has been vetoed on that very ground.

I agree with the Senator; I am 100 percent against roll-back subsidies. However, as a matter of fact, my opinion is that, regardless of what the Congress does, the administration will never again try to put on a roll-back subsidy. As a matter of fact, ordinary subsidies to keep prices down are exactly the same in principle as roll-back subsidies, but are infinitely easier to put into operation, and are much less likely to arouse resentment. So I think the administration made a tremendous mistake in using roll-back subsidies, and I do not think it ever will resort to them again.

The real question is the question of having subsidies to keep prices where they are. That is the fundamental question. That has been settled. The Senate has refused to impose on subsidies any prohibition which it would be possible to get the President to approve. So it seems to me we should simply continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and go home. I do not see what other practical alternative there is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Congress passed a bill. The President vetoed it. The Senator advocates that Congress change its mind. I advocate that the President change his mind. [Laughter.] I believe that all the facts in the situation show that it will be wise for him, taking the long-range view, to change his mind. The Congress is the policy-making branch of the Government and has been, up to now. The President is the executive and administrative branch, particularly so in the domestic field. I grant that he has wide powers in the foreign field, and I ask very little question about it. But in the domestic field, the Congress is the fountainhead and the source and the only place where power can be born.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to the further fact that when the Congress passed subsection (e) upon which the administration relies for the right to give the subsidies——

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course.

Mr. WHEELER. There was no Member of the Senate who for one second construed the bill as permitting the administration to give subsidies to the processors.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that Mr. Cox, who at one time was one of the high-ranking officials in the Department of Justice, within the last year or 18 months, in addressing a number of Government attorneys, said that the mission of the Department of Justice was——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has my time on the joint resolution expired, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall move to recommit the joint resolution, and I desire to speak on that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is the Senate operating under the 15-minute rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The rule under which the Senate is proceeding reads as follows:

> That during the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 147 no Senator shall speak more than once, nor longer than 15 minutes on the House joint resolution, or on any amendment thereto.

The motion before the Senate is the motion to recommit. Does the limitation apply to a motion to recommit, inasmuch as it is neither an amendment to the joint resolution nor the joint resolution itself?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Technically, the agreement limiting debate does not apply to a motion to recommit.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that. I will resume for 15 minutes more—and I hope for only 5.

When the parliamentary question was raised, I was stating that Mr. Cox, a high-ranking official in the Department of Justice, recently in addressing a group of Goverment attorneys said that the mission of the Department of Justice was not to interpret acts of Congress

strictly as they were written, but to find ways and means by which administrative agencies could do things. I think he properly expressed the attitude of the interpreting attorneys under the present dispensation. They do not say, "This seems to restrict us," but "How can we find the means of breaking through this restriction and doing what we want to have done?"

I propose to accept the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut just as he read it, and add the words "or any other Government agency." That would take in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and every other Government agency which might be thinking of going into the business of roll-back food subsidies. If I have an opportunity to vote for this amendment, I can register my position on it; and if it is defeated and the joint resolution goes through, I can register my position again; but that will be the first time since this matter has been before us latterly that I will have had an opportunity to vote on the straight issue, and to vote the proposal up or down.

In conclusion—and I shall yield the floor shortly—if I thought the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the effect that the administration never would go into roll-back food subsidies again, were well-founded, I should be tolerant enough, I hope, to say, "It was a mistake. Everyone recognizes that. We shall emerge from it very gradually, and call it a day. We will have no more of it."

However, the very fact that the President vetoed the bill ought to put Senators on notice as to what lies ahead. I will not assume the responsibility which could very easily flow from the abuse of subsidizing the consumers of America out of the Federal Treasury, in the face of a mounting debt, when we are living in the period of greatest national income this Republic has ever known. It simply does not make sense, and I want no part of it, directly or indirectly.

I have no quarrel with those who disagree. I am interested in maintaining my own position, because I believe that, judged on the basis of any length of time in the future, it will be proved to be eminently and abundantly wise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report it back not later than 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to the argument of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. This afternoon I heard him complain because there had been too many different things combined, so that he was compelled to vote against something which he wanted in order to vote against something which he did not want. He is trying to put the same proposition up to the Senate now, so that any Senator who wishes to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation must vote against it, or vote for subsidies. So his plan does not work for the rest of us. He is putting before us a double proposition, whereas he is asking for a single one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report back not later than 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, this vote is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With instructions to report back not later than 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I assume that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent on official business, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—8

Caraway	Reed	Van Nuys
McCarran	Revercomb	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Scrugham	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bone	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tydings
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Danaher	McKellar	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Murdock	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—33

Andrews	Chavez	Mead
Austin	Clark, Idaho	Moore
Bailey	Eastland	Murray
Ball	Ellender	Overton
Bankhead	Gillette	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Green	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Hatch	Tobey
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrd	Lodge	Willis
Chandler	McNary	Wilson

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's motion to recommit was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. On page 6 of his amendment, in line 8, after the word "Corporation", I propose to insert "or from any funds authorized to be borrowed by such Corporation, or any other governmental agency, including Government-owned corporations."

In a word, this would take in all agencies which might indulge in roll-back subsidies, and I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he will not allow his amendment to be modified in the form I have suggested.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator be good enough to read very slowly the language which he has suggested so that it can be copied?

Mr. TYDINGS. On page 6, line 8, after the word "Corporation", I propose to insert "or from any funds authorized to be borrowed by such Corporation or any other governmental agency, including Government-owned corporations."

If the Senator will accept the amendment and if it shall be submitted to the Senate we will get a close-cut vote on the issue. If the proposal shall be lost,

I am perfectly willing to go along with the philosophy of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DANAHER. That would certainly raise the issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut agree to the modification of his amendment as proposed by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DANAHER. I do.

Mr. TAFT. While I am not in favor of subsidy roll-backs, it seems to me it would be useless again to vote on a provision which the President has already vetoed and would undoubtedly veto again.

Mr. MALONEY and several other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, we are planning to recess. I should like a recess and I think the Senate as a whole would like to recess this week. But if there should be a veto of the pending measure it would kill the Commodity Credit Corporation. It seems to me it would be unwise to pass a measure which would have that result. If the theory is that the amendment is merely to go to conference, it would place the Senate conferees in the really unfortunate position of having to recede, because there certainly is no argument for the House to pass the joint resolution over again and have it again vetoed. While I intend to vote for the amendment, I wish to make it clear that so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to roll-back subsidies, and I believe they should be prohibited.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not desire to debate the amendment. I am perfectly willing to have a vote taken upon it now. But it seems to me that there is an overwhelming sentiment in the Senate in favor of voting on the House joint resolution as it came over, without complications. If the pending amendment is defeated, I intend to seek reconsideration of the votes by which amendments to the joint resolution have already been agreed to, so the Senate may express itself on the simple question of adopting the joint resolution as it was passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], with whom I have a general pair, if present, would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Gurney	Reynolds
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson
Brooks	Holman	Scrugham
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wheeler
George	Reed	Wherry
Gerry	Revercomb	Wiley

NAYS—28

Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Burton	Langer	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Guffey	Nye	White
Hayden	O'Mahoney	
Hill	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Bankhead	Bushfield
Austin	Barbour	Byrd
Bailey	Bilbo	Chandler
Ball	Brewster	Clark, Idaho
Eastland	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Mead	Tobey
Glass	Moore	Truman
Green	Murray	Willis
Hatch	Overton	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	

So Mr. DANAHER's amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 147, which the Senate passed this afternoon, be printed showing the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 35. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1252. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes,

having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 108, 162, and 163.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 96, 99, 154½, 155, and 157; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,270,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,350,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That appropriations heretofore made"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Shasta Dam, reservoir and power plant, $10,900,000; Keswick Dam and power plant, $1,474,000; Friant Dam and Reservoir, $595,000; transmission line to Shasta substation, $400,000; Friant-Kern Canal, $7,000,000; Madera Canal, $1,000,000; Contra Costa Canal, $500,000; Contra Costa laterals, $500,000; and examinations, surveys, and water rights, $200,000; in all, $22,569,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$865,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 9 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "twenty-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,170,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 113, 119, and 156.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER
ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2719, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
July 5, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156 to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,650,000: *Provided*, That of the total construction cost of all features of the project not to exceed $3,080,000 shall be reimbursable under the provisions of the reclamation law";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$32,809,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 113 and 119.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe it is due to some commitments which I have made to Senators to explain that the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill was a complete report, and that the bill now goes to the White House for approval. I also promised to state to the Senate that there is no money appropriated in it for the transmission line from Shasta Dam to Oroville. The situation with respect to that is that no money being provided, in the absence of an appropriation of any kind, the line can be constructed or any work that is necessary to be done on it in the meantime can be carried on with the unexpended balances which are now available. By that I mean that where contracts have been made or where it is necessary to acquire the materials or do anything of the kind, the money is available for such purposes. But we are going to vote on the principle of the line and all other transmission lines for the Central Valley project when a special estimate is submitted to the Congress when we return after the recess.

In the meantime the Reclamation Service can proceed to carry forward any work which is necessary in connection with the proposed transmission line to Oroville.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if, in the conference agreement on the Interior Department appropriation bill just reported by the Senator, there was deleted from the bill the appropriation provided by the Senate of $900,000 for the manganese pilot plant in South Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Can the Senator give me an explanation of the reason for that action?

Mr. HAYDEN. The estimate which was submitted for work of that type was reduced $100,000 by the House. The Senate restored the $1,000,000 Budget estimate and added to it $900,000 for the specific purpose which the Senator stated, but we were unable to induce the House conferees to yield upon that

point. The House conferees said there was no Budget estimate for the extra amount, and they would not agree to it. We were obliged to come to an agreement.

Mr. GURNEY. One more question. There is still $900,000 in the bill which can be used to discover the best process for beneficiating manganese.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, but it does not necessarily apply to the particular place mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. GURNEY. Is there any specific statement in the measure that the money shall be used in any particular spot in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It is for general use throughout the country.

Mr. GURNEY. Then the money provided by the bill, according to the final conference agreement, can be used in South Dakota as well as in any other State?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

FORREST W. DICKEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "$5,000" insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the figures "$116" insert "$416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

VISIT TO WOUNDED NORTH AFRICAN VETERANS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago the Members of the Senate were invited by one of the officials of the War Department to make a trip to New York City, for the purpose of greeting some of our wounded soldiers who have returned from the north African area, and also to visit some of the hospitals on Staten Island. Unfortunately, the Senate was in session at the time when the trip was scheduled, and the many Members of the Senate who desired to make the trip were unable to do so. The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was appointed chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to make the trip. He did so. Following his return he submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs the report I hold in my hand. The report will be deposited with Colonel Watt, in the Committee on Military Affairs, for review by the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky is now absent from the Senate. Rather than take the time of the Senate to read the conclusion stated in the report, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the conclusion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 1, 1943.*

The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In accordance with your instructions to act as your representative in the inspection of the hospital ship *Acadia*, which arrived at Staten Island on Friday, June 25, I arrived in New York in the early morning of that date and was met by United States Army cars furnished by Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, commanding general of the New York port of embarkation.

We proceeded to Staten Island where we inspected the Halloran General Hospital while waiting for the *Acadia* to dock. It was scheduled to arrive about 9:30 a. m., but was held up by fog until 1:30 p. m.

We inspected the ship, the Halloran receiving hospital, and a hospital train then loading to take the wounded and disabled from the Halloran Hospital, following any necessary emergency treatment, to the hospitals nearest their respective homes and where their particular cases could be best treated.

I want to take this occasion to thank you and the members of the committee who made the trip possible, and commend the work of the Medical and Transportation Corps for the thorough and efficient job that they are doing in transporting and caring for our wounded and disabled soldiers.

Sincerely,

A. B. CHANDLER.

To the Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, North Carolina, chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee.

From ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Kentucky, special representative of the chairman.

By direction of the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee I arrived in New York on the early morning train, 5:50 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, accompanied by Representative R. Ewing Thomason, El Paso, Tex.; Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of the Transportation Corps; Col. Joseph Carson; and George W. Malone, special consultant to the committee.

SPECIAL INSPECTION PARTY

Senator ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Kentucky, special representative of the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Representative R. EWING THOMASON, El Paso, Tex., special representative of the House Military Affairs Committee.

War Department: Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of the Transportation Corps; Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, commanding general, New York port of embarkation; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General, United States Army; Col. Robert C. McDonald, and Col. Joseph Carson.

Special consultant: George W. Malone.

SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT

The special assignment of the delegation headed by A. B. CHANDLER was to inspect the hospital ship *Acadia*, scheduled to arrive early Friday morning, and the Halloran receiving hospital, including general conditions and the care of the wounded and disabled soldiers.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. Surgeon General of the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk.

2. The general staff at Halloran hospital, headed by Col. R. G. DeVoe, Medical Corps, commanding.

3. Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, commanding general, New York port of embarkation.

4. The staff of the hospital ship *Acadia*.

5. The staff of the hospital train loading patients at the time of inspection.

OBJECTIVES

There are three distinct phases of the work in treating the sick and wounded soldiers on Staten Island, N. Y.:

1. Unloading the arriving hospital ships and transferring the men to Halloran receiving hospital.

2. Necessary emergency and general treatment of the individual patients pending transportation to the hospital selected, with respect to the two following conditions: First, a hospital where their particular ailment can be properly treated; and second, the nearest such hospital to their homes.

3. Available hospital trains, after the patient is able to travel, transporting him to the selected hospital.

FINDINGS

1. That the hospital ship *Acadia* arrived with approximately 900 wounded and convalescent soldiers from the north Africa area.

2. That the men were cheerful and glad to be arriving home.

3. That, despite the crowded conditions on the ship, the men were receiving excellent care, and good food.

4. That the men, some badly wounded, were in excellent condition considering the nature of their respective injuries or diseases.

5. That the doctors and nurses aboard the *Acadia* hospital ship were exceptionally capable and attentive to the patients.

6. That the capacity of Halloran receiving hospital is approximately 3,000 patients.

7. That the Halloran Hospital is one of the best-equipped emergency hospitals in the country.

8. That the men are receiving first-class treatment in every respect, good medical treatment and good food, and that they are exceptionally cheerful.

9. That, notwithstanding the excessive heat on Staten Island (96.5° on Friday), the hospital air is conditioned and the patients are comfortable.

10. That the doctors and nurses of Halloran Hospital, headed by Col. R. G. DeVoe, are capable, alert, and well trained.

11. That the hospital trains are air-conditioned, well-equipped, and comfortable for the patients.

12. That the doctors and nurses are specially trained for the hospital trains and that they are extremely efficient.

13. That the hospital train consists of a nucleus of three hospital cars, one of which has an operating room, and the necessary number of pullman cars are added for the patients and personnel being transported, and may include a baggage car and as many as two dining cars.

14. That the patients are carefully placed in the Pullman cars so that their particular injury will be nearest the aisle for treatment with the least disturbance and movement.

15. That the transfer to the interior hospitals is made with a minimum of interruption of regular treatment during the travel period, and that the best of medical care and nursing is provided en route.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the committee, through a resolution or other expression, commend Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General; Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding general, Services of Supply; Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of the Transportation Corps; and Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, commanding general, New York port of embarkation, for the efficient and expeditious system that is being effectively carried out in transporting and caring for our wounded and disabled soldiers.

2. That the committee invite Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General, and Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of the Transportation Corps, to appear before them at the earliest opportunity to review the system of treatment, transportation, and care of the soldiers from the time they are wounded on the battlefield until they reach the hospital nearest their homes, and where their particular cases can be best treated.

CONCLUSIONS

The parents and relatives of our soldiers may be assured that their boys are at all times receiving the best of treatement and that they are exceptionally cheerful. In training and in action they are, as I have said previously in reports to this committee, the best fed, the best clothed, and the best housed of any army in the world, and when wounded or disabled they receive the finest care that can be supplied by a carefully trained Medical Corps, and the best equipment and medical supplies that science affords.

I was amazed and highly gratified at the infinite detail in which plans for transporting and caring for the wounded and disabled boys have been worked out. The nurses, doctors, and the personnel handling the hospital ship, the receiving hospital, and the hospital trains deserve special commendation.

I have visited many military areas from Alaska to the Mexican border, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, inspecting the food, beds, induction camps, training grounds, staging areas, hospitals, and equipment, and now a returning hospital ship, the receiving hospital to which the patients are transferred, and the hospital train used to transport them to the hospital nearest their homes, and I can say without reservation that my conclusion is confirmed: Our boys receive the finest possible care from the moment that they are inducted into the service.

In conclusion, I recommend that this committee invite inspection of this report by the entire membership of the Senate, since the patients in the Halloran receiving hospital on the date of the inspection are listed by State, alphabetically, and practically all of the States are represented.

Respectfully submitted.

A. B. CHANDLER.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order adopted by the Senate yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 2936, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on April 12 the Senate passed House bill 2076, a bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] entered a motion to reconsider, which has not yet been disposed of. In the meantime, numerous conferences have been held between the War Shipping Administration, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, the War Department, the Navy Department, and persons interested in the proposed legislation from the standpoint of some of our allies, as a result of which language has been framed which is acceptable, and which would seem to enable us to accomplish the purpose of the bill, which was to see that certain alien seamen remain at their posts, insofar as it is possible for us to keep them there.

In view of the fact that this agreement has been worked out, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be agreed to, in order that I may submit an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I object.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will not object. This does not in anywise affect anything to which the Senator could possibly object. If he will kindly withhold his objection, I feel sure that in a very brief statement I can relieve any fear the Senator may have on this question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I withhold my objection, but I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon, who has been a strong supporter of the bill under discussion, that it brings about the very purpose he desires accomplished, and makes possible the deportation of alien seamen who are in this country illegally.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am perfectly willing to send them out, but I do not want any aliens to come in.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill provides authorization for deportation, and will enable the Bureau of Immigration to deport persons who are not now deportable.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether this is the measure about which he spoke to me earlier in the day, at which time he made what seemed to me a very adequate report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is the legislation concerning which I spoke to the Senator from Maine. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield in order that I might make an additional statement?

Mr. MALONEY. I merely want to make one thing clear before I yield—and, of course, I shall yield—that is that the pending business is only temporarily laid aside, and that it will not be displaced if the bill shall be considered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The bill can be considered only by unanimous consent.

Let me say to the Senator from Oregon, and to other interested Senators, that, as stated by the Senator from Georgia, the bill is designed to make possible the deportation of alien seamen apprehended in the United States, and to return them to their countries of origin.

As the language was drawn, it provided that, so far as the Chinese were concerned, they should be deported to Great Britain. That language was found to be objectionable, and after numerous conferences we have framed language which is entirely satisfactory to the immigration authorities, the War Shipping Administration, and the State Department, and is less objectionable to the Chinese. It provides that if the alien is a citizen or subject of a country whose recognized government is not in exile, the persons involved shall be deported to a country, or any political or territorial subdivision thereof, which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country.

Therefore the Senator can rest assured that the seamen who may be involved will be deported when they are apprehended, and this we hope, and have every reason to believe, will cure the situation which has developed and concerning which the Senator had every right to be concerned.

I believe that this machinery is adequate, and since it is less objectionable to the governments concerned, and since our authorities are convinced it is effective machinery, I hope that the Senator from Oregon will permit the bill to be considered, because otherwise the legislation is likely not to be acted upon before the recess, and there will be no machinery for the deportation of alien seamen.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to

reconsider the votes by which the bill was passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend the bill on page 2, line 9, after the word "exile" to strike out down to and including the word "territory" in line 13 and insert "then, to a country or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2076 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for his patience and consideration in this matter. As always, he has been very considerate, and I appreciate it very deeply.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to have been able to work out a bill which will attain the objectives sought by the Senator from Wisconsin.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and I emphasize the word "temporarily" out of respect for the wishes of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably House bill 2703 to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, and I submit Report No. 403 thereon.

Mr. President, I will say in explanation that this is a bill suggested by the service organizations, and agreed on by the Veterans' Bureau, to provide for adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay. The House has passed the bill. The Senate Finance Committee, which had authority to report directly to the Senate, has unanimously approved the bill with three simple amendments. The bill meets the desires of the Veterans' Bureau. It is very desirable that if a bill be passed, it be passed before the recess of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 4, line 8, after the word "person," to insert "not a citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 13, after "(b)", to strike out "That for" and insert "For."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 15, after the words "naval service", to strike out "for 90 days or more."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 18, after the word "enrollment", to strike out the period, and insert a comma, and the words "or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2703) was read the third time and passed.

DEFINITION OF "MISCONDUCT" FOR COMPENSATION AND PENSION PURPOSES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now make the same request temporarily to lay aside the pending business so I may ask for consideration of another bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably House bill 986, to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious conduct, and I submit Report No. 402 thereon. I ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it was just reported from the committee.

Mr. WHITE. From what committee?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From the Finance Committee. If the Senator desires the bill to go over——

Mr. WHITE. No; I do not. I simply wished to know the status of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A bill similar to this has already passed the Senate at least three times during my senatorial experience, and for the first time such a bill has passed the House. I ask the Senate simply to pass a bill identical to that which has been pending in the Senate for some time.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 986) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with an amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the pending bill, which I have explained in the Senate on more than one occasion in recent days, would authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. That title is the communities section of the Lanham Act.

The bill would make no change in existing law. It would authorize money to be used for the construction and maintenance of community facilities in war areas—in heavily congested areas where the population has been swollen by the establishment of new war plants and by the growth of existing war plants. The funds would be used principally for the construction of such things as water mains and sewers—sanitary facilities, Mr. President, which are absolutely necessary in connection with war housing.

Approximately a week ago Congress provided an additional $400,000,000 for war housing. Obviously, the money sought to be provided by the bill is needed in order to provide community facilities made necessary by the construction of that many new housing units.

That is all the bill would do, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. In the caption of the bill it is stated that the bill is meant to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II, which Congress passed in 1940. I should like to have the Senator explain the act. The figures indicate that the purpose is to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if my recollection serves me well, the original appropriation was for $150,000,000 for community facilities. Some time thereafter, if my memory is not too faulty, Congress provided an additional $150,000,000. In any event, Congress provided a total of $300,000,000 under the act. I may add that that money has been exhausted by allocation. I think the funds have actually about been expended. Many projects which are pending and approved cannot go forward until the funds covered by the bill are made available.

Mr. STEWART. Without having a copy of the original act before me, I was stating my question. I assumed that the body of the bill is in compliance or conformity with the caption; that is, that it actually would authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Increasing the $300,000,000 to $500,000,000.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Let me ask a further question. The original act was entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." The money would be used in the same manner as the other money, under what was at that time called the Lanham Act or the Community Facilities Act; is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. Only for community facilities.

Mr. STEWART. The use of the funds would not be confined to housing, but provision is made that the money may be expended for sewers or sanitation in any way the Commission might offer to spend it; is that correct.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STEWART. Could the money also be used for school purposes?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct again.

Mr. STEWART. And the money could be used to meet needs arising because of the expanding and overflowing, not only of Government industries but of war camps, where a great influx of soldiers occurs because of the construction of camps; is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. I believe the act might be so interpreted, although I think the Army has funds with which to do the work around camps. I do not think it is denied under this act.

Mr. STEWART. It is true that many small towns have suddenly found themselves overrun by a great number of persons, both soldiers and civilians.

Mr. MALONEY. In that connection the Senator is entirely correct. The money can be used in that connection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will have in mind the colloquy we had the other day regarding the importance which some of us attach to continuing to retain some degree of contact with State departments of education and with the United States Office of Education when the funds are to be used in connection with school maintenance and school construction. The Senator is familiar with the fact that a large number of State departments of education throughout the country are critical of the text of the law as it now stands because of the fact that under certain conditions they may be bypassed in the assignment of grants for public-school purposes.

I have submitted an amendment to the Senator. I now wish to offer it. While the amendment is far from going to the extent to which many of us think it should go, at least it provides for prior consultation with the department of education of any State involved in a grant of this nature, and with the United States Office of Education. If the amendment is in order at the moment, I should like to offer it and have it read by the clerk.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there is one committee amendment which I think should be acted upon first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The amendment of the committee was, on page 1, in line 7, after the figures "$500,000,000", to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used for loans, grants, or contributions for the operation of day care or extended school services for children of mothers employed in war areas if and when the War-Area Child-Care Act of 1943 (S. 1130, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) becomes law."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to resume a statement which I made in part several days ago—the exact date now escapes my memory—when the Senator from Connecticut attempted to have this measure considered by unanimous consent. I wish briefly to recapitulate that statement by saying that on at least two occasions the Senate had determined by a vote that legislation affecting the Lanham Act funds should go to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

I hasten to assure every Senator who gives me his attention that this is not a question of committee jealousy over jurisdiction; but the Senate having made that determination, it was quite natural that the Committee on Education and Labor should continue to work on the problems related to the Lanham Act.

Senators may remember that during the consideration of an appropriation bill earlier in the year the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] offered an amendment which was in the nature of legislation, dealing with the question of child care made necessary by the employment of mothers in industry. As I recall, the amendment went out on a point of order. The Senator from Arizona then introduced a legislative bill, which, under the precedent, was referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] subsequently introduced another bill. On those measures the Committee on Education and Labor held extended hearings. We held numerous meetings of the committee, and finally reported the so-called Thomas bill, Senate bill 1130, to the Senate with numerous amendments. It was taken up, the amendments were discussed, and the bill was passed.

In the meantime a bill dealing with title I of the Lanham Act came up, to extend the moneys for housing. It went to the Committee on Education and Labor. That committee reported the bill to the Senate. It went to the House and was amended there. The Senate concurred in the House amendment, and it became law.

Then this bill, dealing with title II of the Lanham Act, namely, community facilities, came up, and for some reason it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. In the meantime it had developed that there was a conflict, which is certainly not unusual in the executive arm of the Government under this administration. In fact, it is a usual situation in the experience of the Senator from Wisconsin. The W. P. A., which was later ordered abolished, was carrying on certain child-care activities under the Lanham Act. It was making the kind of direct grants to communities about which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has been complaining. When the W. P. A. was ordered abolished, that work was transferred to the Public Works Agency, and Lanham Act funds were made available for carrying on that type of activity.

The Committee on Education and Labor had thrashed out the whole controversy as between the Social Security Agency and the Public Works Agency; and we had decided, after weighing all the evidence, that the best plan was to provide for the utilization of the customary program which we inaugurate when the States and the Federal Government join in accomplishing a common objective, namely, to permit the State boards of education, the welfare agencies, and the State health agencies to get together and formulate a plan, submit it, and obtain approval of it, and then have the Federal Government make the money available for it. We had no idea of setting up a permanent organization. In fact, we specifically provided, by a provision in the measure, that it should terminate with the war; but in order to make "assurance double sure," we adopted an amendment on the floor to wind up this activity on July 1, 1945.

Because this measure was sent to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and because the Committee on Education and Labor, which had gone through this long proceeding, was short-circuited, we are now confronted with such a situation that it appears the only way out is to adopt the committee amendment.

I believe that Senators and Members of the House will find, when they reach their homes, that aside from those communities where the public-works program is going full blast, there will be many other communities which will not be included which should be included. I venture to state that they will find that many of their State authorities much prefer the procedure under Senate bill 1130, which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I conclude with the statement I made at the outset, that this is not a question of jealousy between committees over jurisdiction. However, I think it is rather futile and discouraging, with the pressure of work we have to do, to have one committee of the Senate spend a great deal of time on a measure of this kind, reach a conclusion, report it to the Senate, have the matter thrashed out here, and a conclusion reached on the floor of the Senate, only to find that that committee is short-circuited for some reason, because legislation involving in part the same general problem is sent to another committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Why would State officials prefer the procedure under Senate bill 1130?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they would prefer it because they would have an opportunity to come together and work out a program involving schools, child care, and health under a State program in the formulation of which they participate at the State level. Now the program is the direct result of grants flowing in the W. P. A. manner, from the Works Agency direct to the school district, or to the industrial center where child care is being undertaken.

Mr. President, I do not wish anything I have said by any stretch of the imagination to be taken as criticism of the able, fair, and generous chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds [Mr. MALONEY]. I know that he is not responsible for creating this situation. I am not criticizing him; but I am saying that I think the question of committee jurisdiction in the Senate has got into a terrible mess, and that the only way we can straighten it out is to stop the practice of sending bills to committees which do not have proper jurisdiction of them, simply because it is thought that so far as a particular measure is concerned it may receive a little better treatment before one committee than before another.

I say this with all due respect to a former Vice President. I think he made a tragic mistake when, because the Senate rules do not spell out the jurisdiction of committees, and because the jurisdiction had been established through a long series of precedents, he once ruled that a Senator might have a bill referred to any committee to which he desired to have it referred. That ruling has created chaos and confusion in the jurisdiction of Senate committees. That is one further argument in behalf of my efforts to secure an amendment to rule XXV.

I make this statement because I am hopeful that the jurisdiction of Senate committees will eventually be adjusted so far as the Lanham Act is concerned, and that we shall not have the spectacle of committees doing duplicate work in duplicate fields, and meeting themselves coming back, as we have done in this particular instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Is this the amendment of the Senator from Michigan?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the first question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

Provided further, That no grant, loan, or contribution for the maintenance or operation of public schools in any State shall be made without prior consultation with the State department of education and the United States Office of Education.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the amendment pertains to public-school matters and matters affecting public-school children?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And to no other part of the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut what his attitude would be toward the amendment?

Mr. MALONEY. I should not like to see the amendment adopted. I am advised that the practice suggested in the amendment is being carried out at the present time. I am told by the Federal Works Agency that in matters of this sort they immediately consult with the Federal Office of Education, and I assume the Federal Office of Education consults State authorities.

I should dislike to see the amendment written into law because it seems to me that it establishes a mild sort of precedent, which brings the Federal Office of Education more closely into control over local education. For 150 years we have been fighting to keep the Federal Government out of local and State school matters. I believe this amendment, while I know it is not so intended, is a short step in that direction. So for myself I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I put precisely the opposite interpretation on the amendment from that which has been suggested by the able Senator from Connecticut. I submit that the State departments of education in this country would be the last ones to be asking for any additional expansion of Federal authority over local education.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are the ones who are responsible for this request, not only in my State of Michigan—and I have a written document here regarding the matter—but from departments of education in many other States.

As I view the matter, we have further protected home rule and education when we at least insist upon home rule consultation of the State educational authorities before the Federal Government shall directly enter the State with an educational grant of any nature.

I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wish I could believe that. I am told on very reliable authority that in the State of Michigan the school authorities feel as does the Senator from Michigan, that they are very jealous of the rights of States, and particularly as applied to education. But I disagree with him completely in the thought he seems to have that the educational authorities in all the States are so jealous of their position. In my experience I find them quite ready to surrender to the Federal Office of Education, to yield the powers which they have, and to invite the Federal authorities in to participate in the management of local school affairs. That has been my experience, Mr. President. It is for that reason that I am concerned about the proposed amendment. I am not too greatly concerned, but, as I said a moment ago, it is a short step in the wrong direction. I do, however, want to lay emphasis on the fact that in the State of Michigan the State authorities are anxious to guard the rights of the home school authorities. I wish to point out, in the time of the Senator, if I may, that the local school authorities are the people who should be most concerned that the Federal school authorities do not encroach on their authority. The local school authorities who have control over funds, pay the teachers, and have direct supervision over the schools, must be satisfied in all instances before these individual projects are started.

I think the Senator's fears are magnified. I understand he has had one unusual situation in his State, and I think he is a little excited and concerned about that, which is natural, and I assume that it is because of that feeling that we have this particular amendment before us at the present time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I were very much excited about it, I would present a far stronger amendment. I think I am suggesting the very minimum of recognition of home rule in education when I merely suggest that the Federal agency must consult the home-rule authority before it proceeds with its grants.

Mr. President, if there is to be any question about the adoption of the amendment, I very frankly say that I shall ask for a quorum because I do not propose to lose on this issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Michigan in urging the Senator from Connecticut to accept the amendment. The Senator will remember that there was before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a long amendment of three pages attempting to work this matter out in a more scientific way, which the committee felt was too long to consider at this late date, but which was dismissed because it was so long and complicated rather than because of any special principle involved.

The Lanham Act is a rather extraordinary act. In the first place, it gives very broad powers to the Federal Works Agency. The Federal Works Agency is given power to build any of the following public works, and the list, as it may be seen, is long and varied. They may build schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage-, garbage-, and refuse-disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, and streets and access roads. They cover practically every field. In addition to that, the question of the construction of these facilities is one thing, and obviously within the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency. But, further, the act gives power to make contributions to public or private agencies for the maintenance and operation of any of these buildings.

Under that grant the Federal Works Agency, besides spending money, are distributing some $40,000,000 a year for the maintenance and operation of various

public works. They are expending, for instance, $10,000,000 a year for the maintenance of schools in the defense areas where there is a very large growth in population. They are expending nearly $18,000,000 a year on day-care nurseries. They are expending some $6,000,000 a year on the maintenance of hospitals. They are expending some $5,000,000 a year on recreational facilities. Those figures are very rough. But in those cases I believe it was rather intended that they work through the State authorities. However, as a matter of fact, when the W. P. A. was abolished, something was set up called the Federal Works Agency, the W. P. A. officials were transferred to that agency, and they are now undertaking directly throughout the United States to distribute aid to schools, and to day nurseries in particular. I think it is unfortunate for the Federal Government to attempt to operate directly. I do not mind their constructing buildings designed for war purposes, but when it comes to obtaining aid for the operation of them, it seems to me they should clearly work with the local authorities.

We have had a number of cases brought to our attention. There was a case in Maine where a school district needed assistance because of the rapid growth of the shipbuilding industry. The State board of education worked it out, and said the school would be operated with $30,000 a year. The next thing they knew they found that the W. P. A. people had come in and said, "Do not be satisfied with $30,000 a year. Come down to Washington and we will give you $60,000 a year to run that school on." There was a vigorous protest from the State Director of Education of Maine, because he said he could not run his schools if the Federal Government was going to make grants directly to schools.

We had the same question in connection with the day-care facilities. That should be worked out under the Thomas bill. Unfortunately, the House has not passed the Thomas bill. I do not think we should abolish the day-care facilities of the Federal Works Agency, but certainly that is not a body to distribute this assistance directly to private and public institutions scattered through the States. They should work through the State bureaus of charity.

It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Michigan will not seriously interfere, it will merely require consultation. It will not go the whole way, but it does seem to me a very reasonable requirement, that is, that before these grants are approved in any State, they meet with the approval of the State board of education.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to pursue the meaning of the word "consult" as just used. One can consult with a person and ignore what the person consulted says.

Mr. TAFT. I do not even know the words actually used in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The word is "consult," and it includes the possibility of being ignored. There is no question about that. But I should rather be ignored after I had been consulted than not to know what had happened to me when I woke up.

Mr. HOLMAN. What I am interested in is the local control of district schools and public schools generally. I know there is a decided movement in Washington to exercise Federal control in considerable detail over the administration of local district schools. I know what Aubrey Williams did when he was distributing relief. He just told the local relief board in Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., that if they did not feed Communists, there would be no national contribution toward public relief in the emergencies which existed at that time. I do not want to see any Federal authority able to dictate to a local authority, "You do just what we say, or else."

Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to read the bill. I am extremely interested in public schools, and I think it is an outrage, with a handful of Senators present, on possibly the last night of the session, at nearly 6 o'clock in the evening, to consider important legislation like this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following words:

Provided further, (a) That none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies; and

(b) The total amount allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, shall not exceed $40,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the first clause of this amendment provides that "none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies."

When the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs were in Puerto Rico we found that the Federal Works Agency took $10,000,000 of this rather limited fund intended for the construction of works in connection with the housing in industrial areas and used it to acquire all the power companies of Puerto Rico, the San Juan Power Co., and the Mayaguez Power Co. So far as I can see, there was no real justification for that. As a matter of fact, the Federal circuit court in Boston subsequently held that that was an illegal application of those funds.

I do not mean to say that it might not be desirable for the insular government, which owned a good many of the power facilities, the dams, and the like, to take over the private power companies and consolidate them all into one system, but certainly there was nothing in the Lanham Act which authorized any such proceeding. It was intended to provide new facilities, it was not intended to provide for taking over old facilities. I think it is perfectly clear that no such power should be included in the act.

The second part of the amendment provides that "the total amount allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, shall not exceed $40,000,000." That is 20 percent of the total allowance of $200,000,000.

What I am afraid of is that this same agency, which has set up these day-care nurseries, which I do not think were really in contemplation when the Lanham Act was passed—the agency operated or run by Mrs. Florence S. Kerr, formerly the Assistant Administrator of W. P. A.—in attempting to distribute these school grants, will gradually extend that service agency until they take the whole $200,000,000, or a large part of it, instead of it being used for the construction of necessary public works.

It seems to me perfectly clear that we should separate the amount of money in this authorization which can be used for the construction of public works, and that which can be used for the operation and maintenance, or in helping in the operation and maintenance, of the public works after their construction. Therefore I propose that the limitation for that purpose be 20 percent of the total amount authorized in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio advise us as to the purposes of the money appropriated in the Lanham Act? I am very anxious to know about that.

Mr. TAFT. I read just a moment ago the various types of work which could be included.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret I was not present.

Mr. TAFT. In general the President may authorize the construction of public works, and "public works" are thus defined—

Any facility necessary for carrying on community life substantially expanded by the national-defense program—

In other words, it can be used only in communities where the community life is substantially expanded by the national defense program—

but the activities authorized under this title shall be devoted primarily to schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, and streets and access roads.

The money has been spent somewhat for schools, somewhat for water facilities, somewhat for hospitals, and in general the United States Bureau of Education has passed on the schools, and in the initial case the recreational bureau in the Federal Security Administration has passed on school recreational facilities, the Public Health has passed on hospital

and on sanitary, water, and sewage-disposal facilities.

Their recommendations have gone to the Federal Works Agency, and then the Federal Works Agency has distributed the fund among these various different purposes. Someone had to do it, undoubtedly, but the complaint is made that particularly in the operation of the facilities, after the recommendations have been made, they have been increased sometimes in the case of schools, they have been increased sometimes in the case of day-care facilities. We have not gone completely into detail, but it seems to me clear that we should limit the amount of money which can be spent on setting up and operating agencies throughout the United States.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I can see no objection to the amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I agree with him that Lanham Act funds, at least in my opinion—and I was one of those who helped to write the act—were not intended to be used for such a purpose as the acquisition of a public utility in Puerto Rico. So I have no objection to the language, and as a matter of fact I share the feeling of the Senator from Ohio.

In paragraph (b) of the amendment which he proposes I understand that the limitation is $40,000,000. Will the Senator from Ohio tell me if I am correct in that understanding?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. That is based on approximately what is being spent at the present time.

Mr. MALONEY. It seems to me that that is a reasonable figure, Mr. President, and I myself have no objection to these amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a matter of interesting record and history, I think I should read to the Senate two letters in connection with the dispute as to where the child-care program shall be placed, whether under the Federal Works Agency and Mrs. Kerr, or in the Federal Security Administration. It came to the attention of the committee that the President had written two letters, one on October 16 in favor of placing the work in the Federal Works Agency, and one on October 17 in favor of placing it in the Federal Security Agency. This is an example, I think, of the confusion which may exist in the Federal Government.

On June 16 the President wrote to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a letter which is in the record of the committee, and from which I quote as follows:

> I am sure that Mrs. Florence Kerr, of the Federal Works Agency, is doing a very good job on the child-care program in relation to the war, and I have decided that it would be better to leave that program where it is in the Federal Works Agency instead of transferring it to any other agency.

On June 17 the President wrote a letter to Mrs. Harriet Ahlers Houdlette, of the American Association of University Women, in which he referred to their work in connection with this child-care welfare. He wrote:

> Because of the difficulty of specifying in an appropriation bill the conditions under which this important program would operate, its purposes and methods of administration have been further clarified in Senate bill 1130, recently introduced by Senator THOMAS of Utah. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor is considering this bill.
>
> I am glad to know that you concur in the proposal to develop these wartime services through full utilization of the resources of existing agencies concerned with the education, welfare, and health of children.

Which, of course, means the Children's Bureau and the others who are charged with the administration in the Thomas bill (S. 1130). Apparently two different secretaries wrote two different letters for the President recommending that this particular work be in entirely different departments, and wrote them on succeeding days.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am informed that in the past the Federal Works Agency has furnished funds to the United States Office of Education in order to make these surveys and plans. Does the Senator from Connecticut know whether there has been any discussion before the committee with respect to that matter?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; there was a discussion of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Federal Works Agency propose to continue furnishing funds to the United States Office of Education for that purpose?

Mr. MALONEY. I will answer the first question of the Senator first. The matter was discussed by the committee. It was presented to us by Mr. Charles Taft, brother of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He pointed out to us that in the House report on the bill it was suggested that that practice, which was in effect, be discontinued. Mr. Taft asked us, or at least asked me, if in the preparation of our report we would attempt to overcome that situation, and in keeping with his suggestion we recommended in the report on the bill that the practice of providing funds for that purpose be continued for the time being.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hawkes	Stewart
Brooks	Hill	Taft
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Radcliffe	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to notify the absent Senators to return to the Senate until a quorum is obtained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the Senator from West Virginia willing to withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if we are able to agree on a time tomorrow, for instance, 12:30, when the bill will be taken up?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I am willing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule of the Senate, it is impossible to withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, after the absence of a quorum has been announced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rule, the Senate cannot do anything except adjourn. I do not want the Senate to adjourn under the circumstances; I want the Senate to take a recess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is waiting for the Sergeant-at-Arms to summon a sufficient number of absent Senators to constitute a quorum.

Mr. BRIDGES. Are we in recess, or in marching order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is waiting until a sufficient number of Senators arrive to constitute a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GERRY, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WILLIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that not later than 12:45 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote finally upon the pending bill and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that at not later than 12:45 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote finally upon the pending bill and all amendments thereto? In view of the fact that a quorum has just been established, the rule has been complied with.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is the unanimous-consent request made on the assumption that we shall have a quorum present tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; there will be a quorum. Of course, if there is not a quorum, any Senator can make the point and obtain one.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the majority leader will agree that word should be sent to Senators so that there may be an adequate attendance in the closing days of the session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to urge all Senators who are in the city to remain here until we shall have concluded the business of the Senate. I should like to urge those who are absent to return. We have not as yet taken a recess, and there is important business to be transacted.

To be perfectly frank, without criticizing any Senator, I do not believe that Senators have the right to depart from the city a few days before we finish our business unless it is necessary. I hope that Senators who are in the city will not leave the city until we shall have concluded our business, and that those who can return will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, were the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky merely in the nature of an observation, or is he making a motion or speaking officially?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no motion which I can make in that connection once a quorum has been developed. So long as 49 Senators answer to their names there is no motion which I can make. I am urging Senators, who I am sure appreciate their responsibility as Members of this body, to remain in attendance.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator propose to maintain a real quorum, rather than an artificial one?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know anything about any sort of quorum except a real quorum.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator, of course, is a very brilliant man, and he is aware of some of the things which go on, even though he does not recognize them officially.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I decline to yield further. I do not wish to become involved in a Presidential campaign. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATUE OF SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the other day the House passed a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the statue of Sir William Blackstone which the widow of Mr. Paul Bartlett, the sculptor, desires to present to the Government.

From the Committee on the Library, I report the bill, House bill 2106, without amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SEGREGATION OF LOYAL AND DISLOYAL JAPANESE IN RELOCATION CENTERS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 166.

Many months ago the Senate Military Affairs Committee created a subcommittee to consider conditions among the Japanese under the War Relocation Authority. After several months a report was made to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and I have heretofore reported Senate Resolution 166 from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment. The committee unanimously agreed to the resolution. It is merely a resolution of the Senate, and there are imperative reasons why I believe it should be immediately agreed to. The resolution is now on the clerk's desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 166) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is respectfully requested to issue an Executive order (1) directing the War Relocation Authority to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose of segregating persons of Japanese ancestry in relocation centers, whose loyalty to the United States is questionable or who are known to be disloyal, from those whose loyalty to the United States has been established, and for the purpose of establishing additional safeguards against sabotage by such persons; and (2) directing the appropriate agency of the Government to issue a full and complete authoritative public statement concerning conditions in relocation centers, and plans with respect to future operation of centers and the movement of persons of Japanese ancestry interned therein.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the resolution comes from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And that it merely makes a request of the President. There is nothing mandatory in it so far as presidential action is concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been stated that the resolution deals with the matter of Japanese internees, who have given considerable trouble under the agency which is now handling the situation. The Senator now presiding [Mr. HILL] is familiar with the situation. We know that there have been trouble and riots in the various relocation camps.

I am not opposing the resolution. I merely wish the RECORD to show that I, as well as other members of the committee, have expressed the belief that this activity should be placed under the War Department, and not under the agency which is trying to handle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The matter of Japanese in the relocation camps was brought before the Committee on Appropriations not long ago when quite a large sum of money was requested for conducting the camps. I received a very poor impression from the present manager of the camps. I hope that some member of the Committee on Military Affairs will offer an amendment to put the camps under the charge of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 166) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on July 2, 1943, was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GAMBLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Cols. William Edward Raab Covell and Albert Jesse Browning for temporary appointment as brigadier generals in the Army of the United States; and

Sundry persons for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in executive session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, July 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 6 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE NAVY

PROMOTIONS

To be medical directors, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Edward U. Reed, while serving as district medical officer, Third Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

George C. Thomas, while serving as district medical officer, Eleventh Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

William L. Mann, Jr., while serving as district medical officer, Thirteenth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Joseph J. A. McMullin, while serving as district medical officer, Fifth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Richard H. Laning, while serving as district medical officer, First Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Daniel Hunt, while serving as district medical officer, Twelfth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

To be pay directors, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Frank Baldwin, while serving as director of the Naval Cost Inspection Service, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Everett G. Morsell, while serving as district supply officer, Ninth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Arthur H. Mayo, while serving as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Oakland, Calif., to rank from June 25, 1943.

John J. Gaffney, while serving as district supply officer, Fourteenth Naval District and with additional duties as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Pearl Harbor, and supply officer, navy yard, Pearl Harbor, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Malcolm G. Slarrow, while serving as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Norfolk, Va., to rank from July 1, 1943.

To be civil engineers, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Henry F. Bruns, while serving as superintending civil engineer of area VI and area VII, to rank from June 25, 1943.

James T. Mathews, while serving as superintending civil engineer of area IV, to rank from June 25, 1943.

John J. Manning, while serving as director, Atlantic Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Carl H. Cotter, while serving as director, Pacific Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from June 25, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Francis G. Rowland, Childersburg.
Nora W. Hill, Ramer.

ALASKA

Charles H. Hope, Unalaska.

ARKANSAS

Alonzo D. McAllister, Fayetteville.

ARIZONA

Eva L. Wheeler, Nogales.

CALIFORNIA

Lora Belle Fearheiley, Linden.
Alberta Frankamp, Novato.
Clarence C. Foulk, Pacoima.
Orin T. Howard, Santa Cruz.
June E. James, Robbins.
Adrian A. McMullen, Yuba City.

COLORADO

Frank H. Buskirk, Montrose.

CONNECTICUT

Fred E. Constantine, Lakeville.

FLORIDA

William T. Stephens, De Land.
Hilary T. Stewart, Fort Walton.

GEORGIA

Howard Thompson, Alma.

INDIANA

Chester Wagoner, Flora.
Donald Steinkamp, Holland.

IOWA

Milo Mochal, Traer.

KANSAS

Alvin W. Gerber, Fowler.
Logan N. Green, Garden City.
Florence T. Harbin, Irving.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alice M. Corey, Mattapoisett.

MINNESOTA

Gertrude S. Dyson, Becker.
Dorothy C. Tice, Mentor.
Bert H. Myhre, Dexter.
Viola A. Raduenz, Lucan.
Loretta M. Harper, Worthington.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh A. Kennedy, Louin.

NORTH DAKOTA

Luella J. Hokanson, Fort Yates.
Arne M. Sletten, Souris.

OHIO

John B. Mannino, Erieside.

OKLAHOMA

J. C. Bennett, Jr., Tishomingo.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Peterson, Berwick.
Jerome E. Southerton, Honesdale.
William M. Rees, Linwood.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Wilkes, Chester.
Inez C. Wilson, Williamston.

TENNESSEE

Elsie M. Johnson, Sewanee.

TEXAS

Leander J. Scrivener, Eagle Pass.
Arley T. McCarson, Ferris.
Jack P. Molloy, Uvalde.

VERMONT

Herbert B. Butler, St. Albans.

VIRGINIA

Louise L. Smith, Greenway.
Maude V. Mills, Lynnhaven.
John E. Milan, Norfolk.

WISCONSIN

Frederick Walter Anderson, Hawkins.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend Michael Enright, of Carrollton, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, King of Kings and Lord of governments, by whom rulers rule, and from whom earthly power comes, mercifully behold our President, Congress—all in authority. Infuse into them the spirit of Thy divine wisdom, clemency, and justice. Instill Thy spirit into all civil institutions, into every form of government, into laws and armies. May all the powers on earth recognize the majesty of the Eternal God.

May we, citizens, be ever conscious and worthy of the abundant life, the riches, spiritual and economic, we enjoy in this great land.

Through Christ our Lord we pray.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1316. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

BAN ON DRIVING TO SUMMER HOME LIFTED

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a recent O. P. A. order lifting the ban to trips to summer homes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago, the 135 Representatives and 24 Senators from the eastern seaboard States decided upon collective action in an endeavor to provide relief for the critical petroleum shortage on the eastern seaboard.

We pooled our ideas and proposed a program which, if carried out, will do much to alleviate the hardship and distress facing our constituency. As chairman of the Eastern States Conference, I am pleased to announce to the House today that we have won a concession which I am sure will be welcomed by everyone on the eastern seaboard.

I am authorized by the Office of Price Administration to announce that the ban on driving to one's summer home or

vacation place has been lifted. The rationing officials under direction of Price Administrator Prentiss Brown, have agreed to permit one trip to one's vacation destination and return home. This will apply not only to a summer home owner, but will also include those who rent summer homes, or who will spend their vacations at a hotel, camp, rooming house, and so forth.

The trip may be for a weekend, a week, or a month. The holder of A gas rationing coupons will merely pay a visit to his local rationing board, fill out a form stating the date he is to leave for his summer place, and the date of his return. He will then be given a permit to make that trip. This order will be effective on July 15.

I urge my colleagues on the eastern seaboard to make it known to their constituents that these applications from their local boards will not be available until July 15. Our constituents should also be apprised of the fact that an abuse of this concession may result in the elimination of A coupons completely.

The Eastern Conference has contended that because our people had saved their A coupons for this very purpose, that no additional gas should be needed. We hope that our contentions will be proved to be correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The only trouble with this is that it comes too late. The children should have had this opportunity when they came out of school.

Mr. HARTLEY. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent, but I think we have done a good job in getting them to make the decision at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Sterling Morton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and tragic death of General Wladyslaw Sikorski has brought sorrow to liberty-loving people throughout all the world, and I personally am deeply grieved at his passing.

General Sikorski had gained world-wide renown as a diplomat of unusual attainments, as a military strategist of the highest order, and as possessing those humane qualities which all of us respect and admire.

His intense devotion to the interests of his native Poland, and his broad concepts of the principles of freedom and democracy for all peoples of the world stood out as a beacon light in this now stricken world.

At his appearances before the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, he impressed each and every one of us who were privileged to discuss with him in executive session both the military situation and the problems of the coming peace as one who was destined to play an important part in the world that is to come.

When the time comes for the making of the peace, the advice, the influence, and the aid of General Sikorski will be sadly missed.

Again I say, the world regrets his untimely death.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include the Charter Day address delivered by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, at the University of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a news release on the development of electricity at Fort Peck in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BULWINKLE asked, and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, on the subject of food subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio interview of the other evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a recent order from the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement with reference to the iron and steel shortage existing throughout the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement of Mr. O. C. Bailey, chairman of the Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial-Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PREMIUMS ON LIFE-INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to H. R. 2541, which I have introduced, to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums. Hundreds of thousands of policyholders out of the 67,000,000 throughout the country are already faced with such necessity for curtailing expenses that many life-insurance policies will become lapsed through failure to keep up the premiums.

The bill is anti-inflationary. All life-insurance companies are now investing practically all new moneys in Government bonds.

It will promote victory by encouraging the purchase of War bonds; furthermore, it will save many War bonds currently held in the hands of the purchasers because many holders will be facing the question of whether to sacrifice some of the insurance equities they have been building up or to sell some of their bonds in order to keep up their insurance premiums.

It is not a rich man's bill, because $1,000 is the largest deduction which may be taken; it is distinctly in the interests of the great middle class of citizens whose income has not been increased but whose expenses have soared by leaps and bounds.

This proposal has been enthusiastically received by many individuals who have been haunted by the fear that their thrift in building up an insurance program to insure reserves for their old age or the protection of their dependents in case of death is now to be penalized by their inability to carry on the program and at the same time to meet other obligations.

The buying and holding of life insurance for the protection of families and dependents has been one of the stabilizing influences of American life, and a wholesale cancelation of such insurance in this perilous period of our national economy would be correspondingly disastrous.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Daily Independent of Murphysboro, Ill., of July 3, 1943, entitled "Let Freedom Ring."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, as one Republican I wish to be recorded as being opposed to a recess at this time. The American people elected the Congress to do a job that must be done if we are to win the war, and we should stay on the job.

In the midst of this all-out effort to win the war and with the damnable mess existing here in Washington with petty personalities, discriminations, bickering, and wrangling among the high places in the administration forces who are conducting the fight on the home front, and bypassing of the Congress in an effort to regiment the people of America into a socialistic program of administrative democracy; in their efforts to indoctrinate into our economic life the philosophy of "production for use and not for profit," from producer to consumer, to eliminate the middleman and small businessman, a situation has developed which may ultimately prolong the war at the cost of thousands of American lives—and suddenly the Congress decides to recess and leave this critical situation in the hands of a group such as we have in the O. P. A. who haven't the slightest conception of what it is all about.

When we offer an amendment to put practical men in to operate these departments, the Senate knocks it out.

As one Republican, I wish to be recorded that I am of the opinion that the Congress should stay on the job while there is work to do, and there is plenty to do to restore order out of the chaotic situation in the various departments of the Government.

It would be nice for the boys on Guadalcanal, in north Africa, in the Solomon Islands, on the seas, under the seas, on land and in the air to also decide they would like a recess, let the war go, it is too hot, let us go home.

I believe it is our duty and responsibility to make our contribution to this war effort here in Washington. Bureaucracy is anxious for us to get out of Washington. However, I am of the opinion, here is where we belong to bolster up the home front in an efficient and orderly manner to produce the materials to support these boys who in the springtime of their lives are making the fight to preserve our constitutional rights and our Republic.

THE CORN SITUATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I know there are many Members of the House who are interested in finding some solution for the corn situation, which is growing more critical every hour. I do not believe we ought to adjourn without some further effort being made to solve that problem. I have conferred with a number of Members on both sides of the aisle and they have agreed that we ought to have a conference at the earliest possible moment on this subject. There will be a conference to consider this question at the committee room of the House Committee on Agriculture tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. I hope everyone interested will be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters relative to the subsidy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three separate subjects and to include certain excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, and I give warning that I am going to talk about politics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may talk about politics for 15 minutes later today.

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for two purposes. First, I want to emphasize the statement made by my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], with reference to the corn situation. Further, I wish to make this statement. Most of you know that some time ago our distinguished minority leader appointed a food study committee from among the Republican membership. I chance to be the chairman of that committee. Our committee is not quite ready to make a formal report to the House with reference to our activity, but I have just been granted permission to place in the RECORD a speech which I have prepared on the food question. In that speech I hope to cover all phases of the subject. I hope to supply figures and facts that I hope will be interesting and instructive. The food situation is very serious, and it is unfortunate that nobody can see any improvement. All indications are that the food situation is going to get worse. The President's refusal to place the whole food situation in the hands of one Food Administrator was a mistake. The failure of distribution of food is even worse than the failure to produce food.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of a petition signed by a number of people in Sacramento, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOWELL was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a lengthy letter from the secretary-treasurer of the Louisiana Cattlemen's Association with reference to the shortage of corn and the livestock situation in the Southwest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun, of June 8, 1943, extolling Frank E. Gannett because of the fact that he purchased another paper in that town, which contributes materially to the conditions that now exist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the legislative business and the expiration of any other special orders, I may have 10 minutes tonight to talk about corn, petroleum, WALLACE, Jones, and kindred matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress fixed up the silver business. That is not the only thing that should be done before we go home, if we do go home at all. There is the corn situation which needs attention. If we can buy 35-cent silver at 71 cents, there should not be any reason why the department should hold down the price of corn so that it is kept off the market, especially when it is needed to grow cattle, about the scarcity of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] complains about so much.

Then there is another thing which should receive our attention before we go home, if we do go home. Yesterday morning's Post contained an editorial, and last night's Star another, about this man Petrillo, who intends to deprive all of us; yes, even our men in camps and across the sea, of all recorded music. We ought to take care of him before we go home. I introduced a bill a year ago, the 27th of this month, which would remedy the trouble. It is over in the Judiciary Committee, but they do not give me a hearing on it. It would prevent that man stopping the recording and transmission of song or instrumental music. Why should he shut us off? If anybody knows any reason, I would like to have it. If anyone knows of any reason why we should not act on legislation which will end the evil, let us have it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Lawrence Sullivan, from the current issue of the Nation's Business, entitled "Where Price Control Got Off the Beam."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a speech by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORN FOR DAIRY AND POULTRY FEED

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture yesterday passed a bill raising the price of corn to $1.40 a bushel, or taking the ceiling off entirely. I hope that will be acted upon by the Senate and come over here before we recess, possibly tomorrow. If something of that kind is not done, I certainly, and I believe a great many other Members of the House, will vote against adjourning or taking a lengthy recess. We have a definite duty to perform—a duty to legislate—and we have no right to go home and leave these farmers in the East and the South, and even in the States of Ohio and Indiana without corn for their poultry and for their dairy herds. The situation is a desperate one. We cannot afford to go home for 2 months and ignore that situation or wash our hands of it. If we do, the eastern farmers will have to destroy their herds and their poultry, decrease food production, and contribute to a famine in our own country next winter.

I, for one, propose to vote against adjournment or a long recess unless some legislation of this kind is enacted into law before we leave Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE NATIONAL WEALTH

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders and the legislative program today I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Ickes in an illuminating article in the American Magazine figures the total wealth of the United States at $12,023,000,000,000. The American Magazine in a foreword accompanying the article says Secretary Ickes put his statisticians to work so he could arrive at the above figure.

Ickes does a little dividing by 135,000,000 people and figures that we are all worth $87,000 apiece.

Some commentators have criticized Ickes for using the Government pay roll to make the calculation of wealth. I am quite satisfied to take Mr. Ickes' word that he made the calculations himself on his daily meander in his Government limousine between the Interior penthouse and the chicken farm and make the tart comment that he has some rationing cards. I know he does not have any car pool, because he needs more room than six people in a crowded limousine would provide.

Mr. Ickes invites anyone to challenge his figures. I do not have the staff to challenge the figures and do not have the gas card to do the figuring, but I am a little skeptical of New Dealers dividing the wealth of the country. I know I cannot bank the $87,000, so I will not worry about that.

I wish to point out, though, that the Indians had more natural resources on the right-hand side of the ledger than we have. They probably could figure a higher dollar personal worth when the first white man landed on these shores than we can today. Look what happened to the Indians. Ickes is their guardian, and if he is putting these figures down, getting ready to be my guardian, I object.

I do not want to challenge Secretary Ickes' figures because I learned long ago that you cannot get an answer to Broadway arithmetic or Pennsylvania Avenue arithmetic. Broadway arithmetic, you know, is a chorus girl's salary, $20 a week; Park Avenue residence, $400 a month; a limousine, and an ermine coat.

President Roosevelt in an address to the small businessman's conference in Washington a couple of years ago said, "Don't worry about the national debt. We owe it to each other." But you cannot pay off the H. O. L. C. or the butcher with it.

I do not want to get into the contest; I just do not want to end up a ward of the Secretary's or try to get any answer to Broadway or Pennsylvania Avenue arithmetic.

RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AN INSPIRING EXAMPLE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I feel that we need a little inspiration to bring our determination back again. I saw an article in one of the local papers, mentioning the fact that one of our men in the service was engaged at a high altitude in a dog fight in the South Pacific; there were a number of planes engaged in the fight; his plane was hit and caught fire. The young man had to bail out. He was very badly burned. He dropped for some time before pulling the cord to open his parachute. When the chute opened he made all kinds of faces at those in the enemy planes to make it appear that he was a Japanese. He was suffering from intense pain from his burns; he took out his medicine kit and used morphine to deaden the pain caused by his burns. He landed in the ocean. Then he took time to inflate his rubber raft, climbed in, pulled his parachute over him and went to sleep. He was picked up later and taken to the hospital. He recovered and he is now back in the dog fight for his country.

What an example of courage, sacrifice, and heroism in contrast to the conduct of those in high places who bicker and quarrel and play politics in this time of national danger.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL BROWN

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago on yesterday my colleage the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. PAUL BROWN, was first elected as a Member of this body. During the ensuing 10 years he has never missed a roll call; he has never missed a meeting of his committee; he has been faithful to his duties to which the people elected him, and I wish to extend my congratulations to him for his splendid service here and for the outstanding record he has made in his faithful attendance upon the sessions of this body.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We welcome him to this little group.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

CORN PRICES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the comments made here with reference to the corn program. If it is the plan of this body to start tearing down the O. P. A. by passing laws raising the price of individual items selected from time to time, whether it be corn today or beans the next week or something else the next, I can assure my colleagues that we are going to have some legislative trouble in this country. I do not believe in any such stuff. I shall not support any such program. Why does this Congress believe it can successfully legislate individual commodity prices?

If I am long on corn and short on cash I generally sell corn. If I am long on cash and short on corn what right have I to go to the man who has corn and make him sell his corn against his desire to hold? If I can make more money out of corn by feeding the corn to hogs and placing them on the market, why should you want to make me sell the corn so that a neighbor or some stranger who has no corn and wants corn to feed his poultry, so he can make a profit, by buying it. Why should I have to sell my own corn to someone who can use it and make a profit, when I am not allowed to keep it and make a profit by feeding and thus supply meat instead of corn?

I do not own any corn but I think I have practical sense enough to appreciate some of the problems involved in this matter, as between the fellow who has corn he wants to feed to his own livestock, the fellow who holds corn and will not sell it, and the fellow who wants to make a profit out of the corn which he hopes to buy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to attend the conference to be held tomorrow and will be glad to hear some of the views that are expressed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Carl A. Gray, in the June issue of the Connecticut Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ADVERTISING OF THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since I talked last Tuesday on the excess wages paid in war industries I have been receiving many letters, a great number of which contained advertisements for help in war industries. I wish to read from one of the advertisements I received from Alameda, Calif., which are typical. These are ads signed by the United States Employment Service. One ad read:

Moore Dry Dock needs women, 18 to 40 years of age.

It pictures a beautiful looking young lady who says:

I started at $214 per month, and I am now earning $270 a month.

Another young woman in another advertisement says:

We are paid at least $214 a month while we learn to weld, and soon earn over $270 a month as a journeyman. Ten percent extra for swing shift; 15 percent extra for graveyard shift.

The ad is also signed by the United States Employment Service and advertises for help for the shipyards of California.

It continues:

You can do what Louise Meisuer is doing. We'll train you to weld and pay you at the rate of $214 a month during the short training period. Soon you'll be equipped with the knowledge that will win you promotions to pay $270 a month.

The ad is signed "U. S. Employment Service," and then we talk of inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and also on another topic.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PHALANGE: THE AXIS SECRET ARMY IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES FOR CLERICAL PHALANGE: THE AXIS SECRET ARMY IN POSTAL STATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post

offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This bill is to permit not to exceed $2.50 a day to be paid for the actual expenses of postal employees designated to work in postal stations in Army camps and naval stations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is to pay only expenses?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARTLEY. And if the gentleman will yield, it was reported out, I understand, unanimously by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It was.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval personnel at military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units, at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding $2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices."

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for any payments heretofore made not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to the employees so detailed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The bells will be rung at 10 minutes to 2 and the House will resume its session at 2 o'clock. The Chair declares the House in recess until 2 o'clock.

Thereupon at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m. the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1318. An act authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JULY 6, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: World War Veterans' Legislation, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Road, and Patents.

My resignation to be effective as of today.

Sincerely yours,

JOE B. BATES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 291), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Rules, JOE B. BATES, Kentucky; Agriculture, E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of all previous special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the conference reports on the war agencies bill and the last deficiency bill will not be ready before 5 o'clock or perhaps a little bit later. Therefore the Chair thinks it might be well to proceed with the special orders. If a conference report comes in, we will take it up immediately.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months much has been said by certain Members of this House in reference to rationing and there has been considerable talk about nationalities and minority groups. This is not the time or place to criticize or attack any racial groups, nor is it for the Congress to set an example in that kind of procedure. I regret to say that has been done. The Congress must set an example for unity of all the people and if there is disturbance, it is our duty to determine the facts and to see that the culprits are punished properly, wherever that disturbance may be. So much for that.

A year ago I came before this honorable body and appealed to it to give the Committee on Immigration the right to study certain important problems regarding aliens in this country. A minority group in the House, unalterably opposed to anything reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, was able to convince this body not to comply with our committee's request, and as a result of that action we are now at a loss to determine just what to do with certain aliens in this country. On the other hand, since last January you have passed without any question about 8 or 10 resolutions giving various committees the power to study certain problems. You have appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for those committees. In fact, we have so many committees now I do not think we have room for them.

When asking for the resolution I mentioned before, the committee was trying to protect the best interests of the country. The resolution had to do with alien enemies in this country. To illustrate, we have at Ellis Island, only one of the ports, 250 Chinese who have technically deserted. They are alien seamen. Why did they desert? Because certain shipping companies exploited them by low wages and miserable treatment. After they worked for many, many months and got shore leave they could not even get enough money to feed themselves. The public had to do it. The Allied shipping companies, including the British and other countries' steamship companies, have kept these Chinese working 20 or more hours a day. When they got to this country and received a little shore leave, and when they were supposed to receive four or five hundred dollars which was due them to send to their people to buy rice and food, they got only $5 or $10.

These are troublesome problems that the committee was hoping to go into. We have two-hundred-some-odd Nazis at Ellis Island, and that is only one of the many ports in this country. In my opinion, some of them ought not to be allowed to stay there. They receive treatment as if they were in a clubhouse, getting three square meals a day, and lazying around. They are definitely un-American. They have no business at Ellis Island. They should be removed to some other place. Yet we could not go into that because the Congress a year ago said we had no right to study all these questions.

On top of that, Fritz Kuhn has now been released from prison after serving 2½ years. He is the leader of the German-American Bund, Mr. Hitler's friend. He organized all the Nazi sympathizers in this country into Fascist groups to help Hitler. He is now detained at Ellis Island. Why? Why should he not be put some place where he would not be able to contaminate other doubtful internees—as we have in Ellis Island?

We find that our prisoners of war are getting a pretty raw deal in Japan and Germany. Do you know that over 300

or 400 of our soldiers died in Japanese prisons of disease and lack of food and medicine? Do you know that they are dying by the hundreds, that our men who are prisoners of war are being treated worse than cattle, and that American soldiers in the concentration camps in Germany today are dying by the dozens every day? Let me insert two newspaper reports as to the treatment some of our boys received in Japan:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 26, 1943]

PRIEST TELLS HOW JAPS SLEW DOOLITTLE AIDES

ST. LOUIS, May 25.—The Japanese who wreaked vengeance on Chinese and missionaries for aiding Brig. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle's American flyers after the Tokyo raid stopped only at cannibalism, the Reverend George Yager, American missionary who was there, said today.

Father Yager, serving the Congregation of Missions at Yu Kianz, Kiangsi, near which some of the Doolittle flyers landed after their historic bombing, told of the murder, torture, and mayhem which followed the Japs' discovery that Catholic missionaries and Chinese residents of Kiangsi had sheltered the stranded flyers and helped them escape.

As the Japanese descended upon the area, Father Yager said, Bishop Charles Quinn, of Los Angeles, 8 American priests, and 5 nuns retreated into the hills some 20 miles away with 300 Chinese. They left behind Fr. Humbert Verdini, Italian Vincentian priest, who had volunteered to remain in an effort to protect the old, the very young, and the sick.

"With the withdrawal of the Japanese," Father Yager said, "the bishop and the priests moved back into their former missions, and found nothing but destruction and isolation confronting them. Towns were completely laid waste. The whole countryside reeked of death in every form. Poor country people who had stayed on, hoping to be allowed to continue to work their fields, had been savagely tortured and put to death."

FATHER VERDINI MISSING

"From some of the villagers who had managed to escape death we heard stories far too brutal and savage to relate. Just one charge was not heard—cannibalism. But outside of that, take your choice and you can't miss the savage nature of the Japanese Army."

Bishop Quinn found his Yukiang home burned. He searched for Father Verdini and discovered only his sun helmet and a muddled jacket beside a pond in the rear of the compound, which was lined with human bones. Father Verdini never has been found.

"We know the 60 or so children and old people in the residence with him were killed by the Japs," Father Yager said. "The bestiality of the action cannot be imagined by civilized peoples."

A 70-year-old French priest was beaten and stabbed and later died. A Chinese priest was beheaded. Property loss in churches and homes of the American missionaries reached "well over $1,000,000," Father Yager estimated.

The Japs particularly were eager to find Father Dunker, Dutch priest who had brought the wounded Lt. (now Capt.) Harold F. Watson and his crew 40 miles across mountain country to be treated by a Dr. Homberger, German-Jewish doctor working in a hospital operated by the Irish Columban fathers.

GERMAN DOCTOR MALTREATED

"The doctor, who stayed on with his German passport, was subjected to rough treatment as a result of his treatment of Lieutenant Watson," Father Yager said. "The hospital in which the doctor practiced under the care of the Irish missionaries was burned along with the town."

"Doolittle and his crew, who landed near Shang-Yu, were anxious to proceed immediately to Chungking," Father Yager said, "but the injured Watson and his crew stayed a few days with Father Dunker. Some of the flyers also were assisted by Father William Glynn, of Chicago."

"The flyers, with Doolittle in command, arrived at Ying-Tan about 7:30 a. m.," Father Yager said. "They spent about an hour eating breakfast, then got on busses for their next lap toward Chungking. About 40 minutes later three Jap planes came out of Nanchang and flew down the road after the busses.

"Fortunately, they were too late, but they did manage to bomb a mail truck and kill three Chinese."

[From the New York Daily Mirror of June 22, 1943]

DEAD IN JAP PRISON CAMPS PUT AT 300

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Disease and malnutrition have killed 300 Americans in Jap prison camps since the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, the War Department disclosed tonight.

The announcement was based on reports received through the International Red Cross. Chief causes of death, in addition to beriberi, a disease of malnutrition, were malaria, diphtheria, dysentery and pneumonia. Previously the Japs had reported 300 deaths due to battle wounds.

The deaths occurred among a total of 11,307 Army personnel thus far reported as prisoners of war.

The War Department had no comment on whether the mortality rate was exceptionally high and whether it indicated mistreatment or neglect.

The diseases listed ordinarily result from lack of proper food, sanitation, medical care and shelter.

We find that we are bringing over here captured prisoners from Germany and Japan. We set up a very fine camp for them at Huntsville, Tex. They are not only permitted to have their recreation and play baseball and probably see some movies but they are also taken care of medically. We treat them royally. Yet our boys are dying from the treatment that is being accorded them by the Japanese and German Governments.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that these are the things I should like to know more about and that the Congress should know more about and the public should know more about. I hope to appear again before the Committee on Rules. I ask this House for unity, all of you, to give us the right to study these questions, not only those I have illustrated here but many more which should be looked into.

We ought to have the right to segregate the good alien from the bad alien. We have them all bunched together now. One is tripping over the other. There are a number of so-called enemy aliens in this country today. The term "enemy alien" takes in men who are pro-ally, who are willing to fight and die for this country, but unfortunately the present interpretation of this classification is such that we will not take these men because we call them and treat them like real enemies. What a waste of manpower in crucial times like these. All these problems are important and should be examined and determined by some committee that can come back to this House after the recess and submit to this House a constructive program to deal with them for the best interests of our country and for the preservation of our democracy.

There are many Nazis in this country who have become naturalized and we ought to find a short cut to denaturalize them. Under the present process it is impossible to do it fast enough. My committee reported legislation to this Congress to do that very thing, but it seems that the moment we bring up an Immigration Committee bill there is always some opposition in one corner or the other and claims that we are seeking to open the doors of the country. The discussion has usually nothing to do with the merits of the bill and the decision cast without even taking up the provisions of the bill.

My only purpose in appealing to you for unity is to ask for fairness in respect to ourselves and to the citizens of our country. In times when the armed forces and industry need all the manpower and skill obtainable we have no right to disregard an important source for both just because of some old prejudices. There are innumerable highly trained and skilled people who are lost to our war effort because they are unfortunately and incorrectly labeled enemy aliens. We owe it to our fighting men to devise some method to get at this untapped resource of manpower. It is our duty to find some way to utilize people who can be of help to us in our fierce struggle. On the other hand it would seem to me that the several hundred Nazis at Ellis Island should not stay there. I personally would not wait very long, I would send them to a place where they would be far away from any strategic area and from contact with possible accomplices still at large. I would isolate them and not allow them to contaminate other people who visit that island. They are dangerous people. Some of them are citizens. They had no business becoming citizens.

The committee was also hoping to get that authority we asked for a year ago, because there are thousands of Nazis and Japanese who hold dual nationality. They are citizens of several countries. They work with us one day and work against us the next day, but in working against us they have been working behind our back. They are too clever and therefore the more dangerous—to be too obvious.

So, without trying to split any hairs with any Member of this House, we are going in the very near future to present another resolution. It would require hardly any money. We would not ask for $50,000 or $100,000 or $650,000. It would take just a few thousand dollars to make that study which is necessary to promulgate a program of legislation for the best interests of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman expressed the hope that Members would not bring up the racial question, did he not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I said that; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of anyone who has spoken more frequently or at greater length on racial questions than himself?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In my discussions of racial questions I was only appealing for unity. I never attacked any racial group. I only mentioned the subject matter when I felt—in all fairness to our democratic ideals and principles—that I should speak up for any racial group attacked by others. It is true, I have appealed to Congress, time and again, to act against discrimination and intolerance, to act against inhuman treatment of minority groups. I have never injected any racial issue in any other way. The gentleman cannot point out to me one instance in my 22 years as a Member of this honorable body that I have ever attacked anyone because of race, creed, or color. He will not be able to point out one instance where I brought up the question of race or creed unless it was to protect someone against unfair discrimination or attacks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No effort was being made by me to criticize anything the gentleman said today or at any other time, but in view of what the gentleman said, does he know of any Member of the House who has attempted to stir up racial feeling from the Well of the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would hate to stand here and give a bill of particulars. It would take an awful lot of pages to give you a bill of particulars and it would probably start a lot of unnecessary heated arguments. You know what I am referring to and the statements printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will bear me out. I do not want to cross swords with anybody here and I stand here in the most friendly spirit appealing to the Members of Congress who represent the American people to set an example for the people of this great country by using reason instead of emotion in dealing with legislation, by trying to keep our composure in these trying times, and prevent intolerance and discrimination from gaining a foothold in our beloved country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everyone will agree with that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If you go back to the records of a week ago, 2 weeks ago, and 3 weeks ago, I could show you where we have not lived up to our principles. It is not necessary for one Member to make personal attacks upon a colleague—as has been the case quite often lately. We are all here for one purpose. We all represent the interests of our constituencies. We must work together for whatever differences may exist in our constituencies. We all have one all-absorbing interest in common now and that is to win the war as speedily as possible and without sacrificing any of the principles for which we are fighting. I know that everyone is trying to do his best. But we in Congress must always keep in mind that our actions as individuals are also interpreted as the actions of the representatives of the American people. We must be united if we want to show that the American people are united. We must show that there is no race hatred or intolerance or discrimination here if we want the world to believe that the United States and the American people do not believe in such vicious doctrines. It is true, very often I have stood in the well of this House and appealed to you, telling you what has happened to the Jews in Poland and other parts of the world, who are being slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands, and have asked the Congress and the American people to do something for those people. Yes, I plead guilty of having asked your help for the unfortunate Jews who are being systematically exterminated by Hitler's gangsters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the Jews are not the only ones who are suffering in this war, by any means. We are all in it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I admit that. But can you name any other group who has been tortured as much as the Jews have been by the Nazis?

Mr. HOFFMAN. When you said you were appealing to all of us, you included yourself in that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; certainly. I am not exempting myself at any time.

I have not only appealed in behalf of the Jews, but of all persecuted people no matter where they may be. What have we accomplished at the so-called Bermuda conference? We talk about trying to help the innocent victims of Nazi aggression. We have not made one constructive suggestion to rescue the tortured victims of Nazi wrath, whether they be Jew, Catholic, or Protestant.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are we not fighting this war and are not American lives being sacrificed by the thousands for the very purpose that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We are fighting for our own country and for our democracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our democracy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. American democracy. We are fighting for principles. We are fighting for a cause. The people in this war are asking themselves the question, "What are we fighting for?" when they hear about race riots taking place in their own country. They are supposed to be fighting against the principles of fascism and nazi-ism and then they hear about people in our own country expounding the very same ideas and ideals they are fighting against.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, well, now, I would like to get on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right, then.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. To me, Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer, and the answer is tolerance. You may be right, I may be wrong, but why not discuss it like mature human beings? Why can we not sit down around the conference table and discuss problems as they arise—discuss them logically and rationally—without getting personalities involved?

As an illustration, there is a great clamor for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law—a tremendous appeal from a great number of the American people, from every walk of life. The cold facts are that not more than 107 Chinese could come into this country annually if China were put on a quota basis. There is no foundation for some statements made on this floor to the effect that we are going to open the doors and let all the coolie labor come in. Some Members on that side and on this side believed that was true. They were trying to stop consideration of the legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion act by saying that such repeal would flood the country with Chinese coolie labor. What the proponents of this legislation have tried to do is to give China some moral support—to help her against the Japanese propaganda trying to divide and disunite her people. We have been realistic in our approach instead of taking the superior attitude that we can lick any enemy alone. We must have China as our ally to be able to defeat Japan. If we lose China's confidence or if China is conquered from within we may have to fight a costly, bloody war in the Pacific all alone for the next 10 or 15 years. China is ready to fight this war without our sending a single American boy into China if we will just give her the material and leadership. We will not have to sacrifice so many American soldiers if we will do all in our power to keep China in the war and fighting on our side. As I stated before, Japanese propaganda is as potent as Japanese guns and anything we can do to counteract it is of vast military importance.

So I say to you, what I did in asking for the repeal of the exclusion act was motivated by the desire to help my country to keep China in this war. Any statement made to the effect that I was trying to break down our immigration bars is not true and not based on facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

POLITICS AND THE WAR

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I made the announcement that I was going to talk about politics. Partly that remains true. My desire to take this time arises on account of the feeling that I have that we yet have before us a long, hard war. As I am able to analyze or appraise the present situation, we, the Allies, are just beginning to take the offensive in this great struggle. While I would not minimize in the least the wonders that have

been accomplished up to this time in launching this offensive action, I confess to you that I am unable to see the chance of anything like an early conclusion of this great conflict. Feeling this way, I am greatly disturbed, and while it may seem to be in a measure by way of an indictment against some, I feel every day that too many of us—and I speak particularly now of Members of Congress—too many of us are prone to paramount things which, compared with this great struggle going on in the world, are of little consequence.

Notwithstanding the fact that we yet have before us in all probability a long, hard war; it does not disturb me much that that might mean some privations to me or to you, but it does disturb me when I remember that our own boys and our own men are surrendering willingly their lives upon the battlefields of the world that we may continue in the blessings of liberty and the freedoms which were purchased by the blood of those who went before us.

PATRIOTISM, NOT POLITICS

I am strongly impressed with the idea and, indeed, the conviction that I am not sufficiently mindful at all times of the duty I owe to the men in arms, who are fighting for freedom and the preservation of our country. In this war thousands of our men—largely our young men, perhaps—have already given their lives for this cause. I am not unmindful of the fact—not merely the expectation—that thousands of others of our fellow citizens will die for my freedom and yours. How many shall die depends in a large measure upon how faithful I am to my duty and my obligation as a citizen and a recipient of the blessings that will flow from the sacrifices made by my fellow Americans who are standing between me and the loss of my country and my freedom. Through their bravery and sacrifices I shall be free and not slave.

It is not enough that I shall vote for appropriations of money to carry on the war. I must refrain from all acts and avoid all words that would in the least tend to divide those who are engaged in this great battle for freedom. I must not only profess to be, but be, thankful for the allies who are aiding us in this titanic struggle, which, if gained, will assure our enjoyment of the blessings of liberty, but, if lost, will leave us without hope for ourselves or our posterity for centuries to come. I must know that even one word which tends to divide and, consequently, to hinder will result in the loss of a life, or many lives—the lives of those who gallantly defend us. I may fail; I can fail to hold highest my obligation to my country, placing party or other considerations above my loyalty to my country and to the men who bear the toil and heat of the day. If I do this, I shall have brought upon myself the contempt of all my fellows, and particularly of those who are on the battlefields of the world for my security. I must avoid divisions at home. If by action or inaction, word or failure to speak when I ought to speak, I prolong this struggle for liberty 1 minute, I cannot say that I am not guilty of at least allowing some mother's boy to die unnecessarily. This is not a fanciful or an imaginary contemplation. It is truth; it is an everlasting truth.

Let us reason together. What is above our duty to do all we can to secure the peace of the world in the shortest possible time and at the same time make the peace a lasting one? Let us be reminded of the implications of our present struggle. I quote from Archbishop Stritch in his survey of the peace pronouncements of Pope Pius XII in respect to the great things involved in the struggle for the peace and freedom to which we must dedicate ourselves:

> This time we must make a peace that will give lasting security to all nations and all peoples. It is hard to contemplate what would be the consequences of a failure at the peace table when victory comes. Despite all efforts to preserve peace, the Nazi Party went to war. It did not conceal its objective of setting up by force a new world order, in which a single nation would dominate and the other nations would be mere tributaries to its wealth and power. Let any student, in full calmness and impartiality, examine the proposal of the Axis and study the philosophy which inspires it, and he will be compelled to conclude that it holds no promise of world peace.

Archbishop Stritch then reminds of the pronouncements set forth in the "four freedoms," and refers to this as the language of honest peacemakers.

History—

He says—

> has bestowed on us a great, grave world responsibility. We shall be a mighty force at the peace table. Men everywhere will look to us to give them a good peace. We dare not fail. To us men look for a genuine peace, and we must leave no stone unturned to give it to them when victory comes to our arms.

There is so much involved in the war into which we have been thrust and in which we are necessarily engaged that it cannot be believed that the end is even now near at hand. This is a total war. It not only encompasses substantially the whole world but it has its relationship to the freedom and peace of the world now and for generations to come. There are two determinations, one pitted against the other. On the one hand the determination is that one country shall be free and the rest of the world slave. The other determination is that all men shall be free—free as embodied in the statement of the "four freedoms," and all men free to live.

We believe that we shall succeed and not only in victory to our arms, but that we shall succeed in helping the world to a lasting peace, where human rights are regarded, the dignity of man realized, and the moral law upheld; and where it shall be established that "righteousness exalteth a nation" and that "sin is a reproach to any people."

Now we are engaged in a great struggle to overcome the evil forces of the world, who regard neither God nor man. These we must indeed overcome. Therefore it shall be our duty to see that justice and truth prevail in the affairs of men and nations, at least, to contribute our full share toward that realization.

I am going home. I believe it is well that we, the Members of the Congress, do go home and mingle with our people, hearing them and asking them to hear us. But I would warn that the wisdom of our going depends on what we expect to say. Shall we forget that our country is imperiled and talk politics or gloat in complaints about what everybody but us does? Or shall we spend our time in urging or, at the least, contributing to sentiments of strife and division among our folks? Or will we counsel toleration and advise a direct appeal for correction of what we deem errors rather than indulge in idle recriminations and glory in producing resentments?

I do not want to hear much about politics when I go home. I want to hear about a country united in a common cause. I do not want to hear much from candidates for office for reasons of their personal preferment. I want to hear men talk about what they are willing to do for their country.

I want to have opportunity for our reasoning together, in soberness and not bitterness, in unity and not strife, on the subject of our common good and the earliest conclusion of this war possible with complete and lasting victory and peace. I want us to be, in truth and not pretense only, Americans first.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think that the high principles which he has just enunciated are the very essence of good politics?

Mr. FOLGER. Yes; if you do not mix it with common partisanship.

INVESTIGATION OF CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 243), authorizing a study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government exercises jurisdiction, which was referred to the House Calendar and order to be printed.

Resolved, That the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government or any agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto, whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges.

The committee shall report from time to time to the House the results of its investigations and studies, and in its reports the committee may recommend such legislation as may be deemed pertinent.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the

United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

TAX PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION OF LANDS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 281) authorizing a study and investigation of tax problems connected with acquisition of land, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, or subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States; including, but not limited to, (1) an investigation of the tax problems connected with the acquisition of such lands and burden upon local units by reason of use of large tracts of public lands for public use, the effect upon grazing areas and other incidental problems; (2) the study of a homestead program; and (3) a study of the use of such program to assist in the rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION AS IT AFFECTS THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND CIVILIANS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, has for the last few months been engaged in an extensive investigation of the petroleum situation affecting the Army, Navy and civilian program.

This subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, recently returned to Washington after visiting several of the oil-producing centers in the country. At each of these places—Decatur, Ill.; Eldorado, Ark.; Jackson, Miss.; Dallas, Tex., and New Orleans, La.—we conducted comprehensive hearings on every phase of the oil industry. Prior to this tour, our subcommittee worked for several months in Washington. Of necessity most of the hearings here were held in executive session at the request of the Army, Navy and the Petroleum Administrator for War. We have given no publicity to any of our activities to this date. Our group was and is interested in results and not in publicity. The report of our findings is now being drafted. I felt, however, that since this report will not be ready for some time, there are some important phases of the petroleum problem which the Members of the House should carry home with them for consideration during the coming recess.

Your constituents, particularly those who reside along the eastern seaboard, and especially in New England, are going to want to know what, if anything, is being done to prevent a recurrence of the tragic conditions which prevailed last winter.

You Members from the Midwest, and the Farm Belt particularly, are going to be asked to explain where the petroleum is coming from to gather the harvest with which to feed our own people and also meet the obligations this country has made to our gallant allies. We are all going to be asked, even you who represent oil-producing areas, just what is planned to be done with respect to future rationing of petroleum—I regret to advise you that I cannot hazard a guess on the mental machinations of Mr. Ickes or the O. P. A.—I can only tell you that our findings indicate that the petroleum problem forecasts an impending crisis unless we take action to encourage more exploration, more production and the finding of additional oil reserves not only for victory in the great war we are now fighting, but also for adequate oil to supply generations yet unborn.

And right at this point may I say that if everybody in the United States knew that we are using about twice the amount of gasoline, twice the amount of petrolem that we are finding, the people of this Nation would wake up and demand that additional safeguards be provided to see that we produce what is necessary for our armed forces and to meet our needs.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder if the gentleman can advise us whether his committee inquired to what extent the oil fields of the eastern Mediterranean area, that is, Iran and Iraq, are furnishing oil; whether those fields are contributing to the war effort.

Mr. RIVERS. The resolution creating the committee, with which the gentleman is familiar, primarily directed the committee to investigate the petroleum situation as it affected the eastern seaboard, and furnishing petroleum to the Army, the Navy, and the civilian needs.

We went into that question a little, but we did not get a great deal of information on it.

Now, let me make it plain that the committee has worked with the prime thought in view that we must first provide adequate petroleum supplies for our armed forces. For them there can be no rationing. Our ships must be kept in action, our planes must be kept in the air, and our land forces must aggressively move forward.

I want to express for myself and my committee our deep appreciation of the fine cooperation extended to us by the producing branch of the oil industry during our recent tour. These men, imbued with the spirit of the American pioneer, convinced us of their earnest desire to find new reserves and produce more oil. They brought to us their problems. We advised them that we would present these problems to the Congress of the United States and attempt to bring about, as far as possible, an alleviation that will enable them to continue, hampered only by those impediments which we all must face because of the exigencies of war. In all great oil-producing States which we visited we found identical problems. I briefly summarize them, as follows:

First. Subparity prices for crude oil.

Second. Governmental red tape.

Third. Failure of the manpower authority to accord to the industry proper recognition with respect to importance of personnel, long classified as essential to the industry.

Fourth. Denial by the W. P. B. of priorities for adequate materials with which to drill new wells and find new reserves.

We were advised by qualified witnesses, representing both the major and independent interests, that increases in the price ceilings on crude oil are essential to the stimulation of additional exploration and production. Operators of so-called stripper wells testified that the increased overhead for pumping is causing abandonment of many of these wells which could produce oil for many years to come. A stripper well, in the language of the oil man, is a well which has lost its natural pressure and must be pumped.

The subject of governmental red tape was one upon which almost all our witnesses dwelt at considerable length—delay by the Petroleum Administrator's office in even considering applications for drilling permits; centralized control of the industry in Washington, with State regulatory bodies completely ignored and rendered impotent; adoption of nearly impractical and almost inflexible regulations not capable of being applied to all oil-producing areas, and lack of a clear understanding by P. A. W. personnel of the problems of each of the respective oil regions of the country.

An oil producer, with holdings in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi,

and other States, came to me in Dallas to complain privately concerning the delay of the P. A. W. in considering his application for drilling permits. He told me of an instance in which he had been assured of a drilling permit, had set up his rig on location, and then had to wait 10 days, at a loss to him of $500 per day, until the arrival from Washington of his drilling permit. He was asked to take the witness stand and testify for the record. His answer was that he was afraid to do it—because of possible reprisals and delays on future applications. I, therefore, would not insist that he take the witness stand to testify on this matter.

The chief complaint of the officials of State regulatory bodies is that their advices are being completely ignored in the administering of the wartime petroleum program. These agencies, all of them with a background of years of successful practical experience and localized knowledge of petroleum problems, should be given a voice in the solution of these problems in their respective States. The Honorable Beauford H. Jeter, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, testified that his commission had advocated to P. A. W. a gradual increase in Texas production, to build up a petroleum stock pile for the increasing war need. His advice was ignored and the stock pile was not built up. It may now be noted that within the last 2 weeks, Texas was ordered by P. A. W. to produce more oil for immediate use.

It has been the policy of the P. A. W. to issue over-all regulations concerning the spacing of wells. Such regulations have generally specified that only one well be drilled to each 40 acres of land surface. Dr. J. Huner, Jr., Louisiana State geologist, testified that these regulations could not be made to apply alike to the entire Nation. It was pointed out that in some strata, one well may be adequate for 5 acres, while in others, a larger producing well might pull from more than 40 acres. You can readily see, then, why these State advisers would like to have a word in the production of petroleum for our wartime needs. On the same point, Dr. H. M. Morse, Mississippi State oil and gas supervisor, testified that the 40-acre spacing rule would never permit efficient withdrawal of the oil from the sands of his State, which, in places, are 100 feet thick and in other places dwindle down to a thickness of 8 feet. The thicker sands will accommodate one well to every 5 to 10 acres without any waste whatever.

It was not until recently that the local selective service boards were directed by national headquarters at Washington to consider men engaged in production of petroleum supplies as essential to the war effort and eligible for deferment. The men of draft age working on development and production crews have been trained over a period of years and are irreplaceable. The armed forces do not have billets for men of this type of scientific training. I am glad to know that the War Manpower Commission has at last recognized that the work of these men is essential to the war effort.

This is a mechanized war, and oil is the foundation upon which we will eventually ride into Berlin and Tokyo.

The question of materials for drilling concerns the independent more than the major. The large oil companies maintain stock piles of equipment. They also have offices in Washington, where representatives are in daily contact with the Federal agencies. But the independent is the man who discovers the oil. The records show that the independent "wildcatter" has brought in approximately 75 percent of the new fields found during the last 5 years. Before that he brought in almost all our new fields. He is the one who needs and should have relief. Responsibility for delay in expediting priorities for these independent "wildcatters" rests upon the shoulders of Mr. Harold Ickes and his associates in the P. A. W. The W. P. B. set up the regulations for the granting of priorities to the oil industry, but the administration of this program and the issuing of priority orders was accorded to the P. A. W. These orders, generally speaking, stymied the efforts of the independent producer. I believe that it is possible to work out a system of expediting such orders whereby the pioneering spirit of the "wildcatter" in the oil business may be encouraged. To force him to wait and delay his activities pending consideration by the P. A. W. of each individual application will prove disastrous to the war effort.

Now, you all know about the subsidy which was necessary in order to make it possible for the railroads to bring this petroleum to a famished and freezing East. Under this program, brought about by a submarine menace and the requisitioning of ocean tankers to the military service, it has been necessary that the railroads bear the brunt of the transportation of oil to the Atlantic Coastal States.

The cost of rail transportation is, of course, much higher than the cost by ocean movement or by pipe line. The taxpayers of the Nation are paying the difference in a subsidy amounting to approximately $1 per barrel. The railroads are moving about 900,000 barrels of oil daily to the eastern seaboard. This means that approximately $900,000 per day is being taken from the pockets of the taxpayers to pay these transportation costs. A small portion of this is absorbed by increased prices on petroleum products. But most of it is paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation. This amounts in round figures to over a third of a billion dollars a year at the present rate—enough to build three pipe lines from Texas to New York.

Of course, when the pipe lines now under construction have been completed, this cost will be reduced. We have been presented evidence to show that pipeline transportation is cheaper than movement by ocean tanker, even in peacetime. So the answer to this situation is, in my opinion, pipe lines, pipe lines, and more pipe lines.

Now, in answer to the question which naturally arises in your respective minds, where shall these lines originate? First, I will start with the State of Texas. The chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission stated to my committee in no uncertain terms that, if allowed economically to produce under a plan submitted to the P. A. W. by his commission, his State could contribute in excess of 300,000 barrels a day to the war effort without injury to the fields or waste in producing. This same condition prevails in Illinois, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

While we are on the subject of Mississippi, I would like to call to your attention that the Congress of the United States, about a year ago, authorized a pipe line to be constructed from Mississippi to the east coast. To this date, the Petroleum Administrator, through one Mr. Ralph K. Davies, the Deputy Administrator, has refused to permit its construction, merely because he alleges that the reserves in Mississippi do not warrant such construction.

This is an astounding position for Mr. Davies to take. His company, the Standard Oil Co. of California, has leased in excess of 133,000 acres of prospective oil lands in 12 counties in the same Mississippi which he claims will be dry in a very short period of time. What do you think his company is going to do with this land—grow corn and cotton? Testimony from every authority in the State of Mississippi and numerous producers there indicates that an estimate of the reserves in the Tinsley field alone are in excess of 250,000,000 barrels. You boys from the oil-producing States, can you envision any territory producing over 55,000,000 barrels during the last 2 years without a pipe line? Today that is the story of Mississippi.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentleman suggest that a committee be created to work out this problem while the House is in recess; to make a study of the problem and have some recommendation to make to the Congress when it reconvenes? The situation is critical; is it not?

Mr. RIVERS. The situation is so critical, as I stated, that if the people knew to what extent we are using petroleum they would insist that something be done about it.

Mr. FISH. Why is it not the duty of Congress to act, to create a committee to make a recommendation, rather than just talk about it?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman's committee will give us the resolution we will be glad to do so.

Mr. FISH. What I would like to see is action and not just discussion.

Mr. RIVERS. If the subcommittee from the Naval Affairs Committee is given the opportunity it will have a recommendation which I think will be pleasing to the entire Congress.

Mr. FISH. I feel that Congress should stop passing the buck, stop talking so much, because I think it has a duty to perform.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will read our report, he will not feel we are passing the buck.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I believe the subcommittee of which the gentleman is chairman has full authority to proceed during recess and I hope they will do so.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman may be sure that I have not laid down on the job since I have been on the committee, and I think the members of my committee feel about the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes in order that I may yield to these gentlemen who wish to ask me questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from South Carolina that there are several other special orders still pending.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, could not the gentleman make that request and take his time after the other special orders are disposed of?

Mr. RIVERS. This is a very vital question in which many Members are interested.

Mr. FISH. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman not so much that it should be talked about but that we should get action. I do not, however, think that those Members who have other special orders should have to wait. I will have to ask for the regular order.

Mr. RIVERS. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further. I want to say to the Members, and I want you to listen closely, in answer to the question that naturally arises in your minds: What are we going to do about it? First of all, we have got to formulate regulations and we have got to find ways of getting oil to the rest of the country, to increase production, to stimulate interest, and to find a way of bringing oil from the producing areas to the consuming areas. More pipe lines have got to be built. No oil field in the world was ever developed until it had a pipe line.

Let me tell you the story of Mississippi. About a year ago the Congress authorized a pipe line to be built from Mississippi to the east coast, but the Petroleum Administration said there was not any oil in Mississippi. My group went down into Mississippi and held hearings and got the record of applications of those who had filed for leases over the State. We found that the Ralph K. Davies organization, the Standard Oil Co. of California—the organization of the man who had signed the letter saying there was not any oil in Mississippi—had already filed on 130,000 acres of leases for the purpose of drilling for oil. I do not think the Standard Oil Co. of California plants cotton, I do not think it plants corn. The same man who said there was no oil in Mississippi got 130,000 acres of leases, enough to supply half a dozen pipe lines.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, was that producing land?

Mr. RIVERS. It is right near some producing land.

Mr. ROLPH. But it is not producing land?

Mr. RIVERS. No; it is not producing land yet.

In conclusion let me give you my personal opinion: If the oil-producing areas of the United States were not hamstrung by governmental regulations, discouraged and demoralized by Federal indecision and centralization, were given adequate pipe-line transportation, were given materials and equipment with which to find and produce oil, were emancipated from bureaucratic bondage, we would not be faced today with the paradox of a petroleum famine in the land of plenty.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a unanimous-consent request? I withdraw my request for the regular order and should like to ask that the gentleman be given the right to proceed for additional time.

Mr. RIVERS. I appreciate the gentleman's charity, but I am finished.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that since his visit to Illinois I have received several very fine letters on the part of petroleum producers expressing their appreciation of the opportunity of coming before his committee and complimenting him and the other members for the manner in which they carried on their investigation. I know they appreciate it, and I am sure they all realize that the gentleman is making a contribution to the solution of this important problem, and I trust he will continue his efforts along that line.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to the gentleman that his effort in getting witnesses for us was very helpful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

FORREST W. DICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE filed a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey for printing under the rule.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson for printing under the rule.

GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an excerpt from a book entitled "Men in Motion," by Henry J. Taylor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article from Nation's Business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a statement of Jesse Jones of the R. F. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very serious situation that has arisen in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board. We have permitted a situation to develop which presents possibly the greatest threat to our freedom for which we are fighting this war that has yet confronted us.

We are in this war to preserve our freedom and, insofar as possible, to extend that freedom to the other peoples of the world. We can never extend it to others if we lose it ourselves.

There can be no real threat to our freedom, no matter how much we may have to be regimented for the purpose of more effectively carrying on this terrible war, so long as we have reasonable and adequate freedom of the spoken and written word.

If the people are given all the facts and permitted to hear and read all of the divergent opinions by the experts and nonexperts, there is little danger that they will arrive at anything but the right conclusions. Let the people know the facts, have access to all sides of public questions, and the people as a whole will screen out the false and will form their conclusions and base their actions upon the truth.

The most powerful weapon in the preservation of freedom is an informed public opinion. No amount of propaganda, foreign or domestic, will fool the American people if they retain a free press to give them all the facts.

Of course, in time of war, censorship is necessary to deny to the enemy information which would be of value to them in their operations against us. No one can legitimately object to a properly administered censorship. Recognizing that necessity, the Congress authorized the establishment of an Office of Censorship.

There is a shortage of many critical materials in this country and not enough of many items for unlimited civilian use and full prosecution of the war. So, an office was created to balance the military needs and the civilian requirements. In other words, to allocate production of materials that were insufficient for all demands. This office is now known as the War Production Board.

It certainly was never intended that the control of production should be used

also as an agency for censorship and above and beyond and outside the authority granted to the Office of Censorship. And yet, that is exactly the situation with which we find ourselves confronted. The real threat to the freedom of the press is not from the Office of Censorship but from the War Production Board.

A shortage of newsprint having become apparent, the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board issued two directives on December 31, 1942. They are orders L–240 and L–244.

L–240 limited the use of print paper for newspapers in any current quarter to the amount used in the corresponding quarter of 1941. Order L–244 limited the use of print paper for magazines in any current quarter to 22½ percent of the total amount used in the year 1942.

In each instance, the purpose was to effect a substantial curtailment of paper consumption. In the case of newspapers, by restriction to the 1941 use; in the case of magazines, by limitation to 90 percent of the 1942 use.

Each order gave the party who would otherwise be bound by the original order the right to appeal from its provision. By a separate W. P. B. order—Administrative Order No. 13—effective January 18, 1943, it was provided that appeal should be granted only when it was a hardship or an injustice in particular cases.

However, both the Printing and Publishing Division and the Appeals Board have refused to define "hardship" and have refused to make known their standard or formula for determining the basis of exceptions, if they have any such standard or formula.

No one in authority in the War Production Board will state whether hardship is to be judged in the light of financial loss, or curtailment of circulation, or loss of prestige, or limitation on expansion or any other test by which the publisher might present his appeal based on hardship.

It is difficult to press an appeal when none of the rules governing the appeal is known, and very difficult to conduct the appeal when the Board refuses to set forth the rules, even during the hearing of an appeal.

The officials in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board refuse to state the basis upon which appeals for exceptions to the limitation orders are granted and denied. They refuse to explain or give any reason whatever to an appellant as to the treatment of his competitors.

Mr. GALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALE. In the gentleman's opinion, is this action on the part of the W. P. B. an isolated arbitrary case, or is it a part of a general policy existing all through the administration?

Mr. MAAS. I am very much afraid what I am going to state as typical in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board is rather typical throughout the whole Government, particularly in the so-called war agencies that have been newly created.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I may say to the gentleman that I have some figures here with reference to the amounts that have been allowed in these hardship cases, and I would be glad to give the gentleman these figures if he does not have them here.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be very glad to obtain those figures. How long will it take to read them?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. One minute.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I have a letter here under date of June 29 from H. M. Bitner, Director of the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board, with reference to the very thing of which the gentleman speaks. He talks about procedure in general when these hardship cases are brought before the Board and makes this further comment:

A total of 124,241 tons of additional paper have been granted to 501 newspapers to date. Six newspapers received 41 percent of this amount. The largest allowance, 17,525 tons, was made to a newspaper which commenced publication in December 1941, and therefore had no practicable base period usage under the order. Its appeal, therefore, was for the establishment of a quota not for the right to use paper in addition to its quota.

The second and third largest grants, aggregating 21,598 tons, were in a city where one of the largest newspapers went out of business in the latter part of 1941. Its circulation and advertising were taken over by a competing newspaper and the paper quota which it would have used was likewise divided among the other publishers in the field. In addition, there was a large population increase in that city.

Eleven thousand eight hundred and ninety-four tons were granted to three newspapers in a city which has had probably the largest influx of population (approximately 370,000 in the last 10 years).

That gives an idea of the very thing that the gentleman points out as to the broad and extensive scope of these powers which this division is exercising.

Mr. MAAS. I am glad to have that because I can get no information at all as to what they base their standards on for allowing exceptions to the order.

The process of setting appeals for a hearing and decisions are arbitrary and very frequently involve long and unexplained delays.

A publisher, because of the secret proceedings and the secret results, cannot learn if competitors have been granted exceptions and if they do learn from outside sources that a competitor has been granted exception, they are curtly refused any information as to the basis for granting the exception.

The result is that it is impossible to prepare an intelligent appeal on the basis of hardship because no rules are laid down, hearings are secret and confidential, results are not announced, and the whole proceeding is so mysterious that it creates suspicion and chaos in the industry.

There can be no justification for such secret proceedings, certainly not on the basis that it would disclose military information which would aid our enemies. Nor do W. P. B. officials even allege such a motive for maintaining secrecy. Their excuse that they must protect competitors from business secrets is just as ridiculous as to intimate that the facts would be of aid to Hirohito or Hitler.

A. B. C.—Audit Bureau of Circulations—has possession of and regularly publishes circulation figures, newsstand sales, and so forth, of all reputable publications so that excuse is a crude subterfuge. Certainly there would be far less damage to business by publishing these figures than the mysterious secret action of the division which operates with unknown rules and makes decisions that are based on arbitrary actions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that when newspapers and the newspaper industry are at the mercy of the whims of some individual in a bureau rather than being regulated by published law and rules, there is a tendency for the contents of those newspapers to conform with what the bureaus want said?

Mr. MASS. Certainly. Censorship by controlling the paper for printing the written word is potentially one of the most dangerous practices ever permitted in this country. The control of paper is being handled by secret proceedings based upon orders that have never been reviewed by Congress—the only law-making authority of the Government.

The officials who wield this tremendous power to issue orders that have the effect of law are not elected by the people, and they and their action are not subjected to scrutiny by anybody that is elected by the people as they are not subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The greatest safeguard of the people's freedom from the arbitrary decisions of officials who are delegated great discretionary powers is full publicity of the proceedings conducted by such officials and full publication of the results of their actions and decisions.

Such full publicity is the only sure safeguard against ultimate dictatorial abuse. Control of the daily press, magazines, and book publishing is far too dangerous a thing to repose in the hands of officials without adequate checks. The way to prevent abuses of this great power is to have public reports on decisions affecting the allocation of paper with a statement for the reasons for such decisions.

A book that is objectionable to the administration in power may be choked off; and may, in fact, be suppressed after the first edition by denial of paper for further editions, if additional paper is required for its publication. Under similar circumstances a new book may be stopped from being published at all. At the same time a book favoring the administration may be fostered by virtually unlimited grants of paper. It is

hardly necessary for me to point out here how potent a medium for influencing public opinion books are.

I wish to cite a concrete case. A former officer who served in the south Pacific, who is now a Member of Congress, was urged to write a book, particularly about the situation in the Pacific. Several publishers sought a book from him. He finally signed a contract with a publisher. Much of the work on the book had been done. It was to have been published within the month. The publisher in making his application for allotment of paper was asked to submit his schedule of prospective books, their titles, and their authors. This was done. When paper was requested for this Congressman's proposed book, an official of the War Production Board advised the publisher that he could have no paper for any such purpose.

Whether the book would have made any valuable contribution to the general subject or not is beside the point. The officials of the W. P. B. did not see the manuscript, did not request to see it.

It is apparent that these bureaucrats are seeking to dominate what is published by controlling the allotment of white paper.

Magazines play a great part in the life of the average American. The control of magazines by the War Production Board has become arbitrary if not capricious.

One example of the potential abuse in the control of magazines is evident in the W. P. B. allowing new publications to start up in 1943 and at the same time reducing the amount of paper available to a long-established magazine in the same field.

This can become a vicious device to put out of business a magazine whose policies displease the administration and on the other hand to create and subsidize a new competitor who will play ball with the bureaucrats in the administration.

An example of this type of abuse lies in the case of A, an aviation publication of long standing, a leader in its field. They requested additional paper to get out a special edition for one of the branches of the Army.

The additional paper was necessary to carry matter that was requested by this branch of the Army, and most of the articles which were of a technical or informative nature were to be written by Army officers. This magazine circulates widely to the personnel of the Army and Navy, as well as to the industry and general public, and is frequently used as a textbook by the military as well as industry.

Granting the additional paper required would have been an actual economy of paper as well as money as it would have saved the Army from directly publishing the same material at Government expense and with far greater waste in paper. The high officers in this branch of the Army urgently requested the W. P. B. to grant the application of the publisher for this paper.

These urgent requests were put in writing; were supplemented by appeals on the telephone. The request for additional paper was denied.

Publisher B started a new magazine in the same field late in 1942. Apparently intending to have a vigorous policy this magazine contracted with a foreign war correspondent who had been in the South Pacific for an article on conditions in that area.

The article was critical of the lack of unity of command and failure to have adequate air support. The publisher apparently was delighted. Part of the article in the next issue was already set up and about to come off the press when the publisher was advised that the article was looked upon with great disfavor and that "pressure from above" would undoubtedly result in W. P. B.'s denying them sufficient paper to continue if the issue appeared on the stands with this article.

The publisher who would be put out of existence by being limited to 90 percent of the amount of paper he had in 1942 yielded and at considerable expense tore the article out of the edition, substituted an innocuous article, and brought the magazine to the newsstands in a form entirely favorable to the W. P. B. officials.

Publisher B thereafter was allowed a usage in his paper for the base year of 1942 of 12 times the average monthly usage during the short period of existence, less a minor adjustment for excessively heavier paper.

There is evidence of a definite hostility on the part of the War Production Board Printing and Publishing Division, as well as other divisions of that organization, toward the military services. Much, if not most, of the paper being used by Government agencies is in propaganda. If the Government would restrict itself to the amount of paper actually necessary to run the Government and win the war, there would be no paper shortage in this country.

As further indications of the danger of permitting bureaucrats to have unlimited and arbitrary views without any kind of check is the manner in which hearings on appeals from the paper limitation order are conducted. In at least one hearing, responsible W. P. B. officials misrepresented and even lied about the facts.

Favoritism had been definitely demonstrated in numerous cases. War Production Board Printing and Publishing Division has on numerous occasions disregarded urgent appeals by other Government agencies, such as the United States Army, Department of Agriculture, Nelson Rockefeller committee, for grants of paper to publications that were cooperating with these agencies and performing an essential service for them.

The attitude of W. P. B. officials in these cases has shown a spirit of the bureaucrats' thirst for power and the arbitrary attitude that is inconsistent with democracy even during a war.

Frequently, the purpose for which the additional paper is requested in the interest of the war effort is defeated indirectly by insufferable delays and the refusal to give the basis or any reason for such actions.

They have been also very inconsistent in their policy. For instance, they denied the request of a private publisher for paper to get out a Victory garden handbook, which book was urgently supported and the request for the paper made to the War Production Board by the Department of Agriculture.

In this case, the War Production Board gave a reason. They said it was because the Government was going to publish a free book on that subject and therefore they would not allow paper for unnecessary duplication to compete with a Government publication. On the other hand, War Production Board officials refused the request of the Army for additional paper for a magazine to publish technical articles desired by the Army and again they gave the reason. They said that would compete with professional writers who might want to write on those same subjects sometime in the nebulous future.

I do not suggest that the press and book and magazine publishers be exempt from rationing if rationing be needed but I do suggest that such rationing be by law and not by bureaucratic whimsy, prejudice, and favoritism.

A new and foreign principle of law is creeping into our jurisprudence. Officials who were never elected nor passed upon by representatives of the people are delegated the power to issue orders that have the effect of law and that carry economic and even criminal penalties.

They operate with no rules, no standards, and in star-chamber proceedings issue secret orders from which, in effect, there is no appeal. Such orders, proceedings, and decisions are not subject to a check or even a review by the Congress.

There is something very sinister in this situation since no one seems to be able to fix responsibility nor to learn the identity of officials who really determine the policy and make the decisions. In the case of the Printing and Publishing Division, most of the key or front officials have changed. Most of them have resigned but the mysterious secret policy continues unaffected. What is back of all of this? Who is back of all of it? Tampering with the freedom of the press is a dangerous thing. Control of the press which would mean violation of the freedom of the press would be the prelude to the loss of all our freedoms. In the case of paper, the announced objective of paper limitation orders 240 and 244 was to reduce the paper consumption by at least 10 percent. Actually so far it appears not to have been reduced by much more than 1 percent; and in May 1943, it was reported to be actually 2.4 percent more than in May 1942. What has really happened is that the amount of paper consumed is virtually no less than it was before but a considerable shift in its use has been brought about.

The use of paper by those not favorable to nor favored by the self-perpetuating, poltically minded bureaucrats has been reduced, and paper has been increased to those who for personal reasons or through fear have surrendered their independence to the bureaucrats. The method of gaining control is apparent. It is the old method of divide and

destroy. The weaker branch of publishing—magazines and books—are being attacked first. Some 400 requests for additional paper for newspapers have been granted. The "bite" has been put on magazines and books. When they are brought under sufficient control to eliminate them as a threat to the complete control of publishing, the newspapers will then feel the heavy hand of bureaucracy.

The base period for magazines is 1942 and the base period for newspapers is 1941. This is an arbitrary rule and can and may be changed at will. For instance, the change for the base period of magazines to 1939 instead of 1942, as at present, would wipe out most, if not all, of the magazines that are not 100 percent subservient to these bureaucrats. The same thing could and might happen to newspapers. Exceptions can always be granted, and, therefore, those who are willing to play ball with the administration or who are forced to capitulate to it may be allowed to continue and even to expand. Whenever extra paper is allowed to one publisher, it has to be taken away from another. Certainly, up to the present time, the trend has clearly indicated that increased paper is not being allowed to those who oppose the administration and who do not stand in favor with the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board. I do not charge that this method of dealing with control of paper was designed for ulterior and sinister purposes, but I do charge that a perfect system has been evolved which is capable of abuses and that these abuses are almost inevitable in time.

We are getting altogether too much government by personalities and not by law as was intended by the framers of our Constitution. The opportunity for discrimination, favoritism, and retaliation by entrenched bureaucrats is altogether too apparent. The temptation to wield such powers in such manner seems irresistible. This thing has been creeping upon us so insidiously that we have hardly realized what has taken place. Sound, substantial, patriotic, fundamental Americans start out to administer these bureaus, are often forced out quietly and seldom with public notice. They are usually replaced by men without experience in their field but with preconceived social-reform programs. We are placing in their hands the chance and the opportunity to inflict their social schemes upon us without congressional authority, without even the benefit of debate and public examination. The freedom of the press is so sacred to Americans and so essential to the preservation of our liberties that I suggest that special treatment be given to this subject.

White paper for the purpose of distributing the written word is not a commodity like tin and rubber and cannot be dealt with in the same manner. I urge that the War Production Board be required to announce its standards for granting or denying appeals, that it be required to define hardships and then to publish its rules and its proceedings or at least to make them available for public examination, and that they report to the Congress all appeals for exceptions from the limitation order and all decisions made thereunder, with explanations in each case. This procedure will assure to the people of the United States that under the guise of rationing a lessened supply of paper will not be abused now nor in the future nor used to subversively gain control of the press of this country. With a free press we will always be a free people.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who is now upon the floor, permit me to say that never from the Well of this House has anything been said by me against any man or any group of men because of color, race, or creed. The gentleman complained somewhat bitterly, as he has before, because, he says, the racial issue has been raised here. I know of no one who has spoken more frequently or at greater length referring to racial questions in which people of his race are interested than has the gentleman from New York. In saying that, no criticism is made. Merely a fact is stated.

The gentleman complained, too, because the House had created so many special committees and he complained of the work of those committees in some instances. Then he complained because the committees had not taken up other lines of work, and then he complained because another special committee which he desired appointed had not been sanctioned by the House. I ask the gentleman, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think the gentleman got my point very well at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe not.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman is stretching the thing more than I actually said on the floor here. I simply said that there were a number of committees created which were good, and some of them we could have done without. That is all I said about that. I did not make any accusation against the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, I understand; the complaint was about the action of the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not make any accusation against anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman then complained about the way in which the German and the Japanese prisoners were used in this country. None of us want to coddle those prisoners, but I think most of us realize that for every German or Japanese we have here there are 10 or perhaps a hundred Americans, civilians, or prisoners of war, men who fought in the war, in the hands of our enemies, and that if we start holding down our prisoners, refusing them proper food, denying them decent treatment, the natural result will be that our people in these other lands in the hands of our enemies will suffer more severely. All should follow, in a liberal manner, the rules of the Geneva Convention. None should forget that we are human beings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; not now. I cannot. My thought is this: The thing for us to do with all of our prisoners is to treat them according to the regulations of war, or a little better, in the hope that our enemies, having our people in their hands, will some time learn that that is the proper way, the only way for civilized people to treat prisoners of war. If we want to punish anyone, we will do it after the war is over when we have those who are guilty of mistreatment of our men in our hands, where we can inflict punishment upon them and where under no circumstances will the result of any severity which we might impose on their nationals be imposed upon our men and women over there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do you think there will be any punishment of those fellows after the war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I think. I think those who violate the rules of war should be punished, but what I think or what you think or what anyone else thinks about that is all beside the point. It is the present situation that I am trying to discuss.

Now, with reference to this question of adjournment, and the things that are still before us for solution: I have noticed in the papers in the last few days where Mr. Fly of the Federal Communications Commission accused the military and naval authorities of following a course which, broadly speaking, gives aid and comfort to the enemy. That is about the substance of it. That is an unfounded and unjust charge. The charge itself makes our men in service wonder if all is well on the home front. Then we have Mr. WALLACE accusing Mr. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Secretary of Commerce, of following a course of action which hinders our ultimate success. Then again, in almost the next breath, we have Mr. Jones making a like charge against Vice President WALLACE. Then we have each of them saying that the other's charge is without foundation, as a matter of fact. What material for the enemies' propaganda machine. They do not use that brief and ugly word, but that is the meaning of it. We should insist that the truth be known. If either is guilty of one-half the charges made he should be fired or impeached. If neither is guilty there should be retraction and full explanation of any and all false statements. Is there any reason why Mr. Fly should be permitted to get away with his charge that the Army and the Navy are interfering with the war effort? Down here in the District not so long ago, some thirty-odd citizens were

indicted for sedition because it was said the things that they wrote or circulated interfered with the morale of our men. Could anything do more to discourage our men who are abroad than these contradictory statements on the part of these high ranking officials?

Then, again, we have Mr. Petrillo, the gentleman who says that no music shall be made a matter of record. We perhaps can get easily along without songs and jazz here at home, but is there any reason why our boys, who are across, should be denied listening to some of the old hymns and some of the old tunes and some of the old songs? Is there? Who is this man? Where does he come from and where does he get his authority, I ask you, that he should say that here in America there should be no more freedom of recording? No more records which in the frozen north or in the South Seas should be played to cheer our men who are so far from home.

On July 27, 1942, a bill was introduced by me which would make it an offense to interfere with the production, reproduction, transmission, and dissemination of any music through the air. Why should we not stay here and act on legislation of that kind? It would not take more than a day. We all know it should be done.

Do you know how the boys across look at it? Briefly, let me give you a part of this letter. This is from a boy from my district who is now across. He writes:

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am beginning to believe that I am indeed fortunate to be located in far-off New Guinea.

There is an optimist for you.

I am beginning to believe that I am indeed very fortunate to be located in far-off New Guinea. Over here we have only the Japs to contend with. They are our enemies, and we intend to drive them into submission.

Only the Japs. And what have we to contend with here? When we hear this letter we who complain of our hardships should hang our heads in shame.

He continues:

I am inclined to believe that this is not the case with the people in the United States. When I hear of pitched battles being fought in the streets of Detroit, one-half million miners striking, and many other acts of the same caliber, I can't help but think perhaps our fighting is being done in vain. If these so-called men are clamoring for action, as I am inclined to believe, I suggest they be given the opportunity to get into some profitable action; that is, induct them into the Army. However, if these men cannot be trusted as civilians, they certainly couldn't be trusted as soldiers.

He does not want any of them as his buddies fighting beside him. He is afraid they might not be there when he needed them.

It is impossible for me to conceive the incentive for these un-American acts, but it does seem as if our Government could do something about it. I have the highest admiration for the men and women of Congress—

I pause for applause, but I do not hear any—

and it is my sincere hope that they will not allow my opinion of them to be altered by allowing the continuation of these riotous acts. As Representative of my district in Michigan, I trust that you are doing everything possible to improve the situation.

Looking forward to a bigger and better Michigan, I remain,

Faithfully yours,

GARNER A. TOWNE.

There you have it and, of course, there are thousands of boys who think along similar lines, yet here in this administration, in the administration which calls upon Congress—and I join with the gentleman's plea for unity, and charity, and tolerance—yet here this administration which calls for unity—and under these orders thousands of men are making the supreme sacrifice—here the two top managers, the Vice President of the United States, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and Mr. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—here are these two men saying to the other: "You're a liar. What you are doing interferes with the prosecution of the war." And Fly, of the F. C. C., charges the Army and Navy with the same offense. We should stay here until the air is cleared, until we are all back of the servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are no other special orders. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But there are several other special orders.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from a publication called Jewish Comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE AND THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been following two agencies rather closely. The appropriations for these two agencies are enormous; their Administrators are popular and have captivated the imagination and deadened the scrutiny that Congress otherwise might be giving to the Government funds they are spending. The Administrators referred to are Admiral Emory S. Land and Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

Two months ago today I sent a completed questionnaire to E. R. Stettinius, Jr., asking for answers to 68 specific questions. There is nothing of particular importance about the figure 68. It covered the matter I had under surveillance at that time. I can double my questions today with the inquiries I have made of other departments.

It will be remembered that on May 21 a six-billion-plus bill was before the House for consideration. On that day I raised the issue of Mr. Stettinius' refusal to answer the questions. His excuse was that it would consume valuable manpower that he couldn't afford to give me.

This afternoon I want to discuss a few of those questions in the light of a newspaper article of yesterday released by Mr. Stettinius. The newspaper article says that valuable and strategic materials, necessary to the prosecution of the war, have been released to the Army, Navy, and private industry. Now, I do not claim that my questions, which showed that I had a knowledge of just what was happening in Lend-Lease, caused this improvement in policy, but I just want to let the House, Mr. Stettinius, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, members of the Appropriations Committee, and the House majority leader to know that my questions were not just an idle attempt to get publicity with reference to this agency. I want the House and the world to know that my inquiries of any agency are to tighten up the war effort and to settle down to the sober business of helping the men at the front to win the war. So, naturally I asked Mr. Stettinius, among my 68 questions, the following questions:

24. The fortunes of war sometimes change the advisability of sending aid to many countries for which you have made commitments for delivery. For instance, Burma, and other countries coming in a general category. How long after these countries were lost temporarily to the Axis have you held the equipment, material, supplies, and services earmarked for them?

25. What was the longest period these were held by the Lend-Lease Administration and not available to the fighting forces, and what is the shortest period?

26. When did you make arrangements to expedite in your administration the availability of materials so earmarked for countries that are fallen, to the Army, Navy, marines, etc., so that lend-lease purchased equipment would be used in the war effort even though originally intended for countries that subsequently fell?

28. Specifically, what has happened to lend-lease material purchased for Burma? How long after the fall of Burma was the reallocation made?

30. Specifically, what has happened to lend-lease material purchased for Holland? How long after the fall of Holland was the reallocation made?

31. Did your Administration attempt to bring this material into the war effort immediately following the change in circumstances from the fall of the respective countries to the Axis, or did the United States Navy?

32. On what date was the redistribution unit, if any, formed within your organization?

33. To what agency or agencies do you transfer this material allocated to fallen countries?

Today I make the further charge that as of the latest date for which I have figures, there were 7,461 carloads of lend-lease freight over 30 days old and that

these cars are unloaded or are on the rails lacking a specific consignee.

I am informed on reliable sources further:

This includes such things as automobiles, trailers, railway equipment, tin plate, iron pipe, heavy chemicals, and wire and wire rope. One of the reasons for the existence of merchandise in this condition is the change in the fortunes of war. To illustrate, the railway equipment was intended for the Burma-Munnan railway, but when the Japs conquered Burma there was little sense in shipping it to pile up on the docks in India if it could be diverted to other uses. Some of this freight has been diverted. Cases can be found where this merchandise has been lying around from 6 to 9 months, but Lend-Lease is aware of the problem and is developing a priority system and a materials redistribution committee to handle the problem. A priority system is necessary to cope with the unpredictable shipping capacity. Table IV shows the total cars on wheels in ports including current shipments and those over 30 days which have not been unloaded.

On June 18 I stated that Congress could not claim that it discharged its obligations by voting "aye" on appropriation bills. It has a further duty to see that the moneys are spent wisely and that we get a penny's worth of warfare for every penny spent. Seven thousand four hundred and sixty-one cars of lend-lease "frustrated freight" without a consignee lying around the country on rails or in warehouses is a considerable loss to the war effort.

I may say that as of the date we had lend-lease before us the majority leader promised me that I would receive the answers to my questions. Almost 2 months have elapsed and not one word from Mr. Stettinius. Apparently he does not dare answer the rest of the questions because they would show up the same kind of situation I have disclosed here in connection with these carloads of "frustrated freight."

I have made the charge before that the Lend-Lease Administration is a civilian set-up that the Army and Navy personnel have both abandoned since Pearl Harbor and if the American people knew all the facts they would want Lend-Lease Administration abandoned.

Lend-lease reports made by Stettinius presume that there is something holy about the term "lend-lease." They have educated the American people through their "halitosis of wordy releases" that the Australians could not use an American ammunition dump unless we had the lend-lease law; that the British could not use an American tank without H. R. 1776. Just as a gentle reminder, let us go back to World War No. 1, and I raise the inquiry, "How could the United States Navy mine the North Sea in 1918 before any New Deal crackpot ever thought up the name 'lend-lease'?"

This is just a sketchy and a very narrow discussion of the Lend-Lease Administration and the things that Congress ought to investigate during this recess but has refused to investigate and will not investigate because of the personal popularity of E. R. Stettinius, Jr.

Now the Maritime Commission has charge of an eleven billion plus appropriation. The personal popularity of Admiral Emory S. Land with the membership has allowed confusion to exist in the expenditure of funds.

On March 29 I quoted the Black committee report in a statement made on the floor of the House. The Black committee made its report in May of 1935. As a humble citizen in 1935, the Black committee disclosures shocked me, as they did many other citizens throughout the land. That any group of individuals in time of war would rob the Treasury because of the need for ships was just about the lowest performance that the American people had ever contemplated, and they promptly passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act provided for the requisition, charter, and insurance of ships in a positive mandate, as follows:

SEC. 902. (a) * * * But in no case shall the value of the property taken or used be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use.

The terms of the statute are positive. The war or imminence of war are the "causes necessitating the taking." One member of the Merchant Marine Committee told Mr. Land that when the 1936 act was passed, unless this provision was put into the law, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would never have become law. Land did not contradict this observation.

It seems that the public, the shipowners, and everybody understood it. Now let me show you the chronology of what has happened to the interpretation of the act since then.

On December 19, 1940, Admiral Land had this to say about when section 902 (a) became applicable. He was making a statement before the Independent Offices Subcommitttee on Appropriations on this date:

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 had a second and coequal purpose, that of providing a merchant marine which will aid in the national defense by serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of national emergency or war. Such an emergency now exists. In the field of maritime activity it was clearly declared by Congress when in July it passed legislation providing for a two-ocean Navy. (P. 440, pt. I Independent Offices Appropriations Hearings, 1942.)

Now there was not any doubt in Admiral Land's mind that an emergency existed, which brought section 902 (a) into operation when he was testifying on December 19, 1940. At a later date, however, Admiral Land seems to have acquired questions in his mind. On November 24, 1942, he wrote the Comptroller General for an opinion as to whether a date would apply and if so, what date would apply for the operation of section 902 (a). On November 28, the Comptroller General sets the date as September 8, 1939, when the act would apply, in his letter to the Maritime Commission, the pertinent portion of which I quote:

The power lawfully to requisition vessels of private owners was, by the express terms of section 902 (a), authorized to be exercised whenever the President shall proclaim that "the security of the national defense makes it advisable or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President." On September 8, 1939, the President issued the following proclamation:

"Whereas a proclamation issued by me on September 5, 1939, proclaimed the neutrality of the United States in the war now unhappily existing between certain nations; and

"Whereas this state of war imposes on the United States certain duties with respect to the proper observance, safeguarding, and enforcement of such neutrality, and the strengthening of the national defense within the limits of peacetime authorizations; and

"Whereas measures required at this time all for the exercise of only a limited number of the powers granted in a national emergency: Now therefore,

"I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do proclaim that a national emergency exists, in connection with and to the extent necessary for the proper observance, safeguarding, and enforcing of the neutrality of the United States and the strengthening of our national defense within the limits of peacetime authorizations. Specific directions and authorizations will be given from time to time for carrying out these two purposes."

This proclamation is commonly known and spoken of as the proclamation of a limited national emergency. However, it would seem that, although for some purposes and other connections the emergency might have been a limited one, only, it certainly was such a state as was contemplated by said section 902 (a) with respect to the requisitioning of vessels. (Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 1942, p. 228.)

On page 27 et seq. of the Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, Hon. FRANCIS CULKIN, of New York, was examining Admiral Land in regard to section 902 (a), as amended by the act of 1939. I quote from the hearings as follows:

Mr. CULKIN. Were you in the Commission then?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. You did not raise any constitutional question then?

Admiral LAND. No; I did not raise any constitutional question then, and do not now.

Mr. CULKIN. You just raised it.

Admiral LAND. I said there was a controversy. I have nothing to do with the controversy.

Mr. CULKIN. That is the provision of law which includes the provision that there shall be no enhancement of value by reason of an emergency?

Admiral LAND. That is true.

Mr. CULKIN. That was accepted by your Commission as law, was it not?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. And it was accepted by the operators and those seeking to construct ships?

Admiral LAND. That I do not know; they accepted the law.

Mr. CULKIN. You allow your imagination that much play, do you not?

Admiral LAND. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. They knew what was in the law?

Admiral LAND. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. You do not have any illusions about people constructing ships knowing what the law was?

Admiral LAND. None at all.

Mr. CULKIN. And they proceeded with this building program which was very highly subsidized?

Admiral LAND. Are you speaking of the case we have in front of us?

Mr. CULKIN. I am asking if that is not true.

Admiral LAND. No, sir; Waterman did not.

Mr. CULKIN. No; not this case.

Admiral LAND. I asked you; I just want to be clear.

Mr. CULKIN. I am talking about the general proposition.

Admiral LAND. You are correct.

Mr. CULKIN. This frontal attack that is being made on this section seems to be in avoidance of what the understanding was between the country and Congress and some of the members of this committee. In other words, aid to construction was presented to the country as being a necessity for national defense, was it not?

Admiral LAND. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. And these ships were to be of value in the event of national emergency without any enhancement of cost, and you read the debates in Congress on that, I assume?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes. There was no misunderstanding between some of the western groups who were too friendly to subsidize construction and your Commission as to that proposition. In other words, these ships were to be available in the national emergency without enhancement of cost; is that not true?

Admiral LAND. I think so.

Mr. CULKIN. And the country all understood that, including those who were in quasi opposition to the enactment of this law, is that not true?

Admiral LAND. I think so.

Mr. CULKIN. And there is no question about it being the law, now, is there?

Admiral LAND. No, sir; but that does not clear up the question in my mind to the slightest degree about when the law becomes effective. (Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H. O. R., December 15, 16, 17, 1942, pp. 27 and 28.)

Bear in mind we are talking to an administrator of appropriated funds to the tune of $11,226,650,000 exclusive of funds allocated to him by other agencies of the Government; a man who has been given an opinion by the Comptroller General, the agent of Congress who should be the final authority on interpretation of the fiscal problems involved in Admiral Land's job. Notwithstanding that fact, Admiral Land, in 1943, at various times has stated that there is a controversy as to when that law is applicable to his requisitioning and chartering of ships.

At page 611 of the war agencies appropriations hearings in the face of positive terms of the statute, in the face of the Comptroller General's letter, and of Congress on January 18, 1943, being questioned by members of the Independent Offices Committee of Appropriations, Admiral Land said:

We have urged using September 1939 as a base. (National war agencies appropriation bill, 1944 hearings, House of Representatives, pt. I, p. 611.)

We are in a controversy with the Comptroller General as to the time requisitioning of vessels was permitted. We felt that the emergency of September 8, 1939, being a limited emergency, did not affect the Maritime Commission in any way; but the unlimited emergency of May 1941 declared by the President did affect the Maritime Commission and brought into operation section 902 (a), which not only requires just compensation, but has the enhancement clause in it. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, House of Representatives, 1944, p. 718.)

The above statement was made 25 months after the following statement before the same Subcommittee of Appropriations. On December 19, 1940, Admiral Land said this:

Thus, in the past year, the Maritime Commission's activities have slowly been oriented toward the second of the two goals of the Merchant Marine Act, until today the Commission is engaged in an extensive national defense program and is exercising its authority over the merchant marine primarily with consideration to national defense. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1942, p. 440, pt. I.)

And bear in mind in connection with this, he said:

Such an emergency now exists. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1942, p. 440, pt. I.)

In the independent offices hearings in the spring of this year you will see reported the following colloquy between Mr. DIRKSEN and Admiral Land:

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Commission is going to determine the policy under which this program is going forward, instead of Congress, we had as well know it now.

I want to be clear whether you are going to make this policy, notwithstanding the declared intent of Congress, or whether we are going to make it, and if we are going to make it, we want the Maritime Commission to abide by it.

Admiral LAND. Surely.

* * * * *

Mr. DIRKSEN. * * * I have examined that language (sec. 902) and I find no evidence of the fact that we had embraced in that language a limited emergency. The word "limited" is not carried in the provision of the statute, I think you will agree to that.

Admiral LAND. I agree with that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. * * * There would be a very substantial difference to the taxpayers of the Nation, and there would be a very substantial difference to the Treasury of the United States, I take it, involving the amount of the appropriation and the interpretation of the words "any emergency" whether, under the authority of that act, you could have taken those five ships back from Waterman at a value—that is the statute; it does not say anything about prices; it says, "at a value which shall not be enhanced by any factor or any condition attending emergency."

* * * * *

Mr. DIRKSEN. And for that reason an effort was made to secure an amendment to section 902 at a time when we were in a state of hostilities, and when you, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, under the act of 1936, as amended by the act of August 1939, were taking existing vessels in the country at prices that should not be enhanced by the emergency.

Admiral LAND. * * * Whether it is right or wrong, we do not know, but we do not feel that section 902 had anything to do with our transaction. If we operated in error, however, we did not know it, and you will not get anything out of me on that. We had to deal with the emergency, and whether it was done rightly or wrongly, that is the way we did it. I offer no excuse whatever for it. We did not do it with any possible idea of defrauding the Government. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1944, pp. 729, 730, 732.)

Admiral Land says that he will follow the law surely, now let us see if he does. On May 15, 1943, Admiral Land appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee of Appropriations and he is now willing to take the date of September 1939 prescribed by the statute and interpreted by the Comptroller General, but he wants to add 35 percent for the taxpayers to pay in addition to the legal value described by the statute. Admiral Land said this:

There have been a great many hours spent in a great many conferences and we have urged using September 1939 as a base, and adding 35 percent to reflect the average enhancement of wholesale commodities since that date.

Then Admiral Land attempts to jump away from the September 1939 date and take the May 1941 date and he says:

Another possibility would be to take any date between September 1939 and May 1941, which, by indexes of ship costs, ship construction costs, and ship sales, might be a logical and proper date to determine these valuations.

Unless the Comptroller General stands by the law, the Treasury will be looted to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

When Admiral Land repeats there is a constitutional question concerning section 902 and related sections of the Merchant Marine Act, I must observe:

First. It is none of the Commission's business to challenge the constitutionality of that act, either in whole or in part—the Commission's duty is to enforce the law as it finds it, and leave constitutional questions to the court.

Secondly, these matters have been considered by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in connection with the Waterman Steamship Corporation case; and I am informed that Chairman BLAND, of that committee, has been advised by respective authority that there is no serious constitutional question involved; and that section 902 and its related sections of the act are constitutional in all respects.

Now let us see who the Maritime Commission is dealing with when it requisitions ships. It is dealing for the most part with a group of shipowners that bought their ships for $5 a ton or 3 percent of their construction costs and in a great majority of instances for about $10 a ton or 10 percent of their construction cost. In the meantime they received an indirect mail contract subsidy which paid them profits for making available ships for carrying mail on a mileage basis. It would be perfectly possible for a ship to get paid $15,000 to carry one or two letters to China.

The Black committee report in 1935 frowned upon the mail contracts. They were canceled. The act provided direct subsidies to encourage a merchant fleet for the United States that could be used in time of war or imminence of war as a naval auxiliary. The 1936 act provided specific subsidies to equalize American cost of construction, operation, and insurance with the low operating cost, low construction cost, low insurance cost, and other subsidies provided by competing foreign nations.

Admiral Land, when he requisitions ships, is dealing with operators who, according to the authority in public records, I find have received $280,000,000 worth of subsidies, as follows:

1. Forty-three million dollars: Operating subsidies. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1464, March 2, 1943.)

2. Eighty-five million dollars: Tax forgiveness on subsidies. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1464, March 2, 1943.)

3. One hundred and sixty million dollars: Construction subsidies. (U. S. Maritime Commission report to Congress for period ending October 25, 1941.)

It is well to bear in mind that under the law, construction subsidies were limited to 33⅓ percent except where the Commission possessed convincing evidence of a higher differential. Starting from the second contract let and without any indication of any convincing evidence possessed by the Commission, the construction subsidies have averaged from 45 percent, and most of the construction subsidies, especially in the last few years, have been a flat 50 percent, irrespective of the fact that Admiral Land has stated that no person could secure delivery of a ship in the last 3 years from any foreign nation.

Authority: Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, page 757, House Document No. 840, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

On page 713 of the independent offices hearings for 1944, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was examining Mr. Dirsch, of the Maritime Commission, and I quote from the testimony:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That covers all ships under construction?

Mr. KIRSCH. As of October 31, 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And the bulk of them are 50 percent?

Admiral LAND. They are. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 713.)

Continued looting of the Treasury for the benefit of those who are well acquainted with how to secure funds from the Maritime Commission is evidenced from a citation taken from page 756 of the independent offices appropriation hearings for 1944 which reads as follows:

Notwithstanding the fact that competition of foreign shipyards virtually ceased with the beginning of the war in Europe, the Maritime Commission continued to pay construction differentials as high as 50 percent on ships built in American yards. In some cases Italian and Danish shipyards were used in estimating foreign costs, even after Italy was in the war herself and Denmark was in the hands of Hitler. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, p. 756. A part of letter from Senator GEORGE AIKEN to Senator DAVID WALSH.)

This citation indicates that Chairman Land was authorizing the payment of 50 percent which is not mandatory, it is permitted; then he admits as follows—May 15, 1940:

The situation in Europe today is such that there could be no assurance whatever that a ship presently contracted for would be delivered to the party of the original construction contract. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 757. Portion of letter written by Admiral Land to Hon. S. O. BLAND.)

Yet several months later, on July 17, 1941, Capt. Howard L. Vickery, a member of the Maritime Commission, testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in explanation of the reason why a 50-percent subsidy was then being paid for the construction of ships in American yards, that "We had convincing evidence." (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 757. Letter from Senator AIKEN to Senator WALSH.)

The fortunes of war have brought another duty upon the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Private insurance companies will not insure the cargo during wartime at rates that are practical and so the Maritime Commission is issuing war risk insurance contracts to these same private subsidized operators. On December 24, 1942, I inquired of the Maritime Commission the amount of insurance carried on the steamship *President Coolidge* that had been reported sunk just a few days before by the daily press. I asked Admiral Land for the book value, the cost of improvements, the depreciation, and the amount of insurance.

On January 5, 1943, I received a reply from Admiral Land which to me was shocking and I assume this represents the general policy of the value of insurance contracts on subsidized ships with subsidized owners. The letter has been reprinted in the independent offices hearings for 1944 at page 721 and shows that insurance is issued for 100 percent in excess of the legal value of the ship.

With reference to this subject of values, I insert at this point in my remarks a history of the steamship *Wakefield*, formerly the *Manhattan*, and the steamship *President Coolidge*, which clearly indicates the trend of insurance by the Maritime Commission.

Steamship *Manhattan*, renamed the steamship *Wakefield*. Post office reports on mail contracts show a total construction cost of some $10,660,000. The hearings on H. R. 5130 show an estimated differential subsidy of $3,550,000, leaving an estimated cost to the owner of some $7,100,000.

I can find no evidence of improvement cost.

This vessel, based on the legal 5 percent depreciation, over a period of 10 years, left the ship with a value of some three and one-half million dollars. A suit has recently been filed in the Federal court on this value of three and one-half million dollars wherein the owners ask for $10,000,000 which apparently was the insurance coverage they carried on this ship. Strange to relate and for some unknown reason, the papers in this case have been impounded. Surely there is no military or naval secret in the fact that suit has been instituted to recover insurance. The public press brazenly publicized the loss of the ship. The only reason for impounding the papers or for secrecy is for an inside deal to rob the Treasury of $10,000,000 or thereabouts on a value of some $3,000,000.

With reference to the apparent indifference of the Comptroller General it is my understanding that only recently the Comptroller General has reported to the Congress that on five vessels sold by the United States Shipping Board in 1930 for $150,000, which ships were later reconditioned and had, as of the time they were taken over by the Maritime Commission, a value of some $5,000,000. The Maritime Commission paid some $7,000,000. It is my understanding that the Comptroller General has reported to Congress that this payment of $7,000,000 was $2,000,000 in excess of the depreciated value, $2,000,000 in excess of the book value, some $2,000,000 in excess of that value at which the ships could be taken over and yet for reasons best known to himself, the Comptroller General states that he has not asked for the return of this money which he admits was a payment of $2,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in excess of the authority which the Maritime Commission had, or has, according to his own statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am not only alarmed; I am discouraged that the Congress does not have the facilities to get a broad, comprehensive picture of the reasons for the inflated insurance contracts, the reasons for the dilly-dallying by Admiral Land over the value to be paid to shipowners for ships requisitioned and ships chartered in the face of the positive terms of the statute and the rulings by the Comptroller General. I am discouraged that the Comptroller General has not given to this Congress a comprehensive picture of the entire transactions of the Maritime Commission during this war and immediately before the war, which, to my way of thinking, is costing the taxpayers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of his rulings and what the law permits.

I do not think the public will be discriminating and blame Emory S. Land alone—I think it will look to the Congress of the United States as an aider and abetter if they are fleeced out of millions of dollars, and further than that, I think the soldiers, when they come back, will point their fingers with scorn at the Congress which permitted this kind of transaction.

I remind you again that both of these administrators, Stettinius and Land, are presently popular with the Congress, but I warn you that when expenditure of public funds are made unwisely, when there is inefficiency and waste in the conduct of the war under their administration, then and there friendship should cease in the name of the boys who are baring their breasts for the country at the sixty-odd battle fronts of the world and who will pay the cost of this war on their return.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to pursue the matter further just as much as the limited manpower at my command will permit to draft a bill of particulars that will condemn these agencies as the money wasters and tax-spenders they are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JULY 4, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, by way of prelude let me say that I have been a little distressed over the fact that the greatest holiday on the American calendar has gone unobserved in this Chamber.

Sunday was freedom's birthday.

Stout-hearted men said that we should be free.

They said it was a right.

They did something about it.

They made freedom come true.

They invoked the blessings of Divine Providence.

They pledged lives, fortunes, and honor.

There is their measure of freedom's worth.

PERSONAL STRUGGLE

Freedom became a personal issue.

Eighteen times they used the pronoun "he" in the Declaration.

They were referring to the King.

The Declaration is their remonstrance against an individual and his advisers.

THEIR GRIEVANCES SEEM FAMILIAR

Some of their grievances have a fresh and familiar ring.

He refused to approve laws to establish judicial powers.

Short days ago we sought the enactment of the Walter-Logan bill.

He has erected a multitude of offices.

Behold today's bureaucracy.

He sent swarms of officers to harass the people.

Ponder the controls of today.

They ate out the people's substance.

Behold our own revenues and expenditures.

He altered the powers of government.

What of the present effort by the Congress to restore balanced government.

There is a strange familiarity about those grievances.

WHO WERE THESE SIGNERS?

Who were the signers of freedom's charter?

They referred to themselves as representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled.

Freedom was the work of a Congress.

It points a course for this Congress and those to come.

Preservation of that freedom must be our star and compass.

NATURE OF THE DOCUMENT

What is the nature of this document of freedom?

It was a document of dissatisfaction.

The signers were dissatisfied.

The people were dissatisfied.

That dissatisfaction is the motive power of human progress.

We must proclaim our dissatisfaction where freedom is menaced.

We must do more.

It must be translated into action.

It must be directed to the objective of freedom.

A DOCUMENT OF CHANGE

It was a document of change.

One thinks of poor, foolish Gibbon, the historian.

What a great historian he was with a wealth of perspective.

Yet, but a few years before, he proclaimed that the day of upheaval and change had passed.

Yet here was the greatest of upheavals.

This, too, is a time of upheaval and change.

Change is eternal.

And every change must be in the direction of more freedom, not less.

In today's world, the virus of control threatens freedom.

In today's world the dignity and future of man is being measured in terms of governmental control.

We must not abandon freedom and democracy.

We must go back to it.

That, too, requires change.

A DOCUMENT OF YOUTH

It is a document of young men and by young men.

It embodies the courage and resolution of youth.

Jefferson penned this epic at the age of 32.

Carter was 39 and Carroll 38.

Wilson was 33 and Stone 32.

The vigorous scrawl of Hancock was that of a man at 38.

Gerry was but 38.

Consider Lynch of South Carolina at 26 and Heyward at 29.

All life was before them and those lives were forfeit.

There is the yardstick of courage.

A DOCUMENT OF COMMON MEN

The signers were common folks.

Bartlett was a doctor and Harrison a farmer.

Morton was a surveyor and Witherspoon a preacher.

Sherman was once a shoemaker and Clymer a merchant.

Franklin was a printer and Sam Adams a brewer.

Merchants, doctors, lawyers, printers, surveyors, farmers, shoemakers, ironmakers they were.

Not only representatives of the people but representative of the people.

Every Congress since that day has been of the people.

This Congress is of the people.

IT IS A POSITIVE DOCUMENT

It is a positive document.

There is no mincing or equivocation.

Strongly did they state their beliefs on freedom as a right.

Strongly did they indict the abuses of the King.

Strongly did they present their patience.

Strongly did they state what they proposed to do.

Strongly, tenaciously did they do it.

The fruit of their strength is a great land.

Deep and abiding must be our gratitude for their strength.

Strong must be our determination to preserve what they wrought.

Strong and bold must be our remonstrance against any menace to freedom.

IT CONTAINS NOTHING NEW

We are told that freedom's charter contains nothing new.

We are told that it but summarizes current thinking and writing.

We are told that its truths were uttered long before by Locke and Rousseau, by Hobbes and Spinoza, by Dickinson and Otis.

What a fortunate circumstance.

It but proves that freedom is no new invention or new contrivance.

It is as old as the yearnings and strivings of mankind.

It needed but reaffirmation and the courage to make it real.

That somewhat lightens the task for today.

We need but redeclare an ancient truth, unwithered by age and untarnished by time.

But it requires some courage and it requires some determination.

FREEDOM IS IN ISSUE TODAY

Freedom is in issue today.

It is freedom under law versus freedom under administrative fiat.

It is freedom under law versus freedom under unchecked, uncontrolled, unbalanced government.

It is freedom of man in all his divine dignity versus that kind of synthetic freedom that is planned by those who embrace the collective philosophy.

They did something about freedom long ago. They did it in Congress.

What do we propose to do about it?

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak any more today, but I do want to call the attention of this House and the Congress to what I said this afternoon. Our boys are dying from hunger and are subjected to slavery and to disease in the camps of Germany and Japan. We are taking their men in safe convoys from the European countries, bringing them here and curing them of disease. We are giving them proper food and nourishment; then we send them out in the country to a camp where they play ball and see movies. My colleague from Michigan stated a little while ago in answer to my speech this afternoon that we ought to treat them fine, in fact treat them better. How can we reconcile the treatment of the American captured soldiers with the men that we have brought here from the European countries, whom we have treated so royally? In fact, as I said, they can play baseball, they can see moving pictures, and do what they like. I am told also they do a little farming and we even pay them for that. I think it is about 75 cents or a dollar a day. By the time we get through exchanging soldiers, as pointed out, we will have nothing to our credit at all.

There has been testimony before my committee in executive session to the effect that some of our civilian Americans were captured by the Japanese and were hungry for days. Some courageous Chinese people had to smuggle in food to feed the American civilians who were held as prisoners by Japan. If we are treating these aliens, these enemies of ours, so well, we ought to try to make an exchange before it is too late.

It was not my purpose to discuss these questions. They are unpleasant. The fact of the matter is the American people ought to know the great expense we are put to in bringing these prisoners of war in here, giving them everything they ask for, including safe convoy, while our boys are dying from disease and hunger. Something ought to be done, whether it is through the Red Cross or some other channel in order to make this exchange at the earliest possible moment while we will have soldiers to exchange.

I want to point out to this House also something in answer to a criticism by my colleague from Michigan. He probably did it in good faith. I said that we now have a group of enemy aliens held at Ellis Island, which is one of our seaports, and these aliens have been there more than a year. Ellis Island has good grounds, good fresh air, and is surrounded by water. If there are enemy aliens there we ought to separate them and put them where they belong—that is, in some

concentration camp—so they do not contaminate the other prisoners who are aliens and were brought in there under the mere suspicion of being enemy aliens. We ought to be able to segregate the good and bad aliens and put them where they belong. In order to keep the American people safe we ought to take these enemy aliens and isolate them and at the same time we should protect those other aliens who are in this country and who are ready to fight and die for this country if given an opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Colonel Carey, a distinguished engineer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the speech I made earlier in the afternoon I may have permission to insert therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE TIMOTHY T. ANSBERRY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the passing of Hon. Timothy T. Ansberry, former Member of this body.

Mr. Ansberry served in the Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and Sixty-third Congresses. He was born in Defiance, Ohio, on December 24, 1871, was graduated from Notre Dame University in June 1893, and he represented the Fifth District of Ohio, the district I have the honor to represent. He was a militant, old-fashioned Democrat.

The death of Timothy T. Ansberry, Member of the House from the Fifth Ohio District from 1907 to 1915, in Doctors Hospital in New York City was announced last night by his son, T. Peter Ansberry. He made his home at 2139 Wyoming Avenue NW.

The son said Mr. Ansberry died of a heart condition that followed an operation. Mr. Ansberry, a Democrat, was a member of the Ways and Means Committee while in Congress.

He had been in retirement for some time, but for several years had practiced law in Washington, with offices at 1029 Vermont Avenue NW.

Mr. Ansberry was born in Defiance, Ohio, where he was educated in the public schools, and received a law degree from Notre Dame University in 1893. He began the practice of law that year and was justice of the peace from 1893 to 1895 and was prosecuting attorney of Defiance County from 1895 to 1903.

Mr. Ansberry resigned from the House to accept an associate judgeship of the Ohio Court of Appeals, but resigned from that post in 1916 to move back to Washington.

He was a Presidential elector from Ohio in 1916 and a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1920, 1924, and 1928.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House reassembles.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5:58 o'clock p. m.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JULY 6, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs.

E. C. GATHINGS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 113 and 119 to the foregoing bill.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would not consent to the joint resolution being sent to conference, but I would be willing to accede to the gentleman's request if he will modify it by asking that we take the joint resolution from the table and consider the Senate amendments at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 292), as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 147, with Senate amendments thereto, be and the same hereby is taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the conference requested by the Senate agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the resolution adopted by the Senate is to strike from the resolution a provision amending the Federal Reserve Act. The second amendment relates to the matter of grade labeling, which seems to have been acceptable to everybody in the Senate and officials of the Government who are especially interested. That leaves before us one other amendment of the Senate which I will read to the House in order that the matter may be fully understood. This is the language of that amendment:

Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price

Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation or from any funds authorized to be borrowed by such Corporation or any other Government agency including Government-owned corporations, unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Members of the House, after the reading of this amendment, will understand its meaning. Members are familiar with the recent message of the Chief Executive dealing with the recent proposal to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is felt by the conferees who represented the House in the conference on the other bill that this measure should be sent to conference in order that we may be given an opportunity to work out some solution of the problem in controversy.

Let me say that the amendment to this resolution was adopted on the floor of the Senate under very unusual circumstances. It makes no provision for carrying out obligations that have been made and that have accrued down to this time in connection with the administration of this particular phase of the Price Control Act. The conferees, I am sure, will undertake in good faith to work out some solution of this problem that will meet the views of the House if the bill is sent to conference.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have a not unusual situation before us. I know that it is tiresome to talk about this subsidy program any more. The issues are pretty clear. I do not think there is anyone in the House who is any more opposed to the payment of subsidies than I. I do think, however, that the orderly procedure is to send this bill to conference. I say that for several reasons. If we were to accept immediately the Senate version of this bill, in the face of the dispute which has been going on here for weeks about it, we would be charged with acting not finally on the measure, but we would be charged with acting upon the measure without giving due consideration to the language of the Senate bill. There are very few of us who know what the Senate has provided for in the bill, but it does seem to me that the language in the Senate bill is much more rigid than the language in the bill which the President has vetoed.

I think we should have an opportunity to study this out in conference and to report back to this House the result of the conference which we will have on the question and have at least 1 hour of debate on whether the House should accept the Senate language or any modification of it which we agree upon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would not the gentleman be willing for this to go over until tomorrow morning, so that the Members of the House might have an opportunity in the meantime to study the Senate amendments?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman that I do not have any jurisdiction over the matter before the House tonight, which is whether we will suspend the rules and send the bill to conference. I do not think I would be in favor of the gentleman's suggestion, for this reason: We are anxious to recess this House when these controversial matters are out of the way. If we send this bill to conference tonight, as it is hoped we will, we will then be able to work on this either tonight or tomorrow morning and report this matter back to the House and save at least 1 full day. If we do not send this bill to conference tonight, if we send it to conference tomorrow, then the gentleman knows much better than I do that under the rules of the House we cannot take it up until the following day. So I think the proper thing to do is to send this bill to conference now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would not a half day be a small matter when so vital a national interest is concerned? The Members have not had opportunity to see the amendment. We are asked to vote in a very arbitrary way on suspension of the rules, a very unusual procedure on a matter we have had no opportunity to study.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. It is a procedure which we have adopted, and it is not nearly as stringent and arbitrary as the gentleman's procedure, which would compel us to accept or vote down immediately the Senate amendments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I understand that in voting on this motion we do not either vote for or against, or commit ourselves for or against, subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is merely to send the bill to conference to try to work out something to adjust the matter?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct, and we will save at least 1 full day.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We understand if this is sent to conference the conferees will begin to work immediately upon the things contained in these amendments, and come back and report as quickly as they can?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct. If we do not send it to conference tonight it will be impossible to take it up, under the rules of the House, until the following day.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GAMBLE.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the war agencies appropriation bill and the last deficiency bill will have a report ready early in the morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL AND SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the war agencies appropriation bill and the second deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TROUTMAN (at the request of Mr. SCOTT), indefinitely, on account of death of father.

To Mr. MALONEY, for the balance of the week, on account of urgent business reasons.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relat-

ing to water conservation and utilization projects.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 7, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, July 7, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

556. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by this Department during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

557. A letter from the Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting information concerning their personnel for the ensuing quarter, as required by Circular No. 421 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, to investigate the Federal road system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 3140. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus lands and buildings, and fixtures and facilities appurtenant thereto, and surplus war plants, owned by the United States and by corporations owned or controlled by the United States, which were acquired or constructed for use in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3141. A bill relating to the appointment and retirement in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 3142. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3143. A bill to restore one of the "four freedoms," the freedom of expression; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3144. A bill to incorporate the World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3145. A bill authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 3146. A bill to provide for a temporary diversion by the Sanitary District of Chicago of an additional amount of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed in order to protect the health of war workers, members of the armed forces, and other persons living in and near Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3147. A bill to authorize the equitable adjustment of the wages and salaries of employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3148. A bill authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R 3149. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3150. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3151. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from Francisco A. Reyes, President of San Salvador, presenting to the people and Government of the United States sincere congratulations on the occasion of the glorious anniversary of its political emancipation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3154. A bill granting a pension to Fred W. Cron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Mary Magdaline Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3156. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Anton Seles; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of P. B. Hume; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 3159. A bill granting an increase of pension to Malinda J. Conwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1936. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1937. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Conference of Mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, thirty-fifth annual conference, urging the abolition of the policy of discrimination against urban streets and highways in the distribution of Federal highway revenues and substitute therefor a fair and just system of allocating highway revenues based upon actual traffic needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1938. By Mr. KENNEDY: Resolution of the Conference of Mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, thirty-fifth annual conference, urging the abolition of the policy of discrimination against urban streets and highways in the distribution of Federal highway revenues and substitute therefore a fair and just system of allocating highway revenues based upon actual traffic needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1939. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of 78 residents of Toledo, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1940. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Ralph Suter and 34 citizens of South English, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 20 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. Also, petition of Menno D. Rempel and 13 citizens of Coquille, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. Also, petition of G. J. Eckermann and 21 citizens of Pueblo, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. Also, petition of Mrs. D. W. Cowles and 20 citizens of Orwell, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1945. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Torsberg and 40 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1946. Also, petition of Priscilla E. Faries and 61 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1947. Also, petition of Laura Shifler and 68 citizens of Boonsboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1948. Also, petition of W. W. Fridy and 39 citizens of Lyman, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1949. Also, petition of Faye R. Troth and 96 citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1950. Also, petition of L. A. Engler and 149 citizens of Puyallup, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1951. Also, petition of F. L. Duncan and 117 citizens of Flat Rock, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1952. Also, petition of 11 citizens of Winnetka, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1953. Also, petition of Lois B. Hedges and 64 citizens of Spring Valley, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1954. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Royal Jones and 339 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1955. Also, petition of Ruth E. Stahn and 103 citizens of Ketchikan, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1956. Also, petition of Julia M. Martin and 65 citizens of Snohomish, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1957. Also, petition of Pearl A. Lewis and 20 citizens of Ashville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1958. Also, petition of Mrs. Gaynell Protts and 76 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1959. Also, petition of Byron E. Horn and 137 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1960. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of 430 citizens of Pike, Highland, and Scioto Counties, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1961. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mrs. C. B. Penland, of Sulphur Springs, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1962. Also, petition of J. A. Pearce, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1963. Also, petition of Mrs. Wellington Robbins, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1964. Also, petition of Rev. J. W. Hendrickson, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1965. Also, petition of Mrs. W. R. Stapleton, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, b Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1966. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, regarding social security and old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.